When Extended Urbanisation Becomes Extensive Urbanisation

LENDING A HAND

In his elaboration of extended urbanisation, Henri Lefebvre sought, with some precision, to grasp how urban processes replicated themselves across various landscapes and historical and socio-economic situations. The conceptual conundrum was to identify how such processes entail a coherent series of manoeuvres and logics without reifying the intensely malleable, shapeshifting ways urbanisation functions to articulate and inter-calibrate divergent trajectories of spatial production. The conundrum is how to point to specific ramifications of relational density—the tying together and coordination of accumulation, resource distribution, political regulation, population movement, and territorial development—without necessarily fixing these ramifications to predetermined conceptual frameworks of exposition. It means allowing the unanticipated implications of urbanisation to feed forward into new understandings.[1]

Urbanisation not only becomes more extensive as an ongoing, increasingly dominant process of spatial production and realignment with a coherent set of constitutive dynamics but also *extends* itself into a wider multiplicity of situations and histories.[2] It offers a particular working-out of dilemmas, tipping points, and conjunctures faced by settlements. This working-out entails various equations of subsumption, adaptation, erasure, remaking, conciliation, and improvisation. Urbanisation is something that not only spreads out as a function of its own internal operations but is something contributed to through an intensely differentiated process of encounter, enabling it to change gears and operate through a wider range of appearances and instantiations. If urbanisation is extensive, it is not only in the sense that it covers more ground or becomes an increasingly hegemonic modality of spatial and social production but that it also "shows up" as a key facet in the vernaculars, institutional operations, and sectors not previously considered urban.

To be extensive is not only to impose or replicate, but also to extend, as in the sense

of extending a hand and offering something to the functionality of places, bodies, and systems. Extended urbanisation, then, not only signals the progressive unfolding of urbanisation as a set of discrete processes but as a modality of extension, a means through which the operations of multiple systems and actors extend themselves to and through a world as a means to make themselves known as well as to endure.[3]

Extensivity is far from being simply virtuous or destructive. It is a process that continually repositions what exists in a particular place, at times dissipating the sense of boundedness that permits particular forms of self-recognition and, at other times, hardening boundaries as a defensive, immunological manoeuvre against the disturbances ushered in by a larger world of relevant connectivity.[4] The sufficiency of any place or territory relies upon metabolic functioning—i.e., inputs, flows, and regulations of materials and the generation of infrastructures of coordination and interoperability. As these are situated within the larger surroundings to which they are variously articulated, the compositions and character of connectivity play a decisive role in how a place maintains itself as a specific entity, a particular moment of "throwntogetherness."[5] For whom does a particular set of circumstances matter, and to what degree? How far do particular events and outcomes exert a particular impact? How does the thickening of such events and outcomes take place, and from where do they draw force and efficacy? These are fundamental questions informing the particular manners that become extensive ways of offering particular mechanisms for problem-solving.

The degree of urbanisation is not a matter of how particular instances conform or deviate from some kind of overarching normative functioning, but rather how the urban "shows up" in any specific instance of observation; that it is something potentially present in any place. The conceptual challenge, then, is not to decide upon whether something is urban or not, but rather to dynamically account for its oscillating appearances over time. In other words, any place

is articulated to something that exceeds its normative frames of recognition—its boundedness, categorisation, or sense of internal coherence. Even the most seemingly cut-off places derive their relative isolation or detachment from an engineered history of relations that act to maintain that detachment. Thus, what might be considered "rural" is partly a by-product of densities elsewhere, a hinterland perhaps on the surface, marginal to the operations of big city machines yet nevertheless possible because of them.

Relations are always materialised. They are not simply abstract, mediating frameworks but concrete objects. Relations are concretised, not as the interaction of definitive physical forms of life. Rather, they are concretised via the specific media in which they take place, the destination of the transmitted information, the name in which any messaging is enunciated, the content of that which is transmitted, and its particular procedural codification.[6] In other words, the process of *extending*—the very acts of touching, engaging, intersecting, inserting, and resonating—is the materialisation of the relation, the articulation of one place, one operation, and one functioning to another at the heart of urbanisation processes.

This chapter is largely descriptive, touching on the various modes of extending. Extending is not simply a matter of urbanisation overspilling its familiar forms or reaching out into various hinterlands. Extending also entails the expansion of the value form of the experience of residing and operating in urban contexts. It entails the extension of time from unilateral trajectories of past, present, and future into temporal experiences that thoroughly entangle these designations into a complex weaving of cycles, ruptures, continuities, and inversions. The objective of this chapter is to address the multiplicity of these extending processes as a means to better grasp the extensiveness of contemporary urbanisation.

TERRITORIES OF EXPERIENCE

The extending of relationality, so crucial to extended urbanisation, is continuously increased through various forms of calculation. Determinations of *who can do what, with whom, under what circumstances,* and what can be produced from these efforts are increasingly subject to a form of *relationship-making* taken over by integrated systems that convert experiences of all kinds into *interoperable data.* That is data that can be compared across different kinds of locations, bodies, protocols, and operations.[7]

The expansion of capital depends upon not only the colonising of specific resources located in particular places and the subsequent captivation of populations as labour for the extraction of those resources but also the colonisation of multiple operations of organisation and cognition as well. Value formation is not simply anchored in maximised access to cheap resources and labour but in forms of spatial production that entails not only the consolidation of territory but the proliferation of territories of experience as well.

These territories of experience entail the creation of experience as a commodity, as something bearing particular symbolic values. Urbanisation not only reflects the expansion of industrial production and consumption but also the increasing differentiation of space through the production of experience itself, in part made possible through the colonisation of the sensibilities and bodies of diverse peoples. Urbanisation reflects both a reaching outwards into a larger world and an intensive differentiation in the very character of a "locality"— its punctuation according to a more extensive grammar of experience and conceptualisation. In this way, the clear differentiation between a local and a global becomes blurred.

On the one hand, newly built environments are conceptualised and curated as promising the capacity to hold all kinds of experiences. Drawing on the notion of "recentration" posited some decades ago by Sassen, an urban core is expected to facilitate a wide range of synergies across sectors.[8] Rather than being siloed as discrete functions, experiential territories are imagined as an arena of continuous recalibration and mutual shaping that is supposed to reorient existing systems of valuation. As part of the general shift of surplus value away from labour to the production of "lifetimes,"[9] the loosely demarcated terrain of non-stop experience becomes a critical mode not only of commodification, but of the very ambiguation of what constitutes an "economic object." The access to "experience" and the always shifting, uncertain measures of its worth and substance, addressed largely through the ability to prolong and widen it, becomes an overarching priority.[10]

On the other hand, large swathes of urban regions are intensely segregated and particularised according to narrowly drawn backgrounds, interests, and capacities. For example, the popular practices of cosmopolitanism that had once characterised the everyday lives of working-class districts have become increasingly unaffordable. Access to experience becomes increasingly curtailed for many residents, thus instituting new kinds of divides and inequities that exceed income. The capacity to have relations, and thus experience, is something subjected to shifting criteria of eligibility, as well as something to be costed and worth the accrual of debt.

The politics of relation-making through data also becomes a critical facet of capitalist-practised urbanisation. Urban spaces may seem replete with standardised built environments and highly formatted management technologies and systems. Yet, their apparent homogeneity requires the work of many apparatuses, organisations, and actors capable of calibrating the volatilities of financial architecture with the specificities of a particular context.[11] Whatever the built environment may look like, its viability depends on the cultivation of mutable social entities capable of communicating new needs, desires, and practices that *continuously* remake what it means to "inhabit" the spaces being *redeveloped.*

The proliferation of relationality and territories of experience, while tying things

down to particular formats of mutual causation and implication, also induces increased levels of uncertainty as to what particular facets of things are worth paying attention to. It becomes increasingly difficult to bind particular fields of relevance about what factors are important to attend to and what variables are actually at work constituting the disposition of any particular situation.[12] In a situation where everything is potentially relevant to consider and, yet, where decisions must be made and actions undertaken, ensuing events are much less subject to probabilistic calculations among already-weighted variables than they are to forms of pre-emption. For instance, anticipating contingency and instability and then folding that expectation into the very operations of production.[13]

Here, the question is, how do you hedge against the risks generated by exponential increases in the factors considered relevant to productivity and profitability? It is something that requires a way of visualising and calculating how behaviours, events, personal conditions, capacities, and inclinations exert particular effects—in various combinations of variables without the certainty of knowing which combination will be actualised on any given occasion.[14] Generating the multiplicity of such hedges, of such visualisations of the various interactive forces of an increasing number of variables, thus, drives the expansive production of interoperable data and a deep relationality.[15]

If continuous experience and its subsequent territorialisation, as in some instances the erasure and, in others, the hardening of boundaries, becomes increasingly important as the locus of value production, the very trajectories of "development" themselves must be reconsidered. As such, the future is not so much suggested by the present as something imbued within the very existence of any actual situation. Whereas urban development and expansionism remain driven by the attempt to maximise ground rent, as "land" itself becomes something more "social," in the sense of a continuously reconfigured terrain of effects, desires, propensity, and cognition; value is increasingly located

by securing the position to shape contingent future eventualities. Whereas risk management is centred on simultaneously hedging on and against particular unstable scenarios—through instruments such as collateralised debt swaps—the primary purveyors of urban development are increasingly seeking to manage a capacity to give rise to eventualities, no matter what shape or behaviour they might assume.

As such, urban infrastructural development not only constitutes a guess on where the city is "going," it also elicits the possibility of being part of a cascading and lateral chain of tropes, hedges, and realignments not necessarily imprinted with the weight of particular causations or history. It attempts to instigate a temporality "set loose" from calculation—a process of associating place, people, institutions, finance, and politics that ramifies in unanticipated ways. This indifference to an outcome, as the means to make use of any outcome, is, in turn, indifferent to its impact on the majority of urban inhabitants. Yet, speculation only skirts devolving into chaos because it depends on the fraught and increasingly vulnerable everyday efforts, ethical work, cooperation, devices, and experiments of the majority who "keep things together" but do not recognise themselves in any specific form or set of rights.[16]

THE PLURALITY OF TEMPORALITIES

RUNNING OUT OF TIME

When too many variables are potentially relevant to the success or failure of an initiative, and when computing speed and capacity simply generate additional uncertainty over what constitutes a fortuitous disposition, uncertainty itself becomes valorised as a critical resource.[17] With this, then, is an instigation of a temporality set loose from calculation, something that encompasses and exceeds speculation. Such temporality not only operates within the rubrics of the financialisation of risk as a means of hedging a multiplicity of probable futures for how a particular infrastructure will operate and

the value it will have. This instigation also aims to posit infrastructure as *detached from reason* within a scenario that cannot be fully calculated now and which imbues it with adaptability to futures where no matter what happens, there is the possibility of recouping something that cannot be specified.

If, as Luciana Parisi points out, a programmatic calculation is not simply the execution of instructions but a machine ecology thoroughly infected with randomness, then digital infrastructures potentiate "unapprehendable" scenarios not easily subsumed to the dictates of techno-capitalism.[18] As soon as actualities come together, as soon as supposedly discrete events and objects feel each other out, are placed in some kind of relationship with each other, and are assessed in terms of their impact on each other or their respective genealogies of appearance, no matter how prescriptive or limiting their interactions might be, they always suggest a potential of what might have taken place, of non-denumerable dispositions. The compositions of gatherings, the particular ways they unfold, who can do what with whom, when, and how, are critical for how a worldly sensibility embodied within larger deployments of environmental sensing is rendered for a specific human endurance and of making the world appear to us in ways that open up multiple spaces for its reshaping.

This notion of worldly sensibility can be contrasted with the standardisation of time. Much has been written about the homogeneous character of time in a globalised world where every space appears accessible to scrutiny, where somewhere, trading floors are always open, and spatial products seem to adopt similar forms and modes of operation.[19] There is the well-worn image of the businessperson constantly in motion whose life plays out in a series of cities where airports, hotels, restaurants, conference centres, upscale residential communities, and leisure zones all look the same. Simply from the look of things, she would never know where she is located on any given occasion.

The disjointed circadian rhythms of the incessant traveller are the primary means through which she recognises the difference among her locations, evened out by the affective flatlines of pharmaceutical interventions. Within a universe of non-stop transactions, differentiations between night and day, work and play, friendship and commerce are frequently blurred, as are the objectives of social interchange. While instrumentality may prevail as the predominant modus operandi of action, it is often unclear for what purpose it is deployed. Certainly, self-aggrandisement may be an instrumental goal, but the *self* to be *aggrandised* becomes an increasingly elusive and vague entity, partially reflected by the incapacity of people to be alone and detached from their mediums of connectivity. Again, we find an urban resident who is permanently "activated," always needing new experiences and relationships.

As indicated earlier, the nearly decimated publicity of urban life gives rise to intensely divided and segregated cities. The "public city"—with its commitment to an equitable distribution of affordances, even when acknowledged as a nearly impossible goal—sought to imbue urban existence with a common orientation, a shared knowledge among different walks of life, where each person participated in a relationship that superseded those differences and anchored them in relevant, resourceful, and mutual interactions.[20] Now, throughout most of the urban world, residents view themselves as residing in divergent zones that have little to do with each other, even when it is structurally possible to chart out the interdependencies. Even as the rationales of urban administration fluctuate between more spatially encompassing territories of coordination and decentralising competencies and municipal power, the coherence of the city as a felt object and a locus of shared existence across a demarcated territory has largely dissipated. The commonality increasingly depends upon the trappings of large symbolic manoeuvres—megaevents, sports teams, or nationalistic invocations.

Institutions of any kind find it increasingly challenging to suture together the different spaces and times of urban residents. In some cities, shared religious identification might produce a

strong sense of commonality, like the mega-churches in Lagos, even as they intensely compete with each other or, more typically, generate thousands of small units. Micro-territories become sites of intense competition over loyalties and trading opportunities. The wealthy and middle-class retreat to highly secured zones set apart from the unruly fabric of the "old city" as the poor find limited security in their own highly defended zones, often impervious to any official policing. Ironically, the semblance of what we might recognise as community life is increasingly the by-product of a situation where particular territories are "hemmed" in by insalubrious environmental conditions and poor transport infrastructure. They become the accidental pockets of continuity in a setting that has undergone a substantial spatial transformation.

As the working classes and the poor are pushed further into the periphery of urban regions or entrench themselves in areas of the urban core otherwise too expensive or complicated for upscaling development, their role as a hinge of connectivity—i.e., their provision of affordable inputs and services for residents across a city—also diminishes. So does the heterogeneity of time that the "majority districts" embodied, with their variegated rhythms of production, provision of services around the clock, the ebbs and flows of publicly enacted making, marketing, playing, socialising, worshipping, fighting, and deliberating. But this diminution is not a unilateral trend.

Many facets of life that have historically characterised "majority districts" continue to endure, albeit with the need to spend more time trying to sort out daily routines that ask too much from too many. These districts may be replete with intensely differentiated household compositions, entrepreneurial networks that hold too many one-room operations, or too many workers looking out for each other. Eating, sleeping, working, and deciding may increasingly occur in entangled spaces with no clear identities, which are sometimes fought over by clear sides. Residents may have to consider too many variables, watch out for too many potential interferences, and spend too much time avoiding

or resolving conflicts. They are constantly doing something but may be increasingly unsure about its meaning and value. Still, these districts provide the semblance of stability and seemingly inexhaustible resourcefulness. But time is less a backdrop here than something that has to be continuously reinvested. Endurance seems overly leveraged rather than a clear consolidation of discernible assets. Yet, it generates a life that cannot be considered precarious even when it affixes itself to sentiments and expectations that would seem to induce precarity.

As more residents are pushed out or voluntarily locate themselves at the physical peripheries of cities, time is increasingly measured in terms of commuting and traffic. In Mexico City and Jakarta, four hours is the average daily commute time. For families, maintaining a sense of household cohesion is measured in terms of small affective attainments,[21] e.g., the ability of a mother to return home in time to say bedtime prayers with her children. In Delhi's many poor neighbourhoods, male breadwinners are home only on weekends because available work is so far away, leaving the domestic management, as well as the maintenance of the district itself, to women. This is work that is not recognised by the men, who, when they return on the weekends, tend to act as if they are the ones in charge. There simply is not sufficient time to curate the once intensely textured social fabric that intertwined diverse lives with each other.

THE COMPLICITY AND
  INTERDEPENDENCY OF
    TEMPORALITIES

The heterogeneity of time is less a collective composition within specific places than a matter of highly stylised individual itineraries moving across urban spaces in the pursuit of better opportunities and resources. As the embodiment of a public enunciation of commonality, people in particular places being enjoined to a larger orbit of belonging, the state often seems to no longer have the legal, political, or financial means to produce a sense of belonging. If residents piece together a shared sense of identity with a city or region, it is increasingly

because of their navigation of it through continuous circulation.

For urban youth in the global South, particularly, the ability to circulate becomes an overarching value.[22] Even though short-term employment contracts are the norm, and even though the belief that once one attains a job, it should be held onto at all costs, youth in cities such as Jakarta, Abidjan, and Hyderabad normally change jobs every couple of months, using an infrastructure of cheap boarding houses and rooms for rent to expand their orbits across wider swathes of the urban region. A more extensive circulation of individuals in search of better opportunities then, itself, constitutes an income opportunity for residents to convert space in their homes into short-term rentals. Particular places then exude an atmosphere of transiency, of people coming and going, which may destabilise local solidarities but also provide a medium of connections to the larger surroundings.

If the simultaneous erasure of time's heterogeneity and its particularisation through intensified spatial division appears to be an essential characteristic of contemporary urbanisation, the extension of urbanisation also underlines the simultaneous existence of many temporalities. Here, different ways of doing things, transacting, buying and selling, making and distributing, deliberating and deciding are *extended* to each other. Rather than a multiplicity of times being subsumed into a standardised version across much of the south, discrepant temporalities tend to coexist, even if the terms of coexistence tend to disallow the capacity of any one of them to posit their own trajectories of implication.

The time of bazaar, the festival, the factory, the neighbourhood, the coordinates of modernity, the time of extended family and kinship relations, the time of religious devotion, the time of diurnal and nocturnal markets, the time of administrative bureaucracies all coexist, not as individual tracts, not as the rhythms of autonomous worlds, but as pressure points that avail any operation to the exigencies and operational practices of the other. In a world of logistics,

just-in-time production, and constantly recalibrated commodity chains, the bazaar—that multifaceted commercial system that integrated individual merchants and trades, that provided credit to those unable to access formal banking mechanisms, that mobilised political sentiment, that charted out specific geographies of articulation, that shifted resources across various kinds of social, geographic, and religious ties, that established the price of things based on considerations that far exceeded those of supply and demand, and that shaped the structure and settlement of built environments that continue to thrive. It thrives not on the basis of what it was and the implications of its own logics and operations but because those very logics and operations offer a resource to so-called modern economies and to advanced logistical operations when those economies and operations run into difficulty when they confront choke points or blockage.

The implicit design of urban economies elaborates on semi-permeable interfaces amongst varying temporalities. There is just enough of a solid, definitive boundary to enable the ongoing recognition of a specific time's coherence, but it is a porous boundary that can be "reverse engineered" into incorporating or adhering to discrepant times when needed.

In this instance, extensive urbanisation is not the unfolding of a single temporal format or the imposition of a standardised time—although there may indeed be elements of each—but rather the *extending* of diverse temporalities towards each other. Here is an urbanisation of temporality itself, a process of switching back and forth, changing temporal gears, accelerating, slowing down, and diversifying the rhythms of enactment so as to complexify the sensory field of urban life. This process engenders a broader range of implications and behavioural possibilities and, as such, modalities of valuation.

Capital works here less as the subsumption of life to the dictates of exchange and the financialisation of risk[23] than it does as the proliferation of times, caught in a compulsive dance, availing themselves to each other.

The implications of this availing are not always clear or measurable; it is not always clear what these times do for each other. In the case of the bazaar, it is evident that as the once predominant mode of the urban economy from Bombay to Tehran to Lagos to Cairo, it can no longer exist within its own terms. The bazaar must reinvent itself in other ways, such as participating in currency arbitrage or real estate investment to leverage the capital necessary to refund its own defining logics and recuperate from the loss of some of its functions to different "modern" institutions. At the same time, modern economies must turn to the bazaar as the most effective means of circumventing their own constraining regulations or excessive competition.

Not dissimilar, a fundamental consequence of the media is to not just simply link causes and effects, related circumstances and behaviours or connected causal processes and cultural practices. Instead, it is to constitute such distinctions for the collective that rely on such media to condition, stabilise, or transform what is understood to be a causal process versus a cultural practice, to draw a line between cause and effect or a circumstance and behaviour (and so forth). As Paul Kockelman points out: "Information is something that has been deeply transformed by particular modalities of science, technology, and economy such that the values in question seem to have become radically portable: not so much independent of context, as dependent on contexts which have been engineered so as to be relatively ubiquitous, and hence ostensibly and erroneously 'context-free'; not so much able to accommodate all contents but rather able to assimilate all contents to its media logics, and hence, ostensibly and erroneously 'open contexts'."[24]

Here, the experience of enclosure is not defined by a set of stable, unequivocal boundaries, but rather by its sheer open-ended nature, its capacity to make almost anything that exists, in the end, be about itself.

AMBIGUOUS BOUNDARIES

Still, the enfolding of space and populations by and through urbanisation processes generates a wide range of unanticipated outcomes, such as resistance, the diminution of social capital, waste, loss of productivity, and alienation. These are compensated through the resuscitation of something of a time already past. While the capacities of those resuscitated times may simply be reified as components or appendages of some overarching logic of capital accumulation, their endurance does signal the possibility of unanticipated apertures. While boundary lines may be constituted and policed to ensure a particular osmosis among different worlds and times, there is something about the very act of inscribing boundaries that potentially disrupts the very function they were intended to serve.

So, despite the ambition of scaling the urban in terms of the calculations of economy, there remain spaces of uncertainty that available symbolic and semiotic manoeuvres cannot suture. In part, the technologies of division and boundary-making required for the reflexive consideration of relations—i.e., the ability to trace the individuality of components and their interactions with each other—derive from a calculated blindness. If the urban is not so much a particular kind of space or time but rather a field through which both space and time can be differentiated simultaneously in all kinds of ways, then the urban is *indifferent* to any particular formation or content at any given moment. If this is the case, then our ability to consider specific spaces, people, and events that take place within the urban environment depends on being blind to this indifference.

Urbanity then operates on itself in and through these spaces of contingency. It is in the interstices between emerging constructs and whatever is withheld from the realisation that the urban works out its rhythms, narrative tendencies, and relational dynamics. Here, the idea that they *might have been actualised* haunts whatever is brought to life. This "might have been" is always there, always proximate, as some form of a "future past" that is to come but already operates in the present.

The implantation of the axioms of capital within specific contexts requires their transla-

tion into the local vernaculars of how things are done. Faced with the problematic disjunctions precipitated by the confrontation with capital, vernacular methods of doing things must find ways to individuate themselves within these axioms. If this is the case, the generalisability and singularity of urban formations can be narrated, but not without causing a particular spatio-temporal collapse. The resultant relations are not just integration, subsumption, or fragmentation. Something else happens through a complex mirroring process, a series of parallax recursions and gazes that add ambiguity to the differentiating inscription—i.e., is it local or global, here or there, them or us? It becomes difficult to determine *what time it is.* Is it the continuity of some "same old story," the reproduction of the endlessly "new," or the non-contradictory simultaneity of contradiction itself? We can be sure that relations both compose and are composed, depending on the scale of observation and the starting point of narration (e.g., Luhmann)[25]—we can never be certain about which of these dimensions we are observing at any given moment.

Here, the matter of time becomes critical, especially the extensiveness of temporalities. If capital has colonised space and bodies and the particularities of their operations and forms, it has also colonised time, not by subsuming it into a standardised format, but by enabling multiple temporalities to coexist as instantiations of flexible rhythms and continuous adjustment.

THE EXTENSION OF FORM

FINDING A PROPER FORM

Urbanisation has always been a matter of form. For in order to navigate the intensive relationalities of urban life, form was necessary as a delineation of space, as a means of precluding matters from simply becoming a blur, to maintain the sense of actors being able to go from "here" to "there," and of crafting particular domains that enabled actors to know what was expected of them and what to expect.

For, relationships are always moving across other relationships, turning themselves inside out and outside in, opening up possibilities and closing other ones down. At the same time, relations are twisting each other into particular kinds of knots. Sometimes they act as analogies or necessary contradictions for each other so as to pre-figure particular kinds of relations as essential to the exclusion of others. For example, there is no inevitable or necessary reason why kinship relations should be the predominant locus around which households are formed. But they become critical metaphors for each other. Kinship is turned into the household that continues to "turn" to kinship as its moral, expressive underpinning.[26] Similarly, neighbourhoods adapt "familial" feelings and obligations.[27]

But residents must also find ways to pay attention to or concretise the ensuing relationships based on these analogies. In Marilyn Strathern's ethnographies, relations can unfold without overarching reasons for doing so.[28] They can seemingly expand to encompass all kinds of actors and situations. But if relations are to be activated and recognised as operative in the daily lives of individuals and societies, then there must be some means for them to be recognised. This only occurs if they assume a particular *form*, an aesthetic that enables them to appear and be properly recognised.

While Western economies may make the terms explicit for recognising the specific characteristics of objects, for Strathern, objects exuded their own animate powers and means of personifying relations. Engagements had to be crafted, elicited, and designed so that people could see who they were so that there could be something to be exchanged—perspectives about things—that were products of the relationship itself. People have to be able to see rather than simply be within relationships, while visibility requires particular forms.

In cities, residents often initiate particular activities, such as making markets, improving the built environment, managing festivals, or undertaking small entrepreneurial activities to signal their willingness to explore collaborations

beyond the function of these activities. These activities become devices for finding a proper form capable of exchanging perspectives. They explore ways of being together that rely upon making relationships visible in the moment. But they can also serve as a platform for residents to feel out the possibilities of collaboration that are not yet and perhaps never will be visible. As such, what they have in common is the interplay of the visible and invisible. It is not just a vision at work but also atmospheres of feeling and intuitive experimentation with relational devices and interfaces that often lack permanence and solidity.

The working out of the city's interweaving relationalities also involves actions *untaken*. Individuals have to establish a sense of proportionality: What is it about themselves and their capacities that are to be extended to others, and what do these acts of self-extending indicate about what is being withheld, in part, as a lure to incite the engagement of others? This working out of proportionality is not merely the calculations of self-interest. It is also the sculpting of a field of affordances that shapes the connections, interdependencies, and autonomies that people conceive and operationalise with each other. So, any social notion is always "out of joint," never assumed as a stabilised whole. Instead, it is an ongoing anamorphic deformation of systemic entities, as individuals are the carriers of social affordances and memory, and societies are the parts of ongoing transformations of personhood.[29]

This notion of affordances and working out of proportion is particularly evident in cities where the operations of formal governance institutions are sometimes constrained by limited consolidations of authority or by-laws and policies largely inapplicable to the characteristics of the populations and urban dynamics at work. These are places where residents must build residences, livelihoods, transportation, and administration on their own. These processes of auto-construction depend upon intricate ways of allocating land and opportunities and working out divisions of labour with complementary efforts. It is a matter of enabling individuals to experiment with their own singular ways of doing things but in concert with others.

What are the contemporary implications of such relational economies whose definition and scope may never be fully known? How do they play out in conditions where the dispossession of belonging, identity, and assets is very concrete? How do urban inhabitants mediate between the compulsion to turn bodies and lives into logistical instruments—being at the "right place at the right time" unimpeded by history—and slow circulation down sufficiently to be able to reflect on their own actions? How do they maintain some ground to build a sense of memory and a narrative about where they come from? Such are the means to anticipate possible forward trajectories to decide to act instead of succumbing to paralysis or constant anxiety.

The conundrum of urban life is managing the interstices between the accelerated and extensive circulation of things—a process that produces a density of dispositions and a continuous unsettling of identifications—*and* stabilising a population that renders bodies traceable and available for specific functions.[30] If the settling of accounts, that is, the capacity to tell how people are related to each other, is potentially unsettled by spiralling circuits of mobility and exchange, how do urban bodies coalesce in ways that incorporate the overall fluid densities of urban life? How do they deter expending inordinate amounts of energy defending particular modalities of being social from such urban volatility and thus enable them to recalibrate their coexistence with each other in ways that adapt to continuous movement, but in a manner where they continue to experience themselves as enjoined?

The elaboration of the social that mediates these questions cannot simply be the implementation of specific laws or structures of commonality. Instead, the social as an experiential milieu is an economic matter of combining whatever is at hand, whether the elements seem to go together or not, combining ways of tying things down and letting things go.

Such combinations are not the products of prescribed formulas; they are not pieces

of a puzzle pre-designed to fit with others. They are, instead, combinations that reflect expenditures of effort, of an often inexplicable interest, enthusiasm, and patience on the part of individuals and groups to processes and events that they do not fully understand or view as relevant. In the context of urban life, with so many bodies, events, dimensions, and transactions that touch human and non-human residents in so many varying ways, the dilemma is always one of alignment with how one operates in the "crossfires" of such post-plural intersections. To be sure, adaptations cannot rely upon defensive or immunological manoeuvres alone. They also require active assertions of emplacement, opportunism, belonging, and risk in the face of all the things that can draw a person into various associations beyond their control. *It is a matter of things extending themselves to each other.*

STRANGE FORMS OF TIME

Extended urbanisation, as a process of urbanisation extending itself to and through various modalities of existence, also entails a reconsideration of the notion of "form." For urban form has long been the preoccupation of observers seeking to define urbanity's key components. The urban is expected to assume a specific look, to be availed of particular contents. But what happens when we consider urbanisation as a process extended beyond the centrality of particular "inhabitants" of the urban and beyond particular moments and modalities of reflexivity? In other words, who is doing the observing, under what conditions, and are they dependent upon what kinds of other labour or space-making? Form is the product of politics, of who gets to see and say what. The extensiveness of urbanisation then also entails the ways in which it is extended across the perceptions and geographies of those who have long been either disqualified as insufficiently urban or those who have, through the work they have done to support the reflexive consideration of the urban form, implicitly generated other forms removed from visibility.

While it is inevitable that comparative urban analysis will revolve around efforts to maintain the urban as a universal object of geographic focus and, as such, constitute the horizon-limit for the theory's revisability, any definitive identification of a given place or process as "urban" remains *both* elusive and possible. When Eduardo Kohn's Runa collaborators in Ecuador identified the vast surrounding rain forest—the domain of the spirit masters—as an underground "Quito," they were pointing to form as a strange but nonetheless worldly process of pattern production and propagation, one whose peculiar generative logic necessarily comes to permeate living things (human and non-humans) as they harness it.[31] While this forest has long been important to rubber and oil extraction, and has, in recent years, become intensely financialised in terms of both its "subtraction from extraction" in carbon credits and speculation on continued extraction, its urbanisation is not simply the degree of its external articulation, it also rests in its being experienced as "urban" by those who reside within.

Kohn emphasises the spontaneous, self-organising apperception and propagation of iconic associations in ways that can dissolve some of the boundaries we usually recognise both inside and outside. These are not symbolic connections requiring conventions of cultural meaning that generate and pattern differences. Instead, form blurs the lines of distinction as each action and entity flows into the other without cause or effect, without knowing what happened first. The ways particular sounds are associated with images connoting danger and the ways that subsequent reactions are signals for others to alter their behaviours, in turn, precipitate repetitions of the original sound.

Details here are less marks of distinction than they are conveyors of thoughts and feelings, "passing through," with resonance or a sympathetic charge. So, when Kohn says we no longer ask thought to produce a specific outcome or "return," our observations of what we "sense" in the world and in our minds become self-similar iterations. Even as Amazonian forests were objects of extractions and ruination, the capture of wealth could only take place by accessing these associations—i.e., the conjunctions of

physical and biotic patterning in which this wealth was ensconced. The rivers were shaped by the forest embankments, which were, in turn, shaped by the flows of the river generating specific conditions to grow rubber trees. Through this very logic of patterning, the Runa experience the forest as Quito, an urban domain. While the "actual" Quito may look upon this forest as a domain of resource exploitation that is crucial to its own urban development, the Runa look upon Quito as an undeveloped city, a rudimentary imitation of the forest's vast "urban fabric." Here, the value of form is not that of a Platonic ideal but of matter emerging from its own complexity. It is the mimetic archives of an embodied sense, the propagation of self-similarity, and its constraints and potentials (how we are *inside form*—e.g., finding, dreaming, extracting something, anticipating how the world anticipates me anticipating it).

Just as notions of the urban are being extended across multiple spatial and temporal formations, so too are the modes of divergent inhabitation, no longer contained by or cohered within the once predominant form of the human as "Anthropos." The bracketing of cities as the embodiment, performance, and culmination of urbanisation processes while maintaining the façade of distinctive jurisdictions is subject to intensive porosities and fragmentation. Cities exhibit a protracted history as differentiation machines yet still seem obsessed with citing the "proper name" of their normative inhabitant, "the human," as an entity prohibitive of being anything else than what it is. In other words, the human is an inhabitant, a mere facet of a more extensive system, not potentially intertwined with various ecologies and life worlds.[32]

The city existed as the locus through which certain inhabitants could reflect on their being as a singular prerogative that is untranslatable across other modalities of existence. It was the place that formed a "we" unrelated to anything but itself. Yet this "we" was inscribed as the node whose interests and aspirations were to be concretised through the expropriation and enclosure of critical metabolic relations.[33] The city's formation of the "human" also required

the occlusion of a wide range of human activities that could not be easily translated or reduced to labouring bodies.

Here, the figure of the black body looms large as something that cannot be settled even as it clears the way for settlement. Here, the unsettled, dismembered body, not immediately convertible into the figure of sheer labour, elaborates an almost phantasmagorical space of intersections—part human, part vegetative, monstrous, demonic, exotic, liminal, and libidinal. Here is the interweaving of the body with a bush, dirt, swamp, rain, and cacophonies of rhythm. This is a space beyond inhabitation, yet one that can be lived with.[34]

This is a geography that is displaced from any certain utterance or exposition. This is a geography constituted from the lapses in a surveillant and punitive gaze that cannot maintain its sovereignty if it looks too long or too longingly. It is constituted by the illusions of self-assurance of domination's efficacy, where the masters think there is no need to look upon what is essentially nothing anyway. The job of subjugation is already done.

The conversion of blackness into forced labour *and* a monstrous form of human exceptionality in the long march of "moderns" to a bell jar existence in the rarefied enclosures of sense and domesticity has kept cities alive. In contrast to the white urban body with its sense of individual responsibility and free will, black bodies were to intertwine themselves with thick fabrics of complementarity and affordances, of dust becoming flesh and flesh neon; without everything packed into a density of contact, of the discrepant rubbing up against each other in multiple frictions, sparks that ignite chain reactions. Without these webs of many crammed causations looking out for any possible vehicle of release, there would have been no city. Blackness was, then, not simply a vehicle to space things out, to engender order, but also to connote the chaos of intermingling, the loss of boundaries, and the dissipations of propriety.

The blackness of urban life is also found in the inexplicable instances of what might be seen as a form of rogue care. In the aftermaths

of incessant evictions and evisceration of the attempts of black people to abide by the terms of normative urban existence, of being situated in the most toxic and uncertain environmental conditions, blackness also connotes an intertwining of ruined landscapes, making abodes, gardens, ceremonies, and infrastructures of support and communication that operate under the radar. This is not to underestimate the casualties or precarity of livelihoods, nor is it to turn attention away from the substantial accomplishments of alternative urbanisms that can be historically recorded. For instance, the Black Metropolis of Chicago, the vital Afrofuturist urban landscapes of pre-World War Two Detroit, and the black power movements of the 1960s and 1970s generated a wide range of new local institutions.[35] However, these progressive steps remind us that remainders do exist within the aftermaths of containment or the erasure of these more visible accomplishments.

THE EXTENSION OF THE POSSIBLE—WHAT IS AND WHAT MIGHT BE

IN PLAIN SIGHT

The activities of those converted to apparently sheer labour or relegated to labour in reserve give rise to the alternate forms that Moreno, referring to Lefebvre, calls the "residues hiding in plain sight."[36] In the third season of Italy's most popular television series, *Gomorrah,* the urban landscape is the main actor. Across abandoned factories, dilapidated housing projects, freeway underpasses, ruined seaside resorts, waste dumps, empty churches, unused parking garages, and jettisoned construction sites, an urban economy is pieced together and violently contested. While the proceeds from the amorphous *Camorra* are invested in gleaming office towers and offshore accounts, the everyday transactions that forge temporary alliances and betrayals, load and unload narcotics and other contraband, and act as venues for meetings between the licit and illicit all take place among

the unused, wasted remainders of an urban fabric that is always moving on, seeking renewal and greater levels of abstraction.

In the wasted peripheries of Naples and Athens, a vast network of Chinese manufacturing unfolds largely in secret. The banlieues just beyond Gare du Nord are the sites of intricate home-grown real estate systems that house the barely documented, that operate as the interfaces and intersections among various diasporic commercial activities, all under the pretence of being car washes, petrol stations, box stores, delivery services, auto parts markets, recycling centres, and truck parts. Through these are the backdoors into a larger world, of goods and services moving outside official channels and of ethnicities being sutured into provisional complicities. Here, a "strange" urban geography emerges where it is not clear what things are, what they do, or what form they take. The apparent function of things, the ghostly spectres of their past identities shimmer into a blurred network of connections, both inviting and circumventing new modalities of urban control.

Whereas the objective of domesticating inhabitation—of situating urban residents in particular formats of everyday living, with their concomitant visibilities, responsibilities and attainments—may still prevail, acts of governing are no longer primarily predicated on the success or failure of these efforts. Instead, as Diren Valayden points out, a "society of targeting" emerges based on the tracking, monitoring, and targeting of mobilities.[37] This interception can take many forms, ranging from everyday harassment that forces a person to avoid certain areas at certain times, targeted assassinations of "suspected" terrorists, the use of urban designs such as anti-homelessness spikes and narrow benches (backed by laws against panhandling), the sudden demolition of "illegal structures" and temporary homes, and the use of private security guards and extensive border patrols. It is designed simply to make particular kinds of movement and inhabitation impossible and to *shift* problematic populations and practices elsewhere. But these strange geographies suggest

that targeting has limits and cannot always penetrate the dissimilitude that these geographies engender unless it reverts to random firing all over the place.

This dispossession of clarity may increasingly be a prerequisite for the deployment of a collective effort that lives in conditions of *what might be taking place*—something that exceeds the available vernaculars of verification or affirmation—which is experienced as not all that far from *what is taking place*. The practical organisation of everyday life—the melding of different personal dispositions and ways of doing things—does require a sense of internal consolidation and coherence that is composed and communicated. Yet, the capacity of residents to get by, cooperate, and sometimes act in concert requires them to live as if they were always, at the same time, living somewhere else. So, the interface between the concrete empirical status of their identifiable location, their modes and practices of dwelling, *and* the ways their lives cut across territories and recognitions of all kinds—the *what might be taking place*—presents a particular problem. If there are facets of the urban that extend to a wide range of uses under the radar, then the question is how do we engage them, maximise their resourcefulness, and be cognizant of the importance of their opacity? Not rendering them visible in ways that increase their vulnerability is vitally important.

Certain practices of an urban majority may be useful for thinking strategically about this conundrum. Residents of cities across the global South have been recipients of many promises—for better livelihoods, democracy, and well-being. But they also avoided becoming preoccupied with whatever was promised. Through their own steady, incremental efforts to continuously work on their conditions, to turn them into resources, and to recalibrate relations of all kinds in the face of the volatilities of the larger city, promises became something else besides lures, manipulations, or meaningless inheritances of citizenship. Instead, promises were induced as the by-products of the districts' own efforts to prompt municipal governments to "show their cards" and divulge their weaknesses regardless of their

capacity to attain a certain self-sufficiency. This self-sufficiency was manifested in the capacity of these districts to ensure large levels of variation in ways of doing things while not devolving into ongoing conflicts. The idea is to attain a sense of progress without being overwhelmed by specific measures or fears of failure. Promises were important more for what they offered than for their presence as a particular modality of disclosure, as something that kept matters open for deliberation rather than as the specification of a destination to which residents were committed.

In a practice that many residents in Rio de Janeiro refer to as *ficou na promessa* (staying with the promise), these are orientations to the future both staked out in clear terms of sufficiency and sustenance and an ability to not experience failure if those terms never were actualised. It was also a willingness to experience their realisation in unfamiliar forms. Residents may have continuously pushed their particular agendas and aspirations but were willing to be indifferent to them as well. For, endurance was an atmosphere of abiding, of willingness to "stand by" various trajectories of possible futures. Stand-by entailed both the sense of waiting to see how things unfolded and a commitment to see through various initiatives to improve livelihoods and the environment.[38] It is a willingness to operate "in reserve" of being prepared to make something from dispositions seemingly out of their control. There is a strategic indifference and detachment from the aspirations embodied in specific forms that address the problem of vulnerable opacities indicated before. As opposed to investing in particular forms that singularly embody specific attainments or aspirations, it is more important to think about the capacity of actors to recognise possibilities in the most seemingly banal or obscure landscapes.

In this context, the notion of compression, in terms of form, is useful. By compression, Alexander Galloway refers to asymmetric encounters, where things operate in the same space but have no obvious discernible relationships with each other.[39] Rather, the ground on which they are encountered and encounter each other

embodies a generic orientation—a ground that has no particular definition. It is ground where things can show up in various formats without contradiction, that does not need to be realised empirically, according to specific criteria, but which engenders a sense of being in concert. For Galloway, compression is a mode of appearance that need not constantly "announce" itself and its networked positions. It is a mode of appearance that circumvents the imperative that everything must relate. As such, compression is not the simultaneous folding of the powerful or the weak.

COMPRESSED REALITIES

Compression produces a generic form that is not interested in how it relates to other things and stands apart from them. As such, it isn't interested in embodying or representing any particular value judgement. It is also unclear exactly what made it, how it was made or what it will do. It always shows up in "strange" ways, turns the expected into something bizarrely recognisable but, with some details always slightly "off" or "weird."

Many new sites of residence for working- and lower-class inhabitants—mostly at urban peripheries—are popularly understood to be transitory, a steppingstone to something else, a marker of passage rather than the culmination of a destination. Yet, they are accepted practices that often undermine recognition of any discernible status, refuse both past and future horizons, and are declined as measures of specific development processes or transformations.

Promises hold out a trajectory of the *transitive*—the prospect of going from here to there, of leaving one way of being to become something else. Promises then attempt to sweep people away, for their realisation culminates in an entirely different disposition for the person or place that was the initial recipient of that promise. But what if one were detached from such transitive conditions? What if a place or condition was self-sufficient? What if it required neither compensation for a failed past nor constructed aspirations for a better future? What if it was, instead, the very thing promised regardless

of the temporality of its delivery? What if a particular built environment allowed its users to "write themselves into" it in ways where they could recognise their needs and aspirations but where these particularities were not the exclusive characteristics of the place, where various kinds of divergent needs could be held within its confines?

Different kinds of money, residents, managerial practices, material readjustments, forms of ownership and tenancy encounter each other in an overarching atmosphere of indifference. It is a situation where it is difficult to work out how they all impact each other, *compressed* as they are in a space where so many distinct things seem to be happening. As such, the integrity of any of these elements—their distinctiveness as objects for comparison or integration becomes inoperable. This is not about the assemblage of hybrid urbanisations but rather a continuous proliferation of non-subsumable details incapable of being made *interoperable.*

Across Asia, high-rise vertical living has become the norm in the profusion of faceless megacomplexes. Seemingly, Africa will soon follow. Such modes of residence appear to be a standardisation of urban living and a means of domesticating the urban body to greater levels of individuation and self-preoccupation. But what if they held or could hold the incipient forms of new collective expression?

In the past several years, I have been involved in various research projects in megacomplexes that attempt to engage with what people do, who they do it with, where they go, for how long, and how. While it is possible to see an aggregate sense of stasis or stability, it is composed of wildly fluctuating differences in how residents attempt to make ends meet and deal with their fellow residents. Megacomplexes promise self-realisation, attainment, access, rewarding lifestyles, and security. Nevertheless, I found it rare that any prospective residents would buy into these promotions. Why sign a residential contract because the facility is simply there? It stood as an overarching fact devoid of affective registers, which is then perceived as enabling them to simply "get on with it"—

getting on, a methodology without much specification, and *"with it"* an accompanying objective that need not be anything but vague.

In other words, residents often implicitly express their preference not to be recognised. It is not anonymous in that no one pays attention, but rather that when it is paid to them, it does not know what to make of the results. A surfeit of scrutiny becomes an excess of diffraction. The resident may indeed leave their mark on the world—through a series of usually part-time service-provision jobs but then leaps across the assessment of relative success or failure by showing up somewhere completely discrepant, and the rent or mortgage gets paid, albeit barely, through use of another formula derived from these new lines of transit. Residents are far from being simply warehoused or disciplined. They may appear to be a long way from where the real action is, but nevertheless, they find all kinds of ways of associating with it, whatever *it* may be.

At the same time, the financial viability of these megacomplexes requires the ability for residents to write themselves into the landscape according to the practices that work for them and that make living within that landscape practical. So, in this plurality of instantiations of people residing in all kinds of settlement patterns, no one is precisely locatable, despite all the tech gear of surveillance and monitoring.

CONCLUSION

Recent analysis on extended urbanisation has productively demonstrated how urbanisation processes not only extend themselves across various landscapes through various forms of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation, but also come to operate through an expansive set of logics and modalities. The extension is then not simply the expansionism of a coherent set of mechanisms for capital accumulation, and not simply the incursion of the city upon a periphery. It is also not merely the reformatting of space according to a coherent set of regulations, investments, or spatial products.

The extension of urbanisation processes may engender atmospheres of intense uncertainty and infuse places with volatile questions about the future for which urbanisation then becomes the "answer." As everywhere becomes situated in increasingly larger frames of reference in terms of how a place regards itself, its efficacy, and its prospects—or by how it is relegated to its margins, the standardised components of urbanisation— the maximisation of ground rent, the individuation of action and inhabitants, the multiplication of territorial operations, the financialisaton of materialities, and the mediasation of the social sphere become accessible problem-solving mechanisms and imaginaries for a future.

Regardless of the viability of specific dispositions of inhabitation and land in the present, there is increasingly widespread anticipation that, largely regardless of location, places will eventually find themselves within an urban orbit. This anticipation alone, and the concomitant actions informed by it, are converting many non-urban places into urbanised ones. Of course, there must be "recipients" of such anticipations, apparatuses prepared to speculate, invest, and marketise land at apparent peripheries. While the conversions of land use underway may not always seem to operationalise it in any discernible way, it is important to keep in mind that peripheries have historically long functioned as suturing mechanisms, even in liminal spaces that facilitate the articulation of divergent urban centres. Extended urbanisation, then, signals not only the more extensive operationalisation of diverse landscapes but also the engendering of "territories in waiting" in an interstitial temporality of waiting and seeing what something could become.

This chapter focused on the unequal processes of places and the operations "lending each other a hand" by availing to the other a series of affordances *and* constraints that mutually constitute urbanisation across a wide series of modalities. Important work has taken place in trying to be more precise and focused on the processes that seem to be at the heart of urbanisation across the world, albeit in different proportionalities. Still, such investigations leave

open the ways in which urbanisation is a constantly mutating process that assumes new forms of operation and recognition. "Lending a hand" connotes the ambiguous duplicity of both gift and debt relations and thus is in accordance with the vital role that "gifting" plays in the elaboration of social relations.

Various pathways of co-production, of interchanges among patterning and practices operative at different scales and temporalities, potentially alter the forms through which more astute political sensibilities might emerge and through which enduring aspirations for justice might be pursued. Instead of the urban being tied to the models of reflexivity that are historically embodied by the city, where particular ways of doing things and social identities had their own spaces of recognition, the implications of an extended urban form generate possibilities for an expanded opacity in and through which multiple agendas and practices might be held. Here, misrecognition, dissimulation, indifference, and forgetting become important urban practices—ways of extending resistance and experimental formulations through the "minefields" of intensive surveillance and commodification– and are thus a substrate of subversive solidarity.

ENDNOTES

1   Buckley and Strauss, "With, Against, and Beyond Lefebvre."
2   Brenner, *Implosions.*
3   Schmid et al., "Towards a New Vocabulary."
4   Esposito, *Bios.*
5   Massey, *For Space.*
6   Hui, "Towards a Relational Materialism."
7   Crandall, "The Geospatialization of Calculative Operations"; Kitchin, "Big Data"; Luque-Ayala and Marvin, "Urban Operating Systems"; Leszczynski, "Speculative Futures."
8   Sassen, *The Global City.*
9   Adkins, *The Time of Money.*
10 Papadopolous, *Experimental Practice.*
11 Halbert and Attuyer, "Introduction: The Financialization."
12 Guironnet and Halbert, "The Financialization of Urban Development"; Rouanet and Halbert, "Leveraging Financial Capital."
13 Massumi, "Potential Politics."
14 Bryan, Rafferty, and Jefferis, "Risk and Value."
15 Muniesa, *The Provoked Economy.*
16 Gago, *Neoliberalism from Below*; Bear, *Navigating Austerity.*
17 Koonings, *Capital and Time.*
18 Parisi, *Contagious Architecture.*
19 Auge, *Non-Places.*
20 Ghertner, "India's Urban Revolution."
21 Lee, "Absolute Traffic."
22 Simone, "Precarious Detachment."
23 Marazzi, *Capital and Affects.*
24 Kockelman, *The Art of Interpretation.*
25 Luhman, *Introduction to Systems Theory.*
26 Cooper, *Family Values.*
27 Wagner, *An Anthropology of the Subject.*
28 Strathern, "Binary License."
29 Corsín Jimenéz, "Well Being in Anthropological Balance"; Corsín Jimenéz, "The Prototype."
30 Adams, "Natura Urbans."
31 Kohn, *How Forests Think*, 20.
32 Colebrook, "What is it Like to be Human"; Wagner, "The Chess of Kinship."
33 Cohen, *Telemorphosis*; Cohen, "Trolling 'Anthropos.'"
34 King, "The Labor of (re)Reading"; Spillers, "Mama's Baby."
35 Hunter and Robinson, "The Sociology of Urban Black America."
36 Moreno, "Always Crashing."
37 Valayden, "Racialization Feralization."
38 Kemmer, "Free Riding Rio."
39 Galloway, *Laruelle.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Ross Exo. "Natura Urbans, Natura Urbanata: Ecological Urbanization, Circulation, and the Immunization of Nature." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 32, no. 1 (2014): 12–29.

Adkins, Lisa. *The Time of Money.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2018.

Auge, Michel. *Non-Places: An Introduction to Supermodernity.* London: Verso, 2008.

Bear, Laura. *Navigating Austerity: Currents of Debt along a South Asian River.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015.

Brenner, Neil (ed.). *Implosions/Explosions: Studies in Planetary Urbanization.* Berlin: Jovis, 2015.

Bryan, Dick, Michael Rafferty, and Chris Jefferis. "Risk and Value: Finance, Labor, and Production." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 114, no. 2 (2015): 307–329.

Buckley, Michelle, and Kendra Strauss. "With, Against and Beyond Lefebvre: Planetary Urbanization and Epistemic Plurality." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 34, no. 4 (2016): 617–636.

Cohen, Tom. *Telemorphosis: Theory in the Era of Climate Change.* Ann Arbor, MI: Open Humanities Press, 2012.

———."Trolling 'Anthropos'—Or, Requiem for a Failed Prosopopoeia." In *Twilight of the Anthropocene Idols,* edited by Tom Cohen, Claire Colebrook, and J.H. Miller, 20–80. Ann Arbor, MI: Open Humanities Press, 2016.

Colebrook, Claire. "What is it Like to be a Human?" *Transgender Studies Quarterly* 2, no. 2 (2015): 227–243.

Cooper, Melinda. *Family Values: Between Neoliberalism and the New Social Conservatism.* New York: Zone Books, 2017.

Corsín Jimenéz, Alberto. "Well-Being in Anthropological Balance: Remarks on Proportionality as Political Imagination." In *Culture and Well-Being: Anthropological Approaches to Freedom and Political Ethics,* edited by Alberto Corsín Jiménez, 187–197. London: Pluto Press, 2008.

———."The Prototype: More than Many and Less than One." *Journal of Cultural Economy* 7, no. 4 (2014): 381–398.

Crandall, Jordan. "The Geospatialization of Calculative Operations: Tracking, Sensing and Megacities." *Theory, Culture & Society* 27, no. 6 (2010): 68–90.

Esposito, Roberto. *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.

Gago, Véronica. *Neoliberalism from Below: Popular Pragmatics and Baroque Economies.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017.

Galloway, Alexander. *Laruelle: Against the Digital.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014.

Ghertner, D. Asher. "India's Urban Revolution: Geographies of Displacement Beyond Gentrification." *Environment and Planning A* 46, no. 7 (2014): 1554–1571.

Guironnet, Antoine, and Ludovic Halbert. "The Financialization of Urban Development Projects: Concepts, Processes, and Implications." *Document de travail du LATTS.* Working Paper 14–04, no. 44 (2014).

Halbert, Ludovic, and Katia Attuyer. "Introduction: The Financialisation of Urban Production: Conditions, Mediations and Transformations." *Urban Studies* 53, no. 7 (2014): 1347–1361.

Hui, Yuk. "Towards a Relational Materialism. A Reflection on Language, Relations and the Digital." *Digital Culture and Society* 1, no. 1 (2015): 131–147.

Hunter, Marcus Anthony, and Zandria Robinson. "The Sociology of Urban Black America." *Annual Review of Sociology* 42 (2016): 383–405.

Kemmer, Laura. "Free Riding Rio: Protest, Public Transport and the Politics of a Footboard." *City & Society* 32, no. 1 (2020): 157–181.

King, Tiffany Lethabo. "The Labor of (Re) Reading Plantation Landscapes Fungible(ly)." *Antipode* 48, no. 4 (2016): 1022–1039.

Kohn, Eduardo. *How Forests Think: Toward an Anthropology Beyond the Human.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013.

Kitchin, Rob. "Big Data, New Epistemologies and Paradigm Shifts." *Big Data and Society* 1, no. 1 (2014): 1–12.

Kockelman, Paul. *The Art of Interpretation in the Age of Computation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Koonings, Martijn. *Capital and Time: For a New Critique of Neoliberal Reason.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2018.

Lee, Doreen. "Absolute Traffic: Infrastructural Aptitude in Urban Indonesia." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39, no. 2 (2015): 234–250.

Leszczynski, Agniedzka. "Speculative Futures: Cities, Data, and Governance Beyond Smart Urbanism." *Environment and Planning A* 48, no. 9 (2016): 1691–1708.

Luhmann, Niklas. *Introduction to Systems Theory.* Cambridge: Polity, 2013.

Marvin, Simon, and Andrés, Luque-Ayala. "Urban Operating Systems: Diagramming the City." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 41, no. 1 (2017): 84–103.

Marazzi, Christian. *Capital and Affects: The Politics of the Language Economy.* New York: Semiotext(e), 2011.

Massey, Doreen. *For Space.* London: Sage, 2005.

Massumi, Brian. "Potential Politics and the Primacy of Pre-emption." *Theory and Event* 10, no. 2 (2007): 10.1353/tae.2007.0066.

Moreno, Louis. "Always Crashing in the Same City: Real Estate, Psychic Capital, and Planetary Desire." *City* 22, no. 1 (2018): 152–168.

Muniesa, Fabian. *The Provoked Economy: Economic Reality and the Performative Turn.* London: Routledge, 2014.

Papadopoulos, Dimitri. *Experimental Practice: Technosciene, Alterontologies, and More-Than-Social Movements.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018.

Parisi, Luciana. *Contagious Architecture: Computation, Aesthetics and Space.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013.

Rouanet, Hortense, and Ludovic Halbert. "Leveraging Finance Capital: Urban Change and Self-Empowerment of Real Estate Developers in India." *Urban Studies* 53, no. 7 (2014): 1401–1423.

Sassen, Saskia. *The Global City: New York, Tokyo, London.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Schmid, Christian, Ozan Karaman, Naomi C. Hanakata, Pascal Kallenberger, Anne Kockelhorn, Lindsay Sawyer, Monika Streule, and Kit Ping Wong. "Towards a New Vocabulary of Urbanisation Processes: A Comparative Approach. *Urban Studies* 55, no. 1 (2018): 19–52.

Simone, AbdouMaliq. "Precarious Detachment: Youth and Modes of Operating in Hyderabad and Jakarta." In *The Routledge Handbook of Anthropology and the City*, edited by Setha Low, 3–16. London: Routledge, 2018.

Spillers, Hortense. "Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe: An American Grammar Book." *Diacritics* 17, no. 2 (1987): 64–81.

Strathern, Marilyn. "Binary License." *Common Knowledge* 17, no. 1 (2011): 87–103.

Valayden, Diran. "Racial Feralization: Targeting Race in an Era of Planetary Urbanization." *Theory, Culture & Society* 33, no. 7–8 (2016): 159–182.

Wagner, Roy. *An Anthropology of the Subject: Holographic Worldview in New Guinea and its Meaning and Significance for the World of Anthropology.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

———."The Chess of Kinship and the Kinship of Chess." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 1, no. 1 (2011): 165–177.