SPECIFICITY AND URBANIZATION: A THEORETICAL OUTLOOK

Christian Schmid

1. THE QUESTION OF THE SPECIFIC

The core thesis of this book is that every city is distinguished by certain characteristics, which underpin the production and reproduction of its own specificity and, hence, the uniqueness of its material and social existence. This thesis only reveals its full significance and explosiveness in the context of globalization, the global extension of networks of production and consumption, the convergence of living conditions and daily life on a global scale, and the ensuing spread of urban areas over large parts of the planet.

As the studies in this book demonstrate, even under the influence of globalization, urban areas develop very different structures and dynamics; consequently, they also generate a great variety of urban forms. Accordingly, the term "city" refers in this context not to a clearly defined and bounded settlement space, but to all sorts of areas that are affected and determined by urbanization processes. Thus, we treat in this book also examples as the Canary Islands, the Nile Valley or the extended Naples Region: we understand them all as specific forms of urbanized territories.

The process of globalization does not mean that urban spaces are generally becoming ever more homogeneous—on the contrary, it is marked by contradictory processes of homogenization and differentiation, for the materialization of general tendencies in concrete contexts consistently leads to specifically individual urban situations and configurations. These observations tie directly into our project *Switzerland—An Urban Portrait*, in which we were already confronted with the question of the specific: we found out that the differences in various regions in Switzerland have become more marked in recent years rather than less so.[1]

The case studies presented in the present publication, which have been investigated over the years at Studio Basel, further illustrate our argument. We have deliberately avoided selecting spectacular examples. On the contrary, following Jennifer Robinson's proposition, our aim has been to analyze our case studies as "ordinary cities," that is to say, neither to regard them as exotic or extraordinary, but rather as equally important case studies that all provide valuable information and insights.[2] It has explicitly not been our intention to undertake a comparative study; rather, the goal was to contrast our examples and in doing so to learn more about their specific characteristics. In turn these examples allow us to fathom the depth of the possible and to stake out the full extent of different developments. This also requires us not just to consider familiar forms of urban-

ism but also to turn our attention to the very diverse urban forms that are generated across the world.

NEITHER THE PARTICULAR NOR THE GENERIC
The specific should not be confused with the particular. The search for the particular has so far produced large numbers of case studies, each of which focuses on a single city or urban region with the aim of defining its uniqueness in order to portray it as an individual unit, so to speak. They usually present the city in question as a very particular example and attempt to account for its uniqueness by citing a wide range of different factors—the city's location, the landscape, the climate, its historical development, the impact of various events and decisions. The concept of an "intrinsic logic of cities", which emerged some years ago, tends in the same direction and understands the investigation of different forms of urban socialization as a worthwhile field of study.[3] However, for all the insights that investigations of that kind might produce, in this book we have set ourselves a very different aim. Our focus is on embedding the question of specificity in the wider context and on exploring its constitutive meaning for urbanization; we want to identify how specificity is produced and reproduced, what role it plays in the production of urban spaces, and how it influences the planetary trajectory of urbanization.

The problematic of specificity is seen with particular clarity in the counterposition, whose supporters take the view that globalization is making conditions throughout the world ever more similar, and that consequently urban areas increasingly resemble one another. This is not a new position. Ever since the early days of Modernism this notion has been repeated—with varying degrees of optimism or pessimism—on the basis of the argument that the historic particularities of cities were being destroyed by the maelstrom of modernization and worldwide capitalism. However, economic forces of global capitalism are intrinsically unequal and therefore, by necessity, also produce and reproduce unequal developments.[4]

Also today many people claim that globalization is homogenizing patterns of living across the world, because the same models and procedures are taking hold everywhere; they claim that urban forms are adjusting to a single, global standard and that differences are progressively being ironed out. These claims go hand in hand with the notion that cities are becoming increasingly generic, interchangeable, and that the particularities of individual places are disappearing. Rem Koolhaas's resounding battle cry of the generic city is still heard loud and clear.[5]

Even if many urban developments these days are in fact interchangeable and global development companies throughout the world are realizing increasingly banal, transposable projects, even if terrifyingly uniform and monotonous cityscapes are being constructed, the specific has consistently held its own in various ways. During the course of urbanization there is an endless flow of surprising twists and turns: the general formulas and rules that posit all sorts of ideals and models as best practice have always to be applied to specific, concrete contexts and situations; the results that are achieved using these formulas in different places are correspondingly different. The "ideal city," much beloved of architects and social reformers, that is supposed to provide a bright future for all human beings, or the city that is supposed to bring the greatest profits for its global investors—all these ultimately break down, in the current of generic operations, into specific situations and configurations. The task is therefore to discover the specific "laws of motion" that apply to different urban areas and to understand how they develop on the basis of their specific spatial and historical conditions.

CITY AND URBANIZATION
What is urbanization? There are many theories and concepts trying to define and to grasp urbanization. It is often equated to population growth in cities. Yet this is a very narrow view, in that it only takes account of a single criterion—the number of inhabitants—and concentrates exclusively on urban centers and agglomerations. This purely statistical definition has countless implications, which are rarely discussed, and it reduces the city to a black box. Everything that happens outside this black box, anything nonurban, is not even taken into consideration. This approach not only reinforces a simplistic view of the world, it also tends back toward the position of the generic—that there is "city" and "noncity"—and all the distinctions within the urban are ignored.[6] Accordingly, there is a need for a more differentiated concept of urbanization, which, rather than concentrating on statistical definitions, the morphology of settlements, and urban forms, views the urban as a multidimensional process—a process that also includes the economic and social aspects of daily life.

The geographer and urban theorist David Harvey regards urbanization, in the context of political economy, as the process of the production of the built environment, that is to say, the construction of housing, production plants, and infrastructure with all the attendant social implications. As this process unfolds it is not only the conditions of space economy that

change, for experience and consciousness also become urbanized.[7] Therefore, in a wider sense, urbanization can also be understood as a comprehensive transformation of society. The French philosopher Henri Lefebvre has described this as a "total phenomenon." He defines urbanization as the totality of changes that a society undergoes as it evolves from its agrarian beginnings to its urban present. He makes a direct connection between urbanization and the process of industrialization. In his view, the other side of the coin of industrialization is urbanization. Industrialization is used here in its most general sense: it refers not only to industrial manufacturing, factories, and infrastructure but also to the wider industrial organization of the whole of society. This also includes the various economic, social, and cultural networks that permeate and span urban space, the interconnections and structures that determine urban life, and the changes in daily life that come with industrialization. Lefebvre famously concluded that this process tends toward the complete urbanization of society and hence the urbanization of the entire planet.[8]

For thousands of years cities could only grow if there was a sufficiently large agricultural surplus to feed the city's inhabitants. The development of a city was thus crucially dependent on the agricultural productivity of its environs. This is one of the main reasons why most cities were little more than towns up until the industrial revolution, rarely having in excess of twenty to thirty thousand inhabitants. There were of course larger cities, but these were very much the exception.[9] This only changed during the industrial revolution, when cities started to grow on a large scale, and when urbanization, as we know it today, first started to take hold. Industrialization also changed rural regions in a wide variety of ways and, in the long term, led to a comprehensive industrial reorganization of society. This in turn led to a fundamental change in the opposition of town and country: cities were no longer islands in an ocean of land, isolated settlements that could only develop given favorable natural, economic, political, and social conditions—urbanization became a generalized process. Despite coming up against all kinds of obstacles and varying widely from region to region, as a tendency it affected the entire territory.

Urbanization can therefore also be understood as a process of abstraction—a given natural space is transformed into a social space, and hence also into a technologically determined abstract space dominated by industrialization—a "second nature."[10] At the same time, however, this urban space is a concrete,

physical reality: it has its own specific characteristics. Urbanization is a process during which general social developments are, so to speak, projected onto a territory; in other words, it also involves materialization in an actual place and in an actual period of time. In so doing urbanization comes up against concrete conditions—the land with its particular characteristics, specific social and economic constellations—which it reshapes and transforms.

From a general point of view urbanization can therefore be seen as a comprehensive transformation of a certain territory. At the same time, it is also evident that urban territories form as layers: each successive wave of urbanization encounters the results of earlier phases of urbanization and transforms them anew. However, this is not to say that the traces of earlier phases completely disappear. Urbanization is thus not—like a footprint in the sand—the direct expression of a general, social development. The land, the territory, is never empty or primal; it is always already occupied, in one way or another: it bears the marks of earlier processes and is embedded in wider contexts and dispositives. Urbanization is dependent on specific local and historical conditions and therefore does not proceed evenly across the board. Every urban area has its own features and follows a particular path of development. One round of urban development creates the conditions for the next round and this in turn determines significant aspects of subsequent developments.

In view of all this, we have to revisit the question of how certain abstract processes unfold in a given territory: how are the processes of urbanization instigated and which factors influence the specific results that are reproduced, again and again, over time? This can only be answered by examining the deep structures of urbanization and by revealing the hidden "laws of motion" that affect the urbanization of a particular place and ultimately lead to the generation of a specific urban space.

A DYNAMIC DEFINITION OF THE URBAN
How might "the urban" be defined in an urbanized world? When we were trying to fathom the urban condition of Switzerland for *Switzerland—An Urban Portrait*, we came up with a set of three concepts: networks—borders—differences. These three concepts are all derived from Lefebvre's theory of the production of space, and they refer to three specific moments in this production process.[11]

An urban space is primarily a space of material interaction, of exchange, of meetings, of encounters. It is permeated by all kinds of networks, which make

internal and external connections and whose reach can be anything from local to global, depending on their function: networks for trade, production, capital, communication, migration, and so on. Urban space can therefore initially be understood in terms of the networks that pervade and determine it. Every urban area has its own characteristic set of networks that has formed during the course of its historical development. These networks of interaction give an indication of the material side of an urban space: they relate to a spatial praxis and, as such, to a perceivable aspect of space.

The material realm of interaction and of networks is neither continuous nor boundless; on the contrary, it is discontinuous, contained, and structured. Urban areas are intersected by all kinds of borders, which cut territories out of the continuous flow of networks of interaction. A rural area embarks on a process of urbanization at the moment when its borders lose their status as dividers between discrete units by virtue of the fact that they now bring together and connect different elements. Urbanization thus may turn borders from a mode of containment, closure, and stillness into zones of exchange where cross-border movements prevail and differences are coming together.

It is only through the exchange of differences that an urban situation is created. The city is therefore a place of differences. It is a differential space, in which differences come to light and interact. Separations and space-time distances are replaced by oppositions, contrasts, superimpositions, and the juxtaposition of disparate realities. The city can be defined as a place where differences know, recognize, and explore one another, affirm or negate one another. It is only the interplay of differences that releases the energies that allow the city to continuously reinvent itself.

The three concepts—networks, borders, and differences—describe the occupation and urban transformation of a territory, and they accordingly lend themselves to the definition of different forms of urbanization and to the development of a typology of urban realms. This in turn opens up a new relational and dynamic understanding of the urban. It shows that urbanism and urbanity do not automatically ensue from a process of urbanization. Urbanization creates the conditions for the production of urban situations, but these ultimately only arise from the interplay of a wide range of actions and diverse actors. Concrete, enacted urbanity is the result of constant negotiation and thus generates a multiplicity of possibilities and potentials.

In the present publication we explore these three aspects in a wider context. Our aim is not to define

the urban condition of a particular area or to investigate specific forms of urbanization, but to arrive at a broader understanding of the fundamental prerequisites of urban development and to focus on the processes that instigate and shape urbanization. However, this does not mean that we are abandoning those concepts: on the contrary, we will return to each of these three central concepts in a wider context and redefine them on a general level.

TERRITORY–POWER–DIFFERENCE
What are the processes that cause urban areas to develop in different ways? If we want to understand the phenomenon of specificity we have to scrutinize the mechanisms and structures that lay behind the process of urbanization and we have to explore some of the core issues in spatial development. We have to understand how general tendencies and abstract processes materialize, how they become a physical reality, consolidate, and inscribe themselves onto a territory. What specific conditions and constellations determine these processes? What possibilities and prospects arise from them? It is our intention to examine the specific conditions of urbanization in the context of three concepts: territory, power, and difference. In so doing we are opening up three perspectives, three modes of access, three windows onto the process of urbanization and its consequences.

Firstly, we examine territory as the specific, material basis for urbanization and trace the transformation of nature to a second nature, an urban space, an urbanized territory, created by society. What do we mean by this second nature? It creates connections and points of orientation by dint of the formation of centers and peripheries and the production of a system of overlapping networks. The fundamental contradiction that is the hallmark of the urbanization of an area is the conjunction of *fixity* and *motion*. The production of the built environment, with its material structures, creates new possibilities of communication, interaction, and cooperation—yet at the same time these structures fix the material characteristics of the territory on a long-term basis, they hinder or preclude many alternative possibilities of development and thus also determine the broad outlines of any future development.

Secondly, we explore the way in which power is inscribed into the territory and how urbanization is controlled and steered. A central part in these processes is played by the rules and procedures that regulate the production of the built environment and the use of the land and thus also determine what will be localized in which part of the territory. These rules

and procedures arise from specific constellations of social forces, which generate and develop specific forms of territorial regulation. These forms of regulation can be *formal* and *informal* in the sense that the rules of play, according to which the territory is organized and the process of urbanization is steered, are never unequivocal: they are constantly in a contradictory balance between explicit and implicit, traditional and modern, legal and illegal procedures.

Thirdly, we investigate the consequences of urbanization, which creates urban differences by initiating interaction—and hence relationships—between the particularities of people and places. We trace these differences and examine how they develop in urban space. A central aspect that emerged in our research is the dialectics of *open* and *closed*, and hence the question of whether an urban culture evolves that is open to its own differences, or whether urban development leads to processes of closure and segregation. Whatever the case, certain patterns of social, economic, and cultural differentiation arise in every urban area that can be seen as a decisive part of the specificity of this area.

The concepts *territory*, *power*, and *difference* are intended as approximations. They are deliberately general in character, since the aim is that they should provide a way of describing the various aspects of urbanization and the production of territory. The notion of specificity is discussed in the introduction to this book by Jacques Herzog, and an explanation of the concepts is given in the overview text by Marcel Meili and in the chapter by Jacques Herzog and Pierre de Meuron. The following text complements these contributions and places the notion of specificity in a wider theoretical framework. It takes the analyses of cities and urban areas presented here as an opportunity for a theoretical discussion of the fundamental, often invisible, and little-understood determinants of urbanization.[12]

2. TERRITORY AND SECOND NATURE
The starting point for our observations of the specific is the surface of the earth as the material basis for all human activities. We move around on the surface of the earth, with all its various characteristics—its topography, its vegetation, its ground cover—and our movements are embedded in a material structure that was originally formed solely by natural forces, such as relief energy, wind, water, or volcanic activity. However, the very first societies already made their mark on this surface with trails, signs, paths, and clearings. Cultivation and settlements led to the first significant transformation of territory. Thousands of

years later this transformation was vastly accelerated by the process of urbanization and took on an entirely new quality.

This allows us to deduce a different definition of urbanization: urbanization is the production of a second, urban nature. The history of urbanization is a history of socially produced abstraction, turning natural space into abstract space. During this process nature is fundamentally changed and transformed into something new: a second, socially produced, as it were, artificial nature. This is one of the central propositions set out by Lefebvre with regard to the history of the production of space.[13]

Urban space thus has an initial basis: the physical space formed by nature. And it is on this basis that a society produces its social space with its own features; it inscribes itself into the land, into the terrain. The social relations of that society are consequently *localized*: all social activities are allocated their own place on the surface of the earth. The ensuing texture of that social space provides a concrete setting not only for abstract social relationships, but also for a spatial praxis, a usage, that is determined by that same texture. Thus, over the centuries, a second nature arises, a world created by human hand.[14]

A DEFINITION OF THE TERRITORY
In this context the concept of the territory takes on a very distinct meaning: territory can initially be understood as the socially produced basis for all human activity. In a sense it forms the material foundations for activities and interactions.

With this definition we are pursuing a fundamentally different course to many other approaches to the territory. There is a broad spectrum of understandings of territory and these are found in a wide diversity of disciplines, ranging from philosophy and biology, political science and geography to architecture and spatial planning. Despite the widespread use of this term, as yet there is no fully developed theory of the territory and there are no more than a few systematic overviews that investigate the notion of territory either as a concept or in terms of its history.[15] In the present context it is not possible to explore all the various meanings that the concept of territory has taken on hitherto and to trace their historical lines of development. Instead we will concentrate on the aspects that are of importance to this analytical framework.

It is possible to extract from the manifold genealogies of the concept of territory in social sciences and architecture two basic interpretations that are still of major importance today. One interpretation, which

above all prevails in the English-speaking world in political sciences and in political geography, places the question of the power of the state and of sovereignty center stage. Broadly speaking, in this interpretation territory is regarded as a political entity: either as the outcome of a strategy of territorialism[16] or, by contrast, as a defined, demarcated space, as "a portion of the earth's surface under the control of a group of people."[17] In essence this position regards territory as an area, on which a social and/or political institution—in the classical sense, a state—exerts power and control. Territory is here conceived of as an abstract surface, it equates to the extent of a certain authority, it is, so to speak, dematerialized.
A fundamentally different position—that has above all emerged in architecture and geography in the French- and Italian-speaking worlds—takes the materiality of the territory as its starting point. It is driven by the conviction that territory is produced—by human activity, by work, but also by being imbued with symbolic meaning. In one of the classics of architectural theory, the Italian architect Saverio Muratori theorizes territory as a product created by civilization, which can be analyzed on different levels: as a concept, in terms of political economy, ethics, and aesthetics.[18]

In geography it was Claude Raffestin in Geneva who has published the most important theoretical work on territory to date, combining Lefebvre's theory of space with Foucault's concepts on power. For Raffestin territory is a socially appropriated space; the way of appropriation can be either concrete or abstract, it can be realized by means of material or mental activities. Territory is the outcome of actions; it is formed through labor, through the use of energy, and the application of information. This also has the effect of simultaneously incorporating social conditions and relations—particularly existing power structures—into the territory.[19]

A similar view was taken by architectural historian André Corboz, also based in Geneva, who also regarded territory as the product of processes of appropriation and has put forward the metaphor of the territory as palimpsest: through a great variety of social and economic processes, the land is constantly reworked and overwritten with new texts, until it is like a tattered piece of old parchment.[20]

Largely inspired by Raffestin, Alberto Magnaghi and his colleagues developed in Italy in the 1990s a "territorial approach" of urban analysis, whereby the territory is seen as a neo-ecosystem that draws together the milieus of nature, the built environment, and human beings. This approach also put forward

the urbanistic project of a locally determined urbanization.[21]

In this context it should be said that the relationship of the concepts *space* and *territory* create some theoretical difficulties and misunderstandings. Lefebvre, for instance, rarely used the term *territory* and consequently developed a theory of the social production of *space*. In contrast, in Raffestin's writings there are lengthy passages where he uses the term *space* only in conjunction with *nature*, as opposed to *territory*, which he understands as a socially determined and defined space. However, in a later commentary Raffestin rather tellingly all but equates the two terms.[22] One's preference for either one term or the other is ultimately a matter of the applied theoretical approach and the related social theory implicit in that approach.[23] As opposed to the very general term *space*, the term *territory* is particularly suited to the needs of an urbanistic analysis, which has a special focus on the concrete, material conditions of urbanization and a special interest in the political and social processes of negotiation concerning land use.

URBANIZATION AND THE PRODUCTION
OF SECOND NATURE
Urbanization can thus initially be seen as the physical transformation of a territory. Its historical basis depends on the natural conditions that create very different starting points for urbanization. As society engages with these natural forces a second nature comes into being, which finally is accepted as a given and seen almost as a natural precondition of human activities—despite always having been determined by concrete social relations that have materialized during the course of this process of transformation and that have been incorporated into urban space.

Every urban space thus has a history that has its roots in nature and the conditions that originally prevailed there. Nature, in that situation, is nothing other than the raw material that has been transformed into a social product by the process of urbanization. During this process produced space detaches itself from natural space; nature is at once destroyed and recreated as a second nature, as a produced urban space that contains within it specific new characteristics. In the process of social transformation this space loses everything that was once natural about it. This natural aspect, its pure, original state, will never return.[24] However, the natural space does not disappear without a trace. It is still present in the background and can suddenly reemerge in the foreground. The forces of nature are never entirely contained; they can always unexpectedly break through again, as

Vesuvius, for instance, demonstrates only too vividly: its menacing presence constantly affects Naples and its urbanized surroundings, which have crept ever closer to the volcano over the years.

However, although the point of departure of an urban space is in nature, the responses to the initial conditions given by a society are never inevitable or natural: there is always a wide spectrum of possibilities with regard to the appropriation of natural forces and the transformation of the territory. The given conditions may be random, but the way those conditions are handled is never random. It is the result of historical developments that ultimately lead to the formation of an urban space that has its own traits and characteristics.

This second nature is thus the outcome of a society's appropriation and transformation of "first nature." A specific territory is created through human interaction with natural forces—from the first efforts to cultivate land, through early settlements up to urbanization. During this process material structures arise that are only made possible by the long-term occupation of that territory; they are accompanied by particular practices and techniques that can survive for a long time. Even the earliest forms of agriculture have a marked, often enduring, impact on the territory. The cultivation of land with the aid of irrigation and the clearing of woodlands, leading to the creation and formation of very different cultural landscapes, bears witness to major technical interventions and, also in many cases, to great skill.

In this context urbanization can be seen as another round of transformation of these landscapes, in which the changes are determined by an industrial logic. A central role in this process is played by sociometabolic transformations, that is to say, the extraction, treatment, and transportation of materials and energy sources, up to and including the industrialization of agriculture. Industrialization not only increases output, it also makes very different forms of land use possible and creates an entire industrial system. In waves of industrialization—the industrial revolution, the automobilization of society, the microelectronic revolution—ever new claims have been imposed to the territory. It has been repeatedly ploughed up and reorganized to the point where we have now arrived at the contemporary complex, multilayered, and intertwined metropolitan landscapes that bring as a consequence the disappearance of the city as a contained, fixed, clearly identifiable entity—urbanized territories have replaced the once clearly recognizable form of cities. In the present publication the Nile Valley and the Canary Islands, but also the

urbanization circumambient to Vesuvius and the almost complete urbanistic occupation of Hong Kong are telling examples of this process.

NETWORKS, CENTERS, AND PERIPHERIES

The logic of industry is in essence a logic of networking, spanning from ordinary, everyday networks to intercontinental trade links. For their part, these networks are all based on material underpinnings in the form of infrastructure, roads, airports, fiber-optic cables, and so on. In this sense trade links only exist in social terms insofar as they are projected onto the terrain and materialize in concrete, localized transportation networks, markets, and centers. Each aspect of these material foundations underpins a particular network and hence a realm that is a product, that can be consumed, that serves a process of exchange and a use. These material foundations only acquire meaning and finality in and through this space.[25]

As urbanization progresses a structure thus gradually comes into being in the territory and, as such, establishes connections and points of orientation. The territory constitutes the material foundations for the networks that span the urban space. These networks are always based on a built materiality: roads and interconnecting routes, residential areas and places of production—the material basis of every interaction. These networks and points of orientation have their roots in history and inscribe themselves into the territory over a long period of time. Trails, paths, and so on, take on a more permanent form over time. This in turn also creates a material foundation, a structure that guides action and that by necessity predefines further development. In this way processes of interaction become enduring features of space; specific urban forms and patterns emerge and petrify. These material structures make an impact: they lay down the lines along which the urban fabric evolves and thus also influence the further trajectory of urbanization. And hence they also survive as traces or as points of orientation, just like the topography into which they inscribed themselves.

These networks create new conditions, and they produce the specificities of a location as a result of its position in relation to other networks. This also leads to a spatial hierarchy: the networks have hubs, where there is intense interaction, and outer reaches, which thus become peripheries. One of the most important aspects of the urban condition is therefore centrality. Urban centers can have long histories, as in the case of Cairo, Naples, or Beirut, or they can be the outcome of a colonial foundation, as in the case of Hong Kong, Casablanca, and Nairobi. But however they

came into existence, these centers are today all points of encounter and assembly. As Lefebvre pointed out, an urban center may bring many elements together, people and things, the fruits of the earth, the products of industry, human works, acts and situations, signs and symbols.[26] Therefore, the center is antinature par excellence: whereas nature disperses, the center gathers all sorts of things and people and thus creates the basis for the urban condition.

In every urban area centers and peripheries form a specific pattern.[27] This pattern can exist on any scale. On a global scale, there are centers of decision making and control of the world economy, whereas on a regional scale there are subcenters and urban corridors. Urbanization ultimately leads to a complex and multilayered system of hubs and spokes that stake out a logistical space.[28] However, this also means that for every center there are also peripheries—one cannot exist without the other. The periphery is therefore not merely "natural space," "countryside," or "noncity": it is always a relational space that is defined in terms of the center. There are no centers today without multifarious peripheries that supply foodstuffs and raw materials, water and energy, that absorb all kinds of waste materials, and that serve as places of relaxation or of ideological recuperation. This means that the seemingly nonurban parts of our planet are also subject to urban change. They become places that are tied into urban networks and increasingly dominated by an industrial logic in a process that can be described as "planetary urbanization."[29]

BETWEEN FIXITY AND MOTION

All these persistent material patterns develop slowly and over a long period of time, sometimes over centuries. Depending on the concrete situation very different imprints in the territory may evolve: some patterns are rather extensive, others are more densely woven, and the basic principle might be rather monocentric or polycentric. Whatever the concrete pattern may be, it has a dual character: facilitation and limitation. It facilitates processes of interaction, but it also channels them and thus hampers alternative possibilities of development.

David Harvey has grasped this process with his concept of the production of the built environment, and has shown that these material structures are marked by an immanent, fundamental contradiction: the dialectics of fixity and motion, the contradiction between the dynamics of urbanization and the permanence, the persistence, of the spatial structures it produces.[30] The process of urbanization has the tendency to overcome the spatial barriers and to make

ever closer connections between more and more areas, thereby also accelerating the exchange of people, goods, and information. Harvey has called this process "time-space compression": the time needed to cover a certain distance becomes shorter, with the result that places move closer to one another and the globe shrinks.[31]

However, in order to create even closer connections between places and even more tightly knit global networks, it is necessary to produce a material infrastructure: highways, ports, airports, right down to manufacturing plants and office towers. The built environment is itself immobile and rigid, and it establishes a spatial structure that is hard to alter. It also requires massive, long-term capital investments that will yield rewards only over the long duration. And this in turn leads to the major problem: sooner or later the built environment will come into conflict with the dynamics of technological change and the demands of future development.[32] This also explains why urbanization manifests such a high degree of path dependency: the built environment cannot be changed overnight, or at least not without causing massive destruction and devaluation of existing investments. Thus an urban fabric arises that can often barely be fundamentally changed and can only be adjusted with considerable efforts.

SPECIFICITY AND URBAN TERRITORIES

The city, as a second nature, is caught between fixity and motion. Every urban development creates new possibilities, but at the same time also establishes fixed structures, thus limiting the potential for later corrections or changes to the course of development. There is a tendency for the urban fabric to become entrenched, to crystallize, and to fill the entire territory, as in the case of Venice or the inner city of Paris.[33]

Whereas Venice already reached its boundaries in the fifteenth century and is now something of a living museum, over the course of the centuries Paris has extended ever further outward from its center and has created a succession of peripheries: first the *faubourgs*, then, since the nineteenth century, rings of *banlieues*. The last defensive wall in Paris, built by Thiers in 1845, crucially contributed to the consolidation and petrification of the opposition between center and periphery. At a time when in the majority of European cities the city walls were demolished in order to make way for new city extensions, expanding industrial areas and workers' housing, the King of France, Louis Philippe I, wanted to protect Paris, this precious center of French civilization, against all possible enemies from the outside. To this day the

city of Paris is referred to as *Paris intra muros,* with the result that everything outside its walls is seen as periphery. Although the Thiers Wall was removed after the World War I, it still lingers on as an almost impenetrable obstacle, for it has been replaced by a huge highway ring road, which has rather significantly been named *Le périphérique*. A stark divide between center and periphery has thus arisen and deepened over the years. The divide has become even more pronounced with the huge expansion of the Paris *banlieues* after World War II. To this day *Paris intra muros* is still the privileged place that concentrates most of the important cultural, social, and economic centralities of the Paris region—and of France. This divide between the center and the periphery is one of the most intractable problems Paris has to deal with, despite all the efforts undertaken by so many governments to upgrade the periphery by means of massive investments in the infrastructure, in new metropolitan highways, in a whole new network of fast metropolitan railway connections (RER), and even new tramlines in the *banlieues*—and by constructing new centers and "new towns" (*villes nouvelles*). This is a vivid example of the strong influence of the urban fabric of a city as a legacy, which shows a strong inertia and has the tendency to constantly reproduce itself, thus shaping to a certain extent future urban developments.

In Naples this form of entrenchment and petrification has taken an almost tragic turn. The city was established in a volcanic area, where the natural conditions created an extraordinarily fertile and attractive landscape, which allowed Naples to become one of the largest cities in Europe in the Middle Ages. However, this landscape, due to its volcanic nature, is always in motion: it is unpredictable, uncontrollable, unmanageable, and constitutes a permanent threat to the city. Over the years, the city built around Vesuvius has rigidified into a solid crust that can no longer react to movements in the ground it stands on. As such, here second nature is very different to first nature and has created an impossible dilemma: if the volcano were to erupt, this crust, this second nature, would be ripped apart and wreak unimaginable havoc and destruction. Yet the only way to permanently remove the city's inhabitants from this danger would be to construct new settlements in much safer locations—and to devalue the city's existing buildings and infrastructure, leaving them to go to ruin. Obviously, there is no simple solution to this impasse.

The opposite situation is seen in the Nile Valley, where the landscape has been determined by limited natural resources. Here an entire area originally had

a form of stability imposed upon it by the waters of the Nile, which have created a linear oasis in the middle of the desert. However, this stability is at odds with the social dynamics and the huge increase in population that Egypt has seen in recent decades. The only way to overcome the limitations of the Nile Valley is to build out into the desert, but this is not only immensely costly, it also has serious social implications, in the sense that it fundamentally alters a traditional way of life that is tied into agriculture and the land. So the members of this society are in a sense trapped in their valley, immobilized; the possible future development of the valley is forced into a straitjacket and continues to depend almost entirely on Cairo, the vast, dominant center.

Another form of constraint is seen in Hong Kong, which was originally no more than a rocky outcrop in the sea not far from the coast, only inhabited by a few fishermen's families. Here the scarcity of land was the crucial natural condition and a unique urban fabric evolved in response to it. Building upward seems to be the almost inevitable answer to the limited amount of available land. In the smallest area, an incredible urban dynamic has evolved in what is now one of the leading global cities. Here second nature is particularly in evidence, as a largely artificial world that has emerged in the verticality and enormous density of its built structures, which are sustained by a highly sophisticated system of mass transit railways (MTR). This artificiality continues in a complex system of internal spaces and is equally evident in the sophisticated treatment and sealing of the surfaces outside the buildings.

At the same time, superfluity can also be a formative condition for urbanization, as in the case of the Canary Islands, where nature has created the ideal conditions for pleasant living, with its coastal areas and sandy beaches, its varied topography and vegetation, and its equable, gentle climate. These natural conditions provide the raw materials for an entire industry, namely tourism, which has now taken over large parts of the islands and has, in turn, created its own economic, social, and urbanistic structures. The Canary Islands exemplify the ever-expanding touristic landscapes that form a kind of urban edging along many coastal areas across the world and that solidify into new structures, which now often reveal little evidence of the original landscape.

The examples collected in this volume show many different aspects of the dialectics of fixity and motion. From the drama of Vesuvius to the unsolved problem of the periphery of Paris, in every case it is clear that the second nature created by society has a wideranging structuring and determining influence. Second nature contains elements of all phases of development, from the original conditions of location and topography to the large-scale networks and connections that were constructed over the centuries and the multifarious urban forms that have left their marks on territory over time. Thus particular conditions are created that are always specific. The crucial fact is that these outcomes should not be seen as natural responses to the original natural conditions: they are the outcome of concrete historical developments that, for their part, were and are crucially dependent on power structures and territorial regulations, the subject of the following section.

3. THE INCORPORATION OF POWER INTO THE TERRITORY

As we have seen, the material, built-up structure of the territory has a determining character: it guides social activities, it suggests certain actions and hinders or prevents others—it can be understood as an incorporation of instructions. The human being perceives this structure as an obstacle, as an opposing factor, sometimes implacably hard, like a concrete wall; it is not only extremely difficult to alter but also subject to multiple rules designed to control any changes.[34] This therefore means that social relations inscribe themselves into a territory; they solidify and create an urban fabric that in turn determines human actions by allocating a space to them, by defining their possibilities and limitations—although, crucially, it is not only materiality that is a determinant; it is also the rules that pertain to this materiality and the power that is behind those rules.

This is how social relations and power structures become a reality in a terrain. This is as true of the relations of production, of the division of labor, and the organization of labor, as it is of the relationship between the sexes and numerous other social relationships. A territory allocates the appropriate place to the activities by which it is constituted; it localizes them.[35] Power is thus incorporated into any territory in a wide variety of ways. But how does a specific order of built structures arise in a territory? This in turn raises the further question of the different ways a territory is controlled and the process of urbanization is steered. How does a society inscribe itself into a space or a territory?

It is explicitly not the intention in this text to analyze power in general, nor to illuminate the question of state and territoriality, but rather to undertake an analysis of a very specific form of the exercise of power, which takes hold in the territory, which is in fact instrumental in the constitution of that territory. This form of power has its sights set on the land and strives to control the production of the built environment. It goes without saying that this is another very complex issue that cannot be fully explored here. We will therefore concentrate on just a few crucial questions: what are the power structures and the parallelograms of forces that determine the production of the built environment? How do different interests manage to impose themselves in a space? What are the rules that apply to the construction of infrastructure and buildings? Who sets these rules?

The relationship between power and territory is often seen in purely one-dimensional terms—territory is taken to be a particular part of Earth's surface that has been claimed by a government body. This view led to the French concept of *aménagement du territoire* (territorial ordering), which simply means that the state creates order in its sovereign land. Interestingly, this same activity is known in German as *Raumplanung* (spatial planning), which is indicative of different concepts of space and territory in different language areas. Nevertheless, both terms imply particular notions of how a space or a territory should be organized and how this process can be instituted and implemented. The idea that space is an empty container that the state can fill with various objects, or that territory is an empty plane onto which the state projects its plans has little to do with reality because the state's plans come up against all kinds of obstacles that resist its efforts to impose its power. Reality produces much more complex situations within which diverse constellations of actors have to engage one another.

The question of how power structures are incorporated into a territory is linked to the specific constellation of social forces that determine and control the production of that territory. This constellation can also be seen as a specific social relation that arises from the negotiations around the production of the territory; we could call this the "territorial relationship" (*rapport territorial*).[36] The territorial relationship generates a contradictory and complex system of dependencies, jurisdictions, and rules. This system is not static, but dynamic and contested; rules are constantly being breached and questioned, with the result that the system also changes with the passage of time. The framework of rules that ensues from this, the territorial regulation, is complex, since it consists not only of laws, bylaws, and prescriptions, but also of diverse unwritten, implicit rules; as a result it is often barely comprehensible to outsiders—and even so to insiders.

BORDERS

Right at the outset of our reflections on the question of power the concept of borders comes up again, which also occupies a prominent place in *Switzerland—An Urban Portrait*. Borders are the basis of the control of any territory. They mark out and signify a territory; they serve to delimit, to demarcate, and to define that territory. This has been analyzed in detail by Claude Raffestin. He has shown that the totality of a territory's borders constitute a system, which he has called *maillage* (netting, meshing). The overlapping and mutual interpenetration of various borders can lead to complex structures that define the territory and hence also establish specific power structures. Raffestin has described this as a "grid of power" that spans the territory.[37]

Borders serve as a means to control the territory; they define the authority that occupies that area. Borders can also be read as information that structures the territory. In that respect, it is of prime importance to understand the social and political nature of borders, which are in fact instruments of action and control. It therefore makes no sense to talk of "natural borders."[38] Nature does not impose borders; it is society that designates and divides the territory. Topographic features, mountains, rivers, lakes, and the sea—which many like to regard as borders—may be obstacles that make it harder to cross the territory, but it is only social and political domination that turns them into borders. Hundreds of years ago the Mediterranean, for instance, and the Great Lakes in North America did not form borders; on the contrary they connected different cultures and peoples and, as such, constituted cultural, social, and economic spaces in their own right—and they still connect as well as separate people. The Alps and the ability to control Alpine passes were decisive factors in the existence and stability of Switzerland as a political entity.[39] Borders are set by history, not nature, and they also have a history of their own. They are like engravings of historically specific power constellations that might be transformed but sometimes survive for a long time.

Borders are implemented at every scale: nation-states, regions, communes, and so on. Often small-scale borders are more enduring than those on a much larger scale. This is certainly the case in Switzerland, where communal boundaries have had a huge impact on spatial development for a long time and are strongly predefining the course of urbanization.[40] At the same time, it is important to distinguish between political-territorial borders and everyday boundaries: while the first establish a certain political dominance

and are closely linked to formal rules, the latter can be fluid and variable, and ultimately they are mainly informal.

Borders significantly drive certain aspects of urbanization; in a sense they act as invisible guidelines for urban development. At the same time, however, they are also constantly put under pressure by the processes underlying urbanization. Because the process of urbanization has the tendency to cross borders and to undermine divisions, it tends to dissolve existing territories and to redefine them. Accordingly borders are overwritten, but they still might have an impact—often in a subliminal way—and, as such, can take on new meaning. Ultimately an urban territory is an area where borders are transformed, become permeable, and enter into complex new constellations. Borders start to overlap and jurisdictions intersect; in addition new territorial units arise or are deliberately created in order to control the development of expanding urban areas more effectively. These processes have in recent years been discussed at length in the context of the scale question.[41]

REPRESENTATIONS OF SPACE

As the discussion of borders has shown, particular significance attaches to the question of delimiting a territory. Borders are therefore always determined by definitions.[42] Definition is a form of demarcation, and definitions of territories are always founded on particular conceptions or representations of space.

An important step of the definition of a territory comes often in the form of a picture, a map, a plan that describes and records the territory and thus creates a mental space that serves as the basis for any exertion of power and control.[43] The ideas, the images we have of a city also play a decisive part, since an image or a model, like any construction of reality, is always also an instrument of power.[44] In recent years, for instance, numerous new terms have been created to find new ways to refer to expanding urban areas, and today the terminological vocabulary ranges from *urban regions* and *agglomerations* to *conurbations*, *metropolitan regions*, *global city regions*, *mega-regions*, and *urban galaxies*.[45] However, these terms—and the corresponding maps and images—do not simply convey a picture of existing realities; on the contrary, they create new realities. As representations of space, these terms and images also can be understood as interventions into a social field and are accordingly often debated and contested.

Representations of space have an operative dimension: they are intended to denominate, to illuminate, to implement something. As Lefebvre has shown, we cannot engage in any form of activity within a space, if we have not already developed an idea or a concept of what that space looks like. And in order to convey these ideas, we need terms and images that name and depict this space.[46] These representations are never neutral. They privilege certain aspects and ignore others. This raises the question of what elements are either present or absent, what is shown and what is hidden. The things that are not shown are often more important than the things that are shown. Representations thus rely on social conventions that stipulate which elements are to be shown in relation to one another and which are to be excluded. These conventions are learned, yet they are not immutable; they are often disputed and contested and negotiated in discursive (political) engagement.

Specific representations and ideas of an urban area can develop an impressive continuity and, like material structures, can solidify and turn into fixed stereotypes, which almost seem to the inhabitants of that area like natural certainties that are not up for discussion. A typical example of this kind of stereotyping is seen in the division of Paris into two zones, with sophisticated and glamorous urban Paris inside the *Périphérique* and the outlying, ordinary *banlieues* outside it. Although this image relates to the material reality of the situation, it further reinforces and cements that situation through the representation of the area. To this day many maps of Paris only show the inner zone and completely ignore the *banlieues*. The message to visitors and tourists is clear: only this inner zone is the "true" Paris, the remainder, outside it, is not worth visiting. And yet the outer zone of Paris is home to around four times as many people as the inner zone, and as such it is the dominant reality of daily life in Paris. As this example shows, a contributing factor to this is what people consider to be urban or not urban, what they regard as typical for a particular city: views that often arise behind the backs of the actors.

TERRITORIAL REGULATION

Representations convey meaning, they are mental constructs that structure our thinking. As such they have a regulatory influence—in a sense they pave the way for the regulation of a territory. The term *regulation* covers a whole set of explicit and implicit rules of play that apply in a particular area.[47] These include not only laws and explicit orders, but also the procedures and modalities of planning and the processes and forms of negotiation that these involve. They allocate places to activities—they determine what we are allowed to do where.

In the widest sense this form of territorial regulation establishes the manner in which a territory is used. It thus concerns not only the totality of formal and informal agreements and rules in the realms of spatial and urban planning or of architecture and urban design; it also concerns the social processes of negotiation that affect the use of a territory. Of central importance to this are the patterns of ownership, land law, and the various modalities of land rights. All these factors are always extremely complex and contradictory, often impenetrable; they can be very difficult to research and are generally hard to understand. But account also has to be taken of the planning processes, which may have to conform to very convoluted rules, and the diverse arrangements concerning the development of a particular territory (city, district, commune, urban region, and so on). These arrangements can concern anything from agreements regarding construction and urban development to the organization of daily life and the use of public spaces; as such they also involve debates on norms and ideals; such debates may center on the questions of what a city should be, how people should live, what is beautiful and what is ugly, and so on.[48] A characteristic property of territorial regulations is that norms and rules are often applied subconsciously, and specific forms of problem-solving arise that people always return to.

Territorial regulation is always rooted in a specific constellation of social forces that is typical of that particular area. Very different agents can be involved in the establishment of rules and equally diverse interests and constellations of forces can come into play. Different institutions and political-territorial entities can also have an influence on these matters. The ensemble of these agents and their mutual interrelations constitute the *territorial relationship*.[49] Whereas a territorial relationship on a national level is above all determined by centralized, national laws, edicts, and infrastructure policies, the debates surrounding urban development at a regional or local level give rise to the specific social constellations in which not only the local authorities but also all kinds of formal and informal coalitions, alliances, and agreements can be involved.

BETWEEN FORMAL AND INFORMAL

How do regulations imprint on the territory? Are the marks they leave enduring or temporary? During the course of our analyses, one particular aspect of territorial regulation came to the fore: the dialectics of formality and informality. The term *informality* has been used for some time now and has become a permanent instrument for the investigation and analysis of cities. In the dominant urbanistic discourse the informal sector is still often regarded as an independent sector—and sometimes even seen as a specific form of settlement. It is generally equated with poor, precarious living conditions. There is also often an assumption that there are two distinct sectors: a formal sector that conforms to state-regulated procedures and an informal sector that can be clearly delineated in social and spatial terms, and that generally exists without any direct relations to the state sector. Often the informal sector is seen as a temporary aberration in less developed cities, which—as the city develops—will increasingly be integrated into the "modern," formal sector.

However, most of these conceptions and ideas are not tenable. As our own recent research has shown, processes of informalization also appear in the global north and they are by no means only seen in the areas occupied by poorer social groups. The analysis of Belgrade[50] has in fact shown that already under the socialist regime there was an informal sector that existed in parallel to the formal, state-controlled construction of settlements. When the socialist state came into crisis, informality—notably also in rich neighborhoods—became a widespread model of territorial regulation. It is therefore obvious that formal and informal regulations are not a contrastive pair but rather that they coexist in a contradictory balance. These findings tie into research which has also focused on the mutual articulation and interpenetration of the two sectors. Roy and AlSayyad, for instance, have suggested that urban informality should not be seen as a separate sector, but rather as a mode of urbanization, an organizing logic, a system of norms that regulates the process of urban transformation, and as a series of transactions that connect different economies and spaces to one another.[51]

In the case of Naples, informal and often illegal construction is the crucial component in the answer to the question of why urbanization is coming ever closer to Vesuvius, rather than keeping its distance. Without illegal construction, settlements in the danger zone around Vesuvius would not have become so concentrated and so well established. At the same time, however, the existence of a formal sector also has a decisive role: the interplay of formal / informal is precisely the prerequisite for the enormous profits that can be made by illegal practices. The frequent amnesties that were conceded for contraventions of building laws show that illegality has become a permanent component of territorial regulation—in Naples as well as in many other parts of Italy. As a

consequence, criminal organizations such as the Camorra also play an important role in the urbanization of the territory.

These examples demonstrate that it is not only written laws and edicts that determine how urban areas develop. Implicit, illegal, and informal factors should always also be taken into consideration. In fact it is clear that in many places informal practices have always been present, even if, from time to time, they were pushed into the background by the formal sector. As the case of Belgrade shows in an exemplary way, in certain situations it is precisely the informal that creates a degree of stability, while the formal—particularly in times of major change—becomes unstable. This also explains why certain structures have such persistence, even when radical changes are under way. In the case of Belgrade, the informal provided a fallback position that people could turn to when the state itself was in crisis.

SPECIFICITY AND TERRITORIAL REGULATION
The spectrum of different forms of territorial regulation is vast, and that is also one of the main reasons why cities are so distinctive. Very different power systems may intervene in territorial regulation—even traditional, rural, or clientelistic power systems can be of major importance, as can be seen in the cases of Casablanca, Nairobi, and the Nile Valley. However, traditional aspects of regulation, which in fact go back to preindustrial social structures, are still also found in other countries, even in highly industrialized Switzerland where, to this day, individual communes wield very considerable power, especially with regard to the steering of urbanization—what leads to an extremely decentralized and small-meshed urban fabric. We have to delve right back into the Middle Ages to find the roots of this powerful communal autonomy, which still sometimes has preserved many of the traditional elements of decision making and political and social control.[52]

Territorial regulation can of course also be shaped by centralized, authoritarian control which may be determined by only a few actors. The most famous historical example of this was the large-scale transformation of Paris under the regime of Napoleon III and his Prefect Baron Haussmann. In a still unrivalled strategic urbanistic intervention Haussmann set out to impose a new order on the extremely narrow and dense, socially and physically very mixed urban fabric of Paris. He used the famous boulevards to cut through the dense weave of the urban fabric and to reorder the city; in so doing he drove large proportions of the lower classes out into the *banlieues*.

As he pursued his aims, he in fact exploited an urbanistic strategy whose main elements were already present in Paris and which he systematically deployed to restructure the city: by means of axes and central squares forming the node of streets that radiate outward in all directions like the points of a star, and by creating orientation points through the careful positioning of monuments. Parts of this urbanistic strategy were subsequently used in numerous cities in the French colonies and in the Parisian *banlieues* (above all in the *villes nouvelles*). Haussmann's fifteen-year restructuring of central Paris led to the destruction of large parts of the old inner city. In 1871, only a few years after Haussmann's brutal urbanistic intervention the famous insurrection of the Paris Commune shook the city to the very foundations—a wake-up call and a model to so many revolutionaries. The Commune can be interpreted as the people's reconquest of their own city, with the lower classes, who had been banished and driven into the periphery, returning to the center of the city: it could be described as the first urban revolution.[53]

A very different form of centralized planning can be seen in Hong Kong, which could only be constructed as it was by virtue of far-reaching governmental controls over the territory. These had their roots in the particular colonial control over the land and are, as such, very unusual. The territorial relation of Hong Kong was largely determined by an alliance between the government and local capital. This led to a sophisticated top-down planning system that was deliberately used to steer the process of urbanization and to control the population. Over the years that system was consistently refined and perfected, and, with some modifications, it has even survived the handover of the colony to the Peoples Republic of China in 1997. Yet here, too, there are numerous informal structures, from the shanty towns and squatter settlements that still exist on the fringes of Hong Kong to the informal and illegal extensions on rooftops. And this contradiction is also seen in improvised street markets and informal meeting places. Additional analysis also confirms the unexpected survival of rural structures: traditional Chinese village law still plays a major role in the urbanization process of Hong Kong; it is largely responsible for the fact that to this day large expanses of the New Territories are still not at all densely populated and it is therefore also one of the main reasons that the central districts on Hong Kong Island and Kowloon are so densely built over.[54]

The territorial regulation of the Nile Valley is also rooted in a powerful, centralized system of govern-

mental control that is particularly directed at controlling the territory and, in so doing, at determining the spheres of activity and the daily life of the population. The main aims of that system are to stabilize population growth and to limit migration to Cairo. This has indeed led to a slowing down of the process of urbanization, but also to the immobilization of social development, and—at least for a certain time—to the stabilization of the present power structures. The contrast between the highly regulated Nile Valley and the dynamic, restless metropolis of Cairo is in many ways constitutive of present-day Egypt and its political development.

In Nairobi, by contrast, various parallel power systems have developed, which coexist and constitute very different "cities" within that city—although they all relate to one another in terms of economics and daily life. Different geometries of power have arisen here, which have in turn produced various centers of power. This city therefore breaks down very distinctly into individual parts that are very different socially and economically and that also have their own territorial regulations. There could hardly be a greater difference between modern, international Nairobi and the neighborhood of Kibera, which has been shaped by traditional, rural, and informal structures.

All these examples clearly show that urbanization is not only dependent on material structures and conditions, but also on territorial regulations and national as well as local power structures. In many cases, these regulations are even more difficult to change than the material urban structures, and thus strongly contribute to the specificity of an urban area. Our analyses brought a wide variety of models of territorial regulation to the fore. Not only the scale of the main institutional units of territorial regulation differ, ranging from systems with a strong influence of the communal scale up to very centralized models almost entirely depending on the national scale, but also the origins of regulation show a tremendous variation, with traditional and sometimes even rural elements that might still be of great importance. Furthermore, informality and illegality have to be understood as constitutive parts of territorial regulation. In order to understand these specificities, we have to analyze the constellations of social forces that constitute the territorial relation of a city and we have to follow the open and hidden conflicts and fracture lines that mark these relations. Finally, the question of control of the local population is a recurrent feature, and this has precisely to do with one of the most productive aspects of urbanization: the tendency to

bring people together and thus to foster a social dynamic that might become explosive. The question of the power of difference is thus the final issue of this chapter.

4. URBANIZATION AND THE PRODUCTION OF DIFFERENCE

Urbanization transforms society—but how does an urban situation arise from this transformation? There have been numerous attempts to define the difference between town and country. Some definitions place the emphasis on the role of the city as the center, as the seat of power, as the place of civilization and culture. Others point to the specific form of social interaction that arises in cities. However, many definitions are still largely colored by the notion that a certain size of settlement is needed to create an urban situation. But size is always relative and means little in isolation.

We take a fundamentally different approach to the understanding of the urban. Our main proposition is that an urban existence is created when differences arise and become effective. Differences do not only signify social and cultural diversity, for they are also the result of active processes of interaction that often involve social struggle: "City" is where social differences collide and become productive. It is important to understand that these differences are dynamic: they are not something a city has; they are something a city constantly produces and reproduces.

As Friedrich Engels observed, in economic terms, the city is primarily a concentration of means of production and of labor force. In spatial terms this leads to an agglomeration, which in turn has certain advantages that are known as agglomeration economies. The concentration of people, goods, and activities of all kinds leads to a stronger internal differentiation, to a deepened division of labor and hence to a faster economic development of urban centers. To this day this definition has never been seriously challenged and it is still one of the most important economic definitions of the city.[55]

Many scholars regard this as an adequate definition of the urban. But what is the social impact of agglomeration? As Georg Simmel showed more than a hundred years ago, the crowding together of people and things in a confined space has certain social consequences. The variety of things and impressions that are constantly assailing people in a city provide a wide range of stimuli. An increased level of social interaction ensues, which gives much greater significance to the money economy and hence also to exchange values and the market. At the same time,

individuals enjoy a much greater degree of personal freedom, which allows them to develop their own capacities. There are not only opportunities but also economic pressures to generate diverse things and activities, because people have to earn a living. This in turn reinforces the division of labor and increases specialization. The sum of the effects that extend both in terms of time and space beyond the here and now of the city intensifies this process yet further.[56]

Urban life positively strives for differentiation. Difference can thus be seen as a fundamental productive force that basically arises in urban areas, as Marcel Meili has shown in this book: it is crucial that people have the opportunity to live out these differences and to generate new differences.

THE CONCEPT OF DIFFERENCE

The concept of difference has a long history. It is used in a wide variety of contexts and has a correspondingly wide range of meanings. It took on particular importance in relation to Post-Structuralism, Postmodernism, and Deconstruction, most notably in semiotics and linguistics. However, the connection between this concept and urbanism was first made by Henri Lefebvre, who posited difference as the fundamental characteristic of urban life. He regarded difference as a relational concept and viewed it in basically dialectical terms: differences are not to be merely understood as social contrasts, but as enacted contradictions. They can only present and re-present themselves as they relate to one another. Differences connect with the totality of actions, situations, discourses, and contexts; they relate to multifarious networks of interaction that overlap, that interfere with one another, and that change through the influence they have on one another. Thus a current is set in motion that ultimately changes the totality of social relations.[57]

Consequently, differences are not at all the same as particularities. Differences are active, relational elements, whereas particularities remain isolated from one another. In the natural world there were originally only particularities: material elements that were tied to local conditions and circumstances, such as place and location, climatic and topographical conditions, the availability of natural resources, and so on. Rural populations interacted with these natural elements, and they created sometimes remarkable, highly differentiated cultivated landscapes—however, rural life still was determined by particularities. In this original situation differences do not come to the fore as such: they exist in isolation and are externally alien to one another, and can quickly become hostile to other particularities.[58]

With the advent of industrialization this rural order was radically transformed. An overarching industrial system evolved, with a universal, rational, and rationalized logic that also led to the homogenization of society. Particularities disappeared and, with them, the distinguishing features of places. At the same time, however, a crucial change arose from these developments: people became mobile; they cut their dependencies from the land, from subsistence living, and from traditional customs. They came into contact with one another, far and near met, facilitating encounters and interactions. These confrontations led to mutual understanding, to a certain familiarity and a certain awareness of the Other. Transformed by these contacts, the qualities that survived were no longer separated from one another, and differences started to emerge. Thus the concept of difference arose: as enacted praxis, and ultimately as a mental act.[59]

Difference therefore has to be clearly distinguished from diversity and heterogeneity. The point is not that a variety of things or people are in the same space at the same time, the point is that there are interactions between them.[60] Lefebvre also further distinguishes between *minimal difference* and *maximal difference*, and between *induced* and *produced* differences. He extrapolates the first distinction from the rules of logic: minimal difference arises from the variations within a defined sphere—for instance, different types of detached houses in an otherwise homogenous suburb. Minimal difference tends toward formal similarity, that is to say, variations on a theme. Maximal difference is used to delineate differences between distinct fields and hence refers to qualitative differences, such as opposed lifestyles and modes of daily life. Induced differences are contained within a given setting or an existing system. By contrast, produced differences cross the boundaries of a field, as for instance in art, where precisely this form of transgression can lead to innovation. Differences thus become productive in that they generate something new and overcome the existing boundaries of daily life. They always have some surprises at the ready, as they are unpredictable, potentially explosive, and have the capacity to put into question an existing social system.[61]

Accordingly, the dominant social and political powers seek to exclude differences, to push them back to the margins of society and of the city; or they try to include them and to integrate them, to tame and to domesticate the maximal differences, to force them into some kind of order and, in so doing, to reduce them to minimal differences. This integration can also be seen as a process of incorporation, during which urban society is leveled out and homogenized.[62] The ultimate outcome of this integration is indifference. This situation therefore gives rise to what Lefebvre called a "titanic struggle" between homogenizing and differential forces.[63]

Difference signifies potential, a possibility. It is an almost anarchic force that is innate to urban society. It is impossible to immobilize the urban—if it is pinned down, it will be destroyed. But even then urban reality tends to reinstate itself.[64] In Lefebvre's view, differential space—or differential space-time—is a concrete utopia: a possibility that can arise in the Here and Now.

DIFFERENTIAL SPACE

In Lefebvre's model, difference thus becomes a concrete utopia, the immanent potential of the urban. Difference has always to be realized in daily life, it has to evolve out on the terrain. It is thus importantly connected with space, or rather, with space-time, since it takes time to develop. Differences have to interact with one another—it is only then that an urban situation arises: "City" is where social differences collide and become productive.

Urban living is primarily different to village life or rural life in that it can be described in terms of its differences, not its particularities. This allows us to extrapolate a general criterion for the identification of urban areas: the mobilization of differences. If people are no longer chained to the land, but become mobile, if they are relatively free in their material space and also in their social spaces, a fundamental social change sets in. As soon as people start to move and to encounter one another, the possibility arises that people will interact and differences will come to light.

We have already set out our own definition of difference, on the basis of these reflections, in *Switzerland—An Urban Portrait*, which places particular emphasis on an analytical understanding of how a variety of urban situations are evolving. In our view difference is one of the main hallmarks of every urban situation although it is itself highly diverse. Differences have a dual aspect: on the one hand they are the result of the elements that come together in a concrete space—people with their individual experiences, their knowledge, and skills. At the same time, importance also attaches to the locations where people meet and interact, where differences between them can emerge. Difference is thus crucially connected with centrality: difference arises in places that draw contrasting elements together, that assemble these differences and render them productive.

On the other hand, differences can also be generated through networks: after all, urbanization specifically overcomes all kinds of borders and boundaries and brings together areas that were hitherto separate and far apart. Establishing links between areas can thus create new differences. In this sense urbanization involves the connection and articulation of different (nearby and faraway) places and situations. Particularities thus come into contact with one another and can become differences.

The presence of different socioeconomic groups, of rich and poor, is often cited as a contributing factor or even as a prerequisite for difference. However, this idealizing image precisely does not identify the essence of difference: this concept is not intended to serve as a means to romanticize or even legitimize social disparities, poverty, and precarious living conditions. On the contrary—difference includes processes of emancipation and needs equal rights and social justice as a crucial precondition that people really meet and exchange their ideas and experiences.

Immigration of course plays an important role in the emergence of differences: cities such as New York, Paris, or Toronto have been shaped by high levels of immigration, but at the same time, each of these cities also developed to a certain extent an urban culture that allows it to mediate these differences and to encounter the Other in a relatively relaxed, cool manner. Cities of that kind are melting pots, where people from the most diverse contexts, social, and cultural backgrounds productively interact with one another. But as the history of these cities also clearly demonstrates, this mediation is not always successful, and there were many places and moments in which differences were reduced and secluded.

Furthermore, this is not to say that immigration is necessarily essential for an urban culture. As Simmel showed, the urban condition itself leads to social differentiation and hence to the emergence of new differences. A prime example of this is Tokyo, which, despite the very considerable ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic homogeneity of its inhabitants has developed a high degree of urban diversity.[65]

BETWEEN OPEN AND CLOSED

In order to define and analyze difference in greater detail, it is useful to draw up some further analytical distinctions, such as dynamic/static, inert/reactive, and active/passive.[66] For the purposes of the present analysis we have introduced another criterion, namely the dialectics of *open* and *closed*. Crucial importance attaches to the ways that various uses and urban

constellations are arranged in a territory, and to the ways that individual parts of an urban area either open up to one another—communicate with one another, and reach into one another, thereby creating new, urban potential—or turn their backs on one another and hive themselves off. Segregation and separation create all kinds of isolated entities, from gated communities to tourist resorts.

The example of the Canary Islands is paradigmatic for our analysis of difference, because it is possible to observe a particular way of managing differences there—namely segmentation, separation, and seclusion—which have led to the emergence of individual urban worlds that are cut off from one another. The Canary Islands thus break down into, and visibly exemplify, three distinct configurations, which can be described as *local city*, *tourist city*, and *support city*.[67] In other words, the touristic functions in the resorts have so to speak set themselves apart as self-contained territories, which are in turn separated from the territories occupied by the people who work in these resorts. This compartmentalization serves both to control and to commodify the touristic function.

An important role is played here by the commodification of difference. Since difference, as a productive force, can itself become a powerful magnetic force and, as such, attract both wealthy residents and businesses, there is an increasing tendency for differences to be commercialized and commodified. In the last years, processes of gentrification, urban regeneration, and urban upgrading have turned entire inner-city areas into privileged zones for global companies and wealthy population groups, with less prosperous residents and uses increasingly being displaced. This leads to a new kind of closed city, which thus also loses an important part of its differences and, hence, of its urbanity.

The dialectics of open and closed are perfectly exemplified in Paris. Urban contradictions and the debates and struggles concerning the urban have repeatedly flared up in Paris. One of the more recent examples was seen in the events of May 1968, which can be read not only as a rebellion against imperialism and the bourgeois order, but also as an urban revolt, as a reappropriation of the city. It was in this context that Lefebvre wrote his famous book *Le Droit à la ville* (The right to the city).[68] Analyzing the dialectics of this urban situation, almost fifty years ago, Lefebvre was already asking if it could really be in the interest of the political establishment and the hegemonial class to extinguish the spark of revolt and thereby to destroy the city's reputation across the world.[69] Notwithstanding, the subsequent

development of Paris has led to a situation where the Paris that exists *intra muros* has become a largely privileged, pacified urban space that is increasingly shaped by *embourgeoisement* and commodification, and has thus lost an important part of its differences.[70]

SPECIFICITY AND URBAN DIFFERENCES
As these two contrasting examples show, there exists a great variety of sociospatial patterns and modalities for the control or mediation of difference, which are as specific to individual cities as a fingerprint. The concept of difference can thus also be used analytically for the characterization of urban areas.

Right from the outset the colonial government of Hong Kong was at pains to keep control of any differences in order to be able to manage the often precarious social and political situation of this city, which was extremely exposed in political and economic terms. The government-led mass production of housing that started in the 1950s can be seen as one of the most important means of controlling the population. It instigated a long tradition of an authoritarian housing production and urban renewal policy, and Hong Kong still conveys the impression of a highly controlled territory. Nevertheless, difference always reappears and various attempts were made to help it break through: small actions in the cause of the appropriation of public spaces, but also large public protests, for instance, against the destruction of Hong Kong's inner-city neighborhoods and meeting places. The most symbolic of these were the major demonstrations against the demolition of the Star Ferry Pier and the Queen's Pier in 2006 and 2007, which can be interpreted as a call for the self-determined appropriation of the city and its history.[71]

As has already been said, the presence of various population groups, ethnicities, or religions can also contribute to increasing differences in an urban area. In favorable circumstances an open-minded cosmopolitanism can emerge, as happened in Vienna, for instance, around the turn from the nineteenth to the twentieth century.[72] But as the dramatic example of Beirut shows, these differences can also place an impossible strain on integrative possibilities and ultimately lead to an explosion. The onset of civil war in Beirut created an entirely new situation as the city fragmented into territories dominated by different ethnicities and religions. A central aspect of this was the absence of an overarching national or metropolitan structure that could have drawn the various groups together. In Beirut, as in many other places, cosmopolitanism had more to do with the elite than with the population as a whole. What was lacking was

not just an integrative culture of exchange, but also a means of mediation, of making connections between the various interests, which is in itself a crucial prerequisite for the long-term stabilization of differences.

To this day in the Nile Valley, there is only a very limited capacity for differences to arise, since the historical village-like conditions of life there have largely been preserved by the constraints of the territory and the powerful political control. Nevertheless, this area also stands as an example of the fact that differences can also arise within a rural situation. In recent years, and on a small, spatial scale, increasing numbers of networks have come into being, which are now reflected in the growing spatial mobility of people. This is also a form of urbanization of a territory and yet another possible variant of the urban condition.

There is a huge range of models of difference or of forms of territorial segregation and of social differentiation in a territory. Our examples are compelling proof of the fact that there are many ways of developing and handling differences. Furthermore, differences inscribe themselves into a territory in unpredictable ways and are, by definition, highly dynamic: in everyday life differences are constantly being confirmed or refuted; they are in constant motion, and there are moments of opening and moments of closure, in other words, phases when differences can grow and others when they are more powerfully controlled and domesticated. In that sense we could also speak of conjunctures of urbanity. The question of difference, as one of the main conditions of the urban, is a contested question.

5. TOWARD A TERRITORIAL APPROACH OF URBAN ANALYSIS

Our analysis of urbanization engaging the three concepts that we jointly agreed on at the outset has uncovered a wide range of aspects and has shown how important the interplay of these different dimensions is in the generation of specificity. The production of a second nature on the basis of everyday actions and interactions, the processes of territorial regulation through which power structures inscribe themselves into a territory, and the patterns of lived difference that emerge—all these aspects contribute to the specific character of urban territories. In his contribution to this book Marcel Meili has described these three aspects of the production of territory as vectors that relate to one another: the specificity of an urban area can be seen as the outcome of these vectors and their mutual interactions.

These three vectors can also be understood as structuring the existing material conditions that can prove to be very resistant and persistent; the rules that prescribe how a territory is constructed and used and whose roots can go far back into history; and the various patterns and modalities of differences that are constantly forming anew in urban life—they all come together in a specific model of urbanization that is constantly developing further yet still retains certain basic structures and only very rarely suddenly changes.

We could assert that this interplay of specific structures is in fact constituting an urban territory: in the ongoing current of the process of urbanization and in the uninterrupted mesh of the urban fabric that is settling on the surface of the earth, relatively stable configurations emerge. Therefore, it is possible to discern certain consistencies in urban territories within which the same rules apply, the same laws of movement are in operation, and where overarching links and interactions are dominant with the result that a more or less delimitable catchment area arises. This analysis can be applied to the most diverse regions—not only to cities in the classical sense but also to all kinds of extensively urbanized areas, as the examples of the Nile Valley or the Canary Islands demonstrate.

The case studies in this book have shown that the fundamental constellations of urbanization are anything but simple to alter. The basic territorial patterns usually show an enormous inertia. The path dependency of these models of urbanization is self-evident—the specific, fundamental conditions of urbanization are difficult to change; even if—as in Belgrade—they are caught up in sudden upheavals, their main elements will survive. The urban is always a process, always in flux, and it often proceeds along invisible tracks, behind the backs of its actors, allowing a specific model of urbanization to constantly reproduce itself.

What is it that particularly interests us in these examples? They have shown us the vast range of urban developments and hence also the possibilities that are intrinsic to urbanization. The confrontation of general tendencies with local conditions leads to the formation of the most diverse urban situations. And in the process it becomes clear that the urban is always both geographically and historically specific. The urban is not a universal category; it is a specific category that is always dependent on concrete conditions and historical developments.

END NOTES

How Cities Are Inevitably Specific
1 Lucius Burckhardt, "Bauen – ein Prozess ohne Denkmalpflichten," 1967. English version published in *Lucius Burckhardt Writings: Rethinking Man-made Environments,* ed. Jesko Fezer and Martin Schmitz (Vienna: Springer, 2012).
2 German original: *Politik – Umwelt – Mensch.*

How do Cities Differ?
From *Herzog & de Meuron 1997–2001. The Complete Works*, edited by Gerhard Mack. 4 vols. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2008, 4: 241–44. Originally published as: Jacques Herzog, "Terror sin Teoría. Ante la 'Ciudad indiferente,'" *Arquitectura Viva* 91 (July 2003): 128.

Naples, Italy
1 See Alwyn Scarth, *Vesuvius: A Biography* (Princeton, NJ: Princton University Press, 2009), 6, 12ff, 20.
2 This refers to the description by Strabo in his work *Geographica V*; see Ernesto De Carolis and Giovanni Patricelli, *Vesuvius, A.D. 79: The Destruction of Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2003), 55–65. See also Scarth, *Vesuvius*, 40 (see note 1).
3 Scarth, *Vesuvius*, 82 (see note 1).
4 Ibid., 21ff.
5 Ibid., 11ff.
6 Ibid., 137, 166f.
7 Tom Behan, *See Naples and Die: The Camorra & Organised Crime* (London: Turis Parke Paperbacks, 2009), 28ff.
8 Scarth, *Vesuvius*, 267ff (see note 1).
9 C. Pesaresi, M. Marta, C. Palagiano, and R. Scandone, "The Evaluation of 'Social Risk' Due to Volcanic Eruptions of Vesuvius," *Natural Hazards* 47, no. 2 (2008): 229–43.
10 Maria Ronza, "The Difficult Transition of the Vesuvian System between Old and New Development Models," in *The Cultural Turn in Geography*, ed. Paul Claval, Maria Paola Pagnini, and Maurizio Scaini (Trieste: University of Trieste, International Geographical Union [IGU], 2003), 247–57.
11 V. Di Donna, "Social and Economic Reality of Vesuvius Area," in *Vesuvius: Education Security, Prosperity*, ed. Flavio Dobran (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006), 219–33; see also Scarth, *Vesuvius*, 302f (see note 1); Behan, *See Naples and Die*, 64–69 (see note 7); and Pesaresi et al. "Evaluation of 'Social Risk'" (see note 9).
12 Scarth, *Vesuvius*, 307 (see note 1).
13 Interview with Francesco Domenico Moccia, Napels, June 2012.
14 Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri, Dipartimento della Protezione Civile, "2001 Vesuvius Emergency Plan (updated in 2007)."
15 Behan, *See Naples and Die*, 85ff (see note 7).
16 Eric Sylvers, "Build Illegally on Italy's Land and Amnesty Law Will Come," *New York Times*, August 31, 2004.
17 Ellen Hale, "Italians Trying to Prevent a Modern Pompeii," *USA Today*, October 20, 2003.
18 Estimation by Amilcare Troiano, president of the National Park of Vesuvius; see Hale, "Italians Trying to Prevent a Modern Pompeii" (see note 17).
19 Source: Markus Giera, "Napoli, Scenarios of Legalization," diploma thesis, ETH Studio Basel, 2005.
20 See Roberto Saviano, *Gomorrah: A Personal Journey into the Violent International Empire of Naples' Organized Crime System*, trans. Virginia Jewiss (New York: Picador, 2008).
21 Behan, *See Naples and Die,* 38 (see note 7).
22 Marco Cremaschi, "The Dark Side of Social Capital: Crime, Development, and Social Regulations in Southern Italy," paper presented at the Twenty-first Aesop Conference, Naples, 2007.
23 Isaia Sales (with the collaboration of Marcello Ravveduto), *Le strade della violenza: Malviventi e bande di camorra a Napoli* (Naples: L'Ancora del Mediterraneo, 2006).
24 Cremaschi "The Dark Side" (see note 22); Behan, *See Naples and Die*, 54ff (see note 7).
25 Legambiente, "Rapporto Ecomafia 2008", report, Napoli, 2008.
26 See Lucie Greyl, Sara Vegni, Maddalena Natalicchio, Salima Cure, and Jessica Ferretti, "The Waste Crisis in Campania, Italy," paper, CEECEC (Civil Society Engagement with Ecological Economics), May 2010.
27 Giovanni Laino, "The Waste Crisis in Naples," *DISP* 180 (2010), 115–26.
28 Barbie Nadeau, "Naples Blasts Berlusconi as Garbage Piles Up," *Newsweek* (October 27, 2010).
29 See Saviano, *Gomorrah* (see note 20), and *La Terra dei Fuochi*, www.laterradeifuochi.it, accessed February 2013.

Nile Valley, Egypt
1 Aidan Dodson and Dyan Hilton, The Complete Royal Families of Ancient Egypt (London: Thames & Hudson, 2004).
2 Waleed Hamza: "Land Use and Coastal Management in the Third Countries: Egypt as a Case," 2011.
3 Nile Basin Initiative, 2009.
4 BBC News, "East Africa Seeks More Nile Water from Egypt," May 14, 2010; http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/8682387.stm (accessed November 4, 2014).
5 CAPMAS, Cairo and the Nile Valley, 2008.
6 The Central Bank of Egypt (CBE), 2009–2010 fiscal year.
7 Timothy Mitchell, "Dreamland: The Neoliberalism of Your Desires," Middle East Report 210 (Spring 1999): 28–33.

Nairobi, Kenya
1 Government of Kenya and UN-Habitat, *The Kenya Slum Upgrading Programme, Investigation of Actors Operating in Kibera*, vol.1, *Analytical Report, January 2004*, submitted by Acacia Consultants Ltd and Maji Na Ufanisi.
2 P. H. Amis, "A Shanty Town of Tenants: The Commercialization of Unauthorized Housing in Nairobi 1960–1980," PhD disertation, University of Kent at Canterbury, 1980; ETH Studio Basel research and field work in Nairobi 2007, "Kibera as a City," http://www.studio-basel.com/projects/nairobi/student-work/kibera-as-a-city.html; and David Clark, "Kibera: Social Dynamics of a Low-Income Neighborhood in Nairobi," master's thesis, Makerere University, 1972.
3 Dr. Alfred Omenya, "Island Urbanism: Spatial Segregation in Nairobi," in *Learning from Nairobi Mobility: A Cultural Library Project,* edited by Köln International School of Design, Goethe-Institut (Nairobi, Kenya), and University of Nairobi (Cologne: KISDedition Cologne, 2010), 216–19.
4 See P. H. Amis, "A Shanty Town of Tenants," and David Clark, "Kibera" (see note 2).
5 Ibid., and the author's conclusion.
6 Sandra F. Joireman, *Where There Is No Government: Enforcing Property Rights in Common Law Africa* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 14.
7 Government of Kenya and UN-Habitat, *Kenya Slum Upgrading Programme* (see note 1) and P. H. Amis, "A Shanty Town of Tenants" (see note 2).
8 Ibid.
9 Government of Kenya and UN-Habitat, *Kenya Slum Upgrading Programme* (see note 1).
10 Ibid., and ETH Studio Basel research and field work in Nairobi 2007, "Kibera as a City" (see note 2).
11 Ibid., and the author's conclusion.
12 ETH Studio Basel research and field work in Nairobi, 2007, "Kibera as a City" (see note 2). The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) recently reported that the "UN staff in Nairobi is increasing (from 2,500 today to about 4,000 in the future)"; *Making the UN Environment Programme Climate Neutral*, 3 (http://www.unep.org/PDF/Making_UNEP_CLIMATENEUTRAL.pdf).
13 ETH Studio Basel research and field work in Nairobi, 2007, "Kibera as a City" (see note 2). For further reading, see *UN & NGOs in Nairobi* (http://www.studio-basel.com/projects/nairobi/student-work/un-and-ngosinnairobi.html).
14 NGOs Co-ordination Board, http://www.ngobureau.or.ke/search_ngo_by_district.aspx.
15 *United Nations and Kenya: Fifty Years of Partnership*, Office of the United Nations Resident Coordinator in Kenya, 2006, 33.
16 UN and Kenya and UNON, "Nairobi Hotel Rates, 2013" (http://dcs.unon.org/hotelrates2013.pdf).
17 Nairobi was the top-ranked city among twenty-five global cities on the list developed by the Globalization and World Cities Research Network (GaWC) using NGO network connectivity indicators in 2004.
18 Human Rights Watch, *Hidden in Plain View: Refugees Living without Protection in Nairobi and Kampala*, 2002.

Hong Kong, China
1 The Special Administrative Regions are territories that fall under the sovereignty of the People's Republic of China but do not form a part of Mainland China.
2 Formerly Hong Kong – based urban theorist Li Shiqiao analyzes this twofold bias of efficiency and safety in his book *Understanding the Chinese City* (London: Sage, 2014).
3 Y. M. Yeung and Timothy K. Y. Wong, *Fifty Years of Public Housing in Hong Kong: A Golden Jubilee Review and Appraisal* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press for the Hong Kong Housing Authority, 2003).
4 Urban sociologist Manuel Castells studied this relationship between public housing policies and economic improvement in *The Shek Kip Mei Syndrome: Economic Development and Public Housing in Hong Kong and Singapore* (London: Pion, 1987); see also David Harvey discussing the global economic change or neoliberal shift in *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
5 The research project "City within a City: Public Transport as Generator" was developed at ETH Studio Basel by Manuel Gut and Chasper Schmidlin during spring semester 2008.
6 The consequences of the privately owned public space and the bonus-plot-ratio has been discussed and researched by William Luk Wing Lun, Prof. Hendrik Tieben, and Prof. Hector Cheung Yuk-kwan at the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) in 2008.
7 Ackbar Abbas, *Hong Kong: Culture and the Politics of Disappearance* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997). Abbas identified this period as a time of cultural self-invention manifested through what he calls "the space of disappearance." He theorizes on the manifold relationships between cultural forms in Hong Kong and the changing cultural space of the city, describing the space of disappearance as changing cultural space in the transition from colonialism to the capitalist condition of a global city.

Beirut, Lebanon
1 For an account of the transformation of Beirut from a city within the province of Greater Syria, to a provincial capital within the Ottoman empire at the end of the nineteenth century, see: Jens Hanssen, Fin de Siècle Beirut: The Making of an Ottoman Provincial Capital (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
2 The Black September took place between September 1970 and July 1971. It was a Jordanian civil war between the PLO, which was headquartered in Amman, and Jordanian forces. The PLO had attempted to overthrow the Jordanian king and assume leadership of the country. The conflict ended with the defeat of the PLO and its expulsion, along with several thousand Palestinian soldiers and families, from Jordan, most of whom moved on to Beirut.
3 See Assaad Mansour, "La croissance urbaine de Jounieh: Etude de son évolution démographique, économique et spatiale dans le cadre de la géographie urbaine," PhD dissertation, Université Libanaise, Beirut; and République libanaise, Livre Blanc: Beyrouth 1985–2000. Beirut: Direction générale de l'Urbanisme, 1973.
4 Mona Fawaz, Ahmad Gharbich, and Mona Harb, eds., Beirut Mapping Security, Diwan Series (Rotterdam: IABR, 2009).

Casablanca, Morocco
1 The French army invaded the city under the pretext of a tribal uprising caused by the construction of a railroad through a Muslim cemetery. In 1912 the Treaty of Fez officially made Morocco a protectorate of France.
2 Jean-Louis Cohen and Monique Eleb, *Casablanca* (New York: Monacelli, 2002), 47.
3 Military Governor Hubert Lyautey had previously served in Algeria and Indochina and knew the consequences of violent colonial suppression.
4 Cohen and Eleb, *Casablanca* (see note 2).
5 Noted architects active in Casablanca include Marius Boyer, Auguste Perret, Michel Écochard, Roland Simounet, Shadrach Woods, George Candilis and André M. Studer.
6 "Our Moroccan protégés will have no cause for complaint; they will be surrounded by their souks, mosques, fountains and squares; they will be at home in a familiar setting." Claude Favrot, "Une ville française moderne," 1917.
7 Cohen and Eleb, *Casablanca*, 215 (see note 2).
8 In 1950 still 158,000 out of 486,000 inhabitants of Casablanca were Europeans. Today they make up less than 16,000 out of 4 million (Haut-comissariat au plan, Royaume du Maroc).
9 The powerful Ministry of Interior was headed by Driss Basri, the King's iron fist during the social unrest and repression of the so-called Years of Lead.

Specificity and Urbanization
1 Roger Diener, Jacques Herzog, Marcel Meili, Pierre de Meuron, and Christian Schmid, *Switzerland – An Urban Portrait*, 3 vols. (Basel: Birkhäuser, 2006).
2 Jennifer Robinson, *Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development* (London: Routledge, 2006).
3 Helmuth Berking and Martina Löw, eds., *Die Eigenlogik der Städte* (Frankfurt: Campus, 2008).
4 See David Harvey, *Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development* (London: Verso, 2006).
5 Rem Koolhaas, "The Generic City," in Rem Koolhaas and Bruce Mau, *S, M, L, XL* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1995).
6 For a critique of this concept, see Neil Brenner and Christian Schmid, "The 'Urban Age' in Question," *International Journal for Urban and Regional Research* 38, no. 3 (2014): 731–55.
7 David Harvey, *Consciousness and the Urban Experience*, Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization 1 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985).
8 Henri Lefebvre, *The Urban Revolution* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003 [1970]).
9 Paul Bairoch, *De Jéricho à Mexico. Villes et économie dans l'histoire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1985).
10 For the question of "second nature" see Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991 [1974]); Neil Smith, *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and the Production of Space* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1984); Derek Gregory, *Geographical Imaginations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994); and Eric Swyngedouw, *Social Power and the Urbanization of Water: Flows of Power* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
11 See Lefebvre, *Production of Space* (see note 10); Diener et al., *Switzerland* (see note 1); and Christian Schmid, *Stadt, Raum und Gesellschaft: Henri Lefebvre und die Theorie der Produktion des Raumes* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2005).
12 Paris provides an additional example, which was researched during the winter semester in 2004/05.
13 Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 84, 123, 128, 334, and 409 (see note 10).
14 Ibid., 57, 120.
15 See, for instance, Stuart Elden, *The Birth of Territory* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013), 3.
16 See, for instance, Robert D. Sack, *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
17 See Elden, *The Birth of Territory*, 322 (see note 15).
18 Saverio Muratori, *Civilità e territorio* (Rome: Centro Studi di Storia Urbanistica, 1967).
19 Claude Raffestin, *Pour une géographie du pouvoir* (Paris: Libraries Techniques, 1980), 129.
20 André Corboz, "Le territoire come palimpseste," *Diogène* 121 (1983): 14–35.
21 Alberto Magnaghi, "Territorial Heritage: A Genetic Code for Sustainable Development," in *Possible Urban Worlds*, ed. INURA (Basel: Birkhäuser, 1998), 114–21; and Alberto Magnaghi, *Le projet local* (Sprimont: Mardaga, 2003).
22 Claude Raffestin, "Space, Territory, Territoriality," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 30 (2012): 121–41.
23 See Schmid, *Stadt, Raum und Gesellschaft*, chapter 2 (see note 11).
24 Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 30, 110, 190, 229, 330, 368 (see note 10).
25 Ibid., 402f.
26 Lefebvre, *The Urban Revolution*, 39 (see note 8).
27 Raffestin, *Pour une géographie du pouvoir* (see note 19).
28 Pierre Veltz, *Mondialisation, villes et territoires: L'économie d'archipel* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1996).
29 Neil Brenner and Christian Schmid, "Planetary urbanization," in *Urban Constellations*, ed. Mathew Gandy (Berlin: Jovis Verlag, 2011), 10–13.
30 David Harvey, *The Urbanization of Capital*, Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization 2 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985). See also Neil Brenner, "Between Fixity and Motion. Accumulation, Territorial Organization and the Historical Geography of Spatial Scales," *Environment and Planning D, Society and Space*, 16, no. 4 (1998), 459–81.
31 David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989).
32 David Harvey, *The Limits to Capital* (Oxford: Blackwell 1982), xvi, 422.
33 Also see Herzog and de Meuron in this volume.
34 See Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 57, 120 (see note 10).
35 Ibid, 32.
36 Jean-Noël DuPasquier and Daniel Marco, "Régulation fordiste et post-fordiste en Suisse depuis 1937. Materiaux pour une approche," paper presented at Unité pour létude de la régulatiõn en Suisse, Geneva, 1991; Christian Schmiď, "Urbane Region und Territorialverhältnis. Zur Regulation des Urbanisierungsprozesses," in *Unternehmen Globus*, ed. Hans-Peter Krebs and Michael Bruch (Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 1996), 224–53; Christian Schmid, "Raum und Regulation. Henri Lefebvre und der Regulationsansatz," in *Fit für den Postfordismus? Theoretisch-politische Perspektiven des Regulationsansatzes*, ed. Ulrich Brand and Werner Raza (Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 2003), 217–42.
37 Raffestin, *Pour une géographie du pouvoir*, 139 (see note 19).
38 Ibid., 149.
39 For a detailed history of borders within Switzerland, see Diener et al., *Switzerland*, vol. II (see note 1).
40 Ibid.
41 See, for instance, Neil Brenner, *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Roger Keil and Rianne Mahon, eds., *Leviathan Undone? Towards a Political Economy of Scale* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009).
42 Raffestin, *Pour une géographie du pouvoir*, 130 (see note 19).
43 See also Corboz, "Le territoire come palimpseste" (see note 20).
44 Raffestin, *Pour une géographie du pouvoir*, 129, 130 (see note 19).
45 Edward W. Soja and Miguel Kanai, "The Urbanization of the World," in *The Endless City*, ed. Richard Burdett and Deyan Sudjic (London: Phaidon, 2007), 54–69.
46 Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 94 (see note 10).
47 Alain Lipietz, "New Tendencies in the International Division of Labor: Regimes of Accumulation and Modes of Regulation," in *Production, Work, Territory: The Geographical Anatomy of Industrial Capitalism*, ed. Allen Scott and Michael Storper (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986), 16–40.
48 DuPasquier and Marco, "Régulation fordiste" (see note 36); Schmid, "Urbane Region und Territorialverhältnis" (see note 36).
49 Ibid.
50 See Roger Diener, Marcel Meili, Christian Mueller Inderbitzin and Milica Topalović, *Belgrade – Formal / Informal* (Zurich: Scheidegger & Spiess, 2012).
51 See Ananya Roy and Nezar AlSayyad, *Urban Informality: Transnational Perspectives from the Middle East, Latin America, and South Asia* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2004); Ananya Roy, "Urban Informality: Toward an Epistemology of Planning," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 71, no. 2 (2005): 147–58.
52 See Diener et al. *Switzerland*, vol II (see note 1).
53 See, for instance, Henri Lefebvre, *La proclamation de la Commune* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976); and Harvey, *Consciousness* (see note 7).
54 Wing-Shing Tang, "When Lefebvre Meets the East Nowadays: Urban Redevelopment in Hong Kong," in *The Urban Revolution Now: Henri Lefebvre in Social Research and Architecture*, ed. Łukasz Stanek, Christian Schmid, and Ákos Moravánszky (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014 [forthcoming]).
55 Friedrich Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993 [1845]). Allen J. Scott and Michael Storper, "The Nature of Cities: The Scope

and Limits of Urban Theory," *International Journal for Urban and Regional Research* (2014 [forthcoming]).

56 Georg Simmel, "The Metropolis and Mental Life," in *Georg Simmel on Individuality and Social Forms*, ed. Donald N. Levine (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971 [1903]), 324–39.
57 Henri Lefebvre, *Le manifeste différentialiste* (Paris: Gallimard, 1970), 64, 126, 129.
58 Ibid., 63–64.
59 Ibid., 64–65, 127–28.
60 Ibid., 67.
61 Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 372ff, 395–96 (see note 10). See also Stefan Kipfer, "Hegemony, Everyday Life, and Difference: How Lefebvre Urbanized Gramsci," in *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*, ed. Kanishka Goonewardena et al. (New York: Routledge, 2008), 193–211.
62 See Andrew Shmuely, "Totality, Hegemony, Difference: Henri Lefebvre and Raymond Williams," in *Space, Difference, Everyday Life*, 212–30 (see note 61).
63 Lefebvre, *Le manifeste différentialiste*, 97, 129–30 (see note 57).
64 Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 386 (see note 10).
65 See Naomi Hanakata, "Incorporation of Urban Differences in the Tôkyô Metropolitan Complex," paper presented at the ISA RC 21 conference, Yokohama, July 13–19, 2014.
66 Also see Diener et al., *Switzerland* (see note 1).
67 See the essay by Herzog and de Meuron in this book.
68 Henri Lefebvre, *Le droit à la ville*. Paris: Anthropos, 1968. See also Christian Schmid, "Henri Lefebvre, the Right to the City, and the New Metropolitan Mainstream," in *Cities for People, not for Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*, ed. Neil Brenner, Peter Marcuse, and Margit Mayer (New York: Routledge, 2012), 42–62.
69 Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 386 (see note 10).
70 Also see Jean-Pierre Garnier, *Une violence eminemment contemporaine* (Paris: Agone, 2010).
71 See Agnes Shuk-mei Ku, "Remaking Places and Fashioning an Opposition Discourse: Struggle over the Star Ferry Pier and the Queen's Pier in Hong Kong," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 30 (2012): 5–22.
72 See Walter Prigge, *Urbanität und Intellektualität im 20. Jahrhundert: Wien 1900, Frankfurt 1930, Paris 1960* (Frankfurt: Campus, 1996).

IMAGE CREDITS

All images, diagrams and maps copyright by ETH Studio Basel, if not otherwise indicated:

Napoli: 1, 10 Giuseppe Ambrosio, photogiunio; 2 Jasmine Kastani. Source: Roberto Santacroce and Alessandro Sbrana, "Carta Geologica del Vesuvio in scala 1:15,000", Florence: Progetto CARG., SELCA, 2003. (modified). Background map: Regione Campania e dai rilievi in scala 1:25,000, Florence; 3 Jasmine Kastani. Source: Alwyn Scarth, *Vesuvius: A Biography.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009, 13. Background image: Digitalglobe; 4 Alwyn Scarth, *Vesuvius: A Biography*; 5 Giovanni Batista Mascolo; 6 Pierre-Jacques Volaire; 7 Jacob Hackert; 8 Joseph Wright of Derby; 9 G. Julius Poulett Scrope. Lithography published by V. Day & Sons, 1864; 11–14 Christian Schmid; 15–17 Jasmine Kastani. Background image: ESRI relief; 18 ETH Studio Basel. Background map: Regione Campania e dai rilievi in scala 1:25,000, Florence; 19 Corbis Images; 20 NASA Earth Observatory, Digital Globe; 21 Jasmine Kastani and ETH Studio Basel, Background image: ESRI relief; 22–23 Jasmine Kastani; 24 NBC, Shulman; 25 Jasmine Kastani. Sources: Roberto Saviano, *Gomorrah, Italy's Other Mafia* and La Terra dei Fuochi, Background image: ESRI relief; 26 Francesco Esposito

Nile Valley: 1, 15 Bas Princen; 2–3, 10, 16 Milica Topalović; 4 Nicolas Sanson, Royaume et désert de Barca et l'Egypte, 1679; 5 Nina and Norman de Garis Davies; 6 CHELYS srl, October 17, 2010; 14 Vesna Jovanovic; 19 Karim Sayed; 22 NASA Visible Earth

Belgrade: All ETH Studio Basel

Nairobi: 3 Greg Constantine; 7, 18, 20, 26–30, 33–44, 47–49 Manuel Herz and Shadi Rahbaran; 14 Kai Kronfield; 15, 16 United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON)

Hong Kong: 1 Hong Kong. Buildings and Lands Department Survey & Mapping Office; 8: MAP Office Laurent Gutierrez and Valérie Portefaix; 9 Bas Princen; 15, 18, 30, 44, 45 Rolf Jenni; 16 Paul Wolff; 20, 22 Y. M. Yeung, Timothy K. Y. Wong; 23 M. Castells, L. Goh, Ry-W Kwok; 24 Hong Kong Housing Authority; 25 Radio Television Hong Kong; 26 WiNG; 27 Sasalove; 28 Zgw; 29 HKMACAUStuff; 31, 40 Christian Schmid; 38 Fai Quan; 46: Rufina Wu and Stefan Canham, Peperoni Books

Canary Islands: 1 NASA Earthview, 2005; 2 ESA Satellite Images, 2003; 7–8 Fondo Fotográfico de la FEDAC; 9–10 NASA Zulu Server; 20 Ramon Dominguez; 32–33 Google Earth, Grafcan; 36 Städel Museum Frankfurt; 37 Ullstein Bild, Berlin

Beirut: 1–4, 19, 20, 22 Manuel Herz; 9 M. Davie; 10 zona di fotographia; 11–14 Armenian General Benevolent Union; 15 Al Mashriq and Ole Møystad; 21 Aldask

Casablanca: 1, 16 Marc Lacroix; 2, 19 Compagnie des Arts Photomécaniques; 4, 6, 7 Milica Topalović; 9–10 Marcellin Flandrin; 15 Levy et Neurdein Réunis; 17 gta Archiv, ETH Zürich: Nachlass Sigfried Giedion; 18 Christian Müller Inderbitzin; 22 Bart Lootsma; 23 Morocco, Department of the Interior; 25 MAP – Agence Marocaine de Presse; 26 Centre des Archives Diplomatiques, Minstère des Affaires Étrangères et Européennes, Nantes; 30 Digital Globe

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Roger Diener
In 1976 the Basel architect Roger Diener, born 1950, graduated from the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETHZ) and joined the firm Marcus Diener Architect, the company his father had founded in Basel. He was made partner in 1980. Diener & Diener Architects have offices in Basel and Berlin and, currently, a staff of forty-five. Works include the CentrePasquArt, an art museum in Bienne, Switzerland; the Swiss Embassy in Berlin, Germany; the Forum 3 Novartis Campus in Basel, Switzerland; the Musée de la Shoah in Drancy, France; and the Market Hall Tower in Basel, Switzerland.

From 1987 to 1989 he was a professor at the École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), and he has been a professor at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, Studio Basel, since 1999. The Académie d'Architecture in Paris honored his work with the Grande Médaille d'Or in 2002. He was awarded the Prix Meret Oppenheim in 2009. In 2011 he received the Heinrich Tessenow medal.

Mathias Gunz
Mathias Gunz was born in St. Gallen in 1979. He studied architecture at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETH Zurich) from 2000 to 2007 and graduated under Roger Diener and Marcel Meili with a free diploma. Since 2002 he has worked in various architecture offices in St. Gallen, Zurich, and Tokyo and became a self-employed architect in 2008. He has been working as an assistant with Roger Diener and Marcel Meili at ETH Studio Basel since 2007. In 2011 he formed the office Gunz & Künzle Architekten with Michael Künzle in Zurich.

Manuel Herz
Manuel Herz is an architect based in Basel. His projects include the new Synagogue of Mainz and housing projects in Cologne and France. His projects have received various prizes such as the German Façade Prize 2011, the German Concrete Prize 2003 and a nomination for the Mies van der Rohe Prize for European Architecture 2010. His urban research work focuses on the architecture of humanitarian action, with a special emphasis on the planning strategies of refugee camps, and the relationship between architecture and state power. He is the author of the book *From Camp to City: Refugee Camps of the Western Sahara* and, together with Shadi Rahbaran, coauthored the book *Nairobi: Migration Shaping the City*.

Herz has taught at the Bartlett School of Architecture and the Harvard Graduate School of Design. He was head of teaching and research at ETH Studio Basel (at the chair of Herzog, de Meuron) and a visiting professor for architectural design at ETH Zurich.

Jacques Herzog
Jacques Herzog was born in Basel in 1950 and studied architecture at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETH Zurich) from 1970 to 1975 with Aldo Rossi and Dolf Schnebli. He received his degree in architecture in 1975, establishing his own firm with Pierre de Meuron in 1978. In 1977 he was an assistant to Prof. Dolf Schnebli, and in 1983 he was visiting tutor at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York, US. Since 1994 he has been a visiting professor at Harvard University, and since 1999 has been a professor at ETH Zurich, where he cofounded ETH Studio Basel: Contemporary City Institute.

Currently, Herzog & de Meuron employs an international team of around four hundred people working on more than fifty projects across Europe, North and South America, and Asia. Herzog & de Meuron have designed a wide range of projects from the small scale of a private home to the large scale of urban design. The practice has been awarded numerous prizes, including the Pritzker Architecture Prize in 2001 and the RIBA Royal Gold Medal in 2007.

Rolf Jenni
Rolf Jenni is an architect born 1972 in Biel, Switzerland. From 1989 to 1996 he pursued his architectural studies at the technical high school in Biel and the University of Applied Sciences HTL Biel. Between 2004 and 2006 he was a postgraduate student in architecture and urbanism at the Berlage Institute in Rotterdam. He has taught as teaching assistant and researcher at ETH Zurich with Prof. Marc Angélil (2002–4) and at ETH Studio Basel with Prof. Marcel Meili and Prof. Roger Diener (2007–12) and is currently lecturing at the University of Applied Science FHNW in Basel. Between 1997 and 2007 he collaborated with several architecture firms in the Netherlands and Switzerland. Since 2009 he is partner at the office Raumbureau in Zurich.

Jasmine Kastani
Jasmine Kastani was born in Athens in 1983. She studied architecture at the University of Patras in Greece, where she received her diploma in 2006. After working two years in Greece as an architect, she moved to Switzerland, where she completed her Master of Advanced Studies in Urban Design under the lead of Prof. Marc Angélil at ETH Zurich. From 2010 to 2012 she was research assistant of Prof. Christian Schmid at ETH Studio Basel. Since 2012 she has been working as an urban planner in Zurich. Her interests are mainly focused on urban phenomena and urban transformations in developing territories.

Marcel Meili
Marcel Meili was born in Zurich in 1953. He studied architecture at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH Zurich) (1973–80) and was a research associate at the Institute for History and Theory of Architecture, ETH Zurich. He worked in the office of Prof. Dolf Schnebli (1983–85) and was a teaching assistant for Prof. Mario Campi (1985–87). In 1987 he formed an office in Zurich together with Markus Peter.

The recent built work of Meili, Peter Architekten includes the RiffRaff cinema in Zurich, the Zurich Central Station extension, the Swiss Re Center for Global Dialogue in Rüschlikon, and the Hyatt Hotel in Zurich. Major current projects include the Hofstatt-Passage in Munich; the Zölly apartment tower in Zurich; the Sprengel-Museum Hannover; and a four-star hotel in Zurich. The offices in Zurich and Munich currently employ twenty-five staff members.

Marcel Meili has taught as a visiting professor at Harvard Graduate School of Design, and since 1999 has been teaching as a professor in the Department of Architecture at ETH Zurich, where–together with Jacques Herzog, Pierre de Meuron, Roger Diener, and Christian Schmid–he founded and runs ETH Studio Basel: Contemporary City Institute.

Pierre de Meuron
Pierre de Meuron was born in Basel in 1950 and studied architecture at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETH Zurich) from 1970 to 1975 with Aldo Rossi and Dolf Schnebli. He received his degree in architecture in 1975, establishing his own practice with Jacques Herzog in 1978. In 1977 he was an assistant to Prof. Dolf Schnebli. Since 1994, he has been a visiting professor at Harvard University, and he has taught as a professor at ETH Zurich since 1999, where he cofounded ETH Studio Basel: Contemporary City Institute.

Currently, Herzog & de Meuron employs an international team of around four hundred people working on more than fifty projects across Europe, North and South America, and Asia. Herzog & de Meuron have designed a wide range of projects from the small scale of a private home to the large scale of urban design. The practice has been awarded numerous prizes, including the Pritzker Architecture Prize in 2001 and the RIBA Royal Gold Medal in 2007.

Shadi Rahbaran
Shadi Rahbaran is a practicing architect in Basel and has been involved in teaching and urban research at ETH Studio Basel with Jacques Herzog and Pierre de Meuron from 2007 to 2013. After finishing her architecture studies at the University of Toronto, she worked at various offices including Bruce Mau Design in Toronto and OMA/Rem Koolhaas in Rotterdam, Berlin, and Porto. She cofounded Rahbaran Hürzeler Architects in 2011 in Basel, has realized projects in Switzerland and Germany, and is involved in ongoing research and projects of a wide range in Europe and abroad. She has taught at Cornell University and the Harvard GSD Study Abroad Studio and has been a guest critic at various schools. Shadi Rahbaran was born in Teheran, Iran, and has lived in Germany, the USA, and Canada prior to moving to Basel.

Christian Schmid
Christian Schmid is a geographer and sociologist. He is a professor at the Department of Architecture, ETH Zurich and a member of ETH Studio Basel. His scientific work is on planetary urbanization, on comparative urban analysis, and on theories of urbanization and of space. He is a founding member of the International Network for Urban Research and Action (INURA). He is the author of *Stadt, Raum und Gesellschaft: Henri Lefebvre und die Theorie der Produktion des Raumes* (Steiner, 2005), a critical reconstruction of Henri Lefebvre's theory of the production of space; coauthor of *Switzerland: An Urban Portrait* (together with Roger Diener, Jacques Herzog, Marcel Meili, and Pierre de Meuron; Birkhäuser, 2006); and coeditor of *Urban Revolution Now: Henri Lefebvre in Social Research and Architecture* (together with Łukasz Stanek and Ákos Moravánszky; Ashgate, 2015). He currently works on the development of a new theory of urbanization (together with Neil Brenner) and on an international comparison of urbanization processes in large urban regions (in the framework of the ETH Future Cities Laboratory, Singapore).

Milica Topalović
Since 2011, Milica Topalović has been attached to the ETH Future Cities Laboratory in Singapore, as an assistant professor of Architecture and Territorial Planning. In 2006, she joined ETH as head of research at the Studio Basel and the professorial chairs held by Roger Diener and Marcel Meili. Milica comes from Belgrade, where she graduated with distinction from the Faculty of Architecture, subsequently receiving a master's degree from the Dutch Berlage Institute for her thesis on the urban transformation of Belgrade in the postsocialist period.

Since 2000 her work includes different scales and media from urban research and design to architecture and spatial installation. For collaborations with Bas Princen, Milica was awarded the Prix de Rome for Architecture in 2006 and architect-in-residence at the MAK Center for Art and Architecture in Los Angeles in 2005. A Princen-Topalović retrospective was shown at AUT, Innsbruck, in 2008.

Milica has lectured and exhibited at deSingel, in Antwerp, Munich's Haus der Kunst and the Swedish Architecture Museum, among others. She contributes essays on urbanism, architecture, and art to magazines and publications including *Oase* and *San Rocco*.

ETH Studio Basel
ETH Studio Basel is an institute of urban research that was founded in 1999 by the architects Roger Diener, Jacques Herzog, Marcel Meili, and Pierre de Meuron. It is part of the Department of Architecture at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH) Zurich. The institute engages in urban research, teaching, and design work in Switzerland and worldwide. Since 2005 ETH Studio Basel has been running a research program focusing on international cities and urbanizing territories. Research subjects have included the Canary Islands, the development of the trinational region of Basel, the impact of migration flows on the city of Nairobi, the territorial dimension of urban development in the case of the Nile Valley, Florida, and Muscat among others, or the spatial and urban implications of food production and consumption. The institute's publications include *Switzerland: An Urban Portrait* (2004), *Open-Closed: An Urban Research Study on the Canary Islands* (2007), *MetroBasel Comic* (2009), *Belgrade: Formal-Informal* (2012) and *Nairobi: Migration Shaping the City* (2013).

**THE
INEVITABLE
SPECIFICITY
OF CITIES**

ᴱᵀᴴ STUDIO BASEL

�installARCH
Department of Architecture

ETH
Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich