

- Henri Lefebvre and Nancy Fraser-

The Socio-Political Transformation of the Urban and Global Scales in the Global City:  
A Philosophical Inquiry into the Social Justice of Geo-politics

Maria L. Loveys

Thesis submitted to the  
Faculty of Graduation and Postdoctoral Studies  
In partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the MA Degree in Public Ethics

Faculty of Philosophy  
University of Saint Paul

© Maria Loveys, Ottawa, Canada, 2013

# Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM .....	1
II. FROM CITIES TO GLOBAL CITIES: DEFINING THE TERM .....	4
III. METHODOLOGY .....	10
<b>CHAPTER ONE: THE DYNAMICS OF URBANIZATION AND GLOBALIZATION .....</b>	<b>14</b>
1.1.1 URBANIZATION: THE MILIEU OF ECONOMY AND CULTURE .....	14
1.1.2 GLOBALIZATION: FLOWS AND HEGEMONY .....	20
1.2.1 CONSTRUCTING SCALE: THE GEOPOLITICS OF GLOBALIZATION AND URBANIZATION .....	25
1.2.2 FINDING SOCIAL JUSTICE THROUGH THE STRUCTURATION OF SCALE IN THE GLOBAL CITY	29
<b>CHAPTER TWO: THE URBANIZATION OF JUSTICE .....</b>	<b>32</b>
2.1.1 THE SOCIAL PRODUCTION OF SPACE: EXPOSING THE CO-IMBRICATION OF GLOBAL AND LOCAL SPACE .....	33
2.2.1 THE RTTC: RECLAIMING SOCIAL SPACE TO DEVELOP JUST SOCIAL RELATIONS .....	37
2.2.2 THE CONTENTS .....	37
2.2.3 THE SUBJECTS .....	39
2.2.4 THE URBANIZATION OF JUSTICE: ARTICULATING ASSUMPTIONS .....	42
<b>CHAPTER THREE: THE JUSTICE OF URBANIZATION .....</b>	<b>46</b>
3.1.1 CRITICAL DEMOCRATIC THEORY: AN APPLICATION OF HABERMAS TO TODAY .....	47
3.1.2 THE STRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE GLOBAL PUBLIC SPHERE: THE RESCALING OF PUBLICITY ACCORDING TO NANCY FRASER AND MARY KALDOR .....	50
3.1.3 CRITICAL DEMOCRATIC THEORY: GLOBALIZING THE MECHANISMS OF THE PUBLIC SPHERE .....	53
3.2.1 CRITICAL DEMOCRATIC THEORY AND URBAN SOCIAL JUSTICE: THE JUSTICE OF URBANIZATION .....	55
3.2.2 THE JUSTICE OF URBANIZATION: ARTICULATING ASSUMPTIONS .....	58
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: SOCIAL JUSTICE AND GEOPOLITICS IN THE GLOBAL CITY ..</b>	<b>61</b>
4.1 THE URBANIZATION OF JUSTICE: THE GLOBAL SOCIAL PRODUCTION OF SPACE .....	65
4.2 THE JUSTICE OF URBANIZATION: THE RIGHT TO THE GLOBAL CITY .....	69
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>78</b>
I. CONSIDERATIONS AND NEXT STEPS .....	85
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>89</b>

# Introduction

## i. Statement of the Problem

Globalization and urbanization are complex processes that intimately connect mechanisms that organize social life to the content and form of scalar space. Scalar space refers to the social geography of each scale of governance, and the global and urban scales have their own canon of literature expounding the structures and mechanisms operating within their respective scales. However, a rich vein of literature has begun to link these two fields together, and this paper will further develop an understanding of the relationship between globalization and urbanization and the social assemblage of scalar space it produces. This paper will use the Global City as a case study for examining multi-scalar organizations of global and urban social life. The prolific global, national, and local transitions in governance regimes have affected the capacity of all scalar regimes to respond to social justice. This paper will focus on the capacities of local and global governance regimes in the Global City to redress social injustice on the urban-local scale, and consequently on the global scale as well. Through our exploration, this paper will understand the variety of socio-political and economic forces that have constructed global and urban-local scale as isolated entities. How has this construction of scale inhibited our response and contributed to social injustice across all geopolitical scales in the Global City?

The intention will be to highlight the discontinuity and disjuncture in the management of cross-scalar governance, which has had an adverse and unjust affect on social life in the Global City. How can we analyze the scope of activity when responding to social injustices that involve the global and urban-local scale? How can we develop an approach that will integrate global and urban-local scales of governance within a framework of social justice?

This paper will draw its definition of governance from Gilles Paquet's model of stewardship, in which the capacity of an organization depends on the '*nature of the system*'.<sup>1</sup> This would shift the style of government from a big-G hierarchy based on cordoned scalar spaces towards small-g collaboration across networked scalar spaces. The '*governance regime*' is the total set of mechanisms, which has had a tendency to crystallize in geopolitical structures that become immovable and unable to address social injustice. The challenge is to develop a model of governance that is based on social justice and is resilient and high performing in politically unstable or transitioning periods (Paquet, 2008). In terms of this paper, "geo-governance" will refer to the effective coordination of resources, knowledge, and power that are distributed across geographically disparate spaces (Paquet, 2005). Furthermore, in terms of the Global City, this paper will focus on the geo-politics of geo-governance between urban-local and global scales. As urban centres quickly become the milieu for the convergence of technology, markets, governance and people, the policies guiding the interplay of these phenomena are often abstracted away from the urban-local scale. This poses serious problems, as the system's '*old guard-big government*' has isolated people from the public and democratic spaces they inhabit. The concept of '*old guard-big government*' is used by Gilles Paquet to refer to the crystallized governance regimes that isolate and protect themselves (Paquet, 2008). This '*abstraction*' is then magnified through the multiple scales operating in the Global City. In order to respond to this multiscale disenfranchisement, it is important to understand and analyze the precise mixture of harmful and helpful governance tools within each scale without fetishizing them.

---

1 One may analyze the governance regime as stewardship in its three components: (1) the emergence of the governance regime as attractor; (2) the process through which there is - or not rallying support for it, and it acquires or not legitimacy; and (3) the capacity of this focal regime to generate the requisite amount of coordination, resilience, innovation, overcoming and accomplishment (Paquet, 2008).

As a central authority in the process of globalization, the local-urban spaces of the Global City represent the processes of globalization and urbanization and their social relations. This paper will look at two approaches to understanding how to conceptualize social justice and the urbanization of society in a Global City. The first approach is called the '*Urbanization of Justice*' and focuses particularly on the local scale of urbanization processes. It articulates that the social justice of urban processes on the local scale require an intimate and dialectical connection between the form and content of the city. The second approach is called the '*Justice of Urbanization*' and focuses on the global scale of urbanization processes. It states that procedural mechanisms must be able to lace together the networked urban societies of the Global City in order to articulate social justice.

Each philosophical framework chosen provides a unique perspective to understanding social justice and scales that it operates. The '*Urbanization of Justice*' will draw on the spatial theory of Henri Lefebvre, and particularly on his concept of the '*Right to the City*' to construct an approach that uses space as a function of justice. This approach emphasizes the intimate praxis between the social space of scale and the social relations of production. The '*Justice of Urbanization*' draws on contractarian theory, and particularly Nancy Fraser's '*critical democratic theory*'. This approach helps to bridge the theoretical and political gap between scales. The content and form of urbanization and globalization are not a priori to one another; each scale is both dependent and independent of the other, which necessitates the problematization of governance and scalar hierarchies.

This paper argues that in order for governing regimes to be able to respond to social injustice in the Global City, we must read these two approaches together. The combination of the two chosen approaches will produce a theoretical understanding that is robust enough to manage

the complex and multiscalar issues of social justice in the Global City. From the first approach we can discern that a) to overcome the injustices faced by those subjected to governing structures of the Global City requires the recognition that the nature of these new social imaginaries are not 'placeless' but rather permeate and dialogically relate to all places; b) that we recognize the intimate praxis of global social space in the local-urban structures of the Global City. From the second approach we can discern that a) social justice requires the recognition that the new social imaginaries require new political powers to manage first and second order disputes; b) the political processes are required to network these newly transgressing publics.

The assumptions of the first approach argue that we understand the social transformation of the Global City's public sphere as a creature of local and global publicities. The assumptions of the second approach argue that we understand the political transformation of the Global City's governance regimes so that it is able to respond properly to its needs.

It is important to preface this argument by stating that many of the scholars in this paper, as well as the nature of the topics, are theoretical in nature. However, we must be weary of utopian conceptions of space and scale in the Global City, as their production is often technocratic in nature and social-spatial structures that can easily become crystallized. The intention is to spark a discussion on alternatives to the status quo of current governing structures and modes of thinking. The purpose is not to necessarily argue for a particular system, but to argue that geo-political process require a meta-political debate informed by the local and global spaces of the Global City. This paper can provide some philosophical assumptions for which to begin these discussions.

## **ii. From Cities to Global Cities: Defining the Term**

Cities have always been contentious constructions of space. Nietzsche saw them as inauthentic and subservient to the economy, and Rousseau argued that metropolitan life destroyed the intimacy of moral feeling with people pretending to be different than they are (Paetzold, 2000). What is a city? The Chicago School is one of the most prominent schools of thought in urban studies and planning, with scholars such as Robert Park, Louis Wirth and Louis Mumford. Wirth said that the city was a function of population size, density and heterogeneity, which sociologically defined the urban personality (Wirth, 1938). Mumford argued that planning cities meant one could concretely unify social experience and social relatedness (Mumford, 2003). The definition of a city is the combination of its functional form such as the geographical plexus of economic organization, institutional organization, as well as the social content it produces; it is a theatre of social action, and an aesthetic symbol of collective unity. Park stated, "... If the city is the world which man created, it is the world in which he is henceforth condemned to live. Thus, indirectly, and without any clear sense of the nature of his task, in making the city man has remade himself " (Park, 1967).

According to the United Nations Population Fund report, "The State of world population 2007: Unleashing the potential of urban growth" (2007), it is estimated that 1/2 of the world's population resides in urban areas, and that number is expected to rise up to 2/3 or 6 billion people by 2050. In 1950, there was only one city with a population of over 10 million inhabitants and that was New York City. In 2000, there were 22 cities with a population of between 5 and 10 million and 402 cities with a population of 1 to 5 million. By 2015, it is expected that there will be 23 cities with a population over 10 million, and of the 23 cities, 19 of them will be in developing countries. With an estimated 180,000 people added to the urban population each day, it is no wonder that scholars and politicians have turned their attention to the growing demands of these

demographic changes (UNFPA, 2007). How does this hyper urbanization of society affect our understanding of urban life? What does the growth of mega cities tell us about urbanization and globalization today? We will discuss these questions in Chapter One, as they will provide the necessary context for the problem we will solve.

Globalization, as a set of spatial-temporal processes of change, has also had dramatic and transformative affects on the organization of human affairs by linking together and expanding human activity across regions and continents. In *Global Transformations* (1999), David Held, et al., stated:

Globalization can be located on a continuum with the local, national and regional. At one end of the continuum lie social and economic relations and networks which are organized on a local and/or national basis; at the other end lie social and economic relations and networks which crystallize on the wider scale of regional and global interactions. (15)

Professor Saskia Sassen is a prominent scholar of cities and globalization. Sassen is currently the Robert S. Lynd Professor of Sociology at Columbia University and a visiting Professor at London School of Economics. Saskia Sassen's research focuses on the social, economic and political dimensions of globalization, immigration, Global Cities (including cities and terrorism), and the newly networked technologies (London School of Economics, 2011).

In her work *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (1991), Sassen coined the term Global Cities. Unlike mega cities, Global Cities are more than the simple function of population size, density and heterogeneity; they are important nodes in the system of global economics. In 2008, Sassen consulted with *Foreign Policy*, the Chicago Council on Global Affairs and A.T. Kearney to develop '*The Global Cities Index*', which expounded criteria that ranked cities

accordingly around the world (Hales et al., 2010).<sup>2</sup> The report highlights New York and London as the Alpha ++ cities, and they remain the top two Global Cities, with Paris and Tokyo continuing to swap third and fourth positions. The report notes the general globalization of all cities but the score between the highest and lowest ranked cities is continuing to dramatically widen. Moscow and Vienna have made the biggest improvements, and Cairo and Bangkok have dropped down the furthest (Hales & Mendoza Pena, 2012).<sup>3</sup>

Sassen contributed concluding thoughts in the report that focused on dominating ‘urban vectors’ in geopolitics today. She argues that the geopolitics of urban axes is becoming the infrastructure for the global economy, which will be influential in the shaping of geopolitics in the future.<sup>4</sup> *Foreign Policy* noted:

The world’s biggest, most interconnected cities help set global agendas, weather transnational dangers, and serve as the hubs of global integration. They are the engines of growth for their countries and the gateways to the resources of their regions. (Hales & Mendoza Pena, 2012)

---

2 Business activity: Based on the values of a city’s capital markets, the number of Fortune Global 500 Firms, the flow of goods and the volume of good that pass through the city.

Human Capital: Measures how well the city attracts diverse groups of people/ talent through size of foreign-born population, and quality of university.

Information exchange: Measures how well news and information is dispersed based on amount of international news, and censorship.

Cultural Experience: Measure by the level of diverse attractions the city has for travelers, like sporting events, and museums.

Political Engagement: Degree of city influence on global policy making, exemplified through number of embassies, major think tanks, and international organization (Hales, King, & Mendoza Pena, 2010).

3 In the 2012 GCI report, there was a special section called The Emerging Cities Outlook (ECO), which posited the cities rate of change of business activity and human capital as an indicator for potential to raise or fall on the scale. Beijing, Taipei, and Bogota all have high potential and Caracas and Lagos have low potential (Hales & Mendoza Pena, 2012).

4 The report notes that the following urban axis will be the most significant in the next decade: Washington, New York and Chicago; Beijing, Hong Kong, and Shanghai; Berlin and Frankfurt; Istanbul, Ankara; Sao Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Brasilia; Cairo, Beirut; Geneva, Vienna, Nairobi (Hales & Mendoza Pena, 2012).

Saskia Sassen's book *Cities in the World Economy* (2000) examines the construction of place and production in the global economy. She argues that global processes have rearticulated the traditional territorial and scalar hierarchies based around the nation-state frame.<sup>5</sup> Globalization processes, particularly those associated with global capital are a combination of both economic dispersals across traditional geographic borders and an intense integration and concentration of command and control functions in locality. Sassen argues that the Global City has emerged as a strategic locality and thus is ideal for the theorization of these new geographies of power created by the intense integration of systems in globalization (Sassen, 2000).

In her essay, "Theoretical and Empirical Elements in the Study of Globalization", Sassen sets out the methodological elements for studying and interpreting the different dynamics of globalization.<sup>6</sup> She is critical of the perception that global narratives are neutral of place by only emphasizing the upper circuits of global capitalism, such as information and financial flows. These narratives have concealed the place-bounded mechanisms of command and control that global capitalism uses to organize and manage complex economic systems (Sassen, 2000). Sassen sets out to discern the 'places' of global capital systems through her analysis of the falsely

---

5 As noted in the 2012 GCI report, territoriality and geopolitics are not obsolete with the decline of the state, it is rearticulated by urban vectors and axis. Moreover, Global Cities are not isolated entities onto themselves; they are part of transnational urban systems created by economic linkages binding cities across national borders based on distinct types of specialized locations. Example: Multinational networks of affiliates and subsidiaries, or the increased number of stock markets around the world now participating in the global equities market (Sassen, 2000).

6 The theoretical and methodological elements are; 'places', which develops the question of place as central to many of the circuits constitutive of economic globalization, opening up the conceptualization of the global economic system to the possibility that it is partly embedded in specific types of places rather than constituting a system; 'scales', which develops some of the issues of place by focusing on an extreme case of this combination of the global and place; and 'the meaning of the national', which develops how they are altered by the partial embeddedness of the global in the national. This opens up our understanding of the global to the possibility that it gets partly constituted through the partial denationalization (Sassen, 2007).

constructed binary of global and local.<sup>7</sup> We will return to this analysis in Chapter One, as we further deconstruct the global scale.

Introducing cities to the analysis allows us to reconceptualize processes of economic globalization as concrete economic complexes situated in specific places. The radical inference then becomes that urban scales can constitute horizontal types of globality rather than the vertical globalities of supranational institutions (Sassen, 2007). This means that traditional top-down political structures will be re-orientated away from the vertical nature, allowing the global actors within them to interact in on an equal political terrain. Sassen identifies three general factors that help to academically catalogue Global Cities:

- 1) The Global City is a command point in the organization of the world economy;
- 2) It is a key location and marketplace for leading industries;
- 3) It is a major site of production for these industries.

Sassen argues that cities are physical sites of specialized services necessary to maintain global economies. It is common to overlook this spatial dimension by overemphasizing the informational and global dimensions of value and information flows; it is this oversight that has ultimately distorted the role cities or urban-local scales play (Sassen, 2000). The socio-territorial organization of governance regimes affects the political terrains where power is mediated and economic, cultural, social networks operate. Failing to include the specific sites, activities and workers of the Global City ignores the cultural contexts within which the global system exists, and omission of cultural foundations allows social exclusion in the global and urban scales of the Global Cities (Sassen, 2000).

---

<sup>7</sup> She argues that the global simultaneously transcends and inhabits the national and local, thereby rearticulating it as well as arising from it (Sassen, 2007).

Sassen urges us to focus on Global Cities to recover '*place*' from the global by illustrating the multiplicity of economies and work cultures within which the global economy is embedded. We must go beyond the monolithic neoliberal power architectures of dominance that de-emphasize the heterogeneity of space. Focusing on cities allows us to specify the geography of strategic places at the global scale and identify the places bound to each other by the dynamics of economic globalization, which Sassen argues, will ultimately allow us to renegotiate those architectures of power (Sassen, 2007).

### **iii. Methodology**

Chapter one will articulate and analyze the complex global and local scalar processes that operate and determine social life, often producing social injustice. We will begin with the local scale. It will draw on scholars David Harvey and Sharon Zukin to demonstrate how urban form and urban content express the mechanisms of power, and the social struggle. Harvey and Zukin take two different approaches to understanding the relationship between the economy, culture, and politics in an urban context. David Harvey uses the political economy model to examine how local governance has responded to changes in the international economy. Zukin uses the symbolic economy model to examine the relationship between dominant and non-dominant representations of power and the relation between culture and power to draw investment. These two approaches will help us to fully expound how the city and the urban scale produce micro-power relations and organize everyday life in the urban context. The last section of the chapter will discuss scale as a socio-political construction, and how this has affected global and urban processes.

Chapter one will also look at the global scale, and will investigate Arjun Appadurai and Erik Swyngedouw to demonstrate two different approaches to understanding how globalization has produced mechanisms of power that govern global social life. Appadurai's approach

illustrates how globalization has created newly imagined communities through global spaces of cultural flows, noting that the global economy has come to depend on these newly imagined communities. Appadurai will refine our understanding of the disjuncture between culture, politics and the economy so that we can better discern the ironies inherent in the system that produces injustice. The second approach shows how globalization requires a place-bound strategy for producing mechanisms of power. Erik Swyngedouw argues that globalization is better understood as a process of global localization, and demonstrates the intimate connection between space and scale as a function of the territorial organization of power. These two approaches will produce a general understanding of the global scale as an organizing force of social life through its production of normative lexicons, everyday life, and space.

The second chapter will develop the first component of our argument through Henri Lefebvre's theory on the '*Social Production of Space*' and the '*Right to the City*' and will inform the framework called the '*Urbanization of Justice*'. In his book *The Social Production of Space* (1992), Lefebvre argues that space is a social construction and that capitalism has effectively removed people's everyday life from the social project space, replacing the use-value of social space with an exchange-value. Capitalism requires urban space to continue circulation processes, and the construction of abstract space through exchange-value has effectively colonized and valorized social space for circulation. He describes the social spaces of the city as an '*oeuvre*', arguing that social justice, in an urban context, requires us to develop the '*oeuvre*' through everyday life and not capital. Lefebvre asserts that the content and form of social space in the city are dialectically related, which means that producing justice produces forms that are just and vice-versa. Social space produces the social relations necessary to validate that space and Lefebvre uses the '*Right to the City*' to argue that an urban citizen must be given priority in determining the

form and content of urban social space. Lefebvre is explicit about the role space has in producing social justice, and his work will go far to connect the two approaches taken by Harvey and Zukin by illustrating the intimate connection between political economy, symbols and meaning. From this understanding, this paper will argue that there are two analytical assumptions necessary for further developing our argument:

- A) To overcome the injustices faced by those subjected to governing structures of the Global City requires the recognition that the nature of these new social imaginaries are not 'placeless' but rather permeate and dialogically relate to all places;
- B) Moreover, be able to recognize the intimate praxis of global social space in the local-urban structures of the Global City.

The third chapter will focus on the last component and draws from the '*Justice of Urbanization*'. We will draw mostly from Nancy Fraser's book *The Scales of Justice* (2010), which employs a critical theory approach to understanding democratic and public sphere processes in a post-Westphalian world. She develops Habermas' public sphere theory to argue that we must hold the Westphalian processes of publicity to new procedural standards in order for the outcomes to be just in a post-Westphalian world. She argues that both the content of justice and the frame through which content is determined are defined through traditional – or '*normal*'-conceptions, and these are no longer sufficient for our current context. She contends that the development of a global publicity requires that meta-political or first-order disputes about the lexicons and norms of frame setting be opened up to global publics. Fraser expands on the '*all-affected principle*' as well as the legitimacy and efficacy principles so they are able to manage the destabilizing trends of globalization. It is important to note that Nancy Fraser does not explicitly

draw on spatial theory or speak of urban politics; however her development of scale and frames to address procedural deficiencies will help us to connect Appadurai's and Swyngedouw's theories to the urban context. From Nancy Fraser, this paper will extrapolate two analytical assumptions:

- A) Social justice requires the recognition that the new social imaginaries require new political powers to manage first and second order disputes;
- B) The political processes are required to network these newly transgressing publics.

The last chapter will intricately lace the two frameworks together within the context of the Global City. Using the '*Urbanization of Justice*' framework, we will expand Lefebvre's concept of the '*social production of space*' to the '*global social production of space*' using Fraser's '*politics of representation*'. Moreover, through the development of the '*Justice of Urbanization*', we could again extrapolate Lefebvre's theories using Fraser's Global Public Sphere theory. This approach, in conjunction with the second set of key assumptions, will help us to evolve and contextualize our understanding of the '*Right to the City*' to the '*Right to the Global City*' through the application of Global Public Sphere mechanisms and procedures. Lefebvre and Fraser assert the need for socio-political transformation; however, they emphasize different forms of social justice, and thus their methodologies differ. This does not make them incompatible; it simply requires more theoretical work to link them. Fraser has suggested that we open up political space at the global level to increase legitimacy and efficacy of public opinion on all scales (Fraser, 2009). Henri Lefebvre suggested that we rearticulate the focus back to the reified relationships of everyday life created by capital to break down the basic structure of everyday life (Lefebvre, 2008).

# Chapter One

## The Dynamics of Urbanization and Globalization

In this first chapter, we will set out to comprehend the literature base of urbanization and globalization as isolated and interacting organizing processes. It is important to understand the complex scalar relationship between globalization and urbanization and the discontinuities they produce. This chapter will first address the canon of literature pertaining to urbanization, drawing mostly from David Harvey and Sharon Zukin. We will explore how the political economy model and the symbolic economy model can shed light on how hegemony and power is created at the urban scale. The second task will be to address globalization. Drawing from Arjun Appadurai and Erik Swyngedouw, the chapter will discuss globalization as processes of an abstract flow of culture, and then as a process of deterritorialization and reterritorialization to explore how hegemony and power is created at the global scale. The last section will examine the literature on scale and how its socio-cultural and political construction has defined the global and urban as levels of action with set capacities. This is important because it will help us to expand the definitions of scale to give greater competence to both global and urban scales when addressing social justice issues.

### 1.1.1 Urbanization: The Milieu of Economy and Culture

Harvey's political economy model stems from Marxist theory and emphasizes the shifts and trends in investment capital that transfer land ownership and power from one class to another. Zukin's symbolic economy model emphasizes the role of capital in representing social groups in public space and thus makes social rules legible in the forms of the city.

Harvey speaks about the macro-economic implications of inter-urban competition, and what the absorption of risk by the public sector through urban entrepreneurial strategies means for cities.<sup>8</sup> Urban entrepreneurialism encourages the development activities and endeavours that have the strongest localized capacity to enhance property values, the tax base, the local circulation of revenue and employment growth. Increasing geographic mobility in addition to the rapidly changing technologies have rendered many forms of production highly suspect. Harvey argues that production services that are highly localized and characterized by rapid, if not instantaneous, turnover time are the most stable for urban entrepreneurial endeavour (Harvey, 1989). This lessens the cost of locational change incurred by multinational companies, making capital more geographically mobile (Harvey, 1989). Harvey argues that much of the vaunted entrepreneurial strategy of public-private partnership almost always amounts to a subsidy for affluent consumers, corporations, and powerful command functions to stay in town at the expense of local collective consumption for the working class and poor. Many of the innovations and investments designed to make particular cities more attractive are quickly imitated by other cities, thus rendering any competitive advantage ephemeral (Harvey, 1989).

The rhetoric of neo-liberalist policies such as '*New Economic Policy and New Urban Policy*', rooted in hyper free-market liberalism creates a false narrative of decentralized opportunity at all scales through flexible production systems that simply reproduce the same structural inequalities as yesteryear's economic modernization.<sup>9</sup> The basic logic of capital has

---

8 David Harvey was born October 31, 1935 and is the Distinguished Professor of Anthropology and Geography at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY). His work has contributed greatly to broad social and political debate, and has been credited with restoring social class and Marxist methods as serious methodological tools in the critique of capitalism. In 2007, Harvey was listed as the 18th most-cited intellectual of all time in the humanities and social sciences (The Times Higher Education Guide).

9 New Economic Policy encourages private investment, deregulation, privatization in order to remove the state from economic equations; allow for 'naturally gifted investors' to perform these tasks; New Urban Policy is the offspring of these policies, which is suppose to 'launch' cities onto a new path of wealth creation (Moulaert, Swyngedouw, & Rodriguez, 2001).

always been the same, “[the] content and discourse may be decidedly contemporary, but their substance relates a certain déjà-vu of earlier debates” (Moulaert et al., 2001, 100). Harvey complements this approach by fully expounding the hidden geographies of discrimination of normalized activities in his book *Social Justice and the City* (1988).<sup>10</sup> Even though Harvey wrote this original piece long before the trends we see today, we can extrapolate this to our current context and argue that the normalized activities of globalization produce normalized global geographies of power. Geographical and social imaginations are mutually reinforcing, thus the spatial outcome of the neoliberal global economy is not an accident or should not be taken for granted.

Zukin articulates her study of the city from the symbolic cultural model perspective.<sup>11</sup> The symbolic economy model stresses that the spaces of cities are important representations of cultural and public negotiations of meaning. Built forms contribute to the construction of social identities and can either represent a visual means of exclusion or inclusion (Zukin, 1996).<sup>12</sup> In her book *The Cultures of Cities* (1995) Zukin carefully details the architectural and spatial ethnography represented in the macro and micro spaces of the city. She argues that urban space is increasingly

---

10 Harvey’s liberal formulations delve into the ‘everyday activities and operations’ of labour, real estate, housing markets tend to lead consistently to the distribution of wealth in favour of the rich. He critically engaged Rawls’ theory justice by refocusing on the process instead of the outcome (Harvey, 1988).

11 Sharon Zukin is a professor of sociology at Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center of City University in New York. She specializes in modern urban life, and has written on culture and real estate in New York City, and examined consumer society and culture, the new economic order in the United States and France.

12 The symbolic economy has two parallel production systems that are crucial to the city’s economic growth: the first is the production of space, which entails a synergy of capital and cultural meaning; and the second is the production of symbols, which is the currency of commercial exchange as well as the language of social identity (Zukin, 1996).

being appropriated and privatized by corporate and commercial forces, making the study of urban culture one part of a larger analysis of an on-going cultural war in the streets of cities.<sup>13</sup>

In the first chapter of her book mentioned above, “Whose Culture? Whose City?”, Zukin develops the concept of symbolic economy to investigate the use of culture as a tool of social control. Businesses use ‘culture’ as a tool to produce images and memories that symbolize who belongs in the space, which reinforces the meaning of that space and thus its profitability (Zukin, 1995). As city publics become more mobile and diversified across multiple scales, traditional institutions are less relevant as mechanisms for expressing identity, thus making the cultural power to create an image and frame even more important. Zukin identifies significant changes to representational spaces in the new financial-service dominant, prototypical city. The creation of controlled expressions of culture are translated to city structures as legible social rules and identities. She notes that cities share a common cultural strategy to impose an international legibility of social rules and norms cities by abstracting the service economy from production and connecting it with consumption.

The ‘*symbolic economy*’ of cities shape the lingua franca of the global elite and aid the circulation of images that influence opinion, investments and mentalities in that city and globally (Zukin, 1996). Controlling the circulation of cultural images in cities suggests the possibility of controlling social ills. Zukin warns us that we must be mindful of these controlled representations of public and urban life because we risk succumbing to the visually seductive, privatized public culture we consume.<sup>14</sup> The controlled expression of culture determine the shape of public space through the interaction between cultural symbols and entrepreneurial capital (Zukin, 1995). The

---

13 Like Jane Jacobs and Lewis Mumford, Sharon Zukin also considers city life to be a form of social theatre, and her mission to critically analyze the gradual loss of meaningful public life under the control of inclusive democratic forces that creeping privatization implies.

14 Zukin calls this process ‘pacification by cappuccino’.

symbolic economy derives from finance, media and entertainment and reflects the decisions made about who and what should be visible in the city. It reflects concepts of order and disorder based on the use of aestheticized power.<sup>15</sup>

The cultural economy establishes spaces for these cultural narratives of order and disorder to reside: “The symbolic economy recycles workers, sorts people into housing markets, lures investment, and negotiates political claim to public goods” (Zukin, 1996, 49). The web spun by cultural economies relies on a vision of cultural consumption and a social division of labour, which begs the question; who has the right to inhabit the dominant images of the city (Zukin, 1995)?

Jane M. Jacobs helps us to understand this question in her book, *The Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City* (1996). Jacobs employs post-colonial theory to provide us with a complementary examination of urban spaces under neoliberal imperialism. Similar to Sassen and Zukin, Jacobs examines the audacious banality of power structures embedded in the geographical expressions found within urban settings. However, Jacobs’ central concern is to illustrate how the materiality of place, the imaginative spatialities of desire and the cultural politics of territory are fundamental parts of colonial and post-colonial formations in the present. Post-modern urban transformations are intertwined with politics of race, nation, and embedded in imperialist traditions of imaginary and material geographies that give rise to geographies of advantage and disadvantage.<sup>16</sup> She argues that the social construction of space is part of the imperial machine, which works to neutralize and delegitimize all other forms of space (Jacobs, 1996).

---

<sup>15</sup> Cultural consumption aestheticizes cultural difference as a strategy of redevelopment. Peter Marcuse also discussed this through his analysis of generic culture and the appropriation of humanist culture to reinforce regime culture (Marcuse, 2007).

<sup>16</sup> New geographies of advantage and disadvantage are established through processes of valorization, which polarize profit-making ability and engender mass distortion in social society. The new economic geography of centrality partly reproduces existing inequalities but also is the outcome of a dynamic specific to the current forms of economic growth. Thus the geography of colonial

Scholar Kipfer and Goonewardena use the term '*urbicide*' to describe the types of urban strategies employed by neo-liberalism/ neo-imperialism as a means of control.<sup>17</sup> As classic frames of reference become irrelevant in modern processes of power, urban sites are seen as highly unpredictable, whose multicultural hybridity breaks classic spatial imaginaries that bound belonging. Thus, '*urbicide*' is employed to destroy the specific social, physical aspect of urban settlements that establish its continuity and coherence, as well as eliminates the social agonism. All of which increase the capacity of occupying forces to survey, surround, and control land and populations (Kipfer & Goonewardena, 2007).

Jane M. Jacobs carefully deconstructs the grand master narratives of empire - similar to the way Sassen deconstructs the neutrality of global space- and argues that contrary to the assertion of development theory, the colonial city is not a 'mid-point' on the linear evolution from pre-modern to modern. Now, due to the decolonization of traditional articulations of imperialism - mainly the state - the 'other' found at the 'embodied edge' has come to the heart of the empire. This has led to a failure on behalf of control and command technologies to fully construct the imaginary of a *terra nullius* in the empire's heart. Regimes of power, such as global capitalism, now try to re-inscribe their frames of power through mechanisms such as the appropriation of culture and 'otherness' into a malleable and essentialized safe constructions for consumption (Jacobs, 1996).<sup>18</sup> Commercial spaces in cities are permeated by contradictions, as "they bear the burden of representing both a city and the differentiations of power within that city; both a

---

centre/ periphery is incorporated and changed as "it assumes many forms and operates in many sectors, from the distribution of telecommunications facilities to the structure of the economy and of employment" (Sassen, 2007).

17 *Urbicide* implies a killing of cities, but what does that actually mean? If urbanity is principally entailed as a way of life determined by size, density and heterogeneity<sup>14</sup> than the destruction of urban life are the destruction of urban heterogeneity and the conditions necessary for heterogeneity (Kipfer & Goonewardena, 2007).

18 Multiculturalism of convenience domesticates heritage and cultural development often seek out otherness in the construction of contemporary spaces of consumption, such as China Towns; often 'others' want this because it offers them the only means to gain identity and power within the neo-colonial system (Jacobs, 1996).

landscape of power and a vernacular” (Zukin, 1996, 46). The tenacity of imperialism, even in light of the hybridity of global cohabitation, highlights the vulnerability of colonial structures, and is a stark reminder of the fantastic optimism of the term *postcolonialism*. Thus to be realistic, she argues that we must not simply ‘get beyond’ colonialism, we must attend to the social and political processes that struggles against the architectures of dominance, we must renegotiate the structures of power built on difference, as origin and place-based identity is more harmful than helpful (Jacobs, 1996).<sup>19</sup>

### **1.1.2 Globalization: Flows and Hegemony**

Transnational functions such as global finance, the production of capital and cultural images have reinforced ethos of rampant neoliberalism, and effectively reconstructed and reconstituted our traditional notions of geopolitical scale. Globalization, as a neoliberal ideology and strategy, entails destruction and reconstruction of prior institutional frameworks and powers, as well of divisions of labor, social relations, welfare provisions, ways of life, attachments to the land or creation of space (Harvey, 2007). Reordering and reconstituting traditional powers and institutions requires that traditional culture associated with those new structures change.

In the anthology *Theorizing Diaspora: A Reader* (2003), Arjun Appadurai argues in “Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy” that the dissonate nature of cultural globalization flows create *scapes* of new imaginaries, which overlap, encompass or transform

---

<sup>19</sup> Kipfer and Goonewardena also address this optimism. They challenge cosmopolitan theory as a geopolitical intellectual discourse, arguing that the approach often hides its own complicity in the contemporary world order by wedding cosmopolitanism to neoliberal and neo-imperial systems. Cosmopolitan theory naturalizes the capitalist city, structurally concealing the nature of the system, and side-stepping decades of debate about the formation of capitalism and imperialism (Kipfer & Goonewardena, 2007).

traditionally imagined national communities. and bolster the new global geographies of power.<sup>20</sup>

Appadurai's predominant analysis of globalization is through the binary doxic of global v. national. He argues that the newly imagined *scapes* have become a vital part of the global economy and feed off of the central tension between cultural homogenization and heterogeneity (Appadurai, 2003). Appadurai's framework has 5 dimensions of global flows that inform the *scapes* and become the basic building blocks of the newly imagined world:

- 1) Ethnoscapes map the demographic shift of tourists, immigrants, migrant workers and refugees;
- 2) Mediascapes map the distribution of electronic capabilities to produce and disseminate information and images that reflect the world;
- 3) Technoscapes map the global configuration of technology;
- 4) Financescapes map the intensely complex and rapid flows of global capital through currency markets, stock exchanges and commodity speculations;
- 5) Ideoscapes map the images and counter-images to do with politics and ideologies of the state.

Deterritorialization is one of the central forces of modern world. Cultural politics has subverted the hyphen that links nation and state and it's mooring to disorganized capital. In terms of globalism, the new cultural economy can no longer be understood in terms of existing centre-periphery models. The weakening of traditional political territorial frames has eroded the geographical binary separating inside and outside, which has enabled the imperial powers of globalization to obscure the responsibility between homeland economic restructuring projects and

---

<sup>20</sup> Arjun Appadurai, born 1949, is a contemporary social-cultural anthropologist. In his anthropological work he discusses the importance of the modernity of nation states and globalization. He currently is a faculty member of New York University's Media Culture and Communication department in the Steinhardt School.

those overseas (Graham, 2009). The deterritorialization of money and power displaces persons from markets, generating production and consumer fetishes that give the illusion of national productivity and local workers. The disjunction between global ‘*scapes*’ of homogeneity and local *scapes* of heterogeneity often lead to fetishisms and regime culture that ultimately internalize neoliberalist ideology and are purveyed by those that profit most from globalization.<sup>21</sup> The flows of globalization construct and reconstruct culture as fundamentally partitioning, it becomes less of a habitus and more an arena for choice, justification and representation. The central tension of mutual sameness and difference hijack the Enlightenment ideal of ‘triumphantly universal and resiliently particular’, which poses problems for the socialization and reproduction of social groups and identities (Appadurai, 2003, 41).

In the context of heterogeneous social, cultural, economic and ecological regulations organized on all scales, hypermobile networked flows such as those expressed through Appadurai’s framework, permeate and transgress these scales in ways that can be deeply exclusive and disempowering for those operating at that level.

Manuel Castells is the fore-scholar when it comes to discussing how technology has affected our society; *The Rise of the Network Society* (1996) is a seminal piece that discusses how new media and communication technologies based around networks contributes to a fundamental change in culture. Castells coined the term ‘*space flows*’ to help "reconceptualize new forms of spatial arrangements under the new technological paradigm. Thus the space of flows is "the

---

21 Regime Culture is a concept developed by Peter Marcuse’s concept, whereby global cultural ideologies support the practices of power and habits of culture reflect and reinforce such ideologies. David Wilson refers to this as the trope of globalization, which is the extension of neoliberal principles and designs into common thought and city planning measures, particularly the notion of the private-market as best determinant of social and land-use outcomes (Wilson, 2009).

material organization of time-sharing social practices that work through flows" (Castells, 2004, 146).<sup>22</sup>

We have seen that deterritorialization and reterritorialization of these ‘*scapes*’ (which were traditionally associated with the nation state) is a central force in globalization. These trends produce ‘*exogenous geographies*’, which is the superimposing of culture onto places through macrospatial geographies of power created by globalization (Soja, 2010). Soja argues that the cultural disjuncture is creating imagined communities with no sense of place, a rootless alienation with fantasies of electronic propinquity. This requires imagination to play a new role in social life; it is now a central form of agency in constructing landscapes, collectives and social power.

Erik Swyngedouw analyzes globalization through the binary doxic of global v. local, which offers an complementary analysis to Appadurai’s.<sup>23</sup> Swyngedouw prefers to use the term ‘glocalization’ to define the current processes of global integration. He argues that globalization is intensely geographical but this aspect is largely ignored as geographical units are often presumed to be neutral. Swyngedouw urges us to see how the dynamics of capitalism and globalization are perpetually reconfiguring space, particularly the profound geographical restructuring of hyper-urbanization (Swyngedouw, 2004). Swyngedouw argues that strategies of global localization restructure the nation-scale via supra and sub scalar mechanism. Territorial organization manifests through mechanisms such as agglomeration, scale, network flows, and divisions of labour, which all operate to valorize of circulation processes and the monopoly over social spaces

---

<sup>22</sup> The space of flows first was mentioned in *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring, and the Urban Regional Process* (1989).

<sup>23</sup> Swyngedouw is Professor of Geography at the University of Manchester in the School of Environment and Development. Swyngedouw focuses on the political economic analysis of contemporary capitalism, producing several major works on economic globalization, regional development, finance, and urbanization.

(Swyngedouw, 1992). This territorial organization is a necessary force of production and circulation, which internalizes and privatizes profit and externalizes or socializes risk.

In his essay “Scaling the City: The Political Economy of ‘Glocal’ Development—Brussels’ Conundrum” (2001), Swyngedouw notices that ‘glocal elites’ do not share reciprocity with the local institutions and politics, as networks of power create coalitions of growth that short hand localities of their power. Glocal elites often refuse to partake in local institutional or political networks because the commitment to place, which invariably comes with a greater ‘local’ institutional embedding, may militate against their global strategies and aspirations. The pursuit of openly market-led development strategies as the principle driving force lead to persistent restructuring of urban economies. The socio-spatial ordering for and by the market has become the dogma of the day; “the city, more than ever before, has become a landscape of socio-economic power where islands of extreme wealth are interspersed with spaces of poverty, social exclusion and erosion of the socio-economic fabric” (Swyngedouw & Baeten, 2001). Swyngedouw argues that this hegemonic vision of the future lacks coherent growth and instead fosters fragmentation, conflicts within and between local political and economic elites, institutional exclusion, and general malaise.

The main implication is that the global–local economic fabric may produce the desired economic growth and improved competitiveness effects, but does not necessarily induce greater social integration and cohesion. Economic integration, in a context of political fragmentation, often accentuates already acute processes of social polarization and exclusion (Swyngedouw & Baeten, 2001). As the socio-economic structure of urban becomes increasingly globalized, it also becomes increasingly polarized as social and economic processes increasingly exclude the

masses, creating enduring and structural conditions for poverty and proletarianization on the global scale (Swyngedouw & Baeten, 2001).

### **1.2.1 Constructing Scale: The Geopolitics of Globalization and Urbanization**

We have just examined how globalization and urbanization produce mechanism and dogma that govern and reinforce power relations that operate global and urban levels. This last section will show how these two processes interact, confront, and overlap one another to produce new and reified power relations in a post-Westphalian world. The construction of scale establishes and outlines the capacity for action and decisions making in a hierarchal system that is often associated with territorialized governance structures. We saw that globalization produces both imaginary *scapes* of political community through cultural global flows, as well as the necessary territorial configurations at the urban scale to integrate global capital interests and mechanism into the urban milieu. We saw urbanization produce spaces and mechanisms that symbolize social rules and reinforce power relations necessary to produce profit and attract investment. This section will articulate the Global City as a physical representation of the scalar point of intersection between global and urban levels. It is crucial to understand how the Global City produces and reproduces the mechanisms and dogma for both global and urban scales, so that we may be able to better discern counter geographies based on social justice.

The '*politics of scale*' is a concept that refers to process by which scales are socially and politically constructed, and thus historically changeable through sociopolitical contestation. The social and political aspects to the production of scale can now be considered an established truism within contemporary human geography. David Delany's paper, "The Political Construction of Scale" (1997) speaks to the conceptual definition of geographical scale and its relationship to political action and organization. Delany states that traditionally, geographical scale is the nested

hierarchy of bounded space, generally ranging from local to global (Delaney & Leithneh, 1997). However, he also notes that the notion of scale as a fixed concept is problematic. The processes of globalization have created different incentives at different scales and it is important to understand how these scales interact or conflict (Delaney & Leithneh, 1997). Recognizing that politics is not solely exercised by the state, Delany argues that political geography can legitimately concern itself with the spatial aspects of power concerning non-state actors.<sup>24</sup> “The politics of scale involve the politics of interests and of consciousness, and their connections”, which he argues is bound up with different conceptions of localness, mobility, identity (Delaney & Leithneh, 1997, 94).

As mentioned earlier, the politics of localness, mobility and identity are not the sole project of states, which means that power and scale require an examination from the perspective of a wider range of actors.<sup>25</sup> Sallie Marston’s examination in her paper “The Social Construction of Scale” (2000) takes a social constructionist approach to understanding the connection between constructing scale and constructing space. This approach, like Delaney had conceded, is a necessary and complementary approach and places emphasis on capitalist productions, the role of the state, labour, and non-state actors. Marston argues that the complex process of social reproduction and consumption is missing from the analysis of scale and space. As a social

---

24 To understand how scale is constructed Delaney looks at the paradigmatic emblem of geo-political scale, federalism. The arguments used by federalists in the creation of the state, such as the USA, were not mere elements of inevitability but carefully constructed ideologies of social life and human relatedness that actively opposed and pitted against divergent understandings of scale. Even though the federalists won out in 1780, the meaning and practical significance of federalism has continually been questions, rethought, and refashioned, often through the politics of constitutional interpretation. Illustrating that the politics of the social construction of scale is continually ongoing thus making the products fluid and revisable (Delaney & Leithneh, 1997).

25 This is often exemplified through the political construction of economic scale, such as the flexible scales of sourcing and marketing; or through cultural political scale such as post-colonial consciousness or indigenous struggles against ethnocide. “In short, once our conception of scale is freed from the fixed categories inherited from the past and our conception of politics is similarly expanded and enlivened, the questions multiply and the analytic or interpretive problems involved in relating scale to politics become more obvious” (Delaney & Leithneh, 1997, 95).

theorist, understanding social processes that shape social practices at different scales constitutes an operational connotation of physical geographical scale (Marston, 2000). Thus Marston, like Delaney and many other political geographers reaffirm the constructionist framework when analyzing scale, understanding scale is a contingent outcome of tensions that exist between structural forces and human agents.<sup>26</sup>

These two approaches, like many other methodologies in this paper, are not mutually exclusive, and Neil Brenner's paper, "The Limits of Scale" (2001), argues that the generality of the notion of the '*politics of scale*' have been deployed by human geographers to describe a number of different sociospatial practices within contemporary capitalism (Brenner, 2001). Brenner argues that Marston uses the phrase in a singular connotation. In her argument, he notes the absence of an explicit causal argument linking the substantive social content of the spatial unit (in this case the local or urban) to its embeddedness or positionality within a broader scalar hierarchy (that is the regional, national, and global) (Brenner, 2001).<sup>27</sup> Brenner observes that there is a wide breadth of sophisticated analytical vocabulary tools for grasping many other dimensions of capitalist spatiality; however, these new lexicons associated with singular connotations of geographical scale has lead to a denaturalization, dehistoricization and general lack of critical interrogation of the very spatial units and hierarchies in which capitalist social relations are configured (Brenner, 2001).

---

26 Such as David Harvey, Edward Soja, Doreen Massey, Erik Swyngedouw.

27 Brenner notes that the political of scale in its singular connotation refers to a relatively differentiated and self-enclosed geographical unit. Here scale is understood essentially as a boundary separating the unit in question – be it a place, a locality, a territory or any other spatial form – from other geographical units or locations. The plural meaning, refers to the production, reconfiguration or contestation of particular differentiations, orderings and hierarchies among geographical scales, which connotes not only the production of differentiated spatial units as such, but also, more generally, their embeddedness and positionalities. Brenner used Swyngedouws' (1997) examination of glocalization as a paradigmatic example of the flexible accumulation, as a 'glocal' rescaling of political-economic space (Brenner, 2001).

Brenner argues that scale evolves relationally within hierarchies and dispersed interscalar networks that give meaning, function, history and dynamics. Geographical scale is constituted through its “historically evolving positionality within a larger relational grid of vertically ‘stretched’ and horizontally ‘dispersed’ sociospatial processes, relations and interdependencies” (Brenner, 2001, 606). For Brenner, the intelligibility of scalar articulation hinges upon its embeddedness within dense webs of its relation to other scales and spaces (Brenner, 2001).<sup>28</sup> He wants to move beyond the concept’s most generic function, and prevent the ‘*politics of scale*’ concept from being a catchphrase for summarizing the proposition that geographical scales and scalar configurations are socially produced and politically contested through human social struggle. Brenner proposes that we articulate a ‘politics of scalar structuration’ or a ‘politics of scaling’. He argues that this will better connote the core analytical function of a plural connotation of the ‘politics of scale’, systematic account of scale production and scalar transformation (Brenner, 2001). Scalar structuration is a dimension of sociospatial processes that are constituted and continually reworked through everyday social routines and struggles. The processes is dialectically relate to other forms of sociospatial structuration that produce multiple forms and patterns of scale and territory that evolve relationally within hierarchies and networks.

It is important to note that scalar hierarchies and networks do not constitute a pyramid, but a mosaic, this will help us to move beyond vertical global institutions towards horizontal ones. We must also ward against the crystalization of scale as illustrated by Paquet’s concern in the introduction. Crystalized systems of ‘old-guard’ governance will constrain subsequent evolutions of scalar configuration and produce entrenched geographies and choreographies of social power

---

<sup>28</sup> The pervasiveness of this tendency to use the politics of scale in its singular connotation is exemplified, in the urban sociology of the Chicago School and their equation of the neighborhood scale with community cohesion or ethnic identity, as well as in the conventional modern theoretical understandings of the national scale as the ontologically necessary arena for economic development and political democracy (Brenner, 2001).

(Brenner, 2001). Lastly, it is important to note that it is dangerous to assume the state is a powerless victim of globalization and urbanization. Some scholars argue that the role of the state is actually becoming more - rather than less- important in developing the productive powers of territory and in producing new spatial configurations. Swyngedouw argues that the '*glocal state*' is a territorially bounded state that is increasingly embedded within global flows of capital, commodities, and labor-power, and one of its primary goals is to 'mediate between the supra- and the sub-national (Swyngedouw, 1992). The geographies of globalization can be characterized by a situation of territorial noncorrespondence in which the scales of capital, urbanization, and state territorial power increasingly diverge from one another, which is similar to Appadurai's notion of disjuncture.

### **1.2.2 Finding Social Justice through the Structuration of Scale in the Global City**

This chapter has examined the processes of globalization and urbanization and their production of narratives and mechanisms that operate within scale, as well as interact and conflict across scale. From our exploration, we have discerned that narratives of urbanization and globalization require that scale be conceived as constructed vertically and containerized. However, with a deeper appreciation of the inconsistencies and falsities in the dogma perpetuating the construction of scale, narrative and mechanisms of power we can begin to express opportunities for their transformation. Socially and politically transforming conceptions of scale will rearticulate the scope of activity framed by scale when responding to injustices produced by processes of urbanization and globalization. The next step is to develop a framework informed by social justice that can manage the disjunctive geopolitics of urbanization and globalization. Searching for justice in an global and urban context requires a collective frame of action to bring together multiple and disparate efforts in order to realize their transformative potential.

There are three broad streams of social justice literature that will inform our exploration of global and urban scalar structuration in the Global City: liberal political philosophy, communicative rationality, and political economy. Historically, the Greek and Platonic philosophical traditions have always expressed an intimate connection between the city and justice; Socrates conceived of the *'just city'* in order to better discern an argument for justice as an ethical guide for individuals. Justice in this context, was defined by the internal quality of the city, necessarily engaging with political questions of distributive power (Paetzold, 2000). Plato formed the basis for the liberal political conception of justice that is still present in contemporary Western debates with John Rawls' *A Theory of Justice* (1971) as the apex of egalitarian justice. However, many scholars such as Iris Mirion Young have argued that Rawls' contractualist conception of rights and law was fundamentally aspatial and ahistorical (Young 1990). Rawls, and other scholars such as Sen or Nussbaum have not elaborated on how their normative conceptions of justice can be realized. Moreover, scholars such as Soja and Young argue that postmodernist theories on the social production of space characterize the "cultural turn" and the role of recognition in the definition of social justice (Connolly & Steil, 2009).

The second contemporary conception of justice, exemplified in Habermas' communicative rationality, argues that communicative ethics and the ideal speech situation is the basis for creating discourse-based democracy. The implications for urban theory is that the 'ends' or products of discourse are the *de facto* result of practice, which means that there are no standards to judge the outcomes. This approach has also been criticized for failing to recognize the impossibility of creating truly ideal speech situations. The last stream is political economy, based on Marx's critique of liberal conceptions of justice, but can be more aptly applied to our discussions through David Harvey's Marxist geography. The implication for urban theory is thus

much more radical; Harvey argues that we need to explore different modes of production and consumption, rather than deal with the undesirable outcomes of capitalism.

As we advance these streams, we will develop two approaches to understanding spatialized social justice in the Global City. The first is the called the '*Justice of Urbanization*', which articulates social justice from the perspective of liberal political philosophy and communicative rationality, and will draw on the works of Nancy Fraser. The second approach is called the '*Urbanization of Justice*', and articulates social justice from the political economy perspective by drawing on the works of Henri Lefebvre.<sup>29</sup> This paper has chosen to use urbanization as the focal process – instead of globalization- because Saskia Sassen has urged us to recover the places of globalization. Thus by recovering the local-urban scalar spaces of the Global City, it should recover spaces of the global scalar spaces. The intimate interdependencies between scalar spaces requires us to analytically decipher the social transformation of global spaces on all scales, as well as the social transformation of local-urban spaces on all scales. Through a spatially informed design of social justice, we can now begin to connect the processes of scale in a cohesive way that will enable social and political transformation.

---

29 I use David Harvey's idea of the "urbanization of injustice" as inspiration for developing my two analytical streams; the '*Justice of Urbanization*' and the '*Urbanization of Justice*'. It begs us to critique our approach to social justice in the city: Are there problems in the city, or problems with the city (Harvey, 1997)?

## Chapter Two

### The Urbanization of Justice

This chapter will develop the first piece of our framework. It will focus on Henri Lefebvre's theory of *The 'Right to the City'* and the *'Social Production of Space'* to argue that the urban space of the Global City is a function of both global and local justice. Henri Lefebvre (1901-1991) was one of the most prolific of French Marxist intellectuals, "... during his long career, his work has gone in and out of fashion several times, and has influenced the development not only of philosophy but also of sociology, geography, political science and literary criticism" (Radical Philosophy obituary, 1991.) He is best known for pioneering the critique of everyday life, for introducing the concepts of the right to the city and the production of social space, and for his work on dialectics, alienation, and criticism of Stalinism and structuralism. During his prolific career, Lefebvre wrote more than sixty books and three hundred articles.

The first section of the chapter will focus on the *'social production of space'*, which serves as a critical tool to illuminate urban space's role in 'reproducing the relations of production' in everyday life. To speak of producing space sounds strange to some, as many still hold the belief that space is empty prior to whatever fills it. However, Lefebvre argues that economic relations and the state have colonized everyday life by unilaterally producing the space it occupies. Our job, as critical urban theorists, is to overcome the banality of the social spaces defined by economic power relations, which have alienated the local inhabitant from the space in which they inhabit. The second section will extrapolate on Henri Lefebvre's concept of the *'Right to the City'* (RTTC), which is a radical tool designed to appropriate the processes of social space making, and thus rearticulate the social relationships that they express. The last section will be to

extrapolate these lessons to the Global City context with the help of scholars like David Harvey, Neil Brenner and Marc Purcell. The intention is to build an argument that will later enable us to use the human rights language of RTTC as a collective critical tool when addressing the procedural frustration between governing global, and thus reflect on urbanization of justice – or the spatial production of just relations.

### **2.1.1 The Social Production of Space: Exposing the Co-Imbrication of Global and Local Space**

The intent is to clarify the intimate connection between social relations and social space. The urbanization of society has led to the convergence of socio-politics, of wealth, knowledge, and art based on the everyday life of its dwellers. Lefebvre describes this intimate relation as an ‘*oeuvre*’, which refers to the city form and content as defined by its perpetual use. French sociologist and Marxist philosopher, Henri Lefebvre, spent much of his career dedicated to studying the role of (and the production of) space in what he called the ‘*reproduction of social relations of production*’. Lefebvre argued that producing space also produces the social relations necessary to valorize that space. The central argument in his books *The Survival of Capitalism* (1976), and *The Production of Space* (1974) is that urbanization is constituted through the processes of capitalism, and as a result becomes a constituting phenomenon in itself.

This paper will draw mostly on *The Production of Space* (1976), where he argues that space is a complex social construction (based on values and the social production of meanings), which affect spatial practices and perceptions of the city. For Lefebvre, the urban refers to the spatial forms of built environments, as well as the spatial relations found within the spatial form. The ‘*urban form*’ is closely tied to its contents and Lefebvre refers to this as a dialectical

relationship between city and urbanization (Kipfer & Goonewardena, 2007).<sup>30</sup> Lefebvre wants to reconstruct how ‘*the production of space*’ illuminates and validates its own “coming-into-being” as a “theoretical concept and practical activity in indissoluble conjunction” (Lefebvre, 1991, 67).

While most sociologists, including Habermas, address ‘everyday life’ as a subsystem situated between the state and the economy, Lefebvre argued that everyday life constitutes a fundamental layer that supersedes the economy and state as the designer of society. He saw that the social production of space is commanded by the hegemonic class as a tool to reproduce its own dominance and social order. As a Marxist theorist, Lefebvre invoked many Marxist theories such as theories of value, surplus, private property and alienation, whereby the powers of economic relations dictate the basic modes of being and determine social life. The social production of urban space is fundamental to the reproduction of society, and hence of capitalism itself.<sup>31</sup> Lefebvre argues that capitalism takes over space and modifies it, and social space under capitalism is then abstracted from ‘everyday life’, alienating people from the multiple processes of governance and production. Just as Jane M. Jacobs noted in Chapter One, imperialism is not a stage of capitalism but integral to the accumulation process, creating a permanent and systematic role for the destruction and reconstruction of cities in the economic processes.

In his book, *De L’Etat* (1976, 1978), Lefebvre notes the role of the state in organizing the relationships of production require the coordination of pulverized capitalist abstract space by thwarting opposition through hierarchal separation of social space.<sup>32</sup> This analysis can be

---

30 This approach is now called “spatial anthropology”, which studies the structure of urban experiences around schemes of symbolic activities, which denotes a connection between the philosophy of symbols and the phenomenology of bodily-centered experiences and cultural inscriptions of the semantic ordering (Paetzold, 2000).

31 However, Lefebvre is highly critical of the economic structuralism that dominated the academic discourse in this period.

32 The ‘Dual City’ is an example of pulverized hierarchal space whereby the economic consequence of globalization in which entire internal urban peripheries are structurally disconnected from transnational economic development (Graham, 2009).

extrapolated to understand the more general colonization at the macro-level, which allows us to connect global politics with the everyday life experiences in micro-levels spaces.

We all experience ‘physical domination’ in the city; the buildings and streets determine where and how we can move in space, telling us who we are in relation to the dominant powers. City environments represent the dominant powers and thus – in the very least indirectly or by omission— represent the powerless. In the article “Culture Industry Cities: From discipline to exclusion, from citizen to tourist”, Heinz Steinert proposes to illustrate power relations by analyzing a number of city architectures to see what conclusion can be drawn as to the kinds of society represented in today’s city (Steinert, 2009).<sup>33</sup> The capitalist project has been to transform and hack up urban space through the transactions of privatized exchange-value. The unilateral development of factories, banking districts, research complexes, and political power hubs have had grave consequences on people’s ability to contribute to the oeuvre, and thus produce urban social space based on the everyday life of the urban dweller (Merrifield, 2006). The domination experienced by the lower class is established and perpetuated by the physical architecture of the city and by the creation of space, or as Steinert would call it – the ‘*culture of industry*’. Struggles over the city have mostly been defensive: against eviction, against gentrification, against building projects. However, using Lefebvre’s ideas, scholars like Heinz argue that we should start to think about these struggles as offensive by developing a theory of ‘*architecture from below*’.

To develop an offensive strategy will require space to move beyond its conception as a passive locus of social relations; it must be active and instrumental in the construction of

---

<sup>33</sup> Example of dominant city architectures: architecture for entertainment; the panopticon (This new architecture of power is used quite indiscriminately) The way these are set up are to perpetuate power imbalances

Example 2: labor architecture; segregation of working class from the dominant city powers, which is similar to the rent barracks in Vienna (‘factory settlement’ built around the factory). Home-ownership supports the illusion of personality and a personal life. In this way it is, again, a prime example of ‘culture industry’ (Steinert, 2009).

knowledge and action in the existing modes of production. Capitalism – and by extension global capital- as hegemony has understood and taken advantage of space and its instrumental role in the creation of systems based on the hegemonic use of logic, knowledge and expertise. Technocratic managerialism has produced a seductive privatized public culture through which public decisions are made. Moreover, the geography of urbanization has become more extensive with the onset of global spatial practices, and because cities are the sites of everyday life where the consumption of use-value takes place, they are inherently the territorial locals of perceived global contradictions (Brenner, 1997). Within a global capitalists society knowledge and information are the ultimate commodity, and as information becomes the product of capitals organization our ability to think critically about the contradiction inherent in the system is abstracted from us.

According to Castells, the information society fetishizes its own processes by defining the agenda and legitimating the politics, which only enables citizens to dissent on issues but not the mode of life (Castells, 2005). Intellectual labour, like material labour, has been subject to endless division and each mode of thinking - geographical, economic, demographic, sociological, ecological, political, etc. - is piled upon the other, each trying to make society an object of a systematization that must be closed to be complete. Lefebvre also notes that the utter lack of totality requires an enduring violence to close or complete the system. Thus, he prescribes a unity theory to discover or construct a theoretical unity between fields that have been apprehended separately (Lefebvre, 1991). The theory of unity intimately connects all aspects of knowledge production based on everyday life to the urban oeuvre, which would unite form with content through the social transformation of social relations through the production social space. This is the basis of social transformation, praxis between form and content in urban spaces of everyday

life – Lefebvre calls this ‘*cultural revolution*’; the transformation of everyday life that embraces a new urbanism in which ordinary people would produce autonomous space.

### **2.2.1 The RTTC: Reclaiming Social Space to Develop Just Social Relations**

Lefebvre’s grand project was to discern the consequences of modernity, in its latest capitalist incarnation, on the multiplicity of forms of social life. He argues that ‘everyday life’ and social space must be elevated to critical thinking in order to discern its actual relation to the processes of reproduction. He argues that ensuring the multiplicity of social life requires a ‘*right to difference*’, defined by the development of a democratic concept of praxis at the most intimate level of social life.<sup>34</sup> The RTTC is the realization of philosophy through its transformation into the realm of urban space, also requires transforming philosophy into the domain of art – the ‘*oeuvre*’- whereby art functions as a paradigm for the processes of appropriation (praxis on a social scale). Lefebvre draws on Nietzsche’s idea of the festival by arguing that “the eminent use of the city, that is, of the streets, squares, and edifices, and monuments is la fete” (Paetzold, 2000). The RTTC must be claimed and reaffirmed in everyday life and demands a radical reorganization of the socio-economic and political processes from the politics of exclusionary capital processes towards a politics of the local. Henri Lefebvre asks: Can we act on the collective recognition that alienation can be overcome?

### **2.2.2 The Contents**

The RTTC is now a common political slogan used by local activists to fight against the unilateral political power of neo-liberal global capitalists systems. However, Lefebvre intended

---

<sup>34</sup> Many scholars have discussed what this right entails, Kipfer and Goonewardena posit that Lefebvre’s concept of difference is different from the liberal-pluralist, he argues for a maximal or produced difference (non-alienated forms of individuality and plurality = creatively self-determined urban society) (Kipfer & Goonewardena, 2007).

the concept to be much more radical. The RTTC must enable the social transformation of the city based on a new praxis of urban society. The city is a perpetual oeuvre, thus having a RTTC is having a right to the perpetual oeuvre. The RTTC is more than a struggle against capitals claims on the city; it is a new idea for a politicized '*architecture from below*' (Steinert, 2009). Claiming the RTTC is about asserting revolutionary perspectives on urban society that emerge out of the struggles in social space (Kipfer & Goonewardena, 2007).

The 'RTTC' has two tenants:

- A) The first is the having a right to appropriate urban space from systems and political power, and thus the respective socio-political relations;
- B) The second is having a right to participate in determining what is to be done with the appropriated space (Lefebvre, 1996).

The ability to appropriate urban space is the ability to appropriate the urban processes that produce that space, which is the foundation of this right. It requires the full democratization of the processes that determine the social systems – which Lefebvre argues have traditionally never been fully democratized. The radical inference is that the necessary exclusion found in capital systems (such as private property and market shares) are inherently incongruent with the democratic demands of the right. Lefebvre wants us to appropriate the social systems that have been asserted through urban social space and transform them into something new, something based on the everyday lives of the city dwellers.

Marcuse (2009) states that:

It is not just a right to public space, or a right to information and transparency in government, or a right to access the centre, or a right to this service or that, but the right to a totality, a complexity, in which each of the parts in part of a single whole to which the right is demanded. (192)

In order to appropriate the social systems/ relations/ and social space we must appropriate the process - or the '*modes of life*'.<sup>35</sup>

The legal applications of this right have been interpreted and deployed in many ways, and there are two general interpretations of the concept: The first is developed by David Harvey, who generally falls in line with Lefebvre's radical interpretation and argues that the right must be interpreted as a maximal, positivist and collective concept; the second interpretation is developed by Don Mitchell who prescribes the right in a negative and individual way, orienting the right as a guard against the democratic majority.

In his book The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space (2003), Don Mitchell predominantly analyzes the plight of the homeless who have been systematically and structurally left out of governance by the majority. For example, Mitchell uses the example of anti-panhandling laws, which are seen by the majority to keep parks, street corners and other social spaces safe, but actively prevent the homeless from asserting their RTTC by creating space in which live their everyday lives. Mitchell attempts to negotiate between the rights of people when this right often enables conflict between groups (Mitchell, 2003). The consequence of interpretation will determine the nature of the political conflict, and demands that we critically think about who *should* determine what the city looks like, and who 'should' benefit from the city?

### **2.2.3 The Subjects**

Articulating 'who' is the claimant of this right is an important –and perhaps the most challenging- aspect that requires analysis. If the city is an '*oeuvre*' that is constructed and reconstructed through the actions of people's everyday lives, then it can be inferred that the urban

---

<sup>35</sup> Lefebvre is clear that we cannot return to an older system or city and must combat nostalgia (Lefebvre, 1976, 1978).

inhabitants (often referred to as ‘citadens’), who actively (or attempt to actively) exercise the use-value of a space, should hold this right.

“Under the right to the city, membership to the community of enfranchised people is not an accident of nationality, ethnicity, or birth; rather it is earned by living out the routines of everyday life in the space of the city” (Purcell, 2002, 102).

Whether we examine the contents of the right from the perspective of Harvey or Don Mitchell, the intention is to reorient the locus of political belonging from abstract scalar constructions towards the concrete local. The hierarchical layers of political scale have often obfuscated the ways in which disenfranchisement has operated at the nation-state level of Liberal – Democratic/ Westphalian (LDW) citizenship. Within the LDW model, citizen participation is primarily restricted to the affairs of the state, which has never actively made the social project of space an inclusive process. The state has always been a central actor in the generation of capital, which has enabled policy to restrict its affairs to the prime factors of capitalism – labour, land, and capital. As previously discussed, capital requires private land, thus removing its development from public discourse. For Lefebvre, the production of space is the most important aspect of social life, which as Purcell notes, the RTTC focuses more on the right to inhabit and the right to participate in the decision making process (Purcell, 2002). Lefebvre argues that decision-making role of the citizen must be central, however he is not explicit about what this centrality means for other scales of action (Lefebvre, 1996).

According to Lefebvre, the reorientation of democratic processes would primarily privilege the local. However with the advent of globalization there has been a reorientation towards the global as well. The contents of the RTTC must be interpreted within this context, and our task is to imagine new citizenships that challenge LDW’s insistence on the nation as the principal actor, and to observe and understand the ways in which new citizenships are already challenging and

destabilizing the nation as the dominant form of political community. Mark Purcell argues that in order to resist the growing dominance of capital in the economy, the idea of citizenship needs to be expanded so that more citizens are able to contribute to the decision making process where the politics affect their own city.

At the time Lefebvre was writing, he could not have anticipated the full breadth of globalization today; however, the RTTC contributed to the expansion of enfranchisement beyond the conventionally defined citizenry. Globalism has blurred the scalar borders and as a result decision-making regarding the “city” is much more complicated. Moving Lefebvre’s critical argument forward, we must once again re-enfranchise beyond the state scale as well as beyond the mere local. Purcell recognizes citizenship as the mechanism for participation, and it must be rescaled, reterritorialized, and reoriented in order to resist the growing dominance of capital in the economy.<sup>36</sup> The idea of citizenship needs to be expanded to contribute to the decision making process of the politics capitalist social relations by developing alternative measures of participation (Purcell, 2002). Citizenship measures must move beyond territorial and scalar traps, they must be fluid enough so they can be mobilized when social justice issues arise, regardless of scale.

---

<sup>36</sup> Rescaling citizenship incorporates the political community, which consists of a wide range of groups that share a political interest of some kind. Political communities are becoming weakened by the creation of other kinds of communities (For example, as the human rights community and other transnational notions of rights grow and expand, the responsibility of the nation-state becomes less relevant in regards to the basis of citizenship). The rescaling of citizenship has involved a process of glocalization. This means that there has been a move from national-scale citizenship toward new forms of citizenship on other scales, both above and below the nation. This is important because it moves away from the inclusion versus exclusion divide that exists. New citizenship forms are currently being pursued by social movements that emerge out of the poorer half of the global city (Ex. Global cities contain large amounts of TNM, which presents the opportunity for the emergence of new forms of citizenship) Reterritorializing citizenship is often complicated by the continuing link between formal citizenship and the territorial state, and as we develop new forms of citizenship, the state must encompass more than just the spatial reorganization of policies. Reorienting citizenship is the shift away from the nation as the predominant political community. Those who are in favour of this notion maintain that citizenship leads to multiple identities and loyalties to various political communities (Purcell, 2002).

#### **2.2.4 The Urbanization of Justice: Articulating Assumptions**

Lefebvre does not give specific prescriptions for the new socio-political and governance structures, but it is clear that the Global City will require more thorough examination than traditional cities that are embedded predominantly in nation-state scales. Lefebvre's work has primarily focused on deconstructing the mystification of the state as the container of social space through spatialized political theory. The state as a sociospatial configuration uses space as a privileged tool to extend its power and control over social relations in the midst of '*anarchic global flows*' (Lefebvre, 1991). David Harvey also understands the state's role as crucial in constructing the territorial configurations upon which each new round of capital dispossession is grounded. The territorialization of political power has been essential precondition for a state's ability to regulate global flows, however since capital is based on the continuous crisis-induced drive towards restructuring, we have seen the state's capacity to achieve some measure of control is still only relative (Brenner, 1997). The principle role of the state is no longer to produce growth but to protect and ensure the relations of domination that produce growth are protected. The state is forced to mediate between global and local tensions as it becomes denaturalized of its power at both levels.

Since 1970, world capitalism and global social space have been rescaled and reterritorialized, and many scholars have attempted to grapple with the unstated spatial assumptions inherent in the problem. Brenner discerned four main spatial lexicons; territory, place, scale, and network. However, he has criticized all approaches for remaining relatively isolated within their own frameworks. Brenner argues that sociospatial theory has been far too concerned with "fine-tuning and applying conceptual tools associated with one or another 'turn'

rather than with exploring the mutually constitutive relations among those categories and their respective empirical objects” (Jessop, Brenner, & Jones, 2008, 390- 391).

Brenner furthers this argument in his article “Global, Fragmented, Hierarchical: Henri Lefebvre's Geographies of Globalization”, when he states that many scholars who attempt to grapple with the spatial aspects of political theory either fall into the ‘*territorial trap*’, or commit the fallacy of ‘*global babble*’.<sup>37</sup> Brenner makes the case that even though Lefebvre could not have anticipated the hyper-globalization of today; his theory is still able to circumvent the analytical impasse of today’s spatial lexicons by criticizing social political theory for conceiving of space as a static container. Space is crucial to understanding social relations, thus globalization must be understood as a multiscalar transformation of global social space (Brenner, 1997).

Lefebvre’s analysis is an effort to understand how the contradictions of contemporary capitalism are expressed on multiple and intertwined scales, and then to decipher ‘openings’ for transformation politics. Lefebvre calls this ‘*trial by space*’, a process of re-evaluation of systems, values, cultivated elites and that all to dispossessed have to atone with; “it is in space, on a worldwide scale, that each idea of value acquires or loses its distinctiveness through confrontation with other values and ideas” (Lefebvre, 1991, 416). Transcending the ‘*territorial trap*’ and ‘*global babble*’ of current spatialized debates on justice in a globalized world requires us to understand the dialectical and disjunctive relationship of scale in producing and expressing globalization as an idea. The most important lesson to draw from Lefebvre is the recognition that the deterritorialization of social relations once crystallized in the nation-state frame, and the

---

37 These terms were explored in chapter one, as we saw global scholars such as Appadurai, Castells, and Swyngedouw refer to these as ‘the spaces of flows’, ‘hyper space’, and ‘glocalization’. Territorial trap is an ahistorical state-centric explanation of mapping global processes (John Agnew). ‘Global babble’ is an attempt to avoid the territorial trap by focusing on the global v. local and deeming the state incompatible with today’s context, these are binary doxics (global/nationa v. global/local) (Brenner, 1997).

simultaneous reterritorialization into supra and sub spaces will have major consequences for the transformative praxis of '*trial by space*'.<sup>38</sup>

Social space is 'second nature' to urbanized built environments, and the production and reproduction of social space by capital requires the general structuration of and rationalization of social relations to support its hegemony. Globalization increases the spatial density of networks, social spaces (and thus social relations). Geographically distant places become intertwined, and thus become a necessary 'second nature' to the fundamental flows of global capital (Brenner, 1997).<sup>39</sup> Using Lefebvre, Brenner argues that social space becomes the scaffolding for geopolitical scale, and as a result the global scale must be conceived as a hypercomplex amalgamation of multiple social forms of sociospatial organization, and not as a reified territorial essence with unilateral processes (Brenner, 1997). With this in mind, the first assumption to develop from our framework would be to recognize that the nature of the Global City's social imaginaries are not 'placeless' but rather permeate and dialogically relate to all places.

In *De L'Etat* (1978), one of the central arguments was that the 'nation-state mode of production' has been globalized, territorializing the capitalist's trinity within a global matrix of mutually exclusive nation-state scales (Lefebvre, 1978). Thus, while the global market implies a degree of unity, it sub-textually fractures space in order to produce unequal social relations of power, radically intensifying the problem of territorial non-correspondence (Brenner, 1997). The viability of all transformative politics depends on its ability to appropriate, produce and organize social space, and thus the nature of social relations. Lefebvre states, "The space of a [social] order

---

38 Neil Brenner argues that this is the core analysis of the politics of scale (Brenner, 1997).

39 Scholars such as Castells (1996) and Amin (2002) have focused on networks, stressing transversal, 'rhizomatic' forms of interspatial interconnectivity. The ability for technology and capital to overcome the distance of space is predicated on its ability to produce it, which has fed into broader theoretical debates regarding the conceptualization of emergent network geographies and their relation to inherited territorial, place-based, and scalar formations (Amin, 2004; Marston, 2000).

is hidden in the order of space.... [and] there is a violence intrinsic to abstraction, and to abstraction's practical [social] use" (Lefebvre, 1991, 289). With this in mind, the second assumption would argue that there must be recognition of the intimate praxis of global social space in the local-urban structures of the Global City.

We have seen the intimate relationship between social relations in society and the social spaces they express, as well as that the RTTC stresses the need to restructure these power relations that underline the production of urban space in order to fundamentally shift control away from capital and state and toward urban inhabitants. The production of urban space entails much more than just planning the material space of the city: it involves producing and reproducing all aspects of urban life. With respect to this framework, how can our understanding of the urban-global praxis in the Global City help us to better recover the social spaces and produce social justice? How can urbanization, as a dialectical process between form and content, enable us to produce social justice on both local and global scales?

As we move forward with our framework, we will see how the '*Urbanization of Justice*' in the Global City will lead us to expand the social relations conceived in terms of citizenship in order to foster local-global appropriation and participation in social transformation. Lefebvre would argue that the local scale should always take priority, as it is the scale that has an immediate impact on the everyday life. However, Purcell warns us not to assume anything a priori about the characteristics of a particular scale or scalar arrangement.<sup>40</sup> It is clear that issue domains are complex, manifold and compounded, and Lefebvre's concept urges us to examine social justice issues from the perspective of everyday lives in order to enable them to take a central role in decision-making. In the Global City, everyday life now transgresses the propinquity of locality,

---

40 Purcell refers to the 'local trap' in order to warn against the automatic assumption that local scales are inherently democratic (Purcell, 2006).

adding another layer of complexity. How is the production of urban space reflected in processes of govern the complex relationship between global and local scales?

## **Chapter Three**

### **The Justice of Urbanization**

This chapter will develop the second part of our framework, the *'Justice of Urbanization'*. It will draw from Nancy Fraser's *'critical democratic theory'* and her *'tripartite theory of justice'* to argue that complex scalar processes in the Global City require strong but flexible procedural mechanisms to produce social justice. Nancy Fraser was born May 20, 1947, and is an American critical theorist. She is currently the Henry A. and Louise Loeb Professor of Political and Social Science and Professor of Philosophy at The New School in New York City. As a noted feminist thinker, she has devoted most of her academic career to the conceptions of justice. She argues that social theorists should overcome the "false antithesis" between critical theory and post-structuralism in order to gain a fuller understanding of the social and political issues with which both approaches are concerned.

The chapter will start by elaborating on the liberal and communicative conceptions of justice, using Habermas to focus particularly on the latter. The second section will expand these communicative procedural traditions with help from Mary Kaldor to address the globalized context. The chapter will employ and build upon the concepts of *'Global Public Sphere'* and the *'Global Civil Society'* to contextualize the procedures in a spatialized theory of justice. The last section will articulate the lessons and concepts of justice drawn within the literature to the processes of urbanization in the Global City. The intent is to develop a communicatively based concept of procedurally just urbanization.

### **3.1.1 Critical Democratic Theory: An Application of Habermas to Today**

Critical theory and public sphere theory are two veins of literature from which Nancy Fraser draws. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1991) is seminal to the canon of public sphere theory, in which Jurgen Habermas constructs the concept of a *'representative publicity'* and analyzes its structural transformation through the public sphere. According to

Habermas, the public sphere is a body of private actors assembled to discuss matters of public concern, common interests, or public opinion (Habermas, 1991). Habermas argues that people's use of 'reason' in the public sphere mediates society and the state by holding states accountable to discursively generated public opinion. It also ensures the engagement of 'rules' in the decision-making that govern relations in the private – but publicly relevant – realms of commodity exchange and social labour. Within the modern state apparatus of Westphalia, the subject of public opinion is the regulatory counterbalance to public authorities (Habermas, 1991).

Habermas develops the theory of '*Communicative Ethics*' to model procedurally applied rules that private actors acting within the public sphere must adhere. Habermas argues that the validity of a norm ultimately rests on the features of the argument process itself, where discursive agreement contributes to the condition of validity producing substantive grounding for normative consensus; the procedural characteristics must bear the burden of explaining why results achieved in a procedurally correct manner enjoy the presumption of validity (Habermas, 1998). There are two main principles in the communicative ethics theory, which Nancy Fraser will interpret to reassert their critical function against hegemonic consent in a global context:

- 1) The principle of universality (U) states that a norm can only be valid if the consequences associated can be universally accepted by all involved;
- 2) The principle of discourse (D) states that only those norms can claim validity that could meet with the acceptance of all concerned in practical discourse.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> These two general principles guide the process, however there are four important features that must be present in the communicative process to ensure the integrity of the principles; 1) everyone affected by the issue can and must participate in the discourse; 2) all participants are granted an equal opportunity to contribute; 3) participants must mean what they say; 4) communication must be freed from external and internal coercion. Much of the emphasis in a communicative framework is on the mutual understanding of terminology or a shared lexicon, which is important for the universal justification because there can be disparities in norms justified in our context as compared to norms justified in every context. Because truth is not accessible by all, and

Chapter one has already illustrated that the public sphere can no longer be based solely on the Westphalian model, which makes Habermas' theory procedurally insufficient. Habermas has conceded that a bourgeois conception of the public sphere associated with territorially bounded national communities with sovereign heads of state holding public offices can no longer function properly.<sup>42</sup> Simply assuming a Westphalian frame for redress airbrushes away all actors, processes, and mechanisms that operate at the global, transnational scale and even local-urban scale.

Nancy Fraser argues that we must begin to understand how social injustice now operates at different and intersecting scales “when global economic forces converge with local status hierarchies, on the one hand, and with national political structures, on the other” (Fraser, 2010, 368). Thus, as we engage with Nancy Fraser in the following sections we must ask ourselves: 1) Can Fraser's critical democratic theory effectively move us beyond the trap of the territorial-state frame? Can Mary Kaldor's conceptions of Global Civil Society help us to understand the structural transformation of the public sphere post-Westphalian? 2) Can Fraser's tripartite theory of justice provide some form of theoretical standard for discerning just procedural outcomes? Last, from an urban spatial perspective we can evaluate these questions and develop what the *'Justice of Urbanization'* could mean for our framework.

---

is unable to withstand linguistic arguments, truth must then proceed from pre-understood contexts or the common lexicon (Habermas, 1998).

<sup>42</sup> Habermas traces the cultural origins of the public sphere back to eighteenth and nineteenth century print capitalism, which in turn created the new subjective of the private individual acting as a member of the public. This has had great importance because Habermas grounded the structure of public sphere subjectivity in these eighteenth and nineteenth century literary genres that gave rise to the imagined community of the nation and pushed commodity exchange beyond the traditional household economy; both phenomenon to create the private man, which combined the role of commodity owner with the head of the family, or that of property owner with 'human being' (Habermas, 1989).

### **3.1.2 The Structural Transformation of the Global Public Sphere: The Rescaling of Publicity According to Nancy Fraser and Mary Kaldor**

Many contemporary scholars such as Nancy Fraser – as well as Habermas- have noted that the full potential of the public sphere as conceptualized in terms of accessibility, rationality, and suspensions of personal status was never fully realized. The social transformation from ‘I’ to ‘we’ through political deliberation has easily masked subtle forms of control through the language used, protocols of style and decorum, culture and norms. Fraser argues that is very important to overcome ‘singular visions’ of normality proposed by globalization and modernity because they often ‘obliterate’ the public sphere and ‘endanger’ spontaneity and plurality (Fraser, 2009). The practice of media politics and the politics of scandal are used as privileged mechanisms to access power.

Sharon Zukin had noted earlier in Chapter one that the commodification of public space by privatized decision-making bodies is now determining what is visible and valid in public space. In turn, these decisions also determine what is visible and valid in the public sphere, turning public space and the public sphere into a vehicle for hegemonic consent. The question then becomes, if city and urban culture have been appropriated by private global capital and then internalized by the generic culture of that city through hegemonic consent, what tools do we have that will enable us to self-criticize our own cultural systems as a collective? How can we critically engage with the management of our political and governance structures?

Manuel Castells asserts that the crisis facing current political institutions in charge of managing ‘the transition’ from Westphalian to global frames is one of “legitimacy [and] the increasing inability of the political system anchored in the nation state to represent citizens in the effective practice of global governance” (Castells, 2005, 10). The ascendance of global governance, as an increasingly essential component of national and local governance, has widened

the gap between the space where the issues are defined (global) and the space where the issues are managed (the nation-state and local).<sup>43</sup> Nancy Fraser asks if the concept of the public sphere, as a critical tool for theorizing the globalization of hegemonic consent through the privatization of public space, is so thoroughly Westphalian that it is an unsalvageable construct?<sup>44</sup>

To do this, we must first look at how civil society and the publicity of the public sphere been impacted by globalization. The term '*global civil society*', in the normative sense, refers to the territorial extension of the national definitions of civil society elucidated earlier; "global civil society, according to [Kaldor's] definition, is the process through which individuals negotiate, argue, struggle against or agree with each other and with the centres of political and economic authority" (Kaldor, 2000, 106) In a descriptive sense, the term '*global civil society*' tends to refer to those independent Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO's) and social movements that operate across national boundaries - although there are considerable disputes about what is or is not included in that term (Kaldor, 2000). Global civil society refers to the interaction of those groups, networks, and movements that provide the voice for individuals in global arenas and acts

---

43 The crisis of efficiency and legitimacy are what Nancy Fraser will refer to as second-order or meta-disputes. These meta-disputes then produce first-order disputes, which are crisis's of identity: as people see their nation and their culture increasingly disjointed from the mechanisms of political decision making in a global, multinational network, their claim of autonomy takes the form of resistance identity and cultural identity politics as opposed to their political identity as citizens, and of equity: The process of market-led globalization often increases inequality between countries, and between social groups within countries, because of its ability to induce faster economic growth in some areas while bypassing others. In the absence of a global regulatory environment that compensates for growing inequality, existing welfare states come under stress as a result of economic competitiveness, and countries without welfare states have greater difficulty compensating for structurally induced inequality because of the lesser capacity of national institutions to act as compensatory mechanisms (Castells, 2005).

44 The constitution of a world government, on the basis of current international institutions, creating a system of institutional relationships leading to a human rights-founded world constitution with institutions of global governance established over a period of time would be Jurgen Habermas dream. However, Habermas acknowledge, what they call a cosmopolitan system of governance could only be the result of the rise of a cosmopolitan culture in civil societies around the world and it is easy to see that public opinion and political trends point in the opposite direction, as there is considerable reluctance in Europe to surrender more attributes of national sovereignty, and this is unthinkable in decisive countries such as the United States, China, Russia, etc. Thus, for global governance to succeed it must find ways other than from the mechanical transposition of the federal state to the international stage (Castells, 2005).

as the “transmission belts between the individual and global institutions” (Kaldor, 2000, 108). The ‘de facto’ system of governance becomes a public/private partnership in the management of the economy and other major global issues, broadening citizen participation in the political dimension. Kaldor notes that beginning to emerge is an extension of an international rule of law guaranteed by a range of interlocking institutions, including—but not only—states, and the extension of citizens networks who monitor, contest, and put pressure on these institutions (Kaldor, 2000).

Manuel Castells describes this ad hoc governance framework as the ‘*emerging network state*’, which is characterized by shared sovereignty and responsibility, flexibility of procedures of governance, greater diversity of times and spaces in the relationship between governments and citizens (Castells, 2005). If there is no civil society without forms of articulation with the state, then Castells asks; what are the forms of articulation between the dynamics of societies and the institutions of the state in the process of networked global governance? He begins to answer this question by noting that there are a number of processes that do not seem to address the fundamental autonomous link between state and society. He argues that the state must link the state actors each particular process of governance, which would seem to imply partitioning ourselves back into scaled containers, much like the nation-state. However, Castells argues that in order to respect autonomous processes of governance we must foster an ‘*enlightened multilateralism*’.<sup>45</sup> Any attempt at using multilateral institutions to impose unilateral interests or policies destroys the basis of trust on which shared global governance is built, which is why procedural rules are essential. Habermas’ influence here tells us that the process of ‘*public*

---

<sup>45</sup> Disaggregated sovereignty is often used to best describe this type of multilateralism, which refers to the willingness of states to share authority in the face of environmental, economic, and social problems that go well beyond the individual capacity to manage on their own. As relational sovereignty arises, the capacity to engage relies on the proliferation of networks that share information and coordinate their activities (Agnew, 2005).

*communication*’ during the formation of public opinion is essential, and in the global context “this means concurrent development of the system of international institutions, the autonomous expressions of societies, and the mechanisms of their relationship” (Castells, 2005, 15).

What are the mechanisms of social expression and what does their relationship to international institutions look like? How does this relate to the Global City? How do the competing ‘publics’ of the Global City discuss and socially articulate ideas of urban social justice?

### **3.1.3 Critical Democratic Theory: Globalizing the Mechanisms of the Public Sphere**

The title of Fraser’s book, *The Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World* (2009), implies a duality of metaphor, the first is in the traditional sense whereby claims of justice are made and weighed by moral scales. The second metaphor is geographical scale, which represents the problematic of framing justice with the decline of the traditional Westphalian frame. Fraser is optimistic and argues that it is possible to reformulate the critical theory of the public sphere that would enable us to address the issues of both metaphorical scales (Fraser, 2009).<sup>46</sup> In Habermas’ normative model of deliberative democracy there are two conceptual standards that Fraser makes robust use of; the first is the principle of legitimacy, which is a concept that enables us to analyze the genuine nature of public opinion by inquiring into the make up of the publicity forming the public opinion. The second conceptual principle is efficacy,

---

<sup>46</sup> Empirically, Habermas highlighted the historical processes of democratization of the Westphalian nation-state, and began to normatively articulate a model of deliberative democracy. There are six social-theoretical presuppositions that take the Westphalian frame for granted: The first assumption is that the public sphere correlated with the modern state apparatus of sovereign power exercised over bounded territory, thus public opinion can only address the Westphalian State; second assumption states that participants in the public sphere are equal members of a bounded political community, tacitly identifying the citizenry of a democratic Westphalian state as the public; third is that the topos of the public sphere was the proper organization of the political communities economic relations; fourth, Habermas assumed that national communication via modern national media was necessary for enabling communication across distance; fifth, regards the comprehensiveness of the language used within the public sphere and the assumption that it is socially transparent; last, that the cultural origins of the public sphere can be traced back to eighteenth and nineteenth century literature whereby the bourgeois genres created the individual as a new subjective (Fraser, 2009).

which analyzes the tangible political force that public opinion has effecting and affecting on private and public powers (Fraser, 2009). For public sphere theory to retain the legitimacy of its critical orientation in a post-Westphalian world, Fraser employs the '*all-subjected principle*'. This analytically reinterprets the meaning of inclusiveness towards all those subjected to a governance structure, regardless of traditional political community boundaries. Efficacy, on the other hand, analytically reinterprets conceptions of power mobilization (the translation of public opinion to governing bodies) and accountability (the capacity of such governing bodies to carry out public opinion) (Fraser, 2009).

Let us begin with the legitimacy principle of public sphere theory. Habermas had formulated the '*all-affected principle*', which states that all potentially affected by political decisions should have a chance to participate on terms of parity in the informal formation of public opinion to which decision-makers are accountable. Fraser reformulated the '*all-affected principle*' into the '*all-subjected principle*', directly applying the '*all-affected principle*' to the framing of publicity itself, without falling into the previous mentioned political traps of the Westphalian frame. Fraser argues that in order for public sphere theory to retain its critical orientation in the post-Westphalian context it must reinterpret the meaning of inclusiveness. The '*all-subjected principle*' holds that a collection of people becomes fellow members of a public because of their mutual subjection to a governance structure, and not simply their co-habitation or citizenship. Thus for any given problem, the relevant public becomes that which is directly subjected to the governance structure responsible for the problem, and where the structures transgress the borders of states, so too should the corresponding publics. Thus the legitimacy of public opinion hinges on the inclusion and parity of all subjected to governance structures making decisions regardless of Westphalian political citizenship (Fraser, 2009).

The second principle of public sphere theory is efficacy, which is the mobilization of public opinion as a political force that holds public power accountable, ensuring that the latter reflects the will of civil society. There are two functions that are necessary for the efficacy of the public sphere; the first is the translation condition and the second is the capacity condition. Where the translation condition concerns the flows of communication from civil society to an instituted public power, the capacity condition concerns the ability of administration to realize its public's design. It should be no surprise that states no longer have the sole capacity necessary for supporting the efficacy of international and geopolitically separated public spheres. Therefore, the frame through which we analyze the capacity condition requires reorienting it towards the necessary critical function it is to perform, meaning that we can no longer restrict our attention to the communication flows between a public and its constituted addresses (namely the state). This is perhaps the most challenging and controversial aspect of Fraser's work as it entails a reconstruction of current public powers or a construction of new public powers able to address the transnational publics. Moreover it requires that these new public powers have the administrative capacity to solve transnational problems, and thus be accountable to new transnational public spheres (Fraser, 2009).

### **3.2.1 Critical Democratic Theory and Urban Social Justice: The Justice of Urbanization**

This section will outline the features of social justice in the Global City using Nancy Frasers' tripartite theory of justice. Fundamentally, Nancy Fraser has defined justice according to the '*parity of participation principle*', which theoretically expands and grounds our discussion of Castells' and Kaldor's '*global civil society*' in a (urban) social justice context. Participatory parity –or '*parity of participation principle*'- is the norm of social arrangements that permit all members

of society to interact with one another as peers. Traditionally – ‘*normal justice*’- claims have always been a function of either distributive or recognition claims. Fraser’s principal concern has been to develop a ‘*critical theory of recognition*’ that is able to coherently address the analytical and practical rift between redistribution and recognition claims, which she calls the ‘*distribution-recognition dilemma*’ (Fraser, 1995).<sup>47</sup>

With the context of globalization, Fraser addresses a new element to this dilemma - representation in the political. The addition of this dynamic has produced ‘*abnormal justice*’, whereby the common organizing principles of political representation and language are under question. In the wake of transnational production and neoliberal trade, distribution claims are increasingly transgressing the state-centres grammar of distributive claims. Transnational migration and global media flows make claims for recognition acquire new proximity, thus destabilizing the previous horizons of cultural value. Last, contested hegemony and transnational politics increasingly reiterate the claims for representation away from the modern territorial state (Fraser, 2009).<sup>48</sup> Fraser contends that redistributive, recognition, and representation are three conditions necessary for participatory parity. Important to our discussion is that Fraser states that the ‘*norm of parity*’ applies broadly across all major arenas of social interaction, including family and personal life, employment and markets, formal and informal politics, and voluntary

---

47 “Normal justice” is a concept Fraser used to describe the shared social-theoretical assumptions or common organizing principles that manifest as a discernable grammar of this justice. This has traditionally produced language around redistribution of wealth and recognition of identity. Fraser notes that these two problems –redistribution and recognition- are analytically distinct; redistributive claims require an egalitarian equalization of people and resources, and recognition claims require recognizing and revaluing differentiation and specificity. However, practically these two remedies intertwine; redistributive remedies often employ concepts of recognition based on the expression of equal moral worth, and recognition often purposes the redistribution of primary goods (Fraser, 1995).

48 She argues that in addition to the ordinary-political injustice claims, which arise within the frame of a bounded polity – redistributive and recognition claims fall into this category- we can also conceptualize ‘meta-political injustices’, which arise as a result of the division of political space into bounded polities. This second level comprehends injustices of misframing: Such injustices occur when a polity’s boundaries are drawn in such a way as to wrongly deny some people the chance to participate at all in its authorized contests over justice; this simply implies that first-order framings of justice may themselves be unjust (Fraser, 2010).

associations in civil society (Fraser, 2010). Thus, Fraser articulates a three-dimensional framework that is able to take into account the question of scale as it operates within the Global City.

Within the context of a Global City, who is entitled to participate on parity with whom? If ‘publics’ are simultaneously local and global, as we saw in chapter one, it is simply not enough to pit local and global against one another. A mutually intertwined constitution does not allow us to draw such harsh lines, thus social inclusion must be a fluid construct. Fraser’s *‘all-subjected principle’* helps to make our definition of social inclusion fluid by breaking down previously drawn lines (predominantly all those associated with the nation-state). Appadurai’s ethnoscape illustrated the demographics of a Global City public, such as ostensibly excluded populations like migrant and temporary workers, and ‘illegal aliens’. These populations are some of the most isolated demographic because they are removed from global, national and local sovereign public powers. As well, local residents are often removed from global forums, which exclude them from the power politics of incentive. However, by virtue of being subjected to the global system of labour migration and the local ordinances of the Global City both population groups constitute part of the public.

On the other hand, there are global elites, transient businessmen and wealthy visitors who now exert political power where they once did not. However they are still subject to the systems in which they negotiate their power. Differentiation in political power to influence decision-making processes leads to excluding many people who have no ability to make efficacious claims against the “offshore architects of their dispossession” (Fraser, 2010, 368). Foreclosing political avenues for redress by the Westphalian and now local-global gerrymandering of political space misframes disputes about justice and insulates transnational malefactors from critique and control.

As normal justice slowly becomes irrelevant to the social justice problems we find ourselves facing -especially those in the Global City- how can Nancy Fraser's tripartite critical theory of democracy help us to a working framework to evaluate our current socio-political responses? How can we understand critical democratic theory through a spatial lens in order to help us articulate the justice of urbanization?

### **3.2.2 The Justice of Urbanization: Articulating Assumptions**

Now that we have seen how Fraser has examined the three nodes of justice claims, and their reflection upon the processes within '*global public sphere*' and '*critical democratic theory*', we move to understand these contributions from a spatial perspective. How do we articulate the justice of a system within the Global City? Where globalism connects people around the world in complex and overlapping ways, the Global City is a physical expression of that connection, urban planning processes must be able to deal with not only matters of local justice but regional, national and global. Fraser notes that emancipatory movements have often been dwarfed by "neoliberalism and reactionary chauvinism ... [which] has given way to a '*new obscurity*' to use Habermas' phrase" (Fraser, 2009, 143). Progressive movements often lack the coherent vision of an alternative scenario to realize, Fraser's intent - as well as this paper's - is to theorize concepts and tools that can be used by these progressive movement that link social struggles with historically emerging possibilities for transformation.

Nancy Fraser's use of representation as a social justice bench mark for newly developed processes of governance enabled us to look at relations of representation; could there be political obstacles to parity in the absence of misdistribution or misrecognition? Fraser uses representation as accountability in a political system, and representation as symbolic. The idea of representation

as accountability refers to the rules of first-order disputes and is straightforward in terms of political voices and democratic accountability. From this we can discern the assumption that there must be recognition that the new social imaginaries require new political powers to manage first and second order disputes. All publics based on social imaginaries require public powers that are accountable to these new representations of interest. The democratic political landscape will always require processes of critiquing and framing, thus we need spaces and institutions where those questions can be democratically debated and addressed.

Critical theory also enables the political transformation of symbolic representation of the Global City. Fraser (2009) states:

By articulating struggles over representations vis-à-vis struggles over globalization, we can discuss what the prospects for transnational solidarity, democratic frame setting, and emancipatory human rights projects for social transformation on a local and global level. (76)

The symbolic representation evokes the second-order disputes of misframing, which arise from the partitioning of political spaces. When political space is unjustly framed, the result is the denial of political voices. The intention is to produce normative political grammar that enables these struggles over representation to be fluid and transformative. How is the global social transformation from 'I' to 'we' through political deliberation (representative publicity) reflected in the physical forms of urban life in the Global City? A lack of shared understanding around the processes of governance in the Global City contributes to what Fraser refers to as '*abnormal justice*', which directly calls into question the scale at which we address social justice issues. We saw that Nancy Fraser did this by expanding Habermas' public sphere theory to develop a critical democratic theory of justice that enables global civil society to transform through newly expanded

procedural mechanisms. Here, we can draw the second assumption, which states that the political processes are required to network these newly transgressing publics.

The '*Justice of Urbanization*' emphasizes political transformation in order to produce social justice, which means that procedural mechanisms of current governance structures must be reinterpreted or reoriented in order to provide opportunities necessary for transformation. Thus representation in the Global City concerns the intersection of democratic voices and symbolic framing. Fraser states that solidarity between the newly imagined democratic voices generates a communicatively based solidarity reminiscent of constitutional patriotism but without the focus on bounded polities, which addresses the theoretical gap between Habermas' model and the needs of the transgressing realities of the Global City.

Fraser notes that the current political situation is a classic collective action problem. The argument runs: "This is the way the game is organized, and we have no choice but to play the game" (Fraser, 2009,158). History is punctuated with movements of people who have changed the game. These meta-political debates about process provide us with a fertile opportunity to develop the political transformation of the game we play. So we must ask ourselves 'what do the times demand'? What does the Global City require to enable us to develop new public powers based on transformed procedures that are able to legitimately and effectively deal with second-order claims; how are the physical forms of global-urban life reflected in the political transformation of society?

## **Chapter Four**

### **Social Justice and Geopolitics in the Global City**

The last chapter of this paper will examine the philosophical nature of a ‘just’ relationship between the urban and global scales within the Global City. Many may argue that the nature of this topic is highly theoretical, and may be considered utopian. However, this paper would argue, like Lefebvre, that we must guard against utopianism by advocating for a ‘science of space’. We must ward against the ‘technological utopias’ proposed by globalization narratives and existing modes of production. A ‘science of space’ exposes these ideologies that are designed to conceal themselves in space, and analysis followed by exposition exposes the ‘truth of space’ (Lefebvre, 1991). The starting point is “knowledge, which is at once integrated into, and integrative with respect to ... all kinds of projects concerned with space, be they those of architecture, urbanism or social planning” (Lefebvre, 1991, 9). Expanding on this, the intention of this chapter is to begin a discussion that challenges and proposes alternatives to the status quo – or concealed ideologies- of current multiscale governance models and modes of thinking regarding the scales of action in the Global City.

This paper argues that the combination of the two theoretical approaches chosen- the ‘*Urbanization of Justice*’ and the ‘*Justice of Urbanization*’ - will produce theoretical and analytical foundations that are robust enough to facilitate the necessary analysis of complex and multiscale issues of social justice in the Global City. The synthesis of these two analytical approaches will enable us to examine how the processes of globalization and urbanization are no longer the sole project of isolated scales. We will develop two foundational claims from our theoretical framework that can address the complexity of the geopolitical structures through the application of philosophical standards of social justice.

The ‘*Urbanization of Justice*’ purports a dialectical approach, and emphasizes the unity between form and content. Recognizing that form is often overlooked by much socio-political

discussions on justice, it seeks to highlight the form of social space (and to a lesser degree scale) in developing social justice. Lefebvre argues that expounding the intimate connection between the contents of everyday life (which would contribute to the formation of Fraser's publicity) and the physical forms social space produce social justice. Emphasizing the physical form – the '*oeuvre*' – as an object of study in the production of social justice is important for the Global City because it is the enterprise of both local and global processes. In this approach, transformation is socially orientated, which begs the question, how is the production of urban space reflected in processes of govern the complex relationship between global and local scales?

The '*Justice of Urbanization*' purported a procedural approach and emphasized the need to base social justice on processes of political deliberation. In terms of the Global City, this approach stresses content over physical form, which means that justice depends on the 'processes of urbanization', leaving the form of social space and scale a reactive construct. Fraser argued that the conception of justice was a complex combination of redistribution, recognition, and representation claims. Procedural mechanisms are simultaneously determined through meta-political discussions about the nature of justice, and are required to normatively define all three claims. The transformation of the Global City's publicity through political deliberation develops an urban social conscious based its ability to develop '*symbolic representativeness*' that expands beyond its immediate location. We must articulate the need for global publicities and local publicities to be expressed in the same physical space. From this perspective, we must ask: how are the physical forms of global-urban life reflected in the political transformation of society?

The two questions, drawn from our two approaches, are mutually reinforcing and their reciprocal exposition will produce the theoretically thick assumptions we seek. Thus, in order to answer the questions posed by each approach we must recognize that while these two approaches

are different, they are not mutually exclusive. The first section of the chapter will expound opportunities for critical reflection on the nature of the Global City publicity from our two approaches. We will use Fraser's *'tripartite theory of justice'*, particularly the *'participatory parity'* concept to complement Henri Lefebvre's theory of the *'oeuvre'* as philosophical and theoretical standard for social critical reflection on the nature of social justice in the Global City. This section will argue that social justice in the Global City requires: the recognition that the nature of these new social imaginaries are not 'placeless' but rather permeate and dialogically relate to all places; and the recognition of the intimate praxis of global social space in the local-urban structures of the Global City. Together this will mature our understanding of Henri Lefebvre concept of the *'social production of space'* to the *'global social production of space'* based on Fraser's *'politics of representation'*.

The last section of the chapter will argue that the recognition that the new social imaginaries require new political powers to manage first and second order disputes; and that political processes are required to network these newly transgressing publics. Through our two approaches, this chapter will work to understand how the act of framing can be made democratic. How can we understand the political community of the *'all affected'* in the Global City? We will employ Fraser's procedural mechanisms, such as legitimacy and efficacy to extrapolate and build on Lefebvre's concept of a *'Right to the City'* to the *'Right to the Global City'*. The *'Right to the Global City'* is a concept already coined by Marc Purcell. This paper recognizes and draws from his work; however the argument is that Lefebvre's original concept is best fitted to the Global City through its imbrications with Nancy Fraser's procedural mechanism.

#### 4.1 The Urbanization of Justice: The Global Social Production of Space

This paper argues that the first important component of social justice in the Global City requires us to theorize on the nature of publicities. The first assumption stated; we should recognize the nature of new social imaginaries as not ‘placeless’ but rather permeating and dialogically relating to all places; and that there is an intimate praxis between the global social space and the local-urban structures of the Global City. Through our exposition of these assumptions within the framework of the ‘*Urbanization of Justice*’, we will argue that these new social imaginaries have informed ‘*the global social production of space*’ based on a ‘*politics of representation*’.

We have seen that the Global City is caught between all levels of geo-governance assemblages. When the Global City is understood strictly within the paradigm of Westphalian containerized space, social injustice becomes ‘*abnormal*’ as procedural Westphalian language used to resolve first-order disputes become untenable. This does not make Westphalian language irrelevant, it is simply reterritorialized through local and global politics. This paper has chosen to focus on the relationship between local and global politics in producing the form and content of the Global City. However, one of the central concerns is the fanatic lingering of Westphalian language in local and global governance structures. The reliance on containerized scales and space to ensure that political powers are maintained through territorial foundation, but eventually are unable to manage the injustices within their own scale as publicities become multidimensional and multiscalar. Moreover, local governance processes are unable to manage the global flows of power, and the global flows are unwilling to engage meaningfully with locality. Failing to understand how the publicity of a Global City extends beyond the borders of the city structures also fails to understand how the resolution injustice will extend beyond the borders beyond the

city. Within the Global City, global processes and global networks can symbolically use social space, which means that the spaces are no longer just the local community that the city represents. The Global City spaces now represent people who may have never actually stepped foot into the city itself, but through global social networks and processes are connected to it.

Due to the amorphous nature of post-Westphalian social imaginaries, the exposition of its contents (and form) will be much more fluid than traditional sociopolitical theory and reality desire. The paradoxical consequences of the persistent neo-imperial global construction of place require that identity be built on place-entrenched binaries concealed placelessness. Through the extrapolation of Lefebvre's theory on the '*social production of space*' and Nancy Fraser's addition of '*representation*' into the theory of justice, we can begin to articulate the '*global social production of space*'. The '*global social production of space*' assumes the same provisions as Lefebvre's '*social production of space*', it simply appreciates the wider scope of influence that global cultural flows have on the production of space. Lefebvre's construct can help us to examine how global social projects – such as those based on neo-imperial ethics or those based on a global social justice - produce both social imaginaries and global social space in the Global City. We can examine how the production of space valorizes these new imaginaries and how their articulation or representation will produce social justice. This tool will elevate global-urban everyday life to '*critical thought*', which enables us to emphasize how society dialectically produces the global-urban social spaces that express global-urban social relations. The socio-political transformation of urban-global social relations should be based on the expounding the praxis between everyday life and social space and on the urban-local and global scale of the Global City.

Lefebvre's construct of the '*oeuvre*' has made the connection between social spaces and social relations clear; however, the globalization of social networks has changed the foundation of

the *oeuvre* in the Global City. Social spaces in cities all around the world, which have traditionally been geographically disparate and distant, have become linked through global networks. This is something that Lefebvre was unable to foresee or account for, thus this paper proposes it is necessary to re-examine the relationship between geography and identity within the dialectic framework of Lefebvre. It is important now for networked societies to also discuss the added dimension of 'responsibility' when producing space that is geographically local, as well as representatively global. Most often the formulation of our ethical questions assume the geography particular to *walled cities* or close communities, such as the Westphalian construction. This paper argues to expand this sense of place to include the global and begin to articulate a *politics of connectivity through representation*, which will inform the social construction of its geography – or the *global social production of space*.<sup>49</sup>

The *global social production of space* requires us to examine the potential geographies of the relationship between identity and responsibility. Scholars such as Doreen Massey, state that place is the necessary location of the intersection of disparate trajectories, thus it becomes a place of negotiation (Massey, 2004). Lefebvre, like Massey, argues that *global space* is the sum of its relations, connections, embodiments and practices, which gives it meaningful concreteness. Lets extend this argument using a spatial perspective; in constructing Global City identities, we must construct them in relation to our responsibility to the rest of the world that contributes to global flows and processes, which Massey has argued emphasizes the production – compared to the inevitability- of power relations (Massey, 2004). Emphasizing the production of relations and thus the current relations of injustice, implies that we must take a responsibility to re-imagine

---

49 The politics of connectivity is a concept developed by Doreen Massey, who adds the dimension of social responsibility to our discussion. Place can be a political project, but a real recognition of the relationality of space points to a politics of connectivity and a politics whose relation to globalization will vary dramatically from place to place (Massey, 2004).

these localities of globalization: “We are responsible to the areas beyond our bounds of place not because of what we have done, but because of who we are” (Massey, 2004, 21).

Now that we have seen how our first set of socio-political assumptions have matured Lefebvre’s concept, how will this affect geo-governance relationships between the scales of the Global City? To answer this, we can draw from Fraser’s politics of representation to understand how the *‘Urbanization of Justice’* can further expound the relationship between form and content in the global-urban scales of social justice.<sup>50</sup> We saw Nancy Fraser expand the conventional *‘distribution-recognition dilemma’* of justice by adding the concept of *‘representation’* into the equation. This was introduced to address the second-order disputes or to have meta-political discussions on the *‘system of scale’* that have the legitimacy and efficacy to redress social injustice. This is the necessary aide that publicities require to connect their form (based on the *‘global social production of space’*) to build a political content able to respond the new forms of publicity.

For the Global City, the local scale of the city and the global scale of networked locals represent its publicity.<sup>51</sup> Political discussion on the nature of framing issues requires an acute recognition of this fact, and challenging the current construction and role of a place may sometimes be a more appropriate strategy than defense. The theoretical addition of representation to the theory of justice is an important aspect of connecting the form of global-urban social space and the content of just global-urban social relations. It expands the ways in which we determine who is able to participate in the *‘oeuvre’* of the Global City and thus enhance the *‘Urbanization of Justice’*.

---

50 Recall that Fraser’s tripartite theory of justice included 3 nodes: redistribution, recognition, and representation.

51 If we draw on Castells’ argument that publicities require a political body to respond and each public must have a respected sovereignty.

## 4.2 The Justice of Urbanization: The Right to the Global City

This last section will explore the last theoretical assumptions that social justice in the Global City should build on. We saw that the ‘*global social production of space*’ and the ‘*politics of connectivity*’ based on a ‘*politics of representation*’ are radical concepts because they require a total overhaul of current social imaginaries by refocusing them back on the localness of ‘*everyday life*’. This section will ask how these conversations about the nature of publicity will be supported and managed in our political structures today – or- how are the physical forms of global-urban life reflected in the political transformation of society? These kinds of contestations are conceptual and institutional, where the growing gap between conceptions of local civil society and institutional political power are both under question. The intention is to draw upon Fraser and the ‘*Justice of Urbanization*’ to expand Lefebvre’s concept of the *RTTC* to the build groundwork for further development of the ‘*Right to the Global City*’. This conceptual and institutional tool will recognize that the new social imaginaries require new political powers to manage first and second order disputes through political processes that network these newly transgressing publics.

How does the global-urban dynamic affect the praxis of social space and everyday life? It requires that we ensure mechanisms of communication that produce representative publicities be flexible and transparent. The legitimate and effective communication between social groups, as well as between social groups and public powers, will help to expose the praxis of global social space and global social relations. The next step is to further develop our assumption for new global public powers based on social justice in order to mediate the everyday life of local and global scales in the Global City.

Fostering public powers that are able to cope with disjunctive multi-scalar processes requires flexible processes of communication based on mutual recognition of the intimate praxis

of all global social spaces. We must overcome the tendency to ‘containerize’ political power, which often fetishize the capacity of a scale a-priori. New public powers must be spatially aware of the different ‘scales of action’ within a Global City so that political powers can be held accountable and recognize the horizontal nature of decision-making. We can draw on Castells’ idea of ‘*network states and societies*’ to complement Nancy Fraser’s construct of efficacy and legitimacy to support newly created public powers. The capacity of a scale to redress social injustice requires social investment into the necessary tools to do so. Our goal should be to creatively manage the complex scalar interface of local and global everyday life so that social space in the Global City may reflect and reproduce socially just global and urban relations. Fraser offers a source of political transformation through procedural mechanisms that mediate globalism and localism, and Lefebvre offers us a source of social transformation through the intimate connection between social relations and social space.

Fraser’s ‘*critical democratic theory*’ draws on many of the mechanisms of ‘*global public sphere theory*’ and ‘*global civil society*’ to produce an urban locale based on normatively determined criteria of social justice. From a spatial and urban perspective this would produce a ‘Just City’. Drawing on Susan Fainstein’s seminal work *The Just City* (1990), the ‘*Just City*’ draws on concepts of political-philosophical and political-economical justice developed by scholars such as John Rawls, Iris Mirion Young, Peter Marcuse, as well as Nancy Fraser.<sup>52</sup> In the context of neoliberal restructuring of the city, where economic competitiveness seems to give planning a singular vision at the expense of all other values, Fainstein argues that planning developed through praxis, particularly along the lines of justice, can help us to develop and justify

---

<sup>52</sup> John Rawls is one of the most prominently cited political philosophers of the 21st century. His seminal work *A Theory of Justice* (1971) argues that everyone has a right to basic liberties and socio-economic benefits should be distributed to the least advantaged. His normative social contract theory constructs both the ‘original position’ and the ‘veil of ignorance’ to illustrate how, when given the choice, people will rationally choose to distribute resources as even as possible if their own wealth is not assured.

planning practices (Fainstein, 2009).<sup>53</sup> Concepts of justice and their relationship to democracy and diversity are elements of the theory of the good city.<sup>54</sup> Fainstein argues that justice is not achievable at the urban level without support from all other levels or scales, thus it is useless to restrict analysis to the city level.<sup>55</sup> She seeks to develop a model (the '*Just City*') for urban planners to use that "reacts to the social and spatial inequality engendered by capitalism" (Fainstein, 2009).

Fainstein and Fraser do not specifically talk about spatiality as a function of justice; instead, they call on procedural mechanisms that are contextualized in spatiality to produce justice. While Fainstein recognizing that all 'scales' must take part in producing just cities, she does not fully appreciate that the current system of uneven scalar politics might be unjust themselves. Fraser has articulated similar theories of justice, however they are based on critical democracy and better apt to deal with the contextualization of globalization. The scales of action within Global Cities are not well defined containers as implied by Fainstein, the relationship and cooperation on social justice matters is more complex than a simple federation of scalar action. Thus, the Global City requires new forms of governance that are able to recognize abnormal justice. Enabling the creation of new political powers recognizes the rescaling of public, and using the principle of legitimacy and efficacy to articulate the public better.

The use of Fraser and Lefebvre in contextualizing social justice in geographical, historical and institutional plexus of the Global City produces legitimate and effective representations of the

---

53 Fainstein calls for a strong team of urban planning experts within the local government to guide urban development and judge projects put forward by private developers. Fainstein's theory falls short within the global context of a city.

54 Discussions on ideal or utopia processes in the city have enabled the profession of city planning to purpose mechanisms for developing the 'good city'. However, this line of thought has caused much criticism and skepticism, as most scholars believe visionaries shouldn't impose their visions on the public, or that a model of the good city is even possible (Fainstein, 2009) (19).

55 Chinese box problem of participation and power; at the level of neighbourhood, there is the greatest opportunity for democracy but the least amount of power; as we scale up the amount of decision-making increases but the potential for people to affect outcomes diminishes (Dahl, 1967).

Global City's political community. The political community of the Global City is networked through the '*global public sphere*', and intimately connects geographically dispersed people to the *oeuvre* of the city through the global social production of its spaces. Where scales overlap and influence one another, Fraser helps to realize the intimate connection across geographical dispersion through the reinterpretation of 'inclusiveness'. Fraser proposed the '*all-subjected principle*', which asserted that a collection of people becomes fellow members of a public because of their subjection to a political governance structure, instead of from their co-habitation or citizenship. In terms of linking people to the structures of the Global City, this tool is helpful for developing an argument that enables the global and local to discuss meta-principles regardless of geo-political location. As globalization transforms social space on all scales to symbolize its global processes, the issue of social space and justice on one scale now symbolizes and represents social space and justice across all scales, making the contextualization of justice more complicated.

Fraser uses the '*parity of participation principle*', which is a norm of social arrangements that permit all members of society to interact with one another as peers to reinforce the expansion of our understanding of political community beyond the nation-state scale, which enables us to contextual social justice. Contextualizing social justice demands that our political communities be focused issue domains instead of the accidental circumstances of birth, nationality, or co-habitation based on containerized scalar constructions. Being subjected to a governance structure no longer necessitates the physical territory; we saw that global scapes have territorial expressions but these mechanisms produce power that are metaphorically void of spatiality. It is imperative to address both types of power; "speaking truth to power through participatory discourse and argumentation in decision-making will produce the just outcomes" (Fainstein, 2009, 27). We must

overcome the mystification of global ‘spacelessness’ spaces by enabling global publics to create new public powers associated with these new public spaces. Creating new public powers with the legitimacy and efficacy mechanisms will ensure that procedurally the political transformation of public space is just; or the process of urbanization in the Global City is just.

How does the creation of new public powers affect the traditional conceptions of civil and political relations within a governing system? The notion of citizenship has always been implicitly part of Lefebvre’s theories. His thinking on the notion of citizenship became more explicit in his later writings where he argued for a new citizenship linked to a new social ethics that reconstructs citizenship towards the local. For Lefebvre, citizenship was earned through the actions of everyday life and by participating in the ‘*oeuvre*’. Lefebvre argued that the cultural revolution of social space would lead to socially just relationships of production and power. Lefebvre developed the concept the ‘*Right to the City*’ (RTTC) to generate the mechanisms 1) the right to appropriate urban space from systems of power; 2) the right to participate in determining what is to be done with the appropriated space (Lefebvre, 1996). He argued that appropriation of urban space requires urban society to reclaim the ‘*oeuvre*’ against its segregation by rationalized capitalism. The realization of social space as art and philosophy show the totality of urban and social life, and the transformation of space through the art of perpetual use in everyday requires the RTTC is reaffirmed as the renewed right to urban life. “The urban, place of encounter, priority of use value, inscription in space of a time promoted to the rank of a supreme resource among all resources, finds its morphological base and its practico-material realization” (Lefebvre, 1996). If we connect the idea of perpetual use in the *oeuvre* as a mechanism for enfranchisement into the processes that produce it to Fraser’s ‘*all-subjected principle*’ we can begin to develop political processes that transgress traditional borders – with which Lefebvre’s theory still operates.

One of Lefebvre's central arguments is that urban-social life be re-affirmed through the everyday use of urban space. This requires that the city form and urban content be intimately integrated, which should be expounded through the science and art of space. Critical reflection on the urban spaces of fragmentary systems of power will enable us to reflect on the social relationships they produce and represent. What happens when the city becomes an agent of global fragmentary systems in social spaces other than its own? The practices of citizenship as constructed through the RTTC unfold at the local and urban level, whereby concept of the urban citizen consists of: (1) the city is the primary political community (2) urban residence as the criterion of membership and basis for political mobilization (3) formulation of rights-claims addressing urban experiences and related civic performances (Dikeç & Gilbert, 2002). However, in light of the Global City, how can the mechanisms of appropriation and participation of urban spaces be situated on both local and global scales?

Purcell offers us a solution, and argues that Lefebvre's concept could fundamentally reorganize the traditional Westphalian geopolitical order and its liberal-democratic citizenship. In Purcell's article "Citizenship and the Right to the Global City: Reimagining the Capitalist World Order", he argues that traditional geopolitical orders and citizenship are too limiting a structure through which to resist the increasing power of global capital over material life. He contends that in order to resist the growing dominance of capital in the global political economy, one critical project is to develop new notions of citizenship that extend the limits of politics and expand the decision-making control of citizens. The article's main argument is that Henri Lefebvre's concept of the RTTC is one particularly fertile set of principles on which to base such alternative citizenship forms. Lefebvre's concept poses a radical challenge not only to the current citizenship order, but also to capitalist social relations and their increasing control over social life.

Urban citizenship emphasizes the struggles over the conditions/inequalities, and they resonate well with Lefebvre's notions of RTTC and right to difference. While cities are reemerging as sites for citizenship, claiming rights to the city does not simply translate into a relocalization of claims from the national to the urban level. Urban citizenship does not necessarily replace or negate national citizenship. The RTTC, or what Lefebvre also called the 'right to urban life', is a claim upon society rather than territorial affiliation. For Lefebvre, the urban is not simply limited to the boundaries of a city, but also includes the social system of production. Hence the RTTC is a claim for the recognition of the urban as the (re)producer of social relations of power, and the right to participation to it (Dikeç & Gilbert, 2002). It is not enough to simply inflate a neoliberalist 'right' to the city, addressing scalar relations in terms of having a right to the local and global city must overcome the idea of differentiated citizenships that dictate privileges based on territorially defined communities. Lefebvre defines the right to the city most simply as a "transformed and renewed right to urban life and centrality" (Attoh, 2011, 674). The promise of Lefebvre's ideas in this context has not been extensively explored in the literature on new citizenship (Purcell, 2003).<sup>56</sup>

Many scholars would agree that citizenship based in the former hegemony of the national-scale political community is being weakened by the creation of communities on other scales. Citizenship is being deterritorialized and reterritorialized, which has enabled us to question the nature of the relationship between the nation-state's territorial sovereignty and political loyalty. Lefebvre warns that the '*right to difference*' and the RTTC should not only be inscribed on paper, but also cultivated through the sharing space. He argues that often, normative contractarian rights provide citizens a political voice but do not prevent social, cultural, and economic

---

<sup>56</sup> This paper offers just one idea for further exploration within the context of the global-urban relations in the Global City. This does not necessarily mean that this articulation will work in other contextual situations, for example in the urban-rural relation.

marginalization. Purcell recognized this aspect of Lefebvre's work and reconstructs his ideas to develop the '*Right to the Global City*', which is a potential construction of citizenship that can both be enabled by the destabilization of LDW (Liberal Democratic Westphalia) citizenship and contribute to that destabilization by helping to 'unthink' LDW assumptions. It points toward a new politics of inhabitation that goes beyond nationality as the basis for political community and decision-making authority. Purcell draws on Swyngedouw's concept of glocalization to argue that citizenship is moving away from national-scale citizenship from a range of other scales, both above and below the national. He argues that citizenship based on Lefebvre's RTTC is a promising example of a citizenship that poses a direct challenge to global capital and its increasing control over the global economy (Purcell, 2003).

Full and effectual participation in society can be claimed through the notion of urban citizenship, which connotes a sense of engagement in the public and urban realm. Citizenship is acquired through public participation, which as we saw is supported by the '*all-affected principle*' and the '*oeuvre*'. The '*all-affected principle*' recognizes the transgressing nature of the global-urban *oeuvre*, thus the mechanisms of RTTC must be theoretically thick enough to legitimately and effectively manage the publicities that permeate the once isolated '*oeuvre*'. Regardless of the placeless narrative of globalization, the Global City illustrates political power still requires territorialization, which means that critical spatial theory is still required to expound the mediation of complex, overlapping political and social negotiation of belonging.

What does the RTTC mean for a space that is permeated by multiple scalar spaces? Instead of understanding the conceptual tools associated with each layer or scale, we must work to explore their mutually constitutive natures. Social urban space in the Global City has become the scaffolding for geopolitical scale, which enables us to critically reflect on the administration of

public power through its expression in geopolitical scale and ultimately the urban spaces of Global Cities. Recall that the structuration of scale is continually reworked through everyday social routines and struggles, and the processes is dialectically intertwined with other forms of socio-spatial structuration that produce multiple forms and patterns of scale and territory that evolve relationally within hierarchies and networks. This claim helps us to analytically postulate that relationship between RTTC and the multiple scales permeating the urban spaces must also be understood in a politics of structuration. Having RTTC to the local-urban space of the Global City also means that you have RTTC to all of the scales in the Global City.

It is through the transformation of the urban spaces of the Global City that we will be able to appropriate the systems of geopolitical scale that produce global flows of power. The enfranchisement of global-urban citizens through the RTTC bestows both rights (in terms of appropriation and participation) as well as responsibility to take part in the oeuvre by living it. There is a need to complement formal rights of citizenship with an ethics cultivated through living together and sharing space. The RTTC may be seen in this perspective, and recognized as a new social ethic. Lefebvre's argument is radical and necessary insofar as it demands the transformation of everyday life in light of critical philosophy recapturing the genuine nature of experience free from its subjugation under the abstract represented most powerfully by technology and capital.

Understanding the nature of the social transformation of global-urban social imaginaries is important to articulating the '*Urbanization of Justice*' in the Global City. As we saw, the '*Urbanization of Justice*' requires that the politics of connectivity and representation inform the *global social production of space*, thus, fostering social justice through the '*Urbanization of Justice*' dialogically fosters social justice in the global-urban spaces of the Global City. This means that all participants in the Global City '*oeuvre*' must be aware of the nature of the social

project. Social justice according to this analytical framework requires an acute appreciation for the intimate praxis that the content and form have, and in the context of the Global City this means that the geography of responsibility also permeates traditional borders.

With the fast paced nature of globalization and urbanization today, it is necessary to complement these processes with political structures that will encourage and support their complex, overlapping and disjunctive nature. This will require we understand the '*global social production of space*'. The socio-cultural development of publicity that crosses traditional spatial and scalar borders, as exemplified in the Global City, requires politics that is equally transgresses norms. The '*Right to the Global City*' develops legitimacy and efficacy required by political powers that represent networked social imaginaries. The '*Global Public Sphere*' of the Global City requires political processes based in '*The Right to the Global City*' to ensure the relationship between public and government is nimble, dialectical and just. The politics of scalar structuration requires that publicities recognize the communal project of global-urban projects in the Global City; the '*Justice of Urbanization*' ensures that the procedures of the project are just. The '*Urbanization of Justice*' and the '*Justice of Urbanization*' are required in the Global City to ensure that a holistic approach is taken when redressing social injustice.

## Conclusion

*'Abnormal justice'* is an injustice that cannot be properly managed or redressed within the current socio-political system because the system lacks the normative structures to do so. The current set of power relations that rely on the disjunctive nature of global and urban-local processes to employ new strategies of control have contributed to gentrification,

disenfranchisement, and injustice across all scales. These dynamics have created a rift between the average citizen and government, replacing the traditional civil relationship with corporate and government relations. The most stark and problematic bi-product has been the exclusionary discourse of public governance and public space. “Public space engenders fear, fear that is derived from the sense of public space as uncontrolled space, as space in which civilization is exceptionally fragile” (Mitchell, 2003,13). The social and political response to these ‘uncontrolled spaces’ has been to partition them from the public consciousness into private, surplus absorbing capital. This has had dramatic implications on the public consciousness.

The quality of urban life - the city and its governance- has been commodified, in a world where consumerism, tourism, culture and knowledge-based industries have become major elements of the urban political economy. The defense of property value has become an overriding political interest, and has etched itself onto the spatial forms of our cities. “Under these conditions, ideals of urban identity, citizenship and belonging – already threatened by the spreading malaise of neoliberal ethic [which informs\ the LDW conceptions of citizenship] – become much harder to sustain” (Harvey, 2003, 32). Local policy is forced to orientate itself towards competitiveness within the neoliberal system, which has moved governments away from demand-orientated redistribution and towards supply-orientated competition. Many urban scholars have tried to show that the fundamental crisis of this system is that it both necessitates the production of gross material inequality, as well as produces gross insecurity, emotional discontent and distortions. Greed is not an abnormality of the system; it is what makes the system go and a society one-dimensional in its driving force produces one-dimensional people (Marcuse, 2009).

Paquet observed that the ‘dispersive revolution’ has led to the crystallization of new network business organizations, which has lead to “subsidiarity-focused governments, and

increasingly virtual, elective and malleable communities” (Paquet 2006, 4). Internetworked technologies have transformed all levels of governance by making participation easier and less costly. This has redefined the public space and even the notion of publics, as businesses, governments and communities are now confronted with greater demands for participation. New publics have emerged based on new distributed governance regimes with a wider variety of more fluid and always evolving groups of stakeholders (Tapscott, 1999).

This paper has discussed these newly formed publics and governance regimes within the Global City context. Where the milieu of the Global City is both global and urban-local, how do these newly formed publics network? We have seen that the expansion of the democratic sphere has elicited only partial and temporary responses from traditional political powers. There has been no real power distribution, and both local and global elite utilizes the disjunctive nature of the geo-governance systems to guard old political powers.

To expound the publicities of the Global City, will require that we understand the types of networks that intimately connect the global scale with the urban-local. Recall that Sassen identified three general factors that academically catalogue Global Cities:

- 1) The Global City is a command point in the organization of the world economy;
- 2) It is a key location and marketplace for leading industries;
- 3) It is a major site of production for these industries.

Global Cities are important because they enable us to examine the construction of place and production in the global economy. Global processes have rearticulated the traditional territorial and scalar hierarchies based around the nation-state frame, and particularly those associated with global capital, whereby there has been a combination of both economic dispersals across borders and an intense integration and concentration of command and control functions in locality. Thus,

just like Sassen argued, this paper denotes that the Global City has emerged as a strategic locality and thus is ideal for the theorization of these new geographies of power created:

We require a revitalization of the democratic public sphere at every level; but it is important to keep the analytical focus on cities and urban life and ensure that the plethora of social activist projects can be elevated to gain more power and make higher-level political demands. (Graham, 2010, 385)

The first chapter discussed the urban-local narratives that express the governing processes on the local scale. First David Harvey's political economy model was employed to show how urban entrepreneurialism encourages the development activities and endeavours that have the strongest localized capacity to enhance property values, the tax base, the local circulation of revenue and employment growth. Harvey argues that the much of the vaunted entrepreneurial strategy of "public-private partnership" almost always amounts to a subsidy for affluent consumers, corporations, and powerful command functions to stay in town at the expense of local collective consumption for the working class and poor. Zukin uses the symbolic economy. The symbolic economy model stresses that the spaces of cities are important representations of cultural and public negotiations of meaning. Built forms contribute to the construction of social identities and can either represent a visual means of exclusion or inclusion (Zukin, 1996).<sup>57</sup> Together, through our comprehensive exploration of global and urban narratives, we were able to understand the mechanisms on each scale and how they were used to govern social life.

The first chapter also illustrated the many differing narratives that constitute globalization, and contribute to governing processes on the global scale. Apparudrai argued that globalization is

---

57 Recall: The symbolic economy has two parallel production systems that are crucial to the city's economic growth; the first is the production of space, which entails a synergy of capital and cultural meaning; and the second is the production of symbols, which is the currency of commercial exchange as well as the language of social identity (Zukin, 1996).

best described as an arrangement of five different ‘scapes of global flows’.<sup>58</sup> Appadurai’s predominant analysis of globalization is through the binary doxic of global v. national. He argues that the newly imagined *scapes* have become a vital part of the global economy and feed off of the central tension between cultural homogenization and heterogeneity (Appadurai, 2003).

Swyngedouw’s theory of glocalization explains an alternative global narrative based on a binary doxic of global v. local. Swyngedouw argues that strategies of global localization restructure the nation-scale via supra and sub scalar mechanism. Territorial organization manifests through mechanisms such as agglomeration, scale, network flows, and divisions of labour, which all operate to valorize of circulation processes and the monopoly over social spaces (Swyngedouw, 1992).

The second chapter established the first half of the framework for understanding the connection between urban-local space and justice. The ‘*Urbanization of Justice*’ used Henri Lefebvre theories, ‘*the social production of space*’ and the ‘*Right to the City*’, to understand how the social spaces of the Global City reify social relations of production. This enabled us to overcome the social gap between identity and space through their transformation. The product of our inquiry was twofold: First that we must recognize that the natures of these new social imaginaries in the Global City are not ‘placeless’ but rather permeate and dialogically relate to all places; the recognition of the intimate praxis of global social space in the local-urban structures of the Global City.

---

58 Recall: Ethnoscapas map the demographic shift of tourists, immigrants, migrant worker and refugees; Mediascapas map the distribution of electronic capabilities to produce and disseminate information and images that reflect the world; Technoscapas map the global configuration of technology; Finacnescapas map the intensely complex and rapid flows of global capital through currency markets, stock exchanges and commodity speculations; Ideoscapas map the images and counter-images to do with politics and ideologies of the state.

The third chapter established the second half of the framework to understand the connection between the global governance regime and justice. Through Nancy Fraser and her '*critical democratic theory*' we were able to understand how the '*Justice of Urbanization*' can overcome cross-scalar procedural deficiencies. This enabled us to overcome the political gap between scales through their transformation. Similar to the first part of the framework, the outcome of our study of Nancy Fraser was twofold: The recognition that the new social imaginaries require new political powers to manage first and second order disputes; the political processes are required to network these newly transgressing publics.

In the last chapter, this paper proposed that the two sets of assumptions discerned from our two-pronged framework be applied to the original theoretical concepts in our framework. By reading the two these two assumptions together, we can expand our understanding of each theoretical approach and mature the concepts to apply to the Global City context. Lefebvre was unable to foresee the character that globalization and injustice would take; thus using Nancy Fraser's critical democratic theory, we were able to help retrofit Lefebvre's concepts so that his theories may be contextualized within the current state of urban-globalization. This approach, in conjunction with our first set of key assumptions, helped us to mature our understanding of Henri Lefebvre concept of the '*social production of space*' to the '*global social production of space*' based on Fraser's '*politics of representation*'.

The second approach purported by Nancy Fraser was called the '*Justice of Urbanization*'. This approach, in conjunction with the second set of key assumptions, helped us to evolve and contextualize our understanding of the '*Right to the City*' to the '*Right to the Global City*' through the application of Global Public Sphere mechanisms and procedures. Together, these two approaches and subsequent concepts, help us to explore the nature of 'just' multiscalar processes

that penetrate the Global City and organize social life on global and local scales. The assumptions and assertions help to illuminate and overcome the injustices of unilaterally organized social life. This paper argued that both academic approaches needed to be creatively combined in order to define and develop social justice in a multi-scalar organization of social life.

It is important to understand how the socio-political construction of scale affects the geopolitical relationship between urbanization and globalization. Drawing from Neil Brenner's '*theory of structuration*', we could argue that the scales, spaces and thus frames for redress in the Global City were all intimately connected through historically evolving positionality within larger relational grids that stretched vertical and horizontal. To better embody the analytical function of our study, it is also important to understand the socio-political and spatial dimensions of social justice processes, which are worked and reworked through the struggles and routines of everyday life in the Global City. Building a theory of social justice with the process of '*structuration*' in mind, enables the transformative potential of multiple and disparate efforts that would have traditionally been dismissed.

Global Cities reproduce and represent global and urban-local social relations of power through the creation of urban space that affect people beyond the city. The concern of this paper has been to address the social injustice that is caused by this process. Henri Lefebvre appropriated the systems of geopolitics that produce global flows of power by analyzing their socio-cultural roots in the everyday life of Global City global-urban spaces. Nancy Fraser created legitimacy and efficacy in the political transformation of systems that are expressed through multiple scales in the global-urban spaces of the Global City. This complemented Lefebvre's approach by procedurally enabling political processes to move beyond crystallized forms of territorial political belonging. Lefebvre tempered Fraser's approach by ensuring that the 'science' of her approach did not

overshadow or further fragment people from the spaces they produce. Lastly, Fraser helped to justly administrate and mediate between complex scalar institutions that connect everyday life around the world. Unless the forces of the free market, which dominate urban space, are modified, many of Lefebvre's concepts would remain a seductive but impossible ideal for those who cannot bid for the dominated spaces of the city (those who cannot freely exercise their rights).

### **i. Considerations and Next Steps**

As noted above, many of the scholars in this paper, as well as the nature of the topics are highly theoretical but that is simply because the structuration of scale and governance regimes of the neo-liberal imperative have crystallized themselves so deeply into the social fabric that it has abstracted society's ability to '*think critically*' about itself. Lefebvre argued that 'everyday life' and social space must be elevated to '*critical thinking*' in order to discern its actual relation to the processes of reproduction. This has been the intention of this paper. It was not to propose a single model with which to replace our current, but to articulate how we as a social collective that now network across the globe can have this conversation. It is also important to note that for these ideas and arguments to be useful, there is a significant amount of political will required by all forms of crystallized territorial political authority. However, just as history has shown, the more widely the affects of '*abnormal justice*' are felt, the more likely it is to spark change.

While this paper has mostly focused on the injustices faced by urban inhabitants, it is important to remember that the point of this project was to overcome the crystallization of doxics based on cordoned geographies. Globalization and urbanization are two processes that have intimately connected people to social spaces on both scales, regardless of territorial, social and political codified definitions. Thus, in some respect, this paper encourages all governing processes on all scales to be flexible and complementary. For example, regionalism is an

emerging study of territorial organization that focuses on the interests of a particular region or group of regions. Regionalism can either refer to the internal politics of regions in states, or it can refer to the external politics of regions across nations. Moreover, city regions are an emerging area of study, through which metropolitan areas have multiple administrative districts, but share resources like a business district, labour market and transport network. While regionalism would still require its own study, this framework could still apply to these emerging geo-governance regimes, as the framework's principles of permeated social geographies, publicities and social justice could apply.<sup>59</sup>

Another aspect of this study, which Lefebvre did address but was not discussed in this paper, is the rural-city dynamic. Lefebvre notes that the relationship between the town and the countryside is a historical relationship, with the mediating role being played by industrialization and the advancement of technology. Through the evolution of social living, industrial society has, Lefebvre argues, been supplanted by urban society. Lefebvre understands the 'rural and urban' as interrelated rather than isolated entities. He has often criticized many urban scholars for over-emphasizing the urban, which has enabled the rural-urban doxic as another form of crystallized geographical relationships that produce the necessary social relations for its valorization (Lefebvre, 1991). This analysis was beyond the scope of this paper but still remains a viable subject matter for this framework.

Lastly, it would be appropriate to express future opportunities to continue this examination, and further develop the nature of social justice in the Global City. I am interested in understanding the social justice issues that arise from multi-scalar dissonance and non-

---

<sup>59</sup> For further exploration of this subject: Neil Brenner's "Decoding the Newest "Metropolitan Regionalism" in the USA: A Critical Overview" (2002); or Jon Pierre's "Debating Governance : Authority, Steering, and Democracy: Authority, Steering and Democracy," (2000)

correspondence that frustrate and impede on democratic processes within and across geopolitical scales.

The need to continue to explore and understand global, nation, regional and local institutional arrangements will only grow in demand. How best can we expand the knowledge of newly contextualized social justice issues around the world to produce responsive policies? The next research theme of interest would be comparative studies of Global Cities from the Global North, like New York and London, with Global Cities from the Global South, like Sao Paulo, Mexico City, Shanghai. The intention would be to study the social and political movements that further support the development of strategies that encourage ‘just’ cooperation between geopolitical scales of action. With practical case studies, it would be possible to analytically analyze the movements, as well as the assumption and apparatus of our chosen frameworks.

In addition, it would be interesting to apply this analysis to issue domains; for example, the issue domain that would be interesting and pertinent to the relationship between globalization and urbanization in the Global City is ‘*military urbanism*’.<sup>60</sup> This concept is developed by Stephen Graham to explore the massive global proliferation of deeply technophilic state surveillance projects signals a startling militarization of civil society, which along with neoliberal governance models has exacerbated urban inequalities (Graham, 2010). Globally, military urbanism is being employed to secure neoliberal geo-economic architectures, which valorized Global Cities as securitized zones of globalized neoliberal structures.

---

60 The crossover between military and civilian applications of advanced technology are at the heart of a much broader set of trends characterize military urbanism. Surveillance and control of everyday life, circulations, and spaces in Western cities continually blur the line between policing, intelligence, military, war and peace, and global, local and national operations. As security and production becomes the sole criterion of political legitimation, the intimate connection between the colonization of urban spaces by military doctrine and the security-industrial complexes deeply affect the ways in which civil society can operate at each level of governance in the Global City.

Architectures of control produce contemporary power in cities by attempting to separate spaces of privilege, which are risk-free from the spaces of high risk. However, much of the ubiquitous control is an illusion as technology will always fail to control real life, which contributes to the cyclical application of securitized threats and capital induced violence for the re-appropriation of space and re-absorption of surplus; is military urbanism responding to real threats or neoliberal accumulation demands? The most important consequence that necessitates a strong social justice response is the de-legitimization of whole groups of people that leave them beyond the protection of the law and social norms (Graham, 2010). ‘The focus turns to colonizing the intimate inflections of urban culture, and the acquisition of socio-cultural knowledge through the securocratic militarization of urban space boils down to contestation over meaning of that space, power structures, and complex, dichotomized construction of binary geographies.

Lastly, this paper wants to leave you with this thought; “political weakness is not the lack of opposition but, rather the disorganization of dissent” (Graham, 2010, 310). The Global City is a unique example of compounded political processes and identities that break from traditional conceptions. This provides us – the academics, politicians, and global urban inhabitants- to explore these political processes and identities from new perspectives. What are the challenge, perils and opportunities presented to us? It is our collective response to these social justice issues that will define the organization of dissent. The goal was for ‘*Urbanization of Justice*’ and the ‘*Justice of Urbanization*’ to form conceptual resources appropriate for the Global City, that in turn may be used by social struggles to organize socio-political transformations of the scales of action based on social justice; and the global network of urban inhabitants requires tools that intimately connect the urban and global.

## References

- Agnew, J. (2005). Sovereignty regimes: Territoriality and state authority in contemporary world politics. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 95(2), 437-461.
- Amin, A. (2004). Regions unbound: Towards a new politics of place. *Geografiska Annaler*, 86(1), 33-44.
- Appadurai, A. (2003). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. In Braziel J. E., Mannur A. (Eds.), *Theorizing diaspora: A reader* (25-48). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Aronowitz, S. ((2007)). The ignored philosopher and social theorist: On the work of Henri Lefebvre. *Situations: Project of the Radical Imagination*, 2(1).
- Attoh, K. (2011). What kind of right is the right to the city? *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(5), 669-685.
- Brenner, N. (2002). Decoding the newest “metropolitan regionalism” in the usa: A critical overview. *Cities*, 19(1), 3-21. Retrieved from <http://client6.ion.fas.nyu.edu/docs/IO/222/2002.Brenner.Cities.pdf>
- Brenner, N. (1997). Global, fragmented, hierarchical: Henri lefebvre's geographies of globalization. *Public Culture*, 10(1), 135-167.
- Brenner, N. (2000). The urban question: Reflections on henri lefebvre, urban theory and the politics of scale. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24(2), 361-378.
- Brenner, N. (2001). The limits to scale? methodological reflections on scalar structuration. *Progress in Human Geography*, 25(4), 591-614.
- Brenner, N., Marcuse, P., & Mayer, M. (2009). Cities for people, not for profit. *City*, 13(2-3), 176-184.
- Butler, C. (2009). Critical legal studies and the politics of space. *Social & Legal Studies*, 18(3), 313-332.
- Castells, M. (2004). An introduction to the information age. In R. Blom, & F. Webster (Eds.), *The information society reader* (pp. 138-164). London; New York: Routledge.
- Castells, M. (2002). Local and global: Cities in the network society. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, 93(5), 548-558.
- Castells, M. (2005). Global governance and global politics. *Political Science and Politics*, 38(1), 9-16.
- Connolly, J., & Steil, J. (2009). Introduction: Finding justice in the city. In P. Marcuse (Ed.), *Searching for the just city: Debates in urban theory and practice*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Dahl, R. A. (1967). The city in the future of democracy. *The American Political Science Review*, 61(4), 953-970.
- Dikeç, M., & Gilbert, L. (2002). Right to the city: Homage or a new societal ethics? *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 13(2), 58-74.
- Fainstein, S. S. (2009). Planning and the just city. In P. Marcuse (Ed.), *Searching for the just city: debates in urban theory and practice* (pp. 19-39). Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.

- Fainstein, S. S. (2010). Philosophical approaches to the problem of justice. *The just city* (pp. 23-56). Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Fraser Nancy, H. A. (2003.). *Redistribution or recognition? : A political-philosophical exchange*. London: Verso.
- Fraser, N. (1995). Redistribution to recognition: Dilemmas of justice in a 'post-socialist' age. *New Left Review*, 212, 68.
- Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text*, (25/26), 56-80.
- Fraser, N. (2001). Recognition without ethics? *Theory, Culture & Society*, 18(2-3), 21-42.
- Fraser, N. (2007). Special section: Transnational public sphere: Transnationalizing the public sphere. *Theory*, 24(4), 7-30.
- Fraser, N. (2010). Injustice at intersecting scales: On 'Social exclusion' and the 'Global poor'. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 13(3), 363-371.
- Graham, S. (2010). *Cities under siege: The new military urbanism* . London, England: Verso.
- Habermas Jürgen. (1991). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. MIT Press.
- Hales, M., King, S., & Mendoza Pena, A. (2010). *The Urban Elite*. A.T Kearney, The Chicago School of Global Affairs, Foreign Policy Magazine.
- Hales, M., & Mendoza Pena, A. (2012). *2012 Global cities index and emerging cities outlook*. A.T. Kearney, The Chicago School of Global Affairs.
- Harvey David. (2003). The right to the city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(4), 939-941.
- Harvey David. (2006). *The limits to capital* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1988.). *Social justice and the city*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1982). Commodities, values, and class relations. *The limits to capital* (pp. 1-38). Oxford, England: B. Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2000). *Spaces of hope*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Harvey, D. (1989). From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: The transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, 71(1), 3-17.

- Harvey, D. (1997). Contested cities: Social processes and spatial form. In N. Jewson, & S. MacGregor (Eds.), *Transforming cities: Contested governance and new spatial divisions* (pp. 19-27). London, New York: Routledge.
- Harvey, D. (2003). The city as a body politic. In J. Schneider, & I. Susser (Eds.), *Wounded cities: Destruction and reconstruction in a globalized world* (pp. 25-43). Oxford, New York: Berge.
- Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610(1), 21-44.
- Held, D. (1999). Introduction. *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture* (). Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Iveson, K. (2011). Social or spatial justice? Marcuse and Soja on the right to the city. *City*, 15(2), 250-259. doi: 10.1080/13604813.2011.568723
- Jacobs, J. M. (1996). *Edge of empire: Postcolonialism and the city*. New York: Routledge.
- Jessop, B., Brenner, N., & Jones, M. (2008). Theorizing sociospatial relations. *Environment and Planning. D, Society and Space*, 26(3), 389.
- Kaldor, M. (2000). 'Civilising' globalisation? the implications of the 'Battle in seattle'. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, 29(1), 105-114.
- Kaldor, M. (2003). The idea of global civil society. *International Affairs*, 79(3), 583-593.
- Kipfer, S., & Goonewardena, K. (2007). Colonization and the new imperialism: On the meaning of uricide today. *Theory & Event*, 10(2).
- Lefebvre Henri. (2003). *The urban revolution*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith Trans.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, H. (1996). In Kofman Eleonore L. E. (Ed.), *Writings on cities / the right to the city*. Oxford, Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Lefebvre, H. (2008). *Critique of everyday life volume one: Introduction* (J. Moore Trans.). (2nd ed.). London, New York: Verso.
- Lefebvre, H. (1976, 1978). *De l'état*. Paris: Union générale d'éditions.
- Liggett Helen, P. D. C. (1995). *Spatial practices: Critical explorations in social/spatial theory*.
- London School of Economics. ( 2011). *Professor Saskia Sassen*. Retrieved from <http://www2.lse.ac.uk/sociology/whoswho/academic/Sassen.aspx>
- Marcuse, P. (2007). The production of regime culture and instrumentalized art in a globalizing

- state. *Globalizations*, 4(1), 15-28.
- Marcuse, P. (2009). From critical urban theory to the right to the city. *City*, 13(2-3), 185-197.
- Marston, S. A. (2000). The social construction of scale. *Progress in Human Geography*, 24(2), 219-242.
- Massey, D. (2004). Geographies of responsibility. *Geografiska Annaler*, 86(1), 5-18.
- Massey, D., Research Group, H. G., Bond, S., & Featherstone, D. (2009). The possibilities of a politics of place beyond place? A conversation with Doreen Massey. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 125(3-4), 401-420.
- Merrifield Andy. (2006). *Henri Lefebvre: A critical introduction*. New York: Routledge
- Mitchell Don. (2003). *The right to the city: Social justice and the fight for public space*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Moulaert, F., Swyngedouw, E., & Rodriguez, A. (2001). Social polarization in metropolitan areas. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 8(2), 99-102.
- Mumford, L. (2003). What is a city? In R. LeGates, & F. Stout (Eds.), *The city reader* (3rd ed., pp. 92-96). London, New York: Routledge.
- Paetzold, H. (2000). The philosophical notion of the city. In Malcolm Miles, Hall Tim, Borden Iain (Ed.), *The city cultures reader* (pp. 204-220). New York: Routledge.
- Paquet, G. (2008). Governance as stewardship. *Optimum Online*. Retrieved from <http://gouvernance.ca/publications/08-11.pdf>.
- Paquet, G. (2005). *The new geo-governance: A baroque approach*. Ottawa, ON, CAN: University of Ottawa Press.
- Paquet, G. (2006). *The many are smarter than the few: a plea for möbius-web governance*. *Optimum Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.gouvernance.ca/publications/06-19.pdf>
- Park, R. E. (1967). On social control and collective behavior. *Chicago University Press*.
- Pierre, J. (2000). *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering, and Democracy: Authority, Steering, and Democracy* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Purcell, M. (2002). Excavating lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant. *GeoJournal*, 58(2-3), 99-108.
- Purcell, M. (2003). Citizenship and the right to the global city: Reimagining the capitalist world order. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(3), 564-590.
- Purcell, M. (2006). Urban democracy and the local trap. *Urban Studies*, 43(11), 1921-1941.

- Rawls, J. (1993). The law of peoples. *Critical Inquiry*, 20(1), 36-68.
- Routledge, P. (2010). Introduction: Cities, justice and conflict. *Urban Studies*, 47(6), 1165-1177.
- Said, E. W. (1994, 2003). *Orientalism*. New York; Toronto: Random House; Vintage Books.
- Sasaki, K. (2000.). In Borden I., Hall T. and Malcolm M. (Eds.), *The city cultures reader / for whom is city design? Tactility versus visuality*. London: Routledge.
- Sassen, S. (2000.). In Borden I., Hall T. and Malcolm M. (Eds.), *The city cultures reader / the new inequalities within cities* . London: Routledge.
- Sassen, S. (2002.). In Campbell S., Fainstein S. S. (Eds.), *Readings in urban theory/ cities in a world economy* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Sassen, S. (2006). Global cities and survival circuits In C. E. Bose, J. S. Litt & M. K. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Global dimensions of gender and carework* (). Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Social Sciences.
- Sassen, S. (2007). Theoretical and empirical elements in the study of globalization. In I. Rossi (Ed.), *Frontiers of globalization research theoretical and methodological approaches* (3rd ed., pp. 287-305). New York: Springer.
- Sassen, S. (2000). *Cities in a world economy*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press.
- Sassen, S. (2007). Introduction: Deciphering the global. In S. Sassen (Ed.), *Deciphering the global: Its scales, spaces and subjects* (pp. 1-20). New York: Routledge.
- Searching for the just city: Debates in urban theory and practice* (2009). In Marcuse P. (Ed.). Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Shields Rob. (1999). *Lefebvre, love, and struggle: Spatial dialectics*. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, N. (2002). New globalism, new urbanism: Gentrification adoi: 10.1111/1467-8330.00249
- Soja, E. W. (2010). *Seeking spatial justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- State of world population 2007: Unleashing the potential of urban growth*. (2007). New York: United Nations Population Fund.
- Steinert, H. (2009). Culture industry cities: From discipline to exclusion, from citizen to tourist. *City*, 13(2-3), 278-291.
- Swyngedouw, E. (2004). Globalisation or 'glocalisation'? networks, territories and rescaling. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 17(1), 25-48.
- Swyngedouw, E. A. (1992). Territorial organization and the Space/Technology nexus. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 17(4), 417-433.

- Swyngedouw, E., & Baeten, G. (2001). Scaling the city: The political economy of 'glocal' development - brussels' conundrum. *European Planning Studies*, 9(7), 827-849.
- Tapscott and D. Agnew (1999). Governance in the Digital Economy. *Finance & Development*, 36(4), 34-37.
- Wilson, D. (2009). Globalization, the global trope, and poor black communities: The american experience. *Global E-Journal*, 3
- Wirth, L. (1938). Urbanism as a way of life. *American Journal of Sociology*, 44(1), 1-24.
- Woessner, M. (2009). Rescuing the 'Right to the city'. *City*, 13(4), 474-475.
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Zukin, S. (1995). Whose culture? Whose city? *The cultures of cities*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Zukin, S (1996). Space and symbols in an age of decline. In A. D. King (Ed.), *Re-presenting the city: Ethnicity, capital, culture in the 21st-century metropolis* (pp. 43). New York: New York University Press.