Experimenting with new urban planning strategies under conditions of radical modernization

Salet, W.

Publication date
2009
Document Version
Final published version
Published in
DISP

Experimenting with New Urban Planning Strategies under Conditions of Radical Modernization

Willem Salet

Abstract: This article explores the need to experiment with the new urban planning strategies of changing cities under the conditions of radical modernization. Radical modernization is conceptually explored as a combined frame for macrosociological (global) processes of rational specialization and microsociological processes of individualization. The meaning of local spaces is becoming extremely dynamic because of both of these sociological processes of rescaling, which in turn lead to a new appropriation of urban spaces. This urban transformation takes place both within the urban core and in the new in-between locations of city-regional development. The challenge, as far as planning is concerned, is to respond to processes of modernization and individualization. Experimental planning strategies should be linked more directly with the actual changes of urban activities and should attempt, from this position, to establish experimental strategies for social integration. Within the framework of processes of regional identity formation, "soft sources" of strategy building, such as social and cultural infrastructures and elements of heritage and landscaping, may have a far-reaching impact because of their symbolic and emotional value.

1. Introduction

In a theorizing article on the changes cities are undergoing in the early 21st century, Thomas Hutton (2004a) illustrated the three-stage transformation of Vancouver over the last half-century. Vancouver developed from being a "regional center" in the 1950s and 1960s into a "post industrial town" throughout the 1970s and most of the 1980s, and then into the current "global city" from the early 1990s onwards. Although not every western city has experienced this almost ideal typical process of urban transformation via the same trajectories and with the same intensity, Hutton's analysis certainly highlights the structural forces that underlie the recent radical changes undergone by western cities. The provincial town in puritan British Columbia on the Canadian periphery did not just undergo an economic transition, but was transformed in all senses into the current global city with its manifold international, and in particular Asian, influences. During the first stage, when it was a regional economic center, Vancouver's urban shape reflected the land use patterns of the classic American provincial town, namely, a modest central business district (CBD) surrounded by light, and in some cases old, industrial zones and eventually by residential areas. From the early 1970s onward, the post-industrial stage of economic development and social modernization was characterized by the growth of tertiary industries and services related to the national resources economy (wood, energy, agriculture). Considering the physical shape of the city, the transformation led, in particular, to an increase in centralization. The CBD was upgraded and a lot of new, high-rise office buildings were constructed in the urban core with old industries making way for housing construction (new, modernist mega-projects). There was a growth in specialized services, and a new class of office workers appeared on the labor market. The social and economic energies of urban growth were concentrated in the core parts of the city, making the residential periphery even more peripheral. The emergence of the global city in the early 1990s was accompanied by new changes based on globalizing economic and social conditions. Asian investment (in particular, capital from Hong Kong) and numerous Asian migrants have caused changes to the entire urban scenery. Globalization and the further specialization of patterns of production and consumption have led to the introduction of new global offices as well as a booming cultural economy and new patterns of consumption. On the labor market, the rise of the cultural economy gave birth to a new category of "entrepreneurial transnationals" (Hutton 2004b). The physical shape of the postmodern city is extremely differentiated by its highly specialized spaces of production, consumption and living.

This analysis of urban change highlights the integral change in urban conditions. The most important ingredients of urban transformation

Willem Salet is Professor of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Amsterdam.

The article is the result of fruitful debate among colleagues who cooperated within the framework of the COST A26 Programme on "Social and Economic Governance in City-Regions" under the auspices of the European Science Foundation. This COST working group on regional governance produced the book entitled "Synergy in Urban Networks?" (edited by Willem Salet in 2006) in cooperation with Alan Harding, Pieter Terhorst, Pieter Tordoir, Ernst Storm, Gerrit van der Plas, Joost Molenaar, KLM, Schiphol and Air Traffic Control, Ian Gordon, Frank Eckardt, Yuri Kazepow, Carlos Nunes Silva, Arto Haveri. Neil Brenner cooperated closely with this COST network in the capacity of visiting guest professor.

concern the change of the *economy*, the differentiation of *labor*, the social composition of the *urban population*, the *cultural identity*, and the resulting *spatial configuration* of urban activities. The drivers of change are the continuous specialization of production and consumption, the increasing migration and plurality of the population, greater individualization and social mobility (labor market, families, housing), and the growing complexity of non-place-bound, trans-scalar processes of globalization. This is not to say that the meaning of place has disappeared, but rather that the sense of place is changing through its increasingly trans-scalar dimensions and the rescaling of social and economic relationships. This is not the same as the expansion of scale and the "going abroad" of successful home entrepreneurs, which takes place all the time. The home entrepreneur with his local identity and local pride is no longer the dominant economic power in the western city of the 21st century. A lot of place-specific conditions are still crucial for economic and social development, but the characteristics of the developing agents are not necessarily place-bound[1]. Transnational corporations are the new economic powers.

The increasing multiplicity of experiencing space is not easy to explain, it is highly complex and accompanied by a lot of uncertainty. The current stage of research into flows of space is still embryonic and as confusing as the labels of contemporary approaches of urban analysis (such as post-Fordism or postmodernism), which aim at explaining the current dynamics of urban change. Most strikingly, the changes in the current post-Fordist era might be identified by tendencies of both even more Fordism (a lot of new concentrations of huge office complexes) and the contrasting specialization of finely textured spaces for cultural economy and consumption. It demonstrates the ambiguity and complexity of current processes of transformation. However, there is no doubt about the increasing specialization and differentiation of urban experience that are resulting in contrasting urban spaces over expanding urban regions. Many observers have highlighted the increase of social polarization and inequality of the specialized and segregated urban mosaic (Graham, Marvin 2001; Moulaert et al. 2003; Newman, Thornley 2005). Local experiences are, however, very different. The increase in social polarization might be expected to be more radical in the context of market-type American cities than in the European context, where social differences are usually more mitigated by the government and embedded in social history. Still, the underlying tendencies of economic specialization, globalization, and rescaling also play a role in the context of European cities.

The paper explores firstly the fundamental dynamics of radical modernization and globalization on the one hand and the new local appropriation of urban spaces on the other. Next, the new appropriation of spaces is examined in more detail. Thereafter, the enlargement of scale and scope of transforming cities is explored in the emergent in-between spaces of new regional configurations. Finally, the paper focuses on the implications of dynamic urban spaces for urban planning strategies. Urban planning strategies obviously cannot pretend to control the changing economic and social conditions, but have to find new ways of responding to issues of urban life in a context of urban transformation.

2. Radical modernization and the new appropriation of spaces

An interesting contribution to the exploration of the dynamics of urban space is the attempt by French urban sociologists to combine the theses of macrosociologists, such as Giddens, Beck and Lash, with daily experiences in the micro cosmos of urban life (Ascher 1995; Bourdin 2000, 2005; Giddens 1990; Beck 1992; Beck et al. 1994). The dynamics of urban space is defined here against the background of the general tendencies toward global specialization and rationalization on one hand, and the microscopic processes of individualization (including new forms of appropriating urban spaces) on the other. In order to understand this approach better, we first have to go back to the familiar fascination of French urban sociology with the *integration* of private spheres of activity into frames of collective urban action.

As long ago as the 1960s, the research done by Raymond Ledrut and his colleagues focused on the problems of local disintegration due to increasing individualization and social mobility (Ledrut 1968, 1974, 1979). For decades, the establishment of social norms and the mechanisms of social control of daily activities in urban life had been re-delegated from families to local groups and from there increasingly to external functional and professional organizations and policymakers. An increasing dependency on exterior and professional relationships tends to raise issues of involvement and "belonging to" for the local population and leads to the problem of social detachment in urban experience.

The processes of disintegration were exacerbated by individualization and social mobility: smaller households and more broken homes, increasing mobility in labor and housing markets, etc., resulting in unstable conditions for large groups of urban dwellers as regards participation in political, social and cultural networks (Ledrut 1968).

The causes of local disintegration have certainly not diminished since the 1960s. A new phenomenon is the multiplicity of urban experiences. Technological innovations, in particular new forms of long-distance communication, have created new conditions for the experience of space and time. More than ever before, completely different experiences, by completely different groups of reference and different rationalities, are being placed side-by-side at the very same point of time. This *juxtaposition of individualized urban experiences* is a new cause of deficient integration (Lahire 1998). Postmodernist interpretations used the perception of fragmentary, unordered and accidental juxtaposition of individual urban experiences to actualize their radical decomposition of the grand stories of rationalization, modernization and coherence (Augé 1992; Derrida 1978; Lyotard 1984). The postmodernist argument is strong when it comes to dismantling the logic of rationalization, but it makes a mystery of urban experience.

It is here that the above-mentioned sociologists disagree. Beck, Giddens and Lash and the French sociologists Bourdin and Ascher, who were inspired by them, claimed that the project of modernization had not come to an end but instead had reached an even more radical stage of rationalization. The process is becoming more radical because of the double scissors kick of globalization and individualization. Globalization builds on the continuing specialization and rationalization of social and economic relationships, as can be seen in the rationalized patterns of production and consumption. Simultaneously, and maybe sometimes even as a countervailing reaction to these exteriorizing and rationalizing practices, tendencies of individualization attempt to create new atmospheres of familiarity and intimacy. Individuals are searching for new spheres of privacy and intimacy, or specialized domains of "belonging to" (Bourdin 2000, 2005). On both sides of the scissors kick, therefore, radical tendencies of rescaling are drawing the meaning of locality and urban space away from its socle of immovability. De-territorialization and re-territorialization represent a double tendency: one, the tendencies of *detachment* of local space caused by further rationalization and globalization, and two, the processes of new local appropriation. These processes of rescaling occur not only in economic production, but also in social and cultural lifestyles (fashion, music, food, etc.). The detachment of space is visible, for instance, in the standardization of fast-food (Kentucky Fried Chicken, pizza and kebab standards, etc.), while at the same time new local attachments arise in particular places. The dish of *kapsalon* in the port city of Rotterdam is a good example of local re-appropriation of standardized tendencies in fast-food (*kapsalon* means hairdressing salon). *Kapsalon* was served for the first time in a Turkish hairdressing salon in Rotterdam. It consists of a good portion of French fries, covered with melted cheese, dressing and ketchup. On top of this warm bed of blue collar delight is a generous layer of Turkish kebab to finish the dish off. *Kapsalon* is available on every street corner in Rotterdam!

Giddens examines this double and contrasting process of rescaling locality in four dimensions of experience:

- Spatial and temporal distancing (bridging the far and near, here and now)
- Intimacy and impersonality (impersonal rationalization creates need of new familiarity; both sides move)
- Continuous specialization and, simultaneously, new forms of appropriation
- Particularism and engagement

The contrasting dimensions of experience urge people towards a "local reflexive" process, a continuous search for the meaning of place in both tendencies of motion (globalization and individualization) (Giddens 1990). As the processes of globalization and modernization have been investigated intensely in social and economic geographic studies during the last decade. In the following section, I focus on the second part of the assumptions, concerning the dynamics of urban space, namely, new ways of appropriating urban space in order to create safe havens of "belonging to" under the influence of individualization.

3. New appropriation of social spaces

New appropriation of local space is a very complex theme because of the multiplicity of spatial relationships and individualized uses of space. A plethora of spatial decompositions and new spatial bonds are covered by the condition of individualization and many of these are not place-

bound or at least not bound to one particular place. Social bonds increasingly cross the scales of place and human beings participate more and more in a plurality of social and spatial bonds. The social integration and social control options are therefore dependent on limited capacities to guide a plurality of individualized networks (Lahire 1998). In other words, we take part in plural social networks and communities that are not fully known and coordinated, let alone known and coordinated by the government (Healey 2006). One of the consequences of this increasing plurality is that the inherent social risks are not fully controlled. We live in a *risk society* (Beck 1992).

We are interested in the particular forms of spatial appropriation that give people the feeling of serious involvement and belonging-to within new communities of interest. Some of these communities may be place-bound, but proximity is not usually the strongest tie as far as social bonds are concerned. As Melvin Webber already noted in a brilliant forward-looking essay written in the early 1960s, communities are increasingly founded on non-place-bound forms of communication between people that share common interests. These communities may become more important than communities of place in which proximity is the only thing that people have in common. It is interaction, and not place, that matters (Webber 1964). Obviously, there may be a lot of intensive interaction in territorial spaces as well, but this is not evident in individualizing neighborhoods and, if present at all, additional social conditions would be required to establish the potential for social integration.

Some forms of new spatial appropriation are very territorially based. This happens to be true in the case of the growing category of gated communities. However, a characteristic of gated communities is not just the physical proximity, but the presence of a lot of specific social characteristics of participants that define the specific individualization of space. Usually, a lot of social homogeneity is organized within the gates of these communities as something that is to be distinguished from the outside world. Besides gated communities, there are also local communities that are closely related to international cultures. In some neighborhoods, the abundance of satellite dishes may symbolize the multiplication of space: Where are we? In an urban quarter of Berlin or in the middle of Turkey or in both places at the same time? Another example is provided by Marcuse and Van Kempen (2000) who talk about "citadels" in some parts of inner cities (New York, London, Tokyo) that are occupied by the super-rich and who only use their apartments temporarily because they have apartments in a number of different cities. Once again, other communities of interest are not at all bound to a particular territorial space. For instance, some sociologists also explain the international revival of fundamentalist religious communities as a reaction to increasing modernization and as a need to organize new social bonds of integration subject to conditions of individualization (Bourdin 2005). A good overview is provided in a special theme number of *Urban Studies* where Justin Beaumont introduces the new role of faith-based organizations and urban social issues. He points at new urbanizing relationship between religion and the public sphere (Beaumont 2008).

4. In-between cities

Apparently, there is growing empirical evidence of the interrelationships between the tendency to individualization and new forms of appropriating urban spaces. It is interesting to see that this research into the change of urban spaces in Europe focuses more and more on changes in the urban periphery. The urban evolution of American cities has been unfolding for a much longer time in wide urban fields. There, the suburbanization of the masses started before the Second World War with the peak coming in the 1950s and 1960s. In this context, suburbanization meant the appropriation of land in the extensive surroundings of the city for residential use by the middle classes. The social and economic activities were still largely centralized. This pattern of urbanization changed over the course of time and historians who researched the suburbanization of American cities declared the end of the era of suburbanization to be the mid-1980s, due to the spatial decentralization of typical urban core activities such as specialized services of production and consumption (Fishman 1987; Jackson 1985). Following this line, Garreau (1991) produced his well-known work on *Edge Cities*. The typical middle class homogeneity, evident during the first decades of suburbanization, also changed into more differentiation and plurality of residential milieus, bringing all sorts of inner city problems to the surrounding areas (Baldassare 1986). This provided a strong impetus for the creation of smaller and more tightly-knit cells of homogeneity via the excessive growth of gated communities in the broader urban field, resulting in

a wide mosaic of differentiated urban habitats that combine the heterogeneity of the metropolitan level of scale with the increasing forms of social homogeneity at lower levels of scale.

By contrast, suburbanization in Europe has generally been subject to severe constraints over a period of many decades due to policies of urban containment (Hall et al. 1973). Since the early 1990s, however, new processes of dynamic urban evolution have led to different sorts of urban decentralization and poly-nuclear development (for the differences, see Hall et al. 2006).

The enlargement of scale and scope of city-regions and the processes of urban reconfiguration are not a product of urban and regional planning, but unfold as a more or less autonomous urban evolution, accommodated or conditioned, at best, by planning processes. The urban core in many cases is specializing as well, as a center of consumption for visitors and as a center for new cultural production in the finely textured historic quarters. The large-scale specializations of economic and social complexes often cannot be accommodated in the inner cities and tend to escape to outside the urban fabric. Moreover, the low- and middle-income groups find it more difficult to survive in the specializing and increasingly selective inner city quarters. Typical inner city problems are then replaced.

A large number of inner cities are therefore transforming from the idealized centers of compactness and a Jane Jacobs type of social diversity into new spaces of specialization. Beyond the historic cities, in the expanding regional surroundings, a lot of newly planned and unplanned urban activities are being situated that exhibit new urban dynamics in the places that were, for a long time, considered peripheral. François Ascher (1995) analyzed this metropolitan specialization and decentralization in France as the emergence of a new urban archipelago type of *métapolis*. In the same period in Germany, Thomas Sieverts developed the concept of *Zwischenstadt* (in-between city) to indicate the transformation of the contrast between the urban hierarchy and the periphery, the contrast between the urban and rural landscapes and the contrast between distant activities and those in the here and now of urban development (Sieverts 1999; Stein 2006; Sieverts et al. 2005). These urban researchers conclude (with some drama) that the urban shape of cities is being disorganized, based on the concept of a "city without a city". The influence of increasing individualization is visible in the specialization of public places. Instead of the central places being locations at which a lot of different people can meet, they are being given specialist status as separate places for people that share certain interests (Sieverts 1999). The inner city is not the exclusive epicenter of urban activity, and the principle of centrality is being multiplied and reconfigured in new centers of economic, social and cultural specialization. The social ecology of Jane Jacobs no longer provides the necessary ingredients for the structuring of the urban archipelago (Sieverts 1999).

The present condition of urban transformation is not considered ideal by the above-mentioned observers. On the contrary, *Zwischenstadt* and *métapolis* represent a new "thin" condition of urbanity that complicates processes of social integration. Although the new conditions of urbanization may not be neglected, they are far from being regarded as ideal. The authors fear a further erosion of the familiar emotional and symbolic linkages. Sieverts analyses the changes of urban habitat where neighbor relationships are thinning out, where crafts and corner shops have disappeared and where all primary relationships fundamentally differ from the garden city (the family doctor, the school, the priest, the shop). Moreover, the spatial distribution of amenities is crossing the scales instead of being organized hierarchically. Taking the conditions as they are, for urban planning strategies the challenge is to mark responsive strategies, such as social experiences in the regional archipelago, in highly visible ways by new cultural means. In this context, Sieverts refers to the experience of the IBA Emscherpark where "soft" means, in particular, the reconstruction of the landscape and the use of cultural symbols were used to mark the processes of regional reconstruction and to establish a new regional identity. This focus on the use of a soft infrastructure on behalf of experiencing the daily livelihood in disorganized regional settings in more coherent ways has been expanded in recent projects, for example, by focusing on a range of conditions with the potential for experiencing integration such as aesthetics, sport, landscapes, cultural heritage and the topographical uniqueness of spaces (Sieverts et al. 2005; Stein 2006).

Ascher is also searching for cultural means to stimulate the experience of social integration. In particular, he is looking for integrative linkages between the exteriorizing livelihoods and the outside world through the use of the sensory and eventful dimensions of space. As the experience of people is individualized in multiple ways, it is necessary to find symbols that link trans-scalar experiences. For this reason, Ascher

is interested in spaces in the daily environment that adapt to the external society. This type of symbolic and spatial expression may be found in spaces of events, in spaces of memory, in specialized spaces for production and consumption, and in spaces of passage (such as airports or terminals). His colleague Bourdin (2005) investigates the spatial recombination for social survival under radical modern conditions. He analyses some recompositions of "belonging to":

- The recomposition of patrimonial NIMBYs: a group of owners who defend the patrimony and thereby guarantee social homogeneity within their community.
- Thematic territories: areas focused on certain themes such as leisure, sport, or age.
- Ethnic territories: areas that are evolving into enclaves of individual ethnic groups.

Such processes of reconfiguration are very dynamic. Territory is not a constant and here again we are confronted by the notion that territory is not a localized manifestation, but a fragile and rescaling condition that must be repeatedly conquered. Bourdin (2005) speaks of a strategy of *dynamic locality*: new uses of space must be conquered again and again by connecting the space to external relationships on the one hand and by reorganizing the habitat in a new shelter on the other.

5. Something to be learned for new urban planning strategies?

What do we learn from this conceptual work in progress, in the incomplete stage of urban transformation, in the way of new thoughts on urban planning strategies? Most concepts are relatively abstract and only partially based on empirical evidence. Nevertheless, I still believe that processes of conceptual exploration in combination with experimental strategies in practice do make sense. Trying and probing in a reflective way is a useful device in conditions of complexity and uncertainty, given that trajectories of collective action and urban planning may change if things turn out differently. However, one thing is certain, namely, that in the contemporary context of dynamic and rescaling economic and social conditions, strategies of urban and regional planning can no longer rely on the familiar canvas of territorially nested spatial planning, which consists of rational estimates of the space needed for offices, housing, social and physical amenities and infrastructure, followed by the negotiation of financial means, and the eventual implementation of programs. This territorially based focus on objectives, rational calculation, means and implementation assumes the position of a planning authority and knowledge that does not exist in our dynamic society. The traditional claim of establishing more territorial planning capacity at the regional level does not meet the new conditions of social complexity. Urban planners have to respect the social conditions that drive citizens and organizations in the relatively autonomous (and not primarily local-bound) relationships of the plural society. There are new planning themes that require consideration and cooperation between agents from different backgrounds that are operating at different levels of scale. The double dynamics of rescaling the meaning of local space via radical modernization and individualization offers a constructive point of departure. It starts with the autonomous change of social activities. The efforts of urban planning have to get interrelated with these ongoing processes and should find ways to respond to this via new spatial policies.

The COST A26 ESF working group on social and economic aspects of regional governance devoted a lot of time and effort to the further exploration of these emergent, but still highly fragile relationships of regional governance (Salet 2006). Neil Brenners (2004) hypothesis is that national governments in Europe tend to devote economic power to their most advanced regions in order to improve competitiveness with other national economic systems. If economic regions acquire such a strategic meaning, what would be the impact on power relationships in the new contexts of urban and regional governance? Why is it still so difficult to organize leadership with respect to crucial regional issues, such as the coordination of new office sites, public transport arrangements and the coordination of land use and landscaping issues (Gordon 2006; Harding 2006; Eckardt 2006)? According to Gordon, the urgency of the regional agenda is evident, but there is still a severe problem with regard to making regional policies work because of a lack of leadership under the conditions of re-scaling and dynamic in-between relationships. Gordon (2006) discusses four strategies in the search for regional leadership, with one of these being a new enabling cluster rather than a hierarchical central-regional axis. The political dimension is also being explored in the COST network. The questions asked are: why people do not feel represented in the new regional constellations (Harding 2006) and why is it so difficult to embed the regional experiments in more institutionalized ways (Eckardt 2006)?

The radical modernization of urban regions disrupted the long-persued planning strategies of urban containment and compact urban expansion. A lot of European city-regions had realized the containment agenda in direct liaison with the national government (Salet et al. 2003). However, since the early 1990s, the practices of spatial development have begun to diverge more and more from the planning policy of urban and regional containment. A good illustration of this general trend in the urban regions of Europe is the case of the Amsterdam region in The Netherlands, one of the countries with the most outspoken tradition of compact urban policies (Musterd, Salet 2003). Here, in the first instance, the political and planning response to the disruptive tendencies of urban containment simply strengthened the efforts of compact urban policy (claiming more planning capacity for existing goals). However, the private development of housing and offices in large part took its own individual way. What happened in many of these cases (Amsterdam being just one of the examples) is that the planners changed their minds and decided after some years to join the autonomous tendencies and then tried to recombine the autonomous processes in line with public interest. In the case of Amsterdam, the city planners and national planning ministry decided to join the major trends in the market in the southern periphery of Amsterdam (which had actually become the largest and most prestigious economic development area of the whole country!) and the urban planners intended to guide this purely commercial development gently into a mixed project of urban use that had to include the programming of housing, cultural facilities, etc. The change of strategy by the planners is something to reflect on. Instead of following their own instincts as regards urban containment, they decided to follow the private sector development and attempt to recombine this with public goals. This is certainly a strategy that might be reflected in a more pro-active sense and in more differentiated policymaking coalitions.

A further fascinating lesson that we can draw from this conceptual reflexive of macro and micro sociological perspectives is that, via this explorative frame of theorizing, creative energies are mobilized around new themes of urban development. Both sides of the process of radical modernization are dynamic and rescaling in a context of multiple experiences. We are no longer talking about urban planning and territory as a constant. The territorial dimension is perceived as a permanent logic of discovery. A new possible sense of place is not a matter of course, it has to be conquered again and again. One of the most difficult challenges is to find new and effective forms of social integration. The crucial risk of the individualizing tendencies in the uses of urban space is that more domains of experience and action are selected without any need for a confrontation with other types of experience. It is here that the fragile relationship between individualization of space and the need for social integration might lead to creative urban and regional planning approaches. Urban planning strategies cannot control the external social and economic conditions of urban life, but should be able to respond to it. For urban and regional design, this perspective creates an opportunity to profile more emphatically the symbolic meaning of soft social and cultural infrastructures and elements of heritage and landscaping as new integrating powers. These are lightly institutionalized themes and relationships that might help create new meanings of regional identity based on their extensive symbolic and emotional value.

Notes

1 The seaport of Rotterdam was the world's largest in the 1960s thanks to the efforts of Dutch entrepreneurs. Forty years on, a well-known Dutch sociologist (Cees Schuyt) tried to investigate the contemporary role of national entrepreneurs in the port economy of Rotterdam, but representative entrepreneurs had become almost impossible to identify. The place characteristics for the seaport economy are still extremely important for the economic development of Rotterdam, but the structure of corporate agents has become largely detached from the place element.

References

Ascher, F. (1995): *Métapolis ou l'avenir des villes*, Paris, Odile Jacob.

Ascher, F. (1998): La république contre la ville. Essay sur l'avenir de la France urbaine, La Tour d'Aigues, Editions de l'Aube

Augé, M. (1992): *Non-Lieux: Introduction à une anthropologie de la surmodernité*, Paris, Editions du Seuil.

Baldassare, M. (1986): *Trouble in Paradise: The suburban transformation in America*. New York, Columbia University Press.

Beaumont, J. (2008): "Introduction: Faith-based Organizations and Urban Social Issues". *Urban Studies* 45 (10) 2011–2017, September 2008.

Beck, U. (1992): *Risk Society. Towards a new modernity*, London: Sage.

Beck, U.; Giddens, A.; Lash, S. (1994): *Reflexive Modernisation. Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in Modern Social Order*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Bourdin, A. (2000): *La Question Locale*, Paris, Presse Universitaire de France.

Bourdin, A. (2005): *La Métropole des Individus*, Paris, l'Aube

Brenner, N. (2004): "Urban governance and the production of new state spaces in western Europe, 1960–2000". *Review of International Political Economy*, 11: 3 August 2004, 447–488.

Derrida J. (1978): *Writing and Difference*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Eckardt, F. (2006): "Innovation of Institutional Capacity in German Regions". In: Salet, W. (ed.) *Synergy in Urban Networks?*, (COST A26), The Hague, SDU Publishers 161–184.

Fishman, R. (1987): *Bourgeois Utopias: The Rise and Fall of Suburbia*. New York, Basic Books,

Giddens, A. (1990): *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Garreau, J. (1991): *Edge City*, New York, Doubleday.

Gordon, I. (2006): "Finding Institutional Leadership for Regional Networks: the case of London and the Greater South East". In: Salet, W. (ed.) *Synergy in Urban Networks?*, (COST A26), The Hague, SDU Publishers 136–161.

Graham, S.; Marvin, S. (2001): *Splintering urbanism. Networked infrastructures, technological mobilities and the urban condition*. (New York: Routledge)

Hall, P.; Thomas, R.; Gracey, H.; Drewett, R. (1973): *The Containment of Urban England. Vols 1 and 2*. London, Allen and Unwin.

Hall, P.; Pain, K. (2006): *The Polycentric Metropolis*, London, Earthscan.

Harding, A. (2006): "Devolution in England: cause without a rebel?". In: Salet, W. (ed.) (2006): *Synergy in Urban Networks?*, (COST A26), The Hague, SDU Publishers. 27–49.

Healey, P. (2006): "Relational complexity and the imaginative power of strategic spatial planning", *European Planning Studies*, Vol. 14, No 4, May 2006.

Hunter, F. (1963): *Community Power Structure*. New York, Anchor.

Hutton, T. (2004 a): "Post-industrialism, Post-modernism and the Reproduction of Vancouver's Central Area: Retheorizing the 12th century City". *Urban Studies*, Vol.41, No. 10, pp. 1953–1982, September 2004.

Hutton, T. (2004 b): "The New Economy of the inner city". *Cities*, Vol. 21, No. 2, p. 89–108, 2004.

Jackson, K. (1985): *Crabgrass Frontiers*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Lahire, B. (1998): *L'homme pluriel, les resorts de l'action*, Paris, Nathan.

Ledrut, R. (1968): *Sociologie Urbaine*, Paris, PUF.

Ledrut, R. (1974): *La forme et le sens dans la société*, Paris, Libraire des Meridiens-Klincksiek

Ledrut, R. (1979): *La Révolution Cachée*, Tournai, Casterman

Lyotard, J-F. (1984): *The Postmodern Condition: A report on knowledge*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Marcuse, P.; van Kempen, R. (eds.) (2000): *Globalizing Cities: A New spatial Order?*, Cambridge (Mass.), Blackwell.

Moulaert, F., Rodríguez, A.; Swyngedouw, E. (eds.) (2003): *The globalized city: economic restructuring and social polarization in European cities*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Musterd, S.; Salet, W. (2003): *Amsterdam Human Capital*, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press.

Newman, P.; Thornley, A. (2005): *Planning world cities, globalization and urban politics*. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan)

Salet, W.; Thornley, A.; Kreukels A. (eds.) (2003): *Metropolitan Governance and Spatial Planning*. London, Routledge/ Spon Press.

Salet, W. (ed.) (2006): *Synergy in Urban Networks?*, The Hague, SDU Publishers.

Sieverts, T. (1999): *Zwischenstadt: zwischen Ort und Welt, Raum und Zeit, Stadt und Land*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel

Sieverts, T.; Koch, M.; Stein, U.; Steinbusch, M. (2005): *Zwischenstadt – Inzwischen Stadt?*. Wuppertal, Müller und Busmann KG.

Stein, U. (2006): *Lernende Stadtregion*. Wuppertal, Müller und Busmann KG.

Webber, M. (1964): "The Urban Place and the nonplace urban realm". In: Webber, M., Dyckman, W., Foley, D.L., Guttenberg, A.Z., Wheaton, W.L.C. and Bauer Wurster, C. (eds.), *Explorations into Urban Structure*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia 79–153.

Prof. Dr. W.G.M. Salet
Professor of Urban and Regional Planning
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130
NL-1018 VZ Amsterdam
w.g.m.salet@uva.nl
www.willemsalet.nl