



University  
of Glasgow

Tarazona Vento, A. (2015) Santiago Calatrava and the 'power of faith': global imaginaries in Valencia. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(3), pp. 550-567.

This is the accepted version.

Published version available: [10.1111/1468-2427.12217](https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12217)

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/117405/>

Deposited on: 11 March 2016

**SANTIAGO CALATRAVA AND THE “POWER OF FAITH”: GLOBAL  
IMAGINARIES IN VALENCIA**

By Amparo Tarazona Vento

**ABSTRACT**

The focus of this paper is on the importance of collective imaginaries for urban policy mobility, and on the agents and modes of power through which imaginaries are translated, mobilized, and become materialized in specific places. Through the case study of the monumental complex of the City of Arts and Sciences in Valencia, designed by Valencian global architect Santiago Calatrava, I discuss Calatrava’s mobilization of ideas of modernity, tradition, democratization and self-esteem already present in the collective imaginary of the people and the politicians of post-Franco’s Spain to promote his global architecture. In this process, I argue, global imaginaries were translated into local imaginaries and vice versa as they became embodied in persons and objects, represented in this case by Calatrava’s figure as a local/global architect and the architecture of the City of Arts and Sciences. Particularly, I analyze Calatrava’s use of the power of seduction, persuasion and coercion to mobilize such imaginaries in order to build his ubiquitous signature architecture in Valencia.

The pope Benedictus XVI has appointed Spanish architect and engineer Santiago Calatrava adviser to the Pontifical Council of Culture of the Vatican (Europa Press, 2011).

## **INTRODUCTION**

This curious piece of news — published in Valencia’s local press on 10 December 2011 — cuts to the heart of what this article is about: the importance of an almost religious faith in expertise and its role in policy mobility. Here, the concept of faith is used in a general sense, meaning either absolute trust or confidence in someone or something — for instance an idea or remedy — or strong belief in something which is not based on material evidence or logical proof — for instance the doctrines of a religion, but also a set of ideas, or even policy recipes (American Heritage Dictionary, 2006). In the context of this paper, religious faith can be broadly understood as complete and unquestioned trust in an idea or a person — for instance Calatrava acting as an expert. The focus of the paper is the specific processes and modes of power through which imaginaries are mobilized, influence the selection of urban policies and become materialized into physical models that can be imagined again and translated in other locations.

The theoretical approach of the paper is discussed in the first section. The analysis considers mobility as a social process and, therefore, recognizes the importance of the actors and practices involved in it. Also, by drawing on Sum’s (2008, 2009) and Allen’s (2003) work, it applies a Foucauldian perspective to the understanding of power and to what constitutes truth in urban policy. The next section explains the research

methodology used. The last section discusses the development of the City of Arts and Sciences (commonly known as the City of Sciences) by star architect Santiago Calatrava. The case study shows how Calatrava made use of his power of seduction, persuasion and coercion to mobilize social imaginaries with the aim of build his ubiquitous signature architecture in Valencia. It also illustrates how, on the grounds of the credibility granted by his status as a global expert the architect mediated in the translation of social imaginaries and provided the script for the interpretation of his architecture and the real world.

The theoretical and empirical discussions are structured around three main points. First, the role of both local and global imaginaries in the diffusion of urban models and policies are discussed, particularly in the case of urban regeneration policies based on iconic architecture. Second, there is consideration of the actors — particularly star architects and politicians — who mediate in the mobilization, translation and materialization of imaginaries. Third, there is an examination of the ways in which these actors mobilize imaginaries to deploy them as resources of power and materialize them in urban models.

### **Imaginaries in motion**

In trying to understand the paths of the recent changes in a globalizing era the importance of imagination has been recognized (Appadurai, 1996; Massey, 1999). In Massey's words 'the material and the discursive interlock: the way we *imagine* globalization will affect the form that it takes' (Massey, 1999:35). Thus, the diffusion of ideas is central to the shape that the "real world" takes and indeed how urban models are imagined affects the urban landscapes of the future. Similarly, how globalization is imagined depends on the existing social constructs of space and the self but it is also

affected by the so-called “non-material” flows that nurture the imagination (Larner and Le Heron, 2002), a process that Storper (2000:55) has called ‘globalization by ideas’. In line with the understanding of a “global” circulation of “ideas” as a means of globalization, the notion of global imaginaries – involving ideals, norms, discourses and ethics (Leitner et al., 2007) — has been proposed as a metaphor for the shared imagination in a globalizing world (Steger and Patomäki, 2010).

Global imaginaries can be considered social imaginaries of a ‘global society’. The concept of social imaginaries encapsulates the idea that imagination plays a central role in the constitution of collective identities. Although different authors have slightly different understandings of the concept, Taylor’s notion of social imaginary is particularly useful since — being closer to the concept of a cultural model — it leaves room for multiplicity (Strauss, 2006). For Taylor, a social imaginary is ‘the way we imagine our society’ (2002:92); more specifically ‘that common understanding that makes possible common practices and a widely shared sense of legitimacy’ and it is learned and expressed through practices, images, stories and legends (Strauss, 2006:330). Thus, in Taylor’s understanding, the members of a society can share an imaginary although not necessary to the exclusion of other imaginaries (Strauss, 2006). Therefore, global imaginaries can be shared by different epistemic groups and by people coming from different cultural and geographical contexts, but they are not exclusive of other — more local — social imaginaries.

Imaginaries play a crucial role in the diffusion of both urban policies and urban models. In the case of urban policies, through the diffusion of ideas, places are constructed as facing similar problems and therefore needing solutions that have been instituted as successful models elsewhere (Ward, 2006). This is the case of Manchester’s regeneration schemes or in the pervasive allusions to the Barcelona model and the

Guggenheim operation. Along this line of thought, the increasingly rich literature on policy mobility has highlighted that policymaking is both territorial and relational. Urban policy is defined in place but is also ‘based on systems of borrowing, reinterpreting, learning, and building networks’ (Cochrane, 2011:xi). In this way, the identities of places are constructed in relation to other places (Massey, 2011:3–4). This means that we need to understand both locality and mobility to understand place-making.

In short, policy mobility is important because through it place is constituted. Moreover, through policy mobility cities incorporate ‘assemblages of disparate reference points that resonate long-term and condition political discourse and policymaking practice to look globally for inspiration and legitimation’ (McCann, 2011a:100) and therefore through policy mobility, not only places but urban politics and power relationships are shaped. This implies that policy mobility has long-term consequences for cities. However, the focus of this paper is not on the consequences of policy mobility but on how mobility occurs and, in particular, on the importance of imaginaries for policy mobility.

In order to be circulated, imaginaries are stabilized, in Larner and Le Heron’s (2002: 760) words ‘become rationalities, metadiscourses, logics’. The concept of knowledge brand, used by Sum, gives useful insights into the processes through which those imaginaries are “stabilized” and can be circulated as policies. A knowledge brand is

a hegemonic meaning-making device promoted by “world-class” guru-academic-consultants who claim unique understanding of the economic world and translate this into pragmatic policy recipes and methodologies that address social contradictions and also appeal to pride and anxieties of subjects in the

process of socioeconomic changes. Circulating transnationally, these brands provide flexible templates that can be adapted to local circumstances and conjunctures and translated into policy recommendations. (Sum, 2008:139–140)

The definition suggests a concern with the adaptation of knowledge brands to local circumstances and the agents that promote such “meaning-making devices”. Although the concept has been developed in reference to economic policies, it can be applied to urban policies, for instance regeneration policies such as the one represented by Calatrava’s City of Sciences.

In the case of urban models, imaginaries can be stabilized by becoming embodied in architectural works and even in architects. Indeed, there is an ‘increasing component of sign-value or image embodied in material objects’ (Lash and Urry, 1994:4) and architecture is not an exception. Contemporary architecture often makes use of different techniques and devices to construct and communicate meaning, such as the use of form analogies to objects or functions and the use of ‘visual metaphors in the details, materials and interior spaces’ (Jencks, 2006:13). The process of stabilization of imaginaries through actual architectural production is not straightforward. Instead, during the often lengthy period of design and construction the passage from model to architectural object involves different processes of adaptation and reinterpretation, of change in both material and non-material ways. Given that architecture is profoundly territorial the architectural object needs to change to adapt to the local construction market, local regulations, the demands of the client and other local pressures. In consequence physical architectural production – with its constraints and particularities – feeds back to how architectural and urban imaginaries are developed, and to the symbolic meanings attached to iconic buildings. After all, places — and therefore iconic architecture — are also constituted relationally. Their identity and conceptualization are

a result of their history — including the history of their development — and the real or imaginary relationships they have with other places – including the models from which they have been adapted, translated and reinterpreted (Massey, 2011).

Moreover, planning and architecture are discursive practices which, through explanatory discourse and visual representation ‘(re)shape the reading and interpretation of the social and physical meanings’ of place (Pløger, 2001:64). However, as Jones and Moreno-Carranco (2007) have argued, how people experience space shapes the meaning they give to it, and, therefore, the discussion about the construction of urban imaginaries cannot be limited to a debate that is confined to the architectural discipline. Urban imaginaries are grounded on the experience of space and social practice and they are formed through actions of the collective imagination (Çınar and Bender, 2007). Different media and daily life experiences such as, respectively, film, art, literary texts, and media representations, and social interaction and discourse, etc. are the material used for the construction of the collective imagination (Çınar and Bender, 2007).

It has been argued that the appropriation of image by economic and political elites in order to create ‘an “official” urban image’ tends to be exclusionary (Hall, 1998:28). However, places and people have different identities. They can be interpreted in divergent ways and, similarly, architecture and urban space allow multiple meanings (Beriato and Gospodini, 2004). Different imaginaries — what I call overlapping imaginaries — can be embodied in the same building or architect. For instance, Calatrava’s architecture can be seen to embody different local-global imaginaries.

Urban regeneration policies based on iconic architecture offer an instance of the importance of imaginaries for the travelling of ideas both as policy templates and as urban models. Therefore, the analysis of iconic architecture can serve to complement



and further develop the literature of policy mobility particularly concerning the relationship between relationality and territoriality, and their importance for understanding policymaking and place-making (Cochrane and Ward, 2012; McCann, 2011a; Massey, 2011; McCann and Ward, 2011).

Through their financing, design and development iconic architecture megaprojects condense global, national, regional and local political and economic interests and processes. They also reflect the power struggles resulting from different elite groups trying to influence and shape built environments and forms of governance for their own convenience (Hubbard, 1996; Swyngedouw et al., 2005). Thus, through this interaction of scales, ideas from elsewhere and global trends are captured and incorporated in a localized setting, or as Moulaert has put it, through them ‘globalisation becomes urbanised’ (Moulaert et al., 2005:3). In this way, iconic megaprojects become the expression of the socio-spatial and scalar political restructuring of the city and of the ‘struggles, practices, and representations that underpin urban-global relations and that assemble or territorialize global flows’ (McCann and Ward, 2011:xvii). Yet these spatialized interventions are embedded in their geographical contexts and institutional frameworks (Swyngedouw et al., 2005). They are also highly “localized” since it is through the built environment – and particularly through them – that capital from different scales is geographically fixed and valorized (Brenner, 1999; Moulaert et al., 2005a:47). Thus, the consequences of policy mobility remain visible in the materialization of iconic architecture, which also becomes a model that ‘in turn feeds back into further circulation’ (Cochrane and Ward, 2012).

Urban regeneration policies based on iconic megaprojects cannot be explained by referring to the circulation of urban policies and models alone because they respond to wider socioeconomic trends too. The scalar restructuring associated to globalization

processes — which occurs as different political-economic spaces compete to become the new nodes of capital accumulation and governance of the global – has motivated cities to orient their strategies beyond the national boundaries in their attempt to increase their competitive edge (Brenner, 1999). Thus, since the 1970s, an entrepreneurial approach to urban governance has spread out in developed capitalist countries both geographically and across political views (Harvey, 1989). Entrepreneurial strategies typically include the re-imaging of the city through place promotion and the construction of iconic architectural megaprojects [1].

Apart from the spelled-out goal of achieving economic regeneration, the aim of these activities is, via the media and advertising, to ‘galvanize local support and foster civic pride’ (Hubbard, 1996:1443). Therefore, besides material interests, ideational concerns are included in the implementation of urban policies based on iconic architecture. As Lehrer and Laidley (2008) have observed, to anticipate conflict, the new megaprojects tend to be mixed use, include cultural facilities and be surrounded with rhetoric of plurality. Moreover, they counterbalance opposition ‘by absorbing and redefining the imaginaries of the other’ (Leitner et al., 2007:8). Thus, by attempting to convince citizens of the virtues of competitive strategies city marketing has become a form of social control (Philo and Kearns, 1993), and therefore, as Hubbard (1996:1443) has pointed out, ‘city images, cultures and experiences have become every bit as important to the accumulation of social and political power by hegemonic groups as more traditional material concerns.’ Imaginaries affect how the world is interpreted and therefore not only do they influence which policy solutions are considered appropriate but they can also be used to achieve social control by persuading the population of the appropriateness of such policies.

Local and national imaginaries are still central to many people's experiences but they are increasingly being combined with and modified by global imaginaries (Steger and Patomäki, 2010). Thus, global imaginaries play a crucial role in how urban landscapes and urban regeneration policies are imagined as models but 'they are perhaps much better understood as 'translations' [...] that take different forms in different places' (Larner and Le Heron, 2002:761). Global cultural flows are filtered through specific socio-cultural parameters and reinterpreted accordingly, they tend to be indigenized, modified, adapted, interpreted and mixed up with the existing flows (Olds, 1996; Appadurai, 1996). On the other hand, the plausibility of the narratives, and therefore the effectiveness of global imaginaries, depends on their linkage to experiences and personal stories (Jessop, 1997; Leitner et al., 2007). Similarly, urban imaginaries are more effective when their physical embodiment and their rhetorical image complement each other. Accordingly, the first empirical section discusses in relation to the City of Sciences, how global imaginaries were translated in Valencia and how they interacted with local imaginaries.

### **Making the imaginary real: the agents of mobilization and translation**

Global imaginaries – whether embodied in persons and objects or as a discourse – are circulated and are interpreted differently in different locations. Within a relational view of space that involves discourses and practices, subjects and objects (Massey, 1999), not only are flows socially constructed but the agents and practices that produce those flows are part of such a "space of flows". Certainly, if we consider global flows as culturally embedded social constructs rather than as abstract entities, then they are formulated by actors with the ability to activate such flows (Olds, 1996). In the same way, processes of mobilization, translation and materialization of imaginaries are mediated by actors, who interpret the reality according to their own experiences (Hay, 2001).

As Philo and Kearns (1993) have suggested, the mobilization of local imaginaries — local traditions, history and lifestyles — is one of the mechanisms through which local elites have tried to shape urban landscapes in their interest since very early on in history (Philo and Kearns, 1993). In a globalizing world, the imaginaries to mobilize are global as well as local. In fact, ‘the “forces of globalization” and the “demand of global competitiveness” prove powerful leitmotifs for the economic elites to shape local conditions in their desired image’ (Swyngedouw et al., 2005). Likewise, global symbolism is also used in iconic architecture because the message is intended to reach “globally” through mass media circulation of images and tourism and, therefore, it has to be legible as a symbol for a global audience even when it is intended to express a distinct local identity. Thereby, culture has become both place-bound and global in scope.

In addition, the stretching of social relations applies not only to imaginaries but also to the networks and relationships of power through which they are circulated because globalization implies ‘the stretching out over space of relations of power, and of relations imbued with meaning and symbolism’ (Massey, 1992:4). McCann (2011b:114) has identified three categories of agents involved in policy mobility: ‘local policy actors, the global policy consultocracy, and informational infrastructures’. Undeniably, local and regional actors are important in the import and translation of imaginaries. It has been suggested – and it is evident in the case of the City of Sciences — that local elected politicians play a crucial role ‘in shaping elements of ideology, translating transnational interests according to the specifics of particular territories and coordinating bureaucratic machineries’ (Phelps and Wood, 2006:498). But, under processes of globalization, internationally mobile experts become the key actors in the mobility of ideas and knowledge. Thus, modelling and inter-referencing, enhanced by

the mobility of experts who work internationally, play an essential role in promoting convergence not only of policies but also of their physical representations (Olds, 1996). Particularly in the case of urban regeneration based on iconic architecture, star architects moving from city to city to design the urban landscape contribute to the dissemination of urban development models.

In the case of architecture, star architects certainly play a crucial role in the translation and mobilization of imaginaries. The spread of entrepreneurial policies has widened the scope for iconic architecture as both politicians and the general public have shown faith in the capacity of star architects to reverse the fate of declining cities. As a result, the expertise, the symbolic capital and the credibility of the reduced number of star architects who can aspire to big commissions to design iconic architecture around the world have increased (Sklair, 2006), allowing them to mediate in the translation and mobilization of imaginaries.

### **The role of expertise: faith and power**

Expertise — related to authority — is one of the ways in which imaginaries can be mobilized. Global experts are able to provide interpretations of problems and guidance on solutions, steering decision-makers' imagination towards desired strategic responses. This ability endows them with considerable power (Hay, 2001). In everyday language, power is often confused with the resources utilized in its exercise and presented as a possession, such as for instance when someone asserts that Calatrava *has* power (Interview 5). However, following Foucault, I understand power as a relation which is produced through social interaction and, therefore is a different thing to the resources mobilized in its exercise (O'Farrell, 2005).

Consequently, imaginaries can be considered a resource of power susceptible to being mobilized. Star architects are able to mobilize imaginaries and deploy them as resources of power. They do so through their discourse and by conferring iconic status on their buildings. As Harvey has noted (1993:23) ‘The creation of symbolic places is not given in the stars but painstakingly nurtured and fought over, precisely because of the hold that place can have over the imagination.’ Architecture, through its materiality and its configuration of the spaces we live in has the capacity to shape behaviour, as discussed by Foucault (O’Farrell, 2005). Moreover, architecture has contributed to the legitimization of values and ideas by appealing to feelings through visual metaphors and striking images (seen and explained in the media) and through the rhetoric of star architects.

Making a distinction between the exercise of power and the means and resources used in its deployment — and considering imaginaries a resource of power — allows us to see how cultural flows and global imaginaries are able to transcend ‘economic and political borders and [to mobilize] far beyond them’ (Allen, 2003:50). Cultural flows are interpreted differently in different places and therefore the mobilization of global imaginaries or ‘cultural or ideological power at a distance’ (Allen, 2003:50), is much more effective when they resonate with local imaginaries.

On the other hand, if power is understood not as an attribute but as a type of relationship produced through social interaction, in addition to the mobilized resources, it is necessary to analyse the ways in which these resources are mobilized, and the different forms in which power is experienced. In Allen’s (2003:2) words, ‘Power is never power in general, but always power of a particular kind’. Allen (2003) has analysed the different ways in which power is exercised and experienced through a diversity of modes which possess their own relational specificities that differentiate them as

particular modalities of power. Such modalities of power — including domination, authority, seduction, manipulation, coercion, persuasion, etc. — are not reducible to a series of practices or codified strategies but present different modal effects (Allen, 2003). For instance, persuasion and seduction are similar modalities of power because both allow the possibility of opting out (Allen, 2003). However, whereas seduction involves attraction of someone to do something by bringing into ‘sharper definition the aspirations and wants of all kinds of different people’ (Allen, 2003:50), persuasion is based on argumentation and rationality. It involves two-way communication on the basis of mutual reciprocity and therefore ‘is more likely to be exercised effectively among equals’ (Allen, 2003:125). Thus, spectacular architecture and the rhetoric used by the architect to explain it can be sources of seduction, particularly when they embody or are seen to embody certain imaginaries. On the other hand, the power of an expert is generally experienced as authority but also as persuasion. Furthermore, since power is a mediated effect it can mutate modality. In Allen’s words, ‘At each twist and turn the exercise of power may (or may not) take on a different shape’ (Allen, 2003:102).

In short, as contemporary architectural practice has undergone a shift from collectivism towards individualism — linked to wider societal trends of privatization and economic liberalism — architects have become individualistic ‘prophet-like figures’ (Glendinning, 2010:33). This has put them in the position of being able to influence city-building through actions of authority, seduction, persuasion and so on, as in the case of Calatrava in Valencia. Moreover, and as also pointed out by Foucault (O’Farrell, 2005), power may not only be exercised over others but also with others. Thus, not only global architects but other actors involved in policy mobility — in association with the architects — have been empowered through the use of imaginaries as a resource of power.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Having conceptualized space as relational and mobility as a social process, I tackle the question of how to carry out research in policy mobility by, first, using detailed case-study evidence to analyse the practices involved in urban policy mobility and, second, by carefully considering not only what happens in Valencia but also external forces and connections and the influence of actors from both global and local perspectives. Since this is an in-depth single case study, it is not statistically significant. Its significance is related to ‘what it tells us about the world in which it is embedded’ (Burawoy, 1991:281).

I agree with Flyvberg (2006) that more detailed case studies are needed for the production of a contextualized and effective social science. Therefore, I have used detailed case-study evidence to further the understanding of two main questions. The first question is how do (global and local) actors mobilize imaginaries and deploy them as resources of power? The second question is through which social practices and relationships is this done? Addressing these questions is theoretically relevant because, in the context of policy mobilities, answering them can tell us more about the relationships and modes of power through which the adoption of certain policies occurs. Also, the answers to these questions can help us understand better how and through which agents and practices the global is produced, particularly in terms of the link between globalization and urbanization, specifically in relation to Calatrava’s promotion of his own global architecture.

The case of the City of Sciences is significant because it offers a paradigmatic case of the importance of overlapping social imaginaries for the diffusion of urban models. First, the study of the development of a monumental project that has lasted over twenty



years offers useful insights into the different ways in which imaginaries are interpreted, transformed and mobilized. Second, the diverse changes in the actors responsible for carrying out the project have allowed the examination of how changes in power relationships influenced the ways in which the project was imagined, evolved, grew and managed to continue. Third, the fact that Calatrava, who was born in Valencia, is considered as both a local and global architect has allowed the exploration of the connections between local and global imaginaries in the same project and their embodiment in the figure of a single architect. Therefore, although it is a single case study, it covers generalizable theoretical issues that are included in the study of policy mobilities — such as the translation of imaginaries and the adaptation of policy recipes to specific contexts, the role of actors and the social processes through which translation and adaptation occur.

Regarding research methods, this paper draws on a selection of 31 interviews with individuals involved in the decision-making, design and development process of the City of Sciences (conducted face to face between May and December 2009 for a larger study of urban politics in Valencia), supplemented by newspaper articles, published interviews and local publications collected purposely for this paper.

## **THE CITY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN VALENCIA**

Valencia, the third biggest city in Spain, has not been an exception to the use of iconic architecture as a means to urban regeneration, because of its desire to compete for tourism and attention has looked around for inspiration. In particular, the development of the City of Sciences clearly shows the mobilization of imaginaries by the architect and the politicians and the modes of power that underpin the travelling of ideas. The

complex is a prestige cultural project of 350,000 square metres entirely paid for by the regional government, which includes a planetarium, a science museum, an oceanography museum, an opera theatre and a multifunctional building. Apart from the oceanography museum the rest of the buildings have been designed by Calatrava.

**Figure 1. General view of the City of arts and Sciences (author's photograph)**



The City of Sciences took a long time to be completed. The first idea relating to its construction was presented in 1989 and the complex was completed in 2009. Calatrava was commissioned the initial project — which included the planetarium, the museum and a telecommunications tower — in 1991, as a result of a competition to design the telecommunications tower (Polano, 1996). After the conservative party came into office in 1996, the tower was replaced by an opera theatre. The complex continued growing until it was completed (see figure 1).

### **Local and global imaginaries: globalization, modernization and competitiveness**

In Valencia, the circulation of global imaginaries, in combination with local ones, was crucial for the adoption of an urban regeneration policy based on iconic architecture, and for the selection of an architect and an urban model. The first post-Franco regional government was responsible for the inception of the City of Sciences. It was presented by the first president of the regional government some years after a New State of Autonomies was instated in Spain, and Valencia became capital city of the Valencian Autonomous Community. The project was seen as part of the “modernization” of the city, the institutions and even “the economy” after the dictatorship. Indeed, there was the idea in the social imaginaries that Spain and Valencia needed to modernize and the first democratic governments — both local and regional — saw that as their mission.

As expressed by Ródenas, mayor from 1989 to 1991, the modernization of the city started in the second half of the 1980s when, coinciding with the admission of Spain to the EEC, Valencia aimed to become a “European” city (Interview 3). Similarly, in the case of the regional government, Lerma’s era (president between 1982 and 1995) was considered to be the era of the modernization of Valencian society (Interviews 9 and 20). Thus, the project is considered to have spearheaded the process of modernization of the urban fabric. It was during Lerma’s speech of presentation of the City of Sciences, that the idea that the complex would be an emblematic project which would represent Valencia was spelled out for the first time (Interview 20).

The newly acquired political autonomy not only meant that the regional government could set out to modernize the institutions but it could pursue a political project independently from the central government. The city acquired self-confidence when it became head of the regional government and started to promote itself “against” other

cities in Spain. Not surprisingly, for some commentators the iconic character of the City of Sciences represented a “leap into modernity” to overcome a “peasant-like complex of inferiority” (Interviews 7 and 20).

In fact, the idea of competition with other Spanish cities is seen as one of the motives behind the inception of the City of Sciences. The construction of the complex started in 1992, the year of the Barcelona Olympics and Seville’s Expo. Madrid was going to be European Capital of Culture in 1993 and the Guggenheim had begun to be built and, therefore, it was perceived that Valencia needed something powerful not to be left behind (Interviews 1, 5, 15, 18, 20, 22 and 23). It was also a moment when city promotion through prestige megaprojects was in its heyday and was spreading out in cities around the world (Beazley, Loftman and Nevin, 1997). Valencia wanted to ‘consolidate its position as Spain’s third city and position itself in the international geopolitical map’ and projects such as this seemed an opportunity to do so (Interview 1). In the words of the director of the 1989 Urban Plan of Valencia:

The City of Sciences responds to the regional government’s idea of: It is necessary to do something in Valencia to place it on the map. Besides, Bilbao had initiated the Guggenheim operation and, in the end, cities compete against each other, and it is good that it is so and it must be so. (Interview 23)

As argued by Sum (2009), the notion of competitiveness acts as a knowledge brand and entrepreneurial urban regeneration policies based on iconic architecture are circulated and presented as perfect strategies to improve the competitiveness of a city. The words of the director of Valencia’s urban plan illustrate how, in professional circles but not only, the need for competitiveness and the use of architectural icons were taken for

granted: it ‘must be so’. The logic translates like this: cities need to compete (globally) and in order to do so they need architectural icons.

But, as already discussed, in the case of urban policies based on iconic architecture, ideas can travel in two ways. On the one hand, imaginaries can become stabilized in the form of knowledge brands and circulate as policy recommendations. On the other hand, imaginaries can become embodied in architectural works, which act as urban models and are disseminated through modelling and referencing. Despite Valencia’s permanent comparison with Barcelona, when looking for references relating to what to do to promote the city, governors looked at models such as the Parc de la Villette (Paris), Futuroscope (Poitiers) and the CN tower in Toronto (Interview 1). Lerma, the then regional president, had travelled to Paris, had been seduced by the City of Sciences and Industry in the Parc de la Villette, and took the idea with him to Valencia (Interviews 5, 18, 19, 23 and 28). But, importantly, a model such as the “City of Sciences and Industry” was just a model for the imagination, an idea, a concept of what Valencia would like to become. In fact, when Calatrava was commissioned to design, he was given absolute creative freedom (Interview 1). The director of the 1989 Urban Plan admits:

In the beginning, the project was really just an idea. Not even one page about what it was they wanted there had been written. It is Calatrava who defines the project as it goes along (Interview 23)

Thus, the idea travelled first through modelling, as a template, an architectural image which had to be somehow replicated in Valencia and adapted to its context. The logic that Valencia needed a project like that had been accepted; nevertheless, how exactly it had to be adapted had not really been thought through.

According to the regional director general for budget (1982–1995) ‘The idea was of an emblem which could signify that Valencia was also looking to the future’ (Interview 13). Even Calatrava did not hesitate to assert that the project was conceived to be a ‘symbol of reference of the new Valencia’ (Ferrandis, 2006). Such ideas, thanks to the contribution of the media, were also easily accepted by the general public.

The government that conceived the project and subsequent governments took on the idea of modernity. From an image viewpoint, the City of Sciences and therefore ‘being modern and being global’ suited governments of different political persuasions (Interview 7). Furthermore, a project like this one appealed to feelings of local pride that connected very well with politicians’ ideas of internationalization of city marketing. As the regional director general for economy (1995–1998) puts it:

The fact of placing Valencia on the map, the perception is that things are being done here. I hear it on the radio and see it in the written press. And, I say, ‘But, we are poor as church mice’. And everybody says, ‘What things they are doing!’ ... I can affirm that we have a project, the city of Arts and Sciences, which corresponds to a city of ten million inhabitants and not one million. (Interview 5)

These words of the Valencian politician illustrate how a sense of pride in showing the project off to the world dominates over rationality and sense of proportion. The idea that cities need to be competitive — and city and regional governors’ task is to enhance their competitiveness — appears to be linked to the idea of local pride. After all politicians not only followed the logics of a global brand (Sum, 2008) but, as part of Valencian society, also shared the people’s imaginaries. Competitiveness seemed to translate as local pride not only in the politicians’ discourse but also in their minds.

Also, the citizens found it easy to identify with the new Valencia represented by an icon that they could proudly show off rather than with the city of their everyday life (Interviews 20 and 27). In fact, during the long construction period, there was very little opposition to the project despite the enormous cost overruns published in the press (Interview 2, 3, 11, 12, 13, 21, 25 and 27).

In short, global imaginaries of competitiveness and globalization — Valencia competing on the global stage and home of prestige architecture — found fertile ground in a city with a specific historical background that longed for Europeization and modernization after Franco's dictatorship and whose self-esteem needed to overcome a feeling of subsidiarity in relation to the central government. Therefore, the construction of the City of Sciences was in a way also the beginning of the construction of the new Valencia in the minds of politicians and citizens alike.

### **Imaginaries made real: Calatrava as an agent of mobilization and translation**

The role of the architect selected to design the City of Sciences was crucial. On the one hand, Calatrava and his architecture embodied the Valencian imaginary. On the other hand, his status as a star architect allowed him to mediate in the translation and mobilization of imaginaries. At the same time, Calatrava was a global and local architect, and, in this way, local identity was equated with the pride in having a local globally known architect. Described as 'the only Valencian global architect' (Interview 13), he had the glamour of the global architect but, being also local, could understand the aspirations of the Valencians. Therefore, it seemed natural that he should be the architect to build the 'Valencian Vilette' (Interviews 5, 6, 13, 14, 17, 19, 23, 24 and 27). Furthermore, elected politicians used Calatrava's Valencianess as a selling point, and did not hesitate to refer to him as 'a prophet in his own land and an international

reference' or 'the most international Valencian, who works in the five continents and with whom one can speak the Valencian language' (El Mundo, 2008).

In addition, his spectacular and formalist architecture was seen by his fellow citizens as representative of modernity. Although Calatrava's architecture is often criticized by the architectural intellectual class, who see him more as a sculptor than an architect, it connects well with the political class and the public (Interviews 1 and 8). His architecture – often referred to as hideously monumental, megalomaniac, striking and spectacular (Interviews 13, 22, 27 and 29) – has an undeniable visual impact that makes it very attractive. Certainly, Calatrava and his architecture embody what the Valencian long for: modernity, success, local pride and internationalization (globalization). In this way, Calatrava's architecture captured the Valencian people's imagination and helped reimagine Valencia as a global city. It became the physical representation of the new democratic Valencia.

Calatrava used the symbolic capital provided by his star architect status and, through his discourse, the press and exhibitions of his work, actively mobilized the social imaginary of the Valencian to promote his global architecture. He engaged with ideas which were in the Valencian people's social imaginary but which also resonated with global ones. Therefore, in his discourse and in the Valencian people's minds, modernization, democratization and modernity were equated with global and globalization. Similarly, concepts such as tradition, Valencianness and self-esteem were equated with local pride but also with competitiveness and entrepreneurialism. Thus, he presented his architecture as rooted in both local and architectural traditions. For instance, the "modernity" of the City of Sciences was linked in Calatrava's discourse to the modernization of Valencian society and, by extension, to its democratization. The architect endlessly repeated statements confirming that "the City of Arts and Sciences



is the achievement of a democracy and celebrates democracy” (Torres, 2005) or comments along the lines of:

I have been just the linking thread of the evident feeling of modernity that emerges from a democratic Valencian society that I did not know as a child. This is, in my opinion, what the project represents for the city. (Enguix, 2005a)

Calatrava’s discourse moved between the use of tradition, architectural references and the concept of modernity as reflected in the press:

The main stage is decorated with blue glazed ceramic, which refers to the traditional ceramic of Manises — where this material has been manufactured for centuries – and the domes of the Valencian churches. A ceramic material which, according to Calatrava possesses a singular “modernity” which makes it absolutely useful for an avant-garde building such as the opera house. (Aimeur, 2005)

Of course this is not unique to Valencia; the present has been legitimized many times by using architecture to make political, cultural and identity connections with the past (Vale, 1999).

On the other hand, even the social imaginary of a very strong epistemic community such as that of architects, in which architecture acquires epic connotations, fitted into the equation (Olds, 1996). According to Calatrava, ‘architects are responsible for improving the citizen’s way of life’ and that ‘can be done can through buildings’ which can also ‘become landmarks of modernity’ (Enguix, 2005a).

There are therefore multiple overlappings of meaning between the architect’s, the politicians’ and the citizens’ imaginaries which the architect has used to seduce the

Valencians by bringing ‘into sharper definition the aspirations and wants of all kinds of different people’ (Allen, 2003:50). For instance, elements such as *el trencadís* — a type of mosaic created from broken tile shards — made reference to the local ceramic tradition of Manises but also to Gaudí and the architectural tradition (see figure 2). It was even used to appeal to the commercial interests of the local ceramic industry bourgeoisie and their desire for internationalization, as suggested by Calatrava (Interview 5).

**Figure 2. Detail of trencadís (author’s photograph)**



However, despite the rhetoric of the rootedness in place and the local architectural tradition or the references to local monuments and ceramics, Calatrava’s architecture looks the same wherever he builds. As a former close collaborator admits, ‘There is nothing in the drawings that allows you to tell that this project is as it is because it has been done in Valencia’ (Interview 1). Likewise Kaika (2011) has argued in relation to corporate icons, the City of Sciences can be considered an example of ‘autistic architecture’ since it self-references and has no relationship with the surrounding

environment: it could be anywhere. As Zukin (1991:47) has suggested ‘Superstar architects create a standardised form that they move from place to place’, which ‘look[s] stupendous from a distance’ but ‘fail[s] to fit in with local “context”’. Indeed, Calatrava’s architecture is legible as a symbol for a global audience even when it also claims to express a distinct local identity. But architecture is a practice the interpretation of which can be guided by explanatory discourse (Pløger, 2001), and architects often mediate in its interpretation and act as agents of translation. Thus, Calatrava, by providing indications to interpret his architecture, helped the translation between local and global imaginaries. However, contradictorily, the process was not the transformation of a global model through its contact with the local but rather the use of “local” imaginaries with the purpose of spreading a unitary model, a brand, around the globe. The global is reinterpreted but only in the imagination because, in reality, the City of Sciences is no more Valencian than any other of his works. Indeed, Calatrava’s white architecture can easily be emptied of meaning and constructed to represent different things in different locations. The same structures that in Athens signify Greekness and are claimed by the architect to be inspired by classical or Byzantine architecture (Traganou, 2008) refer in Valencia, he says, to the fifteenth century Valencian gothic, for instance. As Vale (1999) has discussed monuments and the media operations directed to create and modify their interpretation are inseparably related. Furthermore, the credibility of the architect’s discourse depended on the authority that granted him his reputation and status as a global star architect.

### **From the power of faith to the faith in Calatrava’s power**

On the one hand Calatrava’s discourse appealed to the Valencian people’s need for self-esteem, modernization and democratization. On the other hand, he was presented not only as an expert but as the embodiment of what the Valencians longed for. Power was

exercised as authority and seduction. But neither his authority nor his “aura” of star architect were enough to achieve Calatrava’s aim of having his project built. Indeed, seduction is a modest mode of power since it does not encompass a complete domination over those upon who it is exercised (Allen, 2003). In difficult times, the power of seduction was not enough to ensure the continuity of the project and, with it, the materialization of imaginaries as urban models. Thus, the exercise of power took other forms.

After the regional elections of 1995, the new conservative regional government stopped the project, which was already under construction. Allegedly, the telecommunications tower was an obsolete project. The complex was clearly the emblematic project of the previous government and the tower a strong iconic element which could be identified with the former president (Interviews 1, 4, 10, 17, 20 and 31). The author of the master plan of the area adjacent to the City of Sciences explains:

The first thing the new government did is to say that [Calatrava’s] project was over and present designs by two architects, civil servants of the regional government. The new projects were banal and badly designed but they presented them to the media saying that that was the project which would substitute Calatrava’s project. I reckon that they soon realised that it was a mistake; that the new project could not compete with the great image of Calatrava’s previous project. Maybe Calatrava manoeuvred to be listened to and to persuade them that his potential was much bigger than that of those improvised projects they were offering. (Interview 26)

Finally, the government decided that Calatrava would continue to design the complex although the tower would be replaced by an opera theatre. Calatrava’s expertise in

creating spectacular iconic architecture — and therefore his power of seduction — was needed. Furthermore, the regional government had undergone several months of continued pressure from the political opposition, their political allies and construction companies, who formed a united front to coerce the government to continue with the project. Thus, the exercise of power took a more forceful form.

However, achieving the continuation of the project was attributed more to Calatrava's public relation skills (Interviews 15, 18 and 20) and the fact that he was considered 'socially very powerful' (Interview 15) and highly influential nationally and internationally (Interview 13) than to coercive measures. Moreover, Calatrava's charisma and magnetism can be 'considered as an act of power in and of itself' (Allen, 2003:119). The architect is very good at persuasion and selling his ideas and projects (Interviews 1, 5, 20, 26, 27 and 30). The regional director general for economy (95-98) recognizes that

apart from being from here, he is a person who has a huge capacity of persuasion, seduction, many things, power, social power. There are people who reject him but he is a man of genius, very bright and anyone he explains his project to falls for him. (Interview 5)

In this way, Calatrava not only managed to save his project but to persuade the president to add more elements to the complex against the opinion of the rest of the government, which had started to see that the cost overruns were too big (Interviews 18 and 27). The regional president had faith in him, and he was commissioned to carry out projects, even against everyone else's opinion. In this vein, the secretary-general of the Valencian Federation of Building Contractors (Interview 31) asserts that Calatrava is President

Camp's architectural guru. He exerts the authority of an influential teacher or even a religious leader over him.

However, the story is not about the star architect exercising “power over” politicians to achieve his goal of completing his project; it is about the beginning of a fruitful relationship of collaboration for both parties (Interviews 7 and 18). Subsequently, more elements were added to the complex. In this case, power was not gained at the expense of others. Instead, through their association both parties gained power (Allen, 2003). Calatrava seduced the politicians – through the mobilization of imaginaries and his aura as architectural guru — but also the politicians made use of Calatrava's status as a global star architect to seduce the Valencian public. In the words of one interviewee, ‘The administration believes that it is raising its status and dimensions in the eyes of their voters; they sell them the idea that we are the reference of the global world’ (Interview 20). Governors surrendered to the charm of the global architect in order to achieve their goals. As expressed by a member of the regional parliament, ‘Calatrava is a media icon, a photo with whom the Valencian governors value very much’ (Interview 27). The architect, who is ‘aware of his media influence and global category’ (Interview 27), has used it to seduce them. Through him, Valencian politicians have also been able to rub shoulders with ‘illustrious surnames such as Silverman or Greenspan’ (Valdeón, 2006) or go to lecture at American Universities (Interview 27).

From the architect's viewpoint, his relationship with the governing class is very productive, and he has cultivated it. As he has recognized, almost 90% of his projects are for public clients in different countries (Cullen and Kieren, 1994). Indeed, only public clients would grant him the creative and budgetary freedom he aspires to for ‘private clients know Santiago's works’ truthful reputation for costing more than budgeted ... and they avoid commissioning him for any projects’ (Interview 22)

whereas ‘politicians will say, I want a twenty thousand square metre container and will give it to Santiago for him to do as he pleases’ (Interview 6). Therefore, ‘Calatrava’s limitless creative eagerness only finds acceptance from governments who see Calatrava and his architecture as an element which will place Valencia on the map’ (Interview 27).

In the development of the City of Sciences we have seen ‘how authority, negotiation and persuasion may play across one another in the formation of group alliances designed to realize shared aims, despite the groups’ quite different backgrounds and interests’(Allen, 2003:126). We have also seen how power has taken different forms depending on the circumstances and on the different relationships that have been forged. Seduction — through the discourse and the aura of star architect — was turned into persuasion by the use of the authority granted by expertise and it was turned into coercion when it was necessary, and vice versa. In the same way, Calatrava’s relationship with the political class evolved over the years. The city architect of Valencia (1980–1987) describes the process very graphically: ‘First ... they resigned themselves to having Calatrava, then they adored him and finally they paid honours to him’ (Interview 11).

Thus, the mobilization of imaginaries as a resource of power by architect and politicians alike was successful. For a long time – during the construction of the complex and even for some time afterwards – and despite the huge cost overruns and indebtedness of the regional government, there was very little opposition to the project and the City of Sciences became the materialization of the Valencian people’s imaginary, remaining in the eyes of most of the population the representation of a modern and successful Valencia, or a global and competitive one (Interviews 1, 14, 16, 17, 24 and 36).

## CONCLUSION

While much attention has been given to the economic and political interests behind urban regeneration policies based on iconic architecture, less attention has been given to how less material concerns — such as faith induced by expertise or the seduction of the word and the architectural image — have contributed to the spreading out of such policies. This paper has focused on the importance of social imaginaries for the diffusion of urban policies and models and on the agents and modes of power through which they are translated, mobilized and become materialized in specific places.

The case study of the City of Arts and Sciences in Valencia has contributed to the understanding of the practices of power through which urban policies based on iconic architecture are circulated and put into place. In order to promote his global architecture, Calatrava, on the grounds of the credibility granted by his status as a global architectural expert mediated in the translation of social imaginaries and provided the script for the interpretation of architecture and the real world. Thus, global imaginaries were translated into local imaginaries and vice versa as they became embodied in persons and objects, represented in this case by the figure of Calatrava as a local-global architect and the architecture of the City of Sciences.

Global imaginaries — combined with and modified by local imaginaries — play a crucial role in the diffusion of both urban policies and models. Imaginaries affect how the world is interpreted and therefore influence not only which policy solutions are considered appropriate but how urban landscapes are imagined as models. In order to circulate imaginaries need to be stabilized. They can be stabilized in the form of policy



recipes. In the case of urban regeneration policies based on iconic architecture, imaginaries can also be stabilized by becoming embodied in architectural works, which act as urban models and are disseminated through modelling and referencing.

Global imaginaries – whether embodied in persons and objects or as a discourse – are circulated, and are interpreted differently in different locations. Processes of mobilization and translation of imaginaries are mediated by actors. In the case of urban regeneration policies based on iconic architecture, the symbolic capital acquired by global star architects has put them in a position to mediate in the translation and mobilization of imaginaries. Star architects have the capacity to mobilize imaginaries by providing their architecture with iconic status through striking images, visual metaphors and, since architecture is a discursive discipline, through their rhetoric. In this way, they are able to steer the decision-makers' imagination towards desired strategic responses. Also, by providing indications for the interpretation their architecture and the real world, they mediate in the translation between local and global imaginaries and contribute to the legitimization of values and ideas.

For these reasons, imaginaries can be considered a resource of power that is susceptible to being mobilized. Thus, the ability to confer iconic status on a building or architect and the ability to provide interpretations of urban spaces are effective resources of power. Expertise – related to authority – seduction, manipulation, coercion and persuasion are different ways in which imaginaries can be mobilized and therefore the different modes in which power can be exercised and experienced.

In studying policy mobility — specifically urban regeneration policies based on iconic architecture — the importance both of the actual urban physical models and of how they are interpreted according to different and overlapping local/global imaginaries needs to

be recognized. This involves the ways in which urban models are imagined and circulated by means of social imaginaries (embodied in persons and objects), the ways in which imaginaries are mobilized and the processes through which they are transformed into physical models. Finally, attention must be given to the agents and relationships of power that underpin those processes. By doing this, the ways in which and the agents through which the global is produced can be better understood, specifically in terms of the relationship between globalization and urbanization.

**NOTE 1:** Megaprojects can be defined as a new development or a substantial rehabilitation of either one big symbolic building or a complex of buildings, which usually take a long period of time to be completed, and involve a transformation of land uses (Fainstein, 2008).

## **INTERVIEWS**

- 1:** Ex-director of the Calatrava office in Valencia, May 14, 2009
- 2:** Member of staff of Valencia's Centre for Strategy and Development, June 6, 2009
- 3:** Mayor of Valencia 1989-91, June 23, 2009
- 4:** Head of the Mayor's Office (1983-89), June 30, 2009
- 5:** Regional Director General for Economy (1995-98), July 1, 2009
- 6:** Director of Architecture of the Calatrava office in Valencia, July 1, 2009
- 7:** Senior lecturer of Economics at University of Valencia, July 2, 2009
- 8:** Advisor of the Institute of the Territory of Valencia, July 3, 2009
- 9:** Regional Minister of Public Works and Transport (1990-95), July 6, 2009
- 10:** Author of the economic impact studies of the City of Sciences, July 7, 2009
- 11:** Head of the service of urban architecture of the Valencia City Council (1984-87),  
July 7, 2009
- 12:** Secretary of Studies and Programs of the Socialist party in Valencia, July 10, 2009
- 13:** Regional Director General for Budget (1982-95), September 18, 2009

**14:** President of the Architects' Professional Association of Valencia, September 21, 2009

**15:** Specialist in town-planning and tourist analysis, September 22, 2009

**16:** Engineer at the Museum of Sciences working site, September 23, 2009

**17:** Regional Minister of Industry, Commerce and Tourism (1987-93), September 23, 2009

**18:** Editor-in-chief of Valencia City magazine, September 25, 2009

**19:** Scientific Director of CACSA (City of Arts and Sciences Corporation), October 1, 2009

**20:** Journalist of El País in Valencia's editorial office, October 2, 2009

**21:** Regional Minister of Education and Science (1983-95), October 7, 2009

**22:** Architect working at the Museum of Science Project, October 22, 2009

**23:** Architect, Director of the 1989 Urban Plan of Valencia, October 26, 2009

**24:** Business director of CACSA, October 27, 2009

**25:** Director of the editorial office of El Mundo in Valencia, October 27, 2009

**26:** Architect, co-author of the master plan of the area adjacent to the City of Sciences, November 5, 2009

**27:** Member of the Valencian Regional Parliament, November 6, 2009

**28:** Secretary-General of the Federation of Property Developers and Urbanizing Agents of the Valencian Community, November 10, 2009

**29:** Administration director of CACSA, November 10, 2009

**30:** Architect at CACSA, November 10, 2009

**31:** Secretary-General of the Federation of Building Contractors for the Valencian Public Administration, December 18, 2009

## **REFERENCES**

Aimeur, C. (2005) *Construcción Colosal. El Mundo*.

Allen, J. (2003) *Lost geographies of power*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Beazley, M., Loftman, P., & Nevin, B. (1997) "Downtown Redevelopment and Community Resistance: an International Perspective," in *Transforming cities: social exclusion and the reinvention of partnership*, N. Jewson & S. MacGregor, eds., Routledge, London.

Beriatos, E. and A. Gospodini (2004) "Glocalising" urban landscapes: Athens and the 2004 Olympics. *Cities* 21:187-202.

Brenner, N. (1999) Globalization as reterritorialisation: The re-scaling of urban governance in the European Union. *Urban Studies* 36:431-451.

Burawoy, M. e. al. (1991) *The extended case method, Ethnography unbound: power and resistance in the modern metropolis*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Çınar, A. and T. Bender. (2007) *Urban imaginaries: Locating the modern city*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Clarke, N. (2012) 'Urban policy mobility, anti-politics, and histories of the transnational municipal movement' *Progress in human Geography* 36(1) 25–43

Cochrane, A. (2011) "Foreword" in *Mobile Urbanism: Cities and Policymaking in the Global Age*, McCann, E. and Ward, K. eds., University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota, pp. ix-xii

Cochrane, A. and Ward, K. (2012) Guest Editorial: Researching the geographies of policy mobility: confronting the methodological challenges. *Environment and Planning A*, 44(1) pp. 5–12.

Cullen, M. and M. Kieren (1994) *Calatrava, Berlin: Five projects*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Boston.

American Heritage dictionary (2006) *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.

El Mundo ( 2008) Camps y Barberá se deshacen en elogios hacia Calatrava en la inauguración. *El Mundo*.

Enguix, S. (2005a) Ciudad Calatrava: Entrevista a Santiago Calatrava, arquitecto. *La Vanguardia*.

Enguix, S. (2005b) Entrevistas: Entrevista a Santiago Calatrava, arquitecto. *La Vanguardia*.

Europa Press (2011) El papa nombra a Calatrava consultor del Vaticano. *Levante*.

Fainstein, S. (2008) Mega-projects in New York, London and Amsterdam. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32.4, 767–84.

Ferrandis, J. (2006) Camps identifica los rascacielos y el Agora de Calatrava con modernidad. *El País*.

Glendinning, M. (2010) *Architecture's evil empire? The triumph and tragedy of global modernism*. Reaktion Books, London.

Hall, T. (1998) *The entrepreneurial city: geographies of politics, regime, and representation*. Wiley, Chichester.

Harvey, D. (1989) From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography* 71:3-17.

Harvey, D. (1993) From space to place and back again: reflections on the condition of postmodernity, pp. 3-29 In J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, G. Robertson, and L. Tickner [eds.], *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*. Routledge, London.

Hay, C. (2001). What Place for Ideas in the Structure-Agency Debate? Globalization as a 'Process Without a Subject' <http://www.theglobalsite.ac.uk/press/109hay.htm> (in press).

Hubbard, P. (1996) Urban Design and City Regeneration: Social Representations of Entrepreneurial Landscapes. *Urban Studies* 33:1441-1461.

Jencks, C. (2006) The iconic building is here to stay, *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 10:01. 3-20

Jessop, B. (1997) The entrepreneurial city: re-imagining localities, redesigning economic governance, or restructuring capital?, *In N. Jewson and S. MacGregor* [eds.], *Transforming cities: social exclusion and the reinvention of partnership*. Routledge, London.

Jones, G. and M. Moreno-Carranco (2007) Megaprojects: beneath the pavement, excess. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 11 (2). 144-164.

Kaika, M. (2011) "Autistic architecture: the fall of the icon and the rise of the serial object of architecture" *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **29**(6) 968 – 992

Larner, W. and R. Le Heron (2002) The spaces and subjects of a globalising economy: A situated exploration of method. *Environment and Planning D-Society & Space* 20:753.

Lash, S. and J. Urry (1994) *Economies of Signs and spaces*. Sage, London.

Lehrer, U. and J. Laidley (2008) Old mega-projects newly packaged? Waterfront redevelopment in Toronto. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32.4, 786–803.



Leitner, H., Sheppard, E., Sziarto, K. & Maringanti, A. (2007) "Contesting Urban Futures: Decentering Neoliberalism," in *Contesting neoliberalism: urban frontiers*, H. Leitner, J. Peck, & E. Sheppard, eds., Guilford press, London, pp. 1-25.

Massey, D. (1992) A place called home? *New formations* 3-15.

Massey, D. (1999) Imagining globalization: power-geometries of time - space, pp. 27-44 In A. Brah, M. Hickman, and M. MacanGhail [eds.], *Global Futures: Migration, Environment and Globalization*. St Martin's Press, Basingstoke, Hants.

Massey, D. (2011) "A Counterhegemonic Relationality of Place" in *Mobile Urbanism: Cities and Policymaking in the Global Age*, McCann, E. and Ward, K. eds., University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota, pp. 1-14

McCann, E. (2008) Expertise, truth, and urban policy mobilities: global circuits of knowledge in the development of Vancouver, Canada's 'four pillar' drug strategy. *Environment and Planning A* 40:885-904.

McCann, E. (2011a) "Points of Reference: Knowledge of Elsewhere in the Politics of Urban Drug Policy" in *Mobile Urbanism: Cities and Policymaking in the Global Age*, McCann, E. and Ward, K. eds., University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota, pp. 97-122

McCann, E. (2011b) Urban Policy Mobilities and Global Circuits of Knowledge: Toward a Research Agenda. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 101:107-130.

McCann, E. and Ward, K. (2011) "Introduction. Urban Assemblages: Territories, Relations, Practices and Power" in *Mobile Urbanism: Cities and Policymaking in the*

*Global Age*, McCann, E. and Ward, K. eds., University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota, pp. xiii-xxv

Moulaert, F., Rodríguez, A., & Swyngedouw, E. (2005) "Large scale urban development projects, urban dynamics and social polarization: a methodological reflection," in *The Globalized City: Economic Restructuring and Social Polarization in European Cities*, F. Moulaert, A. Rodriguez, & E. Swyngedouw, eds., Oxford University Press, Oxford.

O'Farrell, C. (2005) *Michel Foucault*. SAGE, London.

Olds, K. (1996) *Globalization and Urban Change: Capital, Culture and Pacific-Rim Mega Projects*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Phelps, N. A. and A. Wood (2006) Lost in translation? Local interests, global actors and inward investment regimes. *Journal of Economic Geography* 6:493-515.

Philo, C. and G. Kearns (1993) Culture, History, Capital: A Critical Introduction to the Selling of Places, pp. 1-32 In C. Philo and G. Kearns [eds.], *Selling Places: The City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present*.

Pløger, J. (2001) Millennium urbanism – Discursive planning. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 8(1): 63–72

Polano, S. (1996) *Santiago Calatrava: Complete Works*. Electa, Milan.

Sklair, L. (2006) Iconic architecture and capitalist globalization (b). *City* 10:21-47.

Steger, M. B. and H. Patomäki. (2010) Social imaginaries and Big History: Towards a new planetary consciousness? *Futures* 1056-1063.

Storper, M. (2000) Globalization and knowledge flows: an industrial geographer's perspective, 42-62 *In J. Dunning* [ed.], *Regions, Globalization and the Knowledge Based Economy*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Strauss, C. (2006) The imaginary. *Anthropological Theory* 6(3):322-344

Sum, N. L. (2008) Neoliberalism and cultures of 'competitiveness' in East Asia: Clusters, Numbers and Chains *ritsumei.ac.jp* (in press).

Sum, N. L. (2009) The production of hegemonic policy discourses: 'competitiveness' as a knowledge brand and its (re-)contextualizations. *Critical Policy Studies* 3:184-203.

Swyngedouw, E., F. Moulaert, and A. Rodriguez. (2005) 'The World in a Grain of Sand': Large-Scale Urban Development Projects and the Dynamics of 'Glocal' Transformations, *In F. Moulaert, A. Rodriguez, and E. Swyngedouw* [eds.], *The Globalized City: Economic Restructuring and Social Polarization in European Cities*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Taylor, Charles (2002) 'Modern Social Imaginaries', *Public Culture* 14: 91–124.

Traganou, J. (2008) Shades of Blue: Debating Greek Identity through Santiago Calatrava's

Design for the Athens Olympic Stadium. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 26:185-214.

Torres, A. (2005) Democracia formal. Una conversación con Santiago Calatrava. *Arquitectura Viva* 103:32-35.

Valdeón, J. (2006) Nueva York necesitaba a Calatrava. *El Mundo*.

Vale, L. (1999) Mediated monuments and national identity. *The Journal of Architecture* 4:391-408.

Ward, K. (2006) 'Policies in motion', urban management and state restructuring: The trans-local expansion of business improvement districts. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30:54-75.

Zukin, S. (1991) *Landscapes of Power: from Detroit to Disney World*. University of California Press, London.