

Urban geographies I: Still thinking cities relationally

Progress in Human Geography
36(3) 412–422

© The Author(s) 2012

Reprints and permission:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

10.1177/0309132511421715

phg.sagepub.com

Jane M. Jacobs

University of Edinburgh, UK

Abstract

This review essay revisits recent scholarship within urban geography that has been shaped by relational theory, looking specifically at the scholarship on urban policy mobilities and urban assemblages. As will be shown, current urban geographies of relationality operate with irreconcilable grammars.

Keywords

assemblage, cosmopolitan urban theory, relational theory, urban geography, urban policy mobility

I Introduction

Cities exist in an era of increasing geographically extended spatial flows. Rural to urban and transnational migration is transforming the demography of cities in unprecedented ways, such that there is more internal multiplicity and the spatiality of city dwellers is stretched between here and there. Where cities end and rurality begins is unclear, and city effects pulse outwards drawing in rural-based lives and spaces, creating hybrid urbanisms and new types of con-joined city regions. Cities are nowadays intensely embedded in global networks of connectivity, be they economic, cultural or political. In sum, the contemporary city is ‘open, discontinuous, relational and internally diverse’ (Allen et al., 1998: 143). It exists in, and manifests, a *condition* of relationality that defies territorial depiction. As Amin (2004: 34) noted, ‘cities . . . come with no automatic promise of territorial or systemic integrity, since they are made through the spatiality of flow, juxtaposition, porosity and relational connectivity’.

Not surprisingly, then, the past decade or so of ‘[t]hinking space relationally’ (Massey, 2004: 3) has had a profound effect of how urban

geography is conducted and how its project is conceptualized (see K. Ward, 2010). This new ‘mantra’ of early 21st-century geography has brought novel geographies of urbanization into view and placed into question the very nature and logics of the city (Jones, 2009: 488). In this progress report I update relational urban geographical scholarship. As will be apparent, relational thinking is itself not a coherent or singular theoretical turn. Within urban geography, relationality is interpreted and put into action in quite different ways. Indeed, there are urban geographies making claims to relational thinking that are radically incompatible, and live not in relation to each other but in parallel universes. As this review shows, there are irreconcilable grammars of relationality at work in contemporary urban geography.

One dominant articulation of relational thinking in geography has been to think beyond the city-as-territory. This variant of relational thinking has reshaped urban geographical

Corresponding author:

School of GeoSciences, University of Edinburgh,
Drummond Street, Edinburgh EH8 9XP, UK

Email: jane.jacobs@ed.ac.uk

scholarship in profound ways, not least bringing into view novel conditions of relationality, or what we can think of as new *topographies* of relationality. This is most evidently expressed through urban geographical scholarship that concerns itself with flows and relational networks between city entities. But there also exist other, more radically poststructural, variants of relational thinking within contemporary urban geography. These approaches draw on entirely different theoretical wells, and rethink anew the city as we know it.' For example, Amin and Thrift (2002a: 2) not so recently claimed that '[w]e can no longer even agree on what counts as a city' for '[t]he city is everywhere and in every thing'. This is not a networked urbanism, but something far more dissipated and emergent.

II Urban policy mobilities

One especially productive line of inquiry into urban relationality has been the work on urban policy mobilities. In a mobile world, knowledges, expertise and techniques routinely and quickly move from one city to another. Jamie Peck and Nik Theodore (2001) have dubbed this 'fast policy transfer'. The scholarship on urban policy mobilities seeks to better understand how and why cities are *produced* in and through cross-scale, intercity relationships and movements (McCann, 2010: 108). The range of urban policies and practices subject to this kind of geographical analysis is now quite diverse. It covers investigations into mobile urban social policy (McCann, 2008, 2011), studies of urban governance structures (Clarke, 2011), accounts of mobile urban economic policy such as Kevin Ward's (2006, 2007) work on Business Improvement Districts (see also Cook, 2008; Hoyt, 2006; Tait and Jensen, 2007) or some of the work on creative city strategies (González, 2011; Kong et al., 2006; Luckman et al., 2009; Peck, 2005; Wang, 2004), as well as research into mobile urban design and development

styles, including new urbanism (McCann and Ward, 2010; Moore, 2010; Thompson-Fawcett, 2003) and mega-projects (Olds, 2001). Drawing on their own extensive scholarship on the complex geographies of urban policy mobilities, Eugene McCann and Kevin Ward have recently coordinated a range of like-minded studies in a welcome themed issue of *Geoforum* (2010) entitled 'Mobilizing Policy', as well as in an edited collection aptly entitled *Mobile Urbanism* (McCann and Ward, 2011a). As McCann (2011) has reflected, the approach of contributors to these collections is largely within a neo-Marxian political economy, extending a critique of the global effects of neoliberalism as a mobile technology.

Of course, urban policy mobilities are not new, as any historian of imperial city building or welfarist planning and service delivery will testify. Clarke (2011) has argued that contemporary urban policy mobilities are decidedly different from mobilities of the past. Their novelty arises because of their speed and frequency, the type of policies being transferred, the mechanisms of transference, and the technocratic-managerial-entrepreneurial context of transfer. Despite this qualitative difference between urban policy mobilities then and now, there is an extensive body of historical urban scholarship on planning and architectural mobilities that is often overlooked in current scholarship, which has been dominated by economic/urban geographers. A range of scholars have offered comprehensive accounts of the geographies and histories of urban planning and architectural knowledges on the move (e.g. King, 1980, 1984; Saunier, 1999a, 1999b; S. Ward, 1999). The lack of acknowledgement by new urban policy mobility studies of this pre-existing and ongoing historical scholarship is a point recently raised by Clarke (2010), whose work on municipal governance is itself in a historical register. It is a blind spot in part redressed by a forthcoming theme issue of *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* convened by Susan Moore and

Andrew Harris (Moore and Harris, forthcoming) on planning histories and the practices of circulating urban knowledge. The scholarship on planning and architectural mobilities is ongoing and has been rejuvenated by postcolonial and transnational theoretical developments (see, as examples, Beattie, 2004; Brown-May, 2008; Healey and Upton, 2010; King, 2004; McNeill, 2009; Nasr and Volait, 2003; Perera, 2004; Saunier, 2002; Saunier and Ewan, 2008; Vidyarthi, 2010a, 2010b; S. Ward, 2010).

In this mood of consensus about the relevance of urban policy mobility, John Friedmann (2005) raised a useful note of scepticism with respect to planning ideas on the move when he asked 'do planning ideas travel?'. This is not so much a questioning of the fact of policy mobility as an opening to think more carefully about what exactly is moving when 'policy' travels. Especially useful in this respect is the scholarship that shows us something more of what McCann (2010: 109) has referred to as the 'connective tissue' of cities as global-relational nodes. This work has brought into view the ways in which policy does not simply move as a preformed thing (be that a technology, a design, or a set of ideas or procedures) through a smooth space of flow via rational agents called 'policy-makers'. Policy mobilities are embodied, material, piece-meal and often irrational (McFarlane, 2006). Urban policy is not a preformed, well-bounded and immutable thing that moves through time and space. And policy transfer is a stop-start process of 'lesson learning' or 'lesson drawing' (see Marmor et al., 2005; S. Ward, 2009) that entails 'dialogic . . . connections between policy actors and policy-making sites' (Peck and Theodore, 2010: 170). Furthermore, as Larner and Laurie (2010) note, there are far more actors involved in policy transfer than just the policy-makers themselves. Such 'knowledge actors' can include non-state experts (such as academics, activists or personality professionals) who supply a knowledge terrain (sometimes factual, sometimes

rhetorical) that cultivates a receptive ground for policy adoption. And, as the scholarship on urban policy mobility reminds us, such relationalities are not enacted in an entirely novel, smooth space of openness. These transnational urban practices are, as McCann (2010: 109) notes, 'socially produced' and so 'develop in, are conditioned by, [and] travel through' contextualized networks, policy communities, and institutions. In other words, transnational urbanisms operate in rather sticky, history-laden contexts that shape what goes where and how, as well as in what form they materialize. This has variously been thought of as the 'fixity-mobility dialectic' (McCann, 2010: 107) or as a 'relationality/territoriality dialectic' of contemporary urbanisms (McCann and Ward, 2010).

One richly suggestive aspect of this work on the 'connective tissue' of mobility has been the attention given to policy and technology teaching and learning processes. Kevin Ward (2011: 733) calls such processes urban 'policy tourism' (see also González, 2011) and discerns between 'event-led policy tourism', in which 'urban policy entrepreneurs' (Hoyt, 2006) (architects, economists, engineers, designers) are invited by a specific host city to share their experiences, and 'visit-led policy tourism' in which urban policy-makers and city builders tour cities famous for their successes. To date, insufficient attention has been given to the ways in which such 'teaching' and 'learning' events are often themselves commodified exchanges with contracts and tenders in the making. As such, these policy tourism events can have as much in common with the commercial trade fair (with expert providers promoting their wares) as they do knowledge conferences. Although such events are commonplace, geographers have not written of such events themselves, including the micro-scale activities of policy packaging, communicating and persuading that occurs in these hybrid knowledge exchange points/market places. Similarly, there has been little ethnographic attention to urban policy study tours

or site visits, despite such activities resonating with a rich pedagogical tradition of field trips entirely familiar to geographers. In developing these threads of urban policy research there is much common ground between such events/visits and touristic logics (see Clarke, 2011) as well as the research on civic and other exhibitions (see Meller, 2000).

Such connective practices remind us of the centrality of comparative thinking in urban governance and development nowadays – what Robinson (2004, 2011) has referred to as ‘actually existing’ comparative urbanism. These are the prosaic, ongoing but highly influential comparisons that occur among city dwellers and city builders alike. It is true that in this intercity comparative practice, certain cities and certain urbanisms – ‘usual suspects’, McFarlane (2010: 732) calls them – may dominate and be especially influential. But it is also true that there are many alternative geographies of urban comparativism that contemporary scholars overlook in their often Western-centric or North–South axial imaginaries (McFarlane, 2011a). These exist, for example, through alternative or overlooked language and knowledge epistemes, such as the networks between Mandarin or Portuguese speaking cities (to name just two possibilities), or regionally affiliated cities such as the cities of Southeast Asia or South Asia or Africa.

III Emergent urbanism assemblages

In much of the work discussed to date in this review, the emphasis has been on better understanding the ways in which cities are networked, and how these relations shape their trajectories of development. In this conception the city is understood as deterritorialized in as much as it is known to be part of a global network, as opposed to an autonomous and bounded entity. As Smith and Doel (2011) have recently argued, for all of the added complexity and process

charted in geographies of urban networks, it is a geography not entirely freed of a topographical conceptualization of the city. So, for example, although the recent research insists on thinking about policy as diversified mobilities (as opposed to unidirectional transfers), it nonetheless often speaks of following policy presences from one city to another and engages in detection of the effects of such transfers. This is despite the fact that most of the scholarship on urban policy mobilities aspires to move beyond a more narrow and formalist topographical approach. For example, it is not uncommon for a policy mobility study to both assume networks along which ideas travel and at the same time speak of far more spatially and temporally crumpled imaginative geographies (say of intercity comparativism or aspirationalism), which fold cities together in ways that are non-linear and non-sequential. As Clarke (2011: 4) notes, ‘mobility across relational space may well be a necessary precursor to mobility across absolute space’. Such observations remind us that urban policy mobilities are better thought about topologically, a theme that preoccupies a number of the contributors to *Mobile Urbanism* (McCann and Ward, 2011a).

How topological thinking can reshape urban geography has been a recent focus for a number of urban geographers. These scholars are not simply offering us the contours of a more complex map of relational urbanism, they are proposing a concept of urbanism that goes beyond the imaginary of terrains, defies the metaphors of contours and maps altogether, and rejects the often residual formalisms and structuralisms of networked city thinking. Amin (2007: 103), for example, describes a topological urbanism as ‘a subtle folding together of the distant and the proximate, the virtual and the material, presence and absence, flow and stasis’. A topological urban geography would not simply chart mobilities between cities, but see the city *as* mobility or through an *ontology of movement* (Latham and McCormack, 2004). In

such an urban geography cities are not understood to be *in* networks, but are seen *as* networks (Smith and Doel, 2011). One variant of this relational urban geography insists on seeing the city as a virtuality, as something emergent and eventful.

This altogether more demanding variant of thinking cities relationally is indebted to a range of poststructural theories (of eventfulness, complexity, performativity and becoming). Perhaps most ambitious among this work is that by Richard Smith and Marcus Doel. Smith's (2003) contribution to this 'great experiment' in urban studies has been to challenge the existing space, time and scale assumptions in world city theory and move towards a 'topology of circulation and network folding' (p. 571). Drawing on a range of poststructuralist theorists and practitioners (Deleuze, Latour, de Landa and Badiou, to name but a few), he has boldly retheorized how global cities should be thought and researched. His relational urban geography collapses the separation of humans and objects, relies on concepts of folded space, and deconstructs how we see distance, proximity, scale and linearity. Despite the apparent theoretical promiscuity of Smith and Doel's project, it is dedicated to introducing concepts to urban geography that can allow the city to be seen as 'a topology of intensities and relations' (Smith, 2003: 574).

The interest in a more radically poststructural topology of urban relations is being articulated in a range of current urban geographies. This includes those that have as their focus the concept of the *city as assemblage*. Assemblage has come into use within urban studies in the first instance by way of Latour's actor-network theory, wherein assemblage refers to the immanent effect of the association of heterogeneous elements (humans, organizations, tools, objects, technologies, texts, organisms, other cities) (Latour, 2005). These assemblages are never fixed or stable, but always in a process of making or unmaking. Such instability (mobility)

means that there is always potential for innovation, an eventful differentiation. As such, it is also assumed that assemblages have distributed agency such that, for example, a toxic material may *act* within an assemblage just as a policy-maker might. In short, assemblage offers a way of thinking the world, including the urban world, as a 'relational processuality of composition' (McFarlane, 2011b: 652). A recent issue of *Area* (Anderson and McFarlane, 2011) offers a useful summation of the lineages and trajectories of assemblage thinking in contemporary geography.

An explicit statement of the relevance of assemblage to thinking about cities has been the recent collection by Fariás and Bender (2009), aptly entitled *Urban Assemblages*. This collection specifically explores how an actor-network perspective changes the types of questions asked of the city, as well as the nature of the settings and objects scrutinized. *Urban Assemblages* showcases the 'undeniable affinity' between urban studies and ANT (Madden, 2010: 585; see also Jacobs and Cairns, 2011). Fariás, for example, sees the city as an 'open building site', and one that is 'relentlessly being assembled at concrete sites of urban practice' (Fariás, 2009: 2). Bender, speaking with a slightly less emergent sense of networks, sees the urban as bundled networks, be they human, infrastructural, architectural or hybridized). These networks, Bender (2009: 316) argues, 'agglomerate into assemblages, perhaps a neighborhood, or a crowd at a street festival, or a financial center like Wall Street in New York City. The metropolis, then, is an assemblage of assemblages'.

Fariás (2009: 13) argues that 'assemblage' offers an 'alternative ontology for the city', wherein the emphasis is always upon discerning *how* assemblages are being made and unmade at particular sites of practices. This making and unmaking does not simply occur in social hands (the constructivist social shaping of technologies). Rather, an actor-network perspective

conceives of sociotechnical process as enactments (performativities), what Fariás (2009: 13) refers to as ‘heterogeneous ecologies of entities acting’ (see also Latham and McCormack, 2004). This notion of a hybridized, or cyborg, city-in-the-making resonates with a range of studies of how city places and urban technologies are assembled incrementally and contingently (Gandy, 2005; Gieryn, 2002; Guggenheim, 2009; Guy et al., 2001; Hommels, 2005; Hubbard, 2006; Jacobs and Cairns, 2011; Jacobs and Merriman, 2011; Jacobs et al., 2007; Latour and Hermant, 1998; Söderström, 2000; Tait, 2002; Yaneva, 2009). At least some of the more strictly Latourean versions of this scholarship can appear overly detailed and seemingly apolitical to the critical urban scholar. Such scholarship can not only overlook the ‘political and politicized nature of technological assemblages’ (Graham, 2009: 204); it can often emphatically resist such lines of explanation. Indeed, Madden (2010: 588), in reviewing *Urban Assemblages*, concludes that ‘with too much ANT, critical urban studies would be impossible’.

More recently, Colin McFarlane (2011b: 652) has offered an alternative reading of urban assemblages. This is more evidently loyal to a range of concerns within a critical political economy of urban development, and the existing traditions of critical scholarship on socio-technical or cyborg urbanisms (see Gandy, 2005; Graham and Marvin, 2001; Swyngedouw, 1996, 2006) and relational regional geographies (see Allen and Cochrane, 2007; Cochrane, 2011). Like others, McFarlane (2011b) draws upon the concept of assemblage because it offers a way of approaching and representing relations between multiple actors that are variously present or absent, near or far, interior or exterior, human and non-human. For McFarlane, the concept of assemblage is of value because of the way in which it ‘attend[s] to why and how multiple bits-and-pieces accrete and align over time to enable particular forms of urbanism over others’ and how such processes

may be ‘subject to disassembly and reassembly through unequal relations of power and resource’. The moral imagination of his work is aligned with a Deleuzian conception of assemblage such that assemblages are not a ‘spatial category’, a condition or a formation produced as a result of points being joined by linear, fixed, essential or filial relations. They are much more open and mobile alliances and alloys – gatherings – that can stabilize (be territorialized or reterritorialized) and destabilize (be deterritorialized) (McFarlane, 2011b: 653). In fact, because of the residual formalism in a concept like assemblage various scholars have preferred to use the term *agencement*. This term better expresses a coextensive process of arrangement and action. Callon (2007: 313) refers to agencements as ‘arrangements endowed with the capacity of acting in different ways depending on their configuration’.

The use of the term ‘assemblages’ is almost ubiquitous in contemporary urban geography, and not all uses carry the kind of theoretical infrastructure outlined above. For example, within urban policy mobilities work the term is commonplace and is also used by McCann and Ward (2011b) as the key concept of the opening chapter of their recent edited collection. Some notable ways in which it has been used with respect to urban contexts is McFarlane’s application to the making and unmaking of urban dwellings (see also Jacobs and Cairns, 2011; Jacobs et al., 2007). Another variant of assemblage thinking with respect to contemporary urbanisms has seen the concept applied to social relations previously understood in largely dematerialized and disembodied ways (as social constructs, for example). Extending a trajectory of inquiry laid down by Amin and Thrift’s (2002b; see also Amin, 2002) call for an ‘ontology of encounter’, Dan Swanton has examined what he has dubbed ‘the new racism of assemblages’ (Swanton, 2010a: 461; see also 2010b). His work charts assemblages of technologies and bodies that

contingently actualize urban race subjectivities and relations.

IV Presence and proximity

In the final section of this review essay I would like to reflect upon these differing variants of 'thinking the city relationally' showcased in this review and consider some methodological and epistemological issues to which they give rise. Friedmann's (2005) scepticism about what moves when policy moves leads him to call for scholars to thicken their descriptions of policy mobilities. Attending to, and enriching, the methodology of urban policy mobility studies is essential. There is a crucial evidence trap that must be vigilantly worked against, lest our studies of mobilities simply feed universalizing narratives of same-ing and in so doing, once again, position some cities as command centres (exporters of ideas) and others as passive receivers and imitators. Robinson's (2005) project of a postcolonial or cosmopolitan urban theory reminds us not only of the perils of such thinking, but the opportunities for alternative urban imaginaries that are missed. She asks urban scholars to extend the relationships that matter to their scholarship (and the theory they build) by looking to 'ordinary cities', the cities that are off the map, or down the hierarchy of existing theories of globalized urbanism (see also Mbembe and Nuttall, 2004; McFarlane, 2011a; Roy, 2011; Roy and Ong, 2011; Simone, 2005).

Urban scholars might also, in a similar vein, interrogate what they do conceptually and theoretically with instances of repetition. We can reflect back here on the work of urban policy mobilities. If an urban policy exists here and there, what sense do we make of that fact? As I have noted elsewhere (Jacobs, 2006), in diffusionist models of policy mobility it is often assumed that knowledge is produced in a centre somewhere (the West, a Global City) then moves outward to influence and shape more

distant others. But it is crucial that we replace diffusionist models of mobilities (including our residual diffusionist imaginaries) with ones invested in a more Latourian concept of translation (see also McFarlane, 2006). Latour's concept of translation was developed specifically as a critical alternative to diffusionist story-making in which a relatively stable thing moves through space and time by way of social effort. Translation brings into view not only the work required for a thing to reach one point from another, but also the multiplicity of add-ons that contribute, often in unpredictable and varying ways, to transportation, arrival, adoption and (something current urban policy mobility studies are entirely blind to) non-arrival and non-adoption. The concept of translation brings back in not only the forgotten many who carry policies but also the crowds of acting entities that shape the affiliations that form around a thing on the move. These entities meaningfully contribute to how coherent and convincing something that moves remains or becomes, and so the extent to which it is likely to take hold or not take hold. Jamie Peck (2011) has argued something similar in his case to see policy movement not as 'transfer-diffusion' but as 'mobility-mutation', but even then there is a tendency for scholarship to stay fixated on policy presences, following what has already arrived and formed.

It is true that scholars contributing to the new urban policy mobility studies increasingly acknowledge that the quest is not simply to hunt for 'global convergence or homogeneity of outcome' (Clarke, 2011; Peck and Theodore, 2010). Yet there is nonetheless a 'will to map and explain how neoliberal programmes get extended across space' even while scholars may acknowledge that 'neo-liberalization processes are ... contested, unstable' (Clarke, 2011). In this mapping process it is true that certain knowledges and actions emerge as 'best practice' or 'model urbanism', some technologies as unquestioned and immutable, and some experts as global gurus (McCann, 2004). But

this is only one destiny of many. The inability for current urban policy mobility work to see these other destinies is in part a methodological problem. Although urban policy mobility scholarship claims to ‘follow the policy’ (Peck and Theodore, 2010; Olds, 2001), essentially through techniques of policy review and key player interviews, it is more often a method of joining the dots. By that I mean instances of a policy *presence* are discerned and then a back story of connection, translation and arrival is charted. There is a need to reflect on how exactly one ‘follows the policy’. Smith and Doel (2011; see also Doel, 2009), complaining about Latoureaan-inspired notions of assemblage, argue that such conceptions are too wedded to ‘a metaphysics of presence’ and the traceable association between these presences (‘and ... and ... and’). This kind of additive, ‘associative ontology’, they argue, cannot grasp the complex multiplicity and virtuality of contemporary urbanism.

Not least a methodological diversification (more ethnography and less policy review) might allow instances of repetition to be better understood as *effect*, and thus an ambiguous signifier of monotone and linear stories of neoliberal same-ing. What is at stake is important. If one follows presence, say policy presence, then it may guarantee that all we ever see in our urban geographies is neoliberal extension. Sites of failure, absence and mutation are significant empirical instances of differentiation. If, as McCann (2010: 118) notes, policy mobilities produce a set of ‘actionable ideas’, then studies of them must be better attuned not only to the motives and politics of *action-in-the-name-of-repetition* (adoption, learning) but also to the motives and politics of *action-in-the-name-of-differentiation*, reaction, rejection, de-activation, detour, redirection and failure. This is a radically cosmopolitan urbanism that does not simply add in to urban geography different cities, but also enables urban geography to see difference in repetition. It is, in my view, the only way

in which we can have fully alternative urban geographies.

References

- Allen J and Cochrane A (2007) Beyond the territorial fix: Regional assemblages, politics and power. *Regional Studies* 41: 1161–1175.
- Allen J, Massey DB, and Cochrane A (1998) *Rethinking the Region*. London: Routledge.
- Amin A (2002) Ethnicity and the multicultural city: Living with diversity. *Environment and Planning A* 34: 959–980.
- Amin A (2004) Regions unbound: Towards a new politics of place. *Geografiska Annaler, Series B, Human Geography* 86(1): 33–44.
- Amin A (2007) Re-thinking the urban social. *City* 11: 100–114.
- Amin A and Thrift N (2002a) *Cities: Reimagining the Urban*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Amin A and Thrift N (2002b) Cities and ethnicities. *Ethnicities* 2: 291–300.
- Anderson B and McFarlane C (2011) Assemblage and geography. *Area* 43(2): 124–127.
- Beattie M (2004) Sir Patrick Geddes and Barra Bazaar: Competing visions, ambivalence and contradiction. *The Journal of Architecture* 9(2): 131–150.
- Bender T (2009) Postscript: Re-assembling the city. Networks and urban imaginaries. In: Farias I and Bender T (eds) *Urban Assemblages: How Actor-Network Theory Changes Urban Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge, 303–323.
- Brown-May A (2008) In the precincts of the global city: The transnational network of municipal affairs in Melbourne, Australia, at the end of the nineteenth century. In: Saunier P-Y and Ewen S (eds) *Another Global City: Historical Explorations into the Transnational Municipal Movement, 1850–2000*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 19–34.
- Callon M (2007) What does it mean to say that economics is performative? In: Mackenzie D, Muniesa F, and Siu L (eds) *Do Economists Make Markets? On the Performativity of Economics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 311–357.
- Clarke N (2010) Town twinning in cold-war Britain: (Dis)continuities in twentieth-century municipal internationalism. *Contemporary British History* 24(2): 173–191.
- Clarke N (2011) Urban policy mobility, anti-politics, and histories of the transnational municipal movement.

- Progress in Human Geography*. doi: 10.1177/0309132511407952.
- Cochrane A (2011) Urban politics beyond the urban. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35(4): 862–863.
- Cook IR (2008) Mobilising urban policies: The policy transfer of US Business Improvement Districts to England and Wales. *Urban Studies* 45(4): 773–795.
- Doel M (2009) Miserly thinking/excessful geography: From restricted economy to global financial crisis. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 27: 1054–1073.
- Fariás I (2009) Introduction. In: Fariás I and Bender T (eds) *Urban Assemblages: How Actor-Network Theory Changes Urban Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge, 1–24.
- Fariás I and Bender T (eds) (2009) *Urban Assemblages: How Actor-Network Theory Changes Urban Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Friedmann J (2005) Globalization and the emerging culture of planning. *Progress in Planning* 64(3): 183–234.
- Gandy M (2005) Cyborg urbanization: Complexity and monstrosity in the contemporary city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29(1): 26–49.
- Gieryn T (2002) What buildings do. *Theory and Society* 31: 350–374.
- González S (2011) Bilbao and Barcelona ‘in motion’: How urban regeneration ‘models’ travel and mutate in the global flows of policy tourism. *Urban Studies* 48(7): 1397–1418.
- Graham S (2009) Interview with Ignacio Fariás. In: Fariás I and Bender T (eds) *Urban Assemblages: How Actor-Network Theory Changes Urban Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Graham S and Marvin S (2001) *Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities and the Urban Condition*. London: Routledge.
- Guggenheim M (2009) Mutable immobiles: Building conversion as a problem of quasi-technologies. In: Fariás I and Bender T (eds) *Urban Assemblages: How Actor-Network Theory Changes Urban Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge, 161–178.
- Guy S, Marvin S, and Moss T (eds) (2001) *Urban Infrastructure in Transition: Networks, Buildings, Plans*. London: Earthscan.
- Healey P and Upton R (eds) (2010) *Crossing Borders: International Exchange and Planning Practices*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hommels A (2005) *Unbuilding Cities, Obduracy in Urban Sociotechnical Change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hoyt L (2006) Imported ideas: The transnational transfer of urban revitalization policy. *International Journal of Public Administration* 29(1–3): 221–243.
- Hubbard P (2006) *City*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Jacobs JM (2006) A geography of big things. *Cultural Geographies* 13(1): 1–27.
- Jacobs JM and Cairns S (2011) Ecologies of dwelling: Maintaining high-rise housing in Singapore. In: Bridge G and Watson S (eds) *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 79–95.
- Jacobs JM and Merriman P (2011) Practising architectures. *Social and Cultural Geography* 12(3): 211–222.
- Jacobs JM, Cairns S, and Strebel I (2007) ‘A tall story . . . but, a fact just the same’: The Red Road high-rise as a black box. *Urban Studies* 44(3): 609–629.
- Jones M (2009) Phase space: Geography, relational thinking, and beyond. *Progress in Human Geography* 33(4): 487–506.
- King AD (1980) Exporting planning: The colonial and neo-colonial experience. In: Cherry G (ed.) *Shaping an Urban World: Planning in the Twentieth Century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 203–226.
- King AD (1984) *The Bungalow: The Production of a Global Culture*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- King AD (2004) *Spaces of Global Cultures: Architecture, Urbanism, Identity*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Kong L, Gibson C, Khoo L-M, and Semple A-L (2006) Knowledges of the creative economy: Towards a relational geography of diffusion and adaptation in Asia. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 47(2): 173–194.
- Larner W and Laurie N (2010) Travelling technocrats, embodied knowledges: Globalising privatization in telcoms and water. *Geoforum* 41: 218–226.
- Latham A and McCormack DP (2004) Moving cities: Rethinking the materialities of urban geographies. *Progress in Human Geography* 28(6): 701–724.
- Latour B (2005) *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Latour B and Hermant E (1998) *Paris: Ville Invisible*. Paris: Les empêcheurs de penser en rons/La Découverte.
- Luckman S, Gibson C, and Lea T (2009) Mosquitoes in the mix: How transferable is creative city thinking? *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 30(1): 70–85.

- McCann EJ (2004) 'Best places': Interurban competition, quality of life and popular media discourses. *Urban Studies* 41(10): 1909–1929.
- McCann EJ (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(4): 885–904.
- McCann EJ (2010) Urban policy mobilities and global circuits of knowledge: Toward a research agenda. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 101(1): 107–130.
- McCann EJ (2011) Veritable inventions: Cities, policies, and assemblage. *Area* 43(2): 143–147.
- McCann EJ and Ward K (2010) Relationality/territoriality: Toward a conceptualization of cities in the world. *Geoforum* 41(2): 175–184.
- McCann EJ and Ward K (eds) (2011a) *Mobile Urbanism: Cities and Policymaking in the Global Age*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- McCann EJ and Ward K (2011b) Introduction: Urban assemblages: Territories, relations, practices, and power. In: McCann EJ and Ward K (eds) *Mobile Urbanism: Cities and Policymaking in the Global Age*. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota University Press, xiii–xxxv.
- McFarlane C (2006) Knowledge, learning and development: A post-rationalist approach. *Progress in Development Studies* 6: 287–305.
- McFarlane C (2010) The comparative city: Knowledge, learning, urbanism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 34(4): 725–742.
- McFarlane C (2011a) *Learning the City: Knowledge and Translocal Assemblage*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- McFarlane C (2011b) The city as assemblage: Dwelling and urban space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29: 649–671.
- McNeill D (2009) *The Global Architect: Firms, Fame, and Urban Form*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Madden DJ (2010) Urban ANTs: A review essay. *Qualitative Sociology* 33: 583–589.
- Marmor T, Freeman R, and Okma K (2005) Comparative perspectives and policy learning in the world of health care. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* 7(4): 331–348.
- Massey D (2004) The political challenge of relational space: Introduction to the Vega Symposium. *Geografiska Annaler* 86 B: 3.
- Mbembe A and Nuttall S (2004) Writing the world from an African metropolis. *Public Culture* 16(3): 347–372.
- Meller H (2000) Hamburg and Marseilles: Cultural institutions, civic exhibitions and city development 1890–1930. In: Hirschfelder G, Borsay P, and Mohrmann R-E (eds) *New Directions in Urban History: Aspects of European Art, Health, Tourism and Leisure since the Enlightenment*. Münster: Waxmann Verlag, 147–176.
- Moore S (2010) 'More Toronto, naturally' but 'too strange for Orangeville': Deuniversalizing new urbanism in Greater Toronto. *Cities* 27: 103–113.
- Moore S and Harris A (forthcoming) Planning histories and practices of circulating urban knowledge. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*.
- Nasr J and Volait M (2003) *Urbanism: Imported or Exported?* Chichester: Wiley-Academy.
- Olds K (2001) *Globalization and Urban Change: Capital, Culture, And Pacific Rim Mega-Projects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peck J (2005) Struggling with the Creative Class. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29(4): 740–770.
- Peck J (2011) Geographies of policy: From transfer-diffusion to mobility-mutation. *Progress in Human Geography*. doi: 10.1177/0309132510394010.
- Peck J and Theodore N (2001) Exporting workfare/importing welfare-to-work: Exploring the politics of Third Way policy transfer. *Political Geography* 20: 427–460.
- Peck J and Theodore N (2010) Mobilizing policy: Models, methods, and mutations. *Geoforum* 41: 169–174.
- Perera N (2004) Contesting visions: Hybridity, liminality and authorship of the Chandigarh plan. *Planning Perspectives* 19(2): 175–199.
- Robinson J (2004) In the tracks of comparative urbanism: Difference, urban modernity and the primitive. *Urban Geography* 25(8): 709–723.
- Robinson J (2005) *Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Robinson J (2011) Cities in a world of cities: The comparative gesture. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35(1): 1–23.
- Roy A (2011) Slumdog cities: Rethinking subaltern urbanism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35(2): 223–238.
- Roy A and Ong A (eds) (2011) *Worlding Cities: Asian Experiments and the Art of Being Global*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Saunier P-Y (1999a) 'Atlantic crosser': John Nolen and the Urban Internationale. *Planning History* 21(1): 423–431.

- Saunier P-Y (1999b) Changing the city: Urban international information and the Lyon municipality, 1900–1940. *Planning Perspectives* 14: 19–48.
- Saunier P-Y (2002) Taking up the bet on connections: A municipal contribution. *Contemporary European History* 11(4): 507–527.
- Saunier P-Y and Ewen S (eds) (2008) *Another Global City: Historical Explorations into the Transnational Municipal Movement, 1850–2000*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Simone A (2005) *For the City Yet to Come: Changing African Life in Four Cities*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Smith RG (2003) World city topologies. *Progress in Human Geography* 27(5): 561–582.
- Smith RG and Doel M (2011) Questioning the theoretical basis of current global-city research: Structures, networks and actor-networks. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35(1): 24–39.
- Söderström O (2000) *Des Images Pour Agir: Le Visuel en Urbanisme*. Lausanne: Payot.
- Swanton D (2010a) Flesh, metal, road: Tracing the machinic geographies of race. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28: 447–466.
- Swanton D (2010b) Sorting bodies: Race, affect, and everyday multiculturalism in a mill town in northern England. *Environment and Planning A* 42: 2332–2350.
- Swyngedouw E (1996) The city as hybrid: On nature, society and cyborg urbanization. *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism* 7(2): 65–80.
- Swyngedouw E (2006) Metabolic urbanization: The making of cyborg cities. In: Heynen N, Kaika M, and Swyngedouw E (eds) *In the Nature of Cities: Urban Political Ecology and the Politics of Urban Metabolism*. London: Taylor and Francis, 20–39.
- Tait M (2002) Room for manoeuvre? An actor-network study of central-local relations in development plan making. *Planning Theory and Practice* 3: 69–85.
- Tait M and Jensen OB (2007) Travelling ideas, power and place: The cases of urban villages and business improvement districts. *International Planning Studies* 12(2): 107–128.
- Thompson-Fawcett M (2003) A new urbanism diffusion network: The Americo-European connection. *Built Environment* 29(3): 253–270.
- Vidyarthi S (2010a) Inappropriately appropriated or innovatively indigenized?: Neighborhood unit concept in post-independence India. *Journal of Planning History* 9(4): 260–276.
- Vidyarthi S (2010b) Reimagining the neighborhood unit for India. In: Healey P and Upton R (eds) *Crossing Borders: International Exchange and Planning Practices*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Wang J (2004) The global reach of a new discourse: How far can ‘creative industries’ travel? *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 7(1): 9–19.
- 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(1): 54–75.
- Ward K (2007) Business Improvement Districts: Policy origins, mobile policies and urban liveability. *Geography Compass* 1(3): 657–672.
- Ward K (2010) Towards a relational comparative approach to the study of cities. *Progress in Human Geography* 34(4): 471–487.
- Ward K (2011) Entrepreneurial urbanism, policy tourism and the making of mobile policies. In: Bridge G and Watson S (eds) *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 726–737.
- Ward S (1999) The international diffusion of planning: A review and a Canadian case study. *International Planning Studies* 4(1): 53–77.
- Ward S (2009) Cross-national learning in the formation of British planning policies 1940–1999. *Town Planning Review* 78(3): 369–400.
- Ward S (2010) Transnational planners in a postcolonial world. In: Healey P and Upton R (eds) *Crossing Borders: International Exchange and Planning Practices*. London: Routledge, 47–72.
- Yaneva A (2009) *The Making of a Building: A Pragmatists Approach to Architecture*. Bern: Peter Lang.