

Constructing METROPOLITAN SPACE

ACTORS, POLICIES AND PROCESSES OF
RESCALING IN WORLD METROPOLISES



EDITED BY
JILL SIMONE GROSS
ENRICO GUALINI
LIN YE

CONSTRUCTING METROPOLITAN SPACE

There is little question today that processes of globalization affect national and local economies, governance processes, and conditions for economic competitiveness in the major urban regions of the world. In most liberal-democratic countries, these processes are occurring according to a rationale which attempts to combine strategies of state-supported development with increasing local-regional governmental decentralization and autonomy. Against this background, the issue of metropolitan development is being redefined worldwide, along with its institutional frameworks, modes of governance, policy instruments, and spatial planning strategies.

The overarching assumption of this volume is that 'metropolitan space', far from being consolidated as a policy object, is currently being redefined and in some instances 'constructed' and contested as a scale, through a variety of policy practices related to spatial-economic development objectives. Through case studies drawn from across four continents, the authors reveal a range of interesting cross-national commonalities concerning the power that state actors, situated at various spatial scales, exert as agents in these processes. This volume interrogates key research issues raised by these developments, and is intended as a contribution to the establishment of a globally comparative analysis of the construction of metropolitan spaces and scales under conditions of globalization and neoliberalization.

Jill Simone Gross is Associate Professor in the Department of Urban Policy and Planning at Hunter College, City University of New York.

Enrico Gualini is Professor at the Institute of Urban and Regional Planning of TU Berlin - Berlin University of Technology.

Lin Ye is Professor at the School of Government of Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou.

“Across the world economy, the space of metropolitan regions remains a terrain of intense institutional restructuring, state spatial strategies, regulatory experimentation and sociopolitical contestation. This volume offers a powerful geocomparative perspective on contemporary metropolitan transformations, projects and struggles in Western Europe, North and South America, East and South Asia, and beyond. It will be a key resource for anyone interested in understanding emergent patterns and pathways of metropolitan development under contemporary capitalism.”

Neil Brenner, Professor of Urban Theory,
Harvard University, USA

“*Constructing Metropolitan Space* profoundly enriches our understanding of metropolitan rescaling. Beyond rather abstract scale construction, the book interrogates the state, firm, and practices in the governance of eight world cities. Combining rich empirical materials and innovative conceptual perspectives, it is a milestone contribution to governance studies.”

Fulong Wu, Bartlett Professor of Planning,
University College London, UK

CONSTRUCTING METROPOLITAN SPACE

Actors, Policies and Processes of
Rescaling in World Metropolises

*Edited by Jill Simone Gross, Enrico Gualini
and Lin Ye*

First published 2019

Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

and by Routledge

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2019 Taylor & Francis

The right of Jill Simone Gross, Enrico Gualini and Lin Ye to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Gross, Jill Simone, editor. | Gualini, Enrico, editor. | Ye, Lin (Professor of public administration), editor.

Title: Constructing metropolitan space: actors, policies and processes of rescaling in world metropolises / edited by Jill Simone Gross, Enrico Gualini and Lin Ye.

Description: New York, NY: Routledge, 2019. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018031563 | ISBN 9780815380856 (hardback) | ISBN 9780815380870 (pbk.)

Subjects: LCSH: City planning. | Regional planning. | Urban policy. | Urbanization.

Classification: LCC HT166 .C62344 2019 | DDC 307.1/216—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018031563>

ISBN: 978-0-8153-8085-6 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-8153-8087-0 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-351-21208-3 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo

by codeMantra

CONTENTS

<i>List of figures</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>List of tables</i>	<i>viii</i>
<i>Notes on contributors</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>xiii</i>
<i>Preface</i>	<i>xiv</i>

PART I

Introduction 1

- 1 Introduction: actors, policies and processes in the construction of metropolitan space: conceptual and analytical issues 3
Enrico Gualini and Jill Simone Gross

PART II

Constructing metropolitan space in world cities: case studies 29

- 2 Berlin as an 'implicit' metropolitan space: contradictions in the institutional construction of scale 31
Carola Fricke and Enrico Gualini
- 3 Contrasting the spatial and political dimensions of rescaling in metropolitan Delhi 65
Bérénice Bon and Lorraine Kennedy

vi Contents

4	The governance of Istanbul metropolitan development: the role of the state and the private sector <i>Yüksel Demirkaya</i>	88
5	Contesting the region: transportation and the politics of scale in New York <i>Jill Simone Gross and Jen Nelles</i>	109
6	Paris, a contested construction of metropolitan space <i>Christian Lefèvre</i>	132
7	Economic actors at odds with the metropolis: Rio de Janeiro in the context of mega-events <i>Luiz Cesar de Queiroz Ribeiro and Nelson Rojas de Carvalho</i>	151
8	The uncertain metropolization of Rome: economy, space and governance <i>Ernesto d'Albergo, Giulio Moini and Barbara Pizzo</i>	172
9	Urban strategies for extended metropolises in Shenzhen and the Pearl River Delta: state-firm dynamics in anchoring the new metropolitan center <i>Lin Ye and Xinhui Yang</i>	196
PART III		
Findings and conclusions		211
10	The construction of metropolitan space: comparative lessons <i>Jill Simone Gross and Enrico Gualini</i>	213
<i>Index</i>		225

FIGURES

3.1	Location map, National Capital Territory of Delhi	67
3.2	Constituent areas of the NCR	68
3.3	RRTS corridors in the NCR	75
4.1	Istanbul's historical skyline and Zeytinburnu 16/9 Towers	98
4.2	The Marmaray line	101
4.3	The North Marmara Motorway route	102
6.1	The twelve 'territories' of the Métropole du Grand Paris	147
7.1	Metropolitan region of Rio de Janeiro	153
7.2	BTR corridors	163
8.1	Metropolitan sub-centers and their functions in the Master Plan of Rome	184
8.2	Functional sub-systems and their territorial relationships in the Territorial Plan (Provincial level)	185

TABLES

2.1	Institutional set-up and multi-level structure of Berlin-Brandenburg in the fields of spatial and economic development (including the competences' legal basis in the <i>Grundgesetz</i> , GG)	35
2.2	Overview of the policy documents analyzed	42
2.3	Metropolitan scale and scope in selected policy documents	53
3.1	The share of GDP of districts of Haryana sub-region, 2004–2010	79
3.2	Industrial growth in Haryana State as a whole and in its territory situated in the National Capital Region (NCR)	80
4.1	Istanbul's administrative bodies	92
6.1	Paris and Île-de-France: the institutional and territorial context	134
7.1	Participation of economic players in projects of urban renovation in Rio de Janeiro	167
9.1	Shenzhen's urban and economic development 1980–2010	201
9.2	Expected urban village land acquisition 2005–2010 (10,000 sqm)	202

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Bérénice Bon, PhD, is a postdoctoral researcher at the French National Research Institute for Sustainable Development (IRD, France) in the CESSMA research unit – the Centre for Social Sciences Studies on Africa, America and Asia – in Paris. Her research focuses on the political and spatial transformations of Indian and Kenyan metropolises. She is particularly interested in the interrelations between land policies and politics, and large-scale transport infrastructure.

Ernesto d’Albergo, PhD in Social Research and Theory, teaches Political Sociology and Sociology of Urban Policies at Sapienza University of Rome, Department of Social and Economic Sciences, Faculty of Political Science, Sociology, Communication. His research interests focus on political topics at the national, transnational and urban scale, with specific emphasis on the interrelationships between politics and policy as well as those between the material and immaterial dimensions of political life. He co-chaired and took part in several national and international research networks on topics like metropolitan governance and development, urban national agendas and the international strategies of cities.

Yüksel Demirkaya, PhD, is Professor at the Faculty of Political Sciences and the Director of the Center for Civil Society Research (STKAM) in Marmara University in Istanbul. He is also editor of the international *Strategic Public Management Journal*. His academic research interest areas are New Public Management movement and reforms, local and regional government systems, strategic management in the public sector and Corporate Performance Management in public administration.

Carola Fricke, PhD, is a member of the academic staff lecturing at the Institute for Social Environmental Science and Geography of the University of Freiburg.

After her graduation in political science, geography and public law in 2011, she worked as a researcher and teaching fellow at the Chair of Comparative Politics, Department of Political Science at the University of Freiburg, and at the Chair of Planning Theory and Urban-Regional Policy Analysis at the Institute of Urban and Regional Planning of TU Berlin. Her current research concentrates on comparative analyses of spatial and regional policies in Europe, focusing on city-regional and cross-border cooperation, and questions concerning institutional forms of governance in metropolitan regions. In 2017, she obtained her PhD from TU Berlin with a project analyzing the European dimension of metropolitan policies in France and Germany.

Enrico Gualini, PhD, is Professor of Planning Theory and Urban-Regional Policy Analysis at TU Berlin – Berlin University of Technology. His research focuses on the social construction of spatiality and the political dimension of socio-spatial practices, with a focus on their contested nature and on resulting challenges for urban democratic politics. Among his recent publications are *Planning and Conflict: Critical Reflections on Contentious Urban Developments* (ed. 2015); *Conflict in the City: Contested Urban Spaces and Local Democracy* (co-ed. 2015); and “Metropolitan Regions as Contested Spaces: The Discursive Construction of Metropolitan Space in Comparative Perspective”, *Territory Politics Governance* (with C. Fricke, 2017).

Jill Simone Gross, PhD, is Associate Professor of Political Science in the Department of Urban Policy and Planning at Hunter College, City University of New York. She is Director of the Graduate program in Urban Policy and Leadership. She earned her PhD in Political Science from the Graduate Center of the City University of New York and holds a Master's Degree from the London School of Economic and Political Science. She served as Governing Board Chair of the Urban Affairs Association from 2015 to 2017 and was awarded a Fulbright-Shulman in 2012. Her primary areas of research are in comparative urban politics, governance, migration and economic development in Western European and North American cities, with an emphasis on issues equity.

Christian Lefèvre, PhD, is Professor of Urban Government and Policies in the Paris School of Planning at the University of Paris-Est. He has carried out extensive comparative research on issues of metropolitan government, governance and strategies in France, Europe and the United States for French as well as European and international institutions. He is a member of the executive committee of the European Urban Research Association (EURA).

Loraine Kennedy, PhD, is a CNRS Research Director and member of the Center for South Asian Studies (CEIAS) at the EHESS in Paris. Her research focuses on state restructuring, economic development and the politics of

metropolitan space and scale in India, with increasing interest in international comparison. Recent publications include *The Politics of Economic Restructuring in India. Economic Governance and State Spatial Rescaling* (2014); a co-edited volume, *Power, Policy, and Protest: The Politics of India's Special Economic Zones* (2014); and a special issue on "State Restructuring and Emerging Patterns of Subnational Policy-Making and Governance in China and India" in *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* (2017).

Giulio Moini, PhD, teaches Sociology of Public Action and Governance and Participation at Sapienza University of Rome, Department of Social and Economic Sciences. His research interests focus on forms and contents of public action. Among his recent publications are "Depoliticizing Public Action by Politicizing Issues, Practices and Actors", *Partecipazione e Conflitto* (co-author, 2017); "Riding Roughshod over People. Reading Politics, Economy and Civil Society in Metropolization. A case study in Rome", in T. Reilly (ed.) *The Governance of Local Communities: Global Perspectives and Challenges* (co-author 2017); and "Neoliberalism as the 'Connective Tissue' of Contemporary Capitalism", *Partecipazione e Conflitto* (2016).

Jen Nelles, PhD, is a researcher, Professor and consultant based in New York City, specializing in the areas of metropolitan governance and regional economic development. She is the author of *Comparative Metropolitan Governance: Governing Beyond Boundaries in the Imagined Metropolis* (2012) and co-author of *A Quiet Evolution: The Emergence of Indigenous-Local Intergovernmental Partnerships in Canada* (2016). She is particularly interested in developing ways of improving coordination between local authorities to address modern social, economic and environmental issues that inevitably transcend geographical and jurisdictional boundaries.

Barbara Pizzo, PhD, is Research Professor in Urban and Territorial Planning at Sapienza University of Rome. She works mainly in the field of Planning Theory with a critical orientation, and a focus on the theory-practice nexus. Her interests are in processes of socio-spatial structuration; the relationships between urban planning and socio-economic changes, politics and policies; regulation; and contestation over space. Among her latest publications is "Embedding Illegality, or When the Illegal Becomes Licit: Planning Cases and Urban Transformations in Rome", in F. Chiodelli, T. Hall and R. Hudson (eds.) *The Illicit and Illegal in Regional and Urban Governance and Development* (2017).

Luiz Cesar de Queiroz Ribeiro, PhD, is Professor of Urban Sociology at Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Instituto de Pesquisa e Planejamento Urbano e Regional (IPPUR/UFRJ). He chairs the INCT/Observatório das Metrópoles: a research network of comparative studies on fifteen Brazilian metropolises. He

is currently researching metropolization processes, intra-metropolitization dynamics and the national territory, urban governance, citizenship, social-spatial dimension of exclusion and integration inside the metropolises.

Nelson Rojas de Carvalho, PhD, is Associate Professor of Political Science at Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro (UFRRJ) and senior researcher at Observatório das Metrópoles (IPPUR/UFRJ). His teaching and research interests include policy analysis, political representation, political geography, metropolitan governance and urban regime analysis.

Xinhui Yang is a graduate student at School of Government, Sun Yat-sen University (SYSU), in Guangzhou, China. His primary research interests are in the field of urban governance, public policy and quantitative methods.

Lin Ye, PhD, is a Professor at Center for Chinese Public Administration Research, School of Government, Sun Yat-sen University (SYSU), in Guangzhou, China. He received his master's degree in Public Administration and his doctoral degree in Urban and Public Affairs from University of Louisville, USA. He published eight books and over 60 peer-reviewed articles, book chapters and academic reports in both English and Chinese. His articles appear in urban studies and public administration journals, including *Public Administration Review*, *Cities*, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, *Social Policy & Administration*, *Small Business & Economics*, *American Review of Public Administration*, *Journal of Planning Literature*, *Chinese Public Administration Review*, *Small Business Economics*, and *Territory, Politics & Governance*. His primary research interests are in the field of urban policy and regional governance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The International Metropolitan Research Consortium (iMRC) acknowledges support received from several institutions during its four years of activity.

Marmara University Istanbul generously supported an iMRC workshop held in Istanbul on October 16–18, 2013.

The École d'Urbanisme de Paris generously supported an iMRC workshop held in Paris on June 21, 2014. In addition, the *EURA/UAA City Futures* Conference held in Paris on June 18–20, 2014, hosted a special session devoted to research by iMRC.

The Center for Chinese Public Administration Research and the School of Government of Sun Yat-sen University generously supported the participation of iMRC members in the *Second International Conference on Urban and Regional Development* and an iMRC workshop held at Sun Yat-sen University in Guangzhou on December 13–15, 2014.

The DFG (German Research Foundation) granted financial support for a conference and an iMRC workshop held at Technische Universität Berlin on June 26–27, 2015.

The Department of Planning, Design and Technology of Università di Roma 'La Sapienza' generously supported an iMRC workshop held in Rome on February 12–13, 2016.

Bérénice Bon acknowledges support from CNRS and the international program *Urban Chances - City Growth and the Sustainability Challenge*, funded by the EU Framework Programme (FP7) from 2010 to 2014.

Loraine Kennedy acknowledges generous support from CNRS for travel to iMRC meetings and from the CNRS SMI program for her visiting scholarship in New York during 2016–2017.

Enrico Gualini acknowledges support from the FMSH-WZB joint program *Changing Societies: New Frameworks for Societal Policies and Decision Making* for his visiting scholarship at the Collège d'Études Mondiales of FMSH and the Centre d'Études Européennes of SciencesPo in Paris in April–July 2017.

PREFACE

There is little question today that processes of globalization affect national and local economies, governance processes and conditions for economic competitiveness in the major urban regions of the world. The question one must ask is to what degree are these processes generating new configurations of power and politics, and at what spatial scale? This volume is derived from the efforts of fourteen scholars, who together represent the International Metropolitan Research Consortium (iMRC), a four-year collaborative research project structured around the exploration of governance and scale through case study research on metropolitan development in Berlin, Delhi, Istanbul, New York, Paris, Rio de Janeiro, Rome and Shenzhen. Our starting ambition in addressing these cases was not based on expectations of convergence in outcomes, nor did we expect to find a single theoretical frame to neatly encompass all of our studies. Instead, we sought to use the case studies to shed light on the ways metropolitan development was occurring amidst differences (institutionally, politically, economically and discursively). Following a growing body of comparative urban scholarship, we were “committed to revisability, to thinking through a diversity of urban outcomes and to being open to starting to theorize from anywhere” (Robinson 2016: 191). Each team began by identifying development policies which were metropolitan in scope. We recognized that there would be contextual variation in the framing of metropolitan regions; thus, all agreed to explore policies which extended beyond the urban core without pre-given ontological assumptions about the nature of metropolitan regions, exploring the processes of their construction in line with a tradition of analysis of the ‘political economy of scale’. Working across four disciplines – political science, planning, geography and sociology – and traversing three continents, the group members each set out to explore three major hypotheses

on metropolitan governance and scale construction in light of processes of ‘globalized neo-liberalization’:

- i *on the role of the state*: testing the hypothesis that the role of the state, despite ‘globalization’ and decentralization trends, remains very important, if not central, in the governance of metropolitan areas, with instruments varying because of the political culture of the country rather than because of exogenous factors;
- ii *on public-private relations and the role of big firms* in the governance of metropolitan development: testing the hypothesis that the involvement of big firms is strongly dependent upon the nature of public-private relations in the country and in the metropolitan area considered – the behavior of firms may vary according to their degree of strategic capacity, their sector of activity, their degree of internationalization, etc.;
- iii *on rescaling at the metropolitan level*: testing the hypothesis that ‘rescaling’ (whenever occurring) at the metropolitan level depends upon important features of societal configuration (e.g., the nature of the state, degree of centralization/decentralization or strength of local governments) which are highly diverse, and which may have different effects in terms of rescaling according to context conditions.

Each team approaches these questions through their own disciplinary orientations and unique political geographies. At the same time, the research is designed to enable comparison across a variety of cases through a common set of hypotheses and the shared spatial focus on metropolitan region. Thus, taking the advice of Kantor and Savitch (2005: 137), we seek to “to address issues that have similar meaning in a broad variety of political contexts” while allowing for a high diversity of cases, which favors a comparative attitude of variation-finding (cf. Robinson 2017). The result is a rich set of cases which empirically explore the politics and policy of scale constructions. Together, they shed light on the highly contested and often incomplete nature of metropolitan rescaling. They reveal the powerful role that state actors play in metropolitan development politics. And, finally, they highlight the significant place of path dependency in shaping the trajectories of metropolitan development processes.

References

- Kantor, P. and Savitch, H. V. (2005) “How to Study Comparative Urban Development Politics: A Research Note,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(1): 135–151.
- Robinson, J. (2016) “Comparative Urbanism: New Geographies and Cultures of Theorizing the Urban,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 40(1): 187–199.
- Robinson, J. (2017) “Comparison,” in M. Jayne and K. Ward (eds.) *Urban Theory: New Critical Perspectives*, London/New York: Routledge: 84–98.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

PART I

Introduction



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

1

INTRODUCTION

Actors, policies and processes in the construction of metropolitan space: conceptual and analytical issues

Enrico Gualini and Jill Simone Gross

Foreword

This volume moves from the observation that the issue of metropolitan development is being redefined worldwide, along with its institutional frameworks, modes of governance, policy instruments and spatial strategies.

While certainly not new, this phenomenon does appear to be taking on new features. The renewal of attention comes from a discursive framing of metropolitan regions as key ‘spaces of competitiveness’ within globalized ‘spaces of competition’ and as hubs for the management and control of flows of capital, goods and information in globalized economies. This goes hand in hand with the emergence of new patterns of interests, influence and collaboration between states and firms, and between public and economic actors in metropolitan regions.

We do not, however, take these processes to be linear, unidirectional or monolithic; rather, they are “simultaneously constraining structures and enabling constructs of meaning” which may or may not lead to formal institutionalization (Schmidt 2010: 4). In some instances, discursive frames become the basis for institution building, while in others, they fail to overcome the constraints of existing interests, structures or paths. The ‘fuzzy’ nature of metropolitan space as a policy object instead means that its political expression as *scale* is contested. Indeed, each of the cases presented in this volume highlights these dynamics – albeit from their own unique contextual perspectives.

Accordingly, we argue that metropolitan space, far from being a consolidated policy object, is currently being redefined. It is increasingly viewed as a political stake, and, as such, it is being constructed and contested as a spatial scale through policy practices and discourses related to spatial-economic development objectives. In this sense, we stand for the heuristic significance

of a distinctively social-constructivist and strategic-relational understanding of metropolitan space as object of inquiry. In what follows, we present what can best be understood as the meta-theoretical scaffolding that underlies contemporary understandings of the construction of metropolitan scale. This chapter serves as a reference for the empirical cases studies presented in Chapters 2–9 and the comparative lessons discussed in Chapter 10.

Constructing metropolitan space: introducing the topic

The renewed attention to political economy approaches in critical urban studies has been an important undercurrent in contemporary research on metropolitan space. The idea that (social) space is a (social) product can thus be viewed as an expression of changes in our understanding of social and state-society relations. Each society is perceived to be ‘appropriating’ space through relations of (material and symbolic) production and reproduction (Lefèbvre 1974; see Brenner 2001b). Metropolitan space itself is thus seen as a paradigmatic instance of both the ‘historicity of geography’ (Harvey 1995) and its social production as ‘reality’. What is striking about this turn however is the fact that, despite these understandings, analyses of the ‘production of space’ remain an underdeveloped dimension of metropolitan governance research. All the authors in this collection investigate the reconfiguration of metropolitan space, directly or indirectly, in an effort to begin to fill this gap. In doing so, the collection contributes to building better understandings of territoriality and related political-institutional practices. For all cases, the reconfiguration of metropolitan space is viewed as a constitutive dimension of policy and governance practices.

Contemporary theories on metropolitan space are being significantly re-framed by attention to changes in the territoriality of capitalism associated with political-economic restructuring and its spatial dimensions. This has led to a significant conceptual shift in a field long dominated by the theoretical and normative assumptions of ‘public choice’ and reform-oriented ‘metropolitan consolidation’ models. The former emphasized metropolitan spaces as the outcome of the unfettered market with “little or no role for government” (Savitch and Vogel 2000: 164). The latter, by contrast, problematized the region as overly fragmented and focused on governmental consolidation as a normatively desirable response. Thus, metropolitan space was seen as a top-down governmental solution. These dichotomized and normatively driven views of metropolitan regions failed to account for the very real complexities endemic to the governance of metropolitan space, where neither market nor government proved to be adequate explicators. The ‘new-regionalist’ paradigm emerged as a rich but not unproblematic combination of theoretical contributions capable of accounting for new governance and regulation practices as background to the economic geography of late ‘globalized’ capitalism.

In the wake of these developments, research on the politics of metropolitan regions has taken new avenues. On the one hand, the struggle for adequate institutions and 'scales' for metropolitan government and governance is increasingly seen as marked by resistance to governmental changes in territorial jurisdictions and failures in constituting their reform (Lefèvre 1998; Jouve and Lefèvre 2002). Agency thus becomes an important focus in building new understandings of metropolitan space, and urban research has converged toward analyzing the political capacity of actors and coalitions to govern urban society by adapting to outside pressures and transforming local policies. This occurs at the interface between state policies and market competition, leading to new modes of governance (John 2001; Jouve 2005; Gross 2010) and experimental combinations of modes of regulation (Le Galès 1998; Bagnasco and Le Galès 2000; Lefèvre 2001; Kazepov 2005).

On the other hand, the political economy of globalization redefines geographic specificity as a function of global restructuring processes. Spatial relations are reframed in terms of differential connectivity and strategic networking, thus redefining the territorial basis of the global economy as a mosaic of transnationally connected city-regions (Keating 2001; Scott 2001; Scott et al. 2001). In connection with global economic integration and the reordering of urban hierarchies, discourse on metropolitan regions is reframed. In turn, metropolitan spaces are looked upon in terms of their role as nodes of transnational economic transactions and the competitive polarization of metropolitan geographies.

Taken together, these perspectives highlight the multi-level and multi-scalar dynamics of metropolitanization processes. At the intersection of these perspectives, a significant shift has emerged from considering metropolitan areas as outcomes of 'metropolitanization' processes based on linear growth and development patterns – to be administratively 'managed' – to conceiving metropolitan regions as policy spaces for 'performative' issues to be actively addressed at different policy levels and spatial scales – local, national and transnational.

Accordingly, dominant narratives of metropolitan governance are connoted by a constructivist 'relativization of space' as they increasingly question territorial reifications of metropolitan space. 'New-regionalist' interpretations, in particular, as they emphasize the decline of approaches to territorial reform and jurisdictional consolidation, redefine metropolitan regions as 'action spaces' rather than 'action units', focusing attention on governance practices aimed at the modernization of competition- and growth-oriented policies, and on the development of multi-actor forms of cooperation and co-production. Metropolitan spaces are seen as defined by governance practices that reframe actors, institutions and their interests around these performative issues.

The 'new-regionalist' wave of metropolitan governance in Western late-capitalist countries – particularly in Europe – is thus seen as an expression of state-promoted practices of 'experimental regionalism' (Gualini 2004;

Deas and Lord 2006). It is characterized by context-dependent combinations of features, including functionalist or delegated forms of vertical integration; voluntary-associative forms of horizontal integration; loosely coupled and weakly institutionalized policy arenas; consensus-oriented, conflict-avoiding practices of coordination and neo-corporatist deliberation; institutionally provided incentive structures ('shadow of hierarchy'); and new emergent forms of territorially-based political leadership across sectors (see Lefèvre 1998, 2001; Savitch and Vogel 2000; Lowery 2001; Gualini 2004; Hoffmann-Martinot and Sellers 2005; Jouve 2005; Borraz and Le Galès 2010).

Normatively, this emphasizes the need to provide effective functional, organizational and economic spaces, generating experimental policy responses at various scales (Herrschel and Newman 2002; Wilks-Heeg et al. 2003; Brenner 2004). Metropolitan governance comes to be seen as an issue of 'organizing capacity' (Van den Berg et al. 1997) and 'organizing connectivity'. It is seen as facing not only the fragmentation of involved actors and institutions but also the "disconnectedness of learning practices and policies" (Salet et al. 2003: 377). Hence the call for new (supra-)regional coalitions, strategies of local-regional cooperation and new linkages to global economic and cultural networks.

From a critical perspective, new-regionalist practices have prompted significant lines of research, including comparative inquiries into new rationales and symbolic practices of metropolitan policy (Blatter 2006), institutional incentives and conditions for cooperation (Kantor 2008), challenges to territorial sovereignty and 'jurisdictional integrity' (Skelcher 2005), and related democratic dilemmas (Phares 2004; Booth and Jouve 2005; Denters and Rose 2005; Heinelt and Kübler 2005; Purcell 2007). More fundamentally, however, the broadly diffused 'new-regionalist' *koinè* of metropolitan research has lent itself to controversy, particularly from a geographical perspective born out of a critique of the discourses and practices of the political economy of globalization (see Lovering 1999; Gordon 2001; MacLeod 2001b; Ward and Jonas 2004).

Critiques of globalist assumptions have merged with critiques of the theoretical flaws of new regionalist analyses. Reference is made to the often unreflective normative bias of new-regionalist-inspired discourses and practices (MacLeod 2001a, 2001b; McCann 2002; Robinson 2002; Brenner 2003; Jones and MacLeod 2004; Ward and Jonas 2004). Issues of contention are the dominant economic bias of 'new regionalism' in understanding processes of restructuring of geographical space. The result is an overestimation of the importance of issues of interspatial competition and globalization to the neglect of their political economic implications and the political dimension of their construction. The resulting functionalist assumptions about their changing role are seen as implying an identification of metropolitan regions – or 'city-regions' – with functional economic spaces. The functionalist bias of related performance-oriented policy responses implies the reification of metropolitan regions as autonomous political agents. This becomes a part of the "tendency to impute to the city-region a certain degree of agency, such that the city-region

behaves as an autonomous force of global economic and political change” (Jonas and Ward 2007: 172). This occurs at the expense of an understanding of how metropolitan spaces are politically constructed and of the role of politics, collective social agency and state regulation in this process.

In contrast to the economic functionalism and the often implied determinism of ‘new regionalist’ readings, critical geographers have emphasized the fact that the processes by which metropolitan regions are politically constructed are the mediated outcome of trans-regional economic flows, political claims to territory and their ideological construction. In this way, “new territorial structures and imaginaries are being produced” (Jonas and Ward 2007: 169).

Put in these terms, this polemic becomes schematic and certainly overstated. The opposition between interpretations of metropolitan governance as either state-led responses to new demands of globalized capitalisms or collective expressions of autonomous local polities in a framework of ‘state relativization’ is certainly overemphasized (Borraz and Le Galès 2010). In fact, these positions do not need to be seen as rival if placed in an adequate meso-theoretical framework. It is nevertheless fair to say that such criticism rightly highlights some of the theoretical and heuristic flaws of ‘new regionalism’-inspired research. For example, analyses of metropolitan governance have often been framed either by functionalist assumptions about collective action (e.g., Savitch and Vogel 2000) or normative assumptions about the purpose and context of interaction and cooperation (e.g., Kantor 2006, 2008). Most local and comparative studies neglect inquiry into the co-evolution of metropolitan governance practices and discourses and the construction of their object – ‘metropolitan space’.

In contrast, a growing body of research has started addressing the way metropolitan spaces are politically constructed and the processes by which they are perceived, enacted and discursively connoted as policy spaces. Rather than assuming autonomy of agency as the normative purpose of metropolitan governance, this line of research emphasizes the political drivers of change related to the emergence of new forms of territorialization at the metropolitan scale. While this implies developing analyses “at lower levels of scalar abstraction” than alleged ‘global’ processes (McGuirk 2007: 180), it directs attention to the political struggles implied in the redefinition of strategies for the distribution of policy resources across scales and sites of regulation. The formation of metropolitan space is addressed here as an ongoing multi-scalar process of political construction. Importantly, these processes of state restructuring require analysis along political, economic and spatial dimensions. This has originated scholarly contributions (e.g., Brenner 2004; Ward and Jonas 2004; Allen and Cochrane 2007; McGuirk 2007; Harrison 2010; Buser 2012) which highlight the need for historically sensitive and contextually situated accounts connecting state, space and scalar geographies in order to understand the social and political construction of metropolitan space.

Metropolitan 'rescaling' as the reconfiguration of policy spaces

The most consistent contribution to thematizing the constitutive spatial dimension of metropolitan governance comes from research that explicitly contextualizes these practices in light of changing modes of capitalist accumulation, and regulation. Metropolitan governance is 'back on the agenda', according to this perspective, as an expression of a shift in urban policy away from administrative modernization, territorial equalization and welfare-oriented service delivery toward the economic prioritization of territorial competitiveness, capital investments and locational politics. This is occurring, however, in a 'post-Fordist' context of changing modes of capitalist accumulation and regulation which involves changing patterns of spatiality. The resulting practices of 'rescaling' are part of a struggle to define new spaces of regulation for new capital accumulation processes (often in tertiary sectors). 'New regionalist' practices express the attempt to devise policies that may result in building connections between 'spaces of competition' (global) and 'spaces of competitiveness' (local-regional) (Brenner 2000: 321, 2003, 2004).

Research on 'rescaling', in this respect, interprets the notion of the 'historicity of space' in relation to the contingent failure and crisis of territorial space – conceived as a closed, 'bounded' and 'sutured' social-political space – to cope with changes in modes of capital accumulation and in relation to attempts at state response to this crisis in order to redefine and regain an effective role in its regulation. The crisis of traditional forms of state regulation to cope with the economic dynamics of post-Fordist globalized capitalism – and its 'inconstant geography' (Storper and Walker 1989) – has been readily recognized by critical geographers as a constitutive spatial challenge to the effectiveness and integrity of national states (e.g., Harvey 1985; Cox 1993, 1998; Jessop 2002; Brenner 2004). Critical debates on post-Fordism and globalization have been crucial in promoting a critical revision of geographical concepts addressing the nature and logic of state agency.

Of particular concern is the territorial nature of the state and its scalar 'fixity'. Researchers began to highlight the growing inadequacy of the spatial structure of the state. Its consolidated 'scale division of labor' (Cox 1998) is seen as the expression of a 'logic of territorial sovereignty' articulated through nested, hierarchically ordered and self-enclosed areal entities. A 'relativization of scale', however, is seen as emerging as a result of the disconnection between the territorial articulation of the state and the competitive features of the global economy. The competitiveness paradigm of the 'new urban politics' scholars of the 1980s and 1990s promoted a policy frame and a repertoire of local actions designed to enable advanced capitalist economies to cope with the alleged contradictions between the hypermobility of (aspatialized) capital and the territorial fixity of (spatialized) public resources. Authors like Harvey (1985) and Cox (1993) developed an early critique of the determinism of geographic assumptions underlying the 'new urban politics',

pointing to an emergent ‘politics of space’ involving rescaling as a major stake of state restructuring. A politics of scale emerges accordingly as state action attempts to cope with issues of ‘territorial noncorrespondence’, intended as a relationship “in which the geographic scale of the (potential) mobility of agents which the state needs to control in order to achieve its objectives exceeds that of its own territorial scale” (Cox 1993: 442). Since the nonsubstitutability of spatialized social relations for capital accumulation indicates that “alternative, and contingent, accumulation strategies have implications which are localizing rather than spatially emancipatory”, redefining the scale of state action attempts to establish – in often tentative and experimental ways – strategies and means for state policies to deal with the question “of local dependence and of the scale at which agents are locally dependent” (Cox 1993: 434). Accordingly, the scale of effective politics is seen as capable of realizing a nexus between the ‘spaces of dependence’ and the ‘spaces of engagement’ (Cox 1998) of economic policy actors. The issue of scale is redefined as that of establishing a spatial framework for social relations involving state and economy actors in the pursuit of their interests. The ‘politics of space’ thus involves a variety of experimental and contingent state-led attempts at regaining capacity of action through new forms of governance at the appropriate scale.

Accordingly, the notion of ‘rescaling’ emphasizes dynamics of change in the definition of the spatiality of policy and governance practices (Delaney and Leitner 1997; Swyngedouw 1997; Brenner 2000, 2003, 2004; Brenner et al. 2003; Jessop 2000, 2002), and, in particular:

- the relativization of space, that is, the emergence of factors, mechanisms and practices ‘subverting’ given assumptions on policy spaces;
- de-territorialization or the questioning of the fixity of formal-institutional spatial arrangements as well as their normative, functionalist or teleological assumption as ‘policy spaces’;
- re-territorialization through the emergence of contingent and experimental ‘action units’ or ‘policy spaces’.

Conceiving of geographical scales “as materially real frames of social action” and, as such, “historically mutable [...] products of social activity” (Smith 1995/2003: 228) underlines the idea that practices of rescaling are the expression of a significant phase of change in the role and structure of the state as a site of regulation. Geographic scales are the expression of struggles to redefine the ‘spatial fixes’ (Harvey 1985) for effective state modes of regulation.

These struggles reveal the contradictions of extant territorial structures and the logic of action that they express and reproduce. A tension between persistent and emergent spatial logics of regulation may emerge due to the institutional path dependency of established territorial structures (e.g., Brenner 2001a: 607). This tension may result in an increasing relativization of