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Abstract

Neoliberal globalisation is a ubiquitous phenomenon which significantly restructures local mechanisms, including cities, and determines their functions. Neoliberal globalisation contributes to urban discontent, which is often obscured until it erupts as urban conflict such as in the case of Paris in 2006 and the recent conflicts in the Arab spring, Turkey, Brazil and Sweden. This thesis is an attempt within planning theory to conceptualise the globalised city operation and its consequences in late capitalism. As a result of the implementation of market-oriented policies, the homogenisation of urban space and intensification of socio-cultural heterogeneity are identified as two controversial characteristics of the globalised city. This dissertation considers the influences of these trends on the creation of urban discontent and its symptoms, including socio-cultural conflict.

Consistent with the arguments of Lefebvre, this thesis contends that the traditional scientific-based approaches in planning are ontologically incapable of grasping the core of urban discontent. In planning, the deployment of alternative approaches, including that of post-structuralism, seems to be necessary in order to generate a better understanding of the globalised city operation and its consequences, in particular the intensification of urban conflict. To investigate urban conflict and its symptoms as an inherent consequence of neoliberal globalisation, this thesis considers Dubai which is known as the neoliberal utopia, at least before the economic crisis of 2008.

The deployment of critical notions of ‘assemblage’ and ‘desire’ by Deleuze, ‘normalisation’ by Foucault, and ‘lack’ and ‘jouissance’ by Lacan, assist in the investigation of the neoliberalised city’s reproduction of desires and normalisation of attitudes, both of which are intensifying the level of resident discontent. Drawing on Deleuze, this investigation reveals that the economic growth of the globalised city largely relies on the constant flows of capital, both human and financial. Through the implementation of city-marketing policies, decision-makers, including planners, largely endeavour to lure these vital flows by generating desires. Furthermore, Foucault’s (and Althusser’s) investigations demonstrate that capital accumulation in the capitalistic city is dependent on the effectiveness of its control apparatus. Thus, the thesis investigates the way in which planning functions as a component of this control apparatus. Nonetheless, the implementation of market-oriented policies also marginalises a large number of a global city’s residents whose pleas are often neglected. The deployment of Lacan’s work assists in exposing the production of urban discontent and its symptoms,
such as, the level of socio-cultural conflict in a globalised city whose operation is largely determined by hegemonic neoliberal globalisation.
“This idea struck me: the army is the body; I am the brain. Thinking is my fighting.”

Virginia Woolf, 1940
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Chapter One: Introduction

K. kept feeling that he had lost himself, or was further away in a strange land than anyone had ever been before.

(Franz Kafka, 2009)

1.1-Introduction

In his novel The Castle (2009 [1926]), the Czech author Franz Kafka described the discontent that had been generated in relation to changing social institutions and rapid urban transformation in liberalised cities at the beginning of the last century. Yet, discontent seems largely problematic in today’s globalised city, where socio-cultural patterns are increasingly becoming heterogeneous and where built environments are being homogenised as ‘nowhere’. This research is a post-structural exploration of contemporary city operation and its consequences, including the production of new desires, normalisation of its residents’ behaviour and intensification of discontent under the hegemony of global neoliberalism.

According to Sandercock (2000, p. 7), “[o]ur world is ethnically and culturally diverse, and cities concentrate and express that diversity”. At the same time, social conflict and antagonistic behaviour, particularly from marginalised socio-cultural minorities, increasingly occurs in globalised cities (Lehtovuori, 2010). The brutal conflicts between North African migrants and French police that occurred in Paris and its suburbs in 2006 are representative examples of this new phenomenon (Modood et al., 2006; Wiles, 2007). German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, declared that “multiculturalism policy has utterly failed” (Weaver, 2010, N.P). Moreover, the failure of European multicultural policies means the defeat of already implemented policies for normalising ethno-cultural minorities’ behaviours, including the large number of migrants who are often marginalised in isolated, ghetto-like neighbourhoods (Amelina & Faist, 2008; Carle, 2007).

The situation in globalised cities controlled by non-democratic governments, such as Dubai, where foreigners have no citizenship rights, is worse than in democratic countries (Lavergne, 2007, p. 270). In these countries, the recalcitrance of marginalised groups grounded in their discontent and discrimination and the disobedience of indigenous residents that repudiate totalitarian government
policies have been violently crushed. For example, in Dubai in 2009, South Asian labourers participating in protests against discrimination were brutally ejected from the country (Kanna, 2009a).

Yet, discontent and its symptoms, particularly for ethno-cultural groups, is a problematic issue in the globalised city. Scholars such as Marcuse (2005, 2009), Qadeer (2005) and Watson (2006), among others, have attempted to address and analyse phenomena such as segregation, marginalisation and polarisation as a new spatial order in the globalised city. Nonetheless, social manifestations such as that of social conflict demonstrate the significance of the intensification of discontent as an increasing challenge in the globalised city, requiring further investigation in planning theory.

Conversely, Florida’s (2002) investigation of American cities reveals that cultural diversity effectively generates new economic opportunities in globalised cities by attracting more foreign investment (capital) and talented migrants (human capital). Talented expatriates positively influence local production and consumption, which are increasingly tied to global trade networks. Further, Sassen’s (2002) global city research further supports the role of cultural diversity as a key factor in economic growth. Sassen (2002, p. 35) points out that the ranking of global cities in the universal trade network, as global trading hubs, corresponds with their socio-cultural heterogeneity. Vijver et al. (2008) stress that multiculturalism, as a successful policy, has been globally deployed for stimulating the process of economic growth. The implementation of multiculturalism as a strategic policy lures the creative class in response to market demands in global cities (Storper & Scott, 2009). However, while the positive effects of multiculturalism on the economies of cities are well defined, the side effects of this policy are generally concealed behind neoliberal misinterpretations.

The promulgation of multiculturalism as a market-driven policy inevitably intensifies socio-cultural heterogeneity in globalised cities, in which different socio-cultural groups have concentrated as a response to demands for such things as a higher standard of living and more enjoyment (Marcuse & Kempen, 2000, p. 8). Nonetheless, neoliberalism is a “utopia of unlimited exploitation” and exclusion (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 96). Unfulfilled demands, particularly among those minorities including socio-cultural groups that are generally neglected, marginalised or segregated in neoliberalised societies, generate antagonism (Dovey et al., 2009, p. 2610). By marginalising minorities, neoliberalism reproduces social contradictions between social groups, including socio-ethnical minorities, in
contemporary cities. Nonetheless, the accumulation of discontent in the globalised city is largely ignored, concealed or misinterpreted by many academics, especially those who are inclined to accept and legitimise neoliberal values.

This investigation considers multiculturalism as a consequence of the process of globalisation. This thesis will investigate the role of market-driven policies, including multiculturalism, as a causal factor in the intensification of social contradictions in the globalised city. To analyse the process of this reproduction of discontent, the failure of traditional scientific knowledge to fully engage with urban reality will be demonstrated. The potential of post-structuralism will be elucidated as an alternative approach and demonstrated to generate a more comprehensive understanding of urban discontent.

Further, this thesis investigates the standardisation of urban spaces as a consequence of land commodification under the hegemony of globalisation. Townshend and Madanipour (2008) point out that it is a global trend for cities to become physically similar. Built environments in cities are constantly being reshaped by international forces in collaboration with local dominant players, to maximise profit and minimise the risk of investment. It seems that globalisation, as a hegemonic trend, is regulating urban space globally, regardless of a city’s position in the global hierarchy (Marcuse & Kempen, 2000, p. 1). Despite socio-cultural diversity, market-oriented development projects that promise the highest benefits, such as immense shopping malls, luxurious hotels, residential complexes and other urban development projects, are well established in globalised cities (Sassen, 2009). Due to their success in attracting international investments, and by making more financial profits, these market-driven policies have been generally accepted as a successful model for urban development, and deployed by planning practices in cities around the world. Scholars such as Koolhaas (1995), Townshend and Madanipour (2008) and Olds (1995), among others, identify the resultant homogenisation of urban space in contemporary cities. Moreover, further investigation in planning theory is required into the consequences of this standardisation of urban space on the production of antagonism.

Market-oriented policies, including massive urban projects, promise greater enjoyment of urban spaces (Gunder, 2009; Haines, 2011). However, the implementation of these policies also accumulates discontent by excluding the participation of a large number of residents in the new spaces (Young, 1990, p. 234). Middle- and lower-class residents, including newcomers, generally
cannot afford to occupy, or frequent, the homogenised neoliberal spaces being produced such as shopping malls, luxurious residential apartments and entertainment centres that generate the utopian perceptions of globalised cities (Davis, 2006). Lehtovuori (2010) argues that the social conflicts that generally occur in globalised cities are embedded in this exclusion of a large number of a city’s inhabitants, which is inherently generated through the homogenising of urban spaces based on global market values. More importantly, at the same time, the symptoms of the standardisation of urban spaces are mostly either ignored or misinterpreted in the realm of academia, which is generally dominated by neoliberal rationality. This research will investigate the intensification of socio-cultural contradictions in globalised cities and argue that this is embedded in the hegemony of global neoliberalism and its consequences, including the homogenisation of spaces.

Contemporary planning has a significant role in the application of neoliberal values leading to the homogenisation of built environments and the intensification of discontent within cities around the world (Green & Griffith, 2002; Lehtovuori, 2010). Gunder and Hillier (2009), by investigating contemporary planning practice from a post-structural perspective, illustrate the way in which planners accept neoliberal values and legitimise market values in policies under the hegemony of neoliberal globalisation. By considering marginalisation, exclusion and segregation as consequences of implementing these neoliberalised planning polices in globalised cities, this research addresses the consequences of implementing market-oriented policies on the reshaping of built environments, as well as on their residents’ behaviour.

Both trends, toward the standardisation of urban spaces and intensification of socio-cultural diversity, are not historically new phenomena. Cultural interconnections, wars and colonialism have historically played roles in urban physical transformation (Graham, 2004). Cultural diversity in cities can be addressed as a historical reality; consider as representative examples of the historical socio-cultural heterogeneity of cities, the warriors and slaves who lived in ancient cities as foreigners or others, and the merchants who shaped the cities of the Middle Ages (Hirschman, 2004). However, physical separation between migrant neighbourhoods and indigenous residents’ settlements was the main characteristic of colonial cities, such as those founded by the French in Africa. Those cities were also fundamentally multicultural cities, in which European migrants lived with locals (Prochaska, 2004).
Socio-cultural contradictions were not problematic in historic cities due to their political hierarchies, in which discriminatory practices were embedded. These hierarchical systems had been established and aggressively protected by the dominant tribal, royal or aristocratic powers or by the predominance of one ethnicity over the rest. Historically, socio-political hierarchy systems generate physical segregation, such as occurred in the case of apartheid in South Africa (Worden, 2000) and the labour camps of Dubai (Ramos, 2010), in more recent times.

In the era of post-Fordism, international circuits of information, investment, migration and ideology stimulate the process of urban transformations, including the homogenisation of urban spaces and socio-cultural diversity (Amin, 1994, p. 3). Nowadays, multiculturalism, as one of a city’s economic drivers, at least in theory, means equal opportunities and enjoyment for all residents regardless of their ethnicity or cultural background (Florida, 2002, p. 754; Sandercock, 2003b, p. 321). Simultaneously, market-driven projects, by promising greater enjoyment, create place brands to lure expatriates into neoliberalised cities (Govers & Go, 2009; Gunder, 2009). This research will investigate the interconnectivity of these processes of the intensification of socio-cultural diversity and the homogenisation of the built environment because of hegemonic global capitalism.

The dissertation will investigate Dubai as a new global city, which has been shaped by international financial flows as a ‘nowhere’ (Prouty, 2009) and as one of the most socio-cultural diverse cities in the world (Kanna, 2009a). It will consider how the trends of standardisation of urban spaces and socio-cultural heterogeneity accumulate discontent in Dubai. This investigation will also reveal Dubai and its development model as a neoliberal mechanism that attracts expatriates to live in Dubai, while also regenerating discontent by excluding, segregating and marginalising large numbers of Dubai’s inhabitants (Davis, 2006). The deployment of post- and neo-structural perspectives such as those of Deleuze, Foucault and Lacan will assist in this consideration of Dubai and its development policies, which have been, at least until Dubai’s economic downturn in 2008, globally accepted as a successful model of urban development. Further, the thesis will address the inadequacy of scientific knowledge in the investigation of urban everyday life. Post-structural concepts are reviewed as methodologies of the research to introduce metaphors that will assist in the portrayal of new understandings of increasing socio-cultural conflicts in a globalised city.
Although this thesis is research in planning theory, it is also an investigation into the odyssey of the human being in the contemporary city, in which he/she finds him/herself in the middle of nowhere, while at the same time, having his/her behaviour normalised through interactions within adjusted local mechanisms under the hegemony of globalism. Thus, the reproduction of discontent, including residents’ alienation, as a challenge in the globalised city, seems important for further consideration in planning theory.

1.1.1-Globalisation, neoliberalism and contemporary cities

Globalisation has increasingly become a focal point in academic research. It is not a recent phenomenon in the context of history (Banerjee, 2008, p. 1). “Globalisation is a process that can be described in terms of flows, networks, capacities, distribution, diffusions, and movement” (Pizarro et al., 2003, p. 113). Population, capital, information and ideology movements are agents of globalisation (Pizarro et al., 2003, p. 112). Globalisation, as a process, inevitably affects cities and their inhabitants, whatever their position in the international global network hierarchy (Amen et al., 2006, p. 2). Increasingly, international flows restructure local social-political institutions, reshaping the contemporary city’s spatial spaces (Marcuse & Kempen, 2000, p. 2). This section briefly explains why globalisation and its impact on contemporary cities and its residents are important for further academic research in planning theory.

This research considers globalisation as a universal trend that implants, as its dominant ideology, the adoption of neoliberal values, through its encouragement of maximum levels of consumerism and enjoyment (Stavrakakis, 2008a, p. 101). Globally, neoliberalism, as a hegemonic ideology, restructures local socio-political and economical institutions and reshapes spatial spaces in contemporary cities in response to market demands. Drawing on Gramsci, under the hegemony of global neoliberalism, a certain way of life – that is, consumption and the making of greater financial profits for advanced enjoyment – is diffused throughout society to inform norms, values and tastes, political practices and social relations (Katz, 2006, p. 335). In other words, people’s behaviours are normalised through their interactions with adjusted institutions in regulated spaces based on the dominant ideology, which in the early 21st century is neoliberalism.

These neoliberal values generally materialise in the form of built environments and architecturally iconic buildings, such as luxurious hotels and immense shopping malls in globalised cities, as hubs of
consumerism and enjoyment. In other words, global forces, which are interested in higher profits for their investment, are regulating urban spaces to facilitate market operation; consequently “[c]ities [physically] seem to be becoming more similar” (Townshend & Madanipour, 2008, p. 327). Urban researchers view this trend as the homogenisation of a city’s built environments, such as through the standardisation of architectural buildings (Koolhaas, 1995, 2002; Townshend & Madanipour, 2008; Whitehand, 1987, 1992). By addressing the physical segregation of people as a consequence of the regulation of urban spaces based on market values, Marcuse and Kempen (2000, p. 249) denominate this phenomenon as “a new spatial order”. However, the consequences of regularising urban spaces in globalised cities based on dominant market values, including increasing socio-cultural heterogeneity and accumulating antagonism, have been largely neglected by contemporary planning investigations.

Under the hegemony of global neoliberalism, decision makers, including planners, are primarily concerned with generating new economic opportunities (Olds, 1995, p. 1714). Accordingly, the type of development projects that accrue the most financial benefit with the least perceived risk, such as shopping malls, entertainment centres and luxury residential projects, have proliferated in the contemporary city (Bagaeen, 2007, p. 175). Madanipour and Townshend (2008, p. 318) attribute this international process, which plays a central role in neoliberalising urban space, to four main actors: the global financial market, international steering agencies (such as the World Bank), developer interests and the design profession.

Concurrently, multiculturalism, as another consequence of globalisation, has recently been the subject of extensive research across a range of disciplines such as sociology, political studies, and economics (Benhabib, 2002; Castles, 2002; Castles et al., 2005; Guibernau & Rex, 2010; Parekh, 2000; Yiftachel, 2008). In contemporary urban planning research, cultural diversity in the globalised city has been well defined (Gunder, 2005b; Gunder & Hillier, 2009; Hillier, 2007; Rios, 2008; Sandercock, 2003b, 2005). However, multiculturalism has never previously been a core consideration within urban design practice (Cuthbert, 2006, p. 103). Under the process of globalisation, many cities have become progressively more culturally diverse. Indeed, Friedmann (2002, p. 157) indicates that multiculturalism is a defining characteristic of globalised cities. This thesis demonstrates the way in which neoliberalism, by regulating urban spaces based on market values, promises greater enjoyment to attract expatriates (human capital) for stimulating economic growth.
Stavrakakis (2008, p. 84) argues that “the emerging hegemony of consumerism, [as a dominant global value], cannot be explained without taking seriously the dimensions of desire and enjoyment”. Similarly, Žižek (1999, p. 5) identifies ‘surplus-enjoyment’ as a main driver of global neoliberalism, which promises happiness through material consumption. Yet, the potential of post-structuralism has not been fully deployed by researchers in planning theory to fully reveal this global mechanism that regularises urban space according to the neoliberal global aspiration of attracting both creative workers and investment capital to globalised cities. In other words, this research, by investigating globalisation as a series of material flows – both for investment and labour – driven by neoliberal values and its consequences for cities such as through the homogenisation of urban spaces and the intensification of socio-cultural diversity, will assist planners to comprehend the essence of these global trends and to generate a more informed understanding of urban reality in late capitalism.

The thesis critically investigates the increasing socio-cultural contradictions as one of the consequences of the hegemony of neoliberal globalisation. Based on critical theory, including post-structuralism, the thesis illustrates the consequences of implementing market-oriented policies, including regulating urban space, increasing socio-cultural diversity and accumulating increasing resultant discontent. This is particularly, the accumulation of antagonistic behaviours in relation to the intensification of socio-cultural heterogeneity and the standardisation of urban built form.

1.1.2 The failure of orthodox scientific knowledge to explain urban complexity

This section will briefly explain why post-structuralism is deployed in this dissertation instead of more orthodox social science methods that are more generally utilised to define urban phenomena. First, the inadequacy of science-based understandings in investing social phenomena is addressed. Then, the section explains how the deployment of critical theory, including post-structuralism, assists in the creation of a more insightful understanding of urban reality.

Critiques of scientific rationalism have been raised since the middle of the 20th century, due to its often failure to achieve its purpose; that is, the modelling, predicting and controlling of phenomena. Yet, scientific knowledge continues to dominate the academic and practice realm, including planning (Nowotny et al., 2001, p. 3). In response to the inadequacy of scientific methods, thinkers have endeavoured to redefine everyday life by drawing an alternative method.
Lefebvre (1991, 2003), Soja (1987; 2000) and Flyvbjerg (2001, 2004) demonstrate how the rational epistemological approach, which has generally dominated academic and practical realms, has failed to draw an adequate picture of urban phenomena. Academic disciplines, such as planning, geography, sociology and economics, have mostly attempted to fragment and simplify urban phenomena by scientific observation. Flyvbjerg (2001, p. 55) explains how social scientific knowledge is predicated on this epistemological model, derived from natural science, which fails to address the particular that actually constitutes urban space – what Lefebvre (1991) refers to as qualitative space. A reduction to modelable abstraction has been largely accepted by academia as a means to understand and conceptualise reality. To address urban complexity, urban scholars have endeavoured to formulate interrelationships between the simplified abstractions by deploying statistical formulas. Then, experimental results are generalised as a set of universal scientific rules, or models, of an *a priori* underlying of reality. Lefebvre (1991) indicates that these scientific attempts inherently fail to create an integrated understanding of urban phenomena. To address this deficiency, post-structuralism, which is generally located outside the methodological constraints of traditional empirically derived knowledge, attempts to draft a new understanding of the social world, predicated on the insight that any conception of reality is a social construct.

Yet, urban planners predominantly employ traditional scientific approaches to analyse, formulate and control urban phenomena. Planning, like other forms of scientific knowledge, is founded on empirical and rational approaches. These experimental methods are largely the result of analysing simplified and repetitive incidents. These models fragment the urban phenomena. Moreover, Soja (2000) explains that urban phenomena are so complicated that empirical models cannot entirely engage with the complexity of urban reality. Planning practices, which are based on this simplified model of reality, have had limited success (Lefebvre, 2004, p. 54). Such approaches actively present misrecognitions as reality (Žižek, 1989, p. 47). By embracing the scientific models and their simplified outcomes as urban reality, planners misinterpret everyday life.

Scientific-based policies are largely incapable of addressing the large number of residents’ concerns in the neoliberalised city. The deployment of quantitative models diminishes the various demands of residents in relation to homogenised city spaces based on hegemonic market values (Watson, 2006, p. 33). The process of neoliberalising a city’s space generates inherent discontent.
that cannot be addressed by prevalent scientific understandings, or even those derived from the traditional Marxist definition of social class struggles for surplus value (Žižek, 1999, p. 7).

Residents in the globalised city who cannot conform to the dominant neoliberal values are marginalised, or their cultural values are replaced by the imposition of these globally dominant values (Kanna, 2009a). Arguably, orthodox scientific knowledge, which is largely founded on the results of scientific observations, is ontologically incapable of distinguishing the hegemony of market values (Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 1). More importantly, these methods are incapable of addressing the consequences of the hegemony of neoliberal capitalism that are the root of social exclusion within contemporary cities. This research contends that the positivistic scientific methods generally deployed by planners are inadequate for investigating the accumulation of discontent in globalised cities and its symptoms, such as increasing antagonism.

Post-structuralists critically challenge the weakness of scientific methods in social science. Foucault observed that our understanding of the world differs from that of reality (Gutting, 2005, p. 64). Foucault refused to accept the naïve, simplified, fragmented use of abstraction as a means of social science to explain society. He believed that human disciplines, constituted as practices, should be judged in their institutional, practical and discursive context (Joseph, 2004, p. 144). By refuting the generalisation of scientific results, Foucault argued that phenomena are anomalous, so should be considered within their sole contexts (Flyvbjerg, 2005, p. 31).

Jacques Lacan (2006), the French post-Freudian psychoanalyst, also rejected the traditional epistemological method, particularly that of psychology. Firstly, for Lacan, the scientific method was inherently incapable of defining the psychological subject. Moreover, “[t]he Lacanian position contends that categorisation, in itself, gives a false illusion of knowledge and domination over a field of interest, no matter how much may have been excluded in its construction” (Leupin, 2004, pp. 53-54). Recently, Lacanian theory has been applied by several post-structuralists in political science, philosophy, geography and planning to the understanding of social phenomena (Allmendinger & Gunder, 2005; Gunder & Hillier, 2004, 2009; Stavrakakis, 1999, 2007; Swyngedouw, 2009, 2010; Žižek, 1989, 2000, 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2006a, 2006b). Lacan (1966, p. 119) argues that human subject identification is constructed by language, which uses signifiers connected together like a chain. The interaction between the human subject and the signifying chain is a continuous and
dynamic process (Lacan, 2006, p. 6). Yet, the interconnections between signifiers are broken by the very categorisation of the phenomena necessary for the deployment of the scientific method. Detached signifiers lose their particular meanings once segregated from their contexts.

Deleuze and Guattari (1991) also criticised the social science method for failing to effectively engage actual phenomena. From Deleuze and Guattari’s perspective, all elements are joined to each other in different scales and layers as part of a system. Scientific knowledge inevitably detaches the event from its pattern to interpret it as a singular event (Hillier, 2007, p. 24). Yet, all phenomena are part of a universally interacting system. Thus, the interaction of a subject, as part of society, cannot be considered singularly, but rather should be considered through its links to other elements. Hillier (2005, p. 124) argues that the scientific method inherently detaches events from their universal connections by measuring them with empirical scales like time, mass and distance. Thus, traditional scientific knowledge is inherently incapable of analysing and measuring the dynamic complexity suggested by Deleuze and Guattari’s worldview.

Accordingly, a post-structural perspective is deployed in this thesis to draft an understanding of urban phenomena and an attempt is made to avoid the limitations of traditional empirical knowledge in social science. This thesis employs a post-structural description of the interrelationships between individuals, socio-cultural values and urban space in contemporary cities, which are reshaped by international market forces. Urban spatial transformation is analysed, not only as physical homogenisation under globalisation, but also in terms of its relationship with increasing socio-cultural heterogeneity in the globalised city. The investigation contends and demonstrates that the impacts of the homogenisation of urban space under the hegemony of neoliberalism are mostly ignored, or at least misinterpreted, in traditional academic research. Moreover, in the research, the standardisation of urban space and its role in generating alienation and antagonistic behaviours linked to multiculturalism are defined from a post-structural perspective. The symptoms of discontent, such as segregation, marginalisation and alienation, are considered to understand who benefits and who suffers from the implementation of market-oriented policies under the hegemony of global neoliberalism.

A post-structural analysis deploying textual deconstruction provides a new understanding of the individual in the contemporary city. Foucauldian ideas are deployed to analyse the role of power in
progressively homogenising urban spaces and, consequently, normalising residents into docile bodies (Hvidt, 2009, p. 410). A Deleuzean perspective will be developed to represent how the built environment portrays itself as a neoliberal utopia, continuously regenerating new aspirations, such as entertainment centres and high lifestyle standards, thereby attracting the creative class to enjoy this new ‘dreamland’.

1.1.3- The neoliberal city and discrimination

The thesis investigates Dubai and its transformation from a fishing village into a global city. Dubai’s transformation is considered in its context, particularly in relation to its underlying ‘capitalism with Arabic tribal values’. The ruling family in Dubai, in collaboration with their international co-partners, implement market-oriented development policies under a tax-free regime to attract an expatriate workforce and international investment flows. Urban development policies, including urban projects, are deployed for ‘city marketing’ and ‘place branding’ (Davis, 2006; Govers & Go, 2009) to facilitate further inflows of expatriates. Dubai, with its gigantic urban projects, such as Burj Al-Arab and Al-Khalifeh tower, operates as a ‘desiring-machine’. Davis (2006, p. 53) reiterates that

[i]f there was no Burj Dubai, no Palm, no World, would anyone be speaking of Dubai today? You shouldn’t look at projects as crazy stand-alones. It’s part of building the brand.

This brand invokes foreigners to locate, work and invest in Dubai (Govers & Go, 2009, p. 88). Consequently, flows of investment and workforces generate new financial opportunities for the elite groups of Dubai, and particularly for the ruler as the de facto chief executive of Dubai. In this context, the neoliberal values of consumerism and greater enjoyment have inherently reshaped inhabitants’ behaviours and their desires (Elsheshtawy, 2008b, p. 968; Kanna, 2009a, p. 251). Yet, the utopian urban spaces of Dubai, which represent neoliberal aspirations, cannot respond to all residents’ demands. This neoliberal utopia has been established on the exploitation of a large number of labourers (Davis, 2006). Indeed, neoliberalism with its market values, as a hegemonic ideology, plays a major role in regenerating discrimination in globalised cities such as Dubai (Harvey, 2007).

To create a new understanding of contemporary urban operation, post-structural notions are used to investigate Dubai and its neoliberal model of development. By analysing planning practice in Dubai, including urban projects, this thesis addresses the consequences of implementing market-driven
policies, including the increased socio-cultural contradictions that they produce. This is an impact that has been largely ignored in the academic realm.

1.1.4-Aims/Objectives:

This research is an attempt in planning theory to generate a new understanding from a post-structural context about the operation of contemporary cities under the hegemony of global neoliberalism. In this context, two controversial urban phenomena – homogenisation of urban spaces and intensification of socio-cultural diversity – will be studied, not merely as consequences of globalisation, but also as phenomena that need to be deconstructed to reveal their historical and cultural foundations. The exposure of the root of these global trends will assist planners to a better understanding of everyday life and the issues arising in globalised cities. This profound understanding of contemporary city operation will help to mitigate the negative consequences of the implementation of market-based planning, including increased antagonistic behaviour, which this thesis will argue it tends to produce.

The two research objectives are clarified in the following section.

1.2-The research objectives

➢ To develop an understanding of the homogenisation of urban space under globalisation. This follows from Koolhaas’s (2002) observation of homogenising urban spaces, conceptualised as airport terminals. However, the stimulus of this global trend needs further investigation in planning theory to illustrate the role of regulatory planning in accelerating the neoliberalisation of urban spaces.

➢ To demonstrate the impacts of market-oriented policies, including massive urban projects, on intensifying socio-cultural heterogeneity in the neoliberalised global city. Through implementing market-driven policies, planning has a role in luring flows of investment and human capital into globalised cities. This function of planning has been largely neglected by academia.

1.3-The research questions

1) How are urban spaces regulated in the globalised city under the hegemony of neoliberal globalism?
2) What role do market-oriented planning policies, including massive urban projects, have in the homogenisation of urban space?

3) What role do market-driven policies, including urban projects, play in normalising residents’ behaviour?

4) Who benefits and who suffers as a consequence of the standardisation of urban space under the hegemony of global capital values?

5) How does discontent intensify as a consequence of the homogenisation of urban spaces?

6) How can urban planning mitigate the adverse impacts of market-oriented policies?

1.4-The case study of Dubai

Dubai as a global city has been chosen for consideration due to its being one of the fastest growing cities in the world (Pacione, 2005, p. 262). Moreover, “[t]he city of Dubai represents the truly generic condition of the contemporary city” (Katodrytis, 2005, p. 4). Over three decades, Dubai has emerged as a cosmopolitan city, in the south of the Persian Gulf. The population of Dubai grew from 183,000 in 1975 to 1,738,000 in 2009; and it is projected to reach 4 million by 2017 (The Government of Dubai, 2009). Economic opportunities attract immigrants from a variety of countries to Dubai. More than half of the people who had residency in 2000 were born abroad, and these statistics exclude the around one million workers who have a temporary visa, and the four million tourists who visit Dubai annually (Katodrytis, 2005; Pacione, 2005; The Government of Dubai, 2009). Prior to the economic downturn in 2008, this rapid development had made Dubai the biggest construction site in the world. During Dubai’s economic boom, Bagaeen (2007, p. 176) pointed out that “[a] fifth of the world’s cranes are now based in Dubai”. However, as a consequence of the world financial recession, the real estate market in Dubai is currently facing a deep crisis because of a lack of investment confidence and the corresponding lags in global investment flows (Toksoz, 2010, p. 197). Despite this, Dubai’s neoliberal development, which is generally based on the production of consumerism and entertainment activities, has never been comprehensively critiqued from a post-structuralist perspective in the academic realm.

Al-Shomali (Elaph, 2014) indicates "دبي هي مدينة الاحلام, مكان بديع للاستمتاع" [Dubai is a city of dreams, a great place to enjoy]. Dubai’s luxurious buildings, for example, represent a particular marketing activity relating to consumerism and enjoyment. Blain et al. (2005, p. 331) argue that “[t]he marketing
activities that support the creation of a name, symbol, logo, word mark or other graphic both identifies and differentiates a destination”. Dubai, as a world brand, has been known for its gigantic urban projects, which offer a luxury lifestyle based on consumerism and enjoyment (Jackson & Dora, 2009, p. 2087). In this context, architecturally iconic buildings, as the materialisation of neoliberal aspirations, generate the brand. Klingmann (2007, p. 28) states that architecture is often used as a strategic tool for economic and cultural transformation. Klingmann (2007, p. 28) adds that “[b]randing in architecture means the expression of identity, whether of an enterprise or a city”. The mega urban projects in Dubai, which are largely designed by international developers such as Halcrow, symbolise the global values of luxurious consumerism and enjoyment maximisation. In addition to place branding, these urban projects generate cultural transformation.

The process of place branding and cultural transformation is not desirable for all Dubai’s residents (Elsheshtawy, 2008b, p. 976). Some indigenous Arab residents criticise this process. From their point of view, the transforming of urban space symbolises a cultural change from Arabic tribal values to global neoliberal values. The built environment transformation in Dubai generates alienation among Arab residents (Elsheshtawy, 2008b). As the great Arab poet Adonis said:

The Minaret wept

When a stranger came – bought it

And built on top of it a chimney

(Elsheshtawy, 2008a, p. 1)

The alienation among Arab citizens in Dubai increases nostalgia for Arabic tradition. One observer said that the “Middle East represents [the] Middle of nowhere” (Elsheshtawy, 2008a, p. 1). The built environment, as a symbol of neoliberal values, plays a role in creating discontent in Dubai. Cultural insensitivity is often an underlying cause of the fundamentalist’s reactions (Hvidt, 2009, p. 410).

The globalised built environment has also been utilised as a tool to segregate residents based on their ethnicity, social class and gender (Davis, 2006; Elsheshtawy, 2008b; Kanna, 2009a). Labour camps, without any facilities, have been established outside Dubai’s city limits, and it is here that the large population of South Asian workers live (Davis & Monk, 2007). In this way, they are intentionally concealed from tourists and affluent consumers (Kanna, 2007, p. 8). Until recently, the transportation
system on the modern side of Dubai is largely based on the private car. The upper social classes who are able to afford the expense of a private car, or expensive taxi fares, can therefore use the high-standard facilities in the new developed area of Dubai (Elsheshtawy, 2010a, p. 218). A modern luxury metro line recently established in the city primarily connects the area’s landmark buildings; particularly luxury hotels to the huge shopping malls that are generally used by tourists and residents living in the new districts of the city (Decker, 2009, p. 204). A significant proportion of the resident population of Dubai is precluded from using many of the urban facilities produced by the city’s neoliberal model of urban development. Further, both invisible and visible gates, such as interior gates, long access roads to luxury hotels, CCTV cameras, and gated residential complexes and entertainment places, prohibit certain groups’ access based on their ethnicity or social class (Elsheshtawy, 2008b, p. 978). The demands of a substantial proportion of the city’s residents have thus been largely neglected in the process of urban development in Dubai (Davis, 2006, p. 68).

Dubai is a city-state controlled by Sheikh Al-Maktoum as a private company (Davis, 2006; Hvidt, 2009). The primary intention of this private company is to maximise wealth for its owner and his extended family, rather than for the residents of the city-state (Davis, 2006, p. 61). The royal family members manage the major development companies, such as Dubai World and Emaar (Kanna, 2009a, p. 106). Most of the indigenous Arab citizens, less than 10 per cent of the residents, work for the Dubai government on high salaries, and are in fact permanent employees of the “city-company” (Hvidt, 2009, p. 403). As an Arab citizen from Dubai points out, “[a] country is like [a] company. If it doesn’t make profit, it doesn’t succeed” (Kanna, 2009a, p. 109). More importantly, Dubai purchases its workforce from the international market, but these foreign workers are recognised as “temporary workers”. Foreigners cannot gain citizenship in Dubai, regardless of the years they live and work for the city-company (Elsheshtawy, 2010a, p. 213). Therefore, the foreign workforces live in the city-company, while they are needed and then are required to leave once their work has been completed. In this context, non-permanent residents are demeaned based on the dominant market values (Kanna, 2009a, p. 103). Workers improve their position in the city-company by making more profits for its owners and by avoiding becoming involved in any discrimination (Hari, 2009).

This thesis will investigate the role of the built environment in luring expatriates and foreign investment into Dubai through its marketing as a “dreamland” (Prouty, 2009, p. 2). It will also consider the urban projects and their consequences for the shaping of Dubai as a prosperous development
model. The deployment of critical ideas assists in illustrating why Dubai’s neoliberal development is incapable of responding to the demands of a large number of its residents, resulting in it being a place of desire and discontent.

1.5-Three post-structural concepts as the research methodologies

Three key methodologies are deployed in this thesis. These methodologies consider the globalised city from three perspectives: that of a place of desire (desiring-machine), as a controlling machine (normalising-machine) and as a city of dissatisfaction (antagonism-creator).

1.5.1-First methodology

As the first methodology, post-structural perspectives, such as those of Deleuze, Foucault, Lacan and Žižek relating to human subjective understanding, will be considered. Then, the dissertation will explore post-structural conceptualisations of space to clarify the role of the built environment in identification (Lawrence & Low, 1990, p. 466). This literature review will assist in outlining a new understanding of the effects of the homogenisation of urban space on residents’ behaviour in the globalised city (Rios, 2008, p. 217). This research will focus on the Deleuzian perspective to demonstrate the role of the neoliberalised built environment as the actualisation of materialised virtual aspirations to create new desires.

Theory: From a post-structural perspective, social and cultural values are mechanisms that continuously reshape the subject’s identity. The human subject is continuously collecting new values in interaction with others (Žižek, 2002a, p. 309). Human subjects continuously accept new identifications to be accepted by others in a particular role, such as that of a planner (Rendon, 2001, p. 338). Accordingly, “[i]dentity is something always in process” (Barker, 2008, p. 217). Consequently, the subject’s identity cannot be analysed as a separate phenomenon from his/her social context. Likewise, cultural values and social institutions are being continuously reformed by people. Post-structuralists, by analysing social constructs, endeavour to expose this dynamic interaction. In addition, space, as a social production, is not merely a physically independent phenomenon in post-structuralism. Thus, post-structuralists such as Foucault (1986) and Deleuze (1992) attempt to portray a new understanding of space and its interactions.
Lefebvre (1991) challenged the traditional understanding of space based on scientific knowledge. Lefebvre (1991, p. 5) argued that space is traditionally conceptualised to help the mental sphere of science dominate the social and physical realms. Lefebvre (1991, p. 16) argued that the three realms of the mental, physical and social should be considered together to give a better understanding of everyday life. Similarly, Foucault (1986) attempted to define space from a post-structural perspective, as a dynamic phenomenon. It inevitably depends on dynamic socio-cultural practices (Foucault & Miskowiec, 1986, p. 22). Foucault psychologically demonstrated the interaction of the built environment with social and cultural urban life (Mugavin, 1999, p. 96). In addition, Foucault expressed space as a place for the exercise of power (Gutting, 2005, p. 85). From the Foucauldian perspective, the subject in space can be defined in relation to the power of social constructions. Indeed, if the homogenisation of urban space can be interpreted as a normalisation process, then as Foucault observed “[n]ormalizing … is a peculiarly pervasive means of control” (Gutting, 2005, p. 85). Consequently, the regulation of urban space in the globalised city under neoliberalism can be interpreted as a controlling-machine.

In addition, space in the Deleuzian perspective is a fragmented realm composed of different layers, joined together in different scales, so that “[e]verything is linked to everything else” (Hillier, 2007, p. 15). Deleuze thus introduced a ‘folded space’, where interrelationships among various fragments continuously create new understandings (Crysler, 2003, p. 59). Deleuze and Guattari described the built environment as a desiring-machine. People represent their aspirations in connection to their fragmented social life in the context of the built environment (Hillier, 2007, p. 106). In this context, this thesis will investigate the role of the built environment, as a ‘desiring-machine’, for attracting foreign investment and expatriate workforces to Dubai.

### 1.5.2-Second methodology

A second approach will review the development policies, including urban development projects, as controlling tools of the built environment in connection with institutions of powers in Dubai (Dovey et al., 2009, p. 2598; Rose, 2001). The research will review the literature pertaining to planning theory to clarify the way in which contemporary planning operates based on global neoliberalism as the dominant ideology. This section will also define how planners generally legitimise market-driven policies to gain acceptance from Dubai’s elite and to achieve greater financial benefit and enjoyment.
This review will investigate the role of market-driven development policies in Dubai, which are often deployed as tools to regenerate financial opportunities (Peck & Tickell, 2002, p. 389; Pløger, 2001b, p. 230). In particular, in this study, urban development projects for Dubai will be investigated to reveal the role of decision makers in generating neoliberalised urban spaces as a “city-factory” (hereafter, city-machine) (Brenner & Theodore, 2002, p. 345). The deployment of a Foucauldian perspective will explain how homogenised urban spaces, as a “homogenising-factory”, normalise residents’ behaviour by expanding constant surveillance in the globalised city.

**Theory:** Planning theory has been extensively engaged in the externalities of planning under globalisation, including from the post-structuralist perspective (Flyvbjerg, 2001; Hillier, 2007; Neill, 2004; Pløger, 2008; Roy, 2009; Yiftachel, 2005). Yet, the urban design profession has largely neglected, or has been incapable of identifying, the consequences of implementing market-based policies, including urban projects (Cuthbert, 2005, 2006). The visual representation of urban projects, as an epistemological activity, in the form of maps and 3D imagining, does not reveal their underlying socio-cultural values (Banerjee, 2009; Day, 2003; Talen, 2009). Moreover, the rational models deployed to demonstrate the feasibility and viability of projects, cannot adequately illustrate urban reality. Since the role of urban development projects is to create opportunities to lure investment and human capital (Madanipour, 2006, p. 183), planners, including urban designers, should ask themselves: Who benefits and who loses from the implementation of market-oriented policies. Until now, consideration of this question has been rare (Cuthbert, 2006; Flyvbjerg, 2001).

Dubai, by its connection to the global market, has become the trading and entertainment hub of the Middle East (Acuto, 2010, p. 276). Its urban space has been reshaped through this universalising trend toward homogenisation (Madanipour, 1997, p. 16). Towers, shopping malls and luxury residential buildings were initially built in Dubai in the 1970s and 1980s to respond to the demands of new arrivals who worked mainly in the international oil companies in the region. From the middle of the 1990s, Dubai’s government allowed foreign investment in Dubai’s real estate market. Further, the government implemented persuasive policies, such as guaranteeing the financial profit of foreign investment in urban development projects. During its economic boom, Dubai attracted international investment in its massive urban projects. Thus, Dubai achieved the fastest rate of urban transformation in the world; transitioning from a fishing settlement to a cosmopolitan city of one million inhabitants in only half a century. Accordingly, Katodrytis (2005, p. 3) stressed that “[e]verything is
recent in Dubai”. Dubai has emerged as an instant global city. It has largely been constructed within only the last three decades (Bagaeen, 2007) and represents itself as an exemplar of ‘city’ in the global era. However, following the world economic crisis in 2008, this growth has come to a sudden halt; market values, particularly values in the real estate sector, have decreased rapidly. The bubble of this global city has burst. This research will consider Dubai as a consequence of the dominant neoliberalism and ask: Who has actually benefited and who has lost in Dubai?

1.5.3-Third methodology

The deployment of the Lacanian/ Žižekian concepts of ‘lack’ and ‘enjoyment’ will assist in demonstrating the subliminal effect of the homogenisation of urban space as a factor in recreating discontent and its symptoms, such as antagonistic behaviour, in the neoliberalised city (Prouty, 2009, p. 5). By investigating Dubai’s development policies, including its massive urban projects, the thesis will illustrate how regulating urban spaces based on global market values generates adverse effects in a multicultural society, including discrimination and alienation (Davis, 2006; Hari, 2009; Kanna, 2009a). The homogenised urban space, as a materialisation of neoliberal aspirations, inherently segregates residents according to their ethnicity, social class and gender (Elsheshtawy, 2010a, p. 218). This segregation occurs using visible and invisible gates and barriers, which are inherently produced by urban projects and plans. The segregation creates discontent among the large population of excluded middle and lower class residents, on which Dubai’s development is dependent (Elsheshtawy, 2008b, p. 978). The labour camps, situated outside Dubai, are existing representative examples of segregation. Yet, this segregation is actually much more fragmented throughout the city’s urban form; for example, as seen in the settlement of low and middle social classes of Indians, Pakistanis and Filipinos in the old part of the city (Bar Dubai and Deira), built in the 1980s and early 1990s. In contrast, most European and some other ethnicities, who have higher salaries, live in luxurious residential apartments in the newly developed districts, such as Dubai Marina (Elsheshtawy, 2010a, p. 265). As a corollary, neoliberal urban development separates Dubai’s residents into different residential zones according to their ethnicity and social class.

The urban development projects, which inherently represent a globalised nowhere, are not desirable for many Arab citizens (Elsheshtawy, 2008a, p. 3). This neoliberalised urban space will be evaluated not merely as a physical phenomenon, but also as a factor that can reshape and adversely
influence local socio-cultural values (Smith, 2002, p. 265). Also considered will be the way in which most residents displace and normalise their diverse values into those of universal neoliberal values to be accepted into the dominant neoliberal system, to better their positions in the ‘city-company’ (Kanna, 2009a, p. 115). However, the neoliberal values, which are materialised by the market-oriented policies and projects in Dubai, are not compatible with local Arabic tribal customs and traditions. This globalised urban space consequently generates alienation among conservative Arab citizens, who look to Dubai as a “sin-city” (Hazbun, 2006, p. 213). This research will reveal the production of discontent and its symptoms, including alienation, in the neoliberalised urban spaces of Dubai. This alienation, as the consequence of the implementation of market-oriented policies, may be the cause of some radical activities as a symptom of discontent (Hari, 2009; Kanna, 2009a).

In this context, the research will consider the effects of the homogenisation of urban space in Dubai. However, discrimination, exploitation and alienation in Dubai are largely prohibited subjects of research (Davis, 2006; Kanna, 2007). The ruling family, as the city-state owner, in conjunction with international institutions of power, control the information media inside Dubai and exert influence over the media outside the city-state (Kanna, 2009a, p. 108). The Dubai government bans the publication of news about discrimination, or any other “antagonistic” reactions against the system (Hari, 2009). The antagonistic reactions towards segregation, discrimination and alienation, such as protesting or the occupation of luxury buildings by labourers or Arab citizens, are generally censored in the media by the government to prohibit adverse effects on the image of the city-state to the world as a desired place (Lee & Jason, 2009, p. 313). Temporary labourers that participate in protests are forced to leave Dubai (Davis & Monk, 2007, p. 65). The government also penalises indigenous Arab citizens who criticise government policies; and they are also often forced to leave (Hari, 2009; Kanna, 2009a).

This investigation of the consequences of the urban transformation of Dubai will constitute a further understanding of urban reality in the global era. In the context of neoliberalism, planners, including urban designers, largely accept and legitimise the neoliberal global model of development for cities. This thesis will demonstrate the negative effects of this model by considering Dubai and its neoliberal development. Accordingly, the understanding will help planners to recognise and then reduce the adverse effects of market-oriented planning practice, which inherently creates discontent in globalised cities as an “antagonism-creator”. This can be seen in the case of Dubai, under the hegemony of global neoliberalism.
1.6-Thesis structure and chapter summaries

Chapter One: This chapter introduced the problem of the research; that is, that the implementation of market-oriented policies, including massive urban projects, intensifies discontent in the globalised city. This chapter defined why this problem is significant and why traditional scientific approaches are unable to engage with this phenomenon. Specifically, symptoms of dissatisfaction are misinterpreted by traditional epistemological models. The research’s objectives and questions were also clarified in this chapter.

Chapter Two: The second chapter will reveal the necessity of applying critical theory, including post-structuralism, in planning by addressing the inadequacy of the prevalent scientific approaches, such as positivistic understandings. It will review the notions of the post-structuralists Lacan, Deleuze, Foucault and Žižek, to shape the dissertation’s theoretical framework.

Chapter Three: This chapter will clarify the notion of globalisation and its impacts on the local socio-cultural, economic and political systems that reshape the contemporary city. Further, the thesis will investigate the intensification of socio-cultural heterogeneity and the standardisation of urban spaces as consequences of globalisation.

Chapter Four: Based on Deleuze, this chapter will conceptualise contemporary city operation as a “city-assemblage”. Further, it will elucidate how city-assemblage relies on luring flows of capital and creativity. Thus, regenerating new aspirations is imperative for the capitalistic city as a ‘desiring-machine’. Based on Foucault’s work, this chapter will also reveal how the contemporary city normalises its residents’ behaviour.

Chapter Five: This chapter will consider the intensification of discontent as a consequence of neoliberalised city operation. By deploying Lacan’s work, the root of the antagonistic behaviours is demonstrated as a symptom of discontent in the globalised city.

Chapter Six: By investigating Dubai and its neoliberal development, this chapter will reveal how local mechanisms are readjusted to operate effectively as a component of global capitalism. The conceptualised notions in Chapters Four and Five will apply to create a better understanding of Dubai as the neoliberal utopia; at least before its economic downturn in 2008.
Chapter Seven: Based on the previous chapters’ findings, this chapter will endeavour to address the research objectives and respond to the research questions.

Chapter Eight: The conclusion will examine the thesis in the context of the objectives and questions of the research. It will discuss the primary challenges encountered in writing the thesis and identify the potential for further investigations in planning based on the research achievements.

This thesis will consider the neoliberalised city and its operations, including those of desiring-machine, normalising-machine and antagonism-intensifier. In analysing the social manifestations of segregation, marginalisation and exclusion in neoliberalised urban spaces, the thesis will consider the socio-cultural contradictions of the neoliberalised global city. It will demonstrate how, and with what implications, contemporary planning practice plays a role in the creation of social conflict, as a symptom of discontent, in globalised cities. The results of the research will assist planners to mitigate the adverse effects of the implementation of market-driven policies, including massive urban projects.
Chapter Two: Positivism, post-structuralism and urban conflict

*Truths are illusions of which we have forgotten that they are illusions, metaphors which have become worn by frequent use and have lost all sensuous vigour.*

(Nietzsche, 1999)

2.1-Introduction

This chapter will review critical theory, particularly post-structuralism, as the theoretical core of this dissertation. Its findings will be utilised in the following chapters to conceptualise the globalised city operation in the era of late capitalism. The reviewed post-structural notions such as ‘assemblage’, ‘normalisation’ and ‘lack’ will assist in answering the research questions in general and research question number two, regarding the homogenisation of urban space, question three, regarding the normalisation of attitudes and question five, regarding the accumulation of discontent and the standardisation of urban space.

The first section will reveal the necessity of the deployment of critical theory, including post-structuralism, in contemporary planning, as a reflection of the inadequacy of the prevalent positivistic approaches when considering urban phenomena, including the socio-cultural contradictions that urban phenomena produce under globalisation. The second section will review structuralism as the progenitor of post-structuralism and consider its impacts on contemporary planning. The subsequent sections will consider the selected ideas of Foucault (knowledge/power and normalisation), Deleuze (knowledge/desire and other concepts), Lacan (knowledge/lack and other key concepts) and Žižek (knowledge/ideology and enjoyment) that will shape the theoretical framework of the thesis.

Planning, as a production of modernism, operates to underpin the status quo (Allmendinger, 2001; Hillier, 2002). Planning is a bureaucratic instrument that functions as a component of the state apparatus, and its regulative capacity is largely deployed for expanding control over space and everyday life (Foucault, 1991). Global neoliberalism, as the hegemonic ideology, determines the state and its components, including planning, in the era of late capitalism. However, traditional scientific methods are ontologically incapable of identifying the impacts of global neoliberalism on
contemporary planning. Planning theorists largely endeavour to generate new understandings of problematic urban issues by revealing the failures of scientific-based planning practices in investigating space and everyday life (Friedmann, 2011). The deployment of critical theory often assists planning theorists to demonstrate the failures of contemporary planning, when it operates as a component of the hegemonic neoliberalism (Fainstein, 2000; Gunder & Hillier, 2009; Sager, 2013).

The contemporary city’s dependency on the global network intensifies urban complexity. Globalisation, as a ubiquitous process, modifies the contemporary city and its components. For example, immigration flows dramatically change the demography of the contemporary city, and in turn expand socio-culturally heterogeneity (Sassen, 1996). Watson (2006) emphasises that socio-cultural diversity has been one of the most challenging issues in human science, including planning. According to Healey (1997, p. 3), planning is “managing our co-existence in shared space”. The intensification of socio-cultural diversity in the contemporary city is one of interest to planners. “The future of planning is inseparable from the future of cities and the challenges facing them” (Sandercock, 2000, p. 202). Socio-cultural conflict will potentially be the most problematic issue for globalised cities of the future. By widening the conflict of interests, the economic recession in 2008 has expanded socio-cultural contradictions in the contemporary city. Thus, the necessity for further investigations pertaining to socio-cultural diversity in planning theory has been experienced.

Critical thinking, with its capacity for the analysis of socio-cultural phenomena, may assist planning theorists to create better theoretical frameworks pertaining to socio-cultural conflict in globalised cities (Stavrakakis & Chrysoloras, 2006). This chapter will review post-structuralism and its capacity for analysing urban phenomena, including that of antagonism. Then, based on these findings, this dissertation will develop a new understanding of globalised city function and its consequences, including the intensification of discontent and its symptoms, which produce social-cultural conflict.

2.2- Post-structuralism, planning theory and new challenges in the contemporary city

This section will demonstrate the necessity of the deployment of critical theory, such as post-structuralism, in planning by revealing the general inadequacy of the traditional approach of positivistic social science for investigating urban issues, including urban conflict, in late capitalism.
Davoudi (2011) recognises two distinct ways of conceptualising space in social science, including planning: the positivist and the interpretive traditions. Positivism has been traditionally the dominant system of truth in academia (Rawlinson, 1987; Sandercock, 1998). From a positivistic perspective, the world operates according to absolute laws which can be discovered through empirical observations. The empirical approach “starts from the sense and particulars and gradually raises up to the most general axioms” (Davoudi, 2011, p. 430).

The interpretive tradition has challenged the hegemony of positivism in social science (Davoudi, 2011). This rival position has offered an alternative to the naturalist view of the world; one which considers knowledge to be a matter of understanding rather than explanation. Unlike positivism, the interpretive position distinguishes between social and natural science. Hollis (2003, p.16) states:

Its central proposition is that the social world must be understood from within, rather than explained from without. Instead of seeking the causes of behaviour, we are to seek the meaning of action. Actions derive their meaning from the share ideas, rules of social life, and are performed by actors who mean something for them.

The following subsection will comprehensively consider the effects of positivism on planning. After considering positivism, the rest of this section will investigate structuralism and then post-structuralism in the context of the interpretive tradition.

In planning, the adherents of positivism perceive urban space as a neutral container which must be understood through empirical observations. In this context, they consider urban space and its social interactions as objective, bounded and measurable (Davoudi, 2011). In contrast, in the interpretive view, space is relational, dynamic and multiple. Space does not exist as an independent from the concept, apart from the objects within it; rather it is shaped by the relations between objects. Lefebvre (1991) states that social and cultural processes and substances shape space. The adherents of the interpretive tradition endeavour to define space based on its “fluidity, reflexivity, contingency, connectivity, multiplicity and polyvocality” (Davoudi & Strange, 2009, p. 37).

Further, Foucault (1991) observes that the primary intent of planning is to extend control over urban space by regulating it. Positivist planning intends to discipline space in order to expand control over space “by discovering all its secrets, including those related to humanity” (Davoudi, 2011, p.
Nonetheless, Osborne and Rose (1999, p. 732) indicate that the aspiration to control space inherently encompasses a conceptualisation of truth about the city. Positivistic truth has its origin in modernity and the Enlightenment project. Under the hegemony of global capitalism, positivistic understanding is promoted as the sole truth. Yet, from the interpretive perspective, space is perceived as a multiple of overlapping networks with constant flows of people, capital and ideas. The recognition of connectivity and dependency between components is the core interest of the interpretive tradition. Based on Lefebvre’s *trialectic of spatiality*, “interpretive planning considers space as analytically conceived, physically lived and culturally perceived” (Davoudi, 2011, p. 434). Thus, space, in this view, cannot be defined and then controlled completely.

Lefebvre (1991), Flyvbjerg (2001), Sandercock (2005), Gunder (2010a) and Hillier (2007) acknowledge that the positivistic approach embedded in natural science is often inadequate in the analysis of urban everyday life. Planning theorists such as Gunder (2010a), Hillier (2007), Flyvbjerg (2001) and Pløger (2008) have deployed critical theories to generate new understandings of contemporary planning and its role in the neoliberalised society.

This thesis considers the neoliberalised global city and its products, including the production of desires, the normalisation of attitudes and the intensification of socio-cultural contradiction that the globalised city produces. Nonetheless, positivistic social science, based on model-construction and reliant on quantitative methods, is inadequate for investigating the contemporary city and its products. This chapter will reveal these failures of the prevalent positivistic social science in the investigation of the contemporary city, including the positivistic definition of space as a neutral container and its synoptic understanding of the complexity of social behaviour. The following sections will reveal the necessity of the interpretive tradition, particularly post-structuralism, for generating an alternative understanding of the neoliberalised global city and its functions in late capitalism.

**2.2.1-Positivistic social science and its impacts on planning**

Increasing critiques challenge the deployment of positivistic social science and its results. However, the positivistic approach continues to dominate in social science (Clegg, 2006; Davoudi, 2011; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Lake, 1993). In the planning realm, Flyvbjerg (2004, p. 285) states “[p]lanning research practiced as ‘episteme’ would be basic science aiming at universality and searching for generic truths or laws about planning … this type of research has contained strong elements of
positivism and rationalism”. It is thus essential to distinguish between rationalism and positivism before continuing with any discussion of positivism. Although both views originated in the naturalist tradition, which considered the scientific method as the appropriate way of defining causal relations in both natural and social phenomena, rationalists perceive knowledge to underlie theories and laws *a priori*, whereas, empiricists believe knowledge is a matter of experience *a posteriori* (Hollis, 2003). In this context, Hume defined rationalism as a “relation of ideas” and positivism as “matters of fact” (Davoudi, 2011, p. 430). Chapter Five will consider rationalism, including Habermasian’s communicative rationality, and its effects on contemporary planning. This section primarily investigates positivistic social science as a dominant approach in planning.

Comte, the French philosopher, initially coined the term ‘*positivism*’ by employing natural-based approaches for investigating social phenomena. For Comte, empirical science is the realm of the positive, or of reality and truth (Ross, 1997). “The overall aim of positivism was to boost the claims of science as the one and only true approach to understanding the world, including the social world” (Belsey, 2010, p. 553). Thus:

Comte suggested that scientists must eschew the metaphysical and theological realms and restrict their investigations to observable facts and relations that hold among observed phenomena. Within this finite sphere of the empirically observable, scientific inquiry could discover the laws governing the empirical events. (Hawkeworth, 2006, p. 168)

Belsey (2010, p. 553) stresses that positivism is:

[a] doctrine which combines a number of theses about the nature of knowledge and reality. As with all philosophical theories there is much debate about its own nature although the following indicate its major theses: 1- What really exists is what can be experienced by the senses or what is susceptible to experimental manipulation. 2- This reality is the subject matter of science. 3- Only scientific knowledge is genuine knowledge. 4- Non-scientific cognitive claims, such as those of myth, religion, and metaphysics, are idle and spurious.
Positivism has a long history in planning, and remains highly influential (Davoudi, 2011; Flyvbjerg, 2004; Morçöl, 2001). Based on the “positivist tradition and its emphasis on the sole validity of objectified, systematised knowledge couple with a clear separation of facts from values”, the adherents of positivistic planning endeavour to find universal solutions for urban issues (Healey, 1992, p. 9). Although, Innes and Booher (2010) assert that interpretive approaches such as communicative planning and collaborative planning have overtaken positivism since the 1980s, Morçöl’s empirical investigation (2001) demonstrates that positivism still prevails in planning. Lake (1993) observed that new technologies, such as the analytical software ArcGIS, expand positivism in planning.

The adherents of positivism contend that their scientific-based understandings are politically neutral due to technical neutrality (Lake, 1993). Flyvbjerg’s book Making Social Science Matter (2001) reveals how positivistic approaches are deployed in social science, including in planning, to obscure the political purposes of dominant groups. For example, public choice theory and behaviourism as subsets of positive political theory are theorised to scientifically model voters, politicians and bureaucrats’ interests and behaviours to redirect them in more profitable ways (Schram, 2006).

Giddens (1993, p. 145) distinguishes between natural science and social science understandings through his notion of the “double hermeneutic”:

The natural sciences have plainly increased our capabilities of controlling the material contexts of our activities. For surely one cannot make a parallel claim for social science? … But the concepts of the social sciences [including planning] are not produced about an independently constituted subject-matter, which continues regardless of what these concepts are. The findings of the social sciences very often enter constitutively into the world they describe.

From Gidden’s (1993) perspective, positivistic social science, including planning, is mostly unable to recognise that the concepts that are used and also generated through their investigations are constructed within and by the dominant ideology. Thus, the necessity for alternative understandings in planning theory, as a part of social science, seems to be crucial to mitigate the ineffectiveness of scientific approaches, and to enable better planning in globalised cities (Byrne, 2003, p. 172).
Further, the deployment of the positivistic approach “enables one to create an illusion of consensus in both theory and reality ... those voices that might disturb the consensus by raising issues that cannot be answered within the causal, objectivist apparatus must be ignored” (Clegg, 2006, p. 177). The capacity of positivism has been deployed in planning for generating consensus, which has become indispensable for the implementation of urban policies since after the Second World War (Batty, 2013). However, the adherents of positivism accentuate the technocratic role of planning in the process of decision making. Inherently, their positivistic understandings are political.

Based on Foucault’s work, Flyvbjerg (2001) notes the inadequacy of positivistic approaches in recognising the effects of the dominant power in decision-making processes. Drawing on Beck’s conceptualisation of the risk society, Gunder (2008) explains the disillusionment with positivist science. Gunder (2008, p. 189) stresses that “[c]ore to planning is the provision, or at least the appearance of provision, of future certainty in a complex, unstable, dynamic and inherently uncertain world”. Further, in Planning in Ten Words or Less, Gunder and Hillier (2009) demonstrate how contemporary planning, especially via positivistic and rationalistic approaches, often obscures the failures of the state to achieve its stated objectives by providing fantasies of security and certainty.

The epistemologist and philosopher of science, Karl Popper, in his influential book Conjectures and Refutations (1963), challenged the rigour of most positivistic understanding. He conceptualised the notion of falsification, as core to the scientific method, in which a researcher should investigate for facts that are inconsistent with the proposed theory (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000).

Popper’s account of scientific method insisted that any scientific inquiry was first of all driven by some belief or hypothesis about the world. The role of empirical investigation was then to test the veracity of the belief or hypothesis by – according to Popper – examining critically the belief or hypothesis (i.e. attempting to falsify it), so that only those hypotheses which withstood critical testing survived as credible theories. (Taylor, 1998, pp. 69-70)

From the Popperian perspective, the test of falsification, based on the testing of risky prediction, corroborates the theory which can be accepted as the truth. Thus, positivistic scientific knowledge must advance by conjectures and refutations, yet in practice, these are not always the case (Popper, 1963).
Further, in *Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962), Kuhn challenged the hegemony of positivism in social science and engaged post-positivism approaches to social theory (Caldwell, 2003). By reviewing the history of natural science, Kuhn argued that science is entangled in views (paradigms) of reality which shape knowledge of a subject. “In place of positivist and Popperian perspectives that emphasised rigorous scientific method in the search for ‘truth’, Kuhn sought to place scientific activity within a social and historical context dominated by paradigms of accepted knowledge” (Allmendinger & Tewdwr-Jones, 2001, p. 6). Eventually, however, observations will not fit into the dominant paradigm’s theories. These observations are called *anomalies*. These anomalies challenge the dominant understanding and also generate crisis within the discipline (Kuhn, 1962). As a result, they produce new and widely divergent theories. For Kuhn, new theories, new methodologies, new points of views are the primary resources of new paradigms which may reshape the existing knowledge, particularly in social science (Golinski, 1998).

The incapability of positivism in investigating social phenomena persuaded scholars to develop alternative methods, such as post-positivism, post-modernism and post-structuralism (Allmendinger & Tewdwr-Jones, 2001). In contrast with positivistic understanding, post-positivists believe that human knowledge relies on theories, background, knowledge and values of the researcher which influence significantly what is observed and understood as the truth. Like positivists, the adherents of post-positivism presume that a reality exists, but that it cannot be fully known. Allmendinger (2001b, p.6) states “[p]ost-positivism does not mean turning away from experience but it does mean a more contextualised and historic appreciation of how that experience is interpreted”. However, post-positivists largely attempt to identify and mitigate the limitations of positivism, but, due to the inherent limitations of empirical-based approaches, post-positivism is incapable to reveal the role of power, desire and ideology in shaping knowledge (Glynos & Howarth, 2007).

The following sections consider the various limitations of the deployment of positivistic approaches in planning. Natural-based methods are illustrated as largely incapable of addressing urban complexity in late capitalism. The failure of the scientific method to fully recognise the core of socio-cultural conflict will also be considered, as one of the most challenging issues in cities.
2.2.2-Post-structuralism, or after structuralism

Post-structuralism is embedded in critical responses to scientific pretensions, and particularly those of structuralism, which was an important school of thought in social science in the 1950s and 1960s (Balarin, 2008). According to Sturrock (2003, p 123), “[p]ost-structuralism’ is not ‘post’ in the sense of having killed Structuralism off, it is ‘post’ only in the sense of coming after and of seeking to extend structuralism in its rightful direction”. Sturrock (2003, p. 123) adds that “[p]ost-structuralism is a critique of structuralism conducted from within: that is, it turns certain of structuralism’s arguments against themselves and points to certain fundamental inconsistencies in their method which structuralists have ignored”. In the deconstruction context, Derrida (1987, p. 137) argues that the ‘post’ in ‘post-structuralism’ does not simply mean ‘after’. Instead, the ‘post’ means ‘with but also different’. Thus, for defining post-structuralism, ‘structuralism’ should be reviewed first.

Structuralism was first established by Saussure as a scientific approach to linguistics, which largely focused on investigating linguistic structure and its elements. Saussure’s method influenced the human science studies of others, such as the anthropological and cultural studies of Levi-Strauss, the political studies of Althusser and the studies of psychology of Lacan (Olssen, 2003).

Saussure (1983, p 133) defined the core of structuralism in linguistic as follows: “a language is a system in which all the elements fit together, and in which the value of any one element depends on the simultaneous co-existence of all the others”. Saussure suggested that structuralism in linguistics is a method embedded in the recognition of language structures and the categorisation of languages by their structural differences. Thus, Saussure assumed that by analysing structures and addressing the differences and similarities between the laws relating to elements and their relationship to the laws relating to other structures, the researcher would be able to scientifically recognise the characteristics of the whole system. In this context, Best and Kellner (1991, p.19) argue that “[s]tructuralists seek to describe social phenomena in terms of linguistic and social structures, rules, codes and systems, and to develop grand, synthesising theories”.

From a structural perspective, signs are arbitrary; hence, understanding the relation between a sign and its referent is not necessary. Thus, elements, with their interconnections within the system and its structure, find particular meaning. In other words, as opposed to atomism and individualism, structuralism defines a sign in relation to the whole structure within a system (Olssen, 2003). In this

way, relations between signs create their meanings. Structuralists assume that the meaning of signs will be understood by recognising the rules of a structure and the relationship between the signs within it. “[S]tructure is an abstract model of organisation, including a set of elements and the law of their composition” (Sturrock, 2003, p. 6). Thus, structuralism endeavours to simplify social structures to identify relations and principles in a system.

From the structuralist perspective, even human ideas and perceptions are the product of structures. Saussure (1983, p. 110) acknowledged that:

[in itself, thought is like a swirling cloud, where no shape is intrinsically determinate. No ideas are established in advance, and nothing is distinct, before the introduction of linguistic structure the connections with the language structure shape people perceptions and knowledge about the world.

By investigating linguistic structures, structuralists attempt to realise empirically how people make sense of the world; this is as opposed to investigating the nature of the world and then categorising people’s perceptions by analysing their linguistic structures based on similarities and differences (Radford & Radford, 2005, p. 65). Similarly, Pacione (2009, p. 27) stated that “[s]tructuralism is a generic term for a set of principles and procedures designed to expose the underlying causes of the revealed pattern of human behaviour”.

Structuralism has not only been deployed in linguistics, but also in other social sciences, such as sociology, political economy and anthropology, as a new way of analysing everyday life (Bourdieu, 1968). In the structural context, a socio-cultural process is usually defined as the operation or structural modification of systems. Best and Kellner (1991, p. 19) state that “[s]tructuralism focuses on the underlying rules which organise phenomena into social systems and aims at objectivity, coherence, rigour and truth”. In other words, structuralism generally promises a new conceptualisation of the humanities and social science, founded on the recognition of social structures and sourcing their changes through history and/or comparing structures to reveal and then emphasise the differences between systems (Culler, 2007). Structuralists scientifically endeavour to reformulate processes and/or phenomena based on the recognition of the differences and similarities between the systems and subsystems that comprise the universal structure.
Most systems of thought, such as Marxism, which perceive the world as an integrated mechanism, attempt to identify its structures and analyse the relations and interactions between elements in the mechanism. Indeed, although Marx lived before the foundation of structuralism as a school of thought, he first conceptualised structure. His followers later deployed Marx’s structures in their analyses. Marxist doctrine was mainly applied to the analysis of phenomena as a universal reality (Fromm et al., 2004). According to the Marxian political economy approach, every society is built upon a constituted production: a set of institutional practices by which the society organises its productive activities, provides for its material needs and reproduces socio-economic structures (Pacione, 2005, p. 27).

Marxist structuralists, such as Althusser, developed and redefined the concept of structure in Marxism in regard to structuralism. By reading Marxism from a structural perspective, Althusser rejected both humanist Marxism and simplistic economism, which Althusser considered to be inherent in traditional dialectical materialism. Althusser (2009, p. 46) argued that:

[w]orking on its ‘object’ ... does not work on the read object but on the peculiar raw material which constitutes, in the strict sense of the term, its ‘object’ [of knowledge] and which, even in the rudimentary forms of knowledge is distinct from the real object.

Althusser (2005, p. 166) added:

[i]n any practice thus conceived, the determinant moment [or element] in neither the raw material nor the product, but the practice in the narrow sense; the moment of the labour of transformation itself, which sets to work, in a specific structure, men, means and a technical method of utilising the means.

Further, Althusser defined society as a totality and as a structural causality. Althusser stated (2005, p. 232) that a society “is constituted by a certain specific type of complexity, which introduces instances ... we can, very schematically, reduce to three: the economy, politics and ideology”. However, each of these instances is a structure united in a structural causality.

Althusser (2009, p. 185) mentioned that “[t]he whole existence of the structure consist of its effects, in short that the structure, which is merely a specific combination of its peculiar elements, is nothing outside its effects”. He addressed the structural determination of classes in contemporary society, in which its reproduction, in contrast to orthodox Marxism, does not merely occur at an
economic level, but also in other structures, such as those at the political and ideological levels (McLellan, 1979, p. 304). Thus, Althusser portrayed a new interpretation of Marxism, embedded in structuralism. Althusser influenced other later post-structural thinkers, including Žižek (1989), who has deployed some of Althusser's concepts, particularly aspects of his definition of 'ideology', for analysing political and socio-cultural incidents.

Lévi-Strauss endeavoured to initiate a new way of understanding in social science by applying structuralism to anthropology and cultural studies. Lévi-Strauss (2008, p. 33) stated that, “[s]tructural linguistics will certainly play the same renovating role with respect to the social sciences that nuclear physics, for example, has played for physical science”. Lévi-Strauss (2008, p. 33) went on to categorise structural methods into four fundamental operations:

[f]irst, structural linguistics shifts from the study of conscious linguistic phenomena to the study of their unconscious infrastructure; second, it does not treat terms as independent entities, taking instead as its basis of analysis the relations between terms; third, it introduces the concept of system ...; finally, structural linguistics aims at discovering general laws, either by induction or ... by logical deduction, which would give them an absolute character.

Structuralism has played a significant role in generating and empowering critical thinking in social science, although the discipline has been dominated by positivism. Yet, structuralism is a scientific-based method, predicated on the principle that there are universal truths simply awaiting human discovery, and as such, it suffers the same weaknesses and insufficiencies as the other epistemological approaches embedded in scientific observation and its related abstract understandings (Peters & Wain, 2003). However, structuralism created a pattern for the development of other methods of critical thinking in social science, such as post-structuralism.

2.2.3-Structuralism and its effects on the planning realm

Planning largely relies on the deployment of both theoretical frameworks and practical innovations from other disciplines (Friedmann, 1987). Planners rarely apply critical ideas, such as those drawn from structuralism, directly in their analyses, although these are widespread in other social sciences such as sociology, geography and politics (Friedmann, 2008).
Marxism and neo-Marxism, due to having a structurally based perceptive, have been deployed by geographers for the analysis of historical socio-economic trends, urban transformations and social conflicts (Harvey, 2007). Yet, the impact of structuralism on planning has not been significant. Harvey and Castells, as neo-Marxist structuralists, have influenced critical planning theorists, making them more sensitive to integrative social theories. Nonetheless, their ideas have not gained a dominant theoretical position in planning, in comparison with other approaches such as communicative planning or positivistic rational approaches. “Rather it is the best seen as an initial challenge to planning theory based on conventional social science, which opened the field for other successful challenges that followed” (Teitz, 2007, p. 22).

Structuralists endeavour to identify and categorise factors that have a role in shaping a structure (Olssen, 2003). Structuralists, such as Lefebvre (1991) and his follower Soja (2000), among others, recognised the complexity of everyday life as a system and attempted to investigate social formation as a consequence of economics, politics, ideology and science. Lefebvre, as a Marxist structuralist, endeavoured to identify a universal structure that shapes everyday life, by investigating social–political relations in urban life (Elden, 2001, p. 811). In *The Production of Space* (1991), Lefebvre revealed the insufficiency of contemporary academic struggles in orthodox academic disciplines, with their positivistic understandings, in analysing and modelling everyday life. In *The Urban Revolution* (2003), Lefebvre prepared a new understanding of urban everyday life beyond the prevalent simplistic understandings of urban phenomena. In other words, the core of structuralism is endeavouring to find a universal structure based on the recognition of the interactions between various elements of a system (Sturrock, 2003, p. 21). Lefebvre’s structural understanding has had a considerable influence on planning theorists. Scholars such as Fainstein (2010), Allmendinger (2002) and Zukin (2003), and post-structuralists such as Hillier (2007), Pløger (2008) and Gunder (2005b, 2010a), among others, advocate a position for implementing new critical perspectives in planning. Yet, while critical thinking has been well developed by a limited number of planning theorists, positivistic understanding often remain dominant in contemporary planning practice (Davoudi, 2011).

This section illustrated the inadequacy of the prevalent positivistic understanding in addressing urban issues, which have become more complex under the hegemony of global capitalism (Friedmann, 2008, p. 252; Healey, 2007, p.11). In particular, it is important that critical theories are deployed for investigating urban issues. By reviewing structuralism and its effects on planning, this
section revealed that while structuralists such as Lefebvre have identified some of the limitations of the positivistic approaches in analysing everyday urban life, these same theorists have attempted to generate a universal understanding of urban operation based on interactions between elements. These findings lead into a discussion of post-structuralism, which will shape the core of the theoretical framework of this dissertation.

2.3-Post-structuralism

This section will review post-structuralism, which is the core intellectual approach deployed within this dissertation. The findings of this section will provide a theoretical foundation to subsequently conceptualise in later chapters the globalised city and its inherent characteristics of operation, such as generating desire, normalising residents’ attitude and consequently intensifying discontent. Post-structuralism is the name of a movement in philosophy that was founded after structuralism to mitigate the perceived deficiencies of this paradigm. The impact of this latter movement is not limited to philosophy, but has also strongly influenced other social science disciplines such as politics, cultural studies, sociology and planning. Post-structuralists generally challenge dominant knowledge by exposing its ontological limitations (Williams, 2005). The focus is on what the world means for people, rather than on investigating phenomena in the world, in contrast to other orthodox approaches (Peters, 2001). Post-structuralists accept and deploy structural analysis results while also appending new factors such as power and desire, which cannot generally be measured by empirical scientific methods, to the understandings of structuralists (Peters & Wain, 2003).

By revealing the weaknesses of structuralism, the neo-structuralist Lacan, and poststructuralists such as Deleuze and Foucault, attempted to generate new understandings beyond structuralism to amend its failures in the analysis of everyday life. According to Derrida (1987, p. 137), ‘post’, in ‘post-structuralism’, means ‘with but also different’ versus other common definitions, which generally interpret ‘post-structuralism’ as ‘after’ or ‘over’ structuralism. Derrida’s definition seems the most appropriate definition for elucidating ‘post-structuralism’ because post-structuralists generally accept and implement structural concepts in their investigations. However, they develop structuralism a step further by revealing that individuals perceive their beliefs as a universal ‘truth’, rather than accepting them as human constructs.
In reviewing post-structuralism, it is essential to study constructivism and deconstruction for better understanding post-structuralism. Unlike positivists, the adherents of constructivism contend that the world exists independent of human minds, but that knowledge of the world is a human construction. Thus, truth and reality are not something external to humanity to be discovered through conducting experiments as positivists claim, but rather are socially constructed in a dynamic process that is, and must be, reproduced by people acting on their interpretations and their knowledge of it. In this context, Boghossian (2006, p. 6) argues:

> [t]he truth of a belief is not a matter of how things stand with an independently existing reality; and its rationality is not a matter of its approval by transcendent procedures of rational assessment. Rather, whether a belief is knowledge necessarily depends at least in part on the contingent social and material setting in which that belief is produced or maintained.

However, according to Stavrakakis (1999, p. 66), constructionism, by itself, is incapable of recognising the mechanism transcending language and power. Gunder and Hillier (2009) observe that the constructivist approaches lack an appreciation of the complexity of human subjectivity. Hence, in coining the concept of deconstruction, Derrida:

> attempts to show that all concepts are context dependent. Yet it is, at the same time, committed to the view that concepts are governed by conditions that render any determination of meaning according to a universal rule (and hence any single, privileged context) impossible (Edgar & Sedgwick, 2004, p. 51).

Post-structuralists, like structuralists, consider language an essential structure. Language is the main structure in the achievement of knowledge and for representing collected information. Yet, post-structuralists address the unavoidable limitations of linguistics and their effects on the creation of people’s perceptions about themselves and the world. For post-structuralism, “[t]here is always an excess of meaning that eludes representation” (Hillier, 2003, p. 46).

Post-structuralists, to a greater or lesser extent, give value to scientific results, but also generally emphasise two weaknesses in the acceptance of positivistic results as pure knowledge. Firstly, they, like the structuralists, expose the insufficiency of scientific results to generate adequate knowledge
from social phenomena (Williams, 2005). They also point to the influential factors that positivism neglects, such as power and desire, which are inherent in social structures in collecting, presenting and interpreting knowledge.

The most common criticism by post-structuralists in regard to structuralism is the notion of a universal structure. According to the structuralists, universal structures are concealed in historical trends and in everyday life; these universal structures should be exposed by analysing structural relations within the global system. Conversely, post-structuralists criticise the insufficiency of scientific resources to portray universal understanding. Deleuze, among others, saw all structures in universal interactions as affecting each other, and that these dynamic interactions generate a flexible, unlimited, universal system. “Everywhere it is machines – real ones, not figurative ones: machines driving other machines, machines being driven by other machines, with all the necessary coupling and connections” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2009, p. 1). As such, this universal mechanism cannot be sufficiently recognised and measured to be controlled completely.

Post-structuralists assume that each phenomenon has a particular relationship with other structures and elements, so it should be considered in its specific context (Olssen, 2003, p. 190). Thus, there is not a universal law for portraying phenomena. In contrast to both structuralism and positivistic social science, which present the results of their investigations as the universal truth, post-structuralism generates theoretical frameworks for investigating social phenomena through their particular interactions with structures (Flyvbjerg, 2001).

Further, in contrast to some constructivists, post-structuralists generally consider agents as primary components of mechanisms, which are not discrete elements, but are perceived through their interactions with other agents and structures (Sturrock, 2003, p. 48). Post-structuralists endeavour to investigate the reshaped elements precisely through their interactions within a system and to identify the impact of these changes on the whole system. By considering the interaction between people within contemporary society, post-structuralism endeavours to recognise the concealed motifs in human behaviour, such as power, desire and enjoyment (Peters & Wain, 2003). In their analyses, Žižek, Foucault and Deleuze, among others, address the inadequacy of scientific-based knowledge to reveal these drivers of agency (Culler, 2007).
Post-structuralism is a series of critical theories that endeavour to recognise the role of social structures such as language in constituting people's perceptions and, subsequently, changing their behaviour in contemporary society (Sturrock, 2003). Knowledge and truth are the most problematic issues in post-structuralism. Post-structuralists critically challenge common scientific knowledge when it is promoted as unquestionable reality and truth (Peters & Wain, 2003). Post-structural definitions about knowledge influence the academic realm significantly, particularly in the case of the social sciences, whose solid scientific understandings are often open to be challenge (Flyvbjerg, 2001).

2.3-1-Knowledge and its resources in post-structuralism

Common knowledge and its legitimacy is the most challenging issue for post-structuralism. “[O]ne aspect of post-structuralism is its power to resist and work against settled truths” (Williams, 2005, p. 4). The resistance to scientific results constituting actual reality generates a new opportunity to analyse and redefine phenomena, particularly in social science. Post-structuralism, as a critical way of thinking, not only challenges scientific knowledge and its authorised truth, but also reveals the role of concealed factors such as power, desire and enjoyment in the shaping of knowledge (Peters, 2001).

Post-structuralists assume that all experience and knowledge is inevitably filtered by a pre-existing symbolic order of language and culture. They argue that the limitations of structures inevitably affect the generation and/or achievement of knowledge. Knowledge and all other experiences occurring after their conceptualisation in a pre-existing structure are meaningful only in their symbolically ordered patterns, such as those of the numbers in mathematical formulae (Belsey, 2002). This means knowledge is not independent from its pattern, but is a reflection of it.

Post-structuralists agree with the advocates of social constructivism in emphasising the role of context in understanding what occurs in society, and thus helping to construct knowledge. From the social constructivist perspective, knowledge is “a human product, and is socially and culturally constructed. Individuals create meaning through their interactions with each other and with the environment they live in” (Kim, 2010, p. 56). Thus, post-structuralists generally challenge not only the limitations of structures, but also the legitimacy of knowledge. Post-structuralists address the point that knowledge and its results are inherently prejudiced in collecting, analysing and presenting, as these processes are entirely dependent on structural patterns, such as those in linguistics. The processes of the production and development of knowledge are examined to illustrate the
dependency of knowledge on pre-existing mechanisms, which have a significant impact on results; results are deemed the perceived realities of knowledge. The investigations demonstrate other influential variables such as desire (Deleuze, Lacan), enjoyment (Žižek) and power (Foucault) in the shaping, and more importantly, the legitimising of Western-based rationality as a dominant knowledge.

The following sections of this chapter will consider the post-structural definitions of Deleuze, Foucault, Lacan and Žižek concerning the shaping of knowledge in contemporary society. The effects of these post-structural interpretations of knowledge on planning will also be studied to show how critical thought has been largely used by planning theorists to address the weaknesses in contemporary planning knowledge. These findings will assist in firstly, critiquing the scientific-based understandings of everyday life and then, secondly, in generating a new theoretical framework for a better understanding of the operations and productions of neoliberalised cities, including producing new desires, normalising residents’ behaviour and intensifying discontent.

2.4-Foucault on knowledge/power/normalisation

This section will review Foucauldian notions of knowledge, power and normalisation. The findings will assist in conceptualising the neoliberal city as a normalising-machine. Foucault was one of the most influential thinkers in the second half of the 20th century (Barker, 2008, p. 194). His critical investigations involved a wide range of subjects such as psychiatry (1967), human sciences (1970), medicine (1973), the penal system (1977) and sexuality (1981, 1985 and 1986). However, his principal concern was with power, knowledge and subjectivity (Townley, 1993, p. 518). By analysing historic trends, he illustrated the way in which orthodox knowledge has been shaped and promoted by the dominant power and its institutions.

Since the 1970s, Foucault’s controversial ideas have permeated social science (Rose & Miller, 2008). These have been increasingly deployed in the area of planning by researchers such as Flyvbjerg (1998a, 2001), Pløger (2001b, 2004, 2008), Richardson (1996), Huxley (2007) and Hillier (2002). According to Foucault, “[e]ach society has its regime of truth, its ‘general politics’ of truth … what counts as true … in the modern western society, ‘truth’ is centred on the form of scientific discourse and the institutions which produce it” (Richardson, 1996, p. 282). Foucault’s research documented how this scientific “regime of truth” evolved as “power appropriate[d] knowledge, and
[wove] it into discourses” in the achievement of governmental and related societal objectives (Richardson, 1996, p.283). Generally, scholars use Foucauldian ideas to engage power in their analyses, which the commonly used scientific approaches fail to address. This section reviews a selection of Foucault's ideas that assist in analysing power and its effect on the regulation of contemporary planning knowledge and the subsequent homogenising of globalised city spaces. Based on Foucault’s notions, the thesis will expose the process of the normalisation of residents’ attitudes in interaction with political and socio-cultural institutions under the hegemony of global neoliberalism.

2.4.1-Knowledge/power

As a post-structuralist in his later works, Foucault denounced orthodox understandings, particularly in social science, by addressing their inherent failures in the processes of collecting, analysing and representing knowledge. “The reasons for this refusal lie in Foucault's desire to understand more fully power relations, that is, how mechanisms of power affect everyday lives” (Townley, 1993, p. 519). Foucault exposed the role of power as an active factor in generating knowledge. Using this notion, he revealed the process of the normalisation of human's attitudes through the collection of adjusted knowledge, constituted by power mechanisms with related social institutions (Foucault, 1982).

Foucault, among other post-structuralists, addressed the limitations of science by emphasising the role of context, such as language, in shaping knowledge (Gutting, 2005, p. 18). Foucault (1991, 2002) made it clear that the production of knowledge is inseparable from social structures and power mechanisms. He largely emphasises the role of the dominant power, capitalism, and its institutions in shaping and promoting scientific knowledge:

Knowledge is not an epistemological site that disappears in the science that supersedes it. Science (or what is offered as such) is localised in the field of knowledge and plays a role in it. A role that varies according to different discursive formations, and is modified with their mutations (Foucault, 2002, p. 182).

Thus, scientific results are largely dependent on their discourse context, and are mostly modulated by the mechanism of power, which is inherent within discursive structures (Foucault, 1971). By revealing the role of power in shaping knowledge, Foucault addressed the procedure of regulation and the legitimatisation of western rationality as a dominant knowledge (Joseph, 2004, p. 148).
By developing his exclusive methodology for the study of history, Foucault challenged the old definitions of the relationship between power and knowledge, which had formerly been “knowledge is power”. From a Foucauldian perspective, “power is generating knowledge”, or at least reshaping knowledge (Foucault, 1971, p. 8). Joseph (2004, p. 149) observed that Foucault argued “that the production of knowledge is bound up with historical regimes of power”. Thus, Foucault introduced the concept of ‘regime of truth’, which means that the cognitive validity of knowledge relies on the dominant power mechanisms.

Based on Foucault’s ideas, planning theorists such as Flyvbjerg (1998a, 2001, 2002), Hillier (2002) and Pløger (2006, 2008), among others, challenge the validity of dominant knowledge – primarily positivistic understandings – in analysing urban everyday life. The neglect of power in shaping the discourses which underlie and provide choice for the decision-making is problematic in contemporary planning (Flyvbjerg, 2001). Power with its institutions shapes the real rationality of what is required to be done. Planners mostly neglect “how power works is the first prerequisite for action, because action is the exercise of power” (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 107). The above-mentioned planning theorists consider power to be an influential factor in shaping contemporary planning and wide governmental knowledge.

2.4.2-Types of knowledge

“Foucault had been writing about the history of knowledge in the human sciences long before he ever explicitly raised questions about the power” (Rouse, 2005, p. 96). Foucault categorised human knowledge into two types based on their characteristics: subjectivity and structural, which respectively produce conscious knowledge (connaissance) and discursive knowledge (savoir) (Foucault, 2002). This categorisation assisted Foucault in the analysis of social science methods and then in illustrating the deficiency of the prevalent scientific understandings pertaining to social behaviour.

In his book Archaeology of Knowledge (2002), Foucault defined the differences between conscious knowledge and discursive knowledge. First, he introduced archaeology as an approach for analysing trends that is able to militate against dominant scientific methods. By investigating the origins of academic disciplines, he elucidated how discursive knowledge existed and was deployed before the establishment of academic disciplines (Foucault, 2002, p. 196). Accordingly, Foucault (2002, p. 197) noted that a “silent delimitation has been imposed on all the preceding analyses,
without the principle governing it, or even its outline, being made clear”. Moreover, “despite the absence of any established discipline, a discursive practice, with its own regularity and consistency, was in operation” (Foucault, 2002, p. 198). In other words, knowledge is largely dependent on its discursive context, and this dependency generates inevitable limitations for conscious knowledge.

Further, Foucault (2002, p. 200) stressed that “[d]iscursive formations can be identified ... neither as sciences, nor as scarcely scientific disciplines, nor as distant prefigurations of the sciences to come, nor as forms that exclude any scientificity from the outset”. Discursive formations are embedded in sets of epistemological observations, uncontrolled experiments and results, therapeutic prescriptions and institutional regulations. Yet, this is not fragmented or exclusive of science. Thus, Foucault (2002, p. 200) identified a body of knowledge that is autonomous from the scientific disciplines:

- Knowledge is that of which one can speak in a discursive practice, and which is specified by that fact: the domain constituted by the different objects that will or will not acquire a scientific status.
- Knowledge is also the space in which the subject may take up a position and speak of the objects with which he deals in his discourse.
- Knowledge is also the field of coordination and subordination of statements in which concepts appear, and are defined, applied and transformed.
- Knowledge is defined by the possibilities of use and appropriation offered by discourse.

However, all these fields of knowledge have particular discursive patterns in which knowledge is shaped.

Foucault (2002, p. 203) acknowledged that the realm of knowledge is not restricted to scientific disciplines and their discursive patterns, but also that knowledge should be investigated “in fiction, reflection, narrative accounts, institutional regulations, and political decisions”. Foucault developed his field of investigation within the boundaries of academic scientific disciplines as well as in political decisions, social institutions and structures.

Foucault suggested the further investigation of political decisions and their consequences on everyday life, which seemed necessary for crossing from the borders of the limitations of academic
disciplines. The Foucauldian definition of knowledge assists planning theorists to breach the limitations of the dominant positivistic approaches.

2.4.3-Normalisation

In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (1991) extensively demonstrated how dominant power and its institutions normalise people’s behaviours to be more effective in capitalistic societies (Crampton & Elden, 2007, p. 69). By investigating the history of punishment, Foucault critically exposed a control apparatus intended to transform people into docile bodies by expanding surveillance and normalising knowledge. Foucault indicated that this technology of control was fundamental for industrial society.

For Foucault, the process of normalisation occurs in interaction within social structures and institutions such as language and education systems. “The individual is no doubt the fictitious atom of an ideological representation of society; but he is also a reality fabricated by this specific technology of power that I have called discipline” (Foucault, 1991, p. 194). Discipline, as a technology, is normative and the performance of internal standards and personal values. Simultaneously, discipline is normalising knowledge, or judgement, of people within complicated mechanisms. Socio-cultural mechanisms such as language inherently encompass power struggles. These mechanisms persuade people to conform their attitudes in accordance with the dominant power mechanism. Thus, the dominant power, by regulating common knowledge, normalises people’s understandings through their interactions within the regulated socio-cultural mechanisms (Clifford, 2001, p. 50).

Further, Foucault defined the territory of power in the analysis of the process of normalisation. Power endeavours to reproduce and sustain its sovereignty by regulating all interactions and normalising people’s attitudes (Clifford, 2001, p. 38). Power, according to Foucault, is not restricted to groups of institutions and their mechanisms, or even to the domination of powerful elites who subordinate others. Foucault (2008, p. 93) states that:

It seems to me that power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from one another; and lastly, as the strategies in which
they take effect, whose general design or institutional crystallisation is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies.

Thus, force relations, with their related new technologies, normalise human's attitudes in contemporary society.

From the Foucauldian perspective, the process of regulation is initiated by the use of language for communicating with others, when the rules and laws of language, as disciplines, are first imposed on human beings. Thus, discourse knowledge, which is restricted or regulated by power, shapes humans’ perceptions and understandings of themselves and the world (Foucault, 2002). Education, as a new technology of normalisation, regulates people's judgement to perform effectively in the capitalistic mechanism (Foucault & Miskowiec, 1986). For Foucault, the function of universities and other academic institutions is congruent with those of the garrison house and other military institutions. If military training regulates the clothing of soldiers and their appearance, the modern education system normalises students’ knowledge, ideas and perceptions. Obedience in both systems has rewards; whereas punishment follows any resistance. To be successful in the educational system, students should accept the academic rules and follow orders (Foucault, 1991). The students’ perceptions of the world are channelled into particular ways, which generate greater profit for the system. Foucault's comparison is controversial. However, consideration of the consequences of the orthodox academic realm, such as the standardisation of built environments, corroborate that our knowledge is standardised under the hegemony of dominant Western rationality. Regulated contemporary knowledge is largely produced and promulgated by hegemonic global capitalism. Thus, students are educated to operate effectively in the economic system; or, in the words of Adam Smith, in his influential book *The Wealth of Nations* (2009 [1776]), as machines that should be prepared to work, but only now as part of the global economic machine.

The standardisation of urban spaces in globalised cities is a representative consequence of the regulation of knowledge in planning, urban design and architecture (Natrasony & Alexander, 2005). Planning, as a product of modernism, is based on capitalistic values and its related discourses (Allmendinger, 2001a). Planning knowledge is largely shaped and generally published by western-based international publishers around the world (Hall, 2001; Healey, 1997). Planners deploy similar techniques and methods, often based on positivistic approaches, for gathering and processing
information, and suggesting policies, irrespective of the context. Universities generally function as normalising mechanisms that shape planners’ understandings based on the dominant neoliberal discourse (Gunder & Hillier, 2009; Healey, 1997). As a result, urban plans and policies significantly reshape, and more importantly standardise, the built environment of the globalised city (Sandercock, 2005).

Despite this, the homogenisation of cities’ built environments and the effects on residents’ behaviour of implementing regulated knowledge are largely ignored in planning theory. The question thus arises: What is the function of homogenised urban spaces as a part of control apparatuses in normalising residents’ behaviour in the globalised city? The discussion in this section will be used to underpin the answer to this question in Chapter Four, which will give in-depth consideration of the effects of normalised knowledge on regulating urban spaces in late capitalism. Further, the normalisation of residents’ behaviour in globalised cities under the hegemony of neoliberalism will be considered.

2.5-Deleuze on knowledge/desire and other concepts

This section will review Deleuze’s ideas on knowledge and desire, to assist in conceptualising the globalised city as a desiring-machine. In Discipline and Punish (1991), Foucault remarked that the 20th century would perhaps one day be known as the Deleuzian century. Deleuze with his post-structuralist analysis endeavoured to portray a new understanding of the world. From a Deleuzian perspective, the world is not something external, to be judged by empirical approaches. Rather, it is a dynamic mechanism which encompasses people (Colebrook, 2002). Deleuze, among other post-structuralists, denounced orthodox knowledge and its constituted realities, which had dominated the academic realm since the 19th century.

Deleuze states that scientific methods generally detach phenomena from their pattern by simplifying, measuring and categorising phenomena. These simplified understandings are conceptualised and accepted within various academic disciplines, despite scientific results being inadequate for the generation of a comprehensive understanding of everyday life (Lefebvre, 1984, 1991). Deleuze (2006, p. 100) argues that:
Knowledge [based on scientific rationality] is the opposite of life, but because it expresses a life which contradicts life, a reactive life which finds in knowledge the means of preserving and glorifying its type. Thus knowledge gives life laws that separate it from what it can do, that keep it from acting, that forbid it to act, maintaining it in the narrow framework of scientifically observable reactions. But this knowledge that a measure, limits, moulds life is itself entirely modelled on reactive life, within the limit of reactive life.

From a Deleuzian perspective, all elements are components of a universal, dynamic, interactive mechanism. This universal interconnectivity cannot be measured to be formulated (Colebrook, 2002, p. xxvi). Deleuze (2006) repudiates the prevailing ideas that separate objects and/or incidents from their context, categorise them in particular periods and/or groups, and neglect their connections with other mechanisms. For example, scientific investigations inaccurately determine the emergence and ending of events to measure and identify their causes. For Deleuze, a phenomenon both produces and is a product of its complex interconnectivity, and thus cannot be analysed as a discrete object. Deleuze challenges the legitimacy of western-based rationality, which he views as mainly considering symptoms. Deleuze (2006, p. 100) critically argues that

[empirical] knowledge sets up itself as end, as judge, as supreme instance. But we must assess the importance of these texts: the opposition between knowledge and life and the operation by which knowledge makes itself judge of life are symptoms, only symptoms.

Knowledge and human experiences are also products shaped through interactions within a universal mechanism. Therefore, the results of knowledge are prejudiced as the production of multiple universal forces.

Plato’s ideas significantly influenced Deleuze and his definition of knowledge, when he distinguished between being and becoming (Colebrook, 2002). Plato (1921, p.15) states that:

[what is really true, is this: the things of which we naturally say that they ‘are’, are in the process of coming to be, as the result of movement and change and blending with one another. We are wrong when we say that they ‘are’, since nothing ever is, but everything is coming to be.
Thus, Deleuze argues that the universal mechanism is dynamic, and knowledge should define a process of becoming vis-à-vis being.

For Deleuze, the centrality of human subjectivity in contemporary knowledge is another problematic issue that creates technical and technological restrictions in achieving a real understanding of life regarding body limitations (Grosz, 2001, p. 180). “The condition under which we know things and are conscious of ourselves condemn us to have inadequate ideas, ideas that are confused and mutilated, effects separated from their causes” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 19). Deleuze as a post-structuralist emphasised on the inadequacy of the understanding of the human subject, who assumes him/herself to be at the centre of the world. Knowledge is unavoidably shaped by universal trends, but human subjects are not aware of that.

Knowledge is not the operation of a subject but the affirmation of the idea in the mind. It is never we who affirm or deny something of the thing; it is the thing itself that affirms or denies something of itself in us. (Deleuze, 1988, p. 86)

In other words, the knowledge of a human being is generally constituted by interactions within universal structures. People largely misrecognise perception and knowledge as independent individual understandings.

Deleuze endeavoured to address the failure of social and human science in portraying life by exposing human centrality as a problematic aspect of scientific knowledge. “The human and social sciences have accustomed us to see the figure of man behind every social event … Such forms of knowledge project an image of reality, at expense of reality itself” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2009, p. xxii). Thus, he rejected the abstract scientific images commonly accepted and legitimised as reality.

Deleuze, along with his friend Guattari, reconceptualised the meaning of space based on their theory of universal interconnectivity to expose that human knowledge is constantly transformed within its multiple interactions with other mechanisms or machines. This definition of space has assisted urban researchers such as Hillier (2005, 2007, 2011, 2012, 2013), Wood (2009) and Pløger (2010a), among others, to generate new understandings of everyday urban life.
2.5.1-Assemblage

Deleuze and Guattari (2009) introduced other concepts such as ‘assemblage’, territorialisation and deterritorialisation to analyse how human behaviour is reshaped in a multiple cosmic relationship. For Deleuze and Guattari, the mental realm consists of certain layers of thought. Thought generates ‘strata’ based on codifying and categorising events, elements and forming substances from chaotic and disparate phenomena (Markula, 2006, p. 37). Deleuze and Guattari (1988) acknowledged three main strata: organism (world), significance (language) and subjectification (humans). In addition, Deleuze and Guattari (1984) suggested three milieus with three substances: nature by the development of spaces; language by the creation of meanings; and human self-understanding by the formation of subjects. ‘Assemblages’ exist and are formed within these different strata, but they are different from the strata itself. “The assemblage consists of and relates bodies and signs” (Sørensen, 2005, p. 120). Deleuze and Guattari (1984, p. 9) stated that:

Assemblages are made, however, in the strata, but they operate in zones of decoding of the milieus: they first slice a territory out of the milieus. Any assemblage is territorial first. The first concrete rule of assemblages is to discover the territoriality which they envelop because there always is one.

The assemblages “operate where the milieus of the strata become decoded. This way, assemblages extract territory from these milieus. They are able to do this by rearticulating the expression and content of each stratum” (Markula, 2006, p. 37). However, although assemblages are in and between strata, they are dynamic and at the same time stratified, reduced and simplified by strata (Sørensen, 2005, p. 120).

For Deleuze and Guattari, territory is an essential notion for analysing social and human behaviour (DeLanda, 2001). According to Deleuze and Guattari (1988, p. 174), territory is not fixed, but is continually de-territorialised and reshaped with new connections and dynamic interactions. Due to their connections, assemblages have a leading role in the de-territorialisation of territories and the re-territorialisation of fields. The processes of territorialisation, de-territorialisation and then re-territorialisation continuously occur in a cosmic dynamic mechanism (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988).

Since deterritorialisation and territorialisation are continuously altering each other, this constant transfiguration makes the identification of territories one of the most challenging issues in
contemporary society (Best, 2003; Brighenti, 2010; Grosz, 2008; Hillier, 2007). For example, recognition of territories is particularly problematic when planners attempt to identify public and private territories and/or to clarify socio-cultural territories to striate a dynamic space.


2.5.2-Desiring-machine

Deleuze and Guattari also acknowledged that desire produces trends and that new desires are simultaneously produced in infinite relationships. “Desire is connection, to desire is to produce connections” (Sørensen, 2005, p. 120). These relationships are continuously being changed and stimulated by desires.

However, human beings are unaware of the universal mechanism that operates as a desiring-machine. Deleuze and Guattari (2009, p.28) stress that:

[w]e, as subjects, as people with human nature, are nothing more than the result of our desiring-machines (which are connected to each other and, at the same time, they are related to other elements and folds) that meet in an endless process of production whose function is the affirmation of its own existence.

Thus, the desiring-machine continuously reproduces, and is reproduced, as part of dynamic universal interactions. In Anti-Oedipus (2009, p. 1), Deleuze and Guattari developed the following concept:

It [desiring-machine] is at work everywhere, functioning smoothly at times, at other times in fits and starts. It breathes, it heats, it eats, it shits and fucks. What a mistake to have ever said the id. Everywhere it is machines – real ones, not figurative ones: machines driving other machines, machines being driven by other machines, with all the necessary couplings and connections.

For Deleuze and Guattari, everything is a machine. All phenomena and their consequences are produced and productive machines within a cosmic machine in which all things are connected and
influence each other continuously. Deleuze and Guattari (1991, p.2) added that “[p]roducing-machines, desiring-machines everywhere ... all of the species of life: the self and non-self, outside and inside, no longer have any meaning whatsoever”. Hence, everything is production: production of productions as consequences of the productive process of the universal mechanism.

The knowledge and experiences of human beings are also productions shaped by their connections with other machines such as the social institutions, including language (Sørensen, 2005, p. 122). They are productive-machines producing new products. However, people as produced and productive machines within the universal machine are perhaps unaware of this mechanism. Knowledge, as productive-machine, generates the desire to investigate further and cross the accepted boundaries of knowledge.

Desire is one of the essential terms in Deleuze and Guattari’s philosophical works. For Deleuze and Guattari, “desire is viewed not just as an experimental, productive force, but also as a force able to from connections and enhances the power of bodies in their connection” (Ross, 2005, p. 65). Deleuze elucidates desire as assembled or machined. Desires are continuously reproducing new connections and, meanwhile, the generated connections are recreating desires (Deleuze & Guattari, 2009).

Deleuze and Guattari, by conceptualising concepts such as assemblage and the desiring-machine generated new ways in which to portray understandings about everyday life and its issues, such as globalisation, complexity, interconnectivity and interdependency, which the dominant positivistic approaches are incapable of adequately addressing (Williams; 2005, Peters; 2001). Nonetheless, Deleuze and Guattari’s work is difficult to read (Rodwick, 1997), so scholars have interpreted Deleuze and Guattari’s terms in various ways. Some researchers such as Hillier (2007) and Dovey (2005) have used the capacity of these terms to generate an alternative understanding of contemporary society. Goodchild (1996), Massumi (1992) and Purcell (2013), among others, emphasise the revolutionary capacity of Deleuze and Guattari’s work, particularly Anti-Oedipus (2009) and A Thousand Plateaus (1988), in generating a new understanding beyond both capitalism and the state. Purcell (2013, p. 20) states Deleuze and Guattari “are headlong escapes toward a world beyond the state and capitalism”. For Deleuze and Guattari,
[d]esire is revolutionary in its essence ... because it affects and changes every established order of [capitalistic] society ... desire fills all dimensions of society – no principle or order can be extracted from society that could be made to stand outside it. All laws, rights, values, and orders can be created and destroyed by society; none can stand outside as an origin or goal. There can be no absolute distinctions or boundaries imposed upon society because these would need to be justified by some transcendent order or “God”; desire, forming relations between heterogeneous terms, can cross all boundaries. (Goodchild, 1996, p. 74)

In this context, desire with its revolutionary capacity eventually escapes beyond the imposed boundaries and prohibitions which largely attempt to control and direct it in particular ways.

Nonetheless, Badiou, in Deleuze (2000), and Žižek, in Organ without bodies (2004c), have challenged Deleuze and Guattari’s work where it has been deployed as a theoretical foundation for resisting global capitalism and its hegemony. Badiou (2000, p. 10) states:

[a]ll those who believe that Deleuze’s remarks may be seen to encourage autonomy or the anarchising ideal of the sovereign individual populating the Earth with the productions of his/her desires are no less mistaken. They do not take literally enough the strictly “machinic” conception that Deleuze has, not only of desire (the famous “desiring-machine”) but, even more so, of will or choice. For this conception strictly precludes any idea of ourselves as being, at any time, the source of what we think or do. Everything always stems from afar – indeed, everything is always “already-there,” in the infinite and inhuman resource of the One.

Further, Žižek (2004c, p.164) adds:

[m]ore than ever, Capital is the “concrete universal” of our historical epoch. What this means is that, while it remains a particular formation, it overdetermines all alternative formation, as well as all noneconomic strata of social life. The twentieth-century communist movement emerged, defining itself as an opponent of capitalism, and was defeated by it; fascism emerged as an attempt to master capitalism’s excesses, to build a kind of ‘capitalism without capitalism’.
Thus, the desiring-machine inevitably operates as a component of a global mechanism, so it is fundamentally incapable of generating desires beyond global capitalism. In contrast to the prevalent interpretations of Deleuze and Guattari’s work, in *Organ without bodies* (2004c, p. 163), Žižek refers to Deleuze “as the ideologist of late capitalism”. Thus, this research has deployed Deleuze and Guattari’s terms, particularly ‘desiring-machine’, to generate a profound understanding the contemporary city and its products under the hegemony of global capitalism.

The argument is that Deleuze and Guattari offer us a set of concepts that help us think more effectively about how the world actually works. If we can apprehend the world better, it follows that our planning interventions can be more effective. Chapter Four will deploy these concepts to formulate the globalised city operation and its interconnectivities with the global market. Further, Chapter Four will theorise how global cities lure flows of capital and human capital by generating desires.

2.6-Lacan on knowledge/lack and other key concepts

The section will review the ideas of the French neo-structuralist Lacan relating to knowledge and lack. This will assist in the later consideration of the intensification of discontent in neoliberalised cities. Lacan developed his psychoanalytical approach based on Freud’s psychological method (Homer, 2005). He attempted to analyse the process of human self-identification and to conceptualise the mechanism for collecting knowledge of the world in interactions with others (Sturrock, 2003). In many ways, Lacan’s work revolves around the issue of the status of ‘the subject’ and human identification. Lacan deployed and crucially transformed philosophical, anthropological and linguistic ideas in his psychoanalytical approach (Russell, 2008). By defining the human subject’s identification as an unconscious process, Lacan challenges more dominant approaches, such as phenomenology, which generally focus on human subjectivity and consciousness (Homer, 2005, p. 20).

In the 1950s, Lacan developed his psychoanalytical approach by conceptualising the process of human subjectivity into three realms: the imaginary, the symbolic and the real (Homer, 2005). Wolfreys (2004, p.108) stresses that “[t]he principal difficulty even in beginning to speak of the imaginary – [the] symbolic – [the] real, is that one cannot address any one term with any efficiency without speaking of the others”. These realms are fundamental in the Lacanian approach for grasping the core of human and social activities, which are embedded in the unconsciousness (Homer, 2005,
Based on these realms, Lacan conceptualised other notions such as the “big-Other”, “jouissance” and “lack”.

Lacan’s ideas have been deployed to reinterpret social phenomena by scholars in various disciplines, including in planning by Gunder and Hillier (2009), political philosophy by Žižek (1989, 1993, 1997a, 2001, 2009, 2011a, 2012a), politics by Stavrakakis (1999, 2007), sociology by Boothby (2001) and geography by Swyngedouw (2010). This study will selectively review and use Lacanian concepts such as the “big-Other”, “jouissance” and “lack” for investigating the intensification of discontent in globalised cities. However, before deploying Lacan’s ideas, it is necessary to investigate how Lacan conceptualised the process of human knowledge and identification. Lacan, as a neo-structuralist, attempted to formulate the process of human self-identification and to conceptualise the mechanism for collecting knowledge in interactions with others. The following three subsections will review Lacan’s identification stages, which are fundamental for understanding his approach.

2.6.1-Mirror stage

Lacan’s earliest paper, “The Mirror Stage”, which was first presented in 1936 and subsequently revised and published in Écrits (2006 [1966]), was preoccupied with the nature of consciousness, and especially self-consciousness (Evans, 2010). Traditionally in psychology, self-awareness has been defined in relation to the awareness of the physical body and its limitations in connection with things external to the body. Lacan (2002, p. 28) stated that:

>affective identification is a psychic function whose originality has been established by psychoanalysis, especially in the Oedipus complex ... But, at the stage at which we are studying, the use of the term remains ill-defined in the doctrine. That is why I have attempted to fill the gap with a theory of this identification whose genesis I describe by using the term ‘mirror stage.

Lacan, first by investigating the process of infant identification, recognised that mirroring in the construction of self and self-awareness had an important role (Homer, 2005, p. 24). The mirror phase occurs between the ages of 6 to 18 months and coincides with narcissism (Evans, 2010). In this period, the child begins to recognise his/her image and this recognition normally conveys pleasure. The child becomes aware of her/himself for the first time, by seeing her/his image in the mirror and then attempting to manage his body by controlling the image and thus experiencing pleasure (Homer,
For Lacan, the mirror stage is the first stage of identification, and represents a permanent, if imaginary, subjectivity (Evans, 2010).

Identification from the mirror image is the first step in self-awareness, and it is in this stage that the ego is formed (Evans, 2010). Lacan addressed the assumption that alienation occurs by acceptance of the mirror image as the self during this stage. Lacan (2006, p. 78) acknowledges that:

the mirror stage is a drama whose internal pressure pushes precipitously from insufficiency to anticipation – and, for the subject caught up in the lure of spatial identification, turns out fantasies that proceed from a fragmented image of the body to what I will call an ‘orthopedic’ form of its totality – and to the finally donned armor of an alienating identity that will mark his entire mental development with its rigid structure.

For Lacan, the ego is initially shaped by images and “is an imaginary function” (Homer, 2005, p. 25). The Lacanian definition of the ego as an illusory image is contra to the position of ego psychology that prioritises the ego over the unconsciousness and arguably accepts the ego as the self (Lacan, 2006).

Lacan generated new capacities for further consideration in human and social studies by addressing the misrecognitions in the mirror phase between the ego and self, and insisting on the unconsciousness as a resource of identification (Sarup & Raja, 2005). Common knowledge, in general, and scientific knowledge, in particular, is embedded in self-centrality. Lacan challenged this orthodox understanding about the self and the role of self-consciousness in analysing phenomena. “For Lacan, the true subject is the subject of unconscious, not to be confused with the ego, which functions in consciousness as a structure of identification” (Muller, 2000, p. 44). For a better understanding of Lacan’s approach based on unconsciousness, it is necessary to be aware of his identification phases and concepts.

The mirror stage can also be used to illustrate how neoliberalism is embedded in ego-centric (mis)identification. Neoliberalism leads people to perceive themselves, mistakenly, as individuals, separate from other people and their afflictions. The idea of the autonomous, unitary subject or ‘the free individual’ as the egocentric individual is promoted under different guises in neoliberalism. Thus, it becomes the “central character in policy documents relating to all manner of strategies to discipline and regulate the individual: as consumer, patient, student, citizen, and worker” (Venn, 2004, p. 149).
Indeed, in aggregate, the mirror stage process of (mis)identification helps to formulate neoliberalised society as a *society of enjoyment* in which one’s primary duty is the maximisation of self-enjoyment (Dean, 2008), as will be discussed in subsequent sections and chapters.

### 2.6.2-Symbolic stage

After clearly defining the mirror stage, during the 1950s, Lacan (2006) focused on language and its differences from speech, prompted by his 1953 paper, “The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis”. He constituted his controversial theory based on language and the unconscious. Thus, he acknowledges that “the unconscious is structured like a language” (Homer, 2005, p. 33). For Lacan, language is the dominant structure in shaping human subject identification and the unconscious. Lacan is erroneously recognised as a structuralist because of his investigation of language and its structure. However, Lacan (1987, p 113) comments that “psychoanalysis as a science will be structuralist, to the point of recognizing in science a refusal of the subject”. Thus, Lacan is considered a neo-structuralist because he critically challenged the orthodox scientific knowledge and its epistemological results (Sturrock, 2003).

Lacan, drawing his ‘symbolic phase’ of the 1950s, addressed the way in which language, as an unconscious structure, shapes human identity by creating connections with others. Lacan arguably drew on the concepts of other structuralists such as Saussure and Levi-Strauss, and formulated his ideas by transforming structural concepts and deploying them in psychoanalytical analysis (Leupin, 2004, p. 13). For example, Levi-Strauss, in his anthropological considerations, realised that “there is an unconscious structure that determines people’s social position and regulates their relationships without their being aware of it” (Homer, 2005, p. 35). Lacan found that Levi-Strauss’s unconscious structure is compatible with his understanding of human identification.

Accordingly, Lacan (1993) characterised the human world as the symbolic function that dominates all aspects of a human being’s life. From a Lacanian perspective, symbolic order shapes the human understanding of the self, as well as the individual’s perception of the world, unconsciously. Thus, for people, “symbols are more real than what they symbolise” (Roudinesco, 1999, p. 211). In this context, the predominance of market-driven symbols and discourse constitutes residents’ perceptions in contemporary society. Thus, in the contemporary global neoliberal mechanism, planners’ perception and their collective unconscious is largely shaped by the dominant market-driven symbolic order.
Lacan argued that the symbolic stage initiates the point at which an infant starts to learn language and its signifiers, for communicating with others, so as to make its needs clear. “It is the world of words that creates the world of things – things which at first run together in the *hic et nunc* of the all in the process of becoming – by giving its concrete being to their essence, and its ubiquity to what has always been” (Lacan, 2006, p. 229). From Lacan’s perspective:

> [...]he unconscious consists of signifying material. The unconscious is the process of signification that is beyond our control; it is the language that speaks through us rather than the language we speak (Homer, 2005, p. 44).

Thus, the symbolic function restricts the human universe and, subsequently, human knowledge is limited to this symbolic function (Lacan, 2007).

Social, cultural, political and economic principles and interactions inevitably occur in the symbolic order. The symbolic realm is fundamental to the understanding of the core of human and social behaviour, which is embedded in unconsciousness (Homer, 2005). People collect socio-cultural values and find their political position in the symbolic realm. Accordingly, the symbolic stage has been deployed by scholars such as Žižek (1989, 1991a, 1997a, 2012a), Stavrakakis (1999, 2007), Lapping (2007) and others in social and human science to analyse contemporary society. The question arises: Why can we not escape from the limitations of discourse – the symbolic order? To respond to this question, another Lacanian concept, the ‘*signifying-chain*’, should be reviewed.

### 2.6.3-Signifying-chain

Lacan deployed Saussure’s linguistic ideas in developing his own psychoanalytical approach. Saussure explained that language is not merely a list of words that match to a set of phenomena in the world. Rather, it is a structure of signs. He added that signs cannot directly address a phenomenon or thing in the material world; on the contrary, words refer to general concepts (Sturrock, 2003). Thus, two elements shaped Saussure's linguistic formula: the *signifier* as a sound pattern or written word, and the *signified* as the concept. Social convention determines and defines the relationship between the signifier and signified. Further to this, the principles of the structure, that is, the relationships between signs, generate the meaning of the signs.
Lacan deployed, challenged and reformulated Saussure's conceptualisations in his article, published in Écrits, “The Agency of the Letter in the Unconscious, or Reason since Freud” (Lacan, 2006, p. 412). He argued that the signifier takes precedence over the signified. “A sign does not refer us to a specific object in the real material world, but rather to another sign which in turn refers us to another sign and so on” (Homer, 2005, p. 40). In other words, Lacan’s view was that a signifier referred not to the signified, but rather to another signifier, generating an endless process of signification. Thus, from the Lacanian perspective, “signification is not present at any one point in the chain, but rather meaning insists in the movement from one signifier to another” (Evans, 2010, p. 188).

Lacan’s identification stages assist in addressing the weaknesses of traditional scientific knowledge for research on human topics, which are inevitably embedded in linguistic structures and their resultant methodological limitations. By introducing the concept of signifying-chain, Lacan demonstrated that our understanding is largely dependent on the conceptual realm and language, rather than being embedded in the material world. A signifying-chain can never be complete, as it is always possible to add another signifier to it, ad infinitum, in a way that expresses the eternal nature of desire. For this reason, desire is metonymic (Evans, 2010). The signifying-chain also assists thinkers in social and human studies to expose how signifiers have been accepted and legitimised in contemporary society under the neoliberal hegemony of global values.

2.6.4-big-Other/other

Lacan added to his definition of the process of human identification by introducing the ‘big-Other’, which was based on the ‘signifying-chain’. The term ‘other’ and its definitions is perhaps the most complicated subject in Lacan’s work. Lacan conceptualised these types of ‘other’, ‘objet petit ‘a’ (object little ‘a’) – where ‘autre’ is ‘other’ in French and this represents the image(inary) aspect of the other that sets desire in motion, ‘the (general) other’ and ‘the Other’ that for clarity is often referred to as the ‘big-Other’ in the literature, which remained central throughout the remainder of his work (Evans, 2010). This thesis will primarily be concerned only with the latter ‘Other’. “The [O]ther is the [O]ther who is not really [O]ther, but is a reflection and projection of ego” (Evans, 2010, p. 132). The Other is utterly shaped in the imaginary order.
The big-Other is the symbolic insofar as it is particularised for each subject. The Other is both another subject, in its radical alternativeness and unassailable uniqueness, and also in the symbolic order which mediates the relationship with that other subject. (Evans, 2010, p. 133)

Human knowledge and perceptions of self and the world are structured by the Other in the symbolic order (Kirshner, 2004, p. 50).

Lacan assumes that both language and speech are beyond conscious control and are embedded in the unconscious. “Lacan defines the unconscious as the discourse of the Other” (Homer, 2005, p.44). People forced to adopt the symbolic realm, which comprises language and the ‘big-Other’ as an impersonal set of symbolic rules and prohibitions, as they are assimilated as young children into their culture (Stavrakakis, 1999; Žižek, 1991a). From this perspective, human beings also identify the self within the signifying-chain that connects them to the Other in the symbolic realm.

According to Lacan (1988, p. 89), “[i]t is discourse of the circuit in which I am integrated. I am one of its links”. For Lacan, language is not simply a system of signs or signifiers, but it also generates prohibitions and abilities as big-Other (Dean, 1997). The big-Other joins the human subject to the network of discursive structures and other socio-symbolic institutions and values (Stavrakakis, 1999). From a Lacanian perspective, the human subject is inescapably subjected to the linguistic order, as big-Other, and crucially, the big-Other unconsciously structures the subject's perceptions and understanding. “[T]he big-Other is symbolic insofar [as] it is particularised for each subject” (Evans, 2010, p. 133).

The human subject adapts his/her acts in accordance with the big-Other in regard to his/her labels as signifiers in a chain of signification (Brown, 2008, p. 232). The subject’s significations show the position of the subject in the symbolic order, and link him/her to socio-political structures and institutions as part of the signifying-chain (Stavrakakis, 1999). For example, a person accepts different roles with regard to signifiers such as “father” and “planner”, which also links that person to other signifiers such as “family” or “discipline”.

Signifiers also illustrate and, more importantly, constrain the human subject’s position in social structures. In addition to this, the big-Other defines the social rules and disciplines by addressing the
relationship between signifiers in the symbolic order (Barnard, 2000, p. 74). The subject’s signification is an unconscious and endless process, with the labelling of a subject by a new signifier for a new social role coinciding with his/her connection to new networks of the signifier-chain.

Planning theorists such as Gunder and Hillier (2009), among others, use the capacity of the Lacanian concept of the ‘big-Other’ for analysing contemporary planning practices. They endeavour to show how master signifiers create the planner’s identity and then link them to the big-Other. In this current research, this concept will be deployed for analysing resident identification in contemporary cities under the hegemony of neoliberalism. The following chapters will consider how the big-Other has evolved in contemporary cities, and the effect of this transition on residents’ attitudes. In this context, a question arises: What is the mechanism that is driving the human subject to accept and legitimise the big-Other? To respond to this question, it is necessary to review the Lacanian concepts of ‘the real’, ‘lack’ and ‘fantasy’.

2.6.5-The Real

Lacan first used the term ‘Real’ in an early paper, published in 1936. However, the term’s meaning and its usage changed over the course of Lacan’s work (Evans, 2010). Lacan (2006) conceptualised three realms as shaping the human subject’s understanding of reality and the world: the imaginary, the symbolic and the Real. The Real is the most challenging concept of the three in the Lacanian approach.

For Lacan, the Real stands “outside of any means of presentation by imagine and symbolism” (Gunder & Hillier, 2009, p. 67). Any “attempts to describe the Real are destined to simply distort it” (Hillier, 2003, p. 45). Gunder (2008, p. 195) defines the Real as “an un-definable un-thought outside of language, imagination and signification, an unattainable and un-definable void that we desire to fill – but cannot”. “It is symptomatized by the feeling of ‘dis-case’ that we get when something is not right, but we cannot readily put our finger on what is wrong” (personal conversation- Michael Gunder [1/11/13]). The Real is impossible, as it cannot be imagined, integrated into the symbolic order or achieved in any way (Evans, 2010).

Lacan (2006) distinguished between the Real and social reality by defining social reality as the distorted expression of the Real. The Real resists any form of symbolisation, whereas social reality is
the product of symbolic and imaginary articulations. Žižek (2001, p. 166) stresses that the “ultimate experience of the real is not that of ‘reality’ which shatters illusions, but that of an ‘illusion’ which ‘irrationally’ persists against the pressure of reality, which does not give way to ‘reality’”. In Welcome To The Desert Of The Real (2002c, pp. 5-6), Žižek adds that “the ultimate and defining moment of the twentieth century was the direct experience of the Real as opposed to everyday social reality – the Real in its extreme violence as the price to be paid for peeling off the deceptive layers of reality”.

2.6.6-Desire and lack

Lacan carefully clarified the differences between ‘need’, ‘want’ and ‘desire’. A need such as hunger can be fulfilled. However, the human being cannot respond to his/her desire, which addresses something beyond basic human need. Desire is what is left after need is subtracted from want and desire always contains a dimension of the Other, originally arising with the Mother, “as having the ‘privilege’ of satisfying needs” (Lacan, 2006, p. 580). From a Lacanian perspective, the big-Other not only bends human subjects to social structures, but also creates the desires of human beings.

The big-Other is the symbolic order; it is that foreign language that we are born into and must learn to speak if we are to articulate our own desire. It is also the discourse and desires of those around us, through which we internalise and inflect our own desire (Homer, 2005, p. 72).

In other words, ‘others’, such as parents for the infant, lecturers for students in universities, or even media, induce our desires through their use of language and the discourses of the symbolic order. However, people are often unaware that their desires are produced in their interactions with others (Gunder, 2011c).

A human being can articulate his/her desires by deploying language and using signifiers to address what it is that he/she wants. However, this is problematic because his/her demands are not precisely the same as his/her articulation in the symbolic realm. “This is what Lacan refers to as the ‘symbolic order’ and so the symbolic orders determines the sense that is given to our words and the sense of lack that arises from our failure to master it” (Parker, 2003, p. 99). Thus, a lack exists between desire and its expression by deploying the symbolic order and the failure of its manifestation (Fink, 2002, p. 49). “Desire is at the very core of our being and as such it is essentially a relation to lack; indeed, desire and lack are inextricably tied together” (Homer, 2005, p. 72).
For Lacan, desire is always the materialisation of something that is lacking in the subject and in the Other. The Other shows the subject’s position in the symbolic order and constitutes the subject’s desires as something external, which leads to its socio-cultural position. Thus, a separation occurs between the subject and the Other. This is embedded in two lacks: the lack in the subject and the lack in the Other (Homer, 2005, p. 73). Firstly, all (general) others are desiring subjects and therefore their demands are beyond basic needs. This unlimited demand generates desire. Conversely, the subject wants to be accepted and desired by the Other. However, this is problematic because the Other’s desire is not concrete; it is presented by various signifiers and is continually changing in the signifying chain.

Verhaeghe (1998, p.168) attempts to simplify the process:

[T]he subject, confronted with the enigma of the desire of the Other, tries to verbalise this desire and thus constitutes itself by identifying with the signifiers in the field of the Other, without ever succeeding in filling the gap between subject and Other. Hence, the continuous movement from signifier to signifier, in which the subject alternately appears and disappears.

2.6.7-Fantasy

The concept of fantasy is central to Freud’s work. Lacan, as a follower of Freud, deployed Freud’s formulation of fantasy in his analysis by emphasising the imaginary quality of fantasy in performing desire (Evans, 2010). Further, Lacan focused on the protective role of fantasy, which prevents the human subject from facing trauma by covering the lack in the symbolic constituting the Real.

For Lacan, fantasy obscures the lack and the subject by creating an illusion that reality and its subjective constituents are whole and complete (Gunder, 2003b, p. 284). Thus, the existence of fantasy seems imperative to deal with the sense of discontent and its symptoms, including alienation, antagonism and the inconsistencies that pervade contemporary society. Stavrakakis (1999, p. 107) observes that “[f]antasy negates the [R]eal by promising to ‘realise’ it, by promising to close the gap between the real and reality, by repressing the discursive nature of reality’s production”.

Drawing on Lacan, Žižek redefines the concept of ideology, which, he contends, operates not at the level of knowledge, but at the level of the fantasy, and which sustains belief and informs action.
(Dean, 2001). In The Sublime Object of Ideology (1989, p. 125), Žižek pointed out that “an ideology implies, manipulates, produces a pre-ideological enjoyment structured in fantasy.” The next section will comprehensively review Žižek’s concepts.

The deployment of these Lacanian terms such as lack, big-Other, the real and fantasy will assist in the analysis of the intensification of discontent and its symptoms in globalised cities. Further, these concepts pave the way to consider how hegemonic neoliberal values and ideological discourses have been accepted and legitimised as reality in late capitalism.

2.7-Žižek on knowledge/ideology/enjoyment

This section will review Žižek’s ideas on knowledge, ideology and enjoyment to develop an understanding of the process of the intensification of discontent in contemporary society, and to reveal how ideology presages enjoyment structured in fantasy. According to Parker (2004, p. 23):

Writing by the Slovenian philosopher and psychoanalytic researcher, Žižek has assumed immense importance in cultural and political theory in the last ten years, and his combination of ideas from Hegelian phenomenology, Lacanian psychoanalysis and Marxist politics have provided new ways of thinking about the relationship between ideology, subjectivity and revolutionary change.

Žižek challenges the social, cultural and political conditions of contemporary society under the hegemony of neoliberalism. Žižek has become known as one of the most controversial living philosophers. His domains of interest consist of a large range of topics such as cinema, psychoanalysis and politics (Khader & Rothenberg, 2013). Scholars from a variety of disciplines increasingly deploy Žižekian ideas in their investigations, particularly in human and social studies (Myers, 2004).

Žižek, as a Lacanian, first endeavours to portray a new understanding of human behaviour based on the unconsciousness in contemporary society, in which the human subject is shaped by neoliberal dictums such as more consumption for attaining greater self-enjoyment. Žižek develops his argument in consideration of the contemporary socio-political incidents and trends based on Lacanian concepts, including, but not limited to, lack and enjoyment (Myers, 2004). For Žižek, the symbolic realm is not limited to linguistics and discourse; he extends the symbolic realm into other fields such as opera,
religion, visual art and cinema. Žižek’s writings pave the way for other researchers to use Lacanian concepts in other disciplines, particularly in politics and cultural studies. While some other Lacanian followers, such as Stavrakakis (2011b), challenge aspects of Žižek’s interpretations of Lacan, Žižek readily assists researchers to better understand complex Lacanian concepts. This thesis will deploy both Lacanian and Žižekian ideas, to analyse the impacts and consequences of market-driven policies reshaping globalised cities.

Žižek (1989, 1991a, 1997a, 2004b, 2011a, 2012a), who is also a Marxist, engages with and then re-interprets traditional Marxist concepts such as ideology. Leftist thinkers such as Gramsci, and particularly Marxist-structuralists such as Althusser, among others, have had a significant influence on Žižek’s conceptualisation of Marxism (Žižek, 1989). However, Žižek sturdily supports communism and critically challenges dominant neoliberalism by addressing its failures. Based on his interpretations of Lacan, Žižek addresses some of the perceived weaknesses of traditional Marxism, to create a universal understanding of socio-political trends.

Moreover, Žižek generally addresses the issue of identity and the process of identification in contemporary society under the hegemony of neoliberalism. Until now, Žižekian ideas have rarely been used to analyse the impacts of market-oriented policies on human subject identification in globalised cities. Gunder and Hillier (2009) deploy Žižek’s work in their investigations to address how hegemonic neoliberal values shape the identifications of planners. This thesis will use Žižek’s works to consider social conflicts as symptoms of discontent in neoliberalised cities.

2.7.1-Žižek on knowledge

The deployment of Žižek’s critical definition of knowledge is helpful in the investigation of the decision-making process. Žižek (2006b) critically conceptualised the relationship between the known and the unknown as ‘known-knowns’, ‘known-unknowns’, ‘unknown-unknowns’ and ‘unknown-knowns’. Žižek contended that these combinations although apparently axiomatic, actually shape human beliefs and inform actions.

‘Known-knowns’ are the “things we know that we know” (Žižek, 2006b, p. 132); that is, what people perceive as their knowledge about themselves and the world. This knowledge is mostly discerned as the essence of decisions and, subsequently, actions. For Žižek, the dominant ideology promotes regulated knowledge to obscure the numerous inconsistencies in social reality. The adjusted
knowledge is fantasised as the absolute truth which can cover the inconsistencies and generate certainty, such that “today, science provides security that was once guaranteed by religion” (Žižek, 2008b, p. 59). By overstating the capacity of scientific knowledge in controlling both natural and social phenomena, scientific-based knowledge promises certainty. Beck (2006) observes that the fantasy of certainty is imperative for dominant neoliberalism to sustain its hegemony due to the lack of certainty disrupting the circulation of capital, both finance and human, which are imperative for economic growth.

‘Known-unknowns’ are those “things that we know we don’t know” (Žižek, 2006b, p. 132). These are identified gaps in knowledge. “Something is uncertain if it is unknown or cannot be known” (Abbott, 2005, p. 237). These voids are recognised as sources of uncertainty. Uncertainty has always been part of the on-going processes of nature, and the future has always been complex and indeterminate. “The future is the great unknown” (Abbott, 2005, p. 237). However, known-unknowns reveal the limitations of knowledge in addressing the agents of stability in the future. The recognition of knowledge limitations affects the process of decision-making markedly by including unpredictably and unknowability in considerations.

‘Unknown-unknowns’ are those “things we don’t know we don’t know” (Žižek, 2006b, p. 132). These are mostly beyond human knowledge. For instance, new epidemic diseases such as SARS, Swine flu and HIV can be categorised as unknown-unknowns. “The Freudian name for the ‘unknown unknowns’ is trauma, the violent intrusion of something radically unexpected, something the subject was absolutely not ready for, and which it cannot integrate in any way” (Žižek, 2011, p. 292). However, as Beck (2006, p. 336) added:

>[t]he non-compensatability irony comes to a head in tragic fashion: if risks are held to be non-compensatable, the problem of not-knowing is radicalised. If catastrophes are anticipated whose potential for destruction ultimately threatens everyone, then a risk calculation based on experience and rationality breaks down. Now all possible, more or less improbable scenarios have to be taken into consideration; to knowledge, therefore, drawn from experience and science there now also has to be added imagination, suspicion, fiction, fear.
“Unknown-knowns’ refer to “the things we don’t know that we know” (Žižek, 2006b, p. 132). This concept is precisely embedded in the Freudian unconscious. “From a psycho-analytical point of view, the unconscious is exactly about a knowledge which doesn’t know itself; it is not some deep buried unknown secret, it is the self-evident lying at the very surface” (DeVos, 2009, p. 225). From a Žižekian perspective, unknown-knowns, or the unconscious, determine decisions and inform actions. Žižek (2006b, p. 138) stresses that “unknown knowns are the disavowed beliefs, suppositions, and obscene practices we pretend not to know about, although they form the background of our public values.” Žižek (2008, p.66) observes that the informing role of unknown-knowns in shaping our decision taking is largely ignored:

These disavowed beliefs and suppositions [unknown-knowns] are the ones which prevent us from really believing in the possibility of the catastrophe, and they combine with the ‘unknown unknowns’. The situation is like that of the blind spot in our visual field: we do not see the gap, the picture appears continuous.

In other words, despite the fact that scientific-based decisions may generate catastrophes that can be addressed as the failures of positivistic-based planning, the dominant ideology forces decision-makers into believing in the weaknesses of rationalistic knowledge. Thus, the problem is not lack of scientific knowledge. People know the failures of scientific-based decisions, but cannot make themselves believe in what they know.

These Žižekian critical definitions challenge the common boundaries between the known and the unknown in the decision-making process. These definitions distinguish the both unknown-unknown and unknown-known as the primary resource of uncertainty; Žižek also critically contends that the ‘unknown-known’ is more problematic in the process of decision-making.

### 2.7.2-Žižek on ideology

Žižek endeavours to reinterpret traditional Marxist ideas and concepts under the contemporary socio-political situation of globalisation. Neoliberalism, with its market-driven values, conquered the world and became the dominant way of thinking. Thinkers such as Fukuyama (1996) labelled the situation: “The End of History”; a world with one dominant ideology. In this context, Žižek
controversially defends Marxism and emphasises that he believes that communism is the inevitable solution for human civilisation.

As such, Marxist concepts and theories are crucial to Žižekian analysis of socio-political incidents. However, he deploys Marxist concepts in a particular way that differs from traditional Marxist theory (Wood, 2012). Žižek’s understanding of Marxism is fairly close to that of the Marxist structuralists such as Althusser. Also, Žižek engages with and combines some Lacanian concepts, such as the unconscious, with those of Marxism (Žižek, 1989).

The classic definition of the word ‘ideology’ implies a system of wrong, false, distorted and misguided beliefs, which are typically associated with one’s socio-political opponent. Marx stated that, in society, all human consciousness is embedded in material conditions; thus, by merely changing the material conditions, human consciousness can be reshaped. In his base and superstructure doctrine, Marx argued that the social relations of production shape all forms of socio-cultural and political thought in a society and determine human consciousness (Eagleton, 1994; Parker, 2004, p. 23).

Marx (1976) stated that “[i]t is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness”. Further, in The German Ideology (2004, p.47), Marx and Engels articulated that:

[m]orality, religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corresponding form of consciousness, thus no longer retain the semblance of independence. They have no history, no development; but men, developing their material production and their material intercourse, alter, along with this their real existence, their thinking and the productions of their thinking. Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life.

From the traditional Marxist perspective, commodities as human productions have a fetishistic life that is beyond social control. Human consciousness is shaped based on commodity interactions in capitalism; yet people wrongly presume that they have control over these commodities (Marx, 2007). Thus, Marx argued that false conscious is the basis of ideology in capitalist societies.

For Marx and Engels, ideology is linked to power and dominance. According to Dijk (1998, p.2):

These dominant ideas were associated with those of ruling class. They are part of the ‘superstructure’ and hence are determined by the economic or ‘material’ base of society.
Because the ruling class, however defined, controls the means of production, including
the means of the (re)production of ideas – most notably those of politics, the media,
literature and education – they are also able to make their ideologies more or less
accepted by the ruled as the undisputed knowledge of the ‘natural’ ways things are.

Thus, Marx and Engels (2004, p. 94) stated that the “ideas of the ruling class are, in every age, the
ruling ideas”.

Gramsci (2005), as a follower of Marx, formulated the relationship between ideology and society
by conceptualising the concept of ‘hegemony’. From a Gramscian perspective, in hegemony a certain
way of thinking dominates this is imposed on others by the dominant social class. The dominant idea
conforms to norms, values, political views and social relations and, more crucially, shapes human
perceptions in society (Katz, 2006). Gramsci, as a Marxist, conceptualised a hegemony based on
economic struggle; however, this hegemony was not limited to economic relations and mechanisms
(Carroll, 1997). Moreover, both false consciousness and consciousness remain as focal points in
Gramscian thought (Femia, 1975). Gramsci’s definitions have helped other thinkers such as
Althusser, Laclau and Žižek to interpret social political mechanisms. However, these scholars
redefined and deployed hegemony in various ways in their analyses. This thesis will deploy
hegemony to illustrate how neoliberalism as a dominant ideology regulates resident attitudes in
globalised cities.

Althusser (2008), as a Marxist thinker, who was also influenced by Lacan, endeavoured to
reinterpret the concepts of ideology in a structural context. Althusser, among other structuralists,
mainly considered the interactions between the elements that determine an element’s identity.
Althusser (2005, p. 233), as a Marxist-structuralist, articulated that:

[i]deology is a matter of the lived relation between men and their world. This relation, that
only appears as ‘conscious’ on condition that it is unconscious, in the same way only
seems to be simple on condition that is complex, that it is not a simple relation but a
relation between relations, a second degree relation.

For Althusser, reflecting Lacan’s influence, the relation between the human and his/her world is not
a real relation; it is an imaginary relation, or is at least embedded in an imaginary relation (Althusser,
“What is represented in ideology is not a system of real relations which governs the existence of individuals, but the imaginary relation of those individuals to the real in which they live” (Althusser, 2006, p. 89). Thus, for Althusser, ideology does not express the real relations between people and their world. Rather, ideology defines the way in which humans live within the imaginary relations that shape their perceptions about the real world (Althusser, 2005, p. 234).

Althusser, among others, influenced Žižek and his interpretations of socio-cultural phenomena. In the central chapters of The Sublime Object of Ideology (1989) and The Metastases of Enjoyment (1994), Žižek directly engages the Althusserian re-definition of ideology (Sharp, 2006). According to Althusser (2006), since hegemonic values are taken as natural, human conscious awareness about them is pre-empted and people are habituated to them. In addition, Žižek argues that the human subject cannot realise that he/she is living in an ideology. In contrast, it seems to him/her that Others are unwisely following an ideology as a way of living (Sharp, 2006). Drawing on Lacan and Althusser’s work, Žižek (1989, p. 32) argues that “they [people] do not know it, but they are doing that: the illusion is not the side of the knowledge. It is in the side of reality itself”. The human unconsciously accepts and legitimises the symbolic orders as reality by labelling subjects with different signifiers in signifying-chains. In other words, “[l]evels is thus, bypassed as a system that regulates individuals by constraining them to act according to their beliefs; instead it is the system itself that regulates individuals” (Ware, 2004, p. 38). Thus, ideology is embedded in unconsciousness, which is shaped by the big-Other.

Nonetheless, Žižek also challenges the Althusserian interpretation of ideology regarding his understanding of Lacan. For Žižek, ideology is something more than imaginary or symbolic definitions articulated in the form of discourse or imposed on the human subject under the hegemony of particular ideas. Žižek conceptualises his definition of ideology by involving the Lacanian concepts of ‘enjoyment’ and ‘fantasy’, such as in his analysis of the ideological system of Fascism (Žižek, 1989).

Žižek (1989, p. 125) states that: “the other aims at extracting the kernel of enjoyment, at articulating the way in which – beyond the field of meaning but at the same time internal to it – an ideology implies, manipulates, produces a pre-ideological enjoyment structured in fantasy”. In this context, fantasy structures enjoyment as a scenario by filling the gap between desire and its materialisation in the symbolic realm; that is, it is “a screen masking a void” (Žižek, 1989, p. 126).
Ideology is a fantasy that is masking failures in the process of identification by signifiers, symbolic identity and the signifier-chain of socio-symbolic orders. Thus, ideology is a part of the reality of the perceived human world. However, humans may be unaware of this. Žižek (1989, p. 49) argues that “[a]n ideology is really ‘holding us’ only when we do not feel any opposition between it and reality – that is, when the ideology succeeds in determining the mode of our everyday experience of reality itself”.

From a Žižekian perspective, ideology is more than the imaginary and symbolic relationships and/or the hegemony that Althusser suggested. Ideology is embedded in enjoyment as fantasy and inevitably occurs in the process of identification. Žižek (1989, p. 125) recognises two dimensions constituting ideological interpellation of the subject:

[O]ne is discursive, the ‘symptomal reading’ of the ideological text bringing about the ‘deconstruction’ of the spontaneous experience of its meaning – that is, demonstrating how a given ideological field is a result of a montage of heterogeneous ‘floating signifiers’ of their totalization through the intervention of certain ‘nodal points’; the other aims at extracting the kernel of enjoyment, at articulating the way in which – beyond the field of meaning but at the same time internal to it – an ideology implies, manipulates, produces a pre-ideological enjoyment structured in fantasy.

Moreover, the human subject is unaware of how he/she is interpellated/affected by ideological fantasy (Gunder, 2006, 2010b; Žižek, 1989). Rather, it is just the doxa, the everyday common sense of how the world is (after: Gramsci, 2005).

Žižek’s definitions assist in analysing contemporary society and the reproduction of discontent and its symptoms in the globalised city. Gunder (2003a, 2004, 2006, 2009, 2010a, 2011c) has deployed Žižekian ideas in his investigations. However, until now, planning theorists have not used the potential inherent in Žižek’s ideas in their investigations of socio-cultural conflict in contemporary cities.

This section has reviewed Žižek’s ideas, which will be used in later Chapters to consider the intensification of discontent in contemporary society. This section’s main findings relate to how the dominant ideology constitutes human beliefs, which determine actions. Further, the findings of this
section assist in the application of Lacanian notions for investigating contemporary society in late capitalism.

2.8-Conclusion

This chapter endeavoured to create a philosophical foundation for responding to the thesis’s research questions. By addressing the failures of the prevalent positivistic approaches in analysing urban phenomena in general and socio-cultural conflict in particular, this chapter has revealed the necessity of deploying critical theories such as post-structuralism in planning theory. These critical notions will be used as the theoretical framework of the dissertation.

This chapter briefly reviewed positivism, structuralism and post-structuralism in general and focused in particular on selected ideas from the neo-structuralist Lacan, the post-structuralists Deleuze and Foucault and the Lacanian-Marxist Žižek. This chapter illustrated how structuralism, as a scientific movement, was initiated in linguistics and influenced other disciplines in the human and social sciences such as politics, economics, sociology and anthropology. Although the effects of structuralism on planning theory and practice were not significant, arguably apart from the critical planning theory of a few neo-Marxist and related theorists, such as Castells (1977), Fainstien and Fainstien (1979), Harvey (1985) and Scott & Rowies (1977). This movement indirectly affected planning theory by generating new structural interpretations in other related disciplines, such as sociology and politics.

Post-structuralism is increasingly affecting planning theory and its discourse. Post-structuralism’s potential in generating alternative understandings of social phenomena is useful for re-defining contemporary cities and also for analysing the consequences of planning practice. Planning theorists such as Gunder (2009, 2010b), Hiller (2002, 2009), Flyvbjerg (2001, 2004) and Pløger (2006, 2008), among others, deploy post-structuralism to illustrate the failures of the scientific understandings that continue to dominate in contemporary planning. Further, they use post-structuralist ideas to address factors such as power, desire and lack in decision making for planning practice, which have been either neglected, and/or cannot be gauged by, orthodox scientific methods. However, while these post-structuralist planning theorists have analysed diverse aspects of contemporary planning theory and practices, the role of planning practice as a controlling instrument in reshaping and regulating the
built environment in contemporary cities has not yet been considered. Thus, this research attempts to fill this knowledge gap.

This research aims to investigate the built environment and its symbolic function in reshaping residents’ identities in contemporary cities. In this context, cities are multidimensional, dynamic phenomena, which are the consequence of internal and external forces. Planning policies and practices are generally, at least in theory, categorised as internal forces in transforming cities, and urban policies and plans directly and indirectly have a role in regulating the built environment in cities. This research is an attempt to consider the effects of contemporary planning practice on the built environment of cities. In addition, it focuses on resident identification in contemporary cities as symbolic places.

Selected ideas such as ‘big-Other’, ‘lack’ and ‘jouissance’ from Lacan; ‘desiring-machine’ and ‘assemblege’ from Deleuze; ‘regulation’ and ‘normalisation’ from Foucault; and ‘unknown-knowns’ and ‘ideology’ from Žižek, developed in this chapter will be deployed to generate a philosophical foundation for developing four metaphors, defined in Chapter Four. Thus, the process of regulating the built environment and the function of this in normalising residents’ identities in the globalised city will be conceptualised via four metaphors based on a post-structural understanding and an analysis of social symptoms in cities. However, prior to understanding this task, the next chapter will consider the concept of globalisation.
Chapter Three: Globalisation or multinational capitalism

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian nations into civilization ... In one world after its own image.

(Marx & Engels, 1848)

3.1-Introduction

The previous chapter reviewed relevant critical theories, including structuralism, neo-structuralism and post-structuralism, necessary to generate a philosophical foundation for the further investigation of contemporary cities under the hegemony of globalisation. To consider the impacts of globalisation on cities, a clarification of the concept of globalisation is imperative. Through an extensive literature review, this chapter clarifies the concept of globalisation and reveals its impacts on the contemporary city. The findings of this chapter will assist in responding to the research questions in general and, in particular, research questions number one: how regulation of urban space occurs in global cities, and number two, how place marketing induces heterogeneity in global cities.

Until the beginning of the 1960s, ‘globalisation’, ‘globalise’ and ‘globalising’ were not common concepts in academia. ‘Globalising’ was first deployed in the Economist newspaper in 1959. In 1961, Webster’s was the first dictionary to offer a definition for globalisation and globalism (Waters, 2001). Since the 1990s, scholars have attempted to conceptualise globalisation based on measuring its impacts on everyday life. Nowadays, globalisation is used to address a variety of phenomena and trends.

In this context, this chapter firstly defines globalisation as a controversial term that has been impacting the academic realm, in general, and social science, in particular, since the 1990s (Robertson & White, 2005). This chapter clarifies the definition of globalisation by reviewing definitions proposed by various academics. Following this, the chapter briefly considers globalisation as a multi-layered phenomenon that affects all aspects of contemporary society including the economic, political and socio-cultural realms (Ritzer, 2007). Through the reviewing of relevant literature, the effects of
globalisation such as the changes to local political systems, socio-cultural transformation, demographic change, economic interdependency and physical regulation will be considered.

“Transnational processes such as economic, political and cultural globalisation confront the social sciences with a series of theoretical and methodological challenges” (Sassen, 2007, p. 3). Since the middle of the 1990s, planning theorists such as Goodchild (1990), Healey (1997) and Sandercock (1998, 2003a), among others, have attempted to identify the impacts of globalisation on contemporary cities within the context of their discipline. Sandercock (2005), for example, investigated cultural diversity as a consequence of globalisation. However, the role of contemporary planning practice in regard to the intensification of socio-cultural heterogeneity has largely been neglected in planning theory.

To reveal the impacts of contemporary planning practice in intensifying socio-cultural diversity, the literature will be reviewed pertaining to the effects of globalisation on three main domains: the economic, the political and the socio-cultural. The transformation of these systems because of globalisation influences contemporary city operation and planning. Nonetheless, as Lefebvre reminds readers in his influential book The Production of Space (1991), space and everyday life and their transition cannot be simplified and analysed into general categories such as the political, economic and socio-cultural domains. The deployment of the Deleuze and Guattarian notion of universalism and assemblage assists in this regard, as it facilitates the consideration of globalisation as a dynamic and multi-part mechanism.

This chapter will endeavour to reveal the way in which contemporary planning knowledge is dominated by the neoliberal global discourse. Deploying the critical ideas of planning and urban studies, such as those by Gunder (2003b, 2004, 2010b), Gunder and Hillier (2009), Hillier (2007), Keil (2009), Brenner (2009; 2005) and Amin and Thrift (2002). Further, it examines the deployment of planning knowledge, which has been used largely as an instrument to regulate and control urban everyday life. This chapter will also consider the influences of global neoliberalism as a dominant ideology in contemporary society by drawing on the critical perspectives of Žižek (1989, 2002c, 2004b), Stavrakakis (2008a, 2008b; 2006) and others.

Globalisation and its dominant ideology, neoliberalism, are defined or interpreted in a variety of ways in academic disciplines and contexts. Thus, it is necessary to firstly clarify the definitions used
for these concepts in relation to other academic definitions. Following this, the consequences of globalisation on local economies, political systems and built environments, and on the socio-cultural patterns of cities, will be briefly considered. The subsequent section will define globalisation and its impacts on local systems by reviewing the relevant literature. Following this, neoliberalism as an ideological aspect of globalisation will be considered. The last section of this chapter will investigate the intensification of socio-cultural heterogeneity as a consequence of globalisation.

3.2 - Globalisation

This section will initially clarify the term globalisation and consider how globalisation reshapes local political, social and economic mechanisms. After more than two decades of common usage in the language of academia of such words as ‘globalisation’, ‘globalise’ and ‘globalising’, and despite the many remarkable academic investigations of globalisation, globalisation still remains a controversial and vague concept among academics (Steger, 2004). Scholars deploy a variety of empirical techniques and/or descriptive approaches in their various academic disciplines. Academics operating in the field of social science tend to gauge the extent, impact and direction of globalisation and to define it as a phenomenon (Ritzer, 2010a). Nonetheless, globalisation, like other similar “empty signifiers”, is mostly interpreted in a vague, inconsistent and confused manner (Scholte, 2000).

For some scholars such as Fukuyama (1996), Martin (2000) and Wolf (2000) globalisation is an inevitable process that has the capacity to generate a better world. However, they do not specify the beneficiaries and losers of the process of globalisation. Ritzer (2007) calls the promotion of globalisation, ‘globalphilia’. In the past, the perspectives of globalphiles have mainly addressed, and simultaneously exaggerated, the failures of local political and socio-economic mechanisms in generating desirable lifestyles for a polity. The benefits of globalisation, such as the circulation of data, money, ideas and financial opportunities, are the centre of this group’s consideration. Globalphiles also contend that globalisation and its effects assist in the process of democratisation. They refer to the political transformations in South America, such as in Argentina, Chile and Brazil, where dictatorships have been replaced with democratic political systems (Mason, 2003, p. 25). In this context, globalphiles more or less ignore the negative consequences of globalisation, such as exploitation and the increasing inequality of contemporary society (Harvey, 2005b). This dissertation
will examine the claims of these promoters of globalisation in regards to the city of Dubai as an example of a city that has been shaped by global forces.

Other thinkers, activists and researchers have critically addressed the negative side-effects of globalisation, such as the increasing inequality in contemporary societies, the environmental impacts of globalisation and the disappearance of local socio-cultural traditions and values under the hegemony of dominant global values (Rapley, 2004; Ritzer, 2010a; Sassen, 2007). This group perceives the process of globalisation as a threat for the whole of life on earth. Ritzer (2010a) calls this anti-globalisation perspective: *globalphobia*. Anti-globalism has generated a range of radical reactions, including the demonstrations held to coincide with the meetings of the leaders of the Group of Eight (G8) countries; socio-economic conflicts between local farmers; and labour unions rising up against World Trade Organisation (WTO) policies, which they perceive to significantly affect local economic mechanisms. Some radical thinkers even believe globalisation to be a new form of imperialism (Harvey, 2005a; Robertson & Khondker, 1998; Stewart-Harawira, 2005).

While globalisation is considered a relatively new concept in the academic realm, it may not actually be a new phenomenon (Lechner & Boli, 2000). According to some theorists, the roots of globalisation lie in the history of the interactions between nations and societies. Chanda (2007) categorised the historic process of globalisation into four main interactions: trade (commerce), religion (missionary), adventure (scientific journeys) and military (war). From this perspective, local ideas, social perceptions and behaviours have been regulated through the historic processes of globalisation. For example, the Abrahamic faiths, particularly those of Christianity and Islam, with their ideology of universalism, have had a significant impact on local socio-cultural, political and even economic patterns around the world (Waters, 2001). From these examples, these researchers have concluded that globalisation is an unavoidable trend, embedded in the historic interactions between nations.

Scholars such as Waters (2001), among others, believe that the process of globalisation started in the 15th and 16th centuries, during which time western rationality became dominant around the globe. During the period of mercantilism and colonialism, the process was accelerated, as powerful imperialist countries such as England, Spain, France and the Netherlands came to control almost the entire world. As part of this historic process, indigenous residents of regions into which this western
rationality was becoming dominant, were compelled to conform to these newly arrived socio-cultural values or, at least, these newly imposed ideas. This significantly affected local ways of living in the occupied lands. From this perspective, globalisation is synonymous with westernisation. Thus, while globalisation was first initiated by the shaping of early capitalism in Europe, its operation and consequences should be interpreted within wider history of imperialism (Mehmet, 2001).

Yet, while globalisation is not a new trend from an historical perspective, the trend of globalisation has been accelerated by an increase in socio-cultural, political and economic interdependency between nations; the merging of state boundaries under the flag of neoliberalism; and the advent of advanced communication technologies, due to which distance loses its meaning (Amin, 2002; Sassen, 2003). This thesis considers globalisation as a historic trend, but recognises that this historic procedure has been accelerated under the hegemony of neoliberalism. This has had both positive and negative impacts on contemporary cities. Planning, as a discipline that endeavours to manage urban trends and everyday life, should have a realistic understanding of globalisation and its consequences for cities.

In this section, the influences of globalisation on contemporary life are categorised into three main areas: politics, economics and socio-cultural. However, these areas are not separate mechanisms in social life. Rather, this categorisation is necessary for a better understanding of globalisation and its consequences on contemporary social life in general, and on planning practice in globalised cities in particular. The transformations in these three domains are investigated as relative mechanisms that together generate space. Human identity is shaped in space and also impacts upon it (Lefebvre, 1991). Contrary to Marx’s (2007) position that as a pre-condition the economic mechanism is constitutive of polity and socio-cultural institutions, and also to Weber’s (1992) position that socio-cultural institutions determine the other two realms, this thesis argues that all these realms should be considered equivalent in reshaping cities. The transformation of the local social, political and economic mechanisms are imperative to generate better integration within the global mechanism (Brenner, 2004).

Globalisation as a process increases the interconnections between people and social groups, regardless of political borders. By increasing the interconnectivity and integration between people, interdependency in contemporary societies ascends into all domains as a consequence of
globalisation (Robertson & White, 2005). “Globalisation is increasingly omnipresent” (Ritzer, 2010a). According to Castells (2010), local political, economic and socio-cultural mechanisms are restructured by the increasing liquidity and growing multidimensional flows of people, objects, information and ideology. These global flows generate a global hegemony that regulates local mechanisms. Thus, globalisation may be defined as an integrating process that restructures and demands conformity of localities (Waters, 2001).

The reformed local socio-cultural, political and economic mechanisms resulting from the influence of global forces are not universally the same. The multidimensional hegemony of globalism may more or less regulate external and internal interactions, but the heterogeneity of local systems generates inconsistencies. However, overall, these local social, economic and political systems are largely reshaped and adjusted in the dialectic process between local contingencies and global forces (Carpentier, 2011).

The new mechanisms are the synthesis of the dialectic of local and global forces. Taking the case of Dubai, the local tribalism has been changed into a new type of political system that is more comparable to that of a large company rather than to a state or a country. The ruler is de facto the city-company manager and the residents are workers in the city-company. While the political system in Dubai adjusts itself in accordance with the prevailing global forces, it is a synthesis of the local political system and globalism. However, it is dissimilar to any other political system (Kanna, 2011). In other words, local mechanisms are inevitably transformed by globalism and its forces, but the outcomes are not uniform. This conclusion is compatible with the (neo/post)-structural perspectives of Foucault and Deleuze, which hold that phenomena should be considered in their context (Culler, 2007). Thus, new local mechanisms such as those of Dubai should be investigated as distinctive case studies within their socio-cultural, economic and political patterns.

Cities have traditionally been the geographical focal points in which social, political and economic structures have been shaped and transformed by changing local or international conditions (Dovey, 2005, p. 3). Some researchers, such as Abrahamson (2004), have articulated that globalisation is embedded in increasing transnational connections between major cities. Abrahamson (2004, p. 2) argues that “the linkages among cities cutting across nations became a global network”. Thus, local
transformations occur because of the influence of global forces on major cities, which in turn influence other cities, towns and even villages – all are affected by globalisation.

Although planners and geographers have been endeavoursing to identify globalisation and its consequences for cities since the 1990s, globalisation remains as one of the most widespread issues in planning theory. Friedmann (2003, p. 9) argues that “our world has changed dramatically, and planning needs to be brought in line with what is happening, from globalisation and neoliberalist ideologies to multiculturalism and post-modernity”. An investigation of the relevant literature and concepts in planning that conceptualise globalisation is thus indispensable for obtaining a better understanding of the impacts of globalisation on contemporary cities. The following section will clarify the terms ‘global city’ and ‘world city’ as the basis for using these terms in the analysis beginning in the next chapter.

3.2.1-Global cities

This section will consider the concept of the global city and its characteristics. This clarification assists the investigation of the neoliberalised global city and its products in late capitalism. According to Beaverstock et al. (1999, p.445):

Large and significant cities have fascinated social scientists over the last century and this is indicated by the range of terms used to describe them: imperial cities, primate cities, great industrial cities, millionaire cities, world cities, global capitalist cities, international financial centres, mega-cities and global cities are all well-known designations.

Patrick Geddes, the pioneer thinker and writer on the city and regional planning, conceptualised the ‘world city’ in 1915. In doing so, he defined the characteristics of world cities to distinguish them from other population centres. From Geddes’ perspective, world cities are usually major centres of both national and international political power. They also house the main business centres, the major professional organisations and the dominant industries (Hall, 2006). Hall (2006) added to the definition to include the cultural character of the world city, showing the role of major universities, publishers and multimedia in shaping contemporary society. Friedmann and Wolff (2006) developed the concept of world cities in the area of planning theory by exposing the influence of global capitalism
on cities, such as in the restructuring of their local economic, social, physical and political mechanisms.

Cohen first conceptualised the ‘global city’ in 1981, when he recognised the linkages between the major capitalist organisations and the transforming connections of the global urban system. He suggested that cities should be ranked based on their international connections rather than on their local networks (Brenner & Keil, 2006). Cohen (2006, p. 50) added that “[c]hanges in the corporation and in the structure of the advanced corporate services have led to the emergence of a series of global cities which serve as international centres for business decision making and corporate strategy formulation.” Cohen’s primary focus in regards to this was the financial interdependency between cities in developed countries.

Sassen is arguably the most influential and widely cited contemporary analyst of global cities (Robinson, 2005). She endeavours to identify and analyse global cities by considering both the international economic connections among cities and the specification of global cities based on their advanced producer and financial service industries, such as law, banking, accounting, consultancy and insurance (Brenner & Keil, 2006, p. 82). Sassen postulates that the increasing spatial inequality and polarisation in cities are inherent effects of globalisation. Sassen (2000, p. 52) states:

[i]nequality in the profit-making capabilities of different sectors of the economy has always existed. But what we see happening today takes place on another order of magnitude and is engendering massive distortions in the operations of various markets, from housing to labour.

Addressing the consequences of globalisation in the contemporary city, Sassen, among others, emphasises the importance of the economic mechanisms and those of the financial services. Sassen also refers to global cities as ‘command centres’ that have a controlling role in the dominant capitalist system (Thorlney & Rydin, 2002).

Urban scholars such as Friedmann & Wolff (2006), Sassen (2009), Brenner (2005) and Sandercock (2003a), among others, attempt to identify and portray the characteristics of global cities. Keil (1998) stated that the world city formation is the urbanisation of global restructuring. In this context, the processes of global transformation are mainly considered as being multidimensional, and
as significantly restructuring the economic, political, socio-cultural and physical environment (Newman & Thornley, 2002). This chapter defines the global city as a city that is highly dependent on its global networks, which channel into it the vital flows of migration, capital and ideology.

“This multi-faceted process of globalization has profound implications for planning” (Thornley & Rydin, 2002, p. 6). Planning is a part of the state’s bureaucratic machine, and is deployed for predicting and controlling future transformations (Friedmann, 2011). Traditionally, planning methods and techniques have been developed based on investigations of cities’ structures regardless of their regional and historical interdependencies. In other words, the focus of planning practice has traditionally been on internal trends, changes and interactions. However, now more than ever in history, contemporary cities are affected to a greater degree by external forces than by internal interactions (Newman & Thornley, 2005). Due to the restructuring of local mechanisms by globalisation, planners have been confronted with new challenges that the prevailing positivistic planning knowledge arguably fails to tackle (Thornley & Rydin, 2002). Simultaneously, global forces have influenced planning knowledge and discourse through neoliberal values (Allmendinger, 2001a).

As Newman and Thornley (2002) pointed out, the interconnectivity and interdependency of contemporary cities in the global market intensifies urban complexity. Therefore, geographers and planners such as Abrahamson (2004), Friedmann (2002) and Newman and Thornley (2005), among others, have deployed comparative methods to distinguish similarities and differences between globalised cities to clarify global trends and their influences. These urban scholars largely utilise scientific methods in their comparative investigations; and the global interactions between cities at varying spatial levels (for example, national, regional and global levels) are studied to include external forces in research considerations. However, positivistic methods continue to shape the knowledge produced by these comparative studies (Sassen, 2003, p. 3). These comparative results are thus insufficient for understanding the global multi-layered forces that significantly affect cities, because of the limitations inherent in this scientific approach.

The current thesis, which investigates the city of Dubai and deploys critical theories such as post-structuralism, is an attempt to generate a new understanding of global cities in the planning theory. To attain the research objectives, it is necessary to define the term ‘global city’ more specifically. Thus, here, a global city is a city that is shaped, or at least transformed, by global forces; its local political,
economic and socio-cultural mechanisms and even its built environment have been dynamically adjusted to operate effectively within global neoliberalism. The transformations of local systems in global cities create a hegemonic space that influences their residents’ attitudes. Yet, at the same time, hegemony never fully eventuates, and the existing heterogeneity creates contingencies in the global city (Carpentier, 2011). Socio-cultural conflicts are representative examples of the contingencies that increasingly occur in globalised cities. This dissertation defines contemporary globalism as an intensifier of socio-cultural contradictions in contemporary society. Social problems such as exclusion and marginalisation as symptoms of discontent are characteristics of the global city (Beall, 2002; Keil, 1998; Madanipour, 2004; Marcuse & Kempen, 2000). Yet, most scholars in social science, including planners, generally neglect and/or misinterpret these social symptoms due to deploying scientific methods, which are ontologically incapable in grasping discontent as the root of social contradictions.

Magnusson (2000, p. 295) argues that:

[...]he concept of the global city invites us to abandon a number of old distinctions: between the local (the city) and the global; between the economic, the social, the cultural and the political; and between the static (structures, systems, space) and the dynamic (movement, time).

Yet, for better understanding the social symptoms that occur in global cities, it is necessary to review the manner in which globalisation restructures a city’s political, economic and socio-cultural domains. In addition, it is important to consider the way in which these transformations modify planning, as the knowledge exists to support the market operation and sustain the dominant ideology (Allmendinger, 2001a).

3.2.2-Political restructuring

This section will investigate how globalisation transforms local political mechanisms, particularly the capitalistic state. This review will help to generate a better understanding of the role of planning as a part of the state apparatus in late capitalism. Globalisation and its forces increasingly reform local power mechanisms to operate effectively as a component of global capitalism (Keil, 1998). This transformation inherently encompasses planning which generally attains its legitimacy from the state. By changing the role of the capitalistic state under the hegemony of neoliberal globalism, the processes of policy making and their implementation at various spatial levels also change to respond
to new challenges (Healey, 1997). Tiesdell and Allmendinger (2005, p. 61) argued that planning is a political activity. Planning, as a component of the state, often operates to sustain the dominant power mechanism by obscuring its failures (Allmendinger, 2001a; Hillier, 2002). Thus, the transformation of the state’s implemented policies and plans largely reflects the transitions of the role of the capitalistic state. To consider political transformation as a consequence of globalisation, this research concentrates its attention on the role of power institutions, particularly that of the state, under the hegemony of global capitalism.

However, “[s]tate theorists have long emphasised the territorial dimensions of political power in the modern world” (Brenner, 2004, p. 448). For Marx, “the nature of state derives from the nature of economy which underpins it: a feudal state is different to a capitalistic state because the economies of these systems are different” (Fitzpatrick, 2011, p. 88). This research deploys this rationale to analyse the function of the state under contemporary capitalism – neoliberal globalism.

In Anti-Oedipus (2009, p. 235), Deleuze and Guattari extensively elucidate the role of the state in the process of regulation and adjustment of other mechanisms within capitalism to maximise capital accumulation. Further, Foucault (1991) points out that capitalism through its power institutions, such as the state, endeavoured to normalise the historical industrialising city’s residents into productive bodies and to mitigate the side effects of rapid urbanisation. Thus, the regulation of the industrialising city’s space had been essential for mass production. Further, the industrial city was also the place of mass consumption due to its accumulation of people. This city largely depended on flows of raw materials and its work force, particularly from displaced several agricultural workers (e.g. the British “Enclosure Acts”). For Deleuze and Guattari, the capitalistic state with its regulative capacity attempted to codify and control the flows into the city. “The state, its police, and its army form a gigantic enterprise of anti-production, but at the heart of production itself, and conditioning its production” (Deleuze and Guattari, 2009, p. 235). During the 1930s, Keynes suggested that the capitalistic state should expand its control over market operation to secure the condition for stable economic growth and “to save capitalism from itself” (Fitzpatrick, 2011, p. 90). Keynesian economics became widely accepted and implemented after the Second World War.

Neoliberal globalism significantly has changed the economic system and the state’s political mechanisms (Harvey, 2007). Due to the dislocation of industry from the developed to developing
countries with their lower cost of production, including wage, tax and control, the capitalistic city, at least in the west, has changed from a place of mass production and consumption into the place only of consumption (Harvey, 2005); or as Florida (2002, 2003) would argue, of creativity, service and consumption. The geographical distance between a place largely only of mass production and the place of mass consumerism expands interdependencies of the neoliberalised global city to the global market. Žižek (1997b, p. 44) observes that:

[a]t the beginning (ideally, of course), there is capitalism within the confines of a Nation-State, with the accompanying international trade (exchange between sovereign Nation-States); what follows is the relationship of colonisation in which the colonising country subordinates and exploits (economically, politically, culturally) the colonised country; the final moment of this process is the paradox of colonisation in which there are only colonies, no colonising countries – the colonising power is no longer a Nation-State but directly the global company.

The transformation of the economic mechanism changes the function of the capitalistic state from the managerial and regulative into an entrepreneurial, competitiveness, market oriented-framework in late capitalism (Harvey, 1989; Brenner, 2004). Under the flag of globalisation, the market, itself, largely determines the capitalistic state, one which largely facilitates market's operation to sustain economic growth. For Deleuze and Guattari (2009), the constant flows of capital and labour are imperative for the operation of this capitalistic mechanism and its economic growth. In this context, the capitalistic state contests with other to lure the largest portion of global flows of both human capital and finance, based on its market needs.

However, globalisation also reduces the controlling role of the capitalistic state. The regulative capacity of the entrepreneurial state is deployed to conduct and direct the flows of capital and workers in the ways which generate higher profit. Thus, the capitalistic state with its regulative capacity becomes a component of the global system which functions based largely or by on a market rationale. Further, the transformation of capitalistic state largely influences contemporary planning. This understanding of the transformation of the capitalistic state in late capitalism will be deployed in consideration of the neoliberal globalised city and its products, including the production of desires, the normalisation of attitude and the resultant intensification of its discontent.
3.2.3-Economic interdependency

This section will investigate how globalisation changes local economic mechanisms. The process of globalisation has not left economic science untouched: economists comprehensively consider global economic integration and its multi-dimensional impacts on local economies (Went, 2002). Urban scholars such as Friedmann and Wolff (2006), Scott (2001), Harvey (2005a), and others, believe that local economic transformation is the most crucial impact of globalisation on localities in the post-Fordism era. Since the late 1970s, the effects of globalisation at various spatial levels have been a central consideration in planning and geography (Brenner & Keil, 2006).

Over the last three decades, planners and geographers have endeavoured to identify and rank cities based on their international economic interconnections (Cohen, 2006; Friedmann, 2002). Hall (2001), Taylor (2003) and Sassen (2009) all define the global city as a financial hub in global economic interactions. “World city theory has been employed extensively in studies of the role of major cities as global financial centres, as headquarters locations for transnational corporations and as agglomerations for advanced producers and financial services industries” (Brenner & Keil, 2006, p. 9). From this perspective, the economies of cities have become more integrated within the global network and more dependent on financial, information and migration flows. The economic interdependency on the global mechanism precisely illustrates a city’s position in the global cities ranking list (Friedmann, 2002; Hall, 2001; Sassen, 2002).

Marxist and neo-Marxist urbanists such as Lefebvre (1991), Castells (1977), Harvey (2005b, 2007) stress that the global market-oriented economy is embedded in the liberalising of trade and the mitigation of the controlling role of national governments over economic activities (Waters, 2001). For neo-Marxists, globalised cities are the spatial materialisation of capitalism. They study the city and its economic changes within a macro-geographical context; the economic transformation of cities can be interpreted as part of the on-going development and restless spatial expansion of the capitalist economy (Brenner & Keil, 2006).

Global forces significantly reshape the economies of globalised cities. The re-shaping ranges from manufacturing/production to services, consumerism and enjoyment (Knox, 1997). Simultaneously, as global financial centres, globalised cities facilitate the circulation of global finance, people, information and ideological flows (Hall, 2001). These circulations generate surplus-value in neoliberalised global
cities which is materialised in the form of massive urban projects, such as business towers, gated communities and shopping malls. In this context, the entrepreneurial state, including planning, generally attempts to lure the flows of capital by implementing market-oriented policies which suggest higher profit for international investors and greater enjoyment for creative class workers (Florida, 2002).

The global city contests with other cities to purchase the required work force from the global labour market. Florida (2002) observed that the economic growth of the global city relies on the flow of creative class workers (human capital) who are perceived as the primary driving force for the economy. Despite the fact that the movement of footloose workers is indispensable for the economic growth, the entrepreneurial state largely regulates the flow of people based on market needs.

“There are interrelationships between the production of goods and that of space” (Lefebvre, 1976, p. 31). Globalisation changes the mechanism of production, and the distribution and consumption in contemporary cities. Subsequent to the dislocation of industry to the developing countries of China, India and Indonesia, “the [neoliberalised global] city is in fact nothing more than a space for consumption” (Miles, 2010, p. 1). The neoliberalised state, in collaboration with its international co-partners and local influential players, commercialises the contemporary city space. The implementation of market oriented policies, including privatisation of urban space, creates the space of consumption, such as shopping malls, theme parks, art galleries, cinema complexes, waterfront projects, casinos and gated communities, which characterises the neoliberal city (Sager, 2013). The neoliberalised state and its components, including planning, legitimises and facilitates the establishment of these urban projects to lure the flows of finance and workers which both are required for the constant economic growth (Dovey, 2005).

3.2.4-Socio-cultural transformations

Not only the built environment, but also the social environment, is profoundly changed by globalisation. This section will investigate how globalisation, as a ubiquitous phenomenon, transforms contemporary society. At the beginning of the 1990s, Huntington, in his controversial paper, The Clash of Civilizations (1992), argued that socio-cultural conflict is the primary impediment for the completion of the hegemony of neoliberal globalism. The 9/11 attack in New York City on the World Trade Centre – perceived as a symbol of the dominant global capitalism – was a tragedy. It also
revealed the seriousness of socio-cultural global tension in the post-Fordist era. From this, cultural
globalisation and its influences on localities moved beyond being a concern solely of academics,
becoming an issue of global concern (Green & Griffith, 2002). Socio-cultural contradictions are
common in globalised cities, which are characterised by socio-cultural heterogeneity. As a corollary of
this, planners increasingly confront issues relating to the socio-cultural contradictions in globalised
cities (Pizarro et al., 2003).

Pizarro et al. (2003, p. 121) state “[a]ll evidence points at the fact that under the influence of
globalisation, western consumer culture is spreading at great speeds across national borders.” In the
work of scholars on cultural globalisation, the following three terms are prevalent to describe the
different attitudes towards globalisation: the hyper-globaliser (Fagan & Munc, 2009; Steger, 2003),
the sceptic (Martell, 2008) and the transformationists (Fairclough & Thornas, 2004; Held et al., 1999). Deploying these terms below assists in the analysis of the hegemony of globalisation.

The hyper-globalisers mostly elucidate globalisation as a new process in an epoch in which global
markets and competition are the harbingers of human progress. In this context, other cultures (non-
western) are perceived as obstacles to the furtherance of the progress of civilisation (Fairclough & Thornas, 2004). The prediction is that local socio-cultural systems will gradually be replaced by a new
form of dominant ideology (western culture with its mechanism of truth) as a consequence of global
social, political and economic integrations (Martell, 2010; Pizarro et al., 2003). Benyon and Dunkerley
(2000, p. 7) state that “eventually all cultural difference would be erased and cultural sameness
superimposed, fuelled by the immensely powerful, transnational media corporations”. Although some
other researchers such as Appadurai (1990, 2001), contest this view and argue that the globalisation
of culture is not the same as its homogenisation, transnational cultural values are ineluctably
absorbed into local political economies by their transformation under the hegemony of globalism.

The sceptics generally consider globalisation as merely a new discourse that has been greatly
overemphasised (Martell, 2010). They generally perceive the cultural impacts of globalisation as
superficial. For example, sceptics argue that the majority of businesses and companies, including
transnational corporations, are nation-based institutions in the economic realm. Thus, there is a need
for active economic policies to protect local companies in the face of globalisation. The sceptics point
to the importance of the nation-state, as the basic unit of the local political mechanism, retaining its
autonomy and sovereignty, even after increasing the role of regional and global political alliances in shaping local policies (Held et al., 1999; Martell, 2007). The divergence and clashes between local traditions and global hegemonic values are the main concern of sceptics. For sceptics, nationalism and local traditions still play a primary role in shaping contemporary human values. From this perspective, anti-globalists exaggerate the adverse effects of globalisation on local cultures (Beck et al., 2003; Hirst & Thompson, 1996; Huntington, 1992).

The third view is that of the transformationists. This perspective conceptualises globalisation as global transformation (Martell, 2007), and as constituting a historical epoch (Pizarro et al., 2003). Contrary to other theories regarding globalisation, transformationists assert that the process of globalisation creates hybrid socio-cultural, economic and political conditions in the dialectic between locality on the one hand and global hegemony on the other. Based on the diversity of the influences of globalisation on local institutions, transformationists argue that the transformed institutions more or less convey their locality (Held et al., 1999). In other words, globalisation, as a process, generates new local mechanisms by restructuring existing institutions. Socio-cultural contradictions are mostly interpreted as contingencies against the global hegemony. Thus, global homogenisation will not occur entirely under the hegemony of global neoliberalism.

These dominant perspectives endeavour to recognise and conceptualise the cultural effects of globalisation on local socio-cultural systems (Held et al., 1999; Martell, 2007; Pizarro et al., 2003). These general understandings are inadequate for analysing socio-cultural changes as a multidimensional phenomenon. Socio-cultural changes coincide with political and economic transitions. This multi-layered transition increases complexity, making it difficult, if not impossible, to analyse (Steger, 2004).

As is mentioned in previous sections, globalisation constantly transforms political, economic mechanisms in favour of the market, so as to be more effective components, of global capitalism. Further, hegemonic globalisation also has changed socio-cultural values and terms based on neoliberalism and its market values. Dominant capitalism decodes everything, including socio-cultural norms and values, and then regulates them “by imposing a law of general equivalence in the form of monetary” (Roffe, 2010, p. 41). Under the hegemony of globalisation, differences, including local
socio-cultural values and norms, are preserved as far as these values and norms facilitate market operation in generating higher profit.

In regards to this transition, globalisation with its market values shapes a new form of society embedded in more consumerism and greater enjoyment. Marshall (2007, p.110) observes that, since the 1980s, “the prevalence of the market in all facets of social life” in combination with new technology increases possibilities for enjoyment in contemporary society. Consumption is the core of contemporary society – the “desire to buy more, work more, earn more and have more” (Gunder, 2009, p. 292). Drawing on Lacan’s work, in The End of Dissatisfaction? (2004), McGowan conceptualises contemporary society as the society of enjoyment in which enjoyment is perceived as a duty. Pre-existing socio-cultural mechanisms, including those of early capitalism, generally prohibited enjoyment. On the contrary, the society of commanded enjoyment persuades people to enjoy more by further consumption.

This section reviewed the prevalent definitions of cultural globalisation. It demonstrated that these definitions mostly consider the symptoms of globalisation. This section also revealed that globalisation reshapes local socio-cultural norms and values, to be largely reflective of market values.

3.2.5-Globalisation as a dominant ideology

This section endeavours to demonstrate an understanding of globalisation as an ideology which inherently promotes neoliberalism and its market values. “Global change and the increasing importance of transnational flows and networks in all areas of social life create new challenges for the social sciences” (Castles, 2001, p. 13). Socio-cultural transformation is a multi-directional phenomenon. Globalisation significantly restructures the existing mechanisms and simultaneously normalises residents’ behaviour. These consequences are not separate; but are completely intertwined. Rankin (2003) states that culture, and its changes as consequences of globalisation, must be viewed not as a given set of relations and ideas structuring social life, but as something that is produced through human intentions and actions in the mundane routines of daily life.

The process of globalisation is not merely a trend that dramatically restructures existing institutions; it simultaneously conveys capitalistic values that significantly change everyday life interactions (Mittleman, 2004b). Keil (1998, p. 619) points out that “the concept of globalisation
contains ideological and analytical dimensions”. In other words, globalisation, as an extreme form of liberal capitalism, emerges in new forms of social, political and economic organisation and in technology and culture. Specifically, the rise of giant corporations, cartels and international alliances restructure national political mechanisms in both their ‘non-democratic’ and ‘democratic’ capitalist state forms; and cultural industries and mass-media serve as new modes of social control, as powerful forms of ideology and domination, and novel configurations of culture and everyday life (Kellner, 2002).

Thus, the multidimensional process of globalisation is a hegemonic process that significantly affects daily life in the post-Fordism era (Mittelman, 2004a). By deploying Gramscian ideas, Comaroff and Comaroff (1991, p. 22) articulate:

[the hegemonic] power ... hides itself in forms of everyday life. Sometimes ascribed to transcendental, suprahistorical forces (gods or ancestors, nature or physics, biological instinct or probability), these forms are not easily questioned. Being ‘natural’ or ‘ineffable’, they seem to be beyond human agency, notwithstanding the fact that the interests they serve may be all too human.

Rankin (2003) argues that under the hegemonic condition, those in subordinate positions experience the mechanism that dominates them as natural or as an inevitable reality. In this context, the hegemony of globalisation and its capitalist ideology are largely perceived as an unavoidable historic process, even by opponents such as anti-globalists (Steger, 2004).

The question thus arises: What of the diversity of daily life? Lefebvre (1984, p. 8) responds as follows, to much criticism from sceptics:

[w]hatever the case may be, housing, fashion and food have tended and still tend to constitute autonomous subsystems, closed off from one another. Each of them appears to present as great a diversity as the old modes of living of the post-modern era. This diversity is only apparent.

The diversity of daily life is mainly superficial. However, the dominant capitalist mechanism, to some extent, tolerates this diversity and makes it possible in post-industrial societies. It is deployed to generate greater capital accumulation. For example, by attracting expert or affluent immigrants into
globalised cities, socio-cultural heterogeneity creates economic growth (Florida, 2003). From Deleuze and Guattars’ perspective, the capitalist mechanism decodes and then recodes the existing structures, and diversity is only allowed to ground if it is convertible to the capital (Deleuze & Guattari, 2009, p. 223).

At the core of contemporary society, the human subject is inescapably surrounded by global hegemonic forces that constantly reshape his/her understandings about him/herself and the world. On the one hand, neoliberal capitalism, at least in theory, is embedded in the empowerment of the individual’s sovereignty and freedom as a primary driver of the globalisation of the economy, society, culture and politics. On the other hand, a worldwide tendency is observed for uniformity in most aspects of everyday life under the hegemony of the capitalist rationality (Lefebvre, 1984). As Mittelman (2004b, p. 3) points out:

[The power of globalisation orients the development of dominant knowledge. And knowledge about globalisation is, in turn, represented as ideology: a way of interpreting the world and for the contemplation of strategies of action knowledge and ideology should not be construed as either mechanically reflecting material power conditions or wholly autonomous from them. Rather, there is a series of interactions, best understood as being contingent.

In this context, other forms of lifestyle are generally demonised, or at least are perceived as anomalous and/or against the nature of humanity (Rankin, 2003; Steger, 2004).

The human subject, unconsciously or semi-consciously, collects and legitimates the global dominant values in symbolic interactions with others in globalised societies. The intensive and extensive global cultural flows, such as popular music, movies, TV shows and fashion, engender the dominant ideology of consumerism, commercial enrichment and entertainment (Held et al., 1999; Pizarro et al., 2003). These flows constantly generate new desires and needs, to be satisfied only by greater consumption. Further, these cultural flows are accompanied by the standardised knowledge embedded in western capitalist rationality (Lefebvre, 1984; Mittelman, 2004b). Globalisation, with its neoliberal ideologies, significantly regulates human behaviour in contemporary society. However, people may not be aware of this normalisation. *Neoliberalism can thus be said to be hegemonic to the extent that it not only expresses dominant capitalist interests but is also accepted as normal
reality, or common sense, even by those who are hardest hit by ‘deregulation’, fiscal austerity and workfare” (Rankin, 2003, p. 714).

By analysing everyday life in globalised societies, the process of socio-cultural homogenisation can be observed, regardless of the apparent diversity under the hegemony of global capitalism (Banerjee & Linstead, 2001). However, hegemony never completely occurs and is continuously confronted with new contingencies (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001). Moreover, Foucault (1991) recognises an on-going resistance to the process of normalisation. In this context, social contradictions and cultural conflicts can be analysed, not in the way that the sceptics approach them – as a priority of national or local culture – but as reactionary resistance to the hegemony of the dominant global values. Chapter Five will comprehensively investigate how the hegemonic neoliberalism intensifies discontent in late capitalist society.

This section elucidated how globalisation encompasses the ideology of neoliberalism. It revealed how the hegemonic neoliberalism normalises various local socio-cultural values based on the market rationale. The following section will investigate socio-cultural heterogeneity as a consequence of neoliberal globalisation.

3.2.6-Globalisation and multiculturalism

This section considers the intensification of socio-cultural heterogeneity as an inherent consequence of globalisation. “The twenty-first century is indisputably the century of multicultural cities” (Sandercock, 2003b, p. 50). International migration flows, as another consequence of globalisation, significantly affect local political, economic and socio-cultural structures (Appadurai, 1990; Castles et al., 2005; Pizarro et al., 2003; Sassen, 2007). On the one hand, cultural diversity, as a consequence of global forces, creates new opportunities in cities (Florida, 2002). On the other hand, social tensions and cultural contradictions dramatically increase in globalised cities that host people with different ethnicities, culture and religions (Madanipour, 2004). Due to the growing number of problems associated with, and encountered by, the global flow of people and the generation of multicultural societies, this has become a controversial issue within the academic and non-academic realms, particularly since the early 1990s (Castles, 2002).
Scholars, such as Ritzer (2010a), correctly argue that international immigration flows and cultural diversity are not new phenomena limited to the post-Fordist era; rather, it is a historic trend. Indeed, large cross-border population movements and cultural coexistence have been frequent occurrences throughout the course of human history. Historical multiculturalists generally refer to the processes that shaped colonial countries such as the United States of America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand as representative examples of the massive population movements of the pre-industrial and industrial ages (O'Rourke & Williamson, 1999). Undoubtedly, migrant flow accelerated dramatically following the implementation of neoliberal policies, which blurred nation-state borders and facilitated the circulation of capital, populations and information. In this context, multiculturalism is extensively promoted as a policy for encouraging the type of economic growth that attracts cheap labour and skilled experts as human capital, and creates the circumstances for absorbing the increase in international financial flow from the global financial market belonging to the more affluent migrants (Samers, 2006). Consequently, now more than ever, major cities host people of diverse ethnicities, cultures and religions.

In Multiculturalism, Or, the Cultural logic of Multinational Capitalism, Žižek (1997b) critically considers multiculturalism in late capitalism. Global capitalism operates as the “global company” in which the global company is the sole colonising power in late capitalism. In this context, multiculturalism is the ideal form of ideology of the global company, shaping a kind of empty global position which respects local cultures. Nonetheless, it has “towards the French or American local population exactly the same attitude as towards the population of Mexico, Brazil or Taiwan” (Žižek, 1997b, p. 44). For Žižek, multiculturalism encompasses “patronising Eurocentric distance and/or respect for local cultures without roots in one’s own particular culture” (Žižek, 1997b, p. 44). Thus, multiculturalism, as a normalising policy, embraces Others and normalises them to be effective part of the global company.

Global cities as global financial centres, as headquarters locations for transnational corporations, and as agglomerations for advanced producers, become the main destinations for migrant flows (Sassen, 1996). On the one hand, the massive population mobility generates economic opportunities in the host cities. On the other hand, new socio-cultural and political challenges arise because of the increasing number of migrants in cities. For example, socio-cultural contradictions related to migration flow have increased in globalised cities such as Dubai and Singapore (Kanna, 2009a).
Some scholars, such as Harvey (2005a), have endeavoured to recognise and expose the conflicts in globalised cities by using neo-Marxist ideas. In this way, attention is directed towards the economic inequalities inherent in neoliberalism as the primary source of socio-cultural conflict. From this perspective, socio-cultural contradictions such as exclusion and marginalisation are perceived as the inevitable consequences of the neo-liberalisation of society (Harvey, 2005b, 2007). Neo-Marxist’s interpretations assist researchers in urban studies in general, and planners in particular, to analyse conflicts. Yet, this method and its understandings are inadequate to expose the hidden aspects of the socio-cultural contradictions rooted in residents’ dissatisfaction and/or discontent in neoliberalised society (Stavrakakis, 2007). A neoliberalised city is the product of hegemonic and subordinate cultures, while also being the site of their reproduction. Resistance against the process of normalisation under the hegemony of global neoliberalism, in addition to other factors such as increasing economic inequalities, generates social conflicts, such as anti-social behaviours and vandalism in the contemporary city.

Globalised cities, among their other characteristics, are perceived as global cultural hubs, broadcasting neoliberal values. As Hall (2006) observed, international multimedia institutions, cultural centres, main universities, research institutions and global socio-cultural exhibitions are all located in global cities. Thus, these cities play a crucial role in the promotion of neoliberal values in the contemporary world, including those of greater consumption and enjoyment. In this way, global hegemonic forces significantly affect everyday life regardless of the cultural heterogeneity of globalised cities (Cuthbert, 2006).

Resistance against global hegemony is mainly expressed as anti-social behaviour, such as vandalism and racism, or in its radical form by Christian, Jewish or Islamic fundamentalism, which increasingly occurs in or affects global cities. Radical groups demonise globalised cities for their promotion of neoliberal values. For instance, Dubai is referred to as a “sin city” by radical Muslims, who conceptualise Dubai’s neoliberal operation vis-a-vis Islamic Sharia laws (Hazbun, 2006).

“As planners, we are increasingly called on to operate in situations characterised by material and cultural difference, and to deal with the challenges and conflicts to which these differences give rise” (Watson, 2006, p. 32). With the increasing socio-cultural tension in cities, scholars in planning theory must endeavour to distinguish, formulate and manage these conflicts. In doing so, various
approaches have been suggested such as ‘collaborative planning’ by Healey (1997), ‘just planning’ by Watson (2006) and Fainstein (2010), and ‘storytelling’ by Sandercock (2003a). This dissertation deploys a post-structural approach to consider residents’ discontent as one factor, among others, that creates social conflict in neoliberalised cities. From this perspective, the hegemonic process of neoliberalism is perceived as a generator of discontent in contemporary cities, and exclusion, marginalisation and anti-social behaviour are the main symptoms of this discontent.

3.3-Conclusion

This chapter aimed to generate a better understanding of the globalised city’s operation and productions in late capitalism. This understanding will be used to respond to research questions number one, two and three. By reviewing a wide literature, this chapter clarified the term globalisation and exposed its consequences. It revealed when and why globalisation and its effects became a key concern of academia. In addition, it illustrated how the process of globalisation, as a historic trend, accelerated after the Cold War by means of political, economic, socio-cultural and technological change, thereby affecting all aspects of contemporary society. Due to the increasing interconnections, and thus greater interdependency, between nations, governments and individuals, the world now seems more integrated than ever before. This integration coincides with a blurring of national borders, facilitating global flows of information, immigration, finance and ideology. In post-Fordist society, global trends expedite the circulation, reproduction and maximisation of capital accumulation. Based on these findings, Chapter Four will explain how transformations of locality due to the hegemony of global neoliberalism standardise urban spaces.

This chapter also revealed that globalisation is embedded in capitalism. Neoliberalism, as the extreme form of capitalism, precipitated globalisation. Thus, globalisation and neoliberalisation are generally perceived together as a trend by which local political, socio-cultural and economic mechanisms have been transformed based on market values to better integrate them with global mechanisms. In addition, the chapter illustrated that local political, socio-cultural and economic changes are not separate, but rather are intertwined to shape a dynamic mechanism.

The findings of this chapter have been deployed to begin to address the answer to research question number three. The findings show how the neoliberalisation of localities as a global trend promotes extreme individualism and self-enjoyment, which dramatically change human behaviour in
contemporary society. Residents of globalised cities as hubs of financial, cultural and political activities are under the hegemony of neoliberalism. As such, consumerism, alongside an extreme individualism promising surplus enjoyment, has been accepted as essential in a society of commanded enjoyment.

The chapter exposed the role of globalised cities within the global capital mechanism. Globalised cities, as financial, cultural and political hubs, are essential parts of the global capital mechanism. In the global mechanism, as geographic nodal points, cities lure global flows of migration, finance and ideas and allocate them in urban regions. Based on this definition of the globalised city, Chapter Four will conceptualise the functions and productions of globalised cities, including the way in which they generate new desires and normalise their residents’ behaviour based on market values. This conceptualisation will assist to answer research questions numbers one, two and three.
Chapter Four: The neoliberalised city as a desiring- and normalising-machine

*Desire is never separable from complex assemblages that necessarily tie into molecular levels, from micro-formations already shaping postures, attitudes, perceptions expectations, semiotic system, etc.*

(Deleuze & Guattari, 1988, p. 256)

*Space has been shaped and molded from historical and natural elements, but this has been a political process. Space is political and ideological. It is a product literally filled with ideology.*

(Lefebvre, 1976)

### 4.1-Introduction

This chapter will investigate the globalised city to bring understanding to important issues not fully developed in the globalisation literature explored in the previous chapter, such as socio-cultural conflict, drawing on the critical ideas of Deleuze and Foucault reviewed in Chapter Two. The deployment of these critical ideas will assist in conceptualising the reproductions of new desires and the normalisation of residents' behaviour as the inherent products of the globalised city operation.

The following section conceptualises the global city as an assemblage; this conceptualisation will assist to answer the first research question: How are urban spaces regulated in the globalised city under the hegemony of neoliberal globalism? Section 4.3 argues that the globalised city operation largely relies on the production of new desires to lure global flows of financial and human capital to the city; and that market-oriented policies, including massive urban projects, play a major role in generating new desires in globalised cities. This argument begins to answer the second research question: What role do market-oriented policies, including massive urban projects, have in the homogenisation of urban space? Based on Foucault's work, section 4.4 will consider the regulative capacity of planning practice as a component of control apparatuses. This argument is a response to the third research question: What role do market-driven policies including urban projects, play in normalising residents' behaviour?
The contemporary world, more than ever before in history, seems like an intricate machine due to the expanding interconnectivity and interdependency between states, peoples and individuals (Bogue, 2005; Ruccio, 2003). Global flows of finance, migration, information and ideas combine to generate an integrated global mechanism that facilitates the reproduction of capital accumulation (Castells, 2010; Deleuze & Guattari, 2009; Harvey, 2007). Deleuze and Guattari (200p, p. 44) affirm that each flow “must be considered as an ideal thing, an infinite flux”.

In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari (2009) conceptualise global capitalism as a machine that operates within a universal machine and which also conveys other machines. Based on this, Deleuze and Guattari (2009, p. 1) state that “[e]verywhere it is machines – real ones, not figurative ones: machines driving other machines, machines being driven by other machines, with all the necessary couplings and connections”. Further, Deleuze and Guattari (2009, p. 43) argue that every machine “is in relation with a continuous material flow”.

Deleuze and Guattari’s universal mechanism seems more perceptible in a post-industrial society in which impediments such as national borders are increasingly fading and international affiliation creates a new perception of the “global village” (Banerjee & Linstead, 2001; Kellner, 2002). Global capitalism as a machine conveys other machines such as cities in general, and global cities in particular, which operate within and which also create global capitalism (Dovey, 2005, 2010). The global city-machine and its functions in the global mechanism as a new metaphor will be conceptualised in this chapter. In this context, the production of the global city-machine, which includes desire, the standardisation of the built environment and the normalisation of residents’ behaviour, will be considered through the deployment of the critical ideas of Deleuze and Guattari and Foucault. As mentioned, these theories have been relatively neglected in the realm of planning. In addition, this chapter will investigate the role of contemporary planning practice as a part of the state apparatus (the bureaucratic machine) in the global city-machine. The research will reveal how contemporary planning practice assists global capitalism to achieve its aims. Based on Deleuze’s work, the following section will conceptualise the global city operation in late capitalism.

4.2-The city as a machine

This section is an attempt to generate a better understanding of the globalised city operation based on Deleuze’s work. Amin and Thrift (2002, p. 74) note that “[t]he first step in building the new
The city-machine is not a new metaphor in the academic realm; it was first conceptualised by the utopist Garnier in ‘The Industrial City’, and this concept is embedded in the dominant mechanistic rationality of the early 20th century (Kaika & Swyngedouw, 2000). Further, the International Congresses of Modern Architecture (CIAM), in particular Le Corbusier, extensively developed and implemented the concept of the city-machine, “the functional city”, when designing new cities, such as Chandigarh in India, and in the restoration of the demolished cities of Europe following the Second World War (Mumford & Frampton, 2000). These CIAM members endeavoured to reveal the basic functions of cities by investigating industrial cities based on the dominant mechanistic rationality (Akkerman, 2003, p. 93).

The functions of the city-machine were generally categorised into four physical functions: living, working, recreation and circulation (Mumford & Frampton, 2000). Critiques imitated the general mechanical understanding of cities following the failure of the modernist avant-garde movement (of which CIAM was a part) to achieve its promised goals. Despite CIAM’s work being an important influential stream in planning, urban design and architecture since the Second World War, everyday life and its multi-dimensional aspects as representing the soul of existing cities was largely neglected in this mechanistic understanding (Lefebvre, 2002, 2008). Yet, regardless of this failure to generate adequate understanding of city operation, modernist rationality and its scientific-based general definitions, such as those of CIAM, continue to be dominantly deployed and implemented in contemporary planning practice, urban design projects and architecture (Akkerman, 2003; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Gottdiener, 2000; Gunder & Hillier, 2009). In this section, to create a better understanding of the contemporary city, the research endeavours to reconceptualise the city-machine based on Deleuze’s post-structuralist philosophy. In this context, the physical functions of cities are merely perceived as a part of the visible city machine, which is simultaneously interacting with other mechanisms.

Cities are dynamic and complex machines; their functions, interactions and territories cannot be completely recognised and represented, particularly when derived only from the empirical observation of traditional social science (Amin & Thrift, 2002; Byrne, 2003; De Landa, 1997; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Friedmann, 2011). In previous chapters, by reviewing the work of Lefebvre (1991), Flyvbjerg (2001), and others, the weaknesses in planning and analysing urban complexity of the prevailing positivistic approaches have been explained. Thus, in this research the term assemblage, as it is used in
Deleuze and Guattari’s work, is used to conceptualise the complexity of the city-machine. As Farías (2011, p. 369) notes:

[T]he major advantage of introducing the concept of assemblage into the field of urban studies is that it allows us to move away from a notion of the city as a whole to the a notion of the city as multiplicity, from the study of multiple urban assemblages.

According to Wise (2008, p. 77):

An assemblage is not a set of predetermined parts (such as the pieces of a plastic model aeroplane) that are then put together in order or into an already-conceived structure (the model aeroplane). Nor is an assemblage a random collection of things, since there is a sense that an assemblage is a whole of some sort that expresses some identity and claims a territory.

It is the socio-cultural, political and economic institutions, the invisible machines and their interplay with the physical environment that shape the city-machine as a whole. These are not predetermined parts; they have been shaped and then reformed by the city’s history. In other words, “[t]hey [the cities] are an assemblage of active historical agents making daily choices of how to live well” (Sandercock, 2002, p. 4). The interactions between systems generate a provisional identity and also a territory for the city (Dovey, 2005). City identity and territory are not static, but are dynamic; they are transformed in interactions with other machines and crucial flows.

The city as an assemblage is not an enclosed mechanism; it inevitably relies on its connections with other mechanisms through prominent flows (Brenner et al., 2011; Dovey, 2005; Farías, 2011; McFarlane, 2011a). “Through its multiplicity, an assemblage is shaped by, and acts on, a wide range of flows” ( Livesey, 2010, p. 18). This definition is contrary to that of a traditional utopia, which have been theorised as a delimited mechanism, such as in Plato’s Republic and More’s Utopia (Stavrakakis, 2011b, p. 301). Amin (2004, p. 34) states that “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”. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the process of globalisation extends the interdependency of cities; global flows such as those of finance, migration and information become indispensable to the existence of the contemporary city operation (Jacobs,
Briefly, the city-machine is an assemblage with a multiplicity of characters. It is not a predetermined or pre-formed organisation; it is dynamic instead of static and determined by flows (Dovey, 2005).

The city, similar to other machines, is a product of, and also a producer of, flows (Dovey, 2005). Urban historians such as Morris (1994) and Mumford (1986), among others, observed that the first human settlements, as collections of countable huts, arose in fertile lands beside permanently flowing rivers, where the Neolithic agricultural revolution created flows of surplus-food as an essential prerequisite for the settlement of people at a geographical point. Weber, in his book, *The City* (1958), elucidated the way in which, during the Middle Ages, pedlars and traffickers rebuilt most of the existing European cities alongside congested Roman-built roads. In the medieval city, the roads, as arteries, facilitated the movement of commodities, people and ideas. This assisted in the reshaping of socio-cultural, economic and political mechanisms. Further, in the Renaissance period, the prosperous Italian city-states were intercontinental trading hubs that attracted flows of luxurious goods, such as silk, cotton and other fine fabrics, musk, spices, medicines and jewels, and slaves from other continents. The Italian traders then redistributed these commodities around Europe. With the discovery of new sea routes, in conjunction with the discovery of new continents, the direction of flows changed dramatically. Mediterranean cities such as Venice lost their bargaining privilege in contest with the newly formed trading hubs of Amsterdam and London (Martin & Romano, 2000).

Industrial cities were also extremely dependent on incessant flows of water, raw materials and labour to generate capital accumulation. At the commencement of the industrial era, industrial cities such as Manchester had been developed adjacent to perpetually flowing rivers, which supplied both energy and a means of transportation for raw materials, people and products. The invention of the steam engine was a revolution that accelerated the movement of raw materials, goods, people and the domination of colonial power around the world (Heynen *et al.*, 2006; Maw *et al.*, 2011; Swyngedouw, 2004). Flows are also essential for the existence of post-industrial cities, recognised and conceptualised in urban studies as being the main driver of urban transformation facilitating flexible accumulation (Castells, 1997; Harvey, 2004).

The operation of capitalist cities is embedded in a set of flows that generate possibilities for capital accumulation (Harvey, 1989; Marx, 2007; McFarlane, 2011; Roffe, 2010). To be precise, in the post-
industrial era, global cities are geographic nodes that are shaped and developed by flows of capital, information and people (Friedmann, 2002). The city and its rank among other cities is measured by its connectivity and interdependency within the global network of flows, which are empowered by new technologies (Friedmann & Wolff, 2006; Sassen, 2009). Thus, connections and flows are the indispensable preconditions for the operation of the city-machine as an assemblage in the global network of commodities, finance, people and information (Jacobs, 2011).

Deleuze and Guattari’s conceptualisation of flows is complex, comprising a variety of levels including commuters and the traffic in the city, the flow of words bound up in language, the transition of the genetic code between generations and the flow of matter itself, such as in the moving of electrons through conductive materials (Roffe, 2010, p. 40). Thus, flows as referred to in the Deleuzian context are not limited to the movement of commodities and capital, as is familiar in studies in the humanities or economics. Nevertheless, previous investigations mainly concentrate on the physical flows and their impact on cities, which, arguably, seem more recognisable and measurable by the empirical observation methods employed by the social scientific approach than is the case for unseen, difficult to quantify, if at all, flows. Not-withstanding, to reveal urban mechanisms, urban assemblage researchers such as Farias (2010), McFarlane (2011a) and Smith (2010) often study physical city flows, such as inter-urban networking, highways and communication systems (Brenner et al., 2011). However, these general studies of urban complexity appear to be methodologically problematic.

The first problem is that the exact frontiers between the various flows cannot be understood because they are continually converting to other forms (Deleuze & Guattari, 2009). Transformations increase convolution, thus scientific approaches fail to demarcate the flows adequately and estimate them efficiently. In natural science, scientists and engineers utilise the coefficients found in their scientific calculations to mitigate the weaknesses of scientific methods in evaluating natural flows. For example, hydrologists who study the movement, distribution and quality of water on Earth, deploy coefficients to decrease the rate of failure in their calculations of water movement. Planners also encounter the uncertainty inherent in the dominant scientific-based knowledge in their prediction of natural flows such as flooding, earthquakes and tsunamis. Therefore, to address this uncertainty, resilience is conceptualised and deployed in planning discourse (Ernstson et al., 2010). Moreover,
some movements change from the visible to the invisible category, such as the fluidity of water in
dams changed into an energy form.

The essence of flows is transformation. Money and some other commodities are illustrative
examples of this. For example, in electronic banking, physical types of money, such as coins or
banknotes, are changed into non-material forms. This new form facilitates the flow of money around
the globe. Economists also utilise coefficients in their calculations to include informal business
activities such as trading on the unofficial black market and money laundering. Scientific models fail to
reveal financial flows adequately or to predict changes in flows. The failure of the scientific
understanding to anticipate the continuity of financial flows, such as financial flow in an economic
crisis, generates challenges for the process of policy-making and the implementation of plans such as
urban mega projects (Flyvbjerg et al., 2003). Scientific knowledge has shown less item perfect
achievement, in evaluating visible flows such as water, raw materials, products and work forces, and it
is largely incapable of identifying the transitions that occur with information, discourse and ideology.

From a Deleuze and Guattarian perspective, all forms of society, in both the pre-capitalist and
capitalist world, have endeavoured to code fluxes by deploying mysticism and science (Deleuze &
Guattari, 2009). In this context, Deleuze and Guattari view science as an attempt to code flows
embedded in the dominant capitalist mechanism, which are thus different from the flows of pre-
capitalist mechanisms, such as when societies were nomadic. “The difference between primitive and
capitalist social machines is the difference between coding and decoding” (Colebrook, 2002, p. 48).
Dominant scientific knowledge decodes and then recodes the traditional mysticism of flows based on
the market-values within the capitalist mechanism (Holland, 2010, p. 42). “Capitalism is in fact born of
[the] encounter of two sorts of flows: the decoded flows of production in the form of money-capital,
and the decoded flows of labour in the form of [the] free worker” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2009, p. 33).
Thus, in a market-oriented society, “[w]e see all social objects as representative of one general value
– money – that can act as translator or decoder for any system” (Colebrook, 2002, p. 48).

In this context, planning theorists such as Hillier (2005, 2007), Pløger (2008) and Wood (2009)
endeavour to reveal the process of decoding and recoding flows in contemporary planning practice
that operates as part of the capitalist apparatus. Hillier, for example, describes the process of the
decoding and recoding of the Australian Aboriginals’ mysticism in relation to capitalist codes (money)
through a planning project in Western Australia (Hillier, 2005). Yet, dominant capitalist-based understanding fails to generate certainty when there is a dynamic, complex and unpredictable state. In relation to this, Hillier (2010, p. 90) stated: “I identify a need for spatial planning to accommodate fluidity and immanence and to have some form of temporary fixity”. Hillier believes that strategic plans are inherently problematic and cannot mitigate the ontological and methodological failures of the capitalist-coding mechanism. However, this temporary fixity generates possibilities for plutocrats to maximise their financial benefits by affecting the process of policy-making and implementing their policy in the capitalist machine. Further, spatial planning is largely perceived as a democratic process that increases participation by engaging various social groups (Albrechts, 2006, p. 750). Nonetheless, participants’ interests are inevitably (mis)interpreted, decoded and recoded through the capitalist dominant discourse (Gunder, 2010b). According to Deleuze and Guattari (2009, p.233):

The true axiomatic is that the social machine itself [including a bureaucratic machine such as planning practice], which takes [the] place of the old coding and organizes all the decoded flows, including the flows of [the] scientific and technical codes, for the benefit of the capitalist system and in the service of its end.

Using the case study, the problems of spatial planning will be comprehensively analysed in the following chapters.

To generate a better understanding of global capitalism, neo-Marxist thinkers such as Harvey and Castells generally combine two concepts: political economy of space, and flows (Dovey & Sandercock, 2002). The capitalist mechanism continuously engenders the flux of capital, people and information to produce capital accumulation. In this context, Castells (2010) formulated his theory of ‘network society’ to reveal the prominence of flows in the post-Fordist society. Castells’ definition of flux is embedded in Marx’s political economy of space; therefore, he defines “the flows as the purposeful, repetitive, programmable sequences of exchange and interactions between physically disjointed positioned held by social actors in the economic, political, and symbolic structures of society” (Tajbakhsh, 2001, p. 187). Harvey (2000, pp. 70-71) observed that:

[The 1970s and 1980s have consequently been a troubled period of economic restructuring and social and political readjustment. In the social space created by all flux and uncertainty, a series of novel experiments in the realms of industrial organization as
well as in political and social life have begun to take shape. These experiments may represent the early stirring of the passage to an entirely new regime of accumulation, coupled with a quite different system of political and social regulation. Flexible accumulation, as I shall tentatively call it, is marked by a direct confrontation with rigidities of Fordism. It rests on flexibility with respect to labour processes, labour market, products and patterns of consumption. It is characterized by the emergence of an entirely new sector of production, new ways of providing financial services, new markets, and above all greatly intensified rates of commercial, technological, and organizational innovation. Harvey and Castell's contributions significantly influenced urban studies, including planning. However, their neo-Marxist investigations generalise urban complexity because the role of humans as primary actors is generally ignored in neo-Marxist analysis.

The existing theoretical approach in planning theory, such as political economy of space, combined with post-structural concepts such as flow and urban assemblage, contributes in defining the contemporary global urban condition (Brenner et al., 2011). The word *assemblage* is increasingly deployed in urban studies to describe the coming together of heterogeneous elements within an institution, place, built environment or city (McFarlane, 2011b; Purcell, 2013; Sassen, 2008). According to Farias (2011) and McFarlane (2011a), the concept of 'assemblage' potentially assists planners, urban designers and geographers to understand contemporary city change, and in particular built environment transformation. In this context, Farias (2011, p. 368) states that “by looking at cities we can learn more about capitalism as a form of life, although not as a global abstracts logic imposing its form into local spaces, but as a concrete process assuming multiple forms even within a city”.

Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the 'universal mechanism' generates new prospects for critical planning theory, which, arguably, remains mired in outdated research agendas, particularly in grasping the kernel of urban transformation (Brenner et al., 2011, p. 226). In *Anti-Oedipus* (2009), Deleuze and Guattari conceptualise the universe as a mechanism encompassing immeasurable interconnected and interdependent machines. From Deleuze and Guattari's perspective, the universal mechanism is a 'difference-engine'. “The key universal is not just production but specifically the production of difference free from codification and representation” (Holland, 2010, p. 43). By
increasing global integration and its impact on cities, the concept of a universal mechanism seems applicable in the analysis of globalised cities. By addressing the weaknesses of orthodox Marxist implementations of the political economy of space to mitigate the failures of its structural methodology, Deleuze and Guattari suggested a new analytical tool based on flows. In this context, the mechanisms of economic change and socio-political readjustment in capitalist society are considered as consequences of changing flows (Deleuze & Guattari, 2009, p. 346).

Despite disagreements between Deleuze and Guattari’s definitions and those of the neo-Marxists such as Harvey and Castells, both approaches’ interpretations of social, political and economic change, in the context of political economy, are embedded in the work of Marx. As Brenner et al. (2011) argued, the combination of the political economy of space with urban assemblage and the idea of flows creates a more integrated picture of the political, economic and socio-cultural adjustments and urban physical changes occurring under the hegemony of global capitalism. This holistic understanding investigates “change, transgressions, contingency, temporality, fluidity, immanence and emergence giving an open-endedness of social contexts” (Hillier, 2008: 25), all of which are the main challenges of contemporary planning practice. As Dovey accurately (2005, p. 5) stated, “[t]he fluidity of the city is both a condition and an ideology”.

The premise of Deleuze and Guattari’s political thought is embedded in coding, decoding and recoding flows. According to Marxism, the existence of all forms of society, both pre-capitalist and capitalist, are contingent upon restricting, or coding, flows (Roffe, 2010, p. 40). In both Anti-Oedipus (2009) and A Thousand Plateaus (1988), Deleuze and Guattari detailed how the first social, cultural and political institutions in pre-capitalist societies were shaped through the process of coding flows. These mechanisms were subsequently transformed by the decoding and recoding of the flows in capitalist society (Roffe, 2010, p. 41; Surin, 2010, p. 258). “Societies, as regimes of coding, aim to bring about certain fixed ways of existing (living, talking, working, relating) while denying other more malleable ways” (Roffe, 2010, p. 40). Deleuze and Guattari distinguished between pre-capitalist and capitalist coding systems. This distinctiveness of capitalism from other coding mechanisms shapes the core of Deleuze and Guattari’s (2009) understanding of the nature of contemporary society.
From a Deleuze and Guattarian perspective, pre-capitalist societies had a coding order that symbolically shaped their social, political and economic institutions as machines. By deploying Mumford’s concept of the ‘mega-machine’, they (2009, p. 142) articulated that:

The primitive territorial machine, with its immobile motor, the earth, is already a social machine, a mega-machine, that codes the flows of productions, the flows of means of production, of producers and consumers: the full body of the goodness Earth gathers to itself the cultivated species, the agricultural implements, and human organs.

The social machine is operating through a particular coding system as a symbolic realm that regulates socio-cultural, political and economic institutions. For example, in a kinship or tribal system, the flow of genes “is determined as dominant by economic and political factors. And if filiation expresses what is dominant while being itself determined, alliance expresses what is determinant, or rather the return of the determinant in the determinate system of dominant” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2009, p. 147). The coding systems are not fixed; rather, they have changed through the course of history. For instance, the coding of sexual relations through marriage in the tribal tradition changed under despotic mechanisms, such as those of religion, and has finally been decoded – commoditised – in capitalist societies (Roffe, 2010, p. 41).

For Deleuze and Guattari (2009, p. 142), the last coding system is capitalism which they called “the end of history”. By deploying Marxist ideas, they argued that the capitalist coding system becomes self-critical: it continually decodes and recodes flows to produce capital accumulation (Deleuze & Guattari, 2009, p. 153). Based on the works of Deleuze and Guattari, Roffe (2010, p. 41) identified four main characteristics of capitalist society that render it distinct from other forms of coding regime:

First, instead of working by coding flows, capitalism is a regime of decoding. Second, and in tandem of this, the recoding that would take place in non-capitalist societies to recapture decoded flows is replaced by the process of axiomatisation … Axioms operate, in short, by emptying flows of their specific meaning in their coded context and imposing a law of general equivalence in the form of monetary value … The third important aspect of capitalism for Deleuze and Guattari, drawing on Marx – was that this process of decoding/ axiomatisation [commodification] has no real limit … However, such a process
could never be total. Thus, fourthly, the fact that capitalist society proceeds in this way does not mean for Deleuze and Guattari that coded elements of social formation are entirely absent.

The operations of the city-machine as an assemblage of social, political and economic institutions and physical environment rely largely on the existing coding regimes (Bell, 2010, p. 21). By illustrating the differences between capitalist and pre-capitalist societies, the city as a product and a productive machine can be analysed in the context of various coding regimes. Contemporary cities, as machines, inevitably operate within dominant global capital flows. Global capitalism consistently readjusts the local power and socio-economic mechanisms. However, the capitalist coding regime fails to entirely decode and recode the flows (Roffe, 2010). “[U]nlike previous social machines, the capitalist machine is incapable of providing a code that will apply to the whole of the social field” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2009, p. 33). Thus, the pre-capitalist social structures such as tribes, monarchies and governments remain, while having their juridical power substantially or superficially reduced to be accepted and able to operate within the global capitalist mechanism. Social structures as regulative mechanisms are put to work in the service of capitalism and thus stabilise the growth of decoding/axiomatisation. Despite the diversity of local political, social and economic systems, the operations of cities and their productions should be analysed in the context of global capitalism and its flows (Amin & Thrift, 2002).

In Anti-Oedipus, Deleuze and Guattari (2009, p. 33) identified two primary flows in the capitalist coding regime: “the decoded flows of production in the form of money-capital, and the decoded flows of labour in the form of the free worker”. Under the hegemony of global capitalism, both of these flows considerably affect the operation of the city-machine and its products. The capitalist-machine commoditises all aspects of everyday life by readjusting the pre-existing sub-machines, such as the bureaucratic machine, including planning practice. Thus, all forms of capital, including social capital (preferential cooperation), individual capital (labour, skill and talent), public capital (government-owned asserts), natural capital (ecological resources) and even spiritual capital (values of beliefs) are converted into monetary values within the capitalist-machine. The process of decoding and recoding flows occurs in the city-machine in which sub-social machines are operating.

Contemporary planning as part of the state apparatus works as a bureaucratic machine in decoding and recoding flows of land, property and other resources, based on their market-oriented
values (Hillier, 2007). Gunder and Hillier (2009) demonstrated that the most prevalent concepts in contemporary planning discourse, such as sustainability and the public good, among others, are often reified in the dominant capitalist discourse. Further, the capitalist machine promotes new concepts such as those of ‘competitiveness’, which are subsequently legitimised as an indisputable reality and extensively implemented in urban plans and policies (Gunder, 2011b).

For Deleuze and Guattari (2009), the movement of labour is imperative for the capitalist machine. In pre-capitalist society, work forces, such as slaves, peasants and serfs, were subordinated to the dominant legitimate powers, such as the church, or the feudal or despotic state. Conversely, in capitalist society, at least in theory, labourers are perceived as free workers. However, labourers’ freedom is not unconditional: the capitalist machine prohibits complete freedom through its controlling sub-machines, such as schools and universities, which standardise knowledge (Foucault, 1991); the media (Adorno, 2003; Gunder, 2011c); and by reshaping everyday life (Lefebvre, 1991). The process of decoding and recoding labour assists the capitalist mechanism to move labour forces to where there is a demand for them.

Forms of migration, immigration and emigration, represent an important form of flow for the existence of capitalism. In the early stages of capitalism, the flow of peasants from villages to industrial cities empowered the capitalist mechanism. In his extensive investigations of North America, Florida (2002, 2003) found a correspondence between economic growth and immigration. However, the movement of free workers is conditional. Nation states, as pre-existing machines, are adapted to function within the capitalist machine, and one of their primary functions is the regulation of the movement of people with regard to market demand. Deleuze and Guattari (2009, p. 235) described the state as being ‘anti-production’; adding that the regulatory control apparatus is imperative for the operation of the capitalist machine. This function is addressed in the various immigration policies permanently changed by nation states. The policies of a state, including its immigration policies, are generally implemented to lure skilled or affluent expatriates (Ong, 2007, p. 87). Dovey (2005, p. 244) observed that state policies regulate the fluxes of the city-machine. This raises the questions: What incentives persuade people to migrate to neoliberalised cities? How do global cities attract expatriates, whether skilled or unskilled, as one of the priorities driving economic growth in the post-Fordist era?
To respond to these questions, the thesis reveals the necessity of the production of new desires to lure flows of labour and capital into the capitalistic city-machine. The city-machine continuously produce new desires, including promising a better lifestyle and more enjoyment (Bach, 2011; Dovey, 2005; Ong, 2007). Drawing on Deleuze, the following section analyses the process of desire production.

4.3-The city as a desiring-machine

A number of scholars such as Lacan (2007), Baudrillard (1998), Deleuze and Guattari (2009), Jameson (2005) and Žižek (2011a) have indicated that desire is the key driver in contemporary capitalism. This section focuses solely on Deleuze and Guattari’s work. According to Deleuze and Guattari (2009), the flows of desire are the sine qua non of a city-machine’s operations: first and foremost, cities are desiring-machines. Dovey (2005, p. 20) stated that “the city is an immanent flow of desires”. The existence of the city-machine is reliant on the generation of new desires, imperative for attracting capital and labour flows. Dovey (2005, p. 20) added “[f]lows of desire are the life force of the fluid city”. Planning theorists such as Sandercock (2003a) and urban design theorists such as Dovey (2011) deploy the idea of desire and/or flows of desire to redefine the contemporary city. However, the flow of desire, as one of the crucial products of the city-machine, has largely been ignored or misinterpreted. This section endeavours to illustrate the mechanism of desire-production in capitalist cities in late capitalism. First, the process of reshaping a city’s identity based on the flow of desire is considered. Next, the mechanism of the production of new desires within the city-machine is discussed in relation to how it regenerates others flows, which in turn reproduce capital accumulation. Lastly, this section will reveal the functions of contemporary planning practice, as part of the bureaucratic machine that operates to sustain the city-machine in late capitalist society.

Dovey (2005, p. 20) postulated that “[t]he world is not a collection of subjects who have desires, rather desires construct the subject”. The flows of desire fabricate the identity of the city-machine as the assemblage of an urban built environment and everyday life. The type of desires that are produced for profit, investment, privilege, consumption and power generally promise increased enjoyment, and significantly affect contemporary urban transformation. The enormous shopping malls, luxurious residential complexes, hotels, skyscrapers and exorbitant waterfront projects that proliferate in most cities are representative examples of the flow of desires. In the words of Wood (2009, p. 204):
From this account of desire, flows of capital must, of necessity, be parasitic upon flows of desire; the basic argument which follows is ‘before’ the market can play a determining role in urban development, flows of desire must be made tantamount to, and seemingly derivative from, flows of capital.

This researcher agrees with Sandercock’s (2003) notion of ‘the city of desire’, which recognises desire as a resource of city vitality. She accurately observed that contemporary planning dismantles the urban space as a place of various desires in the process of privatisation and commercialisation (Sandercock, 2005, p. 403). However, what is generally neglected is the capacity of capitalism in the regulation of desires. The capitalist mechanism significantly regulates the process of desire production. “For Deleuze and Guattari, the key determinant of a society’s structure is given by the way in which it produces desire rather than the way in which it produces goods and services” (Wood, 2009, p. 204). Local socio-cultural, economic and political institutions are adjusted to generate new desires based on global capitalistic values. Colebrook (2002, p. 127) acknowledges that “[c]apitalism is a surplus of flows; anything is allowable and permissible if it can be translated into a capital flows”.

Sandercock rightly identifies the contemporary city as a place of desires. However, the capitalist city is the machine in which desires are decoded and recoded based on market values. “Capitalism legitimates new flows of desires” (Dovey, 2005, p. 22). Contrary to Sandercock’s ideas, the city-machine mainly operates through regulated desires and “[a]ny ‘Other’ is as good as any ‘Other’ just so long as they are willing to consume” (Wood, 2009, p. 207).

Globalised cities are places in which regulated desires erupt into the production of flows of material and sign values (Dovey, 2005; Ong, 2007). For Deleuze and Guattari (2009), desire is revolutionary for the de-territorialisation of the existing condition or territories. However, new desires are only allowed to transfer and materialise as avant-garde productions if they generate capital flows. Wood (2009, p. 203) argued that “capitalism works by first ‘deterritorialising’ desire, sweeping aside pre-existing desires, and then ‘reterritorialising’ desire, subsequently producing new desires which are indexed to capitalization processes”. The Bilbao Guggenheim Museum is an illustrative example of how an avant-garde desire becomes an economic driver in the capitalist mechanism. The desire to have an iconic architectural building is promoted globally as a lucrative model for city development by advertising-machines in the media. In this context, “[p]ublic interests become redefined for the new entrepreneurial city as ‘place myths’ that are constructed through advertising” (Dovey, 2005, p. 4).
Thus, cities across the western and non-western world have followed in an effort to build the ‘iconic’ as the materialisation of this regulated desire (Hannigan, 2003, p. 357; Kaika & Thielen, 2006, p. 66). Jencks (2005, p. 7) terms this phenomenon ‘the Bilbao effect’.

As the tallest building in the world, Burj Khalifeh in Dubai provides an example of the desire to construct the highest tower. This has stimulated other cities, such as Jeddah in Saudi Arabia and Baku in Azerbaijan to pursue the same desire. “[T]his renewed global quest for height reflects a mix of forces, including a desire for images of modernity, progress and reform in developing nations, constructions of national and cultural identity as well as corporate identity” (Dovey, 2008, p. 131). However, while these new desires appear to deterritorialise the pre-existing conditions and/or design boundaries, they are only allowed to materialise with the grounds of capitalism. Urban mega projects, including the construction of iconic architectural buildings, have purposefully materialised to operate as capitalistic desiring-machines within the city-mechanism.

Market-oriented planning, including urban mega projects, operates through the assimilation of all desires based on capitalism. All flows of desire are decoded or de-territorialised to the flows of capital through the process of project assessment. First, [capitalism] does this by “converting” the qualitative values which underpin social codes into purely quantitative values of money, investment, [and] profit. Using money as a universal equivalent, capitalism brings all social flows to gather in quantifiable and commensurable relations. (Wood, 2009, p. 204)

Market-oriented planning practices, including the practices for urban mega projects, such as lavish waterfront projects, gigantic shopping malls and luxurious hotels, are generally shaped by being embedded in the process of decoding the flows of desire, where only financial values are permitted to play a determining role (Gunder, 2011a). The decoding process creates viable images of projects based on money as the universal equivalent, promising financial investors a secure profit, which is the familiar surplus of capital.

Secondly, consumption is the essence of re-territorialisation. The promised profit is actualised through consumption by generating a set of new regulated desires based on new qualitative values (Wood, 2009). Iconic architectural buildings such a Burj Khalifeh (Dovey, 2008), cultural events such as festivals and mega events like the Olympic Games (Hiller, 2000; Plöger, 2010a) and cultural
diversity policies such as multiculturalism (Florida, 2002; Ong, 2008) can be interpreted within the process of re-territorialisation, conveying the generation of new qualitative values. The new qualitative values generate new desires for more consumption and promise greater enjoyment. “All cities believe that, if they have the best socio-cultural amenities and creative milieus, architectural heritage, and cultural events, they have a reliable strategy to get the maximum in return, in consumption and image turnover” (Pløger, 2010b, p. 848).

In Anti-Oedipus, “Deleuze and Guattari argue that capitalism functions by simultaneously producing two different kinds of surplus values: a quantitative, capitalistic surplus value, and a qualitative, subjectifying surplus value” (Wood, 2009, p. 204). Both of these surplus values seem indispensable in the analysis of urban policies, including the policies for urban mega projects. Scholars of planning and urban studies, urban designers, geographers and even architects deploy various approaches to address the regeneration of capitalistic surplus value as the primary production of cities. Yet, most planners, urban designers and others have largely ignored, or at least misinterpreted, the subjectifying surplus value in analysing urban transformation. By deploying a Deleuze and Guattarian notion, Dovey (2005; 2009) and then Wood (2009) endeavoured to reveal the subjectifying surplus value created in the process of the development of the Melbourne waterfront. They explained that neither type of surplus value was detachable, “[a]lthough these two types of surplus values are based in different flows of capital, they are co-dependent for their realization” (Dovey, 2005, p. 211).

To construct a seductive identity, Dovey (2005) and Wood (2009) observed that the subjective form of surplus values (non-capital), or ‘buzz-charge’, is one of the primary concerns of policy-makers, including planners. The generation of subjective surplus value coincides with the process of de-territorialisation-re-territorialisation, by which profit is produced. Massumi (1992, pp. 200-201) defines subjectifying surplus value based on Deleuze and Guattari’s notion of flows:

This implies the existence, in fact the predominance, of a kind of surplus value that is created in the process of circulation itself. The value of commodity-images (defined broadly this time, to encompass objects, bodies, representations and information: decoded sites of force conversion) is attached more to their exchange and inclusive disjunction (the production of recording accompanying the singular acts of consumption
made possible by the inclusive conjunctions of the capitalist axiomatic) than to their material production. Deleuze and Guattari call this form of surplus value the ‘surplus value of flow’. It has two aspects, corresponding to the consumer/capitalist dense points of the capitalist relation: it continues to feed into capital accumulation in the hands of the capitalist, but wherever capital surplus value is extracted in an act of purchase, an evanescent double of, what accrues for the capitalist is deposited in the hand of the consumer. This ghost surplus value has a non-capital form; it is even reminiscent of the surplus value of pre-capitalism. It is more on the ‘other’ of prestige, an ‘aura’ – style, ‘cool,’ the glow of self-worth, personality.

Thus, urban development projects, including mega projects, are produced and consumed to increase capital accumulation. Simultaneously, non-capitalist surpluses are created, such as those of ‘political kudos’ for the government, ‘civic pride’ and ‘prestige’ for residents, and the ‘aura’ of ‘style’ or ‘hipness’ for consumers, including tourists (Dovey, 2005; Wood, 2009).

As mentioned previously, the process of shaping surplus subjective value operates simultaneously with the process of production and consumption, rather than before or after this process. “[T]he interlocked nature of capitalist and subjectifying surplus value … suggests that identity is contingent on the production process and not the other way around” (Wood, 2009, p. 204). The mechanisms of capitalism, such as the media, promote the necessity for urban developments and projects within the city (Gunder, 2011c). In other words, demands and interests are not necessarily pre-given, but rather are produced in the process of de-territorialisation and re-territorialisation. The production of new desires is the process of desiring-production, which also conveys the circulation of desires, as Massumi (1992, p. 200) conceptualised:

However, the farther both forms of surplus-value production develop, the harder it is to tell which is ‘derivative’ and which ‘determining’. The ghost surplus value of subjectivity, like capitalist surplus as a means of investment, is reinserted into states of things and begins to produce its own effects (it develops into a supplementary feedback level of causality). It gets to the point that it becomes necessary to speak of two interlocking axiomatics, the capitalist and the subjectifying, both of which constitute transpersonal modes of desire (or
abstract machines) coextensive with the social field, and neither of which taken separately is determining of anything.

From this perspective, the regulated desires embedded in the subjectifying surplus values shift public interest from crucial socio-cultural challenges, such as the increase in social inequality, towards superficial demands, such as establishing an iconic building. As Dovey (2005, p. 210) argued, “[t]he interests and identities of social classes can be seen as the end-products of processes of new modes of production, the production of desire”. In this context, the market mechanism that shapes public interest determines the planning process for considering the regulation of desires for mega projects and prestigious architectural buildings. Planners, urban designers and decision-makers are thus misguided in their recognition of existing urban challenges. This misunderstanding becomes more problematic in instances in which planners deploy collaborative planning to increase public participation and legitimise normalised general interests as real demands. Allmendinger and Haughton (2012, p. 92) observe “the new forms of governmentality that have arisen over the past few decades assembled around a consensus that managerial-technological apparatuses permit, despite often conflicting agendas and lifestyles, the negotiation of conflicts in such a way as to arrive at mutually beneficial policy formulations”.

Planning, as a bureaucratic machine, is one of the products of the mechanism of capitalism. Flows of desire are a derived planning machine; planning is a product of desires (for example, the desire to control everyday life) and is productive of new desires (such as sustainable development). During the previous decade, planning scholars endeavoured to address the way in which desire affects the norms and values of contemporary planning (Gunder & Hillier, 2009). Simultaneously, their investigations of contemporary planning revealed that new desires are continually being constituted to adjust the functions of the planning machine within the capitalist mechanism. As Gunder (2003b, p. 279) explained:

[i]Iconic labels capture our hearts and minds. Images of desirous futures capture our aspirations. In this context the role of planners is to create, mediate and facilitate common goals and visions of a desired future for our communities.

Desires for a green city, a sustainable city or a multicultural city, or even for urban mega projects, are representative examples that actuate the contemporary planning machine. These new desires are
regulated through the decoding/recoding process within the capitalist mechanism. Both capitalistic surplus value and subjectifying surplus value are produced through the process of the implementation of urban policies and plans, including the production and consumption of iconic urban projects. First, planning fantasises the desirable images for cities, such as being the most multicultural, liveable, and greenest city in the world. At length, these fantasies are used to attract a greater share of the global flows of finance and immigration, in competition with other cities. Second, these urban policies and plans synchronously generate subjective forms of surplus value such as political praise for local government, civic prestige for residents and acclaim for visitors (Dovey, 2005).

Contemporary planning, as a bureaucratic machine, operates as a component of the local state apparatus, the functions of which are significantly adjusted by global flows in the post-industrial era. Due to globalisation’s blurring of nation state borders and the increasing global integration, the functions of a state, such as its controlling role, have been changed dramatically. To generate greater financial opportunities and facilitate the movement of flows of products, expertise, money and new desires, market rationality increasingly determines state policy, inclusive of the planning process (Sager, 2011, p. 149). According to Dovey (2005, p. 12):

State control of infrastructure and urban design guidelines [by planning practice] are seem by many as the ‘dead hand’ of bureaucratic regulation that will neither meet the global market for footloose capital nor satisfy the demand for new urban imagery. It is as if the ‘hidden hand’ of market will serve public interests better than the ‘dead hand’ of state.

In Anti-Oedipus (2009), Deleuze and Guattari conceptualised the regulative and controlling functions of the state, which are continually being transformed to maximise capital accumulation within capitalism, including planning as “anti-production”. Deleuze and Guattari mentioned that the existence of these anti-production operations is vital for the mechanism of capitalism. Regulation is traditionally recognised as one of the primary intentions of planning practice (Allmendinger, 2009; Friedmann, 2011; Hall, 2006), and it “mediate[s] in the ensuring conflicts, where the structural logic of the system capitals does not permit an equitable distribution of surplus production, nor just resolution of class conflicts” (Cuthbert, 2011, p. 86). However, the regulative function of planning is largely
perceived as an impediment to the reification of flows of desire under the hegemony of global capitalism (Sager, 2011; Short, 2008). Dovey (2005, p.22) observed that:

In capitalism, the flows of desire become grounded in flows of capital, the laws of the market place become the laws of the land. Markets, which enable the exchange of values, become misrecognised as the source of such values. The ways in which capital legitimates the flows of desire loosens the authority of the state. This is one way of understanding the weakening of planning control in the 1980s and 1990s.

Thus, “[p]lanning the city today is all about planning the consumer city: planning for consumption and economic growth” (Ek, 2011, p. 168). Cities are branded as places to consume, as destinations and centres of culture (to consume) and places in which to consume.

The production of new desires due to the process of planning practice has been largely neglected in the literature. However, “through the lens of the social theory of Deleuze and Guattari an emphasis is placed on the way in which the planning process was ‘driven’ by desire, and was productive of desire” (Dovey, 2005, p. 210). The new desires potentially generate new flows for the city machine, attracting the creative class, global investment and ideas. Lloyd and Clark (2001, p. 358) argue that flows are imperative for the existence and growth of cities in the post-industrial era. From the perspective of Deleuze and Guattari (2009), all forms of flow in the capital mechanism are deterritorialised and then re-territorialised to the flows of finance and human capital (as labour). However, this raises the question: How do the flows of regulated desires simultaneously generate, or at least stimulate, the flows of international investment and immigration, in the form of skilled and cheap labour?

Capital and subjectifying surplus value are simultaneously produced through the operation of the city-machine. However, the impact of the circulation of desires is not confined to the requirements of the local residents, such as investors, decision-makers and the public. In addition, the city-machine regenerates new desires to sustain and, more importantly, increase the attraction of global capital flows (Lloyd & Clark, 2001). This is achieved through the implementation of urban polices and plans in the market-oriented society, including those for iconic architectural projects. In this way, new desires are generated, embedded in ‘city marketing’ and ‘place branding’. Dovey (2005, p. 20) argued that “[w]hat we call buildings and cities, identities and institutions, what gets congealed as symbolic
capital, are effects of these flows of desire”. Sager (2011) argued that city marketing has traditionally been seen as a marketing practice with three objectives and target audiences: to attract new inhabitants of the city, to attract business investments and new companies and to attract tourists. Based on the work of Deleuze and Guattari, this categorisation can be converted into two main types of flow: attracting new inhabitants as flows of labour, and absorbing businesses and tourists as flows of capital. Second, the connection of the city-machine to global networks is imperative for the promotion of the new desires that are its productions. For Deleuze and Guattari, desires transit through connections – “to desire is to produce connections” (Sørensen, 2005). As mentioned in the previous chapter, global capitalism reinforces trends, state adjustment and global integration. The process of globalisation blurs state borders, facilitating the movement of products, people and ideas, and is also deregulating state apparatus, or at least, transforming it into an entrepreneur (Dyck, 2012, p. 119; Moulaert et al., 2001, p. 100; Peck, 2001, p. 447; Sager, 2011, p. 153).

The city-machine continually produces new desires; one of the new functions of the state as an entrepreneur is the facilitation and legitimisation of the production and promotion of the regulated desires within global capitalism. The deregulation of the traditional state apparatus significantly affects urban policies and plans, including those for mega urban projects. Urban scholars have endeavoured to identify the role of the state, including planning, in the post-industrial era. To reveal the way in which contemporary planning practice operates to maximise international investment flows and lure the creative class, a variety of concepts have been proposed, including ‘urban-entrepreneurialism’ (Brenner & Theodore, 2005; Jessop et al., 1998), ‘city marketing’ (Doel & Hubbard, 2002; Kavaratzis, 2007) and ‘place branding’ (Govers & Go, 2009; Nicolas, 2004). These concepts emphasise the competition between globalised cities for luring a greater share of global capital flows. Outside judgment and international perceptions are important for raising the profile of cities (Ong, 2007, p. 89). Thus, planners as the workers in an entrepreneurial apparatus, deploy and legitimise market-oriented policies including those of mega urban projects and city promotion. Gotham (2002, p. 1735) states that “[m]arketing is the use of sophisticated advertising techniques aimed at promoting fantasy, manipulating consumer needs, producing desirable tourist experiences and simulating images of place to attract capital and consumers”.

“The reputation of a city, its image, is perhaps the most visible sign of promotional efforts” (Short et al., 2000). Thus, one of the primary objectives of local decision-makers and planners operating under
the hegemony of global capitalism is to construct favourable new images of their city in terms of investment, living and visiting. The production and promotion of desirable images is imperative for the operation of the city-machine, and these images are produced through the process of city operations within the capitalist mechanism. “The best of cities have always been a curious mix of economic engine and seductive surface; places of work and play; producing wealth and desire in abundance” (Dovey, 2005, p. 1). The entrepreneurial images of cities are not generated based only on urban projects such as waterfront development projects, iconic architectural buildings and emporia; rather, cities also create allure through their rhetorical policies, such as those of multiculturalism, liveability and sustainable development. Through the process of planning, interests are produced (Wood, 2009, p. 205). Desiring-production generates a fantasy that persuades non-residents to invest, live in or visit a city. The connection of the city-machine to the global networks within the capitalist mechanism is central in shaping this fantasy.

As regulated information channels new desires, the images produced alongside the rhetorical slogans constitute the perceptions of non-residents in relation to the city-machine and its operations. The process of globalisation facilitates the movement of products, information and ideas. By decoding and recoding all flows, desires are reconstituted and channelled based on market values. In other words, the capitalist mechanism adjusts the flows of desire to mould a fantasy by controlling the production processes and global networks. For example, the media, which largely shapes people’s understanding of the world in the post-industrial era, operates as a global advertising machine that promotes capitalistic values (Gunder, 2011c). Globalisation transforms humans from being the consumers of media to being their product. The new desires embedded in the engineered images or rhetorical slogans create the new flows of international investment, immigration and tourism, which are essential for the existence of the capitalist mechanism. Thus, as Deleuze and Guattari (2009) stated, the flux of desires is the prerequisite for the reproduction of other flows, particularly capital flows. Finance and free labour are thus both parasitic upon flows of desire.

Contemporary planning as a component of the neoliberalised state apparatus vigorously generates new desires by suggesting policies and legitimising capitalistic plans, including lavish urban projects. Ong (2007, p. 87) articulated that “[t]he state [including planning] plays a major role in providing capital to build a ‘world-class city’ and to lure foreign experts and global companies”. Since the 1980s, due to the increase in the flow of neoliberal ideas, planning knowledge and its functions have been
largely modulated within universal global capitalism. In contest with other cities, planning concepts such as flexibility of plans and policies have been, and still are, extensively misinterpreted and misapplied to lure a greater share of the international flows. Market-oriented planning practice operates as a part of the dominant entrepreneurial mechanism, which relies mainly on these continuous flows (Sager, 2013). Therefore, contemporary planning practice becomes a facilitator in the process of the creation of new desires for city marketing. The traditional regulative role of planning in the equitable distribution of wealth in society has diminished (cf Fainstein, 2010), or else is neglected, due to the domination of the flux of capitalism.

According to Foucault, planning is one of the productions of capitalism (Rouse, 2005); it assists capitalism in managing the various challenges temporarily confronted as part of its process. However, planning knowledge and its functions within the mechanism of capital have changed dramatically, particularly since the Cold War. Urban scholars in general, and planning theorists in particular, have comprehensively investigated the various aspects of the transformation of planning knowledge and its functions within capitalist society. Yet, urban scholars have not considered the production of desire as one of the primary objectives of planning practice. From the utopists to contemporary planning practitioners, plans and policies generate desirable perceptions of cities; these perceptions stimulate a desirable harmony in the city-machine. From this perspective, the regulative function of planning practice can also be interpreted as desiring-production, which promises a particular quality of lifestyle within a neoliberal society.

Urban researchers such as Stevens and Dovey (2004) and Doel and Hubbard (2002), among others, have endeavoured to address the production of new desires as a consequence of planning practice, since the concepts of competitiveness, place branding, city marketing and entrepreneurial policy-making increasingly dominate the contemporary planning discourse in the post-industrial era. However, these scholars largely ignore the fact that, from the beginning, planning has been a capitalistic bureaucratic machine, the primary function of which is sustaining flows into the city-machine through facilitating the production of regulated desires in the city as a desiring-machine. More importantly, much the same as with other capitalistic machines, planning generally operates according to the decoding and recoding of flux. This operation is more significant in a contemporary society in which market value is the premier criterion in the process of decision-making. From this
perspective, the planning-machine is a regulative apparatus that homogenises local diversity based on the dominant global values. Sandercock (2005, p. 401) noted that:

The old planning served modernist cities in a project that was, in part, dedicated to the eradication of difference. Metaphorically, this planning can be linked with the machine images of the great Fritz Lang film, *Metropolis*. The emerging planning is dedicated to a social project in which difference can flourish.

However, the flows of neoliberal desires continually reshape contemporary planning practice, which concurrently regenerates and facilitates the generation of new capitalistic desires within the city-machine.

This section has discussed desire-production as the primary function of the city-machine within global capitalism. Its key argument is that desire-production is imperative for capital accumulation as the main production of the city-machine. The city-machine as an assemblage of various machines, including the planning machine, reproduces and readjusts the flows of desires. Under the hegemony of global capitalism, people’s perceptions, demands and identities are grounded in capitalistic desires. This conceptualisation reveals how the capitalistic city-assemblage operates to lure flows of financial and human capital. Further, the implementation of market-oriented policies, including massive urban projects, standardises capitalistic cities’ urban spaces based on market values.

**4.4-The city as a normalising-machine**

This section will consider the regulation of people's attitudes by the capitalistic city-machine operation. In *Discipline and Punish* (1991), Foucault described the process of normalisation as a technical innovation for controlling people as a productive resource. This is extensively deployed in modern society. Historically, public execution, and other forms of body punishment such as torture, were utilised as the dominant power mechanism of the state, to generate a fear of authority to prevent crime and socio-political disagreement. One of the consequences of the economic, political and social reformations commencing in the 18th century was that the instruments of control have also changed. Foucault discerned the new controlling mechanism of normalisation as one of the pivotal products of capitalism, and perhaps the most important one. “For Foucault, normalisation describes the process in modernity where everyone must be shaped to conform to an efficient, safe standard that can
contribute to society” (Gunder, 2002, p. 206). He further listed the institutions that act as mechanisms to achieve this as including schools, prisons and other institutions of regulation. Drawing on Foucault’s work to address the controlling mechanism in contemporary society, Deleuze conceptualised the society of control. He addressed the transformations in the capitalist mechanism by comparing 19th century and contemporary capitalism. For Deleuze (1992, p.5):

"[t]he nineteenth century capitalism is a capitalism of concentration, for production and for property… But in the present situation, it no longer buys raw materials and no longer sells the finished products: it buys the finished products or assemblages parts. What it wants to sell is services but what it wants to buy is stocks. This is no longer capitalism of production but for the product, which to say, for being sold or marketed.

Contemporary society is a new form of control mechanism, which embeds itself in market values.

As a constituent part of global capitalism, the city is the place in which the normalisation of people largely occurs (Beck, 2006, p. 7). Three mechanisms – constant surveillance, formal education and the competitive market – shape residents’ attitudes and aspirations. Normalisation is one of the products of the city-machine and its operations: the capitalist city inherently generates adequate conditions for regulating the everyday lives of its residents (Lefebvre, 2008; McGowan, 2004; Stavrakakis, 2008a). Capital accumulation largely relies on the regulative functions of cities (Foucault, 1991). The process of normalisation aims to achieve docile, productive members of society.

Planning theorists such as Gunder (2003a, 2010b), Flyvbjerg (2001), Hillier (2010 Pløger (2008) and Yiftachel (1998b) deployed Foucault's notions in their investigations to address the implications of contemporary planning practice on such issues as the relationship between power and planning knowledge, ethnic segregation and antagonism. Yet, normalisation as a production of the city-machine, and as a role of contemporary planning within this function of the city, are largely neglected in planning theory. Contemporary planning practice works to sustain the dominant capitalistic mechanism (Allmendinger, 2009; Friedmann, 1987, 2011; Hall, 2006), and to maximise capital accumulation through city-machine operations, particularly by decoding and recoding flows of desire. As prerequisites for urban economic growth, and for attracting greater flows of capital to the city-machine in a competitive global environment, planners largely acquiesce to the commercialisation or privatisation of a city’s spaces, and to city marketing and place branding. The increase in surveillance
of urban spaces and their patrons, the standardisation of the built environment and the increase in the number of regulative institutions in all cities, and in global cities in particular, are the result of market-oriented planning policies and plans, including urban projects (Graham, 2010; Haines, 2011). Accordingly, it seems necessary to address normalisation as one of the products of the city-machine. This section will illustrate that this concealed function of contemporary planning is a product and constituent part of the regulative capitalist mechanism.

The flow of people is imperative for the operation of the capitalistic city-machine. According to the United Nations (2007, p. 1), “for the first time in history, more people live now in urban than in rural areas”. Urbanisation is a challenge for the stability of the city-machine and its effective operation. Foucault (1987) articulated that the process of urbanisation generates institutional instability in cities, where urban spaces are potentially places for power struggles such as revolution, riots and strikes. Thus, control over the flow of people and their behaviour in cities becomes pivotal for optimising capital accumulation as the primary function of the city-machine (Khakee, 1991, p. 155). However, control over a city and its residents brings economic as well as political costs. Thus, a new technology of control has evolved within the capitalist mechanism, encompassing various techniques.

First, the new control technology is embedded in constant surveillance: “an inspecting gaze, a gaze, which each individual under its weight will end by interiorising to the point that he is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against, himself” (Khakee, 1991, p. 155). This power can be exercised continuously and for a minimal cost. Repressive measures such as physical violence and material constraint are also still often utilised under capitalism, when they are deemed necessary. Secondly, Foucault recognised that the power mechanism also produces knowledge that is in the service of its best intentions. Thus, he rephrased the Baconian dictum that knowledge is power to state that knowledge regulates people’s understandings (Flyvbjerg, 2002). In the disciplinary society in particular, the impact of power on people’s knowledge is substantial. It operates through regulative institutions, such as the family, school, military service, university and factory. This research considers these complex and multi-faceted controlling mechanisms, in the context of global cities, to show how planning practice works as a part of this regulative machine.

Foucault (1991, p.133) described punitive mechanisms and the way in which they are deployed in pre-capitalist cities as instruments of control. The punitive city is a place in which:
[a]t the crossroads, in the gardens, at the side of roads being repaired or bridges built, in workshops open to all, in the depth of mines that may be visited, will be hundreds of tiny theatres of punishment. Each crime has its law; each criminal his punishment. It will be a visible punishment, the punishment that tells all, that explains, justifies itself, convicts: placards, different-coloured caps bearing inscriptions, posters symbols, texts read or printed tirelessly repeat the code.

“Foucault was one of the first scholars to see cities as a place for the confinement of deviants in psychiatric hospitals, prisons and asylums, beginning in the 17th century” (Pløger, 2008, p. 51). Since then, the punitive machine has been widely deployed: residents’ behaviours are constantly scrutinised, the juridical system punishes crimes, and the media focuses on cases and punishment (Žižek, 2008a, p. 134). Despite the relocation of prisons out of cities, the media spread the images, names and symbols of prison, to castigate specific crimes or disobediences. Substantive control agencies such as courts, police stations and asylums operate as punitive components of the city-machine (Graham, 2010).

In the politicisation of architecture in the 18th century, Foucault (2010, p. 239) recognised the origins of planning and, potentially, urban design:

Of course, I did not mean to say that architecture was not political before, becoming so only at that time. I only meant to say that in the eighteenth century one sees the development of reflection upon architecture as a function of the aims and techniques of the government of societies. One begins to see a form of political literature that addresses what the order of a society should be, what a city should be, given the requirements of the maintenance of order; given that one should avoid epidemics, avoid revolts, permit a decent and moral family life, and so on.

From the 18th century until the present, control over the physical environment of the city became one of the main concerns of politicians. Thus, the built environment has essentially become a political instrument to intensify the inspection of bodies as a component of the punitive mechanism.

The mechanism of power, along with the economic model of production, dramatically changed following the political and industrial revolutions in the late 18th century. The ensuing institutional
transformation considerably reformed the operations of the control machine. Disciplinary institutions were, at the time, contrived as a new set of control technologies to work in conjunction with the punitive institutions. “Cities are means of mass producing and acculturating bodies … in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries we have seen this insight incorporated into institutions which strive to govern the production of bodies” (Amin & Thrift, 2002, p. 103). Modern institutions shape ways of life; there are institutions for education, discipline and punishment. “Discipline increases the forces of the body (in the economic terms of utility) and diminishes these same forces (in political terms of obedience)” (Foucault, 1991, p. 138). Disciplinary institutions create a normalising machine complete within itself. The control mechanism has both a political and an economic cost; capitalism tends to mitigate expense by accommodating the normalising apparatus with the provision of new situations. Thus, over time, normalisation has become one of the imperative functions of the capitalistic city and its state apparatus, which later Foucault called governmentality (Dean, 2010). However, punitive institutions such as the police, the court and the prison are still required in the capitalistic city.

The dominant capitalistic mechanism, as a regulative instrument, invented planning to facilitate the operation of its normalising-machine. “[In the] late eighteenth century, new problems [population, health and urban question] emerge: it becomes a question of using the disposition of space for economico-political ends” (Khakee, 1991, p. 148). Yiftachel (1998b, p. 397) observed that the regulative capacity of planning expands control over space. However, apart from explicit deployment of zoning and selected regulation of land use, this function of planning has been largely neglected. Planning is an attempt to determine a certain allocation of people in space and the canalisation of their movements, to enable coding of the political, economic and socio-cultural interactions of the city-machine’s residents. Urban plans, including massive projects, standardise the urban environment and, as a result, the dominant power expands its control over resident behaviour.

A strong example of this can be seen in Haussmann’s renovations of the city of Paris, which gave it its present form of long, straight, wide boulevards, with their renowned cafés, restaurants and shops, all of which have a profound influence on the everyday life of Paris’ inhabitants. One of the initial impetuses of Haussmann’s project was to enhance control over the city and its suburbs by widening the narrow medieval streets. These physical transformations facilitate the movement of the police and/or army, if necessary, into the city, and allow for improved inspection of the behaviour of the city’s residents (Akkerman, 2003, p. 90). Haussmann’s standards continue to be taught in
universities and deployed by many planners, urban designers and architects (Cuthbert, 2003). While planning practice, at least in theory, endeavours to engage more people in the process of decision-taking (Healey, 1997) or fighting for the socially disadvantaged (Davidoff, 2005; Fainstein, 2010), as well as other aims, planning also largely operates as an instrument of the control-machine, to make the city-machine operate more efficiency (Yiftachel, 1998b).

The standardised built environment has become one of the primary characteristics of the capitalist city (Townshend & Madanipour, 2008; Whitehand, 1987). As it is defined, the process of recoding and decoding in the capitalist mechanism generates market-oriented policies such as urban entrepreneurialism, city marketing and place branding. This process also has a significant role in the homogenisation of the built environment of city-machines, which in turn enables the constant surveillance of residents' behaviours in neoliberalised cities (Haines, 2011; Watson, 2006; Yiftachel, 1998b). The dominant neoliberalism significantly retransforms the control mechanism of cities by converting the entire city-machine into a control-machine. In addition to the punitive and disciplinary institutions, such as the police and formal education, which operate as components of the control machine, private security forces and surveillance cameras increase control over commercialised spaces and their patrons' behaviour (Yack, 1986, p. 294).

In addition, in mega urban projects, urban restoration and revitalisation projects generate a higher supervision of the everyday life of inhabitants. Thus, surveillance is not limited to disciplinary institutions, but rather exists as a concealed gaze on most urban spaces, including shopping malls, entertainment centres and streets. “Through surveillance cameras the panoptic technology of power has been electronically extended, making our cities like enormous panopticons” (Harvey, 2012, p. 243). Foucault (1991) explicated that this constant gaze becomes interiorised, developing into a mechanism of self-control. At that point, one of the city-machine’s functions is the normalisation of its residents as docile bodies, to maximise their potential for market productivity and minimise the expense of control for the capitalist mechanism.

Planning involves the formulation of content and the implementation of all public policy. Public policy aims towards the type of social control that is imperative for the existence of capitalism. Yiftachel, among others, endeavoured to shed light on the controlling role of contemporary planning practice. Yiftachel (2002, p. 11) argued that “planning is not an age-old discipline of relatively
independent knowledge emerging from scientific endeavour, such as history, geography or philosophy, but rather part of the consolidation of the modern nation-state, with its dominant capitalist and national motivates to control and regulate space.” Nonetheless, the modern state and its functions have been adjusted under the hegemony of global neoliberalism in the post-industrial era. “For neoliberalism accords to the state an active role in securing markets, in producing the subjects of and conditions for markets, although it does not think the state should – at least ideally – intervene in the activities of the market” (Whitehand, 2012, p. 48). In this context, “the position of planning as arm of the modern national-state” (Yiftachel, 1998, p. 397) is dramatically changed.

Gunder (2010b) addressed the fact that contemporary planning operates by following global market logic and has an objective to preserve the status quo. Moreover, planning operates as part of the state apparatus. Yiftachel (1998b, p. 400) correctly argues that “[t]he conceptualization of planning as an apparatus of social control gives rise to a paradox: the very same tools ostensibly introduced to assist social reform and improve people’s quality of life can be used to control and repress peripheral groups”. However, the controlling role of planning is not solely aimed at prohibiting peripheral groups; rather, planning attempts to mitigate the failures of the city-machine as the controlling-mechanism.

The operation of the control-machine is not fixed. Rather, capitalism is constantly adjusting the institutions of control to mitigate the cost of its operation and to maximise the efficiency of its exploitation. Deleuze recognised the mechanism of the control machine in the post-industrial era and briefly conceptualised the notion of a society of control, based on the Foucauldian notion of the ‘disciplinary society’. Deleuze (1992, p. 1) considered the idea that:

[T]he individual never ceases passing from one enclosed environment to another, each having its own laws: first the family; then the school (you are no longer in your family); then barracks (you are no longer at school); then factory; from time to time the hospital; possibly the prison, the preeminent instance of the enclosed environment.

In contrast to the works of Foucault, which generally considered how disciplinary institutions, as control instruments, had developed in the industrial societies of the 18th to mid-20th century, Deleuze endeavoured to demonstrate the mechanism of control in the post-industrial society. The “Society of Control, in which it is argued that since the end of the second world war [sic] a new society – the society of control – has replaced the pre-war disciplinary society where ‘enclosures’ maintained order
through the controls of wages and discipline” (Coaffee, 2005, p. 450). Specifically, the transformation of societies from industrial to post-industrial, at least in Western countries, caused the capitalist mechanism to adjust its control-machine based on market values. The mechanism of capitalism decodes and recodes the relations, laws and language of disciplinary institutions based on a law of general equivalence in the form of money value (Roffe, 2010, p. 41). The society of control then conveys the adjusted disciplinary institutions, which generates a deeper modulation.

To maximise production, the early to mid-twentieth century, the industrial city-machine traditionally concentrated on the acquisition of raw materials, cheap labour and manufacturing expertise. Yet, as a result of globalisation, manufacturing has largely been subsequently relocated to developing countries, such as China, where wages are considerably lower, and the conditions of labour are unregulated, despotic and exploitive (Harvey, 2007, p. 148). Consequently, marketing, combined with its related services, is the primary function of the post-industrial city-machine. The transformation of the city-machine affects its control mechanism (Thompson, 2000).

... in the present situation, capitalism is no longer involved in production, which it often relegates to the Third World, even for the complex form of textiles, metallurgy, or oil production. It’s a capitalism of higher-order production. It no longer buys raw materials and no longer sells the finished products: it buys the finished products or assembles parts. What it wants to sell is services but what it wants to buy is stock. This is no longer a capitalism for production but for the product, which is to say, for being sold or marketed. Thus, it is essentially dispersive, and the factory has given way to corporation. The family, the school, the army, the factory are no longer the distinct analogical spaces that converge towards an owner – state or private power – but coded figures – deformable and transformable – of a single corporation that now has only stockholders. (Deleuze, 1992, p. 6)

The new mechanism of control has become more dynamic, and less concentrated and fixed. The society of control thus has a lower political and economic cost of production. Market values are the core of the post-industrial society of control (Santilli, 2007). Based on Deleuze, Hardt (1998, p. 139) articulated that:
The institutions that constituted disciplinary society – the school, the family, the hospital, the prison, the factory – are all today everywhere in crisis. The walls of the institutions are breaking down in a way that their disciplinary logics do not become in effective but rather generalized in fluid forms across the social field.

The system generates a deeper level of normalisation, embedded in the regulation of desires based on capitalistic values. Control societies engage inhabitants in a form of competition with others to attain a certain level of salary or greater enjoyment (Žižek, 1989). According to Walters (2006, p. 190):

We are moving from an analogical world where the citizen circulates between such discrete sites as family, school and work, to a digital order where the lines between inside and out become blurred; a social order where power is inseparable from mechanisms and circuits of desire, which are actualized by systems of advertising, marketing and self-actualization.

In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari (2009) elucidated the way in which the mechanism of capitalism extensively decodes and recodes flows of desire and, more importantly, how the flows of regulated desires shape inhabitants' identities. The capitalist coding system inherently creates a new system of domination, which is more constant than that of the disciplinary society. Deleuze deciphered a problematic duality in the disciplinary society that appeared to generate possibilities for insubordination:

Disciplinary societies have two poles: the signature that designates the individual, and the number of administrative numeration that indicates his or her position within the mass. This is because the disciplines never saw any incompatibility between these two, and because at the same time power individualises and masses together, that is, constitutes those over whom it exercises power into a body and molds the individuality of each member of that body. (Thompson, 2000, p. 5)

In the post-industrial society, the capitalistic coding mechanism breaks down the disciplinary duality of the individual and the mass. “The individual is becoming a 'dividual', whilst the mass is reconfigured in terms of data, samples and markets.” So, while “disciplinary individuals produced quantifiable and discrete amounts of energy, ‘dividuals’ are caught up in a process of modulation” (Santilli, 2007, p.
56). The coding mechanism progressively blurs the distinctions between the disciplinary institutions, producing a control network. More importantly, the integrated network of control constantly modulates individuals’ interactions, desires and attitudes within a society of control:

If the individual signifies a complete, whole person, the dividual is partial, fragmented and incomplete. Control de-emphasizes, or even abandons, the quest to train moralize, reform and remake the individual. It relinquishes the dream of an all-encompassing normalized society. It is less bothered with reforming the young offender, than with securing the home or the shopping mall against their presence. (Walters, 2006, p. 192)

Thus, the entire globe and its operation is the domain of the market, which controls individuals, physically and mentally, based on its integrated control network.

The control-machine in post-industrial society is the network of control that reshapes and develops such control mechanisms as punishment, disciplinary institutions and surveillance (Hardt, 1998). Surveillance is a representative example of the implementation of a pre-existing control technology in the post-industrial era. As Deleuze (1992) observed, the constant inspection of everyday life has been reinforced by new technologies:

Nothing better captures the ethos of the control society than the password, which can materialize in such forms as the credit card, the passport, the reward card, the identity card, and the electronic ankle tag. Even the body itself can be operated as a password once imprinted by the indelible sign of the biometric. (Walters, 2006, p. 192)

Surveillance is further reinforced by the blurring of borders between private and public spaces. Residents’ everyday lives, even private spaces, can be investigated if necessary due to the data that is constantly being collected and analysed, including from bank accounts (showing everyday expenses), mobile telephones (showing at least the geographical location of the owner), email addresses (showing communication) and online social networks. In both democratic and non-democratic political systems, the police, as members of a punitive institution, have progressively deployed coding mechanisms to inspect and apprehend delinquents. Thereupon, the control-machine is an assemblage of various technologies of control, intended to curtail the need for expenditure on control.
Foucault (1991) with his ‘disciplinary society’ and then Deleuze (2000) with the ‘society of control’ addressed the progression of the control-machine in liberal democracies in general, and in France in particular. However, academic investigations have tended to focus, if at all, on liberal democratic political systems to clarify the process of normalisation and/or the society of control. This does not mean that the power-institutions’ operations and their interactions are the same everywhere. The diversity of local political, socio-cultural and economic mechanisms does have an effect on the control-machine. However, the technologies of control are utilised extensively in both non-democratic and democratic political systems to normalise people’s desires and behaviours. In addition, the ceremonies of punishment, such as execution, stunning, dismembering and flogging, continue to be carried out as controlling instruments in public spaces in countries like Iran and Saudi Arabia. Simultaneously, disciplinary institutions, such as schools, universities and factories, have expanded into the developing countries, where people are ‘normalised’ to work as inexpensive labour. Globally, the deployment of new inspection technologies such as surveillance cameras is progressively manipulating people’s behaviour. Deleuze’s conceptualisation of a ‘society of control’ was based on the global relocation of factories to the developing world, and marketing becomes the soul of society in the post-industrial era:

[C]onsumption practices are grounded in bodily habituation, of repeated action. The branding of everyday life is obviously an intended outcome of the surveillant practices of marketing. The subject is controlled not by the brute force of a disciplinary regime, but by the shaping of the social space in which he or she is embedded, by fostering habits of consumption. (Wise, 2002, p. 38)

Due to the process of globalisation, consumerism, as a controlling instrument, globally determines everyday life; and thus its influence is not delimited to developed countries. The mechanism of control conveys the same technologies and its primary purpose is the normalisation and/or modulation of desires and behaviours, regardless of geographical location.

As a capitalistic apparatus, contemporary planning practice effectively expedites the progression of the society of control in both democratic and non-democratic political systems. Under the hegemony of global capitalism, planning practices, such as housing policies, urban revitalisation projects and urban development plans, are largely dependent on the market and the promotion of property related
products. In particular, real-estate marketing is, or at least it was before the latest economic recession, the primary economic driver of neoliberal capitalism. The debt-based monetary system prepares the floating financial resources for the establishment of urban projects; and the dominant culture of consumerism incites people to rely on the debt-system to respond to their basic needs and demands, including housing. Thus, contemporary urban development is shaped by a growing demand that is not embedded in the production mechanism, but rather in the financial market. Wise (2002, p. 33) argued that:

	[...]he surveillant eye of the disciplinary state is now accompanied, or even superseded, by the surveillant eye of control, which is exemplified in the eye of marketing; the docile subject becomes the consuming subject. It is not the state controlling its citizens, but the economic system monitoring audiences and markets to turn us into perfect consumers (tuning us to match the product as much as vice versa).

People who constantly live in debt are controlled by the market. In other words, in the neoliberalised society, market-oriented planning practice reinforces the control-machine. However, planners may not be aware of the consequences of this practice.

The control-machine function is imperative for the existence of cities in general and global cities in particular. The growth of global cities depends on the flows of new arrivals; yet, this also seems problematic for the city-machine’s existence. The social heterogeneity brought by ethno-cultural diversity potentially creates threats of instability in global cities. Thus, the control-mechanism has two regulative functions in global cities. First, it regulates the flows of people based on market demands. Immigration policy, for example, can be viewed as the regulation of flow, selectively permitting particular groups (usually skilled and affluent immigrants) into the city. Second, global cities are generally recognised due to their hosting the foremost schools and universities (that is, the foremost disciplinary institutions). The process of commercialisation and privatisation has also largely standardised the physical environment in global cities, in which the surveillance of inhabitants’ behaviours is intensified. Police, private security forces and surveillance cameras constantly supervise semi-private, semi-public and public spaces such as business towers, shopping malls, entertainment centres and streets. Further, marketing is the soul of the global city. Such cities are global business hubs from which large international corporations and the international share market
control the global financial market. The culture of consumption is the dominant ideology in these cities. Residents often compete with each other to attain more credit for greater consumption (McGowan, 2004). In a society of control, people are a consumer mass, rather than a productive mass (Deleuze, 1992). Accordingly, this thesis conceptualise the city as a normalising-machine.

The conceptualisation of the city as a normalising-machine will assist researchers in urban studies in general, and planners in particular, in gaining a deeper understanding of a city's operation under the hegemony of global capitalism. This understanding will also reveal the way in which contemporary planning practice, as a component of the capitalistic city-machine, facilitates the functions of the control-machine in neoliberalised cities. Foucault (1991) argued that planning and other human disciplines emerged to increase control over the rapid urbanisation and social conflict occurring in urban public spaces in the 18th and 19th centuries. This research shows that planning continues to have a controlling function under the hegemony of global neoliberalism; but as Yiftachel (1998b) recognised, this control function has been largely disavowed, or at least neglected, by contemporary planning. This reinvestigation of the regulative role of planning is thus necessary, and is particularly relevant in the wake of the most recent economic recession, which has coincided with an increase in urban insurgency, social conflict and political instability around the world. Current social and political instabilities, such as riots, anti-immigration behaviour, the Arab Spring and the Occupy Wall Street movement, challenge the dominant capitalist mechanism and its institutions, including planning as its product. The clarification of the core of socio-cultural conflict is the sine qua non of understanding the city-machine operation.

This section revealed how the capitalistic city-machine, with its control apparatus, aims to normalise residents’ attitudes and convert people into docile bodies. Further, it demonstrated that planning as a product of capitalism operates as a component of the control apparatus through decoding and recoding urban spaces. Through this process, planning expands surveillance over everyday life. This finding assists to respond to research question number three: What role do market-driven policies, including urban projects, play in normalising residents’ behaviour?

4.5-Conclusion

This chapter endeavoured to address some of the problematic aspects of neoliberalised cities by conceptualising their operation. The conceptualisation was formulated based primarily on the
continental philosophical concepts found in the works of Deleuze and Foucault. These philosophical-based concepts assist in revealing the concealed effects of a city’s function, which are ontologically unattainable by using the traditional social scientific methods.

First, the city was formulated as a machine based on Deleuze’s conceptualisation. Then, the characteristics of the city-machine were elucidated and the differences between the definitions of ‘machine’ in Deleuze’s works were clarified from a functionalist perspective. Deploying Deleuze’s definition of machine, the city-machine is not merely a mechanistic enclosed machine, but rather is a multidimensional mechanism with a multiplicity of interactions with other machines. The chapter also revealed the dependency of the city-machine on other mechanisms and the constant flow of materials, people and information (after Castells). It is based on the widening of the interdependencies and interconnectivity of cities in the era of late capitalism. This supports the discussion on the globalised city detailed in the third chapter. The city-machine can thus be considered as an imperative component of the global capitalist mechanism and its operations are continuously being adjusted through its internal and external interactions.

Second, the construct of the city as desiring-machine was conceptualised based on the ‘desiring-machine’ of Deleuze. Through the development of this term, the production of desire was identified as one of the primary productions of the city-machine’s operation. New desires stimulate the attraction of flux, such as of immigrants, both talented and low skilled workers, and the international financial flows that are vital for the operation of the city-machine and its economic growth. The research also extensively considered the process of the production of new desires, channelled under the hegemony of global capitalism. The new desires, as products of dominant capitalism, inherently convey the values of market norms. Thus, market-oriented desires are largely promoted by the apparatus of capitalism and its institutions, such as the media. The consequences of the production of desires are not limited to the stimulation of movements of people or to the international financial market; rather market-oriented desires also profoundly affect local institutions, including planning. Under neoliberalism, local institutions mostly operate as entrepreneurial institutions, the operations of which are adjusted based on market-oriented desires (Sager, 2013). Planning, as a component of the political machine, works in the city-machine apparatus and is involved in the production of desire. However, the production of desire through the city-machine operation and its regulative role under the hegemony of global capitalism has largely been neglected in contemporary planning.
Third, the concept of the city as a normalising-machine was formulated based on Foucault’s work. Additionally, the Deleuzian notion of the ‘society of control’ was appended to the Foucauldian notion of the ‘bio-politic’. The concept of normalisation of residents’ attitudes as another function of the city-machine, is also largely disavowed or ignored in contemporary planning. The transformation of the control mechanism in the capitalist city was investigated. Foucault formulated the concept of the ‘disciplinary society’ as a new technology of control in which the inhabitants are constantly under the gaze of disciplinary institutions. By interiorising this constant gaze, residents become docile subjects that control themselves. Foucault argued that the mechanism of control in the ‘disciplinary society’ is more effective and efficient in comparison to pre-existing control systems that employed such techniques as torture, dismemberment and public execution; although such techniques continue to be deployed by power institutions in some countries. The creation of self-control through constant supervision is the primary technology of control in capitalist society. However, the mechanisms of control are being continually transformed due to the restructuring of the production mechanisms in post-industrial society. The current control mechanism operates via electronic data gathering, whereby residents’ information, including their banking details and emails, can be collected by disciplinary institutions to extend their permanent control and shape their techniques constituting contemporary entrepreneurial governmentality (Dean, 2010).

This chapter was an attempt to reveal the inherent products of cities, which have been largely ignored in contemporary planning. The findings provide insight into city operations in post-industrial society. More importantly, the role of planning was considered as a component of the state apparatus, one which has been transformed due to globalisation. The review revealed cultural diversity to be an inevitable consequence of globalisation, and a characteristic of cities in late capitalism. The concept of the city as a machine helps to explain the essential role of the flux of immigration as human capital for the operation of the city. The concept of the city as a desiring-machine reveals how the neoliberalised city in competition with others endeavours to attract a greater share of the available skilled migration and financial investment flows by generating new desires. In addition, the chapter demonstrated how inhabitants’ attitudes towards the city-machine are progressively normalised under the constant surveillance that transforms them into docile human subjects. However, the process of normalisation is not completed; discontent is also an inherent product of the city-machine. An attempt
has been made here to identify the effects of planning policies in shaping these products. The following chapter considers the multicultural policy that is promoted by the dominant neoliberalism.
Chapter Five: The neoliberalised global city as an antagonism creator

*For the philosopher everything consensual becomes suspicious.*

(Badiou, 2000)

*If there is politics in society it is because there is conflict.*

(Mouffe, 2006)

5.1-Introduction

Cities are dynamic complex machines whose functions, interactions, territories and productions cannot be entirely identified (Amin & Thrift, 2002). Drawing on Deleuze and Foucault, Chapter Four conceptualised the products of the neoliberalised city-machine, including the reproduction of new desires, the standardisation of the built environment and the homogenisation of residents’ attitudes in the creation of a docile and productive body. This chapter will also investigate other products of the capitalistic city-machine, some of which are far from beneficial. In particular, the socio-cultural conflicts that are an inherent part of the neoliberalised city-machine’s operation, yet threaten its efficiency. This chapter primarily considers the production of discontent as an innate product of the city-machine’s operation. The chapter’s key findings will assist in responding to research question number four: Who benefits and who suffers as a consequence of the standardisation of urban space?; question number five: How does discontent intensify as a consequence of the homogenisation of urban spaces?; and question number six: How can urban planning mitigate the adverse impacts of market-oriented policies?

This chapter considers the production of discontent and its symptoms as one of the inherent products of the neoliberalised city’s operation. These products of the capitalistic city are perceived as impediments for the operation of the capitalistic machine. Social collisions such as riots, strikes and rebellion are detrimental to capital accumulation in the capitalistic city-machine (Harvey, 2012; Marcuse, 2009). Further, this chapter will show that the production of discontent in the neoliberalised city-machine is largely neglected, or at least misinterpreted, by contemporary planning, when it is dominated by positivistic and rationalistic understandings.
The symptoms of discontent were problematic prior to the advent of capitalist cities; however, these conflicts seem to have become worse with capitalistic industrialisation (e.g. the Paris Commune of 1871) and even more problematic today following the intensification of socio-cultural heterogeneity due to neoliberal globalisation. Further investigations are important in view of the recent economic recession, which increased socio-cultural contradiction and political instability in developed and developing countries, and generated such movements as Occupy Wall Street and the Arab Spring. In *The Year of Dreaming Dangerously* (2012a), Žižek considers the production of discontent and its symptoms in late capitalism. Further, Harvey, in his book *Rebel Cities* (2012), extensively investigates the occurrence of social, political and economic instability in the neoliberalised city. “These days it is not hard to enumerate all manner of urban discontent and anxieties, as well as excitements, in the midst of even more rapid urban transformation” (Harvey, 2012, p. 4). Drawing on Lacan, this chapter will investigate the production of discontent in the neoliberalised city. The following section will demonstrate that the production of discontent in both pre-capitalist and capitalist societies is inevitable, but that neoliberalism particularly intensifies discontent. Based on Mouffe’s work, section 5.3 will consider *agonism* as a political theory that emphasises the potentially positive aspects of socio-political conflict, but not its antagonistic form.

**5.2-The city as an antagonism-creator**

This section will investigate, with reference to Lacan’s work and those that draw on it, how the neoliberal city operation reproduces and accumulates antagonism. The investigation of the accumulation of discontent in cities is not new. Since the Enlightenment, intellectuals such as Rousseau, Marx, Nietzsche, Freud, Lacan and Foucault, among others, have considered the production of discontent in cities as a problematic issue (Yack, 1986).

Rousseau first identified civilisation and its institutions as the primary driver of discontent, due to its generation of prohibitions. For Rousseau, the origin of civil society was possession, which inherently generated inequality; and institutions such as law were constituted to maintain the status quo. In *Discourse on the Origin and the Foundations of Inequality among Men* (2006 [1754], pp. 1-2), Rousseau pointed out:

> The first man to claim a piece of land as his and to find others foolish enough to believe him was the true founder of civil society, because with the invention of property men
suddenly found something worth associating and competing for. With property, everything changes, simply because inequality of property matters in a way that natural inequality does not. Naturally, unequal men in the State of Nature become the rich and poor of civil society. Whatever the rich are, they are not stupid. They recognise that the cupidity of other men poses problems for their retention of other property. At first, each man protects his own with his own, but the wealthy soon realise that this is an expensive way of doing something which can in fact be done on the cheap. Law is the next fraud perpetrated against the human race. The state and its law, it is said, is in everybody’s interest, not just the interest of a few. The force of the whole community is used to protect what are in fact the ill-gotten gains of the few. By persuading everybody that the law applies equally to all, and by getting everybody to contribute their widow’s mite to the upkeep of the state, the rich get others to pay for what only really concerns them.

Accordingly, Rousseau conceptualised ‘the natural man’, who should return to his state of nature and whose natural rights should be restored (Cassirer & Lukay, 2006). For Rousseau, in nature, there is no ownership and thus no institutions to protect it. In this context, natural man is content.

In Civilisation and its Discontents (2002 [1929]), Freud extensively elucidated how civilisation restricts people’s actions as they are forced to conform to a society’s values and norms. These limitations to agency are the source of the production of discontent:

Individual liberty is not an asset of civilisation. It was greatest before there was any civilisation; through admittedly even then it was largely worthless, because the individual was hardly in a position to defend it. With the development of civilisation, it underwent restrictions, and justice requires that no one shall be seared these restrictions. Whatever, makes itself felt in a human community as an urge for freedom may amount to a revolt against an existing injustice, thus favouring a further advance of civilisation and remaining compatible with it. But it may spring from what remains of the original personality, still untamed by civilisation, and so become a basis for hostility to civilisation. (Freud, 2002, p. 42)

Freud, like Rousseau, viewed civilisation as the primary source of existing discontent in society, and he endeavoured to identify the sources of discontent by the deployment of psychoanalytical
Freud’s investigations focused mainly on attainment of pleasure as the main stimulus of human life and on the recognition of its prohibitions. Freud (2002, p. 16) argued:

[i]t is simply the programme of the pleasure principle that determines the purpose of life. This principle governs the functioning of our mental apparatus from the start; there can be no doubt about its efficacy, and yet its programme is at odds with the whole world—with the macrocosm as much as with the microcosm.

Nonetheless, living within society inevitably prohibits the seeking of pleasure. In other words, as Lévi-Strauss (1969, p. 41) stated “a person cannot do just what he pleases”, so every social order depends on a shared sacrifice, something that must be given up by those who enter into it, a societal entry fee. Freud identified these limitations as the primary resource of suffering. Nonetheless, he emphasises that:

[i]t seems certain that we do not feel comfortable in our present civilisation, but it is very hard to form a judgement as to whether and to what extent people of an earlier age felt happier, and what part their cultural conditions played in the matter. (Freud, 2002, p. 33)

Thus, the recognition of the sources of suffering in existing societal conditions became one of Freud’s main considerations (Laclau, 2005, p. 52).

As a post-Freudist, Lacan deployed and developed the concepts of ‘jouissance’ and discontent in his psychoanalytical investigations. Lacan refuted the anti-civilization perspective, including the Rousseauian concept of ‘the natural man’:

Lacan pointed out in Seminar XVII that no one has ever seen the least trace of the father of the human horde. It becomes impossible to look at the origins of the social order – or prior to them – except through the reflection of that order itself. Hence, when we look back, we do not see ‘natural humanity’ in its pure form, unmediated by the social order, but the order’s own fundamental ideological presuppositions. (McGowan, 2004, p. 15)

Thus, the symbolic social order defines both enjoyment and dissatisfaction. There is no distinction between enjoyment and discontent outside of the social order. Lacan’s work generated a new potential for further investigation of the production of discontent in neoliberalised society (Glynos & Stavrakakis, 2008; McGowan, 2004).
For Lacan, although the symbolic order restricts enjoyment, it simultaneously allows for the fantasy of the attainment of complete future enjoyment, so as to make the restrictions endurable. For instance, religion as a dominant social order provides the fantasy of Heaven as a place for eternal enjoyment (Gunder, 2009). In the ‘society of prohibition’, by following religious junctures, people sacrifice their worldly enjoyment to attain the promised enjoyment of eternal life. However, this mechanism seems to be more complicated in the neoliberalised society, which promises “advanced enjoyment” (Stavrakakis, 2008a) or “surplus-enjoyment” (Žižek, 1989) as the core of the market operation. Accordingly, McGowan (2004) conceptualises contemporary society as the society of commanded enjoyment.

Lacan argues that since the French Revolution, conceptions of “happiness” have been prescribed by the political machinery (Bar, 2003, p. 14). Capitalism was not the society of enjoyment in its initial stages. In The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Weber (2011) stated that early capitalism was shaped by the protestant work ethic, which was mainly embedded in religious morality. Thus, capitalism in its early stage deployed the restrictive promises of religion. By widening the culture of consumerism along with mass production, metaphysical eternal enjoyment was transformed into a new form of mechanism that promised immediate “advanced happiness” based on consumption and greater personal enjoyment. Thus, to have more enjoyment is perceived as a duty in neoliberalised society (McGowan, 2004; Stavrakakis, 2011a). The ‘society of prohibition’ was transformed into a ‘society of commanded enjoyment’ through the transformation of the social order under the hegemony of global capitalism (Stavrakakis, 2008a).

The capitalistic city-machine, as an indispensable component of the capitalistic mechanism, becomes a place of consumption and advanced enjoyment. When investigating local economic development policies, Gunder (2009, p. 286) observed that “an enjoyable place and cool population correspond to strong economic growth”. Economic growth largely depends on creative people (Florida, 2002). Further, in a society of command enjoyment, the creative class pursues more enjoyment.

Cities need to become more open, diverse and tolerant places to lure in the creative classes – a plethora of intelligent, innovative and professional people. In improving their
appeal to these types of talented people, cities require improvements in various lifestyle attractions. (Boland, 2007, p. 1023)

In this context, decision makers, including planners, endeavour to project a desirable image of the city by implementing appropriate city-marketing policies. In brief, “[p]romoting the right image [largely focused on advanced enjoyment] is central to city-marketing” (Boland, 2007, p. 1027). The previous chapter extensively documented the function of city-marketing policies as a part of a desiring-machine.

Neoliberalism and its components, including the capitalistic city, promote advanced enjoyment through more consumption. This obligation is one of the drivers of urban discontent and its symptoms. Freud (2002, p. 81) stated that “the programme of becoming happy cannot be fulfilled”. Following this, Lacan (1966) referred to the advertising slogan ‘Enjoy Coca-Cola’, in speaking about “le sujet de la jouissance”, associating advertising and consumerism with the entire psychoanalytic problem of enjoyment: a problem deeply revealing of the foundations of capitalism. Lacan deployed the notion of lack to formulate the mechanism of capitalism and its promised enjoyment (Evans, 2010, p. 96). For Lacan, enjoyment is incomplete because desire can never be fully satisfied; instead desire is continually being replaced by new desire. “Desire can only be sustained by dialectic of lack and excess; in order to remain attractive, the promise of excess relies on the continuous renewal of lack” (Stavrakakis, 2008a, p. 94). To consider the mechanism of advertisements in capitalism, Žižek (2002d, p. 7) states:

Isn’t the necessary obverse of my interacting with the object instead of passively following the show the situation in which the object itself deprives me of my own passive reaction of satisfaction (or mourning or laughter), so that it is the object itself that ‘enjoys the show’ instead of me, relieving me of the superego duty to enjoy myself? Do we not witness ‘interpassivity’ in a great number of today’s TV or billboard ads, which, as it were, passively enjoy the product instead of us? (Coke cans bearing the inscription ‘Ooh! Ooh! What taste!’ emulate in advance the ideal customer’s reaction.)

For example, the recent New Zealand television (TVNZ) advertisement shows an image of a giant Coke bottle ejaculating beautiful young teenage boys and girls into the air/water as they have their “summer fun!”
Baudrillard, in the *Consumer Society*, argues that “happiness is part of a bourgeois ideology insofar as it steers our attention away from social and political questions towards personal ones” (Cederström & Hoedemaekers, 2010, p. 108). Further, Deleuze developed the ‘society of control’ in which individuals become ‘dividuals’, or a herd of consumers in the post-industrial era. Colebrook (2006, p. 86) states: “[w]e no longer submit to an exploitative labour market because of some imposed belief – work harder and your reward will be in heaven – but because there is no belief, nothing other than the axiom of capital – the desire to buy more, work more, earn more, have more”. In the society of the imperative to enjoy, “dissatisfied subjects have no other options, but to seek to gain enjoyment and satisfaction” (Gunder, 2009, p. 292).

Antagonistic social behaviours in their extreme forms, such as religious fundamentalism or fascist anti-immigrant movements, are symptoms of the inherent problems of dominant neoliberalism. Moreover, the recent economic recession has brought an increase in socio-political conflict in late capitalism. Critical thinkers, particularly those in the area of political studies, such as Žižek (2009, 2011a), Laclau (2005), Stavrakakis (2002, 2007) and Mouffe (2007), among others, have extensively deployed Lacanian concepts to investigate these socio-political conflicts.

The distinctions between need, want and desire is essential for exposing the production of urban discontent in the late capitalist era (Stavrakakis & Chrysoloras, 2006). For Lacan, want is beyond biological or basic needs. Want is expressed by language, as a demand of the ‘big-Other’. Satisfaction inevitably relies on the acceptance of the big-Other. However, “[t]here is something in need (a certain real) [want] that cannot be symbolically articulated [or are not allowed] in demand and appears in an offshoot that presents itself in man as desire” (Stavrakakis, 2008a, p. 89). In this context, desire is constituted around a lack. “It is lack which causes desire to arise” (Evans, 2010, p. 95). Thus, contrary to the Deleuzian notion of the ‘desiring-machine’, which emphasises the productivity of desire, the Lacanian definition of desire is embedded in its lack. For Lacan, “desire and lack always go together, overdetermining the dialectic aporia of human life” (Stavrakakis, 2008a, p. 90). This dichotomy between lack and desire perpetuates the capitalistic city-machine in late capitalism (Baudrillard, 1998).

The mechanism of capitalism, including the city-machine, is largely dependent on generating new desires, which are constituted around lack (Baudrillard, 1998; Gunder, 2009; Stavrakakis, 2000;
Žižek, 1989). “Desire can only be sustained by the dialectic of lack and excess; in order to remain attractive, the promise of excess relies on the continuous renewal of experiences of lack” (Stavrakakis, 2008a, p. 94). Gunder (2009, p. 287) observes that “[b]eyond the traditional employment and investment opportunities, the quality of life available, including amenity, life and range of leisure opportunities are necessary elements for the city-region to attract businesses and talented people”. City-marketing policies, including massive urban projects, are also constituted around lack; the attainment of full enjoyment is fantasised through living in the city-machine (Haines, 2011). However, despite the promises made, satisfaction cannot be achieved due to an inherent lack.

The only end of desire is more desire. We desire because we don’t find the sacrifice of our enjoyment entirely satisfying, but desire, unfortunately, does nothing to overcome that dissatisfaction. In fact, desire is sustained dissatisfaction. (McGowan, 2004, p. 16)

The neoliberal utopia is predominantly a virtual utopia; its promised enjoyment, by advertising fantasy, cannot be actualised (Stavrakakis, 2008b). Desire:

[j]s constructed through fantasy – and it is through the fantasy we learn how to desire. As far as the final satisfaction of our desire is concerned this is postponed from discourse to discourse, from fantasy to fantasy, from product to product. It is this continuous displacement that constitutes the essence of consumer culture. (Stavrakakis, 2000, p. 89)

Neoliberalism fantasises advanced enjoyment. Fantasy channels inhabitants’ desires, informing their behaviours.

Žižek (1989, 1993), Stavrakakis (2006) and Laclau (2005), among others, conceptualise socio-political antagonisms, such as religious fundamentalism and neo-Nazism, as fantasies embedded in this same impossibility of full enjoyment. Since fantasies can seldom be realised and full enjoyment is unattainable, some people misidentify the source of their dissatisfaction in external agents such as immigrants or ethnic groups. In this context, new fantasies, often of a racist nature, are generated that demonise others as the cause of one’s lack of attainment of full enjoyment. They stop the fantasy from being attained – essentially, they are stealing my enjoyment.

Socio-cultural heterogeneity is one of the central characteristics of the neoliberalised city-machine. Florida’s (2003) observation shows that cultural diversity is one of the attractions for skilled migrants.
These new immigrants’ preference for living in a multi-ethnic society is embedded in the hope of fulfilling the lack that exists after immigrating to a foreign country. To satisfy the lack, immigrants shape their communities based on their religious, ethnic and socio-cultural backgrounds (Amin & Parkinson, 2002). “Urban areas are frequently divided geographically by ethnicity, race, income and age” (Bollens, 1998, p. 730). The Chinese communities known as “China Town” are a representative example of this cultural or ethnic segregation in the globalised city. However, full enjoyment is, of course, not readily attainable by living in these areas, potentially giving rise to radicalism among some in these communities.

Cultural diversity is thus problematic for a host society, which inevitably suffers from social, cultural, political and economic problems generated by the capitalistic city operation. Indigenous residents often come to perceive foreigners as the main agent of the lack of enjoyment in their society. By condemning others for society’s challenges, locals are in fact misrecognising the real source of their lack of enjoyment. This misrecognition reinforces the existing exclusions, deprivations and inequalities under neoliberalism, and further widens socio-cultural segregation in the neoliberalised society (Bollens, 2008, p. 43; Castles, 2011, p. 319).

Due to the heightening of existing tensions, communities, immigrants and native inhabitants tend to demonise each other. “[O]ftentimes the cause of the lack of enjoyment is attributed to someone who has stolen it” (Glynos & Stavrakakis, 2008, p. 8). Thus, each group denounces another group for appropriating their enjoyment. The recent economic recession has exacerbated dissatisfaction in globalised cities. Some indigenous residents consider immigrants as having stolen their jobs and happiness. “In the eye of a racist, immigrant workers who steal our jobs are simultaneously lazy and overdiligent: they work excessively for low wages yet, simultaneously, they seem to work too little, to exploit our healthcare and welfare systems” (Žižek, 1997a, p. 54). Some immigrants experience discrimination, exclusion and inequality in their host society from locals that want to exploit them. In this context, the failure of dominant capitalism in reproducing new desires for advanced enjoyment generates alternative fantasies, such as religious fundamentalism, nationalism or racism.

These alternative fantasies are often grounded in idealised images of the past, such as the golden age of Islamic civilisation, or the Roman Empire. “During this imagined golden age, the nation was prosperous and happy, only to be later destroyed by an evil ‘other’, someone who deprived the
nation of its enjoyment” (Glynos & Stavrakakis, 2008, p. 8). These fantasies refute capitalism for abolishing their glorious history through increasing socio-cultural heterogeneity. Accordingly, pre-capitalist coding systems are advocated as the prerequisite for regenerating societies able to provide full enjoyment. Unsurprisingly, followers of these fantasies sacrifice their enjoyment to realise their fantasies. The immolation of enjoyment is largely perceived as a part of one’s duty for the glory of nation, race, ethnicity or God (Žižek, 1989).

Following the terrorist attacks in the United States in 2001, radical fantasies, particularly Islamic fundamentalism, have come to be perceived as the main source of trauma in late capitalism. However, Stavrakakis (2008a) states that these terrorist activities cannot challenge dominant capitalism. Critical thinkers such as Žižek (2002c), Laclau (1996) and Graham (2010), among others, articulate that, while the dysfunction of dominant capitalism does generate radical fantasies, capitalism deceives people through propaganda into identifying these, incorrectly, as the sources of trauma or lack of enjoyment. Through this misidentification, neoliberalism can further expand its hegemony (Vries, 2008). In this context, Graham (2010) observes that the public trauma surrounding terrorist activities is largely deployed for widening the surveillance of all aspects of inhabitants’ lives.

Baudrillard (2004, p. 18) recognised that the “system takes as objectively terrorist whatever is set against it”. Political activities that challenge the dominant power mechanism are thus rendered as “evils” that intend to destroy residents’ enjoyment.

Furthermore, since the enemy consists of an abstraction, the limits of war are indeterminate, both in spatial and in temporal terms. The war on terror must be a war without end. (Vries, 2008, p. 192)

However, as Occupy Wall Street and the Arab Spring movements demonstrate, the dysfunction of neoliberalism inherently generates urban discontent, which can potentially erupt as urban conflict.

Drawing on Lacan, this section has shown that discontent is one of the inherent productions of the city-machine. The production of urban discontent is rooted in the inherent contradiction between what is desired and what is attainable. While urban discontent was also a product of pre-capitalistic and early capitalistic city-machines, it is more challenging for the neoliberalised city-machine, which
functions by promising advanced enjoyment. Further, the intensification of urban discontent widens socio-cultural raptures, fuelling religious and cultural contradictions.

This section identified socio-cultural conflict as one of the inherent products of the city-machine, particularly the neoliberalised city-machine. Neoliberalism and its components, including the globalised city, promote full enjoyment through increased consumption. In this context, promoting fantasied images of a city obscures the failures of neoliberalism, as the dominant ideology, to provide the promised full enjoyment. This section’s arguments underpin the thesis’s further investigations on urban discontent and the mitigation of its symptoms, such as socio-cultural conflict. Based on this understanding, the next section proposes an approach to potentially mitigate, although not eliminate, socio-cultural collisions in neoliberalised cities.

5.3-The globalised city; the place of agonism or antagonism

This section will consider the neoliberalised city as a place of urban discontent and its symptoms, including antagonism. Based on critical theory, it will challenge the consensus-centric approaches typically deployed by planners to confront urban conflict. Through the deployment of critical theory, agonism is suggested as a means to mitigate antagonism in the neoliberalised city.

The contemporary city as an assemblage operates within a global network of flows of ideas, finance and people (Dovey, 2005; Wood, 2009). The production of new desires, normalisation of residents’ attitudes and socio-political conflict are the inherent productions of the capitalistic city-machine. The production of urban conflict is largely perceived as a threat to the city-machine and its operation, and as such should be eliminated (Foucault, 2010). In Discipline and Punish (1991), Foucault elucidated how capitalism deploys new techniques such as the bio-politic to expand its control over people. However, despite the dominant capitalistic mechanism utilising various controlling approaches, such as punitive methods, surveillance and the regulation of inhabitants’ desires through consumerism and the debt mechanism, urban conflict is prevalent in the neoliberalised city.

Tajbakhsh (2001, p. 5) observes that the intensification of heterogeneity and ethnic, racial, linguistic and religious difference in the globalised city has generated many challenges. The globalised city is
[c]haracterised by intense heterogeneity that stems from migrations to the city of very diverse social groups: ethnic, cultural, artistic, professional, intranational, and international groups. In the city we therefore find, within a limited space, a high level of cultural complexity and subcultural variety. (Leeuwen, 2010, p. 633)

By conceptualising the heterogeneity as a surplus of difference, Tajbakhsh (2001) identifies cultural diversity as one of the drivers of urban conflict.

Socio-cultural collisions are increasingly confronted in neoliberalised cities, including by planners (Watson, 2006; Yiftachel, 1998b). This section reviews the primary perspectives on the socio-political contradictions in academia in general, and political studies in particular, which significantly influence contemporary planning. Based on the literature review, the thesis discerns three prevalent perspectives: non-conflictual urban life, consensus-centric theories and conflictual urban life.

Based largely on positivist social science, the advocates of the non-conflictual perspective generally emphasise the absence of widespread political contradictions such as revolution, insurrection and uprising in contemporary society as an indicator of the openness and inclusiveness of neoliberalism towards diversity and new interests. This index shows a widespread global consensus over market goals and values. Tajbakhsh (2001, p. 13) stresses that:

[j]n this [non-conflictual] perspective, the patterns and transformation of urban space (changing configurations of ethnic and class segregation, the spatial distribution of economic and political function), explained in terms of an evolutionary paradigm of functional adaptation influenced by natural demographic and market variables, reflected an equilibrium of social, demographic, and economic forces in the space.

Thus, the non-conflictual view is largely shaped on the disavowal of socio-political tensions in the neoliberalised city. The eruption of socio-political tensions around a range of issues, such as anti-immigrant movements and ghetto riots, in the contemporary city demonstrates the lack of capacity of this perspective in analysing urban conflict.

The consensus-centric perspective recognises the existing pluralism in contemporary society. “Pluralism is in a sense the people are not one … [b]ut for them, pluralism goes without antagonism” (Carpentier & Cammaerts, 2006, p. 972). From their perspective, socio-political conflict is a
problematic issue. Mouffe (2006a, p. 972) argues that "[i]t is the view of plurality that recognises the different positions on the world, but believes if you were able to assemble all of them together, then you would be able to reconstitute some form of harmony". Accordingly, the adherents of this perspective endeavour to establish an aggregative model by generating consensus between various interests.

Since the end of the Cold War, liberal democracy is recognised as the only legitimate form of government (Mouffe, 1999). The legitimacy of liberal democracies is embedded in their consensus building, which is challenged by the increasing socio-political collisions. Mouffe (2007, p. 1) argues that

[i]t is not clear how strong is the present consensus and how long it will last. While very few dare to openly challenge the liberal democratic model, the signs of disaffection with present institutions are becoming widespread.

More importantly, she contends:

[i]t the type of democratic political theory dominant today [deliberative theories] cannot help us understanding the importance of dissensus in a democratic society. It is unable to grasp the different forms of antagonisms which have emerged in our globalised, post-cold war world and to envisage a type of democratic politics that could take them into account.

(Mouffe, 2004, p. 42)

Thus, socio-cultural conflict demonstrates the failure of the consensus-centric view in addressing antagonism. Habermas’s (1984, 1987) notion of ‘communicative theory’ has had an important influence on both politics and planning (Hillier, 2002).

Some studies have argued that urban conflict is an inevitable product of social interactions and that social contradictions are at the heart of social change and democracy (Carpentier & Cammaerts, 2006; Purcell, 2009; Tajbakhsh, 2001). Orthodox-Marxists generally frame this ineradicable antagonism in the theory of class struggle, which is imperative for the proletarian revolution. However, following the student riots of 1968, post-Marxists such as Laclau and Mouffe (2001), among others, reproved traditional Marxism for its synoptic understanding of social conflict. Mouffe (2001, p. 116) states that:
We insisted on the need to abandon the traditional idea of the revolution in the sense of a complete break. Instead, we were proposing what could be seen as an immanent critique of liberal democracy, understood as a political regime and not necessarily as a component of capitalism.

Post-Marxists also shape their counter-hegemonic theory based on the necessity of urban conflict. From their perspective, socio-political contradictions are not threats to democracy that should be eliminated, but are rather essential for the protection of pluralism and democracy. From their perspective, hegemonic neoliberal globalism is the primary danger to democracy and pluralism, due to its attempt to normalise contemporary society based on market values (Carpentier & Cammaerts, 2006).

Although the scientific-based viewpoint generally repudiates the existence of urban contradictions, deliberative theorists and post-Marxists have considered social tensions. Chapter Two described the inadequacy of the prevalent positivistic methods in considering urban conflicts. The previous section further illustrated the necessity of additional investigations on urban conflict as a production of city-machine operation by addressing the increasing socio-cultural contradictions in contemporary society. To avoid repetition, this section investigates two influential notions on urban conflict: one by Mouffe and one by Habermas.

Although “discourse theory has been central both to Habermas’ and Mouffe’s work, this has been very differently framed and employed” (Tambakaki, 2009, p. 104). Habermas endeavoured to mitigate the existing social tensions as a primary challenge for the existing liberal democracy. Conversely, Mouffe emphasised the capacity of socio-political contradictions as counter-hegemonic struggles to protect and radicalise the existing democracy. Further, while Mouffe emphasised the privileges of liberal democracy in comparison with despotic mechanisms, she also revealed the weaknesses of liberal democracy and its advocates, such as deliberative theories (Carpentier & Cammaerts, 2006).

Cities have historically encompassed various desires and interests (Wirth, 2005). As previously mentioned, the operation of the capitalistic city-machine relies on constant flows of financial and human capital. The constant reproduction of new desires is essential for sustaining these flows. According to Florida (2002), cultural diversity is a primary stimuli to attract skilled immigrants to
capitalistic cities. As a corollary, flows of people inevitably encompass flows of ideas and interests (Amin & Parkinson, 2002; Tajbakhsh, 2001).

Socio-cultural, economic and political identities are generally constituted around existing differences. Based on discrepancies and resemblances, people distinguish themselves as ‘us’ as distinct from ‘others’. Thus, the existence of ‘others’ is essential to constitute ‘us’ (Mouffe, 2007). Further, “[t]ransposed to the realm of human identities, the idea is that individual or collective identity, an ‘I’ or a ‘we’, is always formed in relation to others, a ‘them’; a relation which, according to Mouffe, is always possibly one of antagonism; identity is constructed against some other” (Fossen, 2008, p. 382).

In contrast, Habermas considers exiting differences as a hindrance to attaining communicative rationality. For Habermas, these obstacles are empirical and can be eradicated through the process of communication and reasoning (Mouffe, 2007). In this context, procedural communication and its reasonings shape the identity of participants. More importantly, they modify residents’ interests based on mutual understanding. Habermas’s (1984, 1987) deliberative theory has been applied extensively in politics, including planning, to generate consensus based on mutual understanding. However, the increasing socio-cultural conflict because of marginalisation and exclusion of minorities in neoliberalised city reveals the failure of his consensus-centric theory in harmonising disparate elements in contemporary society.

The establishment of a firm consensus based on dialogue seems unattainable in heterogeneous society (Healey, 1997). Consensus-based theory largely pertains to language and its capacity to create a common rationality through procedural communication. Based on Wittgenstein’s language games, “Habermas maintains that reaching mutual understanding requires a speaker and hearer to operate at two levels: the level of intersubjectivity on which they speak with one another, and the level of objects or states of affairs about which they communicate” (Fultner, 2001, p. xiii). Further, “communicative rationalists accept the idea of postmodernism as epoch, as demonstrated by the associated importance attached to difference and the poststructuralist concern with the relativity of language” (Tewdwr-Jones & Allmendinger, 1998, p. 1979). They precisely emphasise the role of discourse to build a consistent consensus:
Habermas’s key move in linking communicative rationality with a theory of meaning is to connect the theory meaning with a theory of argumentation and justification. There is, as he puts it, a ‘validity basis’ to speech; all speech acts carry an implicit commitment to justification, giving reasons that back one’s claims. (Fultner, 2001, p. xiv)

However, according to Lacan, “language is always incomplete. It always lacks. It never says completely what we want it to” (Gunder, 2005a, p. 84). From a Lacanian perspective, the generation of a complete mechanism of meanings and values, as the essence of a firm consensus, is not acquirable. Due to the existence of an ineradicable lack in the process of articulation, people cannot completely declare their interests and desires, even in the idealistic Habermasian discourse situation (Hillier, 2003). Thus, communication-based consensus cannot fully reflect participants’ interests.

The inherent impotence of discourse appears even more challenging in a multicultural society in which different languages are employed in daily life. Based on Lacan’s works, Gunder (2005a, p. 84) argues that:

[w]ord meaning is never concrete, with signifiers constantly slipping from one meaning into another ... what we think we hear is often more reflective of the structure of our unconscious than anything the speaker meant to assert.

However, the deployment of a symbolic system as a dominant language to communicate with others in a heterogeneous society is unavoidable; the constituted understandings of communication are inevitably diverse. The various understandings of the words’ meanings cannot be eliminated through the processes of communication and reasoning.

For Habermas, power and its effects are eliminated in the ideal discourse situation to attain a rational consensus (Flyvbjerg, 1998b). The aim of communicative theory is to generate the communicative power based on a generated consensus:

In a society following this model, citizenship would be defined in terms of taking part in public debate. Participation is discursive participation. And participation is detached participation, in as much as communicative rationality requires ideal role taking, power neutrality. (Flyvbjerg, 1998b, p. 213)
However, this “is underpinned by a conception of power, inspired by Nietzsche and Foucault, in which any social construction is constituted through discourse, and discourse is an expression of relations of power” (Fossen, 2008, p. 381). Accordingly, the eliminating of power and its effects to generate a neutral political situation as an ideal situation for communication is unrealistic.

According to Gramsci, “common sense is always something which is the result of political articulation” (Carpentier & Cammaerts, 2006, p. 967). The outcome of the Habermasian ideal discourse condition, as a power-neutral sphere, is inherently a political articulation; that is, the process of the depoliticisation of society is largely promoted as a political struggle (Žižek, 2011b). More importantly, the process of depoliticisation of space to attain a Habermasian ideal speech situation seems desirable for hegemonic neoliberalism (Purcell, 2009). From a Lacanian perspective, “this very attempt to exclude constraint and power from rational communication is itself the return of constraint and power” (Hillier, 2003, p. 53). Accordingly, there is a significant paradox in Habermas’s deliberative theory. On the one hand, a neutral political realm is a prerequisite to attain consensus-based rationality. On the other, the depoliticising society prevents radical political change from attaining emancipation as the primary aim of enlightenment. Thus, Habermas largely endeavours to create harmony and mitigate social conflicts in contemporary society by depoliticising society.

Agonists such as Arendt, Mouffe and Connolly, among others, perceive socio-cultural contradictions as an ineradicable phenomenon. More crucially, they emphasise agonism’s capacity for political change. In contrast to advocates of deliberative democracy, who generally strive to eliminate social conflict and antagonism, “[p]roponents of agonistic democracy insist that political conflict and disagreement are endemic to political life and cannot be resolved by appeals to rationality” (Deveaux, 1999, p. 3).

Nietzsche initially punctuated the political and cultural value of the ‘agon’. Based on the concept of agon, Nietzsche critically challenged the desire of Enlightenment to create a universal rationality as the dominant mechanism of thinking. In one of his unpublished books, Homers Wettkampf, Nietzsche claimed that the ancient Greeks knew that “competition is vital if the well-being of the state is to continue” (Schrift, 2000, p. 155). The Greeks believed power conflict to be essential for socio-cultural advancement. Nietzsche added:
[a]n absolute victory with in the agon would mark the death of the agon, and he acknowledges that in order to preserve freedom from dominance, one must be committed to maintaining the institution of the agon as a shared public space for open competition.

(Schrift, 2000, p. 155)

From the agonists’ perspective, the existence of democracy depends on the existence of agon (Carpentier & Cammaerts, 2006). This section will elucidate that agon is a prerequisite for the operation of the capitalistic city-machine in both democratic and non-democratic mechanisms.

Agonists such as Connolly, Honig, and Mouffe, amongst others, endorse some version of democracy in which social disagreements are perceived as the very essence of the polis and citizenship (Deveaux, 1999). In between, Mouffe’s agonistic perspective has been influential in a variety of domains, including sociology, cultural studies, law, art, literary criticism and politics. Planning theorists such as Hillier (2003), Gunder (2003a) and Pløger (2004), among others, deploy Mouffe’s works in their investigations. These planning theorists generally utilise agonism to reveal the failures of communicative and collaborative planning, which are embedded in consensus-centric theories.

By employing Mouffe’s agonistic notion, this section contends that social contradictions and agonism are inherent products of the city-machine operation. There are at least two convergences between this research and Mouffe’s works. First, the thesis illustrates that social conflict is an inherent product of the city-machine, which is in line with Mouffe’s agonism. Second, as is the case for this thesis, Mouffe is inspired by post-structuralism in general, and Lacanian notions in particular (Hillier, 2003). Thus, the focus in this section is on Mouffe’s agonistic notion.

Mouffe’s agonistic notion is embedded in post-structuralism. Language and its functions in reshaping social institutions and human identity are essential in Mouffe’s work. For Mouffe, people’s understandings of the world and themselves are constructed through communication with others. However, discourse is incomplete. To avoid any form of essentialism, she clarifies that the meanings of words are neither stable nor fixed. There is an indelible lack between words as signifiers and what is signified. Based on the Lacanian notion of ‘lack’, Mouffe defines “how identities are formed through political struggles, generating processes of othering – or the creation of a frontier between the self and the other” (Carpentier & Cammaerts, 2006). “When dealing with political identities, which are
always collective identities, we are dealing with the creation of an ‘us’ that can only exist by its demarcation from a ‘them’” (Mouffe, 2009, p. 550). This socio-political identification is shaped through communication with others. However, the political identity that is constituted based on discourse is not solid, but rather is dynamic and changeable due to meaning sliding from one signified to other.

The constitution of political identity based on the distinction of ‘us’ and ‘them’ is useful for analysing the increasing antagonism in the neoliberalised city, which is generally recognised by its socio-cultural heterogeneity. The accumulation of differences such as ethnicity, religion and social class unavoidably generates various socio-political identities in the city-machine. According to Mouffe (2009, p.550):

This does not mean of course that such a relation is by necessity an antagonistic one. But it means that there is always the possibility of this relation us/them becoming one of friend/enemy. This happens when the others, who up to now had been considered as simply different, start to be perceived as putting into question our identity and threatening our existence. From that moment on, any form of us/them relation, be it religious, ethnic or economic, becomes the locus of an antagonism.

To avoid antagonism, it is necessary to legitimise the various residents’ identities and their inherent interests. Mouffe formulates her ‘agonistic pluralism’ based on the legitimisation of various political identities in contemporary society. However, antagonism cannot be completely eradicated by the implementation of agonistic policies (Mouffe, 1999).

To develop her agonistic pluralism theory, Mouffe (1999, p.15) redefined ‘politics’ and ‘the political’:

[b]y ‘the political’, I refer to the dimension of antagonism that is inherent in human relations, antagonism that can take many forms and emerge in different type of social relations. ‘Politics’, on the other hand, indicates the ensemble of practices, discourses and institutions which seek to establish a certain order and organise human coexistence in conditions that are always potentially conflictual because they are affected by the dimension of the political.

From this perspective, the homogenisation of inhabitants’ attitudes in the capitalistic city-machine, as formulated as a ‘society of enjoyment’ and ‘bio-politics’ in the previous chapter, can be perceived as
components of politics. Further, as Habermas’s consensus-centric theory aims to eradicate the
difference between us/them through communication, existing distinctions should be eliminated to
attain a universal rationality. This politic “aims at the creation of unity in a context of conflict and
diversity; it is always concerned with the creation of an ‘us’ by the determination of a ‘them’” (Mouffe,
1999, p. 15). However, considering the implementation of consensus-based theories alongside
regulative mechanisms as components of the control apparatus that generally functions to obscure
diversity, the increasing socio-cultural contradictions evident in contemporary society demonstrate
that the regulation of people’s identities is impracticable.

As noted, the contemporary city-machine primarily operates based on market values and norms;
however various desiring-machines comprise a city-machine. Deleuze and Guattari (2009) argue that
the pre-capitalist desiring-machines such as kinship, tribal and religious values have not completely
disappeared under the hegemony of capitalism, but have only been adjusted to operate within
capitalism. Other desiring-machines, such as nationalism, which were produced, or reinforced, by
capitalism in its early stages, also continue to operate as part of the neoliberalised city-machine.
Thus, the contemporary city is an assemblage of various desiring-machines operating simultaneously
to permanently reproduce new fantasies. However, as Žižek (1991b, p. 168) argues, “Fantasies
cannot coexist peacefully”. In addressing the socio-cultural conflicts in the Balkan, Gunder (2005a)
stressed that the profound tribal/cultural differences can be a source of brutal antagonism. Moreover,
the terrorist attack on the Twin Towers in September 2001 demonstrates that antagonistic behaviour
is not restricted to conflicts between socio-cultural groups; it can also challenge the hegemony of
dominant neoliberalism. Thus:

Terrorism highlights the dangers implied in the delusions of the universalist globalist
discourse which postulates that human progress requires the establishment of world unity
based on the implementation of the western model. It shatters the illusions … that
antagonisms could be eliminated thanks to a unification of the world that would be
achieved by transcending the political, conflict and negativity. (Mouffe, 2005, pp. 82-83)

Carpentier and Cammaerts (2006, p. 971) further explain that “if conflict plays a key role in the social
and political, care needs to be taken that this conflict does not release the destructive potential of
these antagonisms”.
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In formulating agonistic politics, Mouffe separates the destructive aspects from the social conflicts. To attain agonism, the enemy-other should be modified into the adversary-other. Mouffe (1999, p. 16) states that “[i]ntroducing the category of the ‘adversary’ requires complexifying the notion of antagonism and distinguishing it from agonism. Antagonism is struggle between enemies, while agonism is struggle between adversaries”. From an antagonistic perspective, the other is generally perceived as an enemy to be curtailed. In contrast, others and their existence are protected in agonism, despite their interests essentially conflicting with ‘ours’. “Agonism thus domesticates antagonism in the sense that it prevents conflictual relations from being engaged existentially” (Purcell, 2009, p. 151). However, agonists declare that antagonism will not be eliminated, even when transforming the enemy-other into an adversary-other in society.

Further, Mouffe deploys social conflicts’ tendency as a counter-hegemonic phenomena for socio-political reform. Purcell (2009, p. 151) argues:

Politics, in their view [agonistics], is not the search for intersubjective understanding and agreement; it is necessarily a struggle for hegemony. The goal is not to develop, with Habermas, a priori processes to control, neutralize, or eliminate conflictual relations of power. It is instead to transform those relations: to mobilize power to engage in counter-hegemonic struggles to establish new hegemonies.

Mouffe develops her agonistic theory based on the Gramscian notion of ‘hegemony’ and post-structuralism. Thus, Mouffe (2006, p. 976) in interview with Carpentier and Cammaerts declares that:

[common sense is always something which is the result of political articulation. Reality is not given to us; meaning is always constructed. There is no meaning that is just essentially given to us; there is no essence of the social, it is always constructed. The social is always the result of a hegemonic articulation; every type of social order is the product of a hegemony as a specific political articulation.

Thus, all forms of social order including consensus inevitably exclude others. The excluded other attempts to challenge and destabilise the dominant hegemony based on the political. “Every order is therefore susceptible of being challenged by counter-hegemonic practices which attempt to
disarticulate it in order to install another form of hegemony” (Mouffe, 2009, p. 549). The existing disobediences and disagreements are generally perceived as counter-hegemonic practices.

Socio-cultural contradictions are widespread in the globalised city, which operates based on market-based values regardless of socio-cultural heterogeneity. People who cannot conform to the dominant neoliberal values are generally ignored, excluded or marginalised from the neoliberalised society. Thus, excluded groups defy the dominant mechanism and its norms and values. In Mouffe’s agonistic pluralism, these counter-hegemonic practices are necessary for socio-political reformation, or at least maintain the existing democracy under the hegemony of neoliberalism (Carpentier & Cammaerts, 2006). Further, social conflicts are essential for the operation of the capitalistic city-machine as an assemblage of various desiring-machines.

Mouffe (1999, p. 13) also challenges consensus-centric theories such as Habermas’s communicative theory by arguing that “this model of democratic politics is unable to acknowledge the dimension of antagonism that the pluralism of values entails and its ineradicable character”. Mouffe (1999, p. 16) highlights the necessity of consensus as a prerequisite for politics:

I agree with those who affirm that a pluralist democracy demands a certain amount of consensus and that it requires allegiance to the values, which constitute its ethico-political principles. But since those ethico-political principles can only exist through many different and conflicting interpretations, such a consensus is bound to be a conflictual consensus.

In contrast with Habermas’s rational consensus, which excludes conflict as irrational from communication, Mouffe’s conflictual consensus generates an appropriate condition for agonistic confrontation among adversaries. In other words, agonistic agreements are not fixed as an unquestionable reality; they exist through many different and conflicting interpretations. The adversaries constantly recommend interpretations of the “common good”, and endeavour to implement various forms of hegemony. Mouffe claims that only this democratic situation transforms antagonism into agonism.

Agonists, including Mouffe, are aware of the privileges of liberal democracy in comparison with despotic systems:
Power is constitutive for the social; there is no social without power relations. Now, any form of order is a hegemonic order, but of course there are some forms of order that are more democratic than others. Power relations are constructed in different ways. A democratic society in which there is accountability is a form of order and it is a better form of order than an authoritarian regime. (Carpentier & Cammaerts, 2006, p. 967)

However, by addressing the failures of liberal democracy, they endeavour to formulate a more democratic system. Therefore, agonists concentrate their attention on power and its institutions, particularly in the democratic mechanism.

Agonism is not a peaceful movement; it intends to change the status quo through a constant challenging of dominant power. However, agonistic struggles, unlike antagonism, are not based in violence or brutality. In this way, agonism is an attempt to mitigate antagonism in the process of political transformation.

Importantly, Habermasian communication theory has had a strong influence on contemporary planning (Allmendinger, 2009; Gunder, 2010b; Hillier, 2003). Purcell (2009, p. 143) argues:

In order to ensure its long-term stability, neoliberals must make neoliberalism into a dominant common-sense, so that market competition—creating a business-friendly climate—comes to be seen as a necessary (and even the only) value in decision-making.

Accordingly, planners deploy consensus-centric planning approaches such as collaborative and communicative planning, which legitimise market-based policies under the hegemony of global neoliberalism (Allmendinger & Haughton, 2012). Planning theorists such as Gunder (2003a, 2005a), Hillier (2003), Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger (1998) and Pløger (2004) stress that some city inhabitants are inherently excluded through consensus-based policies. The exclusion of residents’ interests potentially generates antagonism (Amin & Parkinson, 2002).

Neoliberalised planning knowledge has been utilised to support economic growth and generate greater financial benefits for particular groups, such as plutocrats and local rulers, alongside international investors in the real-estate market as the main driver of neoliberal development (Swyngedouw et al., 2002). Planning techniques and rational models have been used to draw flows of international investors to cities through the presentation of attractive images of future urban projects.
Planned urban projects promise maximum benefit with minimum risk to investors (Brenner & Theodore, 2005). However, by investigating spatial planning in England, Allmendinger and Haughton (2012, p. 89) observe that:

[n]eoliberal spatial governance [including planning], underpinned by a variety of post-politics that has sought to replace antagonism and agonism with consensus. Conflict has not been removed from planning, but it is instead more carefully choreographed and in some cases displaced or otherwise residualised. This has been achieved through a variety of mechanisms including partnership-led governance arrangements and inclusive though vague objectives and nomenclature around sustainable [economic] growth.

In the context of the post-political planning condition, the social, cultural and political aspects of planning are mostly omitted. As a corollary, residents’ desires and interests, which may not be compatible with market values, are neglected in the process of decision-making.

Economic growth reinforces the constant flow of immigrants. Tunbridge (1984, p. 174) notes that the process of decision-taking, including in urban redevelopment in multicultural cities, is often a contested process, ‘frequently with sinister overtones for those groups out of power.’ The majority of social groups are deliberately marginalised within city-states through the implementation of market-oriented policies. The exclusion of residents in the process of decision-making is inevitably accompanied by the production of discontent, social conflict and antagonism (Lee & Yeoh, 2004). In the post-political condition, consensus is shaped around market values. Partnership is perceived as constructive, whereas political conflict is assessed as unproductive and to be eliminated (Allmendinger & Haughton, 2012). Since hegemony cannot be complete, resistance and political conflict seem inevitable (Carpentier, 2011). Marginalised inhabitants will challenge the hegemony of the city-states’ ruling class. These counter-hegemonic practices potentially shape social contradictions in antagonistic ways, especially where there is a lack of democratic institutions, such as in Brazil, Turkey and Dubai.

Until now, the control apparatus has managed socio-political conflict by utilising various punitive and bio-political controlling technologies. However, the increasing contradictions are becoming one of the most challenging impediments for the operation of the neoliberal city-machine. Political thinkers such as Žižek (2011a) and Mouffe (2006b) argue that the hegemony of neoliberalism is the primary
danger for the existence of liberal democracy. Thus, to transform antagonism into agonism, the existing political regimes should be radically restructured and democratic institutions should be able to challenge the dominant neoliberalism constantly.

This section has revealed that the capitalistic city is a place of socio-political conflict due to its socio-cultural heterogeneity of interests. Drawing on Mouffe’s work, this section suggests the implementation of agonistic policies to mitigate antagonism and violence in the neoliberalised city. This section’s findings are essential to respond to the final research question, which questions how urban planning may mitigate the adverse impacts of market-oriented policies.

5.4-Conclusion

This chapter provided insight into the increasing social contradictions that have been neglected, or at least misinterpreted, by contemporary planning approaches. Dominant methods in planning largely predicated on positivistic social science are ontologically incapable of distinguishing the core of this discontent. To address the production of discontent through city-machine operation, this chapter drew on the psychoanalytical approach of Freud and his follower Lacan. Accordingly, the constant production of discontent through the functioning of the city-machine was conceptualised as city as antagonism-creator.

Commencing with Rousseau, this chapter illustrated that discontent is not a new problem in cities. Deploying Freud and Lacan’s ideas, the chapter showed that discontent is an inherent production of the city-machine embedded in inevitable social restrictions. Both pre-capitalist and capitalist societies rely on enjoyment and both, in their early stages, were societies of prohibition, in which the lack of enjoyment was perceived as a cost to be paid for an eternal enjoyment after life. In contrast, late capitalism is a ‘society of commanded enjoyment’ in which personal enjoyment becomes a duty. Thus, the city-mechanism constantly promises ‘advanced enjoyment’ by generating new desires for more consumption.

The Lacanian notion of lack reveals the paradox that exists in late capitalism. The existence of lack is a constant barrier to attaining complete enjoyment, yet the market primarily operates based on lack. Further, the lack of promised enjoyment widens existing social-cultural ruptures. Generally, others are misrecognised as sources of the lack of enjoyment, which generates antagonistic reactions against
these others. Yet, the existence of discontent is neglected by contemporary planning, which operates based on market values, and multicultural policies continue to be promoted by decision-makers and planners to attract the creative class, which is imperative for economic growth.

Following the conceptualisation of discontent as a production of the city-machine, the chapter deployed Mouffe’s notion of agonism to investigate social conflict in contemporary society. Based on Mouffe’s work, this chapter considered Habermas’s communicative theory, which is arguably the most prevalent approach for consideration of social conflict in planning. Habermas holds that socio-political contradictions are destructive and that conflict should be eradicated through the process of mutual communication. However, for Mouffe, socio-political conflict is imperative to sustain pluralism and democracy under the hegemony of neoliberalism. Moreover, by addressing the failures of the implementation of Habermas’s consensus-centric theories in planning, Gunder, Hillier and Płöger, among others, indicate the necessity of incorporating agonistic theory into contemporary planning.

This chapter’s findings responded to research question number five: How does discontent intensify as a consequence of the homogenisation of urban spaces? Drawing on Lacan’s work, this chapter revealed that neoliberalism operation relies on promising full enjoyment through greater consumption. Market-oriented policies, including urban massive projects, fantasise the achievement of full enjoyment by living in the neoliberalised city. However, the promised enjoyment cannot be actualised due to the persistent existence of lack. Large numbers of residents are thus excluded and their interests ignored through the implementation of market-oriented policies. This exclusion intensifies discontent and its symptoms, such as antagonistic behaviour.

The chapter’s findings were also used to answer research question six: How can urban planning mitigate the adverse impacts of market-oriented policies? Based on Mouffe’s work, this chapter revealed the necessity of implementing agonistic policies for mitigating antagonism in the neoliberalised city.
Chapter Six: Dubai, a neoliberal utopia?

What is good for merchants is good for Dubai.
(Sheikh Rashid bin Saeed Al Makhtoum, 2007)

Dubai is Market Fundamentalist Globalisation in One City.
(Henri, 2009)

6.1-Introduction

Cities, more than ever in history, are being affected by international forces as a consequence of the process of globalisation (Lever, 2001). Global forces are not merely reshaping pre-existing cities; rather new cities are being fostered through the process of globalisation as ‘sudden cities’ (Molavi, 2007) or ‘instant cities’ (Bagaeen, 2007). Further, these cities, including Dubai, are often categorised as new global hubs in the global city rankings (Marcuse & Kempen, 2000). Indeed, the rapid economic growth of these new global cities generally makes them appear as prosperous models of development under the hegemony of neoliberalism. For example, Dubai, with its rapid economic growth (at least prior to the economic recession in 2008) has been called a “neoliberal utopia” (Kanna, 2009a). The economic growth of new global cities such as Dubai draws on the constant flux of cheap labour and footloose skilled immigrants (Haines, 2011). These cities, by generating new desires, endeavour to lure skilled workers in competition with other cities. By investigating Dubai as a neoliberal utopia, this chapter attempts to provide an insightful understanding of the globalised city operation as a component of global capitalism. Its findings will assist in responding to research question number two: What role do market-oriented planning policies have in the homogenisation of urban space?; question number three: What role do market-driven policies, including urban projects, play in normalising residents’ behaviour?; question number four: Who benefits and who suffers as a consequence of the standardisation of urban space under the hegemony of global capital values?; and question number five: How does discontent intensify as a consequence of the homogenisation of urban spaces?

Social heterogeneity is one of the characteristics of these new global cities (Buckley, 2013). Despite traditional global cities such as London and New York having been developed within historical
democratic states, these new global cities tend to be controlled by non-democratic mechanisms. These autocratic political systems generally embody a combination of capitalism with local pre-capitalist mechanisms such as “capitalism with tribal values” in Dubai (Ramos, 2010) or “capitalism with Asian values” in Singapore (Žižek, 2009). The efficiency of the control apparatus is pivotal for capital accumulation in these new global cities.

This chapter will scrutinise the characteristics of these new global cities based on the concepts of city-assemblage, city as a desiring-machine, city as a normalising-machine and city as a discontent-intensifier, as conceptualised in the previous chapters. By investigating Dubai, the thesis will endeavour to illustrate how a neoliberal city operates as an assemblage within global capitalism. By considering the dominant socio-cultural and political mechanisms in Dubai, the thesis will demonstrate that the traditional local mechanisms of Dubai continue to operate, that is, the flow of genes, based on tribalism as well as the global mechanism of neoliberal capitalism. This chapter will reveal the dependency of Dubai on the global market, and particularly on the constant flow of capital and expatriate exploitable workers. To lure flows of capital and creative workers from the global market in competition with other globalised cities, Dubai depends on the production of new desire. Market-oriented policies, including massive urban projects such as Burj Khalifeh, are pivotal in generating these new desires. Drawing on Foucault and Deleuze’s work, the chapter will consider the control apparatus in Dubai, the efficiency of which is essential for capital accumulation. By investigating social, economic and political mechanisms in Dubai, the chapter will illustrate the intensification of discontent between both indigenous and temporary workers because of the hegemony of global neoliberalism. The following section considers Dubai as a city-assemblage, and details the consequences of this. Section 6.3 will then discuss Dubai as a desiring-machine seeking to lure essential financial and human capital flows. Section 6.4 will consider Dubai’s control apparatus, and Section 6.5 will investigate Dubai and its market-oriented development as an antagonism-creator.

6.2-Dubai as an assemblage

Based on Deleuze and Guattari’s work, Chapter Four argued that cities are Deleuzian machines; as opposed to the mechanical machines conceptualised by the avant-garde modernists in the early 20th century. However, “[c]ities are, if nothing else, an agglomeration of people, buildings, technologies, communications networks, offices, homes, parks, services” (Amin & Thrift, 2002, p. 70).
These parts are completely intermixed and operate as components of a machine, or an assemblage, based on Deleuze and Guattari’s (2009) definition. From this perspective, “[a]n assemblage [the city-machine] is not a collection of things (whether buildings or people), but an entity that emerges from the interaction of parts” (Dovey et al., 2009, p. 2611). Wise (2008, p. 77) stresses that “an assemblage is a whole of some sort that expresses some identity and claims a territory”. Deleuze and Guattari’s (2009) work assists to define the concept of the city as an assemblage. This section will consider Dubai as an assemblage, its dependency on the global market as a new global hub, and the transformation of its components – that is, its socio-cultural, economic and political mechanisms, including planning – as a consequence of internal and external interactions with other mechanisms.

Scholars such as Bagaeen (2007), Molavi (2007) and Ramos (2010) generally consider Dubai as a new city in comparison with other cities in the Middle East region. Ramos (2009, p. 1) rightly asserts that “[t]o understand Dubai’s modern history since its founding in 1833, one must go further back in time to explore the regional history that frames its foundation”. Dubai’s often invisible socio-cultural, political and economic institutions are not recent constructs; rather, they have been shaped and reformed throughout the history of Dubai. The interactions of these invisible machines constantly transform their physical environment and these interplays shape Dubai’s identity and its territory. Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari, assemblage “is not a static term; it is not arrangement or organisation but the process of arranging, organising and fitting together” (Wise, 2008, p. 77). In Fluid City (2005), Dovey declares that the city’s identity is not static, but is transitive. Dovey conceives the role of constant flows in the creation of a city and the reshaping of its identity.

By deploying the notion of flows, this research will consider the history of Dubai and its components, including its built environment. Further, this section concentrates on three essential flows: the flow of genes, the flow of capital and the flow of transitory labour, which have significantly shaped the Dubai-assemblage as a contemporary neoliberal utopia. Dubai, similar to other Deleuzian machines, is the product of flows. Deleuze and Guattari (2009, p. 36) stressed that “every [city-]machine functions as a break in the flow in relation to the machine to which it is connected, but at the same time is also a flow itself, or the production of a flow, in relation to the machine connected to it”. Flows determine Dubai’s operation, define its territory and identity and regulate the interactions between its components.
Dubai is located in the south of the Persian Gulf. According to Ramos (2009, p. 2):

Traditionally, this geographic diversity has marked two distinct cultures: coastal settlements dedicated to trade, fishing and pearl and other socio-economic activities oriented toward the sea [such as piracy], and interior settlements and nomadic Bedouin communities based on agriculture and animal husbandry.

Both communities were largely structured on coding flows of genes; that is, the systems of kinship or tribalism. The seaside settlements functioned to facilitate the flows of commodities through the Persian Gulf, which significantly increased following the intervention of European countries such as the British in the region. “For many decades Dubai was a stopover for boats heading to and from Persia, India, China and East Africa. It was also the starting point of the great caravans to the West” (Al-Sayegh, 1998, p. 87). According to Deleuze and Guattari (2009, p. 148), constant decampment is one of the primary characteristics of nomads:

The great nomad hunter follows the flows, exhausts them in place, and moves on with them to another place. He reproduces in an accelerated fashion his entire filiation, and contracts it into a point that keeps him in a direct relationship with the ancestor or the god.

Tribal society is a pre-capitalistic coding system that embodies the flow of genes across generations. This nomadic coding system subdivides people into hierarchy groups based on their kinship. Deleuze and Guattari (2009, p. 147) argued that “[a] kinship system is not a structure but a practice, a praxis, a method, and even a strategy”. Mouffe (2009, p. 550) states that “[w]hen dealing with political identities, which are always collective identities, we are dealing with the creation of an ‘us’ that can only exist by its demarcation from a ‘them’”. From Mouffe’s perspective, the coding mechanism determines the ‘we’ from the ‘others’ in a tribal society, based on the affiliation. Deleuze and Guattari (2009, p. 148) state that “[a] kinship system only appears closed to the extent that it is severed from the political and economic references that keep it open, and that make alliance something other than an arrangement of matrimonial classes and filiative lineage”. In the Arab peninsula, including Dubai, the kinship coding mechanism defines the social, political and economic identities of its inhabitants. Kanna (2009b) argues that Dubai’s society is hierarchical, and that its residents, including many of its indigenous Arab citizens, were, and still are, significantly discriminated
against based on their ethnicity and lineage. Thus, the contemporary discrimination in Dubai originates in its pre-capitalistic coding mechanism, tribalism.

Traditionally, a kinship mechanism such as tribalism has been an effective strategy to control limited resources (Ramos, 2010). However, tribes encompass many subsections, each disputing over who should preside over the region’s scarce resources. They also intermingled with one another in tribal confederations as the basis for “the creation of a nation-state within a large and geographically very varied territory” (Heard-Bey, 1982, p. 34). Since the establishment of Dubai in 1833, the Maktoum family has been the ruling dynasty in Dubai. However, the majority of its residents belong to a subsection of a bigger tribe, Beni Yas. Dubai traditionally functioned as a buffer zone between rival tribes, eventually emerging as a new trading centre in the region. Its political neutrality, and the boost of its becoming a tax heaven and relaxing commercial controls in 1904, meant that the small merchant communities grew rapidly into a thriving commercial centre. Traders from Iran, India and other cities immigrated to Dubai because of increasing flows of commodities and money into Dubai. Nevertheless, “Dubai owes much of its prosperity and development to its merchants who played a key role in restructuring the economy and in the government decision-making process” (Al-Sayegh, 1998, p. 87). The kinship coding mechanism has determined the socio-political interactions in Dubai. Ramos (2009) argues that these flows of capital reinforced the merchants and traders against the ruling family, at least before oil exploration began in 1939. Al-Sayegh (1998, p. 90) describes how:

> [s]ince the ruler’s income was not as high as that of the pearl merchants, and sometimes fluctuated with the market, the ruler often turned to the merchant for financial assistance, a fact which increased his dependency on them. This caused a unique situation where in fact the merchants were often in a position to dictate their wishes. The ruler was fully aware of this fact, and in return for merchants’ financial contributions he appointed them to his ‘majlis’, or advisory board.

However, only Arab indigenous merchants were accredited to participate in the ruler’s ‘majlis’, and other traders, including Iranians and Indians, were deprived of the process of decision-making.

The tribal system, as the pre-capitalistic coding mechanism, intensified following the discovery of oil in the region, and in Dubai in particular (Pacione, 2005; Ramos, 2009). The conjunction of the two flows, of genes and of oil money, significantly transformed Dubai’s social, political and economic
institutions. The flow of money into Dubai meant the financial independence of the ruler, who consolidated his power among other Arab tribes and families in Dubai. Davidson (2008) remarks that the flow of money accrued directly to the sheikh, as the legitimised power in Dubai, with most of the city’s inhabitants excluded from access to this new wealth. The ruler’s financial independence also attenuated the role of the majlis and its members in the process of decision-making in Dubai, creating political contradictions between the ruling family and the influential indigenous merchants (Ramos, 2009).

The British army intervened to assist the Al-Maktoum family in confronting these political challenges, including that of the Dubai reform movement:

Indeed, as a prominent Dubai national has described, the British had fears about what they saw as the emergence of progressive tendencies demonstrated by the separatists … and the establishment of an assembly which was actually representative of the community … It would be easier to keep dealing with traditional tribal structures than the more diffuse, less predictable activities of popular assemblies. (Davidson, 2008, p. 35)

The ruling family endeavoured to improve their connections with some influential traders through the mixture of genes; affiance is common in tribal society. The sheikh disbanded the majlis and blinded, exiled or killed some of its disobedient members in 1940. He established a new council in the late of 1940s, the ‘majlis al-tujjar’ whose members were all selected at the ruler’s discretion (Ramos, 2009). In other words, the flux of money consolidated the pre-existing tribal mechanism in the region, which in turn assured the flows of oil and commodities.

Over recent decades, Dubai has become a global trading hub. The socio-political institutions primarily operate under a kinship coding system. Davis (2006, p. 61) stresses that Dubai is a ‘city-state’, which Sheikh Al-Maktoum and his family govern as a company. All of the city’s major companies, such as Dubai Holding, Nakheel and Emaar, are controlled directly or indirectly by Dubai’s ruler (Bloch, 2010; Kanna, 2009a). “In Dubai, the Executive Council, headed by the ruler and consisting of thirteen appointed notables (aside from the ruler), closely resembles previous mercantile–urban colluding social hierarchies” (Kanna, 2009a, p. 106).
In one of his meetings with leaders and officials in Dubai, Sheik Mohammed bin Rashid asked: What do you think is the most difficult thing in human life? He said to them that the decision-making. Brothers, decision-making is the most difficult thing in human life and more difficult for the commander, for this decision entails the destinies of human beings and the life of society. A correct, decision results in everyone sharing appropriately the benefits and resources with the commander, but if the opposite happens, everyone points the blame to the leader (Al-Soltan, November 15, 2013).

Accordingly, Sheikh Al-Maktoum designates himself the ‘Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Dubai Inc.’ (Davis, 2006; Kanna, 2009b).

At the top of the hierarchy is the Maktoum holding corporation, Dubai’s largest and most powerful company. Like the traditional Dubai family corporation, with its massive portfolio of diverse interests, the Maktoum firm has spun off various subsidiaries. (Kanna, 2009b, p. 108)

Indigenous Arab citizens comprise less than 10 per cent of the population of Dubai, and most work for the government on high salaries. They are in fact permanent employees of the city-company (Hvidt, 2009). More importantly, these permanent workers are generally categorised into a set of hierarchical groups based on their kinship relations to the ruling family. Discrimination against indigenous Arab citizens is not unknown, but it is more prevalent for expatriates, who are not recognised as permanent residents of Dubai.

The history of Dubai was initially tied to the movement of people. Prejudice has been another characteristic of the city-state from its inception. The coding mechanism of tribalism continuously determines new arrivals’ position in society. Most immigrants to Dubai, if not all, are perceived as temporary workers who cannot attain any form of citizenship or any other rights (Lavergne, 2007). The first non-Arab groups, Persian and Indian traders, immigrated primarily from Iran to Dubai in the early
20th century following the introduction of a pro-business policy in Dubai, under which the ruler declared Dubai a free port, abolishing the five per cent customs duty and controls on trading (Al-Sayegh, 1998; Davidson, 2008). This made Dubai particularly attractive to Iranian traders, as the government of Iran was imposing higher duties in its ports (for example, Lingah), reaching 400 per cent on some goods, and had also started implementing modernisation policies, including “hijab prevention”, which persuaded some conservative Islamist traders to move to Dubai on the other side of the Persian Gulf. This group of immigrants established a new suburb in Dubai, called Bastakiya, separate from the indigenous Arab residents. Figure 1 shows a building in Bastakiya, from this period. Persian traders also developed Iranian technologies in Dubai such as wind tower. Wind tower is a traditional architectural element mainly part of residential houses. These towers were used to catch cooler breeze that prevail at a higher level above the ground and to direct it into the interior of the buildings.

“Many Persians and some South Asians have since become Dubai citizens, officially Arab and patriotically Emirati. Indeed, the majority of Dubai citizens today are ethnically Iranian” (Kanna, 2009b, p. 104). These newly arrived traders accelerated the economic growth of Dubai. Yet, they have been largely excluded from the decision-making process.
Oil discovery further dramatically changed the demography in the Arab peninsula, including Dubai. The flow of oil created flows of money and people to the region in general and to Dubai in particular (Davidson, 2008; Khalaf & Alkobaisi, 1999; Ramos, 2010). According to Davidson (2008, p. 190):

In 1968, just before Dubai’s first oil exports, it was estimated that around 38 percent of the sheikhdom’s population were foreigners, however, by 1976, seven years after the Fateh field had commenced production, it was thought that the expatriate contingent had swelled to over 60 percent, with over 100,000 work permits being issued each year.

Kanna (2011, p. 46) points out:

At a certain point in the twentieth century, the [Persian] Gulf country in question discovered oil, became instantaneously wealthy, and began a modernising development program. Because the population of the country in question was so small, it didn’t have the demographic capacity to develop this oil wealth and therefore needed to import vast numbers of unskilled foreign workers. The resulting disproportion between foreigners and locals led to resentments among the local population, which began to see its culture being threatened by these foreigners.

Thus, tribalism and its coding mechanism became the guiding logic to keep the territory internal to indigenous Arab citizens in post-oil Dubai as in the rest of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and much of the south Persian Gulf.

In contrast to the pre-oil immigrants, the post-oil group of immigrants has not been codified as citizens of Dubai. According to the hegemonic tribal mechanism, even indigenous Arabs that are not members of the Beni Yas tribe are recognised merely as permanent residents and the others are just interim workers (Hvidt, 2009). Elsheshtawy (2008b, p. 971) stresses that under tribalism the large expatriate population are recognised as “temporary workers” rather than immigrant workers. Further, it is not possible for expatriates to obtain citizenship irrespective of the number of years they spend in the country. In Bastakiya, I interviewed an Iranian shopkeeper. He said:

“My family and I came here [Dubai] after the Islamic revolution in 1979. My children grow up here. They never travel to Iran during this period. Currently, the Dubai government asks my children to leave Dubai. After the sanctions, the Dubai government has created a
lot of problem for Iranians. You know Dubai does not accept refuges, so we have applied for permanent residency of Australia and Canada. It is not fair, we spent more than 30 years in Dubai, but we should leave now. As foreigners, we do not have any rights”.

I conducted an informal interview with a Filipino civil engineer at Dubai international Airport.

“I worked here for 16 years; I lost my job last month. Now, I should leave Dubai because they [the Dubai government] did not extend my visa. I have lost everything such as my car, my home and my saving[s]. They also block my bank account. I don’t know what I will do in [the] Philippines. These Arab people are thieves and they steal my life”.

“By and large, the groups [of Dubai’s inhabitants] did not mix, either socially or in terms of marriage, either with each other or with the local ‘muwatinun’ (Emirati nationals)” (Kanna, 2005, p. 63).

In the Arab states of the south Persian Gulf in general, where tribalism is the hegemonic system, indigenous female citizens lose their citizenship if they marry non-Arab immigrants, or even Arabs from other regions, such as Iraq, Lebanon or Egypt (Kanna, 2009b). Further, the ‘Sheikh Zayed Marriage Fund’ encourages all Emiratis to marry a compatriot. The tribal coding mechanism has been particularly restrictive in relation to women: “[t]hose who marry foreign men effectively have to give up their nationality, as their children will not be entitled to a UAE passport and therefore neither they nor her husband will be entitled to the benefits of the welfare state” (Kanna, 2009b, p. 113). The nomadic mechanism functions under the rationale of protecting the flow of genes in this tribal society. Thus, the tribal coding machine is intensified by the flow of money and immigrants.

According to Human Rights Watch (HRW), foreign workers constitute more than 90 per cent of the workforce and 80 per cent of the entire population in the UAE. Yet these Dubai workers are labelled temporary within the hegemonic tribal discourse. In reaction to HRW’s (2006) report, which reveals the deplorable situation of foreign labourers in the UAE, the permanent representative of the UAE to the UN stressed that:

Workers hosted by the UAE and other [Persian Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC)] countries cannot be considered migrants workers, as they work on a temporary basis and according to fixed-term employment contracts … Therefore, the immigration laws
applicable in the western countries cannot be applied to these workers. (Kanna, 2011, p. 45)

The dominant tribal mechanism thus refutes any forms of discourse, laws or variations that may challenge its hegemony, including the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

Scholars such as Kanna (2011), Davis (2006) and Hvidt (2009), among others, have endeavoured to analyse this discriminatory and exploitative mechanism. However, the dominant mechanism in the GCC states cannot be defined based on the traditional understanding, and the synoptic definition of ethnicity, as Arab or non-Arab, does not apply. The coding mechanism constantly labels residents based on their genes. According to Khalaf and Alkobaisi’s observation (1999), no Arab workers from non-Gulf countries such as Yemen, Sudan, Egypt and Iraq are privileged due to their ethnicity; rather, their condition is as poor as any other. Non-local Arab workers’ linguistic, cultural and religious characteristics are more comparable with the local Arab population, which suggests they would be more attractive as workers than are non-Arabs. However, Kapiszewski (2006) observes that local citizens prefer to engage Asian or South Asian workers such as Filipinos, Indians, Pakistanis or Bangladeshis, who are less expensive to employ, easier to lay-off and are believed to be more efficient, obedient and manageable. During my data collection in 2011, I spoke with an Afghan taxi driver. He said:

“During the civil war, I came here. UAE is a Muslim country; they [Arabs] respect Islam… But we are just workers. They can deport us any time they want. There is no difference between me as a Muslim and an Indian Hindu. Dubai is an Islamic city; it is our land as well. I heard that Dubaian prefers Indian workers because they accept to work in any conditions”.

Thus, the existing mechanism in the GCC states, including Dubai, is not based on the privileging of Arab ethnicity, often referred to as Pan-Arabism, which occurs in other Arab countries such as Egypt, Syria and Iraq (Kanna, 2011; 2007). Moreover, the tribal mechanism seems too influential to be categorised as an ethnocracy, such as has been shaped in and practiced in western countries since the early 20th century. The pre-existing nomadic system has been adjusted in the region to be an effective component of global capitalism. Drawing on Marx, Žižek (2008c, p. 673) argues that
“capitalism is not a name for a civilization, for a specific cultural-symbolic world, but the name for a truly neutral economico-symbolic machine which operates with Asian values as well as with others”. Thus, Žižek formulates Capitalism with Asian values, based on the motto of Lee Quan Yew, the Singaporean leader. Žižek (2009, p. 131) adds that “[t]he various of this authoritarian form of capitalism is slowly but surely spreading around the globe”. Thus, this thesis conceives the existing mechanism in the GCC states, including Dubai, as a ‘tribocracy’: a type of oligarchy based around the flow of genes and founded in both tribalism and capitalism. The pre-capitalistic machine in the region is significantly regulated to operate efficiently within global capitalism. In short, tribocracy is ‘capitalism with Arabic tribal values’.

The flow of genes broadly determines the existing social, political and economic mechanisms in Dubai. Tribocracy, capitalism with Arabic tribal values, also pertains to the two constant flows of money and cheap labour (Amrith, 2011; Ramos, 2010). In Anti-Oedipus (2009, p. 33), Deleuze and Guattari argue that “[c]apitalism is in fact born of the encounter of two sorts of flows: the decoded flows of production in the form of money-capital, and the decoded flows of labour in the form of free workers”. These two flows, alongside the flow of genes, shaped Dubai as a city-assemblage during the last century. The thesis deploys the concept of city as desiring-machine to elucidate how the constant flow of money and cheap labour has transformed Dubai from a fishing village into the region’s global trading hub. Further, the transformation of the built environment because of the flow of genes, labour and money will be investigated. In addition, the role of planning practice as a component of the globalised state apparatus in Dubai will be considered.

6.3-Dubai as a desiring-machine

Dubai is a neoliberal utopia, an “oasis of free enterprise without income taxes, trade unions or opposition parties” (Davis, 2006, p. 61). These characteristics define Dubai as a desiring-machine that reproduces itself as an object of desire for international investors, tourists and migrants, who flock to its construction projects, urban villages, white-collar jobs and luxurious residential complexes along with its legal and illegal economy. In 2011, I interviewed an American manager who worked in Dubai. He said:

“Dubai is a great place for living. It is a tax-free city. Everything is perfect here: salary, shopping malls and entertainment centres. Imagine, we can ski in Dubai in the middle of
Dubai's transformation from a fishing village into a post-global city embodies the constant production of new desires that sustain the flow of money and immigrant workers (skilled workers and cheap labourers). This section considers the production of new desires in Dubai as an assemblage.

Dubai is geographically, naturally and politically privileged in comparison with other cities of the GCC states. These privileges have enticed regional merchants and international companies alike to establish themselves in Dubai. Dubai is located in a strategic geographical location in the east of the Persian Gulf, near the Strait of Hormuz, which is the sole sea passage from the Gulf to the open ocean. Dubai's creek was the only port naturally deep enough for shipping in the south of the Gulf. Since the establishment of Dubai, it was perceived as a neutral zone between the disputatious tribes in the region, a buffer area that came to be a place for merchants to trade with the Arab peninsula. However, until relatively recently, Dubai was not attractive.

Dubai became the primary trading hub and entrepot in the Persian Gulf region in the pre-oil era, following the declaration of a tax- and control-free zone by Dubai's ruler at the beginning of the 20th century (Bagaeen, 2007; Davidson, 2008; Kanna, 2011; Ramos, 2010). The development of Dubai historically ties with the production of desires for its partners, particularly merchants from the region and the world. However, the production of desires in Dubai can be investigated from various perspectives due to the complexity of urban phenomena. This chapter investigates the opportunistic policies deployed by the city's ruling family. This investigation assists in demonstrating how the production of new desires has become the primary strategy to sustain the flows of workers and money to Dubai as a neoliberal-utopia. This strategy has also significantly determined planning practice and urban development policies in Dubai since its establishment.

Stephens and Weston (2009, p. 71) state that "[t]he market requires the foreign; it requires tax-free havens, zones of exception". The declaration of Dubai as a tax-free port, which coincided with increasing taxation in Iranian ports in the north of the Persian Gulf, shifted the regional trading hub from Lingah in Iran to Dubai. The tax and control free policy lured foreign merchants, primarily Iranians and Indians, through the generation of new desires. It also redirected the flow of commodities to Dubai. Thus, Dubai became the primary entrepot in the region, where goods could be imported,
stored and then re-exported duty-free. In the pre-oil era, rent was the major financial resource of the ruling family, which was the exclusive landowner in Dubai according to the tradition of tribalism. At that time, Arab and non-Arab merchants were merely tenants who rented land for their accommodation and trading activities. They settled mostly in two areas around Dubai’s creek: Deira and Bur Dubai. The lease of land in Dubai was significantly lower than the levy on trading in other ports in the region. The tax-free policy and, more crucially, the control-free policy, led foreign traders to become involved in illegal activities such as smuggling. Thus, Dubai’s development was initiated with a policy geared towards attracting flows of financial and human capital, which consequently produced new desires.

The discovery of oil, firstly in other parts of the region such as Iraq and Kuwait, and then in Dubai, dramatically transformed the local socio-political and economic mechanisms. The flow of oil money into the region augmented exchanges with the region. The economic boom as a consequence of the flow of oil money attracted foreign workers into the region and generated new aspirations for the indigenous Arab residents and the rulers (Kanna, 2011). However, Dubai’s oil resources were discovered later than in the other GCC states, such as Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. Dubai’s ruler thus first profited from the economic boom in the region due to the geographical and natural advantages of the port city and the pre-established rentier system (Ramos, 2010). To reinforce Dubai’s position as the primary trading hub in the region, the Sheikh of Dubai declared an ‘open skies’ policy and then established the international airport in the early 1960s. He also promised to buy any vacant seats on flights to persuade the international airlines to redirect flight routes to Dubai. Subsequently, Dubai’s international airport became the main transit airport in the region (Davidson, 2008). Through the open skies policy, Dubai’s economy continued to thrive under the flow of workers, particularly with the arrival of western experts working in the oil industry. Following the discovery of oil in Dubai, oil profits were directed into expanding facilities and amenities such as hotels, restaurants and malls, along with the institutions that would help to establish future economic activity in Dubai, such as banks (Ramos, 2010). Dubai was thus transformed into a regional and international transit hub, continuing its historic role as the main port for the region.

The flow of commodities, money, people and new ideas are intertwined in a complicated way. The flow of new ideas, alongside the increasing proceeds of trading, persuaded the Al Makhtoum family to initiate modernisation through the establishment of infrastructure essential for further development.
The ruler of Dubai promulgated a land law that legitimised the ruler's ownership of all the lands in Dubai. The first Dubai master plan (the Urban Plan) in 1960 was drafted to instigate boom expansion and infrastructure projects. According to Ramos (2009, p. 15):

[I]t was principally a road map outlining the transportation armature to help structure the city's growth, which also included general land use indications for industrial, residential, commercial and public use (such as future schools and hospitals), but these plans were stated in general term, and could later be changed substantially according to new project and investment requirements.

Affluent sheikhdoms, such as Kuwait and Qatar, contributed financially, and Britain helped technically through its protectorate policy, to support large infrastructure projects, such as dredging the creek, drilling for additional fresh water resources for the growing population, setting up the Dubai State Telephone Company and the Dubai Electric Company and, most significantly, building the Al-Maktoum Bridge access Dubai creek (which near the sea is more a river in width), which connected Bur Dubai with Deira (Ramos, 2010). “The emphasis on infrastructural projects in Dubai marked its development pattern throughout this period, which would then serve as a blueprint for projects in its post-oil discovery phase” (Ramos, 2009, p. 3).

Through oil exploration in 1966, Dubai became an official member of the club of oil exporting countries (Davidson, 2008). In addition to generating capital accumulation in Dubai, the flow of oil money also accumulated desires that were then manifested through urban development in the form of large infrastructure projects for developing trade, luxurious hotels, emporia and shopping malls (Ramos, 2010). This thesis suggests three consequences of the reproduction and accumulation of desires after the flow of oil money into Dubai. First, international companies and financial institutions increased their investments and activities in Dubai to gain access to a greater portion of the money that floated around Dubai after the discovery of oil. Dubai was historically known as a merchant-friendly city in which the ruler ensured the freedom and profits of foreign investors, traders and his international partners (Al-Sayegh, 1998). Second, the feasibility of the proposed urban projects relied on the availability of cheap labour (Hvidt, 2009). The substantial wage difference between what was being offered in the GCC states, including Dubai, as compared to in the poor countries of the region, such as Bangladesh, India and Pakistan, induced workers to migrate to these oil-rich states (Smith,
The flow of capital and its accumulation in the GCC states swiftly destabilised the economy in the region, which historically had remained in agriculture, fishing, pearling and trading.

Thus, the flow of free labour is intertwined with the flow of capital and the production of new desires in Dubai. The flow of oil money and cheap labour persuaded the Al-Makhtoum family to define a global role for Dubai, rather than remaining satisfied with its historic regional function. From the Dubai ruler’s perspective, Dubai should not merely compete with other cities in the region, but with global cities such as New York, London and Tokyo. Thereupon, the Urban Plan was redrafted in 1971 and the development projects, including infrastructure, were rescaled and expanded to comply with the rulers’ new desires (Ramos, 2010). The production of these desires is an inherent consequence of the capitalistic city-assemblage in the post-oil era.

Dubai’s oil resources are less than most of the other GCC states (Matly & Dillon, 2007; Ramos, 2009). However, the oil revenue assisted Dubai’s ruler to develop trade infrastructure to compete with other cities in the region and around the globe. “Sheikh Rashid’s development strategy clustered infrastructural elements and systems to enhance Dubai’s international trade profile” (Ramos, 2010, p. 78). Although the Dubai development project relied largely on money borrowed from the other GCC states in the pre-oil era, the financial independence after oil export began enabled the ruler of Dubai to pursue his ambitions (Kanna, 2011). Ramos (2010) argues that the development projects in global cities substantially inspired the desires and futuristic plans of Dubai’s ruler. Thus, the intertwined flows of oil money and new ideas stimulated the city-assemblage’s operation, which constantly reproduced new desires. These desires have subsequently shaped the city.
The second Urban Plan was prepared in the early 1970s following the oil discovery to direct rapid urban growth, to regulate vigorous construction activity and to shape Dubai as a metropolitan city around its creek (Elsheshtawy, 2010a; Ramos, 2010). Its large-scale projects determined the city territory and shaped its physical structure. The grandiose plans, including vast infrastructure projects, firstly extended the city into the hinterland and then redirected its development along the Persian Gulf coast towards the state border with Abu Dhabi, particularly after the establishment of the Jebel Ali port (Ramos, 2010, p. 77). Rapid urban sprawl and massive construction along the creek included mixed-use buildings and hotels, responding to an increased demand for office space due to expanded business activity from the oil industry. The proposed projects, such as the Rashid port (the largest modern port in the Persian gulf), Dubai Dry Dock and Ship Repair Facility (the largest dry dock in the world), Dubai’s World Trade Centre (the tallest building in the Middle East at that time) and the Jebel Ali port, with its industrial area and free zone (the largest port construction and excavation project ever completed), were to reshape the physical structure of the existing city (Ramos, 2010). In other words, the autocratic mechanism (tribalism) allowed the ruler to interfere extensively in the process of structuring the city. The suggested 1971 plan, which was based on zoning, was not transformative enough to assure success for Sheikh Rashid’s market-oriented ambitions, so it was not implemented (Ramos, 2012). The ruler expected that the establishment of massive urban projects such as Dubai’s
World Trade Centre and Jebel Ali port, among others, would reflect the market dynamism and its diverse demands. Sheikh Rashid’s ambitions were the primary factor in shaping the city’s structure, rather than technocratic-managerial programmes such as the Urban Plan.

The constant production of desires as the moving force of the economy is necessary in the capitalistic city (Maciocco, 2008). Sheikh Mohammed, who became the new ruler of Dubai in 2006, has followed a market-oriented policy to attract a larger portion of the global flow of money and workers into Dubai (Davis, 2006; Kanna, 2011; Ramos, 2010):

Desire is revolutionary in its essence because it constantly unsettles stabilities identity (or ‘being’) in favour of new ‘becomings’. From this view the grounding of urban development in market rationality is linked to the grounding of flows of desire in flows of capital. Before the market can play a determining role in urban development, flows of desire must be made to appear to derive from flows of capital. (Dovey, 2005, p. 211)

From the Sheikh’s perspective, Dubai should operate beyond its historical role as the commercial hub; it should depict the characteristics of a global city. The new Sheikh stressed: “I want to be number one in the world” (Davis, 2006, p. 50). In addition to the establishment of huge infrastructure projects such as the Al Maktoum International Airport (which will be largest airport in the world) and extending existing infrastructure, Sheikh Mohammed initiated new urban projects including hyper-malls, theme parks and entertainment centres, and the architectural landmarks of the Palm Islands, the Island World, Burj Al Arab and Burj Al Khalifa, to shape Dubai’s brand as a global city (Hashim et al., 2010). At least, this was the plan before the economic recession in 2008. In his speech for the 21\textsuperscript{st} century, on 1 September 2002, the ruler of Dubai, Sheikh Mohammad argued that:

[It is] supposed to be the third millennium, the millennium that will be able to tranquillize the rhythm of the times, and has the ability to compete in the international economic blocs, to make a niche for itself in the forefront of the international public
And Dubai, which completed its infrastructure at the end of the nineties of the last century, is now starting to fly with projects that encourage investment of national capital and that attract foreign capital and migration at the same time.

His ambitions transformed Dubai into a world-class tourist destination, an international financial centre, an investment opportunity paradise, a manufacturing and trading hub, and most recently a cosmopolitan residential location copied from other cities such as New York, Las Vegas, Miami, London and particularly Singapore (Bagaeen, 2007; Hashim et al., 2010). Al-Farooq, H. & Byzza, M (2010, April 28) wrote:

Wherever you go in [Dubai's] streets or beaches or sand or markets or malls, whether in summer or winter, you will find thousands of tourists daily roaming the place, safely, and in peace. They come from the east, the west, north or south of the world; they are looking for the joy of life, in the world that rival the most prestigious tourist capitals in the world, from Tokyo, Paris and London all the way to Las Vegas. Dubai has collected all past experiences brilliantly and beautifully.

Davis (2006, p. 50) observes that “[u]nder the enlightened despotism of its Emir and CEO, 58-year old Sheikh Mohammad, Dubai has become the new global icon of imagineered urbanism”.
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In his investigation of the Docklands development project in Melbourne, Dovey (2005, p. 211) distinguishes two types of surplus value: profits and subjective surplus value (symbolic capital in Bourdieu’s terminology). These are concurrently produced through the materialisation of desires in large-scale urban projects. While massive urban projects are generally established to produce capital, they also create a symbolic (qualitative) surplus, including political glorification for the government, pride for citizens, prestige for residents, an aura affecting other consumers and the global promotion of the city being developed (Dovey, 2005).

Dubai’s development, including large-scale infrastructure and architectural landmarks, also generates both types of surplus value. These projects lure capital into Dubai and generate new desires. They also regenerate and deposit quantitative and qualitative surplus in the city. These two types of surplus value are co-dependent for their realisation. The rapid economic growth, followed by economic recession in Dubai after 2008, demonstrates the potent interdependence between the production of profits and subjective value (Acuto, 2010). Dubai experienced a rapid economic growth from the middle of the 1990s to 2008. Most of the massive urban projects, including the architectural icons of Burj Al-Arab and the first Palm Island, were undertaken during Dubai’s boom period (Bagaeen, 2007).
The establishment of large-scale urban infrastructure projects and iconic architectural buildings is perceived as a primary component of city marketing policy. These projects seem imperative for the reproduction of capital and its accumulation in a capitalistic city. Simultaneously, subjective values such as prestige, pride, style and identity are generated as an inherent product of these city projects. Urban projects enhance the credit and prestige of the Al Maktoum family among other ruling families and in the world. Under their leadership, Dubai has been transformed from a fishing village into a world-class city with the tallest building, the biggest shopping mall and the most luxurious hotel in the world (Hvidt, 2009). Its indigenous Arab citizens, who comprise less than 10 per cent of Dubai’s population, derive a benefit from these entrepreneurial policies; they boast about the architectural landmarks and urban projects that they perceive as a primary source of success, glory and pride for the state (Kanna, 2009b). Kanna (2011) argues that the Emirate’s Arab citizens, who mostly, directly or indirectly, work for the royal family, support the ruler’s development policies in Dubai.

The reproduction of qualitative values is an imperative component of city marketing and place branding. The production of subjective values does not impress nationals, but these values, beside other incentives, motivate expatriate workers to live in, and tourists to visit, the city. In 2011, I spoke with a German family who had come to Dubai for a holyday. When I asked them why they had selected Dubai, the father of family replied:

“Dubai is a fantastic place. It is cheap for shopping and its entertainment centres are amazing. I came here before for business. This time, I bring my family to visit Dubai. We will be here for two weeks. We want to visit Burj Al Khalifa tomorrow; you know it is the tallest building in the world”.

Elsheshtawy (2010b, p. 55) stresses:

[T]he notion of the Dubai Model was particularly enticing for Dubaians for its potential to help assert their dominance in the Middle East … [nonetheless] they were typically viewed as Bedouins who acquired great riches due to oil, but lacked the sophistication and culture of the region’s traditional centres.

The urban projects such as Burj Al-Khalifeh, Burj Al-Arab, massive shopping malls and luxurious hotels shape the general perceptions of Dubai as a global city which offers a prestigious lifestyle
This new perception, beside other motivations such as higher salaries, cultural diversity and its historical image as a foreign-friendly city in the region, attracts skilled workers, particularly western experts who form another elite group in the hierarchical social structure in Dubai (Al-Sayegh, 1998; Davis, 2006). The catalyst for much of the real estate expansion was the declaration of a new ownership law in 2002, which permits non-nationals – actual and potential consumers – to buy property in Dubai. “Under the new law, non-GCC expatriates are given the right to acquire freehold and 99-year lease property in certain locations marketed by the leading developers, such as the Palms, Jumeirah Islands, Emirates Hills, the Meadows, the Montgomery and Arabian Ranches” (Bagaeen, 2007, p. 178). The real estate market rapidly flourished as a result of the freehold ownership of properties in Dubai, which lured further international investors and urban developers to Dubai (Matly & Dillon, 2007).

“Without desire there is no city. Flows of desire are the life force of the fluid city” (Dovey, 2005, p. 20). The recent recession blocked the production of new desires in Dubai. The Sheikh of Dubai endeavoured to follow his market-oriented policies by borrowing money from Abu Dhabi – the most oil-rich state in the UAE (Toksoz, 2010). The financial support has been used to complete urban
projects such as Burj Al Khalifa (Acuto, 2010). However, this patronage is not free of charge for Dubai, and the city operation increasingly relies on the oil-rich states and their financial support. For example, the tallest building, which should be the symbol of the city, was renamed from Burj Al-Dubai to Burj Al-Khalifeh in respect for Khalifeh Al Nahyan, the ruler of Abu Dhabi, who financed the project following the recession (Acuto, 2010). This financial dependence on Abu Dhabi impedes Dubai’s autonomy in policy-making, particularly in extending projects that are indispensable to the city’s competition with other fast growing cities in the region, such as Doha, Jeddah and Abu Dhabi (Bassens et al., 2011). The financial affiliation also frustrates the production of desires, which are essential for sustaining the flow of money and free labour into the city.

6.4-Dubai as a neoliberal normalising machine

Capital accumulation in cities generally hinges on their regulative function (Foucault, 1991, p. 221) and Dubai is no exception. Buckley (2013), Davis (2006), Kanna (2009a) and Hvidt (2009) contend that the rapid economic growth in Dubai relied on the efficiency of its controlling mechanism. In considering the controlling mechanism in Dubai, this research endeavours to reveal how the combination of the tribal system with capitalistic controlling technologies created a highly efficient controlling apparatus. Based on the ‘disciplinary society’ of Foucault and the ‘society of control’ of Deleuze, the thesis will consider the components of the control apparatus of Dubai such as surveillance, the debt mechanism and the promise of enjoyment. This section investigates the effects of the controlling apparatus, including planning practice, in reshaping the physical environment in Dubai as a normalising-machine.

In Discipline and Punish, Foucault (1991) revealed how controlling instruments dramatically transform a city through the process of industrialisation and rapid urbanisation. Foucault argued that ‘bio-politics’ is one of the most important inventions of capitalism, as it permits the dominant social class to control residents as docile, but productive, bodies effectively and efficiently in industrialised cities. Based on Foucault’s work, Deleuze (1992) conceived the ‘society of control’ to distinguish between controlling mechanisms in industrial and post-industrial society. Deleuze contended that the Foucauldian ‘disciplinary society’ and its institutions, such as schools, universities and police, was a response to the demands of mass production, which largely depended on submissive workers and labourers. Through the relocation of factories to developing countries, the controlling mechanism in
general and developed countries in particular have significantly evolved to a ‘society of control’ embodied by the share market, debt system, consumerism and ‘dividualisation’ (Andrejevic, 2003; Hardt, 1998). The punitive approaches of bio-politics, consumerism and the debt mechanism are also components of the control apparatus.

‘Bio-politics’, ‘governmentality’ and the ‘society of control’ are products of dominant capitalism in liberal democracies. These technologies are also deployed by non-democratic regimes to maintain their hegemony (Hardt & Negri, 2000). The control approaches, such as constant surveillance, mentalities of self-normalisation, the debt mechanism and the promise of absolute enjoyment alongside urban policies, are globally utilised to meliorate the operation of the controlling machine in the neoliberalised city (Žižek, 2011a). However, these technologies are adjusted for use in local political, socio-cultural and economic contexts. They are often used alongside pre-existing control mechanisms to produce the highest capital accumulation with the lowest cost of control. This control machine is part of the new form of capitalism without democratic values, such as ‘guided capitalism’ in South Korea, the ‘planned free economy’ in Taiwan, ‘capitalism with Asian values’ in Singapore and ‘capitalism with Arabic tribal values’ in Dubai (Hvidt, 2009). To analyse the existing control machine and its impact on Dubai’s built environment, it is necessary to investigate tribalism and its controlling role in Dubai prior to the oil era.

The dominant tribalism in the GCC states, including Dubai, is the historic controlling mechanism based on kinship (Bagaeen, 2010; Eleshtawy, 2010a; Kanna, 2009b). “Tribalism is [also] defined as the possession of a strong cultural identity that separates oneself as a member of one group from the members of another” (Euske et al., 2011, p. 260). In Anti-Oedipus (2009), Deleuze and Guattari stressed that tribalism is a controlling or coding mechanism that endeavours to protect its limited resources, such as land.

Prior to the oil-era, the tribal coding mechanism imposed Arab and non-Arab inhabitants into a hierarchical system in which they could not change their determined social, political or economic positions. However, non-Arab merchants, as ‘others’, were permitted to live, work and trade in Dubai (Kanna, 2009b). These others have been perceived as a potential menace for the dominant autocratic mechanism and were thus to be controlled.
In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (1991) elucidated that punitive punishment, as the primitive technology of control, has been replaced by new control technologies such as constant surveillance and formal education – where the subject became a unit of biological production. This replacement of control technologies reflects the transformation of social, economic and political mechanisms during industrialisation and is necessary to maintain an efficient control apparatus in a society of mass production (Foucault, 1991, p. 221). However, Hvidt (2009, p. 404) stresses that “Dubai has no intention of developing through industrialisation. Although the country has not completely bypassed industrialisation, Dubai is jumping directly from a pearling/trading society to a service society.” Thus, in contrast to the western experience, the sudden transformation of the city of Dubai has created a unique mechanism of control that encompasses both punitive punishment and new technologies of control, since the Fordist 20th century production of mass factories did not exist in the UAE, requiring a regulated manual work force.

The despotic rulers in the region, including Dubai, deploy various controlling instruments to repress any disagreement, rebellion or insubordination in their societies. Davidson (2008) describes how, despite the fact that Arab traders in Dubai financially supported the ruler of Dubai before the discovery of oil, any form of objection that might challenge the dominant tribal despotism, even from Arab citizens, is not tolerated. Brutal punishments were used in Dubai when the ‘majlis o al tujjar’ (the Council of Traders) challenged the authority of the ruling family during the reformist movement of 1940, which was a counter-hegemonic reaction to the dominant tribalism. With support from British troops in the region and his allied Bedouin tribes, the ruler suppressed the democratic movement and consolidated his control over the city. Afterwards, 10 eminent members of the majlis were executed and other members were blinded in one eye (Davidson, 2008, p. 35). Punitive punishments such as dismemberment, blinding and public execution as part of Sharia law are still used in the Middle East (Ballantyne, 1985). Rejali’s investigation (2007) showed that persecution as a controlling instrument is still used in Dubai to repress disobedience, particularly political disobedience. Moreover, Kanna (2011) observed that tribalism and its coding system remain at the core of the control mechanism in Dubai.

Physical segregation has historically been utilised as an effective instrument by the dominant group to extend their hegemony over subordinate groups including socio-cultural minorities (Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004). Bagaeen (2010, p. 15) indicates that “[h]istorically, traditional settlements in the
Middle East have incorporated climatic, cultural social, economic and religious control mechanisms that manifested themselves in the way in which physical elements, and barriers, were built in the environment”. Scholars such as Ramos (2009), Davidson (2008) and Al-Sayegh (1998), investigating the history of Dubai, reveal that Arab and non-Arab residents inhabited separate neighbourhoods in the pre-oil era. Based on the tribal coding mechanism, people are not perceived as equal, and do not live together in the same place (Abu-Lughod, 1987). Thus, the residents are codified and classified into groups, and are permitted to lodge only in assigned areas (Elsheshtawy, 2010a). Following the declaration of the tax-free law, which lured Persian traders to migrate to Dubai in the early 20th century, the ruler of Dubai assigned an area outside the fishing village in the Bar Dubai area to the new arrivals for living and working. The Persian merchants established their houses there, along the creek. These traders named their new neighbourhood Bastakiya for their motherland Bastak in the south of Iran.

This physical segregation was a controlling policy that assisted with the surveillance of foreign immigrants, who were perceived as a potential threat. Today, Bastakiya is reserved as the historical core of Dubai despite its Persian characteristics, such as its wind towers (see Figure 5) (Hawker et al., 2005). The spatial segregation is an attribute of the controlling apparatus in tribalism-based cities, such as Dubai. However, spatial segregation is not limited to tribalism: it occurred in other forms of pre-capitalist society; it is legitimised in the industrialised era by zoning policy (Yiftachel, 1998b); and in post-industrial cities, it is achieved by gated communities (Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004). Further, spatial division as a historical control mechanism is aligned with capitalistic controlling methods in general, and with planning policies in particular. Accordingly, Dubai is recognised by Davis (2006) as one of the most gated communities in the world.
Following the discovery of oil in the region and in Dubai, oil money strengthened the control apparatus, which was based on 'capitalism with Arabic tribal values' (Davis, 2006; Hvidt, 2009). From the neoliberalist perspective, this mechanism is perceived as highly efficient, as it had the highest economic growth rates (at least prior to the recession in 2008), with the lowest control expenses in the world (Žižek, 2011a, x). First, pre-existing control instruments were adjusted to operate more efficiently and effectively as a component of global capitalism (Degorge, 2006; Mahdavi, 2010). Second, the flow of oil money was interwoven with the flows of new technologies of control into the region (Ramos, 2010). Thus, in the post-oil era, the combination of the hierarchical society, physical segregation with bio-politics, debt mechanism and consumerism shaped a highly efficient control mechanism in Dubai.

The flow of oil money reinforced tribalism and its coding mechanism as a pre-capitalistic apparatus (Davidson, 2008; Kanna, 2011; Ramos, 2010). In the pre-oil era, the financial dependence of the ruler of Dubai on the local merchants was the primary challenge for the hegemony of tribalism. The dependency generated democratic demands from Dubaians, particularly among the Arab traders, who initiated the reformist movement as a counter-hegemonic reaction to the dominant mechanism.
However, the flow of oil money into the region reversed the situation in favour of the sheikhs. Tribalism is effectively supported by global capitalism since the ruler of Dubai holds a monopoly on all rent income in the city, as well as the income from oil exploration concessions (Al-Sayegh, 1998, p. 94). Thus, the ruler of Dubai controls the land and the oil-wealth base, supported by the dominant tribalism. The indigenous Arab citizens have access to financial resources through endorsement of the rulers’ orders and aspirations. “[O]il exploration and air landing rights were the initial infrastructure pursuits that tilted monetary dependency and power advantage away from the majlis [the council of traders] in favour of the ruler” (Ramos, 2010, p. 143).

Researchers have coined new terms to conceptualise the local socio-political transformations in the region, including Dubai, following oil extraction; for example, Hvidt (2009, p. 400) with ‘neo-patrimonial’ and Kanna (2011, p. 50) with ‘ruling bargain’, among others. Kanna (2011, p. 50) elucidates that the ruling bargain is a hierarchy mechanism based on loyalty to the ruler. In this context, national residents would lose the patronage of the state (the tribal mechanism and the ruler) if they were to show any objection or disagreement. Hvidt (2009, p. 400) argues that “[t]he state structure in Dubai is also characterised by neo-patrimonialism, which implies that the regime is organised around the ruler as an individual, maintaining other members of the elite in a relationship of personal dependence on his grace and good favour”. Kathiravelu (2012, p. 105) stresses that:

Functioning as autocratic welfare states, the social contract between citizens and rulers rests upon the understanding that as long as the welfare of subjects is taken care of, the Sheikh’s authority to govern is not questioned. This mode of governance, which has its roots in Bedouin tribal politics, has evolved into the current system, where the profits from oil and state investments are distributed to citizens.

The financial dependence of nationals on the dominant tribalism impedes disagreement and objection. This mechanism of control will be examined closely later in this chapter as part of the society of control.

Returning to the spatial segregation that has historically existed in cities; initially, Foucault (1980) described how urban projects as regulative instruments have legitimated spatial segregation since the 18th century. Drawing on Foucault, Yiftachel (1998a) reveals the regulative role of planning policies, including zoning, which operates as part of the modern state apparatus. Further, Talen (2012, p. 2)
argues that “zoning is ‘plans of oppression’ in which principles of exclusion and protection of self-interest are allowed to drive the urban landscape”. Zoning regulations have a crucial role in sustaining socio-political segregations (Rothwell & Massey, 2009). Planning in the city of Dubai strengthens the social, political and functional divisions (Bloch, 2010; Ramos, 2009).

After the 1960s, both the first and then the second master plans (zoning-based master plans) were deployed to manage the rapid urban development and its implications for Dubai (Elshehtawy, 2004; Ramos, 2010). Watson (2007, p. 214) stressed that “planning of urban settlements [including zoning] was frequently bound up with the ‘modernising and civilising’ mission of colonial authorities, and also with the control of urbanisation processes and of the urbanising population”. Nonetheless, the process of modernisation and urbanisation in the GCC states was fundamentally different from that in European colonies. In rapidly developing cities, control over urban growth and, more crucially, over new arrivals becomes more urgent due to the immigration into the city of large numbers of foreigners. In the case of Dubai, the particularly large numbers of Indian workers are perceived as a primary potential threat to the hegemony of indigenous Arabs, through the demographic distortion that they induce (Kanna, 2011, p. 65).

Watson (2009, p. 188) observes that:

Colonial, ethnocratic and racist states have used planning far more explicitly to achieve segregation and control in urban areas. Planning and power have therefore always been closely interlinked and this relationship helps to explain much of what has, and still does, happen in the name of planning.

Prior to the discovery of oil in the region, the regulative function of master plans, particularly zoning, was deployed to fortify the control apparatus of the dominant tribalism in Dubai. The proposed master plans (both the first and then the second master plan) divided the city into functional zones, and suggested the segregation of inhabitants within the city based on their ethno-cultural and social class. For example, Jumeirah was identified as a residential area, with low density, one or two storeys villas, to accommodate high-income groups. Thus, affluent residents, predominantly indigenous Arab traders, live in luxurious villas in Jumeirah, which is one of the most sumptuous neighbourhoods in Dubai (Ramos, 2010).
“In the first instance, discipline proceeds from the distribution of individuals in space” (Foucault, 1991, p. 141). Physical segregation has long existed in the history of Dubai. Spatial segregation is recognised as one of the primary characteristics of Dubai in its post-oil era (Davis, 2006; Elsheshtawy, 2010b; Prouty, 2009). Although inhabitants were segregated into pre-defined neighbourhoods, such as Bastakiya, based on their ethnicity or kinship, these neighbourhoods were not delimited by physical barriers such as walls or hedges in the pre-oil era. Thus, urban spaces in Dubai were accessible, more or less, to all male inhabitants, regardless of their social class or ethnicity (Bagaeen, 2010, p. 19). The master plan was utilised as a new mechanism of control, one that combined the capitalist coding machine and the tribal coding system to determine residents’ living and working spaces, and their access to urban spaces and amenities in Dubai. According to Foucault, the spatial segregation augments the surveillance of residents, which is deemed necessary particularly of the large number of low-skilled labourers who are perceived as the main threat for tribalism as the hegemonic power.

Oil-extraction in the region increased the number of construction projects in Dubai. As such, the second wave of immigrants from the 1960s can be categorised into two main groups: skilled and unskilled workers (that is, labourers) (Davidson, 2008; Davis, 2006; Kanna, 2011; Ramos, 2010). The skilled workers included architects, engineers and managers, generally coming from western countries to work in international companies, with comparatively high salaries. A large number of labourers also arrived, primarily from the subcontinent states of India, Bangladesh and Pakistan, to work on the urban development projects (Pacione, 2005, p. 260). The westerners primarily settled in the creek area and the gated villages, where they had access to all the facilities and services prepared for them by international companies. This generated the first boom in the real-estate market in Dubai between the 1960s and 1980s. In stark contrast to these conditions, labour camps were established to accommodate the unskilled workers, firstly beside the construction projects and then outside the city borders, in the hinterland (that is, the desert). According to Ramos (2010, p. 84):

The antecedent of this kind of housing division can be tracked back to the company town urban structure in nineteenth century United States and England, where ‘skilled’ and ‘non-skilled’ labour houses were separated. The urban design established facilities for workers and management as a means to maximise efficiency and production.
Thus, spatial segregation has become the primary policy for further urban development in Dubai (see Figure 6).

Following Foucault (1991), gates, walls and camps reflect the exercise of power over space to sustain its hegemony and to enhance its economic efficiency. The ruler of Dubai declared that “one of his proudest achievements in Dubai is to have introduced gated communities to Arabia, the land of nomads and tents” (Davis, 2006, p. 51). Grant and Mittelsteadt (2004) distinguish two primary types of gated community: for the affluent and for the poor. The higher paid prefer to live in gated enclaves for privacy, exclusivity, prestige and in flight from the fear of outsiders; while the lower classes, especially deprived groups such as gypsies, migrants and vagrants, are compelled to settle in segregated areas, such as in labour compounds set apart from the fabric of the city. Gated communities have shaped the urban morphology of Dubai (Elsheshtawy, 2010a; Hvidt, 2009).

At least prior to the recession in 2008, Dubai had a global reputation for luxurious hotels, theme parks and gigantic shopping malls, as well as the tallest, biggest and most expensive buildings and urban projects. Further, Dubai is distinguished by the gated residential complexes such as Palm Island and Jumeirah city, among others (Davis, 2006; Masad, 2008; Sidaway, 2007). Accordingly,
Davis (2006, p. 60) called Dubai "a vast gated community". Grants and Mittelsteadt (2004, p. 914) argue that:

> developers see gated projects as an important niche marketing strategy in a competitive environment: enclaves can attract consumers searching for a sense of community, identity, and security. By providing beautiful amenities and keeping out undesirables, gating may increase property values.

Thus, in Dubai, the establishment of gated projects is the main strategy in urban development to lure international investors such as international urban developers and affluent foreigners to Dubai’s real estate market. The deployment of gated projects as a market-oriented strategy, alongside the announcement of the freehold ownership law in 2002 to permit foreigners to purchase properties, generated the real estate boom in Dubai. Bagaeen (2007, p. 177) reveals that in the “initial results from the building census conducted in Dubai in 2005, the number of housing units stood at 237,728, up from 145,363 in 2000, an increase of nearly 64% that reflects the current building boom in the city.” Thus, gated projects have proliferated between the Persian Gulf coast and the Al-Maktoum highway towards the Jabil Ali port. Moreover, urban projects such as Palm Island and Jumeirah city shape the new image of Dubai.
Grant and Mittelsteadt (2004, p. 914) point out that “[g]ates and barriers indicate the depth of the security concerns contemporary cities must address: crime, traffic, loss of sense of community, and fear of mixing”. The demography of Dubai demonstrates an ethnic imbalance among the residents, which began in the 1960s with the increasing number of migrants from the Indian subcontinent. Kathiravelu (2012, p. 105) considers that the division “between citizen and foreign ‘other’ [particularly south Asian labourers] is used in the construction of an Emirati national consciousness”. At least from the indigenous Arab citizens’ perspectives, “[t]his imbalance … has become a threat” (Kanna, 2011, p. 65). Spatial segregation, including gated projects, maintains the hegemony of the small number of citizens, based on their tribal values. Elsheshtawy (2008b, p. 974) observes that indigenous Arabs mostly departed from the old parts of the city, Bur Dubai and Deira, due to these areas being invaded by foreigners from the Indian sub-continent. Nationals prefer to live in the gated enclaves. Arab citizens in Dubai perceive foreign workers as the chief threat to their culture and the hegemony of the city-state. In Bastakiya’s mosque, I asked a local Arab resident whether he and his family live in Bastakiya. He replied:
“We don’t live in Bastakiya. Dubai is not our city anymore. It is a city of Pakistanis and Indians. They are everywhere. Just look around, there is no Arabs. Indeed, Dubai is not an Arab city; it is a Pakistani city like Karachi. We [the local Arabs] escape into desert, we just come here to pray during Ramadan. Our families are safe there. These foreign workers are bachelors. Dubai is dangerous for our wives and children”.

The distortion in the demography of Dubai does not only intimidate nationals; it is also of concern to western technocrats and other expatriates, high and middle class groups, who derive a benefit from the dominant mechanism (Smith, 2010, p. 276). In this context, living in the gated communities generates a sense of security among those of higher income. The gated enclaves allow more privacy, particularly for westerners, citizens and tourists. The gated projects can be generally categorised according to their amenities and facilities, types of security features and spatial patterns, which indicate the level of affluence of their inhabitants (Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004, p. 917). Byers (2003, p. 23) argues that “[g]ated communities may provide a means for people to separate themselves from the unknown or feared ‘other’, or to congregate with others who share their world view”. While Dubai seems more foreign-friendly overall as compared to other GCC states, perceiving foreigners as
indispensable to the city mechanism’s operation (Al-Sayegh, 1998), gated communities are deployed as a component of the control apparatus, to limit social mixing between classes, and particularly limiting the spaces available for low-income labourers.

The deployment of enclosures is not solely to keep others out, but also to lock selected groups in. Based on Foucault’s works, gates and walls simplify surveillance and signify social distance and control (Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004; Lianos, 2003). While Ramos (2010, p. 85) points out that the gated communities were initially established to accommodate the large number of workers in camps following oil discovery in the region, a field survey on workers’ conditions in the UAE demonstrates that one-third of foreign labourers still live in gated camps (Zachariah et al., 2004, p. 2233). In two field trips, the researcher found that the barrack-shaped camps in Al Quaz, Sonapur and Jebel Ali accommodate large numbers of construction workers. The camps are surrounded by fences, and armed security guards constantly control workers’ behaviours. The camps are mostly located outside the city. For example, Sonapur is 15 km outside the city (Elsheshtawy, 2008b). In the absence of official records, Hunt (2011, p. 24) estimates that more than 500,000 workers are forced to live in the labour camps in Dubai (see Figure 6). I conducted an informal interview with an Indian worker in 2011.

“I am working in a construction project in Jabal Ali Port. I am living in a labour camp outside of the city. We have our shops, restaurants and barbers in our camp; they are cheap. You know the city is expensive; I can save some money by living in the camp. My friends living in the city, they cannot save money. It is hard to live in the camp, but I prefer living there.”

Thus, there are two forms of gated projects in Dubai: the luxurious residential complexes of the wealthy inhabitants of the city, and the labour camps of unskilled workers; both of which are indispensable components of the control apparatus in Dubai.

Urban development policies in Dubai, including zoning, maintain spatial segregation and, more crucially, expand the constant gaze over the city’s inhabitants (Yiftachel, 1998b). Further, while Dubai is recognised mostly by its gated communities, hidden barriers such as highways also strengthen the control mechanism. Ramos (2010, p. 87) notes that initial plans suggested a radial development around the creek. In addition, these plans recommended increasing car usage in Dubai. However, the
placement of urban projects, such as the World Trade Centre and Jebel Ali Port, shaped the city structure as a linear development alongside the Persian Gulf coast. The Al Maktoum highway connects Jebel Ali port and the later urban developments such as the Dubai Marina to the core of the city (Elsheshtawy, 2010a). Car dependency is substantially increased in Dubai because of this linear development such that Dubai is not perceived as a pedestrian-friendly city (Elsheshtawy, 2013). Based on Dubai’s urban morphology, Elsheshtawy (2008b, p. 974) stresses that “one of the first impressions of the city is its fragmentary nature and its reliance on cars as the primary method of circulation. The city is composed of multiple, disconnected centres, which are separated by multi-lane highways”. This urban fragmentation comes from the zoning and land use policy.

Accessibility is the primary function of highways in cities. Highways are deployed as hidden barriers to disconnect, or at least limit, access for undesirable groups such as the poor or ethnic minorities to other parts of the city (Kuswa, 2002, p. 54). “Deleuze’s image is that of a highway: a highway does not confine one, but it does control one’s movements, the options available to one” (Wise, 2002, p. 31). Elsheshtawy’s investigations (2010a, p. 218) reveal that in Dubai, highways and rigid roads have detached poor and middle class residential areas such as Satwa from other neighbourhoods. The highways effectively prohibit access to the poor, who cannot afford to keep a car or pay the taxi fares to access the new amenities and facilities. Beckett and Herbert (2008, p. 7) stress that:

[These techniques are used to channel the socially undesirable to one area of the city, a strategy Davis describes as ‘containment’. These new architectural forms also effect what Davis argues is the ultimate raison d’être of the fortress city: the enhancement and protection of social insulation and segregation.

A recently established modern luxury metro line connects the area’s landmark buildings and luxury hotels to the huge shopping malls generally used by tourists and residents living in the new districts of the city (Decker, 2009, p. 204). This mechanism excludes the labourers living in the labour camps.
Legislation and laws are a substantial part of the control machine in consolidating spatial segregation. “They work nonetheless to expand the number of behaviours subject to investigation, arrest, and incarceration. These new techniques include off-limits orders and the creation of zones of exclusion, parks exclusion laws, and new applications of trespass law” (Beckett & Herbert, 2008, p. 6). In Dubai, these mechanisms work alongside other techniques, such as zoning or gated projects, to maintain spatial segregation. Smith (2010, p. 276) reveals that the majority of labourers are married men whose wage is not enough to bring their spouse to Dubai. These (bachelor) labourers mostly prefer to share their accommodation to decrease living costs. I observed the same problem in Dubai during my several trips there. An Indian chef told me:

“I am working in a hotel. I like my job … I can save some money and send it to my family. I have two daughters; I should pay for their education and also save money for their marriage. But I cannot bring my family here. It is so expensive and this hard for me. I afraid if [I] go to visit them, I will lose my job”.

By investigating the gated communities, Goix and Webster (2008) identified that the high cost of property and rent impedes the lower income groups from settling in the neighbourhoods. Since the
financial recession in Dubai in 2008, rents have dramatically decreased because of the economic downturn in the real estate market. Thus, groups of bachelor labourers are able to hire large villas in the wealthy neighbourhoods, some of which might accommodate more than 150 men (Smith, 2010). The Dubai government perceives this trend as a threat to social segregation. Thus, a new rule, ‘One Villa, One Family’, was declared in 2007, which permits low income labourers to live only in apartments, outside of camps (Ahmed, 2007). This law also prohibits lower income families from sharing a villa (Ahmed & Menon, 2007). These groups excluded from sharing villas mostly live in the concrete four and five storey buildings established during the first real estate boom in the 1960s and 1970s in bur Dubai and Deira (see Figure 10). During an informal interview in the Dubai mall, a Pakistani shopkeeper mentioned to me:

“I live with eleven other Pakistani friends in an apartment in Deira. It is much cheaper for us to live in Deira. A lot of foreign drivers and workers live in Deira. By sharing our place, we can to reduce the cost of living. You know I should save money for my family in Makli, it is close to Karachi. I just earn US$250 per a month”.

In addition I spoke with a Filipino waitress in the lobby of a hotel in Bur Dubai. She told me that:

“Dubai is a good place to work. It is safer place for women than other places in the region such as Saudi. But it [Dubai] is so expensive to live... I should share my room with two other girls to reduce the rent cost. We rent an apartment in Deira. It is cheaper, but I should pay for transport which is expensive. There is no option here because we cannot rent [an] apartment in the areas close to the hotel. They easily label us as prostitutes which is so dangerous in Dubai”.

As in the deployment of the built environment, legislation as “the new control techniques also help to perpetuate the segregation that is so essential to the maintenance of ‘playful’ urban spaces, spaces that are, in turn, increasingly vital to the well-being of the urban economy” (Beckett & Herbert, 2008, p. 17).
Foucault (1991, p. 198) discusses “two ways of exercising power over men, of controlling their relations, of separating out their dangerous mixture”. In *Discipline and Punish* (1991), Foucault comprehensively described how people become docile bodies through the internalisation of the constant gaze of a disciplinary society. “Surveillance is the systematic collection, classification and sorting of information about populations for the purposes of behavioural adjustment or control” (Wood, 2012, p. 336). Dubai as the city of gates, highways and controlled urban spaces could be named the “city of the constant gaze”. “At each of the town gates there will be an observation post; at the end of each street sentinels” (Foucault, 1991, p. 196). Installed in Dubai’s airports, Crime Prevention Cameras constantly record people’s actions. All arrivals, except Western and GCC citizens, as potential threats, are directed to specific gates for further compulsory examination such as fingerprinting and eye scanning (Fakhry & Cardozo, 2006). The highways are monitored by various types of cameras. Residents and tourists have access to urban public spaces, including shopping malls and entertainment centres, solely through the defined gates, which are constantly monitored by cameras and security guards. This makes Dubai an:
enclosed, segmented space, observed at every point, in which the individuals are
inserted in a fixed place, in which the slightest movements are supervised, in which all
events are recorded, in which an uninterrupted work of writing links the centre and
periphery, in which power is exercised without division, according to a continuous
hierarchical figure, in which each individual is constantly located, examined and
distributed among the living beings, the sick and the dead – all this constitutes a compact
model of the disciplinary mechanism. (Foucault, 1991, p. 197)

In short, the whole city operates as a normalising-machine, which normalises its residents’ attitudes in
favour of the dominant power: the ruler and his tribocracy.

Following Foucault’s description of a regime of surveillance and discipline, Deleuze conceptualised
a society of control to reveal a new mechanism of control in the post-industrial era. Whereas the
disciplinary society was shaped by mass production, the society of control is embedded in
consumption: in the share market and the debt mechanism. Hvidt (2009, p. 404) points out that:
“Dubai has no intention of developing through industrialisation. Although the country has not
completely bypassed industrialisation, Dubai is jumping directly from a pearling/trading society to a

The non-oil sector played a more prominent role in 2005 with a 95% contribution to GDP,
as compared to 90% in 2000 (and as much as 46% in 1975). This was mainly the result
of reduced dependence on oil as well as a deliberate policy of diversifying the economy in
favour of the non-oil sectors in which both the overall business environment and sector-
specific programmes have played vital roles. The service sector has been the key driver
of economic growth with an annual growth rate of 21% since 2000, constituting Dhs.
101.4 billion ($27.6 billion) or 74% of Dubai’s current GDP in 2005.

Conversely, the non-oil sectors such as manufacturing, government service and agriculture
decreased in size between 2000 and 2005. Deleuze (1992, p. 6) stressed that “[w]hat it [society of
control] wants to sell is services and what it wants to buy is stocks”. The Dubai Strategic Plan intends
to “move existing sectors of strength to new frontiers, both domestically and internationally” (The
Dubai Government, 2007, p. 18). Thereupon, Dubai can be categorised as a service-based economy
rather than an oil-based or industrial economy.
The market-based mechanism of control seems more effective than a disciplinary society:

The disciplinary societies have two poles: the signature that designates the individual, and the number or administrative numeration that indicates his or her position within mass … In societies of control, on the other hand, what is important is no longer either a signature or a number, but a code: the code is a password, while on the other hand the disciplinary societies are regulated by watchwords. (Deleuze, 1992, p. 6)

The capitalist coding mechanism shapes societies of control. The market-based mechanism constantly measures and codifies everything. In this context, everything has been coded, so it is purchasable. Through the process of coding, individuals are transformed into dividuals and masses. According to Simon (2005, p. 15):

> In societies of control the individual is doubled as code, as information, or as simulation such that the reference of the panoptic gaze is no longer the body but its double, and indeed this is no longer a matter of looking but rather one of data analysis.

Debt is the core of control societies: “[m]an is no longer man enclosed, but man in debt” (Deleuze, 1992, p. 6). The debtor is not the individual, but instead the dividual, multiplied in the very process of impersonal social construction (Hannah, 1997, p. 179).
“[A] creditopolis [is] a city built entirely on debt” (Hari, 2009). A debt mechanism has been deployed as part of Dubai’s control apparatus to regulate inhabitants’ behaviours. Expatriates constitute 90 per cent of Dubai’s residents. Dubai purchases its workforces from the global market and these residents are temporary inhabitants (Hvidt, 2009, p. 403). Nonetheless, the large numbers of foreigners are perceived as a potential threat to the hegemony of capitalism with tribal values (Kanna, 2011, p. 172). A debt mechanism is utilised in Dubai as a control instrument, in addition to other components of the control apparatus such as punitive approaches, spatial segregation and surveillance (Hari, 2009; Hunt, 2011; Molavi, 2007). During an informal interview in 2009, an Indian construction worker told me:

“I was a farmer in India. I came here three years ago to gain more money. But there is no money here. I borrowed money to buy flight ticket to come here; I cannot repay the money back. I don’t know what I should do. We work 12 hours per day, we don’t have weekend. But we don’t earn enough to save money”.

In an investigation of Indian labourers working in Dubai, Buckley (2012, p. 253) observed that this group of workers are mostly in debt:

Those seeking a job on one of Dubai’s construction sites have typically had to pay a large sum of money – often equivalent to one or more years of their overseas salary – to local labour recruiters or other intermediaries in order to secure employment, work permits and transportation to the region.

Debt bondage as a control instrument generates a new form of slavery in Dubai, where traditional slavery was abolished in 1963 (Davis, 2006, p. 64). Further:

Debt bondage, that is to say, the status or condition arising from a pledge by a debtor of his personal services or of those of a person under his control as security for a debt, if the value of those services as reasonably assessed is not applied towards the liquidation of the debt or the length and nature of those services are not respectively limited and defined. (Keane & McGeehan, 2008, p. 106)

In this context, debt bondage entangles labourers, who are transmuted into individualls.
The regulative function of the debt mechanism is not limited in its application to the labourers that have migrated to Dubai from impoverished countries; this mechanism of control is also applied to regulate western workers’ behaviours. Hari (2009) reports stories of expatriates who lost their savings following the economic crisis in 2008 and are trapped in Dubai. Dubai initially seems a dreamland: a tax-free city, comparatively higher salaries, vast shopping malls and a wealthy lifestyle, all of which lure skilled workers to this desirable city-state. In its Islamic economic mechanism, there is no supporting system such as a bankruptcy law to protect business activity and personal debt. Following a resignation or dismissal, employers immediately inform the banking system. If the employee’s savings do not cover his/her outstanding debts, all of the employee’s accounts are frozen, and they are forbidden to leave Dubai. “If you get into debt and you can’t pay, you go to prison” (Hari, 2009, N.P.).

Deleuze (1992, p. 5) elucidated that “[t]he numerical language of control is made of codes that mark access to information or reject it”. The market-based control system codifies the inhabitants, or potential debtors, and their everyday activities are constantly monitored based on the registered code. In this context, any form of insubordination, misbehaviour or inefficiency is punished through deactivating the residents’ access codes. This mechanism of control has badly affected the skilled expatriates who lost their jobs because of the recession in 2008. They mostly absconded from Dubai before becoming ensnared in the city-state. Worth (2009, N.P.) reported that:

[m]ore than 3,000 cars sit abandoned in the parking lot at Dubai Airport, left by fleeing, debt-ridden foreigners (who could in fact be imprisoned if they failed to pay their bills). Some are said to have maxed-out credit cards inside and notes of apology taped to the windshield.

Thus, the debt system functions as a regulative mechanism in Dubai. An American architect who worked in Dubai, Sleiman (2012, p. x), comments that:

Dubai is a simple Fata Morgana, which is an unusual and very complex form of mirage. It is a form of superior mirage, which is seen in a narrow band right above the horizon like heaven and which derives from a belief that this mirage is a fairy castle in the air or a false land designed to lure sailors to their death, exactly like hell.
Dubai displays characteristics of the mechanisms of both discipline and control. However, Dubai’s service-based economy, with its debt mechanism, suggests a society of control. According to the *Dubai Strategic Plan 2015* (2007, p. 19), the service sector in Dubai encompasses trade, construction, transport, storage and communication, real estate and business services, restaurants, hotels, social and personal services, and domestic services. Following the trade sector, the construction and real estate sectors have had the fastest growing economic activity. “The construction has also exhibited share gains, primarily due to the availability of land, labour, domestic and foreign capital, and changes in regulations” (The Dubai Government, 2007, p. 20). As elucidated above, the pre-recession construction boom in Dubai depended on the control apparatus, which created the conditions for the extreme exploitation of foreign labourers. In this context, capitalism in Dubai is still “a capitalism of concentration, for production and for property” (Deleuze, 1992, p. 6). However, spatial segregation is the core component of Dubai’s control apparatus. The deployment of debt bondage generates a new form of slavery, which strengthens the control mechanism and its efficiency in Dubai.

This section demonstrated how Dubai’s controlling-machine reproduces the hegemony of the dominant power – ‘capitalism with Arabic tribal values’ – which in turn generates an exploitative labour regime for accumulating global capital. Harvey (2007, p. 76) points out that “it would seem that labour control and maintenance of a high rate of labour exploitation have been central to neoliberalisation all along”. By analysing the control apparatus in Dubai, this section illustrated that the rapid economic growth and high rate of exploitation are intertwined.

### 6.5-Dubai as an antagonism-creator

Global capitalism, with its city machines such as Dubai, depends on promising the impossibility of absolute enjoyment (Gunder, 2009; McGowan, 2004; Stavrakakis, 2008b). Chapter Five comprehensively described the transformation of the society of prohibition into the society of enjoyment in late capitalism based on the work of Lacan and his followers such as Žižek (1991a, 2000, 2011a), Stavrakakis (2010), McGowan (2004), Cederström and Hoedemaekers (2010) and Gunder (2009). The chapter concluded that the attainment of complete enjoyment is impossible due to the existence of a constant lack. Further, this constant lack is the primary driver of the production of discontent and antagonism in a neoliberalised society.
The neoliberalised society is conceptualised as the ‘society of commanded enjoyment’ (McGowan, 2004). Enjoyment was also the core of pre-capitalist or early capitalist societies. “Indeed every age, every historical conjuncture, every socio-political order, will institute its own blend of coercion, symbolic authority as well as fantasmatic and self-transgressive jouissance [enjoyment]” (Stavrakakis, 2010, p. 73). Pre-capitalist and early capitalist societies were formed around the idealisation of sacrifice, of sacrificing enjoyment for the sake of social duty or God. These societies promised complete enjoyment in fantasised places such as Heaven. “[T]he social order today demands enjoyment instead of a sacrifice of enjoyment, this is no way allows subjects within the social order to enjoy themselves, any more than they were ever able to” (McGowan, 2004, p. 37). In the neoliberalised society, or society of commanded enjoyment, enjoyment has become the primary duty (McGowan, 2004; Stavrakakis, 2011a).

The globalised city-machines such as Dubai are places in which absolute enjoyment is promised to lure flows of money and workers. Gunder (2009, p. 287) stresses that “[b]eyond traditional employment and investment opportunities, the quality of life available, including amenity, life style and range of leisure opportunities are necessary elements for the city-region to attract both businesses and talented people”. High-standard services and facilities, with entertainment centres such as enormous shopping malls, theme parks and luxurious residential areas, are offered by the global city-machines to convince immigrants and tourists that they will achieve complete enjoyment by living in or visiting these places. The global city-machines compete to attract a greater portion of the international investors and skilled immigrants through the production of new desires for greater enjoyment by affluent consumers.

Dubai is a representative example of a global city that pledges absolute enjoyment to visitors and immigrants affluent enough to pay the necessary costs. “Thus, Dubai is building the world’s largest theme park, the biggest mall (and within it, the largest aquarium), the tallest building, the largest international airport, the biggest artificial island, the first sunken hotel and so on” (Davis, 2006, p. 51). Moreover, just as the promise of complete enjoyment can entice affluent people to live or at least visit Dubai, poor labourers from impoverished countries are also attracted to Dubai, where they are promised better lifestyles, job opportunities and higher salaries (Buckley, 2012; Kathiravelu, 2012; Zachariah et al., 2004). Thus, despite enjoyment and its definitions seeming dissimilar due to the
socio-cultural heterogeneity in Dubai, by offering various types of facilities, Dubai, as a society of commanded enjoyment, promises happiness to different types of inhabitants.

However, the placement of these facilities often seems contradictory. There are several mosques and temples beside mega-scale leisure parks, shopping centres, beaches and nightclubs (Barrett, 2010); prostitutes work in Dubai’s nightclubs, irrespective of the illegality of sexual relations outside marriage under Islamic Sharia law (Goh, 2009); and alcoholic drinks are served in Dubai’s hotels, while at the same time restaurants are closed and drinking and eating in public spaces is penalised during Ramadan under Islamic law. Davis (2006, p. 49) described Dubai as “a strange paradise”.

Nonetheless, as McGowan (2004, p. 7) emphasises, “[t]he fundamental thing to recognize about the society of enjoyment is that in it the pursuit of enjoyment has misfired: the society of enjoyment has not provided the enjoyment that it promises”. Based on Lacan’s work (2006), complete enjoyment is unattainable due to the irremediable lack necessary to constitute desire. However, the neoliberalised society embodies the production of new desires around the lack by promising happiness through greater consumption. The production of dissatisfaction in Dubai, as the ‘ultimate neoliberal utopia’ (Buckley, 2013, p. 5; Kanna, 2009a, p. 100), has become problematic, particularly since the recession in 2008. By considering three social groups in Dubai – citizens (indigenous Arabs), expatriates (primarily westerners) and labourers (mostly from South and East Asia such as Indians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis and Filipinos) – the dissertation reveals that the production of dissatisfaction is not restricted to a specific social, economic or ethnic group.

The flow of oil money rapidly transformed Dubai from an impoverished oasis into a wealthy city-state, altering the indigenous Arab lifestyle (Davidson, 2008; Kanna, 2011; Ramos, 2009), and generating dissatisfaction among nationals. The field investigations of Kanna (2011, p. 46) and Elsheshtawy (2008b) reveal that the disappearance of the Arabic identity is the main driver of dissatisfaction among Arab citizens in Dubai. First, the large number of foreigners, particularly from South Asia, is perceived as the primary threat to the Arabic identity of Dubai (Vora, 2011). Moreover, the rapid modernisation, including urban transfiguration, alienates the indigenous citizens from their city (Bebbington et al., 1993; Elsheshtawy, 2010b). Thus, nationals assert that others; that is, foreigners, have ruined their happiness in Dubai.
In the post-oil era, a large number of workers from South Asia, particularly from India, flowed to the GCC states and into Dubai. The local Arabs have become a minority, comprising less than 10 per cent of the population of the city (Davis, 2006; Hvidt, 2011; Ramos, 2010). The dominant tribal coding-mechanism in Dubai categorises people into two main groups: indigenous Arabs (primarily from the Arab peninsula) and others (Kathiravelu, 2012, p. 195). Kanna (2011, p. 47) observes that the unbalanced demography in Dubai produces dissatisfaction between Arab citizens. “The flood of the foreign labour was wiping out the character of the country where some areas now resembled parts of India or Pakistan” (Davidson, 2005, p. 146). Arab citizens demonise the South Asian workers, who are condemned for their lack of happiness (Elsheshtawy, 2004). Elsheshtawy’s investigation (2008b, p. 974) revealed that the nationals “have moved out of the older parts of the city because it was invaded by Indians, Pakistanis and bachelors. The locals have moved into areas like Mizher 1 and 2, considered desert enclaves, past the city’s airport”. In this context, the ruling families in the GCC states, including the Al Maktoum family in Dubai, represent themselves as the protectors of the Arabic identity and its values. By overstating the danger of Asian workers (the vicious others) for Arabic identity, the ruling family misdirects the dissatisfaction produced and utilises it as a political instrument to strengthen its hegemony as the primary defender of the Arabic identity (Kanna, 2011).

Urban transfiguration is one of the consequences of the flow of oil money into the Persian Gulf region. Peteru (2008, p. 76) claims that “the modernisation is diminishing social solidarity and thereby, alienating the citizen from the larger society”. Through the process of modernisation, historical buildings were mostly destroyed to establish four or five storey concrete buildings. In addition, the second real estate boom from 1997 to 2007 transformed the city into a global city. Haines (2011, p. 170) points out that “[e]xcept for the Jumeriah mosque, built in the neo-Mamluk architectural style borrowed from Cairo, there is very little about the urban landscape of Dubai that expresses a Muslim orientation”. Rapid development is often alien, hostile and devoid of local character, resulting in a significant loss of identity (Al Jazeera, 2006). Modernisation detaches locals from their city’s built environment. In the case of Dubai, this produces dissatisfaction among the minor Arab citizens. Following the financial crisis in 2008, some local activists challenged the ruler’s development policy by emphasising the local identity.

Skilled expatriates, mostly westerners, tend to make a greater income and are relatively more socio-economically privileged in comparison with other foreigners in Dubai (Vora, 2008). Yet, high
salaries and privileges cannot provide complete satisfaction for this group of residents. Past investigations have shown that the profound socio-cultural distance between westerners and Arabs generates dissatisfaction between expatriates (Harrison & Michailova, 2011). The dominant mechanism in Dubai, capitalism with Arabic tribal values, is an inconsistent mechanism. Global capitalism, a society of enjoyment, persuades both inhabitants and tourists to follow hedonism, consumerism to attain greater enjoyment. However, Sharia Law, as a society of prohibition, limits some pleasures in Dubai such as drinking alcohol in public spaces, eating and drinking in public spaces during Ramadan, and having sexual relations out of marriage (Walsh, 2007, p. 514). Despite the fact that most of the banned enjoyments such as prostitution are tolerated and are even systematically countenanced to seduce skilled expatriates and affluent tourists into Dubai (Goh, 2009, p. 313; Mahdavi, 2010, p. 973), the duality between tribalism and neoliberalism is problematic for affluent expatriates who perceive Islamic prohibitions as the main barriers to full enjoyment.

The advent of the economic downturn in Dubai in 2008 caused the neoliberal utopian fantasy to fade (Huston, 2011; Vora, 2008) and has influenced expatriates’ lifestyles. As Ali (2010, p. 28) points out: “Where labourers’ lives are largely regulated by this series of ‘sticks’, the middle class and professionals’ lives are regulated mostly with ‘carrots’ like high salaries, fast professional advancement, and luxury living”. As a consequence of the financial crisis, a large number of skilled workers such as engineers, architects and managers, among others, lost their promised high-salary jobs and their splendid lifestyles (Ohm, 2008).

In Dubai, the economic hardship that Dubai faces has resulted in deplorable working conditions for foreign labourers. Official figures show that more than half of the residents in the UAE have family or friends who have lost their jobs. (Abdo & Ayman, 2010, p. 12)

While these newly unemployed mostly left Dubai before they become trapped in the city-state, the financial crisis produces dissatisfaction among Dubai’s remaining residents in general, and expert inhabitants in particular (Colton, 2011; Hari, 2009). Since 2008, a large number of reports, papers, articles and books have been published by Westerners who abandoned Dubai (Kanna, 2009a, p. 122). They describe the dissatisfaction among the skilled expatriates, confirming the failure of the dominant mechanism to provide complete happiness.
Scholars such as Davis (2006), Bloch (2010) and Hvidt (2009), among others, elucidate that Dubai’s rapid economic growth has been derived from a large number of labourers. Therefore, the exploitative mechanism inherently produces discontent among the majority of Dubai’s inhabitants, the unskilled labourers from South and East Asia, who are not perceived as immigrants, but as merely temporary workers (Colton, 2011). However, “all expatriates in Dubai, even those born in Dubai, are on short-term, renewable visa, regulated through the ‘kafala’, or sponsorship, system” (Ali, 2010, p. 28). However, the kafala operates differently for labourers, the middle class and professionals. The dominant mechanism codifies skilled expatriates as human capital whose existence is indispensable for the capitalist machine. Thus, their misbehaviour, according to the Sharia law, such as drinking alcohol or sexual relations out of marriage, is largely overlooked. However, “[a]t any point and for practically any reason, the government or an employer may arbitrarily cancel a worker’s visa and trigger immediate deportation” (Ali, 2010, p. 29). As explained in the previous section, because impermanence is effectively used as a control policy, it inevitably produces discontent among the vast majority of Dubai’s population.

Moreover, the wages of construction workers, house cleaners and cab drivers in Dubai are only slightly higher than third-world rates, keeping these workers captive in Dubai. The dominant exploitative mechanism, with its multiple control apparatuses, generates discontent among the lower-class residents in Dubai (Hunt, 2011). Further, dissatisfaction is generated by their squalid living conditions in barrack-style camps, with poor sanitation and faulty air-conditioning, unbearable working conditions in muggy and warm weather of often up to 50 degrees centigrade, the withholding of travel documents and, more crucially, low rates of pay or non-payment of wages since the financial downturn (Human Rights Watch, 2010). HRW annually reports the dissatisfaction among labourers in Dubai. Specifically, unskilled labourers point to the Dubaians’ abuse of their impoverishment to make a profit.

Discontent as an inherent product of the capitalist city is the main driver of antagonistic behaviours such as strikes, riots and vandalism. Through strict control over the media, the dominant power mechanism endeavours to conceal the production of antagonism in Dubai. Davis (2006, p. 67) discusses the unrest that occurred in 2004, when several thousand Asian workers closed the Sheikh Zayed Highway. According to the HRW Report (2012), 34 worker protests occurred in the first three months of 2011, and 26 known suicides were reported among Indian workers in 2011. Further,
thousands of workers were deported from Dubai for participating in strikes and other forms of disobedience.

Drawing on Lacan’s works, Mouffe addresses the production of antagonism as an ineradicable phenomenon; however, its existence is largely denied by liberal capitalism. Mouffe (2009, p. 550) conceptualises “the ‘political’ understood as [an] antagonistic dimension which is inherent in all human societies”. However, the production of antagonism is not limited to Dubai and its hegemonic ideology, ‘capitalism with Arabic tribal values’. In an interview with Carpentier (2006, p. 967), Mouffe points out that despite the fact that antagonism occurs in all societies, it seems more problematic in despotic mechanisms than in the liberal democracies. In non-democratic mechanisms such as Dubai, antagonism unavoidably brings violence and destruction (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001).

Drawing on Derrida’s work, Mouffe (2009, p. 550) argues that “the creation of an identity implies the establishment of a difference”. Nonetheless, the recognition of difference between ‘us’ and ‘other’ does not necessarily generate antagonism. Rather:

This happens when the others, who up to now had been considered as simply different, start to be perceived as putting into question our identity and threatening our existence [or our enjoyment]. From that moment on, any form of us/them relation, be it religious, ethnic or economic, becomes the locus of an antagonism. (Mouffe, 2009, p. 550)

In the Dubai context, the dominant tribalism with its coding mechanism constantly classifies inhabitants according to their differences such as ethnicity, nationality and social class; and this classification determines residents’ socio-political positions in society. Although highlighting disparities between residents can generate antagonism, it is not the sole stimuli of animosity. For example, Persian traders who immigrated into Dubai in the early 20th century were first embraced in the host society (Al-Sayegh, 1998, p. 88). Kanna (2011, p. 46) argues that “[t]he resulting disproportion between foreigners and locals led to resentment among the local population, which began to see its culture being threatened by these foreigners”. The large numbers of foreigners are perceived as a challenge to the dominant tribalism and the projected identities that underwrite nationals’ lifestyle and enjoyment. The antagonistic behaviour of expatriates in general and unskilled labourers in particular embodies the recognition of ‘us’ and ‘them’ based on similarities and differences. In this context, expatriates demonise indigenous Arab citizens for threatening the cheap labourers’ existence, and for
limiting skilled expatriates’ freedom. Thus, antagonism is an inherent product of capitalism with tribal values in Dubai.

For Mouffe, “politics’ refers to the ensemble of practices, discourses and institutions which seek to establish a certain order and to organise human coexistence in conditions which are always potentially conflicting because they are affected by the dimension of ‘the political’” (Mouffe, 2009, p. 550). From this perspective, capitalism with Arabic tribal values, with its practices, discourses and institutions, constitutes politics in Dubai. The politics effectively regulates the inhabitants’ interactions in favour of the dominant ruling family and their international associates. However, “[h]egemony is always possible but can never be total” (Carpentier, 2005, p. 206). While the flow of oil-money into the region and the patronage of global capitalism have consolidated the hegemony of tribalism in Dubai, the production of antagonism, particularly among the majority low-income residents, progressively generates counter-hegemonic behaviours such as strikes, riots and rebellions. These counter-hegemonic struggles potentially destabilise the dominant tribalism and its hegemony.

From Mouffe’s perspective, antagonism will not be totally eradicated from society by the implementation of policies such as collaborative or communicative approaches. Nonetheless, Mouffe theorises ‘agonism’ to confront the ineradicable antagonism:

In the realm of politics, this presupposes that the 'other' is no longer seen as an enemy to be destroyed, but as an ‘adversary,’ i.e., somebody with whose ideas we are going to struggle but whose right to defend those ideas we will not put into question. (Mouffe, 1999, p. 755)

Agonism is conceptualised as mitigating the existing antagonism in democratic mechanisms.

The deployment of agonism in non-democratic mechanisms such as Dubai seems indispensable in confronting the escalating antagonism. To mitigate the antagonism, the existing despotic mechanism, capitalism with tribal values, could be argued to need to be dramatically transformed into a democratic mechanism that recognises the rights of others; not as temporary workers, but as residents. “In reality power is only exercised at a cost. Obviously, there is an economic cost … But there is also a specifically political cost” (Foucault, 1980, p. 156). However, while the Dubai city-machine is capable of purchasing cheap workers from the global market to replace the deported
labourers, maintaining the current control apparatus carries a lower cost than any radical transformation of politics, so it is unlikely to occur.

“[T]he general assumption of that the nation is under threat of being overwhelmed by foreigners, especially those from Iran and South Asia” (Kanna, 2011, p. 121) generates pretexts for suppressive reactions (often accompanied by violence) to counter-hegemonic struggles (Kanna, 2011, p. 55). By demonising others, the implementation of suppressive policies are justified as legitimate struggles for defending national identity, kinship and land. The implementation of agonism in tribalism, which is based on flows of genes, seems inoperable. Under the hegemony of capitalism with tribal values, no democratic institutions exist that can be deployed to apply agonistic policies to mitigate antagonism in Dubai.

By investigating Dubai and its operation as a neoliberal city-machine, this section revealed the production of dissatisfaction among its inhabitants; and how Dubai as a capitalist machine pledges complete enjoyment to inhabitants and tourists to attract them to the city. However, the unattainability of complete enjoyment generates dissatisfaction among the residents. Through collective identification, people distinguish themselves from others based on similarities and differences, typically based in ethnicity, religion and kinship. They then condemn these identified others for spoiling their enjoyment. The production of dissatisfaction seems more problematic in autocratic mechanisms constituted on tribalism and the flow of genes, such as Dubai. By considering the three primary groups that shape the socio-political mechanism in Dubai; that is, Arab citizens, skilled workers and unskilled workers, this section illustrated that dissatisfaction is generated among all these social groups. This dissatisfaction is mostly displayed through antagonistic behaviours that are normally accompanied by violence. The section indicated that the dominant tribalism with its coding mechanism is the primary impediment to mitigating the increasing antagonism and violence in Dubai.

6.6-Conclusion

This chapter endeavoured to analyse Dubai and its functions as a global city that is mostly known for its economic prosperity, at least prior to its economic downturn in 2008. Based on the findings of previous chapters, this chapter generated insights into multiple products of Dubai as a city-machine, including the production of desires, normalisation of inhabitants’ behaviours and creation of
antagonism. In this context, the role of policies and plans in shaping Dubai as a neoliberal utopia was considered.

Drawing on Deleuze, the chapter demonstrated that Dubai operates as an assemblage encompassing multiple political, socio-cultural and economic systems, alongside physical machines. These machines are not discrete units that function independently. Rather, they are intertwined and together function as components of Dubai’s city-machine. Further, ‘capitalism with Arabic tribal values’ determines how Dubai as a city-machine operates.

The city-machine’s operation and prosperity depends on the constant flow of capital, money and cheap workers, as well as the flux of genes. Dubai as a desiring-machine constantly produces new desires to reinforce these flows of money and cheap workers. With its gigantic shopping malls, luxurious residential gated neighbourhoods and iconic architectural buildings such as Burj al Khalifa, Dubai promises a high standard of lifestyle to its customers, tourists and inhabitants (Haines, 2011). Therefore, Dubai is a desiring-machine, whose existence relies on the production and accumulation of desires. This chapter investigated the role of planning practice in the creation of new desires in Dubai.

By investigating Dubai’s function, the chapter concluded that Dubai’s control apparatus encompasses punitive methods, bio-politics and the debt mechanism. The punitive methods historically occur in Dubai as control instruments of tribalism and, more crucially, Sharia law generally legitimises this punishment mechanism. Gated communities, including labour camps, have been utilised to control large numbers of cheap labourers in the post-oil discovery period. Further, new technologies such as surveillance cameras are deployed in public spaces to increase the gaze over inhabitants’ actions. Plans and policies, such as zoning, reinforce the control apparatus through regulating urban space; and debt as a new mechanism of control effectively enmeshes workers in Dubai. Dubai’s city-machine operation and its success in capital accumulation rely on the efficiency of its control apparatus.

This chapter addressed the ineradicable antagonism in Dubai. The consideration of three primary groups; that is, Arab citizens, skilled workers and South Asian low-skilled workers, revealed the production of dissatisfaction among Dubai’s residents due to the unattainability of complete enjoyment. Despite the production of dissatisfaction not being confined to Dubai, the hierarchical mechanism alongside exploitation exacerbates the production of dissatisfaction in this city. In this
context, members of socio-ethnic groups demonise others for causing their lack of enjoyment. The demonisation generates antagonism and violence against others who are condemned for the lack of enjoyment. Agonism is proposed in political studies to mitigate antagonism, or at least to decrease its symptoms, such as violence. However, an investigation of Dubai reveals that ‘capitalism with Arabic tribal values’ is the primary impediment to implementing agonism in the Dubaian context.
Chapter Seven: Findings

*Space has been shaped and molded from historical and natural elements, but this has been a political process. Space is political and ideological. It is a product literally filled with ideology.*

(Lefebvre, 1976)

*If there is no universal democratic state, ... it is because the market is the only thing that is universal in capitalism.*

(Deleuze and Guattari, 1994)

7.1-Introduction

This chapter summarises and consolidates the finding of the thesis. Drawing on the key findings of the previous chapters, this chapter illustrates how neoliberal globalisation transforms the contemporary city, to include an intensification of socio-cultural heterogeneity and the standardisation of the built environment. Further, it reveals the products of the neoliberalised global city, including the production of new desires, the normalisation of residents’ attitude and the intensification of urban conflict. By addressing planning as a product of capitalism, the chapter reveals that contemporary planning tends to confirm and underpin this status quo.

The following section illustrates how the hegemonic ideology constantly redefines planning and readjusts its discourses to function more effectively as a component of the capitalistic mechanism. The managerial-technocratic capacities of planning are largely utilised to reproduce new desires and to extend control over urban space, which both are indispensable for the reproduction of capital and its accumulation in the capitalistic city. Section 7.3 discusses how neoliberal planning contributes to the intensification of dissatisfaction through suggesting, legitimising and implementing market-oriented policies. Section 7.4 demonstrates how global capitalism as the hegemonic ideology depoliticises contemporary society, including planning. Neoliberalism largely regulates contemporary planning knowledge by promoting its ‘scientific methods’ (Flyvbjerg, 2001) and urban design approaches (Gunder, 2011a) as apolitical understandings. By addressing the failures of neoliberalised planning, this chapter demonstrates the necessity for the (re)politicisation of contemporary planning as a counter-hegemonic struggle.
7.2-Neoliberal globalism, the entrepreneurial state and the neoliberalisation of contemporary planning

‘Globalisation and neoliberalisation are both perplexingly ubiquitous phenomena’ and, more crucially, are utterly interwoven (Tickell & Peck, 2005, p. 163). Neoliberal globalisation gradually restructures local mechanisms, including those of nation states, to facilitate market operation. The adjustment of local systems based on market values is intrinsically "[t]he neo-liberal doctrine … that virtually all economic and social problems have market solutions … is that state failures are typically worse than market failures" (Sager, 2013, p. 129). The section defines how neoliberalism modulates the operation of the state, including contemporary planning, in late capitalism.

7.2.1-Neoliberalism and the entrepreneurial state

In Anti-Oedipus (2009, p. 235), Deleuze and Guattari considered capitalism to be a universal productive mechanism, the existence of which is utterly dependent on the constant flow of money and workers. Despite the fact that the state apparatus with its regulative functions is perceived as an anti-productive mechanism, due to impediments to the flow of money and people, Deleuze and Guattari stressed that this regulative function is obligatory for the existence of capital mechanisms. “Neoliberalism need not be just the privileging of markets or the infrastructure of support to market process, but also a regime of governance, or what the French philosopher of power, Michel Foucault, called governmentality” (Bridge & Watson, 2010, p. 333). Thus, the state’s function as a component of capitalism is two-fold. The state is anti-productive due to generating obstacles for the free movement of capital and labour, but its existence is imperative for sustaining the process of production. “Under neoliberalisation, therefore, the state assists capital by both retreating and intervening” (Purcell, 2009, p. 142).

Global capitalism constantly reforms the state to be more efficient within global capitalism. “Under the banner of neo-liberalism, the national state, which had been dominant throughout the post-war era, gradually retreated from its steering functions” (Friedmann, 2011, p. 4). Peck and Tickell (2002, p. 380) point out that “[n]eoliberalism has provided a kind of operating framework or ‘ideological software’ for competitive globalisation, inspiring and imposing far-reaching programs of state restructuring and rescaling across a wide range of national and local contexts”. Global forces reshape...
the state, and its bureaucratic systems, including planning, transforming them into entrepreneurs that facilitate market operation.

7.2.2-Neoliberalisation of planning

Neoliberalism redefines planning and its functions as a component of the state apparatus. Sager (2013, p. 130) notes that “[p]olitical-economic ideas of neo-liberalism have become deeply entrenched in the public sector administration of countries in most parts of the world, affecting planners in a number of ways”. The key motivation of market-oriented planning is to ensure that a city has a competitive edge for capital investment. Policy makers, including planners, generally endeavour to facilitate market operation and to lure a greater share of capital and skilled workers in competition with other cities.

Retroactively, planning has emerged to pacify the side effects of modernism; specifically its industrial effects, by regulating urban space (Allmendinger, 2009; Foucault, 2010; Friedmann, 1987; Lefebvre, 1991). Foucault (2010, p. 243) indicated that “[u]rban space has its own dangers: such as the epidemics of cholera in Europe from 1830 to about 1880; and revolution, such as the series of urban revolts that shook all of Europe during the same period”. Thus, regulative policies, including planning, are generally implemented, alongside other techniques, to mitigate the side effects of rapid urbanisation. Foucault (2010) pointed out that whereas regulative policies were typically deployed in early capitalist cities, nowadays states apply regulative policies to consolidate sovereignty over their territories.

Following the great economic crises of the 1930s, Keynes contended that “[w]ithout state intervention, market capitalism and liberal democracy would be unstable” (Fitzpatrick, 2011, p. 90). The state utilised the regulatory capacity of planning to manipulate market operation, such as by the implementation of inner-city redevelopment projects and the production of public housing. Gleeson and Low (2000, p. 88) indicate:

The idea took root that democratic governments would make ‘blueprint’ plans for many different policy domains. Urban or ‘town’ planning was one such domain. Planning was to be government-led – only democratic governments would have the economic power, administrative scope and political authority to undertake the necessary programmes for reconstruction.
These regulative policies were deployed to redistribute the produced wealth as marginal assistance to disadvantaged groups. However, in the context of greater social control, the primary intention of these policies was to bolster the conditions for capital accumulation in cities in the post-War era (Florida & Jonas, 1991; Gaffikin & Warf, 1993). Thus, planning was largely created as an agent of the state to facilitate market relations; that is, to help in the provision of labour and resources to secure capital formation (Sandercock, 1998; Yiftachel, 1998).

Following the failure of the Keynesian model to accommodate the stagflation of the 1970s, a free-market alternative, neoliberalism, was adopted (Harvey, 2007; Peck & Tickell, 2007; Purcell, 2009). Purcell (2009, p. 141) points out that “[t]he doctrine of neoliberalism is in many ways the reassertion of a classical liberal economic argument: society functions better under a market logic than any other logic, especially a state-directed one”. More crucially, the adherents of neoliberalism argue that entire mechanisms and institutions, including the state, should be fundamentally restructured based on market logic. Sager (2013, p. 129) indicates that “much of urban public planning is seen as a distortion of market mechanisms, and thus as a threat to private motivation and efficient allocation of resources”. For neoliberals, the age of planning has become redundant in the face of a more complex and unpredictable world, to which only the market, with its ‘invisible hand’ has the flexibility to respond.

Nonetheless, neoliberal capitalism deploys planning and its capacities to sustain its hegemony (Gunder, 2010b; Purcell, 2009; Sager, 2013). Neoliberal partisans assert “that the market should discipline politics [including planning], which is contrary to the social-democratic view that politics should discipline the market” (Sager, 2011, p. 149). Thus, regulative policies such as public housing projects, which attempt to manipulate market operation, are mostly diminished under the hegemony of neoliberalism. Now, planning primarily supports the expansion of market hegemony through suggesting, legitimising and implementing market-driven policies (McDermott, 1998; Sandercock, 2005; Swyngedouw et al., 2002). Planning policies such as city branding are implemented to assist market operation and to lure flows of capital and skilled workers to a city. Indeed, market-driven policies have been in use even prior to the political breakthrough of neoliberalism. Sager (2011, p. 153) mentions that “these policies, for example, gentrification and city marketing, are nevertheless included, as they fit hand in glove with neo-liberal ideology and have taken on new importance as
policy instruments under neoliberal urban regimes”. Thus, contemporary planning and its functions are adjusted under the hegemony of global neoliberalism.

7.2.3-Neoliberalised planning and its functions in late capitalism

Market-driven policies tend to create conditions conducive to capital accumulation in neoliberal cities (Gunder, 2011a; Peck et al., 2009; Sager, 2013). Wise (2008, p. 78) points out that “[a]ssemblages select elements from the milieus (the surroundings, the context, the mediums in which assemblages work) and bring them together in a particular way”. This thesis comprehensively defined capital accumulation as the primary intention of the city-assemblage, which is contingent upon both the production of new desires and the efficiency of its controlling apparatus. The thesis recognised two primary functions for planning policies under the hegemony of global capitalism: first to produce desires (Vries, 2007; Gunder, 2009; Hillier, 2005), and second, to expand the hegemony of the dominant power: neoliberalism (Miraftab, 2009; Purcell, 2009; Yiftachel, 1998b). Peck et al. (2009, p. 58) stress that “[t]he overarching goal of such [neoliberal] policy experiments is to mobilize city space as an arena both for market-oriented economic growth and for elite consumption practices, while at the same time securing order and control amongst marginalized populations”. In short, planning as a component of the capitalistic city-assemblage tends to confirm and underpin the status quo.

Drawing on Deleuze, a description was given of how the operation of a city as an assemblage relies on its connectivity to other mechanisms and the flows of various resources. In Anti-Oedipus (2009), Deleuze and Guattari indicated that the constant flow of capital and workers is essential for the operation of the capitalistic assemblage. By blurring the role of the state in manipulating market operation, neoliberalism, as an advocate of the global market, facilitates capital and worker movement. Further, the process of globalisation increasingly heightens the dependency of cities on the global market and the flows of resources. Under the hegemony of neoliberal ideology, market competition comes to be seen as a necessary (or even the only) value in decision-making. To lure a larger portion of the global flow of capital and workers to a city in competition with others, decision-makers, including planners, must participate in the production of desire.

This research identifies two primary stages in which planners engage in the process of desire production to attract flows of skilled workers and international investors to their cities. Concepts such as ‘multiculturalism’, ‘multicultural city’ and ‘multi-ethnicity city’, among others, are increasingly
deployed in city marketing and place branding policies to accentuate the existing socio-cultural diversity of cities. Florida’s (2003) investigation of creative migrant workers and their role in economic growth reveals that cultural diversity is the primary attraction for skilled foreign workers in selecting their destinations. Thus, rhetoric that appeals to this class is included as part of city marketing policies. At the same time, the discrimination, inequality and socio-cultural conflicts engendered by social heterogeneity is mostly ignored in these documents. This neglect is later argued to be a consequence of the depoliticisation of contemporary planning. The second stage of planning’s participation in the process of desire-production is its role in shaping urban development projects. Gunder (2009) discusses the role of urban development projects, amenities and advanced infrastructure, which promise greater enjoyment, in luring the creative class/skilled immigrants. Thus, contemporary planning effectively serves the market and its operation in late capitalism.

According to Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 106), the “market is the only thing that is universal in capitalism”. Globalised cities operate based on capitalism in combination with pre-existing ideologies: ‘capitalism with Arabic tribal values’ in the case of Dubai. These cities thus offer high-standard lifestyles and cultural diversity, which make them common destinations for creative workers and international investors. The example of Dubai demonstrates how the capacity of built environment is utilised to facilitate market operation, and to attract the flows of vital resources:

The growing population and the presence of a large number of different nationalities has resulted from the significant influx of foreign workforce that have been attracted to participate and benefit from the unprecedented rapid economic growth. This has created a unique multicultural environment with rich opportunities for cultural interaction and cooperation. (The Dubai Goverment, 2007, p. 29)

The technical and managerial knowledge of planning has been deployed to shape the massive urban projects and to represent Dubai as an appealing place for investment and living.

However, just as the production of desires is obligatory to attract international flows of capital and workers, it is necessary to conceal the failures of neoliberalism. McGowan (2004, p. 2) emphasises:

[T]his is the transformation from a society founded on the prohibition of enjoyment (and thus the dissatisfaction of its subjects) to a society that commands enjoyment or
jouissance (in which there seems to be no requisite dissatisfaction). Whereas formerly society has required subjects to renounce their private enjoyment in the name of social duty, today the only duty seems to consist in enjoying oneself as much as possible.

Pre-capitalistic societies, or even capitalism in its early stage, mostly promised attainment of complete enjoyment in its metaphoric form. In contrast, contemporary society promises complete enjoyment through greater consumption (Özselçuk & Madra, 2010; Stavrakakis, 2000). Stavrakakis (2008a, p. 93) explains that the existence of lack is the kernel of the market operation, in which “every experience of lack is projected onto the lack of the product”. The lag in the process of reproducing desires intensifies discontent; thus, the on-going reproduction of desires is essential for the existence of the capitalistic city-assemblage.

Furthermore, the production of new desire generates a subjective, non-capital form of surplus value (Dovey, 2005; Massumi, 1992; Wood, 2009). The non-capital surplus value “is more on the order of a prestige, an ‘aura’ – style, ‘cool’, the glow of self-worth, personality” (Massumi, 1992, p. 201). By investigating Dubai and its development process, this research demonstrates that urban projects such as Burj Al-Khalifa create glory for the ruler and ruling family of Dubai, a positive reputation for Dubai's residents, a sense of style for its inhabitants and validation for the planners, architects and engineers who work on these projects. Further, the potential for both capital and non-capital surplus value persuade decision-makers, planners and other officials to push for the production of new desires through new urban projects – it is the Society of the Spectacle (Debord, 2006 [1970]).

Based on Deleuze and Guattari, Roffe (2010, p. 41) points out that “capitalism is the regime of decoding”; contrary to pre-capitalist societies, which were regimes of coding and restrictions. Capitalism decodes (pre)existing restrictions by imposing a law of general equivalence in the form of a monetary value. In this context, planning as a regulative instrument decodes and recodes urban space based on market values. In other words, planning is a component of the capitalistic assemblage that administers everyday life, including urban space.

This thesis demonstrates that planning transubstantiates urban space. Through the process of decoding and recoding, planning preserves space, which serves market operation; otherwise, this space is regulated through the establishment of new projects. For example, in Dubai, the historic
buildings in Bastakiya are preserved and converted into museums, traditional restaurants and hotels, whereas the historic neighbourhoods in Bur Dubai and Deira have mostly been destroyed as impediments to further development (Elsheshtawy, 2008b). Therefore, capitalism tolerates only those differences that benefit economic growth.

The standardisation of urban space mitigates the inevitable cost of control, which is obligatory for capital accumulation and to reinforce the hegemony of the dominant power (Foucault, 1980, 1991). In conceptualising the ‘disciplinary society,’ Foucault depicted that regulated urban space, alongside other disciplinary institutions such as schools, military camps and hospitals, increasingly watches over inhabitants’ behaviours, working to convert them into docile bodies through their internalisation of the state’s gaze. Chapter 4 broadly described how planning decodes and recodes urban space in the interests of the dominant power.

7.2.4-Neoliberal planning functions in the capitalistic autocratic mechanism

The thesis investigated the impacts of neoliberalism on the city-assemblage and its components based on the diversity of the pre-existing local mechanisms. It was found that:

Neoliberalism does not engender identical (economic, political or spatial) outcomes in each context in which it is imposed; rather, as place-, territory- and scale-specific neoliberal projects collide with inherited regulatory landscapes, contextually specific pathways of institutional reorganization crystallize that reflect the legacies of earlier modes of regulation and forms of contestation. (Brenner & Theodore, 2005, p. 102)

In A Brief History of Neoliberalism (2007), Harvey asserts that neoliberalism emerged from the liberal democracies to mitigate the failures of the dysfunctional state-centric mechanism and to restore the hegemony of the dominant social classes. Further, Žižek (2009) observes that global capitalism in combination with local mechanisms shapes various political, economic and socio-cultural mechanisms. Neoliberal autocratic mechanisms, such as that in Dubai, are generally more prosperous than are those in western liberal democracies.

Planning reflects the ideological aspects of its time and place (Allmendinger & Haughton, 2012; Gunder, 2010b; Stavrakakis, 2011b), and Dubai is a representative example of this. Chapter 6 revealed that the dominant ideology, capitalism with Arabic tribal values, determines how planning
and its functions serve the local power, which is intertwined with global forces. By deploying regulative plans and policies, Dubai’s ruler bolstered his authority over the city and everyday life. To this end, the regulative capacity of planning was deployed to underpin the hegemony of the dominant power mechanism – capitalism with tribal values.

Chapter Six demonstrated that the capacity of planning, including urban projects, is used to shape Dubai as a ‘neoliberal utopia’ (Buckley, 2013; Kanna, 2009b). Traditional plans were perceived as impediments to market-driven ambitions. The Dubai Strategic Plan 2015 thus encompasses the primary objectives of Dubai’s development. The iconic project of Burj Al-Khalifa, for example, was designed to contribute Dubai’s image as a prosperous global city. Chapter 6 explained how these massive projects help to lure the flow of workers and investors to Dubai (Burj Al-Khalifa Master Plan, 2004; Bloch, 2010; Pacione, 2005).

In western liberal democracy in the post-War era, public confirmation seems obligatory for the implementation of urban plans and policies. Neoliberalism, with its market values, is embraced by the majority of people, if not all, as an unquestionable reality. Under the hegemony of neoliberalism, consensus-based planning theories are largely (mis)used to legitimise market-driven policies and plans as for the ‘public good’ or in the ‘public interest’ (Friedmann, 2011). Planning theorists such as Friedmann (2011), Hillier (2007), Gunder (2010b) and Allmendinger and Haughton (2012) have addressed the failure of consensus-centric theories as counter-hegemonic approaches. Yet, professional planners continue to utilise these theories in liberal democracies. In Planning in Ten Words or Less (2009), Gunder and Hillier describe how planners largely accept market values and implement market-driven policies under the hegemony of neoliberalism.

The investigation of Dubai and its economic growth illustrated that, planning is deployed to maximise the profit of the city-company and its owner as the absolute power. In this context, urban plans and policies gain their legitimacy from the ruler as CEO and from those in his close circles, who control the government-owned developers (Bagaeen, 2007; Bloch, 2010). Acuto (2010) stresses that planning is undermined to carry out the implementation of the ruler’s vision. Planning is reduced to the preparation of site plans for urban projects under the supervision of the Dubai government. The pleas of large numbers of inhabitants of the city, categorised as temporary workers regardless of their length of residency, are ignored in the process of decision-making in Dubai.
The thesis revealed that planning and its functions are determined by both the dominant ideology (neoliberalism) and the local context (political mechanisms). More crucially, global neoliberalism and the local political mechanisms are not separate as external and internal forces, but are intertwined. The existence of the capitalistic assemblage depends on the constant flows of capital and skilled workers and their accumulation in cities, achieved by promising the highest profits.

"The cities need to be globally competitive increasingly dictates urban policy decisions, narrowing the options open to decision-makers ... urban governing institutions [including planning] have been restructured so that they are better able to respond to the needs of capital. (Purcell, 2006, p. 1922)

This research demonstrates that planning and its capacities are largely deployed to facilitate the process of desire production in aid of the control apparatus.

Under the flag of neoliberalism, “[t]he virus of authoritarian capitalism is slowly but surely spreading around the globe” (Žižek, 2009, p. 131). The prosperity of authoritarian capitalism, such as in the example of ‘capitalism with Arabic tribal values’ in Dubai, affects processes of decision-making, including planning. The mechanism of decision making in this pro-market authoritarian political system is extremely centralised. For example, the ruler of Dubai takes most of the important urban development decisions. This autocratic mechanism significantly abridges the process of decision making, which meliorates its efficiency (Hvidt, 2009, p. 401). Purcell (2006, p. 1923) stresses that “[i]n this climate, democratic decision-making is seen as slow, messy, inefficient and less likely to produce the kind of tax reductions, infrastructure spending, insurance reforms and business deregulation that attract and keep capital in an increasingly competitive global economy”. The prevalent approaches for the democritisation of decision making, such as collaborative planning, are perceived as hindrances to react effectively to global market operations. Under the hegemony of neoliberalism, “they are becoming less a democratic forum for citizens to make decisions and more a tool to ensure that the area competes effectively for capital investment” (Purcell, 2006, p. 1923). By diminishing the democratic aspects of planning, the discipline is being subordinated to the global market, even in the liberal democracies.

This research demonstrates that global neoliberalism encompasses globalised city-assemblages in democratic and non-democratic regimes. These assemblages and their components, including
urban plans, policies and projects, are constantly reshaped to attract the flows of resources required to flourish. This understanding of the issues assists in responding to four of the research questions.

7.2.4.1-How are urban spaces homogenised under the hegemony of neoliberal global values in the neoliberalised city?

This research reveals that the standardisation of urban spaces is an omnipresent trend embedded in global capitalism. For Deleuze, capitalism is the decoding and recoding mechanism that imposes “a law of general equivalence in the form of monetary value” (Roffe, 2010, p. 41). The standardisation of urban space is one of the consequences of the hegemony of capitalism. Drawing on Foucault and Deleuze, the thesis distinguished two primary functions for the standardisation of urban space embedded in the capitalistic city-assemblage operation and its functions as desiring-machine and control-machine.

For Foucault (1991, p. 221), cities are places in which both capital and people are accumulated. The accumulation of men inherently increases the cost of control apparatus. As Chapter 4 explained, from Foucault’s perspective, the systematic regulation of urban space alongside the expansion of disciplinary institutions such as schools, universities and hospitals, generates a control mechanism that effectively converts inhabitants into docile bodies through their internalisation of constant surveillance. This control mechanism mitigates the cost of operation of the control apparatus.

This research also identified the new function of urban projects in late capitalism. The primary function of the capitalistic city-assemblage and its components, including planning, is economic growth. Chapter 4 formulated the neoliberal city-assemblage as a ‘desiring-machine’ in which the production of new desires is indispensable for attracting flows of capital and workers. Market-oriented policies, including massive urban projects, privatisation and marketisation of urban spaces, have become the core of the process of desire production, which inherently reinforces the standardisation of urban space. Thus, the new function of regulating urban space is part of the desiring-machine of the neoliberal city.

The research contends that the standardisation of urban spaces is an inevitable consequence of the hegemony of global capitalism. The regulation of urban spaces also reveals the process of capital accumulation; it mitigates the cost of control and lures essential flows into the capitalistic city.
7.2.4.2-What role do urban plans and projects have in the homogenisation of urban space?

Planning tends to underpin the status quo. Under the hegemony of global neoliberalism, planning as a component of the entrepreneurial state serves the market. This investigation reveals that the function of contemporary planning is readjusted because of its interplay with other mechanisms to control economic growth. In this context, the regulatory capacity of planning is deployed as a bureaucratic instrument to standardise urban space and everyday life, which is necessary for capital accumulation in the city-assemblage. Based on Foucault's work, the research shows that planning mitigates the cost of the operation of the city-assemblage by regulating urban space. In addition, place promotion is crucial in a competitive environment. Thus, profitable urban projects, such as up-market property developments, waterfront redevelopment and convention centre construction, have proliferated in neoliberal cities. Neoliberalised planning is largely utilised to legitimise market-oriented regulative policies if needed, and to vindicate the establishment of urban development projects. In short, market-based planning creates technocratic-managerial pretexts for the homogenisation of the built environment based on global market demands.

7.2.4.3-Who benefits and who suffers as a consequence of the homogenisation of urban space under the hegemony of global capital values?

This investigation into contemporary planning in democratic and non-democratic regimes reveals that market-driven projects are established for the sake of the global market. The dominant social groups, in cooperation with their international co-partners, acquire a large portion of the generated benefits from the commodification of urban space. Nonetheless, the establishment of lucrative urban projects as a part of the process of desire production is obligatory for economic growth. Neoliberalism with its dysfunctional mechanism of wealth redistribution widens the income gaps between social classes. In this context, this research distinguishes two primary challenging issues based in the marketisation of urban space.

First, capital flows are pledged to places that produce the highest profit and have the lowest costs (Harvey, 2007). To compete with other cities, decision makers are induced to cut social and environmental regulatory standards to reduce costs. Harvey observed that the labour wage is one of
the most important expenses of production. Increasing labour wages in developed countries led to factories being relocated to developing countries in which wages were comparatively lower. In the competitive world, the global market dictates workers’ wages. The process of globalisation also generates flows of both skilled and unskilled workers. This exploitative mechanism challenges local low-income groups in general, and labourers in particular, who compete in the global market to obtain jobs. Despite massive urban projects generating job opportunities for inhabitants in general, and low-income groups in particular, the global exploitative mechanism, by imposing competitive conditions, decreases these workers’ opportunity to negotiate for higher salaries. From this perspective, low-income groups are disadvantaged due to being able to obtain only a fraction of the benefit generated by the standardisation of urban spaces.

Chapter 6 revealed that one of Dubai’s advantages is its large number of temporary workers; these are the main drivers of Dubai’s economic boom. Neoliberal globalism intensifies labour movements, which generates a global labour market. The global labour market reduces the opportunity for bargaining by workers, who can be replaced by cheaper and more docile workers if needed. In this context:

Dubai basically purchases its workforces on the international market to suit current needs: construction workers and domestic servants from the Indian subcontinent; nurses, doctors, and teachers from Egypt … highly educated persons with qualifications in technical or economic fields from Europe and the United States. (Hvidt, 2009, p. 403)

Thus, the global flow of workers reduces the cost of the globalised city-assemblage in general, and its urban development projects in particular.

Second, the enjoyment created, or promised, by market-driven urban projects are unaffordable for lower income groups in neoliberalised cities. In Dubai, for example, these massive urban projects are separated from lower-income parts of the city by visible and invisible gates. The controlling mechanism prevents certain of the city’s inhabitants, particularly the poor, from entering new areas and using their amenities. As a corollary of this, by excluding a large number of residents, market-driven urban projects intensify discontent in the neoliberal city.
Chapter Six demonstrated that the dominant local social groups, alongside their international co-partners, procure a large portion of the accumulated surplus value generated by the operation of the city-assemblage, including the standardisation of urban space. The dominant local groups possess most of the local resources, such as land, which are essential for capital accumulation. These dominant groups establish their interests as synonymous to the public good, which grants them interim public confirmation for the standardisation of urban space. This reinforces their hegemony in society and produces capital surplus value in the capitalistic city, of which they in turn take the bulk. Thus, the interests of these influential groups are intertwined with the benefits of global markets.

7.2.4.4-What role does the homogenisation of urban space play in reshaping and devaluing the diversity of resident values under the hegemony of global capital values?

The deployment of the Foucauldian notion of the ‘disciplinary society’ and the Deleuzian notion of the ‘society of control’ help in describing the impacts of the regulation of urban space on inhabitants’ behaviours. In Chapter 4, Section 4.4 elucidated that the homogenisation of urban space inherently encompasses the extension of surveillance over people’s activities in that space. Foucault stressed that the internalisation of this constant gaze generates a self-control mechanism by which people permanently control themselves based on the ordered criteria. The regulation of urban space is thus a component of the control apparatus. Under this constant surveillance, which is reinforced by the regulation of urban spaces in neoliberal cities, inhabitants are transformed to docile bodies, regardless to their socio-cultural background or position.

The regulation of space as a technology of control is based in the industrial era; and global capitalism expands the usage of the standardisation of urban space as a controlling instrument. Market-driven projects are mostly surrounded by physical barriers such as walls and gates. Further, these spaces are constantly under watch by cameras, much as in Orwell’s (1987) dystopian novel, Nineteen Eighty-Four, in which ‘big-brother’ had everyone under constant surveillance. In addition, police continue to control urban space physically as a legal force; and the quasi-public spaces of entertainment centres, shopping malls and gated communities are administered by private security guards. Thus, new urban projects, in combination with the privatisation and commodification of existing urban space, expand control over space in late capitalism.
Deleuze contended that the mechanism of control is ubiquitous in post-Fordist society. The notion of a 'control society' reflects the social, political, economic and technological transformations that have occurred since the 1980s. The society of control relies largely on electronic technologies. Deleuze (1992, p. 6) stressed that surveillance is not limited to enclosed spaces, but that new technologies expand the gaze to all aspects of daily life. These new digital technologies also significantly facilitate modern life. People are increasingly denoted by digital codes, which in turn provide access to facilities and spaces. Guattari contended that residents' accessibility to spaces and facilities can be restricted by deactivating their access codes (Deleuze, 1992, p. 7). Thus, the code-based system classifies residents in urban space; and their disposal of facilities depends on their ability to pay their debts and meet pre-defined criteria. Upon complying with the required conditions, access to spaces and facilities is granted. Whereupon, the control mechanism ensures that residents continue to fulfil the conditions, to remain eligible to use the facilities. In Chapter 4, Section 4.4 revealed that the control apparatus encompasses various controlling technologies such as punitive, disciplinary and coding mechanisms. This ubiquitous and incessant control reshapess people into coded docile bodies, or herds of consumers.

This section has responded to the four initial research questions using the key findings of previous chapters. The city-assemblage relies on the constant fluxes of capital and workers. Under the hegemony of global capitalism, globalised city-assemblages compete to lure a larger portion of the essential flows from the global market. Further, the research reveals that decision-makers, including planners, attempt to facilitate market operation by suggesting market-driven policies such as city marketing. The implementation of these market-oriented policies increasingly homogenise urban space. Thus, tall buildings, gated communities, shopping centres and entertainment complexes have proliferated as a consequence of the neoliberalisation of urban policies. The research shows that planning functions as a component of the neoliberal state apparatus. By suggesting, legitimising and implementing market-driven policies, planning facilitates capital accumulation in the globalised city. The consideration of the global market rationale showed that the dominant local groups and their foreign co-partners obtain the majority of the profits from the implementation of market-driven policies. Lower-income groups have access to only a fraction of the produced wealth. Drawing on the works of Foucault and Deleuze, this thesis demonstrates that planning is a component of the control apparatus in late capitalism.
This section endeavoured to generate insights into the role of planning in the globalised city, where it progressively operates based on the market rationale. This study indicates that neoliberalism as the dominant ideology determines the city-assemblage operation. However, hegemony is limited and impermanent and is challenged constantly by other ideologies.

7.3-Neoliberalism as a discontent intensifier

To respond to the remaining research questions, this section will address the intensification of discontent in the city-assemblage. Historically, cities have been the sites of the contestation of various socio-cultural, political and economic groups. Neoliberal globalisation significantly intensifies these contradictions (Tajbakhsh, 2001, p. 5). Based on Rousseau’s, Freud’s and Lacan’s works, Chapter Five contended that the production of discontent is not limited to contemporary society, but is an inherent product of any type of social order (McGowan, 2004). Nevertheless, the production of discontent does seem more problematic in the late capitalist age, in which neoliberalism significantly modifies the pre-existing social orders.

Neoliberalism converts a society of prohibition into a society of commanded enjoyment (McGowan, 2004). In Civilisation and its Discontents, Freud (2002) raised the issue of the existing relation between the production of discontent and enjoyment. His follower, Lacan (2006), developed the notion of jouissance (enjoyment) in his investigations and, more crucially, used it to critique the foundations of capitalism (Stavrakakis, 2008a, p. 85). By generating new desires for greater consumption, dominant capitalism pledges a surplus enjoyment (a plus-de-jouir) or advanced enjoyment. Drawing on Lacan, McGowan (2004) conceptualised contemporary society as the society of commanded enjoyment, which differs fundamentally from the pre-existing societies of prohibition. From this perspective, the maximisation of consumptive enjoyment is perceived as a primary duty, contrary to the society of prohibition, which restricted enjoyment based on the defined social orders. Thus, the promise of enjoyment is at the heart of neoliberalism, and is the reason that the ideology depends on the constant production of new desires (Žižek, 2012a).

The constant production of new desires is indispensable for the society of commanded enjoyment (Gunder, 2009; McGowan, 2004; Stavrakakis, 2008a). Based on Lacan’s notion of ‘lack’, Stavrakakis (2008a, p. 90) stresses that “[a]liened from natural need, incapable of any immediate access to ‘real’, ‘natural’ objects of satisfaction, human desire is always a desire for something else, for what is
lacking, for the part of the real impossible to articulate in demand”. From the Lacanian perspective, complete fulfilment is unattainable due to the occurrence of perpetual lack between what is desired and what is achieved. This lack is essential to the market operation, in which greater enjoyment is promised to customers through greater consumption. By promising greater enjoyment, the hegemonic market rationale persuades people that their endorsement of the market and its values is obligatory for achieving complete enjoyment. Gunder (2009, p. 292) points out:

“Individuals no longer submit to an exploitative labour market because of some imposed belief—work harder and your reward will be in heaven—but because of no belief, nothing other than the axiom of capital—the desire to buy more, work more, earn more, have more. That is the imperative to have more enjoyment, more happiness, for its good for you, your community and the nation.”

In this view, the unfulfilled subject constantly consumes the offered products, which all promise the unachievable advanced enjoyment. Thus, market operations result in continued consumption.

This thesis showed that the existence of lack also challenges the market operation and its hegemony. From the Lacanian perspective, the production of discontent results in the existence of perpetual lack. Antagonistic behaviour, vandalism and rebellion are detrimental to the operation of the neoliberal city-assemblage. Discontent and its symptoms prevent the capitalistic city-assemblage operation from achieving its intention of capital accumulation (Harvey, 2012). This research primarily considers the two mechanisms – the desiring-machine and control apparatus – whose operations are essential to maintaining the capitalistic city-assemblage. First, the production of discontent affects the production of new desires, which are obligatory for luring flows of capital and workers. By increasing antagonistic behaviour such as rebellion and transgression in neoliberal cities, the positive image of these cities are globally challenged. Second, growing disobedience and rebellion in contemporary society dramatically increases the cost of control apparatus operation. Harvey (2007) pointed out that strikes and riots caused by discontent significantly increase the expense of production. Thus, the capitalistic city-assemblage is challenged by the intensifying discontent, which is also rooted in the perpetual lack of the subject.

Neoliberalism transforms inhabitants into both docile and productive bodies by redirecting their enjoyment (Gunder, 2009, p. 292). However, again, the offered enjoyment is incomplete due to the
perpetual lack. Stavrakakis (2008a, p. 95) argues that “[t]he incapability to produce the satisfaction promised does not kill desire but, on the contrary, sets off a ‘cyclical quest’”. This continuous displacement constitutes the kernel of consumer culture. The cyclical quest of consumer culture is not sequential. The ineluctable dysfunctions of the market, such as economic crises, break the chain of production of new desires, which in turn intensifies discontent and its symptoms in contemporary society. Discontented residents are attracted to other ideologies, such as religious fundamentalism, which fantasise full enjoyment in its metaphorical forms. These ideologies promulgate violence in society by demonising others such as immigrants for the lack of enjoyment (McGowan, 2004; Žižek, 2011a). Thus, the perpetual lack is destructive as well as constructive.

Moreover, the dysfunction of neoliberalism in redistributing the produced wealth in society intensifies discontent in the neoliberal city. “Any ambitious agenda like neoliberalisation is going to produce political, as well as economic and social, instability. One central problem for neoliberalisation is that virtually everywhere it has produced rapidly rising material inequality, because its logic rewards winners and punishes losers” (Purcell, 2009, p. 144). The deployment of redistributing policies mitigated (material) inequality in the Keynesian era; but, the erosion of state welfare policies, such as economic redistribution, widens inequality in the neoliberal society (Fainstein, 2010; Harvey, 2005b; Purcell, 2008). In this context, powerful market actors, such as dominant local groups and their foreign co-partners, become the primary winners, while the working class are the losers.

One of the punishments for losers is their restriction from access to urban spaces and facilities. This persuades inhabitants to comply with required conditions to achieve the promised enjoyment. However, the prohibitions also aggravate discontent among people who cannot meet the requirements (Bayat, 2012; Kanai, 2010; Eijk, 2010). Thus, the dysfunction of neoliberalism, particularly its lack of a wealth redistribution mechanism, produces discontent in the neoliberal city.

By investigating Dubai as a neoliberal ‘utopia’, Chapter Six showed that the production of discontent is an inherent consequence of the neoliberalised city operation. Following the economic recession in 2008, the production of new desires in Dubai has been frustrated. Many scholars, including Elsheshtawy, Kanna and Buckley, have addressed the intensification of dissatisfaction, not merely among the large number of temporary workers, but also among indigenous Arab citizens and skilled expatriates, who reaped substantial benefits during Dubai’s hedonistic period. Assaults and
disobedience are on the rise among Arab citizens due to Dubai’s downturn. The discontented citizens are attracted to the pre-existing social order such as Islamism.

Large numbers of Dubai’s residents have limited access, or no access, to the new high-standard facilities built around the city. Thus while Dubai generates new desires for advanced enjoyment, these are unattainable for the majority poor inhabitants of the city. Temporary workers are also excluded from the wealth distribution mechanism, which includes free education and health insurance (Kanna, 2011; Vora, 2008). According to HRW (2010, 2011, 2012), strikes and riots and other antagonistic behaviours such as suicides are on the increase in Dubai.

This deeper understanding of neoliberalism and its role in intensifying discontent in contemporary society enables the researcher to answer the fifth research question.

7.3.1-How does discontent occur in the neoliberalised city as a consequence of the homogenisation of urban spaces?

This thesis showed that the mechanism of discontent accumulation in the contemporary city is primarily embedded in neoliberalism. The standardisation of urban space because of neoliberalism plays a role in the intensification of discontent.

The implementation of market-driven policies breeds feelings of despair and alienation among the neoliberalised city’s residents (González & Lejano, 2009). In Chapter 4, Section 4.3 considered how massive urban projects such as waterfront development projects and entertainment centres constantly reshape the contemporary city’s built environment. The rapid physical urban transition, in combination with a widening deprivation in neoliberal society, alienates residents from their cities.

Chapter Three revealed that locals mostly blame foreigners for urban transition and their alienation. Indigenous citizens often misidentify the cause of urban transition because rapid urban transition generally coincides with a growth in a city’s socio-cultural heterogeneity. The implementation of city-marketing projects, including urban projects, lures creative class immigrants into the neoliberalised city. The homogenisation of urban spaces and increasing socio-cultural diversity are consequences of the hegemony of global neoliberalism. The effect – an increasing number of others – is thus misidentified as the cause of urban transformation and residents’
alienation. Thus, the actual cause, neoliberalism, is overlooked, as the hegemonic ideology tends to be accepted as an unquestionable reality.

The standardisation of urban spaces also generates discontent among expatriates. By generating new desires, the neoliberal city-assemblage endeavours to lure creative class workers to the city. However, the high-standard facilities that were so appealing are not affordable for lower income arrivals. The study of Dubai reveals that visible and invisible barriers, such as gated communities or controlling policies, prohibit the access of foreign workers, particularly South Asian labourers, to newly developed neighbourhoods (Ali, 2010, p. 28). Thus, these expatriates feel deceived by not having access to the glamorous projects that drew them to Dubai (Hunt, 2011).

Gunder (2011a, p. 188) observed that:

planners, unlike many calling themselves urban design practitioners, are aware of these crucial issues of capitalism and the problems and inequities that accrue from them; or at least, they have been trained to be aware in their planning education, where they have been provided with the normative framework to, where possible, try to act against this often oppressive and ecologically unsustainable consumptive vision of the city.

Yet, notwithstanding this knowledge, planners mostly evade the adverse effects of the city-marketing policies such as intensification of discontent under the hegemony of global neoliberalism. This section revealed that the dominant ideology, neoliberalism, is the main source of the accumulated discontent in the neoliberalised city. This key finding assists to respond to research question number five.

7.4-(Re)Politcisation of contemporary planning

To respond to the last research question, this section will consider why the side effects of city-marketing policies, including the establishment of massive urban projects, have been largely neglected by contemporary planning. “Planning is the ideology of how we define and use space” (Gunder, 2010b, p. 299). This chapter reveals that planning as a component of the neoliberal city-assemblage inherently intertwines with other mechanisms. More importantly, the hegemonic ideology constantly redefines planning and regulates its interactions with other mechanisms to sustain economic growth. Based on the Žižekian notion of the ‘unknown knowns’, as comprehensively
defined in Chapter 2, Section 2.7, this section contends that neoliberalised planning is knowledge that does not know the adverse influence it has on society, such as in the intensification of discontent.

Planning theorists including Friedmann (1987), Healey (1997), Gunder and Hillier (2009), Flyvbjerg (2001) and Yiftachel (1998b), among others, have sought to define the dimensions of planning that have been neglected. Pløger (2001a, p. 63) observed urban planning since the 1980s as “turning away from pure physical environmental planning, and moving towards social environmental planning, and the term ‘social sustainability’ moved into the vocabulary”. Planning theorists such as Bollens (1998), Sandercock (2005), Watson (2006) and Yiftachel (2000), among others, have considered the socio-cultural contradictions in the late capitalist era, despite the on-going lack of a critical foundation in planning theory to address the ignored dimensions in general, and the ignored socio-cultural aspects in particular (Gunder, 2011a). The current research shows that the production of discontent and its destructive symptoms, such as antagonistic behaviours due to the implementation of market-driven policies, have been largely ignored by neoliberalised planning.

In Chapter 2, Section 2.2 revealed that neoliberalism constantly reshapes planning knowledge as an apolitical knowledge, to make it a more effective component of global capitalism. This research shows that neoliberalism generally promotes a scientific approach and urban design methods, both of which are ontologically incapable of critically addressing the failures of market-oriented plans.

Lefebvre (1991) was the first to indicate that planning knowledge is largely dominated by positivistic scientific, which is unable to fully address urban phenomena. Later, Flyvbjerg (2001) emphasised the inadequacies of natural-based knowledge to grasp the mechanism of human activities. Despite planning theorists’ struggles to reveal the deficiencies of scientific approaches, planners continue to utilise them to investigate urban issues, including the measurable symptoms of socio-cultural contradictions.

Under the hegemony of neoliberalism, planning is progressively being replaced by urban design (Cuthbert, 2001; Madanipour, 2006; Punter, 2007). Gunder (2011a, p. 185) stresses that:

[c]ontemporary urban design, as an independent field, is largely a creation and product of neoliberalism, because it effectively mirrors its values of reification and façade, the
superficial, the surface, in the commodification of the built environment for the achievement of capital accumulation under competitive globalisation.

Thus, urban-design-based development seems more effective for the neoliberal city-assemblage as compared to traditional planning practices such as comprehensive plans or structure plans, which are largely perceived as inflexible in responding to dynamic market demands. Chapter Six has demonstrated that urban design projects shape Dubai as an agglomerate city. By applying a flexible mechanism of urban-project-based development, the ruler effectively redirects Dubai’s growth based on global market demands. Following the shelving of the last structural plan of Dubai, the Sheikh, as local landowner and holder of all resources, in collaboration with international urban developers, established massive enclosed urban projects at the neighbourhood wide scale based on site plans. This research conceptualises this neoliberal planning practice as ‘planning without the plan’, which encompasses urban design projects and neighbourhood-level site plans. The research also drew on scientific, planning and engineering-based technical knowledge, as required; for example, in development of the Dubai metro system (Zi, 2010).

This thesis demonstrates that the dominant market ideology largely renders planning an apolitical knowledge. Neoliberalism promotes the use of scientific methods alongside urban design in contemporary planning. Beck (2006) elucidates that scientific-based understandings aim to achieve certainty, which is imperative for market operation. Further, urban design is largely deployed for producing new desires in neoliberalised cities. However, neither the scientific method nor urban design is ontologically able to address the failures of market operations. The role of the dominant power in shaping knowledge thus becomes apparent. Drawing on Lacan, Gunder and Hillier (2009) demonstrated that it is clear that under the hegemony of neoliberal globalism, contemporary planning is enmeshed with market-driven values and norms. Based on Žižek’s work, the thesis contends that contemporary planning is an ‘unknown-known’.

Unknown-knowns refer to "the things we don’t know that we know" (Žižek, 2006b, p. 137). This concept encompasses the Freudian unconscious. “From a psycho-analytical point of view, the unconscious is exactly about a knowledge which doesn’t know itself; it is not some deep buried unknown secret, it is the self-evident lying at the very surface” (DeVos, 2009, p. 225). From a Žižekian perspective, unknown-knowns constitute most decisions, or at least their impacts on the process of
decision-making are significant. Žižek (2008b, p. 66) states that unknown-knowns are the most problematic issue in the process of decision-making because:

these disavowed beliefs and suppositions are the ones which prevent us from really believing in the possibility of the catastrophe, and they combine with the unknown unknowns. The situation is like that of the blind spot in our visual field: we do not see the gap, the picture appears continuous.

From this perspective, the intensification of discontent and its symptoms such as rebellion, strikes and vandalism increasingly challenge the neoliberal city operation. By promoting uncritical methods, that is, positivistic scientific method and urban design, dominant capitalistic ideology impedes planners from recognising the consequences of implementing market-oriented policies. “We know it, but we cannot make ourselves believe in what we know” (Žižek, 2008b, 66). Therefore, contemporary planning practice, which is utterly enmeshed in market values, is incapable of identifying neoliberalism as the main resource of discontent in the globalised city.

In Dubai, the prosperity of the city is grounded on extensive exploitation, exclusion and socio-cultural segregation. Contemporary planning, which is enmeshed in market values cannot recognise exploitation and discrimination as a problematic issue in Dubai. More importantly, by emphasising the neutrality of planning, planners largely repudiate the political function of market-driven policies in the reinforcement of the dominant ideology.

The study of neoliberal planning as a component of the neoliberal city-assemblage demonstrates that “planning is politics, something we all recognise today” (Alexander, 2001, p. 312). Neoliberalism as the dominant ideology extensively promotes depoliticisation of all aspects of contemporary society. Nevertheless, the depoliticisation is inherently a political struggle (Miraftab, 2004; Swyngedouw, 2010). Büscher (2010, p. 32) emphasises that:

Since development institutions [including planning] are not mandated to mingle in politics, but to stimulate ‘technical’ development, they must follow the political [ideological] strategy of portraying their development targets as non-political in order to justify their intervention.
Chapter 5 investigated the Habermasian consensus-based approaches, which have been used in the planning mainstream for two decades (Allmendinger, 2002; Allmendinger & Tewdwr-Jones, 2001). Both collaborative planning and communicative planning endeavour to achieve agreement across diverse socio-political actors and to eradicate antagonism based on a common rationality. Planners as apolitical actors have attempted to facilitate communications between various socio-political groups to create a consensus-based strategy. However, this system gives the superficial appearance of engagement and legitimacy, whilst focusing on delivering growth expedited through some carefully choreographed processes for participation which minimise the potential for those with conflicting views to be given a meaningful hearing (Allmendinger & Haughton, 2012, p. 90).

This research indicates that apolitical planning as unknown-knowns is ontologically incapable of considering the contemporary urban space as the space of power, conflict and antagonism; that is, as ‘political’. Planning is politics, in its Mouffian definition, which refers to it as “the set of practices and institutions through which an order is created, organising human coexistence in the context of conflictuality provided by the political” (Mouffe, 2005, p. 9). The recognition of planning as politics enables an answer to the final research question.

7.4.1-How can urban planning and design practice decrease the adverse impacts of the neoliberal urban transformation in neoliberalised cities?

This dissertation contends that planning tends to confirm and underpin the status quo. The ignored adverse impacts of implementing market-driven policies such as the intensification of antagonism increasingly frustrate the neoliberalised city-assemblage operation, or at least increase the cost of control in the city.

Planning theorists have attempted to address the consequences of contemporary planning practice by the deployment of critical ideas of philosophers, sociologists and critical thinkers (Gunder, 2011a). However, because of the hegemony of neoliberalism, dominant scientific methods and urban design techniques have become hegemonic in contemporary planning as they do not contradict this dominant status quo. Neither of these approaches is ontologically capable of grasping the kernel of the urban problems embedded in the dysfunction of dominant neoliberalism. Therefore, technocratic solutions, including both science-based plans and urban design projects, are often deficient for solving the problems in contemporary cities. More crucially, the dominant ideology promotes these
superficial attempts at addressing the increasing dissatisfaction generated through the neoliberal city-assemblage operation (Glynos et al., 2012).

Notwithstanding existing trends, contemporary planning should be (re)politicised, to be able to identify the adverse consequences of market-oriented policies. The deployment of critical political theories creates new capacities to recognise the relations between contemporary planning and the dominant ideology. In the current apolitical context, planning as a component of the state apparatus operates solely according to particular values and norms determined by the dominant ideology. The regulative capacity of planning as a bureaucratic instrument is extensively utilised to reinforce the hegemonic ideology. The investigation of Dubai shows how ‘capitalism with Arabic tribal values’ deploys the regulative capacity of planning to strengthen its hegemony.

Yiftachel (1989) observes that a role of planning theorists is to increasingly expand the idea of the politicisation of planning. This thesis also revealed that the politicisation of planning is indispensable in late capitalism. Žižek (2009) argues that non-democratic capitalistic mechanisms such as Dubai are more effective and prosperous than the liberal democracies. By investigating Dubai as an autocratic mechanism, Chapter 6 showed that the centralised decision-making practiced by Dubai’s ruler is widely perceived to be the main factor accelerating Dubai’s economic growth. Mouffe stresses that under the hegemony of global neoliberalism, the prosperity of autocratic mechanisms influences the democratic mechanism, including the process of decision-making in liberal democracies (Carpentier & Cammaerts, 2006). Thus, the politicisation of planning is necessary to preserve its democratic trait.

This is increasingly important in this recent period of global economic recession, which widens the socio-political rupture, increases socio-cultural contradictions and expands political instability. The dominant understandings in neoliberalised planning are ontologically incapable of addressing the core of the socio-political tensions in contemporary cities. Planning should be (re)politicised to allow it to identify the kernel of socio-cultural conflict and to apply policies aimed at mitigating the destructive impacts of antagonism in contemporary cities.

This section responded to the final research question, by arguing that the first stage in mitigating the side effects of the implementation of market-orientated policies is the (re) politicisation of planning.
7.5-Conclusion

This chapter addressed the research objectives and responded to the research questions based on the conceptualisation of the contemporary city as a neoliberal city-assemblage. It argued that planning as a component of the state apparatus is enmeshed in the norms and values determined by the hegemonic ideology. Global capitalism, as the hegemonic ideology, permeates local economic, socio-cultural and political mechanisms, including the state and its components, such as planning. By investigating city-marketing policies and their role in generating new desires and control apparatuses, the research identifies that contemporary planning works to facilitate the process of capital accumulation in the neoliberal city. However, neoliberalised planning, as an unknown-known, cannot recognise its adverse side effects on society, such as the accumulation of discontent. The key finding of this chapter is the need for the deployment of critical political ideas in planning; that is, the (re)politicisation of planning, as necessary for the discipline to recognise the dysfunction of neoliberalism and its symptoms, such as increasing urban conflict, and to be able to take measures to mitigate it.
Chapter Eight: Conclusion

*In fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth.*

(Foucault, 1995)

8.1-Introduction

This thesis endeavoured to conceptualise the contemporary city operation and its products in the age of late capitalism. This concluding chapter connects the key findings with the thesis objectives and research questions. The thesis objectives were to determine whether neoliberalism as the hegemonic ideology standardises the contemporary city’s built environment and, simultaneously, intensifies its socio-cultural heterogeneity. The inadequacy of positivistic approaches in responding to this question required the deployment of critical theory for analysing the impacts of neoliberalism on the globalised city. Drawing on Deleuze, Foucault and Lacan, this dissertation conceptualised the contemporary city-assemblage in which desire and control accumulation are essential for economic growth. In this context, planning was deemed as largely used to reproduce new desires and expand control over urban space in the neoliberalised city. The implementation of market-oriented policies inherently standardises urban space and lures available foreign workers. However, the neoliberalised city is also a place of discontent accumulation, due to the neglect of the pleas of large numbers of inhabitants. Contemporary planning as a body of apolitical knowledge is enmeshed in market values and discourse such that it cannot distinguish the dysfunctions of neoliberalism as the hegemonic ideology. This thesis stressed that contemporary planning should be (re)politicised, to be able to address the symptoms of discontent accumulation, such as urban conflict.

The following section returns to the motivations of the research. Section 8.3 explains how the key findings assist to respond to the research questions and the thesis objectives. Section 8.4 reveals the challenges that arose during the completion of the dissertation; and Section 8.5 recommends some further investigations in the discipline.
8.2-Motivation of study

This research reflects my experience as a professional planner in Iran. Since the 1990s, Dubai, due to its economic boom, called ‘Dubaisation’, has greatly influenced the Middle East (Elsheshtawy, 2004). Global forces transformed Dubai from a fishing village into a prosperous global city; making it the primary trade, entertainment and service hub of the region (Bagaeen, 2007). However, contrary to other oil-based states, the real-estate market has been the main driver of Dubai’s economic growth (The Goverment of Dubai, 2007). The Sheikh of Dubai, as de facto CEO, governs the city-company (Davis, 2006; Kanna, 2009a), and the implementation of market-driven policies, such as the ‘tax-free policy’ and ‘freehold ownership’, have lured international investors into Dubai’s real estate market. “For the Middle East, Dubai’s model of urbanism once offered a shining example of progressive urbanity that had eluded other urban centres in the region” (Elsheshtawy, 2010b, p. 53). Thus, Dubai’s massive urban projects have greatly affected planning and urban development policies in the region.

However, “[a]lthough Dubai is growing as a new competing global city and introducing an Arabic version of globalisation, the process of ‘Dubaisation’ is constantly criticised” (Arabady, 2013, p. 2). Following the economic crisis in 2008, Dubai’s economic bubble burst. Consequently, a large number of urban projects, such as the second Palm Island, were withdrawn or postponed. Despite this, Dubai maintains its position as the primary trade hub in the region, although it has lost its reputation as a prosperous model of development. This rise and fall of Dubai as a neoliberal utopia persuaded me to conduct an investigation of neoliberal globalisation and its role in (re)shaping contemporary cities.

Further, Dubaisation as a part of the global hegemony has affected urban policies and plans in Iran, regardless of the ideological differences between ‘capitalism with Arabic tribal values’ in Dubai and the dominant Shi’ism in Iran. By imitating Dubai’s policies, decision-makers, including planners, increasingly implemented market-oriented policies in Iranian cities in general and the capital, Tehran, in particular. These new policies and plans challenged the pre-existing definition of planning, the function of which was defined as to, at least in theory, serve the public good. Yet, gigantic shopping malls, entertainment centres and iconic architectural buildings have proliferated across the region because of the implementation of market-driven policies. This significant transition in the role of planning convinced me to investigate the functions of contemporary planning under the hegemony of global capitalism.
Dubai is recognised as one of the most socio-culturally diverse cities in the world. More than 90 per cent of its residents are foreign workers (Hvidt, 2009). Contrary to most global cities, such as London and New York, which are located in liberal democracies, the political mechanism in Dubai is autocratic and embedded in tribalism. The dominant ideology is a hierarchical system that inherently segregates Dubai’s residents based on their socio-ethnicity. A 2006 HRW report drew attention to the deplorable conditions of foreign workers, particularly construction labours in Dubai. This report was followed by other remonstrative reports, articles and books, criticising the exploitative mechanism in Dubai. Following the economic downturn in 2008, large numbers of temporary residents left Dubai. Reports emerged in the media about the lamentable condition of foreign workers still trapped in the city. Yet, Dubai remains a primary destination for temporary workers in the region. Through my investigation, I attempted to reveal how Dubai as a non-democratic mechanism continues to lure a large number of expatriates.

The economic recession intensified discontent and its symptoms such as antagonism as reflections of the exploitative mechanism in Dubai. Moreover, the emergence of socio-political movements such as ‘Occupy Wall Street’ and ‘the Arab Spring’ demonstrates that the accumulation of discontent is not limited to Dubai with its autocratic mechanism, but is a global phenomenon. Drawing on critical theory, I addressed the intensification of discontent in the globalised city in general and Dubai in particular. More importantly, the thesis investigated the role of market-oriented policies in exacerbating antagonism.

8.3-Key findings and their connectivity with thesis objectives and research questions

Neoliberalism as the dominant ideology constantly reshapes local socio-cultural, economic and political mechanisms, and the transition of local systems inherently influences city operation. This thesis endeavoured to generate insight into the transition of a city in late capitalism. The research investigated the homogenisation of urban spaces (Koolhaas, 2002; Townshend & Madanipour, 2008) and the intensification of socio-ethnical heterogeneity (Parekh, 2000; Sandercock, 2005) as characteristics of the globalised city. This thesis contended that the processes of homogenisation of urban space and intensification of socio-ethnicity heterogeneity are expedited under the hegemony of
neoliberal globalism. It was thus asked: How are urban spaces homogenised under the hegemony of neoliberal global values in late capitalism?

Drawing on Lacan, Foucault and Deleuze, Chapter Two addressed the ontological failures of positivistic understandings in social science. Then, by deploying critical ideas such as ‘assemblage’ and ‘desiring-machine’ by Deleuze, ‘disciplinary society’ by Foucault and ‘jouissance’ and ‘lack’ by Lacan, I detailed the impacts of neoliberal globalism on the contemporary city.

Chapter Three reviewed the literature on globalisation and its impacts on local mechanisms to respond to this question. The investigation revealed that globalisation is not a new phenomenon, but that the market rationale of neoliberalism strengthens the process of globalisation to facilitate market operation. Thus, globalisation and neoliberalism are generally perceived as conjunctive trends, collectively termed as neoliberal globalism. Neoliberal globalism is a hegemonic and ubiquitous process that constantly readjusts local socio-cultural, economic and political systems. From this perspective, global forces constantly restructure local mechanisms to operate effectively within global capitalism. However, these transformations of local mechanisms are multifarious due to the variety of local mechanisms involved.

The work of urban scholars such as Friedmann (2002), Newman and Thornley (2002), Hall (2001) and Sassen (1991, 2009), among others, was reviewed to consider the impacts of globalisation on contemporary cities. Following conceptualising the ‘global city’, these researchers ranked cities based on their interdependency in the global network. Globalised cities were deemed essential components of global capitalism; however, most of these investigations were based on traditional scientific methods, which are ontologically incapable of addressing significant urban phenomena pertaining to human subjectification (Flyvbjerg, 2001; Gunder & Hillier, 2009; Lefebvre, 1991).

Chapter Four utilised Deleuzian notions to consider the globalised city within global capitalism and to reveal its dependency on the global flows of capital and workers. These constant flows are imperative for economic growth, which is determined as the primary function of the globalised city. Under the flag of neoliberal globalisation, globalised cities compete to lure a larger portion of the essential flows. Theorising the city as a desiring-machine assisted in revealing the necessity of desire production in the globalised city for attracting these flows. Based on these concepts, the processes of standardisation of urban space in the globalised city were considered. It was revealed that ‘city
marketing’ and ‘place branding’ policies generate desires that lure investors in the neoliberal city. The conceptualisation of ‘city as a desiring-machine’ also assisted in answering the second research question: What role do urban plans and projects have in the homogenisation of urban spaces? Large urban projects were determined to homogenise urban space based on global market demands.

Further, by conceptualising the city as a desiring-machine in Chapter Four, the research revealed the impacts of the implementation of market-oriented policies in general, and urban projects in particular, in intensifying socio-cultural heterogeneity in globalised cities. Writing on American cities, Florida (2002) discussed the role of the creative class as human capital in economic growth. In addition, Gunder (2009) stressed that urban amenities and high-standard infrastructure are imperative to lure workers in a society of commanded enjoyment. In this context, decision makers and planners work to create an appealing image of the city, such as by using rhetoric such as ‘multicultural city’, ‘liveable city’ and ‘sustainable city’ (Gunder & Hillier, 2009) alongside the establishment of massive urban projects, such as waterfront projects (Dovey, 2005).

For Foucault (1991), capital accumulation in the capitalistic city is dependent on worker accumulation and, more crucially, on the efficiency with which people are converted into docile and productive bodies. During industrialisation, the systematic regulation of space was developed to increase surveillance over the city’s residents. Deleuze (1992) observed that new digital technologies operate in combination with the regulation of space to expand state and related observation over inhabitants’ behaviours. Therefore, the standardisation of urban spaces has a dual function within the globalised city-assemblage. First, it is a component of the desiring-machine, and second, it decreases the cost of the control apparatus.

In Chapter 5, the research recognised that urban conflict challenges dominant political mechanisms, or at least increases the cost of the control apparatus. Although the accumulation of discontent in the globalised city is mostly neglected, or misinterpreted, in favour of the interest of the dominant power, discontent is inherently generated as a consequence of living in any form of society (Freud, 2002). The research demonstrated that neoliberalism intensifies antagonism in the contemporary city by marginalising large numbers of people from the distribution of wealth and by excluding ‘others’ from the process of decision-making. In this context, large numbers of residents are deprived through the implementation of market-oriented policies, including the development of mega-
sized urban projects, alongside the privatisation and commodification of existing space in the globalised city. Accordingly, the globalised city was theorised as a discontent-intensifier.

Chapter Six studied Dubai as a neoliberal utopia based on the concepts of ‘city-assemblage’, ‘city as a desiring-machine’, ‘city as a normalising machine’ and ‘city as discontent-intensifier’. The investigation revealed that Dubai is an instant city, having been transformed from a fishing village into a global city over the period of a few decades (Bagaeen, 2007). Dubai’s prosperity is largely dependent on flows of capital and workers. The implementation of incentive policies, such as a tax-free policy, in combination with the establishment of immense urban projects and iconic architectural buildings have constituted Dubai’s brand (Davis, 2006). These policies and projects are a component of Dubai’s desiring-machine, which promises consumption, enjoyment and prestige. The regulative capacity of planning is largely utilised in this context to reinforce the control apparatus by expanding surveillance in the city. Labour camps and enclosed communities alongside the implementation of policies such as “one family, one villa” extend control over Dubai’s residents in general, and temporary workers (others) in particular. Based on sources such as the HRW reports (2006, 2010, 2011, 2012), the research illustrated that the operation of Dubai as a city-assemblage inherently intensifies discontent and its symptoms such as strikes and riots. The intensification of discontent is embedded in the dominant ideology, ‘capitalism with Arabic tribal values’, which is the combination of neoliberal capitalism as the dominant global ideology, with tribalism as the pre-existing ideology in Dubai. The results of Chapter 6 were utilised to respond to the thesis’s secondary research objective: to demonstrate the impacts of urban planning and design on shaping multicultural identity in the neoliberalised global city.

The key findings are extensively explained in Chapter 7. Based on these findings, all research questions were addressed. The concepts including ‘city as an assemblage’ and ‘city as a desiring-machine’ in Chapter Four, alongside ‘a city as normalising-machine’ in Chapter 5, assisted in responding to the first and second research questions: How are urban spaces homogenised under the hegemony of neoliberal globalism?; and, What role do urban plans and projects have in the homogenisation of urban space? By investigating the function of contemporary planning as a component of the capitalistic city-assemblage, the research revealed that planning is regulated to facilitate capital accumulation. Thus, contemporary planning plays a primary role in decoding and recoding urban space based on market values.
In answering the third research question, the results of Chapters 3, 4 and 6 were utilised. The research indicated that the domestic dominant groups who control local resources, such as land, in cooperation with their international co-partners, obtain a large portion of the wealth generated through the standardisation of urban space. The marketisation of urban space increasingly prohibits the majority of inhabitants, especially the lower income groups, from accessing urban amenities. Based on the outcomes of Chapter Five, the research identified the implementation of market-driven projects as producing discontent in the globalised city.

Based on critical theory, this thesis has responded to all of its research questions, thereby developing a profound understanding of the homogenisation of urban space under globalisation which constitutes the thesis’s first and, primary, research objective. In particular, this dissertation has considered the impacts of market-oriented policies, including massive urban projects, on intensifying socio-cultural heterogeneity in neoliberalised cities.

8.4-The primary problems faced in the investigation

In writing this thesis, the primary challenges encountered related to the research methodologies and analysing information. These problems stemmed from the dominant ideology in Dubai, ‘capitalism with Arabic tribal values’, which generated the following limitations for this research.

First, the arbitrary style of decision making by the executive in Dubai obscures the processes behind the determination of the city’s urban development policies. The Sheikh of Dubai as a de facto city-company owner governs the city as a company. He and his coadjutants privately take decisions about urban development policies and projects, and the new rules, policies and plans are subsequently declared by the ruler. Thus, there was inadequate information of the processes of decision-making regarding these policies in Dubai.

Second, following the HRW report in 2006 regarding the conditions of labourers in Dubai, a process of concealment was begun regarding the existence of inequality in the city. This process included increased control over the media, NGOs and scholars, and a censorship policy banning the conduct of research on labourers’ conditions in Dubai. In this context, it was decided that face-to-face interviews with labours, company owners or human rights activists in Dubai was too dangerous. This created problems, particularly in responding to research question four – who benefits and loses from
the values of globalisation. To tackle the limitation, I utilised secondary data such as HRW reports and informal interviews as empirical evidence for analysing Dubai and its exploitative mechanism.

8.5-Opportunities for further investigations

This investigation creates new opportunities for further investigations in the discipline. Based on the research achievements, three main areas emerge for future work.

First, the research demonstrated that the increasing socio-political conflicts in the contemporary city are embedded in the dysfunctions of global neoliberalism, and this occurs even in non-democratic regimes. Moreover, planning operates based on a framework determined by the dominant ideology, which contrasts with the work of many planning theorists such as Forester (1982) on communicative planning and Healey (1997) on collaborative planning, which have endeavoured to mitigate social conflicts. Critical thinkers in politics such as Mouffe have revealed the failures of the Habermasian, and related approaches to eliminate social contradictions by generating a communicative rationality. Planning theorists such as Allmendinger and Haughton (2012) and Purcell (2009) have illustrated how Habermasian-based theories are deployed to legitimise market-oriented policies in favour of the dominant group. To reduce the destructive antagonism in autocratic mechanisms such as Dubai, further investigations are required into planning/conflicts.

Comparative studies will contribute to the discipline by generating understanding of the role of planning in (re)shaping global cities. Further investigations on other newly emerged global cities such as Singapore, Hong Kong, Macau, Doha and Abu Dhabi, based on the theorised concepts used in this study, will generate a better understanding of neoliberal globalisation and its impacts on contemporary cities.

Globalisation has largely reshaped the Middle East, particularly following the discovery of oil resources in the region. Flows of oil-money and foreign workers have restructured the pre-existing socio-cultural, economic and political systems. These transformations have inherently changed the cities in the region; and oil-money and massive urban development projects continue to lure international companies, developers and investors to the Middle East. The transformation of, and problems in, Middle Eastern cities have been largely neglected in academia. During the last decade, urban researchers such as Elsheshtawy (2004, 2010a), among others, have considered Middle
Eastern cities; however, there remains a significant knowledge gap in the theoretical field of urban studies, including planning, regarding the region. Thus, this thesis, and future related work, will contribute to filling this existing gap through investigating urban problems in the Middle East based on critical theories in general, and post-structuralism in particular.

8.6-Conclusion

When I started on this academic journey, I was curious about how hegemonic neoliberal globalisation transforms the contemporary city. Further, my work experience as a professional planner persuaded me to investigate the role of contemporary planning practice, including massive urban projects, in reshaping the globalised city. To achieve this, I travelled from Iran, my home country, to New Zealand, to pursue my goals and, of course, attain a better lifestyle.

My personal experience as an immigrant, as part of the global flow of workers, has had a significant effect on this dissertation. Through writing my thesis, I have identified the primary incentives that attract creative class immigrants to globalised cities such as Auckland, the city in which I currently live. Socio-cultural heterogeneity, a unique natural environment and high-standard amenities such as The University of Auckland shape Auckland as one of the best cities in the world in which to live. Its reputation lures large numbers of immigrants to Auckland. Thus, this dissertation also reflects my personal experience.

Through teaching planning in both Iran and New Zealand, I have witnessed the hegemony of positivistic approaches and urban design in the discipline. By promoting these apolitical understandings, the hegemonic neoliberal globalism defines planning as a technocratic-managerial discipline, whose function is to serve the market and facilitate capital accumulation in neoliberalised cities. Apolitical planning practice thus neglects the political consequences of implementing market-oriented policies, plans, bylaws and urban projects in contemporary cities.

During my PhD programme, several urban conflicts, such as the Arab Spring, Occupy Wall Street and those in Stockholm, Brazil and Turkey, have occurred. These contradictions have demonstrated the dysfunction of neoliberalism and its market rationale, which underpins contemporary society, including planning practice. These urban conflicts further provide a firm impetus to challenge the apolitical neoliberalised planning approach.
Once I have finished my PhD, my academic journey will be continued. The findings of my dissertation convince me that constantly challenging the hegemonic ideology and the dominant powers is the way to shape a better society. Thus, I will deploy this thesis and its achievements as a basis for further investigations in planning theory.
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