

BULLETIN 2

AUTUMN 2005



EDITORIAL

Welcome to the Urban Age Bulletin, the series of documents charting the progress of the Urban Age conferences as we move from city to city, from New York to Shanghai, from London to Mexico City, from Johannesburg to Berlin. This bulletin is designed as an informal vehicle of communication for the Urban Age project, a two-year sequence of investigations on cities across the globe, jointly organised by the London School of Economics and the Alfred Herrhausen Society, the International Forum of the Deutsche Bank. Alongside the website (www.urban-age.net), individual conference newspapers and reflection papers by urban experts, the bulletin facilitates the evolving international dialogue between urban policymakers, designers, academics and 'city builders'. At the heart of the Urban Age project lies the ambition to better understand how people live, work, move and engage with the contemporary city, at a moment of intense urban growth and transformation.

This second edition of the Bulletin revisits the Urban Age Shanghai conference held in July 2005. It contains a selection of contributions to the conference discussions and texts from members of the traveling group – Deyan Sudjic, Gerald Frug and Saskia Sassen. Please read it as a short summary indicative of the breadth of the debates and the richness of opinions and positions contributed by the conference speakers, respondents and participants. This first cut of our ongoing investigation will be followed up by additional material that will be made available on our website and included in the Urban Age "blueprint for cities" to be published at the end of 2006.

The Urban Age Shanghai conference provided the travelling group with a unique opportunity to test our ideas in a different political, economic and cultural context. It was also enormously stimulating to experience first-hand the lights and shades of a city that is growing, demographically and economically, at such accelerated speed. We feel privileged with the breath of know-ledge and insights that our colleagues from Shanghai and the broader Asia Pacific region brought to the discussions and welcome them to our interdisciplinary and international network. We look forward to many more discussions and a prolific exchange of ideas.

Urban Age is a worldwide series of conferences investigating the future of cities

Organised by the Cities Programme at the London School of Economics and Political Science and the Alfred Herrhausen Society, the International Forum of Deutsche Bank



Alfred Herrhausen Society
The International Forum of Deutsche Bank



SIGNALLING CHANGES

DEYAN SUDJIC

Cedric Price was an English architect who built almost nothing while he was alive. He had a way with ideas and words that have left more of a legacy than most architects who spend their entire careers building. It was Price who suggested that, given the treacle-like speed of the construction process, all buildings are out of date before they are finished. A modern office used to be built around its mainframe computer sitting at the centre of a deep plan block housed in sterile conditions like a hospital operating theatre. But even before its acolytes had moved into those offices, this pampered computer god had been supplanted by a flock of laptops sitting on every desk. Airports that were first planned for Boeing 707's will have to operate with the Airbus 380. Financial services offices used to be built around trading rooms the size of football pitches but that was no longer the way the dealers did business even before they were finished, and those trading rooms were instantly made redundant.

Even Cedric Price might have been a little unnerved by Shanghai. Architecture happens so fast there, that the city might seem as if it stands a better chance than most places of avoiding the particular trap that he warned against. It's not being made redundant before it's finished, that's the trouble in Shanghai. The problem may more likely be that construction starts so fast that there is no time to work out just exactly what the building is going to do before it's built. Very often it seems to turn into something else en-route. Shanghai is one of those cities that had to build an idea of what it was going to be before it could start living that future. When the City Planning Museum, which is one of the places that all new visitors come to see in Shanghai, was first put up the city, as far as the world outside China was concerned, was a place that might have been seen as gone to sleep. It was no longer the financial centre that it had once been, nor the cosmopolitan hub that it was in the 1930s. So the first step that it took to transform itself into a new kind of metropolis was to announce to the world what it was going to be and that ultimately was a statement about what it was going to look like.

Shanghai built a new skyline that is famous now, a skyline that could be understood as an attempt to measure itself against its rivals. "Pay attention" is the message of all those towers. They may not be as beautiful but they send precisely the same signal that Siena wanted to send when it built a tower for its town hall almost 300 feet high 600 years ago. "Build the towers" seems to be the message and "people will follow" still seems to be the same unstated belief now as it was in Siena. Towers are symbols but they are also a vital step in achieving substance. Shanghai of course is not the only city in the world that believes in the uses of symbolism as a practical planning tool. Look for example at the enormous symbolic investment in the reconstruction of the open wound in Lower Manhattan at Ground Zero. Despite the best efforts of Larry Silverstein,

the developer, and David Childs of SOM as architect, to persuade us that they are motivated simply by the cold logic of hard cash. It's perfectly clear that the Freedom Tower at Ground Zero is intended to send a signal or signals. The project is full of symbolic readings. It's an attempt to build a skyline that is telling us something about the nature of the city it belongs to or at least the nature of the city as certain significant individuals see it and even the latest, most negative readings still seem to send a symbolic message about how New York sees itself.

It wasn't just that the original towers were very tall; there were two of them which, banal a gesture as it might be, ensured that the world knew exactly where they belonged because they didn't look like anywhere else. Their mooted replacement, the Statue of Liberty in abstract form, is a reminder of the American Constitution and the Declaration of Independence of 1776 as spelled out by the height of the tower in feet, a gesture of continuity and defiance and of course those original two towers had themselves been an attempt to create a distinctive landmark for New York.

London is also using tall buildings to signal something about itself. Renzo Piano's tower for Irvine Sellars at London Bridge is certainly an example of the highly symbolic uses of building. Mr Sellars, the developer of the London Bridge Tower, has managed to sign up his first tenant, the Shangri-La Hotel Group. Without the prospect of putting their hotel in what will be the tallest building in Europe it's absolutely inconceivable that the company would ever have dreamed of putting a luxury hotel in this particular location on top of a commuter railway station in the midst of a bleak piece of inner city on the unfashionable south side of the river. No doubt the decision to bring the Olympics to London in 2012 will make them think they weren't taking quite such a crazy gamble.

No European city has done more to re-invent itself in the last decade than London. It is a city that is going through a once in a lifetime burst of growth and transformation on a scale of ambition not seen in Britain since the 19th century when London went through its first or perhaps last great period of metropolitan growth. That was the era that saw the huge expansion of the underground railway system, the completion of the main line railway network, the cutting of major new roads through the existing urban fabric. Then as now a concentration of large-scale interventions has served to transform the geography of the city and it is in this context that the cumulative impact of individual projects needs to be understood.

The shift began in the 1980s when a financial centre on a world scale in the shape of Canary Wharf erupted from the site of what had been a derelict banana warehouse in just 5 years. It happened through a combination of the unforeseen use of tax subsidies urgently devised to encourage light industry within the city and the more relaxed planning regime. This then was an old economic order giving way to a new one made visible on the skyline. The shipping container killed off the old Port of London. The glittering towers of Canary Wharf loom over the brow beaten streets of the east end of the city,

in which the cleaners and the catering staff who service these towers live in another parallel world.

"Why does it have to be so tall?" the Prince of Wales once asked about the first and tallest of the Canary Wharf towers to its American architect Cesar Pelli. The answer of course that he was too polite to give was obvious, to make nowhere into somewhere. This was grand vision British style. The offices went up first. The infrastructure to get people to fill the buildings came second or third but when they were built there was a deliberate attempt to give them a visual coherence.

The new Jubilee underground mass transit line was built after the towers went up in a bid to convince Londoners that the underground was a civilised transport system, a reflection of a civilised public realm.

London was going through political as well as social changes, which will also have a physical dimension. Twenty years ago the Government of Margaret Thatcher abolished the Greater London Council and to make sure there was no chance the administration that she hated so much would ever return, the County Hall building in which its Councillors had deliberated for almost a century was sold off to a Japanese financier and turned into a curious mix of hotel, art gallery, Chinese restaurant and aquarium. Tony Blair's administration resurrected pan-London government and it was time to send another clear visual signal.

The new London Assembly's 500 staff and its 26 elected members could easily have been accommodated in an anonymous office building with no public face or graphic significance. It would have been presented as the financially responsible option but it would have left London's government invisible and lacking any sense of authority in its physical presence. Ken Livingstone's seat of power you could say is British municipal politics given the baseball treatment. No more English cricket whites, instead the old game is played out under floodlights with the players in lime green pyjamas or in the case of City Hall, local democracy has a background of a purple carpet and yellow walls that look good on television and one of the most conspicuous new buildings in London. Fundamentally City Hall looks the way it does because it's trying to tell us something about itself. And that is an aspect of the way that every city from Shanghai to New York to London presents itself. Before it can become what it wants to be, it has to imagine what it will look like.

Deyan Sudjic is the Architectural Critic of The Observer and the Dean of the Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture at Kingston University, London

POWER: SHANGHAI, NEW YORK, LONDON

GERALD E. FRUG

The goal of being a global city dominates the consciousness of local government officials in New York, London, and Shanghai. Who has the power to define what this goal means? Who can redefine it and modify it? I want to talk today about how London, New York, and Shanghai now have little of this kind of power – and about how they might gain more of it. Many people have written about global cities, none more insightfully than Saskia Sassen and Deyan Sudjic. But their work is devoted to analysing the global city phenomenon, even criticising it. They are not responsible for the concept of a global city becoming a desire, for the fact that the development objective for so many cities across the world is to rise higher and higher on the list of global cities.

Where is this desire coming from? It's not simply the result of the forces of globalisation, the demands of the marketplace, or the worldwide shifting of power from government to the private sector. If these forces were making the goal of becoming a global city inevitable, why are all three cities working so hard to achieve it? And they are working hard. Land-use is being structured, infrastructure is being put in place, whole sections of the city population are being re-located. London has its Canary Wharf and Thames Gateway; New York its Brooklyn Waterfront and World Trade Centre site. And Shanghai is organising a multitude of functionally defined special districts, building infrastructure at a dizzying rate, and restructuring housing for millions of people. All these concrete steps are decisions – not the involuntary adjustment to global forces.

We should try to understand these decisions by locating them within the culture and legal system of the different countries. There has been a long history – and not only in Shanghai – of accommodating international business and dividing the city into an upper quarter and lower quarter. Shanghai, New York, and London are making their decisions within a legal frame. In all three countries that legal frame is controlled by central governments and not by the cities themselves. The famous decision in the early 1990's to launch the Pudong New Area, after all, was made by the national leadership, not by Shanghai. The decentralisation of power in China was therefore itself a centralised decision. And there is nothing unusual about that. The extent and nature of decentralisation is also a centralised decision in the U.K. and the United States, although in the United States it is the state government, not the national government, that is the source of city power. The crucial importance of income generated from the leasing of land for the Shanghai Municipal government, like New York's reliance on the property tax and the Greater London Authority's inability to generate its own income – these are all central government decisions. Shanghai's reliance on enterprise-related income, like the reliance on the property tax in the United States, creates an incentive to foster particular kinds of economic development. The national government here also determines that foreign banks can deal in domestic currency only in the Pudong New Area, the length of the term of the city's land leases, how to cool down an overheated real estate market, and where else in the

country to create special economic zones. In the U.K., the national government limits the powers of the Greater London Authority essentially to transportation and planning, and it is New York State, not the city, that controls the future of the World Trade Centre site. We should not use the word “autonomy” when we think about how cities exercise power. Intervention by the national governments in China and the U.K., and by state governments in the United States, is pervasive, and it is not going to go away.

This is not to say that central governments have not empowered Shanghai, New York, and London. All three cities have been given power to make decisions by higher levels of government. But their power is greatest when they are implementing the global city ideal. They have much less of an ability to resist it. This is true even for Shanghai, which has the most authority of the three cities to determine how to implement the global city concept. The national government has given the Shanghai Municipal Government financial flexibility, decision-making authority over planning, the ability to build infrastructure at an enviable rate, and control over much more of its region than London or New York have. The national government has decided to promote Shanghai as a global city and has selected leadership that it thinks can deliver that result. London and New York City have nothing like the kind of trust and authority that Shanghai enjoys. The British government and the state of New York are very suspicious of their cities. They micro-manage their decisions not just about whether to be a global city but about how to achieve that goal. They empower public authorities or quangos to do the business that the city might do. And they drain resources from the city rather than, as in Shanghai, significantly increase its ability to keep the revenue it generates. Moreover, Shanghai is divided into districts, like London into boroughs. But Shanghai's districts have more planning and operating authority than London's boroughs yet, unlike London's boroughs, they are responsible to the city-wide government. New York has nothing like this kind of decentralised structure. Those of us from Europe and the Americas can learn a lot from Shanghai about how to get things done.

But Shanghai can learn something from us too. It can learn how not to get things done. Sometimes, what the government decides to do is the wrong thing. In New York and London, citizen action and community organising – civil society – can slow things down. This annoys the city government, but it sometimes produces a better result.

Citizen involvement has had a major impact on the way New York is developing, ranging from its recently failed effort to build a football stadium to its plans for the World Trade Centre site. And, because the Greater London Authority needs to be responsive to its own citizens, London is far more openly confronting the impact of the increasing division between rich and poor within the city than anywhere else. The differences between citizen opinion and official policy in London and New York often involve citizen opposition to city officials' attempts to implement their vision of being a global city.

When we talk about how to empower city governments, then, we must recognise the interdependence between the central government, the local government, and the city's population. Only then can we begin to understand how cities can be empowered to think about and redesign the meaning of becoming a global city. Those of us involved in this Urban Age project are seeking to focus attention on the relationship between physical development and social development. On this point, the Mayor of London, on his own website, says this: "London's growth . . . is the root cause of many of its chronic problems – congestion, high prices, pollution, and a deep and growing polarisation between rich and poor." The same can be said, I suggest, about New York and Shanghai. In all three cases, as the Mayor says, the items listed are not just city problems. The cities' own actions are generating these problems. A city that focuses on its immigrants or its floating population would look different than a city focused on international finance. But none of the three cities has the power to control immigration policy. A city that focused on the income disparity that divides its own population would be different than one that seeks to attract those who can afford gated communities. But none of the three cities has the power to confront the causes of their current income disparities. If one concentrates the mind only on being a global city, some parts of the city are favored at the expense of others. The choice of focus, however, is not now within the city's power to make.

I hope we can talk this week about how Shanghai, New York, and London can be empowered to think about these kinds of issues. To do so, we need to talk about empowering cities in a way that recognises both national concerns and the rights of local citizens. In my view, in order to gain power, Shanghai, New York, and London need to pay more attention to their own region and to other cities within their own country. They too often think of these other cities simply as competitors in the race to be a global city. They should think of them more as allies. Alliances with other localities can strengthen local voices in the national debate. The first place to find these allies is in the cities' own region. There's a lot of loose talk these days in urban circles about how the region, not the city, is the real urban centre. But there is no regional decision maker in any of the three countries that actually can plan for the region as a whole. The only entities in a position to make a policy for the region now are central governments. Regional co-operation can empower the cities to do so instead.

The focus on ensuring one's place on the list of world cities also distracts attention from a city's own population. It seems to me very odd when people say that Shanghai is going to be the next New York or London. What could that mean? Even New York and London are not like each other. The only way you can think of these cities as being interchangeable is to focus on parts of the city – finance or commerce – at the expense of everything else. Very different kinds of people live in these three cities; very different kinds of people live in different parts of the same city. Taking the rest of the city – and rest of the region – into account does more than simply change the focus. It adds political strength to the city.

In a world in which cities are never going to have autonomy from centralised decision-making, cities can gain more authority by building alliances with others in the region and with the local population. This path might do more than add flexibility: it might also lead to a very different future than a focus on a single global list.

Gerald Frug is the Louis D. Brandeis Professor of Law at Harvard University

CITYNESS IN THE URBAN AGE

SASKIA SASSEN

Urban agglomerations are very often seen as lacking the features, quality and sense of what we think of as cities. Yet, urbanity is perhaps too charged a term, charged with a Western sense of cosmopolitanism of what public space is or should be. Instead, cityness suggests the possibility that there are kinds of urbanity that do not fit with this very large body of urbanism developed in the West. In fact that may be part of history in the making and we do not have a language for it yet. So cityness in a way is an instrument to capture something that might easily get lost.

Public space and cosmopolitanism are foundational elements of any city. They have however, been constructed in deeply Western ways. In my work on global cities, for instance, I address this issue through the notion of non-cosmopolitan forms of the global, of globality and vernacular cosmopolitanism. But as the Urban Age moves from one city to another, from New York to Shanghai, this becomes a critical question. In Shanghai, many interventions seem to be destabilising these very Western concepts. For example architect QinYu Ma argues that the Chinese city does not need public space because it makes public spaces that we might think of as private; bus shelters at night become a public space where people set up their tables to play cards. Clearly the notion of public space as we have developed it out of a Western European context might not help us read a city such as Shanghai, or perhaps even Mexico City, in ways that are very useful.

We need to strip our concept of the city from the overcharged meanings it currently has. In that process, I identify a couple of categories that allow us to understand, to see something about alternative kinds of urban-ity. The first point has to do with the whole and its parts. In traditionally defined urban-ity, multiple elements come together in the context of an urban aggregate and produce something that is more than the sum of these individual parts. When we look at a lot of the urban aggregates that we are dealing with today, these vast expanses of urban built space seem to produce a formula whereby the whole is not more than the sum of its parts. So that would be an obstacle to a notion of urbanity.

The second point is differences. You could have many similar things working together but I would say that, in order to specify the foundations of urbanity or cityness, it is necessary to acknowledge that the intersection of differences produces something new, whether it is good or bad, and that this actually occurring intersection is consequential. A very practical and subjective example comes from London: London is a city where there are many different types of Muslim groups, Muslim women with a Bangladeshi origin intersect with Muslim women who are Turkish, Muslim women from India, Muslim women from a number of Arab countries. In that intersecting they discover that the notion of “Muslim woman” is actually multi-faceted; there are many different versions of it. Something happens in that intersection of differences even within what we might think of as a very narrow range, (i.e. Muslim women). The city is full of that.

So for me cityness needs to entail that intersection which begins to constitute a form of subjectivity and may or may not be translating into an immediate tangible outcome.

Another more practical example from mid-town Manhattan: an incredibly solid set of high-rise buildings, that unlike Shanghai is not interspersed with typologies other than the corporate tower, signals neutrality, precision, engineering. But if you are actually in that space at lunch time, that visual experience is conjoined by the experience of smell coming from immigrant vendors grilling meat. There is already a juxtaposition of something but these are not two separate worlds. The people who are eating from those vendors at noon are not only the tourists and the secretaries but also the professionals who are in a great hurry, who inhabit a space of high-speed, for whom that intersecting with the vendor is the most efficient intersection of velocities. These are not two separate worlds. We could multiply these examples endlessly but what matters is the notion of intersection and its productivity.

This relates to Rem Koolhaas' notion of Lagos, a city that might look like a mess but that has order none-the-less. My previous examples signal an order albeit not the order corresponding to the formal logic of planners. In this order of juxtapositions, that may be following a fuzzy logic, something can occur that was not considered in the space of the formal plan situation. In that fuzziness poesies, in the sense of making, becomes possible. This connects with the question of public space, not as a representation of what it ought to be, but public space as the activity of making. An important distinction must be made between public space and a space with public access, in the latter there is no poesies, no making of public space. If there is in fact some order underlying the spaces where all kinds of things seem to be happening chaotically, then in that fuzzy logic type of order, there is room for certain kinds of intervention that have to do with making public space.

Here again I think Shanghai is a very interesting city. There are different ways in which this space is used. I am intrigued by what I see from the outside and want to dig into these spaces even though it may look like there cannot be any making in them. A proposition that has guided my own work is that the excluded also make history and the space of the city can allow you to capture that making in a way that other situations do not. So again in the instances of big corporate buildings for which foreign architects usually take the blame, who knows what kind of making is happening within them? It might well be an economy producing poverty. The critique of Shanghai's emerging built environment should go beyond the architects who were let in and did their thing.

But now we are stuck at the limit, some of it is very attractive some of it is not. However, there is still the possibility of transforming, of making, coming back to some of the elements of flexibility and the fact that buildings can be morphed by usage. One example is Chicago, a landmark of historic monuments. Twenty-three Taylorist office buildings in downtown Chicago have been transformed into fantastic housing, interior parks, child-care centres, all kinds of things. So even those structures that seem so rigid and to have a single

function can actually be now morphed into something else. The same thing applies to this question of cityness as a way to capture forms of urbanity that do not necessarily correspond to our more Westernised eye, who knows what morphing is going on, even in these very rigid structures.

Beyond the case of Lagos and its underlying order, I thought Enrique Peñalosa's notion of the long street, or what could be conceived of as an extended linear public space, is another example of where cityness can occur. It does not correspond to our notion of public space, the piazza, the centre ville, Central Park or whatever. But in fact that there are instantiations of cityness that take place in forms that we do not easily associate with what we know about the city. A different example comes from Frank Duffy's notions of networked office buildings, the idea that work can be done in several places at the same time is still connecting a potentially networked space that is multi-sited with the question of real place. In my work also, I have found that spaces that operate partly in territory and partly in electronic space can actually be part of the constitution of place, even though they do so in very different ways.

Now coming back to what you have here in Shanghai, its multiple experience: when I exit my hotel, a certain kind of transnational space, I am immediately in the street fabric, a thick street fabric. I walk 30 metres and I am in another world. This raises a question for me to which I do not necessarily have answers but that nevertheless needs to be asked: are those two worlds connected? As I argued earlier, the part of that world that we experience as very different, either belonging to another economic era or belonging to another technological era with a certain backwardness to it, might actually be part of the infrastructure for the advanced sector rather than actually a different world.

I want to conclude with the notion that certain inequalities and gaps might be reaching a threshold in cities such as New York, Shanghai, London, Paris, etc. The question is whether in some of these cities, in some of their components, we are reaching a threshold in the dynamics that keep the intersection of differences from happening, from being productive. Partly this is an empirical question but, coming back to this notion of stripping urbanity from its Western richness and trying to use cityness as a tool to detect urbanities that may be constituted in very different ways, I would say that one issue that cuts across all of this is if the gaps between the differences, between component parts that belong to slightly different worlds, if those gaps cross certain thresholds, to what extent do we actually lose the possibility of cityness?

What I am also saying then is that cityness can reside in a long line. It can reside in what to the Western eye might look like urban sprawl, either flat or high-rise, but that nevertheless meets to enable productive intersections. If those intersections cannot happen then cityness is really lost but at the same time they do not need to inhabit, or be limited to, certain urban forms. There are more possibilities.

Now a final point here, I want to return to fuzzy logic as a structuring sort of logic, a dash of anarchy, inefficiency,

disorder, because in that possibility lies this making; the fact that something can happen, that these intersections can be productive. So I have lots of questions for my colleagues in Shanghai because when you think about it in that way, when you try to strip it down from what you know, you see all kinds of possibilities for cityness to happen including the vertical urban sprawl that you experience here, this ocean of buildings. This is really a scale that one does not see easily around the world, I would say, so when we use cityness rather than urbanity, rather than public space, rather than those more familiar categories, where can we detect cityness in a place like Shanghai? Are those who have been confined to spaces that may really have serious limitations nonetheless able to throw in that dash of creativity, whatever you might want to call it, so that cityness is constituted even when you have a built environment that might be working against it?

Saskia Sassen is Professor of Political Economy at the London School of Economics and Political Science and Ralph Lewis Professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago

QUOTES: URBAN AGE SHANGHAI CONFERENCE JULY 2005

THE URBAN AGE

Our reason to start this very large process was quite simply that we, as urbanists, felt that our generation, which had worked in the 20th century, largely failed to create liveable cities for ourselves. Places like New York, London and Berlin show that the intellectual inquiry into urban conditions did not produce a vision of the good city in which people could prosper both materially and culturally. We were moved to have this set of meetings out of the fear that in the present age, where there is a massive physical expansion of cities in the rest of the world, our mistakes would be repeated as though we had found an image of modernity, a Western solution which would serve as a model for growth in the new urban age of the world. To us, that seemed to be a potential disaster.

Richard Sennett, Professor of Sociology, London School of Economics and Political Science and Massachusetts Institute of Technology

CHINESE URBANISM

In recent years urban China has been economically overheated, statistically exuberant and visually disturbing. Those who try to understand it as a blueprint of the globally expanding capitalist economy however, will not be able to comprehend what is happening in contemporary China. Much of the contemporary Chinese city is still determined by fundamental principles set in place in the 1950s and 1960s, the early years of the socialist system. The Shanghai of today reflects these principles: it is a centrally-controlled city with mandatory planning procedures and at least a minimum level of social welfare but it also has a "street administration" where strong local units monitor the actions and happenings in the neighbourhood as much as they act as entrepreneurial units with their own economic resources to generate revenues. The informal housing rental market has grown because the overall market has grown and no monitoring system was deemed necessary to regulate it. I would argue, perhaps controversially, that in China we do not need "public space" as such, because Chinese people do not need a space to be designated to be able to do public things. In summary, contemporary Chinese urbanism is not based on the individualistic freedom of capitalism but rather on a system of effective cooperation. Even at the risk of sounding politically backward, I would suggest that we can put people together and find an agent that is intelligent enough to plan our cities scientifically, rather than be led by the aggregation of individual desires focused on acquiring and occupying bigger and bigger spaces, wider and wider ocean or park views and more and more happiness.

Qingyun Ma, Director, MADA Architects, Shanghai

SHANGHAI PLANNING

At the Shanghai government, we are aware of the problems associated with rapid development. Two years ago we implemented an urban development policy that confers tighter controls on the process to the urban planning authority. We call it "double decrease, double increase" because it decreases the means and pace of development and because of that it provides the potential to increase the urban character

and green areas of the city. This policy did cause a slow down in the speed of development in Shanghai and provoked a large reaction from developers – for instance leading to noticeable rises in the price of housing. For us it is challenging to keep a balance between good policies that lead to a better urban space and on the other hand to control and stabilise the market.

Jiang Wu, Deputy Director, Shanghai Municipal Urban Planning Bureau

ECONOMIC GROWTH

My relatively conservative forecast of Shanghai's future growth indicates that annual double digit growth will continue until 2010, it will average 7% for the following 10 years and then stabilize at 3% for another 30 years. By 2020, Shanghai's gross geographic product will be 5 times bigger than now, equalling that of New York in 1997. By the year 2050, Shanghai's economic size will be 12 times bigger than now, an amount equal to the product of the whole of China in the year 2000. Policies by Shanghai's government are designed to channel this growth so as to make Shanghai an advanced manufacturing centre, a centre of trade and transport, and an international finance centre. Its current weaknesses are the relatively low level of international connectivity of the city, the glass ceilings that small and medium enterprises face to growth and the limited participation that civil society has as a stake-holder in the economic development process.

Qiyu Tu, Assistant President, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences

URBAN LABOUR MARKET

The urban economic transition in Shanghai is highly complex. Foremost, it has been extremely accelerated. What took one hundred years in other countries has been compressed to two decades here. Then, Shanghai faces the challenges of multiple simultaneous transitions: from a newly industrial economy to a knowledge-based service economy; from a state organised urban working system to a market driven urban labour market; and from a national centre reaching to global city status. Shanghai has always been China's big manufacturing centre and, at its peak, this sector employed about 60% of Shanghai's total workforce. Since the 1990s this share has declined to 40% while the share of services has grown from 30% in 1990 to 50% today. This tremendous transformation process is linked with the restructuring of state organised enterprises. Their downsizing, mergers, privatisation and outplacements have led to a decline in formal employment. As formal employment is directly linked with access to social insurance, you can imagine what this means in terms of contingencies, for the people and for the economy. Shanghai is confronted today with a multiplicity of working and living worlds that overlap in different forms in its urban spaces and districts. We only have to look outside of the window to see this complexity, this multiplicity of different working and living worlds. Now, you could look on this superimposed multiplicity as an incomplete modernisation but this, I think, would be missing the point. This multiplicity is a real asset: the diversity of working and living worlds can work as a thick

pool of innovation, as an asset for economic and social adaptability. However, there are also risks of pulling apart these working and living worlds by an increase in inequality as there is a risk of pushing away the lower ends with stringent land-use regulations or by uncontrolled real estate development.

Dieter Läßle, Professor of Urban and Regional Economics, Hamburg University of Technology

LABOUR MARKET SEGMENTATION

The scale of economic development in Shanghai can be characterised by its massive labour force. Statistics show that the total number of employees in Shanghai was 8.13 million in 2003. This figure more than doubles the labour force in New York or London and it is also larger than Tokyo's. More than half of these workers are employed in the services sector but also more than a third works in labour-intensive manufacturing industries. Growth at the top has meant an increase in international workers. Shanghai's labour market also provides opportunities for low-skill workers and this is a key element to explain the attraction of a "floating population" of 5 million people to the city. All the various segments in the labour force are important to sustain economic development in Shanghai. Yet, this complex labour market with an increasingly polarised or dual structure has not been fully discussed in the existing plans for the city. Shanghai's two-leg strategy is based on highly skilled services in the core area and labour-intensive manufacturing and traditional services in outer areas. This strategy may be causing a deepening spatial polarisation. The opportunities and challenges of polarisation in Shanghai deserve further research.

Yuemin Ning, Professor of Urban Geography, Director, The Center for Modern Chinese City Studies, East China Normal University

HISTORICAL PRESERVATION

In recent years, Shanghai has begun to realise the importance of preserving its urban heritage. Great efforts have been made by the local government in the past three years to establish the protection of not only individual buildings but also entire historical areas. Currently, 12 historical areas covering more than 27 square kilometres have been protected. But great challenges come from all the residential blocks, especially the Li Long houses from the 1920s and the 1930s. They have been very badly maintained for almost 80 years and space originally designed for one family is now shared by four, six or even eight families. The scale of land-use has also changed completely and government policies are usually to encourage real-estate developers to rebuild entire city blocks in their urban renovation programmes. Even when the original housing stock is preserved and still used as housing, very little is left of the original community. We really need more comprehensive mechanics to take care of our urban heritage. It is really challenging but it is also very clear that if the historical preservation always has little to do with the local inhabitants then why is there urban heritage in the first place?

Yongyin Lu, Professor of Architecture, Tongji University

OPPORTUNITIES

The open policy reforms taken by the central government have given Shanghai a chance to redevelop since the 1990s. The city now has three historical opportunities to consolidate its future structure and also to guide the course of Chinese urbanisation: the opening of Pudong New District and extension of the urban core; the metropolitan expansion with suburban growth, planned new towns and consolidation of urban centralities; and the redevelopment inner-city areas related to the Expo 2010. Once again the Huangpu River becomes an element providing coherence to urban form. The former waterfront along the river is now being transformed from an industrial area full of factories, shipyards, warehouses and docklands into a public open space.

Shiling Zheng, Director, Urban Planning Commission of Shanghai Municipal Government

THREATS

Urban sprawl is a real threat to the future of China, considering the country's gigantic population and its limited resources, both energy and available land. If we look at the case of Shanghai, we can see that rapid suburban sprawl has not relieved the conditions of overcrowding in the centre. This problem could be solved by changing the land-use regulations that generate overly accelerated development and artificially low densities in inner-ring suburbs. In the Pudong New District, we are now working on revitalising an area that has not even been completed. We are trying to improve its unusually low densities by focusing on small and mixed streets, a local market, open-air theatres for the local community and the overall revitalisation of local culture.

Yue Wu, Chief Planner, Developmental & Planning Bureau of Pudong New Area, Shanghai

OFFICE SPACE

The contemporary office building provides a metaphor for the city. The way in which designers talk about strategic issues with clients who are in multiple places, and at the same time about short-term issues with end users, can offer a model of dealing with different timescales in a coherent and nested way. At the same time, rapid innovations in information technologies have weakened assumptions of co-location and synchronicity on which decisions are made concerning the supply of office space. There is an increasing need to think of offices as instruments for the development of ideas, for opening up possibilities, for generating wealth and for supporting businesses – instead of offices as commodities to be traded. Shanghai and other growing cities need to think not only how much office space but also what types of offices and how they are integrated into wider spatial structures and social fabrics.

Frank Duffy, Founder, DEGW, London

URBAN CHANGE AND SOCIAL CONTROL

Not surprisingly, massive urbanisation and modernisation have put traditional grassroots mechanisms of social control under stress in contemporary Chinese cities. The

neighbourhood's cohesion is in decline due to demographic mutations, demolitions and renewal. Culturally, residents show less interest in neighbourhood involvement, watchers for the wealthiest in central district gated communities solve security problems while they "go bowling alone", and for the middle classes management companies deal with their security. The proliferation of video surveillance cameras, 200,000 in Shanghai and 200,000 more to come, is beginning to become problematic. Another contradiction relates to the presence of unregistered rural migrants. They are part of the city yet they are invisible. They do not have citizenship and they add to the fragmentation of the city. A survey administered by Australian researchers shows that urbanites' attitudes to migrants influence their perceptions of public security. Crime in urban China is rising in spite of the fact that it is still very low. The challenging questions for the future of the city here are the following: Are Shanghai elites really eager to produce inclusive togetherness in their city? What new identity formation springs from rapidly changing spaces? What is the meaning of community or neighbourliness in a fluid society like this? Will the children of invisible interstitial subjects that have been long deprived of citizenship cope and if not will forces of intimidation be deployed to make them comply? We all know by experience that it is more advantageous to govern by consent than by coercion.

Sophie Body-Gendrot, Professor of Political Science and American Studies and Director, Center for Urban Studies, Sorbonne

TRANSPORT

Decisions about transport imply trade-offs. Coming to this conference site today, you probably noticed the poor road conditions in the surrounding area. There was a plan to widen the road 20 years ago but that could not be implemented because of problems in the land clearance process. Had the plan not been abandoned, this very building would probably not exist here today. During the past several years Shanghai has invested large amounts to improve the capacity of the road system. The dilemma is that if we try to improve the mobility of our city, we induce more people to drive cars, if we do not, mounting congestion makes our city unliveable. From 1986 to 2004 the area serviced by underground lines increased by 50% but the average trip length remained the same at about 13 minutes. This is an advantage of improved mobility that critics of transport planning in Shanghai do not see.

Xiaohong Chen, Vice Dean, School of Transportation Engineering, Tongji University

CONSUMER DEMANDS

What does quality mean? Does quality mean durability or does it mean affluence? If we talk about quality today in terms of durability, there is no comparison in what we produce now versus what used to be produced, say 50 years ago. But if we were to talk about affluence, everyone would agree that if you go down to a supermarket today the variety of products is probably one hundred times that of 20 years ago. So it is important to consider what people want when they ask for

quality. My opinion is that we live in a time where people do not want durability. I used to think that I was in an industry [real estate] that built something to last for hundreds of years. I have been proved completely wrong. My customers move, on average, every two years. If we did not come up with new products on a six monthly basis, no one would walk into our sales office. When people talk about speed and quality you do not really have to worry about quality because everything recycles much faster today. If you want people to move up the social ladder quickly, inevitable with a GDP growing 9% every year, then you need speed. If I do not have a new apartment to move into the person who wants to buy my apartment has to wait. It is only when I vacate that they can move in. When they vacate, someone else will move in. That is, in my opinion, what makes society work well and what we need to think about when we talk about quality and speed.

Zhang Xin, Co-Chief Executive Officer, Soho China, Beijing

IN-MIGRATION AND SOCIAL CONFLICT

The conflicts between city residents and in-migrants, sometimes called peasant workers, have drawn remarkable attention from academics and the press. These conflicts could assume larger and deeper proportions in the future given the increasing volume of rural migration to cities. Policies taken by the Shanghai Municipal Government have had a certain level of success in reducing conflict and furthering social integration. On the one hand, there are policies in place to educate and train in-migrants and to regularise their situation in the city. But on the other hand, what is still pending is the reform of the household registration system which prevents in-migrants to become city-residents. As the former is an effort to reduce the psychological gap between city residents and in-migrants, the later would eliminate an institutional wall against cohesion. If these two strategies can be achieved, we will make a large step towards a harmonious society.

Guixin Wang, Professor of Population Research, Fudan University

SPEED

China's demographic context, economic dynamism and pro-urbanisation policies provide the background of Shanghai's hyper-growth. Hyper-growth translates into hyper-density, not only population and structures, but also of ideas and styles. In the centre of Pudong, a very typical case of growing areas in Shanghai, we have an administrative building in the middle that was designed by Japanese architects, then the science centre in the south side, the central avenue, and the Century Park, which were commissioned from American, French and British architects respectively. The job for Shanghai planners is to integrate all these differences. Every project is a mega-project in comparison to the West or by standards in developed countries. Different languages, different ideas, different styles, different materials and even a different attitude towards the implementation of projects is what we deal with everyday.

Siegfried Zhiqiang Wu, Dean, College of Architecture & Urban Planning, Tongji University

TRANSPORT, MOBILITY AND URBAN SUSTAINABILITY

A successful city has low energy demands from its transport system and good city planning should not require much physical mobility. Transport engineers are often contented with meeting increasing demand levels, but what they are actually addressing is a deficit in urban planning. Pedestrian streets, bicycle lanes and public transport routes are the types of road that enhance the urban quality of life. In a wonderful way, I think, no other big city has the opportunities for cycling that Shanghai has. The outcome of that is lots of cyclists and a huge density of transport that supports the city without any pollution. You can also produce a good transport system based on public transport, as in Hong Kong for example. Such systems attract people to use public transport. If, on the other hand, you build a very attractive system for the use of cars, the ultimate outcome, which looks very similar everywhere in the world, is that speed increases but so do expenses and ultimately you are only becoming richer in wasted time used for driving longer distances. You get the far but lose the near, you destroy the small structures by supporting the big ones: the city runs out over its borders. If we look at efficiency in terms of energy for the same purpose and compare the efficiency of the car versus non-motorised means, the former has an inefficiency of less than 1% of the latter. Public transport lies in between. If we face a shortage of energy in the future, cars will be the least sustainable means. Shanghai is in a wonderful position concerning energy consumption in the transport system still now. However, everybody wants to have a car in Shanghai so energy consumption is going up steeply.

Hermann Knoflacher, Professor of Transport Planning and Traffic Engineering, Technical University Vienna

URBAN INFORMALITY AND TRANSPORT DESIGN

As a transport planner, I think that the way we design our cities, how we understand what is happening in them, actually gets reflected in our transport systems. In both China and India, the two fast-growing mega-economies of the future, the spread of urbanisation is taking place along the growth of the informal sector. When we talk about the transport sector or the kind of transport systems we design we really have to be very, very aware of this fact: the multiple cities and the multiple needs that we are designing for. In India, over the past 50 years since independence, we have been doing a lot of planning and making grand master plans but we have ended up building roads where there is nothing designed for pedestrians, really nothing designed for bicycles. We have standard six lane highways with standards copied from American or British highway capacity manuals, but if you notice how the road is being used, the reality is very different. The pedestrians and bicycles that occupy the road are captive users, people without choices whether we design a physical environment that is safe for them or not. We, as designers, may keep blaming people who do not know how to be on the road, but their reality remains the same.

Geetam Tiwari, Chair & Associate Professor, TRIPP, Civil Engineering Department, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

HOUSING AND THE URBAN FABRIC

In China, the state had a standard for individual living space of 10 square metres per person within a room. All facilities, including bathrooms and kitchens, were meant to be communal and not the personal space of individuals. As recently as last year, this standard was changed. It has been raised to a little over 23 square metres per person and that includes various facilities. The measuring unit is now the apartment rather than the room. What it means, of course, is that we are now leading more private lives rather than a completely public life. So this increase in personal space changes not only how we live but also how we think about urban issues. For me, the role of housing in relation to community, neighbourhood and city is tied to the notion of urban fabric – that is to say housing as fabric. In opposition to the kind of monumental architecture or the architecture of monumentality, the architecture of fabric is an architecture, or urbanism, of democracy.

Yung Ho Chang, Professor of Architecture and Head of the Department of Architecture, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Edited by Miguel Kanai, Urban Age Project Researcher

URBAN AGE SHANGHAI CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

- David Adjaye, *Principal, Adjaye Associates, London*
Andrew Altman, *President and CEO, Anacostia Waterfront Corporation*
Sophie Body-Gendrot, *Professor of Political Science and American Studies and Director, Center for Urban Studies, Sorbonne*
Oliver Brinkmann, *Head of Corporate Banking Coverage North Asia, Deutsche Bank AG, Shanghai*
Ricky Burdett, *Centennial Professor in Architecture and Urbanism & Director, Urban Age, London School of Economics and Political Science*
Yung Ho Chang, *Professor of Architecture and Head of Department Architecture, Massachusetts Institute of Technology*
Yingfang Chen, *Professor and Deputy Director, Center for Modern Chinese Cities Studies, East China Normal University*
Jinhai Chen, *Professor, Faculty of World Economy Research, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences*
Wei Chen, *Vice Chief Editor, Shanghai Economy Studies, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences*
Weishu Chen, *Vice Chairman, Shanghai Industrial Investment Co.*
Xiaohong Chen, *Vice Dean, School of Transportation Engineering, Tongji University*
Xiangming Chen, *Professor of Sociology and Urban Planning and Policy, University of Illinois at Chicago*
Ren Li Chi, *Head of the School of Architecture and Planning, Tongji University*
Xingyi Dai, *Professor, Department of Regional Development Studies, Fudan University*
Johannes Dell, *Board Member, China Representative, Albert Speer und Partner, Shanghai*
Jinhong Ding, *Professor and Deputy Director, Center for Modern Chinese Cities Studies, East China Normal University*
Frank Duffy, *Founder, DEGW, London*
Lutz Engelke, *CEO, Triad, Berlin*
Jin Fang, *Director, International Investment Studies Department, Faculty of World Economy Research, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences*
Thomas Felber, *General Manager, European Chamber in China, Shanghai*
Heidrun Förster, *Deputy Chairperson of the Supervisory Board, Deutsche Bank AG, Berlin*
Gerald Frug, *Louis D. Brandeis Professor of Law, Harvard University*
Feng Gao, *Head of Shanghai Branch, Deutsche Bank*
Weiyu Gao, *Chief Economic Analyst, Shanghai Municipal Centre for Research and Development*
Loyd Grossman, *Chairman of the National Museums, Liverpool*
Alejandro Gutierrez, *Project Manager, Arup London*
Niall Hobbhouse, *Governor, London School of Economics and Political Science*
Jim Hollington, *Consul (Cultural) British Council Deputy Director, Shanghai British Consulate-General, Cultural and Education Section*
Jianfu Huang, *Vice Chief Officer, Long-term Planning Dept., Shanghai Commission on Reform and Development*
Attar Hussain, *Asia Research Centre, London School of Economics and Political Science*
Sarah Ichioka, *Research Associate, Urban Age, London School of Economics and Political Science*
Hitoshi Ieda, *Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Tokyo*
Jinwei Sun, *Vice-Mayor, Shanghai*
Miguel Kanai, *Project Researcher, Urban Age, London School of Economics and Political Science*
Bruce Katz, *Vice President and Director, Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings Institution*
Zhao Ke Ping, *Deputy Director, Construction Coordination Department, Shanghai World Expo Coordination Bureau*
Hermann Knoflachner, *Professor of Transport Planning and Traffic Engineering, TU Vienna*
Rem Koolhaas, *Principal, Office for Metropolitan Architecture, Rotterdam*
Dieter Läßle, *Professor of Urban and Regional Economics, Hamburg University of Technology*
Götz Lehmann, *Producer, Timespot, Berlin*
Florian Lennert, *Director of Corporate Relations, London School of Economics and Political Science*
Jason Leow, *Correspondent, The Singapore Straits Times*
Bingqin Li, *Lecturer, Social Policy Department, London School of Economics and Political Science*
Keping Li, *Doctoral Supervisor, Tongji University*
Yihai Li, *Director, International Programs Office, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences*
Youmei Li, *Vice President, Shanghai University*
Ma Liang, *Vice President, Shanghai Industrial Investment Co.*
Weng Ling, *Director, Three on the Bund, Shanghai Gallery of Art*
Alexander Lohausen, *Senior Architect, Albert Speer & Partner, Shanghai*
Hanlong Lu, *Director, Institute of Sociology, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences*
Ximing Lu, *Director, Shanghai City Comprehensive Transportation Planning Institute*
Yongyi Lu, *Professor, Tongji University*
Qingyun Ma, *Director, MADA Architects, Shanghai*
Anthony Mayer, *Chief-Executive, Greater London Authority*
Rory McGowan, *Director, Arup Beijing*
Ye Ming, *Vice Director, Shanghai Qingpu Planning Administration Bureau*
William H. Mobley, *Professor, CEIBS, & Managing Director, Mobley Group Pacific (Shanghai) Co. Ltd.*
Bruno Moser, *Research Associate, Urban Age, London School of Economics and Political Science*
Yuemin Ning, *Professor of Urban Geography, Director, The Center for Modern Chinese City Studies, East China Normal University*
Wolfgang Nowak, *Spokesman of the Executive Board, Alfred Herrhausen Society, Deutsche Bank*
Eric Parry, *Principal, Eric Parry Architects, London*
Dr. P.S. Pasricha, *Director General of Police, Maharashtra State, India*
Enrique Peñalosa, *Former Mayor of Bogota*
Xizhe Peng, *Dean and Professor, School of Social Policy and Public Policy, Fudan University*
Ann Kathrine Prior, *KfW Bankengruppe, Beijing*
Zaiming Pu, *Deputy Director, Shanghai Commission on Reform and Development*
Ruan Qing, *Director, Planning Department, Shanghai Commission on Reform and Development*
Yuan Ren, *Associate Professor, Deputy Director, Center for Urban and Regional Development Studies, Fudan University*
Xuefei Ren, *PhD Program, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago*
Philipp Rode, *Project Manager, Urban Age, London School of Economics and Political Science*
Saskia Sassen, *Professor of Political Economy, London School of Economics and Political Science and Ralph Lewis Professor of Sociology, University of Chicago*
Stephan Sattler, *Journalist, Focus Magazine Verlag, Munich*
Christoph Schwöbel, *Director, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Universität Tübingen – Institut für Hermeneutik und Dialog der Kulturen*
Richard Sennett, *Professor of Sociology, London School of Economics and Political Science and MIT*
Bob Shear, *Consul, Trade and Investment, British Consulate-General Shanghai*
Wang Shi, *Chairman, China Vanke Co Ltd., Shenzhen City*
Wu Short, *Vice Director, Graduate Institute, Tongji University*
Yunsheng Su, *Director, International Communication & Cooperation Department, College of Architecture and Urban Planning, Tongji University*
Deyan Sudjic, *Architectural Critic, The Observer and Dean of the Faculty of Art Design and Architecture, Kingston University, London*
Zhiping Tang, *Deputy Director, Shanghai Bureau for Urban Planning and Management*
Xiaoma Tao, *Director, Department of Public Administration, School of Economics and Management, Tongji University*
Geetam Tiwari, *Chair & Associate Professor, TRIPP, Civil Engineering Department, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi*
Tony Travers, *Director, Greater London Group, London School of Economics and Political Science*
Qiyu Tu, *Assistant President, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences*
Guixin Wang, *Professor of Population Research, Fudan University*
Hongxia Wang, *Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences*
Lord Weidenfeld, *Member of the Board of Trustees, Alfred Herrhausen Society, Deutsche Bank*
Ute Weiland, *AHS/LSE Coordinator, Urban Age, Alfred Herrhausen Society, Deutsche Bank*
Carl Weisbrod, *President, Trinity Real Estate, Trinity Church*
Jianhua Weng, *Departmental Chief, Shanghai Commission on Reform and Development*
Mike West, *Managing Director, Head of Communications, Asia Pacific Deutsche Bank AG*
Anthony Williams, *Mayor of Washington D.C.*
Karen Wong, *Managing Director, Adjaye Associates, London*
Roger Wood, *Project Manager, Arup London*
Jianping Wu, *Professor, Geography, East China Normal University*
Jiang Wu, *Deputy Director, Shanghai Municipal Urban Planning Bureau*
Christopher Wu, *Property Sales & Leasing, Shui-On Properties, Shanghai*
Yue Wu, *Chief Planner, Developmental & Planning Bureau of Pudong New Area, Shanghai*
Siegfried Zhiqiang Wu, *Dean, College of Architecture & Urban Planning, Tongji University*

Zhang Xin, *Co-Chief Executive Officer, Soho China, Beijing*
 Mingqi Xu, *Chief of International Finance Studies Department, Faculty of World Economy Research, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences*
 Xiaoguang Yang, *Vice Director of Department of Transport Engineering, ITS Research Center, Tongji University*
 Peikun Yang, *Doctoral Supervisor, Tongji University*
 Deng Yi, *Chief of Policy & Code Research Dept., Shanghai Commission of Construction and Transportation*
 Sauw Yim, *CIB Divisional Functions, Deutsche Bank, Hong Kong*
 Zhigang Yuan, *Dean & Professor, School of Economics, Fudan University*
 Alejandro Zaera-Polo, *Joint Director, Foreign Office Architects, London*
 Gang Zeng, *Professor & Dean, Resource and Environment Institute, East China Normal University*
 Guanzen Zhang, *Professor, Tongji University*
 Lee Zhang, *Chairman for Deutsche Bank China and Co-Head of Global Banking for Asia Pacific, Deutsche Bank*
 Ying Zhang, *School of Transportation Engineering, Tongji University*
 Shiling Zheng, *Director, Urban Planning Commission of Shanghai Municipal Government*
 Zhenhua Zhou, *Professor & Deputy Dean, Faculty of Economy Studies, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences*
 Guoping Zhou, *Director, Department of Research, Shanghai Municipal Centre for Research and Development*
 Dajian Zhu, *Professor, Economics and Sustainable Development, Harvard University*
 Jinhai Zhu, *Executive Deputy Director, Institute of Economics, Shanghai Commission on Reform and Development*
 Linchu Zhu, *Deputy Director, Shanghai Municipal Centre for Research and Development*
 Xuejin Zuo, *Executive Vice President & Senior Fellow Director, Institute of Economics, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences*

ORGANISED BY

LSE Cities Programme

The Cities Programme at the London School of Economics and Political Science is an interdisciplinary centre that links urban design to urban society through teaching, research and public activities. The Cities Programme is responsible for running the Urban Age project at the LSE, the annual European Mayors conferences and carries out consultancy projects for public and private sector clients.

Alfred Herrhausen Society, the International Forum of Deutsche Bank

The Alfred Herrhausen Society is a centre of independent thinking that seeks to identify traces of the future in the present, and thereby raise public awareness of the directions in which society is moving. As Deutsche Bank's socio-political think tank, the Herrhausen Society brings together people who are committed to working for the future of civil society. Founded in 1992, the Society is dedicated to maintaining and building on the legacy of Alfred Herrhausen.

URBAN AGE SHANGHAI PARTNERS

Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences

Established in 1958, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences (SASS) is China's oldest and largest research institution for the humanities and social sciences outside the capital of Beijing. As a leading think-tank and distinguished academic institution in China, SASS has fifteen institutes and several inter-disciplinary centers which conduct theoretical research and applied studies in the humanities and social sciences, with a special focus on important issues arising from the social and economic transformation and the country's reform and opening up to the outside world. With its comprehensive research results, SASS currently has more than 717 employees, of which more than 500 are research staff.

Fudan University

Fudan University was established in 1905. It comprises 17 full-time schools, 69 departments, 73 bachelor's degree programs, 22 disciplines and 134 sub-disciplines authorised to confer Ph. D. degrees, 201 master degree programs, 6 professional degree programs, 7 key social science research centres of Ministry of Education P.R.C, 9 national basic science research and training institutes and 25 post-doctoral research stations. It has 40 national key disciplines granted by the Ministry of Education P.R.C, nationally third. At present, it encompasses 77 research institutes, 112 cross-disciplinary research institutes and 5 national key laboratories.

College of Architecture & Urban Planning (CAUP), Tongji University

Established in 1986, CAUP is the largest architecture and urban planning college in China. CAUP has strong links with various local governments and institutions which feed into the teaching process and enrich the students' practical experience. CAUP has a worldwide network of academics in teaching and research, it has established good relationships with leading international architecture and planning

schools and about 20 internationally renowned experts have been invited to be visiting professors. In 2001, the first World Planning School Congress was held in Tongji University, organised by the CAUP. Due to the rapid progress of Chinese urbanisation and successful cooperation with foreign academic institutions, the CAUP will play an important role in the educational and professional field in Asia and the world.

Center for Modern Chinese City Studies, East China Normal University

The Center for Modern Chinese City Studies of East China Normal University was founded in March 2003, and was approved as a key research institute of humanities and social sciences in universities by the Ministry of Education in November 2004. The Center comprises four research groups, specialising in Urban Economics and Planning, Urban Population and Society Development, Urban History and Culture Development, and Urban Institution and Management studies. It has a high-level research team of 15 staff and 14 research fellows. Researchers have focused on China's urbanisation, urban economy, society, culture, history. The Center also aims to provide services for the development of both the city of Shanghai and other parts of China.

Shanghai Industrial Investment Co.

Shanghai Industrial Investment Company is an investment holding group wholly owned by the Shanghai Municipal Government. It includes many listed companies and wholly owned enterprise groups both in China and abroad and has 9 overseas regional head offices. Based on the 86 km² of Dongtan on Chongming Island, Shanghai Industry Group has, since 2000, been cooperating with many specialised institutions both at home and abroad, to actively explore new models for urbanisation that are consistent with the actual conditions in China, with the core principles of sustainable ecological development, in order to inform the sustainable development of Shanghai, China and the whole world. Shanghai Industrial Investment Company welcomes more partners from home and abroad to join in this process of knowledge-creation.

In addition to our local partners we would also like to thank the British Council Shanghai and the Minerva LSE Research Group for their generous help and support.

URBAN AGE TEAM

Executive Group

Ricky Burdett, *Director, LSE*
Philipp Rode, *Project Manager, LSE*
Ute Weiland, *Coordinator AHS-LSE, AHS*

Steering Committee

Henrietta Moore (Chair), *Deputy Director, LSE*
Ricky Burdett, *Director Urban Age, LSE*
Niall Hobhouse, *Governor, LSE*
Josef Estermann, *Former Mayor, City of Zurich*
Florian Lennert, *Director of Corporate Relations, LSE*
Wolfgang Nowak, *Spokesman of the Executive Board, AHS*
Philipp Rode, *Project Manager Urban Age, LSE*
Richard Sennett, *Co-Chair Urban Age Advisory Board, LSE*
Norbert Walter, *Director of Economic Research, Deutsche Bank*

Advisory Board

Richard Sennett (Co-chair), *Professor of Sociology, LSE and MIT*
Deyan Sudjic (Co-chair), *Architectural Critic, The Observer, Dean, Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture, Kingston University*
David Adjaye, *Architect, Adjaye Associates*
Andy Altman, *President and Chief Executive Officer, Anacostia Waterfront Corporation, Washington DC*
Sophie Body-Gendrot, *Professor of Political Science, Universite Paris-Sorbonne*
Ricky Burdett, *Centennial Professor in Architecture and Urbanism, LSE*
Xiangming Chen, *Professor of Sociology and Urban Planning and Policy, University of Illinois at Chicago*
Joan Clos, *Mayor of Barcelona, City of Barcelona*
Frank Duffy, *Architect, DEGW*
Gerald Frug, *Louis D. Brandeis Professor of Law, Harvard University*
Gareth Jones, *Senior Lecturer in Development Geography, LSE*
Bruce Katz, *Vice President and Director, Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings Institution*
Herman Knoflachner, *Professor of Transport Planning, TU Vienna*
Rem Koolhaas, *Architect, Office for Metropolitan Architecture*
Dieter Läßle, *Professor of Urban and Regional Economics, Hamburg University of Technology*
Murray Low, *Lecturer in Human Geography, LSE*
Guy Nordenson, *Professor of Structural Engineering, Princeton University*
Enrique Penalosa, *Former Mayor of Bogota*
Anne Power, *Professor of Social Policy, LSE*
Hashim Sarkis, *Aga Khan Professor of Landscape Architecture and Urbanism, Harvard University*
Saskia Sassen, *Ralph Lewis Professor of Sociology, University of Chicago and LSE*
Ed Soja, *Visiting Centennial Professor, LSE*
Michael Storper, *Centennial Professor of Economic Geography, LSE*
Tony Travers, *Director of Greater London Group, LSE*
Lawrence Vale, *Ford Professor of Urban and Environmental Planning, MIT*
Anthony Williams, *Mayor of Washington DC*
Alejandro Zaera Polo, *Architect, Foreign Office Architects*
Siegfried Zhiqiang Wu, *Dean and Professor, College of Architecture and Urban Planning, Tongji University*

Research

Miguel Kanai, *Project Researcher, LSE*
Sarah Ichioka, *Research Associate, LSE*
Bruno Moser, *Research Associate, LSE*

Conference Logistics

Jessica Barthel
Emily Cruz
Stella Dai
Mira Dikanarova
Sonja Ecker

Research Assistants

Shiuh-Shen Chien
Maoqiang Dong
Karen England
Mai Ni
Xuefei Ren
Peter Schwinger

Graphic Design

Atelier Works

URBAN AGE CONTACT

Cities Programme
London School of Economics
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE
T +44 (0)20 7955 7706
urban.age@lse.ac.uk
www.urban-age.net

Alfred Herrhausen Society

Deutsche Bank
Unter den Linden 13/15
10117 Berlin

Ute Weiland
T +49 (0)30 3407 4201
ute.weiland@db.com
www.alfred-herrhausen-society.de