

# **Globalization and Urban Governance: A Comparative Analysis of Decentralization in World Cities**

Takashi Tsukamoto and Ronald K. Vogel (University of Louisville)

## **Abstract**

The “world cities” thesis has emerged as a key paradigm in urban studies. The general argument is that advanced telecommunications, global financial markets, and transnational corporations led to a global division of labor and the rise of global or world cities as the strategic nodes in a global economic network. Globalization determines the city’s place in the new hierarchy of cities. Globalization is also associated with political decentralization. Recent research has called into question initial assumptions about globalization and cities. In this paper, we (1) identify four distinct perspectives on the relationship between globalization and cities—World City System, Local-Global Interaction, State Glocalization, and New Localism; and (2) investigate whether globalization or politics is the primary factor stimulating decentralization movements evident in many world cities.

Beaverstock, Smith, and Taylor (1999) provide a widely accepted operationalization of world cities. We selected the largest 20 cities in their roster of world cities to investigate the relationship between globalization and decentralization. None of the four theories of globalization adequately account for decentralization processes. Moreover and contrary to expectations, we find that globalization is *not* related to decentralization. In a majority of world cities, the trend is toward greater centralization rather than decentralization. In addition, where it occurs, decentralization appears to be a function of politics and not globalization. Finally, higher-level governments continue to play the dominant role in ordering local political structure.

Paper Presented at *City Futures* Conference, University of Illinois at Chicago, July 8-10, 2004.

## **Many Globalizations and Two Dichotomies**

The “world cities” thesis has emerged as a key paradigm in urban studies. The gist of the thesis is that advanced telecommunications, global financial markets, and transnational corporations created a global division of labor and the rise of global or world cities as the strategic nodes in a global economic network. Globalization determines the city’s place in the new hierarchy of cities. Globalization is also linked to convergence among cities in culture and appearance. Local culture and variation are replaced by global products, culture, and experiences leading to cities that are bland and undistinguishable. Urbanists point to globalization as a primary factor to explain redevelopment, reterritorialization, and political decentralization in cities and metropolises dominated by corporate capital and multinationals and their top tier managers.

The “world cities” thesis has come under sharp criticism in recent years (e.g., White 1998; Hill and Kim 2002). Criticism of the “world cities” thesis centers on three problems (Saito 2003). First, researchers embrace an economistic logic where macro-economic structure (i.e., the global economy) determines urban development patterns. Second, researchers neglect the role of governments at all levels and political agency is given little importance. Third, researchers overlook local variations and are indifferent to indigenous social and political cultures that affect urban form.

The criticism of the world cities thesis highlights two competing sets of hypotheses accepted by scholars regarding (1) the primary factor behind world city formation—globalization or politics, and (2) whether globalization leads to convergence of urban development forms among world cities—globalization trumps local or local trumps global. The four hypotheses may be stated as follows:

Hypothesis 1	Hypothesis 2
The global market structure (globalization) creates world cities and determines their relative positions in the hierarchy of world cities.	Political agency (politics) is the primary factor in the creation of world cities and their relative positions in a hierarchy of world cities.
Hypothesis 3	Hypothesis 4
Global market structure (globalization) generates more or less uniform urbanization patterns in world cities.	Local history and culture ensure distinct urban development patterns despite the global market structure (globalization).

As a combination, the patterns of answers to these two sets of hypotheses reveals four positions within the globalization and world city literature: *I. The World City System Perspective*, *II. The Local-global Interaction Perspective*, *III. The State Glocalization Perspective* and *IV. The New Localism Perspective* (see Table 1).

**- Insert Table 1 here -**

### **I. World City System Perspective**

In this perspective, it is largely agreed that the key culprit of globalization is the transnational corporations (Friedmann and Wolff 1984; Sassen 1991). These organizations make direct investments across national boundaries in order to maximize capital accumulation. In so

doing, they operate in extensive global networks for international division of labor, exploitation of cheap labor costs and development of new market territories. These networks of economic activity and capital accumulation become possible only through command and control centers. The wider the scope of business activities, the stronger the need to have central locations for administrative functions, financial resources and supportive producer services (Sassen 1991). Consequently, these strategic sites of command form the world cities (Friedmann 1986) allowing economic activities to spread across state borders in the global system (Ohmae 2000).

These world cities (e.g., London, New York, Tokyo) sit atop the global hierarchical economic order because of the economic capacity and strategic knowledge the largest transnational corporations endow to these cities (Friedmann 1986). The economic position of world cities is a function of where the cities rank in the system of world cities on international trade, migration, and capital flows (Friedmann and Wolff 1984; Sassen 1991). In this view, little regard is placed on the actions of nation-states in the emergence of world cities. In addition, researchers with this perspective generally take the position that cities are converging in the globalized capitalistic logic as mere functional apparatuses to produce advanced service economies. Therefore, Castells (1996) explains that the sense of local community and “place” are lost in the cyberspace economy and taken over by the flow of information and capital that pass through technological channels. Consequently, cities are converging as “space of flow.”

## **II. Local-Global Interaction Perspective**

As opposed to the emphasis in the World City System perspective on world city convergence, some researchers insist on the resilience of locality against the global economic logic. For example, by comparing New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago, Abu-Lughod (1999)

finds that the urbanization patterns of these world cities differ, reflecting their unique history, strategic locations, demographic characteristics, and civic culture. This is true even though these cities are all in the global economic system. She concludes that economic globalization and close interactions among world cities do influence urban development. However, she asserts that the dominant sociopolitical culture of the community had greater consequence for urbanization and development in the cities.

Similarly, Michael Peter Smith (2001) not only criticizes the economic structuralism of the World City System perspective but also questions the existence of a limited number of “world cities” or “global cities” in the economic hierarchy. Instead, taking a holistic approach to analyze urban changes, he suggests the concept of “transnational urbanism” and explains that all cities are socially constructed to be more or less “world cities” through the interactions of sociocultural as well as political-economic global networks. Smith’s claims match an anthropological understanding of globalization posited by Hannerz (1996) who views “globalization” as a term slightly exaggerated – it implies synchronization of societies across the world whereas close observations of urbanization patterns in the various parts of the world prove otherwise. Instead, he suggests a term, “transnationalism” to describe the current urban conditions characterized with dynamic and evolutionary negotiations between the top-down influence of international economic forces and the horizontal connections of place-based local cultures and ideologies. Knox (1997, 21) aptly summarizes the intricate local-global interactions and negotiations in the following paragraph:

All in all, the reality is that globalization is variously embraced, resisted, subverted, and exploited as it makes contact with specific

settings. In response, cities are modified and reconstructed, rather than being effaced or homogenized.

In other words, despite globalization, “place matters.”

### **III. State Glocalization Perspective**

Nation-states can play important roles in the making of world cities despite the power and influence of transnational corporations. For example, White (1998) and Hill and Kim (2000) demonstrate how Japan and Korea developed Tokyo and Seoul respectively into world cities as a part of their national policies. Although the important position of nation-states as producers of world cities is a factor in this way, some researchers assert even more significant roles nation-states perform for globalization and world city formation. These researchers claim that nation-states instigate the new world economic order by devolving their urban policies to cities and forcing them to be more self-reliance and compete with one another to serve the needs of capital. Brenner (1999) explains, states “fix” territorial scales at both sub-national and supra-national levels for economic regulation in order to

enhance the administrative efficiency of state institutions, to enable new forms of capital mobility on supranational [scale] to promote the global competitiveness of major sub-national growth poles and to enforce the de- and revalorisation of capital within declining cities and regions. (1999, 439)

Here, globalization is a political objective as well as a political instrument. It is a rationale as well as methodology with which political elites advance neoliberal policies that leads to convergence of world cities under the global economic order and diminishes liberal welfare

state policies. In this perspective, nation-states serve as change-agents to foster a post-Fordist economy. Neil Smith (2002, 434) asserts, “national states are reframing themselves as purer, territorially rooted economic actors in and of the market, rather than external compliments to it.”

Swyngedouw (1997) calls this scale fixing by nation-states “glocalization,” which is constructed through social conflicts and political struggles. He (1996, 1518) observes the consequence of a glocalized scale fix as follows:

[R]escalating of spatial levels of governance leads to multiply articulated, but increasingly authoritarian, state apparatuses and a parallel marginalization and reconstruction of the ‘citizen.’ These changes are legitimated and pushed through on the basis of the need to develop competitive places in a context of intensifying inter-place competition.

He concludes that although local characteristics do influence urbanization patterns under globalization, what kind of “local” depends on scale and ultimately those who decide the scale hold power over the political economy of cities and welfare of citizens therein. Therefore, “place matters but scale decides” (Swyngedouw 1997, 144).

#### **IV. New Localism Perspective**

In the above perspectives, the political entity that is least capable and most vulnerable to macro-economic forces is the city. Yet, some researchers believe cities are much more capable than widely perceived even under the globalized economy. Local leaders devise strategic plans and make political choices that shape their cities’ fortunes. For example, Clarke and Gaile (1997) see the autonomy and decentralization emanating from “glocalization” and “hollowing

out” of nation-state political hegemony as an opportunity for cities to negotiate with higher-level political and economic actors. Thus, local government is an active agent and broker for urban development, connecting local interests and macro-environmental opportunities via strategic interventions. Consequently, the development patterns of world cities vary, depending on political decisions of and available resources in the locality, even under globalization.

Savitch and Kantor (2003) also positively evaluate the capabilities and strategic options available to cities. Choices available to local leaders include pursuing strategies of slow or smart growth, fostering community development, embracing regionalism, and promoting supportive national urban policies. Savitch and Kantor (2003) acknowledge that cities must receive cooperation from their higher governments to implement these strategies but they also observe that cities can influence their higher governments through bottom-up initiatives. Such bottom-up initiatives are possible because cities are the locations where actual value-adding activities take place through place-based human capital and knowledge accumulation (Clarke and Gaile 1998).

Beauregard (1995, 242-243) expresses his optimistic view on cities in the globalized economy because

the global is the organization of many local actors on a broader geographical canvas, and that without local places the global cannot exist. Global actors hardly begin at the global scale...Rather, they work together outwards from the local, at least initially.

Thus, he suggests that one should “think locally and act globally.”

## **Globalization and Decentralization**

There is a worldwide trend towards decentralization (Dillinger 1994). As Richard Stren (2003) explains, “by decentralization we mean the transfer of significant powers and functions, along with fiscal responsibility to carry out these powers and functions, from the national to the local level of government” (1). He continues:

For this transfer to be meaningful, Philip Mawhood argues, the decentralized local body should have its own budget, a separate legal existence, and the authority to allocated substantial resources on a range of different functions, the decisions being made by representatives of the local people (Mawhood 1983, 9-10). In federal states, decentralization may involve both the transfer of powers and functions from the national to the state or provincial level, as well as the transfer of powers and functions from the state or provincial level to the local. In both unitary and federal systems, the essential point is that local authorities (however they are defined) are strengthened. (1-2)

The globalization literature implies that globalization leads to political decentralization (Hambleton, Savitch, and Stewart 2002; Keating 2001; Borja and Castells 1997; Knox 1997). First, globalization is associated with “delocalised cities” which require new governance arrangements (Savitch 2002). Second, in response to globalization, nation-states have “devolved responsibilities that they had traditionally assigned to lower levels of government” (United Nations 2001, 234). Political institutions and the intergovernmental system are restructured in response to external pressure under globalization. City leaders embrace new public management

techniques (e.g. privatization, public-private partnerships, low taxes) to improve efficiency and supply amenities demanded by the upper tier of the global economy (World City System). Political institutions and their boundaries are adjusted to create metropolitan or regional interests to compete in the world economy (State Glocalization). Local officials seek to mitigate the negative effects of globalization on the local community (Local-global Interaction). In addition, local leaders are proactive in redesigning and rebuilding their cities in the post-industrial age (New Localism).

However, the relationship between globalization and decentralization, which the four perspectives in the globalization literature endorse, is tenuous. It is also plausible that globalization reduces local autonomy. If cities are limited or dependent (e.g., Peterson 1981; Kantor 1988) then cities must focus on development policy and shy away from redistribution. If globalization is merely the rhetoric that rationalizes the agenda of corporate capital then decentralization is the language that fools communities into believing they made these choices democratically. Cities may mediate globalization. However, can they resist it?

Stren (2003) finds that decentralization initiatives in the Developing World have been “endogenous in origin” in most places (11). Thus, it is an open question whether globalization spurs decentralization or if decentralization is a function of politics. We explore this relationship in the remainder of the paper.

## **The Study**

If there is a relationship between globalization and decentralization, this should be apparent in world cities that have certainly been among the most globalized. Moreover, we may also discern whether political decentralization is a factor in achieving world city status.

Beaverstock, Smith and Taylor (1999) provide a widely accepted operationalization of world cities (see Table 2). We selected the largest 20 cities (10 Alpha and 10 Beta cities) in their roster of world cities to investigate the relationship between globalization and decentralization.

**- Insert Table 2 about here -**

Our major research question is did globalization lead to decentralization? Alternatively, are internal political dynamics responsible for changes in local governance? Globalization forces include factors, issues, incidences, and policy actions that are directly relating to or resulting from globalized market forces. Political factors include political characteristics, conditions, culture, and power structure that are more or less indigenous to the locales and not directly related to globalization. Changes in governing arrangements focus on changes in the intergovernmental system that foster more or less decentralization or centralization. As the discussion of globalization indicated, there are theoretical reasons why globalization might lead to greater centralization and we include this possibility in our analysis. We summarized the governance condition of each city in a snapshot description together with the evaluation as to whether the city is currently centralized or decentralized due to globalization or politics. An appendix provides detail that informs our assessment of the causes and consequences of globalization and local governance in the twenty world cities.

**- Insert Table 3 here -**

### **Does Globalization Lead to Decentralization?**

We identified four perspectives on globalization all of which suggest that globalization leads to greater decentralization. We then reviewed the experience of 20 world cities to determine whether there was evidence that significant decentralization was underway or had

occurred in the recent past (see Table 4). Decentralization is not the overwhelming trend. Rather, we found evidence of decentralization processes at work in only seven cities (35 percent). The remaining 13 cities (65 percent) exhibited evidence of recent centralization. There were no cases where globalization led to decentralization. This is contrary to the conventional wisdom and leads us to reject the hypothesis that globalization leads to greater decentralization.

**- Insert Table 4 here -**

Turning to the specific theories of globalization, we found no examples of cities experiencing decentralization consistent with the explanations of the World City System or Local-Global Interaction. The push towards decentralization in London and Tokyo was consistent with the State Glocalization perspective. The central governments promoted decentralization as a way to increase the competitiveness of their capital cities in the world economy. The impetus for decentralization was external to the city. The five other cases of decentralization were consistent with the New Localism Perspective—New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Brussels. In these cities, political and cultural factors have resulted in a politically fragmented local governance system and/or devolution movements. Here, the strong position of local governments in the legal-political system and supporting localist values embedded in the political culture reinforce the strong role of local leaders in “governing” and the distinctive local solutions to global pressures.

### **Does Globalization Lead to a Hollowing out of the Nation-state?**

In fifteen of our cases (75 percent), we find the strong hand of higher-level government (central or state/provincial government) in reordering the scope, resources, and organization of local government. In two cases, Tokyo and London, the intervention was to foster greater decentralization. In the remaining 13 of those cases, the intervention resulted in greater

centralization rather than decentralization—Frankfort, Zurich, Singapore, Sydney, Mexico City, Sao Paulo, Seoul, Moscow, Paris, Hong Kong, Milan, Toronto, and Madrid.

What was behind the centralization—politics or globalization? In eight of the 13 cases, intervention was motivated by globalization. That is, the main rationale for reordering central/local relations was improving the city’s competitive position in the world economy. In the remaining five cases, politics was the primary factor in strengthening central (higher-level) control. That is, non-market criteria such as advantaging party or bureaucratic influence in particular policy domains.

Globalization does not appear to foster political autonomy in world cities. As mentioned, in none of our cities did globalization lead to decentralization. Global competition, in some cases, prompts higher-level governments to develop world-class cities in their territories. Centralization provides a mechanism to ensure the development of a world-class city that captures a share of the world economy in the nation’s borders and facilitates national development goals.

## **Conclusion**

In this paper, we reviewed existing theories of globalization and their effects on cities as well as the relationship between globalization and decentralization. We find that globalization by itself has little relevance to the political decentralization of governments and that the contrary seems to be the case. In fact, in two-thirds of the cases (13 cities), there was evidence of higher-level governments promoting greater centralization. In cases of senior governments pursuing a policy of centralization, a political rationale accounted for five of the cases and globalization accounted for eight. Globalization appears to be encouraging higher-level governments, whether

nation-states or states/provinces, to intervene in the policymaking of the world cities in favor of centralization.

Meanwhile, we observed decentralization in historically and culturally decentralized American cities – New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco – and ethnically deeply divided Brussels. This indicates that socio-political agency matters strongly and certain institutional foundations function as effective aids for decentralization. However, those political and cultural backgrounds conducive to decentralization may have other negative impacts in world cities. For example, these five mentioned decentralized cities have governability problems associated with the contentious and fragmented nature of their communities.

Finally, our analysis highlights the role of higher-level governments and especially the nation-state in reordering intergovernmental relations and changing geographic scales (i.e., reterritorialization). The four perspectives of globalization literature are still wanting in describing what is taking place in the world cities under the globalized economy when paralleled with what we find in our world city analysis. Their common shortcoming is neglecting the direct involvement of central governments, which are now re-inserting themselves in the world-cities as a reaction to intensified globalization. Moreover, the theories imply a decentralizing trend while the data suggests a centralizing one. Globalization theories need to be modified to better correspond with reality. The active participation of nation-states in world-city policies may be an indication that the world economic system is becoming truly global. As European economic integration shook up European nations to strategically develop their key cities, now nation-states in the globalized economy may be developing their strategic cities as their national economic “champions.”

## Reference

- ABU-LUGHOD, J. L. (1999) New York, Chicago, Los Angeles: America's Global Cities. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- AJA, E. (2001) Spain: Nation, Nationalities, and Regions, in: J. LOUGHLIN (Ed.) Subnational Democracy in the European Union: Challenges and Opportunities, pp. 229-254. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ALBRECHTS, L. (2001) Devolution, Regional Governance and Planning Systems, International Planning Studies, 6(2), pp. 167-182.
- ALDEN, J., CROW, S. and BEIGULENKO, Y. (1998) Moscow: Planning for a world capital city toward 2000, Cities, 15(5), pp. 361-374.
- BAETEN, G. (2001) The Europeanization of Brussels and the Urbanization of 'Europe', European Urban and Regional Studies, 8(2), pp.117-130.
- BEAUREGARD, R. A. (1995) Theorizing the global-local connection, in: P. L. KNOX and P. J. TAYLOR (Eds) World Cities in a World-System, pp. 232-248. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BEAVERSTOCK, J. V. SMITH, R.G. and TAYLOR P. J. (1999) A Roaster of World Cities, Cities, 16(6), pp. 445-458.
- BENJAMIN, G. and NATHAN, R. (2001) Regionalism and Realism: A Study of Governments in the New York Metropolitan Area. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- BERG, B. and KANTOR, P. (1996) New York: The Politics of Conflict and Avoidance, in: H. V. SAVITCH and V. K. VOGEL (Eds) Regional Politics: America in a Post-City Age, pp. 25-45. Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage.

- BERSELLI, E. (2001) The Crisis and Transformation of Italian Politics. *Daedalus*, 130(3), pp. 1-24.
- BOLLENS, S. A. (1997) Fragments of Regionalism: The Limits of Southern California Governance, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 19(1), pp.105-122.
- BORJA, J. and CASTELLS, M. (1997). *Local and Global*. London: Earthscan Publications.
- BRENNER, N. (1999) Globalisation as Reterritorialisation: The Re-scaling of Urban Governance in the European Union, *Urban Studies*, 36(3), pp. 431-451.
- CASTELLS, M. (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- CHIA, S. Y. (2001) Singapore: Global city and service hub, in: F. LO and P. J. MARCOTULLIO (Eds) *Globalization and the sustainability of cities in the Asia Pacific region*, pp. 239-268. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- CHO, M. (1997) Flexibilization through metropolis: The case of postfordist Seoul, Korea, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 21(2), pp. 180-201.
- CHURCH, C. H. (2000) Switzerland: a paradigm in evolution, *Parliamentary Affairs*, 53(1), pp. 96-113.
- CLARKE, S. E. and GAILE, G. L. (1997) *Local Politics in a Global Era: Thinking Locally, Acting Globally*, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 551, pp. 28-43.
- CLARKE, S. E. and GAILE, G. L. (1998) *The Work of Cities: Globalization and Community*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minneapolis Press.
- CLEGG, T. (1987) Spain, in: E. C. PAGE and M. J. GOLDSMITH (Eds) *Central and Local Government Relations: A Comparative Analysis of West European Unitary*

- States, pp.130-155. London: Sage.
- COLTON, T. J. (1995) *Moscow: Governing the Socialist Metropolis*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- DELEON, R. E. (1992) *Left Coast City: Progressive Politics in San Francisco, 1975-1991*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- DIGAETANO, A. and STROM, E. (2003) *Comparative Urban Governance: An Integrated Approach*, *Urban Affairs Review*, 38(3), pp. 356-395.
- DILLINGER, W. (1994) *Decentralization and Its Implications for Urban Services Delivery*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- FERMAN, B. (1996) *Challenging the Growth Machine: Neighborhood Politics in Chicago and Pittsburgh*. Lawrence, KS: The University Press of Kansas.
- FOOT, J. (2001) *Milan since the Miracle: City, Culture and Identity*. Oxford: Berg.
- FRIEDMANN, J. (1986) *The World City Hypothesis*, *Development and Change*, 17(1), pp. 69-83.
- FRIEDMANN, J. and WOLFF, G. (1982) *World City Formation: an agenda for research and action*, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 6(3), pp. 309-344.
- FRISKEN, F. (2001) *The Toronto Story: Sober Reflections on Fifty Years of Experiments with Regional Governance*, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 23(5), pp. 513-541.
- FUJITA, K. (2003) *Neo-industrial Tokyo: Urban Development and Globalisation in Japan's State-Centred Developmental Capitalism*, *Urban Studies*, 40(2), pp. 249-281.

- GELLI, F. (2001) Planning Systems in Italy within the Context of New Processes of 'Regionalization', *International Planning Studies*, 6(2), pp. 183-197.
- GODFREY, B. J. (1997) Urban Development and Redevelopment in San Francisco, *Geographical Review*, 87(3), pp. 309-333.
- GOLDSMITH, M. (1995) Autonomy and City Limits, in: D. JUDGE, G. STOKER and H. WOLMAN (Eds) *Theories of Urban Politics*, pp. 228-252. London: Sage.
- HAMBLETON, R., SAVITCH, H. V., and STEWART, M. (2002) Globalism and Local Democracy, in: R. HAMBLETON, H. V. SAVITCH, and M. STEWART (Eds) *Globalism and Local Democracy: Challenge and Change in Europe and North America*, pp. 1-16. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- HAMILTON, D.K. (2002) Regionalism in Metropolitan Chicago: A Work in Progress. *National Civic Review*, 91(1), pp. 63-80.
- HANNERZ, U. (1996) *Transnational Connections: Culture, people, places*. London: Routledge.
- HARTMAN, C. W. (2002) *City for Sale: The Transformation of San Francisco*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- HASSINK, R. (1999) South Korea's Economic Miracle and Crisis: Explanations and Regional Consequences, *European Planning Studies*, 7(2), pp. 127-143.
- HAUSSERMANN, H. (1991) The relationship between local and federal government policy in the Federal Republic of Germany, in: C. PICKVANCE and E. PRETECEILLE (Eds) *State Restructuring and Local Power: A comparative perspective*, pp. 89-121. London: Pinter.
- HILL, R. C. and KIM, J. W. (2000) *Global Cities and Developmental States*: New York,

- Tokyo and Seoul, *Urban Studies*, 37(12), pp. 2167-2195.
- HO, K. C. (1999) *Transborder Regional Governance and Planning: The Case of Singapore and its Neighbors*, in: J. FRIEDMANN (Ed.) *Urban and Regional Governance in the Asia Pacific*, pp. 81-100. Vancouver, BC: Institute of Asian Research.
- HOLSTON, J. (2000) *Urban Citizenship and Globalization*, in: A. J. SCOTT (Ed.) *Global City-Regions: Trends, Theory, Policy*, pp. 324-348. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- KAMO, T. (2000) *An Aftermath of Globalization? East Asian Economic Turmoil and Japanese Cities Adrift*, *Urban Studies*, 37(12), pp. 2145-2165.
- KANTOR, P. (1988) *The Dependent City: The Changing Political Economy of Urban America*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Freshman.
- KEATING, M. (2000) *Governing Cities and Regions: Territorial Restructuring in a Global Age*, in: A. J. SCOTT (Ed.) *Global City-Regions*, pp.371-390. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KEIL, R. (2000) *Governance Restructuring in Los Angeles and Toronto: Amalgamation or Secession?* *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24(4), pp. 758-781.
- KEIL, R. and LIESER, P. (1992) *Frankfurt: Global City - Local Politics*, in: M. P. Smith (Ed.) *After Modernism: Global Restructuring and the Changing Boundaries of City Life*, pp. 39-69. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- KIM, W. B. (1999) *National Competitiveness and Governance of Seoul, Korea*, in: J. FRIEDMANN (Ed.) *Urban and Regional Governance in the Asia Pacific*, pp. 33-

50. Vancouver, BC: Institute of Asian Research.
- KIM, W. B. (2000) Repositioning of City-Regions: Korea after the Crisis, in: A. J. SCOTT (Ed.) *Global City-Regions: Trends, Theory, Policy*, pp. 263-284. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KNOX, P. L. (1997) Globalization and Urban Economic Change, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 551, pp. 17-27.
- LIN, G. C. S. (1999) State Policy and Spatial Restructuring in Post-reform China, 1978-95, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 23(4), pp. 670-696.
- LINDER, W. and VATTER, A. (2001) Institutions and Outcomes of Swiss Federalism: The Role of the Cantons in Swiss Politics, *West European Politics*, 24(2), pp. 95-122.
- LO, S. (1999) Democratization without Decentralization: local government in Hong Kong, *Journal of Contemporary China*, 8(21), pp. 297-318.
- LOGAN, J. R. (2002) Three Challenges for the Chinese City: Globalization, Migration, and Market Reform, in: J. R. LOGAN (Ed.) *The New Chinese City: Globalization and Market Reform*, pp. 3-21. Oxford: Blackwell.
- LOUGHLIN, J. (2001) Italy: The Crisis of the Second Republic, in: J. LOUGHLIN (Ed.) *Subnational Democracy in the European Union: Challenges and Opportunities*, pp. 211-228. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MACLEOD, and GOODWIN, M. (1999) Space, scale and state strategy: rethinking urban and regional governance, *Progress in Human Geography*, 23(4), pp. 503-527.
- MONTERO, A. P. (2001a) Decentralizing Democracy: Spain and Brazil in Comparative Perspective, *Comparative Politics*, 33(2), pp.149-169.

- MONTERO, A. P. (2001b) After Decentralization: Patterns of Intergovernmental Conflict in Argentina, Brazil, Spain and Mexico, *Publius*, 31(4), pp. 43-64.
- MOORE, M. B., CAMPSIE, P., WHITTAKER, R., and GIRLING, Z. (1999) Who Says Toronto Is a "Good City?" in: C. ANDREW, P. ARMSTRONG, and A. LAPIERRE (Eds) *World Class Cities: Can Canada Play?* pp. 159-193. Ottawa: University of Ottawa.
- MURAMATSU, M., IQBAL, F. AND KUME, I. (2001) *Local Government Development in Post-war Japan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MURPHY, P. and WU, C. (2001) Globalization and the Sustainability of Cities in the Asia Pacific Region: The case of Sydney, in: F. LO and M. P. MARCOTULLIO (Eds) *Globalization and the Sustainability of Cities in the Asia Pacific Region*, pp. 399-427. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- NEWMAN, P. and THORNLEY, A. (1997) Fragmentation and Centralisation in the Governance of London: Influencing the Urban Policy and Planning Agenda, *Urban Studies*, 34(7), pp. 967-988.
- NG, M. K. and TANG, W. (1999) Land-use Planning in 'One County, Two Systems': Hong Kong, Guangzhou and Shenzhen, *International Planning Studies*, 4(1), pp. 7-27.
- O'CLEIREACAIN, C. (1997) The Private Economy and the Public Budget, in: M. E. CRAHAN and A. VOURVOULIAS-BUSH (Eds) *The City and the World: New York's Global Future*, pp. 22-38. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press.
- OHMAE, K. (2000) How to Invite Prosperity from the Global Economy Into a Region, in: A. J. SCOTT (Ed.) *Global City-Regions*, pp. 33-43. Oxford: Oxford University

Press.

PETERSON, P. (1981) *City Limits*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

PIMLOTT, B. and RAO, N. (2002) *Governing London*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

RAST, J. (1999) *Remaking Chicago: The Political Origins of Urban Industrial Chicago*.

DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.

RESINA, J. R. (2001) *Madrid's Palimpsest: Reading the Capital against the grain*, in: J.

R. Resina (Ed.) *Iberian Cities*, pp. 56-92. New York: Routledge.

RODRIGUEZ, V. E. (1993) *The Politics of Decentralisation in Mexico*, *Bulletin of Latin*

*American Research*, 12(2), pp. 133-145.

ROWLAND, A. and GORDON, P. (1996) *Mexico City: No longer a leviathan?* in: A.

GILBERT (Ed.) *The Mega-city in Latin America*, pp. 173-202. Tokyo: United

Nations University Press.

SAITO, A. (2003) *Global City Formation in a Capitalist Developmental State: Tokyo and*

*the Waterfront Sub-centre Project*, *Urban Studies*, 40(2), pp. 283-308.

SANANTONIO, T. (1987) *Italy*, in: E. PAGE and M. J. GOLDSMITH (Eds) *Central and*

*Local Government Relations: A Comparative Analysis of West European Unitary*

*States*, pp. 107-129. London: Sage.

SANFORD, M. (2002) *What Place for England in an Asymmetrically Devolved UK?*

*Regional Studies*, 36(7), pp. 789-796.

SANTOS, M. (1996) *Sao Paulo: A growth process full of contradictions*, in: A.

GILBERT (Ed.) *The mega-city in Latin America*, pp. 224-240. Tokyo: United

Nations University Press.

SASSEN, S. (1991) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, NJ:

Princeton University Press.

SAUNDERS, P. J. (2001) Why "Globalization" Didn't Rescue Russia, *Policy Review*, Feb. & Mar., pp. 27-39.

SAVITCH, H. V. (1988) *Post-Industrial Cities: Politics and Planning in New York, Paris, and London*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

SAVITCH, H. V. (2002) The Globalisation Process, in: R. HAMBLETON, H. V.

SAVITCH, and M. STEWART (Eds) *Globalism and Local Democracy: Challenge and Change in Europe and North America*, pp. 19-29. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

SAVITCH, H. V. and KANTOR, P. (2002) *Cities in the International Marketplace: the Political Economy of Urban Development in North America and Western Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

SAVITCH, H. V. and KANTOR, P. (2003) Urban Strategies for a Global Era, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46(8), pp. 1002-1033.

SEARLE, G. H. (2002) The Demise of Place Equity in Sydney's Economic Development Planning, *Australian Geographer*, 33(3), pp. 317-336.

SHORT, J. R., BREITBACH, C., BUCKMAN, S. and ESSEX, J (2000) From world cities to gateway cities: Extending the boundaries of globalization theory, *City*, pp. 4(3), 317-340.

SIT, V. F. S. (2001) Increasing globalization and the growth of the Hong Kong extended metropolitan region, in: F. LO and P. J. MARCOTULLIO (Eds) *Globalization and the sustainability of cities in the Asia Pacific region*, pp. 199-238. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

SMART, A. (2002) *The Hong Kong/Pearl River Delta Urban Region: An Emerging*

- Transnational Mode of Regulation or Just Muddling Through? in: J. R. LOGAN (Ed.) *The New Chinese City: Globalization and Market Reform*, pp. 92-105. Oxford: Blackwell.
- SMITH, M. P. (2001) *Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalization*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- SMITH, N. (2002) *New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy*, *Antipode*, 34(3), pp. 427-449.
- SOJA, E. W. (1987) *Economic Restructuring and the Internationalization of the Los Angeles Region*, in: M. P. SMITH and J. R. FEAGIN (Eds) *The Capitalist City*, pp. 178-198. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- STREN, R. (2003) *Decentralization and Development: Rhetoric or Reality?* Paper presented at the Canadian Political Science Association, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
- SWYNGEDOUW, E. (1996) *Reconstructing Citizenship, the Re-scaling of the State and the New Authoritarianism: Closing the Belgian Mines*, *Urban Studies*, 33(8), pp. 1499-1521.
- SWYNGEDOUW, E. (1997) *Neither Global nor Local: "Glocalization" and the Politics of Scale*, in: K. R. COX (Ed.) *Spaces of Globalization*, pp. 137-166. New York: The Guilford Press.
- SWYNGEDOUW, E. and BAETEN, G. (2001) *Scaling the City: The Political Economy of 'Glocal' Development - Brussels' Conundrum*, *European Planning Studies*, 9(7), pp. 827-849.
- THIERSTEIN, A. and EGGER, U. K. (1998) *Integrated regional policy: lessons from Switzerland*, *Environment and Planning C*, 16(2), pp. 155-172.

- TRAVERS, T. (2002) Decentralization London-style: The GLA and London Governance, *Regional Studies*, 36(7), pp. 779-788.
- UNITED NATIONS CENTRE FOR HUMANSETTLEMENTS (2001) *Cities in a Globalizing World: Global Report on Human Settlements 2001*. Nairobi: United Nations Centre for Human Settlements.
- VOGEL, R. K. (2000) Decentralization and Urban Governance: Reforming Tokyo Metropolitan Government, in: B. A. RUBLE, R. E. STREN, J. S. TULCHIN, and D. H. VARAT (Eds) *Urban Government Governance Around the World*, pp.114-148. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- VOGEL, R.K. (2003) *Rescaling the City: Metropolitan Reform and Regionalism in Toronto and Tokyo*. Paper presented at the Canadian Political Science Association, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
- WARD, P. M. (1998) *Mexico City*. Chichester, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- WHITE, J. W. (1998) Old Wine, Cracked Bottle? Tokyo, Paris, and the Global City Hypothesis, *Urban Affairs Review*, 33(4), pp. 451-477.

**Table 1: Four Perspectives in the Globalization and World City Literature**

		Consequence in global-local relation	
		Global convergence	Local diversity
Causes of globalization: economic structure or political agency	<b>Market economy</b>	<p><b>I. World City System Perspective: “Space of Flow”</b></p> <p>TNCs, supported by technologies and global financial markets, undermine state sovereignty, and the global division of labor reduces cities into mere nodes of economic system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Friedmann (1986): world cities as hierarchical economic nodes.</li> <li>▪ Sassen (1991): global financial markets and advanced service economy concentrate in global cities.</li> <li>▪ Castells (1996): Cities are converging and place turns to space of flow.</li> </ul>	<p><b>II. Local-global Interaction Perspective: “Place Matters”</b></p> <p>Working towards uniformity, globalization is a powerful macro economic force. But local peculiarities mediate the globalization force in local place making. Place still matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Abu-Lughod (1999): place and history continue to exert influences.</li> <li>▪ Smith: (2001) globalization takes socially constructed, place-specific shapes at locales.</li> <li>▪ Knox (1997): globalization is global-local negotiation.</li> </ul>
	<b>Political agency</b>	<p><b>III. State Glocalization Perspective: “Scale Decides”</b></p> <p>Globalization is produced by neoliberal ideology, under which central governments fix supra- and sub-national spaces for competition among cities and post-Fordism economic order.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Brenner (1999): states regulate for reterritorialization of socioeconomic and political-institutional spaces.</li> <li>▪ Swyngedouw (1997): socio-economic scale is redefined through political process for “constructive destruction.”</li> </ul>	<p><b>IV. New Localism Perspective: “Think Locally and Act Globally”</b></p> <p>Cities are not simply subject to globalization. As a political, economic and sociocultural institution, cities actively participate in and make globalization.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Clarke &amp; Gaile (1998): As the producer of human resources and economic values, cities can strategically and politically respond to globalization.</li> <li>▪ Beauregard (1995): Cities are the actors of globalization and capable of creating global consequences.</li> </ul>

**Table 2: The GaWC Inventory of World Cities.**

<p><b>A. Alpha world cities</b> 12: London, Paris, New York, Tokyo 10: Chicago, Frankfurt, Hong Kong, Los Angeles, Milan, Singapore</p> <p><b>B. Beta world cities</b> 9: San Francisco, Sydney, Toronto, Zurich 8: Brussels, Madrid, Mexico City, Sao Paulo 7: Moscow, Seoul</p>
<p><b>C. Gamma world cities</b> 6: Amsterdam, Boston, Caracas, Dallas, Dusseldorf, Geneva, Houston, Jakarta, Johannesburg, 5: Melbourne, Osaka, Prague, Santiago, Taipei, Washington 4: Bangkok, Beijing, Rome, Stockholm, Warsaw Atlanta, Barcelona, Berlin, Buenos Aires, Budapest, Copenhagen, Hamburg, Istanbul, Kuala Lumpur, Manila, Miami, Minneapolis, Montreal, Munich, Shanghai</p>
<p><i>Definitions</i> – World-cityness values were produced by scoring 3 for prime centre status, 2 for major centre status, and 1 for minor centre status.</p>

Source: GaWC inventory of world cities by Beaverstock and Taylor (1999, 456). Cities are ordered in terms of world-cityness with values ranging from 1 to 12.

**Table 3: Snapshot of World City Governance and Cause/Consequence Evaluation**

City	Snapshot of current governance condition	Evaluation
London	The Greater London Authority (GLA) is created for economic strategy as well as the promised devolution. Central government still aims to steer London toward strategic development under global competition and to stave off the ideological difference of the elected mayor. However, the strategic planning role and the position of mayor provide a base for an independent metropolitan city to emerge. GLA has fought with the central government on key issues.	Decentralized due to the economic imperative felt by the central government and promises of Labour Party to devolve authority.
Paris	There are strong interactions between national and local politics and policies. Globalization is a factor for the newly adopted market-oriented governance system. However, the central government and other middle tier institutions strongly guide Paris to maintain French ideals as the center of French society and culture.	Centralized due to the political culture and ideal of the government.
New York	New York is a socially liberal city that increasingly needs to be financed by itself under the current mode of federal system and globalization. Given this, negotiations between corporatist leaders and pluralistic forces continue. However, as the secession movement shows, liberal economic individualism underlies the mode of governance in this city.	Decentralized due to local ideology as well as the higher government system.
Tokyo	Close but sometimes contentious influences run both ways between the central bureaucracy, state government and the local political elite while, at the same time, competing for leadership. Global economic imperative requires the central government and Tokyo Metropolitan Government to be cooperative to implement effective development strategies. However, the resources and independence of Tokyo Metropolitan Government combined with official decentralization policy from the central government push towards greater decentralization.	Current tendency towards decentralization. However, strategic needs under global economic system keep Tokyo tied to the central government.
Chicago	Economic effects of globalization impact Chicago through racial tensions and parochial territorial interests. However, local politics heavily influence Chicago's policy making more so than globalization does under American federal system and decreasing state aid. The fragmentation along the racial line and machine politics still persist.	Decentralized due to local ideology as well as the higher government system.
Frankfurt	Structurally, Germany has highly decentralized local governments. However, functionally, national and state interests heavily weigh in on Frankfurt through the party system. Globalized economy and competition is the motivation for the coalition between the city, state and central government elites to build the world city in Frankfurt.	Centralized due to the economic order under globalization.

<b>Hong Kong</b>	Chinese central government's executive office (HKSAR) has been undermining the autonomy of local political institutions. As a result, although HKSAR is given the highest level of autonomy within the Chinese political system, Hong Kong's autonomous status has been compromised despite the "one country, two systems" policy since the 1997 repatriation.	Centralizing due to higher government interventions for control.
<b>Los Angeles</b>	Contentious cooperation for economic viability and quality of life among ethnically divided communities produces a precarious balance in the governance of Los Angeles. However, the ideology of privatism is strong in the political scene as noted in the affluent San Fernando Valley's secession movement.	Decentralized due to local ideology as well as the higher government system.
<b>Milan</b>	Social and political parochialism characterizes Milan while the city relies on the central government and national political power for development through the strong party system. Although the separatist Northern League lead the city during the mid 1990s, the current city regime is closely connected to the central government through the populist premier, Berlusconi.	Political condition and social culture closely binds Milan and central political power.
<b>Singapore</b>	International regionalism and cooperation is essential for continued prosperity of this small city-state. Globalization expands the scale of economic, therefore political, interests over national boundaries.	Globalization necessitates further centralized planning.
<b>San Francisco</b>	Growth politics is prevalent in the current governance mode after a history of political battles between "growth management" supporters and "pro-growth" elites. The regime shift had to take place due to increasing regional rivalry and high social costs. Thus, globalization is a factor but not a cause of decentralization. Fundamentally and historically, the city has thrived on the ideology of economic individualism under the federal system and it still determines the mode of governance.	Decentralized due to local ideology as well as the higher government system.
<b>Sydney</b>	The state leads urban policies and development, undermining city government autonomy. Sydney and Melbourne have been competing since 1950s in the interstate rivalry in the British Commonwealth but globalization has changed the nature of the competition. Now Sydney is a strategic site for the state of New South Walls (NSW) to grow in the globalized economy.	Centralized due to the state-led policies under the influence of globalization.
<b>Toronto</b>	The province of Ontario resolved a political struggle over the control of Toronto though a rescaling of political territory. As the amalgamation problem intensified, it became increasingly apparent that ideological disagreements, rather than economic logic, created the governance restructuring. Downloading policies shifted budget costs downwards while reducing local autonomy over decisions.	Centralized due to the political interests of a higher government.
<b>Zurich</b>	Traditional local autonomy is being reviewed. Uneven effects of globalized economy work toward regionalization of local communities while, at the regional level, such uneven developments widen the division along the ethnicity/language lines.	Centralizing due to the effects of globalized economy.

<b>Brussels</b>	Ethnic divisions are exacerbated by new class polarization between traditional local elites and new international elites. Globalization added another complication to the contentious multi-ethnic society but it is not the basic cause of the governance decentralization that took place in Brussels.	Decentralized due to local as well as national socio-political issues.
<b>Madrid</b>	Although regional governments have been strengthened for decentralization and democratization, Madrid has been developed by the central government as the center of the new democratic Spain for symbolic purposes. Current governance of Madrid is influenced more strongly by the political intent of the national government than by globalization.	Centralized due to the political purpose of the national government.
<b>Mexico City</b>	For both democratization efforts and economic development, the central government adopts neoliberal policies, with privatization and open economy. However, crucial economic policies such as NAFTA and currency issues under globalized economy allow the president to retain strong control over sub-national governments. Likewise, the governance of Mexico City is connected to the president through party politics.	Centralized due to central government's policy direction under globalization.
<b>Sao Paulo</b>	The central government took a decentralization policy as a part of its democratization efforts after a military dictatorship, including liberation of domestic market for foreign businesses. However, advanced functional decentralization achieved in the 1980s is being re-centralized by the federal government because the state governments' fiscal policy failed under globalized economy.	Re-centralizing by federal fiscal policies because of globalized economy.
<b>Moscow</b>	Although decentralized decision capability has been slowly growing for smoother economic development as well as democratization, economic reform policies to embrace globalization have recently called for strong central government decrees. Meanwhile, the control by the central government remains strong and the delicate political balance characterizes the relationship between the city leaders and central government executives.	Recentralizing as the central government elite tries to embrace globalized economy.
<b>Seoul</b>	After guided capitalism and under more "open" economic policies, economic growth further concentrated in Seoul despite the central government's political efforts for deconcentration. The central government's political interests in Seoul persist under globalization.	Continued centralization due to politics under globalization.

**Table 4: Globalization and Decentralization: Analysis of Cause and Consequence**

<b>Globalization Theories</b>	<b>Causal Link</b>	<b>Source of Change</b>	<b>Predictions</b>	<b>Cases</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>World City System</b>	Globalization	Above/External	Decentralization	none	0
<b>Local Global Interaction</b>	Globalization	Negotiated	Decentralization	none	0
<b>State Glocalization</b>	Politics	Above/External	Decentralization	London, Tokyo	2
<b>New Localism</b>	Politics	Below/Negotiated	Decentralization	New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Brussels	5
<b>Subtotal (Decentralized)</b>					<b>7</b>
<b>Cities having Centralized Contrary to Theory Predictions</b>	Globalization	Above/External	--	Frankfurt, Singapore, Sydney, Zurich, Mexico City, Sao Paulo, Moscow, Seoul,	8
	Politics			Paris, Hong Kong, Milan, Toronto, Madrid	5
<b>Subtotal (Centralized)</b>					<b>13</b>
<b>Total</b>					<b>20</b>

## Appendix: Globalization and Local Governance: Cause and Consequence in World City Governance

Cause of Governance Forms		Consequence in Governance Forms		
Globalization	Political Factors	Toward Decentralization	Toward Centralization	
<b>London</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As the competition against other European major cities intensified, the private and public sectors have cooperated to boost the position of London (Newman and Thornley 1997).</li> <li>▪ Global economic imperative motivated the state to form Greater London Authority (GLA) (MacLeod and Goodwin 1999).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Devolution for enhanced democracy was Labour's campaign platform during the 1997 general election (Pimlott and Rao 2002).</li> <li>▪ It is speculated that the central government felt a need to limit the authority of the GLA and its mayor to maintain political influence over London (Pimlott and Rao 2002; Travers 2002).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Labour Party established GLA and an elected mayor position in 2000 (Pimlott and Rao 2002).</li> <li>▪ GLA resembles an upper tier government with four key functions: transport, economic development, police, and strategic planning (Sanford 2002).</li> <li>▪ Position of elected mayor resulting in emergence of an independent metropolitan city which has resisted central administration (Pimlott and Rao 2002).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Thatcher conservative administration abolished the Greater London Council in 1986 (Pimlott and Rao 2002).</li> <li>▪ There are practically four different kinds of government exist in London: central government departments, government-appointed boards, the GLA, and the boroughs. This undermines GLA's authority (Travers 2002).</li> <li>▪ The new mayor does not have the executive power to implement policies for which he is accountable (Sanford 2002).</li> </ul>
<b>Paris</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Competition with other EC cities and neoliberalism are combined to induce decentralization in Paris (DiGaetano and Strom 2003).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Statist culture modifies neoliberalism from developing into full-fledged autonomous corporatist governance. (DiGaetano and Strom 2003).</li> <li>▪ Urban policies are a vital part of national politics supported by laws, budgets and overlapping networks of power (Savitch and Kantor 2002).</li> <li>▪ As the center of French culture and society as well as economy, the state guides Paris to maintain its social and cultural ideals before economic prosperity (White 1998).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In 1975, a statute at the national government was passed to grant Paris to have its own mayor to encourage developments through market forces (Savitch 1988).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In addition to direct policy interventions by the National government, a state agency; DATAR, and the regional authority; Ile-de-France, also coordinate and implement development policies over Paris (Savitch and Kantor 2002).</li> <li>▪ Strong public sector dominates public-private partnership (DiGaetano and Strom 2003).</li> <li>▪ Although the system of dual public office holding has been curtailed since 1985, local leaders still use this system for political influence on the resources of national and regional governments (Savitch and Kantor 2002).</li> </ul>

New York	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the center of the world finance, New York's prominence increased as globalization progressed while the city is increasingly susceptible to global economic changes (Abu-Lughod 1999).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although corporatism leadership is evident, implemented by bureaucrats, politicians and business leaders, there is a strong pluralistic counter forces from various local interest groups (Savitch 1988).</li> <li>The city is traditionally committed to social services while New York State mandates the city for a high rate of self-financing (O'Cleireacain, 1997).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As federal sponsored financial aids decline, the city's fiscal independence increased (O'Cleireacain, 1997).</li> <li>Staten Island attempted secession in 1994 (Benjamin and Nathan 2001).</li> <li>Regional governance has proven to be very difficult due to contentious relationships between New York and surrounding cities in the adjacent states (Berg &amp; Kantor 1996).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With the micro-management by the state for expenditures, New York suffers from the lack of autonomous policy making capability (Abu-Lughod 1999).</li> </ul>
Tokyo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under globalized competition in the 1990s, Tokyo took a different policy path from Anglo-American world cities due to Japan's state-centered developmental capitalist system (Fujita 2003).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TMG and the central state government need to depend on each other to maintain Tokyo's competitiveness under globalization while the central government and TMG sometimes clash for conflicts of interests (Fujita 2003; Saito 2003).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decentralization has been a key policy agenda but the motivation is unclear. On the one hand, it appears aimed at reducing the central government's budget deficit (Muramatsu et al 2001). However, decentralization and other administrative reform is also viewed as necessary to solve Japan's economic crisis (Vogel 2000).</li> <li>Central government directs TMG for urban development but TMG has substantial discretion and independent resources (Fujita 2003, Muramatsu et al 2001).</li> <li>TMG reforms lead to transformation of 23 subordinate wards into full-fledged municipalities (Vogel 2000).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The thrusts of Tokyo's economic development have been guided by central government bureaucracy (Hill and Kim 2000).</li> <li>Since the 1980s, the development of Tokyo to a world-city has been a central government policy (Kamo 2000).</li> </ul>
Chicago	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fordist Chicago was particularly hit hard by deindustrialization, which had started in the late 1960s and continued until the mid-1990s (Abu-Lughod 1999).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Race and machine politics form the basis of Chicago's urban regime (Ferman 1996).</li> <li>Chicago's dominant influence in the regional and the state political scenes has declined (Rast 1999; Hamilton 2002).</li> <li>Neighborhood movements developed into a citywide new industrial policy despite the perception that manufacturing is no longer feasible under globalization (Rast 1999).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chicago's reliance on the federal government is relatively sparse due to the loss of defense industries (Abu-Lughod 1999).</li> <li>Racial segregation centers on the determination of city boundaries and new service economy has had unequal effects along different racial groups and different locations (Abu-Lughod 1999).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>White elites in Chicago manage to implement regional coordination through special districts and get the state government involved for financial help (Abu-Lughod 1999).</li> </ul>

Frankfurt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Globalized economic changes and competition motivated the CDU-lead regime to develop Frankfurt into a world city (Keil and Lieser 1992).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Election voting is conducted on the basis of political parties, connecting national politics and local policies (Keil and Lieser 1992).</li> <li>Municipalities form parts of states (“Bundeslander”) and their local responsibilities are stipulated by the Federal laws as well as the state laws. (Hausserman 1991).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under a federal government system, states (<i>Länder</i>) and municipalities exercise considerable autonomy and political influence for politics from below (Goldsmith1995).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A powerful pro-growth regime backed by the conservative party (CDU) at both national and regional levels transformed the city into a world city (Keil and Lieser 1992).</li> </ul>
Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>China benefited from globalized economy as a major foreign direct investment site. After 1991, its foreign direct investment increased exponentially (Logan 2002).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognizing the deficiencies of the Maoist political system and economic policy, Deng Xiaopiing adopted the Open Door policy to allow decentralized decision-makings, international trade and foreign investments (Lin 1999).</li> <li>To join the world economy, the Chinese government adopted the “Open Door” policy in 1978 (Ng and Tang 1999).</li> <li>Hong Kong was repatriated to China by UK in 1997 (Lo 1999).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hong Kong Special Administrative Region enjoys the highest level of autonomy among special economic areas (Ng and Tang 1999).</li> <li>Regional industrial developments between Hong Kong, the Pearl River Delta and Macau emerged since 1980s. However, effective political coordination is still lacking (Sit 2001; Smart 2002).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Beijing government attempted to re-centralize administrative and political power through the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) (Lo 1999).</li> <li>The immigration control controversy between HKSAR and the Pearl River Delta Urban Region prompted central government’s intervention (Smart 2002).</li> </ul>
Los Angeles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post-modern urbanization under globalized economy changed the city’s economic base from manufacturing to finance and advanced services (Soja 1987).</li> <li>Due to increased immigration, whites are becoming numerical minority (Abu-Lughod 1999).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fragmented local governments with class and racial tension. (Bollens 1997).</li> <li>Minority representation is regularly tampered by gerrymandering of wards, from which representatives to the city council are elected (Abu-Lughod 1999).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since 1970s, secession from Los Angeles has been an issue in San Fernando Valley (Keil 2000).</li> <li>Existing political power can persist at the cost of growing racial minorities (Abu-Lughod 1999).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Despite fragmented local governments, special Districts manage key functions, such as water supply and air quality control, at the regional level (Bollens 1997).</li> </ul>

Milan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Globalization increased polarization between the rich north and the poor south (Savitch and Kantor 2002).</li> <li>▪ During the 1990s, the city leaders emphasized need for competitiveness under the fuller European Union integration (Savitch and Kantor 2002).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Political parties play important roles, controlling local government decisions from the national political arena, while local politics influence the central party policies in the bottom-up manner (Sanantonio 1987).</li> <li>▪ Since 1997 Berlusconi's pro-business regime governs Milan (Foot 2001) and since 2001 it leads Italy on a neo-liberal, center-right political platform (Berselli 2001).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The North-East opposes current centralized and hierarchical government system for federalism (Gelli 2001; Loughlin 2001).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Despite the success of the Northern League during early 1990s, the separatist movement lacked policy substance or real public support (Foot 2001).</li> <li>▪ The city government controls land use planning but highly relies on higher governments for finance, particularly from the national government (Savitch and Kantor 2002).</li> </ul>
Singapore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Being a part of global economy imposes a threat as well as opportunity; as a small country, Singapore is more vulnerable to international economic fluctuations and competition (Yue 2001).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Singapore is characterized with a strong central planning political culture (Yue 2001).</li> <li>▪ It has to overcome the endemic shortages of land and human resource (Yue 2001).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As a city-state, there is only a single tier (national level) of government (Yue 2001).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A cross-border regional approach in collaboration with Malaysia and Indonesia has been developing since 1990s for economic development (Ho 1999; Yue 2001).</li> </ul>
San Francisco	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Globalization shifted liberal anti-growth political culture toward more growth friendly environment (Godfrey 1997)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ With economic decentralization spreading over the region, and as the city loses regional economic prominence, local competition intensified and progrowth regime took the city office in the late 1990s (Godfrey 1997).</li> <li>▪ Pluralistic political culture with strong and diverse community activism (DeLeon 1992; Hartman 2002).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Within the national political framework of liberal democracy and federalism, the city must orient itself toward economic development (Hartman 2002).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ With its high social policy costs and deteriorating infrastructure, the city must work with the state government (DeLeon 1992).</li> </ul>
Sydney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sydney, with its post-modern economy, overtook Melbourne as the leading world city after Australia joined the "global" economy in place of British Commonwealth in the 1970s (Short et al. 2000).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Federal government lacks constitutional authority to intervene directly in the city affairs. State agencies control land use regulation and infrastructure provision. (Murphy and Wu 2001).</li> <li>▪ State governments, rather than cities, take the leading role for growth politics and civic boosterism (Short et al. 2000).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Local government has an important regulatory and strategic planning role but state legislation overrides municipal initiatives (Murphy and Wu 2001).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ States lead the local political unit for the federal system (Murphy and Wu 1999).</li> <li>▪ Pro-market state government pushed forward downtown redevelopment projects, including the 2000 Olympic Games, using its centralized planning powers and overriding obstacles from the Sydney council (Searle 2002).</li> </ul>

Toronto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was a perception that Toronto needs to be more efficient and competitive under globalized economy (Keil 2000).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political polarization existed between suburban constituents and the central city residents, with suburban conservatives opposing the liberal policies in the central city (Milroy et al 1999).</li> <li>The Tory provincial government had a political incentive; to sway the political weight of Toronto from the central city liberals to suburban conservatives (Keil 2000).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under a federal system, the federal government largely defers to provinces for urban policies (Savitch and Kantor 2002).</li> <li>After creating the “mega city” Toronto, the Ontario government downloaded social policies to the city (Vogel 2003).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In 1996, the former “Metro Toronto,” which was composed of six municipalities, was amalgamated into a single city by the provincial government (Friskin 2001).</li> </ul>
Zurich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uneven urbanization due to globalized economy is creating population concentration and growth gaps between cantons (Thierstein and Egger 1998).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decentralization and local autonomy are the political foundation of the country (Linder and Vatter 2001).</li> <li>Language divides the society (Church 2000).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zurich is considered the powerhouse of German speaking society, pushing the Francophone towards Brussels (Church 2000).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uneven developments motivate regionalism and the formation of metropolitan authorities (Church 2000; Linder and Vatter 2001).</li> </ul>
Brussels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Globalization brought in the city new international elites whose economic interest does not mesh with the parochial interests of local elites (Swyngedouw and Beaten 2001).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language, ethnicity and class intertwine to form a fragmented society (Beaten 2001).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belgium became a federal state in 1989. There are two types of sub-state units with substantial autonomy: regions are established for economic and spatial planning related matters, and communities are for language and people related matters (Albrechts 2001).</li> <li>With its municipalities having fiefdom status, Brussels is under far-reaching political fragmentation and parochialism (Beaten 2001).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brussels is considered a de facto city-state, with two community councils (the French and Flemish) and nineteen municipalities with their own elected councils (Baeten 2001).</li> </ul>
Madrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spain entered EC in 1985. EC structural funds were used to spur decentralized functions of regional governments (Montero 2001a).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new constitution in 1978 after Franco’s death marks the democratization and decentralization. Historically, regions dominate the subject of decentralization (Clegg 1987; Montero 2001a).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regions increased their spending power and discretion in fiscal resources over the central government (Montero 2001a).</li> <li>Regions enjoy autonomous status with their own economic policies, resulting in a fragmented form of federalism (Montero 2001b).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Municipalities enjoy very limited political autonomy from regional and central governments (Aja 2001).</li> <li>As the capital of new democratic Spain, Madrid has been receiving disproportionate amount of investments from the central government to symbolize the center of the new nation (Resin 2001).</li> </ul>

Mexico City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Since the 1980s when Mexico joined GATT, the central government has tried to de-concentrate economic activities in the capital and decentralize political power (Ward 1998).</li> <li>▪ The president continues to retain strong power through economic policies such as NAFTA, the central bank and currency issues (Montero 2001<sup>b</sup>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Party politics and the connection to the president control the governance of Mexico City, undermining efforts for decentralization and democratization (Ward 1998).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Two regional jurisdictions divide Mexico City (the Federal District and areas under the State of Mexico) and the different financial capacities between them create tensions (Rowland and Gordon 1996).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The democratization campaign by the central government in the 1980s produced more balanced regional developments. However, through the decentralization process, the capacities of states and municipalities are more controlled by the central government (Rodriguez 1993).</li> </ul>
Sao Paulo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Banks, professional services and transnational businesses started to concentrate in Sao Paulo since 1970s as the country opened its economy and joined global economy (Santos 1996).</li> <li>▪ State economic policies to attract foreign investments resulted in fiscal crisis in the 1990s (Montero 2001a).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As a democratization process, the bureaucratic military regime gradually relinquished its control in the late 1970s and early 1980s. This process laid ground for decentralization before the first direct election of the president in 1989 (Montero 2001a).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Political decentralization took place as a result of democratization process and redistribution of access to power (Montero 2001a).</li> <li>▪ As Sao Paulo globalized, average income of workers dropped due to deindustrialization (Santos 1996). Consequently, clear spatial division between the pattern of the rich center and poor periphery emerged within Sao Paulo (Holston 2000).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hyper-inflation and financial crisis led to a drastic federal government intervention for re-centralized controls of state governments (Montero 2001b).</li> </ul>
Moscow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The city is increasingly embracing the free market system and democratic procedures (Alden 1998).</li> <li>▪ Economic reforms to adopt globalization have undermined democratization efforts and induced some draconian policies in the central government (Saunders 2001).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As a part of democratization process, decentralization is the political motto (Colton 1995).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The elected strong mayor has the capability to appoint the city's prefecture leaders and develop strategic planning (Alden 1998).</li> <li>▪ Amalgamation between the city of Moscow and its hinterland municipalities took place in 1993 for economic development and political gains to the city's political elite (Colton 1995).</li> <li>▪ More freedom is given for local taxation (Colton 1995).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The central executive branch and central government bureaucrats still strongly intervene the city government affairs while the city continued to rely on the central government for finance (Colton 1995).</li> </ul>

Seoul	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ After the 1997 economic crisis, the central government was forced to take IMF-led, free market policies to operate in line with the global market disciplines (Kim 2000).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “Guided capitalism,” produced a rapid economic success, with the concentration of industry and population in Seoul (Hill and Kim 2000).</li> <li>▪ State regulation of and investments to the Seoul region are geared toward the economic globalization of the entire state (Cho 1997).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Since 1990s, there have been deconcentration efforts of the political and economic power gathered in the Seoul region to diversify economic and decision making capabilities (Hassink 1999).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The capital region is governed by the capital region managing plan, whose committee includes the prime minister and other related ministry heads (Kim 1999).</li> <li>▪ Decentralized, neoliberal open-market policies after the 1997 economic crisis further accentuate the crucial role Seoul plays for the entire national economy (Kim 2000).</li> </ul>
-------	---	---	--	---