This chapter demonstrates the particularity and situatedness of the dominant frameworks that are passed off as global norms and criteria of desirable outcomes, as well as identifies visual and spatial modes that might help re-vision the infrastructure of the urban. It poses two modes by which the world enters the imagination of Indian cities—plug-in and cut-and-paste—to argue that the emphasis on flow as the leitmotif of the global disregards the point that in a globalized world, one’s orientation and vantage have become more critical. It also states that the critique of global flows and the real-estate industry lays out the dominant visual and ideological positions that the marginalized majority negotiates.

The second essay explores the interplay of abstraction and concreteness in financial systems, in urban slums, and in luxury real estate development. For more than a century, the social relations of the metropolis have been linked analytically to financial circulation, a connection that is clearly audible in the phrase “global city.”
This chapter assesses the construction of an optical field in which dominant frameworks are unlearned. It evaluates the theoretical approach that would give access to the ways of viewing cities that do not a priori privilege global flows or the amassment of fixed capital and infrastructure. It states that the theories of resistance and subalternity yield a range of conceptual devices to underline the ontological priority of the dominant. These devices include strategy versus tactics, homogenous versus fragmentary, visible versus hidden, and continuous versus episodic. The chapter suggests that the assumption of ontological priority of the people requires a more thorough explanation of the relation between elite and popular culture.
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This chapter examines the architecture of China’s global cities: Shanghai, Hong Kong, and Beijing. It shows that while new architectural forms are more often imported than homegrown, the ways in which they are deployed remain local, as evidenced by the Chinese preference for skyscrapers with pagoda roofs and atria. The chapter also identifies the three different architectural cultures that coexist in the first years of the new millennium. These include the places in which the disadvantaged and dispossessed live with inadequate access to the infrastructure that the middle class around the world takes for granted; the places created by those who exert a significant degree of economic, political, and social control over the spaces in which they live, work, shop, and play; and the relatively narrow sliver reserved for negotiation between the elite tier of the design professions and the clients and publics they serve.
This chapter discusses the efforts to restructure and revitalize the university landscape within a large-scale network of cities, especially when serving within the implications of global economics. The university’s physical space, as well as its relationship with the urban community at large, has continually evolved throughout the years; but in the late twentieth century, urban planners have come to think in terms of hybridity—a movement away from the town-and-gown urban encounters of yore and into the mutual stabilization of both city and campus. Although the urban campus has indeed become a closed environment, the boundaries of this environment have continued to expand and invigorate the local economy, what with the restoration of public infrastructure as well as its student population providing further economic opportunities for the community. The university space has become a hybrid city—one that is indistinct from the larger community in which it thrives.

Conclusion

This concluding chapter speculates on the trends and future of twenty-first-century higher education and urban campus development, following the scars left behind by postwar urban renewal. This Chicago case study illustrates the complex interplay of interactions between the campus and the city—which creates not a homogenous landscape, but an irregular, fragmented set of “scapes” that nevertheless creates community rather than a ruined institution. The city is likewise just as diverse—with its own set of peoples and cultures that can oftentimes come into conflict with the university in terms of physical space, identity, and scarce resources. Such chaos belies the organization evident within the urban campus—which, despite containing several sub-communities of its own, cannot isolate itself from the larger context of the global city.
This chapter focuses on the opposing insights of Manfredo Tafuri and Francis Fukuyama about the architectural postmodernism period from the early 1970s through the late 1980s. Tafuri said that discourses about architectural modernism were in fact stage-managed to conceal the collective failure of architects to substantially alter patterns of capitalist development at the urban scale. On the other hand, Fukuyama believed that architectural modernism brought about by global capitalism is driven by its inevitable consequence of the “economic self-interest” of a newly conscious class of consumers. The chapter explains how postmodern architecture replaces the serial imagination of historical time frames with a temporality that obeys commands like “rewind” and “fast forward”.