『社会科学ジャーナル』54 COE特別号〔2005〕
The Journal of Social Science 54 COE Special Edition [2005]
pp.*49-72*

Development and Urban Futures
"Urban Public Spheres" as Arenas for Composing More
"Inclusive Development"

Development and Urban Futures
"Urban Public Spheres" as Arenas for Composing More "Inclusive Development"

Mitsuhiro Tanimura*

I. Introduction

Under accelerated globalization in market economy, the frameworks of conventional values, issues, and actors that are moving forward "international development" have been called into question. These frameworks will further be shaken by such anticipated streams as rapid urbanization in the developing world, worldwide aging, escalation of transnational migrations, and the progress of twenty-first century science and technology with concomitant ethical dilemmas.

In the transformation of society, "inclusive development" approaches — including "enabling strategies" aiming to weave the deprived into the mainstream — have been advocated as innovative measures for the marginalized. However, as will be discussed later, some critiques argue that these are mere partial expedients with sophisticated tricks and even logical contradictions.

This paper primarily aims at building up a common ground for discussions on "development and urban futures", with a view to literally crystallizing steps toward "urbanization for all". As a pre-stage to the coming detailed analyses involving a wide variety of sector-scenarios, it will be extremely useful to first consider more "inclusive development" and new roles of "cities" in light of rough picture on the shaken "human society" in the twenty-first century.

This study, which is based mainly on literature review, begins with depicting the shaken "human society" and touching on the actors and public spheres as their arenas that would be involved in dealing with a large variety of problems.

* 本学 COE リサーチ・フェロー

Subsequent sections accentuate some issues regarding/hindrances to more "inclusive development" by analysing new dimensions of urban challenges in relation to demographic, economic, and socio-cultural urbanization, and by looking at endeavours to build up a new paradigm in physical planning/design. Finally, for the intensive discussions hereafter on "development and urban futures" in the twenty-first century, on the basis of the above consideration, this paper enters into a discussion of "urban public spheres" that could be important poles for more "inclusive development", and tentatively indicates some fundamental points/concepts (rather than concrete, elaborate policy designs) at the present moment.

II. Whither Twenty-first Century "Human Society"?

1. Shaken "Human Society": How could We Control Outrageous Vectors of Exclusiveness?

New currents, such as market-driven globalization and a worldwide surge of civil societies independently struggling with its distortions, have shaken traditional key actors, including states and international organizations who cling to functionalist thinking. These actors can no longer cope by applying their customary logic (Sakamoto, 1997, p.46; Nye, 2003, pp.239, 252–253). With the living foundations of the general public being abruptly undermined by transnational economic powers, the public has come to share a dissatisfaction with the "unreliable" conventional actors and ceaseless anxiety about their own identities. Thus, as particularly seen by the new buzzword of "global citizens" — persons who identify themselves with "global communities" — people are beginning to show aspirations for greater solidarity.

It must be kept in mind, however, that even communities of "global citizens" do not always apply a logic that could include all marginalized individuals, partly due to a risk of coerced homogeneity (Washida, 2001, p.28). Furthermore, the mixed feelings of the disempowered, rather, help to key up inward vectors

and are significantly reflected in retrogression to a "national community" and "fundamentalism" overly focusing on specific cultures/values. In every future scenario, a grave challenge for society will be the creation of political/economic systems that can ensure human dignity and equality for all, on the basis of logic that controls excessively narrow-minded, exclusive tendencies. The endeavour should be promoted through multi-actor/-sector/-level approaches (Sakamoto, 1997, pp.47–48; Saito, 2000, pp.3–4, 84–85; Kaul et al., eds., 2003, pp.14, 53).

In addition, as foreseeable real issues, not theoretical conjectures, some scientists and cultural critics warn that, in a half century or so, "human society" per se might be shaken by the dawn of a "next society" grounded on "gene-ism", with much more powerful bases of exclusion — for example, apprehensions about a bio-caste system (discrimination rooted in genotype), and a subsequent speciation of human-beings in line with advances in science and technology (Rifkin, 1999, pp.221–233; Kaku, 2000, pp.340–341). Yet, whole twenty-first century science and technology are unquestionably potential driving forces, there will soon be a grave need to reconsider the meaning and form of "human society" from unimaginable dimensions and in light of "human development" as well (Tanimura, 2001, pp.80, 83).

2. Public Spheres as Arenas of "the Global Public"

As worldwide interdependence has recently been intensified, the concepts of "commons" and "public goods" are being extended to an international level as "global commons" and "global public goods", respectively. In particular, the latter is an emerging term in the area of international cooperation. Taking account of the transforming power structure among key actors, the notion of "global public goods" can be tentatively defined, as follows.

"Global public goods" are goods with benefits that extend to all countries, population groups, and generations. The first element, "global(ness)", refers to bridging all divides: borders, sectors, or actors. Accordingly, "global(ness)" embraces local, national, regional, and international levels. "Public" implies

"the public" — composed of the general population, civil society organizations, corporate citizens, and the like — with "the global public" also including states (Kaul et al., eds., 2003, pp.14, 23). What is made "public" (or "private") is often a matter of choice that changes over time and locality (Nakai, 2000, p.167; Kaul et al., eds., 2003, pp.6, 14).

Furthermore, in contrast to "communityness" — which essentially builds on homogeneous values and contains a mechanism of assimilation and exclusion (applicable to both senses of communities, territorial and virtual/non-territorial) — "publicness" is conceived as spheres of discourse that are generated in the midst of people sharing common concerns in different ways. Thus, public spheres are open (unbound), divergent, and polysemous, presenting a great contrast to community spaces of identity, including ones of networked communities as extensive as the worldwide (Saito, 2000, pp.x, 5–6).

No doubt, the above-mentioned key terms (such as "global public goods" and "publicness") should theoretically/empirically be deepened further. In addition, it will be indispensable to cope with the risks that these terms and their related concepts might be distorted and incorporated as direct opposites for the sake of logical reinforcement. For instance, "respect for diversity", originally spoken in critical tones, increasingly has been employed to key up the "assimilation" of market liberalization under "pro-choice" environment approaches. In the circumstances, the view that contemporary socio-political movements should have turned their considerable attention to this sort of tricky "displacement" is gradually gathering momentum (Ouchi & Sakai, 2004, p.58). In any case, given the dynamic transformation of global society, rather than community space, which has frequently been in the spotlight, it is the public spheres that will be extremely important arenas for "the global public" to work out a wide range of multifaceted issues. This should also be a crucial angle for mulling over "development and urban futures" in the twenty-first century.

III. "Urbanization" and New Dimensions of Urban Challenges

Friedmann (2002, pp.3–6) has showed that the broader notion of "urbanization" would contain three distinct perspectives: demographic, economic, and socio-cultural. This section, on the basis of this working classification, explores new dimensions of urban challenges and accentuates some issues regarding/hindrances to more "inclusive development".

1. Demographic Urbanization
(1) Rapid Urbanization in the Developing World

Global society has stepped into the urban millennium. Now, urban inhabitants account for almost half the world's population (Habitat, 2001, p.v). The ratio is expected to grow to more than two-thirds by 2050, in a world accommodating a further 3 billion people. Nearly all of this urban increase will be in developing countries, through rural-to-urban migration, natural population increases within cities, and other factors. The number of mega-cities (cities with over 10 million inhabitants) is likely to skyrocket to 54 in the developing world, while remaining stable at 5 in the wealthy countries, in the next half century (World Bank, 2003, pp.xiii, 8). Sufficient attention should be paid to the outlook that those cities of the developing world absorbing most of the unprecedented population growth will be medium/smaller ones with populations of 5 million or less (UN-Habitat, 2003, p.3).

Contemporary rapid urbanization is advancing in a milieu of much higher population growth, at much lower economic levels, and with much less institutional/financial capability. As UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan aptly stated, a major challenge for international society will be "to make both urbanization and globalization work for all" (Habitat, 2001, pp.v, 3).

(2) Another Trend: Worldwide Aging

In 2050, the most heavily populated countries will be (in order) India, China, the United States, Pakistan, Indonesia, Nigeria, Brazil, Bangladesh, and

Ethiopia. Among high-income countries, only the US will remain in the upper rank. Also by the middle of this century, the demographic proportion of wealthy nations will plunge to only about 10 percent of the world's population (Peterson, 2001, pp.15, 268).

Although the policy implications of the demographic trends must be looked into thoroughly, the daring prospect below proposed by Peterson (2001, pp.16–22, 270–271) and Wallace (2001, pp.273–276) is an interesting assertion for this study, and one that should be kept in mind as a perspective.

Greying developed countries with sluggish economies might be surpassed by the much brisker developing countries. Conceivably, the "advanced" countries cannot help relinquishing their powers to the emergent countries. In this scenario, global societies will increasingly become vulnerable due to tensions and conflicts between different population groups, for instance, on the issue of vested interests for the aged and the original community members. The haves, in particular, must redefine their own roles in light of the above demographic scenario. A crucial role would be demonstrating how the aged-predominant societies could provide more opportunities for the marginalized, in view of the further longer term. Developing countries also eventually will be faced with great volatility through far faster, broader aging of their populations.

Regarding the above perspective, different viewpoints and arguments will unquestionably be presented. Nevertheless, the latter half of the discussion could be noteworthy. In addition, with the viewpoint being somewhat away from conventional scenarios premised on nation-state institutions, diverse in-depth research will be needed in this field — for example, on account of the current expansion of the religious world (Islam and urbanism; cf. Itagaki, 2003, p.18) beyond national boundaries to a great degree.

2. Economic Urbanization

(1) "Urbanites" in the Economic Space:
Transformation of Rural–Urban Relationships

Historically, in the name of "cities as engines of economic growth", industrialization has been promoted at the expense of rural areas. There is no doubt that such "modernization", which placed a special emphasis on nation-building, was a sword that served to undermine subsistence economy in rural communities (Iyotani, 2001, pp.28–29).

Under the current market-led globalization process, economic urbanization has showed quite different pictures from the stereotypical rural–urban relationship. Rural societies are more and more directly linked with global markets, regardless of national boundaries. Conversely, a city might come to have more connections with overseas villages than with its neighbouring villages and rural areas (Habitat, 2001, p.4; Iyotani, 2001, p.57; Friedmann, 2002, p.4). With the arrival of bio-industrialism, agriculture has increasingly become a sophisticated industry, wherein transnational business management is rationalized. In an economic sense — beyond the conventional demographic sense — in such a space-extensive agribusiness, farmers are as "fully urbanized" as any mid-sized Fordist manufacturer. It is foreseen by some that residual rural activities, which have been associated with "pastoral life", could practically fade out in the next half century or so (Friedmann, 2002, p.4).

As scarcity of arable land and water will alarmingly be intensified, in due course, rural areas may come to gain unprecedented powers in the global economy (Brown, 2002, p.244). In contrast, some corners of mega-cities that are swollen with a myriad of urban poor could ruthlessly be hit by urban crises, triggered by food/water shortages. Yet, the ceaseless superintendence of multinational urban elites for rural resources would be a reasonable assumption. (Incidentally, who will represent rural voices under such a situation?)

(2) Global Competitions among Cities:
The Aspect of Struggles among Nationalistic Entities

Some of the higher ranking cities in the worldwide urban hierarchy are energetically taking part in borderless competitions to ensure their influential positions as global urban nodes. Harsh competition has often been led by national/municipal elites on the conceptual basis of a "national community", aimed primarily at pursuing national interests. Some urban sociologists and other experts point out that the logic of identifying "public welfare" with "national interests" is out of harmony with key ideas of "publicness", such as divergence and openness (Saito, 2000, p.4; Sato, 2000, p.237; Machimura et al., 2003, p.49).

Furthermore, "best practices" (useful tactics of the more competent players) should be thoroughly re-examined in this context —that is, in light of their concealed economic mechanism of nationalism, which goes far beyond straight arguments on the technical applicability.

(3) "Community" as a Tool for Ensuring Wealthy Enclosure

Spatial divisions of pre-modern cities were, by and large, the reflection of political and/or religious systems (Machimura & Nishizawa, 2000, p.66). In contrast, modern urban areas are predominantly divided by powers of wealth, as indicated by the symbolic term "dual cities". The jargon literally depicts bi-polar disparities between the haves and the have-nots; in the real world, needless to say, those divisions are multidimensional (Habitat, 2001, p.30; Yoshihara, 2002, p.91).

Among others, one extremely worrying tendency is the recent emergence of urban enclosures by the rich, areas dubbed "gated communities". Wealthy residents make use of the very concept of "community" for self-defence against urban crimes, as well as to disengage themselves from local public spheres. Such segregation causes a loss of opportunities for public exchange of views, and tends to create inhumane societies of indifference (Saito, 2000, pp.81–82; Saito, 2001, p.54).

No doubt, these self-interested behaviours are more or less observed by other urban citizens holding tangible/intangible vested interests, regardless of whether there are physical fences. There is an urgent need to overcome the exclusive aspects of such "community" and nurture the perspectives of publicness to the full. It is anticipated that the endeavours would be an ultimate deterrent to economy-centric, inward-oriented population groups. At the same time, as mentioned earlier, full attention should also be paid to the devious "displacement" that key ideas of the critical opinion might, in reverse, be exploited for direct-opposite purposes.

3. Socio-cultural Urbanization

(1) Virtual Cities: Beyond Territory-based Communities

Socio-cultural urbanization connotes involvement in knowledge-based activities that have been a part of urban ways of life since ancient times (Friedmann, 2002, p.5). Among these, a pivot of the Islamic civilization (which had a highly developed concept of "urbanism" prior to European modern times) is said to have been the formation of "urbanites" — internalized urbanization of human beings — that can encourage a broader exchange network and better symbiotic relationships among diverse peoples with different cultural backgrounds, and thus naturally relinquish dualism, such as the prevailing idea of a rural vs. urban dichotomy (Itagaki, 2003, pp.14–16, 226–227).

Nowadays, with the advent of modern information and communications technologies, younger generations, in particular, are more and more convivially "living" in "virtual cities" (Friedmann, 2002, p.5). Also in virtual (non-territorial) spaces, innumerable epistemic communities, international NGOs, and, moreover, those who wish to free themselves from the political hands/structures of such actors, are working on transnational issues (Tanaka, 2004, p.43). The trend has great expectations of becoming a new step through which the "modernistic" fabric — markets and states as unduly highlighted components — could be transformed into more open-door spheres of "the global public".

In the meantime, though, regarding these information and communications technologies, some relevant experts have raised a wide range of questions. With relation to the present subject, the points raised are not only the technical digital divide, but also the socio-cultural risk that uniformity and the formation of exclusive spaces are apt to be fostered by these very same advanced technologies. Sufficient attention must be paid to the potential negative influence (Goldsmith, 1999, pp.142–143).

In any case, like the economic urbanization mentioned above, socio-cultural urbanization assumes an aspect that is not entirely linked to demographic/ physical cities (Friedmann, 2002, p.5).

(2) Rootless Transnational Migrants and Closed Territorial Urban Communities

Rustic communities have increasingly been dismantled under globalization. Massive migrations from rural areas to metropolitan regions — multilayer currents beginning with internal migrations, up to transnational leaps into the mega-cities/metropolises of neighbouring countries and the "advanced" world — will be an inevitable tide (Iyotani, 2001, pp.24, 57). In particular, rootless transnational migrants encounter such hardships as exclusion from host communities and blurred identity (Friedmann, 2002, pp.55, 71).

A critical challenge in the coming decades will be redefinition of life space, identity, citizenship, democracy, and the like — concepts that have been inclined to take root in territory-based communities and which include a national community as one of their expressions (Iyotani, 2001, pp.232–234; Scott et al., 2001, p.27; Friedmann, 2002, p.71). Although democratic governments have shown a preference for multi-cultural policies, a hidden agenda from time to time has emerged — the temptations of assimilation and authorized interpretations of homogeneities and differences (Washida, 2001, p.39; Shimizu, 2003, p.190). In a very real sense, a national community can be seen as an extension of a "gated community".

With more and more people in uneasy circumstances through the control of

conventional state-centred institutions on an individual's citizenship, innovative scholars suggest a transnational "multiple citizenship": everyone should be a proper citizen, regardless of where he/she may go/stay (Sakamoto, 1997, pp.66 –67; Friedmann, 2002, pp.75–78; Negri, 2003, p.39). Above all, Friedmann (2002, pp.75–78) sets out a self-declared, non-territorial "insurgent citizenship", with relation to social movements and political struggles "from below". This "insurgent citizenship" aims to expand the spaces of democracy (further democratizing the present "unfinished" democracy) and build trans-territorial solidarities.

(3) Limitations in Community-based "Alternative Development"

Against the mainstream of international development, community-based "alternative development" thought has worked out various significant conceptual/operational innovations. However, the endogenous approach, which clearly defines a hedge of local community, has not necessarily been applicable on an ad hoc basis to the current transforming societies (cf. Iwasaki & Nagahara, 2000, pp.216–217). The plurality of "alternative development" is not quite so valuable when every self-help social movement de facto closes the door to the rootless and merely ensures exclusive benefits-sharing among the insiders (cf. Machimura & Nishizawa, 2000, p.155; Saito, 2001, p.54).

For example, the Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement in Sri Lanka is theoretically founded on enlightenment of Theravada Buddhism. But the endogenous social movement is faced with critical questions, such as an excessive dependence on and obedience to project leaders under the customary social norms. Hence, Ishii (1999, p.78) asserts that grass-roots development practice has failed to overcome the element of exclusivity.

Another case in point, which might also be related to the aforementioned "economic urbanization", is the thriving management of township development in China. Local communities that were shrewdly consolidating their own foundations within respective territories must be the first self-organizations to successfully enter the global market economy. However, when it comes

to sharing of development outcomes, by and large, only original community members have been taken into consideration, while "strangers", such as migratory workers to those wealthy "enclaves", have been excluded (Tanimura, 1993, pp.233, 252).

Neither can alliances of fundamentally enclosed community movements be depicted as activities for the disempowered in "public spheres". It is high time that we should add key concepts of publicness to "alternative development", in favour of sublimating motivations for "development from within" into much higher philosophical stages.

IV. Endeavours to Build up a New Paradigm in Physical Planning/ Design

Conventional methodologies and value systems of physical planning/design, though substantially supported by modernization and its "pro-poor/unfortunate" modification view, have also been questioned in regard to their logic (including legitimacy), as follows.

1. Reconsideration of Modern Urban Planning Philosophy

In the narrative of modernization, industrialization, and nation-building during the last several decades, physical urban planning and management were, in effect, universal. Similar blueprints of ideal cities — bureaucrat-led, growth/ efficiency-oriented proposals — had largely been drawn up in each individual country.

However, in recent times of uncertainty, complexity, plurality, and diversity, both local voluntary groups and urban experts have critically re-examined the static planning style. In view of the dynamic nature of cities, as keenly advocated, it is held that untiring incremental improvements should be seen as more and more autonomous and creative (Hirayama, 1999, pp.214, 252; Sato, 2000, pp.228, 236; Furuya, 2002, pp.42–43). Regarding levels in planning,

from the perspective of such urban challenges, there are merely wider regional planning and smaller area planning; the difference between the two is simply in the degree of abstractness in urban design. In short, an innovative angle — that planning is no more, in a traditional sense, about the superior and the subordinate — is being taken up for discussion (Nishimura, 2000, p.200). Consequently, conventional programmes such as "rational" infrastructure development schemes (as a key to shaping highly centralized societies) should thoroughly be re-examined from the viewpoint of public spheres (Uzawa, 2002, p.34).

Interestingly, Shunsuke Tsurumi (philosopher), deriving from his studies on popular entertainment, implies that "pleasure with intentional inconsistency" — rather than the quest for a single "most optimum solution" — will henceforth be a crucial concept for urban management. His points can be encapsulated as 1. "optimism": not setting ideals, and retaining candour for higher transparency; 2. "tolerance": coexisting with "heretics"; and 3. "independent status as critics": breaking stereotypes through individual, unique perspectives (Machimura & Nishizawa, 2000, pp.342–344). The anarchistic idea of sustaining "discrepancy" would, indeed, be a countermeasure against the stream of "assimilation" in a national community.

2. "Enabling Approaches" Revisited

Since the mid-1980s, the "enabling approaches" concept has been the mainstream, with an emphasis on a new role of government as an enabler (a regulator, catalyst, and partner) rather than a provider. The "enabling" makes it a point to assist the deprived to upgrade their living surroundings through self-reliance (Habitat, 2001, pp.xxxiii, 45, 155). More recently, in light of pro-poor development, "enabling economic environment" has been discussed extensively, in order to expand people's choices and opportunities (UNDP, 2000, pp.2, 7, 11), or to help them to become productive members of urban society (World Bank, 2003, p.107) In any case, the enabling approaches are anticipated to incrementally mitigate distortions of both modernization and a subsequent surge of globalization, with a view to retaining the present political and economic

mainstream as well as strengthening the current even more.

Incidentally, the enabling strategies are being re-examined from the perspective of publicness. A noticeable defect is logic in relief, inspiring deprived people to re-enter "active" society. The crux of the matter is that "the marginalized" are tested as to whether they can make the most of a provided opportunity and join a circle of the active. Then, the "inclusive" approaches to development implicitly come to see disqualified people as "useless" and, further, socially "risky" groups that disturb communal harmony. The trendy catchword, "enabling", is not necessarily inclusive of those people who are not able to express their willingness/needs for in certain reasons (Sanbonmatsu, 1999, p.106; Saito, 2000, pp.64, 79–81).

Moreover, the basis of argument that society should be composed of the ordinary (normal) and the challenged (abnormal) has been revisited in a social movement of broadening inclusive design for physical facilities, dubbed "universal design." The inclusive concept definitely brings our perception of "the adaptable" into question and points out that the above dual structure must be deceptive. Actually, the current systems are not always comfortable even for "the adaptable", depending on individual cases. The essentials must be better design for all (without any exclusion, literally), rather than modifications distinctively taking care of the non-adaptable within the present institutions. Advocators are asking designers for accountability — that is, to responsibly uncover who would potentially be excluded by their final design and also its alternatives (Kawauchi, 2001, pp.47, 141). Likewise, hereafter, policy makers might be requested to transparently warn "the public" of their "defective" enabling schemes instead of merely promoting enabling approaches.

V. "Urban Public Spheres": A Key to More "Inclusive Development"

Based on the above arguments, this final section weaves the keywords of more "inclusive development", "publicness", and "city/urban" together into several points/concepts that will be crucial in discussions hereafter.

1. "Cities" as Arenas for Cultivating Public Spheres: "Publicability-building" in Strategically Critical "Global Public Poles"

Under today's much-accelerated globalization in both market economy and science and technology, there is a great risk that rough urban and/or rural policies may inflame social trends, latently splitting human society into disconnected species. Particularly, major cities — once fashionably treated as "world cities" — are highly expected to play a crucial role as "current regulators" to mitigate inequality and to avert social divides (Yoshihara, 2002, p.263). In effect, historically, cities have vitalized a dimension as an incubator of new culture and value systems, grounded on synergy among heterogeneity (Kitagawa, 2002, p.182; Itagaki, 2003, pp.220–221).

Interestingly, in the latest art scene, the spearhead artists are groping for something "invisible" or "intangible" that would question or even rise above the present value framework of a knowledge-based global economy — for instance, "conceptually representative/display values" (of no value in an economic sense) at a demolished corner under urban renewal projects in the developing world as well as in exhibitions (Ogura et al., 2000, pp.50–51, 57; Ushiroshoji, 2000, pp.246–247).

Likewise, in the quest for more "inclusive development" — especially keeping in mind the ill facets of communityness — "the global public" should vastly enhance a "capability" to flexibly explore notions of publicness regardless of the stereotypical concepts of influential disciplines, and to operationalize such notions without overlooking risks of the deceptive "displacement" by the direct opposite as well as logical drawbacks of the renewed "publicness" — as one might say, "publicability". Beyond a doubt, globally prominent cities will be crucial poles in the above process. Taking future trends into consideration, "cities" must encompass both senses of urban spaces: not just in the real (demographic) sense, but also in the economic/socio-cultural sense. There will be a need to redefine "cities" in terms of how to nurture public spheres and make them

function effectively — i.e., constructing "urban public spheres" — in respective "cities" (see Box 1).

Thus, in coordination with the innovative ideas on "cities", an important purpose of "international development" might be preparing the ground for such "publability- building" in strategically critical "urban public spheres" set up as "global public poles", which are much higher minded than primitive, sectarian "economic growth poles".

2. "Post-community-based Alternative Development" with "the Global Public"

With respect to building of global safety nets and endogenous development, it would be vital to step up to more "inclusive development" founded upon key concepts of publicness — far beyond those of communityness — in light of the aforementioned foreseeable social transformation (including rapid urbanization in the developing world, worldwide aging, and transnational migrations). Actually, a "humane" concept of community, which used to be highlighted as "resistant bases" of the marginalized to economic-centred development thought, comes to take part in exclusion of the far disempowered. "Fort-like institutions" of the normal and/or the harmonious locals are not schematically different from the controversial "enclosures" of the wealthy.

Nearly a decade ago, in his book entitled *Empowerment*, Friedmann (1992, p.166) suggested that "advocates of an alternative development would treat mainstream doctrine as only a partial expression of a more inclusive approach to development." Updating this view in light of the latest transitions and prospects of global society, we could say that endeavours to work out a "post-community-based alternative development" with "the global public", into which is incorporated the core concepts of inclusive (or universal) design, would see conventional growth-centred development and community-based alternative development as merely partial expressions of a more "inclusive development" approach. Further, due to the connotation of the term of "alternative", a tentative proposal, at worst, might simplistically be drawn into the schema

of "new counterpoint to conventional thought." Hereupon, a key is definitely reconsideration of dualistic views and discourses.

Even people's struggles are outgrowths of territorial/non-territorial "communities"; these movements need, more preferably, to be rethought from an angle of publicness, which would be consistently deepened in the above "global public poles", and elevated to higher dimensions of "inclusive development", partly grounded on "practiced publicness" (that could be nurtured through a lifestyle such as "parallel habitats" brought forward in Box 1).

This paper has looked into key ideas that would be the very basis for future intensive discussions on issues of "development and urban futures". It has shown that "publicness" and "inclusiveness" will be essential points of view to which sufficient attention must be paid in any scenario of respective urban-related sectors and their interfaces, rather than being the last "quick-acting cures" for global urban challenges.

Box 1. A Vision on the Basis of <Plural> "Parallel Habitats" Ensuring "Adequate Solutions" as well as <Singular> Habitat as Only One "Most Optimum Solution"

When working out a vision, in view of uncertainty, complexity, plurality, and diversity, "the global public" would be urged to transform the current "grammar" of human settlements. Logically, the "next grammar" should be premised on <plural> habitations ensuring "adequate solutions" that depend on each individual need and environment — or, as one might say, "parallel habitats (synchronously inhabiting <plural> territorial/non-territorial spaces)"* — as well as on a conventional <singular> habitat as the only "most optimum solution", including migration in pursuit of the optimal.

Needless to say, a lifestyle synchronously lived in <plural> "gated communities" that are isolated from local public spheres is not acceptable. In contrast, unbound "parallel habitats" will be expected to foster crucial building blocks of "urban public spheres", such as "compound eye" -like perspectives, values, and identities. Incidentally, against the urban vulnerability that rises to the surface in times of disaster and/or social unrest, the <plural> habitations would be conducive to improving the resiliency of urbanites to a great degree. Furthermore, though the future impact of rapid urbanization in the developing world will vary among cities, it is conceivable that, fundamentally, even for the poor informally getting into urban slums, the overall benefits of living in the "optimal" site will increasingly be limited. Thus, the deprived may inevitably be driven to obtain complementary places, in order to ensure "adequate solutions" for their own survival and empowerment.

Keeping the "parallel habitats" in sight, after all, there is an urgent need to reconstruct such key concepts as national sovereignty, decentralization, subsidiarity, citizenship, civic engagement, and city-to-city cooperation. "The global public" should explore innovative modes of

urban governance (including feasibility studies on the "parallel habitats" wherein another option could be available in the global public domain, and, moreover, comprehensively beyond the dichotomy between public and private domains) as to "urban" scale and character, far beyond the dynamic operations of current urban governance-related programmes. In addition, the outcomes of this exploration should be applied to more inclusive public/urban policies.

At the very least, prior to substantial discussions, it will be essential to fully review the actual patterns of present-day "human settlements" from the perspective of "parallel habitats" — regardless of any distinction between developed and developing countries. It also would be useful to preliminarily look into conceivable scenarios and probable issues in relevant sectors (such as the global environment, transportation, information and communications, agriculture, and water) based on those <plural> habitations.

---

*As regards those who frequently travel between <plural> living places (territorial spaces), Iyotani (2001, p.237) terms them "shuttle migrants".

Bibliography

Brown, Lester R. (2002). *Eco-Economy*. Tokyo: Ienohikari Kyokai.

Friedmann, John (2002). *The Prospect of Cities*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.

Friedmann, John (1992). *Empowerment*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

Furuya, Nobuaki (2002). Haipa Konpurekkusu Shithi ni Mukete [Toward Hyper Complex Cities]. in T.Nishigaki et al. eds. *Joho Toshi Ron* [Information Cities], 3-46, Tokyo: NTT Shuppan.

Goldsmith, Marshall (1999). Gurobaru Komyunikeshon to Sentaku no Kyodotai [Global Communication and Communities of Choice]. in F.Hesselbein et al. eds. *Mirai Shakai eno Henkaku* [The Community of the Future], 133-152, Tokyo: Forest Shuppan.

Hirayama, Yosuke (1999). Hisai-Toshi to Gendai no Puranningu [Devastated Cities and Contemporary Planning]. in M.Okuda ed. *Toshi* [Cities], 213-255, Tokyo: Univ. of Tokyo Press.

Ishii, Mayako (1999). Hinkon karano Dakkyaku to Hatten eno Michi [Getting over Poverty and Approaches to Development]. in Y.Kibata et al. eds. *Gurobarizeshon ka no Kuto* [Struggles under Globalization], 45-88, Tokyo: Otsuki Shoten.

Itagaki, Yuzo (2003). *Isuramu Gonin* [Prejudice against Islam]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Iwasaki, Minoru and Yutaka Nagahara (2000). Kyotsu no Kotoba wa Arunoka [Are There Common Words?]. in *Gendai-Shiso* Vol. 28-3, 200-223.

Iyotani, Toshio (2001). *Gurobarizeshon to Imin* [Migration in an Age of Globalization]. Tokyo: Yushindo.

Kaku, Michio (2000). *Saiensu 21* [Visions]. Tokyo: Shoeisha.

Kaul, Inge et al. eds. (2003). *Providing Global Public Goods*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Kawauchi, Yoshihiko (2001). *Yunibasaru Dezain* [Universal Design]. Kyoto: Gakugei Shuppansha.

Kitagawa, Takashi (2002). Shin-Sedai Joho Toshi no Bizyon [Visions of Information Cities in the New Generation]. in T.Nishigaki et al. eds. *Joho Toshi Ron*, 149-184, Tokyo: NTT Shuppan.

Machimura, Takashi et al. (2003). Sassen wo Dou Yomuka [Deepening Sassen's Thoughts]. in *Gendai-Shiso*, Vol. 31-6: 40-57.

Machimura, Takashi and Akihiko Nishizawa (2000). *Toshi no Shakaigaku* [Sociology in Cities]. Tokyo: Yuhikaku.

Nakai, Norihiro (2000). Toshi-Keikaku to Kokyosei [Urban Planning and Publicness]. in K.Minohara ed. *Toshi-Keikaku no Chosen* [Challenges in Urban Planning], 165-188, Kyoto: Gakugei Shuppansha.

Negri, Antonio (2003). Teikoku towa Nanika [E in Du retour-abecedaire biopolitique]. in *Gendai-Shiso*, Vol. 31-2: 38-45.

Nishimura, Yukio (2000). 21 Seiki no Toshizo e Mukete Toshi-Keikaku ni Motomerareru Mono [Indispensable Elements toward 21st Century City Images]. in K.Minohara ed. *Toshi-Keikaku no Chosen*, 190-212, Kyoto: Gakugei Shuppansha.

Nye, Joseph S. (2003). *Understanding International Conflicts*. New York: Longman.

Ogura, Masashi et al. (2000). 2000 Nen no Ato no tameni Ima Kataro [Let's discuss Arts in the Coming 2000]. in Bijutsu-Techo Henshubu ed. *Very New Art 2000*, 49-57, Tokyo: Bijutsu Shuppansha.

Ouchi, Hirokazu and Takashi Sakai. (2004). Kyoiku to Shakai [Education and Society]. in *Gendai-Shiso* Vol. 32-4, 48-69.

Peterson, Peter G. (2001). *Oiteyuku Mirai* [Gray Dawn]. Tokyo: Diamond sha.

Rifkin, Jeremy (1999). *Bai-teku Senchuri* [The Biotech Century]. Tokyo: Shueisha.

Saito, Junichi (2001). Kokyosei [Publicness]. in *Gendai-Shiso* Vol. 29-15: 52-55.

Saito, Junichi (2000). *Kokyosei*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Sakamoto, Yoshikazu (1997). Soutaika no Jidai [The Age of Relativization]. in *Sekai* No. 630: 35-67.

Sanbonmatsu, Masayuki (1999). Komyunithi to Fukushi [Community and Welfare]. in H.Fujita et al. eds. *Toshi Shakaigaku* [Urban Sociology], 99-119, Tokyo: Yuhikaku.

Sato, Shigeru (2000). 21 Seiki no Toshi-Keikaku no Wakugumi to Toshizo no Seisei [A Framework of 21st Century Urban Planning and Generation of Urban Images]. in K.Minohara ed. *Toshi-Keikaku no Chosen*, 213-240, Kyoto: Gakugei Shuppansha.

Scott, Allen J. et al. (2001). Global City-Regions. in A.J. Scott ed. *Global City-Regions*, 11-32, New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Shimizu, Tomoko (2003). Kuru Buritanika to Sono Fuman [Cool Britannia, with Displeasure]. in *Gendai-Shiso*, Vol. 31-6: 188-205.

Tanaka, Hikaru (2004). Han Gurobaru ka Undo ni okeru Anakizumu [Anarchism in Anti-globalization Movements]. in *Gendai-Shiso* Vol. 32-6, 37-51.

Tanimura, Mitsuhiro (2001). 21st Century Human Society. in K.Takahashi ed. *Agenda for International Development 2001*, 61-91, Tokyo: FASID.

Tanimura, Mitsuhiro (1993). *Kaikaku Kaiho ka niokeru Chugoku no Kaihatsu Rinen to Unei* [China's Development Doctrine & Management under Reform] (Doctoral Dissertation). Tokyo: Univ. of Tokyo.

United Nations Centre for Human Settlements [Habitat] (2001). Cities in a Globalizing World. London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.

United Nations Development Programme [UNDP] (2000). Human Development Report 2000. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

United Nations Human Settlements Programme [UN-Habitat] (2003). The Challenge of Slums. London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.

Ushiroshoji, Masahiro (2000). Zhan Wang. in Bijutsu-Techo Henshubu ed. *Very New Art 2000*, 246-247, Tokyo: Bijutsu Shuppansha.

Uzawa, Hirofumi (2002). Chikyu Ondanka to Rinri [Global Warming and Ethics]. in T.Sasaki et al. eds. *Chikyu Kankyo to Kokyosei* [Global Environment and Publicness], 33-46, Tokyo: Univ. of Tokyo Press.

Wallace, Paul (2001). *Jinko Piramiddo ga Hikkurikaeru Toki* [Agequake]. Tokyo: Soshisha.

Washida, Kiyokazu (2001). Zentai to Iu Gisei [A Fiction of Totality]. in *ASTEION* 56, 9-41.

World Bank (2003). *World Development Report 2003*. Washington/New York: World Bank and Oxford Univ. Press.

Yoshihara, Naoki (2002). *Toshi to Modanithi no Riron* [The City and Modernity]. Tokyo: Univ. of Tokyo Press.

開発と都市の未来
より「インクルーシブな開発」を形成する
舞台としての「都市公共圏」

< 要 約 >

谷村　光浩

I. 本論文のアウトライン

　本論文では、おもに文献研究をもとに、まずはグローバリゼーション、途上国における急速な都市化、世界的な高齢化、トランスナショナルな移民の増大、さらには倫理的な難問をはらむ科学技術の進展などの新しい潮流によって大きく揺らぐ「人間社会」をとらえ、さまざまな課題への対処に関与するアクターやそれらの舞台としての公共圏を論じる。

　次に、とりわけ人口統計的、経済的、社会・文化的な「都市化」との関係において、都市問題の新局面、そしてフィジカル・プランニング / デザインにおける新パラダイムへの模索について整理するなかで、今後のより「インクルーシブな開発 (inclusive development)」にむけた諸課題を際立たせていく。

　そして最後に、21 世紀の「開発と都市の未来」に関わる今後の本格的な研究にむけて、現段階では具体的で精緻な施策というよりも、上述の考察をもとに、より「インクルーシブな開発」の重要拠点となりうる「都市公共圏」に着目しながら、そうした議論の基礎となるような試案を提起する。

II. 試案として提起した主要な論点

　より「インクルーシブな開発」にむけて、「グローバルに公共的なるもの (the global public)」は、コミュニティ性の論理に内在するかげの部分に留意しつつ、「公共性」といった概念をしなやかに探究し、実地に活かす、いわば「公共展開力 (publicability)」を大いに高めなければならないであろう。

グローバルに影響力のある都市は、そうした作業を進める上で重要な拠点になるであろうが、今後の潮流を読むと、これは実在の都市空間だけでなく、経済的／社会・文化的都市空間の両義においてでなければならない。それぞれの「都市」に公共圏をいかに涵養し、機能させるか、言うなれば「都市公共圏」の構築という観点から、「都市」を改めてとらえる必要があろう。

　そうしたなか、「国際開発」の重要な目的のひとつは、特に政策的にクリティカルな「都市公共圏」を、かつての偏狭な経済的成長拠点よりも一層高次元な「地球公共拠点」として位置づけ、上述の「公共展開力」を高められるようにするための基盤整備となるかもしれない。また、「グローバルに公共的なるもの」とともに、「ユニバーサル・デザイン」の中核をなす考え方を取り入れた「ポスト・コミュニティ型のもうひとつの開発」を探究していくことによって、従来の「成長を中心にすえた開発」やコミュニティに束ねられた「もうひとつの開発」は、より「インクルーシブな開発」アプローチの部分的な表現にすぎないとみなせるかもしれない。

　なお、不確実性や複雑性などを視野にビジョンを練り上げる際、「グローバルに公共的なるもの」は、人間居住に関わる現行「文法」の変換をせまられよう。論理的に、「次なる文法」は、従来の「唯一の最適解」としての単数形の居住のみならず、「十分な解」を確保するための複数形の「パラレル居住（同時に複数のテリトリー／ノン・テリトリー空間に住まうこと）」を前提とすべきであり、ひいては国家主権、地方分権、補完性、市民権等の重要概念の再構築も急務となろう。