
Beyond UN-Habitat's Classic Framework in Urban Development Strategies –On an Innovative Conception of “Quantum Urban Governance” in Response to “Parallel Habitats”–

Mitsuhiro Tanimura *

I. Introduction

On “International Migrants’ Day,” 18 December 2004, the International Organization for Migration (IOM, 2004) reported that the number of people living outside their birth-countries had more than doubled over the last 35 years, and now exceeds 175 million persons (one out of every 35 people) worldwide. And regarding remittances made by migrant workers, which has received keen attention as a crucial factor to sustain economic growth in developing countries, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB, 2005b) has showed that, in cases like Latin American and the Caribbean, the monetary flows already amount to over the totals of overseas assistance and foreign direct investment received by the region.⁽¹⁾ Taking account of the increasingly multi-layered high mobility at national, urban-regional, and peripheral (remote but accessible villages) levels as well, there is an urgent need, in discussions on future “development” and “urban” related issues, to preliminarily explore an alternative “urban governance” that is of a substantially different dimension from what conventional actors (including international organizations) have promoted on such assumption as “sedentary society (fixing down to the domicile selected as only one most optimum solution)” and “nation-state (a form of communities made up by inhabitants)” building. Furthermore, it is essential to work out new visions from the alternative standpoint.

This paper aims at building up a common ground for the deliberations on “development and urban futures.” This study, which is based primarily

* COE Research Fellow

on literature review, begins by depicting the latest societal transformation, dubbed “Liquefaction,” and critically re-examining UN-Habitat’s global urban development strategies in light of the current dynamism. Subsequent sections—through literature research on specific cases of “Parallel Habitats (synchronously ‘inhabiting’ <plural> territorial/non-territorial spaces that are arranged in parallel and shuttled back and forth between them so as to ensure adequate solutions)” that Tanimura (2005, pp.66-67) presented at DIMSUD Conference 2004⁽²⁾ in Switzerland—put forward an innovative concept of “Quantum Urban Governance” derived from an analogy to an interpretation in quantum physics, and revisit UN-Habitat’s urban development strategies with this dimensionally different viewpoint from well-established “urban governance.” The last section then encapsulates several immediate issues that must be dealt with prior to formulating visions in view of the “Quantum Urban Governance,” far beyond the conventional paradigm of urban governance.

II. In the “Liquefaction” of Society

Technological breakthroughs in information/communication and transportation and market-driven globalization, as aptly pointed out by such recent works as Drewe (2001; 2004) and Friedmann (2002),⁽³⁾ have been instrumental in the drastic transformation of time-space—to such an extent that some formerly predominant factors in “urbanism,” such as “physical proximity” and “high density,” have become less significant while a new fashionable term, “virtual city (fictional city in cyberspace),” is widely recognized. Beyond a doubt, those surges have also impacted on the “liquefaction” of prevalent stereotypes shaping social building blocks, including community, nation-state, and publicness. As a prelude to the following discussions, this section briefly touches on a few crucial aspects in the liquidizing society.⁽⁴⁾

1. Going Beyond Traditional “Community”: “Deterritorialization/Reterritorialization”

In the mainstream of political and urban thought, since the ancient city-

state up to the modern nation-state, society has essentially been seen as a “community (autonomous and closed unity),” and managed in justification of such a fundamental attitude. However, this position is no longer fully conducive to depiction of the latest liquidizing power formation in the 21st century. Nowadays, unique perspectives, such as “Space of Flows (instead of “space of places”)” in Castells (1996) and “Deterritorialization/Reterritorialization” forwarded by “Network Power” in Hardt and Negri (2000), are frequently cited as a clue to sharpen insight for globalizing society (Mizushima, 2004, pp.250-251; Mori, 2004, p.67; Newman and Thornley, 2005, pp.13,18). While a discourse on the “hollowed out” nation-state has been plugged from the viewpoint rooted in traditional “community,” an aspect of “reterritorialization” has insightfully been found out in such currents as “world city” formation and reconstitution for a “stronger nation-state” that would be capable of carrying out a variety of worldwide policies in alliance with global entrepreneurs (Marcotullio, 2003, p.226; Watanabe, 2004, pp.94,102).⁽⁵⁾

2. “(Real) Globalization”: Voices of Global Civil Society Organizations

Neo-liberal reforms have not necessarily brought forward the freedom and independence of each individual person, as literally professed. At first glance, the goal seems to be society with an abundance of freedom and diverse choices. Nevertheless, some critics present intense apprehensions for the machinery of those reforms wherein everyone is, in effect, forced to be a “productive player” and “consumer”—while countermeasures are hammered out against the non-adaptable population with a view to preventing social disorder (Iwasaki and Ueno, 2003, pp.30,33; Ouchi and Sakai, 2004, pp.61-63; Watanabe, 2004, pp.101-102). As described above, under the “reterritorialization” urged by global entrepreneurs and a group of “stronger nation-states” and the like, some global civil societies are demanding a further leap of “(genuine) globalization,” such as [1] a globally standardized “basic wage,” [2] global citizenship, and [3] transnational human mobility without any barriers (Tanaka, 2004, p.43). In

this connection, Hardt and Negri (2000, pp.103,393-413) highlighted the term “multitude (a multiplicity, a plane of singularities, an open set of relations)” for the sake of resistance to new power formation.

3. “Surveillance Society” Anticipating Mobile Persons

As to management of geographically more and more mobile persons, referring to Deleuze’s (1992) conception of “Societies of Control,” Lyon (2001, parts 1-2; 2003, ch.6) deals with the evolution of “Surveillance Society (another expression of information society)” wherein computer systems track “nomadic bodies” and “digitized persons,” rather than the artificial boundaries that conventionally enclose people. The “Surveillance Society” can be characterized as [1] dispersed and shared surveillance systems, much more than the term “Surveillance State,” [2] machinery of classifying target groups (e.g., deportees, refugees, or migrant workers) enabling scenario analyses of foreseeable matters and, moreover, formulation of pre-emptive countermeasures, far beyond observation at the present moment and ex post facto verification, and [3] blurred boundaries between modern notions of “public” and “private.” Consequently, the critic of digital technologies places a special emphasis on the importance of nurturing social trust and inclusive thought, in addition to objection to the power behind the classificatory systems serving to reinforce stereotypical ideas.

4. An Innovative Perspective of “Liquidized Publicness”

Kim et al. (2004, pp.142-147), an epistemic group at the arena for publicness-related extensive discussions, arrive at the conclusion that “publicness in solidity” clearly distinguishing “public” and “private” and seeing them as a dichotomy from the traditional viewpoint of native inhabitants in respective homelands could not fit with the “liquefaction” of society. Public intellectuals alternatively, from the perspective of migrants, stress the need for “Liquidized Publicness” that would go far toward re-depicting the present dynamic “localness” in fluidity⁽⁶⁾ and flexibly connecting various communities. Moreover, in the above epistemic circle, Machimura (2004, p.137) points out that the basis

of publicness must not be “crystal clear transparency,” but “misty visibility” of urban space, and that civil societies then need to work out an appropriate logic that is in favour of adaptation to “lower transparency” instead of easily leaping at “publicness provided by surveillance monitors.”

5. Fictional “Sedentary” Society Revealed by Fluctuation of the Global Environment

A conceivable factor dramatically raising geographical mobility of human society might be climate changes. A series of future scenarios by Schwartz and Randall (2003, pp.1-2,17), in which global warming and related harsher winter weather would pull the trigger on disastrous futures such as food shortages, countless environmental refugees, and frequent conflicts, has made a significant impact on specialists, especially in the area of environment and security, aside from their accuracy of calculation and political/strategic attempts. On the occasion of mulling over urban futures, as Clark (2003, pp.186-192) suggested on the basis of climatological analyses, it must deeply be kept in mind that the subsequent idea might be reasonable; urbanism could have thrived in an exceptionally stable era, that is to say “with a stroke of luck”, in the history of the Earth; at least, human beings have not always lived “sedentary” lives. Also, it must be suggestive that key catchwords henceforth would be sloppiness, changeableness, resilience, flexibility, and the like, which may be incompatible with economic efficiency.⁽⁷⁾

Having in view the above points recently unfolded in the “liquefaction” of society, the next section re-examines the urban development strategies of UN-Habitat, which has especially coped with problems of human settlements in the developing world, and then looks at the features and limitations of its approaches.

III. “UN-Habitat’s Urban Development Strategies” Re-examined

In the hope of achieving human settlement-related targets, e.g., “significant improvement in lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers, by 2020,” among

the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) that were mainly formulated by the outcomes of major international conferences in the 1990s, UN-Habitat has carried out a wide variety of projects in partnership with multiple actors, including international organizations, central/local governments, civil society organizations, and business circles (UN-Habitat, 2003c, pp.2-3; 2003e, p.8; 2003f, pp.2,12-16).⁽⁸⁾

The groundwork for UN-Habitat’s projects is the “Habitat Agenda,” hammered out by the Second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) in Istanbul, Turkey, 3–14 June 1996. In order to materialize the prime document, UN-Habitat has worked out guidelines on two global campaigns (on “secure tenure” and “urban governance”) and *The UN-Habitat Strategic Vision*. Hereafter, first touching on their essential concepts, this section looks into new issue definition of UN-Habitat in its latest report, *The State of the World’s Cities 2004/05*.

1. The Habitat Agenda: Global Plan of Action

Chapter IV—Global Plan of Action in the Habitat Agenda concisely shows the challenges that must be dealt with in an urbanizing world, including primary overall goals of “adequate shelter for all” and “sustainable human settlements development,” as follows (UN-Habitat, 2003b):

(1) Adequate Shelter for All

[1] Shelter Policies/Delivery Systems (legal security of tenure and equal access to land, etc.), [2] Sufficient Attention to Vulnerable People (the deprived poor, women, youth, refugees, migrants, etc.) with Special Needs

(2) Sustainable Human Settlements Development in an Urbanizing World

[1] Environmentally Sustainable, Healthy, and Liveable Human Settlements (including the application of science and technology), [2] Social Development (eradication of poverty—in view of “feminization of poverty,” creation of productive employment—in light of changes in the structure of employment with technological developments, social integration—including international

migrants, and cultivation of citizenship and identity), [3] Sustainable Land Use (balanced geographical distribution, spatial diversification and mixed use, and optimal use), Energy Use, Transport Systems (mobility alternatives other than the automobile, alternative fuels, etc.), and Communication Systems (changing roles and functions of cities by information and communications technology, and empowerment of citizens), [4] Conservation and Rehabilitation of the Historical and Cultural Heritage, [5] Improving Urban Economies (cities as engines of growth—evolution of knowledge and culture), [6] Complementary Linkages of Rural and Urban Areas, Employment and Educational Opportunities in Rural Settlements, Development of Regional Centers and Secondary Cities, and Diversity of Human Settlements Types, [7] Disaster Prevention, Mitigation, and Post-disaster Rehabilitation Capabilities

(3) Capacity-building and Institutional Development

[1] Decentralization and Strengthening of Local Authorities and their Networks, [2] Popular Participation, [3] Metropolitan/Human Settlements Management, [4] Domestic Financial Resources and Economic Instruments, [5] Information and Communications

(4) International Cooperation and Coordination

[1] Enabling Environment for Economic/Social Development and Environmental Protection under Globalization of the World Economy (in view of finance, external debt, international trade, and transfer of technology), [2] Financial Resources and Economic Instruments, [3] Technology Transfer and Information Exchange, [4] Institutional Cooperation

(5) Implementation and Follow-up of the Habitat Agenda

[1] Implementation at the National/International Levels, [2] Involvement of Multi-actors, including Local Authorities—such as city-to-city cooperation, Civil Society, and the Private Sector (strengthening financial and technical assistance for community-based development and self-help programmes, etc.), [3] Performance Evaluation and Best Practices

The Istanbul Declaration on Human Settlements (1996), which was a reaffirmation of the Habitat Agenda, also briefly referred to some crucial steps to be addressed, such as [1] reconsideration of unsustainable consumption and production patterns—especially developed countries, [2] mitigation of social exclusion, [3] small/medium-sized town developments to minimize rural-to-urban migration, and [4] improvement in local authorities’ financial and institutional capacities, transparency, and accountability. The Declaration concluded with the following remark: “This Conference in Istanbul marks a new era of cooperation, an era of a culture of solidarity.... we offer a positive vision of sustainable human settlements, a sense of hope for our common future and an exhortation to join a truly worthwhile and engaging challenge, that of building together a world where everyone can live in a safe home with the premise of a decent life of dignity, good health, safety, happiness and hope” (UN-Habitat, 2003d).

2. “Global Campaigns” on Secure Tenure and Urban Governance

Toward the above primary goals, UN-Habitat has carried out a “Global Campaign on Secure Tenure” and “Global Campaign on Urban Governance.” Since UN-Habitat sees poor capacity of local institutions as a bottleneck for efficient urban development, both of the global campaigns stress capacity-building of local governments and city-to-city cooperation, focusing on “eradication of poverty” and “inclusive city.” As a key to the “inclusive city,” UN-Habitat (2002, pp.5,26-29) has highlighted “good urban governance” based on such principles as [1] sustainability (balanced social, economic, and environmental priorities, and stakeholder involvement), [2] subsidiarity (local autonomy), [3] equity (resource allocation and empowerment), [4] efficiency (management and service delivery, and investment in infrastructure), [5] transparency and accountability (decision-making processes, access to information, and ethics and professional conduct), [6] civic engagement and citizenship (leadership, stakeholder involvement and responsibility, building democratic culture, and enabling environment), and [7] security (environmental

management, crime control and prevention, and legal tenure and livelihoods).

3. “The UN-Habitat Strategic Vision” (2003)

The UN-Habitat Strategic Vision has aimed at the means of programme/project implementation, such as knowledge management, innovative financing for pro-poor investment, and strategic partnerships.⁽⁹⁾ As for slum problems, of all others, this report has put an emphasis on the integrated approach of [1] slum upgrading, [2] urban development (job creation, urban governance, community empowerment, vulnerability reduction, etc.), and [3] regional development (urbanization through national policies and institutions supporting secondary cities, integrated urban-rural systems, etc.). Moreover, on account of effectively responding to candid voices of local governments and their partners at the front, UN-Habitat's farsighted paper newly touches on the need to further urge decentralization of target countries, as described in the Habitat Agenda. Nevertheless, the Strategic Vision also expresses its views on the Habitat Agenda that the Istanbul document is not “a universal blueprint for sustainable urban development,” but “a menu of proposals for identifying and dealing with specific urban problems, *in situ*” (UN-Habitat, 2003f, pp.1-5).

4. From the Latest UN-Habitat Report (*The State of the World's Cities 2004/05*)

A focal point of the latest UN-Habitat report is urban governance that has been urged to transform into different ways with globalization. The publication covers the present state that, disregarding classic debates in regional planning (like secondary city development), national and local governments, by and large, attempt to strengthen global competitiveness of respective cities in the midst of increasingly mobile urban economic activities and transnational formation of urban networks, but, in contrast, insignificant implication of physical proximity/accumulation. With regard to poor international migrants flowing into slums in other developing countries, the UN-Habitat report characterizes them as a population group of the deprived urban poor destined for “the confining spaces

of poverty.”⁽¹⁰⁾ Comparatively, illustrating the polar current that the rise of the transnational middle class coming into and going from the world’s major cities on business has challenged the conventional inseparability between democratic representation/participation and the physical place, the report also points out that the present metropolitan management has conceptually and institutionally been unable to cope well with issues of such transient populations. The volume consistently advocates that, with a view to creating multicultural and inclusive cities, building and strengthening of urban management capacities—especially local authorities—are a crucial point, which is further extended to “virtual cities” (UN-Habitat, 2004, chs.1,3-5).

5. Self/External Evaluation for UN-Habitat’s Action

Regarding UN-Habitat’s action as described above, UN-Habitat staff members and external experts have presented the following comments in its reports and quarterlies:

(1) Relevance of the Habitat Agenda plus the MDGs

Asked whether or not the Habitat Agenda is too complicated and obsolete in comparison with the MDGs, Jay Moor (2004, p.6), Chief of Strategic Planning in the Office of the Executive Director, UN-Habitat, has argued that “the MDGs are at the level of a mission statement” and “are not accompanied by strategies or operational principles,” while the Habitat Agenda is quite useful as “the road map” toward the MDGs. Further, William Cobbett (2004, p.9), a UN-Habitat expert, has contended that “one of the failures of the Habitat Agenda was not to define a global goal,” which has been solvable with the inclusion of a specific urban target in the MDGs.

For these self-evaluations, Michael Cohen (2004, p.8), former Senior Advisor and Chief, Urban Development Division, the World Bank, asserted that “the Habitat Agenda was not sufficiently forward-looking in anticipating the heavy economic and social impacts of globalization on cities,” and the very points of the two UN global campaigns “had been identified well before Habitat II,” whose intellectual heritage was “quite thin” and missed the opportunity to shape

new solutions far beyond the conventional framework. Regarding the slum upgrading target of the MDGs, the UN Secretary-General articulated that the goal is “patently inadequate” (Putten 2004, p.10).

(2) Strategic Questions on Urban Development

While stressing the need of “strengthening local authorities” as a pivotal issue of urban development, UN-Habitat (2003a, pp.135-136; 2003f, p.4) rightly perceives that city governments are structurally faced with financial weakness, and do not always have a great influence in the present context of a global economy and international regimes. As for “city-to-city cooperation (C2C),” UN-Habitat (2003e, pp.30,32) deliberately placed emphases on not only the necessity of raising the awareness and understanding of target governments (due to their generally low-key response to the potential of C2C), but also the endeavour of pioneering C2C practice in the areas where synergies might be expected to a great degree (such as policy formulation and implementation), in addition to the comparatively easier areas of information exchange, training, and provision of know-how. As regards urban-rural linkages, UN-Habitat has, frequently, still analyzed their interaction within the conventional context of a nation-state. However, by bit-by-bit, UN-Habitat has come to share the broader notion of economic and socio-cultural “urbanization” beyond the prevalent stereotype of a domestic rural vs. urban dichotomy, as Friedmann (2004) was included in the latest report of UN-Habitat (2004, ch.7). Finally, as Tanimura (2005, pp.61-62) concisely discussed, “enabling approaches,” which are a key strategy for UN-Habitat, too, have critically been revisited from the perspective of publicness.

6. Uniqueness of UN-Habitat's Urban Development Strategies

Keeping in mind the points in the previous section and the above overview, this section discusses the uniqueness of UN-Habitat's urban development strategies in the respective terms of “Good,” “Urban,” and “Governance.”

(1) “Good” with a Latent Mechanism

The “good” situations that UN-Habitat has been willing to accomplish,

in alliance with a wide range of partners, are shown in such principal pieces of writing as the Habitat Agenda and the Istanbul Declaration on Human Settlements. Weaving key points of these documents, critics would pierce a deep-rooted logic that, from the viewpoint of the actors leading the current global society and those intimate entities entering into their schemes (e.g., global entrepreneurs, national/local governments, and international organizations), “good” action should be mainstreaming the “target groups”—who are the majority in number, but “the unfortunate” exceptionally identified from their standpoint—into the present market economy system as “productive players” and “consumers.” Further, it is a highly fearful structure that even a view to creating multicultural and inclusive cities might be employed to solely strengthen the above logic.

(2) “Urban” within the Context of a Nation-State

A main arena of UN-Habitat’s action is primarily respective cities where local authorities are struggling with urban management on the basis of both domestic and international situations. Under the present stage that market-driven globalization has increasingly deepened, UN-Habitat has still stuck to the Habitat Agenda, whose prevailing idea was grounded on classic urban-rural linkages. In the eyes of an international organization, it might be inevitable that a basic stance must be nonintervention in respective national policies, as demonstrated by the typical treatment of urban/rural issues within the framework of a nation-state. Nevertheless, critics would read the above-mentioned attempts at spreading market economy everywhere in the world into the undercurrent of an urban-oriented concept that infrastructure development and creation of productive employment must be simply extended from cities to the countryside. Beyond doubt, the pro-urban perspective lacks an alternative point of view of holistically appreciating the diverse values peculiar to rural areas. Lastly, in comparison with the Global Campaign on Secure Tenure in “real” cities, UN-Habitat has not yet taken the innovative initiative of ensuring deprived persons’ access to “virtual cities.”

(3) Managing the “Liquefaction” from the Perspective of “Governance in Solidity”

UN-Habitat has taken the “liquefaction” of society into account. However, the point of view that UN-Habitat has worked on human settlements-related issues could be primarily seen as governance centring on the building blocks of modern nation-state institutions, such as national/local governments and conventional territorial communities composed of “sedentary”-oriented inhabitants—as one might say, “governance in solidity.” While stressing the need for its innovative and strengthening measures, UN-Habitat does not hammer out “governance in fluidity” looking into the liquidizing society from the standpoint of the migratory side. Those “international migrants” living in poverty are just described as new inhabitants/urban poor populations of host communities. Hence, on the basis of conceptions rooted in the “governance in solidity,” the initiative of UN-Habitat and its partners might provide the most optimum solution to each case, and significantly contribute to international society. Nevertheless, a limitation of their schemes would fundamentally be derived from the very stance of UN-Habitat, even though the action is aimed at fully enhancing the synergy of multi-sector/-actor/-level strategic alliances, and also facilitating effective knowledge management. Furthermore, UN-Habitat’s key documents, including the Habitat Agenda, have made no exact mention of “surveillance society” and fictional “sedentary” society.

In contrast to the UN-Habitat’s stance to cope with the “liquefaction” of society from the traditional viewpoint of “governance in solidity,” this section has tentatively brought up an alternative perspective of the migratory side—that is, “governance in fluidity”—based on the analogy of the aforementioned discussion on publicness by Kim et al. (2004, pp.142-147). Yet, there is an urgent need to ascertain whether or not contemporary mobility could really be described by the metaphor of “in fluidity.” The next section rethinks the dimensions of this question.

IV. Minting “Quantum Urban Governance” in Response to “Parallel Habitats”

1. Spatial Mobility that is More Than Simply the “Space of Flows”

Recently, spatial mobility has increasingly been intensified, and also engendered a notably different aspect from the conventional “international migration” (unidirectional, one-time movement to a permanent settlement). Contemporary migration studies have directed a spotlight on such key concepts as “transnationalism” and “diasporas” (Ma, 2003, pp.1-12).

(1) “Transnationalism”

Schiller et al. (1992, pp.1-2) have seen “transnationalism” as “the process by which immigrants build social fields that link together their country of origin and their country of settlement” in diverse facets, such as familial, economic, organizational, political, and religious. These immigrants are termed “transmigrants,” who “take actions, make decisions, and feel concerns, and develop identities within social networks that connect them to two or more societies simultaneously.”

(2) “Diasporas”

Ma (2003, pp.5,7-9) has suggested that “diasporas are best viewed geographically as complex and interrelated sets of places and spatial processes, created as a consequence of varied forms of transmigration and transnational economic activity.” Also, “diasporic practices are always localized but not permanently fixed in particular places.” Hence, “diasporic space” is more than simply Castells’ (1996) “space of flows.”

Both concepts show that spatial mobility of the present society is far beyond the world-view “in solidity.” Especially, the term “diasporas” implies that even the perspective “in fluidity” is no longer sufficient to read into the advent of the current dynamic, complicated dimensions. Applying these arguments to the form of human settlements, one would find out partly coincidence with an inference of Tanimura (2005, pp.66-67) that has proposed to formulate urban visions in view of <plural> “parallel habitats” ensuring “adequate solutions,” as well as <singular> habitat as only one “most optimum solution.” Thereupon,

first, especially keeping in mind the diasporic conception as a clue, this section seeks relevant cases commensurate with the notion of “parallel habitats” at each of transnational, national, and urban-regional and its peripheral levels. Subsequently, the overview could be indispensable material to design future urban governance. Although the original notion of “parallel habitats” includes parallel circumstances synchronously living in <plural> territorial/non-territorial spaces, this paper consistently confines case studies to “inhabiting <plural> territorial spaces.”

2. Cases at the Transnational Level

(1) “Astronauts” and “Parachute Kids”

Many transnationally mobile households from Hong Kong and Taiwan retain plural homes. Those husbands who are frequently in the air shuttling between new diasporic homes of their families in the U.S.A, Canada, Australia, and other countries and residences in their homelands on business have recently been termed “astronauts,” with the concomitant term of “parachute kids” (children who strategically stay at the dwelling places suggested by their parents). Through in-depth analyses on their arrangement to maintain two or more homes, Ma (2003, pp.33-34) has found the familial safety-net building as an important motivation, and seen these diasporans as “voluntary political risk minimizers” rather than “economic migrants.” Hardill (2004, pp.375,379), meanwhile, has indicated that diasporic households ardently take into consideration such factors as children’s educational opportunities and digestion of ancestral heritages (socio-cultural capital), and therefore their familial lives are complexly formed to a great degree.

(2) “Dual-career Households”

When both highly educated partners in a household are respectively willing to develop their professional careers to a large extent, but then minimize risks in their lives, the partners might be faced with the situation of one and the same family separately living in plural countries now and then. Hardill (2004, pp.375,379,387) has looked into transnational elite families, especially

“dual-career households.” Distilling such cases from households of Indian IT specialists as well as the aforementioned “astronauts” from Hong Kong, the U.K.-based expert has asserted that the emergence of a transnational middle class, who can even buy citizenships, makes the traditional nation-state unit of class analyses irrelevant. Moreover, Sun (2002, p.212) has pointed out that the attitude of retaining citizenships as a tool could potentially amplify antagonism between original community members and the transnational elites who occasionally display disloyalty to their host countries.

(3) Transnational Spatial Mobility of Low-income Households

Comparable cases have also been observed in low-income groups: for instance, [1] members of one and the same household who are living separately on account of emigration to the developed world and the Middle East, and [2] those families designated as “refugees” who are making their livelihoods by frequently shuttling between a dwelling built for a period of evacuation and a house reconstructed after the return to homeland.⁽¹¹⁾ Furthermore, Cainkar et al. (2004, p.229), who have studied low-income Palestinians migrating from Amman to Chicago as a way to deal with economic uncertainty and political turmoil, have insightfully concluded that, rather than settling in the new home permanently, they intend to transnationally live in both the U.S.A and Jordan, and to enjoy the bilateral strengths—much higher economic and educational opportunities and relatively safer and stronger social supports, respectively—in light of their own and their children’s life stages. The life of these low-income diasporans is considerably different from that of the above-mentioned transnational middle class. Nevertheless, as to spatial mobility, affinities can be picked out.

3. Cases at the National Level

Migrant Peasants with “Amphibiousness”

In China, the population of internal migrant peasants, who have significantly supported recent economic growth, amounted to more than 114 million in 2003. Most of the migrant peasants leave their aged and young

family members in their home villages. The number of children who are compelled to stay at the rural homes is reported to exceed 70 million (Sui, 2005, pp.2,306-307). Many migrant peasants live in lodgings either provided by their employer or that they rent themselves, and return their respective homes to take care of dependent relatives and farmland about twice a year (for risk management, the great majority do not part with their arable land). Their life spanning two domiciles is dubbed “amphibiousness,” an analogy to amphibians. It is reported that some migrant peasants have developed a new phase of “amphibiousness” by which they did not return to their birthplace but to its neighbouring town after the original “home villages–metropolises” phase over a few years (Cui, 2004, pp.51-53,169; Tang, 2004, pp.217-218).

From the perspective of the household registration system, Chinese public policy experts have increasingly discussed the issue of a “divorce between person and registration” (a gap between present and registered addresses), and stressed an urgent need to shift the household registration system from the conventional workforce management (classic classification of agricultural and non-agricultural populations) to a new management model of residents (Gao, 2004, pp.107-109; Lian, 2005, pp.384-385).⁽¹²⁾ Also, it has recently been considered whether the government agencies concerned could coordinate training programmes for migrant peasants, and bestow “vocational licenses” for those course participants satisfying certain standards (Lian, 2005, pp.122-123).⁽¹³⁾

4. Cases at the Urban-regional and Peripheral Levels

(1) Booming “Second House” Markets

With the drastic transformation of time-space in developed countries, some professionals have also taken part in the urban knowledge economy from their “second houses” located in good natural surroundings on the periphery of urban-region. Actually, very recently, in China’s metropolises riding on the present globalization, urban upper/middle-income groups have created “second house” markets in suburban and far outer areas, against the background of swift expressway development, an increase in the private car ownership rate, and

serious urban environmental problems—particularly air pollution (Cyber Brains, 2004, p.2). The boom in real estate markets overheated by “second house” seekers is another factor to engender the above-mentioned question of a “divorce between person and registration” (Gao, 2004, p.108).

(2) Urban Terrors and “Defensive Dispersal”

With reference to contemporary urban studies, especially since the 9/11 attack, one of the latest research topics might be a latent trend of foraging alternative house for “defensive dispersal” in peri-urban areas (including remote but accessible villages) by those urbanites who hope to get away from vulnerable cities—risky skyscrapers, subways, and other “soft” targets of conceivable terror attacks—from time to time. At present, these terms are solely “armchair talk.” Yet, it is useful to pay sufficient attention to the outlook that, in the wake of fearful crime, those middle-income, highly educated households (i.e., the leading actors of urban economy) would potentially prompt such movements (Savitch, 2003, pp.118-120).

(3) Urban Agriculture

It might be necessary to keep sight of small-scale urban agriculture that, in developing countries, the urban poor often work on in varied spaces, such as “on road strips,” “along railways,” “on river banks,” and “below power lines,” for primarily subsistence. Although the case is not related to plural dwellings per se, it must be relevant to discuss the issue in the sense of making a livelihood by plural strongholds. FAO (2001, pp.3,18,39,52) has asserted that urban agriculture could be a crucial safety net in case of insecure access to employment opportunities and food supplies during economic crises triggered by armed conflicts, structural adjustment, and the like; but taking into consideration unavoidable arrangements with stakeholders about land tenure and water rights, formal promotion of such urban agriculture would not be straightforward. At FAO conferences, in consequence, it has concretely been proposed that open space and public land for urban agriculture should remain “in the public domain under community control” (Drescher et al., 2002, p.104). In contrast, regarding urban food security, Okpala (2003, p.18), chief of UN-Habitat’s urban economy

and finance branch, has explained that the challenge is not to guarantee each individual family's opportunity for food production, but to improve markets and transportation networks to ensure all population groups smoother access to food, as implied in the Habitat Agenda, and that UN-Habitat is acting under its definite mission in the UN system.

5. A Tentative Proposal: the Innovative Viewpoint of “Quantum Urban Governance”

It may be relevant that the case of “transnationalism” engendered by globe-trotters flying from a “permanent” residence that has been selected as the only one most optimum solution, those migrants who are going after the ultimate “sedentary” home, and the like, should be seen from the “governance in fluidity.” Nevertheless, those limited but suggestive cases of <plural> “parallel habitats” ensuring “adequate solutions,” which have been sought for at different levels with the clue of diasporic thought, must go far beyond such an analogical dimension. Then, for the purpose of effectually shaping future urban governance, what “analogy” is more applicable to the emerging pattern? Hereupon, this paper puts forward a tentative proposal that is a new perspective of urban governance on the basis of the “many worlds interpretation” in quantum physics (see Box 1)—or, as one might say, “Quantum Urban Governance.”

On the assumption of “sedentary” society, those actors leading globalizing society and taking the side of the former (global entrepreneurs, national/local governments, international organizations, etc.) have perceived that, once having surveyed (or checked previous records), one could by and large identify the individual's “present address” and “the flow” of any population group, such as citizens, consumers, migrant workers, and refugees, from the standpoint of “governance in solidity,” and then even from the viewpoint of “governance in fluidity.” In sum, these world-views would be based on Newtonian paradigm that interprets and manages fictional “sedentary” society with approximate expressions. In contrast, the point to be stressed in this section is a much more sophisticated interpretation of the real world in which, as shown by the cases

of “parallel habitats,” the individual’s “present address” and “the flow” are, in effect, uncertain and, moreover, states of the individuals have been probabilistic “waves” (that is, on the move) until the moment of observation. An innovative idea of urban governance should be worked out by close analogy with the “many worlds interpretation” in quantum physics, implying that there should be “parallel worlds”—as many as the chances of looking at a person.

Box 1. An Inventive View of the “Many Worlds Interpretation” in Quantum Physics

Quantum Physics looks upon electrons not only as “particles” (for which both position and momentum cannot be determined at the same time, according to the “principle of uncertainty”), but also as “waves” (that can be shown by probability). This goes far beyond conventional common knowledge—a world-view simply grounded on approximation—of classical physics derived from Sir Isaac Newton. In addition, the probabilistic “waves” are regarded to exist as “waves” until observation but, once observed, they are identified as “particles.” Among others, H. Everett’s “Many Worlds Interpretation” presents the interesting view that there should be “parallel worlds”—as many as the chances of looking at an electron. To put it another way, when detecting an electron at point A of a “wave,” the observer sees a world in which the electron is positioned at point A. This innovative perspective implies that, aside from this world, there are plural “parallel worlds,” such as those in which the electron is observed not at point A, but at point B, C or D (Sato, 2001, pp.160-161,178-179; Takeuchi, 2001, pp.12-17).

**V. “UN-Habitat’s Urban Development Strategies” Revisited:
From the Viewpoint of “Quantum Urban Governance”**

The previous sections have looked into such urban governances as the “in quantum model”—tentatively applying quantum physics to its perspective—as well as “in solidity” and “in fluidity”—comparable to the conventional paradigm

of classical physics. Concisely summarizing each perspective, this section would further review the characteristics of UN-Habitat's urban development strategies, especially from the angle of the above-minted "Quantum Urban Governance."

(1) Viewpoints Working out Urban Governance

The different viewpoints of urban governance that have been entered into in this paper, are encapsulated as follows.

[1] "Governance in Solidity" is grounded on such building blocks of modern nation-states as conventional communities and local/national governments that have territorially been woven by "sedentary" inhabitants. This perspective could also be shared by international organizations and global entrepreneurs attempting to reinforce/strengthen the territory-based logic. In consequence, migrants are treated within the framework of newly coming "permanent" residents, and for the sake of each individual, there is only one "most optimum" solution.

[2] "Governance in Fluidity" is a dynamic view of the peripatetic side as local communities are shaped from networked relationships of plural societies, including the idea of "transnationalism" woven by those globally mobile people that are "commuting" from permanent residents selected as the only one "most optimum" solution and those migratory population groups that are seeking to attain such a new "sedentary" home, considerably far beyond the static view of the above-mentioned "solidity."

[3] "Quantum Urban Governance" is an alternative viewpoint to the conventional fabric so as to more precisely figure out the real world—"uncertainty" and probabilistic "waves" (the individuals on the move) of human settlements implied by the concept of "parallel habitats"—by applying the "many worlds interpretation" in quantum physics, far beyond the Newtonian paradigm for managing the aforementioned fictional "sedentary" society with approximate expressions.

(2) The Scope of UN-Habitat's Urban Development

As reviewed at the end of the third section, UN-Habitat has approached the respective issues primarily from the viewpoint of the world-view "in solidity."⁽¹⁴⁾

Even touching on the advent of transnational middle-income groups, UN-Habitat has simply treated the matter in a dimension of short-term visitors/passers (from each individual “sedentary” home, with high frequency), and has been reticent about those situations in which they are transnationally taking plural residences and moreover buying citizenships. In light of the conventional framework of metropolitan management, the international organization has solely pointed out insufficient countermeasures against the mobile populations.

Now, revisiting UN-Habitat’s urban development strategies in view of “quantum urban governance,” one might come to the conclusion that the most appreciated element of its comprehensive research on globalizing cities and scheme-formulation/implementation under the elaborate global action would be, in a sense, a practical methodology to grasp the real world with “approximate expressions.” It might not be irrelevant to point out that UN-Habitat’s strategies and campaigns have tacitly attempted to strengthen “governance in solidity,” which is in harmony with the lines expected by national/local governments and global entrepreneurs. Likewise, apart from the relevance of the “millennium development goals” per se, UN-Habitat’s endeavours at attaining the human settlements-related goals would have been logically restricted to those issue definitions and approaches that are rooted in “governance in solidity.”

Hence, even though the key concepts toward “urban good governance” facilitated by UN-Habitat are literally the very same as those suggested by “governance in fluidity” and/or “quantum urban governance,” a different philosophy and orientation are identified at the back of the common reformative words. In contrast, the alternative viewpoints to conventional governance would direct a spotlight on those issues that have never been looked at within “governance in solidity.” As discussed at the beginning of this paper, Kim et al. (2004, pp.142-147) have already urged the need to re-examine “publicness” in terms of the phase of liquidity. Consequently, above all, another urgent key task must be entering into the implications of “publicness” in such a context that a pattern of contemporary human settlements could be aptly depicted by adoption of the “many worlds interpretation.”

VI. For the Intensive Discussions on “Development and Urban Futures”

Primarily aiming at building up a common ground for discussions on “Development and Urban Futures,” this paper, on the basis of a review on recent social trends, has critically retraced the urban development strategies of UN-Habitat and, moreover, revisited its stance on urban governance from the alternative perspective of “quantum urban governance,” keeping “parallel habitats” in sight.

As touched upon in the section on the overview of UN-Habitat urban development strategies, the Habitat Agenda and the two pivotal “global campaigns” have specially emphasized such key concepts as adequate shelter, sustainability, inclusiveness, decentralization, subsidiarity, equity, efficiency, transparency, accountability, participation, citizenship, security, and disaster prevention/post-disaster rehabilitation capabilities. There will soon be a grave need to redefine these terms, especially from the viewpoint of “quantum urban governance.” Furthermore, at the same time, the classic jargon should be reconsidered in light of the alternative thought on actors, such as “the global public”⁽¹⁵⁾ (Kaul et al., 2003) and “multitude” (Hardt and Negri, 2000), and the evolution of surveillance society (Lyon, 2001, 2003), which are closely related to the aforementioned quest for “publicness.” Unquestionably, when comprehensively mulling over these points, every stakeholder should also keep “non-territorial space” in sight.

The last, but not least, hope is that this paper could partly contribute toward shaping future urban visions and formulating holistic policies to produce positive global public goods with these visions, far beyond simply dealing with urgent agenda at the present time.

Notes

- (1) The Inter-American Development Bank (IDB, 2005a) will venture on “a pilot project to expand access to mortgages and home improvement loans for families that receive remittances in Mexico”.
- (2) DIMSUD (Designing, Implementing and Measuring Sustainable Urban Development) is a research project carried out by a global team on urban studies, including the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH) and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), in partnership with their counterparts in the developing world.
- (3) As to Friedmann’s (2002, pp.3-6) alternative definition on “urbanization,” Tanimura (2005) has placed it as a vital analytical framework.
- (4) Contemporary human society is being faced with the situation that conventional solid thought/fabric—once conceived to be the ideal—can no longer properly deal with the fluid aspects of each individual issue, and alternative institutions with flexible lights will be critically needed. This paper tentatively begins by reviewing the dynamic circumstances as “liquefaction” of society; hence, the term draws a line between the above “liquefaction” and such “liquid” situations within the framework of conventional notions as reconstruction of “fragile countries” toward “(real) nation-states.” But, this article keeps these countries in sight, in terms of “liquefaction” of the aforementioned dimension.
- (5) Meanwhile, far beyond “retreat,” some nation-states have even fallen into pieces. As mentioned above, these countries should also be analyzed within the currents of “deterritorialization/reterritorialization.”
- (6) Concretely, Kim et al. (2004, pp.145-146) have discussed such issues as trans/multi-localness generated by exchanges between migrant communities and their host societies.
- (7) In the realms of contemporary arts and architecture, a remarkable trend would be “ephemeralization”—transitoriness, rather than permanence (Ichihara, 2000, p.5; Namba, 2004, p.13). In light of the implication, it will be highly expected to develop earth-friendly building materials, like spiders’ webs, for “transient housing.”
- (8) The target of slum improvement was originally laid down within the “Cities Without Slums” Action Plan of the Cities Alliance (<http://www.citiesalliance.org/>), which was mainly established by UN-Habitat and the World Bank in 1999 (UN-Habitat, 2003f, pp.2,12-13).
- (9) The UN-Habitat Strategic Vision (2003, pp.9-10) makes mention of such schemes as the “Water for African/Asian Cities Program,” “Sustainable Cities Program,” “Urban Management Program,” “Risk and Disaster Management Program,” and “Safer Cities Program.”
- (10) As to the international (illegal) migrants to existing slums/squatter settlements, UN-Habitat (2004, pp.82,85) has reported such notable cases as Burmese migrants in the slums of Klong Toey, Nigerian and French-speaking African immigrants in a squatter settlement of Johannesburg, Nicaraguan migratory population in informal settlements of San Jose de Costa Rica, and Bengalese, Afghan, and Burmese immigrants in the unplanned area of Orangi,

Karachi.

- (11) As regards the transnational “parallel habitats” of those households who have been designated as “refugees,” circumstantial reports will be needed. Yet, reliable experts on the Middle East issues have implied that such cases can be found in Afghanistan under reconstruction.
- (12) In Japan, recently, Governor of Nagano moved his residential registration to a remote village within the same prefecture, allegedly because he wished to pay local taxes to his favorite municipality. Once, his name was also inscribed in a voters’ list of the rural area. However, Nagano district court has ruled that the inscription must be invalidated due to his “paper” movement (http://www2.asahi.com/2004_senkyo/news/). It would be an exceptional case that movement of residential registration is rooted in one’s good faith supporting rural development of his/her favorite local community. Nevertheless, it is obvious that Japanese society has been increasingly faced with a widening gap between the conventional institutions –grounded on the <singular> present address under the “sedentary” society–and the present-day mobile society–practical living <plural> homes on account of long-distance coming and going for not only business and school but also intensive/preventive care for aged family member(s) (<http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/iryu/ansin/>)–.
- (13) At present, migrant workers are required to carry an “identification card,” a “temporary residential permit,” and a “work permit.” Soon after formalization of the training schemes, the itinerant population might further be required to carry a “vocational license,” which could be, in effect, a tool for authorities to manage the mobile society.
- (14) Those poor “international migrants” flowing into slums in other developing countries who have been reported by UN-Habitat (2004, chs.4-5) as the deprived urban poor destined for “the confining spaces of poverty” must be carefully looked at as to whether they have actually engendered “diasporic spaces.”
- (15) Kaul et al. (2003, p.14) have suggested that “the global public” would be composed of the general population, civil society organizations, corporate citizens, states, and the like.

Bibliography

- Cainkar, Louise et al. (2004). Migration as a Method of Coping with Turbulence among Palestinians. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*. 35-2, 229-240.
- Castells, Manuel (1996). *The Information Age*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Clark, Nigel (2003). Turbulent Prospects. in Malcolm Miles et al.(eds.), *Urban Futures*. London: Routledge, 182-193.
- Cobbett, William (2004). Moving beyond the Habitat Agenda. *Habitat Debate*. 10-2,9.
- Cohen, Michael (2004). Looking back at the Habitat Agenda. *Habitat Debate*. 10-2,8.
- Cui Chuan-yi (2004). *Zhongguo Nongmin Liudong GuanCha* [Studies on Peasants’ Mobility in

- China]. Taiyuan:Shanxi Economic Press.
- Cyber Brains (2004). Peking Shimin no Jutaku Kounyu Saishin Doko [The Latest Trend in the Housing Market in Beijing]. Tokyo: Cyber Brains Inc.
- Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the Societies of Control. October,59,3-7. (referred by Lyon, 2001)
- Drescher, Axel W. et al. (2002). *Urbanization*. Rome: FAO.
- Drewe, Paul (2004). *What about Time in Urban Planning & Design in the ICT Age?*. Delft: Delft University of Technology.
- Drewe, Paul (2001). ICT and Urban Design. in M.Carmona et al.(eds.), *Globalization Urban Form and Governance*. Delft: Delft University Press.
- FAO (2001). *Urban and Peri-Urban Agriculture*. Rome: FAO.
- Friedmann, John (2004). Globalization and the Emerging Culture of Planning. University of British Columbia.
- Friedmann, John (2002). *The Prospect of Cities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gao Xiang-dong (2004). *Dachengshi Renkou Fenbu Biandong Yu Jiaohu Hua Yanjiu* [The Alternation of Population Distributing and Suburbanization of Metropolis]. Shanghai: Fudan Press.
- Hardill, Irene (2004). Transnational Living and Moving Experiences. *Population, Space and Place*. 10,375-389.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ichihara, Kentaro (2000). Art 2000 no tameno 10 no Teigi [Ten Definitions for Art in 2000]. in Bijutsu Techo Henshubu(ed.), *Very New Art 2000*. Tokyo: Bijutsu Shuppansha, 5.
- IDB (2005a). IDB Fund to Support Pilot Project for Remittances-based Mortgages in Mexico. Press Release (30/3/2005).
- IDB (2005b). Remittances to Latin American and Caribbean Countries Topped \$45 Billion in 2004. Press Release (22/3/2005).
- IOM (2004). Valuing Migration. News Release No.873 (18/12/2004).
- Iwasaki, Minoru and Osamu Ueno (2003). Hobbes wo Koete [Beyond Hobbes's Thought]. *Gendai Shiso*. 31-15,24-41.
- Kaul, Inge et al.(eds.) (2003). *Providing Global Public Goods*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kim, Tae-chang et al. (2004). Hatsudai IV wo Ukete no Toron [Discussion on the Basis of Presentation IV]. in Takatoshi Imada et al.(eds.), *Publicness from the Perspective of City*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 138-151.
- Lian, Yu-ming(ed.) (2005). *Zhongguo Chengshi Baogao 2005* [Urban Report in China 2005]. Beijing: China Modern Economic Publishing House.
- Lyon, David (2003). *Surveillance after September 11*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lyon, David (2001). *Surveillance Society*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ma, Laurence J.C. (2003). Space, Place and Transnationalism in the Chinese Diaspora. in Laurence J.C. Ma et al.(eds.), *The Chinese Diaspora*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1-50.
- Machimura, Takashi (2004). Kokyosei no Soshitsu to Kokyosei no Sai-shinko [The Ruin of Publicness and the Re-invasion of Publicness]. in Takatoshi Imada et al.(eds.), *Publicness from*

- the Perspective of City*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 123-137.
- Marcotullio, Peter John (2003). Globalisation, Urban Form and Environmental Conditions in Asia-Pacific Cities. *Urban Studies*. 40-2,219-247.
- Mizushima Kazunori (2004). Teikoku [The Empire (2000)]. *Gendai Shiso—Book Guide 60*. 32-11,250-253.
- Moor, Jay (2004). Reviving the Habitat Agenda. *Habitat Debate*. 10-2,4-6.
- Mori, Masatoshi (2004). Anarchism teki Moment [Anarchistic Moment]. *Gendai Shiso*. 32-6,64-87.
- Namba, Kazuhiko (2004). Gishi no Bigaku to Kenchikuka no Bigaku [Engineers' Aesthetic and Architects' Aesthetic], *Kenchiku Zasshi*. 119-1524,10-13.
- Newman, Peter and Andy Thornley (2005). *Planning World Cities*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Okpala, Don (2003). Urban Agriculture. *Habitat Debate*. 9-4,18.
- Ouchi, Hirokazu and Takashi Sakai (2004). Kyoiku to Shakai [Education and Society]. *Gendai Shiso*. 32-4,48-69.
- Putten, Han van (2004). A First for NGOs in the UN System. *Habitat Debate*. 10-2,10.
- Sato, Katsuhiko(ed.) (2001). *Ryoshi-ron*[The Quantum Theory]. Tokyo: Natsume-sha.
- Savitch, H.V. (2003). Does 9-11 Portend a New Paradigm for Cities?. *Urban Affairs Review*. 39-1,103-127.
- Schiller, Nina Glick et al.(eds.) (1992). *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences. (referred by Ma, 2003)
- Schwartz, Peter and Doug Randall (2003). An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and its Implications for United States National Security. (a report commissioned by the U.S. Defense Department)
- Sui, Xiao-ming(ed.) (2005). *Zhongguo Mingong Diaocha* [Research on Migrant Workers in China]. Beijing: Qunyan Press.
- Sun, Wanning (2002). *Leaving China*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Takeuchi, Kaoru (2001). *Ryoshi Rikigaku* [Quantum Mechanics]. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Tanaka, Hikaru (2004). Han Gurobaru ka Undo ni okeru Anakizumu [Anarchism in Anti-globalization Movements]. *Gendai Shiso*. 32-6,37-51.
- Tang, Meng-jun (2004). Migrated Husbands. in Zheng Zhen-zhen et al.(eds.), *Migration and Rural Women's Development*. Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 207-225.
- Tanimura, Mitsuhiro (2005). Development and Urban Futures. *The Journal of Social Science*. 54,49-72.
- UN-Habitat (2004). *The State of the World's Cities 2004/2005*. London: Earthscan.
- UN-Habitat (2003a). *The Challenge of Slums*. London: Earthscan Publications.
- UN-Habitat (2003b), *The Habitat Agenda*. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
- UN-Habitat (2003c). *Improving the Lives of 100 Million Slum Dwellers*. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
- UN-Habitat (2003d). *Istanbul Declaration on Human Settlements*. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
- UN-Habitat (2003e). *Partnership for Local Capacity Development*. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
- UN-Habitat (2003f). *The UN-Habitat Strategic Vision*. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
- UN-Habitat (2002). *The Global Campaign on Urban Governance*. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.

Watanabe, Osamu (2004). Gendai Kokka no Henbo [Transformation of Contemporary Nation-states]. *Gendai Shiso*. 32-9,94-110.

国連ハビタットによる都市開発政策を越えて —「パラレル居住」対応の「量子都市ガバナンス」を新機軸に—

< 要 約 >

谷村 光浩

2004年12月、出生国以外に生活する人々は、過去35年間に2倍以上になり、世界全体で約1億7,500万人と発表された(IOM News Releases #873)。国内、都市圏内・外縁レベルでの人々の高まるモビリティとも重層化させて勘案すれば、今後の開発や都市を論じる際、従来の「定住社会」、「国民国家」づくりを前提にした「都市ガバナンス」とは本質的に次元の異なる見方が早急に探究され、さらにはそこから新たなビジョンを描き出せるように手はずを整えておく必要がある。

本論文では、おもに文献研究を通じて、最初に「液化化」と称されるような最近の社会変容をとらえ、それを糸口に国連ハビタットの都市開発政策を批判的に考察する。次いで、Tanimura (*The Journal of Social Science* 54, '05) が提起した「パラレル居住(十分な解を確保するため、複数のテリトリー/ノンテリトリー空間を並列に編成し、それらを行き来して、同時化させながら“住まう”こと)」論をもとに、具体的な諸事例を整理した後、量子物理学の概念とのアナロジーから「量子都市ガバナンス」という新機軸を設定し、再度、国連ハビタットのアプローチを論考する。なお最後に、この「量子都市ガバナンス」からビジョンを描く前に求められる今後の課題を整理する。

まず、都市ガバナンスの異なる観点は、次のように要約できよう。①「固体相」の視点とは、テリトリーをもとに定住者が編成する旧来の共同体、地方・中央政府という近代国民国家の構成要素を基軸にしたもので、これは、そうしたロジックの補強・強化を企図する国際機関やグローバル企業によっても共有される。②「液体相」とは、唯一の最適解として選択された定住地からグローバル空間を駆け回る人々や、そうした定住地を求めた移民が織りなすトランスナショナルリズムのように、固体相の想定す

る静的枠組みを越え、地域共同体が複数の社会とのネットワーク状の関係性の中で編成されていくという、流動者からみた動的なとらえ方である。そして、③「量子都市ガバナンス」とは、以上のような擬制「定住」社会を近似計算で運営してきたニュートニアン・パラダイムを越え、「パラレル居住」の概念を契機に見えてきた人間居住に関わる「不確定性」や「波動(運動状態)」を、量子物理学における「多世界解釈」の適用によって、リアルにとらえようとする都市ガバナンスの提案である。

国連ハビタットの都市開発政策を考察すると、グローバル化する都市が丹念に探究され、精緻なグローバル行動計画が立案・実施されてきたと評価されるのは、現実社会を近似計算でとらえる意味合いにおいてであり、打ち出される各種施策の底流には、「固体相のガバナンス」強化が透けて見える。今後、国連ハビタットが論じる重要概念については、ことに「量子都市ガバナンス」の観点から、いかに定義しうるのか/すべきかを論考する作業等が不可欠となる。