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Travelling Ideas and Concepts in Urban Development: Limits of Transfers and Local Contexts

Globalisation is perceived as a major enabler of all kinds of flows, be it of capital, trends and fashions, lifestyle, culture, people, technology, and many more. Moreover, various international and sometimes world-wide initiatives, organizations and agreements, of which key examples are the European Union, the United Nations, or the Paris climate agreement, exert a powerful influence on policies. As a result, perhaps the most important transfer process to follow is that of ideas. These are carried by people, who are never free of positive or negative prejudice, of biases, and, most fundamentally, of the characteristics of the culture in which they were raised and educated (Dunkel 2015, p. 173; de Groot et al. 2010).

Culture and local traditions have important impacts on the creation and perception of space (Li 2014; Alexander 1977, 1979), the mediation of institutional and policy transfers as well as on the outcomes of their local implementation and adaptation (de Jong et al. 2002). Therefore, in the process of transfer of ideas across cultural borders, sensitivity to local cultural specifics (Eigenart) (Norberg-Schulz 1991; WBGU 2017) and tacit knowledge plays a crucial role (Inkpen and Wang 2016). We argue that despite the increased easiness of flow of both material and non-material goods between countries and continents, there still exists significant tension between ‘global’ culture and local culture, where the first one relates to an institutional regular pattern which has a universal validity claim transcending local contingency, while the other to the particular and unique customs, conventions and special institutional and bureaucratic settings within the national borders (Löw 2008; Sassen 2001). It is argued that the first one leads to global convergence and isomorphism; the second one, being situation- and milieu-related, and locally bounded, leads rather to divergence and decoupling from the global values. In an era of rapid urban development across the hemispheres analysing, understanding, and catering to the local contextual specifics gains critical importance to achieve a long-term sustainable and holistic urban growth. At the same time expanding the toolbox of urban researchers by engaging in active exchange and dialogue across the disciplines seems equally as important to achieve the goal.

During this workshop we would like to discuss the often neglected and complex aspects of the cultural layer environmental design professions and urban researchers are confronted with. A particular focus will be laid at the limits of transferred ideas, policies, concepts, and models and how these limits are discussed, evaluated, and dealt with in practice. We are interested in an exchange of the different disciplinary and interdisciplinary research frameworks, theories, approaches, or methods that can be applied for research on cross-cultural urbanisation strategies, concepts, policies, ideas, and frameworks.
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PRELIMINARY PROGRAM
October 8, 2018

9.00 Welcome and Introduction

9.15 **Food for Thoughts Session 1**
Policy Mobility and the Notion of “Scripts”: Narratives, Media and Figures as Success Factors in the Global Diffusion of Blueprints for Urban Development (The Case of the Garden City Movement)
*Jens M. Gurr & Barbara Buchenau*
Translatology of Space: The Woonerf in Poland – Borrowing or Transfer?
*Przemysław A. Paluszek*

10.45 Coffee Break

10.45 The ‘Singapore-ETH Centre’ – A Challenging Knowledge Exchange Loop between Zurich and Singapore
*Conrad H. Philipp*

11.30 Local Context and Global Concepts: Sustainable Urban Development Strategies in the Case of China, India, and Singapore
*Katharina M. Borgmann*

12.15 Discussion

12.45 Lunch Break

14.00 **Food for Thoughts Session 2**
N.a.
*Shiqiao Li*

The “Low-Carbon Community (LCC)” under Different Context: A comparison between Germany and China
*Lijie Gao*

Establishing Regional Profiles for Megacity Regions in China – A Multi-Level Governance Perspective
*Martin de Jong*

15.30 Coffee Break

15.45 **Roundtable Discussion**

17.00 Closing Remarks

17.30 Transfer to Restaurant

18.00 Dinner at Lindenwirtin

Speakers and organisers invited, participants welcome to join
Speakers (in alphabetical order):

Borgmann, Katharina M. – Local Context and Global Concepts: Sustainable Urban Development Strategies in the Case of China, India, and Singapore

Katharina M. Borgmann works as a postdoctoral researcher at the IN-EAST School of Advanced Studies. She has gained several years of professional experience during her work as an architect and urban designer in Israel, China, and India. Currently, at the University of Duisburg-Essen, her research focus is centered around Chinese urbanisation and local contextuality. Her further research interests lie in cross-cultural transfer processes, empirical urban aesthetics, digital planning tools and scenario development, and how international (sustainability) agreements impact cities and city-building professionals. In 2018 Katharina Borgmann has received a research grant to support her project on contextualisation processes of urban sustainability concepts in China, India, and Singapore.

De Jong, Martin – Establishing Regional Profiles for Megacity Regions in China – A Multi-Level Governance Perspective

Dr. W.M. Martin de Jong is professor of Policy, Organization, Law & Gaming at the Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management at Delft University of Technology. He is specialized in urban and infrastructure development in China, with special strength in transport infrastructures and eco city / low-carbon city development. Key publications such as Sustainable-Smart-Resilient-Low Carbon-Eco-Knowledge Cities; Making sense of a multitude of concepts promoting sustainable urbanization (Journal of Cleaner Production, 2015) and Exploring the relevance of the eco-city concept in China: The Case of Shenzhen Sino-Dutch Low Carbon City (Journal of Urban Technology, 2013) demonstrate his research interest in public policies, urban planning, transport planning and China.

Gao, Lijie – The “Low-Carbon Community (LCC)” under Different Context: A Comparison between Germany and China

Dr. Lijie Gao is from the Institute of Urban Environment of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. She has worked as a postdoctoral researcher with the focus on “Ecological-Sustainable Planning and Assessment” for several years with her main research interests in Sustainability; Low-Carbon Development; IndustrialEcology; Urban Ecology. Her projects were awarded with several prestigious grants such as the National Natural Science Foundation China or the Foreign & Commonwealth Office’s Strategic Programme Fund (SPF). Her works have been published in several peer-reviewed journals, monographs and edited volumes.

Gurr, Jens M. & Buchenau, Barbara – Policy Mobility and the Notion of “Scripts”: Narratives, Media and Figures as Success Factors in the Global Diffusion of Blueprints for Urban Development (The Case of the Garden City Movement)

Dr. Jens M. Gurr is Professor of British Literature and Culture and Member of the University Council of University of Duisburg-Essen. His field of work includes research and teaching about Urban Literary Studies, Urban Cultural Studies and Transdisciplinary Urban Studies, Contemporary Anglophone Fiction and Literary and Cultural Theory, among others. He co-edited Understanding Complex Urban Systems: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Modeling (Springer, 2014), Romantic Cityscapes (Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2013) and Healthy and Liveable Cities: Selected Papers from the Essen Conference (Ludwigsburg: avedition, 2013).
Li, Shiqiao – n.a.

Li Shiqiao, PhD is Weedon Professor in Asian Architecture and Architecture + Architectural History and Chair of Architectural History at the University of Virginia’s School of Architecture. His research is focused on understanding Chinese architecture with its culture and intellectual frameworks. His books include *Understanding the Chinese City* (Sage, 2014), *Kowloon Cultural District* (MCCM Creations, 2014), *Architecture and Modern Thought* (China WaterPower Press, 2009) and *Power and Virtue: Architecture and Intellectual Change in England 1660–1730* (Routledge, 2007).

Paluszek, Przemysław A. – The Woonerf in Poland – A Cultural Transfer or just a Lexical Borrowing?

Przemysław A. Paluszek teaches Dutch language and culture at the Institute of Germanic Studies, Opole University, Poland. He’s currently attempting to complete his doctoral dissertation on the image of the Dutch Golden Age in the 19th-century Dutch literary histories. His research interests are focused on Dutch and Afrikaans literature and culture, applied linguistics (translation studies and Dutch-as-foreign-language-teaching methodology) and most recently spatial aspects of culture as well as conceptualisation of certain spaces in literature and culture (within the methodological framework of cognitive poetics).

Philipp, Conrad H. – The ‘Singapore-ETH Centre’ – A Challenging Knowledge Exchange Loop between Zurich and Singapore

Dr. Conrad H. Philipp is Senior Researcher and project coordinator of Cooling Singapore at the Singapore-ETH Centre of ETH Zürich. His main research focus is on urban climate mitigation strategies within which he coordinates the project Cooling Singapore (CS) as the first inter-CREATE project. CS will bring together several researchers from different universities, such as TUM Create, SMART, FCL and NUS.
Abstracts (in alphabetical order of the speakers):

**Borgmann, Katharina M.**

**Local Context and Global Concepts: Sustainable Urban Development Strategies in the Case of China, India, and Singapore**

At a global scale, borders seem to continuously vanish, and the world gets ‘smaller’ and larger at the same time, since it provides us with many more opportunities and chances. Planning concepts, urban design approaches, and architecture have joined the international trade goods, which are traded globally according to the market and the demand. Traditionally, the exchange happens from the more developed to the less developed regions and countries (see here Edward Said’s famous work *Orientalism* (1978), discussing ‘the other’ parts of the world, narratives and imaginaries, often disconnected from the actual developments and examples). However, this is not a new phenomenon. Urban form generated in faraway places has changed cities on regional, metropolitan, and local scales for many centuries. Monks, traders, politicians, surveyors, and many others have taken ideas about urban form, function, policy, and technology with them as they have moved between cities, countries, and continents, as Carola Hein (2014, 2016) has discussed, among others, while pointing out that vast research gaps still exist.

The scale and speed of these processes indeed has reached a level never witnessed before, especially concerning China and very soon India. This calls for a re-emphasis on the urgency of looking at the challenges of transfer and implementation of concepts, ideas, and frameworks. The recent report on “the transformative power of cities” by the WBGU (German Advisory Council on Global Change) from 2016 as well as in the UN Habitat III “New Urban Agenda” (2016) point out the need for a better understanding of local specifics and characteristics, the Eigenart, to achieve successful long-term implementation and resulting sustainable urban development. This talk highlights aspects of these processes in China and India.

How sustainable city-building concepts are contextualised in China and in India, and what are the characteristics of the role that Singapore plays in that process of transfer and appropriation? The scholarly discussion categorises Singapore as having fewer challenges in bilateral transfers – compared to Sino-European and Indo-European – due to the kinship with China and India; meanwhile, reports of actors of these collaborations frequently indicate otherwise (see Inkpen et al. 2006). The different experiences of China (a more established test ground for a variety of different spatial models in the realm of sustainable urbanisation strategies) and India (a country that has just started ‘the 100 Smart Cities’ programme) are excellent grounds to investigate these processes.

---

1 Scholarly work on urban transfer and transformation processes in China has been carried out, for example by WU Fulong, Wu and Gaubatz, or Sun and Chen.

2 This field of study has coined the terms *Transnational Urbanism*, *Transcultural Urbanism*, and *Cross-cultural Urbanism*.

3 For research approaches on the dynamics of “global and local” from a theoretical perspective, see also Saskia Sassen: *The global City*, 1991, or Martina Löw: *Die Eigenlogik der Städte: Neue Wege für die Stadtforforschung*, engl. “the intrinsic logic of cities,” from 2008.
De Jong, Martin

Establishing Regional Profiles for Megacity Regions in China – A Multi-Level Governance Perspective

In this study, the establishment and evolution of regional profiles for three megacity regions in China is examined, not as seen by the public, but institutionally embedded in intergovernmental relations. Developing regional profiles should be seen as a process, consisting of three developmental stages: (1) emergence of an urban agglomeration, (2) institutionalization through government promotion, and (3) general recognition with declining government involvement. The Greater Pearl River Delta (GPRD) and Jing-Jin-Ji are in stage 2, while the Yangzi River Delta is in stage 3. The regional profiles are generally supported by the national government, further detailed by provincial governments, and eventually recognised only to a limited extent by municipal governments.

Gao, Lijie

The “Low-carbon community (LCC)” under different context: A comparison between Germany and China

In the context of global climate change, low-carbon economy and urban development have gradually become an important consensus of governments to formulate policies (Stern, 2006). More than 70% of the global fossil fuel greenhouse gas (GHG) emission, has become a high-intensity energy-intensive areas and the key human source. A significant reduction in the expanding urban emission is critical in combating climate change both locally and globally.

As an effective approach to control urban GHG emissions and to launch low-carbon transformation, “Low Carbon Community (LCC)” has gradually been seen a suitable urban sustainable development model and becoming an important starting point of low-carbon transformation in cities. It has proved that through a rational development framework, better understanding key elements of success, combination of designed tools for low-carbon and sustainability assessment, deliberated action plans and rational research, public participation from the root, low-carbon and sustainable community could be effectively realized.

China is today one of the biggest carbon intensive economies in the world. Like many other parts of the world, more than 80% of CO2 emissions come from urban areas in China. These years, start from the introduction of foreign practices and successful demonstration, LCC rational and initiatives are newly introduced and transferred to China. The practices emphasizes “pilot city-approach” as a model for low-carbon development transformation, in which the process of planning and nurturing a space (niche) for protecting transformation and management is focused, and the participants, technologies and networks are updated and transformed (Ding, 2016). However, problems appeared in China such as the lack of evaluation criteria, actions influenced by lack of cognition, lack of systematisms and imperfect policy mechanisms, etc. (Khanna, 2014).

As one of the early promoter of LCC and sustainable community (SC), Germany has accumulated rich experience in emphasizing participatory and action-oriented evaluation applications and standardization. Due to the different social, cultural, development and even political context, low-carbon planning strategies are also quite different. Under these circumstances, what can be transferred and where exist the limits? By comparing LCC practices in different developing and culture background, this study will study relative theories and practices in Germany and China, by taking two pilot LCCs Xiamen and Essen as two examples, clarify the definition, connotation and boundary of LCC in different context, explores how the mechanism shapes the paradigm of low-carbon urbanization at local level (community & neighborhood) in Germany and China. To be specific, to investigate what are transferred and missing during the progress, their concept and aims,
implementation modes and limits, indicators, organization forms, governance and management structure, public participation process etc. will be illustrated and compared. Consequently, this study will clarify what can be transferred, how the good experiences and models can be transferred, the result will improve the development of LCCs under different context, and the way to transfer properly in different urbanization and culture background (the conference focus).

Gurr, Jens M. & Buchenau, Barbara

Policy Mobility and the Notion of “Scripts”: Narratives, Media and Figures as Success Factors in the Global Diffusion of Blueprints for Urban Development (The Case of the Garden City Movement)

Policy mobility has come to be recognized as a major factor in global policy developments and various attempts have been made to identify key actors, mechanisms and contextual factors crucial to its understanding. However, the ways in which policies concretely travel still remains understudied: The overwhelming majority of studies on policy mobility across disciplines – whether they take an institutional, actor-centric approach, a “cultural fit” approach studying the compatibility of belief systems, or a global convergence approach – appears to have a blind spot in the analysis of how, i.e. in what material form, such ideas actually travel. Moreover, even where contributions do mention “document analysis” as a research method, there is generally little to no engagement with the materiality, mediality and narrativity of the actual documents, speeches, etc. involved. We suggest that a literary and cultural studies approach that proceeds by means of a close reading of the material and pays attention, for instance, to rhetoric, iconography, or intertextuality might profitably supplement existing approaches to the study of policy mobility and diffusion. More specifically, we argue that the notion of “scripts” – in a conception which deliberately combines descriptive as well as prescriptive definitions of the term from a range of fields and disciplines (including literary studies, social psychology, law, biblical scholarship, and artificial intelligence research) – might prove helpful. In this understanding, “scripts” combine procedural knowledge, self-description, and blueprint for the future.

As a case study, we propose the virtually global spread in the early 20th century of the “Garden City Movement” initiated by Ebenezer Howard’s Garden Cities of Tomorrow (1902, rev. 2nd ed. of what in 1898 was called To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform). Howard lived in the US from 1871 to 1876, both as a farmer in Nebraska and in Chicago, and the “garden city script” resonates with anti-urban sentiments that are not only typical of a – broadly speaking – English tradition of Romantic anti-urbanism, but also of a specifically American anti-urbanism in the tradition of Jeffersonian pastoralism. Moreover, the frequently religious fervour and the missionary tone prevalent in the Garden City tradition closely echo an American “City upon a hill” rhetoric and iconography, as in Louis de Soissons’ plans for “Welwyn Garden City”, founded by Howard himself in 1920. Thus, what has generally been regarded as the global diffusion of a quintessentially “English” script – the establishment of greener, less crowded cities (in effect mostly really suburbs) as a response to the living conditions in industrial cities under free-market capitalism – on closer inspection turns out to have been based on a far more complex transatlantic – and later global – exchange of ideological preconceptions, interpretive patterns, narratives, imaginaries, and iconographies.

In sum, we argue that the frequently scripted nature of blueprints for urban development relies on narrative acts, generic formula, medial forms and structures, figural thought, and cognitive models, and thus on processes of narrativization, mediation, and figuration (both in the sense of personification and condensation into figures of thought) – and that a literary studies approach to policy diffusion might therefore profitably complement existing approaches.
Translatology of Space: The Woonerf in Poland – Borrowing or Transfer?

The Dutch word woonerf meaning ‘a residential area street’, a coinage of the verb wonen (to live / dwell) and the noun het erf, which could be translated as ‘premises, property’ or ‘estate / grounds’, is one of those Dutch words that, like cookie (from koekje) or coleslaw (koolsla), managed to be borrowed into a number of languages due to the lack of a native name for those concepts in a given language. It does not mean that there were no native names for small pastries or cabbage salads. It rather means that Dutch versions of both dishes seemed new enough to adopt them together with the (approximation of the) original name. A woonerf is a living street or a street in a residential area, but not every street in a residential area could automatically be called a woonerf, in case of which a paved area can be used for traffic and parking, but also for walking, meeting people, playing ... Its *differentia specifica* lies in the surrender of the traditional design of the street, consisting of a carriageway and a footpath, in order to create a public space that could serve as a plaza, parking area, playground, or the residents’ meeting place. The design and functions of a woonerf (since 1988 – an erf) were first legally defined in 1976 and are currently regulated by the implementing orders of the Wegenverkeerswet 1994 (WWW 1994, Road Traffic Act of 1994).

The term woonerf was widely heard in post-communist Poland for the first time in 2014, when the 6 sierpnia street in Łódź was converted to a ‘woonerf’ as a result of participatory budgeting. Although after the initial success of this particular initiative a number of areas not only in Łódź have been converted into ‘woonerven’, no legal regulations were introduced in order to define and regulate this issue, hence the inverted commas.

After a presentation of the methodological framework (Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet’s *A Methodology of Translation* [1958], André Lefevere’s *Mother Courage’s Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature* [1982]) and a brief examination of such socio-cultural aspects of the Netherlands of the 1970s, such as post-pillarisation or depillarisation (Dutch: ontzuiling – the process of dismounting the system of socio-economic segregation, present in the Netherlands between the 1860s and 1960s) and the polder model (Dutch: poldermodel - a consensus-based model of socio-economic decision making), and their role in designing the housing policy that included the planning of woonerven, a sketch of the development of this phenomenon in its native context will be presented. In the second part, the proto-woonerf layouts such as ‘alejka osiedlowa’ (‘home zone’ or ‘living street’) from the socialist period in Poland will be discussed, followed by the examination of the grassroots processes leading to converting the streets in Łódź to ‘woonerven’. In the final part Polish ‘woonerven’ will be viewed as refractions of Dutch originals. The press and social media coverage of the ‘woonerven’ in Poland will then be used to establish a linguistic conceptual framework around woonerf in Poland and to describe the linguistic / cultural (?) consciousness concerning the Polish version of the phenomenon.

The ‘Singapore-ETH Centre’ – A Challenging Knowledge Exchange Loop between Zurich and Singapore

The Singapore-ETH Centre was established in 2010 by ETH Zurich – The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology and Singapore’s National Research Foundation (NRF), as part of the NRF’s CREATE campus. As ETH Zurich’s only research centre outside of Switzerland, the centre intend to strengthened the research capacity of ETH Zurich to develop sustainable solutions to global challenges in Switzerland, Singapore and the surrounding regions.
Set in Asia, in a rapidly urbanising region, the Singapore-ETH Centre aims to provide practical solutions to some of the most pressing challenges on urban sustainability. The centre’s first research programme – the Future Cities Laboratory (FCL) combines science and design for a sustainable urban future with an Asian perspective. Launched in 2014, the Future Resilient Systems (FRS) programme seeks to develop a framework, methods and tools to make critical infrastructure systems more robust and resilient.

Through its programmes, the centre serves as an intellectual hub for research, postgraduate and postdoctoral training, and entrepreneurship, bringing together principal investigators and researchers from diverse disciplines and backgrounds.

To promote the exchange of ideas and expertise, researchers at the centre actively collaborate with universities and research institutes in Singapore and in overseas. Engagement with industry and government agencies also helps researchers translate knowledge to action by providing practical solutions to real-world problems.

In 2017, the Singapore-ETH Centre led the inter-institutional Cooling Singapore research project in developing a roadmap to improve thermal comfort in tropical Singapore. The project is a collaboration with centres established by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Technical University of Munich and with the National University of Singapore under the National Research Foundation’s CREATE programme in Singapore.

The knowledge transfer from Switzerland to Singapore will be discussed, the interaction with local authorities will be highlighted and the framework of collaboration within the different universities in the Cooling Singapore project will be presented.