

The Un-Exceptional Middle Eastern Cityⁱ

Sarah El-Kazaz, Oberlin College
Kevin Mazur, Nuffield College, University of Oxford

No trope has defined the study of the Middle East as a region more than the claim that it is “exceptional.” The region’s alleged exceptionalism has skewed scholarship in favor of topics such as Islamism, rentierism, patriarchy and sectarianism, and colored the explanations posited for a wide variety of phenomena in the region.ⁱⁱ The study of Middle Eastern cities has not escaped this curse. The perspectives through which Middle Eastern cities are studied are based in a triad of regional exceptions: Islam, oil and authoritarianism. Although recent scholarship on the city has moved beyond studying Middle Eastern cities as “exceptional” in important ways, the angles through which the city is seen and the methods through which it is studied remain largely beholden to that genealogy. This special section represents a conscious effort to de-exceptionalize the study of Middle Eastern cities. Its three articles pay close attention to urban scales, sensoriums and vertical layers while putting them in conversation with contemporary debates in urban studies. In doing so, they transcend the exceptionalist genealogy and open up unexplored vistas in the study of Middle Eastern cities. In particular, they ethnographically historicize the study of the planned and unplanned processes through which cities in the region transform and the global and regional connections that shape these transformations. They each bring a unique lens to studying places and epochs (post-WWII and the Cold War) that have been peripheralized in the study of Middle Eastern cities and demonstrate how the study of Middle Eastern cities can offer distinctive contributions to the field of urban studies.

A Genealogy of Exception:

Until as recently as the early 2000s, the study of the city remained on the periphery of scholarship on the region, in the shadow of topics seen as more relevant in an “exceptional” Middle East. When scholarship did focus on the city, the studies were framed around the exceptional nature of Middle Eastern cities in a variety of ways. The earliest and long-dominating tradition in the field epitomized this tendency, with its focus on “the Islamic city.” Originating within (and eventually moving beyond) the

Orientalist tradition, works in this genre sought to unveil the special relationship between Islam and the city and the timeless characteristics of the “Islamic city,” which had become synonymous with the Middle Eastern city. Janet Abu-Lughod (1987) demonstrated that these cities changed dramatically over time and that Islam was often a peripheral influence, at best. An incisive body of work (e.g. Mitchell 1988; Wright 1991; Çelik 1997) followed, exploring the ways in which colonial powers played an active role in representing (through the Exhibition and otherwise) and physically preserving urban centers in the Middle East as “Islamic” and “traditional.” By demonstrating the construction of exceptionalism in the Middle East, this scholarship revealed the unexceptional nature of colonial politics in the Middle East and its connections to global colonial strategies of domination. Because this literature took *colonial* rather than *urban* politics as its object of analysis, however, it left largely unexplored the workings of urban politics and livelihood in the Middle East. The exceptional, albeit constructed, Middle Eastern city remained in the limelight with the concept of the “dual city,” developed to characterize colonized urban centers with preserved Islamic cores such as Cairo, Algiers and Casablanca. Orientalizing scholars and colonial apparatuses had highlighted the contrast between European and Muslim quarters as one symbolizing the contrast between European and Islamic civilization. This gave the “dual city” concept a special, civilizational importance in the study of Middle Eastern cities, and thus a conceptual permanence distinct from studies of other “dual cities” around the colonized world. Recently, the study of colonized cities has begun to interrogate whether these colonized cities did in fact operate as “dual cities” and to show the fluidity of and interconnection between Muslim and European quarters (e.g. Fahmy 2002; Reynolds 2012), moving beyond that civilizational framework. However, most work on the modern colonized Middle Eastern cities remains focused on that boundary, real or imagined, between an “Islamic” and “European” quarter.

The notion that Islam pervades life in the Middle East and is antithetical to pluralism and cosmopolitanism—brought back into the mainstream through work on a “clash of civilizations” and world events like the September 11 attacks—occasioned the development of a literature debating the nature and existence of “cosmopolitanism” in Muslim-majority societies (Barkey 2005). This debate gave

rise to another framework for studying the region's cities: the "cosmopolitan" city (e.g. Eldem et al. 1999; Bora 1999; Leichtman and Schulz 2012; Barkan and Barkey 2015). Although the interest in studying the "cosmopolitan" city may have been sparked by "exceptional" anxieties specific to Muslim societies, this scholarship developed to astutely question the politics behind valorizing "cosmopolitanism" in the region (e.g. Hanley 2008; Mills 2010), as well as unpacking its history relative to unexceptional phenomena such as nationalism and global interconnectedness (e.g. Hanssen 2005; Amar and Singerman 2006; Hanley 2007; Minkin 2009; Bashkin 2009; Mills 2010; Reynolds 2012). Even as the literature has developed beyond a discourse of exceptionalism, there remains a disproportionate interest in studying Middle Eastern cities through the lens of cosmopolitanism because of that scholarly genealogy.

The special relationship between Islam and the region is not the only realm of exception that has shaped the study of Middle Eastern cities. The region has also been hailed as an exceptionally robust bastion of authoritarianism. For the past two decades, and especially after the Third Wave of democratization in Latin American and in post-Soviet states, scholarship on the Middle East within the discipline of political science has been almost exclusively dedicated to explaining the exceptional robustness of authoritarianism in the Middle East (e.g. Ross 2001; Bellin 2004; Lust-Okar 2005; Heydemann 2007; Blaydes 2010). Although most of this work was dedicated to regime dynamics, a strand of this literature turned to understanding modes of resistance and everyday lived experience under the rule of these exceptionally resilient authoritarian regimes. This scholarship unequivocally turned to everyday spatial tactics and "weapons of the weak" (Scott 1985) mobilized by urban dwellers to resist or cope with authoritarianism. Pioneering works by Diane Singerman (1995) and Asef Bayat (1997), born of efforts to find voice under an exceptionally robust authoritarianism, brought the city as a unit of analysis from the margins of scholarship on the region to its center. As a result, unpacking everyday spatial "tactics" (de Certeau 1984) of resistance became hailed as one of the main contributions of Middle East studies to urban studies.ⁱⁱⁱ The absence of other forms of direct resistance in the region both necessitated such an approach to understand political contention and made it easier to see and study these bottom-up, urban "weapons of the weak." In the wake of this scholarship's impact on urban studies and with the

perceived unique opportunities for studying everyday forms of resistance in the Middle East, an incredibly diverse and dynamic body of works developed to study these bottom-up tactics. From its initial focus on voice under authoritarianism, this scholarship expanded to include studies of spatial tactics and networks in the face of unexceptional processes such as modernization, globalization and neoliberalization (e.g. Ghannam 2002; Amar and Singerman 2006; Ismail 2006; Tuğal 2009; Fawaz 2009; Turam 2013). Thus, as the study of the city finally got the attention it warranted in Middle East studies it was almost entirely oriented towards studying spatial tactics and the lived experience of the city rather than the processes through which cities were planned, built, transformed and governed.

Finally, with several notable exceptions, oil has dominated the study of Arab Gulf cities. The primary interest of many social scientists in the Gulf has been to make sense of the rentier state phenomenon—the heavy reliance of a government on revenues derived from resource extraction, rather than industrial or other productive economic activity (e.g. Beblawi 1987; Ross 2015). The development of urban politics and livelihood in the Gulf has been studied almost entirely to understand the political, social and economic mechanics of this phenomenon, rather than the lived experience of urban residents or the dynamics of the city in their own right. Recent work (e.g. Fuccaro 2013) has escaped the essentializing assumption that oil abundance operates only through rentierism, the process through which states forestall the implementation of democratic reforms by buying off the citizenry with oil revenues. Yet most work remains wedded to the notion of oil as the primary reason for studying urbanism in the Gulf. Nevertheless, some work to think beyond oil in the Gulf is already underway; a nascent body of scholarship (e.g. Center for International and Regional Studies 2015) is dedicated to studying port cities in the Gulf as a distinct group with historical and contemporary linkages to other port cities in the area, rather than only to other oil abundant cities. Pascal Menoret (2014) approaches inequality and violence in Saudi Arabia through its ‘drifting’ sub-culture. Seeing the Gulf beyond oil can orient our attention to issues such as class inequality and the lived experience of a rapidly developing city, which rightfully receive greater attention in the study of other world areas.

Though the genealogy of exception has drawn the major contours of the field, there are works on the Middle Eastern city that have escaped those parameters and identified processes and phenomena paralleling those in the rest of the world. The nascent tradition of studying Middle Eastern cities under the rubric of “global” or “neoliberal” cities grows out of a conscious effort to study the Middle East as a not-so-exceptional node in an interconnected globe. Nonetheless, the majority of work on urbanism and globalization and/or neoliberalization in the Middle East has focused on bottom-up processes of resistance and spatial re-appropriation; only a few have escaped that trajectory to study the processes of conceiving, building, transforming and governing the city (e.g. Keyder 1999; Mitchell 2002; Elyachar 2005; Kanna 2011; Angell et al. 2014). As such, most of the scholarship on neoliberal and globalizing cities in the region remains beholden to that genealogy in its method and angle of analysis, if not in the subject matter motivating its queries..

In short, a genealogy rooted in exceptionalism has created a field in which a disproportionate amount of attention is devoted to the study of the colonized “dual city,” the “cosmopolitan” city, and bottom-up, urban “weapons of the weak,” leaving wide gaps in the study of Middle Eastern cities. The first and most urgent gap is the lack of work on the political economic processes and institutional configurations through which urban built environments are conceived, planned and transformed in the Middle East. What is especially lacking is a *historical* approach to the study of these processes that unpacks their transformation over time. Second, the study of the region lacks a networked approach that unpacks the connections through which the city is produced. In particular, there is very little work on the networks of expertise, within and outside the region, that have shaped planning and architectural techniques in the Middle East.^{iv} The third is a temporal gap. The study of modern Middle Eastern cities is almost exclusively limited to two epochs: a) pre-1930s colonial and Ottoman cities and b) contemporary, post-Cold War cities. The genealogy of exception shaping this field has left the transformation of the city under modernist, decolonizing and Cold War regimes almost entirely unexplored.^v The fourth gap is geographical. Scholarship on Cairo, Beirut, Istanbul, and Tehran completely overwhelms the study of other cities in the Middle East. There are specialized nodes of work on colonial North Africa and

globalized Dubai but the number of edited volumes on cities like Cairo and Istanbul (e.g. Keyder 1999; AlSayyad et al. 2005; Amar and Singerman 2006 and 2009; Angell et al. 2014) attests to how overly centralized the study of Middle Eastern cities has become. The focus on these major urban centers comes at the detriment of understanding other centers in the region that may be seen as less “metropolitan” or “cosmopolitan,” as well as the secondary or peripheral cities in the orbit of those major urban centers, whether in Egypt or Morocco. The centralized nature of urban studies in the region is unsurprising given the incredible centralization of most political regimes in the region, but it leaves much to be explored in the “periphery.” Excluding the well-studied Cairo, Istanbul, Beirut and Teheran, there are thirty-seven cities with over one million inhabitants in the region; Turkey and Iran each have twenty-seven cities of over 300,000, and Egypt has thirteen.^{vi}

The three pieces in this special issue defy this trajectory by treating the development of the cities of Aswan, Riyadh and Algiers as quite unexceptional and connected to the contemporaneous trajectories of cities around the globe; they directly address the gaps detailed above. Nancy Reynolds turns our attention to the peripheral Egyptian city of Aswan, the site of the post-independence project to build Egypt’s High Dam. Moving our gaze away from the national impact of the building of the Dam to the local urban impact it had on the development of Aswan as a city, Reynolds interrogates the processes through which the city was planned, governed, lived, and marketed to outside audiences as it became the site of the biggest national development project of the Nasser era. In her contribution, Sheila Crane unpacks the political dynamics of Algerian decolonization by studying the planning and re-appropriation of housing built by the French colonial regime for the “containment and control” of its subjects when its power was most at peril in Algiers. Moving our attention away from a “dual city” paradigm, Crane interrogates the development of these housing projects that housed both European and Muslim Algerian residents on the outskirts of Algiers. She demonstrates how this created a complicated web of relations and interactions rarely addressed in the study of colonial urbanism in the Middle East. Finally, Pascal Menoret flips one exceptionalist question—Islamism—on its head. He traces the dynamics fueling Islamist political activism in contemporary Riyadh not to processes specific to Muslim religious

institutions and socialization, but to the unexceptional planning processes that produced Saudi (sub)urbanism in the Cold War era.

As they interrogate these important but underexplored urban dynamics, the authors address crucial gaps in the field of Middle Eastern urbanism. Rather than exclusively focusing on bottom-up practices of resistance, all three pieces take a historical approach to tracing the processes through which Aswan, Algiers and Riyadh are planned, conceived and transformed. In doing so they employ a range of creative archival sources to bring to life both deliberate strategies of planners and haphazard, unplanned processes through which the topography of cities is built up and transformed. The planning processes are never locally isolated but are connected to global planning networks, as is clear through Crane's exposé of how plans for housing traveled along French colonial expert networks to Algiers and from Algiers' experiments back to France in Marseille. Menoret also makes these connections clear as he links plans for Saudi (sub)urbanism, and especially the planning of Riyadh, to liberal American urban planning techniques as envisioned by the Greek architect Constantinos Doxiadis, who also worked on urban plans for a wide range of developing world cities in the United States' orbit, including Baghdad and Islamabad. Reynolds takes a different angle to illuminate these global connections, demonstrating the role of Soviet engineers in the development of Aswan as post-independence Egypt aimed to carve out a "Third Way" during the Cold War. As is clear from the time periods they cover, all three pieces then also address a major temporal gap by looking at urban processes in the 1950s and 60s that are intertwined with the politics of de-colonization, post-independence nation-building, and the Cold War. Finally, by looking at the non-metropolitan capital of Riyadh, the tertiary Egyptian city of Aswan and the peripheral outskirts of Algiers, the authors explore geographical arenas that have remained peripheral to the field of Middle Eastern urban studies.

In seeing the development of these three cities as unexceptional, the authors not only address critical gaps in the study of Middle Eastern cities but also make important contributions to how we study the conception and transformation of the city beyond the Middle East. The three articles contribute to several ongoing debates in urban studies and, in doing so, widen the scope with which Middle Eastern

cities are viewed. Specifically, the articles highlight the interconnections among different scales of activity, employ a layered approach attuned to the “politics of verticality” and integrate the urban sensorium into our study of the city across time and space.

Scale:

The urban is often studied as a “scale” within a hierarchy of scales of analysis. Such hierarchies often subsume the city under the privileged nation-state or position the city as merely an intermediary within investigations of global-local dynamics. This special issue joins the scholarship in urban geography that seeks to move beyond scale as a simple, static hierarchy and seeks to push that debate further by investigating the ways in which forces and actors connect and interact *across scales*—sometimes in pursuit of shared interests, sometimes in conflict with one another—to produce urban politics and livelihood.

Scale can be thought of as both a category of *analysis*, helping scholars think through the ways that material and ideational forces operating at different distances shape politics on the one hand, and a category of *practice*, deployed by social actors as part of their discursive strategies to produce new nodes of power on the other (Moore 2008). This special issue heeds MacKinnon’s (2011) call to take both approaches seriously to illuminate the ways in which actors press their claims, as well as how those discursive strategies are shaped by the broader social structures in which actors find themselves.

By demonstrating the ways in which historical and supra-local relations of power can condition the struggle between the implementers of state policy and the targets of those policies, the pieces in this issue show that such struggles are never dyadic. Forces greater than the state authorities, such as conflict between world powers and global economic conditions, and those peripheral to those authorities, such as local actors not directly targeted by state policies, all play an important role in shaping the outcomes of contention, and ultimately the city. In short, the articles focus on connections between actors and forces at different scales and the conflicts amongst actors operating at the same scale. In doing so, they draw out the role of proximate *and* distant factors bearing upon those struggles, without reifying the distinction between those scales.

Specifically, Menoret traces the interaction between global and local forces in producing specific forms of Islamist action in post-World War II Saudi Arabia. He demonstrates how American interest in blocking local collective action, rooted in Cold War strategy, converged with the Saudi government's fears of domestic unrest and its particular vision of modernity to produce plans that radically reshaped Saudi urbanism. American designs did not flow onto Saudi soil unmediated, however. Saudi planners replaced the apartment "super blocks" recommended by foreign planners with dispersed villas, producing a particular form of suburbanism that contributed to the erosion of pre-existing horizontal linkages among average citizens and enabled new Islamist strategies of network building. Menoret thus draws into focus agentive action at different scales and the ways in which actors reach beyond the context to which they are ostensibly confined.

Reynolds challenges the prevailing tendency to read state modernization projects solely through their effects on a national or international scale. She demonstrates how the project of building Egypt's High Dam enacted the Nasserist Egyptian state's vision of modernization on the local scale through the production of a "new consumer citizenship," the simultaneous integration into a state project and national markets, among residents of Aswan. At the same time, she shows how global capital and notions of racial difference play out on the local level, with foreign experts living in special quarters separate from 'native' engineers. Reynolds' choice to work on "the smaller and more intimate scale" of a peripheral city brings into greater focus the heterogeneity of local actors who sometimes challenge and sometimes collaborate with state authorities, highlighting how their action mediates the implementation of high modernist projects.

By shifting our attention from the city center to the outskirts of Algiers, Crane complicates our understanding of the "local" as a coherent scale by pointing to the fallacies produced by focusing our analysis on the center rather than the geographical peripheries of the city. By focusing on a peripheral "local" she challenges the idea that pitted European and Muslim quarters of the city against one another in a "dual city" approach. She instead demonstrates that it was precisely the spatial proximity between Muslim and European Algerian residents fostered by colonial housing projects on the outskirts of the city

that intensified and enabled the specific modalities of the Algerian decolonization struggle. Moving from a bird's-eye view of the city's layout to the specific floor plans designed for European and Muslim Algerians, and traveling across state boundaries to trace networks of colonial expertise that produced these plans, Crane's piece demonstrates the interactions across scales that enabled particular forms of resistance in decolonizing Algeria.

The Layered City:

Most scholarship in urban studies looks at the city horizontally, interrogating the ways in which space is organized, produced and re-appropriated as though it were a two-dimensional, flat plane. In other words, space remains understood in terms of notions of "territory" rather than as a multi-layered "topography" that spans both horizontal and vertical axes. This outlook is unsurprising given that the territorial nation-state is the quintessential modern political entity, yet it occludes our view of the wide and innovative range of techniques planners and subaltern actors deploy in their struggle over power and sustaining life in the city. In spite of Weizman's (2002) call to think about space in three dimensions, there still is very little engagement with the politics of verticality in urban studies. Hence, Graham and Hewitt (2013) call for a "fully volumetric urbanism... which addresses the ways in which horizontal and vertical extensions, imaginaries, materialities and lived practices intersect and mutually construct each other within and between subterranean, surficial and supersurface domains."^{vii} The three pieces in this special issue bring the politics of verticality to the forefront, reading the city as a multi-layered topography.

Crane's piece takes on "the politics of verticality" most directly by showing the ways in which the French colonial regime capitalized on Algiers' mountainous terrain to "control and contain" its subjects, enabling surveillance reminiscent of the Panoptical gaze of the modern state (Foucault 1977). Her careful tracing—enabled by the panoramic images of the housing projects her archival work uncovered—of how planners placed housing for European subjects above housing for Muslim Algerian subjects illustrates the reliance of the politics of verticality not just on savvy architectural techniques but also on an intimate knowledge and manipulation of a city's natural terrain. In addition to a topography of

surveillance, Crane illuminates the ways in which the evacuation of Algerian subjects from flat squatter settlements or *bidonvilles* to vertical housing blocks produced new modalities of containment and control. The use of constraining building materials like concrete, for example, hampered uncontrolled growth of urban settlements and organized these dense populations into navigable and accessible blocks. This very verticality would be re-appropriated during the resistances that Crane vividly describes at the end of the paper. In other words, for Crane, the politics of colonial domination and its resistance most dramatically unfolded on the city's vertical, rather than horizontal axis. Menoret, too, pays attention to the city's layers, though he flips our perspective on the politics of verticality by examining the politics of deliberately flattening the city. Through a careful tracing of the politics of suburbanization in Saudi Arabia, he demonstrates the ways in which flattening the country's urban terrain into sparsely populated suburbs was part of an explicit Cold War-era strategy to suppress dissent and urban protest.

Reynolds takes us most explicitly to the subterranean layers of the city in her engagement with practices of "ruin-making" in Aswan. Moving beyond the deliberate political strategies involved in manipulating a city's layered ruins to empower one history over another (e.g. Abu El-Haj 2008; Weizman 2007), Reynolds shows how everyday ruin-making practices challenged the progress-oriented, modernist political project of the post-independence Egyptian state. Aswan's residents dwelled amongst and re-purposed the city's layers of millennia-old ruins, and some new arrivals to the city flocked to its ruins to escape the loneliness of the modernist project that had brought them to Aswan in the first place. Her attention to the Nile's flooding cycles before and after the Aswan Dam's construction reveals the relationship between the natural and built environments in creating new subterranean and supersurface layers and ruins in the modern city. Moreover, Reynolds highlights the logistical uses of ruins as residents built upon the foundations of older buildings for stronger building structures. In showing the continuity between the ruin and new layers of the city, she not only moves beyond a strictly political reading of ruin-making, but also builds upon a scholarship dedicated to studying the affective materialities of ruins (e.g. Edensor 2005; Stoler 2013) to bring in the everyday mundane logistical dynamics of urban ruin-making.

Urban Sensorium:

The articles in this issue also draw our attention to the full range of senses, including sound, smell, and feel, in constituting the lived experience of the city and the struggle to control it. Sight has been the dominant sense through which scholars describe the city (and, indeed, most human processes), causing them to neglect other aspects of the sensorium, or the full set of human senses.^{viii} A comprehensive picture of urban actors' experience requires more than an accounting of what they saw; this is particularly true in an environment as densely populated and heterogeneous as the city, where the cacophony of traffic and stink of uncollected garbage—or the luxury of escaping them—indicate how actors live and the inequalities among them. The senses can be powerful tools in what Oosterbaan (2009, 82) has called the “politics of presence”; sound and smell can be associated with a particular group, and thereby both constitute the boundary between groups and serve as tools for claiming ownership of an area in that group's name. Scholars of the Middle East have been at the forefront of this movement to investigate the role of sound in political and social life (e.g. Fahmy 2011; Hirschkind 2006; Abu Lughod 2005), and the pieces in this special issue push this line of inquiry further.

While existing work has demonstrated the ways in which sound and smell can facilitate ownership of space (e.g. Schwarz 2014), Crane details the ways in which sound functioned as a tactic of self-defense in an increasingly violent struggle for Algiers. Muslim Algerians, for example confused and intimidated paramilitaries entering their neighborhoods by ululating in unison. The built environment factored centrally into these tactics. Whereas police can stop the chanting of protesters at demonstrations by breaking up the crowd, the dense housing units into which the state resettled many Muslim Algerians provided a platform for chants against the colonial state, and the units' sturdy limestone walls made the protesters dispersed and anonymous, impervious to policing.

Reconstructing the sensorium for periods before mass availability of recording technologies poses a major methodological challenge and requires creative selection and careful reading of written sources (Fahmy 2016). Reynolds uses literary and cinematic sources to reconstruct the lived experience of 1960s Aswan, and these sources are especially revealing of the sensorium. The radio blasts and cacophonous noises of the city overwhelm the ears, and rubbish plays an ambivalent role in the lives of urban dwellers,

giving off a distinct smell and cluttering paths. Yet the familiar sounds and smells also offer a welcome escape from the lonely modernist city. In addition, heat plays a prominent role in Reynolds' piece, revealing the inequality of the city through the contrast between the feeling of air-conditioning or sweat on people's skin. The examples Reynolds draws from memoir and literary sources are critical links connecting macro-structures like the unequal relations between Soviet experts, Egyptian engineers and Egyptian workers with the micro-processes through which inequality is manifest, as well as the lived experience of the city.

Conclusion:

This special issue is dedicated to moving beyond the genealogy of exception that has shaped the study of Middle Eastern cities. The three contributions have defied that trajectory by adopting a historical perspective on the local and global processes through which cities are planned and transformed in order to understand urban contestation and livelihood in cities that have remained peripheral to the field. They pay particular attention to the role of global networks of expertise in producing the lived experience of the city, the multi-layered topography of the city, and the wide array of sensory experiences through which the city is lived. In doing so they enrich not only the study of Middle Eastern cities, but our understanding of the production of power and livelihood in cities more generally. In other words, they demonstrate that Middle Eastern cities are, in many ways, un-exceptional, linked to broader global processes and functioning as sites of struggles that parallel those occurring in cities across the globe.

References:

- Abu-Lughod, Janet L. 1987. "The Islamic City – Historic Myth, Islamic Essence, and Contemporary Relevance." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 19 (2): 155–176.
- Abu-Lughod, Lila. 2005. *Dramas of Nationhood: The Politics of Television in Egypt*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Abu El-Haj, Nadia. 2008. *Facts on the Ground: Archaeological Practice and Territorial Self-Fashioning in Israeli Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Akcan, Esra. 2012. *Architecture in Translation: Germany, Turkey, and the Modern House*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- AlSayyad, Nezar, Irene A. Bierman, and Nasser Rabbat. 2005. *Making Cairo Medieval*. Lexington Books: Lanham, MD.
- Angell, Elizabeth, Timur Hammond and Danielle van Dobben Schoon. 2014. "Assembling Istanbul: Buildings and Bodies in a World City: Introduction." *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action* 18 (6): 644–654.
- Barkan, Elazar, and Karen Barkey. 2014. *Choreographies of Shared Sacred Sites: Religion, Politics, and Conflict Resolution*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Barkey, Karen. 2007. "Islam and Toleration: Studying the Ottoman Imperial Model." *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 19 (1-2): 5–19.
- Bashkin, Orit. 2008. *The Other Iraq: Pluralism and Culture in Hashemite Iraq*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bayat, Asef. 1997. *Street Politics: Poor People's Movements in Iran*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Beblawi, Hazem. 1987. "The Rentier State in the Arab World." In *The Rentier State*, edited by Hazem Beblawi and Giacomo Luciani, 49–62. London: Croom Helm.
- Bellin, Eva. 2004. "The Robustness of Authoritarianism in the Middle East: Exceptionalism in Comparative Perspective." *Comparative Politics* 36 (2): 139–57..
- Blaydes, Lisa. 2010. *Elections and Distributive Politics in Mubarak's Egypt*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bora, Tanil. 1999. "Istanbul of the Conqueror: The 'Alternative Global City,' Dreams of Political Islam." In *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local*, edited by Çağlar Keyder. 47–58. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bull, Michael, Paul Gilroy, David Howes, and Douglas Kahn. 2006. "Introducing Sensory Studies." *The Senses and Society* 1 (1): 5–7.
- Çelik, Zeynep. 1997. *Urban Forms and Colonial Confrontations: Algiers Under French Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Center for International and Regional Studies, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar.
2015. "Gateways to the World: Port Cities in the Gulf." Summary Report no. 13.
- De Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*, translated. by Steven Randall. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Edensor, Tim. 2005. *Industrial Ruins: Space, Aesthetics and Materiality*. Oxford: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Eldem, Edhem, Daniel Goffman, and Bruce Masters. 1999. *The Ottoman City Between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir, and Istanbul*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Elshahed, Mohamed. 2015. "Revolutionary Modernism? Architecture and the Politics of Transition in Egypt 1936-1967." PhD diss., NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.
- Elyachar, Julia. 2005. *Markets of Dispossession: NGOs, Economic Development, and the State in Cairo*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Fawaz, Mona. 2008. "An Unusual Clique of City-Makers: Social Networks in the Production of a Neighborhood in Beirut (1950–75)." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32 (3): 565–85.
- Fahmy, Khaled. 2002. "An Olfactory Tale of Two Cities: Cairo in the Nineteenth Century." In *Historians in Cairo*, edited by Jill Edwards. New York: American University in Cairo Press.
- Fahmy, Ziad. 2016. "An Earwitness to History: Street Hawkers and Their Calls in Early 20th-Century Egypt." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 48 (1): 129–34.
- Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Fuccaro, Nelida. 2013. "Introduction: Histories of Oil and Urban Modernity in the Middle East." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33 (1): 1–6.
- Ghannam, Farha. 2002. *Remaking the Modern: Space, Relocation, and the Politics of Identity in a Global Cairo*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Graham, Stephen, and Lucy Hewitt. 2013. "Getting off the Ground On the Politics of Urban Verticality." *Progress in Human Geography* 37 (1): 72–92.
- Hanley, Will. 2008. "Grieving Cosmopolitanism in Middle East Studies." *History Compass* 6 (5): 1346–67.
- Hanssen, Jens. 2005. *Fin de Siècle Beirut: The Making of an Ottoman Provincial Capital*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hirschkind, Charles. 2006. *The Ethical Soundscape: Cassette Sermons and Islamic Counterpublics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ismail, Salwa. 2006. *Political Life in Cairo's New Quarters: Encountering the Everyday State*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kanna, Ahmed. 2011. *Dubai, the City as Corporation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Keyder, Çağlar. 1999. *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kezer, Zeynep. 2016. *Building Modern Turkey: State, Space, and Ideology in the Early Republic*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Leichtman, Mara A., and Dorothea Schulz. 2012. "Introduction to Special Issue: Muslim Cosmopolitanism: Movement, Identity, and Contemporary Reconfigurations." *City & Society* 24 (1): 1–6.
- Lust-Okar, Ellen. 2005. *Structuring Conflict in the Arab World: Incumbents, Opponents, and Institutions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- MacKinnon, Danny. 2011. "Reconstructing Scale: Towards a New Scalar Politics." *Progress in Human Geography* 35 (1): 21–36.
- Ménoret, Pascal. 2014. *Joyriding in Riyadh: Oil, Urbanism, and Road Revolt*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mills, Amy. 2010. *Streets of Memory: Landscape, Tolerance, and National Identity in Istanbul*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 1988. *Colonising Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Moore, Adam. 2008. "Rethinking Scale as a Geographical Category: From Analysis to Practice." *Progress in Human Geography* 32 (2): 203–25.
- Oosterbaan, Martijn. 2009. "Sonic Supremacy Sound, Space and Charisma in a Favela in Rio de Janeiro." *Critique of Anthropology* 29 (1): 81–104.
- Reynolds, Nancy. 2012. *A City Consumed: Urban Commerce, the Cairo Fire, and the Politics of Decolonization in Egypt*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Ross, Michael L. 2001. "Does Oil Hinder Democracy?" *World Politics* 53 (3): 325–61.
- . 2015. "What Have We Learned about the Resource Curse?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 18 (1): 239–59.
- Schwarz, Ori. 2014. "Arab Sounds in a Contested Space: Life Quality, Cultural Hierarchies and National Silencing." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37 (11): 2034–54.
- Scott, James C. 2008. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Singerman, Diane, and Paul Amar. 2006. *Cairo Cosmopolitan: Politics, Culture, and Urban Space in the New Globalized Middle East*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press.
- Singerman, Diane. 1995. *Avenues of Participation: Family, Politics, and Networks in Urban Quarters of Cairo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Stoler, Ann L. 2013. "Introduction 'The Rot Remains': From Ruins to Ruination." In *Imperial Debris*, edited by Ann L. Stoler. 1–35. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Till, Karen. 2012. "Wounded Cities: Memory-work and a place-based ethics of care." *Political Geography* 31 (1): 3-14.
- Tuğal, Cihan. 2009. "Transforming Everyday Life: Islamism and Social Movement Theory." *Theory and Society* 38 (5): 423–58.
- Turam, Berna. 2013. "The Primacy of Space in Politics: Bargaining Rights, Freedom and Power in an İstanbul Neighborhood." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37 (2): 409–29.
- United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. 2014. "Global City Population Estimates." <https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/global-city-population-estimates>.
- Weizman, Eyal. 2002. "Introduction to the politics of verticality," *Open Democracy*. Available at: http://www.opendemocracy.net/ecology-politics/verticality/article_801.jsp.
- Weizman, Eyal. 2012. *Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation*. London: Verso Books.
- Wright, Gwendolyn. 1991. *The Politics of Design in French Colonial Urbanism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

ⁱ Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Joshua Barker, Suzanne Scheld and Sheri Gibbings for their incredible editorial support. We would like to thank Amaney Jamal for her support of the May 2013 conference at Princeton University upon which this issue is based, and the Mamdouha S. Bobst Center for Peace and Justice, the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies and the Institute for the Transregional Study of the Contemporary Middle East, North Africa & Central Asia for their financial and institutional support. We would also like to thank the conference participants who were not able to contribute to this issue but vastly enriched this conversation and issue with their engagement throughout: Saskia Sassen, Farha Ghannam, Diane Singerman, Christine Boyer, Arang Keshavarzian, Jillian Schwedler, Salwa Ismail, Ayşe Özil and Bernard Haykel. Finally, we would like to thank our three contributors for fantastic papers.

ⁱⁱ There are obvious exceptions here: for example, the study of global capitalism in history and science and technology studies.

ⁱⁱⁱ For example, see Karen Till's (2012) discussion of Bayat's impact on the field.

^{iv} An admirable example of such work is Esra Akcan's (2012) *Architecture in Translation: Germany, Turkey and the Modern House*.

^v Recent work that starts a conversation about these epochs includes: Kezer (2015); El Shahed (2015).

^{vi} Population data taken from the 2010 entry of the United Nations Global City Population Estimates database (2014).

^{vii} Graham and Hewitt, 74-75.

^{viii} Bull et al. (2006: 5) describe the sensorium as “the entire perceptual apparatus as an operational complex.”