

Introduction

The Claim

<i>Market City</i>	<i>People City</i>
So Busy	An Equal Diddy
Business and Growth	Few Fret
Love them Both	Safety Net
Amidst the Jobs	Life Is Good
Faint Sobs	The Collective Could
How Do We Know	One Concern
We Asked	We Heard
They Told Us So	Will it Last or Will It Turn

History screams truth. The truth about cities is that they rise and fall—sometimes slowly, sometimes with head-spinning speed—because of their relationship to the times. What is an advantage in one era is of little use in the next. Cities must adapt—always and continually—or they wilt and drop, become shriveled and used up, at least until they find a way to adjust to the new times.

Rightly assessing the future is fundamental to the work of cities. Prepare correctly and prosper. Guess incorrectly, put the proverbial eggs in the wrong basket, or simply focus on the now, and join the junkyard of has-been cities.

We are in the midst of changes, of a new time. We will explore these changes—and make sense of them—by drawing on stories and data from dozens of cities across the world, and exploring in depth two cities, each going its own way, hedging its bet on a different future. Each is staking its claim to a different fundamental focus. This tale is told so that we can understand more broadly the choices cities face and the directions they may go, and so we can consider the possible outcomes.

Lots of urban prognosticators are currently busy prognosticating. They tell cities things like “you have to cater to the creative class,” “you have to focus on bio-tech,” “you have to go green,” “you have to attract jobs,” “you

have to redesign your transportation system.” The list goes on. In the end, cities must focus. They must create a *priorities rubric* through which they make their decisions from a myriad of possibilities and choices.

At its core, this book argues that cities now orient themselves in one of two main directions as they move forward. They either privilege the market or they privilege people. Put more directly, some cities exist first and foremost for the market, some first and foremost for people. The difference is profound, so profound that we must conceive of them as different entities: *Market Cities* or *People Cities*.

To be sure, both types of cities care about both the market and people. After all, both of these must be present to be a city. We have not seen a city yet that does not want a strong economy, and it is difficult to find a city that does not want a good life for its citizens. But cities ultimately privilege one over the other, often because they view their focus as the best way to achieve the other objective. That is, for Market Cities their reasoning is something like this: “Want a good quality of life and a vibrant community? Then you must work to have a strong economy, producing jobs, luring companies to your city, spurring lots of start-ups, and being business friendly.” And for People Cities, their reasoning is something like this: “Want a strong economy and lots of good jobs? Then you must work to make your city a place where people want to live, a city that is friendly to their needs, that is lively, healthy, safe, sustainable, and most of all, livable.”

These simple terms, we will argue, have far-reaching implications. People’s lives in Market Cities and People Cities—the very experience and meaning of being human and living with others—are poles apart. From urban form to diversity to crime to transportation decisions to sustainability, the choices cities make to be Market Cities or People Cities reverberate across lives and across generations.

Market and People Cities in Action

Cities have choices, choices about what they exist for and about what they want to be. We will describe a coalescing of these choices such that we are witnessing fundamentally different types of cities emerging across the globalized, developed world. We will describe mind-boggling sprawl and purposeful density, social parity and racial inequality, public infrastructure and private largess, gleaming skyscrapers and humble

shops, legions of bikes and armies of cars, crime and peace, and a can-do spirit and a must-do spirit. Contrasts abound.

But underpinning these contrasts are two essential similarities. The first is that cities across the world are subject to the same structural and institutional influences that paradoxically necessitate these immense contrasts. We live in a global age, one in which urban transformation is seen as a central component of any city agenda. Where that city agenda is directed is the primary subject of this book, and it is demonstrated through the contrasts, but that the contrasts are born out of the same globalized world is no small matter. The globalized world makes cities focus.

How cities respond in our interconnected globe has much to do with the second similarity: that residents of a city, whether political leaders, economic elites, homeowners, or the most marginalized citizens, rely on, respond to, and re-create the gravitational pull of cultural beliefs about what is possible and what should be prioritized in their city. This book centers on the idea that cities have their own cultural milieu, and what the most powerful resident and the everyday resident believe about their city is in large part thanks to this cultural milieu. This is not to say that residents within cities are homogeneous—we urbanists love cities because of their heterogeneity—but instead simply that that heterogeneity centers on fundamental ideas. And it's not to say that culture is the end-all factor in cities: indeed, history, politics, and economics all play crucial roles. We believe, though, that culture has long been neglected in the study of cities, and that how it interacts with those other important institutions over time can tell us a lot about how a city will respond in the global age. And taking a new look at how residents think is critical to that task. We detail more about our theoretical perspective in a separate article.¹

It is the cultural, political, and economic responses to the global world that compose the thesis of this book. Nearly all cities in the Western and developed world have been around for at least a century, most much longer, and we think that the historical paths that cities have taken allow for many of the cities to easily answer the question: Why do we exist as a city?

Cities have *culturally imbued priorities rubrics through which policymakers and residents focus attention, take action, and orient their future*. Market Cities and People Cities are two ends of a spectrum of priorities rubrics, with many cities today clustered toward one end or the other. Few cities, though, epitomize each ideal type quite like Copenhagen and Houston.

Let's consider two quotations from city leaders. The first is from Tina Saaby, the head city architect of the city of Copenhagen:

We seek to make a livable city. Our approach is that we consider urban life before urban space, and urban space before buildings. Urban life is for people. . . . Our goal is that in the next five years, 80% or more of Copenhageners will feel they belong to the city and it meets their needs. . . . We use a people strategy. Our task is to help people make things happen, be creative, be social in the city, and have good health. Instead of a list of “no’s” we work with the residents to let them create the city they want.

The second quotation is from Angela Blanchard, the head of Neighborhood Centers, the largest local nonprofit in Houston:

If you're poor, you want to be poor in Houston, because there's a ladder here. Our purpose is not to eliminate poverty. People do that on their own. What we're doing is to provide the rungs of the ladder. . . . The starting point for community change is looking at your city and the DNA of your city and understanding, what is that city really built around. What are the aspirations here? . . . Houston was built to work, and for work. The people that Neighborhood Centers works with came here to work. Everybody in Houston understands that.²

Houston, the city “built to work, and for work,” is the quintessential Market City: it is geared to wealth accumulation, and holds individualism as a core value. Copenhagen, where “urban life is for people,” is the quintessential People City: the city is collective-minded and focused on ensuring quality of life at a scale understandable to its citizens. The quotations from influential citizens epitomize the priorities rubric of each type of city.

Defining Market Cities and People Cities

Market Cities and People Cities are not just the sum of their priorities rubrics or cultural beliefs. Instead, they are played out actively in the diverse realms of the city. From crime to taxes to the environment and everywhere in between, being a Market City or a People City provides

for different social outcomes. These social outcomes also operate in a feedback loop with the priorities rubric, and with each other. What we are arguing is simple: the many important institutions of urban life go together. With the co-varying character that is underwritten by city character, Market Cities and People Cities should exhibit similarities along a number of social indicators. Table I.1 shows many of these urban institutions, and how we expect they should vary for Market Cities and People Cities.

To unpack this further, consider directly how we believe these urban institutions go together. First, Market Cities have priorities rubrics that emphasize individualism, and the city overall is focused on making money, increasing regional wealth, and attracting businesses and jobs. Inequality is high in Market Cities, rewarding the economically privileged and providing less support for the poor. Market Cities have laissez-faire economic systems and governments, tend to have low taxes (except Market Cities with high governmental graft), and many city services are privatized. Governments are decentralized among municipalities, many of which spar with one another. Crime is a constant in Market Cities, in good part due to its other characteristics of individualism, segregated diversity, inequality, and emphasis on material acquisition.

Other things being equal, cars dominate in Market Cities, and transportation services are reactive to individual patterns of behavior and developers' desires. Market Cities have more environmental degradation and distribute it more unequally. Students in Market Cities attend public schools of high quality and low quality, private schools and charter schools (often operating under school choice policies), while higher education costs increasingly threaten equal access. Diversity is seen as a virtue in Market Cities because all people are welcomed to make a life, achieve something great, and add to the dynamism of the city, even while the diversity is residentially and socially segregated. Few provisions are made to alleviate any inequality across diverse intersections.

In some ways, People Cities operate similarly to Market Cities. They have priorities rubrics that are engaged in a back-and-forth with many facets of urban life, but the substance of their rubric and the facets of urban life could not be more different. People Cities are other-regarding and are focused on quality-of-life issues: these are the primary parts of the People Cities priorities rubric. Inequality is relatively low in People

Cities because social and economic parity is a core value—both between citizens and between neighborhoods—and protections are regulated to that effect. Government is strong in People Cities: much of the work of public space and public policy is carried out in city hall corridors and in concert with citizens. Governance is also centralized, and regional authorities have regulatory power. Crime is low in People Cities, as trust is high, there is less emphasis on material goods and winning, and the relative equality necessitates less taking from others.

TABLE I.1. Characteristics of Market Cities and People Cities

	People City	Market City
Land use	Dense, walkable, even in suburban areas. Residents often design spaces in concert with government.	Sprawl, low density for areas built after 1950s. Suburban growth is primary method of growth; land use policies lax.
Transportation	Multimodal. Public transit, walking, and bicycling encouraged; cars discouraged.	Car-centric. Transportation funds mostly for roads and street improvements.
Crime	Low crime, especially violent crimes.	High crime, especially violent crimes.
Environment	Low overall levels of environmental degradation, and less inequality among neighborhoods. Committed to climate change reform.	Higher overall levels of environmental degradation and greater inequality between neighborhoods. Limited commitment to climate change reforms.
Inequality	Low inequality. Strong social safety net and smaller gap between rich and poor.	High inequality. Inconsistent safety net, large gap between rich and poor.
Civic participation and trust	High levels of civic participation and trust of others.	Low levels of civic participation and trust of others.
Government	Strong, and regionally focused. City government is key convener on all city issues. Governments have clear responsibilities, and municipalities are not in competition.	Decentralized, with weak regional governance. Only sometimes convenes relevant stakeholders on key city issues. Municipalities are in competition for resources and people.
Racial diversity and immigration	Variation on racial and ethnic tolerance. Stress policies of inclusion. Immigration can be a threat to unity. Residential segregation is low, while social segregation can be high.	Encourages racial and ethnic diversity in the metropolitan area. Often open to immigration. Residential and social segregation between racial and ethnic groups is high.
Nonprofits and foundations	Most public work is done in government, but civil society outside of it keeps it accountable.	Strong. Many public services and issues are championed through this sector.
Health care	Strong, centralized health care institutions. Free or low cost.	Strong, privatized health care institutions. Cost varies, and access varies accordingly.
Taxes	High taxes.	Low taxes.
Parks and public spaces	Many public spaces. Are well maintained throughout the city.	Few public spaces, not well maintained, unequal.

Transportation options are diverse in People Cities, with many citizens taking to public transportation and bicycles, and with urban planning proactively encouraging such options. People Cities recognize climate change as a serious problem, and they have less environmental degradation in their residents' backyards. Students almost always attend public schools in People Cities, and higher education is often free or inexpensive. Diversity is valued, but for People Cities inclusion of its diverse peoples is stressed, so policies for achieving such are put into place. Interestingly, a strong, monolithic culture can challenge the success of such inclusion policies.

With these descriptions of Market Cities and People Cities in hand, how do these institutions interlock to create the ideal types we posit? We believe that these factors are converging, and overlap in both empirical substance and through a cultural worldview. For example, the overall levels of inequality in a city, the density of the city, and the modes of transportation are related to the crime rate. Higher inequality cities that are sprawling with car-centered transportation will have higher crime rates: disadvantaged neighborhoods are substantially segregated from better neighborhoods by distance and transportation, and this social distance of disinvestment allows the possibility for greater crime rates in the face of little opportunity. In turn, mistrust of fellow residents multiplies when media outlets report their city's high (often violent) crime rate, further contributing to residents isolating themselves in urban space, increasingly behind gates and walls, and furthering metropolitan sprawl.

For People Cities, this relationship works in the opposite direction: crime is low because neighborhoods, while still partly segregated, are closer together, more equal, and located at sheer distances that are a fraction of those in a Market City. This type of milieu also has many eyes on the street, with noncar users populating busy sidewalks and bike paths. All of these—combined with lower inequality—build to a collective social camaraderie that discourages crime through low inequality and frequent social contact.

Government has much to do with how people trust one another, and whether that trust can build to a collective buy-in for a regional vision. The ability to regulate a number of the other institutions can vary substantially in the decentralized market system of governance. Schools may be outstanding in one area and barely functioning in another.

Racial segregation occurs along municipal lines. Police forces may be funded adequately in some municipalities but not in others. Unevenness of urban space rules the Market City, and those who are fortunate enough to make choices within such a city—always for the best neighborhoods with the best schools, the lowest crime, far from the poor—only further heighten the unevenness.

In People Cities, much of the public conversation—and the public funding—occurs across a larger proportion of the metropolitan population. Communities connected by shared tax dollars in addition to shared territory are able to provide for public services that more fully reach all. These shared services, such as school systems and well-kept public parks, provide for the spaces that bridge divides and build public trust.

The key takeaway from these two examples is to note how interrelated urban institutions really are. Crime is not a stand-alone factor but involves inequality, trust, transportation, density, and much more. We argue that this interrelation creates an emergent effect, an effect that exists above and through the institutional mixing that creates it. The emergent effect develops in one of two types: Market Cities or People Cities.

Three Questions

Three critical questions can aid in further elaborating the Market City and People City framework. An understanding of how the Market City and People City perspective pairs with the important urban questions of our time is essential to explaining why our particular approach to studying cities is needed.

The first question concerns the idea that cities are nested within countries, asking: To what extent are the market and people types actually just reflective of their nation-states? To be clear, the character of a city will depend, in part, on the country in which it is located. We argue, however, that it cannot fully explain a city's trajectory, and a city's way of getting things done. This is easily tested—if both Market and People Cities exist within a nation (we find they do), then something more than the nation-state is determining city outcomes.

Cities are as important now as they ever have been, if not more important—a position we do not hold alone. Saskia Sassen, whose research agenda on global cities is one of the most important academic advances

in urban studies, powerfully shows that cities are essential to the global capitalist system's functioning.³ Urban economist Edward Glaeser believes the city's role in attracting human capital has proved the city triumphant.⁴ Urban policy advocates Bruce Katz and Jennifer Bradley argue that we are in the midst of a "metropolitan revolution" where cities will lead the way with policy.⁵

We argue that the city itself possesses a unique role as a distinct place in and of itself.⁶ It's neither a snapshot of the nation-state nor a sum of its neighborhoods. The role of structural and institutional global processes creates the economic and political conditions that make cities crucial nodes in our social world. To date, urban experts mostly assume that cities are all playing the same capitalist game for the same outcomes. But we think something even more substantial is occurring. By thinking about the different types of cities that we highlight, we can better enunciate what the outcomes of this metropolitan revolution will be. Indeed, we believe that the historical configurations of power accumulate, thereby creating a citywide culture that affects action in a metropolitan area. Cities remain important not just for the mass migrations to them or because of their place in the globalized economy, but also because they deeply condition the many milieus—and the minds—of their residents.

The second question concerns the changes we have seen in global polity across the last four decades toward deregulation, decentralization, the lessened importance of borders, and a host of other market-fueled shifts. Broadly held under the umbrella term of "neoliberalism," these shifts would seem to suggest that all cities are becoming Market Cities. Few things define the Market City more than ceding urban priorities to any program to compel economic growth. The question begs: Are not all cities becoming Market Cities?

Expecting homogeneity across cities in the form of a global shift to Market Cities, however, is unlikely. Despite the neoliberal turn to what David Harvey calls "the entrepreneurial city," cities are neither deregulating at the same pace nor are they completely ceding their purposes to growth.⁷ There is variation in the paths that cities are taking. The speed varies. The substance differs. Reducing the heterogeneity across cities today not only misidentifies the core of People Cities by displacing them under the market framework, but it also means too broad an aegis for Market Cities, thereby losing crucial texture that can describe those cities.

The third question is straightforward: Can cities be both Market Cities and People Cities, somehow striking a balance? Take, for instance, the vision statement for a new general plan for the city of Houston. “We promote healthy and resilient communities through smart civic investments, dynamic partnerships, education, and innovation. Houston is the place where anyone can prosper and feel at home.” Or consider a 2015 article that we picked up from the University of Copenhagen’s newspaper about how recruiting international students is good for business. These words strike some contradictory tones to the priorities rubric we have outlined for each city: Houston shouldn’t be highlighting “healthy and resilient communities” if it’s a Market City, and Copenhagen shouldn’t think of students as dollar signs.

It is important to note that all Market Cities will have people elements, and all People Cities will have market ones. Nonetheless, we argue—and will show in later chapters—that most cities trend in one direction or the other, toward the market or toward people. The importance of heterogeneity here is critical. Cities, and the people who live in them, are not monoliths: they are diverse places riddled with contradictions. The cultural fulcrum of cities, however, exerts a gravitational pull that centers those ideas in relation to dominant themes of the city.

Perhaps most interesting, these contradictions help us understand how urban social change occurs: movements not in agreement with the priorities rubric can marshal supporters and leverage resources, especially during crises, to alter the placement of that cultural fulcrum and to shift the gravitational pull of the city’s culture. It is a daunting task; nevertheless, it is constant, as small-scale shifts occur every day among the city’s diverse residents.

Two Journeys

Recognizing the Market City and People City can be as simple as availing yourself of your senses. To introduce the concepts in practice, we encourage you to go out and take a journey in your city and check out the market or people dynamics along way. We did.

A late morning sunrise in a chilly Copenhagen February, our bikes spin off down the hill. We have come from a suburb, Søborg, where Smiley lived, and are riding down Bispebjerg Hill. Crowning the hill

was Grundtvig's Church, a towering, yet surprising muted relic of the Danish national church, whose fortunes sway not with the offering plate but with the tax receipt. We pass Bispebjerg Hospital on our left, where the Danish state guarantees free health care for all (even us, temporary immigrants).

At the bottom of the hill, we see the colorful—as in literally painted with all the colors of the rainbow—Mimersparken, a striking park that nonetheless would never rank among the city's most prominent. Next to it is the Mjølnerparken, a public housing project home to approximately 2,500 residents, many of whom are non-Western immigrants. Despite some people's fears over who the residents are, the public housing looks like just another five-story apartment building in a city full of them: it is well taken care of and next to a beautiful park. Picturesque, wonderful Copenhagen it seems.

Parks dot both sides of our bike ride, but Fælledparken ranks as the city's biggest, and it is home to the massive Worker's Day festival for the city, which is also a national holiday. But parks do not tell us the whole story about public spaces. We swing our bikes onto the protected, raised bicycle lanes over to Strøget, and hop off our bikes to take in the shopping street and pedestrian mecca. It was here in 1962 that (now world-famous) architect Jan Gehl convinced city officials to shut down part of the street to car traffic and to open the possibilities to pedestrians. It worked. The city opened even more of the street to pedestrians over time and has mimicked this tactic all across the city—indeed, our bike ride has been more comfortable because cars have been systematically discouraged by city government, simply disappearing in the process.

On the harbor between the mainland of the city center of Copenhagen and the city's development on Amager island, we find an unlikely activity: swimming. While many cities (be it their governments or private companies) are highlighting their river waterfronts by actually getting people out in the water with kayaks and canoes, Copenhagen goes even further by inviting the people themselves into the water. Most of these harbor baths are closed during the winter, but even in these frigid times a dip is possible in select parts. Copenhagen's transition to a postindustrial economy meant shuttering the industries of old, and this meant cleaning up a polluted waterway through the central part of the city. They cleaned it up to the point where it was possible to swim

and, or perhaps more crucially, people *perceived* it was possible to swim. Finding a seat on the bench down the way from the baths in the park, we contemplate the open water, the multitudes of bicycles, and how an energetic People City government can even convince cold people to jump into even colder water.

On another day, an early Monday evening in the fall, we roll the car windows down and feel the humid air offering a partial respite from the long, intense summer. We are in downtown Houston. We pass City Hall, some scattered government buildings, and a slew of glistening skyscrapers, taking note that the latter are consistently bigger and nicer than what the city government has. There are not many people on the streets: they appear to have left the skyscrapers and headed home. Looping around, we circle Discovery Green, a signature public space that is privately run. Here we find a smattering of people, many of them doing a program called “bum-ba-toning” to get fit. We notice the Brown Convention Center directly across the street from Discovery Green, its impressive façade meant to connote ships with smokestacks emerging from the top of the structure. Meanwhile, we look north to a nearly finished high-end apartment complex that will be sleek and shiny. A 2014 development subsidy passed by city council is already paying off for emergent downtown living and for developers.

We head out to Navigation Boulevard, through the heart of the East End. On our way there, we pass several new midrise apartment complexes, the early fringes of gentrification creeping in on the East End, both the historic center for Houston Hispanics, and a former industrial area. The new soccer stadium rises high above the neighborhood, itself partly financed with a cool \$35 million from city government. Navigation Boulevard is bustling, with residents hanging outside famed restaurants and around picnic tables in the revitalized esplanade. The esplanade’s new doodads are one of the first installations from the Greater East End District, a tax increment financing area. The area is “hot” and the young and the hip flock to the area. Vibrant Houston.

We turn left and head to the Fifth Ward, a historically black neighborhood established for freed slaves and of late also shared by Hispanic immigrants. Poverty here is dire, life expectancies resemble those of developing nations, public infrastructure feels nearly absent—apart from a couple of main roads, there are no curbs, no gutters, no sidewalks, mini-

mal trash pickup, small, poorly paved streets, decaying houses on “pier and beams” (stilts), and much of the land sits empty or with dilapidated, boarded-up dwellings long ago abandoned. Public transportation here—the bus—is infrequent, irregular, and without much attention given to those waiting at the stops. Typically, just a pole marks the spot as a stop, with no shelter offered from the intense sun, rain, or other elements. Despite the best efforts of neighborhood residents, this is a neighborhood that few of Houston’s elite ever visit, and it is rarely a location for their philanthropic and development efforts. Forgotten Houston.

As we then travel to the Pasadena Freeway, we wonder if we should roll the windows up. Refineries are rising all around us as we enter the area around the Houston Ship Channel. Houston is one of the most polluted metropolitan areas in the United States, and the Ship Channel is its most polluted place. That’s the current price of being a global headquarters for the oil and gas industry. City governments’ (including not just Houston, but suburbs around the Ship Channel) inattention to measuring air quality in the area has everything to do with the Market City promoting its biggest brands. In Houston, this means energy, and the refineries are a testament to the prowess of the Market City. As we sign off on our journey with a trip on the Lynchburg Ferry across the Ship Channel, we reflect on the beauty of the open water, the incredible hulking commercial facilities all around us, and the sincerity of the men fishing next to signs indicating they shouldn’t eat more than one fish from the channel per month.

Go take your trip in a Market City or a People City. The route has already been provided; you just have to follow the signs.

The Direction of the Book

We have roughly outlined our main idea, but the fun is in the story, the process, and the details that we embark upon in the rest of the book. Our approach, hinted at above, is to use “ideal-type” cities that fully embody the very concepts we discuss, cities that are in many ways polar opposites despite being rated similarly in world rankings of cities. By “ideal types” we mean that these cities draw out the extremes of difference in choices, orientations, and actions. We do so to highlight our conceptual distinction in types of cities.

This book is organized into two parts: (1) How It Happens (chapters 1–3), in which we explore the ongoing process by which cities become and re-create being Market or People Cities; and (2) Why It Matters (chapters 4–8), in which we explore the vast and substantial implications of being one type of city or another.

Each of the chapters takes us on part of the journey into the realities of two cities, but always connecting to cities beyond Copenhagen and Houston. In chapter 1, we analyze the role of histories in the development of Market and People Cities, comparing how each has responded to crisis across time, and how their deep pasts contributed to whether a Market City or a People City emerged. Chapter 2 examines how government and civic leaders create and sustain the Market City or People City, especially through the government's design, how its money is spent, and through the leadership's relative influence outside of city hall. Chapter 3 moves away from the government and elites to the residents themselves, who more loosely renew the Market City and People City, and who even at times contest it.

Part 2 of the book investigates the massive implications of living in a Market City or People City. In chapter 4, we illustrate how these dynamics affect land-use policies, especially as they relate to transportation and recreational life: being in one type of city or the other means interacting in distinctive built environments. Chapter 5 turns to the environment, where Market Cities and People Cities have very different approaches to dealing with industry and with climate change mitigation and adaptation. In chapter 6, we show how the Market City and People City navigate through issues of difference and diversity, namely, through public trust, racial and ethnic inequality, and the impact of and on immigration. In chapter 7, we use multiple approaches to see if our arguments hold across cities. We find they do.

We marshal a wide variety of evidence for our arguments, attempting at every turn to root our arguments in measurable facts. Undoubtedly residents and experts of other cities will weigh our arguments against their local experience and knowledge, hopefully finding commonalities but also extending our arguments. We conclude this book by considering what our argument means for our future. For clearly, when the majority of humanity lives in cities, understanding the cities we create means understanding ourselves.