2. Urbanisation in African Cities

This chapter summarises the current state of discussion on theories of urbanisation for cities in Africa and their role in urban studies, based on a literature review. Urbanisation can, thereby, not only be seen as quantifiable urban growth in the form of built structures and population growth. The concept of urbanisation as a social, cultural and economic transformation that society is undergoing within the cities by shifting large proportions of its livelihood to urban environments is introduced as an alternative reading. However, the current discourse on urbanisation sees a division of data availability between contexts of the "Global North" and the "Global South" (Watson 2009). While the largest part of urbanisation theory was formulated on the basis of urbanisation processes triggered by industrialisation in late 19th century North America and Europe, current urban planning and urbanisation practices in the regions currently facing rapid urbanisation are increasingly running into difficulty implementing the urban planning tools developed outside of their context. It is, therefore, academically now quite widely acknowledged that not all current urbanisation processes can be explained with the theories that until recently had been considered universal. Moving supposedly universal urbanisation theory to the African context unquestioned for its suitability, hence, frequently results in a failure of existing explanation building for the processes encountered there (Coquery-Vidrovic 1991, Myers 1994, Watson 2002, Pieterse 2010, Myers 2011, Simone 2011, Berrisford 2011, Jenkins and Eskemose 2011). Yet, without a suitable concept of what is happening in the urbanisation processes, policy cannot improve living situations on the ground effectively and accompany the urbanisation. A qualitative approach for investigating these processes is argued for, following the discussions on "rapid urban growth" (Ministry of Works and Urban Development 2007: 2) or "rapid urbanization" (Daniel Weldegebriel 2011: 3), leading to differentiated needs for action in urban development of the different cities. Starting with the insights from quantitative descriptions, followed by results from qualitative work, the discussion from literature review will, therefore, be presented to give an overview of how far the discussion on the conceptualisation of urbanisation in African cities has so far advanced.

Reliable data on urbanisation in Sub-Saharan Africa is still scarce, and estimates of the extent and nature of the phenomenon are consequently rather speculative. According to the available and most commonly quoted data, Sub-Saharan Africa's rate of urbanisation remains the lowest in the world (Boquier 2004: 135). Thus, Eastern, Middle and Western Africa are clearly lagging behind in urbanisation in comparison to Southern and Northern Africa (ibid: 137, Potts 2009: 254). In general, though, the growth rates of African cities are noted to be higher than in other world regions (Watson 2009: 161). The international organisations that take a lead role in the policy debate on urban policy worldwide, depict urbanisation in Africa as part of a large-scale process, whereby the majority of urban population growth on the continent can be found in secondary cities with fewer than 500,000 inhabitants (UN-Habitat 2008: ix). With a few exceptions, no regional studies on migration have been conducted in Africa, while poor statistical systems further complicate analyses based on secondary sources (Boquier 2004: 143). However, the pace of urban growth in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) has decreased considerably since the recent turn of the century (ibid: 135). The overall slowdown of the urbanisation rate is most probably not temporary (ibid). Moreover a large-scale analysis of francophone African cities suggests that the overall in-migration has slowed or halted in many large and middle size towns (Potts 2009: 257). Since the growth is mostly slowed and not inversed, however, the size of cities is still increasing considerably (Boquier 2004: 149).

Further differentiation of the phenomenon remains difficult, as the collection and comparison of quantitative data is often inconsistent due to varied definitions of "urban" from country to country; the lack of data, leading to the use of extrapolations instead of censuses for projections; the incongruent boundaries of the built-up area with the administrative city boundaries, leaving new urban neighbourhoods out of the equation; and the impacts of changing boundaries, which distort the growth rates based on migration and natural population growth (Rakodi 2002: 26–27). The picture drawn of the process is, hence, still characterised by accounts that are insufficiently differentiated. The UNPDF defines urbanisation as: "The process of transition from a rural to a more urban society. Statistically, urbanization reflects an increasing proportion of the population living in settlements defined as urban, primarily through net rural to urban migration." (UNPDF 2007: 6). This quantitative understanding of urbanisation is also reflected in the data informing many urbanisation policies: Referring to the situation on a continental level in Africa, the description of urbanisation is most commonly described as the shift of population proportions from rural districts to urban areas, expressed in a rural-urban population ratio. The description of demographic urbanisation, thus, assesses the contribution of in-migration to the growth of towns by comparing towns' growth to the national growth rate (cf. Potts 2009: 254).

Such a demographic description of urbanisation gives an outline of the general trends of urbanisation on the African continent in figures, but it also contains

insufficiencies of a description limited to a rural-urban population ratio and its understandings of the consequences and requirements of the urbanisation process within the affected areas. These generalisations obscure the fact that there are strong regional, national and local differences in the patterns, speed and also the extent of urban growth across certain regions and between the individual cities (Potts 2009: 254). As described, there are two main reasons for this: insufficient quantitative data, and a lack of qualitative interpretation. The sparse quantitative data situation makes it difficult even to depict the extent of the progress and all prognoses are, therefore, subject to high relativity (Boquier 2004, Rakodi 2002).

Currently, demographic data cannot sufficiently provide an answer to the question of reasons for urbanisation. Due to the very general nature of quantitative data on a continental scale, qualitative interpretations of the phenomenon are consequently often general and speculative. Nevertheless, scholarly discussion is producing hypotheses to explain the phenomenon, which will be summarised in the following.

Reasons for urbanisation are derived from a wide range of aspects. The UNPDF generalises the qualities of urbanisation (beyond the quantitative extent and ratios) under the term "urban transition", which it has defined as: "The passage from a predominantly rural to a predominantly urban society." (ibid). It, thereby, seems to suggest that the societal aspects of the urbanisation process can be disconnected from the speed of population movement and describes a linear development pattern from rural to urban. Further assumptions are stated as marketisation, the growing significance of cities as a habitat due to overpopulation in the rural areas and changing external factors triggering more growth (Boquier 2004: 141). This hypothesis of rural-urban migration stands in contrast to Watson, who claims that growth rates in African cities are primarily due to natural increase (Watson 2009: 161). These hypotheses, however, are not mutually exclusive and reasons for urban growth in Ethiopia need to be established for the individual cities. It might be due to a combination of factors. Sources, further, state that urban fertility in African cities is currently lower, but lower death rates in the city due to lower infant and child mortality significantly impact and result in equal growth rates in urban areas and rural areas with high birth rates (Boquier 2004: 140, Potts 2009: 254). Slowing rates of in-migration might be due not to lower mobility, but to circular migration, which is not reflected in the population figures (Boquier 2004: 140, Potts 2009: 257). Boquier therefore predicts that future urbanisation in SSA will depend on migration, though the direct collection of migration data has been limited and prognoses are difficult (Boquier 2004: 149).

Meanwhile, the phenomenon also puts conventional theories of urbanisation as a result of industrialisation into question. It appears that macro-economic conditions do not favour African urban growth (rank in national and international economies), which is said to distinguish the urbanisation process in Africa from that of other world regions (Boquier 2004: 139). In most African cities across the

scale, urban economies are not growing at the same rate as the influx of population that reaches the urban areas. Deborah Potts (2009: 254) elaborates on this and states that rises in urban-based employment as seen in the Asian contexts of urbanisation have generally not been observed in Africa. She points out that structural adjustments have lead to the decline or stagnation of formal employment since the 1980s, while informal jobs in the low-income ranges have gained massive significance for income generation (ibid). According to Potts, this is due to the structural conditions currently affecting urbanisation in Sub-Saharan Africa, which she names as "different" from those in other regions of the "developing world", leading to distinct forms of economic geographies to be shaped on the continent in the process (ibid). According to UN-Habitat (2008: 4), it seems that new strategies for survival are developed within these geographies. However, they might be putting the urban dwellers in constant "states of emergency", as AbdouMaliq Simone (2004: 4) puts it. As the spatially most visible phenomenon of rapid urban growth is informal settlements, these have been described as an outcome and visible product of the urbanisation process in various locations. Cattle in the street and practices of urban agriculture are omnipresent. However, a locally grounded analysis of the living conditions is mostly not available, or the areas are assessed by universal standards, resulting in the declaration of poverty-affected urban areas as slums (Ministry of Works and Urban Development 2007: 4) by purely technical and economic criteria. Such assessments term rapid urbanisation that does not result in urban structures conforming to standards as somewhat divergent from an implicit norm of urbanisation. It replicates dualistic thinking on the "developed" and the "undeveloped", in which African cities are regarded as something "other" than cities. The temptation to regard them as temporary phenomena in a transition phase is large. However, this again would rely on the explanation of theories that are "out of place" (Myers 1994: 209) instead of depicting the local context. Reducing the phenomenon of urbanisation to such – however critical – aspects, hence, does not do justice to the contingent complex realities of planning and everyday urbanisation that can be observed in individual cities. While this kind of incremental growth remains a planning challenge for various reasons, these new areas have been insufficiently studied to provide evidence for the patterns of in-migration (Potts 2009: 257) or the rationales behind the (self-) construction of new urban structures. The assumption is that the outcome of the general trend of population shift to the urban settlements is that a large proportion of the newly urbanised population is dependent on irregular income sources and, therefore, particularly prone to food insecurity and lacks access to basic amenities. However, what we can observe in Africa at the moment seems to suggest that industrialisation might act as a driver (as the example of Europe proves), but is not a pre-condition for urbanisation.

The reasons named for urbanisation indicate that either a variety of reasons contribute to urbanisation and/or that generalisation of the issue is not possible on a continental scale. There is a notion of deviance from existing development

theories that describe industrialisation as the initiating driver of urbanisation, and an account for the current phenomena of urbanisation within African cities is missing. While, in consequence, descriptions of uni-directional migration processes need to be elaborated to portray the more complex migration patterns and diversification of livelihoods within the urban context (Boquier 2004: 149), suggestions that, due to the slowed urban growth rate, rural lifestyles could stay dominant in SSA with the exception of South Africa (ibid: 140) need interpretive discussion, as circular migration and diversified livelihoods with multiple sites and sources of residence and income generation would still include a higher number of people making use of the city's resources. Exploring this, the explanations given for the larger phenomenon of urbanisation need to be broken down and verified for the urban development of respective cities.

Generalisations are often obstructive to policy formulation within growing and emerging cities. Often only the size and speed of the population-shift towards urban settlements in combination with increasing poverty levels justifies the calls for action, mostly geared to the rising demand in housing and infrastructure, while qualifications of the needs resulting from urbanisation remain under-researched. It is, therefore, beneficial to look into the academic discussions that have addressed the shortcomings of research on cities in Africa and their theoretical output. As described in the following post-colonial urban studies will be looked into as a reference point for this purpose, as its criticism can serve to derive an analytical framework for describing contingent urbanisation processes in a specified location.

2.1 Concepts from Urban Studies

The lack of differentiated explanation for current urbanisation processes across the African continent marks a major research gap. Urbanisation needs to be described as a fundamental cultural and socio-economic transformation that requires academic investigation and recognition in policies and goes beyond demographic accounts. Trying to review from literature what frames the urbanisation processes in distinct cities in Africa and trace their exact qualities, it becomes evident that the social, cultural and economic aspects of urbanisation in their locations are understudied. So far the description of specific qualities of these settlements has been generalised or limited to narratives on the largest centres of urbanisation. International attention is focused on capitals and mega-cities, such as Lagos, Johannesburg and Nairobi to give some names. As Garth Myers describes, the lacking recognition of African cities as such resulted in a lack of study of them (Myers 2011). Acknowledging the idiosyncratic nature of place, there is hence a need for descriptions of spatial arrangements resulting from path-dependent development in cities from an extended range of location (Nijman 2007: 2). However, assuming

a distinctly African urbanisation trajectory and a resulting general typology of an "African City" by structural or cultural criteria is thereby called into question. As Anderson and Rathborne (2000: 1) point out, the research on urban history of African towns has gained relevance in the face of amounting social and economic problems in today's African cities. Thereby, they can claim that the scale of current urbanisation is a modern phenomenon, but urbanisation as such can be observed on the continent as far back as 2000 years ago. The towns have their distinctive histories that need to be understood for catering to their specific problems (ibid). They, further, refer to the fact that Africa has largely been depicted as rural, and a history of cities and, thus, the contingent urbanisation processes in the different cities have not been contextualised or reviewed according to assumptions of path-dependency. This has consequences for the research on African cities: there is a rural bias, a focus on mega-cities and often a de-historisation of their accounts of foundation. Additionally Nijman explains that, while comparative urbanism produces "the systematic study of similarity and difference among cities or urban processes" (Nijman 2007: 1), the "continental" typologies of cities are proof of the undeveloped state of the comparative methods and lack of typologies based on empirical criteria and conceptual underpinnings applied in the discipline of urban geography (ibid: 2). He, therefore, calls for methodological self-consciousness in order to avoid the misleading notions of scientism, developmentalism and universalist categories in the comparative study of cities regarding their converging or diverging development under conditions of globalisation (ibid: 1). In effect, this also counters attempts to construct a generalising category of "African urbanisation" and calls for a diversification of the account across the variety of cities.

Countering this lack of locally grounded analyses, the discussion under the headword of "urbanization under poverty" (Scholz 2008: 5, Baumgart and Kreibich 2012) calls for differentiated engagement with the local realities created in the urbanising world regions. Thereby the aspect of poverty is relevant, as the poverty levels in the originating regions of migrants might play an important role in explaining the phenomenon of urban-rural migration and needs consideration in the data collection. As a reference to the resources of administration dealing with aspects of urbanisation, this claim to poverty might also be made. However, the conditions, under which a population prone to urban poverty makes its migration choice and under which the migrating individual evaluates chances for income generation and sustained livelihood are in question as explaining factors of urbanisation and conditions in the city can not be reduced to living in economic despair. Even if poverty is rising in the African cities, pairing urbanisation with economic wealth is highly debatable. The definition of the ongoing process of urbanisation is thereby linked to the absence of a somewhat generalised economic status. However, the informal building and economies characterising current urban growth in many urbanising cities in Africa are not only strategies of poverty or indicators

for lacking state capital. Instead, there are indicators that many cities undergoing urbanisation processes are indeed facing processes of segregation through formal and informal rationales of urbanisation and thus struggle over the distribution of resources (Roy 2009). The questions therein are, thereby, not (only) the provision of resources, but rather the access to them and power relations responsible for their distribution. Having to deal with the living situations of urban poor is therefore not necessarily a result of "urbanization under poverty", but under circumstances the result of socio-economic segregation and the distribution of resources. The specific economic contexts of urbanisation hence need to be discussed for the individual national and local cases and attempts to uncouple the definition of urbanisation from conditions of economic development need to be undertaken.

A strong impulse to write new accounts of urbanisation in specific towns comes from the post-colonial strand of urban studies that has formulated the necessity to overcome historical patterns of thinking in order to describe local development trajectories in the former colonies. Post-colonial studies first arose as a branch of literary studies, but they have extended to other disciplines and expanded to urban studies from there (Göckede 2010: 52, Lindner 2011). Thus, post-colonialism should not be understood as a time period after the wave of (African) independence, but rather as an analytical approach which seeks to question and uncover power-relations developed in a colonial mindset and continued in the practice of a post-colonial environment (see Lindner 2011). The call for a thorough de-colonisation based on analytical findings is mostly inherent. However, their writing has relevance beyond the formerly colonised geographical contexts, as according to these discussions disciplinary thinking in urban studies needs to be reframed. For a long time, urban studies hardly took African cities into account as sites of study and sites of knowledge. The colonial and neo-imperial power relations are deemed responsible for this, are reflected in themes and analytical views in theoretical discourse and are meant to be questioned by the findings of post-colonial (urban) research (Robinson 2006: 2). The approach seeks to overcome developmentalism, conceptions that have led to an exclusion of traditional, informal or low-tech urbanisms from the recognition by urban studies. Urban development policy is thereby informed by the theory on urbanisation questioning these power-relations and relies on instruments for implementation that are effectively directed at addressing the aim of inclusiveness in policy formulation. This is mainly achieved by using dialectic approaches to interpreting the concepts of modernity and tradition, understanding them not as succeeding each other in a progressive development, but rather as parallel developments, which leave space for many ambiguities.

The theoretical discussion is fed from a discussion resulting from practitioners' insights. Since the 1990s, urban professionals increasingly started questioning the body of urban theory, which did not include, represent or explain the urban contexts of rapid urbanisation that they were working in. The point of criticism was thereby not that ideas might come from the West, but that cities with a poor data

base and inventory have adopted policies that do not match their potential and have not undergone a local target formulation. In 1994, Garth Myers specified that a "Eurocentric 'imprint' as a sub-text" led to the dismissal of indigenous African ideas of the urban for the African cities (Myers 1994: 196). The dismissal of local urbanism is thereby described as a key issue in many failures of states in Africa (ibid), leaving the local planners and urbanists concerned with African cities to question the universality of the common urban theories in place. The discussion, thereby, identifies the planning discipline and key ideas linked to the popular understanding of cities as generally rooted in Europe and North America and as, thus, having a European cultural background (Robinson 2006, Watson 2009). Efforts to establish a universal account of urbanism on the basis of the experiences of cities limited to these "western" regions were consequently strongly contested (Robinson 2006: 41). Referring to this, the predominating "global" view on cities, which is almost exclusively fed by North American and European experience, strikes Roy as focused on flows connected to global economy, excluding large proportions of the world's cities from the research agenda and contributing to policy formulation (Roy 2011a: 406-08). As a result the normative ethic of current planning has to be considered an export product from the European and North American context and questioned as to its appropriateness to the (southern) application context. The resulting guiding principles for urban development spring from the models developed in the "western" context and are termed "regulating fictions" by Jennifer Robinson (2006: 11).

A critical discussion of prevailing planning approaches hence arose among scholars such as Abdumaliq Simone (2004), Jennifer Robinson (2006) and Vanessa Watson (2009), due to the dismissal of local cultures and informal realities and related to theories developed in the urbanising geographical contexts beyond those reflected widely in theory (Roy and AlSayyad 2004). From the starting point of "provincialising" the common "global" and "modern" urban theories as originating in Europe and North America by only granting them validity for their own geographical contexts (Chakrabarty 2008), authors have started to call for what Watson has named "seeing from the South" (Watson 2009). Watson, thereby, does not seek to establish a competing paradigm valid for the hemisphere, but argues that instruments of contemporary urban planning have to be re-evaluated according to their suitability to their implementation context. All in all, the discussion on "seeing from the South" reveals that the problem focus on the global economy and a lack of critical self-questioning regarding hegemonial implications of the urban planning profession have led to inadequate theories for practical application in the many local working contexts.

In the urban professional's quest for policy revision for the cities of the global South, the analytical approach of post-colonial studies has been looking to provide new approaches to some of the crucial questions in various African cities. According to Robinson, the theoretical body of urbanism, springing from western

experience and claiming universality, should be complemented by urban theories based on the knowledge systems and experience of cities not characterised by strong connections to the global economy or subject to traditional urban planning (Robinson 2006). The acknowledgement that urbanisation processes might be subject to different path-dependencies and logics of organisation than is suggested by "western" urbanisation through industrialisation, signifies that new types of theory building need to be undertaken in cities of Latin America, Asia and Africa in order to describe the phenomena adequately (see Coquery-Vidrovitch 1991, Roy and AlSayyad 2004, Robinson 2006, Watson 2009). The aim is to question and critically reflect patterns and legacies of urban development and overcome universalist and developmentalist assumptions. Based on these insights, impacts of urbanisation in the various cities in and outside of Africa require to be looked at.

2.2 Informing Urban Policy on Urbanisation

After the above description of the theoretical proposals from urban studies concerning the phenomenon of urbanisation, this chapter seeks to establish how policy formulation and planning address urbanisation following these implications. Thereby, a re-reading of historical urbanisation considering the uneven power-relations in the urban planning profession and practice is also called for. It is along the lines of post-colonialism that Regina Göckede (2010) describes the necessity for a post-colonial reading of modern urban planning in her article on Ernst May's planning efforts in Kampala (Uganda) in the 1930s. While she notes a tendency by planners and architectural historians to evaluate the social and technical contents of modernist projects as progressive, she finds the African context is all too often reduced to climate and topography, fading out social and architectural history (ibid: 53). Göckede, further, points out that modernism and, hence, modern practices of urban design cannot claim to have developed outside a colonialist context. As she states, the first modernist ideas were developed in Europe in colonial times and with inherent colonial contents, meaning that an intertwinement of colonialism and modernism has to be assumed, beyond the adaption of "neues Bauen" ideas in the colonial territories (ibid: 52). She describes how, although modernism reached the global South with a delay, after it had become a symbol of progress and democracy in the USA, it was used as an instrument to consolidate racist spatial hierarchies and the modernisation of colonial exploitation structures by colonial powers in Africa (ibid: 52-53). She, further, argues that architecture and urban design are dependent on facts generated by the socio-political conditions of the location. So, although modern planning shapes the physical environment and, thereby, has a strong impact on society's everyday life, western historians claim that among all spatial references of globalising architectural modernity, the sovereign subject is only found in Europe's cultural reference. But unlike in the literary disciplines,

the critical discussion of such racist and colonialist assumptions has bypassed the spatial and construction disciplines so far. She, therefore, calls on the spatial and architectural disciplines to abandon their denial of involvement in colonialism and imperialism and to uncover the origins of the planning epistemologies. The post-colonial approach from other disciplines tackles these issues and is, therefore, found to be a suitable reference point from which urban studies might depart (ibid: 54). In this regard, Robinson (2006: 172) argues that urban policy has - equally to urban theory - been divided into strategies for richer and for poorer cities. Thereby the poorer cities have been recommended to apply tools and interventions geared towards aims of developmentalism and global economics (ibid). Consequently, poorer cities are currently left "tossed" between ambitions to globalise and meeting the demands of the developmentalist agenda (Robinson 2006: 166). Meanwhile, ordinary, casual or everyday aspects of urbanisation also need to be described and conceptualised. Based on these insights, Amin and Graham (1997) as well as Robinson (2006) call for accounts of "ordinary cities" and Hall (2013) describes "ordinary streets". The impetus, practices and movements that construct spaces of operation, habitation and transaction in urbanisation beyond statutory provision need to be considered in the overall accounts. In order to acknowledge and address rationales of urbanisation outside of governmental planning, everyday urbanisation, therefore, needs to be added to the research agenda.

As described earlier, what is on the table in the African urban studies, is nothing less than the re-evaluation of underlying theories and ideas of urban planning in order to avoid replicating segregational patterns of development and power distribution. Thereby, the laws on which urban development is based and by which urban policy is executed need to be challenged for their legitimacy, if they rule out the majority. In this study of urbanisation practices, urban planning needs to be understood as "the management of resources, particularly land, through dynamic processes of informality" (Roy 2009: 80). Hence, understanding planning as inherently forecasting is disregarded, but the review of planning is also set as the crucial question on how to reform the sovereign's rationale on accompanying urbanisation. Unlike the more technically oriented disciplines, Healy (2012: 191f.) describes urban planning as driven by a "community of inquirers", leading to the idea of the planning field not being determined by the delimitations of formal planning parameters, but by "a continually open exploratory and evolving process", a "contingent universal". She, thereby, defines "planning" as "the effort to shape urban and regional development pathways through some deliberate, collective governance efforts" (ibid: 194). The idea of such governance can, thereby, emerge also outside of the formal and professional planning field (ibid: 199).

In the face of a largely unknown but assumed diversification of urban lifestyles, there is generally a need to address the widening range of city life, further referred to as "inclusiveness" (cf. Watson 2009: 188) by revised understandings of urban development and an expanded spectrum of actors contributing to improving living

conditions in the growing urban settings. The legal constellations in place, though, are often protected by the ruling powers, who seek to protect their covert privileges relying on social exclusion and profit making (Watson 2009: 186). Nevertheless, re-describing the urbanisation process and establishing a theoretical base for current and anticipated urbanisation practice allows policies to be formulated that overcome established professional patterns and address the distinctive needs of the respective cities (Robinson 2006: 172).

A precondition for planning schemes that address the broadest possible range of citizen's interests in the sense of inclusiveness is the understanding of the systems of knowledge informing current planning decisions. To meet the actual local requirements of urbanisation, systems currently informing the planning decisions need to be questioned and revised. Thereby, the current dis-link between development standards and the development potential on the ground - described as "developmentalism" (Escobar cited in Robinson 2006: 4) - needs to be overcome not only in analytical categories but also the regarding the institutional memories, structures and practices of policy directed to current urbanisation. This thesis, thereby, suggests following three steps: data collection in the local context, analysis of the data and third strategy formulation grounded in the results of local findings.

Gathering information: Empirical investigations need to be undertaken to identify the constituting elements of urbanisation before policy aims and principles can be formulated on how to address the phenomenon. For data collection on issues of urban development, Jennifer Robinson (2011) and Patsy Healy (2012) have advocated the use of "case studies" for the purpose of filling in knowledge on urbanising cities but reveal that the question of how to delimit the unit of study, how to organise data collection and how to set up the analysis to adequately grasp the urbanisms of the cities that have so far been underrepresented in urban theory building is still at an experimental level. Even considering the wide range of local predicaments and variations of research project set-ups and resources, this has to be considered a research gap. To address this, they advocate thorough revision of the methodology of case studies and consideration of comparative approaches. While the field of urban studies is described as hitherto largely reluctant to pursue systematic comparative strategies, planning consultancy is noted to have been heavily engaged in almost random comparison by best-practice transfers across cities (Robinson 2011: 2). Not only has this practice failed to take into account failures and possible lessons (Roy 2005: 156), even correcting this omission would ignore the more crucial argumentation against "simplistic borrowing" (Watson 2009: 186). Instead of looking at the success of projects as a criterion for the transfer of planning systems and policy sets, Watson proposes reviewing new ideas regarding their potential to yield principles as opposed to models of development (ibid).

Systematisation, identification of fields of action: Very few suggestions have been made on systemising data in analyses geared towards formulating policies for urban development that acknowledge current urbanisation. However, Watson identifies the current relationship of informal strategies for survival and the high requirements implied in formal planning and land-use management as "anti-poor" (Watson 2009: 187). Reviewing urban planning to make it stop excluding the poor is thus necessary, as it has not adapted to the changing conditions of urbanisation (Watson 2009). Her argumentation rules that, in order for urban policies not to be anti-poor, the high level requirements of conventional urban legislation need to be discussed in relation to survival strategies of low-income urban dwellers (Watson 2009: 187). Thereby, it is assumed that current urban policies stand in competition to other land-use interests that have so far not been the subject of urban studies. For this, Watson has coined the term "conflict of rationalities" (Watson 2009: 187) in which different governmental and non-governmental actors pursue their own agendas of urban establishment. As these relations are often dominated by their formal or informal legal statuses, remembering that it is the state's institutions that determine this status and questioning on what basis this is undertaken is central to the investigation on "competing rationales of urbanization" (Watson 2009: 187, Roy 2005: 156). However, in the course of this, it is necessary not only to document the questions of land use and possible struggles over it, but also the question of ownership, land-titles and rules of access to land use (Roy 2005: 155), including the parallel (informal) systems of land distribution and appropriation. The consequences of such simultaneous regulatory systems for resource management in urbanisation cannot be discussed without regard for their hierarchical dimension and need to be identified for each particular city affected by urbanisation.

Strategy formulation: While the planning practices guided by modernist understandings and ideals often supplied local elites with tools for promoting modernisation, they are often unsuited to addressing the living conditions of many informal settlements in conditions of rapid urbanisation (Healy 2012: 191, Watson 2009: 187). Therefore, the findings from the accounts of urbanisation of African cities need to serve as information bases for selecting adequate instruments and measures for their specific contexts. Here, a research gap has to be acknowledged, as there are few specifics on how to find adequate planning tools to accommodate the diversified rationales of urbanisation. Nevertheless, the spaces and practices of informal urbanisation are not beyond the control of planning. Since informality has been accounted for largely as a product of the state, it is within the realm of planning professionals to tackle the issues it raises (Roy 2005: 155). For planners in the African context this does not signify a way back to what Myers, referring to Foucault, describes as the „ideology of return", where „myths" about pre-colonial history tell of times when „African towns were bastions of equality and fine living for all" (Myers 1994: 200). Such descriptions are ideals that cannot be re-installed

or serve as a contextualised planning vision. In this sense, a way ahead needs to be found that addresses the current challenges and complexities of urbanisation in a locally grounded manner. Planning can address the current and anticipated urbanisation in its policies if it can increase its impact on distributive justice and inclusiveness of the urbanisation process.

While Parnell and Simon (2010) suggest tackling the phenomenon of urbanisation at the national level by formulating an "urbanisation policy", recommendations on planning strategies on a city scale are given by Watson (2009). She names different types of strategic planning and participatory budgeting and refers to a Brazilian planning instrument called ZEIS, which, in her mind, has the potential of being inclusive, as it might be adapted to local conditions of dealing with poverty (Watson 2009: 188). On this, a reverse perspective is given by Roy, who describes how existing informal urbanisation practice can feed into policy. Roy recommends four policy epistemologies that might be included in addressing the issues of urban informality (Roy 2005). The first she names as "Policies of Shit", in which the residents of underserviced locations are recognised as the experts in questions of upgrading (ibid: 150-152). Robinson, further, suggests exploring the economic relevance of such basic-infrastructure delivery, by which the provision could be turned into job-opportunities (Robinson 2006: 164-165). Roy's second suggestion is "Underwriting the Right to Participate in the Market", by which policymakers need to actively allow market access for the owners of self-constructed property (Roy 2005: 152-153). By "Strategically using the State of Exception", her third proposition, she propagates the use of the state of informality as a strategic planning tool that can open spaces of possibility (ibid: 153-154). In these, supportive infrastructure for informal activities could be inserted, instead of concentrating state investment on established economic ventures (Robinson 2006: 165). The fourth proposal is "Scale Jumping", by which decision-makers at higher policy levels should be addressed directly (Roy 2005: 154-155). It is assumed that this step would have the effect of making the needs not accommodated by formal regulatory conditions visible with the aim of entering a recognition process.

The urban policy agenda arising from the broadened array of urbanisation practice needs to be "situated" in the sense that it takes into account the distinct characteristics of the place for which it is formulated (Watson 2009: 187). While it seems efficient and legitimate to base policy formulation on experiences from other times or locations, Watson points out that the underlying assumptions on society, politics, economy or environment need to be made transparent in the any transfer of ideas, while it needs to be questioned if these can be upheld in the receiving context (ibid). The perils of a planning view disconnected from low-income urbanisation lie in the fact that the "aggregate impact" of local individual planning and building decisions might not be as clearly traceable as governmental or large-scale interventions, while impacting strongly on everyday life (Myers 1994: 196).

Reconsidering the notion of parallel rationales of urbanisation, Jenkins and Eskemose further propose that one has to assume there to be a governmental practice in place already that "engages with these largely endogenous social processes, while pretending to adhere to its generally exogenous normative principles" (Jenkins and Eskemose 2011: 14). Their advice is to support these practices as a "Realpraxis" in reference to a "Realpolitik" (ibid). The underlying rationales of political practice are so obscured for many locations in Sub-Saharan Africa, but need to be given consideration, when questioning the aims and effectiveness of the actual practice before the point at which it might reflexively feed into policy formulation and tool-shaping.

The literature review has made evident that current policy re-conceptualisations not only aim at the legal status of urbanisation practices and resulting structures, but are also concerned with their consideration as "modern", as "urban" itself, and as seeing its inhabitants as "sovereign subjects". Roy's "idiom of urbanization" can, therefore, serve as a starting point and is supplemented by these topics to structure the account of urbanisation in a flexible and modular account. The discussion on these four aspects is summarised in the following accounts on the legal status of urbanisation practices and structures, the regulating principles and paradigms that underpin the urbanisation practices, the question of delimitations of the urban as well as the negotiation of citizenship in the rapidly growing cities.

2.2.1 Beyond the Formal-Informal Dichotomy[1]

Informal modes of urbanisation seem to account for a large proportion of current urbanisation but have so far largely been ignored in the accounts of urbanisation and as a basis of policy formulation (Roy 2005). Informal structures and practices come about in urbanisation, for the one part because obtaining the necessary building permissions, plans and land rights is tedious, expensive, and, therefore, demands are opaque (Watson 2009: 173). For the other, planning law is often merely seen as an irritation by project developers and is not in a position or willing to control the excessive developments of the private sector (Berrisford 2011: 210).

In the general European understanding, urban informality as described by Roy and Al Sayyad (2004) is still imagined as a phenomenon of poverty, existing in geographies of "the Global South", far beyond Europe's own urban realities. In the public debate, but also in parts of the academic discussion, urban informality as a structural phenomenon and practical rationale is, hence, attributed to the emergence of slums. According to some, the slum has, therefore, become synonymous with urban informality and is clearly distinguished from the formal city (Myers 2011: 76). In this binary understanding, the legal status of building structures

1 | An earlier version of this sub-chapter was published in German (Appelhans 2014).

and urban practices is specified by the terms "formal" and "informal". Thereby, structures and processes abiding by the law are classified as formal, while actions outside of regulation are informal. The theoretical discussion on urban informality practised in everyday life of many urbanising cities is, thus, divided from the mainly European discussion centred around informal planning tools, such as master plans or participation processes beyond the requirements of local planning law.

Yet, the structures and practices produced informally are not necessarily illegal and the binary and static understanding needs to be countered by the acknowledgement of a dynamic dialectic between formal and informal, encompassing also the activities of state institutions. Viewing informality as a strategy of urbanisation that can be practised by the administration, as well as the population, thereby, serves as an analytical vantage point that allows to interpret the interplay of formal and informal practices constructing informal dwellings, as well as seeing formal urban structures as being produced by a range of formal and informal activities (Roy 2011a: 233). Informal urban development can therefore not be reduced to appear in squatter settlements, but rather needs to be understood as independent from poverty and as a wider phenomenon of urbanisation, that also includes wealthy agents and state actors. On this basis, formality and informality are integral components of urbanisation processes and can be found in all cities across the globe, while the qualification of city structures outside the formal regulatory framework as "informal" is not a fixed attribute and can be interpreted as a heuristic construction, as the sovereign himself variably determines the informal status (Roy 2011: 233). By holding the authority over appointing formality, the sovereign has the possibility of drawing lines between formal and informal. The legal status is therefore not a fixed condition, but rather subject to a dynamic of de- and re-formalisation. On the African continent control of this sanction and legitimisation is of particular sensitivity, as planning law has gained a bad reputation after being put into use by oppressive regimes to legitimise the repression of parts of the population (Berrisford 2011: 215).

Despite the clear definitions in documents and regulations, research observations show that formal and informal are not clearly distinguishable on the ground. Next to building activities, the informal urbanisation, thereby, may also include socio-economic strategies of survival that are not necessarily bound to a specific location and are of service also to residents of formal areas. Formal and informal spatial practices thereby intertwine. A study of governance in Mozambique by Jenkins and Eskemose (2011: 14) reveals how land and housing development as physical aspects of urban development materialise through a complex and hybrid set of interactions. Thereby, government agencies, which are generally considered formal agents, interact with social agents (such as households) that are considered informal actors in such hybrid manners. The resulting urban structures manifested in land-use and construction apply to socio-cultural norms of the households developing them, while adhering to the structures of economic and mainly local

political concepts (ibid). On the basis of her research in India, Roy, meanwhile. describes how random and fluctuant the conditions of "legal/illegal, legitimate and illegitimate, authorized and unauthorized" are, while at the same time they are instruments for the execution of state power (Roy 2011: 233). She shows how different strategies of urbanisation that are undertaken by the state and by non-governmental actors include formal as well as informal practices (Roy 2009: 86). As Meagher describes for the case of informal economies in Nigeria, if informal organisations have no means of holding public officials accountable regarding their needs, this results in a relation of neglect or conspiracy between the informal economies and the state (Meagher 2011: 68-69). According to Berrisford (2011: 211), the negotiation of formal and informal is thereby a deciding societal distinction, as in connection with enforcing land rights it can have re-directional or consolidating effects on land distribution. Structures mimicking formal appearances and practices, such as middle-income housing constructed on agricultural land or nature reserves, are not even recognised as informal and have good chances of being legitimised. The practice of informal urbanisation is thus not limited to activities of informal dwellers but is also practised by wealthy citizens and public officers (Roy 2011: 233). According to Roy, this meriting of "elite informality", paired with the criminalisation of poorer forms of informality, produces spatial inequality. In a development dynamic the announcement of acceptance or non-acceptance of structures thereby tends to render poorer areas illegal, while wealthier informal urbanisation is legalised and can continue accumulating wealth (Roy 2011: 233).

At the same time, traditional, colonial, modernist or neo-liberal practices coexist for land distribution and the access to settlement areas, limiting each other's reach and, under circumstances, leading to a dominance of de-facto rights (Jenkins 2004: 211f.). The competing formal and informal agency leads to the parallel existence of principles of regulation. It is, thereby, possible for different modes of land distribution and claims resulting from land practices to collide (ibid). Some urban researchers even doubt the legitimacy of formal regulatory systems and laws if they do not accommodate these complex social, economic and political realities of population majorities, ruling them out of formality (Jenkins 2004: 210, Watson 2009: 187, Jenkins and Eskemose 2011: 14).

Due to the recent insights, dissolving the dichotomy between formality and informality plays a central role in the re-conceptualisation of urbanisation. The binary understanding of formality and informality in the sense of "order and chaos" or "citizenry and labourers" cannot be upheld, although it could be questioned if the contrasting terms "formal" and "informal" adequately describe the urban structures and processes in which formal and informal conditions alternate and are overlaid, thus subjecting them to conditions of clear distinction of status. An investigation of these conditions is seen as particularly useful in the deconstructing the legitimising bases of state power and its use of planning instruments such as mapping, cadastres, land-use, surveying and foremost legislation to secure its

status (Roy 2011: 233). Explicitly, this deconstruction means documenting how the determination of informality structures the urbanisation practices of different actors. For Roy, the crucial question in this context is "why some forms of informality are criminalized and thus rendered illegal while others enjoy state sanction or are even practises of the state" (Roy 2009: 83). There is a need to unveil these issues and question the corresponding interventions on behalf of distributive justice.

2.2.2 Establishing Rural-Urban Linkages

The distinction between "modern" and "traditional" is a fundamental regulating factor for the selection of building styles and adaptation of urban practices. The structures and actions considered modern will usually be selected as acceptable or desired in the course of urbanisation, while others that are not considered state of the art will fall into general disregard. The definition of modern and traditional is also grounded in the underlying paradigms of planning. Since ethical considerations should underlie all urban planning, their origin and suitability to the context of application must be considered in thought and practice of the profession (Roy 2011a: 412). However, what is modern is subject to negotiation. It has been recognised as a fundamental problem that modernity has, so far, not been attributed to artefacts and processes in what has been coined "the developing world".

According to Robinson, it is a theoretical manoeuvre that suggested a close tie between particular cities and the notion of modernity, which dominated the view on cities and resulted in hierarchical orders dividing the cities of the world into developed and undeveloped (Robinson 2011: 3). Cities embracing tradition were, thereby, rendered primitive or outdated and therefore un-modern (ibid). What results is a Eurocentric interpretation of modernity as "dynamic, individualising, rational", with a contrasting understanding of tradition as "static, communal, in thrall to the sacred" (Robinson 2006: 15). Thereby, the Western cities considered as modern were held to be particularly innovative if they adopted novelty, while those regarded as traditional were stigmatised as imitative if they embraced the new (ibid: 7).

Thus far, drawing on the assumption of a divided tradition and modernity among cities, those places not conforming to the assumed traits of contemporary urbanity have been deemed "in need of development" (Robinson 2011: 3). The practices and resulting structures are, consequently, negotiable based on such a declaration. This approach of institutional encouragement of "lifting" cities to a supposedly "higher" standard by mainly technical criteria has become known as "developmentalism" (Robinson 2006: 4). Modern buildings, designed according to technical and economic criteria, are thereby meant to replace structures with conditions of sub-standard sanitation. However, this fails to take into account the strengths of informally constructed settlements regarding the social, cultural and flexible (Robinson 2006). Thereby, fictive representations of other urban locations

are used as benchmarks, a phenomenon Robinson (2006: 11) refers to as "regulating fiction". By using such de-contextualised best-practice examples and stereotyped images as guiding principles of urban development, the actual traits and potentials of the cities supposedly not conforming to modernity have fallen out of view and hence the perspectives of development are reduced to standardised imaginations (Robinson 2006: 4). However, there are limits to the power of travelling planning paradigms transported in best-practice examples and "regulating fictions". On the transfer of planning concepts, Healy points out that "travelling planning concepts" cannot be reduced to promoting new forms of colonisation, as the acknowledgement of the intricacy and contingency of their implementation within certain development pathways calls their universal validity into question (Healy 2012: 191). In fact, Robinson herself states that "we can generally predict an active cultural politics of engagement with circulating modernities – even when modernity is externally imposed" (Robinson 2006: 78) Cities thereby take the role of settings for the circulation and gathering of urbanisms, which acquire particular contextual meanings (Robinson 2006: 20). As a result, what remains undescribed is how paradigms are adapted to local contexts and form specific interpretations of modernity and tradition.

In order to qualify the current urbanisation process and gain insights into its aspects of transformation, the complex phenomenon of "urbanisation" needs to be conceptualised based on data from local experience. According to Robinson, poorer cities need to be released from "the imaginative straightjacket of imitative urbanism and the regulating fiction of catching up to wealthier, Western cities that categorising and hierarchical approaches to cities produce" (Robinson 2006: 11). Avoiding these pitfalls new approaches to urban development need to be explored. On these grounds, the understanding and transfer of planning ideas needs to be perpetually questioned and updated, in order to critically confront existing practices, which cannot claim to be planning on the grounds of having evaded the critical debate by the field (Healy 2012: 201-202). Just like the work by Roy mentioned above on the relation of formality and informality within urbanisation, Robinson (2006) suggests dissolving the binary view of modern and traditional as attributes of cities and put them into a dialectic relation. Robinson (2006: 4) therefore challenges the understanding of urban modernity and re-coins the term "urban modernity" to be understood as "cultural experience of contemporary city life and the associated cultural valorisation and celebration of innovation and novelty" . Thereby tradition is understood as an element of modernity, leaving African city dwellers that practise forms of reworking their traditions to be modern urbanites (ibid: 48f).

2.2.3 Countering the Rural-Urban Divide

Current phenomena of urbanisation are calling into question what is conventionally understood as defining "cityness". Apparently, the commonplace ideas of the countryside being a site of village-life and agricultural economy and the city being the site of industrial development and progressive lifestyles can be attributed to modernist interpretations (Redepennig 2011: 86). These interpretations were based on a moral as well as a political geography that established a binary view on the two parts at the start of the 20th century (Redepennig 2011: 87). Despite the strong distinction between rural and urban practices, the Chicago school assumed that "urban culture could pop up almost anywhere", as it was not confined to the physical area of cities. This dualist distinction has eventually become relevant to everyday life in the Western nations (Redepennig 2011: 89).

The commonplace distinctions of rural and urban have been called into question by observations of recent urbanisation. The movement of people, goods and practices across the African countries seems to follow organisational patterns that are not congruent with the administrative distinction between rural and urban and questions the binary understanding of rural and urban. Two important phenomena are identified by Einhard Schmidt-Kallert that shape migration in the current rapid urbanisation of Africa and Asia: non-permanent migration and the reliance on multi-locational households (Schmidt-Kallert 2009: 323). The urbanisation processes in Asia and Africa, thus, do not follow uni-directional patterns of permanent migration (ibid: 320). Instead, one or several members of one household change their location for reasons of income generation or education for a seasonal or aim-specific period of time. This, for example, can be moving to the city during a bad harvest for alternative employment opportunities or accessing secondary education, but just as well be temporarily returning to the rural areas to re-invest capital gains from economic activities in the city in livestock. These movements can be assumed to serve as a strategy for households to deal with rising urban poverty (UN-Habitat 2007: 5) as they strive to minimise risks by spreading sources of income generation. The rural-urban divide is, hence, cross cut by mobility of practices and structures once allocated to rural or urban geographies, causing it to be blurred and dissolved in the course.

Yet, it is currently not well documented and quantified where the reception structures of rural-urban migration lie in the urban fabric and how the patterns function (Schmidt-Kallert 2009: 323). It can, however, be assumed that temporary migration is increasing in different parts of the world (ibid: 319). The discrepancy between housing needs as well as access to land use and the prospective delivery of shelter is particularly high under such fluctuant circumstances.

As ephemeral as the phenomena appear in descriptions, the assumed impact is, nevertheless, substantial: While it is suspected that migration is, at least seasonally, depriving rural and urban areas of their most educated labour force, there

is a concentration of skills in the cities, as also external return migrants come to the cities rather than to the countryside (Boquier 2004:140). On this issue, Simone notes that, as yet, "not enough attention is placed in urban planning on making use of how movement continuously respatializes social positions and resources. Cities are mobile entities – oscillating relationalities that stretch and retract, include and exclude, filter and circulate." (Simone 2011: 390). The challenge posed is. hence. to integrate movement as a mode of urbanisation into frameworks directing urban development and fixed building structures. It is. thereby, assumed that building structures need to reflect and facilitate mobile livelihoods and are, therefore, directly linked to the occupant's lifestyle and income opportunity. For providing this, analyses with broader household concepts than those assuming living and eating under the same roof have to be utilised to allow the explanation of multilocational livelihood patterns (Schmidt-Kallert 2009: 324).

These issues and phenomena observed in the rural-urban interface need not only to be recognised but also to be translated into policies and projects (Schmidt-Kallert 2009: 331). So far, the longstanding history of movement on the African continent has rarely been considered in urban development policies (Simone 2012: 379). Simone suggests that "instead of trying to keep people in place, in newly democratic and decentralized localities, perhaps emphasis should be placed on how to make already existent movement more productive and convenient, and to accede to the possibility that urban residents "come to go and go to come" (ibid: 390). He calls this "making productive use of urbanities of movement as a formal resource" (ibid: 379). How, then, can rural and urban be defined in contexts of high-mobility creating fluctuant structures and constantly shifting boundaries to do so? Meanwhile urban studies researchers have countered binary and exclusionary assumptions of the "rural" and the "urban" and have declared that a range of social processes which had been declared un-urban by Chicago School scholars are actually shaping the nature of cities (Robinson 2006: 37). To clearly identify the impacts, the rural-urban divide in the analytical description of urbanisation needs to be overcome. It is suggested that complementary and differentiated urban and rural development strategies are developed, rather than abandoning one for the other (Parnell and Simon 2010: n.n.). Rural and urban should, hence, not be viewed as opposites, but as concepts that, in a dialectic understanding, spring from one another. To dissolve the predominant duality, Redepenning refers to the work of Luhmann, who points out that there are always interconnections between the divided (Redepennig 2011: 91). Using the image of the rural being a mirror to recognise the urban and vice versa, he states that "even if only one side of the distinction is picked out as a central theme, and therefore made present, the absent side is nevertheless present and necessary and silently shapes its other" (ibid: 97). There is, therefore, no sharp border between the concepts, but they rather serve as means of interpretation for social concepts. The idea of transition from a rural to an urban lifestyle within two generations, thus, has to be questioned, as it originates from

Eurocentric views of observation and is not adequate to describe the rural-urban relations within the rapid urbanisation processes in the global regions mentioned (Schmidt-Kallert 2009: 319). Instead, "most of the studies from Africa and Asia [...] converge on the statement that forming multi-locational households, thereby spreading assets and risks across space, is not simply an interim phenomenon but a strategy which may be upheld for generations" (ibid: 330). Migration in these areas, therefore, has to be viewed not as a "once in a life-time decision to leave" rural areas and move into a city, but rather more complex and diverse than models based on industrialisation suggest (Schmidt-Kallert 2009: 319). While some migrants undergo a transgression from rural "traditional" lifestyles towards what is perceived as modern and urban lifestyles, others undergo more hybrid transitions. Bearing in mind the analogies of the socio-cultural interpretation of rural-urban and modern-traditional, the dichotomy of rural-urban can, thus, be dissolved by reading them as varied manners of livelihood that come in different varieties of being purely agricultural and rural based or urban and wage labour oriented, but also as a range of intermediate and mixed strategies of survival (Fereya and Terefe 2011: 223). While it is understood that a universal theory of urbanism can not be formulated, the differences between the livelihoods forming the practices of urbanism can be understood as diverse, without creating judgement by installing benchmarking or a hiearchical order among the variety (Robinson 2006: 41). The range of lifestyles currently viewed is, hence, not a mix of progressive developments at different stages but rather one of parallel coexistence and interaction of varieties, of which some will vanish and others might prevail. Which of the strategies is considered urban and which rural will be defined from the local rural and the local urban viewpoint, acting as the mirrors of self-identification. The "rural" is used to describe something that does not represent the idea of city-life. This local definition of what belongs in a city and what does not will lead to a local notion of urban deviating from what a developmentalist perspective would assume. One of the central understandings of the revised position is thereby, that modernity can occur in cities, but it is not a pre-condition for their definition as "urban" in relation to the „rural".

2.2.4 Re-Framing Local-Cosmopolitan Constellations

The question what is termed as "ethnic" – or in the African context "tribal", "clan related" or "traditional" – and what is "cosmopolitan" is at the heart of the question on who is an urbanite. To local identities "connections and travels beyond the local are long-standing and constitutive" (Robinson 2006: 3). In a globalising world, these connections are assumed to become increasingly accessible to the individual. Connected to this question is the attribution of citizen's rights in the understanding of the term "citizen" as the culturally and socially "legitimate" or accepted urban dweller acting within such networks. According to Simone, the

sovereign rationale of development "is also about capturing residents to a life aesthetic defined by the state so that they can be citizens. It is making ethical beings; about holding people in relations that makes them governable. As such, development is about assisting residents to meet their needs in a "good" way or a "moral" way." (Simone 2004: 7). Thereby, the state as the sovereign has an interest in subjecting individuals to its policies and disregarding competing power structures. However, ethnic ties and family structures are major configurators of African societies. Here the hierarchical construction of the primitive and the developed is often applied to draw boundaries between clan structures and the government. The assumptions regarding the uni-directional flow of ideas between the tribal and the cosmopolitan thus become relevant. The "primitive" is, thereby, implicitly assumed to be receptional and accommodating, while its agency is overlooked. Traditional forms of administration are then overlooked and community leadership unrecognised (cf. Berrisford 2011). However, evidence has been provided that the competition between indigenous law and international standards implemented in African cities cannot be assumed to be uni-directional, but an exchange embrace and adaptation of ideas takes place. An example for this is the adoption of modernist ideas by the African independence movements and the construction of new capitals with hybrid interpretations of modernist design principles to suit local socialities (Robinson 2006: 84). Other cases, such as the embrace of role models, changing identities and clashes of gender roles with globalised value systems as phenomena of how conformity to citizenship and, thus, access to rights can be seen as a struggle for power, identity and resources, have hardly been the subject of discussion in urban studies.

The description of formation of identities compatible or non-compatible with awarding citizenship consequently needs to be addressed in urban studies' accounts of urbanism. While Simone (2004: 17) argues that all African cities are subject to similar conditions of globalisation and are, thus, converging, the links between external factors such as globalisation and local configurations need to be examined and their respective roles as factors determining convergence or divergence in development paths established. It has to be established, how connected citizens are to a universal idea of the "urbanite" while in keeping with local contingencies. Therein, "we need a form of theorizing that can be as cosmopolitan as the cities we try to describe" (Robinson 2006: 3). Comparative urbanism, thereby, needs to aim for an analytical concept that reflects diversity regarding actors and systems of regulation of urban development (ibid: 9). The topic also needs to leave the realm of anthropological descriptions to enter policy formulation. In this respect, it needs to be identified who the sovereign subjects in urban contexts of postcolonial African cities are, how they are organised and governed. The question is: Who is a citizen? In order to overcome exclusionary perceptions of which criteria allow individuals to be viewed as citizens, the diversity of local identities needs to be placed into a global context. If the circulation of ideas formerly described as

imitative in certain contexts is described as appropriation instead (ibid: 77), the role of the implementing society changes from being viewed as perceptive to being selective and adaptive. Thereby, ethnic identities can conform to cosmopolitan requirements. Hence, "there is a possibility for different kinds of urbanism and diverse ways of life" (ibid: 7) that give account "on a diversity of ways of living in the city" (ibid: 63). What was deemed primitive by colonial accounts, hence, has to be re-assumed to be tradition in the sense of being an "element of urban modernity, urban nature of ethnicities, specific form of urbanism, revising the ethnic identity" (ibid: 48), giving evidence of social innovation not only in the cosmopolitan, but also in the tribal. Spatially, this results in viewing places as a composite with connections to other locations and cultures (ibid: 3), while the citizens can be acknowledged as citizens with decision-making rights, regardless of their ethnic and cultural background.

2.3 Assembling Narratives of Urbanisation in African Cities

The literature review for this research project has confirmed that there is a lack of to-the-point descriptions of the processes and impacts of contemporary urbanisation in the African context. The variants of the phenomenon of urbanisation have not been identified between the different cities, and hypothetical urbanisation types resulting are not included in general urbanisation theory. Neither have differentiation processes within cities' urbanisation trajectories received adequate academic attention. Current urbanisation in Africa is not only a population shift from the rural to the urban, but also livelihood transformation leading to socio-economic and cultural diversification. The process is multi-directional and irreversible, the sites of urbanisation are not only situated in the mega-cities, but rapid rates of urbanisation are observed especially in the small and medium-sized towns. However, according to the findings of current academic debate, the conceptualisation of urbanisation in Africa has been obstructed by the lack of adequate analytical tools. The lack of matching theory to describe the everyday reality in many African cities and its substitution by Eurocentric concepts has been named as "theories which are out of place" (Myers 1994: 209). Consequently urbanisation in Africa has not been systematically described and accounts of urban development are still scarce. There is need for African-centred research to verify the applicability of the existing theoretical concepts to the object of investigation (thus the respective city in question). There is, hence, a research gap on urbanisation in Africa and need for more nuanced local data that needs to be addressed. Within this account of urbanisation, location-specific typologies of urbanisation practices need to be portrayed and discussed.

As a result of urbanisation, the incremental strategies and assumed diversification of urbanising trajectories among and lifestyles within the cities, form new challenges to urban planning that until now remain largely unspecified. Currently, the implementation of "universal" planning tools to address the most urgent or highly prioritised issues of development are bridging the gap of laying down informed policies to address such issues. On the basis of data collection, site-specific descriptions of the phenomena, impacts and arising needs of urbanisation within the towns can be given. Policy can, thereby, improve its role and impact to serve distributive justice and promote wider-scale improvement of living conditions. Choosing from the range of analytical approaches reviewed in this chapter, the focus on the relation of urbanisation will, therefore, be studied by following the proposals made by Ananya Roy's "idiom of urbanisation" (Roy 2009). Theorising on the case of India, Roy talks of an "idiom of urbanization", which is "antithetical to planning – indeed anti-planning – while it can and must be understood as a planning regime, with informality as a key feature" (Roy 2009: 82). Following the argumentation of Roy (2009: 86), governmental planning and the ordinary practices beyond it both include formal and informal actions. Together, they constitute the "idiom of urbanisation" that can be used to structure the account of urban development. (ibid) Based on the evidence from such an analytical approach, planning procedures and instruments can be reconsidered and revised, while also granting practices of everyday urbanisation legitimacy. Her experiences from India will be used as a framework to structure the investigation of Bahir Dar as a case of urbanisation practice in the Ethiopian context. Thereby the concept of "urbanisation as an idiom" is useful to structure the description of urbanisation for the use in planning, as it allows the complexities to be described instead of reducing the process to a linear transgression by questioning power relations and constellations of interests behind urbanisation. The idiom of urbanisation as Roy describes it will, thereby, be expanded to suit the purposes of this investigation, not only to include formal and informal aspects but rather to distinguish "planning" from other rationales of urbanisation that are either formal or informal but non-governmental, which will be termed "everyday urbanisation". Thereby the development path of urban planning and its relation to everyday urbanisation will be described as a variety of competing rationales forming a location-specific "idiom of urbanisation". The approach can, thereby, reflect not only the dialectic of urban formality and informality but also the dialectic in other topics such as those described in this chapter (2.2.2 to 2.2.4), including those that might arise from site-specific constellations. It is, hence, possible to value the contingencies rather than to judge by a set standard.

Although the set-up of the actors practising urbanisation is assumed to be dialectic and not binary, a focus on the relation of formal governmental and unspecified self-organised urbanisation in a specific location is necessary, as current policy transfers and concepts need to be questioned regarding their local suitability. So, in order to move away from the common de-contextualisation in planning

programme development, local conditions in a relevant spatial area need to be studied. By applying and developing post-colonial research suggestions into methodological frameworks for policy formulation, dominant planning approaches like the "African City", developmentalism, economic ranking and best-practice are disregarded to avoid a planning practice that is not placed in the relevant urban context. Instead, the findings from investigating "everyday urbanisation" with its elements such as migration, auto-construction, traditional land-practices, investment-driven projects etc. and its relation to statutory planning as another rationale of urbanisation can be re-considered regarding their contribution to the ongoing urban transformation.

It is assumed, however, that the current generalisations on the urbanisation processes in Sub-Saharan African cities prevent the production of specific solutions to local demands and the consideration of locally available resources in the individual cities. The location should define what kind of practical development tools it requires in contrast to the way they are currently chosen. The subject of the thesis is hence to specify in what respect they need to be elaborated or adapted, in order to improve living conditions under the conditions of urbanisation.