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Introduction

The popularization of ‘World City’ as an analytical concept dates to 1966. Taking up a term introduced fifty years earlier by Patrick Geddes, Peter Hall’s now classic description of The World Cities explored the evolution of a handful of key urban areas from national into global roles and functions.¹ The original emphasis on size and comprehensive economic functions has since been extended by the argument that a distinct class of global cities are a characteristic product of the technologies and economy of the late twentieth century. As well, such cities are thought to embrace common spatial forms that respond to a specific balance of centralizing and decentralizing tendencies in the location of commercial, financial, and manufacturing industries.

In Hall’s list, New York was the representative world city of the United States. Indeed, it had been the national standard of urban success since the 1830s and 1840s, when it consolidated its lead as the major entrepôt of eastern North America.² It continued to grow after the Civil War as a major Atlantic trading centre supported by extensive and diversified manufacturing. By the start of the twentieth century, New York was also a national and international financial market and a centre of information-processing industries. The city also played a specialized role in the transmission of European modernism in social theory and the arts to American audiences.³ Raymond Vernon’s data for the 1950s show that New York concentrated 23 per cent of United States employment in business and professional services, 30 per cent in life insurance home offices, 35 per cent in national market finance, 40 per cent in national market wholesaling, and 46 per cent in book publishing.⁴
New York remained the American world city for as long as the global role of the United States was primarily that of an Atlantic trading partner. Beginning after 1940 and accelerating in the 1970s and 1980s, however, Washington and Los Angeles have claimed increasing shares of New York's world-city functions as gateways between the United States and the larger world. Washington now defines itself as a centre for international business as well as 'the most important city in the world'. Los Angeles emerged after the Second World War as one of four or five dominant 'national cities' of the United States. Since the 1970s, it has been commonly recognized as a key market, migration, and transportation centre for the Pacific Basin.

Despite their shared world prominence, however, Washington and Los Angeles offer fundamental contrasts in their functions, structure, and historical development. Changes in each city are tied to changes in the global roles of the United States - Washington to the rise of the United States as a dominant international political actor, Los Angeles to the rise of the Pacific Basin as an American economic sphere comparable in importance to the North Atlantic system. Indeed, their varied careers suggest that the concept of 'world city' as a category of contemporary settlement needs to be modified with an understanding of complex and potentially disparate origins. Not only Los Angeles and Washington but also cities in other national and geographical settings may well have converged on world-city roles from substantially different starting points.

The origins of world cities

Theoretical literature on the sources of urban growth divides into two broad categories. One set of models, most prominently those associated with theories of central places, emphasize the natural emergence of an urban hierarchy of trade and service centres with the gradual extension of exchange from shorter to longer distances. Growth impulses in this approach are understood to work their way outward from relatively small to relatively larger regions. The second approach emphasizes the formative role of long-range commerce through key gateway cities. Such mercantile cities are able to link otherwise isolated regions and to transmit growth impulses over long distances.

Discussions of the origins of world cities follow roughly the same dichotomy. A number of writers treat world cities as primary regional or national cities whose importance has grown beyond national boundaries. The new terminology is used to describe cities that are situated at the top of national or macro-regional hierarchies and that link their hinterlands together through interaction as a single 'world-level system of leading cities'. In this view, world cities are the climax product of the central place system, created through a natural upward evolution to regional metropolis to national city.

This central place approach of evolutionary continuity. It is perhaps most useful when applied to cities in regions within the world economic system. For example, East Asia has emerged during the last twenty-five years as a region of rising economic importance, with the rise of 'world city' or 'global city' through the development of a new product of recent economic innovation in communication. By positing a fundamental relevance of historical analysis, we gain a better understanding of the process. Indeed, many economic innovations are much better at detailing the processes of decision-making and business services. It also implies that the world city or global city should not be reduced to a single type that is detached from its local historical context and the intensification of interaction.

By positing a fundamental relevance of historical analysis, we gain a better understanding of the process. Indeed, many economic innovations are much better at detailing the processes of decision-making and business services. It also implies that the world city or global city should not be reduced to a single type that is detached from its local historical context and the intensification of interaction.

Panama City is not.

It is clear that our understanding of world cities as a unique set of phenomena is limited and that attempts to explain why Panama City is not.
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This central place approach to world cities assumes the importance
of evolutionary continuity. It implies that the present roster of world
cities may well grow with the maturing of additional nations or
regions within the world economy, much as several world cities of
East Asia have emerged during the last generation. Conversely, it
also implies that the world city as a type has a long heritage, even
though our contemporary examples may have some distinguishing
modern characteristics. In particular, this defining framework
would recognize historic trading cities that have linked their nation
or region to world markets - eighteenth-century London, nineteenth-
An alternative approach argues that the 'world city' is a unique
phenomenon and urban type that is specific to the long-range
commercial system of the late twentieth century. It is seen as the
new product of a recently restructured world-economy in which the
innovations in communication and information technologies of the
last twenty-five years have allowed the spatial separation of control
and decision-making from the physical production of goods. The
'world city' or 'global city' becomes a producer of financial and
business services. It also becomes the control and decision centre
for non-regionalized resources of public information, private
intelligence, and capital. The world city in this model has
detached itself from its local region and enjoys the potential for an
equal intensity of interaction with any part of the globe.
By positing a fundamental system break, this second interpretation
of world cities as a unique set of information wholesalers reduces the
relevance of historical analysis. Despite John Friedmann's request
that we understand where world cities have come from, there is a
tendency to ignore the questions of origins. Many English
language discussions avoid the issue by using neutral intransitive
verbs. At a certain point, world cities are said to have 'appeared' or
'happened', somewhat as a compound may precipitate from a
saturated solution. The geographers, regional planners, and
political economists who have written on the world city phenomenon
are much better at detailing what world cities do and what they are
like than at explaining why Singapore is on everybody's list but
Panama City is not.
It is clear that our understanding of the world city as a process and
a type can be enhanced by historical case analysis. We need to
examine the changing sources of urban growth and the evolving
differentiation of urban fortunes with the present in mind - that is,
with an eye to understanding the rise of the world city rather than
the more common concern to explain the decline of the classic
industrial city. Such analysis involves a middle range between world-
system theorists, with their perspective of centuries or millenia, and
policy analysts who support broad generalizations with the detailed analysis of four-year trends. If we cross the twenty-five-year barrier, the idea of a systems break becomes a testable hypothesis rather than an axiom.

The dual system model

The present paper frames such an historical approach within the ‘dual system model’ of urban development. As noted above, much of the writing on world cities is set within a larger framework of urban theory that posits a choice or shift between regionally-based and system-oriented growth. Historical comparison, however, suggests that it may be more fruitful to understand the development of world cities as a new manifestation of a dual system pattern that has been found in a variety of times and societies. As an explanatory device, the dual system model recognizes the multiplicity of roles that cities play in given historical situations. In essence, it allows us to look at Friedmann’s ‘modes of integration’ with an explicit framework that is sensitive to a variety of historical experience and inclusive of a wide range of data.

Several other historians who have taken on topics with broad spatial and temporal sweep have described dual urban systems in which a set of regionally-based cities co-exists with a second set of cities oriented to national or transnational networks. G. William Skinner, for example, has found such a dual system in late imperial China. One hierarchy of towns and cities served regional trading needs with few connections outside the local hinterlands. The hierarchy developed from the bottom up with the expansion of local and provincial commerce in accord with the assumptions of central place theory. A second hierarchy of administrative centres, in contrast, was created from the top down by imperial agents and functioned as a single network of centres for control and information transmission.

Edward W. Fox has divided pre-modern France into two sub-areas and urban systems based on different patterns of exchange. Central and interior France was a territorial society organized around local trade between provincial cities and regional agricultural hinterlands. The commercial society of the western coast, in contrast, was dominated by Atlantic seaports tied more closely to interregional and international flows of goods than to their own backcountry. Bordeaux and Nantes co-existed with interior cities in the same political unit but also participated in a network of trading cities that extended from Amsterdam and London to Lisbon, Barcelona and Naples.

Lynn Lees and Paul Hohenberg have elaborated Fox’s idea of regional and commercial systems as a major explanatory concept in their recent survey of The Making of Urban Europe. They argue that western European urbanization produced two parallel systems that co-existed in time and that system were rooted in a close environment, expressed indigenously to the state through Network cities took their served as ‘centres, nodes, complex sets of economic a borders. They were cosmopolitan from one culture to the next: systems not as exclusive but with different for their co-ordination of metropolitan to evolve into a central place and regional through the expansion of Washington.

Los Angeles as a region
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The dual system model does not divide producing cities from control/service cities as do many functional classification schemes. Instead, it views both types of cities as decision and co-ordination centres, but with different national or world clienteles and markets for their co-ordination services. It is therefore possible for a metropolis to evolve into a world city either as the culmination of central place and regional functions - as with Los Angeles - or through the expansion of network roles and contacts - as with Washington.

Los Angeles as a regional city

Los Angeles has grown into its international prominence literally from the ground up. It originated as a local market centre for southern California farmers in the nineteenth century. It grew into a regional production and distribution centre for much of the American South-west in the first half of the twentieth century before finally emerging as a major world city over the last twenty-five years. Despite the presence of several national and international market industries - particularly aircraft, electronics, and motion pictures - development at each stage has been driven by the city's regional roles and markets.

When Los Angeles celebrated the centennial of its founding (in 1781 by forty-four Spanish-speaking settlers from Sonora and Baja California), the town still counted only 11,183 residents. Four years later (1885'), the arrival of the Santa Fe Railroad gave the city two competing rail connections to the eastern United States and triggered the first of the city's repeated booms. Although spectacular growth in the later 1880s and again after 1900 involved the migration of tens of thousands of newcomers from the eastern and central states, the regional economy depended on the intensive development of the natural resources of Orange, Riverside, and Los Angeles counties. Out of hundreds of speculative plats and subdivisions from the 1886-87 boom, those that turned into thriving towns were the locations with good soil and adequate water. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce promoted intensive farming as the exit from the
depression of the 1890s, and produce from their orange, lemon, and avocado groves, peach and walnut orchards, truck gardens, and dairy farms was marketed through Los Angeles. Health resorts and retirement communities like Pasadena were similarly based on the regional resources of clear air and mild climate. In 1920, Los Angeles and Long Beach produced 15 per cent of all Californian manufactures by value, but 39 per cent of its canned fish, 27 per cent of its processed meat, 21 per cent of its flour and bread products, 43 per cent of its furniture, and 22 per cent of its lumber. As with San Diego 200 km. to the south-east, early twentieth-century Los Angeles was essentially an agricultural market, processing, and service centre on the model of Des Moines, Iowa, or Wichita, Kansas.

The 1920s and 1930s brought new economic activities that still looked to regional resources and markets. Oil discoveries at Huntington Beach (1920) and Signal Hill (1921) south of Los Angeles triggered the growth of ‘black gold suburbs’, but much of the product was sold locally to power Californian automobiles and diesel locomotives. A growing manufacturing sector also depended on markets in southern California and the larger South-west. Beginning with a Goodyear Tyre and Rubber plant in 1919, the city developed as North America’s largest manufacturer of tyres west of Akron and its largest automobile assembly centre west of Detroit. At the same time, the immediate hinterland of Los Angeles remained an area of intensive and profitable specialized agriculture until well into the post-war suburban boom.

The five counties now included in the Los Angeles Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura) reached their greatest specialization in manufacturing in 1959 with 38 per cent of the total labour force. The manufacturing was significantly fuelled by the wartime expansion and cold war revival of the aircraft industry. As the California State Planning Board noted as early as 1942, however, just as important in cumulative impact was the continuing process of import substitution as the growing population of southern California and wider western markets allowed the local production of goods previously imported from the eastern states. The number of new or expanded manufacturing plants was 50 per cent higher for 1945-48 than for the war years of 1942-44. One-eighth of all the new manufacturing enterprises in the United States during these early post-war years were located in the Los Angeles area. Post-war Los Angeles also proved especially attractive for branch plants and subsidiaries of major United States corporations interested in direct access to the South-western or Western market.
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By the 1960s, Los Angeles and San Francisco had achieved a rough division of metropolitan functions on the American West Coast. San Francisco remained the chief international contact point for the western states. As R.B. Cohen has shown, San Francisco was one of the three major international banking cities in the United States. It accounted not only for 3.2 per cent of total sales by the largest American manufacturing corporations but also for 5.4 per cent of their foreign sales for a 'multi-national index' of 1.69. The comparable index for Los Angeles was only 0.83. Los Angeles, in contrast, usurped San Francisco's historic role as the chief factory and warehouse of the Pacific states. Metropolitan Los Angeles held a 3.5 to 1 margin over San Francisco-Oakland in manufacturing employment in 1960 and a 4.3 to 1 margin in 1970. In wholesaling, Los Angeles and Orange counties moved from a 19 per cent edge in total sales over the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area in 1948 to a 134 per cent edge in 1977. If the figures are converted to a per capita basis, Los Angeles and Orange county sales grew from 60 per cent to 82 per cent of those in San Francisco-Oakland.

Population flows have reflected Los Angeles's role as the economic and social centre of the Greater South-west. The city is the most common destination for migrants from Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Nevada. It is a secondary destination for the entire American West. In the post-war decades it has attracted special flows of white migrants from the Missouri Valley and blacks from Oklahoma and Arkansas. Since the economic depression of the 1930s concentrated Mexican-origin workers and their families in a handful of Western cities, Los Angeles has also been the most important United States destination for immigrants from Mexico and the most important staging point for migratory farm labourers for the Pacific states.

As the American economy has shifted steadily towards international exchange and towards the Pacific Basin, Los Angeles has built new global roles directly on its established functions as the regional focus for the south-western quadrant of the United States.

In one example, Los Angeles and Long Beach over the last twenty years have emerged as one of the premier ports of the United States. The city's maritime ambitions date to the early years of the century, when the construction of the Panama Canal triggered a vision of Los Angeles as the halfway point between Europe and the Orient and 'the great harbor of the Southwest.' Realization of the ambitions waited until the 1970s, for as late as 1967 Los Angeles and Long Beach together loaded and received essentially the same value of goods ($2 billion) as did San Francisco, Oakland and other Bay Area ports ($1.8 billion). In 1986, LA trade at $63.8 billion was 3.5 times that of the Bay Area. In particular, other West Coast ports find it impossible to compete for import trade because the rich southern California market draws overseas shippers and shipping lines. Table 1 shows the increasing dominance of Los Angeles as both a Pacific
and a national port. Los Angeles-Long Beach held an equivalent share of lucrative containerized cargo, accounting for 51 per cent of containerized tonnage through West Coast ports in 1985 and 50 per cent measured in dollar value.32

The huge job market of greater Los Angeles has become extraordinarily attractive to a wide range of foreign immigrants who have taken advantage of the easing of American immigration law after 1965. The popular press now characterizes Los Angeles as the 'new Ellis Island', implying an ethnic variety comparable to that of New York in 1900. The foreign-born residents of Los Angeles fill the full range of economic roles - low-skill service workers, low-wage garment workers, skilled electronics assemblers, small entrepreneurs in retailing and manufacturing, scientific and professional workers.33 This pattern contrasts with Washington, where overseas immigrants are concentrated at the low and high ends of the occupational hierarchy, with native-born African-Americans filling many of the intermediate jobs.

Census data through 1980 support the understanding of Los Angeles as a key destination in the new American immigration. The city can be compared both with Washington and with San Francisco, the traditional cosmopolis of the Pacific states. Between 1970 and 1980, the number of foreign-born residents in the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area increased by 49 per cent, in metropolitan Washington by 92 per cent, and in the consolidated Los Angeles metropolitan area by 118 per cent. Data on year of arrival of foreign-born residents also show that Los Angeles and Washington benefited more substantially than San Francisco from immigration reform. Sixty-eight per cent of the foreign-born in the Los Angeles area in 1980 had arrived since 1965, 67 per cent of those in the Washington area, but only 56 per cent of those in the San Francisco area. Other studies show that more than most major American entry ports, Los Angeles is a final destination as well as point of arrival.34

Los Angeles is attractive to international investment capital because of the vital regional economic base. Local observers such as the Los Angeles Times noticed an upturn in investment in the second half of the 1970s. Canadian, Japanese, and other Asian investors in
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Table 2: Headquarters of 500 largest US companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Greater LA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>$4,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>$17,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>$53,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>$76,306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fortune Magazine, annual list of corporations.
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Table 2: Headquarters of 500 largest US industrial corporations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Greater LA</th>
<th>SF-O-SJ</th>
<th>SF:LA ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies</td>
<td>$4,817</td>
<td>$5,929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>$17,313</td>
<td>$12,594</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies</td>
<td>$53,500</td>
<td>$32,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>$76,306</td>
<td>$63,926</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fortune Magazine, annual lists of 500 largest United States industrial corporations.

Washington as a network city

In contrast to Los Angeles, Washington is a city that has grown on the basis of a series of network functions. Over the last century, it has evolved from a 'federal city' to a 'national city' to an 'international city' by adding information-generating and information-transmitting activities. Although the city's commercial-civic elite made repeated efforts to capture a significant commercial hinterland, especially between 1820 and 1860 and again between 1890 and 1930, Washington has never been able to define an effective regional role. Indeed, both periods of most active effort to build a regional city now
look essentially like timefillers during pauses in the growth of the city's network functions.

Washington was created, of course, to be the neutral seat of American national government. A federative nation in which sovereign states voluntarily ceded powers to a central government required a capital that was unattached to existing political or economic interests. The site was chosen in 1790 in a political bargain between Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State and leader of the nascent Democratic-Republican party, and Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury and spokesman for the Federalist party. Indeed, the site lay roughly midway in the region of Anglo-American settlement along the Atlantic coast.

As designed by Pierre L'Enfant, Washington was more a statement of national expectations than a real city. From 1801, when Jefferson became the first President to govern from the new capital, until the outbreak of the four-year Civil War in 1861, Washington was a small town. Attempts to channel the trade of the growing American interior through the Potomac River corridor and Washington failed to make it an effective competitor with Baltimore and Philadelphia. Its Chesapeake and Ohio Canal had stalled without crossing the Appalachian Mountains and its single railroad forced trade and travel through the larger cities of the American North-east. The Civil War itself, fought most intensively in the eastern theatre within a 250 km. radius of Washington, disrupted commercial relations with the city's immediate hinterland.

At the same time, however, the Civil War reconfirmed and intensified Washington's function as a federal city. Total federal government employment in Washington jumped sixfold from 2,199 in 1861 to 13,124 in 1881. It continued to grow at a slower pace for the next generation, reaching roughly 40,000 before the First World War. The presence of elected officials and a growing federal establishment made Washington a secondary social centre for the American elite. As described, for example, in Henry Adams's satiric novel Democracy, Washington's winter social season (while Congress was in session) attracted New Yorkers and Bostonians for weeks or months at a time. Washington's role as the 'federal city' was also apparent in the responses of more ordinary citizens. Observers might have noted the increasing numbers of tourists drawn by the nation's civic shrines, the Civil War veterans and widows pleading their cases at the huge new Pension Office building, or the students drawn to new federally chartered institutions such as Howard University.

In the final decades of the nineteenth century, Washingtonians began to express increasing interest in building on the federal role to become a true national city - a multi-faceted capital that attracted national institutions, private decision centres, public attention, and patriotic pride. As late as 1888, the British critic James Bryce could dismiss Washington in a few paragraphs as lacking nearly all the attributes of a true capital. Perhaps in response, Alexander Anderson's 1897 volume on Gns Viewed from a Material Stand destined to be a 'paradise for all of America' because of access to scientific agencies. It was also a site of important public movements' actions and travel. In Anderson's the Rome of America in the arts and the Paris of America as a capital.

By the start of the twentieth century, the federal interest in Washington's symbolic and ceremonial roles had increased. Local businessmen who wanted the city to be the factoring capital city faced a Congress that was not keen to channel the trade of the growing American interior through the Potomac River corridor. The Civil War itself, fought most intensively in the eastern theatre within a 250 km. radius of Washington, disrupted commercial relations with the city's immediate hinterland.

At the same time, however, the Civil War reconfirmed and intensified Washington's function as a federal city. Total federal government employment in Washington jumped sixfold from 2,199 in 1861 to 13,124 in 1881. It continued to grow at a slower pace for the next generation, reaching roughly 40,000 before the First World War. The presence of elected officials and a growing federal establishment made Washington a secondary social centre for the American elite. As described, for example, in Henry Adams's satiric novel Democracy, Washington's winter social season (while Congress was in session) attracted New Yorkers and Bostonians for weeks or months at a time. Washington's role as the 'federal city' was also apparent in the responses of more ordinary citizens. Observers might have noted the increasing numbers of tourists drawn by the nation's civic shrines, the Civil War veterans and widows pleading their cases at the huge new Pension Office building, or the students drawn to new federally chartered institutions such as Howard University.

In the final decades of the nineteenth century, Washingtonians began to express increasing interest in building on the federal role to become a true national city - a multi-faceted capital that attracted national institutions, private decision centres, public attention, and patriotic pride. As late as 1888, the British critic James Bryce could dismiss Washington in a few paragraphs as lacking nearly all the attributes of a true capital. Perhaps in response, Alexander Anderson's 1897 volume on Gns Viewed from a Material Stand destined to be a 'paradise for all of America' because of access to scientific agencies. It was also a site of important public movements' actions and travel. In Anderson's the Rome of America in the arts and the Paris of America as a capital.
g pauses in the growth of the e, to be the neutral seat of federative nation in which powered to a central government sched to existing political or in 1790 in a political bargain of State and leader of the y, and Alexander Hamilton, nan for the Federalist party. of Anglo-American settlement

hington was more a statement y. From 1801, when Jefferson rom the new capital, until the 1861, Washington was a small le of the growing American corridor and Washington failed to Baltimore and Philadelphia. stalled without crossing the le railroad forced trade and American North-east. The lively in the eastern theatre n, disrupted commercial rela­ land. l War reconfirmed and inten­ al city. Total federal govern­ ed sixfold from 2,199 in 1861 at a slower pace for the next before the First World War. The growing federal establishment entre for the American elite. ny Adams's satric novel season (while Congress was id Bostonians for weeks or as the ‘federal city’ was also any citizens. Observers might tourists drawn by the nation's d widows pleading their cases rg, or the students drawn to ch as Howard University.

th century, Washingtonians building on the federal role faceted capital that attracted entres, public attention, andish critic James Bryce could hs as lacking nearly all the ps in response, Alexander

Anderson’s 1897 volume on Greater Washington: The Nation’s City Viewed from a Material Standpoint argued that Washington was destined to be a ‘paradise for authors’ and the ‘great University City of America’ because of access to the Library of Congress and federal scientific agencies. It was already headquarters for a number of national organizations interested in ‘the promotion of great and important public movements’ and a focal point for national conventions and travel. In Anderson’s view, Washington could aspire to be the Rome of America in the arts, the Berlin of America in education, and the Paris of America as a city of beauty and pleasure.

By the start of the twentieth century, Congress had clearly defined the federal interest in Washington as the preservation of the city’s symbolic and ceremonial roles within the American domestic system. Local businessmen who wanted to promote Washington as a manufacturing city faced a Congressional desire to keep the city’s air and monuments clear of polluting coal smoke and its streets clear of unionized factory workers. The same policy would presumably please military retirees and ‘men of wealth or political prominence’ who established permanent or seasonal homes. The great replanning and rebuilding of Washington in the early decades of this century was certainly undertaken in the same spirit of creating a true centre for national institutions and pride. The architects and artists who constituted the famous McMillan Commission in 1901 consciously imitated the capitals of Europe in their rewriting of L’Enfant’s grand design. Over the next decades, the Commission on Fine Arts (1910), the National Capital Park Commission (1924), and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission (1926) worked to create and embellish the ‘public city’ of federal offices, open spaces, and national institutions. With almost no manufacturing and limited commercial business, there was little in turn-of-the-century Washington to interfere with its attractions as a ceremonial centre.

The reconstruction of Washington as a city ‘worthy of a nation’ contributed directly to its emergence as a national convention centre. As early as 1903, the Washington Board of Trade reported that the annual number of major gatherings had doubled in a decade. The Chamber of Commerce soon defined conventions as a ‘great commercial resource’ and took the lead in convention recruitment. Attention to conventions and to private tourism was tied to the completion of the American railroad system after 1900, when improved service and declining fares opened a new era of planned excursions, national expositions, and civic festivals that catered to school teachers, small businessmen, and other members of the American middle class. As local hopes for manufacturing faded in the 1920s, the Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade continued to push the idea of a national city, with the promotion of conventions, tourism, and air travel remaining at the top of the agenda.

Initial aspirations to develop Washington as a centre for national educational and cultural institutions proved harder to realize.
Despite periodic agitation, Congress was unwilling to create a comprehensive national university that would have competed with state and private institutions. Both the Catholic University of America (1889) and American University (1898) were founded as ‘flagship’ schools for particular religious denominations, but neither obtained the resources in its early decades to achieve its impressive goals. Indeed, the development of major research universities in the north-eastern and middle-western states after 1880 reduced the relative importance of Washington’s federal science agencies such as the Geological Survey, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Bureau of Standards.

In contrast, Washington held a central position as an intellectual centre for black Americans into the 1920s. The centrepiece was Howard University, conceived as a ‘national Negro university’ and promoted as ‘the Capstone of Negro Education’. Howard University faculty helped to make Washington a centre for black literature and art until the city was eclipsed by New York. Washington’s national role also attracted the headquarters of organizations such as the American negro Academy (1897) and the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (1915).

Washington’s full flowering as a national city has come between 1930 and 1970, when it added comprehensive regulatory and administrative functions to its earlier roles as political arena and symbol of national unity. The pencil-sharpener revolution of the New Deal, the wartime boom, and the hardening of post-war tensions into the Cold War raised the number of federal employees in metropolitan Washington from 73,000 in 1930 to 223,000 in 1950. The further expansion of activist federal government under the aegis of the New Frontier and Great Society raised the total to 327,000 in 1970. With one slowdown in the 1970s, metropolitan Washington has grown steadily from 620,000 residents in 1930 to approximately 3,500,000 in 1990.

The essential activity of Washington as an administrative capital is the network function of centralizing, processing, and disseminating information. One of the key engines of metropolitan growth has been the private brokers, users, and broadcasters of public information – journalists, lobbyists, consultants, and what Washingtonians call the AAA professions of attorney, accountant, and association executive. As early as 1946, journalist Jonathan Daniels commented that ‘the list of organizations standing guard around the Capitol and the White House runs for thirteen tight columns on yellow paper in the back of the directory of the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company’. By the 1980s, Washington was the home for more than 2,000 national trade and professional associations and hundreds of additional public interest organizations that range from the American Historical Association and American Association for the Advancement of Science to the National Electrical Manufacturers Association and the National Association of Dredging Contractors. In the 1980s, brokers have been followed by a like Gannett Communications quarters from New York to finance capital for instant access. Washington has also assumed the exchange of formal exchange earlier in the century, high city’s leading export industries have emerged as the non-teac university. Under entrepreneurial Institution has made itself the American history and culture, developed with the assistance of the National Gallery of Art (op the Kennedy Center opened ! consumer of culture. Such institution of Washington tourism, automobile and airplane touris regional travel patterns as or itself a major national tourist.
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Dredging Contractors. In the 1980s, these information and influence
brokers have been followed by a handful of major corporations. Firms
like Gannett Communications and Mobil have moved their head-
quarters from New York to Washington, trading easy access to
finance capital for instant access to political intelligence.51

Washington has also assumed a new importance for the centraliza-
tion and exchange of formal education and high culture. After lag-
ging earlier in the century, higher education has become one of the
city's leading export industries.52 The National Institutes of Health
have emerged as the non-teaching equivalent of a huge bioscience
iversity. Under entrepreneurial leadership, the Smithsonian
stitution has made itself the leading custodian and disseminator of
American history and culture. Other cultural institutions that have
developed with the assistance of the federal government - especially
the National Gallery of Art (opened 1941, expanded in the 1970s) and
the Kennedy Center (opened 1971) - have made Washington a key
sumer of culture. Such institutions have supported a vast expan-
sion of Washington tourism. As the national city in the age of
automobile and airplane tourism, Washington is able to reach beyond
regional travel patterns as one of the rare American cities that is
itself a major national tourist destination.

Washington's third stage of development as an international city
has built directly on its centrality within national information
etworks. The expansion of 'national capital functions' in the private
sector prompted business leaders such as developer Oliver Carr
and Board of Trade executive John Tydings to argue in the 1970s that
Washington was growing into an international business city. By the
1980s, civic organizations found it reasonable to assert that
Washington was a global political and financial co-ordinating centre
and a 'world center of research and information'. The Washington
Post supported the new world-city image with stories on the city's
cosmopolitan character - foreign real estate investment, foreign
residents, and even the number of Washingtonians holding passports
- twice the proportion in Detroit or Dallas.53

The same factors that worked to make Washington a national
business and information centre presumably operated as well on the
global scale. The Board of Trade's 1987 promotional brochure argued
that Washington is the place to be for companies engaged in world
markets. It houses key international financial institutions in the
World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and Import-Export Bank.
'For American firms,' argue the boosters, 'Greater Washington offers
a community of worldwide investment and trade organizations which
create an entrée to the far corners of the earth. For international
firms, Washington offers the US base of operations close to the
government regulatory agencies which oversee import/export
trade.'54 The result is now the denial that Washington has any
North American rivals except New York and possibly Los Angeles.

Washington's place within national and global information
networks is expressed in the intense centralization of its leading economic sectors. The core of the metropolitan area embraces eight distinct nodes of government and/or private sector office employment. On the north side of the Potomac River these include the historic downtown, the Federal Triangle, Capitol Hill, the Lafayette Square/DuPont Circle corridor, Foggy Bottom, and the South Mall/South-west Washington. South of the river are the Pentagon and Crystal City. Construction of a high-speed and high-volume subway system during the 1970s linked these several districts into a functional whole within which half a million regular employees and visitors can efficiently arrange face to face interaction.

Washington as a network city thus stands in sharp contrast to the regional metropolis of Los Angeles. Although a number of national corporations and international banks have rebuilt the west side of downtown Los Angeles in the last fifteen years, the city's central district absorbs less than a quarter of new Class-A office space in Los Angeles County. Instead of concentration, the city's diversified regional functions have spawned a dispersed set of office employment nodes scattered across 30 km. of neighbourhood and suburban landscape along Olympic and Wilshire boulevards, in Long Beach, around Los Angeles International Airport, in Glendale, in Pasadena, and in Orange County. Each of these alternative nodes offers a particular mix of local, regional, national, and international market businesses with particular abilities to serve regional needs.

Conclusion

For the information elite who staff its federal bureaux and Connecticut Avenue office buildings, Washington is very much the neutral territory anticipated two hundred years ago. The phrase ‘inside the Beltway’ is a pejorative reference to Washington’s supposed isolation from the common currents of life and thought in the rest of the United States. The same traits that have made Washington an ‘island’ or an ‘aberration’ within its region and nation, however, also make it an essential node within international networks. Indeed, its very peculiarity as an American city has given it a special role as a global city.

Los Angeles, in contrast, has grown as the regional metropolis for two overlapping North American regions. In its eighteenth-century founding and again in its later twentieth-century growth, Los Angeles has been a focal point for north-western Mexico. When its influence as a labour market, cultural centre, and source of capital crosses into Baja California, Sonora and other Mexican states, it is fulfilling a role that is formally international but essentially regional. At the same time, Los Angeles is the centre and symbol of the Anglo-American South-west, a six-state region roughly coterminous with the territories ceded by Mexico to the United States in 1848-53. As the ‘center of gr Angeles since the 1880s has: physical space. Los Angeles city-building the western Sunbelt long before
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1848-53. As the ‘center of gravity’ for the nation’s westward tilt, Los Angeles since the 1880s has signified freedom, opportunity, social and physical space. Los Angeles architecture, Los Angeles lifestyles, and Los Angeles city-building represented the openness of the southwestern Sunbelt long before the term was invented.58

The prominence that Los Angeles now enjoys within the much larger world of the Pacific Basin is a logical but ironic outgrowth of its earlier history. It grew into a metropolis of 7-8 million in 1960 because of reciprocal growth with the South-west. It has continued to develop into a cosmopolis of roughly 14 million in 1989 because of its prominence as the focus of one of the key component regions of the Pacific Rim. Even in the global system, it continues to be more important for the transfer of people and goods than for the concentration of intangible control and information functions.

The contrast between Washington and Los Angeles can be measured in their employment structures. As Table 3 indicates, Washington has developed a substantial edge in the number of professional workers essential to the operation of long-range information networks. Indeed, it leads all of the large American metropolitan areas in the proportion of such employees. A quadrupling of workers in the specific category of management consulting and commercial research between 1970 and 1980 (from 15,000 to 60,000) reflected the same dimension of the Washington economy. Los Angeles, in contrast, has paralleled national trends with slightly more than a doubling of such employment.

The two cases of Los Angeles and Washington demonstrate the simultaneous operation of regional and network forces in creating and defining the new global city. Neither central place models nor more recent restatements of finance capital models in the language of the information era are sufficient in themselves. In broader perspective, the preceding analysis tries to suggest that the larger set of emerging world cities needs to be understood as the product of both vectors operating separately on some cities and in combination on others. A Sao Paolo or Seoul is analogous to Los Angeles as the centre of a major productive world region, a Zurich or Vienna analogous to Washington as an information centre, and the most complex of world cities such as Paris or New York the products of both forces.

Carl Abbott
Portland State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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