Globalization is a central focus of research in contemporary human geography. The increasing connections among more and more places on the planet and the accelerated pace at which interactions occur mean that understanding places must entail looking at their situation and representation in relation to global economic, political, and cultural ties. We saw hints of this approach in chapter 2, but in this chapter, Seattle's global geographies are the central focus, providing a way to see Seattle as a global city in relation to three different regimes of global interdependency: as a competitive city, a collaborative city, and a curative city.

Seattle is undoubtedly a global city, but of what sort? At the end of the 1980s, local business leaders promoted it as a globally competitive, livable city. Urban development and renewal were to be built on growing Pacific Rim trade, software and biotech innovation, and the remaking of the downtown as a spectacular world-class urban destination. A decade later, this same vision of the city as a “24/7” meeting place for trade partners and advocates, techies, and transnational tourists prompted a successful bid to host the 1999 World Trade Organization meeting. However, arriving along with the trade officials for the much-anticipated event were other global citizens with much more radical ideas about how to make the livable city world class.

Environmentalists, students, unionists, and a wide range of human rights groups organized to remake Seattle into an altogether different sort of global city. Seattle was still envisioned as a gateway for border-crossing transnationals, but in November 1999 the polyglot citizenry swarmed the streets to redefine the meaning of world-class livability in terms of global justice, democracy, and more collaborative approaches to global living. The resulting confrontation made Seattle renowned in the world as a con-
tested global city, but, after the tear gas cleared, the visions of city and citizenship did not stop evolving. Thus today we see yet another global Seattle being built. Neither the promoters of market competition nor the collaborative proponents of global justice have gone away, but in the aftermath of their now-famous standoff, a third and arguably "curative" rethinking of the city is taking shape: a re-visioning of Seattle as a world center of global health philanthropy and other private-sector treatments for the mismatch between global markets and global justice.

From competitive global business city to collaborative global justice city to curative global philanthropy city: each vision of Seattle's global nature enables and exemplifies different forms of citizenship. These distinct forms of citizenship are important because they suggest how citizens are becoming denationalized in global cities. Studying a city such as Seattle provides a way of examining the so-called cosmopolitanism of citizenship on the ground. Following the argument of David Harvey, geographical research can also in this way reveal whose freedoms and what rights are at stake in metropolitan accounts of cosmopolitanism. But, beyond academic debates over denationalization, the changing articulations of city and citizenship are also of immediate local importance because of the ways in which each incarnation of a "global Seattle" has been lived and thereby layered onto the city's landscape.

To understand the different articulations of city and citizenship, it is vital to come to terms with how the competitive, collaborative, and curative visions of Seattle relate and respond to one another. They do not represent a simple

3.1 The skyscrapers of livability.
historical trajectory, because the competitive global city remains dominant. Yet, while it is vital to address the ways in which the city and citizenship have been transformed by the pro-market boosters of competitive global development, the second and third sections of this chapter show that alternative articulations of the collaborative and curative global city are also embodied in Seattle's landscape for all who care to look for them and remember.

One place from which to see the three incarnations of Seattle's global status is the observation deck of the Space Needle. Had you been there on November 30, 1999, you would have seen the office towers, hotels, and condominiums of the competitive global city (fig. 3.1). But at the same time you would have seen the helicopters and even some of the tear gas that police used against the Direct Action Network representatives as the union-led protestors massed and marched from an area beneath the Space Needle. It was the direct-action activists who so strengthened the association between Seattle and the global justice movement. They were the ones who chained themselves together at various sites around the Trade and Convention Center downtown, and who thereby ultimately succeeded in their goal of "shutting down the WTO." Yet, had it not been for the collaboration of vast crowds of other protestors in the big march coming south from the Space Needle—vast crowds "fifty thousand deep" in the haunting rap of Seattle's Blue Scholars—the police might never have been overwhelmed and the competitive business vision of a global Seattle would not have been so radically transformed.

In the pre-protest planning, the police and the mayor's office had imagined that most marchers would do a U-turn downtown and turn north, away from the convention center, away from confronting the WTO directly and back toward the Space Needle, where the crowds would disperse. Yet while this plan to save the business-friendly city failed spectacularly in 1999, and while the collaboration between marchers and direct-action activists instead ensured Seattle's new reputation as a global city associated with global justice, the rerouting of the calls for justice, democracy, and collaboration did, in a sense, come back north again to the South Lake Union area in the decade that followed. Thus, if you turn around to look north and east from the Space Needle today, an altogether different landscape becomes visible. Instead of the cosmopolitan crowds of Canadian, American, Mexican, European, and Asian protestors, you can now see signs of a different, more market-friendly cosmopolitanism. In the telling words of a 2009 Seattle Times article reporting on the Pacific Health Summit: "The glitterati of global health are gathering in Seattle," making the city the "Davos of global health."  

Most notably, near 500 Fifth Avenue North large displays advertising the work of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation picture people from all over the world as beneficiaries of global health philanthropy. Initiated in 1998, but officially founded a year after the Seattle protests in 2000, the foundation is now the largest (which is to say richest) private philanthropic institution in the world. Its new campus in South Lake Union, just a few blocks from the Space Needle, is set to be opened in the spring of 2011 (fig. 3.2) and is imagined by the foundation as a "hub for innovation and gatherings of experts from many fields, perspectives, and countries, who are dedicated to improving lives here and around the world." This work of innovation and gathering expertise is premised on the ethical axiom that, as the foundation's homepage says in capital letters, "ALL LIVES HAVE EQUAL VALUE." It is an ethical premise that clearly implies an inclusive and egalitarian conception of global citizenship, and there can be no doubting the foundation's core commitment to helping people everywhere in overcoming diverse forms of disease and dispossession. Moreover, the global health work that the foundation funds is not simply market fundamentalist, as critics sometimes suggest. Instead, its innovators see themselves as creating cures for "market failure." These cures are aimed at particular places and problems where capitalist market-making has been found wanting: for example, funding drug research for diseases that afflict the poor and that normally provide no profit motive for drug companies to get involved; or, organizing financial services for poor com-
munities shunned by big banks. Yet, as the managers at the Gates Foundation go about their business of funding these global market-curatives, their largesse also has considerable local labor and land market impacts, too.

Today’s South Lake Union is being transformed by global philanthropy’s vision of Seattle. Here, for example, you can find the imposing head offices of PATH, the Program for Appropriate Technology in Health (fig. 3.3), the largest single recipient of Gates funding (having received in the period up to 2007 forty-seven grants worth a total of $949 million, mostly for medical research). And here, too, as we shall explore further below, you can find all sorts of other nongovernmental organizations and research centers that are also nonprofit in name but, like PATH, notably entrepreneurial, businesslike and market-oriented in nature. In short, while the landscape of South Lake Union may not have been the site of crowd dispersion that the

3.2 The Gates Foundation campus under construction in South Lake Union.

3.3 The new place of PATH.
Seattle police had hoped it would be in 1999, it has ultimately become a place where the anti-capitalist calls for global justice articulated in the WTO protests have been rerouted into more market-friendly activities today.

We will reexamine the complexities of the hybrid philanthro-capitalist landscape at the close of the chapter for the lessons it teaches about the degree to which city and citizenship in the age of curative global philanthropy diverge from the competitive and collaborative models of global Seattle that have come before. To begin with, though, we must first explore in more detail what the boosters' vision of the growth-oriented and globally competitive livable city actually involved, before turning to examine its repudiation in the streets in 1999.

The Competitive Global City: Remaking Seattle as a World-Class Destination

"There is an extra perk that comes with living near the heart of downtown Seattle: global soul. A world-class city that hasn't lost sight of its down-home roots, Seattle offers urban living that trumps mere status with genuine international flavor."

This glowing advertisement for the “global soul” that is supposedly available to condominium buyers in downtown Seattle no doubt sounds a little generic and, well, soulless. Whether you have read something similar in an in-flight magazine or in the travel section or new homes section of your own local newspaper, the familiarity of the sales pitch from one city to another may make you overlook the fact that such property market promotion has a local history. To get a sense of this history in Seattle, it is worth pausing before leaving the Space Needle to consider some other signs in the landscape that tell us something about the longer term development of urban boosterism in the city. Its strategies and styles have changed over time, but it has a relatively long history, going back at least as far as the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition of 1909: a world’s fair aimed at showcasing Seattle as a city on the Pacific with ties to colonial opportunities in the Philippines and Hawaii, as well as to the gold of the Klondike.

From the Space Needle you can see a part of the 1909 fairgrounds, now transformed into the main campus of the University of Washington. By contrast, the Space Needle itself, along with the monorail and the nearby grounds of the Seattle Center, stands as a monument to another World’s Fair, which in 1962 sought to promote Seattle quite differently as a center of science, industry, and innovation.

Trading on the importance of Boeing and associated industries in the space race, the Century 21 Exposition of 1962 revised the frontier themes of the 1909 World’s Fair with a futuristic focus on Seattle’s leadership in the advancement of American technology and planning. The Soviet success with Sputnik I in 1957 had enabled the Seattle promoters of the fair to successfully lobby an anxious federal government for support, and thus the decidedly nationalistic and science-centric concerns of the space race meant that Century 21 turned into a classic Cold War concatenation of military-industrial capitalism, all presented as in the fun-loving interest of the liberal American citizen.

Today, the Space Needle, public fountain, and KCTS Public TV studios still remain as reminders of the modernism and public inclusivity of this liberal American citizenship (as does the Elvis Presley movie It Happened at the World’s Fair, which conveys the romance and fun of the exhibition along with a sense of trust in its public policing). Yet today, too, one can see more postmodern and privatized neoliberal landmarks (think Frasier instead of Elvis). These include: the plush make-over of the opera house; the nearby luxury condos; and, if you are out looking for a property to buy, the occasional sign emblazoned with the brand name—symbolizing the broader market take-over of the 1962 exposition themes—of what is now a real estate company called Century 21. Most conspicuous of all is the multicolored Experience Music Project (EMP) museum of rock and pop (fig. 3.4). There you can experience the affect and architecture of the transition from modern to postmodern urban boosterism in a place whose Web site tellingly boasts of being “a key economic driver among Seattle non-
profit arts and culture organizations ... with $580 million dollars of local economic impact ... [and] a spectacular, prominently visible structure [that] has the presence of a monumental sculpture." In all these ways, EMP illustrates how arts and culture are used in the crafting of "spectacular" world-class livability: a process that has gone hand in hand with the wider efforts to rebrand and rebuild Seattle in the era after the Boeing bust of the early 70s, after the Cold War, and after the related rise of postindustrial and postnational ideas about promoting individual cities in a globalized competition for investment and tourism.⁹

Created by the other Microsoft billionaire, Paul Allen, and designed by Frank Gehry, the EMP arguably continues the spirit of the 60s. But after paying the hefty entrance fee and putting on the headphone guides, visitors see and hear the rock and pop music as an assemblage of individualized and objectified museum experiences cut off from the shared sounds and communal vibes of the concert crowd. The outcome undoubtedly makes American rock more accessible and understandable for uninitiated visitors, but it also repackages the music's popular energy and occasional notes of radicalism in ways that diminish their social message. What is left instead seems to be just personalized cultural improvement tied to competitive global city promotion. Advertised as a world-class tourist destination, the EMP would therefore seem to co-opt and commodify the liberalism of sixties Seattle, transforming it into the same sort of neoliberal experience in individualized edification available to globe-trotting museumgoers everywhere, Gehry’s Guggenheim museum in Bilbao included.¹⁰ And whether Gehry calls himself a “deconstructivist” architect or not, the external architecture of the EMP building would similarly seem to deconstruct the changing meaning of citizenship in the world-class livable city: its fanciful outer skin swallowing up paying passengers who arrive on the mass-transit model turned tourist attraction that is today’s monorail.

The monorail’s changing symbolic significance notwithstanding, you can still take it back out of the EMP shell. If you do, the journey south toward the downtown brings many more landmarks of the globally competitive livable city into view. Through the Belltown neighborhood, new luxury condominiums are advertised to the left and right, nearly always, it seems, using images of swingers in sexy clothing or fitness gear to lure would-be buyers into the latest “hot” new urban lifestyle (read, real estate) opportunity. Then, after getting off the monorail at Westlake Center, the commercial heart of the livable city beckons and beats on all sides. Here are the brand-name shops: Abercrombie and Fitch, Anthropologie, Banana Republic, Niketown, Nordstrom, and Planet Hollywood. Here close by, too, is Pike Place Market, which, like Boston’s Faneuil Hall and other destination urban markets the world over, is now so full of tourists buying trinkets and T-shirts that it is hard to imagine how the vegetable stalls ever do a profitable business. And here also, not much more than a salmon toss from the Market, are many of Seattle’s famous fine-dining restaurants: Flying Fish, Campagne, Place Pigalle, Maximilien, the Dahlia Lounge, and Wild Ginger. Benaroya Hall, another asset in the livable-city portfolio, welcomes Seattle Symphony audiences into an atrium topped with Dale Chihuly glasswork. And just another block down Union—a street name that does not mesh well with the surrounding spectacle of postindustrial redevelopment—
the Seattle Art Museum offers its own good taste to the wrap-around picture of urbane livability.

While the picture may be pretty, the way it was painted was not. Securing “the spectacular city” instead involved the diversion of public funds into heavily subsidized commercial ventures, along with all sorts of authoritarian efforts to rid the downtown of the downtrodden and homeless. With the economic challenges facing the city after the busts of the 1970s and ‘80s, local leaders, such as mayors Norm Rice and Paul Schell, were pressured by the same worldwide economic forces that were imposing business-friendly norms of competitive urban investment and boosterism right across North America. At the same time, city elites saw the project of attracting the wealthy to downtown as simultaneously necessitating the marginalization of the urban poor. In other words, the project of revitalization also became about making citizenship in the city more exclusive. One reason why, it seems, was a chain of associations that linked the poor with urban legends about the decay and death of cities, associations that at the same time linked the wealthy with visions of vitality, livability, and global success. On the one side, there was the fear of decline—as with Detroit, Buffalo, and other cities in the U.S. rust belt. On the other side, there was the hope of winning in the international competition for investment like other competitive West Coast cities, such as San Francisco and Vancouver, B.C. Thus, urban governance was understood to be a bifurcated choice between industrial-era managerialism associated with supporting citizens of all classes (albeit unequally) and global-era entrepreneurialism associated with the gentrification of urban citizenship and the punitive policing and exclusion of the poor.

The shift toward more exclusive and authoritarian ideas about citizenship in Seattle also worked as something of a distraction from the investment of public money in all the new commercial and cultural ventures. These big public subsidies included millions of dollars for two new sports stadiums, and the fact that these stadiums still ended up being named after big private corporations was a good indication of who the real winners were in the entrepreneurial pursuit of global city competitiveness. However, and this is key to how citizenship in the livable city became increasingly exclusive, instead of being made to feel like losers themselves, the tax-paying public was instead encouraged to concern itself with the threats posed to security by a loser class of poor people. Following a pattern that is found in cities all around the globe, extensive efforts were made to reassure urban and suburban shoppers, visiting tourists, and professional office workers that the beggars would be banished. The livable city of the elites had to become unlivable for others.

Not all Seattle art lovers and concertgoers see the poor and homeless as noncitizens without rights to the city. It is true that some notable individuals and editorialists pontificated as if they truly believed this. An aggressive city attorney named Mark Sidran, for example, did his best to look like the Rudy Giuliani of Seattle by pushing a set of anti-vagrancy ordinances through the City Council in 1993, and these and other allied initiatives by city elites were welcomed by the ever worried Seattle Times editorial page. “Seatleites have made huge investments to make the downtown an economically viable, physically inviting place,” the editors explained. “Those achievements are threatened when some streets and parks become unpoliced havens for panhandlers and unruly drunks.” Likewise, the language later used in 1997 to defeat plans to build a service center for the homeless on Third Avenue near Benaroya Hall was littered with similar depictions of the poor as uncivil and unsavory subcitizens. “It’s like [putting] a meat rendering plant next to a high-income residential area,” argued one opponent of the service center. “It’s a safety thing,” explained another, “I might get accosted, I might get beat up, I might get robbed, I might get raped, or whatever.”

Structurally, the actual outcome of all the revitalization efforts, anti-vagrancy laws, and associated policing policies was to make urban citizenship more and more a matter of class privilege. In King County as a whole, growing income inequality shows up only as a small increase in the Gini coefficient from 0.144 in 1970 to 0.187 in 2000.
However, in Seattle’s downtown itself, the gentrification of urban citizenship was much more marked in increasing income inequality, increasing per-household income (which, in adjusted 2007 dollars, went from $28,669 in 1980 to $42,562 in 1990 to $63,088 in 2000), and in the imagination and enforcement of who belonged and who did not. The liberal American inclusiveness planned for Century 21 was replaced on the eve of the real twenty-first century by a neoliberal market-sorting that undermined the universality of an urban future for all. As John Fox and John Reese of the Seattle Displacement Coalition predicted in their campaign against Sidran’s ordinances: “When the civil rights of the poor and homeless are at stake, the rights of all of us are threatened.”

In terms of global city developments, one other aspect of the changing class composition of citizenship in Seattle deserves attention: the ways in which the global business classes became interwoven with the efforts to package and sell the Seattle scene internationally. While the poor and homeless were being banished and diminished as rights-bearing citizens, all sorts of efforts were afoot to make Seattle part of a global network of “gateway” cities, in which borderless business-class citizens and allied professional and consumer classes might enjoy new rights of membership and mobility transnationally. The binational, cross-border concept of Cascadia, for example, was promoted all through the 1990s and right up to the 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver and Whistler in the hope that, by bonding with British Columbia, Washington State (and Seattle) could attract more interest from cosmopolitan capitalists. The idealized Cascadian citizens as conceptualized by these binational boosters were not environmental activists (as in the original bioregional conceptualization of Cascadia), but rather capital-carrying global investors and tourists. This is reflected in the denationalization of citizenship in global cities more generally. Rights to buy property and make contracts, to move freely with work visas, or simply to enjoy fusion cuisine in other cultures can all be understood as developments to denationalize citizenship. The result is that the livability of the American global city is opened and sold to foreigners with capital, even as poor Americans (including, for example, many Native Americans in Seattle) are effectively excluded from full citizenship.

If we return to our tour of Seattle, the trip from the Space Needle south through the downtown leads us eventually to a site where the cheek-by-jowl juxtapositions of global-city citizenship and its excluded “others” (remember Benaroya Hall and the meat-rendering plant) are especially marked in the landscape. Walk between Pioneer Square, the International District, and the areas south of downtown called SoDo, and you will see signs of this extraordinary intersection on every side (SoDo itself suggests Soho/NewYork/London global city exclusivity). There are foreign tourists and city shoppers in the Pioneer Square coffee shops. Around the corner, to the chagrin of the local shop owners, are the homeless in Occidental Park and the hungry waiting for the Seattle Union Gospel Mission to open. Down the road on game days, sports fans head to their class-assigned positions in the stadiums (which accommodate more luxury corporate boxes than the Kingdome they replaced). If there is no game, there are still the business-day lines of professional staff heading into the headquarters of Starbucks, some returning from overseas trips for the company. Yet right by Starbucks is the SoDo Home Depot, with its all-American indication of the curtailment of citizenship for working-class cosmopolitans: Latino laborers lined up in hopes of being picked for work on local building sites. And right behind Home Depot and the Starbucks offices is a different kind of line: containers packed with the products of Asian laborers, who are themselves managed by far-flung, subcitizenship systems such as the hokou registration regime in China. In the summer, there are also cruise ships. Packed with retirees enjoying the last leisure opportunities afforded by diminishing social security, these excursions, again, tell a story of citizenship becoming more exclusive.

Back closer to downtown is the International District. Once a euphemism for Chinatown, the name now signifies the bigger story of Pacific Rim development and gentrification; the upscale Uwajimaya superstore and apartments,
for example, demonstrate the ways in which Seattle's Asian
ties now bring wealth and investment to the city, even if
the old rooming houses and cheap Chinese restaurants still
share space in the district.

In all these ways, the Seattle landscape illustrates
how class—something that most Seattle residents tend not
to talk about—influences who wins and who loses amidst
global city development and denationalization.

Capital, at least in the form of American dollars,
introduces another leitmotif in the selling of Seattle as a
competitive global city: namely, greenery. "Seattle, the
Emerald City, is the jewel of the Northwest, the queen of the
Evergreen State, the many-faceted city of space, elegance,
magic and beauty," or so claimed the Seattle–King County
Convention and Visitors Bureau back in the 1980s. Taken
from The Wonderful Wizard of Oz, though, the name Emer-
ald City also said something important about the eco-fash-
ioning of the global city. "Just to amuse myself," explained
Oz to Dorothy in the original story, "I ordered them to
build this City, and my palace. Then I thought . . . I would
call it the Emerald City, and to make the name fit better I
put green spectacles on all the people, so that everything
they saw was green." As Matthew Kingle outlines in his
eloquent account of Seattle's environmental history, this
allusion to the wizardry of Oz is telling because myths of
Seattle being closer to nature than other cities rest on simi-
lar spectacular illusions. Too much of the green spectacle,
it turns out, is like wearing green spectacles: the decline
of Seattle's salmon, for instance, is often obscured by the
widespread use of salmon signs and symbols in the visual
branding of the city.

Notwithstanding other ongoing environmental prob-
lems, such as the Duwamish Superfund sites, the worsen-
ing of Puget Sound's water quality, and the death of most
first-born Orca whales because of toxins that collect in their
mothers' milk, Kingle ends his own story hopefully, sug-
gesting that at least a few of their green illusions may now
lead Seattleites toward more genuinely sustainable models
of development. Whatever we may make of this, there can
be no doubting that along with all the sustainable develop-
ment discourse in the city, a great deal of what has actually
been sustained is the idea of world-class livability itself.
Again, the question of class—specifically, which classes
can see the green vision and partake of its rewards—needs
answering. In 2009 Outside Magazine named Seattle the
second-best U.S. city. The fact that Seattle was ranked
so high no doubt gave local promoters of the competitive
global-city vision another good reason to raise their glasses
of Washington State reserve wine. But when one reflects on
what was also factored into the ranking by the magazine—
including "percentage of college degrees" and "income
level," as well as "quality and proximity to biking, running,
paddling, hiking and skiing"—the exclusivity of the vision
becomes clear. Seeing green, like buying ski-tickets, clearly
costs, making the "outside" Emerald City livability features
accessible to class outsiders.

In 2006 a global-city newspaper report answered the
class question with unusual candor. The Seattle Post-
Intelligencer noted that the Urban Land Institute/Price
Waterhouse rankings of that year had rated Seattle the "top
global gateway city" in the United States, and it acknowled-
ged that high-ranking cities were "expensive and elitist,"
because "people pay a premium to live in them." Such
exclusivity was fine, though, the report reassured readers,
because it created a virtuous cycle of the real green stuff
of consequence, namely dollars: "Companies pay hand-
somely for brainpower," it went on, "so employees can
afford to live in these places. In turn, an affluent population
supports the art community, which drives tourism." It is
this neat ecosystem of profit-making that repeatedly turns
sustainable development into sustaining competitive capi-
talist growth in the global city. It also allows boosters to go
on selling the city as a great green place to live. But more
than this, it has also allowed businesses to turn Seattle and
its image of livability into a tool for selling other things,
including everything from outdoor sports equipment and
clothing to cars and SUVs advertised on downtown build-
ings and skyline.

Most notably, the imagery of the Emerald City has
become a way of globally selling another brand with green
signage: Starbucks. As James Lyons explains in his study of the Seattle-coffee connection, “retailers [such as Starbucks] sought to cultivate and mobilize associations with Seattle, and make explicit and oblique signifiers of the city crucial to their promotional and branding activities.” In this way, Seattle effectively reached competitive global city nirvana: its highly ranked livability helped sell a product associated with class distinction and good taste in many other places around the world.

Given the coffee connection to the Emerald City’s global branding, it is notable that since the financial crises of 2008–9, Starbucks has responded locally to falling demand by rebranding and shedding its green signs. The new strategy converts some of its coffee shops back into nonbrand local coffee shops. Might this reflect the falling stature of the Emerald City brand, too? After all, the financial crisis hit Seattle hard: emptying downtown offices, shops, and condos; lowering its gateway-city ranking, and spectacularly bankrupting the biggest Seattle-based bank, Washington Mutual. Here again, what is impressive about the promoters is their repeated return to the resources they see in the local landscape, always implying that its sublime physical geography somehow ensures Seattle’s success in the ongoing race to develop a globally competitive economic geography. Thus, in 2010 the Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce continued to promote the city with the following sound bites:

Ringed by snow-capped mountain peaks.

Crisscrossed by fresh- and salt-waterways.

Home to urban centers, small cities and vibrant neighborhoods.

Greater Seattle is an incredible place to live as well as to do business.

The continuing growth of the Puget Sound region is a clear indication of its desirability as a place to do business and to live.

What remains less remarked upon, but nonetheless is very noticeable in all the promotional idealization of the city, is the idea that its citizens should also be considered special and exclusive in terms of class. Education is key here, and the boosters are keen to underline that: “Residents are highly educated; in fact, Seattle consistently ranks at the top in national polls for college degrees per capita.” But important, too, are taste and income. Victories for local wineries are listed alongside all the “best city,” “fast city,” and “gateway city” successes. The high median household income for King County was projected at $67,338 in February 2010, and the Trade and Development Alliance states that “the Puget Sound region is a relatively affluent area.” Whether this observation is a discreet acknowledgment or a bragging boast, the underlying point about class is surely clear. Seattle is a city where wealthy transnational investors and tourists are warmly welcomed into the livability enjoyed by similarly privileged local citizens. It is a gateway city, in other words, that puts class exclusivity into the term “world class,” redefining belonging, ownership, and the mobility rights of citizenship in ways that are commensurate with the competition for global capital. In 1999 it was this same eagerness to embrace the leaders of corporate globalization that led the city to play host to the WTO. However, as we shall now examine in more detail, this invitation to the borderless business class cost the competitive global-city promoters dearly.

The Collaborative Global City: Retaking Seattle through World Class Resistance

“It is time to raise the social and political cost to those who aim to increase the destruction and misery caused by corporate globalization.”

So began the invitation to “Come to Seattle” by the Direct Action Network as it reached out to diverse groups, welcoming them openly to collaborate in staging the anti-WTO protests. “This will help catalyze desperately needed mass movements,” it went on, “capable of challenging global
capital and making radical change and social revolution." Clearly, this invitation was very different in tone and goals from those prepared by global-city proponents (a contrast also addressed in chapter 7). Before the protests, for instance, Mayor Paul Schell had depicted the WTO ministerial as a "momentous, exciting affair for Seattle." Going on to make the classic claims of a booster for world-class status, the mayor argued that hosting the event spoke "to the growing stature of Seattle’s place on the world stage."

Instead of joining the competition for global capital, the Direct Action Network’s invitation spoke to how such competition disciplines and diminishes citizenship and democracy. And, instead of class exclusivity, it called for class struggle and other struggles for global justice to be joined in shared nonviolent demonstrations in the streets. Thus, along with issuing the challenge to global capital, the protestors planned for a notably collaborative gathering that would be inclusive and radically democratic in its organization. These plans for the protests—which were extensive and involved all sorts of educational efforts—ensured, in turn, that the collaborations that ensued were multiple and far from just a singular, spontaneous outcry of the multitude.

The political philosophers Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri are no doubt right to claim that “the real importance of Seattle was to provide a ‘convergence center’ for all the grievances against the global system.” But such convergence had to be invited and planned, and this is where real on-the-ground collaboration became so important. At least three collaborations stand out for the ways in which they sutured together the reputation of Seattle as a global city and the idea of global justice. The first was the transnational cooperation of local and global activists sharing common grievances against corporate globalization and WTO rule-making. The second was the “Teamsters and Turtles” collaboration between the unionized working class and various environmental movements that joined the protests. And the third was what might be called the “No Globalization without Representation” collaboration between the direct action activists, who did the bulk of the organizing and planning, and the less radical, but nevertheless vast and engaged population of ordinary citizens for whom the reworking of the old revolutionary adage about taxation and representation resonated increasingly as the struggle over representational rights unfolded in and over the public space of the city. By examining each of these three collaborations in turn, it is possible to reflect on how they transformed the meaning of world-class citizenship by revising and re-visioning its urban geography.

The first collaboration, between local and global protestors, is important because one of the main mistakes made in media coverage was to ignore the “globalization from below” that the protests represented by simply dubbing them “anti-globalization.” The protestations were instead aimed at a very particular pro-privatization, pro-deregulation, pro-corporate approach to WTO-enforced globalization. A more nuanced and historically savvy description of this critical political position is “anti-neoliberalism.” But such nuance, along with the fact that the protests involved global planning, global participation, and global solidarity, could be negated by the “anti-globalization” label. This negation was easy to do from afar, not least because the involvement of a few right-wing, xenophobic, and anti-trade crusaders (such as Patrick Buchanan) could convince pro-business commentators and economists to conclude that all the protestors were simply old-fashioned “protectionists.” But for those who witnessed or joined the protests on the streets of Seattle, an altogether more global set of arguments and alliances could be seen and heard, advancing a new, postnationalist protectionism.

The old union chant, “An Injury to One Is an Injury to All,” reverberated loudly down Fifth Avenue in the march led by the AFL-CIO, but it was given new, postnational meaning by the attendant signs calling for a global struggle for a better, more humane, environmentally friendly, and democratically accountable approach to globalization (fig. 3.5). “The End of Suffering Comes about Locally through Global Solidarity,” read one. “No Child Labor,” said others. And “Free—to exploit people and nature—Trade” explained one of the spectral street puppets: making visible the
lack of freedoms for people and nature that haunt WTO-enforced free trade. If this was protectionism, therefore, it was based on a new postnational and nonchauvinistic desire to protect people and the environment everywhere. And further emphasizing both the promise and practicality of this new kind of protectionism was the profoundly globalized collaboration of local and global protestors in the organization, implementation, and celebration of the protest itself. As Anuradha Mittal has subsequently put it: “The World Turned Out in Seattle.”

While the Direct Action Network was sending out invitations ahead of the protests, another group, the International Forum on Globalization (IFG) based in San Francisco, organized an extraordinary teach-in on the WTO in Benaroya Hall. This free event generated such interest that it was virtually impossible to get in without reserved passes (a problem with access based on over popularity that was in telling contrast to the problem of access at the WTO meetings in subsequent days). The teach-in featured diverse speakers (including Vandana Shiva and a number of other foreign experts), who delivered powerful if pedagogic speeches explaining the destructive downward harmonization unleashed by WTO rule-making: the prohibition of seed-saving practices by TRIPS; the “race to the bottom” dynamic created by liberalized international competition; and the direct dismantling of environmental, labor, and community protections as a result of WTO nontariff barrier removal laws. These are all now lessons about legal neoliberalism routinely taught in university classes on globalization, but back in 1999 they arrived as insights from activists working around the world on the global impact of WTO law.

Carrying their lessons on corporate globalization into the streets on November 30, 1999, the IFG and associated international trade law activists went on to mingle with other cross-border organizers concerned with migrant rights, indigenous rights, and human rights. Anti-war signs, Canadian maple leaves, and Mexican flags were all abundantly evident, as too were all sorts of foreign-language signs held aloft by small contingents of protestors from Germany, France, Korea, South Africa, and the Caribbean. Moreover, many banners and placards held by these groups made it clear that it was precisely the cross-border character of their organizing that made it make sense for them to be there together in Seattle. Maguindara women’s solidarity organizers were there next to “FIX IT OR NIX IT” Canadian organizers; the Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice held up a banner saying “BUILDING POWER WITHOUT BORDERS IN THE SPIRIT OF OUR PEOPLE”; and a pro-Cuban group walked next to Chicanas and Chicanos carrying a sign saying “SOMOS UNO PORQUE AMERICA ES UNO.”

Joined together in the streets of Seattle, it was this polyglot crew of world citizens making their local-turned-global cases for another kind of globalization that then went on to merge with the direct-action activists battling with the Seattle police around the Trade and Convention Center. The merging did not go smoothly, and it would be wrong to suggest that the overall collaborative effect had the character of a centrally planned and well-coordinated action. In fact, union plans enforced by marshals wearing orange hats succeeded in steering many protestors away from the direction of the barricades and police violence.

Meanwhile, that violence combined with the opportunistic defacement of shop fronts by Black Block vandals, made many marchers nervous about going closer to the action. Odd scenes in which anarchy mixed with fascination and bewilderment were common. Yet, there was solidarity and a sense of shared citizenship amid the confusion. And, in the end, so many marching protestors filled the downtown streets that crowd control became impossible for the police. Running out of tear gas, they therefore had to abandon their initial efforts to clear the streets. As a result, WTO delegates found it next to impossible to leave their hotels, and even members of President Clinton’s administration complained to the Secret Service that they could not get to the Trade and Convention Center. The collaborative global city had made competitive global city winners into losers.

In showing that street protests in a world-class American city could produce meaningful resistance to global
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capitalism, the protestors also succeeded in making the name of Seattle an emblem of anti-neoliberal organizing across the globe. This, though, was not just about making Seattle a single signifier of global resistance. As significant as this semiotic association with anti-neoliberalism remained afterwards, there were also more material linkages with real-world struggles for global justice as well. As one of the organizers summarized for fellow activists in the days that followed, global collaborations with Seattle were real and happened in real time.

People across the globe took action in solidarity. In India thousands of farmers in Karnataka marched to Bangalore, and over a thousand villagers from Anjar in Narmada Valley held a procession. Thousands took to the streets in the Philippines, Portugal, Pakistan, Turkey, Korea, and across Europe, the United States and Canada. 75,000 people marched in 80 different French cities and 800 miners clashed with police.31

After 1999, what many global activists celebrated as “the spirit of Seattle” lived on and grew. The next WTO meeting took place in Doha in 2001, where active civil society engagement was effectively prohibited, but two years later in 2003, when the ministerial was held in Cancun protestors again pressed their critical cases, and the same happened again in Hong Kong in 2005. Over this time, campaigns against other institutions of global corporate governance—ranging from the World Bank and IMF to the G8 and G20—also continued to attract widespread “Seattle-style” opposition. In terms of citizenship, these subsequent developments meant that the collaborative global connections exemplified by Seattle went on to inspire a form of democratic denationalization involving civil society groups in other newly collaborative global cities across the planet. Prague, Gothenburg, Montreal, Mumbai, Genoa, Cape Town, Nice, New York, and even Washington, D.C., have all come to join this list. It is true that the policing of this new, global-city resistance has also become routinely draconian and preemptive in its zoning and targeting of protestors. In becoming more authoritarian, however, the policing reveals that the market-makers of global capital continue to be haunted by the specter of Seattle. In this sense, the ongoing repression of the global justice movement in other collaborative global cities further vindicates Seattle critics, who argued that the police reprisals made manifest the repressive unfreedom at the heart of global free-market rule-making. While academics and jurists may well go on debating what sort of spaces democratic states should provide for protest within particular national jurisdictions, the larger lessons spiraling out of Seattle relate to demands for a wider, denationalized, collaborative freedom across the planetary space of global citizenship itself. This then is no doubt why political philosophers conclude that “Seattle was the first global protest: the first major protest against the global system as a whole, the first real convergence of the innumerable grievances against the injustices and inequalities of the global system.”32

The second collaboration that further ensured Seattle’s global salience and transnational ties was the coming together of the “Teamsters and Turtles.” The sense of joy in this collaboration was evident on the streets. Environmentalists marched happily alongside rank-and-file union members, the two groups clearly moving beyond divisive stereotypes of one another. In terms of citizenship, the Teamsters and Turtles alliance also represented a re-imagination of the space of democracy: the global scope of environmental concerns helping at least at a symbolic level to denationalize union concerns about outsourcing and reawaken the old internationalist spirit made so famous by the International Workers of the World in Seattle in the early twentieth century. Speech makers from both the environmental movement and the unions articulated a shared global perspective on improving both environmental and labor standards globally. To be sure, some union placards still railed against the offshore siting of jobs. And some environmentalists still spoke of the need for environmental protections, without addressing the plight of workers. But on November 30, 1999, these ongoing tensions were
replaced by a shared global concern articulated loudly with linked arms in Seattle streets.

Capturing the collaborative qualities of the protests in their own philosophical style, Hardt and Negri also emphasize that “the unexpected collaboration of trade unionists and environmentalists was just the tip of the iceberg.”

The protests “brought together innumerable other groups expressing their grievances against the global system—those against the practices of huge agribusiness corporations, those against the prison system, those against the crushing debt of African countries, those against IMF controls of national economic policies . . . and so on, ad infinitum.” The Teamsters and Turtles alliteration stood for a much longer chain of allied social movement solidarities. It was for the same reason, though, that less sympathetic commentators pored scorn on the collaborations as sixties-style incoherence. Corporate globalization guru Thomas Friedman dismissed the protests in this way as “Senseless in Seattle”: “Is there anything more ridiculous in the news today than the protests against the World Trade Organization in Seattle? These anti-W.T.O. protesters—who are a Noah’s ark of flat-earth advocates, protectionist trade unions and yuppies looking for their 1960’s fix—are protesting against the wrong target with the wrong tools.” Given that Friedman subsequently went on to write a book that used the flat-earth metaphor to represent the world-changing implications of globalization, this was an especially egregious, and self-incriminating, effort at ridicule. The protestors were not out-of-touch flat-earthers at all, nor did they demand or represent a return to the American-centric anti-war radicalism of the 1960s. Instead, their transnational and trans-grievance collaboration in united criticism of the WTO effectively anticipated and argued against precisely the flattened vision of the world that Friedman himself went on to peddle in his best-selling book. In doing so, it also involved a third collaboration: a collaboration that used the tools of American democracy to argue for more global democracy in institutions of global governance such as the WTO.

NO GLOBALIZATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION was probably one of the most popular and powerful slogans of the whole protest. It was used by Sierra Club environmentalists and union protestors alike, and it clearly resonated with the wide variety of ordinary Seattleites who, at Benaroya Hall and elsewhere, clamored against the unelected, unaccountable, and generally undemocratic nature of WTO administration. As the Sierra Club sign made obvious, the slogan deliberately recalled the spirit of democratic uprising associated with the Revolutionary War. And out in the harbor, a protest stunt by the steelworkers union dumped fake steel bars from Asia in the water, in a reference to the Boston Tea Party. But the slogan itself—No Globalization without Representation—also departed from the original nationalism of “No Taxation without Representation” (not to mention the xenophobia of today's Tea-partiers). By substituting “globalization” for the American concern with “taxation,” it pointed postnationally toward a vision of global citizenship, to the idea that economic globalization had to come with the globalization of democracy. The primary target here was the WTO for not allowing any stakeholders except trade lawyers and trade ministers into meetings over trade complaints. But the larger argument, and one made powerfully and poetically in other signs recalling and revising U.S. constitutionalism, was that ordinary people need new ways to make global institutions more democratically accountable.

As the police confrontations became more violent and more people were arrested and imprisoned, a civil emergency was declared. City streets were cordoned off and the National Guard was brought in. In this context, the importance of demanding democratic rights became increasingly resonant locally as well as globally. Ordinary members of the Seattle public who joined the protests, and even just passersby, were arrested along with the direct-action activists. Residents of the Capitol Hill neighborhood where officers chased demonstrators and fired tear gas also experienced police violence and arrests. And those who were arrested went on to face further abuse and detention without access to legal counsel. As Jill Friedberg’s brilliant movie This is What Democracy Looks Like documents in detail, all of these developments only increased solidar-
ity among citizens, marchers, and activists. Outside King County jail, a huge vigil took place, and a chant that had already been heard all day reverberated into the night: “Whose Streets? Our Streets!” These and other similar moments illustrated that the demands for global democracy, such as those made by the Sierra Club and union protest signs, were suddenly, and for many people surprisingly, salient for Seattle citizens, too. Global justice had also come to be about local justice in the collaborative global city.

The Curative Global City: Remaking Seattle as a World-Class Philanthropy Center

“Every year, millions of people in developing countries die from diseases, including malaria and tuberculosis that have been all but forgotten in rich countries. For these diseases, the economics of the marketplace are not sufficient to commercially justify the large-scale investment needed to develop and deliver vaccines and drugs. Through global advocacy, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is working to address this market failure by promoting innovative health financing mechanisms that provide better incentives to the private sector to create global public goods.”

Providing here a frank acknowledgment of global health inequalities, explicitly referring to markets not serving the poor, and making references to “market failure” and the “failures of the marketplace,” Joe Corell’s explanation of how the Gates Foundation approaches its work sounds a little like some of the arguments made against the WTO in Seattle in 1999. Yet published on the Web site of the International Monetary Fund and emphasizing public-private partnerships as the correct cure for market failure, there are very big differences, too. The concern with global injustice and the desire to honor the idea that all lives are of equal value still obviously animate this vision of global health philanthropy. In this sense, the basic concept of global citizenship shares something with the inclusive impulses of Seattle in 1999. But, at the same time, democratic collaboration, support for governments resisting structural adjustment policies, and demands for popular protest and public accountability are not seen as ways to win global justice. Instead, the Gates Foundation focuses on strategies deliberately designed to cure market failure using private-sector incentive schemes and market-mediated innovations in global health, development, and education. Market fundamentalism, business-knows-best ideology, and an absolute faith in the power of markets are thus not radically challenged as they were in 1999. Instead, they have been revised and replaced by what is better termed “market foster-care” through diverse plans for micro-management and development.

Huge debates rage online between ardent critics (represented, for instance, by gatekeepers.civiblog.org) and sympathetic observers (represented by Matthew Bishop and Michael Green’s philanthro-capitalism.net) of the impact Seattle philanthropy is having on global health, development, and education. Here the much more specific aim is to ask how the philanthro-capitalist cures are related to Seattle as a global city and the denationalization of citizenship. The strong ethical insistence on the equal value of all human life in the statements of the Gates Foundation translates into a wider commitment by much of the rest of the Seattle-based global philanthropy community into seeing life across all national borders as worth saving. The concept of citizenship underpinning their efforts is in this sense global and denationalized. At the same time, a closer look at the details of the programs envisioned and implemented by Seattle’s philanthro-capitalists indicates that this same global inclusivity is also radically individualizing. The goals are about empowering individuals—not nation-states—to overcome disease and diminished circumstances where markets have failed. Thus, just as activists’ critiques of market failure are replaced by an emphasis on micro-market management, so, too, it seems, are the protesters’ ideas of collaborative global citizenship and collective responsibility replaced by an emphasis on individual empowerment and personal responsibility.
Along with the individualizing imperatives comes a notably entrepreneurial reimagining of the geography of intervention. Target areas for global philanthropic involvement are imagined and mapped as investment sites where the philanthro-capitalists seek to create the greatest possible return on their money. To be sure, the return is measured in terms of improved health outcomes, environmental enhancements, and human capital development rather than on purely monetary measures of capital. Yet, the broad investment vision and vocabulary, the talk of more health for money, and all the associated investments in innovations ranging from vaccines to transgenic seeds to water contamination measurement tools would seem to suggest that Seattle’s philanthro-capitalists bring some of the same business outlook to their approach to global empowerment as the city’s competitive boosters employ to advocate for local investment. What changes is that the investment logic is inverted: going outward from Seattle to the rest of the world and enfolding it in a reconceptualization of planetary space as the staging ground for Seattle’s global ambition. This approach is no doubt much healthier than the spread of Starbucks, but there remains nonetheless a certain sort of promotional logic at work that is very much of a piece with the ranking boasts that preoccupy Seattle’s more traditional urban boosters. The result, not surprisingly, represents a notable hybridization of the meaning of world class.

One example of the hybrid reconceptualization of world-class Seattle, produced by leaders of the curative global city, has been cartographic. Created by the Washington Global Health Alliance, it takes the form of world maps that represent all the other parts of the planet to which the global curative efforts of Washington State, and Seattle-based institutions in particular, are linked by the integrative ties and investments of global health development (fig. 3.6). The Washington Global Health Alliance’s global vision clearly represents something different and distinctly denationalized. Scaling up John Snow’s inaugural cartography of public health citizenship in Victorian London, it might even be argued to represent a new “ghost map” of global public health citizenship. But investment-oriented and promotional as it is—a form of mapping that would register cholera deaths as a new opportunity for targeted curative capacity-building rather than as an indication of an infected water source—this denationalized remapping of health citizenship clearly has a local agenda. In short, it represents an attempt to leverage local economic development opportunities out of the global developments being planned by Seattle’s philanthro-capitalists. As a result, Washington Global Health Alliance meetings have featured Washington State’s senators and governors celebrating what they see as the local job and growth opportunities tied to global health, and reports from these gatherings help highlight the ways in which the curative global-city vision emerges from the ongoing tension between competitive and collaborative ideas about Seattle’s ties to global health.

“Global health is now part of our region’s economy,” explained Senator Patty Murray at one joint Health Alliance and Chamber of Commerce meeting in 2008. Her colleague, Senator Maria Cantwell, added that the economic impact included an extra $4 billion in business activities in the state. The reporter commenting on the resulting big business interest in this emergent “industry” further captured the way in which enduring concerns with the competitive global city rankings race were overshadowing the proceedings. “The field of global health, once perhaps regarded as a noble humanitarian endeavor aimed at healing and helping the world’s poorest people,” he began, “is now becoming something of an ‘emerging industry’ that the Seattle business community sees as a highly competitive enterprise that is ours to lose.”

The same reporter went on in his article to highlight more collaborative concepts of the region’s role in global health still being articulated at the conference. “The bottom line here is jobs and income for us as opposed to being focused on assisting poor people in the developing world,” argued Dr. Steve Gloyd, the head of Health Alliance International (HAI) and director for global health curriculum at the University of Washington. Joining him in resisting all the corporate pressures, Wendy Johnson, another UW and HAI
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doctor, said: “I think it’s a slippery slope. Once you define this as an industry, you tend to start investing in the kinds of projects that support jobs and programs rather than in what’s really needed to solve health inequities in poor countries.”

What makes these tensions over the meaning of global health in Seattle especially significant is that they help explain how the curative philanthro-capitalist vision sees things in relation to the tension. The same reporter concluded his article by quoting Cheryl Scott, the conference co-chair and a senior adviser at the Gates Foundation. She told him that “she understood the concern about treating global health as if it were just another commercial enterprise.” However, she explained, this was largely a semantic tool aimed at arriving at a “framework” for building a unique kind of public-private partnership. “None of this is to imply that we (the Gates Foundation) think global health can work solely as a private model,” she said. Contrary to the criticism that the Seattle philanthropy favors privatizing global health, Scott said that many of their projects are being done “in close collaboration with Third World governments.” With ongoing pressure from global public health advocates who emphasize strengthening health systems, and with their own rigorous commitment to objective results assessment, it is no doubt true that the Gates Foundation and other allied institutions in the city will continue to build global collaborations. Indeed, with new critical
studies published in medical journals posing questions about "the geographical location of primary recipients [of funding]," the pressure to share the wealth outside of Seattle looks set to rise. As they go global, though, Seattle's philanthro-capitalists also continue to build new buildings in South Lake Union, and here the pull on curative global city ideas seems very much more in the direction of the competitive global city with which we began.

One sign of the times that indicates which way global Seattle is headed is that the Seattle Displacement Coalition, which fought for the rejected downtown service center and against Sidran's ordinances, now finds itself fighting publicly subsidized gentrification in South Lake Union. In 2008 John Fox of the coalition complained thus that in the seven preceding years over $100 million in public city funds had gone into the redevelopment of South Lake Union, much of it supporting the property development plans of the real estate company Vulcan owned by Paul Allen. This amount almost equaled what Allen had hoped to win originally from the public when a referendum was held on his vision for an Upper East Side plus Central Park plan of a "Seattle Commons" in South Lake Union. But having rejected that plan in a referendum in 1995, the public is still providing the money and, as it were, getting the upper east side but not much park space. Going forward, Fox further fears that many more municipal dollars will be used to support Vulcan's high-rise plans for the area, with global health humanitarism and Emerald City sustainability both playing their part in "green washing" the corporate demands for higher height limits on South Lake Union's skyscrapers.

While the old commons continue to become increasingly about public-private partnerships in South Lake Union, the boosters of the competitive global city have added the area's soaring global philanthropy reputation to their own playbook of promotional props. A local "Prosperity" blog put it like this in late 2009:

There's been a lot of buzz about the region's growing global health industry over the last two years, and for good reason: with the largest philanthropic investor in this industry in the world (Gates Foundation) here in our backyard, combined with leading research institutions in global health (University of Washington's School of Global Health, Seattle Biomedical Research Institute), and internationally recognized service delivery organizations (PATH), we're pretty well situated to become THE epicenter for this industry in the world. But a lot of people are still confused as to how a cluster that's focused on helping the world's poorest people survive the world's most widespread diseases translates into economic prosperity for our region.

Confused as they might be at the start, their confusion seems unlikely to last long after they turn to the Web sites of the Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce or the Trade and Development Alliance, where all sorts of high-ranking success stories of Seattle's global health business class are recorded, alongside the enduring hype about the region's natural future as a victor in other global city championships. In this sense, the curative global city assets merely help complement an earlier reliance on Boeing, Microsoft, Amazon, and Starbucks as growth generators. Now in addition, we are told, we can rely further on Zymogenetics, Heartstream, Alcide, Immunex, Physio-Control, and the Siemens Medical Systems' Ultrasound Group, and all these private corporations can in turn rely for expert support and labor market synergies on the public-private, philanthro-capitalist complex of South Lake Union.

In February 2010 a new Global Health Nexus venture was launched, "aimed at bringing together the expertise of local life-science companies, global-health researchers, businesses and nonprofit groups." The venture further highlighted the ongoing effort to harness curative philanthropy to the larger project of selling Seattle and competing globally for foreign markets and cosmopolitan investment dollars. Summing up this promotional vision, Bob Aylward, the executive vice president for business operations for the Seattle Mariners, described the rationale for the Global Health Nexus to the Seattle Times: "We're sitting on the edge of a magnificent opportunity for this region to take this differentiated product, global
health, and brand it as a sector that can go out and attract worldwide attention.” Meanwhile Chris Rivera, president of the Washington Biotechnology and Biomedical Association, explained to the same Seattle Times reporter that industry really did see denationalized global opportunity in the curative global city’s global reach. “For a for-profit private biotech company, the fastest emerging markets are the developing nations,” he said. “We have to figure out how to partner with the organizations that already understand these markets.”

From curing the world to competing in world markets, the denationalized but clearly also commodified and corporatized vision of the Global Health Nexus seems to take us back to the age-old competitive concern about promoting Seattle as a global market leader.

The co-optation of global health for selling the city in the old game of global boosterism will seem for many a bitter pill to swallow. But if the historical geography of Seattle’s ongoing remaking as a global city tells us anything, it is that the definition of citizenship is always in flux, always being contested, and always, therefore, up for grabs. The Chamber of Commerce and the downtown elites may now be championing denationalized global citizenship in ways that trump global health with global competition, but the advocates of a collaborative global Seattle have not given up on the city. In 1999 the citizenry made Seattle stand for something different, and the memory of “No Globalization without Representation” continues to serve as a reminder of other more critical and collaborative conceptualizations of the global city that won’t go away. Global soul is not always for sale, and, this city reminds us that there is going to be a battle for it—an ongoing Battle of Seattle over the meaning of world class.
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While focused on a so-called First World city, this present chapter is part of a broader project to decenter such cities as normative models in competitive global rankings. This can most obviously be done by refocusing attention on city regions outside of North America and Northern Europe (e.g., Matthew Sparke et al., “Triangulating the Borderless World: Geographies of Power in the Indonesia-Malaysia-Singapore Growth Triangle,” Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, n.s. 29 (2004): 485–98; and Ananya Roy, “The 21st-Century Metropolis: New Geographies of Theory,” Regional Studies 43 (2009): 819–30. But, as Ananya Roy suggests, we also need to revisit how cities “everywhere”—including in the West—are “worlded” by social ties and political tensions that variously transect and transcend traditional global city competitiveness hierarchies. By engaging with questions of denationalized citizenship in the worlding of collaborative Seattle and curative Seattle, this chapter seeks to contribute in this cross-cutting way.
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