



Delft University of Technology

Selling Smartness

Corporate Narratives and the Smart City as a Sociotechnical Imaginary

Sadowski, Jathan; Bendor, Roy

DOI

[10.1177/0162243918806061](https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243918806061)

Publication date

2019

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

Published in

Science, Technology & Human Values

Citation (APA)

Sadowski, J., & Bendor, R. (2019). Selling Smartness: Corporate Narratives and the Smart City as a Sociotechnical Imaginary. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 44(3), 540-563.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243918806061>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Science, Technology, & Human Values

Selling Smartness: Corporate Narratives and the Smart City as a Sociotechnical Imaginary

Journal:	<i>Science, Technology, & Human Values</i>
Manuscript ID	ST&HV-2018-01-018.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keyword:	smart city, sociotechnical imaginary, digital technology, discourse, corporate
Abstract:	<p>This article argues for engaging with the smart city as a sociotechnical imaginary. By conducting a close reading of primary source material produced by IBM and Cisco over a decade of work on smart urbanism, we argue that the smart city imaginary is premised in a particular narrative about urban crises and technological salvation. This narrative serves three main purposes: (1) it is an overarching structure used to fit different ideas and initiatives into a coherent view of smart urbanism; (2) it is a vehicle to sell and spread this version of smartness; and (3) it serves to crowd out alternative visions and corresponding arrangements of smart urbanism. Furthermore, we argue that IBM and Cisco construct smart urbanism as both a reactionary and visionary force, plotting a model of the near future, but one that largely reflects and reinforces existing socio-political systems. We conclude by suggesting that breaking IBM's and Cisco's discursive dominance of the smart city imaginary requires us to reimagine what smart urbanism means and create counter-narratives that open up space for alternative values, designs, and models.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Selling Smartness: Corporate Narratives and the Smart City as a Sociotechnical Imaginary

Abstract

This article argues for engaging with the smart city as a sociotechnical imaginary. By conducting a close reading of primary source material produced by IBM and Cisco over a decade of work on smart urbanism, we argue that the smart city imaginary is premised in a particular narrative about urban crises and technological salvation. This narrative serves three main purposes: (1) it is an overarching structure used to fit different ideas and initiatives into a coherent view of smart urbanism; (2) it is a vehicle to sell and spread this version of smartness; and (3) it serves to crowd out alternative visions and corresponding arrangements of smart urbanism. Furthermore, we argue that IBM and Cisco construct smart urbanism as both a reactionary and visionary force, plotting a model of the near future, but one that largely reflects and reinforces existing socio-political systems. We conclude by suggesting that breaking IBM's and Cisco's discursive dominance of the smart city imaginary requires us to reimagine what smart urbanism means and create counter-narratives that open up space for alternative values, designs, and models.

Introduction

Few urban development models are as popular as the smart city. Urban scholars, technology designers, municipal bureaucrats, and, of course, city dwellers may find it difficult to avoid the term and, no less important, to elude the consequences of its materialization. But just what is the smart city? What is this thing that seemingly exists in a liminal space between marketing and materiality, imagination and implementation, becoming and being? The answer is not clear (Angelidou, 2015; Hollands, 2008; McFarlane & Söderström, 2017). And while some definitions identify the smart city with its technical infrastructure, the smart city is not equivalent to any single technology or collection of technologies. The sensors, networks, and algorithms associated with the smart city could be deployed in other settings and contexts. What makes them “smart city technologies,” therefore, is neither strictly technical (pertaining to functionality, instrumental causes, or driven by efficiency) nor entirely social (produced by specific actors, reflecting particular incentives, or embraced by certain institutions). Smart city technologies become smart city technologies only by association with the idea of the smart city and the narratives, logics, practices, and symbolism of which it is constituted. As a consequence, the smart city can be seen as both a container for innovation and a yardstick for evaluating innovation.

Ostensibly, “smartness” refers to the intelligence of technology. As the logical conclusion of the cybernetic dream of frictionless control, coordinated command, and optimal reactions, smartness serves as a measure of a technology’s context-specific adaptability. Smart systems are meant to deploy data-driven analytics, networked communication, and algorithmic decisions to respond in real-time to complex, dynamic situations (Kitchin, 2014). The ability to act autonomously, appropriately, and promptly is seen as a way to add value to a range of products and services, whereby scaling up the advancement of smartness will “force economic growth” and “force societal progress,” as IBM’s CEO, Ginni Rometty (2013b) proclaimed.

When smartness is projected onto the city as a whole, it exceeds its technical premise and becomes a cornerstone for an urban sociotechnical imaginary (Jasanoff & Kim, 2009; 2015): a set of ideas, beliefs, and visions about the future of urbanity. As a sociotechnical imaginary, the smart city is always in the process of becoming – expanding in both scope and reach. We aim to illustrate this process by critically analyzing documents produced by two of the largest players in the smart city marketplace of ideas and systems: IBM and Cisco. We argue that these documents comprise a narrative according to which the smart city appears as an inevitability, the only reasonable response to an impending urban crisis. At the same time, since the smart city as an “actually existing” sociotechnical assemblage is still nascent, we argue that the smart city is an anticipatory vision – even a self-fulfilling prophecy. It is a set of orienting assumptions and operationalizable propositions about urban planning and development. Indeed, smart urbanism is about the very constitution of what Saskia Sassen (2013) calls “cityness.” This paper, therefore, analyzes how corporate narratives seek to provide the parameters of cityness – and, in the process, preclude alternative imaginaries – by constructing and extending the smart city sociotechnical imaginary.

The Smart City as a Sociotechnical Imaginary

Sociotechnical imaginaries, writes Sheila Jasanoff, indicate “the myriad ways in which scientific and technological visions enter into the assemblages of materiality, meaning, and morality that constitute robust forms of social life” (2015a, p. 4). The concept encodes the imbrication of science, technology, and society – how “imagination, objects, and social norms... become fused in practice” (Jasanoff, 2015b, p. 321). This is reflected in the definition of sociotechnical imaginaries as “collectively held, institutionally stabilized, and publicly performed visions of desirable futures, animated by shared understandings of forms of social life and social order attainable through, and supportive of, advances in science and technology” (Jasanoff, 2015a, p. 4). Sociotechnical imaginaries illustrate the symmetrical relation of technoscience and society, which results in the co-production of “political orders and technoscientific projects” (McNeil et al., 2017, p. 449). In a sense, then, the

1
2
3 presence of sociotechnical imaginaries undermines attempts to
4 compartmentalize technoscientific and sociopolitical discourses, thus providing
5 Science and Technology Studies with a much needed normative perspective
6 (Jasanoff, 2015a, p. 5) while also expanding the conceptual vocabulary of critical
7 constructivism (Feenberg, 2017).
8
9

10 Sociotechnical imaginaries cut through longstanding cultural categories built
11 around the dyadic relations of mental and material phenomena. As a concept,
12 they help us strike a better balance “between the theoretical poles of abstract
13 idealism and deterministic materialism” (Jasanoff, 2015a, p. 22). By bridging
14 idealism and materialism – that liminal space where the smart city exists –
15 sociotechnical imaginaries play a critical role in framing what technology is made
16 and why. “Whereas science and technology were formerly generally regarded as
17 the domains of facts and artifacts, they are now also associated with storytelling,
18 imaging, and imagining” (McNeil et al., 2017, p. 457). These mediums are where
19 sociotechnical imaginaries are forged, stabilized, and propagated, and where
20 alternative imaginaries compete for the power to establish which narratives and
21 ideas take hold. When it comes to highly contested and highly consequential
22 topics like the smart city or nuclear energy (Jasanoff & Kim, 2009), the
23 competition to establish a particular sociotechnical imaginary is often dominated
24 by powerful institutions.
25
26
27

28 With few exceptions (e.g., Smith, 2009; 2015), the majority of research on
29 sociotechnical imaginaries has focused on the state as the central site for the
30 evolution and expansion of sociotechnical imaginaries, specifically via national
31 policies, regulations, and institutions (Jasanoff & Kim, 2009; McNeil et al., 2017).
32 Our focus here, however, is on corporate actors. Although policymaking plays an
33 important role in streamlining and applying smart city technologies – and
34 governments have marshalled the discourses and practices of smart urbanism to
35 enact austerity agendas (Pollio, 2016) and expand their power (Ho, 2017) –
36 corporations originate and extend the smart city sociotechnical imaginary. Large
37 technology vendors set the tone, enroll other actors, and weave the narratives
38 that make possible the smart city’s actualization (Hollands, 2015; Södeström et
39 al., 2014).
40
41
42

43 In this vein, Hollands (2008) shows that the “smart city” label is an object of
44 boundary work by those who wish to define and claim smartness on their own
45 terms. This remains true today, as evidenced in recent work that examines the
46 role of IBM, the largest smart city proprietor, in constructing smart urbanism
47 through discursive means (Greenfield, 2013; McNeil, 2015; Wiig, 2015). Through
48 an exploration of “the origin and development of IBM’s pervasive and influential
49 Smarter Cities strategies,” McNeil (2015) describes how the company
50 strategically shifted from a hardware manufacturer to a consultancy firm and
51 service provider. With this the company sought to enact a form of “global smart
52 city policymaking”, using projects and rhetoric that enroll cities into adopting
53 IBM’s proposals for smart urbanism (Wiig, 2015, p. 258; Alizadeh, 2017).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 However, as Wiig (2016) explains, a city can also use IBM to sell a positive
4 image of itself as an attractive place for private investment, regardless of whether
5 the smart initiative actually solves its intended problem. The smart initiative can,
6 in a way, succeed just by virtue of its discursive power. The question then
7 becomes who does it succeed for and who exerts agency over the initiative?
8 Such questions, we argue, can be better answered if we see the smart city for
9 what it is: a sociotechnical “urban imaginary” (de Waal, 2014).
10
11

12 The success of new sociotechnical imaginaries relies on their fit with existing
13 cultural norms and moral values, social structures and material infrastructure,
14 political institutions and economic systems, hopes and aspirations. Importantly,
15 this process often takes place through the use of narratives, which help render
16 imaginaries as intuitively recognizable, understandable, digestible, and relatable
17 (Hurlbut, 2015; Jasanoff & Kim, 2009; 2015). Not only do narratives seed beliefs,
18 shape understandings, and form associations, they can also be a clarion call that
19 “helps create the political will or public resolve to attain [a sociotechnical
20 imaginary]” (Jasanoff & Kim, 2009, p. 123). At the same time, the circulation of
21 compelling narratives does not guarantee the frictionless propagation of
22 imaginaries.
23
24
25

26 Like other sociotechnical imaginaries, the smart city is a field of struggle over the
27 political imagination. We should think of these corporate discourses as a tool for
28 directing and delimiting what we can imagine as possible. As this paper shows,
29 IBM and Cisco do not set out a suite of scenarios that represent radically
30 different visions and politics. There are variations to the services they offer, but
31 rarely do they deviate from reflecting and reinforcing the technocratic and
32 neoliberal precepts that motivate this vision of smart urbanism (see also Levenda
33 et al., 2016; Sadowski & Pasquale, 2015). Their aim is to establish *their* version
34 of smartness as *the* future – the only one available or possible. Nonetheless,
35 there are alternative imaginaries that are opposed to the corporate imaginary,
36 which are built on, for example, ideas of urban social justice (McFarlane and
37 Söderström, 2017), urban commons (Borch & Kornberger, 2015), or civic hacking
38 and openness (Townsend, 2013). There is even the rare case of a city like
39 Barcelona, which was a testing ground for Cisco’s technology until a radical leftist
40 mayor took office in 2015 and instituted a new vision of the smart city based on
41 initiatives like a “city data commons” and participatory civic platforms (Morozov
42 and Bria, 2018).
43
44
45
46

47 Yet, as important as these counter-imaginaries are, they are dwarfed by the
48 scale and influence of IBM and Cisco. The hegemonic mission statement of the
49 corporate imaginary echoes the Thatcherite declaration “There is no alternative.”
50 The slogan could also just as well be, “There is no debate.” By seeking to
51 dominate the discursive field and capture the imagination of city leaders, IBM and
52 Cisco aim to ensure that alternative smart city imaginaries remain effectively
53 closed off. It follows that if we are to open the space for alternatives and counter-
54 imaginaries, then we need to first understand the principles and attributes of the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 dominant imaginary as a way of better knowing what needs to be challenged and
4 how.
5

6
7 Whereas existing discursive analyses of the smart city have focused on specific
8 ideas promoted by corporate initiatives or sought to reveal the neoliberal ideology
9 of their marketing brochures, relatively little attention has been paid to explicating
10 the overarching narrative that forms the foundation of the smart city imaginary.
11 Moreover, while most work focuses on IBM, we also undertook an in-depth
12 analysis and comparison of Cisco in order to demonstrate how multiple major
13 tech companies are simultaneously constructing the same narrative. In this way
14 we hope to augment critical analyses of the technical aspects of the smart city
15 with an analysis of the powerful imaginary by which the smart city is realized. No
16 less important, we hope that by pointing to the incompleteness and
17 indeterminacy of the smart city as a sociotechnical imaginary our analysis will
18 signal that there is still room to intervene in the smart city's development.
19
20
21

22 23 **Two Companies, One imaginary**

24
25 Many large corporations and government agencies have staked out their place in
26 the market for smart city systems and services. Projections for the market value
27 of the smart city sector hover around \$1 trillion dollars by 2020. While some
28 market research firms are bullish – Frost & Sullivan (2014) projects the value at
29 \$1.56 trillion – even conservative forecasts tend to be north of \$500 billion
30 (Future Cities Catapult, 2017). However, a small number of firms dominate the
31 sector (Navigant Research, 2016), and at the forefront stand two firms, IBM and
32 Cisco, which have both made a conscious shift towards creating the ways we
33 understand, imagine, and implement smartness. Both of these tech giants
34 pivoted towards smart cities around the same time, doing so years earlier than
35 many of their current competitors. IBM's top executive at the time, Samuel
36 Palmisano, first announced the company's vision for a "Smarter Planet" in a 2008
37 speech to the Council on Foreign Relations. This program includes a slew of
38 interrelated projects that tack "smarter" onto a range of topics, like water, energy,
39 and electronics. Cisco was not far behind, announcing in 2009 a "holistic
40 blueprint for Intelligent Urbanisation" (which became "Smart+Connected
41 Communities"), similarly tying together different sectors like transportation,
42 security, and government administration (Cisco, 2009).
43
44
45
46

47 By leveraging their first-to-market achievements and continuous investment in
48 technological development and marketing, IBM and Cisco have been able to
49 essentially set the terms by which the smart city is promoted and implemented.
50 While they do not have an iron-fisted authority over what smart urbanism means,
51 they wield outsized influence. In the business parlance, IBM and Cisco are well
52 established "thought leaders" of the smart city. Rankings of market size and other
53 metrics consistently put IBM and Cisco at the top. For instance, since at least
54 2013 Navigant Research, a market analysis and consulting firm focused on
55
56
57

1
2
3 technology trends, has been ranking “smart city suppliers” (Navigant Research
4 2016). While other companies move around the leaderboard and jockey for
5 positions, IBM and Cisco retain the top two spots. According to Navigant’s
6 criteria, they are the only suppliers categorized as “leaders.” Even as other
7 companies, both small startups and major multinationals, edge into the business
8 of smart urbanism, IBM and Cisco have maintained a dominant position in the
9 market.
10

11
12 Moreover, whether intended or not, IBM and Cisco’s approaches to the smart city
13 tend to be complementary. Whereas IBM focuses heavily on software and
14 consulting services like data analytics and strategic planning, Cisco’s specialty is
15 installing and maintaining hardware like network infrastructure. As Anthony
16 Townsend (2013, p. 63) writes, “If Siemens and Cisco aim to be the electrician
17 and the plumber for smart cities, IBM’s ambition is to be their choreographers,
18 superintendent, and oracle rolled into one.” Rather than driving each other out of
19 the market, they are able to blissfully coexist.
20
21

22
23 IBM and Cisco’s status as renowned (and revered) thought leaders is important
24 since the smart city is a world-in-the-making. It exists in a state of temporal
25 suspension: existing in a possible future while being built in the present. Thus,
26 these corporations must simultaneously operate within different temporal
27 contexts, effectively performing the future in the present (Pollock & Williams,
28 2010; Söderström et al., 2014). As we will see, this causes smart urbanism to
29 contain both reactionary and visionary elements: as a sociotechnical imaginary,
30 the smart city responds to present conditions and entrenches existing political
31 economies while also paving the way to a thriving, prosperous future. In this
32 sense, the smart city represents a wager on the future – a strategic belief that
33 smartness will operate as implied by the smart city sociotechnical imaginary. This
34 could mean buying a suite of smart services from IBM, installing smart
35 infrastructure from Cisco, or handing over an entire district to be developed and
36 run by Sidewalk Labs (a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc.) as is currently happening in
37 Toronto (Bozickovic, 2017).
38
39
40

41
42 Given their past and future investments, it stands to reason that IBM and Cisco
43 aim to shape the ways in which smart urbanism is perceived by city leaders
44 (Alizadeh 2017; McNeill 2015). This is often done by producing a wide range of
45 materials that propagate a common discourse. These texts explain core
46 principles, catalog technologies, and pair solutions to problems, but they also lay
47 out a particular narrative about the past, the future, and how to get there. We
48 may say that IBM and Cisco use storytelling to establish themselves as
49 “obligatory passage points” (Callon, 1986; Söderström et al., 2014). In this mode,
50 thinking about the smart city and implementing the smart city vision requires
51 relevant actors to adopt IBM and/or Cisco’s concepts, frameworks, and solutions.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A Note on Method

This article reports on the results of a grounded theoretical analysis of IBM and Cisco's large corpus of discursive material (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). It consists of over 75 documents, including public speeches, white papers, technical reports, "solutions briefs," "point of view papers," financial reports, websites, magazine essays, promotional marketing, and advertisements. In an attempt to be complete, as many documents as possible were gathered by downloading everything from each company's website, using targeted web searches, collecting documents from third-party partners (e.g. Frost & Sullivan), and relying on the Internet Archive to recover websites and documents that were changed or deleted. After gathering the corpus of material, each document was read closely, memoed, and coded for themes, concepts, and categories. Once the coding system was developed, major documents were re-analyzed (e.g. programmatic frameworks and core reports) to ensure useful data was not overlooked (Ryan & Bernard, 2003). The data about IBM and Cisco was analyzed separately and then together. While there are certainly differences in terminology, concepts, and initiatives between the two firms, as reflected in the following analysis, we found that they closely fit into the same overarching narrative. Methodologically, we rely on discourse analysis because documents are the medium most often used to construct and transmit sociotechnical imaginaries (see Levenda et al. 2018; Tidwell and Smith 2015). Sociotechnical imaginaries "reside in the reservoir of norms and discourses" (Jasanoff and Kim 2009, p. 123) and that is where we directed our analysis of smart urbanism.

As became clear during the analysis, the documents produced by IBM and Cisco are not just examples of corporate marketing or technical reports; they also detail the features of a future they hope to build. In other words, these two projects – IBM's "Smarter City" and Cisco's "Smart+Connected Communities" – weave a complex story about the technological salvation of the city. The narrative begins with crises, the catastrophes that cities will inevitably face now and in the near future. Then we are provided with theories that outline how cities may be transformed into smart places that stand strong and thrive. Next we are told about the smart solutions that provide the interventions, systems, and services for real change. Finally, we encounter different implementation strategies that ensure the smart city will be actualized. We discuss these four elements in turn.

Crisis as Catalyst

The story of the smart city imaginary begins by establishing that we – as a society, as urban citizens, as city leaders – are confronted with a number of daunting problems and crises. They threaten our very way of life, forcing us to discover new ways of doing things as the old ways become obsolete and insufficient. As Cisco says, "Cities and communities around the world face intractable challenges," including population increase and rapid urbanization that

1
2
3 place “massive pressure on city infrastructures,” the continuation of austerity
4 budgets that cause cities to be “limited in their ability to respond to these
5 pressures,” and the catastrophes promised by climate change, “forcing cities to
6 develop sustainability strategies” (Falconer & Mitchell, 2012, p. 2). For both Cisco
7 and IBM, crisis is certain; it is just a matter of when it will strike. At stake is
8 nothing less than the fate of the world: “It’s clear now that the future of cities is
9 the future of the planet. So it’s essential that solutions be found” (IBM, 2013, p.
10 2).
11
12

13 Naturally, preparation for crises, perceived or actual, is crucial. According to
14 IBM’s manifesto, “A Vision of Smarter Cities” (Dirks & Keeling 2009, p. 3), “Cities
15 face a range of challenges and threats to their sustainability across all their core
16 systems that they need to address holistically”. Nonetheless, a crisis is also a
17 chance to “seize opportunities and build sustainable prosperity by becoming
18 smarter” (ibid.) No city, rich or poor, can escape the need for smart restructuring.
19 “In both mature and emerging markets,” says a consulting report sponsored by
20 Cisco, “city authorities are facing a number of significant challenges” (Green,
21 2011, p. 1). At the core of the smart city sociotechnical imaginary, then, lies the
22 belief that, “Faced with an increasingly unpredictable and hazardous future the
23 smartest cities will be those which best prepare for imminent insecurity” (White,
24 2016, p. 574). Such insecurity is often represented as three different types of
25 crisis: rapid urbanization, fiscal austerity, and climatic catastrophe.
26
27
28

29 The idea that human society has entered the “urban age” – that is, over half of
30 the world’s population lives in cities – is a common truism (Brenner & Schmid,
31 2013). “We should be proud of this unprecedented urbanization,” IBM’s Samuel
32 Palmisano (2010, np) writes, “But it is also a huge strain on the planet’s
33 infrastructure.” Similarly, Cisco deems our current epoch the “urban century”
34 (Hodgkinson, 2011). At the same time, the rise of urbanity signals an impending
35 overpopulation crisis, and cities are warned about the intense strain this may
36 have on services and infrastructure. If cities are going to survive and thrive in
37 spite of this pressure, then the entire urban “system of systems” – transportation,
38 buildings, water, power, public safety, emergency responses, and more – must
39 eventually be redesigned and made smart(er) so it can sustain growth.
40
41
42

43 Additionally, cities everywhere must grapple with the economic realities of fiscal
44 austerity and fierce competition. As Cisco establishes, “fragilities in the global
45 financial system threaten to stall, if not reverse, years of economic progress”
46 (Evans, 2012, p. 1). The financial crash in 2008, adds IBM, has “ushered in a
47 systemic and prolonged economic adjustment that has severely crippled the
48 ability of governments to deliver expected services to citizens, let alone push for
49 innovative, new services” (IBM, 2012, p. 1). Meeting increased demands and
50 managing austerity will require instituting new forms of smart urban governance
51 that allow cities to “do more with less” by embracing “force multipliers” like data-
52 driven systems and public-private partnerships, while also improving security,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 safety, and stability to create good business climates. In this sense, smart
4 urbanism promises shelter from financial uncertainty.
5

6
7 The third crisis faced by cities involves environmental disasters brought about by
8 climate change and unsustainable practices. Cisco sets the scene by matter-of-
9 factly pointing out that “rapid climate change, regardless of the cause, threatens
10 our way of life by impacting the weather, agriculture, and much more” (Evans,
11 2012, p. 1). What’s more, cities are “uniquely vulnerable to the consequences of
12 climate change,” which puts their populations, their infrastructure, and their
13 prosperity at further risk (Green, 2011, p. 10). It is unsurprising, then, that the
14 smart city sociotechnical imaginary incorporates notions of sustainability,
15 leveraging climate change to argue that the smart city is much more sustainable
16 than the non-smart city. “This approach,” says IBM, “recognizes that information
17 provides one of the greatest opportunities for making the planet smarter, and
18 becoming smarter leads to new ideas, efficiencies, and equally important, new
19 possibilities for our planet’s sustainability” (Biciocchi & Phillips, 2015, p. 3).
20 Furthermore, since climate change is a crisis of global scale, it requires building
21 what IBM calls a “smarter planet.” Smartness, therefore, allows cities to adapt
22 and respond to the Anthropocene.
23
24
25

26 Given this overall crisis-based framing we can read the smart city as a
27 reactionary story, and not only the ultimate manifestation of techno-utopian
28 thought. To be sure, those utopian elements are still present, especially in the
29 dreamscapes of smart cities that are built from scratch on empty plots, networked
30 and sensed from the outset. Yet, when we consider the smart city as a
31 piecemeal project of securing against an impending catastrophic future, it begins
32 to take shape as a conservative project in which the best course of action is to
33 pragmatically maintain stability and to technically control uncertainty
34 (Leszczynski, 2016). “In this way, response to extreme and exceptional events—
35 such as are imagined to be brought on by weather shifts and domestic
36 insecurity—might be efficiently managed, and the city quickly returned to a state
37 of normalcy” (White, 2016, p. 582).
38
39
40
41

42 **Technological Transformations**

43
44

45 The many crises faced by cities – and the choices made about which ones to
46 marshal and what elements to emphasize – are the backdrop for the real
47 descriptive and prescriptive work of the smart city imaginary. Insofar as “efforts to
48 build new sociotechnical futures are typically grounded in positive visions of
49 social progress” (Jasanoff, 2015a, p.4), the work of establishing and stoking
50 crises serves to precipitate demand for frameworks that can be used for guiding
51 change (Pfotenhauer & Jasanoff, 2017). In our reading, this is precisely the
52 modus operandi of IBM and Cisco. Both companies lay out largely cohesive, and
53 often overlapping, frameworks for urban transformation. They rearticulate cities
54 as places in need of smart systems. Framing both the principles and practices of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 smart urbanism as ready-made panaceas for urban problems, IBM and Cisco
4 promote the embedding of the smart city imaginary in municipal institutions.
5

6 Both companies mobilize a theory of the city as a “system of systems” (IBM) or a
7 “network of networks” (Cisco) – a theory that is meant to describe how cities
8 exist, how they are knowable, and how their infrastructures and services operate.
9 Each company then fleshes out a prescriptive framework of how to design,
10 deploy, and actualize the smart city. For IBM it is the three I’s of instrumentation,
11 interconnection, and intelligence. For Cisco it is the Internet of Everything (IoE).
12 These frameworks are the foundation for much of IBM and Cisco’s model of
13 smart urbanism. They turn the city into a single smart assemblage and form a
14 crucial element of the smart city imaginary.
15
16
17

18 In a 2011 speech entitled “Smarter Cities: Crucibles of Progress,” IBM’s Sam
19 Palmisano said, “Smarter city leaders think in terms of systems. When you
20 understand that the world has become pervasively instrumented and
21 interconnected it inevitably leads you to see our planet not as a collection of
22 countries or industries, but as a system of systems.” For IBM, transforming cities
23 into their smarter incarnations requires a suite of new technologies that render
24 the city’s core systems instrumented, interconnected, and intelligent. Each of the
25 three I’s represents a layer of technologies and services that build on top of each
26 other. The bottom layer, instrumentation, is “made up of sensors, actuators,
27 programmable logic controllers, and distributed intelligent sensors” (Kehoe et al.,
28 2011, p. 11). The main purpose is “data capture and control” by turning the city
29 into a source of endlessly flowing streams of data (Ibid., p. 12). The middle layer,
30 interconnection, clusters and integrates the city’s systems by embedding
31 computational power into a variety of objects that are then linked into a vast
32 network. Through this process commands can be sent anywhere and different
33 data sources can be fused, allowing managers “to monitor the [city] domain
34 effectively” (Ibid., p. 12). The top layer, intelligence, then uses analytics to make
35 sense of the data produced from the networked systems. The analyzed data can
36 then be used to create performance dashboards, control interfaces, and other
37 urban software applications. When the three levels are optimized, argues IBM,
38 the smart city unlocks competitive advantage, creates value, and enhances
39 “economic vitality” (Fleming et al., 2015).
40
41
42
43
44

45 Cisco’s framework is an explicit expansion of the ongoing technological trend
46 known as the Internet of Things (IoT), in which physical objects, ranging from
47 household appliances to industrial machinery, are embedded with sensors and
48 computation so they can collect, communicate, and analyze information through
49 the Internet. Cisco positions the Internet of Everything (IoE) as more than just a
50 new term for an existing “phase” or “era.” Rather, the IoE is described as a
51 transformative evolution in technological progress in which “billions or even
52 trillions of connections create unprecedented opportunities as well as new risks”
53 (Mitchell et al., 2013, p. 12). The IoE incorporates four components: people, data,
54 things, and process. First, people will connect not just through device interfaces,
55
56
57

1
2
3 but also with wearables, implantables, and simply by inhabiting sensed
4 environments. They will become nodes on the Internet, like “a constantly emitting
5 activity system” (Evans, 2012, p. 3). Second, data will no longer be simply
6 gathered and streamed to a central source for processing, but instead will be
7 turned into “information” through constant accumulation, real-time analysis, and
8 fusion of multiple sources. Third, things in the IoE “will sense more data, become
9 context-aware, and provide more experiential information to help people and
10 machines make more relevant and valuable decisions” (Ibid., p. 4). Fourth,
11 process works to ensure the other three components make relevant connections,
12 enhance intelligence, and create value.
13
14

15
16 For tech corporations and city leaders, the sociotechnical imaginary of smart
17 urbanism promises control over a myriad urban dynamics, and then outlines
18 ways to make that dream come true. By embracing the IoE and a network of
19 networks view – or, for IBM, the three I’s and a “system of systems” view – the
20 city ceases to be a messy, unknowable, and uncontrollable place. Urban elites
21 can imagine themselves possessing a panoptical power, similar to the way
22 Sherlock Holmes describes his nemesis, the mastermind Moriarty: “He sits
23 motionless, like a spider in the centre of its web, but that web has a thousand
24 radiations, and he knows well every quiver of each of them” (Doyle, 2012, np).
25 The framework proffered by IBM and Cisco reimagines – and seeks to recreate –
26 the city as a smart technological web with tech corporations and city leaders
27 sitting at its center.
28
29
30
31

32 **Smart Solutions**

33

34
35 The way IBM and Cisco theorize the smart city is scarcely a description of how
36 cities exist. It establishes the foundation for “smart solutions” that lead to control
37 of the city, optimization of its operations, and extraction of value (Sadowski &
38 Pasquale, 2015; Vanolo, 2014). The goal of the technologies, services, and
39 policies that make up the smart city is to transform the city into a “platform” for
40 the integrated ICTs and governance models provided by the tech corporations.
41
42

43 It is important to recognize that the language of “solutions” – like that of
44 “smartness” – is more than just a puerile label. “These aren’t harmless verbal
45 frames,” explains Ian Bogost (2015, np). “They are signs of our willingness to
46 allow a certain kind of technological thinking to take over all other thinking” (ibid.)
47 Decisions over terminology tell us something important about how Silicon Valley
48 frames the world. At the core is a deeply held “solutionism” (Morozov, 2013): the
49 belief that all the world’s problems, even those that should not be thought of as
50 problems in the first place, can be solved technologically. By recasting everything
51 as a problem waiting for a techno-fix, especially issues that are social in nature,
52 the space for philosophical reflection and political contention shrinks.
53
54 Furthermore, in effect, the solutionist language works backward: for those in the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 business of providing solutions, solvable problems are essential. The crises are
4 tailored to justify the solutions, and the latter come in different forms and guises.
5

6
7 Perhaps the most popular image of a smart city solution is the control room
8 (Luque-Ayala & Marvin, 2016). Control rooms have been installed in a range of
9 places – from Camden, New Jersey (Wiig, 2017) to Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
10 (Gaffney & Robertson, 2016) – because they promise to enact the smart city in a
11 very real, impactful way. These control rooms typically contain rows of computer
12 terminals and workstations occupied by city managers, data analysts, and/or
13 police dispatchers, all facing a wall-sized grid of screens. Cisco has called these
14 centers the “brain” or “engine” of the smart city (Cisco, 2014b, p. 3), and IBM
15 adds that control rooms help “transform raw data – collected from sensors
16 located across the city, historical databases, existing applications and other
17 sources – into actionable insights” (IBM, 2011, p. 7). Insofar as the smart city
18 imaginary is reinforced through a story of crisis and preservation, the control
19 room embodies the very possibility of salvation.
20
21

22
23 If the flesh of the smart city is its physical infrastructure, and its nerves the
24 networks that pass information from street to control room, its lifeblood is data.
25 Many of the smart city solutions promoted by IBM and Cisco are based on
26 creating, collecting, processing, and using data. The prevailing attitude is based
27 on an imperative to extract all data, from all sources, by any means possible
28 (Fourcade & Healy, 2016). It has created an arms race for data, fueling the
29 creation of surveillance technologies that infiltrate all aspects of the urban
30 environment and city life. According to a Cisco report, “Smart City technologies
31 integrate and analyze massive amounts of data to anticipate, mitigate, and even
32 prevent many problems” (Clarke, 2013, p. 1). Much of this data has immediate
33 application in areas such as traffic management, predictive policing, and
34 environmental sensing. However, the unending accumulation of data is also
35 based on the speculation about the value data might generate in some
36 undisclosed future for some imagined purpose. IBM’s Palmisano (2010, np)
37 acknowledges that the barrage of data may be overwhelming, but he quickly
38 dismisses such concerns: “You may be thinking that the last thing we need is
39 more information raining down on us, more noise. But we now have the
40 capability, with advanced software analytic tools, to extract value from data—to
41 see the patterns, the correlations and the outliers.” For the leading imagineers of
42 the smart city, if data can be collected, then it must be. Big data is never big
43 enough.
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Implementing Initiatives**

50
51
52 Making smartness a reality – a physical thing in the world – requires using a
53 plurality of methods. The implementation process is shaped by aspects such as
54 the local context and social/material structures of the target city, the challenges
55 and desires that motivate city leaders, and the profitability and feasibility for tech
56
57

1
2
3 corporations. As important as the visions, theories, and frameworks of smartness
4 are, the ultimate goal is to leverage the smart city imaginary into concrete
5 technological commodities.
6

7
8 Cisco admonishes other stakeholders for lagging behind on the “how” phase of
9 smart cities. While urban experts and academics spend a considerable amount
10 of time thinking about “why,” and tech companies and consultants focus on
11 “what,” city leaders need the most assistance with “how.” Cisco concludes that,
12 “The debate is no longer about why a Smart City initiative is good for a city or
13 what to do (which available options to choose), but instead about how to
14 implement Smart City infrastructures and services, including the importance of a
15 common language and a structured approach to implementation” (Falconer &
16 Mitchell, 2012, p. 9; emphasis in original). This is a strong declaration: The black
17 box has closed, and the smart city imaginary has emerged victorious. Cisco
18 admits that both types of questions – “why” and “how” – “are important, but
19 focusing too much on the ‘why’ will hinder quick adoption of solutions and
20 initiatives” (ibid.) Urgent demands to innovate and iterate are based in an anxiety
21 to realise the promised potential of the smart city. Yet, the world is not a blank
22 slate, there are existing policies, materialities, and structures that the smart city
23 must plug into or work around (Selin and Sadowski, 2016). This means that
24 implementation strategies vary place by place. We identify three broad styles of
25 implementing the smart city.
26
27
28

29
30 By far the most common “actually existing” smart cities are those that are
31 retrofitted and renovated with upgrades that transition them from “dumb” to
32 “smart”. This usually starts with one or a few initiatives meant to address a
33 specific problem, such as parking or public safety. In these cases, “the smart city
34 is assembled piecemeal, integrated awkwardly into existing configurations of
35 urban governance and the built environment” (Shelton et al., 2015, p. 15). A
36 Cisco report calls this process “digital urban renewal” (Green, 2011, p. 6). Rather
37 than stripping out “legacy systems” and replacing them with smart updates, many
38 retrofits involve the “use of ICT as an overlay for existing infrastructure” and
39 incremental changes to current institutions (Ibid., p. 7).
40
41

42
43 Then there is the ‘shock therapy’ method of implementation – or, what we call
44 smart shock – in which a city undergoes a quick, large-scale integration of smart
45 urbanism ideals, technologies, and policies into an existing landscape. In these
46 cases, the smart city transition happens to a greater degree and over a short
47 time period. Smart shocks are much rarer than retrofits because they require
48 much more financial and political capital. It is unsurprising, then, that those cities
49 that have undergone a smart shock tend to make smartness a central part of
50 their identity, perhaps to justify the large expenditure. They also tend to receive
51 more attention from scholars and journalists since the operations and impacts of
52 smartness are more apparent and contentious. An example of a smart shock is
53 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. In 2010, Rio partnered with IBM to install the Rio
54 Operations Center, which drew together data from 30 different agencies and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 centralized city management. The city also installed an Integrated Center of
4 Command and Control, which serves as the headquarters for general security
5 planning and Rio's Police Pacification Units. These control centers were installed
6 in advance of two mega-events in Rio: the 2014 FIFA World Cup and the 2016
7 Olympics (Gaffney & Robertson, 2016).
8
9

10 Perhaps the most idealistic models for the smart city are built from scratch
11 projects that are being constructed where nothing existed before. A canonical
12 case is New Songdo in South Korea, which serves as a global test-bed (Halpern
13 et al., 2013) and urban laboratory (Cardullo et al., 2017) for implementing large-
14 scale smart systems "in the wild." Even the island it is being constructed on is
15 human-made, truly allowing it to be a city from nowhere. The built-from-scratch
16 method of implementation seeks to realize a zone of futurity, like a living
17 exhibition of our grand urban future. However, none of these cities have yet to be
18 fully brought online. "Building new, green cities from scratch is a great way to
19 showcase potential solutions, but most people will never live in this kind of
20 development," Cisco recognizes (Green, 2011, p. 1). These model cities are
21 more like showcases for the technology's potential: why just tell customers about
22 the smart city with a pamphlet, when you can show them the imaginary in
23 tangible form?
24
25
26
27

28 **Conclusion**

29
30
31 In this article, we have described how the smart city narrative is structured: stoke
32 a crisis (or three), theorize a framework for transforming the city, marshal
33 solutions to fix what ails city-clients, and strategize about different
34 implementation styles. The narrative shows how IBM and Cisco sell the smart
35 city as both a reactionary and visionary force. In this model, smart urbanism is
36 not just a collection of discrete ideas and initiatives but a coherent vision with
37 motivations and goals. It plots out a near future, but one that largely reproduces
38 and maintains existing socio-political systems (Leszczynski, 2016; Pollio, 2016;
39 Wiig, 2017). The narrative of the future provides an overarching structure and a
40 vehicle for delivering this model of smart urbanism to city leaders.
41
42
43

44 As of 2013, Rometty said that IBM has been involved in "more than 2,000
45 Smarter Cities engagements," in which IBM has helped "mayors and other urban
46 leaders manage, analyze and use data for economic growth, increased
47 profitability and the public good" (Rometty, 2013a, np). A more recent report from
48 Cisco boasts the company has "deployed solutions in many cities worldwide –
49 some 120 deployments of varying sizes" (Cisco, 2014a, p. 3). Places such as
50 Copenhagen, Chicago, and Dubai serve as "lighthouse cities" that signal the
51 paths for other smartness-seeking cities. The smart city movement has spread
52 quite successfully so far and it is still growing. With that said, we should be
53 cautious about over-emphasizing IBM's and Cisco's capacity to successfully
54 propagate their smart city imaginary and dominate the smart city discourse. As
55
56
57

1
2
3 Shelton et al. (2014, p. 14) warn, there is a “tendency within critical accounts to
4 see the smart city as a kind of universal, rational, and depoliticized project that
5 largely plays out according to the terms of profit-maximising, multinational
6 technology companies.” The corporatized model of the smart city, in other words,
7 must be recognized for its contingency. So even if IBM and Cisco were able to
8 establish their version of smartness as hegemonic – indeed, other than the
9 corporate model “there exist no large-scale alternative smart city models”
10 (Hollands, 2015, p. 70) – this isn’t to say there are no alternatives, only that they
11 are still struggling to compete with the corporate imaginary. With the risk of
12 technological momentum (Hughes, 1994) and technological lock-in, there is an
13 obligation for critical scholarship to analyze the features and confront the
14 influence of the corporate imaginary.
15
16
17

18 In doing so, future research must resist the temptation to assume that the smart
19 city will work or be materialized in exactly the way the corporate imaginary lays
20 out. As the smart city imaginary is actualized, it will be important to pay attention
21 to places where divergence, breakdown, and resistance happen (Bulkeley et al.
22 2016; Hoyng 2016). Doing so will help shed light on the material politics and
23 ontology of the smart city, while also revealing cracks in its foundation.
24 Furthermore, future research should also trace the movement from corporate
25 imaginaries to real cities by analyzing city governments, leaders, and planners in
26 terms of both their own perception of the smart city and their process of
27 actualizing the smart city (Alizadeh 2017; Wiig 2015). How do specific, actually
28 existing cities reproduce and differ from IBM and Cisco’s imaginary of the smart
29 city? What characteristics of the city influence how the imaginary is enacted?
30 What processes, people, and power dynamics are involved in attempts to make a
31 city smart?
32
33
34

35 The smart city is a dynamic future-in-the-making. While it is true that the
36 corporate model is an offshoot of a deeply rooted political economic regime, we
37 must not mistake a contingency for inevitability, despite IBM and Cisco’s efforts.
38 In this vein, reframing and reimagining smart urbanism must involve creating
39 counter-narratives that open up space for alternative values, designs, and
40 models (Kitchin, 2016; March, 2016). Doing so requires understanding the
41 existing narrative’s tenets and characteristics – “attending to the means by which
42 imaginaries frame and represent alternative futures, link past and future times,
43 enable or restrict actions in space, and naturalize ways of thinking about possible
44 worlds” (Jasanoff, 2015a, p. 24) – as a way of better knowing what needs to be
45 challenged and how.
46
47
48
49

50 **References**

51
52
53 Alizadeh, T. (2017). “An Investigation of IBM's Smarter Cities Challenge: What
54 Do Participating Cities Want?” *Cities* 63 (March): 70-80.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Angelidou, M. (2015). "Smart Cities: A Conjunction of Four Forces." *Cities* 47:
4 95-106.
5

6 Biciocchi, R.L. and Phillips, J.M. (2015). "Building a Smarter Transportation
7 Management Network." *IBM Smarter Cities*.
8
9

10 Brenner, N. and Schmid, C. (2014). "The 'Urban Age' in Question." *International*
11 *Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38 (3): 731-755.
12

13 Bogost, I. (2015). "The Problem With Ketchup Leather." *The Atlantic* (November
14 19). Accessed 25 January 2018:
15 [http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2015/11/burgers-arent-](http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2015/11/burgers-arent-broken/416727/)
16 [broken/416727/](http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2015/11/burgers-arent-broken/416727/)
17
18

19 Borch, C., & Kornberger, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Urban Commons: Rethinking the*
20 *City*. Abingdon, UK & New York: Routledge.
21

22 Bozikovic, A. (2017). "Google's Sidewalk Labs Signs Deal for 'Smart City'
23 Makeover of Toronto's Waterfront." *The Globe and Mail*, 17 October. Accessed
24 25 January 2018: [https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/toronto/google-](https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/toronto/google-sidewalk-toronto-waterfront/article36612387/)
25 [sidewalk-toronto-waterfront/article36612387/](https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/toronto/google-sidewalk-toronto-waterfront/article36612387/)
26
27

28 Bulkeley, H., McGuirk, P.M., and Dowling, R. (2016). "Making a Smart City for
29 the Smart Grid? The Urban Material Politics of Actualising Smart Electricity
30 Networks." *Environment and Planning A* 48 (9): 1709-1726.
31
32

33 Callon, M. (1986) "Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the
34 Scallops and the Fishermen of St. Brieuc Bay". In John Law (Ed.), *Power, Action*
35 *and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?*, 196-233. London: Routledge.
36
37

38 Cardullo, P., Kitchin, R. and Feliciantonio, C.D. (2017). "Living Labs and Vacancy
39 in the Neoliberal City." *Cities*.
40

41 Cisco (2009). "Cisco Unveils 'Intelligent Urbanisation' Global Blueprint." *Cisco*
42 *Newsroom*, 12 February. Accessed 25 January 2018:
43 [https://newsroom.cisco.com/press-release-](https://newsroom.cisco.com/press-release-content?type=webcontent&articleId=4767464)
44 [content?type=webcontent&articleId=4767464](https://newsroom.cisco.com/press-release-content?type=webcontent&articleId=4767464)
45
46

47 Cisco. (2014a). "Cisco Smart+Connected Communities: Envisioning the Future of
48 Cities Now." *Cisco*
49

50 Cisco. (2014b). *Cisco Smart+Connected City Operations Center: Unified*
51 *Management for City Infrastructure*.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Clarke, R.Y. (2013). "Smart Cities and the Internet of Everything: The Foundation
4 for Delivering Next-Generation Citizen Services." IDC Government Insights
5 (sponsored by Cisco).
6

7
8 de Waal, M. (2014). *The City as Interface: How New Media Are Changing the*
9 *City*. Rotterdam: nai010 publishers. □
10

11 Dirks, S. and Keeling, M. (2009). "A Vision of Smarter Cities: How Cities Can
12 Lead the Way into a Prosperous and Sustainable Future." IBM Institute for
13 Business Value.
14

15
16 Doyle, A.C. (2012). *Memoirs of Sherlock Holmes*. Available at Project Gutenberg:
17 <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/834/834-h/834-h.htm>
18

19 Evans, D. (2012). "The Internet of Everything: How More Relevant and Valuable
20 Connections Will Change the World." Cisco Internet Business Solutions Group.
21

22
23 Falconer, G. and Mitchell, S. (2012). "Smart City Framework: A Systematic
24 Process for Enabling Smart+Connected Communities." Cisco Internet Business
25 Solutions Group.
26

27 Feenberg, A. (2017). *Technosystem: The Social Life of Reason*. Cambridge:
28 Harvard University Press.
29

30
31 Fleming, M., Dencik, J. and Forcke, A-R. (2015). "Economic Vitality: Prosperity
32 and Public Engagement in the Data-Driven Economy." IBM Public Sector.
33

34 Fourcade, M. and Healy, K. (2016). "Seeing Like a Market." *Socio-Economic*
35 *Review* 15 (1): 9-29.
36

37
38 Frost & Sullivan (2014). "Frost & Sullivan: Global Smart Cities market to reach
39 US\$1.56 trillion by 2020." Accessed 25 January 2018:
40 [https://ww2.frost.com/news/press-releases/frost-sullivan-global-smart-cities-](https://ww2.frost.com/news/press-releases/frost-sullivan-global-smart-cities-market-reach-us156-trillion-2020)
41 [market-reach-us156-trillion-2020](https://ww2.frost.com/news/press-releases/frost-sullivan-global-smart-cities-market-reach-us156-trillion-2020)
42

43
44 Future Cities Catapult (2017). "Smart City Strategies: A Global Review."
45 Accessed 25 January 2018: [http://futurecities.catapult.org.uk/wp-](http://futurecities.catapult.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/GRSCS-Final-Report.pdf)
46 [content/uploads/2017/11/GRSCS-Final-Report.pdf](http://futurecities.catapult.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/GRSCS-Final-Report.pdf)
47

48 Gaffney, C. and Robertson, C. (2016). "Smarter than Smart: Rio de Janeiro's
49 Flawed Emergence as a Smart City." *Journal of Urban Technology* DOI:
50 10.1080/10630732.2015.1102423
51

52
53 Green, J. (2011). "Digital Urban Renewal: Retro-Fitting Existing Cities With Smart
54 Solutions is the Urban Challenge of the 21st Century." A report by Ovum
55 (sponsored by Cisco).
56
57

1
2
3
4 Greenfield, A. (2013). *Against the Smart City*. New York: Do Projects.

5
6 Halpern, O., LeCavalier, J., Calvillo, N., and Pietsch, W. (2013). "Test-Bed
7 Urbanism." *Public Culture* 25 (2): 273-306.

8
9
10 Ho, E. (2017). "Smart Subjects for a Smart Nation? Governing (Smart)mentalities
11 in Singapore." *Urban Studies* 54 (13): 3101–3118.

12
13 Hodgkinson, S. (2011). "Is Your City Smart Enough? Digitally Enabled Cities and
14 Societies Will Enhance Economic, Social, and Environmental Sustainability in the
15 Urban Century." A report by Ovum (sponsored by Cisco).

16
17
18 Hollands, R.G. (2008). "Will the Real Smart City Please Stand Up? Intelligent,
19 Progressive or Entrepreneurial?" *City* 12 (3): 303-320.

20
21
22 Hollands, R.G. (2015). "Critical Interventions Into the Corporate Smart City."
23 *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* (8) 61-77.

24
25
26 Hoyng, R. (2016). "From Infrastructural Breakdown to Data Vandalism:
27 Repoliticizing the Smart City?" *Television & New Media* 17 (5): 397-415.

28
29
30 Hughes, T. P. (1994). "Technological Momentum." In M. R. Smith & L. Marx
31 (Eds.), *Does Technology Drive History? The Dilemma of Technological
32 Determinism*, p. 101-113. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

33
34
35 Hurlbut, J.B. (2015). "Remembering the Future: Science, Law, and the Legacy of
36 Asilomar." In S. Jasanoff and S-H. Kim (Eds.), *Dreamscapes of Modernity:
37 Sociotechnical Imaginaries and the Fabrication of Power*, p. 126-151. Chicago:
38 The University of Chicago Press.

39
40
41 IBM. (2011). "IBM Intelligent Operations Center for Smarter Cities: Coordinate
42 City Agencies and Resources to Deliver Exceptional Service to Citizens." IBM
43 Industry Solutions.

44
45
46 IBM. (2012). "The Foundations of Efficiency: Learning to do More With Less is
47 the New Normal in Government." IBM Smarter Government.

48
49
50 IBM. (2013). "How to Reinvent a City: Mayors' Lessons From the Smarter Cities®
51 Challenge." IBM Smarter Cities.

52
53
54 Jasanoff, S. and Kim, S-H. (2009). "Containing the Atom: Sociotechnical
55 Imaginaries and Nuclear Power in the United States and South Korea." *Minerva*
56 47 (2): 119-146.

1
2
3 Jasanoff, S. and Kim, S-H. (eds.) (2015). *Dreamscapes of Modernity: Sociotechnical Imaginaries and the Fabrication of Power*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

7
8 Jasanoff, S. (2015a). "Future Imperfect: Science, Technology, and the Imaginations of Modernity." In S. Jasanoff and S-H. Kim (Eds.), *Dreamscapes of Modernity: Sociotechnical Imaginaries and the Fabrication of Power*, p. 1-33. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

13
14 Jasanoff, S. (2015b). "Imagined and Invented Worlds." In S. Jasanoff and S-H. Kim (Eds.), *Dreamscapes of Modernity: Sociotechnical Imaginaries and the Fabrication of Power*, p. 321-342. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

18
19 Kehoe, M., Cosgrove, M., De Gennaro, S., Harrison, C., Harthoor, W., Hogan, J., Meegan, J., Nesbitt, P., and Peters C. (2011). "A Foundation for Understanding IBM Smarter Cities." IBM Redguides.

22
23 Kitchin, R. (2014). "The Real-Time City? Big Data and Smart Urbanism." *GeoJournal* 79 (1): 1-14.

26
27 Kitchin, R. (2016). "Reframing, Reimagining and Remaking Smart Cities." *The Programmable City Working Paper* 20. Accessed 25 January 2018: <http://eprints.maynoothuniversity.ie/7354/>

30
31 Kuhn, T. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

34
35 Leszczynski, A. (2016). "Speculative Futures: Cities, Data, and Governance Beyond Smart Urbanism." *Environment and Planning A* 48 (9): 1691-1708.

37
38 Levenda, A., Mahmoudi, D., and Sussman, G. (2016). "The Neoliberal Politics of 'Smart': Electricity Consumption, Household Monitoring, and the Enterprise Form." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 40: 615-636.

42
43 Levenda, A.M., Richter, J., Miller T.R., and Fisher, E. (2018). "Regional Sociotechnical Imaginaries and the Governance of Energy Innovations." *Futures*. In press.

46
47 Luque-Ayala, A. and Marvin, S. (2016). "The Maintenance of Urban Circulation." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 34 (2): 191-208.

50
51 March, H. (2016). "The Smart City and Other ICT-led Techno-imaginaries: Any Room for Dialogue with Degrowth?" *Journal of Cleaner Production* (in press): 1-10.

1
2
3 McFarlane, C. and Söderström, O. (2017). "On Alternative Smart Cities: From a
4 Technology-Intensive to a Knowledge-Intensive Smart Urbanism." *City 21* (3-4):
5 312-328.
6

7
8 McNeil, M., Arribas-Ayllon, M., Haran, J., Mackenzie, A. and Tutton, R. (2017).
9 "Conceptualizing Imaginaries of Science, Technology, and Society." In U. Felt, R.
10 Fouché, C.A. Miller, and L. Smith-Doeer (Eds.), *The Handbook of Science and*
11 *Technology Studies*, Fourth Edition, p. 435-463. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
12

13
14 McNeill, D. (2015). "Global Firms and Smart Technologies: IBM and the
15 Reduction of Cities." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 40 (4):
16 562-574.
17

18
19 Mitchell, S., Villa, N., Stewart-Weeks, M., and Lange, A. (2013). "The Internet of
20 Everything for Cities: Connecting People, Process, Data, and Things to Improve
21 the 'Livability' of Cities and Communities." Cisco.
22

23
24 Morozov, E. (2013). *To Save Everything, Click Here: The Folly of Technological*
25 *Solutionism*. New York: Public Affairs Books.
26

27
28 Morozov, E. and Bria, F. (2018). *Rethinking the Smart City: Democratizing Urban*
29 *Technology*. New York: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung.
30

31
32 Navigant Research (2016). "Navigant Research Leaderboard Report: Smart City
33 Suppliers. Assessment of Strategy and Execution for 16 Smart City Suppliers."
34 Accessed 25 January 2018:
35 [https://www.navigantresearch.com/research/navigant-research-leaderboard-](https://www.navigantresearch.com/research/navigant-research-leaderboard-report-smart-city-suppliers)
36 [report-smart-city-suppliers](https://www.navigantresearch.com/research/navigant-research-leaderboard-report-smart-city-suppliers)
37

38
39 Palmisano, S. (2008). "Smarter Planet." Speech delivered to the Council on
40 Foreign Relations. Accessed 25 January 2018: [http://www.cfr.org/world/smarter-](http://www.cfr.org/world/smarter-planet/p34480)
41 [planet/p34480](http://www.cfr.org/world/smarter-planet/p34480)
42

43
44 Palmisano, S. (2010). "Building a Smarter Planet: The Time to Act is Now."
45 Speech delivered to Chatham House (January 12). Accessed 25 January 2018:
46 [https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/15656_120110palmisan](https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/15656_120110palmisano.pdf)
47 [o.pdf](https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/15656_120110palmisano.pdf)
48

49
50 Palmisano, S. (2011). "Smarter Cities: Crucibles of Progress." Speech delivered
51 at SmarterCities Rio (November 9). Accessed 25 January 2018:
52 [https://www.ibm.com/smarterplanet/us/en/smarter_](https://www.ibm.com/smarterplanet/us/en/smarter_cities/article/rio_keynote.html)
53 [cities/article/rio_keynote.html](https://www.ibm.com/smarterplanet/us/en/smarter_cities/article/rio_keynote.html)
54

55
56 Pollio, A. (2016). "Technologies of Austerity Urbanism: The "Smart City" Agenda
57 in Italy (2011–2013)." *Urban Geography* 37 (4): 514-534.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Pollock, N. and Williams, R. (2010). "The Business of Expectations: How
4 Promissory Organizations Shape Technology and Innovation." *Social Studies of*
5 *Science* 40 (4) 525-548.
6

7
8 Pfothenauer, S. and Jasanoff, S. (2017). "Panacea or Diagnosis? Imaginaries of
9 Innovation and the 'MIT Model' in Three Political Cultures. *Social Studies of*
10 *Science* 47 (6): 783-810.
11

12 Rometty, G. (2013a). "Competitive Advantage in an Era of Innovation." Speech at
13 Lisbon Council. Accessed 25 January 2018: [http://www.lisboncouncil.net/news-a-](http://www.lisboncouncil.net/news-a-events/495.html)
14 [events/495.html](http://www.lisboncouncil.net/news-a-events/495.html)
15

16
17 Rometty, G. (2013b). "Leadership in the Era of Smart." Speech delivered at IBM
18 InterConnect, Singapore. Accessed 25 January 2018:
19 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?t=1238&v=iNZj38sD81w>
20

21 Ryan, G.W. and Bernard, H.R. (2003). "Techniques to Identify Themes." *Field*
22 *Methods* 15 (1): 85-109.
23

24
25 Sadowski, J. and Pasquale, F. (2015). "The Spectrum of Control: A Social
26 Theory of the Smart City." *First Monday* 20 (7): online.
27

28 Sassen, S. (2013). "Does the City Have Speech?" *Public Culture* 25 (2): 209-
29 221.
30

31
32 Selin, C. and Sadowski, J (2015) "Against Blank Slate Futuring: Noticing
33 Obduracy in the City Through Experiential Methods of Public Engagement." In:
34 Kearnes, M, Chilvers, J (eds) *Remaking Participation: Science, Environment and*
35 *Emerging Publics*. New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 218–237.
36

37
38 Shelton, T., Zook, M. and Wiig, A. (2014). "The 'Actually Existing Smart City.'"
39 *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy, and Society* 8 (1): 13-25.
40

41 Smith, E. (2009). "Imaginaries of Development: The Rockefeller Foundation and
42 Rice Research." *Science as Culture* 18 (4): 461-482.
43

44
45 Smith, E. (2015). "Corporate Imaginaries of Biotechnology and Global
46 Governance: Syngenta, Golden Rice, and Corporate Social Responsibility." In S.
47 Jasanoff and S-H. Kim (Eds.), *Dreamscapes of Modernity: Sociotechnical*
48 *Imaginaries and the Fabrication of Power*, p. 254-276. Chicago: The University of
49 Chicago Press.
50

51
52 Söderström, O., Paasche, T., and Klauser, F. (2014). "Smart Cities as Corporate
53 Storytelling." *City* 18 (3): 307-320.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques*
4 *and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*, third edition. London: Sage
5 Publications.
6

7
8 Tidwell, A.S.D. and Smith, J.M. (2015). "Morals, Materials, and Technoscience:
9 The Energy Security Imaginary in the United States." *Science, Technology, &*
10 *Human Values* 40 (5): 687-711.
11

12 Townsend, A.M. (2013). *Smart Cities: Big Data, Civic Hackers, and the Quest for*
13 *a New Utopia*. New York: WW Norton & Company.
14

15
16 Vanolo, A. (2014). "Smartmentality: The Smart City as Disciplinary Strategy."
17 *Urban Studies* 51 (5): 883-898.
18

19 White, J.M. (2016). "Anticipatory Logics of the Smart City's Global Imaginary."
20 *Urban Geography* 37 (4): 572-589.
21

22
23 Wiig, A. (2015). "IBM's Smart City as Techno-Utopian Policy Mobility." *City* 19
24 (2-3): 258-273.
25

26
27 Wiig, A. (2016). "The Empty Rhetoric of the Smart City: From Digital Inclusion to
28 Economic Promotion in Philadelphia." *Urban Geography* 37 (4): 535-553
29

30
31 Wiig, A. (2017). "Secure the City, Revitalize the Zone: Smart Urbanization in
32 Camden, New Jersey." *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*. DOI:
33 10.1177/2399654417743767
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60