

ties, surpassed the even larger urbanized area of Greater New York as *the densest in the United States*. A few census tracts in Manhattan still exceed all others in population density, but across the remaining 99 percent of tracts, Los Angeles's density is unsurpassed.

This astonishing transformation was not the product of clever planning or efforts to control sprawl and induce sustainability and smart growth through densification. Nor was it simply the result of the multiplication of edge cities or the efforts of New Urbanists and others to create swarms of "urban villages." What has been happening in Los Angeles and, to varying degrees, is also happening in many other cities around the world is best described as a *regional urbanization process*.

Linked to a resurgence of regionalism at many different scales, mass regional urbanization, with its combination of both decentralization (the migration of jobs and people from the old inner city) and recentralization (in new "suburban cities" as well as some old downtowns), has been replacing the mass suburbanization process that dominated postwar urban development in most of the world's cities. These processes have expanded the size and scope of how we view the metropolitan region and placed increasing importance on specifically regional perspectives in urban planning, governance, and public policy.

One of the major effects of regional urbanization has been an "unbounding" of the modern metropolis. At a macrospatial level, it has broken open traditional urban hinterlands to extend the reach of the metropolis to a global scale, while at the same time bringing globalization deeper into the city. Accompanied by intensified transnational flows of capital, labor, and information, this has led to the formation of the most culturally and economically heterogeneous cities the world has ever known, with Los Angeles and New York leading the way. Architects and urban designers must recognize and build upon this increasing cultural diversity and the increasing attention it engenders to vernacular styles, the need to recognize cultural differences, and the creative effects of hybridity.

Many have used such terms as *world city* and *global city* to describe the globalization of the modern metropolis, but I suggest that a more appropriate term is *global city-region*. Even without the global prefix, such terms as *city-region*, *region-city*, *regional city*, and *regional metropolis* signify something substantially different from traditional notions of metropolitan urbanism. For a start, there has been