

**The production of extended local territory:
Topology and the spatial politics of city-region making in China**

Dr Xuan Wang,

Department of Urban Management, School of Government, Central University of Finance
and Economics, xuanwang@cufe.edu.cn;

Dr Yimin Zhao,

Department of Urban Planning and Management, School of Public Administration and
Policy, Renmin University of China

& Department of Geography, Durham University, yimin.zhao@durham.ac.uk

(Corresponding author)

Acknowledgement: We appreciate the supports of our interviewees in Shenzhen and Shanwei Municipal Governments and Shenzhen-Shanwei Special Cooperation Zone Management Committee, as well as the local residents we encountered. An earlier draft of this paper was presented in the 2021 Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers. We want to thank Shaina Potts and Julie Klinger for organizing related panel and offering constructive comments. This paper also benefits from the discussions with Yanli Gui and Hanna Hilbrandt, and we are grateful for their supports. The usual disclaimers apply.

Funding: The fieldwork of this research was supported by Major Research Project of Shenzhen Municipal Government in 2018. The follow-up research and writing-up have been supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 42301233; No. 42101196), the SNSF Swiss Postdoctoral Fellowship (Grant No. TMPFP1_210051), Central University of Finance and Economics (Xinmiao Scholar Support Plan, Grant No. XMXZ2307) and Renmin University of China (Grant No. 22XNA010).

Abstract

A new trend has been emerging in China's urban and regional politics, as it becomes prevailing to extend one municipal authority to another with the boundary transcended, often through the establishment of joint development zones. These newly produced subnational territories are worth further attention to clarify the underlying political dynamics of China's changing state space. This paper examines the Shenzhen-Shanwei Special Cooperation Zone in Guangdong and analyses the political-spatial processes through which a certain area of Shanwei has been transformed into "East Shenzhen." Looking into the relational power nexus that has also been inflected by trans-scalar and cross-boundary dynamics, as well as its manifestations in urban landscapes, we propose *extended local territory* as a key analytical concept to explore how and how far the rise of extensive territoriality has been articulated with intensive localities. Empirically, we elaborate on the ways in which the territorial ambition and authority of Shenzhen have been managing to traverse boundaries, while also recognise that Shenzhen's aspiration of materializing its extensive territoriality is challenged by both scalar constraints and the grassroots politics rooted in local history and geography. Addressing the dialectics between the extensive territoriality and intensive locality, we should attend to the inter-topological effects and trace the patterns of correlation that are involved in this process, which also turns out to be a critical approach to better understand changing state spaces in and beyond China.

Keywords

territory, state, spatial politics, topology, city-region, China

Introduction

Walking in a place where urban landscapes with “Shenzhen logo” are commonly seen, we may easily get a feeling that these are in Shenzhen, one of the most prosperous cities in China. There are branches of Shenzhen hospital, Shenzhen school, Shenzhen urban utility systems such as gas, water and electricity; even the road signs and bus stops are very similar to those in Shenzhen. These representations of space, that act to pin down inseparable connections between places, people, actions and things (Simone, 2004: 409), render this place well-known as the “Eastern Shenzhen” – which however is 100 kilometers away from Shenzhen. For residents here, “these all look and feel familiar... Though it is not at the center of Shenzhen, there are shadows of Shenzhen everywhere” (*Nanfang Daily*, 24 August 2018).

This is the Shenzhen-Shanwei Special Cooperation Zone (SSCZ) in Guangdong, co-configured by Shenzhen and Shanwei municipal governments, and developing as a model of institutional innovations for city-regional governance in China (Chan, 2021; Zhang et al., 2022). Previously an agricultural area in Shanwei, the SSCZ includes four towns: Ebu, Xiaomo, Houmen and Chishi (Figure 1). Designated as an experimental site of regionally coordinated development by Guangdong provincial government, this place was turned into a joint development zone of Shenzhen and Shanwei in February 2011. In September 2017, a revised plan of SSCZ was approved to promote a new mode with and through Shenzhen’s direct administration. Shenzhen-style urban landscapes have since been emerging and strengthening Shenzhen’s territorial authority in SSCZ. This extra-territorial pattern of city-regional governance not only embodies the national

and regional concerns of economic cooperation, but also shows the work of territorial strategies to control resources and population beyond boundaries.

[Figure 1 about here]

China's city-regions have long been discussed in both policy discourses and the literature on urban-regional geographies and political economy (Li and Wu, 2018; Zhang et al., 2022). Apart from the general accounts of city-regions from the perspective of capitalist territorial development (Brenner, 2004), it is often reported that city-region making in China follows alternative logics (Jonas, 2020). With the co-existence of authoritarian and neoliberal mechanisms (Ma, 2009), the rise of city-regions is seen as a state orchestration, underlined by national development agendas to reterritorialize state power and internationalize sub-national territories (Ye, 2014). The former goal marks a response to power imbalance induced by fiscal and administrative restructuring since the 1980s (Ngo et al., 2017; Wu, 2016), while the latter is inflected by geo-political and geo-economic aspirations of reordering the urban-regional space (Li & Jonas, 2019; Sum, 2018). These discussions recognize the role of the central state in deploying city-region as a strategic instrument, yet they paid relatively less attention to how and how far the urban authorities participate in the shaping of city-regions. More works are needed to uncover the spatial politics manifested at the urban level, so as to better understand the subnational territorial relations that are interwoven with inter-urban competition and cooperation (Chien, 2013).

Indeed, territorial competition has been a key characteristic of local authorities in China since the 1980s (Xu & Yeh, 2009). To tackle regional inequalities, the central government has proposed various initiatives to coordinate regional development and foster cooperation between those well-off cities and regions and their surrounding areas. However, the effects of these initiatives are often with question marks, partly due to the impasse of the subject of implementing coordination: beyond the hierarchical settings and administrative boundaries, there is no corresponding state agents to monitor related issues for the city-region (Li and Wu, 2018). This impasse enables urban authorities' maneuvers to materialize their own respective and locally oriented agendas. Further investigation into such issues will not only decode the scalar-territorial mechanisms of city-region production in China, but also contribute to our reflection on the state space, where the spatial, social, institutional and strategical frontiers are often articulated with each other, signaled by while also transcending borders and boundaries in various kinds (Brenner et al. 2003).

Our main concern here is to interrogate the subjects, spatialities and power that are involved in city-region making and figure out the patterns of correlation between these different elements in the collision and collusion among variegated concerns and goals. With the case of SSCZ, we elaborate on how and how far the territorial ambition and authority of Shenzhen have been turned into an "immutable mobile" (Law and Mol 2001; Latour 1986) that aims to traverse boundaries and gaps between Shenzhen and other places. However, this project of making reach from afar intensifies the spatiality-power correlation in SSCZ, shaping while also being shaped by the local discursive and

material conditions. Together with the unfolding of what local authorities label “special cooperation,” we see the rise of an *extended local territory* that involves both extensive territoriality and intensive locality in pursuing reach, proximity and regional evenness. To illustrate this point, we start from a critical reflection on territory in and from China. Drawing on critical engagement with recent discussion on the topology of space and power, we propose the *extended local territory* to elaborate on the dialectics between the rise of extensive territoriality and the limit set by intensive locality in making reach and proximity. We then analyze the SSCZ case empirically, attending to the extensive territoriality and the intensive locality respectively. The paper concludes that we should attend to the inter-topological effects to trace the patterns of correlation involved in the territorial dynamics of city-region making, which also turns out to be a critical approach to better understand changing state spaces both in and beyond China.

Rethinking territory inter-topologically

In light of the relational turn in human geography since the 1980s, territory, a concept formerly taken for granted as a *regulated-bounded* space has been interrogated and updated to make it relevant for our understanding of the changing political geography of the state (and beyond) in a globalizing era (Delaney, 2008; Novak, 2011; Sack, 1986; Schwarz & Streule, 2016). In his now classic intervention, Elden (2007, 2010, 2013) invites us to revisit territory as a predominantly political technology practiced to control a certain place rather than a solid geographical container. From this perspective, Elden argues that there has been a long-standing tension between the territorial aspirations of

maintaining particular spatial orders and the actual treatment of territory as a contingent (and violable) spatial process contested by related subjects. Also along this line, Painter (2010: 1116) reminds us that the territory is not a timeless or fixed container of state power, but rather a provisional and porous product of the networked socio-technical practices. Likewise, Paasi (2012) and Halvorsen (2019) move beyond the bounded view and argue for a relatively open understanding of territory as sites of complex relational juxtapositions. Seen in this way, cities and regions that used to be conceived as self-contained territorial settings, are indeed rearticulated as variegated spaces of circulation and connectivity, made through increasing economic flows and interchanges (Amin, 2004; Jones & MacLeod, 2004).

These reflections not only allow a relational conceptualization of territory in terms of spatially unbounded processes and networked practices, but also promote a shift of analytical focus to the dynamic interactions among multiple scales (Fernandes, 2013). In this respect, urban research on China, particularly those on the intensified inter-city interaction at the regional scale, has also made a similar move to integrate a relational view into reflections on the local territorial dynamics (Xu & Yeh, 2013; Li & Jonas, 2019). In addition, the relational turn in understanding China's local territory is also reshaping regional development strategies in practice, with both cross-sectoral and cross-jurisdictional cooperation and integration increasingly foregrounded (Ye, 2014; Li et al., 2014). In line with these strategies, the local states' conducts are less subject to the enclosed urban territories, as they are encouraged to transcend fixed boundaries and make relational contacts and reach at the regional scale. Recognizing this new

pattern, China urban researchers have explored its various manifestations, such as enclaves of economic collaboration and co-built zones with connective infrastructure (Feng & Zhao, 2004; Huang et al., 2016; Li et al., 2023). These discussions have attended well to the spatiality-power nexus and provided critical evidence to rethink local territory in China as effects of relational networks at work (Ngo et al., 2017; Oakes, 2023; Xu, 2008). They together figure out a timely and much-needed empirical approach to understand new and increasingly elastic characteristics of local territorial dynamics, involving supra-urban extension and intensified inter-city interactions at the same time.

Nevertheless, the relational perspective also has its limit, especially when analyzing a regime that is also with fundamentally authoritarian settings. As mentioned above, the Chinese cities have long been woven in a clearly demarcated hierarchical structure with a complicated system of administrative and spatial divisions (Chan, 2010a). Local territorial dynamics are hence first and foremost shaped hierarchically, with five levels (central, provincial, prefectural, county and township) and their power hierarchy defined *a priori* (Ma, 2005). This power hierarchy is also and often represented via the “rank-based power,” which establishes rigorous and corresponding relations between each level and their territorial and spatial power in dealing with local and trans-local issues (Cartier, 2016; Landry, 2008). Hence, when we look into inter-city interactions, we have to figure out first what ranks of power are at work, and how they are hierarchically arranged, so as to understand the asymmetrical power relations and avoid the simplified assumption of homogenous authorities (Chung and Lam, 2009; He,

Bayrak & Lin, 2018). In this regard, how and how far, we may wonder, are local territories (re-)shaped simultaneously by various authorities with different ranks and uneven power relations? In other words, how is the relational and the hierarchical articulated and reconciled in practices? To better decode the relational making of local territory in China's emerging city regions, it turns out that we should attend to the uneven power hierarchy, together with their impacts on the issue of relationality. And for this concern, we suggest further engaging with and reflecting on recent debates on the topological view of space, power and the state.

Topology and the extended local territory

In the endeavor to bring a topological view into discussions on the geographies of power, Allen and his collaborators (Allen, 2011, 2016; Allen and Cochrane, 2007, 2010) mainly focus on the making of *reach* through and beyond physical distances. From this perspective, the most important lesson we can learn topologically is to see how and how far certain power dynamics are cutting across proximity and distance, so as to make nearby anew from afar or bring distant others within close reach. "Reach" is redefined here as "the ability of the state to permeate everyday life or to make itself present... at a distance" (Allen and Cochrane, 2010: 1074), which then pre-conditions intensified and mediated relations of power and transforms the power geometries (located and fixed space-power nexus) into power topologies (mundane and fluid geographies of power, see Allen, 2011: 290-91). Ghertner (2017), on the other hand, develops an alternative framework with what he coins "the topological state." Shifting

the focus from the conduct of the state to that of the local people, he recognizes the vernacular ways in which “provisional access to a state apparatus” is enabled (ibid, 737), eventually rendering the state functioning “as a more porous form prone to manipulation and rule bending” (p.745). On top of the difference between the two accounts – on the state’s making of reach and the grassroots and conjunctural agency of shaping proximate connections – we suggest they together mark two key moments that demonstrate the validity of the topological perspective in interrogating the prosaic geographies of power and stateness (see Painter, 2006). This validity can also be clearly recognized in some recent discussions on the reassembling of governmental techniques (Collier, 2009; Harvey, P., 2012) and the politics of urban densities (McFarlane, 2016; Zhao, 2020), among other related topics.

The popularity of this topological approach, however, requires further reflections. Instead of taking the topology as “a satisfactory synonym for relationality,” Martin and Secor (2014: 435) aptly remind us to attend more to the processes through which “those relations are repetitively reproduced, and yet continually changed.” A topological view, in other words, is to focus on the rules of connection, disconnection and transformation, rather than simply claiming that certain things or forces are related to each other, as if this has been turned into another kind of “spatial truth.” The attention to the patterns of correlation also marks Collier’s (2009) key concern in his Foucauldian account of the topologies of power. He recognizes the break in Foucault’s writing on biopolitics and the state and foreground the changing arrangements of governmental elements and their connective properties to reflect on bio-politics of population. The topological approach,

in this view, would require us to “trace certain techniques and technical mechanisms from one context to the other” (ibid., 100), so as to make the new topologies of power intelligible. This approach is not something set *a priori* or has by default been a panacea to better investigate the spatiality-power nexus. Instead of essentializing the topological approach, our task is to look into the grounded and actually-existing spatial and power dynamics in making certain reaches possible or distances being cut across – often also with their own limits. In this process, it is crucial to interrogate together – rather than isolate between – the topology and the topography, the connection and the rupture, the reproduction and the transformation and the arrangement and the rearrangement (see, for instance, Abdullah et al., 2023).

This reflection has an echo from the past, when researchers on the Actor Network Theory work hard to explore the spatialities of heterogeneous manners of “the social” (see particularly Law and Mol 2001, Mol and Law 1994). Instead of making a dualism between the topography and the topology, as was premised on in Allen’s works, they take a radical view and see different spatialities as diverse manifestations of the social topologies: the *regions* are with “old and secure” solidity, the *networks* are newer with formality yet still bounded, and the *fluid* is without boundaries and allows leakage, for instance (Mol and Law 1994: 644). On top of this, and more relevant to our discussions here, they bring to the fore “the inter-topological effects” as the primary issue to attend to when dealing with more than one spatialities. When the networks are generating new regions “by crossing boundaries and spreading themselves” (ibid., 649), for instance, a certain type of inter-topological effects is at work and induce what Latour (1986) would

coin the “immutable mobile.” Similarly, the flows of elements could sometimes lead to “variation without boundaries and transformation without discontinuity,” which in turn paves the way for the rise of a fluid space (Mol and Law 1994: 658), characterized not by breaks or disruptions but rather by the gradual adaptation (Law and Mol 2001: 614). This pattern marks another kind of inter-topological effects where the object is turned into a “mutable mobile,” one that changes its shape gradually as it flows, cutting across regions and/or networks, yet still with a shape constancy at the same time.

When the “Eastern Shenzhen” is being configured, how to account for the roles of Shenzhen and Shanwei authorities respectively in the complicated scalar and territorial pattern? Shall we take Shenzhen as an “immutable mobile” that has been replicating and spreading its own socio-spatiality simply by crossing boundaries and cutting across distances? Or is it more appropriate to examine whether and how the authorities, images and landscapes of both Shenzhen and Shanwei have been transformed in this process, more akin to “mutable mobiles”? In this paper, we want to draw on the above discussion on the inter-topological effect and propose the *extended local territory* as our analytical concept. Recognising and reconciling both the extensive (topography) and the intensive (topology), this concept aims to illustrate how and how far SSCZ is co-configured with both extensive territoriality and intensive locality. On the one hand, Shenzhen is indeed turned into a model “place-object” in the state’s territorial agenda, embodying a more advanced urban economy, society and landscape in the view of both the central and the provincial authorities, which *should* be spread elsewhere to tackle regional unevenness as an “immutable mobile.” But on the other hand, the local remaking of this Shenzhen

socio-spatiality in SSCZ does not manage to dissolve the gap between two places at all.

While Shanwei concurs with the view on Shenzhen's advanced-ness and would capture this opportunity to pursue economic growth and achieve their own aspiration, the long-lasting local conditions are not ready for a complete or smooth replication of Shenzhen.

The integrity of Shenzhen as a "place-object" is hence challenged and disrupted, in particular by existing institutional arrangements and boundaries (hierarchical) and local concerns and demands in SSCZ (regional). Here, two different types of localities have to encounter and play with each other in configuring SSCZ – the locality of Shenzhen as a "place-object" and that of SSCZ, rooted in the local history and geography and pre-conditions what the zone is and could be. Also, these intensified localities have to come across at the same time the solid and "old" state space (together with all the institutions that are involved) that is also in the way of making the "immutable mobile." Because of these tensions and interactions, the gap and distance between Shenzhen and Shanwei are only partly traversed and hardly dissolved (cf. Allen, 2011), with Shenzhen's reach as a "place-object" made and felt in SSCZ to a certain extent while with its limit as well. The meaning of seeing through the inter-topological effects hence emerges vividly: it is at boundaries between the extensive and the intensive, the immutable and the mutable, the mobile and the immobile and the local and the trans-local that we can best illustrate the ways in which spatiality and power are imbued with each other in SSCZ. Our task, to wrap up, is to draw on this inter-topological view and trace the patterns of correlation in the mundane geographies of power that are configuring the *extended local*

territory – in terms for example of replication, rupture, connection and gradual adaptation.

The following sections will take Shenzhen-Shanwei Special Cooperation Zone as an example to scrutinize the scalar-territorial dynamics and inter-topological effects in the making of “Eastern Shenzhen.” Our investigation here focuses on the multi-faceted state territorial strategies and maneuvers of various actors in this case. Semi-structured interviews and participant observations were conducted during five spells of fieldwork in Shenzhen and SSCZ between July 2018 and April 2021. We did 35 interviews with various key figures in the place-making process, including the officials in Shenzhen and Shanwei municipal governments and the SSCZ management committee. We had another 11 interviews with those who witnessed or experienced the development of SSCZ, including urban planners, academics as well as local residents living or working in the zone. On average, each interview is with around one hour. we have also collected and compiled secondary data to triangulate our findings with other sources, including the statistical yearbooks, government reports and local news reports between 2011 and 2022.

Extensive territoriality and multi-scalar power relations

Despite its reputation as the “World Factory” and one of the most productive economic regions in China, Guangdong Province has been grappling with regional disparities in recent decades. Building up joint development zones, as the inter-urban cooperation between developed and less developed cities, is often regarded a significant strategy to

tackle regional unevenness. In 2008, Guangdong provincial government pledged a 50-billion yuan (about \$7,480 million) financial package to build regional facilities, half of which were invested into the joint development zones. Shenzhen-Shanwei Industrial Transfer Zone, the predecessor of SSCZ, was established under the provincial agenda of “Special Economic Zone in partnership with the underdeveloped Revolutionary Zone” (*tequ dai laoqu*). Such a political-strategic agenda, implicitly laden with the daunting task of “paired assistance” (*duikou bangfu*), was shortly reoriented into a more appealing narrative and embodied in the new name of this zone – Shenzhen-Shanwei Special Cooperation Zone (see also Wang and Zheng, 2024). With the narrative of “special cooperation,” SSCZ has been developed through two stages: the Shenzhen-Shanwei joint management model from 2011 to 2017, followed by Shenzhen’s overall management since September 2017. This evolution also delineates clearly the process of making extensive territoriality, that is, enabling territorial practices of the extra-territorial authority from elsewhere.

This section examines the making of extensive territoriality intertwined with multi-scalar power relations. We first explore how the “special cooperation” narrative initially deployed by the provincial government binds two significantly different areas together and paves the way for the extensive territoriality of Shenzhen. We will then look at the ways in which Shenzhen and Shanwei have been utilizing this narrative to fulfill their own territorial aspirations. The extensiveness at issue is also with its limits, and we will turn to this point in the next section.

The scalar-making of “special cooperation”

The “special cooperation” narrative was first and foremost manifested in a public speech by Wang Yang, then top leader of Guangdong province, when he paid a visit to Shanwei in 2011 and elaborated on his vision of further developing SSCZ:

“The mode of cooperation should surpass paired support with friendship and lead instead to coordinated and mutually beneficial development. For this purpose, we must move from one-way transfer to *special cooperation* between both sides” (Yangcheng Evening News, 22 May 2011).

Along with this vision, SSCZ was turned into a joint development zone between Shenzhen and Shanwei, which marks an alternative approach of “special cooperation” and paves the way for Shenzhen’s socio-economic and material elements, as the “place-object,” to be gradually spread into SSCZ. Being empowered to establish mutually beneficial partnerships with Shanwei, Shenzhen was expected to “play a more critical role than a provider of economic aid,” instructed by Wang Yang (interview with Shenzhen official, 11 July 2018). Accordingly, Shenzhen municipal government has been striving for greater control in SSCZ, so as to offer a “Guangdong Model” and address the national concerns of tackling regional unevenness (interview with SSCZ official, 25 December 2019). This aspiration had also been recognized by Hu Chunhua, the succeeding top leader of Guangdong. During his visit to SSCZ in 2017, Hu declared that “the existing mode of Shenzhen-Shanwei joint management can no longer meet the

needs of SSCZ's rapid development. It is imperative to change the collaboration from a temporary, assistance-based mode to one that is appropriate for long-term production, operation, and management" (Shenshan Yearbook Editorial Committee, 2020). As such, SSCZ embarked on a new administrative mode with Shenzhen's overall management in September 2017.

Concurring with the "special cooperation" narrative, Shanwei has been embracing this new mode by emphasizing its comparative advantage of territory, part of which is ready for further developing SSCZ. We can illustrate this issue more clearly with some numbers. While Shenzhen has been generating the highest GDP per capita among Chinese cities, it has been constrained by its limited territory, with only 1,997 square kilometers in total, which are with more than 50 per cent of land development intensity (*First Finance*, 19 March 2021). Shanwei on the other hand is much bigger, with 5,271 square kilometers of territory, while it ranks the last in terms of economic growth rate in Guangdong. The two cities' respective aspirations of spatial expansion and economic development could hence be articulated together to "hook up" the provincial agenda of regional development. This is also evidenced by our interview with a SSCZ official:

"The complementarity between Shenzhen and Shanwei is much stronger than that between any other cities. From a political-strategic view, such cooperation is in line with the trend of coordinated development. If Shenzhen cooperates with Dongguan or Huizhou (another two developed cities in PRD), it might be joked as

a ‘club of the rich’ and will lose much of its strategic significance” (interview with SSCZ official, 7 January 2020).

Indeed, the multi-scalar making of “special cooperation” has had its strategic significance being recognized before long. In 2019, SSCZ gained recognition from the central government and was designated as a national demonstration zone of regional coordination (State Council, 2019). In other words, the legitimacy of Shenzhen’s extra-territorial authority has been endorsed with the central and provincial governments’ concern of tackling regional unevenness by spreading Shenzhen’s advanced-ness. This explains why and how Shenzhen is turned into a model “place-object” in the state’s territorial agenda, referring to a more advanced economy, society and landscape to be replicated and expanded. We now turn to the conducts of both Shanwei and Shenzhen in enabling and conditioning such vision, which eventually pave the way for the rise of extensive territoriality in SSCZ.

The rise of extensive territoriality

In line with the territorial arrangement of promoting coordinated regional development in the form of replicating Shenzhen’s advanced-ness in SSCZ, a series of administrative reforms have been carried out, involving both Shanwei’s concessions on jurisdictional managements and Shenzhen’s increasing authority on local issues. In the first stage (before 2017), to better cooperate with Shenzhen in driving economic development, Shanwei delegated a total of 188 economic functions to SSCZ and kept only its role of

social management in the zone. Meanwhile, staff members of the SSCZ authority were co-dispatched by Shenzhen and Shanwei. For example, the Party Secretary of SSCZ was from Shanwei while the Director was from Shenzhen; Shenzhen officials were in general appointed to manage economic affairs while Shanwei officials were responsible for social affairs. With the transfer of local management responsibilities, the subjects involved in SSCZ started to produce a more topological space with institutional continuity that links Shenzhen to SSCZ in a closer way, where according to a top leader of Shanwei, “Shenzhen Special Economic Zone now comes to Shanwei’s doorstep” (Shenshan Yearbook Editorial Committee, 2020). Furthermore, a metaphor of “Eastern Shenzhen” was promoted to further showcase the extensive territoriality of Shenzhen. For, the retreat of Shanwei from managing SSCZ makes an institutional void to be filled with Shenzhen’s jurisdictional power, which in turn makes the reach of Shenzhen increasingly palpable.

The extensive territoriality was further intensified in the second stage (after 2017), when SSCZ has been under Shenzhen’s overall management, with leadership positions all taken up by Shenzhen officials. Illustrating the direct presence and intense impacts of Shenzhen authorities, our interviewees often address a key transition from personnel “dispatch” to “appointment.” Dispatch, as a method of personnel transfer conducted in the first stage, was a form of cross-border administrative aid: officials from Shenzhen would only have a term of three years, the renewal of which is subject to approval from both Shenzhen and Shanwei. Appointment, on the other hand, implies that Shenzhen municipal government can appoint officials directly for SSCZ, with no restrictions on

the length of term or its renewal. This depicts vividly Shenzhen's consolidation of its political-territorial authorities in places beyond its border, gradually promoting "the production of the continuity necessary for the existence of legitimate territory" (Lussault, 2016: 114) in and through its extensive territoriality.

Topological continuities as such have not only reconfigured the local state power, but also elicited strong responses from local residents and enterprises keen to invest in the zone, both of whom aspire to benefit from the spreading of Shenzhen's advancedness. Being informed that Shenzhen had been granted power of overall management, "some villagers started to engage in land and housing development illegally, aiming to capture the expected increase of land values, which might be induced by the possible incorporation of SSCZ into Shenzhen" (interview with SSCZ official, 13 September 2018). In addition, local residents in SSCZ are eager to transfer their *hukou* to Shenzhen and turn themselves into "Shenzhen people" (see further discussion in the next section). According to a local report:

"The local residents fully support Shenzhen's overall management, and even take the *hukou* transfer for granted. Some villagers believe that if their *hukou* could not be transferred to Shenzhen, then the term 'special cooperation' is an exaggeration, and they will visit government offices or write letters to lodge complaints" (SSCZ Management Committee, 2018)

The market actors are also optimistic about this extensive territoriality. We were told by an enterprise manager that “as long as Shenzhen enables its authority to be exercised, SSCZ would be a half of success” (interview with manager, 18 December 2018). With the rise of topological connections in SSCZ, the number of enterprises that are interested in making investment has been increasing dramatically. For example, in the first half of 2018, more than 300 enterprises visited SSCZ (mostly from Shenzhen), which exceeded the whole year’s figure in 2017. By the end of 2018, 87% of enterprises settled down in SSCZ were from Shenzhen (Shenshan Yearbook Editorial Committee, 2020), which further evidences economic effects of Shenzhen’s extensive authority and territoriality in SSCZ.

The material replication of place-object

Following the institutional changes towards extensive territoriality, we also witnessed the transplanting of Shenzhen-based facilities and Shenzhen-style landscapes in SSCZ, which is a further step of replicating Shenzhen as a model “place-object.” This spatial transformation first unfolded with the reorientation of SSCZ’s urban function in its new master plan, formulated by Shenzhen municipal government and incorporated into the Shenzhen City Master Plan (2017-2035). SSCZ was recognized as “Eastern Gateway of Greater Bay Area, New Centre of Guangdong Eastern Coastal Economic Belt, and the Extended Zone of Shenzhen Self-dependent Innovation.” In this way, national and regional strategies were incorporated into Shenzhen’s ambition and vision of remaking SSCZ, rendering the image of “Eastern Shenzhen” palpable, accessible and operational.

This aspiration of territorial extension is further supported by a new and high-standard transport system. Historically, Shanwei had long been marginalized with poor transport connections, which has been “sitting on 455-kilometer coastline yet with no port, and adjacent to Special Economic Zones yet with no access to railway” (*21st Century Business Herald*, 19 March 2012). In the SSCZ Master Plan, a new transport system was set up, with three ports, four stations, four railways and five highways, aiming to integrate the zone into the “30-minute circle” of Shenzhen. This marks a key step in promoting “Eastern Shenzhen,” where topological maneuvers were consolidated in and through topographical transformation of the zone, particularly in terms of transport connections and time-space compression for more investments.

Furthermore, the transplant of Shenzhen-based facilities and Shenzhen-style urban landscapes marks another strategy of local place-making to reshape SSCZ in line with Shenzhen as a model “place-object” (see Figure 2). Taking education infrastructures as an example, there has been neither middle nor high school in this zone for decades, and local students had to leave their hometown to get education opportunities elsewhere. On the other hand, the rapid expansion of urban population in Shenzhen induced a severe shortage in land provision for building up new schools. The two dilemmas were well resolved together in and through SSCZ. Nanshan district government in Shenzhen signed an agreement with SSCZ in 2018 to introduce high-quality educational resources ranging from kindergarten to high school. This was soon put into practice: a 12-acre school campus was built up in just two years, aiming to teach with the same standard as Shenzhen Nanshan Foreign Language School, one of the most prestigious schools in

Shenzhen. Shenzhen also issued High School Construction Plan (2020-2025) in 2020 and proposed to construct four education parks for new high schools, including one in SSCZ that would involve a total investment of 3.3 billion yuan (about \$ 450 million, see SSCZ Management Committee, 2021).

[Figure 2 about here]

In terms of medical cares, as the first Shenzhen medical institution settling down in SSCZ, the SSCZ Branch of Peking University Shenzhen Hospital also marks that the medical operation at SSCZ has been incorporated into Shenzhen's medical system. As to other urban utility systems, such as gas, water and public transport, most of them have also been taken over by public or private sectors from Shenzhen. These changes in both urban landscapes and social services not just visualize the territorial authority of Shenzhen, but also produces a socio-spatial pattern underlined by the lure of Shenzhen's advanced-ness, which plays a crucial role in legitimatizing the new political-territorial conjuncture in SSCZ.

To wrap up, the operation and integration of various territorial ideas, technologies and practices together enables the development of SSCZ, and this in turn shows alternative approaches to the (re-)imagination and production of extended territory in city-region making. This zone hence illustrates well how and how far the local territory, as a politically contested arena, has been (re-)made topologically by the multi-scalar power relations that are involved. In this sense, we should attend to the relatedness and

extendedness of power topology in spatial politics and seek to locate their material configurations in variegated forms. Instead of foregrounding the administrative levels or pre-given boundaries *per se*, it would be more helpful to capture the porous and flexible nature of boundaries and explore the territorial modalities that are getting increasingly elastic and extensive. This marks a promising approach to better decode the process of territorial differentiation, circulation and calculation in terms of city-region making, both in and beyond China. There are still gaps, nevertheless, in the local replication of this Shenzhen “place-object,” since the tensions among localities and the institutional underpinnings of scalar politics are at best partly resolved. In this regard, there are always limits to the capacity of Shenzhen as an *immutable mobile* in reshaping SSCZ. We will now turn to such tensions and local conditions that are at work.

Intensive localities and the limits of the *immutable mobile*

While Shenzhen gains greater control in managing SSCZ, it is not able to make SSCZ its own territory through the adjustment of administrative division, which in turn sets an actually-existing limit to the production of extended territory. In contrast to Shenzhen’s sometimes aggressive territorial maneuvers, other actors involved tend to maintain the institutional setting of temporary – even though “special” – cooperation. For both the central and provincial governments, the practice of coordinated regional development is the primary concern. In this vein, Shenzhen’s experiences, resources and achievements could be helpful to foster Shanwei’s economic growth by producing “Eastern Shenzhen”. And as long as SSCZ is “located” in Shanwei and subordinated

jurisdictionally to the latter, it can still be depicted as a model of regional cooperation, which refers only implicitly to Shenzhen's authority and control in the zone. Otherwise, as an official indicates, "if Shenzhen incorporates SSCZ, then it would be questioned as a new kind of 'hegemonic localism,' and other cities are likely to follow similar maneuvers to acquire land beyond their border. This is what the higher-level authorities may worry about" (interview with SSCZ official, 2 November 2020).

As to Shanwei, though it waives most of its jurisdictional power, this is better seen as a temporary strategy that is also in line with the expectations from the above: Shenzhen will have to step back from SSCZ by the end of the cooperation period. Interestingly, Shenzhen has been avoiding mentioning the expiration date of their agreement with Shanwei, while Shanwei officials keep talking about it in public. The counterbalance in an assemblage of central, regional and local actors keeps working, and thus the integrity of Shenzhen as an *immutable mobile* – in terms of economic leverage, political authority and social engineering – has consistently been challenged. The intensiveness of the extended territory has been further amplified by the tensions between various localities and scalar-oriented institutional underpinnings, inviting us to attend more to the dialectics between the extensive and the intensive, the immutable and the mutable and the local and the trans-local in making "Eastern Shenzhen."

The challenged economic leverage

Since the establishment of SSCZ, Shenzhen has been working hard to render sensible its economic influence in the zone by implementing a series of industrial policies. They

signed industrial transfer agreements with Shanwei in 2011, designated SSCZ as a key area for industrial transformation and upgrading in 2012, and provided equal treatments with preferential policies and efficient services in 2015. Shenzhen authorities were very confident in their capabilities, through such policy schemes, to develop SSCZ. However, the reality in the zone did not echo this grand vision, especially in its early years. For example, in contrast to the commitment that Shenzhen would transfer 4,000 industrial projects to SSCZ by 2015, the reality is that only 244 projects were contracted and 13 put into full operation from 2011 to 2016. Moreover, SSCZ's share of the total GDP in Shanwei was only 4.9% in 2016, contributing little to the latter's economic take-off (Shenshan Yearbook Editorial Committee, 2020).

The slow progress reflects the limit of Shenzhen's economic leverage in SSCZ, and our interviewees offered some clues to understand this better. The reason was straightforward in the first stage of SSCZ (before 2017): "those enterprises would hesitate to invest here as long as Shenzhen does not really come into SSCZ" (interview with SSCZ official, 25 December 2019). In other words, Shenzhen was expected to play a dominant role in much the same way as what Allen talked about regarding the arm's-length reach and relational proximity: "the mutable geometry involved is less concerned with... their inscribed position, and more interested in what works, say, to hold authority in place" (Allen, 2011:292). Yet, with no adjustment of administrative division, Shenzhen failed to make its spatial leverage and presence sensible or visible. In another interview, we were informed that even when Shenzhen started its overall

management of SSCZ in the second stage, the structural constraints still prevented it from promoting local business environment.

“While Shenzhen has made substantial efforts in attracting investment, it is we town governments who are in charge of enterprise service and management, including land expropriation, business qualification review and safety production supervision. However, we are understaffed and lack the power of administrative enforcement. Previously, Haifeng county government often sent personnel to assist us in routine management; now, with the retreat of Shanwei, Haifeng is also reluctant to continue its involvement, which results in much lower efficiency of administration and hence diminishes the enthusiasm for investment” (interview with town official, 19 April 2021).

This is a moment when the tension between the “immutable mobile” and the local conditions is vividly presented. Even though Shenzhen manages to spread its economic influences and “advanced-ness,” this mobility is yet constrained by the regions that are with “old and secure” solidity (Mol and Law 1994), showcasing the dialectics between the extensive and the intensive while also highlighting the significance of locality and power hierarchy in understanding better the inter-topological effects at work.

Troubling political authority

Not only the economic leverage, but also the political authority of Shenzhen has been situated in tensions, if not struggles. This situation could be illustrated through a case of local mobilization we learned in our fieldwork, which happened at the beginning of making SSCZ in the early 2010s. At that time, the management committee of SSCZ planned to build up a road to connect the four towns in the zone, which required town governments and local villagers' supports for land appropriation. One of the town mayors convened a meeting with villagers, yet not to persuade them, but instead to mobilize them to boycott this plan. The tension between the management committee and town governments was first and foremost induced by the vague connotation of the term "joint management," which lacked legal instructions and bureaucratic clarification. These towns were under Shanwei's jurisdiction and the SSCZ management committee did not get administrative endorsements for its political technologies and conducts. Unmatched authorities and non-affiliated bureaucrats hence led to an impasse of city-region making.

While direct confrontations as such gradually disappeared afterwards, especially in the second stage of SSCZ, nonconfrontational yet disobedient local responses continue setting the limit of transplanting the "immutable mobile." For instance, the SSCZ management committee initiated a project of rural environmental beautification. This effort, however, met with indifference from local villagers and was eventually stopped "as they argue this is an encroachment on their territory" (interview with SSCZ official, 18 April 2021). Similar cases are so common that the officials we interviewed

often complained to us: “what we have been striving to do progressed very slowly since people here remain suspicious of this cooperation” (interview with SSCZ official, 13 July 2018).

Moments as such reveal the power dynamics involved in the encounter between the “immutable mobile” and local conditions in SSCZ, where Shenzhen’s aspiration of materializing its extensive territoriality is undermined by the grassroots politics rooted in local history and geography. These tensions in and between localities also invite us to attend more carefully to the “local” dimension in the production of “extended local territory,” where the intensive locality has always been challenging, interrupting and setting the limit of boundary crossing and distance traversing.

The suspended social transformation

The tension between the extensive territoriality and the intensive locality has been further increased by the undelivered commitment of *hukou* transfer, which was an important tactic of Shenzhen to consolidate its authorities in SSCZ. The *hukou* system in China is a key institutional arrangement of social welfare provision for different social groups. Since the quantity and quality of welfares depend on each place’s economic strength (Chan, 2010b), the prosperity of Shenzhen is hence translated into much better social welfare provision than that in Shanwei. In this context, getting Shenzhen *hukou* became extremely attractive for SSCZ residents. This expectation was in turn deployed tactically by Shenzhen officials. In August 2018, for instance, a deputy mayor of Shenzhen declared that “local residents’ *hukou* in SSCZ will be transferred to

Shenzhen” (*Nanfang Daily*, 24 August 2018). Enterprise employees working in SSCZ were also expected to be granted Shenzhen *hukou*, which marks another way to attract more “talents.”

This *hukou* commitment was arguably the most exciting news for residents and workers in SSCZ, as mentioned earlier. However, whether Shenzhen can really deliver on its commitment remains uncertain as there has been no precedent of transferring local people’s *hukou* status without the adjustment of administrative division. Indeed, more than five years have passed since Shenzhen announced the above plan, but SSCZ residents are still waiting while enterprise employees are not assured to get Shenzhen *hukou* either. This suspension can be partly explained by concerns of the central and provincial governments about the risk of “hegemonic localism.” To avoid Shenzhen being regionally “hegemonic,” administrative restructuring has not been put on the agenda, which hence prevents the transfer of *hukou* for SSCZ residents. An interviewee reminded us that the media coverage of that deputy mayor’s *hukou* commitment had already been withdrawn from the Internet (interview with SSCZ official, 2 November 2020).

Once again, this scenario shows us another limit of the extensive territoriality in making “Eastern Shenzhen.” Even though this project embodies a new political framing of territorial (re-)making towards city-region development, it is by no means a singular political-spatial action to territorialize social and material transformation once and for all. The role of the central and provincial governments, as well as Shanwei authorities, still looms large, often casting intensive shadows over the extensiveness of Shenzhen

and challenging and disrupting its otherwise significant social, political and economic effects.

Conclusion

This paper analyses the subjects, spatialities and power dynamics involved in China's city-region making through the case of Shenzhen-Shanwei Special Cooperation Zone. Critically engaging with the relational lens in addressing spatio-political dynamics of city-region making, we also attend to the authoritarian setting of power hierarchy and explore how the relational and the hierarchical have been articulated in the grounded political dynamics. Inspired by works of the actor-network theorists, we foreground the inter-topological effects (in terms of the *immutable mobile*, for instance) to trace the spatial, political and lived mechanisms of correlation that are involved in the production of SSCZ, which turn out to be critical to register more clearly the prosaic geographies of power in making certain reaches possible or distances being cut across – often also with their own limits. This approach to state, space and power is promising for us to better understand subnational territorial relations that are interwoven with inter-urban competition and cooperation.

With the case of SSCZ, we elaborate on how and how far the territorial ambition and authority of Shenzhen have been wrapped up into an *immutable mobile* to traverse boundaries and bridge gaps. In the rise of extensive territoriality in SSCZ, we can see clearly how the operation and integration of territorial ideas, technologies and practices have enabled SSCZ's development. It is hence helpful to foreground the porous and

flexible nature of boundaries and explore the territorial modalities that are getting increasingly elastic and extensive, which marks a promising approach to better decode the processes of territorial differentiation, circulation and calculation in city-region making. On the other hand, the intensiveness of extended territory has been amplified by tensions among various localities and scalar-oriented institutional underpinnings, inviting us to attend more to the dialectics between the extensive and the intensive, the immutable and the mutable and the local and the trans-local in “Eastern Shenzhen.” In such moments as the challenged aspirations of economic leverage, the troubling of local authorities by grassroots politics, and the suspension of promised social transformation due to scalar constraints and fears of “hegemonic localism,” we are reminded how and how far those long-lasting local conditions and trans-scalar settings of power hierarchy are not yet ready for a complete transplant of Shenzhen in SSCZ. Shenzhen’s aspiration of materializing its extensive territoriality has consistently been challenged by both the scalar constraints and the grassroots politics rooted in local history and geography.

The *mobility* of this “immutable mobile,” in other words, has been constrained by the regions that are with “old and secure” *solidity* (see Mol and Law 1994), reminding us of the efficacy of the inter-topological framework in interrogating such cases. This is also the reason why we advocate for the *extended local territory* as a keyword to investigate the replication, rupture, connection and adaptation in the spatial politics of city-region making. The institutional underpinnings of the extensive territoriality and the intensive localities are also depicted in Figure 3, where the solid arrow indicates the scalar-hierarchical effects in consolidating “old and secure” local territories (rank and

locality), while the dotted arrow highlights the emergence of “immutable mobile” that struggles to transcend the scalar setting and remake places topologically. In addition to further demonstrate the dialectics between the extensive and the intensive and the immutable and the mutable, this figure is also helpful to further reflect on city-region making: it is not, and will not be, a singular political-spatial action to territorialize social and material transformation once and for all.

[Figure 3 about here]

Instead of simply claiming that certain things or forces are related to each other, we focus here on the rules of connection, disconnection and transformation and the patterns of correlation at work. This also marks a further concern of us to reflect on the long-lasting discussions on the spatiality of state power (see Brenner et al. 2003). While we concur with previous critiques of the “territorial trap,” we want to suggest that the jump from territory to scale (and later upgraded to the TPSN framework, see Jessop et al. 2008) is still with its weakness, which might be too neat to depict vividly the spatial-political dynamics. We hope the inter-topological lens facilitated here could be of help to extend these debates and critiques. Further works are needed to examine the validity of this analytical lens elsewhere and to interrogate the lived experiences and effects of spatial transformation in city-region making. Is it more likely, for instance, to recognise with this lens tactical and tacit arrangements of spatial politics that lead to intensified

regional *unevenness* – instead of *coordinated* development? The answer to questions as such, it seems, is still blowing in the wind.

Acknowledgement

We appreciate the supports of our interviewees in Shenzhen and Shanwei Municipal Governments and Shenzhen-Shanwei Special Cooperation Zone Management Committee, as well as the local residents we encountered. An earlier draft of this paper was presented in the 2021 Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers. We want to thank Shaina Potts and Julie Klinger for organizing related panel and offering constructive comments. This paper also benefits from the discussions with Yanli Gui and Hanna Hilbrandt, and we are grateful for their supports. The usual disclaimers apply.

Funding

The fieldwork of this research was supported by Major Research Project of Shenzhen Municipal Government in 2018. The follow-up research and writing-up have been supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 42301233; No. 42101196), the SNSF Swiss Postdoctoral Fellowship (Grant No. TMPFP1_210051), Central University of Finance and Economics (Xinmiao Scholar Support Plan, Grant No. XMXZ2307) and Renmin University of China (Grant No. 22XNA010).

References

- 21st Century Business Herald (2012) Shanwei phenomenon (Shanwei xianxiang), 21st Century Business Herald, 19 March.
- Abdullah A, Cardoso R, Dasgupta S, Pati S, Plueckhahn R, Shafique T, Simone A, Teo SSK, Ye J and Zhao Y (2023) Re-arranging the urban: Forms, rhythms, politics. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 48(4) 718-744.
- Allen J and Cochrane A (2010) Assemblages of state power: topological shifts in the organization of government and politics. *Antipode* 42(5): 1071-1089.
- Allen J (2011) Topological twists: Power's shifting geographies. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 1(3): 283-298.
- Allen J (2016) *Topologies of power: Beyond territory and networks*. London: Routledge.
- Allen J and Cochrane A (2007) Beyond the territorial fix: Regional assemblages, politics and power. *Regional Studies* 41(9):1161-1175.
- Amin A (2004) Regions unbound: towards a new politics of place. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 86(1): 33-44.
- Brenner N (2004) *New state spaces: Urban governance and the rescaling of statehood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brenner N, Jessop B, Jones M, et al. (2003) *State/space: A reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cartier C (2016) A political economy of rank: The territorial administrative hierarchy and leadership mobility in urban China. *Journal of Contemporary China* 25(100): 529-546.
- Chan KW (2010a) Fundamentals of China's urbanization and policy. *China Review* 10(1): 63-93.

- Chan KW (2010b) The global financial crisis and migrant workers in China: 'There is no future as a labourer; returning to the village has no meaning'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 34(3): 659-677.
- Chan Y (2021) Research on the Development of the Shenzhen-Shanwei Special Cooperation Zone from the Perspective of the Enclave Economy Model. *Studies on China's Special Economic Zones* 4: 137-155.
- Chien SS (2013) New local state power through administrative restructuring—A case study of post-Mao China county-level urban entrepreneurialism in Kunshan. *Geoforum* 46: 103-112.
- Chung JH and Lam TC (2009) *China's Local Administration*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Collier S (2009) Topologies of Power- Foucault's Analysis of Political Government beyond 'Governmentality'. *Theory, Culture and Society* 26(6): 78-108.
- Delaney D (2008) *Territory: A short introduction*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Elden S (2007) Governmentality, calculation, territory. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 25(3): 562-580.
- Elden S (2010) Land, terrain, territory. *Progress in Human Geography* 34(6): 799-817.
- Elden S (2013) *The birth of territory*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Feng X and Zhao M (2004) On cooperation between the hi-tech zones in the region of Suzhou, Wuxi and Changzhou. *Urban Planning Forum* 1: 18-24+95
- Fernandes BM (2013) Territorios: teoría y disputas por el desarrollo rural. *Novedades en población* 17: 116-113.
- First Finance (2021) Shenzhen has nearly reached 50 per cent of land development intensity. *First Finance*, 14 October.

- Ghertner DA (2017) When Is the State? Topology, Temporality, and the Navigation of Everyday State Space in Delhi. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 107(3): 731-750.
- Halvorsen S (2019) Decolonising territory: Dialogues with Latin American knowledges and grassroots strategies. *Progress in Human Geography* 43(5): 790-814.
- Harvey P (2012) The Topological Quality of Infrastructural Relation: An Ethnographic Approach. *Theory, Culture & Society* 29(45): 76-92.
- He S, Bayrak MM and Lin H (2018) A comparative analysis of multi-scalar regional inequality in China. *Geoforum* 78: 1-11.
- Huang X, Li Y & Hay I (2016) Polycentric city-regions in the state-scalar politics of land development: The case of China. *Land Use Policy* 59: 168-175.
- Jessop, B., Brenner, N., & Jones, M. (2008). Theorizing Sociospatial Relations. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26(3): 389–401.
- Jonas AE (2020) China's urban development in context: Variegated geographies of city-regionalism and managing the territorial politics of urban development. *Urban Studies* 57(3): 701-708.
- Jones M and MacLeod G (2004) Regional spaces, spaces of regionalism: territory, insurgent politics and the English question. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 29(4): 433-452.
- Landry PF (2008) *Decentralized Authoritarianism in China*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Latour B (1986) Visualization and cognition: Drawing Things Together. In: Kuklick H (ed) *Knowledge and Society: Studies in the Sociology of Culture Past and Present* Vol. 6. Greenwich: JAI Press, pp.1-40.

- Law J and Mol A (2001) Situating Technoscience: An Inquiry into Spatialities. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 19(5): 609-621.
- Li Y and Jonas AE (2019) City-regionalism as countervailing geopolitical processes: The evolution and dynamics of Yangtze River Delta region, China. *Political Geography* 73: 70-81.
- Li Y and Wu F (2018) Understanding city-regionalism in China: Regional cooperation in the Yangtze River Delta. *Regional Studies* 52(3): 313-324.
- Li Z, Xu J and Yeh A (2014) State rescaling and the making of city-regions in the Pearl River Delta, China. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 32(1): 129-143.
- Li Y, Zhang X, Phelps N and Tu M (2023) Closed or connected? The economic geography of technological collaboration between special economic zones in China's Suzhou-Wuxi-Changzhou metropolitan area. *Urban Geography* 44(9): 1995-2015.
- Lussault M (2016) *L'Homme spatial. La construction sociale de l'espace humain: La construction sociale de l'espace humain*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Ma LJ (2005) Urban administrative restructuring, changing scale relations and local economic development in China. *Political Geography* 24(4): 477-497.
- Ma LJ (2009) China's authoritarian capitalism: growth, elitism and legitimacy. *International Development Planning Review* 31(1): i-xii.
- Martin L and Secor AJ (2014) Towards a post-mathematical topology. *Progress in Human Geography* 38(3): 420-438.
- McFarlane C (2016) The geographies of urban density: Topology, politics and the city. *Progress in Human Geography* 40(5): 629-648.

- Mol A and Law J (1994) Regions, networks and fluids: Anaemia and social topology. *Social Studies of Science* 24(4): 641-671.
- Nanfang Daily (2018) How to share Shenzhen benefit with new Shenzhen people. *Nanfang Daily*, 24 August.
- Ngo TW, Yin C and Tang Z (2017) Scalar restructuring of the Chinese state: The subnational politics of development zones. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 35(1): 57-75.
- Oakes T (2023) The National New Area as an Infrastructure Space: Urbanization and the New Regime of Circulation in China. *The China Quarterly* 255: 575-590.
- Paasi A (2012) Border studies reanimated: going beyond the territorial/relational divide. *Environment and Planning A* 44(10): 2303-2309.
- Painter J (2006) Prosaic geographies of stateness. *Political Geography* 25(2): 752-774
- Painter J (2010) Rethinking territory. *Antipode* 42(5): 1090-1118.
- Schwarz A and Streule M (2016) A transposition of territory: Decolonized perspectives in current urban research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 40(5): 1000-1016.
- Shenshan Yearbook Editorial Committee (2011-2020) *Shenshan Yearbook*. Unpublished government document.
- Shenzhen Special Zone Daily* (2018) Pathfinder in enclave economy, pioneer in regional coordination. *Shenzhen Special Zone Daily*, 20 November.
- Simone A (2004) People as infrastructure: intersecting fragments in Johannesburg. *Public Culture* 16(3): 407-429.
- SSCZ Management Committee (2018) *Reflections and Suggestions for Accelerating the Integrated Development of SSCZ at the New Beginning*. Unpublished government report.

- SSCZ Management Committee (2021) Three public tenders launched for the Construction Project of SSCZ Education Park. Available at: http://www.szss.gov.cn/sstbhzq/ssw/jrss/tpxw/content/post_9055323.html (accessed 6 June 2024).
- Sum NL (2018) The production of a trans-regional scale: China's 'One Belt One Road' imaginary. In: Paasi A, Harrison J and Jones M (eds) *Handbook on the Geographies of Regions and Territories*. Cheltenham and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp.428-443.
- The State Council (2019) Opinions on Supporting Shenzhen to Build a Pilot Demonstration Area of Socialism with Chinese Characteristics. Available at: http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/2019-08/18/content_5422183.htm (accessed 8 April 2020).
- Wang X and Zheng G (2024) Narrating regional coordinated development: Discursive practices in China's city-regions. *Cities* 146: 104768.
- Wu F (2016) China's emergent city-region governance: A new form of state spatial selectivity through state-orchestrated rescaling. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 40(6): 1134-1151.
- Xu J (2008) Governing city-regions in China: Theoretical issues and perspectives for regional strategic planning. *Town Planning Review* 79(2-3): 157-187.
- Xu J and Yeh A (2009) Decoding urban land governance: state reconstruction in contemporary Chinese cities. *Urban Studies* 46(3): 559-581.
- Xu J and Yeh A (2013) Interjurisdictional Cooperation through Bargaining: The Case of the Guangzhou—Zhuhai Railway in the Pearl River Delta, China. *The China Quarterly* 213: 130-151.

Yangcheng Evening News (2011) A sign ceremony was held in Shenzhen-Shanwei

Special Cooperation Zone yesterday. *Yangcheng Evening News*, 22 May.

Zhang X, Li Y, Zhou C, et al. (2023) Rescaling of the land regime in the making of city-regions: A case study of China's Pearl River Delta. *Urban Studies* 60(3): 483-500.

Zhao Y (2020) Folding Beijing in Houchangcun Road, or, the topology of power density. *Urban Geography* 41(10): 1247-1259.




Figure 1. The location of Shenzhen-Shanwei Special Cooperation Zone
Source: produced by authors

143x94mm (150 x 150 DPI)



Figure 2. Shenzhen facilities and landscapes in SSCZ (top: Peking University Shenzhen Hospital; bottom: Shenzhen Nanshan Foreign Language School)
Source: photos by interviewees, April 2024

345x352mm (150 x 150 DPI)




Figure 3. The institutional dynamics of the extended local territorySource: produced by authors

357x297mm (72 x 72 DPI)



Citation on deposit: Wang, X., & Zhao, Y. (in press). The production of extended local territory: Topology and the spatial politics of city-region making in China. *Urban Studies*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980241270959>

For final citation and metadata, visit Durham

Research Online URL: <https://durham-research.worktribe.com/record.jx?recordid=2852727>

Copyright statement: This accepted manuscript is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 licence.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>