

This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Mohammed, Saeed Bin

Title: Re-Thinking the global cosmopolis : an analysis of the un-habitat “city we need” policies in Helsinki And Sydney

Year: 2022

Version: Published version

Copyright: © 2022 The Author(s)

Rights: CC BY 4.0

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

Please cite the original version:

Mohammed, S. B. (2022). Re-Thinking the global cosmopolis : an analysis of the un-habitat “city we need” policies in Helsinki And Sydney. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, 9(1), Article 2132615. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2022.2132615>



Re-Thinking the global cosmopolis: an analysis of the un-habitat “city we need” policies in Helsinki And Sydney

Saeed Bin Mohammed

To cite this article: Saeed Bin Mohammed (2022) Re-Thinking the global cosmopolis: an analysis of the un-habitat “city we need” policies in Helsinki And Sydney, Cogent Arts & Humanities, 9:1, 2132615, DOI: [10.1080/23311983.2022.2132615](https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2022.2132615)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2022.2132615>



© 2022 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.



Published online: 11 Oct 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Received: 21 December 2020
Accepted: 01 October 2022

*Corresponding author: Saeed Bin Mohammed, Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, Jyväskylä yliopisto, Finland
E-mail: sabimoha@student.jyu.fi

Reviewing editor:
Timothy Clack, School of Anthropology & Museum Ethnography, University of Oxford, Oxford United Kingdom

Additional information is available at the end of the article

CULTURAL HERITAGE | RESEARCH ARTICLE

Re-Thinking the global cosmopolis: an analysis of the un-habitat “city we need” policies in Helsinki And Sydney

Saeed Bin Mohammed^{1*}

Abstract: This paper contributes to the sustainability debates concerning the UN Habitat III agenda for 2030 of “leaving no one behind.” I mainly focus on how the ideas of the classical cosmopolis are manifested in contemporary urban policies and strategies. I seek to discuss the similarities between the ancient Greek Cynics’ and Stoics’ concept of cosmopolis and the one more or less explicitly expressed in the UN-Habitat manifesto *The City We Need 2.0: Towards a New Urban Paradigm*, for explaining/showing/understanding. I do so by examining specific case examples based on the UN-Habitat manifesto: the City of Sydney (*A City for All: Towards a Socially Just and Resilient Sydney*) and the City of Helsinki. Finally, by using the close reading method, I analyze how these local level goals are related to the broader Habitat III goals and, on the other hand, to the classical definitions of cosmopolitan political practices.

Subjects: Urban Studies; Cities & Infrastructure; Urban Studies; Urban Cultures; Urban Policy; Urban Politics; Classical Studies; Philosophy

Keywords: cosmopolis; cosmopolitanism; cities; diversity; urbanization; inclusion; participation

1. Introduction

Cosmopolitanism is an old ideal introduced by the ancient Cynics and Stoics. It has travelled a long way and still holds relevance in many ways. One context in which it is currently deployed is the United Nations’ (UN) policies on human rights, social inclusion, cultural diversity, and global peace (Gilmore, 2015; Kant, 1795). This paper focuses on the relationship between the classical concept of cosmopolis and the United Nations Human Settlements Programme’s (UN-Habitat) agenda of

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Saeed Bin Mohammed is a doctoral researcher at the Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy at the University of Jyväskylä. His research interests are in culture, communities, and changes. Currently, he is working on his PhD dissertation tentatively entitled “The governance of urban culture in the era of globalization: An analysis of international policy discourses and cosmopolitan case examples.” This topic is examined from the perspective of cosmopolitanism and liberal governmentality. This publication constitutes the third article in Mohammed’s PhD dissertation.

PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT

The article contributes to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal number 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities. The study focuses particularly on UN-Habitat’s efforts to create cities that are more inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable. In this article, the ideas of cosmopolis, inclusion, and citizen participation are examined to better understand how theoretical concepts of good cities are related to the strategies and policies of two modern cities—Sydney and Helsinki. In this context, the concept of cosmopolis can be viewed as a strategy and model for ensuring the inclusion and participation of all inhabitants, regardless of nationality, gender, and race.

“the city we need.” More precisely, the focus is on the first principle of the *New Urban Agenda*: “to leave no one behind” (UN-Habitat, 2016a, 7). This agenda was adopted at the UN Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III) in 2016. In this regard, this paper seeks to investigate: (a) how the principle resonates with the classical understanding of cosmopolis, and (b) how it is expressed at local level. The aim of this comparison is to contribute to the urban sustainability debates of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. According to Douglass (2016, 1), the reference to the term cosmopolis in contemporary urban planning is a strategy to “make cities responsive to the diverse aspirations of their people”—towards inclusive and participatory city-making. In addition, its mobilization is an essential characteristic of what UN-Habitat has termed “the city we need”: it is the conditions under which new forms of socio-cultural diversity can be fostered and perpetuated. Lefebvre, 1968, 140) has posited that policymakers’ ability to realize old ideals is what gives meaning to the science of sociocultural reality in cities. This study examines not only explanations supporting the concept of cosmopolis, but also various arguments against it. However, the idea of cosmopolis is the conceptual tool used to analyze and frame the empirical data of this paper.

The urban policies of the Cities of Helsinki and Sydney were chosen for closer scrutiny here because, firstly, both cities have explicitly adopted classical conceptions of the city as guiding models in their plans and strategies for sustainable urbanization, even though their main focus differs. For instance, it is stated that Sydney is a “cosmopolitan city” (City of Sydney, 2016a, 9), and that Helsinki is “for a good life” (City of Helsinki, 2017, 9). From the classical point of view, “good life” means that residents live in harmony with their surroundings, and that each person has the chance to participate in the socio-cultural life of the city. Along similar lines, Aristotle contended that the purpose of the existence of cities is to enhance good life (City of Helsinki, 2017, 4). Secondly, an analysis of the UN-Habitat agenda of “the city we need” against two big cities that differ in terms of geographical location, governance structure, and culture provides more information than an examination of only one city or two similar cities. Analysis of these two cities and the UN-Habitat agenda not only reveals similarities cutting across the field of the classical conception of the city, but also suggests specific and geographical differences.

I begin the article by introducing the analysis method (close reading) and the empirical context of the selected policies. I will then provide a more detailed historical overview of the concept of cosmopolis, from the classical beginnings to modern cosmopolis and its inclusivity and exclusivity. Under the historical overview, I will also introduce a subsection that discusses the theoretical relationship and tension between diversity and cosmopolis/tanism. This will be followed by the empirical section, which mainly focuses on urban diversity in the context of cosmopolis. This empirical section includes two subsections, which deal with participation and inclusion. The final section will describe and discuss the key findings.

2. Close reading of the empirical documents

The method used in this study combines a close reading of policy documents and of research publications on the classical notions of cosmopolis and cosmopolitanism. The purpose of this approach is to read the texts carefully against their background and main principles, which can be reinterpreted as cosmopolitan ideas. This method also aims to understand what elements of the classical understanding are manifested in modern practical policy speech and why. Furthermore, the use of close reading analysis for this particular study serves as a basis for analyzing “the relationship that exists within the text” (De Castilla, 2017, 4). In this paper, the notion of cosmopolis is the theoretical basis for the close reading analysis.

2.1. The empirical context

The primary data used in the close reading analysis in this paper consists of the following documents: UN-Habitat’s *The City We Need 2.0: Towards a New Urban Paradigm*, the City of Helsinki’s urban policy *The Most Functional City in The World: Helsinki City Strategy 2017–2021*,

and the City of Sydney's urban policy *A City for All: Towards a Socially Just and Resilient Sydney* (Discussion paper. March 2016 and Social Sustainability Policy. July 2016).

UN-Habitat's 2016 document *The City We Need 2.0* (TCWN) is a manifesto of ten principles suggesting solid strategies on how to achieve urban sustainability in cities across the globe. It was written based on contributions from more than 7,701 individuals from 113 countries and 1,600 institutions that represent fourteen constituent groups: local and subnational authorities, research and scholars, civil societies, grassroots groups, women, legislators, minors and youth, business and industries, foundations and philanthropies, experts, labor unions and workers, farmers, indigenous groups, and the media (UN-Habitat, 2016b, 1). The local representation and networks across the globe that co-authored the UN-Habitat document evidently show how local urban policies influence and represent the UN-Habitat general perspective.

The urban policy of Sydney sets out the aspirations for a socially sustainable City of Sydney. It was written in response to the critical challenges and opportunities facing the community as the city experiences a period of major urban transformation (City of Sydney, 2016b, 1). It is stated in the document that the imperative is "to seek to strengthen society in the face of change" through deliberate policies and strategies (ibid.). It also outlines the vision, guiding principles, and roles of Sydney in strengthening the well-being and resilience of the community—the people who work, live, and study in and visit the City of Sydney local area (ibid.). The City of Sydney's social sustainability discussion paper also suggests strategies that can be used to implement the commitments of this policy to ensure Sydney is a city for all (City of Sydney, 2016a).

The City of Helsinki's urban policy draws its aspiration from the Greek philosopher Aristotle's vision that cities exist for the sake of good life (City of Helsinki, 2017, 4). Helsinki follows that vision by seeking to create the best possible conditions for urban life and thus to be the most functional city in the world (ibid.). Helsinki's functionality is also rooted in the Nordic perspective of high-quality urban services, transparent governance and almost zero corruption (ibid.). In addition, good life in the City of Helsinki requires more action. The policy document outlines strategies, plans, programs, conditions, and evidence needed to achieve a sustainable and functional city that works for all its residents.

3. Cosmopolis: a historical overview

3.1. From the classical beginning to the contemporary cosmopolis

The debate about the concept of cosmopolis has an extended history. From the political writings idealized by Aristotle (1984), the purpose of the existence of the *polis* or city is to enhance good life. He further defined the polis as a place where all people could participate in what is regarded as good (ibid.). Plato's and Aristotle's political idea of the polis was not related to cosmopolitanism (Kleingeld & Brown, 2019). In their thinking, a person first identifies themselves as a citizen of a particular polis and then pays allegiance to the institutions and people in that polis (ibid.). Their responsibility is to defend the polis from assaults, support its justice systems, and contribute to the common good of that polis (ibid.). In this sense, allegiance to and responsibility for the polis and other citizens explain what is termed as a good life (ibid.). In this context, the common good or good life does not extend to slaves and strangers living outside the boundaries of the polis (ibid.). Furthermore, in those eras, cities were also based on human relationships within the polis (Lilley, 2004a, 2004b).

The fourth-century BCE Cynic Diogenes was the first in Western philosophy to give a perfect and explicit expression to the term cosmopolitanism (Nussbaum, 2019). Thus, "when he was asked where he came from, he replied, 'I am a citizen of the world [kosmopolitês]'" (Diogenes Laertius VI 63). This new understanding of cosmopolis differs from Plato's and Aristotle's earlier understandings. In the case of Plato and Aristotle, citizenship was strictly tied to allegiance to the polis. While Diogenes considered himself to be a citizen of the cosmos and not a citizen of Sinope, he refused

to admit that he owed allegiance to Sinope and the Sinopeans (Kleingeld & Brown, 2019). From Diogenes' and the Cynic perspective, cosmopolitans live in agreement with nature and denounce the conventional ties to the polis (ibid.). According to Cynic philosophers, this was an essential way of living in the polis at that time, and it also allowed the creation of a space for criticism of inequality within the polis (Turner, 2015). For Paone (2018, 1), Diogenes' Cynicism was a classical example of cosmopolitanism, which is philanthropic, minimalistic, utopian, and experimental. For Kleingeld and Brown (2019), the Cynics offered an example of high-minded virtue towards all others irrespective of their city of birth or allegiance.

The Cynic-influenced Stoics expanded the ideal of cosmopolitanism philosophically in the third century CE. For the Stoics, the cosmos is, as it was, a polis because the cosmos is perfectly put in order by law, which is right reason (Nussbaum, 1997). According to Brown (2010), the Stoics' right reason refers to the standard of right/wrong, suggesting to naturally political subjects the things that must be done and those that must not. The Stoics maintained that law represents right reason (ibid.). In this context, all people are considered to have the right and opportunity to improve themselves—their lives. The Stoics posited that the good or good life requires helping other people as the best one can—through *political engagement* (Kleingeld & Brown, 2019). They admitted that political engagement is not possible for all (the polis politically excludes the most vulnerable of its residents—slaves, women, the poor, etc.), and serving as a private teacher of virtue is an alternative or supplement to political engagement in terms of goodness towards vulnerable others (ibid.). In this context, the Stoics provided a clear and practical content to the word cosmopolis: “a cosmopolitan considers moving away in order to serve, whereas a non-cosmopolitan does not” (ibid.). Tsolis (2000) maintains that the Stoics had a broader perspective when it came to what they called the cosmopolis. For Brown (2010, 2), living as a citizen of the cosmopolis is a metaphor for living according to the right reason that pervades the natural surroundings.

Cosmopolitanism was also less demanding for the Stoics at Rome than for those in Greece. For instance, Chrysippus limited the notion of citizenship in the cosmos to those who live in accordance with the cosmos and its law, while the Roman Stoics extended this citizenship to all humans by virtue of their rationality. Cicero (44 BCE) claimed that the vision of cosmopolis is to expand the boundaries of traditional societies so that a society may emerge that has natural rather than traditional unifying bonds and that is thus destined for the whole human race without segregation. In this perspective, the city belongs to all, which deepens urban diversity among residents and goes beyond the city borders. This context of cosmopolis focuses on the equality and diversity of human nature, which enhance socio-cultural connectedness beyond the boundaries of allegiance and recognition. The Stoics claimed that citizens of both the polis and the cosmopolis have the same responsibility—both aim to enhance the lives of citizens. Additionally, the concept of cosmopolis prevailed in Christian philosophy and theology in Europe before 1600 and was regarded as a moral map of the city that served as a foundation of progress for drawing socio-cultural borders (Lilley, 2004a, 686). In this context, the city was imagined to be a “cosmos” and the cosmos to be a “city” (ibid., 683). Both were ordered in God's image, each a map of the other.

3.2. The transition to a modern cosmopolis

In the humanist era, Erasmus of Rotterdam (1521) used ancient cosmopolitanism as the basis for advocating the idea of worldwide peace. He pointed out the unity of humanity over its division into different peoples and states by arguing that human beings are destined by nature to interact and live in harmony (ibid.). In addition, in the eighteenth century, some scholars of cosmopolitanism drew on Stoic philosophy, implying the constructive moral ideal of a universal human society. For instance, Kant (1795) argued that all rational human beings are members of one moral community. In a political sense, they are similar to citizens in that they share the attributes of freedom, independence, and equality, and that they live under their independent laws (ibid.). The laws that unite them are the laws of morality, rooted in reason (ibid.). Kant also introduced the notion of

cosmopolitan law according to which people have these rights as citizens of the earth instead of citizens of specific states.

Lastly, as Stephen Toulmin (1992) has described, the cosmopolis has re-emerged in contemporary urbanization. He argues that the idea of cosmopolis is that human society should, in some way, reflect the structure of the universe since “nature” and “society” are understood as images of one another. Thus, the order of society and nature is governed by a similar set of laws (Toulmin, 1992, 127). Additionally, he claims that cosmopolitanism is still strongly visible in Western philosophy, science, and cities. While the concept of cosmopolis changed into an image of a rational, predictable, and governable structure during the Scientific Revolution, it also incorporated the idea of progress and finally resulted in the emergence of the cities of the Industrial Revolution.

3.3. Inclusion and exclusion in the classical cosmopolis

The classical concept of cosmopolis may have had a metaphorical dimension, but there were factors that determined who was included and excluded from the cultural and political affairs of the actual city-state of that time. Therefore, in the Greek polis Athens, people who were *xenoi* (foreigners) or *metokoi* (metics, resident aliens), vulnerable, day laborers or fishermen because they had lost everything, or women confined in the home of their spouse were not recognized as full citizens and were denied basic rights such as *isonomia*—equality before the law—and freedom of speech (Turner, 2015, 3). In this context, the term cosmopolis, the universe, as the entirety of space, and the polis, as the place of residence, were combined into one symbolic space (Jain, 2016, 3). In other words, in its metaphorical sense, the cosmos was originally nothing more than an order, a harmony that encompasses all matter and all beings (ibid.).

Furthermore, ancient Greek city-states were in some ways similar to the classical idea of cosmos. As portrayed, it is an orderly space where each individual has a particular place, and, ideally, it is a political community characterized by a common ethos and a spirit of unity (ibid.). At the beginning, however, cosmopolitanism was not a mainstream ideology; rather, it was the worldview of outsiders such as the Cynic Diogenes (Nussbaum, 2019). It is clear that unlike Diogenes, citizens in his era were proud of their nation of origin because citizenship was not only a source of patriotic pride but also a political right (ibid.).

In this context, the Greek polis demonstrated that the unity of the cosmopolis was an ideological construction, and the real conditions of social unity were very limited (ibid., 4). Slavery and patriarchy dominated the social, cultural, and economic system (Turner, 2015, 44). Hence, to maintain the illusion of unity and equality, a sharp distinction was drawn between those who were considered fully capable of becoming citizens (the natives and wealthy males) and the rest of the population (ibid.). For example, in his *Political Works* (III–12), Aristotle (1984) observes that the noble, or free-born, or rich, may with good reason claim office: in that capacity, they must be free men and taxpayers because a state cannot be overwhelmingly composed of slaves or the poor. As a result, participation in the polis was based on inequality—the patriarchal rule of men over women, the paternal rule of fathers over children, and the rule of masters over slaves (Rosivach & Manville, 1992). In the Greek polis, the slaves were classified as somewhere between the free men and domesticated animals (ibid.). These facts indicate that the Greek cosmopolis as a participatory or inclusive urban center was idealized metaphor/metonym and rhetoric for the utopian thinking or at least thinking for a better (more virtuous) future (Jain, 2016, 4).

Lastly, the classical polis was a special kind of civil society in which any individual not associated with the bourgeois community was excluded from political participation (Jain, 2016, 8; Lefebvre, 1968; 8). This is a society which exists simultaneously with the global society of the global class as well as the local societies of the excluded working class and the service class (Jain, 2016, 8). For example, in this polis, the Cynics were thought of as advocating a radical transformation of society that would end all privileges of class, gender, and race and establish a universal human community not only to realize equality, but also to implement it (Hill, 2010; Turner, 2015). In this regard,

cosmopolitanism can be seen as an ideology that conceals global inequality—a contradiction that enables the cosmopolitan cosmopolis to be viewed as a non-place and as an alternative vision for creating the city of the future (Jain, 2016, 8).

3.4. The tension/relationship between diversity and cosmopolis/tanism: Towards redefining the global city

Bohman (2006, 104) suggests that in the context of cosmopolitanism, the global city is a vibrant place of interconnection and interaction for socio-cultural transformation and possible utopian aspirations. In this context, cities are now becoming the leading sites for the lived reality of diversity because globalization creates cities of differences along with other issues (Sandercock & Lyssiotis, 2003). In addition, urban policy leads to a process of change based on a shared agenda to reconstruct the built environment in a context that reflects the global cultural diversity and a subjective sense of belonging for all (ibid., 151) without discrimination.

The concept of urban diversity has become complex, resulting in the formulation of new terminologies linked to the concept and the degree to which the population is changing in cities (see, Vertovec, 2007, 1024; Tasan-Kok et al., 2013, 6). Diversity, as defined by Vertovec (2007, 1024), is a dynamic interplay of variables among an increased number of new, small, and dispersed, multiple-origin, transnationally linked, socioeconomically differentiated, and legally stratified immigrants who have arrived over the last decade. This urban diversity is what Vertovec refers to as “super-diversity”. Tasan-Kok et al. (2013, 6) also see urban diversity as an intense diversification of subjects, not only in socio-economic, socio-demographic, and ethnic relationships, but also concerning lifestyles, attitudes, and activities. In other words, they frame this type of urban diversity as hyper-diversity. Their explanation of diversity is significant for this paper since it highlights the extent to which socio-cultural patterns and expressions in cities should be examined. For Skovgaard et al. (2016, 11), diversity in an urban context means the presence or co-existence of specific socio-economic, socio-demographic, ethnic and cultural groups within a specified spatial entity such as a city or a neighborhood. Douglass (2009, 23) contends that diversity is increasing in multiple ways in the social context of cities. In the context of diversity, the concept of cosmopolis is about reconstructing the city as an extension of welcome and providing rights to people who escape unbearable situations, such as refugees, asylum seekers, and those in search of alternative livelihoods (Conley, 2002). Along similar lines, Kristeva (1993) posits that cosmopolitan culture in cities will result in generating tolerance among people who broadly accept the concept of citizenship beyond that of a narrowly defined nation-state, similarly to the Cynics and Stoics.

The concept of urban diversity is crucial for cosmopolitanism as well as connected to the idea of the cosmopolis and the “city we need” paradigm, which enhances the natural “duty to live with all kinds of people” (Appiah, 2006) in urban areas. According to Nussbaum (1997), urban policymakers and populations have the obligation to promote the happiness of others, which also entails their constructive engagement in the political and cultural life to promote their societal representation in terms of laws and policies. However, this situation has made questions of governance increasingly complex, and governments are looking for strategies to enhance the internal dynamics of urban development that tackles the growing divisions between the shrinking institutional capacities and the rising differences between increasingly diverse subjects’ needs (Nielsen et al. 2016, 15).

The above perspective of diversity is in line with the classical ideal of cosmopolis as a perfect place where residents live in harmony with each other and their surroundings without segregation—a participatory city for all (Beumer, 2017; Lilley, 2004a; Sandercock, 1998; Toulmin, 1992; Tsolis, 2000). In this context, Beumer (2017, 2) posits that the classical ways of conceptualizing the city are still meaningful when seeking to understand the role that contemporary cities can play in global urban sustainability and human well-being. Similarly to the classical times, the focus of modern cities is geared towards strengthening the urban-nature relationship and the role of their

people (ibid.). This affirms Plato's claim that "this city is what it is because our citizens are what they are" (Beumer, 2017, 10).

The concept of cosmopolis re-emerges as a strategy for planning and negotiating differences in contemporary societies. As Sandercock (1998) claims, paying attention to the voices of differences in cities helps achieve social justice and respect for urban cultural diversity. She argues that the realization of cosmopolitanism will be visible in cities if their policymakers abandon the "pillar of modernist planning and wisdom—rationality, comprehensiveness, scientific objectivity, and the project of interest" and replace it with "new concepts of social justice, citizenship, community and multiple publics" (ibid.). Additionally, Sandercock (1998, 111) claims that cosmopolitanism builds on the voices of people who dwell in cultures with a long history of discrimination, who have been segregated for a century, but who are now insurgent and turning their very marginalization into a creative space for theorizing, which resembles the recognition of indigenous rights in recent history (Howard-Wagner et al., 2018; United Nations General Assembly, 2007).

In this context, a sustainable city becomes a widely embraced model of twenty-first-century urban development, which integrates the global/urban features similarly to what Conley (2002) defines as a cosmopolis—a *recreation of the city as an extension of welcome that provides rights and privileges to people who escape intolerable circumstances*. In my view, the extension of welcome in the contemporary cosmopolitan perspective includes people in search of better and alternative lifestyles. I will now move on to the next section that presents the empirical discussion.

4. Urban diversity and cosmopolis

When analyzing the selected current urban policies, documents, and their messages in the light of the theoretical concepts, it might be said that similarities such as inclusion and participation arise in the context of diversity.

In the context of diversity, Conley (2002) sees cosmopolitan cities as an extension of welcome to others grounded in right reason, which enables subjects and authorities to reconstruct themselves both culturally and socially beyond the ethnic borders and national allegiances. Similarly to what Harvey (2003) has argued, it means the right to remake ourselves by creating a qualitatively different kind of urban sociality and entails a reflexive attitude towards urban development for all. Brown (2010, 6) claims that in this context, public policy is set to guide "Cynic/Stoic life"—living in agreement with nature or the surroundings. In addition, in this paper, urban diversity is understood in a way that recognizes that every person irrespective of their identity or city of birth should be able to realize their potential, interact with others, and share the profits of progress and increased success in the city. In this respect, the aspiration for a cosmopolis can be achieved and realized through enhancing openness and the virtue of welcoming and helping others without ethnic limitation. In this regard, UN-Habitat (2016) describes "the city we need" in the twenty-first century as follows:

... it embraces cultural diversity, including differences of belief and language, and encourages social integration of migrants and refugees. It encourages all segments and age groups of the population to partake in social and cultural life (UN-Habitat, 2016b, 4).

In line with the above quotation, strategies and policies of urban diversity must be geared towards recognizing and integrating people's socio-cultural identities without referring to their city of birth or nationality. The above quotation is also silent on the attachment or allegiance of people regarded as refugees or others to their previous city or polis. This brings to mind the above reference to Diogenes when he arrived in Athens after being banished from Sinope. He philosophically refused to be recognized as Sinopean, but neither did he pay total allegiance to the current city—instead he paid it to humanity in general. The above aspiration is also somewhat similar to what Kant (1795) describes as universal hospitality. For Kant, those who are welcome should arrive in peace, and the current place should be open to all persons as a shared universal right or as

a right to a city, as described by Henri Lefebvre, 1968). Therefore, both the classical conception of a city and the current UN-Habitat's manifesto of the city we need metaphorically support the claim that all humans, whether native or refugees, are equal members of the shared universal place, and this includes communities where they are welcome as outsiders. This is in line with what the ancient Greek and Roman Stoics described as the virtue of helping others, even though the included quotation did not mention their political engagement in their new polis. In addition, UN-Habitat's *New Urban Agenda* for sustainable cities also seeks to promote this kind of cosmopolitan approach in the coming years to create cities that provide everyone with an equal chance in life as a way of welcoming and providing Kantian universal hospitality to all and ensuring the happiness of others. According to UN-Habitat:

The City We Need fosters a culture of peace. It does so by working together with all stakeholder groups in organizing inter-generational, inter-cultural dialogue and events to promote understanding, tolerance and communications (UN-Habitat, 2016b, 12).

Based on the classical and modern perspectives on cosmopolis, urban spaces also serve as an extension of welcome to all kinds of marginalized people, which can be enhanced in line with UN-Habitat's principles if existing residents or citizens regard themselves as negotiating their culture and identity with others. This approach is evident in the City of Sydney policy, which states that "our strengths include our rich social and cultural diversity" (City of Sydney, 2016a, 9). In their policies, both Sydney and Helsinki are committed to taking decisive action on critical issues such as differences and marginalization. In my view, these statements are exactly in line with the Habitat III agenda of leaving no one behind, as well as the classical notion of cosmopolis, which rejects national attachments and particular allegiances. Along similar lines, the City of Helsinki's strategy (City of Helsinki, 2017, 12) posits that "true, vivid bilingualism is a great asset to Helsinki." In relation to this, the new models of sharing economy that are being created by residents and companies make the city more diverse inclusively and economically (ibid.). In my view, Helsinki's aspiration is more Platonic, and Aristotelian in disguise: the model here is to enable residents, including citizens and migrants, to participate in the good life that the city has to offer them, the people. However, in the classical era, the good life was limited to minority groups with citizenship rights. In parallel with the political ideas of Plato and Aristotle mentioned in the theoretical section, these benefits of sharing Helsinki's economy do not go beyond the borders of the city even though it is inclusive and attractive. In this context, Helsinki's good life is dependent on an individual's residency status (e.g., the type of visa or permit). This is similar to the classical concept of a city-state. Some scholars describe these political ideas of the classical era as "uncosmopolitan" though welcoming (Kleingeld & Brown, 2019).

Another concept which recurs in the UN documents is participation, which is an element of diversity. In what follows, I will discuss in more detail the recognition of and openness to others from the cosmopolitan point of view, focusing on the issue of participation.

4.1. Participation

In global cities, planning for diversity aims at providing a code of communication that is common to all and transforming the interaction between people in a way that ensures openness to others in society, similarly to what Tsois (2000) and Brown (2010, 3) claim. From an ideological standpoint, as mentioned in the previous section, living in a cosmopolis means taking part in governance and ordinary politics as a means of influencing matters that directly affect one's well-being. In my view, active participation in politics and socio-cultural events ensures a mutual sense of belonging and trust that forms shared urban identities and cultures. For UN-Habitat:

The City We Need is participatory. It promotes effective partnerships and active engagement by all members of society and partners (public, private and civil society). It safeguards local democracy by encouraging participation, transparency and accountability (UN-Habitat, 2016b, 7).

The above principle is reflected in the Helsinki strategy (City of Helsinki, 2017, 16): “a healthy, mutually respectful pride of one’s own neighbourhood is part of the city’s identity.” The City of Sydney (2016b, 4) argues that “people’s views are genuinely considered, and they can see and understand the impact of their participation.” Deducing from the above quotations, I consider that living as a citizen of a contemporary cosmopolis, one should be able to celebrate one’s own socio-cultural life and participate in that of others by virtue of one’s rationality. In the theoretical section, it is suggested that for the Stoics, good life is about helping other people fully, which may at times necessitate active political engagement, even when such participation excludes those who are most vulnerable. The above aspirations of the Cities of Helsinki and Sydney are literally in line with Stoicism and reaffirm Stephen Toulmin’s (1992) claim concerning the visibility of the classical cosmopolis in contemporary cities. The actualization of these statements, however, depends on who is entitled to participate in culture and social life. The issue of participation is related to issues of immigration and citizenship (including those with a legal residence permit and visa), which are beyond the jurisdiction of the above cities. The type of residence permit and visa that a person with a non-citizen status holds determines their rights and obligations in a city or country and poses a barrier to the realization of participation.

Notwithstanding the limitations that affect its achievability, this context of diversity contributes to the formation of a shared universal culture of the city, which generates tolerance among residents, who respect and recognize differences, which is similar to what Kristeva (1993) refers to as “cosmopolitan culture” in cities. I see this principle as an attempt towards enhancing participatory city-making in the interest of all residents as part of sustainable urban development. The realization of the cosmopolitan vision will create the best conditions that enable urban subjects to act in accordance with the cosmos, which boosts the relationship between people and the city. It is a strategy towards living together with dignity and peace in a multicultural-centered space perfectly put in order by law. The above principle is also evident in Sydney’s policy: “ensuring Sydney is a city for all—is a shared responsibility for government, business, community organizations and individuals” (City of Sydney, 2016a, 9). In this perspective, the global cosmopolis reaffirms the vision of achieving participatory city-making, which promotes a shared sense of belonging for all. For the City of Helsinki:

It seeks to create the best conditions possible for urban life for its residents and for visitors The city’s strategic intent is to do things a little bit better every time, in order to make the life of Helsinki’s residents easier and more pleasant (City of Helsinki, 2017, 9).

In addition, these actions ensure openness to socio-cultural patterns and expressions, which connects urban subjects to those responsible for policymaking, as well as to people around them. In this context, the ownership of cities becomes open to all, and each subject contributes to the reconstruction of the cosmopolis and making it liveable and attractive. However, Helsinki and Sydney differ from a classical city-state in many respects: for example, citizenship and ownership have been extended to include women, foreigners, and children, and slavery has been abolished. Irrespective of that, this period has its own set of problems that create roadblocks to the policies, as opposed to the classical period. In addition, the realization of participation in cities can be a virtue of helping others. An example of similar action that organizes the city, notably its public and open spaces, is offered by Helsinki’s strategy, in which participation is connected to the equality of all subjects irrespective of their city of birth or nationality. The City of Helsinki posits that

Each resident of Helsinki has the right to feel they are a true Helsinki citizen and do something significant for their community In Helsinki, it is easy to be of help to others. The city strives to maintain the trust of residents and companies, to strengthen their real influence and to improve equality, service standards and mutual understanding between population groups through modern models of inclusion (City of Helsinki, 2017, 16).

In this context, I see participation as a tool to achieve the perfect place grounded in the classical right reason, or in Lefebvre's, (1968) contemporary *right to the city*, which provides inhabitants as well as visitors with access and pathways to progress, regardless of their ethnic and national affiliation. An example of participation as right reason put in order by law that organizes the spaces of interaction is reflected in Sydney as follows: "People's fundamental human rights and dignity are respected and protected Equitable access to our city's resources and opportunities means that everyone can enjoy a great quality of life and reach their full potential" (City of Sydney, 2016b, 3). In my view, in cities, natural equality and rights constitute what is meant by living as citizens of a free cosmopolis that defines the rights to a city, which is the same as offering people the chance to live as world citizens envisaged by the classical/modern scholars of cosmopolitanism. In this regard, the agenda of contemporary cities' socio-cultural urban policy is linked to an endless course of creating order—the alternative society of welcoming and providing rights to those who have suffered unbearable conditions as revealed above in the policies of Helsinki and Sydney. Cosmopolitan rights are thus seen naturally as a virtue of helping other humans because they are fellow humans. However, the realism of these policy statements is hindered by economic, administrative, and bureaucratic procedures which are beyond the jurisdiction of these cities.

In the section that follows, I will discuss inclusion as another dimension of urban diversity from the cosmopolitan point of view.

4.2. Inclusion

According to Douglass (2016, 1), the concept of cosmopolis means inclusive governance to make cities responsive to the different hopes of their subjects. In Douglass's terms, inclusiveness enhances openness, which leads to the construction of a safer urban space with a high level of trust and sense of belonging. This is also in line with Lefebvre's, (1968) idea of the right to the city and the notion of the city as an extension of welcome and a place that integrates migrants seeking a better and alternative way of life. In the cosmopolitan perspective, the principle that residents live in agreement with the city is critical for inclusive urban development. Inclusiveness in the city brings opportunities for creative and cultural expression, which enable urban subjects to share their experiences, negotiate their differences, and live together in a multicultural-centered space that opposes particularistic ideologies (Mohammed 2019). In this context, the City of Sydney posits that

The City aims to develop a new city centre inclusive, play space, providing a play-friendly environment in the heart of our city It would provide extended recreation and play opportunities in a convenient location, subject to finding a site supported by city residents and businesses (City of Sydney, 2016a, 51).

I would argue that these inclusive strategies concentrate on internal processes that enhance diversity and a shared sense of belonging for all instead of creating a universal order to accommodate everyone similarly to Plato's and Aristotle's political idea of good life. This is in line with what Delanty (2006) and Douglass (2016) posit as participatory city-making.

The cosmopolis is built in a way that considers the different users of the city and people's relationships. Here the focus is geared towards strengthening the socio-cultural bond that connects people even more than their next-of-kin relationships. The above is similar to how the Roman Stoics conceptualized cosmopolitanism: they extended nationality and rights to all people by virtue of their rationality. In this regard, diversity is about the recognition and equalization of differences in the city, which is also included in the city's cultural planning. In the new cosmopolis (the city we need), urban subjects need to acknowledge that the bond that connects people to one another in general is equally close to the bond that connects subjects to their relatives.

According to UN-Habitat:

The City We Need promotes the right to the city for all. This entails the right to a dignified and secure existence with access to decent housing, public goods and services and a voice in decision-making (UN-Habitat, 2016b, 4).

The above statement highlights the connection between people, as well as that between people and the city, especially their access to socio-cultural spaces and facilities. In my view, inclusiveness is one of the primary mechanisms for strengthening interaction and sociability in cities. As a result, contemporary policymakers must re-strategize their actions towards achieving a global city or a cosmopolis as described above. Furthermore, through connecting people to the city or enabling them to live in harmony with the spaces within the city, it is possible to create a safer and healthy society that is accessible to both strong and weak urban subjects. In this regard, UN-Habitat (2016b, 12) argues:

The City We Need is free from violence, conflict and crime. It is welcoming night and day, inviting all people to use its streets, parks, and transit without fear. It guarantees the safety of women and girls and the elderly in both public and workplaces.

In this context, how do individuals, especially the vulnerable ones, access and integrate into cities? Inclusiveness serves as an opportunity to reduce urban stress and enhance the free movement of people within cities. However, is such an opportunity available to all? Can the vulnerable ones afford it? For instance, the City of Sydney posits that “a safe, accessible Sydney enables everyone in our community to lead enriched, fulfilling and contributing lives” (City of Sydney, 2016b, 4). In this context, the immediate solution to inclusion in terms of affordability is how urban planners strive to transport people and creativity closer to each other to make the city sustainable in a cosmopolitan way. Similarly, the City of Helsinki argues that “Helsinki furthers tolerance and pluralism, becomes more international and provides conditions for the creation of interesting destinations and events” (City of Helsinki, 2017, 12).

Lastly, the virtue of helping others can be considered another way of living in agreement with the city. In this context, the effort of the city is to create attractive spaces that foster interaction between urban subjects concerning economic and socio-cultural matters. This effort of bringing people closer to the city, especially the creative spaces, also serves as an approach to promote cultural tourism that promotes Kantian universal hospitality and cosmopolitanism. In the cosmopolis, in both the classical and contemporary sense, inclusion encourages policymakers and urban subjects to develop innovative ideas together that make the city more attractive, cheaper, and safer and promote the principle of leaving no one behind in such spaces. The purpose of these rationalities regarding urban diversity and inclusion is to offer opportunities for different people and communities to meet and socialize even at a distance through a range of broad-based social and creative programs. In this way, the city becomes a platform for replicating the classical conception of good life, creativity, and a shared sense of belonging that can be called a cosmopolis in the twenty-first century. Despite the nice policy statements above, their implementation is hampered by both external and internal factors that make living in large cities very expensive for the most vulnerable. The socio-economic factors include high living costs, unemployment (the lack of a decent job), residence status, and the lack of affordable housing, as well as the effects of globalization (such as the UN) and regionalization (such as the EU) especially when it comes to socio-economic directives that grant certain rights and privileges to specific groups of people based on their nationality. All these external factors are outside the jurisdiction of the cities and therefore have a direct or indirect impact on the inclusive policy.

5. Conclusion

This paper has discussed and interpreted the urban policy documents of the Cities of Helsinki and Sydney along with UN-Habitat's 2016 manifesto *The City We Need 2.0* from the perspective of the

classical idea of cosmopolis. A close reading of the empirical data revealed similarities between the texts primarily in issues related to urban diversity, and especially participation and inclusion. It also provided a historical overview of the concept of cosmopolis and its exclusiveness and inclusiveness in the classical era and highlighted the tension and relationship between the concepts of diversity and cosmopolis/tanism. The discussion was geared towards contributing to the sustainability debates regarding the Habitat III goal for 2030 of leaving no one behind.

In my analysis I found that the concept of cosmopolis is not limited to the creation of a universal order perfect for accommodating the whole human race; instead, it has shifted the focus of the debate to the internal processes of socio-cultural city-making and positions urban space or the city as an extension of welcome to people regarded as outsiders without referring to their city of birth, allegiance, or nationality. Furthermore, the classical notion and definitions of cosmopolis resonate with the modern practical policy speech of Helsinki and Sydney only in the context that describes the virtue of helping and welcoming others with a legal residence status—permanent residents and visitors—within the territory of the cities. This virtue of helping and welcoming others does not extend to foreigners (residents) living outside the city. I posit that the cosmopolitan vision of “the city we need” is a realistic response to the demand for openness to and recognition of people and their natural freedom and sociability. In addition, the idea of cosmopolis, as discussed above, concentrates on (local, national, and international) processes of transformation concerning individuals and the city, in which new socio-cultural policies and strategies are manifested and create an enabling shared cultural space for interacting and socializing. Meanwhile, as is evident from the study, the metaphor of the classical cosmopolis as a participatory or inclusive urban center is a myth that existed in the minds of political philosophers, whereas political participation in the Greek polis was a privilege enjoyed by the minority based on citizenship rights. In my view, the metaphorical conceptualization of the city provides a strategy for understanding the changing population, a strategy in which residents realize the benefit of learning and living together in a way that improves people’s participation in the common good.

These similarities lead again to ideas about a more cosmopolitan city, a city in which policymakers contribute to broader social and cultural sustainability, and people learn to live with each other through the processes of urban governance and spaces for celebrating diversity and acknowledging differences. The welcoming and accommodation of multiple cultures call for policymakers to assist in negotiating the terms of urban identity and culture among different people. This strategy contributes to the creation of an alternative society, such as the new cosmopolis or “the city we need” (UN-Habitat, 2016b), which is centered on natural acceptance, connection, and respect for cultural spaces and people regarded as others with the possibility of working together for a shared future. Although UN-Habitat and cities make virtuous statements and slogans, it does not mean that they describe the reality. Factors such as prices of goods and services, high living costs, immigration laws, and other bureaucratic complexities practically prevent these ideals from becoming a reality in these cities.

Funding

This work was supported by the

Author details

Saeed Bin Mohammed¹

E-mail: sabimoha@student.jyu.fi

ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2075-4155>

¹ Unit of Culture, Communities, and Change, Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä Finland.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Citation information

Cite this article as: Re-Thinking the global cosmopolis: an analysis of the un-habitat “city we need” policies in Helsinki And Sydney, Saeed Bin Mohammed, *Cogent Arts & Humanities* (2022), 9: 2132615.

References

- Appiah, A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: ethics in a world of strangers*. Norton and Company.
- Aristotle. (1984). The politics. In *Translated and with an introduction by carnes lord* (pp. 284). University of Chicago Press.
- Beumer, C. (2017). Sustopia or Cosmopolis? A critical reflection on the sustainable city. *Sustainability*, 9(5), 845. doi:10.3390/su9050845
- Bohman, J. (2006). Book Review: *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel Cities of the 21st Century*. *Planning Theory*, 5 (1), 102–104. Available from. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26001862>.
- Brown, E. (2010). The stoic invention of cosmopolitan politics. In M. Lutz-Bachmann, A. Niederberger, & P. Schink (Eds.), *Kosmopolitanismus: Zur Geschichte und Zukunft eines umstrittenen Ideals* (pp. 9–24). Velbrück Wissenschaft.
- City of Helsinki (2017). *The most functional city in the world: Helsinki city strategy 2017–2021*. Available

- from: https://www.hel.fi/static/helsinki/kaupunkistrategia/helsinki_city_strategy_leaflet.pdf
- City of Sydney (2016a). *A city for all. towards a socially just and resilient Sydney: discussion paper. march 2016*. Available from: https://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0019/262342/Social-Sustainability-discussion-paper.pdf
- City of Sydney (2016b). *A city for all. towards a socially just and resilient Sydney: social sustainability policy. July 2016*. Available from: https://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/262346/Social-Sustainability-Policy.pdf
- Conley, V. A. (2002). Chaospopolis. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(1–2), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026327640201900106>
- De Castilla, C. R. (2017). Close Reading. M. Allen, ed., *The Sage Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*, 4 Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411>.
- Delanty, G. (2006). The Cosmopolitan Imagination: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Social Theory. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 57(1), 25–47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2006.00092.x>
- Douglass, M. (2009). Globopolis or Cosmopolis? Alternative Futures of City Life in East Asia. *Journal of Urban Humanities*, 2, 67–115.
- Douglass, M. (2016). Globopolis vs. cosmopolis: urbanization and the future of asian megacities. *Global Asia*, 11 (3), 52–57. Available from https://www.globalasia.org/v11no3/cover/globopolis-vs-cosmopolis-urbanization-and-the-future-of-asian-megacities_mike-douglass
- Gilmore, J. (2015). The united nations: concepts, capability and the cosmopolitan military. In *The cosmopolitan military. new security challenges series* (pp. 127–159). palgrave macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137032270_6
- Harvey, D. (2003). The Right to the City. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(4), 939–941. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0309-1317.2003.00492.x>
- Hill, J. D. (2010). *Becoming a Cosmopolitan: what it means to be a human being in the new millennium*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Howard-Wagner, D., Bargh, M., & Altamirano-Jiménez, I. (eds.). (2018). *The neoliberal state, recognition and indigenous rights: new paternalism to New Imaginings*. ANU Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv5cgbkm>
- Jain, A. K. (2016). Inclusion and Exclusion in the Cosmopolis: Some Critical Perspectives on Cosmopolitanism. In A. Machin & N. Stehr (Eds.), *Understanding Inequality – Social Costs and Benefits* (pp. 115–126). Springer.
- Kant, I. (1795). Perpetual Peace. In H. Reiss (Ed.), *Kant's political writings* (pp. 1991). Cambridge University Press.
- Kleingeld, P., & Brown, E. (2019). Cosmopolitanism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (pp. 1–24). Winter 2019 Edition. Available from <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/cosmopolitanism>.
- Kristeva, J. (1993). Nations without Nationalism. In *translated by Léon Roudiez* (pp. 108). Columbia University Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (1968). [1996]. In *Le Droit à la ville [The right to the city], 2nd edition*. Anthropolos, 3–77.
- Lilley, K. D. (2004a). Mapping cosmopolis: moral topographies of the Medieval City. *Environment Plan. D Social Space*, 22(5), 681–698. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d276t>
- Lilley, K. D. (2004b). Cities of god? medieval urban forms and their Christian symbolism. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 29(3), 296–313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0020-2754.2004.00229.x>
- Mohammed, S. B. (2019). Cosmopolitanism as a Potential Theoretical Solution to the Challenges of Globalised Urbanisation. *Arts & International Affairs*, 4(2), 139–161. doi:10.18278/aia.4.2.19
- Nations, U., *Department of economic & social affairs, population division* (2016). *The World's Cities in 2016. Data Booklet (ST/SER.A/392)*. Available from: http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/urbanization/the_worlds_cities_in_2016_data_booklet.pdf
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 5 (1), 1–25. Available from: <https://iow.eui.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/28/2013/03/13-De-Frouville-Background-Kant-and-Stoic-Cosmopolitanism.pdf>.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2019). *The cosmopolitan tradition: A noble but flawed ideal*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Paone, C. (2018). Diogenes the Cynic on Law and World Citizenship. *Polis: The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought*, 35(2), 478–498. <https://doi.org/10.1163/20512996-12340176>
- Rosivach, V., & Manville, P. B. (1992). The origins of citizenship in ancient athens by philip brook manville. *Classical World: A Quarterly Journal on Antiquity*, 85 (3), 268–269. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4351108>
- Sandercock, L. (1998). *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for multicultural cities*. J. Wiley.
- Sandercock, L., & Lyssiotis, P. (2003). *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel cities in the twenty-first century*. Continuum.
- Skovgaard, N.R., Beckman, A. W., Blach, V., & Andersen, H. T. (2016). DIVERCITIES: Dealing with Urban Diversity – The case of Copenhagen. In *Copenhagen*, (pp. 9–180). Danish Building Research Institute, Aalborg University.
- Souza, E. (2019). “The Role of Urban Mobility in Providing Accessibility” [O papel da mobilidade Urbana no acesso à cidade]. *ArchDaily*. Available from: <https://www.archdaily.com/923959/the-role-of-urban-mobility-in-providing-accessibility>
- Tasan-Kok, T., van Kempen, R., Raco, M., & Bolt, G. (2013). *Towards Hyper Diversified European Cities: A Critical Literature Review*. Utrecht University, Faculty of Geosciences.
- Toulmin, S. (1992). *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*. University of Chicago Press.
- Tsolis, T. L. (2000). The Stoic Cosmopolis: A vision of justice and virtue in a multicultural society. *Phronimon*, 2(1), 336–345.
- Turner, C. (2015). “Cosmopolis: Towards a positive conception of Cynic political philosophy.” *Yearbook in Cosmopolitan Studies* 2. Available from: <https://ojs.st-andrews.ac.uk/index.php/yics/article/view/1278/977>
- UNESCO (2020). *UNESCO At WUF10: culture and innovation as drivers of urban sustainability*. Available from: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/news/2085>
- UN-Habitat (2016a). *New Urban Agenda*. Available from: <https://habitat3.org/the-new-urban-agenda>
- UN-Habitat (2016b). *the city we need 2.0: towards a new urban paradigm*. Available from: <https://unhabitat.org/wpcontent/uploads/2016/03/The%20City%20We%20Need%20TCWN%202.0.pdf>
- United Nations General Assembly (2007). *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly (A/RES/61/295). Available from: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/471355a82.html>
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465>



© 2022 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.

You are free to:

Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format.

Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially.

The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms.

Under the following terms:

Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.

You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use.

No additional restrictions

You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.



***Cogent Arts & Humanities* (ISSN: 2331-1983) is published by Cogent OA, part of Taylor & Francis Group.**

Publishing with Cogent OA ensures:

- Immediate, universal access to your article on publication
- High visibility and discoverability via the Cogent OA website as well as Taylor & Francis Online
- Download and citation statistics for your article
- Rapid online publication
- Input from, and dialog with, expert editors and editorial boards
- Retention of full copyright of your article
- Guaranteed legacy preservation of your article
- Discounts and waivers for authors in developing regions

Submit your manuscript to a Cogent OA journal at www.CogentOA.com

