

JYX



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: Liberal Governmentality and Urban Culture : Governing Differences and Diversity in the Policies of Helsinki and Sydney

Year: 2023

Version: Published version

Copyright: © 2023 the Authors

Rights: CC BY 4.0

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

Please cite the original version:

Mohammed, S. B. (2023). Liberal Governmentality and Urban Culture : Governing Differences and Diversity in the Policies of Helsinki and Sydney. *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidskrift*, 26(1), 77-93.
<https://doi.org/10.18261/nkt.26.1.6>



Liberal Governmentality and Urban Culture: Governing Differences and Diversity in the Policies of Helsinki and Sydney

Saeed Bin Mohammed

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

Mohammed is a doctoral candidate at the University of Jyväskylä's Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy. His research interests are in the areas of culture, communities, and change. His Ph.D. dissertation is tentatively entitled "Governance of urban culture in the era of globalization: An analysis of international policy discourse and cosmopolitan case examples." This topic is examined from the perspective of cosmopolitanism and liberal governmentality. As part of Mohammed's Ph.D. dissertation, this article constitutes the fourth section.

saeed.b.mohammed@juu.fi

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2075-4155>

Abstract

This article uses Michel Foucault's understanding of police and liberalism to discuss the governance of diversity and differences, and how they appear as a regulatory form of power in urban cultural policy. The data consists of interviews conducted with policymakers in Helsinki and Sydney. The article asserts that the policing of cultural spaces of encounter at the city level is not limited to the regulatory practices and controls that produce a sense of safety and order for citizens in the city. This governance has great significance for representing excluded people and the socio-economic identity of their neighborhoods. Finally, the use of language as a means of communication in cultural policy practices in Helsinki and Sydney is identified as a powerful resource that facilitates community entry, contact, and interaction with others within cultural spaces and the city.

Keywords

diversity, differences, governmentality, urban cultural policy, Helsinki, Sydney

Introduction

In recent years, there has been an interest in developing governance theories and concepts that address the differences within and between people learning to live together (Skovgaard Nielsen et al. 2016; Fincher et al. 2014). Cities, their administrative sectors, and councils play a crucial role in advancing the new urban governmentality and governmental rationality (Appadurai 2001: 25). According to Skovgaard Nielsen et al. (2016), "diversity" means the coexistence of various socioeconomic, demographic, ethnic, and cultural groups within a certain space such as a city or neighborhood (Skovgaard Nielsen et al. 2016: 11). This article adopts Huttunen et al.'s (2022) way of thinking about "diversity and difference" as its analytical frame. Huttunen et al. (2022: 1) view diversity as a positive force within a state or city that deserves to be protected and preserved, whereas "difference" is considered to be a negative phenomenon between states, cities, or neighborhoods. In this article, I define dif-

ference as an unfavorable factor in a city that tends to directly or indirectly limit people's communication and participation in what can be called normal everyday life.

In this context, Richard Sennett (1991: 133–141) has noted how difficult it could be to see how different groups of people — strangers or others — could interact, socialize with locals, and participate in the sociocultural and political affairs of a city. However, Sennett does not make a reasonable effort to grasp the problems involved in managing urban diversity so that a typically *urban culture of difference* can be governed (Kraus 2016: 17). To address this issue, this article discusses Foucault's notion of police and liberal governmentality in governing urban diversity and differences. Specifically, this study aims to clarify the following research question: How does the city government represent “police” culturally if approached from the Foucauldian perspective? Foucault's notion thus provides an analytical perspective on how urban diversity and differences can be governed within the context of governable spaces of encounter, such as Chinatowns.

To answer the research question, I conducted in-depth interviews with policymakers from the cultural departments or units of the cities of Sydney and Helsinki, which were analyzed against the first principle of UN-Habitat's New Urban Agenda: leaving no one behind (UN-Habitat 2016). The New Urban Agenda (Habitat III) is an action-oriented document adopted by the United Nations in Quito, Ecuador, at its 2016 Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development. It represents a paradigm shift based on the science of cities and provides guidelines, standards, and principles for planning, building, developing, governing, and improving urban spaces (*ibid.*). In this article, the section titled “Case Study” describes in detail how this empirical analysis was conducted, which methodological tools were utilized, and why these particular cities were selected.

The term “governable spaces of encounter” is used in this article as a manifestation of diversity and differences. It describes public, open spaces in cities in which residents and visitors can interact socially, culturally, and economically, but which require — and are a product of — a certain kind of government. This article turns to the notion of a “Chinatown” as an empirical example of such a space. For Ahponen (2009: 92), the establishment of such spaces of encounter makes it easier for people to create movable identities and achieve full citizenship, which values and acknowledges the diversity of cities and neighborhoods. According to Järvelä (2009: 163), such spaces only become culturally significant and governable when people use them, which creates and reproduces spatial and sociocultural forms that promote communication between individuals learning to live together, as stipulated in Habitat III's new urban agenda (UN-Habitat 2016). As a result, as this reproduction intensifies and more people move to cities, urban culture and cultural policy become increasingly entwined, resulting in a city of differences that has a significant impact on who should be governed and how (Järvelä 2009: 163).

In this context, policy is often conceived as a process of “governmentality,” or the process by which the state comes to govern individuals and space (Foucault 1991: 87–90; Mulcahy 2006: 320; cf. Rose 1999). Dean (2002) asserts that the governmentality approach to the governance of urban cultures in cities adheres to a liberal interpretation of the task of government itself. In this article, Foucauldian liberalism is introduced as a technique for understanding both explicit and implicit cultural policy practices (cf. Ahearne 2009) of city government. However, in light of the data and objectives of this article, cultural policy is addressed particularly from the perspective of implicit or effective cultural policy (*ibid.*). According to Ahearne (2009: 143), “implicit cultural policy” refers to any political strategy that more or less directly influences the culture(s) of the territory or space (e.g., city, region, neighborhood, etc.) over which it has authority.

It is also critical for this article to distinguish between policy and police. According to Palonen (2003), policy is the regularizing aspect of politics. In this regard, Pyykkönen et al. (2009: 11) posit policy as the result of government actions that depend on the coordination, measurement, and regulation of activities that people engage in or do not engage in in their daily lives, and the spaces around them. In contrast, the concept of *police* was developed in Germany to better understand and control the socially diverse city-states and their ways of life (Pasquino 1978). As such, police, or liberal police—a concept which I approach through the notion of *cultural police* — is a form of governmentality that refers to the process through which the strength and power of a state or city are enhanced (Knemeyer 1980: 181). Given this, I approach police (cultural police) as a political technology of governing urban spaces and the individual (cf. Dean 2002).

The following section discusses the concepts of diversity, space, and language in relation to urban culture and the main objective of this study. It is followed by a theoretical discussion of liberal governmentality, liberalism and police. The Foucauldian understanding of liberalism and police provides a valuable basis for analyzing my data, as it offers a way to assess the governance of diversity and differences in a way that leads to meaningful conclusions. After the theoretical section, I describe the research methods, namely case study and thematic analysis, and the data and its analysis in this study. In the empirical section of the article, I then discuss the cases of Sydney and Helsinki under the theme of cultural spaces of encounter and communication. Finally, in the conclusion, I summarize my key findings.

Redefining Diversity, Space, and Language

Nowadays, diversity has also become a norm in the official urban and global discourse and policy discussion. In the United Nations' New Urban Agenda (Habitat III), it is claimed that “we further commit ourselves to promoting culture and respect for diversity and equality as key elements in the humanization of our cities and human settlements” (UN-Habitat 2016: 11). Fincher et al. (2014: 5) argue that the increasing ethnic and racial diversity and differences in contemporary cities present a challenge for urban planners and policymakers to guide urban areas to achieve harmonious social and cultural interactions. Essentially, their discourses and strategies are shaped by the residents' conceptions of the diversities, which vary significantly from country to country (Castle & Niller 2009). This diversity affects how residents and visitors interact, and how these spaces of encounter are represented and constructed (ibid.). In this context, difference becomes the responsibility of the state or city, while diversity becomes the responsibility of the people (cf. Huttunen et al. 2022).

Western cities have traditionally been distinguished by their cultural identity with respect to the nations they claim to represent (Kraus 2016: 19–21). Kraus (2016) argues that larger cities are associated with the history of their national identity because their inhabitants speak the same language and exhibit a similar way of life. Yet, since the 1800s, Western cities have faced a remarkable diversification of ethnicities, cultures, and languages (Wahlbeck 2022; UNESCO 2009). In this article, urban spaces, serving as examples of diversity and difference, are described as places where people can meet and interact in a way that can be controlled. One example of this development are the “Chinatowns” in the major capitals of the Western world. This is the reason why the notion of Chinatowns was selected as one of the focal points of this article. Here, the concept of Chinatown, however, refers to a larger phenomenon than merely Chinese residents in a specific location. According to Ang (2015: 4), Chinatowns in Western countries, including Australia, are pre-eminent spaces where the Chinese diaspora has established a sense of belonging and societal representation.

Kraus (2016: 38) posits that the recognition and inclusion of others in the above context may be a suitable technique for governing such multilingual and multidimensional spaces in cities. According to Wahlbeck (2022: 170), this technique can create communicative resources that enable residents and visitors to act independently and tolerate each other locally and internationally.

In the context of learning to live together as governable subjects, language as a means of communication is one of the most important factors in understanding diversity and differences, interaction and wellbeing, trade and commerce, contacts, and socialization in urban contexts (Deltas & Evenett 2020: 1–2). Therefore, it is necessary to recognize the symbolic significance of language differences for individuals' and cultures' formation of identities (*ibid.*). Furthermore, Hodler et al. (2017) suggest that using a common language in urban interactions and contacts in shared urban spaces would help reduce bitter personal feelings towards people regarded as others in society. Robinson (2020) argues that such an approach would promote peaceful coexistence and diversity in cities, thereby ultimately increasing trust between ethnicities and cultures.

Liberal Governmentality

In urban studies, a practical way of thinking about liberalism as a government strategy is related to the multiple ways local councils (city governments) operate and attempt to reconstruct a world of openness for self-governing and self-determining individuals (Rose et al. 2006: 101). For modern and liberal urban governance to function, the subject (urban residents and visitors) must be shaped, guided, and transformed into a person capable of living freely through systems of liberal government, which involve people with their multiple desires, interests, capabilities, and so on (Dean 1999: 164–165).

In this context, governmentality is “understood in the broad sense of techniques and procedures for directing human behavior—government of children, government of souls and consciences, government of a household, of a state, or of oneself” (Foucault 1997: 82). For Gordon (1991: 2), Foucault’s definition of governmentality as “the conduct of conduct” or “arts of government” is a type of activity — of government — aimed at shaping, guiding, or affecting the conduct of oneself and others. It includes practices that make it possible for visitors and residents to be governed, interact, and shape cultural spaces that can be governed (Rose et al., 2006: 101).

Rose (2000) sees governance, in its broader scope, as a kind of action in which various stakeholders (not only governments) seek to produce and reproduce lifestyles and spaces that are safer for the city, its government, and its residents. In terms of governance, governmentality utilizes a variety of rationales or mentalities associated with the many approaches to government (Bacchi 2009: 26). According to Gordon (1991: 2–3), urban governance as an activity concerns relationships between individuals, private interpersonal relations that involve some form of control or guidance, relationships between cultural institutions and communities, and concerns related to political influence. Nielsen et al. (2016: 3) define this type of governance as partnerships implemented at different policy and spatial levels to achieve a particular result.

In Foucault’s theory, governance is viewed as an activity, and the arts of government are ways to comprehend what that activity entails, and how it might be applied to governing differences and diversity (Gordon 1991). These concepts also enable the study of urban cultural policies, programs, and technology to destabilize taken-for-granted notions about how cultural politics should be conducted and thought about (Bacchi & Goodwin 2016:

43). The rationality of governance is described here as the capacity to make some form of government activity (who is governed, what constitutes governing, what is governed, and in what ways) both thinkable and practical, both for those practicing it and for those on whom it is performed (*ibid.*). As Dean (1999: 89) notes, the internal practices and rationale of this type of government activity can be described as “policing.”

Liberalism

Foucauldian scholars like Dean (2002: 41) view liberalism as a general philosophy of rule that governs governmental organizations and is followed throughout the world. The fundamental principles of this perspective are a commitment to personal liberty and limited and accountable government (*ibid.*). Dean’s argument (2010: 228) should be considered when contemplating these new types of urban spaces that aim to leave no one behind in cities as described in the United Nations’ New Urban Agenda. He argues that today’s cities and states are limited in their ability to act due to the complexity of urban space and the population of those cities.

For Foucault, the study of liberalism entails the examination of the governmental reason and the political rationality of government as an activity instead of an institution (Burchell 1996: 21). Today, urban space represents one of the most important contexts for exploring this activity in the form of enabling government through sense-making concerning the intersection of diversity, difference, and cultures in urban areas (Geertz 1973: 5; Wirth 1940: 743). In this regard, Borer (2006) describes culture as a process of finding a space where liberal governance can take shape. Urban cultural policies serve as vehicles for teaching people how to live together in urban environments (Gilberg et al. 2012; Williams 1958).

Lastly, drawing on Foucault’s late remarks, liberalism is considered a technology of governmentality (Hunt 1996: 167). In this regard, Dean (1991: 13) maintains that a liberal form of government should be recognized as the result of multiple government interventions promoting and reproducing a specific way of life. Moreover, this lifestyle is based on the regulative notions of autonomy, rationality, and obligation. According to Gilberg et al. (2012), urban culture entails everyday activities, space, discursive discourses, ideology, and sociocultural policy. An example of this is how urban space governance affects city life, and how city life influences urban space governance (*ibid.*). For Hindess (1996: 65–66), the liberal form of government promotes a way of life suitable for a society composed of such independent individuals. Pyykkönen (2015: 10) argues that by using Foucauldian ideas of liberal governance and their premises of reasoning, one can understand how governance and freedom are intertwined in urban contexts. This idea is evocative of various strategies and directions designed to regulate and control the diversity and differences found in urban cultural policies and spaces. In this regard, liberalism views government as an evil to be minimized and the city or government as a means of promoting a particular way of living (Hindess 1996: 65–66).

Police

According to Dean (2002: 42), liberalism started as a critique of the theory and practice of rule that views police, security, and public order as conditions to be accomplished through a comprehensive set of regulations. Furthermore, this type of government practice is also based on a clear and thorough understanding of the culture, lifestyle, and livelihoods to be governed. Police attempt to ensure the security of the urban area, and this act of government is achieved by adopting a facilitating role (*ibid.*). In these circumstances, the police technology can be seen in the city council’s role (local government), which functioned within state

frameworks and enabled governments to govern individuals in a way that was beneficial to the world (Foucault 2007: 410). The police carried out this operation under the assumption that a good place produces good citizens (Dušan & Dušan 2019). Due to this, the policing of cities has historically been based on their populations, requiring a great deal of consideration and effort in making urban policies (Pasquino 1978; Foucault 1988: 82–83).

According to Dean (1999: 95), the older version of police — ensuring security and public order — no longer serves as a model to be followed by government officials. This transformation describes the beginning of a new government technique (Dean 2002: 95). In Foucault's final analysis, police is seen as a political technology of the individual deployed by the liberal government (Jobe 2014). In this regard, the local or urban government utilizes this technology to cooperate with, contract out to, or enter into partnerships with agencies, groups, companies, communities, neighborhoods, bodies of civil society, and the private housing market within governed urban areas and spaces of encounter. These new spaces are what interest the police in the contemporary cultural context. According to Camponeschi (2010), utilizing public and open spaces is one way for the cultural police to experiment with new ways of interacting with people and gain a better understanding of urban subjects. In cities without these spaces, people with different backgrounds cannot interact with one another, and their understanding of one another is hampered by a lack of interaction, contacts, socializing, and dialogue (Neal et al. 2015).

For Foucault (2000: 412), the new version of police is concerned with the coexistence of people in a territory, their property relationships, what they produce, what is exchanged on the market, and so on. With this approach to diversity, the city government will gain a deeper understanding of contemporary public spaces, how they are shaped by differences, the way people live, and the diseases and accidents they may experience. In this regard, liberal governance is related to the claim to knowledge and the capability of the technology of police to accelerate the liberalistic notion of limited government that function through the understanding of cultural diversity and other processes outside of the formal political institutions of governing urban communities. It follows that the liberal fear of governing too much does not substantially exceed the fear that the population is being governed too much or wrongly, but that the state or city is doing too much of the governing to reinforce differences or celebrate diversity (Dean & Hindess 1998: 3–7). The section that follows will outline the methodological aspects of this study.

Case Study

This study includes in-depth examinations of cases of *diversity and differences* in urban governance to demonstrate how to promote the city government's strategy of governing residents and visitors. Within the scope of this article, the analysis is based on the working definition proposed by Yin (2015: 194): a case study is "an empirical inquiry that closely examines a contemporary phenomenon (the case) within its real-world context." The two countries were chosen because Finland has been a bilingual country since its independence, and multiculturalism is a central part of the Australian constitution. Helsinki and Sydney were selected for this examination because, first, both cities have explicitly acknowledged diversity and pluralism as part of their identities and placemaking. Second, both cities provide an excellent context for studying the concept of Chinatown and its discussion as an example of a space of encounter.

According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2019), the City of Sydney is expected to have a population of 275,370 as of the year 2022, out of the Greater Sydney population of

5,367,206. Helsinki has an estimated population of 653,835 out of the 1.5 million people living in the Helsinki Region (City of Helsinki 2020).

The geographical and cultural differences were also taken into consideration when selecting the cities. For example, Finnish and Swedish are both official languages in Finland, and in Helsinki, 78.2% speak Finnish as their first language, 5.6% speak Swedish, and 16.2% speak another language (City of Helsinki 2020). In Helsinki, more than 140 nationalities are represented, which makes it one of the most ethnically diverse cities in Finland. According to the World Population Review (2022), approximately 45% of the people who live in Greater Sydney were born outside of Australia, indicating that the population is diverse and represents many different cultures.

Data and Its Analysis

The study includes four semi-structured recorded interviews and one online interview conducted in Sydney between October and December 2019 and in Helsinki between June and July 2020. Before each data collection period, a formal request was emailed to a contact person in each city, explaining the broader purpose of my study and the necessity of obtaining data by interviewing respondents. My request was answered by the cities' unit or department of cultural policy, which selected three key candidates in Sydney and two in Helsinki for an interview. In each case, the participants represented the views of their respective cities within the cultural policy unit. As part of my broader research goal, the interviews conducted were purposively limited to the cultural policy units, and these did not include the perspectives of other departments of the city council.

To begin with, I conducted three semi-structured interviews with strategy advisors and managers from the cultural and creativity unit of the City of Sydney local government area (LGA). Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, it was very challenging to collect data in Helsinki. Therefore, two semi-structured interviews (one of which was an online interview) were conducted with policymakers (a former director and a deputy mayor) within the Culture and Leisure Division of the City of Helsinki.

The recorded interviews were transcribed and analyzed using the thematic analysis guidelines described by Braun and Clarke (2006). Based on the recommendations of the cities' cultural policy units or departments regarding my initial request, I conducted a smaller number of interviews than originally planned. However, thematic analysis can be used with both small and large data sets, and with as few as one or two participants (Cederwall & Berg, 2010).

To gain a comprehensive understanding of the data and to perform a thematic analysis, it was necessary to read the material multiple times. Following the transcription, coding was performed to categorize the data into smaller, more meaningful units. Codes were added to similar sentences, words, and sometimes even groups of sentences in the transcripts. However, not every phrase or word was coded, and only responses that were relevant to the study's goals were coded. Because I did not have pre-established codes, I utilized the open coding method, which involved developing codes as I coded and refining them as I progressed (Braun & Clarke 2006). Once I had read all the transcripts and assigned codes to different data components, I grouped codes that fit together into themes. In addition, I reviewed all the initial themes and determined that each theme should be distinct from the others. As a result of this thorough consideration and review, language and spaces of encounter were identified as themes, and Chinatown was categorized as a sub-theme within the theme of spaces of encounter. Through this process, I refined the themes to reveal their essence. To do this, I looked at how the themes, research purpose, and theo-

retical frameworks that were used to answer the research questions fit together. The analysis was conducted at a descriptive level as well as more comprehensively, in search of models and patterns that might be used to explain the statements.

Finally, the interview participants from Sydney were anonymized as Syn1 and Syn2, and the participants from Helsinki were anonymized as Hel1 and Hel2. To obtain a more comprehensive understanding, the findings of the present study were analyzed from a theoretical perspective. This understanding will be discussed in the following section, which covers the analysis.

Policing Differences and Diversity at Local (City) Council Level

Policing cultural spaces of encounter and notions of communication: What about Chinatown?

As discussed in the previous sections, spaces of encounter are determined by economic factors, cultural norms, and, most importantly, the police's control of the targeted population. Considering this, it may be argued that such cultural encounters in cities and their spaces have led to today's urban governmentality, which includes both explicit and implicit cultural policies characteristic of liberal governance. Furthermore, the normalization of such spaces or communities has the effect of restricting sociability and interaction between citizens who live alongside excluded individuals.

In the context of language and spaces of encounter identified as the themes in the data and Chinatown as the subtheme, Hel2 describes the City of Helsinki as "a bilingual city with some other languages in Helsinki." Syn2 describes the City of Sydney as "strangely diverse in terms of being a lot of people from a lot of places." Based on these quotations, communication methods, such as the languages people speak, provide insight into how the city's diverse population can function together. In practice, the City of Sydney primarily functions in English. It is a city with a large number of immigrants who settled there during the early stages of European settlement. For this reason, Sydney is highly diverse despite the fact that English is the dominant language of communication and contact. In the City of Helsinki, the number of immigrants has grown since the early 1990s, but it is still low compared to Sydney and other Western cities with a long history of immigration.

According to Sager (2011), cities and their governments set the agenda for governing people through a variety of means of communication that involve agreements between businesses, governments, and people. In addition, this approach allows for an assessment of how differences and diversity are governed within ethnic spaces or concentrations by observing details of daily life. The case studies below will discuss this further.

The City of Sydney's case

According to Ang (2015: 5), Chinatowns have re-emerged as an icon of multiculturalism in Australia. Australia's declaration as a multicultural nation in the 1980s has changed the meaning of Chinatowns (ibid.). Historically, Sydney's Chinatown was a place of differences and segregation, enforced by the majority of residents and colonial governments as the settlers sought to maintain cultural ties to their homeland (Inglis 2011: 1). Today, Chinatowns are places for celebrating cultural diversity and serve as a symbol of differences that should be protected from discrimination and prejudice rather than criticized (Anderson 1990: 137). The City of Sydney recognizes this opportunity to promote the colorful potential of

Chinatown as a means of boosting economic growth and increasing mutual participation among Chinese residents (ibid.).

In Sydney, interviewee Syn2 raised the theme of cultural expectations:

It's hard for me to say because when I go to Chinatown, I am experiencing it as a European, as a white Australian. That's how I am experiencing it. So, when I am going there and ordering food, or you know, I am buying something or hanging around, I will be speaking English.

And I have never had a situation in Chinatown or any place similar to Chinatown because we have Korea town, which is kind of around this area. So, I have never had the experience of being unable to converse with someone in Chinatown.

In light of the above statements regarding cultural expectations, foreign origin is sometimes a starting point for developing new visitors' spaces with opportunities for interaction between urban residents and others. In this context, Sydney's Chinatown, which is a place with foreign roots, may also help improve communication between people who speak different languages. For example, the original settlers gathered in Chinatown in Sydney solely to work and survive. Now, it is a bustling dining district, attracting tourists who are not culturally different in their approach to communication from those who possess a basic understanding of English and the language of the settlers. It is evident from the above that business and cultural contacts occur at all levels, even at the level of ordering food. Accordingly, these trends indicate that the differences in the governing procedures in Sydney's Chinatown can be seen as a manifestation of urban diversity and a representation of the minority group. Diversity is also present, but mostly in the form of tourism and trade, in which people from different cultures meet and interact with each other. In terms of interaction and encounters between different cultures and ethnic groups and visitors, Chinatowns are one of the most visible indicators.

With respect to the theme of policy directives, Syn2 stated:

They would not have assumed any policy work done around what we are going to do regarding language. So, it's literally like we will create. We will work with the Chinese community to create this place where they can congregate and share and interact and share their culture and all of that. But whether or not that would have gone to the level of how we are going to regulate, or we will create the policy conditions for the sharing of language, I don't think it would have gone that far.

I mean obviously, there is a lot of signage in Chinese, Mandarin, and Cantonese, there is a lot of, you know, kind of British communication and obviously, the community there talking in Mandarin or Cantonese amongst themselves. But it is an interesting question about whether or not there would be a policy layer to that. I don't know.

Based on this, the urban lifestyle in Sydney has increased the visibility of cultural relationships, making government policing simpler. The development of spaces for interaction and encounters is consistent with the limited government rationality, which portrays this development as the voice of cultural representation in a *multicultural focused space* (Mohammed 2019). For Hunt (1996), such a rationality and development can be seen as the birth of (cultural) politics leading to increasing diversity and differences in regulatory activity. Based on this analysis of Sydney's Chinatown, I think Chinatown is no longer a restricted racial enclave and a space of exclusion. Instead, it is becoming a more connected, open, and universal space where an Asian-Australian identity is equally represented.

As stated in the theoretical section, freedom in the city and its spaces of encounters are rooted in the linguistic expression of urban culture in these spaces and by its people. Accordingly, it is crucial to recognize the symbolic significance of language differences and

diversity in urban cultural policy formation. With regard to the role of language in cultural policy, Syn2 stated:

Language from a cultural policy perspective, so I can't speak to immigration policy, housing policy, and all that. From a cultural perspective, language has been left out for most of the Australian cultural policies. And I think that probably speaks to my privileges as a natural-born Australian white person. From what I can see and I think, that is a bad thing.

As noted by the participant, language is an essential aspect of communication in cultural policy. However, the barriers to or enablers of interaction and contacts between people learning to live together have not been fully considered in explicit cultural policy and practice. Presently, this scenario is further complicated by the extensive use of the English language as an official means of interaction and communication at all levels of urban encounters, both institutional and urban.

It is also important to note that language is a major concern for those who do not speak English well. In such a case, a city or neighborhood may not be welcoming to non-English-speaking residents, which is likely to widen the communication gap. For Syn2:

There are parts of Australia where people believe that, and you know, on a day-to-day level, the number of people who can speak more than one language in Australia, I don't know. But I will assume it is significantly less than in Europe. So, you know, if you are someone who is coming from Ghana or Finland and your English is not great, I imagine you struggle quite significantly. And your opportunities to engage in the cultural life of Australia, outside of sharing your culture with people from your country of origin. I imagine that would be very difficult.

As seen above, language barriers describe how city government policies become feasible and practical as an art of living with differences. To Foucault (1997: 74), this kind of action is an approach that is connected to the liberal critique of excessive or wrong governance. Therefore, to repoliticize the communicative issue in light of people coming to Australia, policymakers need to think about what the minority language communities are — whether those coming in or intending to become part of the community. It could lead to a general re-evaluation whereby the governance of differences and diversity through communication at the city level might become distorted or complicated, resulting in the exclusion of others with language difficulties. I think that the differences in the way people communicate in Sydney show how a liberal technology is used as a government product, and how different government strategies promote a certain way of life by using techniques that could be called “cultural police.” Next, I will move on to discuss Helsinki's case.

The City of Helsinki's case

Finland's official bilingual status is manifested in the capital, the City of Helsinki, as well as in the country's public organizations, which are legally bound to govern in both Swedish and Finnish (Kraus 2016: 26). In contrast to Sydney, where languages as a means of communication in governed spaces of encounter are excluded from explicit cultural policy-making, Helsinki acknowledges the importance of communication as a concept in cultural policy (both implicit and explicit) and city-making.

Helsinki is a very diverse city when compared to other Finnish cities, but its ethnic composition is still relatively homogeneous when compared to places like London. The city has several ethnic restaurants and shopping options. However, ethnic concentrations as self-standing communities are considered problematic and ghettos, which the Helsinki city

government opposes. Below is the response of an interviewee when asked whether they were interested in ethnic spaces such as Chinatowns.

According to Hel1:

No, it doesn't. There are some areas where, for example, there are several ethnic restaurants or shops. Helsinki is still quite a homogenous city, and immigration is a somewhat new thing. Ethnic concentration would be considered segregation, which Helsinki is fighting against. The city's goal is to have equality between different neighborhoods with no social division.

As Hel1 suggests, Helsinki aspires to be a city that promotes its citizens' welfare, their participation in cultural activities, and its strength as a city without divisions. In such circumstances, police practice is not governed by law but rather by a number of positive interventions that aim to affect people's urban lifestyles (Foucault 2000: 415). Accordingly, Hel1 believes that the City of Helsinki is committed to good policing that focuses on urban areas and brings everyone together into a single community. This is in line with the goal of UN Habitat III, which is to leave no one behind. In this sense, urban governance can be viewed as an attempt to promote a certain way of life or culture through the use of police technology. As a result, the police play an important role in preserving the changing nature of urban interactions, in which people learn to coexist in a governed space. Moreover, this indicates some degree of diversity in the city, even though migration is relatively recent compared to Sydney, where immigration has a long history. Like Sydney, there is some interaction among urban residents in Helsinki, but this interaction is primarily related to tourism and commerce. With regard to interaction and encounters between different cultures, ethnic groups, and visitors, Helsinki's alternative serves as an important and visible manifestation of an integrative urban culture.

In relation to the themes of policy and cultural expectations, Hel2 also pointed out:

It has been an active policy not to have one, and I personally don't quite understand it if I will move to, let's say, Ethiopia. I would like to live where let's say, not Finns but Nordic people, European people, and people probably from a Nordic city inside some Ethiopian city I don't know. But we actually go strongly against creating these kinds of communities, trying to blend everybody into our own society.

And there is, there is a researcher in Helsinki who is specialized in these kinds of things, God, I don't remember her name, but I see this grass of weird non-Finnish people in Helsinki, and where do they come from, the language schools, and it's really diverse actually. The only Chinatown-like area you can find is actually Otaniemi, where the Aalto University is based, and there is like 75% of the non-Finnish people living in Otaniemi are from China, Japan, or Korea, but of course, it's temporary; they are there just as students.

I argue that Hel2's responses (personal opinion) are an important analytical point, given that the respondent opposes the official urban policy of Helsinki and Finland, which aim to mix ethnicities extensively. In essence, this is a matter of governing diversity and difference in urban space. It is also an issue that is contested among policymakers, as pointed out by Hel2. In addition, these questions pertain to the issue of differences, which is echoed in UN-Habitat's New Urban Agenda. However, these communities are also excellent places to learn about these new cultures and traditions. In this situation, the creation of Chinatowns and other similar enclaves will give people the chance to learn from each other's social and cultural differences.

As was the case in Sydney, acknowledging and including others can be an effective way to govern multilingual and multidimensional spaces. As part of this cultural process, it is possible to develop communicative resources that will facilitate the interaction between

diverse groups of people in the city. Regarding the role of language in cultural policy, Hell stated:

Helsinki has recognized the challenge of language barriers. More and more people live in Helsinki who don't speak Finnish or Swedish. We also need to offer non-verbal culture and give space to non-Finnish culture and performances as well.

Through liberal forms of governance, a plurality of languages can be promoted explicitly as a way of living and as an art of living, with no one left behind. Based on the above, it appears that the urban context of Helsinki is a space that plays a significant role in symbolizing the coexistence of the two national languages (Kraus 2016: 30). I would argue that Helsinki's bilingual cultural services are the result of applying liberalism, which stipulates freedom as a function of government. This occurs as a consequence of urban governmentality, which creates regulation strategies that can be considered "cultural police." They provide insights into the tensions between diversity, differences, and participation in urban planning. In the discussion above, tensions have been expressed regarding the governance of differences and diversity, which seeks to maintain tradition while striving to introduce a new cultural rationality.

Conclusion

Cities like Sydney and Helsinki offer laboratory-like conditions for studying what the Foucauldian police means in urban cultural policy and planning. This article has explored the question of how the city government in Sydney and Helsinki culturally express what Foucault and Foucauldian theory call police in the contexts of diversity and difference. A thematic analysis of the interviews in these cities revealed similarities and differences in their policy directives regarding differences and diversity, especially in relation to communication and cultural spaces of encounter, such as Chinatowns.

This article found that at the city level, policing is not limited to policymakers' regulatory practices and control mechanisms for ensuring good order in the city. Accordingly, cultural policing has improved the socioeconomic status of the city and enabled the marginalized to be recognized. In Helsinki and Sydney, governable cultural spaces of encounter, including Chinatowns, and their governance are key examples of the challenges presented by urban differences and diversity. Yet, the discussion of urban differences and diversity also honor the culturally rooted contexts of urban spaces to ensure the shared urban cultural identity of the cities. According to the empirical evidence presented, cultural policing primarily seeks to develop a strategy to manage diversity and differences in accordance with the city policy objectives. The earlier conceptions of Chinatown in Sydney represent a different understanding and way of governing. It was about controlling the main population in such spaces, which aligns with what Foucault terms a disciplined society in relation to his earlier notion of the police state. However, this article concluded that Sydney's Chinatown is no longer a Chinese community enclave, isolated from the Australian majority. On the contrary, it is a dynamic, lively, multicultural, multilingual, and diversified cultural space where learning to live together with differences is experienced and expressed.

In the case of Helsinki, it was revealed that it aims to increase the construction of something new, which is supposed to foster citizens' lives, their participation in sociocultural activities, and the city's strength in what was referred to as "spaces or communities with no social division." The way of life that the City of Helsinki is interested in promises police practices

focused on urban areas that blend the whole society into one community. Such an approach to urban cultural governance attests to the significant space that existed as forms of police that were manifested in specific, continuous, and positive interventions aimed at people's behavior (Foucault 2000: 415). Unlike Sydney, Helsinki views Chinatown as an ethnic concentration—an example of self-standing communities that are deemed problematic, as well as ghettos, which the Helsinki city government opposes. In this case, the police become the precondition for maintaining the course of interactions in governing diversity and differences.

In addition, language plays a significant role in Helsinki's and Sydney's cultural policy practices. It provides an entry into society and a means of establishing contacts and interaction with others. The evidence presented in this article practically suggests that communicative policies and interventions contribute to helping and welcoming others with differences and difficulties.

Based on the analysis, it can be argued that if urban governance keeps shifting towards a regulative city, the cultural police will not abandon its mechanisms that create differences. It will activate them in a situational and temporary manner, but its permanent and actual subject will be the residents and their way of life and the population's culture. These are the premises on which the police began to operate and express its rationality regarding UN-Habitat's current slogan, "The city we need." In addition, Chinatowns have been reconceptualized in this article as models for understanding the socioeconomic and cultural implications of living together, cultivating tolerant attitudes toward differences, and creating spaces for people to interact. Throughout this article, the interplay between Chinatowns, urban space, and language has been explored to illustrate the complexity of diverse cultural practices that characterize cities and their governance. To accommodate the linguistic and cultural diversity of the city in question, this level of responsiveness is critical. Based on the analysis of the data from a Foucauldian perspective presented here, this article has arrived at conclusions reaching beyond a generalization of how the selected cities govern and police the issues raised in this study.

References

- Ahearne, Jeremy (2009). "Cultural policy, explicit and implicit: a distinction and some uses." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 141–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630902746245>
- Ahmadi, Donya (2018). "Is diversity our strength? An analysis of the facts and fancies of diversity in Toronto." *City, Culture and Society*, Vol. 13, pp. 64–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2017.11.002>
- Ahponen, Pirkkoliisa (2009). "Perspectives for Cultural Political Research: Keywords from Participation through Creativity and Alienation to Self-expression and Competition." M. Pyykkonen, N. Simanainen, & S. Sokka (Eds.), *What about Cultural Policy?* Helsinki: Minerva. Pp. 75–92.
- Althusser, Louis (1971). "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly. Pp. 127–86.
- Anderson, Kay (1990). "Chinatown re-oriented: A critical analysis of recent redevelopment schemes in a Melbourne and Sydney enclave." *Australian Geographical Studies*, Vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 137–154. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8470.1990.tb00609.x>
- Anderson, Kay (1991). *Vancouver's Chinatown: Racial Discourse in Canada 1875–1980*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queens's University Press.
- Ang, Ien (2016). "At home in Asia? Sydney's Chinatown and Australia's 'Asian Century.'" *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, Vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 257–269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367877915573763>
- Appadurai, Arjun (2001). "Deep democracy: urban governmentality and the horizon of politics." *Environment and Urbanization*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 23–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095624780101300203>

- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2019). Census of Population and Housing 2011 and 2016. accessed 29 March 2020. <https://forecast.id.com.au/sydney#:~:text=The%20City%20of%20Sydney%20population%20forecast%20for%202022%20is%20275%2C370,year%20between%202016%20and%202041>
- Bacchi, Carol & Goodwin, Susan (2016). *Poststructural policy analysis: A guide to practice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-52546-8_1
- Bacchi, Carol (2009). *Analyzing policy: What's the problem represented to be?* Frenchs Forest, N.S.W: Pearson.
- Boisjoly, Johanne, Duncan, Greg J., Kremer, Michael, Levy, Dan M., & Eccles, Jacque (2006). "Empathy or antipathy? The impact of diversity." *Am. Econ. Rev.*, Vol. 96, pp. 1890–1905. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.96.5.1890>
- Borer, Michael Ian (2006). "The Location of Culture: The Urban Culturalist Perspective." *City & Community*, Vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 173–197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6040.2006.00168.x>
- Braun, Virginia & Clarke, Victoria (2006). "Using thematic analysis in psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, Vol. 3, pp. 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Burchell, Graham (1996). "Liberal Government and Techniques of the Self." In Barry, Andrew, Osborne, Thomas, & Rose, Nikolas (Eds.). *Foucault And Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism And The Rationalities Of Government* (1st ed.). Oxon: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315072500>
- Camponesch, Chiara (2010). "The Enabling City: Place-Based Creative Problem-Solving and the Power of the Everyday." Available at <http://enablingcity.com/read>
- Castles, Stephen, & Miller, Mark J. (2009). *The Age of Migration*. 4th edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan. <https://doi.org/10.30950/jcer.v5i2.188>
- Cedervall, Ylva, & Åberg, Anna Cristina (2010). "Physical activity and implications on well-being in mild Alzheimer's disease: A qualitative case study on two men with dementia and their spouses." *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice*, Vol. 26, pp. 226–239. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09593980903423012>
- City of Helsinki (2020). Helsinki facts and figures 2020. Accessed 21 May 2021. <https://www.hel.fi/uutiset/en/kaupunginkanslia/helsinki-facts-and-figures-2020>
- Dean, Mitchell (1991). *The Constitution of Poverty. Toward a Genealogy of Liberal Governance* (1st ed.). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315823294>
- Dean, Mitchell (1999). *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society* (1st ed.). London: SAGE Publications.
- Dean, Mitchell (2002). "Liberal government and authoritarianism." *Economy and Society*, Vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 37–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03085140120109240>
- Dean, Mitchell (2010). *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE Publications.
- Dean, Mitchell, & Hindess, Barry (1998). "Introduction: Society, government, liberalism." In Mitchell Dean & Barry Hindess (Eds.), *Governing Australia: Studies in Contemporary Rationalities of Government*. Pp. 1–19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deltas, George, & Evenett, Simon (2020). "Language as a barrier to entry: Foreign competition in Georgian public procurement." *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, Vol. 73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijindorg.2020.102616>
- Desmet, Klaus & Gomes, Joseph Flavian, & Ortuño-Ortín, Ignacio (2020). "The geography of linguistic diversity and the provision of public goods." *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 143(C). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2019.102384>
- Dušan, Marinković & Dušan, Ristić (2019). "Foucault and the Birth of the Police." *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo*, Vol. 70, no. 4., pp. 352–363.
- Fincher, Ruth, Iveson, Kurt, Leitner, Helga, & Preston, Valerie (2014). "Planning in the multicultural city: Celebrating diversity or reinforcing difference?" *Progress in Planning*, Vol. 92, pp. 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progress.2013.04.001>
- Foucault, Michel (1979). "Governmentality." *Ideology and Consciousness*, Vol. 6, pp. 5–21.
- Foucault, Michel (1981). "Omnes et singulatim: Towards a Criticism of 'Political Reason.'" In S. McMurrin (Ed.), *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, vol. 2, (pp. 223–254). Salt Lake City, UT: The University of Utah Press.

- Foucault, Michel (1984). "Space, knowledge, and power." In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault Reader*. Pp. 239–257. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Foucault, Michel (1988). *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977–1984* (Ed. L. D. Kritzman). New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel (1989a). *Foucault Live* (Ed. S. Lotringer). New York: Semiotext(e).
- Foucault, Michel (1989b). *Résumé des cours 1970–1982*. Paris: Juilliard.
- Foucault, Michel (1991). "Governmentality." G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Pp. 87–104. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault, Michel (1997). *The Essential Works 1954–1984, Vol. 1, Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth* (Ed. P. Rabinow). New York: New Press.
- Foucault, Michel (2000). *The Essential Works of Foucault: 1954–1984, Vol. 3, Power* (Ed. J. Faubion). New York: New Press.
- Foucault, Michel (2007). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977–78*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Geertz, Clifford (1973). *The Interpretation of Culture*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gillberg, Daniel, Berglund, Ylva, Brembeck, Helene & Stenbäck, Olle (2012). "Urban Cultures as a field of knowledge and learning." *Mistra Urban Futures Report 2012, Vol. 1*. Gothenburg: Mistra Urban Futures.
- Gordon, Colin (1991). "Introduction." In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Pp. 1–51. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Hall, C. Michael, & Rath, Jan (2007). "Tourism, migration, and place advantage in the global cultural economy." In Jan. Rath (Ed.), *Tourism, Ethnic Diversity, and the City*. Pp. 199–215. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203413869>
- Hannerz, Ulf (2006). "Two Faces of Cosmopolitanism: Culture and Politics." in *Statsvetenskaplig Tidsskrift*. Vol. 107, no. 3, pp. 199–213. Fahlbeckska Stiftelsen.
- Hindess, Barry (1996). "Liberalism, socialism, and democracy: Variations on a governmental theme." Barry, Andrew, Osborne, Thomas, & Rose, Nikolas (Eds.). *Foucault And Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism And The Rationalities Of Government* (1st ed.). Oxon: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315072500>
- Hindess, Barry (2001). "The liberal government of unfreedom." *Alternatives*, Vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 93–111. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030437540102600201>
- Hodler, Roland, Valsecchi, Michele, & Vesperoni, Alberto (2017). *Ethnic Geography: Measurement and Evidence*. CEPR Discussion Paper no. 12378.
- Hunt, Alan (1996). "Governing the city: Liberalism and early modern modes of governance." Barry, Andrew, Osborne, Thomas, & Rose, Nikolas (Eds.). *Foucault And Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism And The Rationalities Of Government* (1st ed.). Oxon: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315072500>
- Huttunen, Miia, Mohammed, Saeed Bin, & Pyykkönen, Miikka (2022). "Cosmopolitan internationalism: UNESCO's ideological ambiguity and the difference/diversity problematic." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2022.2096879>
- Inglis, Christine (2011). "Chinatown Sydney: A Window on the Chinese Community." *Journal of Chinese Overseas*, Vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 45–68. <https://doi.org/10.1163/179325411X565407>
- Järvelä, Marja (2009). "Reclaiming Space as a Meaningful Place." M. Pyykkonen, N. Simanainen, & S. Sokka (Eds.), *What about Cultural Policy?* Helsinki: Minerva. Pp. 161–172.
- Jobe, Kevin Scott (2014). *The Policing of Self and Others: Foucault, Political Reason & a Critical Ontology of Police*. A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate School in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Philosophy. Stony Brook University. https://repo.library.stonybrook.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11401/76620/Jobe_grad.sunysb_0771E_12217.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- John, Nagle (2009). "The right to Belfast City Centre: From ethnocracy to liberal multiculturalism?" *Political Geography*, Vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 132–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2009.02.002>
- Knemeyer, Franz-Ludwig (1980). "Polizei." *Economy and Society*, Vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 172–96.

- Kraus, Peter A. (2016): "The Multilingual City: The Cases of Helsinki and Barcelona." In I. Irazabalbeitia Fernandez (Ed.), *Migrations and Cultural and Linguistic Minorities in Europe*. Pp. 16–45. Brussels: Center Maurits Coppieters.
- Lowe Kelley, Daphne (2011, 30 June). Chinese Australians owed apology for discrimination against forebears. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. <https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/chinese-australians-owed-apology-for-discrimination-against-forebears-20110629-1gr05.html>
- Malik, Kenan (1996). *The Meaning of Race: Race, History, and Culture in Western Society*. Houndmills and London: Macmillan.
- McDonogh, Gary W., & Wong, Cindy Hing-Yuk (2012). "Beside downtown: Global Chinatowns." In M. Peterson, & G. W. McDonogh (Eds.), *Global Downtowns*. Pp. 273–295. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- McGuigan, Jim (1996). *Culture and the Public Sphere*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Mead, Lawrence M. (1986). *Beyond Entitlement: The Social Obligations of Citizenship*. New York : Free Press.
- Mohammed, Saeed Bin (2019). "Cosmopolitanism as a Potential Theoretical Solution to the Challenges of Globalised Urbanisation." *Arts & International Affairs*, Vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 139–161. <https://doi.org/10.18278/aia.4.2.19>
- Mooney-Somers, Julie, Perz, Janette, & Ussher, Jane M. (2008). "A complex negotiation: Women's experiences of naming and not naming premenstrual distress in couple relationships." *Women & Health*, Vol. 47, pp. 57–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03630240802134134>
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. (2006). "Cultural Policy: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, Vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 319–330. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JAML.35.4.319-330>
- Neal, Sarah, Bennett, Katy, Jones, Hannah, et al. (2015) "Multicultural and public parks: Researching super-diversity and attachment in public green space." *Population, Space and Place*, Vol. 21, pp. 463–475. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.1910>
- Osborne, David & Gaebler, Ted (1993). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. New York: Plume Books.
- Osborne, Thomas (1994). "On liberalism, neo-liberalism, and the 'liberal' profession of medicine." *Economy and Society - London*, Vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 345–356.
- Palonen, Kari (2003). "Four Times of Politics: Policy, Polity, Politicking, and Politicization". *Alternatives*, Vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 171–186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030437540302800202>
- Pasquino, Pasquale (1980). "Theatricum politicum. The genealogy of capital: Police and the state of prosperity." *Ideology and Consciousness*, 4, pp. 41–54.
- Pyykkonen, Miikka (2015). "Liberalism, Governmentality, and Counter-Conduct: An Introduction to Foucauldian Analytics of Liberal Civil Society Notions." *Foucault Studies*, No. 20, pp. 8–35. <https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v0i0.4925>
- Pyykkonen, Miikka, Simanainen, Niina, & Sokka, Sakarias (Eds.) (2009). *What about Cultural Policy?* Helsinki: Minerva.
- Robinson, Amanda Lea (2020). "Ethnic Diversity, Segregation and Ethnocentric Trust in Africa." *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 217–239. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123417000540>
- Rose, Nikolas (1999). *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511488856>
- Rose, Nikolas (2000). "Governing cities, governing citizens." E. Isin (Ed.), *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City*. Pp. 95–109. London: Routledge.
- Rose, Nikolas, O'Malley, Pat, & Valverde, Mariana (2006). "Governmentality." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, Vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 83–104. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.2.081805.105900>
- Sager, Tore (2011). "Neo-liberal urban planning policies: A literature survey 1990–2010." *Progress in Planning*, Vol. 76, no. 4, pp. 147–199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progress.2011.09.001>
- Sennett, Richard (1991). *The conscience of the eye: the design and social life of cities*. London, UK: Faber and Faber.
- Simons, Helen (2009). *Case Study Research in Practice*. London: SAGE Publications, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446268322>

- Skinner, Quentin (1978). *The Foundation of Modern Political Thought*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skovgaard Nielsen, R., Beckman, A. W., Blach, V., & Andersen, H. T. (2016). *DIVERCITIES: Dealing with Urban Diversity: The Case of Copenhagen*. Copenhagen: SBI Forlag.
- Tasan-Kok, Tuna, Van Kempen, Ronald, Raco, Mike, & Bolt, Gideon (2013). *Towards Hyper Diversified European Cities: A Critical Literature Review*. Utrecht: Universiteit Utrecht
- UNESCO (2009). *Investing in cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue: UNESCO world report*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UN-Habitat (2016). *HABITAT III New Urban Agenda*. <https://habitat3.org/the-new-urban-agenda>
- Valverde, Mariana (1996). "Despotism' and ethical governance." *Economy and Society*, Vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 357–72.
- Vertovec, Steven (2007). "Super-diversity and its implications." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 1024–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465>
- Wahlbeck, Östen (2022). "Ethnic boundary making among Swedish migrants in Helsinki." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 45, no. 16, pp. 168–188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2021.2019814>
- Williams, Raymond (1958). *Culture and Society, 1780–1950*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Wirth, Louis (1940). "The Urban Society and Civilization." *American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 743–755.
- World Population Review (2022). *Sydney Population 2022: Demographics, Maps, Graphs*. Retrieved October 4, 2022, from <https://worldpopulationreview.com/world-cities/sydney-population>
- Yiftachel, Oren & Ghanem, As'ad (2004). "Understanding 'ethnocratic regimes': The politics of seizing contested territory." *Political Geography*, Vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 647–676. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2004.04.003>
- Yin, Robert K. (1984). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Yin, Robert K. (2015). "Case studies." In J. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopaedia of the Social & Behavioural Sciences*. 2nd edition. Pp. 194–201. Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.10507-0>