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Introduction

In Europe, the systematic education of planners turned one hundred in 2009, taking the W.H. Lever Chair for Civic Design in University of Liverpool’s Department of Civic Design as the commonly agreed starting point (Hall, 1996, Albers, 1997). The British founder of a company producing ‘bare necessities of life’ (with the slogan ‘A bar of soap is a piece of hope’) stands actually at the beginning of a systematic approach towards the education of people who plan and develop our living environment. In those days it was Victorian Utopian Humanist thinking which made Lever experiment with the 1887 Port Sunlight garden city – or for similar reasons Krupp with the 1909 Margarethen Höhe in Essen, at that time the German steel capital – giving people of the heavy days of industrialization a better life and living environment. A lively picture of these conditions was provided by Friedrich Engels (1892), observing the ‘conditions of the working class’ and its methods very ‘dense’ description of urban issues.

One hundred years later, spatial planning is still at the point of attempting to give people better places to live in and, at the same time, allowing them to produce their own little harbours of delight, as well as the motorways to commute between spatially separated functions of work and living (due to the very influential Charter of Athens (CIAM) 1933, LeCorbusier 1942; see also the New Charter of Athens, http://www.ceu-ectp.org/e/athens/). The aspect of ‘social deliberation’ is possibly still there or might have been surpassed by questions of sustainability (Sachs and Santarius, 2007). What became a systematic activity at the level of individual quarters or model towns (the policing of buildings is a long-standing historic practice especially; see e.g. Benevolo, 2000) has evolved into a system of elaborate and highly integrated layers of government and non-government action. Those planning territorial development systems have faced change time and again and have, at least in the European context, also seen the rise of a new layer, that of the European Union (Faludi, 2007), no matter how elaborate this level is or is not at the start of the third millennium.

The following sections will elaborate on aspects of these dimensions – which are by no means an exhaustive account of what planning is or can be (an overview on existing practice can be found in Ryser and Franchini, 2008). In the first section, formal planning systems will be addressed and the
increasing ‘hybridization’ of planning activities outlined. Whereas over its history the planning task might have been easily captured by one dimension only, in today’s world planners face much more complex tasks and need to invent new approaches to cope with those challenges. The second section will elaborate on new spatial structures and problem situations, mainly from a European perspective. The main point here is the enlarged spatio-functional context surpassing traditional spatial patterns and city perimeters and establishing polycentric metropolitan spaces at a European level. The management and the achievement of territorial cohesion (if at all) are major issues of the future. The third section will widen the perspective and look across European borders into those development features which have already been labelled as ‘urban millennium’. The dire outlooks of population ‘metapologies’ (UN Habitat, 2006) of the southern hemisphere call for new planning governance and sustainability but are also full of social innovations. The concluding remarks at the end remind us that there is still a utopian function for cities in society.

Territorial development systems

Planning and territorial development, defined as a coordinated approach towards specific aims or objectives, is usually based on a set of processes and institutional structures and at least in part defined as an act of sovereignty with mandatory results. This statement might surprise in the face of the many different forms which the core activities in the professional field have taken, as is indicated by the notion of a change ‘from government to governance’. Yes, planning has changed its instruments and procedures and much has happened over recent years in terms of empowerment, participation and new managerial approaches in planning. But try imagining a multi-billion Euro investment being fixed without a solid legally binding basis (e.g. a local plan, even if this is increasingly negotiated between public and private parties) (Ennis, 2003). For the exploding population mega metropolises one instrument which helps in getting those cities straight is to empower citizens via ownership of land, enabling the citizens to take responsibility without being expelled (e.g. property rights, land titles and registers, cadastres; see UN Habitat, 2006). A ‘planner’ usually has to be ‘registered’ to have the full rights in professional terms (i.e. the role of professional associations regulating markets; see Geppert and Verhage, 2008). This starts usually at the higher education level with the question whether a course in planning has been ‘accredited’ (in the UK e.g. by the Royal Town Planning Institute; see Ache, 2008b). In sum, there are many complex ‘system dimensions’ structuring the field, and some of the core aspects, in particular institutional structures and plans, will be addressed in the following sections.

Over past years research but also practice related projects (like the Interreg IIIB Baltic Sea Region; see http://commin.org/en/commin/) tried to develop a full picture of such dimensions of planning and territorial development systems. One such project was the ‘compendium of European planning systems’ (European Commission, 1997). In 2006, with the enlarging European Union a fresh overview was needed and provided, using a more generic approach to understand the governance of territorial and urban policies from EU to local level, acknowledging the more elaborate structure and changes inside territorial development (University of Valencia et al., 2006). The analysis of territorial development systems is an altogether difficult venture, given that there are not only differences between state systems (due to varying constitutional settings or basic laws) but also because of cultural differences which are expressed in varying professional traditions. Despite variations in what constitutes such systems in the various countries, on the basis of the compendium we can identify some structural similarities. At the national
level we can find spatial planning frameworks as point of reference for lower tiers with a coordination function. At the regional level again spatial planning policies have been defined as frame of references for intra-regional development. At the level of regions there is also the overlap with regional policy, i.e. the economically driven development of regions. And, last but not least, at the local level spatial frameworks can be found, but then again, instruments stipulating and controlling land use (especially land use plans) are even more important. So, the usual composition of planning systems works with a multi-level government of three to four layers. With the European Union and the discussions outlined earlier, we are likely to see one additional layer arising (Faludi, 2008).

One decisive element of such an analysis is the locus of power (i.e. who has the right to define what kind of development is intended and allowed) and between how many levels the power (in planning) is distributed. In a plan-led system like the one established in Germany, the existing levels are linked together by what is called the ‘counter current principle’, i.e. frameworks at national level have to be respected by lower tiers, whereas existing strategies or projects inform the comprehensive planning documents of the upper tier.

When looking into the predominant professional orientation and dimensions, the various systems in Europe have been categorized as follows (European Commission, 1997).

Urbanism tradition is the managing of space through the smallest geographical unit available, the physical structure, through building regulations. Countries that can be classified under the urbanism tradition don’t have spatial plans on a higher scale, or are not developed when they do exist, but only have building regulations (e.g. Mediterranean Countries).

Land use management is the planning of space through the development of a local plan for the future use of land in accordance with the land’s capabilities through zoning laws based on the regulation and control of land controlling the changes of use. All land use plans distinguish at least three categories of land use, namely: infrastructure, urban and open land. In the case where a country has a land use planning style it has a land use plan in the form of a municipal or other plans at the local level, for instance, a land use designation plan. Furthermore, plans on a higher scale are absent (e.g. UK).

Regional economic approach is the managing of space through the development of regional plans that are made by either the regions or the national level. Regional planning deals with the efficient placement of infrastructure and zoning of economic activities and population for the sustainable growth of a region; it addresses region-wide issues such as environment, social and economic concerns. It pursues a balanced spatial development in all fields (spatial justice). When a country can be categorized under the regional economic approach style it has regional plans, national plans with a regional focus and local plans that are there to execute the regional plans (usually because hierarchic relations among levels and spatial justice presuppose presence of a main tutorial level) (e.g. France).

Comprehensive integrated approach is the managing of space through a hierarchical system of spatial plans on several geographical levels taking into account all relevant sectors that have an impact on the spatial development. It is related with land use and cross-sectoral coordination. Countries that fall under the comprehensive integrated approach planning always have a hierarchy of plans and institutions with a planning competency. Furthermore one can see vertical and horizontal coordination between the different sectors and levels taking place (e.g. Nordic Countries, Germany).

The second part of the aforementioned report (University of Valencia et al., 2006) approached the issue of territorial development from a governance perspective, i.e. trying to pay attention to the general changes in state action. The conceptualization followed a multi-level approach, reflecting...
among others the shifting of responsibilities (but not always also resources) towards lower levels, which are observable in various states. Parallel to that, also the more formal approach towards territorial development opened to softer horizontally integrated approaches. Furthermore, not only at the EU level a strong connection with regional economic policy exists. In general, a discussion of a more integrated approach and the reorientation of planning systems is observable. The first impulse comes from the territorial cohesion theme (CEC, 2008) which is so prominent at the European level, demanding a more integrated territorial approach in all its development activities (EC, 2006, EC and Ministers for Spatial Development, 2005). The second point is that the existing planning systems increasingly evolve towards the comprehensive integrative and the regional economic management models (University of Valencia et al., 2006). Ultimately the message is that territorial organization matters with the implication that coordination and development using integrated schemes is of the essence. This does not mean a strict hierarchical approach in the sense of primacy of any level over the other, but of agreed and discussed sets of aims and objectives. An important further aspect is the need for a more cooperative approach between national territories. This idea of ‘territorial cooperation’ has been built into the current ERDF regulations as one of the major policy orientations and it has therefore become a part of EU regional development policy (EC, 2006).

In addition to these large-scale systems shifts, are there further visible changes inside the planning systems, giving them a new character? A synthesis (Fürst, 2005) of such changes from a German perspective (arguing against the background of a rather elaborate plan-led system) includes:

i) The replacing of a rather technocratic approach with one emphasizing communicative action (towards planning diplomacy).

ii) A superseding of what might be called ‘basic spatial ordering’ with a development function including the development of a new regional governance (ultimately very closely connecting the two fields of planning with regional development).

iii) The embracing of project-based planning, i.e. using projects as drivers and components for more comprehensive plans.

iv) The incorporation of ‘stakeholders’ to promote ‘problem ownership’.

v) The opening up of expert-led planning as a political arena via integration of wider groups (actually going beyond ‘stakeholders’).

vi) The attempt to control projects via Environmental Impact and Territorial Impact Assessment (regarding the latter see various projects of the ESPON research programme, http://www.espon.eu/).

vii) The adoption of management concepts on the side of institutions but also for processes.

viii) The management by objectives in the frame of sustainable development.

ix) The introduction of economic control instruments (e.g. licensing).

Planning, in sum, shows therefore several tendencies, establishing hybrid systems between still important formal foundations, which need to be politically and democratically legitimized, and new ‘governance’ features, of an increasingly softer nature and bringing in more parties to ‘chart the courses of action into the future’ (Friedmann, 1987). The next section will look into the new territories for which planning and development need to draft those courses of actions.

Spatial development problems

Spatial planning and territorial development policy look onto a considerable set of spatial
problem situations (EC and DG Regional Policy, 2007, European Commission, 2008a, European Commission, 2008b, World Bank, 2009). The complexity of societal development lends itself to a matching set of not least ‘unintended spatial consequences’ of policies and practices. Looking into this landscape there is clearly an indication that we need more ‘planning’ instead of less. For instance, it is quite obvious that market interactions alone do not produce the best result, where best might be defined in the sense of a ‘common good’ or ‘public interest’. This is a constant struggle in planning and territorial development (Hillier and Healey, 2008), battles ‘lost and won’ on an almost daily basis. By way of demonstration, looking at the actual global economic crisis and responses by various governments to control the onward effects, in many cases public investments into infrastructures are considered a possible solution. However, building broadband networks, motorways, investing in built structures in general (no matter how beneficial this might be for a local populace in the individual case) for instance, put strategies to harness the consumption of unspoilt unbuilt land immediately at risk and therefore the aims of sustainability.

This said, the core process driving land use in our modern Western societies is clearly the economy and its varying features over different periods of time. The question here is, which spatial form the economy takes, e.g. what links global flows and local conditions (Swyngedouw, 1992)? Two scenarios will be looked at to demonstrate those concerns. One is the work by Pierre Veltz (2004) who speaks about ‘archipelago economies’. The second resulted from the ESPON research programme, namely the projects on territorial futures (ESPON 3.2 Project, 2007, Robert and Lennertz, 2007). The core of the first hypothesis builds on metropolitan spaces (the OECD defines a metropolis of at least one million inhabitants; OECD, 2006) which become the adequate ‘ecosystems’ of advanced technology and economy.

A threefold reinforcement process of increased mobility factors, innovation and quality-based competition, and general metropolization forms the positive feedback triangle. Metropolitan regions are the principal suppliers of the relational resources that fuel open-ended coordination processes, which cannot be set up either by decision making of a centralized techno-structure or through sheer market forces (Veltz, 2004). In terms of spatial structures, the resulting picture is that of a system of highly dynamic and well-connected metropolitan islands on which the better off and economic dynamic parts of society settle, which are floating in deserts of abandoned spaces (see below on the situation in East Germany).

In terms of further territorial futures, the ESPON 3.2 Project (2007) describes the economic core territory of the European Union, what was once called ‘Blue Banana’ (Brunet, 1989) or the ‘Pentagon’ (EC, 1999), as an ‘oscillating’ space, depending on whether those scenarios continue a trend, look at the effects of increased competitiveness or attempt to compensate at a regional level. In particular the competition scenario (following basically the ideas of the Lisbon strategy; Lisbon European Council, 2000) is alarming, describing a further concentration of growth processes on the European core territory. In fact, looking at one of the key indicators Europe is interested in, which is R&D activities, already today most of it is concentrated in the centre (e.g. about 60 per cent of all patents in 2002 came from that region; ESPON Project 3.1 and BBR, 2006 (October)).

This large-scale picture re-emphasizes the need to think about ‘territorial cohesion’, which will be the prominent issue for Europe over the coming years:

“The concept of territorial cohesion extends beyond the notion of economic and social cohesion by both adding to this and reinforcing it. In policy terms, the objective is to help achieve a more
balanced development by reducing existing disparities, avoiding territorial imbalances and by making both sectoral policies which have a spatial impact and regional policy more coherent. The concern is also to improve territorial integration and encourage co-operation between regions”.

(EC, 2004)

Territorial development policies financed by the Structural Funds of the EU have since their inception in the mid-1970s attempted to initiate a catch-up process (Ache, 2004). The results of it can be expressed as a relative process of cohesion, i.e. least developed regions can be more dynamic but they start from a very low level (in the EU from index values of 40 where the EU average is 100; European Commission, 2008b) – but this means also that we speak about generations to come or need ultimately to bring the most disadvantaged regions closer to the currently leading regions (Bröcker et al., 2004, Cheshire and Carbonaro, 1997).

Territorial cohesion at the level of the EU is at the moment the theme which might lever proper planning activities in addition to regional development policies, using an integrated comprehensive approach (to remain in the terminology of the previous section). However, at the same time the immediate policy orientation seems to turn away from a compensation pattern towards a ‘strengthening of the strong’ and hoping for spread effects. The guidelines for the Structural Funds are read here as an indicator for such an approach or model (EC, 2006). The texts however also emphasize the potentials of ‘territorial capital’ (European Commission, 2005, OECD, 2001) which is diverse in Europe (and should continue being diverse) and which should be utilized by the less advantaged regions to the maximum possible effect. It will be interesting to observe how the practice will work and whether we will see a possibly accelerating process of cohesion.

In any case, looking at such problems in various countries (like the UK, Finland or Germany) it is obvious that from a planning perspective the professional world will still have to cope with disadvantaged regions. In the UK context, the dominating southern region around London almost strangulates the rest of the country (Buck et al., 2005). In the Finnish context, the demographic change and internal migration movements will empty the expansive countryside (Steinbock, 2007). The unification of East with West Germany did not result in blossoming landscapes but, on the contrary, nowadays planners are talking about ‘perforated cities’ (Lütke-Daldrup, 2001, Sander, 2006), where entire quarters were abandoned and housing or infrastructure systems have fallen derelict. It is especially this latter phenomenon, which provides at the moment the most striking ‘evidence’ for the scenarios mentioned at the outset, in particular with reference to the ‘archipelagos’. Beyond such already serious anecdotes, what are other spatial development trends for which answers have to be found in Europe?

Clearly one major issue relates to demographic changes, migration and multicultural societies. Births and deaths, ageing and the balance of inward to outward migration are the main drivers of demographic change. Their individual combination is a response to external factors in fields like economy, life-styles, general cultural setting and – talking about an individual – aspirations (ESPON Project 3.1 and BBR, 2006). Migration becomes the prime driver of regional population changes. Europe is one of the major net immigration areas globally:

All migratory flows, whether external or internal in relation to the EU, as well as in inter-and intra-regional movements, are regionally targeted and age-specific. A redistribution from less favoured to more favoured areas occurs.... Demographic structures and trends in Europe highlight the
potential for a further increase in regional polarisation, with declining and growing areas existing side by side. Urban areas and metropolitan agglomerations are the main winners from current demographic trends. They are the regions in which positive migratory balances reinforce positive natural increases or compensate for natural population losses in this era when families have fewer children. The south of Germany, central England and southern and western France, as well as Ireland, are representatives of this kind of region.

(ESPON 3.1, 2006: 11)

European cities are increasingly turning into the multi cultural stages of our societies (Sandercock, 1998, 2003). This implies new forms of potentials but also conflict not least over contested spaces (Harvey, 1997). In 2008/2009 the city of Rotterdam, I guess as one of the very first, saw the election of a new mayor with a migratory background and of Muslim faith. Looking at him in this high political office, citizens with a migratory background have finally arrived in the centre of our societies. And hopefully, the cynical comment made by Max Frisch on the politics in the 1950s and 1960s can be buried: “Wir riefen Arbeitskräfte, und es kamen Menschen” (We called labour force, and ‘Menschen’ came; Frisch, 1965). Beyond or on side of ethnic issues many more social problems characterize in particular our cities (Ache and Andersen, 2008, 2009).

In summary, the direct and indirect spatial effects of what can be called ‘globalization’ (Held and McGrew, 2000, Taylor, 2004) or ‘glocalization’ (Swyngedouw, 1992) create new spatial structures which also have an increasingly growing interdependency and responsibility (Massey, 2005). Urban development processes show a ‘transitional’ character in that they are no longer confined to tightly bounded cities but spread out into urban regions of unprecedented scale with the possible climax of a 70 million inhabitant ‘Europolis’ (Hall and Pain, 2006). The look across European boundaries proves that such a situation is already there, as the next section will demonstrate.

Urban millennium

The final point of this chapter tries to open the perspective which until now was mainly the perspective of the ‘northern hemisphere’ and Europe. The UN Habitat programme has labelled the new millennium as ‘urban’, i.e. alluding to the continuous streams of people into the population mega-metropolises, basically of the ‘southern hemisphere’ posing different planning problems to respond, like the principal organization of ‘cities’, urban social divides, or risk through environmental disasters, to name the important ones.

UN Habitat (2006) in view of the World Development Goal 7: ‘Ensure Environmental Sustainability, Improving the Lives of at Least 100 Million Slum Dwellers’ produced an extensive report on the state of the world’s cities with alarming results regarding the negative side of things: “Africa is the least urbanised continent but by 2030 its urban population will exceed the total population of Europe.” Also the World Development Report 2009 (World Bank, 2009) foresees a continued process of concentration of populations in mega-cities in the ‘southern hemisphere’, i.e. in situations of serious development problems. The United Nations (UN Habitat, 2006) speak about ‘metapolis’ with more than 20 million inhabitants which grow in particular in the developing countries. One out of every three city dwellers – nearly one billion people – already lives in a slum. The forecast for 2020 is 1.4 billion altogether. The problems are revealed through the criteria which are applied to measure ‘slum conditions’: durable housing, sufficient living area, access to improved water, access to sanitation, secure tenure (referring back to the formal instruments still needed
in planning). The future of such a radically unequal and explosively unstable urban world has been captured by Mike Davis (2006), speaking about a ‘planet of slums’ and portraying a vast humanity ‘warehoused in shantytowns and exiled from the formal world economy’.

Already in the year 2000 for the Global Conference on the Urban Future held in Berlin, Hall and Pfeiffer prepared a report based on the results provided by a ‘World Commission URBAN 21’ and a related expert group which worked for more than two years on millennial challenges of the urban world in 2025. One of the main sections formulates so-called ‘urban essentials’, i.e. dimensions of a sustainable city. These can be listed as follows: a sustainable urban economy – work and wealth; a sustainable urban society – social coherence and solidarity; sustainable urban shelter – decent affordable housing for all; a sustainable urban environment – stable ecosystems; sustainable urban access – resource-conserving mobility; sustainable urban life – building the liveable city; and sustainable urban democracy – empowering the citizenry.

All of these very broad issues are bound together with what Hall and Pfeiffer (2000) call ‘good governance in practice’. The basic principles are laid down in strong urban government at a local level with adequate distribution of responsibilities and resources. The normative aim is set to sustainable development, i.e. the major concern lies with health and pollution, recycling and renewable energy, in general high sanitation standards. But also economic growth and social inclusion are obvious aims. The liveable city in the end is a city which provides proper housing and infrastructures, allowing citizens successfully to seize opportunities and develop their individual potentials accordingly. Here the question is also raised: what kind of planning can ‘poor’ cities afford? The answer meanders between a yes ascertaining universally applicable principles and solutions and a no, as the hyper-growth city will always be a fragmented city of planned and unplanned sections.

The report did not find unanimous acclaim and has been criticized by John Friedmann (2002) as a typical view from the developed world. As to the issues, they can also be critically reviewed, not least with a view towards the imprints and resulting responsibilities which colonial periods of the past left behind. For instance, most of the planning ideas and features of planning systems, including the education of planners, go back to those periods and might be considered culturally inadequate. In terms of the normative orientations for ‘development’, again most ideas were generated from a support philosophy, focusing on model orientations of ‘exogenous’ vs. ‘endogenous’ development (see Vázquez-Barquero, 2002) or following from ‘growth pole’ ideas (referring to the work by F. Perroux in the 1950s; see Parr, 1999a, 1999b).

One of the most conspicuous trends of the last decade has been the transformation of the state, creating new arenas for pluralistic debates and helping a more diversified range of actors to emerge. One-party or military governments have been replaced by multi-party systems and civil society organizations have gained voice. The decentralization of government functions and their devolvement to regional and local political and administrative levels is progressing, albeit slowly. The last decade has, however, also seen increased political destabilization in some parts of the world, internal conflicts, civil wars or ‘failed states’.

Given the extended global economic relations nowadays, much of the ‘development issues’ therefore are subject to conflicting interests if not power games. Rather typical than a-typical continues to be the issue of resource exploitation. By way of an example, much of the communication technology for the Western information and communication society depends on ‘tantal oxides’ (coltan), for which the main global supplier nowadays is the Democratic Republic of the Congo (so
at least the official title). As observers report, “Mineral firms ‘fuel Congo unrest’” (BBC News, 2009), pointing out the power games not only between local groups (in part militia) but also between global economic interests and nation states, leaving much of the population in unrest or a state of flight. Urban areas and cities are in such a context often the locus of conflict.

In sum, does this constitute a perspective that inescapably results in a dystopia? And has the ‘utopian’ power of the city, as essentially the important place of individual freedom, escape, opportunity, innovation and creation of new solutions vanished? The European view might be largely covered by a ‘veil of ignorance’ in this respect, but looking into cities of the ‘southern hemisphere’ and their approaches towards social and environmental issues, there is a lot to be learnt. The 2006 Nobel Peace Prize went to Muhammad Yunus and the Grameen Bank, pioneers of microfinance, supporting social entrepreneurship which not least has a strong gender impact and aims at a self-sustained economy. Meanwhile, microcredits re-enter the ‘northern’ cities as a tool to remedy unemployment under conditions of economic crisis.

Conclusions

In their edited publication on the ‘Endless Metropolis’, Burdett and Sudjic (2007) bring together the dimensions of a London School of Economics-based Urban Age Project:

(It) is ... an exploration of the connections between urban form and urban society, translating a conventionally constrained two-dimensional discourse into a three-dimensional dialogue. In (...) the insights of Jane Jacobs (...) that ‘the look of things and the way they work are inextricably bound together’.

The project reflects on key investigation areas, like the changing nature of work and its impact on the physical form of the city; the effects of mobility and transport systems on social cohesion and economic viability; how the design of housing and neighbourhoods affects local communities and urban integration; and how the public life and urban spaces of the city foster or impede tolerance and conflict among the different constituencies (Burdett and Sudjic, 2007: 10). But there is also the intention to generate new ideas and impulses for the betterment of local living situations, understanding cities “as places where ‘urban life becomes a source of mutual strength rather than a source of mutual estrangement and civic bitterness’” (Burdett and Sudjic, 2007).

Cities and metropolitan regions are not just concentrations of problems – which they are, too – but they are also the places where we create the solutions to problems in an ongoing set of experiments and failures. Planning professionals do what they can to create and shape those ‘spaces of hope’, sometimes futile but many more times surprisingly effectively and efficiently.

And what could be the utopian dimensions? John Friedman (2002), one of the most out- and long-standing ‘urbanists’, keeps to a vision of a ‘good city’, consisting of both a manual of indispensable processes and normative indications for achievements. The ‘good city’ is a political act in the sense of Arendt’s ‘vita activa’ (Arendt 1958). John Friedmann postulates as a common aim of the ‘good city’ human flourishing, a minimal agenda of appropriate homes, health, waged labour, and social networks and infrastructures. A central instrument for this is ‘good governance’, in the end also good government, which consists of inspired and inspiring political actors with visions, publicly accountable, working transparently, satisfying the public information duty. All citizens have equal rights to the city, harnessing and forcing politics to be responsive. Suffice it to say that this society is free of aggression but not
free from conflict, and solutions are found in peaceful ways. ‘A Bias for Hope’ (John Friedmann quoting Albert Hirschmann) is the overall guidance for that vision:

“The position I hold is for inclusive, democratic practices, for local citizen rights, for peaceful, multicultural diversity in the cities of this world, for cooperative rather than competitive solutions, and for meaningful intervention by states in the market economy to protect and further citizen rights”

(Friedmann, 2002).
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