

A Secure Sense of Place

5.1. Introduction

In the broadest sense, two types of concerns recurred in the interviews: the type of facilities, services, and resources people had access to, and how they felt treated, whether by other city-zens or by the civic authorities. Putting these two together leads us to our key claim. When city-zens reflect about what a city of equal means to them they think about feeling welcome or at home in their city, and in particular having a sense of belonging, which can be broken down into several general core values which we have mentioned several times before but will now develop in detail. Accordingly, we argue that in a city of equals everybody has a secure sense of place. But what is interesting, and this became clear in the interviews, is that when city-zens think about a city of equals, they don't think only about themselves. People want to be accepted for themselves and in their own right, *although among others with similar entitlements*. That is the egalitarian sentiment of the city. No one settled in the city wants to be regarded as a guest or a servant or an outsider or as someone visiting or passing through, or merely tolerated but not welcomed. Rather they wish to be considered to be someone who is recognized as having as much right to live within the city as anyone else, and who makes a contribution to its richness and vitality. At the same time, they understand that a city of equals implies that this experience of recognition should extend to all, including, but not limited to, newcomers, immigrants, the young, the elderly, people with disabilities, those who identify as LGBTQ+, all ethnic and racial groups, and people from all social classes.

As indicated, drilling down further, and based on the material we explored in Chapters 3 and 4, we find that the idea of a secure sense of place can be understood in terms of four core values. These overlap to some degree, but are worth emphasizing independently:

1. Accessibility to the city's services is not constituted by the market.
2. A sense of a meaningful life.
3. Diversity and social mixing.

4. Non-deferential inclusion (that is, being included without having to defer).

We arrived at this conception by developing and refining our initial understanding of a city of equals in the light of our interview results, as we explained in Chapter 1 and elaborated in Chapters 3 and 4. Indeed, we will continue to draw on the interviews as we illustrate the themes, as well as the literature review from Chapter 2 and some further sources. We will begin by discussing the sense of place and belonging, and then will consider each core value in turn.

5.1.1. The Sense of Place

Urban life and activities are often related to space and a sense of space. As sociologist Jennifer Cross beautifully explains (Cross 2021), a sense of place is an inter-disciplinary concept, and therefore, to grasp its full meaning and complexity we need to understand how anthropologists, psychologists, geographers, landscape architects, sociologists, and—we would add—philosophers, perceive a sense of place. This is consistent with what we saw in Chapter 2, where we discussed theorists from many disciplines who wish to understand inequality in the city largely in spatial terms. What seems to be common to all accounts is that a person's sense of place involves particular experiences in a particular setting or space, which are interpreted via culturally shared values or beliefs and sometimes practices, and which refer to both the physical and social environments of the person. All these result in attributing some culturally shared *meanings* to a particular space and in some bonding between the person and the place. Sometimes—when the sense of place is very strong—these also result in the person asserting that the place constitutes part of their identity—who they are—thereby defining a kind of attachment to the place. This attachment can involve biographical dimensions, most commonly a place where one was born and grew up, but also where one fell in love for the first time, or where one went to university and stayed on, or found work after a long job search, and so on. Equally, it can involve community or heritage dimensions, such as the place where our first national institutions were established, or where we stopped the enemy's army from advancing, or where our ancestors had the first open-air theatre, among many other possibilities. More controversially some may think that a sense of place could also be associated with negative memories; a battlefield or the site of an atrocity, which could be even more difficult to reconcile with a positive sense of identity if one's forbears were among the perpetrators.

Whatever we think of the negative aspects of place Cannavò (2007, 20–1) captures its positive form well: Place is not just an object. The creation and identification of something as a defined place, he argues, is a process of social construction. Thus, place is an essential human practice. It involves the physical and conceptual organization of our surroundings into a coherent, enduring landscape. Indeed, we can imagine a person, walking and wandering through the cityscape, thereby constructing

a very concrete and vivid image loaded with meanings and emotional attachments to the street life, local cafés, grocery shops, schools and all the fundamental components of quotidian urban life.

(Barak and de-Shalit 2021; see also Löw 2013)

It is interesting to note that when people interpret the city in which they live as, for example, ‘beautiful’, ‘vibrant’, ‘exciting’, ‘relaxed’, ‘cosy’, ‘friendly’, ‘old fashioned’, and so on, often they are ascribing a meaning to the place. Of course, they do not do this in a vacuum. They reach a sense of place through learning, incorporating, and understanding the way their neighbours, community, even the city itself understand the place. And when people reach this sense of place, they feel that this is *their* place, that they feel at home, they belong, and hence can flourish and develop in this place. The point is that this is very much a contextual, iterative, process. As Bart van Leeuwen writes (2010, 2018), the patterns of recognition that people live with define a kind of space in which one is able (or not) to develop a way of life that is truly human. Van Leeuwen here captures the essence of our idea of a sense of place.

The concept of a sense of place can helpfully be illuminated further within the context of the Capability Approach (Sen 1992; 2009; Nussbaum 2000). Arguably, having a sense of place is closely related to what Martha Nussbaum defines in her list of capabilities as ‘affiliation’, but in our case here applied to a particular place. A capability is a person’s opportunity to achieve a functioning, and a functioning is something which people have a good reason to do or be. For a number of reasons, unlike Nussbaum, we often prefer to focus on functionings rather than capabilities, though we can leave that debate aside for present purposes (Nussbaum 2011; Wolff and de-Shalit 2007; Wolff and de-Shalit 2013). Nussbaum describes affiliation as:

Being able to live with and towards others, to recognize and show concern for other human beings, to engage in various forms of social interaction, having the social bases of self-respect and non-humiliation. Not being discriminated against on the basis of gender, religion, race, ethnicity, and the like.

(Nussbaum 2000, 79)

There is, however, an important difference between ‘affiliation’ and ‘having a sense of place’, which is in one way narrower and one way broader than affiliation as Nussbaum understands it. The narrowing of our conception, or perhaps better to say further specification, is that whereas affiliation is about belonging in the context of relations to other people, but without geographical connection or restriction, a sense of place focuses on belonging in a particular space, describing the relationship with artefacts located within it (buildings, streets, pavements, parks, etc.) as well as the people who use them. In this way, then, the set of relations with others that partly constitute a sense of place is narrower than those that generate affiliation in Nussbaum’s sense, which will include connection to friends, family members, and others one has a connection with, living a distance away.

This restriction brings with it a broadening, which may be implicit in Nussbaum’s account of affiliation, but which we need to bring out explicitly: inevitably this spatial feeling is also social. For example, one’s relationship with the street on which one lives includes how secure one feels in this street, and this, in turn, and as Jacobs taught us, derives from many factors, including: the architecture of the street’s buildings (for example, are the buildings huge and apparently empty or built on a human scale and lively, are there cafes and shops that are open in the evenings?); the way people use the buildings and the streets and pavements (for example, do people tend to hang around, chat outside for long periods, do children play on the street?); how they behave (for example, do people shout and quarrel in the streets or do they respect each other?); their norms (for example, do people ignore each other or do they tend to assist you if you fall and twist your ankle, or if they know you are ill at home?), and also the way people think about how safe the street is.

Now, while in much social psychology having a sense of place is conceived as part of one’s well-being (e.g. Hernandez et al. 2007; Cresswell 2009), we argue that it is also a functioning. This is because this sense of place, this understanding of one’s environment, is a key component of one’s identity. It attaches the person to something which is greater than just his or her individual self. One is not just a person, one is a New Yorker, or Shanghainese, or Istanbulie, or a Porteño (the name for residents of Buenos Aires) or a Carioca (the name for residents of Rio de Janeiro), or a Parisian.

Not only is sense of place a functioning, it is also important in that it is a ‘fertile functioning’, by which we mean that it strengthens other functionings or makes them less insecure (Wolff and de-Shalit 2007). As many scholars have found when researching immigration and integration (van Bochove 2012; Okamoto and Ebert 2016), feeling at home and having a sense of place affects

behaviour in a positive way. It makes people feel more self-assured, more positive, and capable of doing more things. To see this, think of yourself in different neighbourhoods or streets—some in which you feel a stranger, and some in which you feel at home—and imagine how you behave in each one of them. These feelings affect the entire range of our everyday activities and they have an impact on many of our cognitive and emotional capabilities.

Moreover, when people have a stable and strong sense of place they often become more tolerant of and open to others, including immigrants. Similarly, people who lack a sense of place often end up not tolerating others, and in particular not tolerating immigrants, whom they perceive as a threat to their already unstable and vulnerable sense of place. Given that in cities people meet others, including immigrants, on a regular basis, this fertile functioning becomes fertile for *everybody's* sense of place.¹

Therefore, no wonder that having a sense of place is sometimes seen as a strong interest. The philosopher Margaret Moore (2019) argues that people have place-related interests which derive from the role of place in their life plans and their life projects. In fact, she argues, a connection to a place and a sense of place is an important precondition for people's projects, plans, and way of life. She claims that people live their lives and make choices and decisions against a background context; and that land or place is such a context, which people assume as part of the fabric of their lives, from which they make choices and pursue their way of life. As sociologist Göran Therborn (2009) argues, places 'mold actors, structure their life chances, and provide them with identities and traditions of social and political action' (Therborn 2009, 529).

However, a sense of place can become insecure. During wars, or violent clashes, city-zens' attachment to a place could start to become under threat or more questionable, especially if it is destroyed, as we have recently seen in Ukraine. The point is not that people's psychological attachment falters (although it could do), but that they become anxious about their prospects of flourishing, or even surviving, there. Similarly, victims of environmental disasters, floods, or droughts report that they fear that they might not be able to remain in their homes, or to cultivate their land, which we interpret as a way of expressing that their sense of place has become insecure. They may well still have a sense of place, but it is becoming less secure, compared to somebody who lives in a place which is not in a war or is not vulnerable to repeated flooding.

A person's sense of place can also become insecure if others around them send them a message that they are no longer welcome there. Jews in Berlin

¹ We thank Bart van Leeuwen for this point, as well as for other insightful suggestions.

at the beginning of the twentieth century had a very strong sense of place; they enjoyed more political and economic rights than probably most of the Jews in Europe had ever done before, and felt not only that Berlin constituted their identity but also that they were an important part of the body of city-zens who constituted Berlin's unique character, as they were very much involved in Berlin's spheres of art, literature, philosophy, and science. However, in the early 1930s when the Nazis rose to power, this sense of place became insecure, as was described by the novelist Stefan Zweig in his memoir *The World of Yesterday*. Zweig (1943), albeit in relation to Vienna rather than Berlin, describes how in no time the Jewish intellectual elite of Vienna, which had a very strong sense of place in the city, found themselves utterly bewildered, feeling that they could not recognize the very Vienna which they had loved so much. Zweig himself was one of hundreds of thousands of Jews who left Germany and Austria, in Zweig's case travelling ultimately to Brazil, where soon after arrival he and his wife tragically took their own lives. Other German, Austrian, and Czech Jews who, for whatever reason, decided at first not to leave, later found it too late to arrange visas, but in some cases were able to send their children on the Kindertransport trains as refugees to the United Kingdom, hoping to join them later, which some, but far from all, managed to do. The place which was home became a threat to life.

Of course, the examples of Berlin's or Vienna's Jews in the 1930 are very extreme, and no hostility or exclusion in today's world is on the same scale and level as the Holocaust, although many minoritized groups, families, and individuals continue to face similarly tragic fates all over the world. Some of our interviewees had been under such threats themselves and provided stark illustration of the idea that without a *secure* sense of place it can feel that one simply doesn't belong. Ibrahim, 36, is originally from Syria and had lived in Turkey, Sudan, Libya, and Italy before moving to Hamburg where we interviewed him. He says that his hope is that one day it will be safe for him to return to Syria, but he quickly adds that Hamburg is like a second *Heimat*, a word meaning home in the spatial sense, in a nostalgic, and both biographical and national sense of the word. For him, he says, this means that even though he is alone in Hamburg, having arrived only recently, everything seems fine. But at the same time others in Hamburg have been made to seem something of an outsider. Jason, the young Black German construction worker in Hamburg who we quoted before says:

You know . . . I have been to Stuttgart, to Munich . . . and I was being looked at strangely, because I'm Black. In Hamburg, and I think also in Berlin, we accept everyone, and it's truly multi-cultural.

But even so, as we discussed in Chapter 4, Jason adds how at work some people looked at him suspiciously because they realized he was a Muslim, and this made him realize he was not part of the place in the same way as everybody else. Marzieh, 25 years old, originally from Tehran, now in Hamburg complains:

There are always weird or crazy people, everywhere . . . For instance, people talking about my headscarf. They come straight to me and ask me why I wear it. I grew up like this, and perhaps I don't have sufficient information and opinion about this but I think it's a question only for those who wear it.

But she reassures us as well that she has never experienced inequality in treatment in official matters.

Some non-Muslims in Hamburg may worry that if Ibrahim, Jason, and Marzieh feel at home there, with a good sense of place, it will put their own sense of place at risk. And indeed, it may be that it is common to believe that enabling some people to find a sense of place implies that others will have less of it. In academic terms, such people believe that a sense of place is a rivalrous good, a zero-sum game. And yet, we want to argue, having a sense of place can be seen as a non-rivalrous good too. Enabling a sense of place to immigrants can be done without compromising the sense of place that exists among the city's more long-standing inhabitants; similarly, a city can enable a sense of place for elderly people without compromising the sense of place that exists among its younger city-zens, and so on, even though there are also ways in which conflicts can emerge and compromise is necessary, such as over issues such as noise in the streets late at night.

At this point, we should concede that seeing a sense of place as a non-rivalrous good might appear to some readers as too naive and optimistic, as 'easier said than done' because empirically, in some neighbourhoods locals see immigrants, or for that matter gentrifiers too, coming and changing the ethnic or class composition of the neighbourhood, and this weakens their sense of place. They claim that their new neighbours do not speak their language, or share their styles of dress, food, or celebration, or that they seek very different communal ties from the ones that are already there. While, as we have noted, multiculturalism appealed to many of the interviewees, we do not claim to put forward any accurate empirical generalization of how all, or even a majority, of city dwellers think about newcomers to their neighbourhoods. Indeed, as we explained in Chapter 1, we terminated some interviews early when racist opinions were expressed, for our task is to construct a theory of a city of equals, not to conduct a survey. So let us clarify: we are not

treating every voice in the city as equally valid for our project, even though we accept that there may be a superficial tension with our argument for equal political standing for all. But the tension disappears when it is realized that our project here—as distinct from our views about political representation in the city—is only to give voice to those that will help create and deepen a normative theory of a city of equals. So we remind the reader that by claiming that a sense of place can be non-rivalrous, we do not suggest that this is so with every city dweller worldwide.

Cities can potentially enable us to have this sense of place due to their very nature: they are systems which work to connect, create bonds, and form attachments. This happens at the workplace, in sports events, at rock concerts, on the street, and at the small park around the corner when one meets neighbours, when city dwellers walk their children to school, or walk their dogs, or sit with friends for a drink, shop, or just stroll in the street. Cities and the communities which live in them bind city dwellers to their history, personal and collective memory, language, natural surroundings; to things with which they are familiar and at ease.

Yet at the same time inequality can enter the picture. Cities might intentionally or unintentionally harm or risk the sense of place of some of its inhabitants. Which policies sustain this sense of place and which weaken it among some groups in the city needs much more empirical research, as to the best of our knowledge only a small literature exists on this question (Feitelson 1991; Devine-Wright 2013; Žlender and Gemin 2020). Nevertheless ideas which we frame as working through the questions of who does, and who does not, have a secure sense of place were at the centre of many of the interviews we discussed in Chapters 3 and 4. One poignant example from the interviews of how and when the sense of place can unintentionally, but thoughtlessly be disturbed among some of the city-zens, concerns policies of street naming. Cities often name streets to consolidate the city's collective memory by linking to notable people or events evocative of local or national symbolism. This is part of what offers sense of place to the city dwellers. However, in Jerusalem, for example, there are Arabs who live in the western (predominantly Jewish) part of the city, in streets named after the pre-independence Jewish military organizations (Etsel and Haganah). Nona, a Jewish resident sees this as highly problematic, saying:

The fact that they [Jerusalem's Arabs] have to live in a street that is called 'Etsel' is a major bad. Moreover, there is nothing they can do about it. They can't say 'please change the name of the streets'.

A sense of place is also related to trust. People consider a sense of trust, if it exists in their city, as precious. Mano, 70 years old, lives and work in central Jerusalem and recalls from his childhood:

When my mother used to go to the market, say to buy tomatoes, she wouldn't ask 'how much does it cost?' She would just take a note, put it in the hands of the merchant, and trust he would give her back the right change.

Hany from Tel Aviv claims that familiarity and trust have changed over the decades:

When I was a child, you could walk four or five streets away from your home, walk into any apartment, and feel like it is your own family . . . I have been living in the same building for thirty-five years, and now I don't even know the names of all the residents in the building. They won't talk to me. This is not privacy; this is snob-bishness. The municipality has to be blamed; they have been developing the city into something snobbish.

Resonating with the concerns of other interviewees we discussed in Chapter 3, Hany blames rising rent prices for a process of gentrification during which long-standing residents lost their trust in their neighbours, hence their sense of place.

In the city the sense of place includes the opportunity to be amused, entertained, and even astounded or amazed by the things around us. We go to parks and we see the children running, and people trying out their football skills and we are impressed with their vitality and talent; we listen to a woman singing, accompanying herself with her guitar, when we take the tube. Even window shopping for goods we could not dream of owning contributes to our experience of the city. The richness of life is connected to seeing what other human beings are capable of doing: building a beautiful cathedral with what must have been limited tools, crafting the treasures in a museum, and designing and building breathtakingly imaginative skyscrapers. We ask ourselves how could humans make and build such things? Who thought of putting those ingredients together to create such a great meal at a restaurant? We go to a cafe where the barista is professional and we treat ourselves to a really good espresso, especially on a cold rainy day. We enter a good book shop or library and think—how wonderful it would be to spend the next month just sitting here reading. In the city we have so many opportunities to be astounded with what humans can do, marvelling at human achievements and excellence. Many theories of the human good rightly emphasize the importance

of being creative. In doing so they sometimes neglect the other side of creativity; how life-fulfilling it is (for both sides of the relationship) for there to be an audience to enjoy the creations of others.

But not everybody has this opportunity to be amazed and astounded. Nathan is 18 years old, a young man, born and raised in Rio de Janeiro. He has black roots and is the father of a two-year-old child. He lives in one of the favelas with his mother together with two brothers and three sisters. His son does not live with him, but with his ex-girlfriend. He stopped schooling early. He complains about 'lack of opportunities to study, teachers who are authoritarian at school . . . It is a lot of shit.' He describes how because he had to help at home he could not study. But what made a difficult situation impossible was the city closing down the CIEPS, the integrated centres of public education, where he had studied. These were established in Rio de Janeiro's poor neighbourhoods, where high-quality public education was offered to everyone. But, as Nathan complains, 'Bolsonaro and Witzel² are both destroying us here.' He adds that if he had free public transportation he would be able to see the city. Both Nathan and Valentina (37), also from Rio, complained that because the police are violent towards the poor, they are afraid of even trying to reach places in the city, and so cannot enjoy what Valentina describes as 'the outdoor life of the city, where we get to experience the Brazilian culture, including bars, music (especially samba and funk) and dance performances'. Arthur (35) from Rio says that 'the poor are being wiped out here.' He adds:

I'm from a privileged group. I'm white and well-educated. A black person, on the other hand, is someone who will be less regarded in Rio by other citizens. Think about how people choose to sit inside the bus? It is very often far away from a black person. I also notice that policemen treat a black person very violently. This is taken for granted by people. The blacks here are used to being segregated and discriminated against, and the whites are used to treating them badly.

Who has the opportunities to be amazed and astounded will depend, in part at least, on where and how you live. As discussed in Chapter 4, Jane Jacobs advocated local small parks, and it's easy to understand why, but if that's all we have we miss the big astonishing park, with landscaping, trees, and large lawns acting as impromptu playing fields, often for improvised unusual team sports. New York without Central Park is unthinkable, even if the number of small local parks increased. Yet we should also bear in mind Margaret Kohn's

² Wilson Witzel was Rio de Janeiro's governor at the time of the interview. He is from the same party as Jair Bolsonaro, Brazil's populist president at that time; his policy emphasized security more than anything else.

observation mentioned in Chapter 3 that a highly regulated park will be less attractive to those who want to engage in boisterous, loud, and exuberant activities; indeed, to those who like to express their enjoyment. But still, if in a city there is a culture whereby it is common for people from various neighbourhoods to move around, to see other neighbourhoods and therefore to have more chances to be astonished, and in different ways, then it is more egalitarian than a city where there is no such culture because of, for example, racism or classism, because of narrow horizons or just lack of convenient transport.

As noted above, we have found it helpful to break down a healthy sense of place into four themes that slightly overlap but can be analytically distinguished, and which we will call ‘core values’. We approached the interviews with a general conception in mind, which we greatly enriched through the interview methodology. But the interviews don’t speak for themselves. We need to select and collate the materials and put them into a compelling order, not unlike the work of a good film editor, taking scenes and drawing out a narrative, which we attempt in the following, while accepting that it is possible that there are other ways of presenting our results.

5.2. The Four Core Values

5.2.1. Core Value 1: Access to the City’s Services Is Not Constituted by the Market

One form of significant inequality in some cities is unequal access to various services and amenities of the city. This includes what we termed in Chapters 3 and 4 basic services such as food shops, markets, pharmacies and health clinics, or schools for children with special needs; leisure services such as museums, cinemas, pubs, cafes, parks, playgrounds, tennis courts and football grounds; and public amenities, from public toilets to libraries. If only the wealthy or the ethnic majority group can live in convenient locations, easily reach the beach, listen to live music, or find somewhere to play tennis, or even meet with their friends, if they enjoy more cafes and pubs per person than the poor or the groups that are minoritized, if they find food markets and farmers’ markets, health food shops, clinics, psychological services, and the like within easy reach and walkable distance, while the poor or the minoritized do not, then there is a very visible form of exclusion in the city, which, perhaps even just as importantly, gives those excluded diminished opportunities for enjoyment. It also, centrally for us, links to a sense of belonging and sense

of place through the idea of exclusion: a city dweller might feel that: ‘The city is not for the benefit of the likes of me, but only the wealthy and privileged. If I cannot make use of the things the city is famous for, I am not part of its story.’

If, on the other hand, the city provides everyone with access to valued facilities, it no longer suffers from this defect. Of course, in liberal countries with a market economy wealthier people are inevitably more likely to be able to find more luxurious places to live, and in some societies can also purchase preferential medical care and education for their children. They will also be able to find exclusive forms of access to beach or tennis clubs, or reserve choice seats at the concert hall. But if there’s subsidized public housing or rent control, universal health care and education, an even spread of clinics, pharmacies, and medical centres so that nobody has to travel far to reach them, then there are forms of inclusion to basic and other services for all. Also, it is important that these services are of good quality, especially concerning education as we discussed earlier. In some megacities, residents of poor neighbourhoods do not need to travel far to reach a school or a college, so *prima facie*, it appears as if the accessibility of education services is independent of the market. However, to reach a *good* school, which are usually located in the city centre or the more affluent neighbourhoods, they do have a long and exhausting commute. When the quality of the school or college is a factor, then the picture changes (Giannotti and Logiodice 2023).

Similarly, if there is a public park or beach open to all, public tennis courts rentable by the hour at reasonable rates, ways of lining up for a cheap theatre ticket on the day, or free concerts in the park, free entry to museums and libraries, and so on, everyone can feel that the city’s facilities are their own too. As Renata from Rio de Janeiro says when she reflects about what gives her a good feeling in the city:

I really like to go to the beaches here . . . enjoy the urban nature areas during my weekends—such as walking around the park ‘Lage’, Flamengo Park, and Morro da Urca. Such beautiful natural spaces are open to all. You don’t need to pay to enjoy them.

This is, then, essentially a matter of non-market access to goods: public, concessionary, or collective provision of goods and services, so that one’s general success in urban life does not track one’s economic success, or class or other circumstances. In an unpublished paper Thad Williamson presents, as a definition of ‘mobility’ as ‘the capacity to access and participate in the economic, civic, and social life of one’s community, without respect to social

class or personal economic circumstances' (Williamson 2013, 1). Whether or not it is an appropriate definition of mobility, it provides one way of understanding what we mean by this present theme, although our emphasis here is less on economic life (important though it is) and more on civic and, especially, social life. The city has much more to offer than economic and political participation, for example participation in projects of preservation and conservation (Light 2003), and we are especially interested in those activities that make up the rich fabric of people's informal existence and experience.

Public services and facilities provide material benefits, but also strengthen the other categories we will come to below, such as social meaning, and non-deferential inclusion. In some cities there is very little public or collective provision of goods and services, and hence one's general success in life closely tracks one's economic success. But this is unfortunate in placing so much emphasis on income and wealth, especially when, very often, access to financial resources is only partially under individual control. With the right public support, virtually everyone has the chance of a life that is successful in some way, especially in the sense that they can make use of the city's potential, even if with some limits to options, whether or not they are economically successful. So alongside a strong economy and fair equality of opportunity a city of equals needs to have such things as high-quality subsidized housing, whether publicly or privately owned and run; an education system from kindergarten to high schools and colleges; transport, which is frequent, varied, inexpensive, and accessible; health care services either in small clinics or in hospitals; and parks, museums, and libraries which are either free or cheap; as well as a good physical environment.

In our interviews ideas related to non-market access to services came out in various, imaginative, ways, including creating the conditions that will allow individuals access to the labour market. In Chapter 3 we saw that many interviewees were concerned about play facilities for their children. Children also figured in another way. Andrea from Berlin (aged 47) and Erika, aged 75 from Hamburg, both claim that if they were mayor they would first and foremost provide free day care for children, so that their parents can both work, should they wish to. However, as we touched on before, in one memorable contribution, Erika adds also night care—a topic that seems rarely discussed in social policy—for parents who work night shifts, such as hospital nurses, people who clean up the city during nights, workers in bakeries, truck drivers, and so on.

We should comment, though, that market-pricing is not the only barrier. Access to goods can be blocked for non-financial reasons, such as travel time or limited opening hours, which can be particularly difficult for those hard

pressed through work. For example, public parks, which are generally free to all visitors and publicly funded, are not necessarily accessible to all city dwellers, as their accessibility depends on how far away one lives (this relates to the third core value below, social mixing). Similarly, housing, and many other services, does not always have to be non-market to be affordable, and, vice versa, for even goods and services that are not supplied on the free market, most notably social housing, can be unaffordable for many. For example, social housing in Greece, or Germany, or Denmark can be expensive and sometimes comparable to market-rate housing.³ This can happen also in cities where the rent-setting mechanism for social and affordable housing is neither income-based (rents are set relative to the assessed means to pay of an household) nor cost-based (rent are set at a level which allows the social provider to meet the costs of provision, including maintenance, insurance, etc.), but rather market-based: rents are set relative to 'market' rents, for example 80 per cent of the private market price. In such cases decent accommodation is not accessible for the significant percentage for whom it is not economically affordable. And even if affordable, long waiting lists, as is the case in Amsterdam, Barcelona, and other cities put public housing out of reach for many.⁴ In this case social housing is non-market, but it is not really accessible.

Therefore, we wish to make two points. First, to clarify that by non-market accessibility we mean affordable and adequate provision of (high quality) goods and services, instead of allowing the rationale of the profit-seeking market to exert its effects. Second, that it is not the case that services *must* be non-market for the city to be a city of equals; it is just that we see that *in general* if the services and good are provided by the market then they are likely to be inaccessible and unaffordable to many people, with, for example, powerful groups lobbying for the end of rent control. Of course, this is an empirical observation and in cities where rents are historically lower, relative to income, financial barriers to access may present much less of a problem.

³ In the EU in 2020, 12.3 per cent of the population in cities lived in a household where total housing costs represent more than 40 per cent of the household's disposable income (what is called the housing cost overburden rate). The corresponding rate for rural areas was 7 per cent. The highest housing cost overburden rates in cities were observed in Greece (36.9 per cent), Germany (22.2 per cent), and Denmark (20.3 per cent) (Eurostat n.d.; European Commission n.d.).

⁴ According to a joint statement to the United Nations issued in 2018 by the cities of Amsterdam, Barcelona, London, Montreal, Montevideo, New York, and Paris, citizens' rights to affordable housing was at risk due to the influence of investors and mass tourism (among other things, Airbnb) on urban property markets (Cities for Adequate Housing 2018).

Although we are interested in access to leisure and cultural facilities too, as we set out in detail in Chapter 3, many of our interviewees, rightly, saw housing as the central issue. In many cities we heard complaints about the great expense of housing in more appealing neighbourhoods and districts. People would like to live in this or that neighbourhood but they cannot afford to. This complaint was bitterly expressed time and again in Berlin and Tel Aviv for example, which in recent decades have seen a major rise in housing costs which has made some previously accessible neighbourhoods out of reach for many residents, especially young couples or young families.⁵

One of the challenges any attractive city needs to face is how to balance the interests of residents against those of visitors to the city, who not only would enjoy the experience and bring welcome commercial activity, but also feel they have their own rights to freedom of movement. Some cities have taken a pragmatic approach of at least trying to regulate the flow of visitors. Venice, which particularly suffers from this dilemma, has introduced a new policy commencing in January 2023 whereby day trippers to the city will need to reserve their visit and pay a fee for their visit (NPR 2022). Many of Amsterdam's city-zens, supported by the municipality and the mayor, Femke Halsema, have been campaigning to reduce the number of tourists every year, and to ban tourists from buying marijuana in the city's coffee shops (Froyd 2021). *Prima facie* a city should be happy with a large number of tourists, as it brings income and is good for business. Business owners pay higher city taxes than residents, so once again it seems reasonable for the city not to try and reduce the number of tourists. But when Julia (29), a young Amsterdammer explains the rationale, she talks about the city's obligations to its residents, which override market considerations:

I love the fact that Amsterdam is a global city, I'm proud of it. That is why most of the time I don't really notice that people talk to me almost exclusively in English. (...) [But] the city owes me more. If for example something happens now and I need to call the police or to call an ambulance, it would take much longer than it used to because we are now sharing these sorts of facilities with millions a year. The city owes me more than it owes you [i.e. the interviewer who was only spending a short time in Amsterdam], and yet it will take the police much more time to get to me.⁶

⁵ From 2012 to 2022 the price per square meter in Berlin has increased by around 10 per cent per year, and therefore has much more than doubled when price rises are compounded, for both older and new homes (Yujelevski 2023).

⁶ The question of a city's obligations to non-residents versus its obligations to its residents is not exhausted by this short discussion here; but, as we wrote in the Introduction, we cannot cover in a single book our question together with the question of justice between cities, or between a city and its environment.

5.2.2. Core Value 2: A Sense of Meaning and Meaningful Urban Life

As we noted in Chapter 3, from the outset one of our theoretical points was confirmed indirectly by the interviewees. When asked about what a city of equals would mean, only a few people mentioned income gaps in the city as a matter that concerned them in particular. On the other hand, many mentioned issues which we frame as ‘having a sense of meaningful urban life’, which, as we have said is consistent with Martina Löw’s argument that city-zens regard their cities as ‘entities of meaning’ (Löw 2012; 2013). The type of attachment people have to their cities is based on their rich tapestry of experience, rather than reducible to a financial calculation.

In *The Adventure of the Copper Beeches*, one of Arthur Conan Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories, Holmes turns to his friend Watson and says:

It is my belief, Watson, founded upon my experience, that the lowest and vilest alleys in London do not present a more dreadful record of sin than does the smiling and beautiful countryside. (Doyle 1892, 277)

And yet, most city dwellers who read this will probably smile, thinking that Holmes is really exaggerating. Most city dwellers associate country life with ‘nothing really happens.’ It is the opposite that they associate with, and enjoy in the city. In other words, city dwellers typically enjoy living in lively, energetic surroundings which are full of vibrant life, and where they are almost spoilt for choice about what to do and how to use their time. But the city is not only valued for offering exciting individual experiences. Many of our interviewees mentioned that they want to enjoy good communal relationships with their neighbours. As Carl (68) from Amsterdam says after praising the city’s social life:

What’s great about this city is the chance to have a good coffee and look at the rain through the window, to read the newspaper, to talk to strangers like we are doing now.

Strikingly, from our interviews we learn that people value living close to lively areas of the city with much going on, and the ability to make choices about how to spend their time and energy, including the ability to take respite from the bustle to visit very peaceful locations. Yet often interviewees did not want to live in what they regarded as noisy, crowded streets. Rather they wanted to live with a sense of community, on good terms with, and known by, their neighbours. There is almost a paradox here. People want to recreate a type of

communal village life, where parents and children picnic together in the local park on a sunny afternoon, but with easy access both to the vibrancy of the city centre and the calm of the countryside (or at least a large park), and to feel welcome and at home in all these disparate places. Looking at this in more depth, this is not a paradox at all. City-zens appreciate lively surroundings, but while they want the freedom to make use of them or not, depending on what suits them best at the time, they don't want to feel either dominated by the chaos, or as if they are only visitors to the exciting parts of town. They behave in ways that are in tune with 'the intrinsic logic' of their city (Löw 2012), or its 'spirit' (Bell and de-Shalit 2011), and they typically also want to understand the history of their city, maybe even of their neighbourhood, and their own relation to it, whether it goes back generations or is new. Through their choices, interests, and relations with other people, with buildings, parks, facilities, and history, their life in the city takes on layers of meaning for them. Having a sense of community with others who work or use the facilities of the places one goes to, including the livelier parts of the city, helps create and consolidate this sense of meaningful urban life.

Now, remember that our point is not only that this is an ideal experience of the city, but that it should be equally accessible to all. How can the need for a sense of meaningful urban life for all be translated to, and implemented in, policy? Does it make sense to demand it from the city's authorities? Any such policies would surely raise paternalistic, if not authoritarian, concerns. The role of the city is not so much to provide meaningful lives directly, but rather to provide many foundational elements as a platform for people together to develop the activities and relationships that give shape to both the neighbourhood and to individual life. There will be many aspects to this, from giving licences to restaurants and bars and encouraging independent small businesses, to keeping the streets safe and secure, to providing community centres, night classes, good transport into the late evening, and libraries. Consider how Yap (67) born and raised in Amsterdam, where his family has been living since the eighteenth century, describes his beloved city:

What I find most precious about Amsterdam is its history, both regarding my own history, and the one of the city. Amsterdam offers everything one might need: culture, social life, accessibility. Yesterday we went to a small square near our house, where there was live music, and a nice cafe nearby served food, and all right outside of our home.

What Yap described is not merely a story about 'how we had fun'. It is the feeling that when you can do, and do, all this, you feel attachment, you feel

part of the city in a strong sense, and you feel that your attachment to the urban space in which you live, your city, has a special meaning. Inclusivity was mentioned time and again in the context of policies vis-à-vis gay people, immigrants, the elderly and the young, and how working-class residents could or could not access services in the city. But inclusivity is also about how a city-zen feels in everyday activities and in what many of us take for granted, such as sitting in a cafe, meeting friends in the pub, or having an opportunity to express your culture and customs. Notice, also, that all this is not only about self interest. It is also about how we as a community live, what our city stands for, how we treat immigrants, or what kind of help we offer the less fortunate among us, or whether we respect elderly people. When all this is secure, people feel that their life in the city is meaningful.

Indeed, some cities encourage cultural festivals, or work with communities to provide displays of local history in public libraries. Small, independent, bookshops often try to feature the work of local residents. It is important for many small businesses to employ local youngsters. In July 2022, when we presented parts of this research in Jerusalem, a person in the audience said he buys books only at a local second-hand bookstore called Re-book, because they employ local youngsters with special needs:

I know it is slightly more expensive than buying second-hand books on the Internet . . . and with the number of books that I buy you might think that I am irrational, but it's about making buying a book much more meaningful for me. You see, even buying a book becomes part of what it is to be a city-zen of Jerusalem.

Another person told a similar story about a second-hand clothes shop. Many Jerusalemites come to these shops to buy their books or clothes because they feel that this is part of what it is to be a Jerusalemite; that you push aside financial considerations and live your life in a more meaningful way. As one Jerusalemite once said, referring to the hedonistic way of life in Tel Aviv, 'in Tel Aviv they know how to live; in Jerusalem we know why we live' (Bell and de-Shalit 2011, 21). Other examples include volunteering within the community, free courses on local urban history, newcomer clubs, street signs in different languages to cater for communities of immigrants and to show respect, and volunteering at the local community garden, a shared space where residents of the neighbourhood can together grow vegetables, flowers, and sometimes picnic together.

City-zens often refer to political activism in the city as part of what constitutes the meaning of urban life. Valentina from Rio de Janeiro describes how

significant music and bars are for her urban life, but makes sure we also hear about her political activities:

I enjoy the outdoor life of the city, where we get to experience the Brazilian culture, including bars, music (especially samba and funk) and dance performances. I also like to be involved in Rio de Janeiro's social movements. I'm affiliated to the Brazilian Communist Party, and I've participated in many political protests (either as an ordinary protester or as a member of the marching band) to fight for better health and education systems.

Indeed, we find that leading a meaningful urban life is clearly the motivation for action when people choose to participate in local politics. For scholars studying participation on the state level, this might appear odd. Being active and participating in politics is often associated with trying to achieve something, securing your rights, or achieving a benefit for you or your community, whether it is a material interest or persuading the legislators to regulate something which you believe is just, or will work for your community's advantage. In other words, on the state level participation is usually instrumental. However, evidence from perhaps the current most innovative form of participation in urban politics—Participatory Budgeting—shows that the main point is to participate, almost regardless of the consequences. Those who participate tell how they enjoy the very idea that local politics becomes meaningful, it is 'ours' so to speak, bottom-up, and not imposed by some alienated council or mayor.

Participatory Budgeting is worth exploring in a little more detail. It is a process whereby the municipality reserves a certain portion of its budget for spending on priorities determined by the community and issues a call for ideas. The sums can be very modest, such as several thousand dollars for each winning project, which can finance, for example, the formation of a local choir, through to much larger sums which can help renovate schools, such as \$35 million in NYC (CEC NYC n.d.) and as much as 70 million euro in Barcelona and 100 million euro in Paris.

Participatory Budgeting processes take various forms. Some are mostly online, as is the case in Madrid (Decide_Madrid n.d.) whereas some use a local church or school to provide a setting for face-to-face gatherings, such as the participatory budgeting process in Glasgow, with the aim of tackling child poverty and child obesity, and where part of the goal was to create forums for discussions between residents, including—this was clearly a goal—'ensuring the needs and aspirations of people with disabilities were equitably represented' (Harkins 2019, 11). In the Glasgow example sums of money allocated

were not terribly high, around £35,000 for all winning projects together, so each project could hope to receive just a few thousand pounds. Accordingly, the main idea was not primarily instrumental in the sense of getting something from the municipality. It was, rather, to enable groups that are often more vulnerable and disadvantaged to raise their voice, to participate, to feel that they belong, that both politics and their urban life, their life in Glasgow, are also meaningful, and perhaps build on this particular experience to generate new activities. Glasgow's *Centre for Population Health* studied and analysed the process in the city. Their conclusion is illuminating, because their report does not even mention the consequences, in terms of how the money allocated was spent. Instead, they describe how meaningful and democratic the process was:

In the broadest terms our work has found that PB has the potential to energise and empower communities and to transform and enrich the relationships between citizens, community groups, community anchor organisations and all levels of government and public service. PB can be an effective means of deepening democratic processes and enhancing local participation. PB can illuminate community aspirations and priorities and provide clear direction as to the ways in which service delivery can be improved and potentially co-produced.

...

Our work highlights that, like all democratic processes PB is imperfect. However, when it works well PB can be a process of significant learning and collaborative development for those involved.

(Glasgow Centre for Population Health 2022)

Such activities and facilities help provide a sense of meaning both for those from the cultural groups who are celebrated in public activities, and for others who can enjoy and learn from something new. There is, however, a potential tension here. Interviewees both valued living in a community with people like themselves, but also often valued diversity (our next core value). How this tension can be managed successfully is perhaps one of the major problems of our age, and to this we turn next.

5.2.3. Core Value 3: Diversity and Social Mixing

Diversity and social mixing is a third core value and a natural follow-up from the second, incorporating a sense of social fluidity. It includes access to lively and diverse shops, restaurants, bars, and entertainments, the presence of a

variety of types of people on the street; feeling the city is inclusive with respect to gender, age, and race and so on. As one interviewee said, the egalitarian city should regard multiculturalism as an asset, as an opportunity, rather than as a challenge. Many of our interviewees showed their appreciation of the idea of ‘cities with lots of flavours.’ Indeed, flavours are a good metaphor: in Amsterdam the Milkshake Festival is celebrated, a multi-genre dance party, where

life is just a party thanks to the great diversity of skin colours, religions, sexual preferences and male and female forms (. . .) with a clear message where respect, freedom, love, tolerance and fun are of paramount importance.

(Discover Amsterdam 2023)

Such practices are already thought to be common in many cities. We think of them as cases whereby the city does not merely tolerate all city dwellers regardless of their race, ethnicity, gender, sex orientation, and so on, but actually takes pride in all of its city-zens and celebrates their presence in the city. In sum, in a city of equals each city dweller is proud of their city, and their city is proud of them.

So a city of equals is a city of plurality and diversity. This is almost another paradox, because often people—especially critics of equality—associate equality with sameness and therefore with conformity. But that is not our aspiration at all, and we did not find among our interviewees any desire for greater homogeneity in the city. Rather, a city of equals is one in which, ideally, everyone, whatever their attributes and tastes, can feel in place, at home. Hence making space for diversity in the city is egalitarian. Compare, for example, a city where transport is difficult and time-consuming, and workplaces are not accessible, and so people with disabilities tend to stay at home, with another city that has taken thoughtful measures to make the environment usable and comfortable for everyone, whatever their disability status, and so city-zens with disabilities make use of, and pass through, the city on similar terms to all other city users. The presence of such diversity is surely a feature of a city of equals.

To push the sense of paradox further, an egalitarian city could include greater economic inequality than its surrounding region, if it can make all people, rich or poor, feel at home. But it is critical that there is mixing and experience, not mere presence, of diversity. There is little more expressive of inequality than extreme residential segregation, especially by skin colour. This is not to say that there is an objection to different neighbourhoods having very distinctive characters. We are not aware, for example, of any

significant opposition to the existence of Chinatowns in many major cities, or to enclaves such as the Portuguese-speaking community in South London (South Lambeth Rd) who live in a tight, self-selecting, community. As discussed in Chapter 2, we also need to keep in mind the debate especially in the United States between thinkers such as Elizabeth Anderson (2010) who argues for ‘The Imperative of Integration,’ while others, such as Ronald Sundstrom and Tommie Shelby respond that liberals who insist that neighbourhoods must be mixed misinterpret what African Americans and other minoritized groups currently want in American cities, as many want to feel that their neighbourhoods reflect their own values and culture, whereas moving to mixed neighbourhoods would always place them in a minority. The idea of being able to choose where you live and whom you live with seems very appealing. But at the same time, it seems highly problematic from the point of view of equality when minorities are pushed into inner-city ghettos, or out to poorly connected outer suburbs, not only because these areas will lack facilities available in wealthier areas, but also it is likely to lead to segregation not just in housing, but in work and leisure too, leading to far-reduced social mixing.

Young is also critical of integration *per se* (2002, 203–4). We have discussed some of her ideas in Chapters 2 and 3, but here we wish to elaborate, as we find her work very relevant to the core value of diversity and social mixing. Referring to the urban setting she argues that integration as mixing is not necessarily the best model for creating inclusive democracies. Group-differentiated residential and associational clustering is not necessarily bad in itself, she claims, provided that it has arisen from legitimate desires to form and maintain affinity grouping, and any spatial group differentiation is voluntary, fluid, without clear borders, and with many overlapping, unmarked, and hybrid places. Young argues that it is reasonable to assume that many residential patterns result at least partly from a preference that members of these groups have for living near those with whom they feel affinity. As mentioned in Chapter 2, in Peter Marcuse’s (1997) terms, these neighbourhoods may simply be ethnic enclaves rather than ghettos resulting from exclusion by the white majority.⁷ While it is hard to object to people choosing where to live if they have the means to do so, one worrying trend is for the privileged to take dramatic steps to isolate themselves from others. In her evocatively

⁷ Marcuse develops conceptual distinctions among these three types of residential patterns. An enclave is a clustering of persons according to affinity groups, whereas a ghetto is the exclusion and confinement of a subordinate group by a dominant group. A citadel is an exclusive community of class and race privilege, from which others are restricted access. An enclave is a positive and empowering social structure, according to Marcuse, whereas a ghetto perpetuates disadvantage. Many spaces of racial or ethnic concentration share characteristics of each.

named study *City of Walls: Crime, Segregation, and Citizenship in São Paulo*, urban anthropologist Teresa Caldeira has used the term ‘fortified enclaves’ (in Marcuse’s terms this would be ‘fortified citadels’) to describe gated communities with guarded entrances and private security, which have become common in some of the most divided cities in the world, and are a powerful symbol of inequality on all levels (Caldeira 2000).

Realizing that residential segregation comes in different forms, Young writes:

If residential concentrations simply reflect a preference for living near certain kinds of people, then their existence should not present a problem. But how do we tell the difference between residential segregation and residential clustering in these multicultural cities?

(Young 2000, 203)

Now, Young’s main concern is clearly racial segregation, although in Chapter 3 we noted that our interviewees were also concerned with other many other forms of discrimination. We are also concerned about patterns that create ghettos as the effect of explicit or implicit collusion. So, in the following points, while remaining very heavily dependent on Young’s analysis, we take the liberty of slightly modifying Young’s criteria distinguishing between voluntary residential concentrations, which reflect a preference for living near certain kinds of people, and segregation which is exclusionary:

1. If studies show that migrants, elderly people, working-class people, or others marked as racially or ethnically different experience housing discrimination in majority neighbourhoods, then this means that many members of these groups are confined in their housing options to racially, age-oriented, or class-oriented, concentrated neighbourhoods.
2. If residents of the city ‘know’ where racial and ethnic minorities, or immigrants, or the less-affluent, are said to be living, and if these neighbourhoods carry associations of danger or boundedness to city residents, then those living in them are likely to suffer stigma that affects other opportunities.
3. If members of the majority cultural group are moving out of neighbourhoods associated with racialized groups or with immigrants there is probably a segregating process.
4. If both public and private resource and property owners fail to invest in the racially concentrated neighbourhoods, or in neighbourhoods where the less-affluent reside, and the latter decline in quality, there is probably a segregation process.

5. If the neighbourhoods in which racialized groups, immigrants, or poorer people cluster have disadvantages compared to others, such as having weak transportation access, low-quality housing for the price, location near unpleasant or polluting industrial facilities, and so on, then the cluster is partly a matter of privilege.
6. To the extent that discriminatory attitudes and behaviour force or induce members of racial or ethnic minorities to live in certain neighbourhoods when they might otherwise seek housing elsewhere, or if people from minority cultures find themselves in such a situation, they live in segregated conditions.
7. Even more importantly if their housing conditions, neighbourhood location, and general quality of residential life are inferior, then their segregation contributes to conditions of structural inequality.

Young encourages a shift in the focus of inclusiveness from spatial integration alone to economic participation in the labour market and political participation in the polity of the city. This reinforces our point from Chapter 2 that space does not capture the entire picture when it comes to equality in the city. Thus, she argues inclusiveness means integration to labour markets and to political positions, and not only at the neighbourhood level, and this is obviously true with regard to gender in the city as well as race. It is also highly important to see that there is no hidden, informal exclusion from political positions for women and minoritized groups despite legislation and regulations that prohibits it. Not only, typically, are there far fewer women than men as councillors (Fawcett 2022), but in some cities female council members testify that while formally they could join committees and debates, in practice they often suffer from the chauvinistic attitudes of many of the male members in those committees (Drage 2001). No doubt similar comments could be made about race and disability status.

We have just argued that a city of equals should not be defined in terms of housing settlements and space alone, and yet, as should already be apparent there is such a difficult balance to be struck with regard to patterns of residence. So we must concede that it will often be a critical factor, and feel the need to return to the topic, especially of apparently voluntary self-segregation, and look at some more examples from our interviews. While a segregated city seems almost a paradigm of inequality the fact that minorities often want to live together came out starkly in interviews with many ultra-Orthodox Jews in Jerusalem. A significant proportion of our interviewees often wished to live in a segregated neighbourhood or town, and this is, at least in part, due to their rabbis and leaders teaching them that exposure to

other cultures is a threat to their purity, religious strength, and spirituality. A cynical sociologist might claim that this is yet another way the leaders control their followers and make them obey the leaders without a second thought. False consciousness would be another dismissive way to interpret what we were told. A more charitable interpretation would acknowledge the wish to retain a culture and system of beliefs in the context of a modern, liberal, or at least partly liberal country, which provides a constant challenge to their world view if not held at arm's length.

An unpublished seminar paper by Adi Ben-Dahan discusses the pros and cons of voluntary segregation for minorities, based on a series of interviews with twenty ultra-Orthodox men and women in various neighbourhoods of Jerusalem, both mixed (ultra-Orthodox, modern religious, traditional, and secular living in the same area) and ultra-Orthodox only.⁸ Based on these interviews she argues that some ultra-Orthodox people are very happy to remain within a monistic neighbourhood whereas others see the advantages in living in a pluralistic neighbourhood. Although this is our speculation, it would not be surprising if what is said here would also be typical of other groups around the world who wish to live their lives based on a very strong religious faith. Some had no doubt that living in a self-segregated neighbourhood was to be favoured. Yedidah, aged 20, male, says:

Of course a separate neighbourhood is preferable; no question at all. I don't wish to tackle what I don't need to tackle and see. Each according to his lifestyle, the more separate the merrier. It's not because I have a problem with secular people, but when you live in mixed neighbourhoods it only creates problems.

Hedva, female 29, says that she was looking to live with very similar people, because 'one needs to feel one belongs' (she means in cultural and spatial terms). Plus, living with others might be a threat to your way of life. Jonatan, aged 18, explains that

there are things one does not want to see, for example breaking the law of Sabbath, dressing in a non-modest way. What is the threat? This can harm your spirituality, this is confusing.

But even those who see the advantages of living in a segregated neighbourhood can also experience it as oppressive: Netanel, male, aged 20, says:

⁸ We should add that among the ultra-Orthodox there are many different castes and schools of thought, and tradition, and some extreme ultra-Orthodox wish to reside only with those who obey the same rabbi.

The advantage of an ultra-Orthodox-only neighbourhood is that you live with people whose behaviour is exactly like yours. But the drawback is that sometimes this is annoying—everybody knows everything about everybody else. You just have to behave the way they want you to.

For these reasons many of those who prefer to live in a mixed neighbourhood justify it in terms of the liberty it gives them. Jacob, aged 57, says that ‘in such a neighbourhood you owe nothing to nobody’, whereas in a monistic neighbourhood you must conform to the norms and what you do is everyone’s business, and they are all watching you all the time to make sure. But Jacob immediately adds that if the neighbourhood is too pluralistic then he would feel uneasy: ‘People wish to feel comfortable; and they feel so when their neighbours’ life style is not too different.’ Shoshi, aged 17, also agrees that when people are all the same you must constantly take into account they are watching you, whereas in her mixed neighbourhood, where she prefers to live, she does not need to please anybody; she does what she pleases. Annette, female 48, explains that she and her husband always looked for a mixed community so that they could live with open-minded people.

Similarly, Ruth, aged 23, is less worried about what happens to her purity and spirituality. She claims that when she lives in a mixed neighbourhood she learns and adopts a form of tolerance: ‘People just seem fine and so I learn to be less judgmental of them.’ Rivka, 47, says ‘only by living in a mixed neighbourhood did my children learn to know the other and to appreciate the way we live without disrespecting the way others live.’ For the same reason Eliezer, 27 male, prefers a mixed neighbourhood, and he adds, perhaps prejudicially, that the monistic ghettos are always dirty and never well kept.

For ourselves we do not want to be judgmental about those who wish to remain within their particularistic community, although admittedly this way of life is not our choice. However, we do wish to assert that a city in which sub-communities are totally sealed off from each other is at odds with the idea of a city of equals as we see it, and in particular the idea of diversity and social mixing, the core value we are currently discussing. But at the same time, we accept that social mixing first can, under the right circumstances, be compatible with the existence of residential enclaves. And this is because, in our advocacy of social mixing, we do not take the position that social mixing needs to be central to the life of everyone in the city. That itself would be to be too directive and intrusive in giving directions to how people should lead their lives. Rather, in our view in a city of equals people have a sense of social fluidity, which means that they should not feel trapped in their locale, but have the ability to move through the city, and, correspondingly, to welcome

others to their neighbourhood. There is a delicate balance between preserving traditions and embracing change, and different people will have different taste and judgement here. Of course, it may be impossible to satisfy all.

The discussion above refers to a widely shared dilemma in many cities: how can we cater for the preferences of those who wish to live with similar people, and yet refrain from preventing others who wish to live in the same area from living there? In Chapter 4 we discussed the issues of gentrification and urban renewal; they also become critically important in the context of the current discussion, in terms of what types of renewal can treat everybody's interests and preferences equally. This is not necessarily about the city authorities because the process is not always directed by the city municipality. It is sometimes encouraged by the state (Shmaryahu-Yeshurun 2022), and more often by the market. Nevertheless, even when the market is the main determining force there remains the question of how individuals, NGOs, civil society behave and act.

Now, obviously, there is a difference between people claiming that they want to live in a neighbourhood with people who share with them a culture or a religious belief, and people who claim that they wish to live in a neighbourhood where everybody is, say, white. The distinction is between cases in which the minoritized group expresses such a wish, as in the cases discussed by Sundstrom and Shelby, and cases in which the majority deceptively uses the claim 'I want to protect my culture' in order to cover up racial discrimination. It seems to us that, for example, a city of equals can tolerate, even embrace, cases in which immigrants from Arab countries to a large city claim that they wish to live side by side with people like them, to have their mosques, etc.; but a city of equals cannot accept cases in which white Christian dwellers of the same city put forward a claim according they wish to live only with Christians in their neighbourhood. This may seem very hard to explain. But there seems to us an important distinction between a situation where a minority culture is fragile and needs a certain degree of protection to survive and cases where members of the majority hide behind implausible claims that their culture is under threat as a rationalization for racial discrimination and protecting their own group's privileged access to superior resources.

An even more difficult case is that of a minority that forms an enclave with people like themselves, but then discriminates against a minority within this minority, most notably on the basis of gender or sexual orientation. This is a serious problem concerning the limits to liberal toleration, and we accept it shows that there can be tensions within the idea of equality. We do not believe that there is a simple answer to such dilemmas, but recognizing and

respecting the standing and voice of all within a community will at least be a start towards breaking the stranglehold of long-standing prejudice.

Our overarching question, however, is how to achieve a sense of fairness and equality for all, while respecting traditions of different groups, often identified with specific locations in the city, and drawing on different ethnic and religious heritage. A case study in how this could be managed is taken from what was reported to us about school lunches in Paris, where 80 per cent of children eat lunch at school which, whether or not it is accurate, is a helpful model to reflect upon. The regulations, so we understand, lay down rules about the nutritional value of the food, setting out the expected calorie content, and that it should be fresh, prepared the same day, and based on local ingredients. However, each quarter has the autonomy to supply different food, sensitive to local preferences including those of groups of minority ethnicity.

As we have noted, generally speaking multiculturalism was widely appealing to our interviewees. Linn, 25 Belgian by origin, has been living in London for some years. When reflecting about what equality in the city means she comes forward with a single sentence which we are happy to embrace. 'The multiculturalism . . . So that's what I like about this. There's no monolithic culture here, so to speak.' A city comes closer to the idea of a city of equals in this dimension the more difficult it is to characterize the monolithic and dominant culture. This is not to endorse a dull homogeneity. We do not ask for every city to resemble each other in the way, perhaps, their international airports or up-market shopping malls do. We have emphasized that each city will have its own character, but we argue that this needs to be a distinctive blend, not the domination of a single flavour. Fatima, a Muslim Berliner, aged 24, previously lived in Hamburg and Mannheim says:

Well, what's really better here [in Berlin], in comparison with many other places, is that we've got many people from many different places here, which means that it's very diverse.

In discussing social mixing we have particularly emphasized people from different backgrounds meeting together. But we should not overlook the importance of people being able to mix with others more generally. Loneliness, going beyond the welcome 'anonymity' we have discussed, especially for elderly people, is becoming recognized as a major social problem, both in itself, and in its consequences for health and, of course, for community. It is often assumed that it is a particular problem in cities, which it may be, but cities also have the resources to do much about it. One way of attempting to

solve the problem could be through redistribution of income, so that more people can afford to go out to pubs, restaurants, the theatre, and meet more people, although it may have to be very significant to have more than a minimal effect, and indeed these are all places where people, while being with others, rarely interact with strangers on more than a very superficial level. It could be more effective for the local municipality to try to subsidize clubs or build dedicated places—cafes, classes, etc.—for elderly people, as well as for lonely people at all other life stages, to meet others. Or put benches on the pavements so that anyone can take a walk knowing that there's a place to rest and watch the world go by and at least feel part of a wider social world. And of course such facilities are more likely to be used by older people. Another possible policy is to allocate special time for elderly people to use public facilities such as swimming pools, because some may be embarrassed to swim next to young swimmers, feeling that they 'stand (or swim) in their way'. Interestingly the alienated city can offer more opportunities in this respect even than some deliberately communal forms of living. An unpublished interview study compared the experience of elderly people in kibbutzim (communal, collective farms) and moshavim (semi-collective farms) and the experience of people a similar age in the cities. Contrary to expectations elderly people in the cities felt much less lonely, not only because there is more chance that other family members live close by and can visit, but because they can walk outside in the busy streets, on pavements with benches, where they can rest, and engage in unplanned conversations, whereas in the moshav and kibbutz there were no places to stop. Elderly people in the city went out for a walk more often even than those a little younger than them in the village.

But to return to the issue of social mixing between people of different backgrounds, as we have noted, a balance must be struck between preserving traditions and embracing change, and it will be very hard to solve this problem in a way that satisfies everyone. But it is vital that no one has good reason to feel excluded. Which leads us to the fourth core value.

5.2.4. Core Value 4: Non-deferential Inclusion

The term 'non-deferential inclusion' may be slightly unusual. What we mean is that all people should be able to receive the same type of treatment without some having to show particular gratitude or deference on receipt, or go through processes, without good reason, that others are spared. All individuals are to be included in social, political, and economic life on equal terms with others, rather than grudgingly or in ways that humiliate them, such as

making it clear, implicitly or explicitly, that they are, or could have been, in some sense, outsiders or second-class citizens, who should be grateful (cf. Wolff 1998). The idea is that inclusion is a right, not a mere privilege, but also such a deeply held and respected right that no one need even mention it. When waiting for a bus, others don't push past you, ignoring that you are even there. When waiting at a bar, you are served when it's your turn, and not after all the wealthy, white men have been served first. When claiming welfare benefits you are not made to feel that you have lesser claim than others, and need to wait and show special gratitude, because you are an immigrant. When you apply for affordable housing or a kindergarten for your child you are given consideration when you reach the top of the list, no matter your religion, your gender, your sexual orientation, the colour of your skin, or who your ancestors are. When the city authorities plant trees to create shade, which is becoming more and more important due to climate change, you don't have to fight for the municipality to plant trees in your neighbourhood as well, even if you pay less local tax, because you earn less compared to your boss, who lives in the nearby affluent neighbourhood; and when the municipality decides where to locate a garbage processing plant, they do not consider only those neighbourhoods where the less-powerful, less-connected, and poorer city dwellers live; and so on. It is easy to see the intrinsic connection with a sense of belonging, but also a recognition of the belonging of others.

Another way of putting this is that we can distinguish two 'levels' of inclusion. The first is simply to have your basic rights recognized and satisfied. The second is for those who you are dealing with to recognize that the rights are the rights of a human being with a whole set of needs and interests connected to each right, and there are ways in which rights can be fulfilled in a minimal way that ignore these surrounding needs and interests. Only if these other factors are taken into account has one truly been treated with respect.

The idea, then, of non-deferential inclusion is the feeling of being part of what constitutes the city, of what makes it what it is;⁹ being treated fairly and with respect by the city and other city-zens; people having access to the facilities and resources of their city by way of automatically assumed

⁹ In some cities the more affluent and advantaged feel embarrassed to associate themselves with the city, which is thought to be poor or deteriorating. This was the case in cities like Detroit that went through an economic and demographic decline in the 2000s and early 2010s. In Brighton we heard that residents of the more affluent nearby suburbs are said to reply 'Hove, actually' when they are asked whether they are from Brighton ('Brighton and Hove' is the formal name of the city), as the Brighton part has a high percentage of deprivation and the city has the third largest number of homeless people in Britain (Berry 2021) and is thought to be a lower-middle-class or working-class city. Thus, in that respect, the more people who come from the more wealthy neighbourhoods associate themselves with the city as a whole and answer that they are from the city, the more the city is a city of equals.

entitlement, rather than having to throw themselves on the mercy or discretion of gatekeepers. An important parameter is whether officials listen to everybody.

What does feeling part of what constitutes the city mean? It means that one feels, for example Shanghainese, or Istanbulie, or a Porteño, or a Londoner, and not merely a person who happens to reside in Shanghai, or Istanbul, or Buenos Aires, or London. It means that your dialect or accent does not make you a stranger or even unwanted. It means not having to justify your customs, and so on, at least as long as you don't harm others. It also means that you can be who you are in public without being ashamed or embarrassed, such as same-sex couples walking hand in hand in the street, without others staring or pointing or showing disapproval.

Non-deferential inclusion implies that people should feel welcome anywhere they go. Earlier we reported the remark of Amalia, a religious woman in her twenties, who told us that Jerusalem is 'the most egalitarian city' she knows of because 'as a religious woman I can go to a bar here and feel free'. One can sense the diversity, she says, and yet it is not an obstacle. (We might wonder whether this is true of Arab city-zens of Jerusalem, or of secular female Jerusalemites who attend a restaurant in the ultra-Orthodox neighbourhood, but if Amalia's picture is true, then this is a sign of a city coming closer to the idea of a city of equals.)

Inclusiveness also means that the newcomers (immigrants from within the country or from outside the country) and also those previously socially marginalized are included in the job market, cultural events, social initiatives, local politics, social networks, local NGOs, and so on. Inclusion can be a quantitative concept, measured by statistics, such as the numbers or percentages of the newcomers or the previously marginalized and excluded who are now taking part in planning, deliberation, politics, social activities, cultural activities, or whatever parameter we can think of. (And this can be measured either subjectively, that is to say by relying on people's reports, or objectively, by comparing statistics and so on). But we are equally interested in inclusion as a qualitative concept, and in particular the quality of relationships. This again can be found by interviewing people and asking them about their feelings; or by asking what the expectations of newcomers and the hosting community members from each other are, or what do they think should happen.

It is also possible to explore the quality of relationship more objectively by interpreting what we see. In our previous work *Disadvantage* (Wolff and de-Shalit 2007) we identified a number of functionings that have to do with the level of relationships, which most obviously includes the functioning

‘affiliation.’ However, we also added a number of additional categories to Nussbaum’s famous list of functionings, or, rather, in her terms, capabilities, including: (1) understanding the law; (2) being able to communicate, including being able to speak the local language (where the local language is broader than language, it is also about norms, values, etc.); and even (3) doing good to others. All of these are relevant to the idea of non-deferential inclusion. Consider the last. One way of being excluded is by people declining your hospitality, if, for example, people shun a free festival put on by an immigrant group.

Related themes regularly occurred in our interviews, as we reported in Chapter 4, and it is worth revisiting these ideas for the insight they provide into the idea of non-deferential inclusion. Homelessness, and especially street sleeping, is a particular case in point. No city will completely ignore homeless people, or those unable to feed themselves, and there will always be some sort of provision, whether through the city or the voluntary sector, including religious groups. But what level of provision is on offer, and how people are made to feel about using it, can vary tremendously. Do food banks insist on minute examination of your paperwork and send you away as soon as you have your allocation, or are you invited in for a cup of tea and a chat, and made to feel, at least while you are there, a human being? Tina, 49, from Hamburg, complains not about the presence of homeless people, but about the lack of support that they receive from the city, and similar sentiments were expressed many times by our interviewees. City dwellers nowadays accept that homeless people are attracted to their city or that due to rising accommodation prices many become homeless; but they strongly believe that therefore the city should do more to help them, assist them, with food, medical treatment, and shelter.¹⁰ Andrew (32) from Oxford echoes Tina’s views about the lack of much-needed policies to assist homeless people. He says:

I don’t blame the homeless. It’s not these people’s fault at all. They are victims of the system. (. . .) The council doesn’t do anything. They let them do whatever they want, as if they didn’t care. There should be more shelters. But this system, in a way it seems as if people have simply accepted that [the poor’s] children will also be poor.

We have also already noted the comments of Jason, a young Black German in Hamburg, who remarked that while he believed that the city is ‘truly multicultural, especially compared to other cities I have been to’ nevertheless on

¹⁰ For an interesting discussion of what a city’s obligations towards the homeless are, see van Leeuwen (2018).

his first day at work at a construction company ‘my colleagues met me and the first thing they asked me was “You’re not a Muslim, are you?”’ It is interesting that he was not denied the job, so in that sense was included, yet his workmates were not instinctively prepared to accept him on equal terms. Now, they may defend themselves by claiming they were just having a bit of fun and making a joke, but what counts as an acceptable joke sends a message; that Jason, unlike his workmates of European descent, has to prove himself before he is included. This, therefore, is an example for us of deferential inclusion—at least at first, he had to acquiesce in treatment that others, most likely, did not need to suffer.

There are also less noticed, but no less fateful, patterns of exclusion. We were struck, when considering measures of relative poverty, that one item that comes near the top of the list on some studies is ‘being able to visit friends and family in hospital’. We speculate that most academics reading these words would be very surprised, as they have the financial means and flexible schedules to be able to visit their friends and families, and simply take it for granted that this is not so much a privilege as a matter of ordinary life. But those who work inflexible shifts, or lack a car or money for travel, or have extensive caring relationships with no support, are in a different position. This has been exacerbated in recent decades by changing patterns of hospital provision in some countries, with small, local, general hospitals being replaced with large, specialist hospitals, sometimes on the edge of the city or even in a different city within the same medical authority, or, in the most extreme cases for very specialized care, on the other side of the province or country. There are, of course, very good medical reasons for such specialization and consolidation, but the effect on poorer residents and those with less-flexible lifestyles can be highly problematic. Suppose a family member points out the difficulty of visiting and is told by the hospital or their boss ‘you should be grateful that your family member is receiving the right care’ rather than being helped to find ways to visit. We would call this almost a paradigm example of a failure of inclusion without (the expectation of) deference: as we said above, a matter of someone’s basic rights being met, without full recognition that they are the rights of a human being with other, connected, needs.

This is also an example of how not being fully equal in one way can be associated with, or even cause, inequality in other respects, in this case how inequality in working and living conditions can cause inequality in access to friends and family in hospital. In *Disadvantage* (Wolff and de-Shalit 2007) we refer to this as clustering of disadvantages, and similar comments were made in our interviews. Tid (30) from London explains how sometimes

disadvantages cluster, creating a compound which needs to be analysed in its own terms (what is termed today ‘intersectionality’):

OK, so (. . .) in East London, the thing is, you had all this [being not only working class but also often unemployed] and then on top of this, it’s racially charged. And also, the rich here, they live exactly on the other side of the street. This racial segregation is there because poverty and areas of poverty largely get inhabited by, you know, people of colour who are migrants, or their descendants, involuntary migrants, many Windrush people really.

Now, we need to address the question of whose responsibility it is to send the message that everyone is equal and included: the city’s authorities or the city dwellers? J. S. Mill’s answer, we have already noted, is that informal social norms have the potential to harm dignity and liberty no less, perhaps even more, than formal regulations. Jason’s story about being asked whether he is a Muslim is about his co-workers. Even if the municipality, or more likely the state, produced laws forbidding racist speech, it won’t be able to stop people from thinking this way. But it might be able to make them think twice before they express prejudicial thoughts. This has three advantages. First, expression of discriminatory thoughts is likely to become less common. Second, third parties will be less exposed to discriminatory attitudes and therefore less likely to legitimize them, which might have a positive effect on these other people as well, in the sense that such thoughts may fade from their minds. Third, if people are exposed to such attitudes, they will know that they are entitled to complain, either directly to the assaulting person or body or to the city’s authorities or the police.

Sometimes more privileged city dwellers are unaware of, or not sensitive to, such cases of deferential inclusion. This is very clearly explained by Klaus, from Hamburg, who says that the poorer in Hamburg, where he lives, who lack education, feel they will be looked down on if they don’t dress up, and so despite not having enough money they spend a lot on things you would assume they don’t really need:

I can afford being looked at strangely and with bewilderment (if I am not dressed up)—but they can’t. They feel downgraded. No one needs to starve here, but people feel left out.

Sometimes these are more than thoughts. Alba, aged 38, a Berliner who came from Africa, tells us this story (also quoted in part above):

I understand it to be prejudices. (. . .) Africans and Arabs are treated differently. Africans particularly badly. (. . .) I was refused entrance to a club. Everyone got in. The bouncer didn't allow me in. I had no drugs, nothing. This is denial of freedom of association. I told that to the police around there, but they just told me to go home. I felt bitter and humiliated.

He argues prejudice is all too common: 'Young women—when a black man approaches her, she will start holding on to her stuff. It's so humiliating.' Alba claims that Hamburg's bureaucrats are also guilty of instinctive prejudice, which is especially important to our analysis. In a city of equals bureaucrats in particular should make everyone feel that they have an equal right to the services of the city. To our question whether this xenophobic prejudice comes from individuals or whether it is something structural Alba answers:

Five years ago I applied for housing and had all my papers ready and I didn't get anything. So, I had to live in a *Wohnheim* [shelter or residence hall]. All this is a disenfranchisement of people's life. And when you complain you're considered a troublemaker.

Inclusion of cultural, lifestyle, and gender minorities is important, and yet, as we have noted, it should not come at the cost of ignoring class and economic differences (and vice versa). In Chapter 4 we discussed our interview with Lisa, 43, who lives in Oxford, and we reported that she describes the city as extremely sensitive and egalitarian towards minorities, with regard for extensive gender, and especially LGBTQ+ issues, but she claims this comes at a cost:

See, gay rights are important and high on the agenda, rightfully, this kind of inclusiveness is, I think, very present. There are many students here and it is great for that. (. . .) But I often feel like many are not fully aware of the fact that their rooms are being cleaned by someone, and not aware of their backgrounds or situation. At my workplace, for instance, I just learned that the cleaners there, who work for an outside contractor, they don't get sick leave. I definitely think that many people here, young people, are very aware of the gender and sexuality issue—but it seems to me that there are many other problematic things that they are not so much aware of. Oxford as a city (. . .) is trying to be very inclusive . . . and promoting equality . . . and people are aware, but there is awareness of certain types or directions in particular. I am talking about social and economic inequalities.

Many of our interviewees had in mind quality of relationships when discussing inclusion. When asked about what she would want to be improved in

Berlin, Kathi, a 33-year-old Berliner, says: 'Well, I do think that people have become less and less friendly, and that the number of people here has grown and grown.' This complaint came out time and again in Berlin, and it seems that it matters to city dwellers a lot. She continues:

I can tell you something (. . .) No 'good morning', no 'good day', only being honked at on the streets, people even spit at you, all this vulgar behaviour—isn't this super annoying? No child says 'please' or 'thank you' anymore (. . .) There is no friendly 'togetherness', community.

The opposite picture was revealed in Jerusalem. Many interviewees said that although the city is very multicultural to the extent that opposite and rival cultures live together side by side, this does not harm the friendly atmosphere in the street and the latter compensates for the political tension. Once again, we are not endorsing the empirical accuracy of these testimonies and it very well might be the case that Berliners, for example, tend to be more self-critical than Jerusalemites, or that some Jewish Jerusalemites deceive themselves about how welcome Arab Jerusalemites feel. But this is not the point. What is important to us, and what we derive from these interviews, are the core values for the city of equals. And what is impressive is that in all these cities and among the many interviewees, the same parameters were mentioned.

Last but not least, generating a sense of non-deferential inclusion depends heavily on the way the city authorities plan, and the ideological intention behind the planning. Moreover, it also depends on the extent to which city dwellers actually fulfil these intentions in their everyday implementation of the regulations and policies. To explain, let us consider urban right-of-way regulation. The public right of way in a city refers to areas on or above a public roadway, street, public pavement, alley, etc. Perhaps more interestingly, it can include privately owned spaces adjacent to private properties, such as paved areas around offices and apartment blocks. Where the public right of way applies, these surrounding areas are to be kept available for public use. It is the equivalent of the right to roam in the countryside: private property which often remains private, and yet must be open for people to use or walk through. City planners also often allocate and design areas around schools, or other public buildings to remain open and available for everybody. The idea that everyone can walk through, without feeling that others are doing him or her a favour, is crucial for this feeling of non-deferential inclusion as part of a secure sense of place.

However, it is sometimes the case, in less-egalitarian cities, where property owners have a lot of power and influence, that despite the planning

regulations, property owners put obstacles and make it difficult for others to use the place. For example, in Tel Aviv, the legal status of the right of way is very strong. Any constructor or company that gets a permit to build a house should leave some space for public enjoyment of the area; a little garden, park, plaza. And yet many young residents of Tel Aviv who often cannot afford to live in the more modern and expensive buildings often complain that these open spaces are designed so as not to give people the feeling that they are invited; fences, bushes, trees, even gates which are illegal, create an impression that the place is for private use only.

A way to overcome this is to apply placemaking philosophy in planning, which means that the planner sets out not to build an object, such as a house, a plaza, a museum, a shop, or a factory, but rather to make a place, which is a more holistic concept. This is a matter of thinking not only of the building and how it will look, but also about who will live there or nearby, who will walk by or through, how it will be used, for what purpose and by whom, and how will it be maintained, and so on.

Another way to overcome effective privatization of space is by regulation. A city can disallow signs such as 'private, no unauthorized entrance' or 'no trespassing' at the entrance to apartment buildings and public buildings, such as university campuses, libraries, and so on. Of course, the question is complicated regarding the lobbies of apartment buildings. On the one hand, the owners who purchased the apartments or those who rented them in practice paid for the use of the lobby as well as their own apartments. So there seems an obvious sense in which such lobbies are private property. On the other hand, many such buildings have spacious lobbies which are rarely used and could function as gathering places for others who could make use of them, such as groups of students who want to study together, a local NGO that needs a place to meet, and so on. Why not allow them to use these spaces? This is especially pertinent in cities where real estate is very expensive. So, it seems to us that in some cases a city of equals could introduce measures to allow greater use of scarce space. This is most obvious in cases of public buildings which particular groups regularly use (e.g. university buildings, schools, churches) but could benefit others when and if they need to use them. Passing through gardens in the front of private apartment buildings should be equally unproblematic. For other cases, such as spacious lobbies of apartment buildings, there could be particular arrangements, to regulate times and conditions under which they could be used by non-residents. But this would not be because this is private space or private property but because of respect to the privacy and security of tenants and their right to enjoy quiet evenings and nights. Whatever the details of the arrangements, such approaches take into

account the plurality of the city dwellers, and their different levels of access to resources and in that sense should sustain non-deferential inclusion, as well as advancing all the other values: non-market access to facilities, a sense of a meaningful life, and diversity and social mixing.

5.3. Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has been to introduce the details of our theory of what makes a city a city of equals. Our general conception, repeated many times, and based on reflection on our interviews, is that a city of equals is a city in which all of its residents feel that they are part of the city's story, and enjoy a secure sense of place. This overall characterization of a city of equals derived from the four core values that we defined in the following way:

1. Accessibility to the city's services is not constituted by the market.
2. A sense of a meaningful life.
3. Diversity and social mixing.
4. Non-deferential inclusion (that is, being included without having to defer).

We finished Chapter 4 by referring to possible tensions between the various themes, forcing cities to make difficult choices. Now that we have expanded further on the themes and core values, we are in a position to explain our approach to the potential tensions and trade-offs between the many different goals that a city of equals should promote. For example, there is tension between permitting boisterous uses of public space and fostering a sense of security. In reply, we would like to make three related points building on each other. First, we accept that this is true, and in reality cities, mayors, and councils will have to prioritize according to their own city's values which may point to different outcomes in different cities, but will often lead to a pragmatic compromise, such as reserved and protected times of use. Second, and developing this first point, unlike material equality, where typically one person or group's gain is another's loss, in relational equality, people are often prepared to make compromises because they benefit in another way, in terms of their sense of belonging to a community with others which is essential to them. Third, and perhaps just a more detailed way of making the last point, these tensions are often diminished and might even vanish when it comes to urban politics, as opposed to national politics. There is a considerable difference between the way people think as citizens of states versus how they

think as city-zens of cities. The difference corresponds with the two ways in which politics is perceived. One way is politics as a competition: who gets what and how, which implies that politics is antagonistic; it is about trying to persuade the governing body to prioritize your interests over the interests of others. The other way politics is perceived is as a process by which we find a way to live together despite all our different interests and ideologies, religions, and so on, and the living together despite differences is regarded as highly valuable in itself. It is evident that city dwellers switch from thinking as citizens to thinking as city-zens and that when they do so, they also switch from the first to the second conception of politics. So, many of the tensions between core values can be handled in deliberations, city-zens' forums, and so on. One mechanism which started to spread rapidly and quite successfully is the Participatory Budgeting mechanism which we mentioned.

But we do not want to pretend problems of tension and trade-offs in the city can be made to disappear. City council meetings, not to mention local elections, are often places of intense contestation of values, and local papers overflow with stories of protest at city plans and neighbourhood disputes. The problem of conflict of values will always be a practical, as well as theoretical drawback of any pluralistic theory. Still, we remain faithful to our goal of putting forward a pluralistic theory because it is more realistic than any theory based on a single principle. Thus, we acknowledge that since our theory is pluralistic indeed, there will always be some worries about such tensions. But we do not regard it as a weakness that we have declined to provide detailed solutions for each and every case. When tensions arise, especially when several options all are viable candidates, there is room for democratic intervention, and policies should be decided deliberatively and democratically by each city, as we see in the case of the many models of Participatory Budgeting. This is just one example of how such local democratic processes are possible and when the city-zens of a city find tensions between the core values, they can deliberate about it and find a solution. Nevertheless, we regard the core values as aspirations for any city that takes equality seriously, and in Chapter 6 we set out a wide range of factors that officials should consider if they care about the equality of their city-zens. The thought, then, that there are always many factors that need to be taken into account, but how exactly they should be dealt with will depend on context, history, and local values, among perhaps many other things.

Moreover, we would not by any means claim to have produced a conclusive argument for this picture or any part of it. Rather we have come to this account on the basis of a type of an interpretive triangulation between our own theoretical reflections, including conversations with colleagues and

students, the existing scholarly literature, and the many interviews we undertook for this study. We are very open to the idea that there are alternative ways of conceiving of a city of equals, but we feel we have captured the underlying spirit, and expect that any alternative account would at least have a great deal of overlap with what we have done here. The next question, of course, is what can be done with this account now that we have it. And that is the task of the next, and final, chapter.