

Dysfunctional Nations and Rising Cities

'To which extent could an elected mayor of a European city improve policies of the local government and the perception of its inhabitants?'

Aniek Dianne Maria Poelhekke
10061460 / ES4e-4B
Dissertation
P.G. Nixon
30-09-2014

Academy of European Studies & Communication Management

The Hague University of Applied Science

Executive Summary

The nation-state had a long history of success, but today it is failing its citizens on a global scale. Over the last hundred years, nation-states focussed on maximizing internal unity and jurisdictional sovereignty. Benjamin R. Barber's *'If Mayors Ruled The World'* is the central source of this thesis and the aim of Barber's book is to focus on the ability of cities to cooperate across borders and govern globally in ways that nations cannot. Barber claims that true democracy can be achieved if we let cities do what states cannot. Barber outlines a body in global governance that can be effective in a world where "power is shared at the several levels by inter-state regions, states, provinces, and local authorities" (Barber, 2014, p. 320). This body, a Parliament of Mayors, could meet three times a year in different cities – to create an ongoing feeling of engagement.

The relationship between the findings of Barber and other leading theoretical work can be found in cities' growing responsibilities and the growing interconnectivity between cities all over the world.

However, Barber's idea of a Parliament of Mayors receives sharp oppositions. Therefore, implementation of Barber's idea of a Parliament of Mayors requires clarification of different important areas. The concept of decentralisation, local spheres of governance, representation, participation, mayoral elections and global challenges are the main areas of this thesis.

There are two main arguments that will show why the first area, local spheres of governance, will allow citizens to engage in local governance. Firstly, (1) engagement of citizens on local governance will arise naturally due to the shift of power towards cities. Secondly, (2) citizens are very likely to connect with their mayor. I believe that (1) "Establishing Direct Representation in the Global Parliament or in a Parallel Parliament of Regions" is the most suitable solution to the second area, representation. There are two main reasons that will explain why the area of mayoral participation does not require that all mayors attend meetings of the Parliament of Mayors. Firstly, (1) everything that the Parliament decides remains voluntary. Secondly, (2) it is relatively easy to collaborate via internet and therefore, mayors are not required to physically attend meetings. The fourth area, mayoral elections, remains the most difficult area to answer due to the differences in the world. However, Barber believes that directly elected mayors are a necessity for implementation of a Parliament of Mayors. The last area discussed in this thesis, global challenges, have a high (inter)national impact due to (1) the organisations Mayors for Peace, (2) C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group, (3) United Cities and Local Governments and due to concepts such as (4) City Visas.

Due to the differences in the world on the election or appointment of mayors, I have decided to focus merely on the Netherlands. The current situation in the Netherlands will be researched based on three different areas.

Firstly, the concept of decentralisation has been discussed. The Netherlands is very progressive on decentralising national governance. The recent changes in the Social Support Act set a perfect example of decentralisation in the Netherlands. Secondly, the discussion on implementing direct elected mayors has been explained. Implementation of direct elected mayors requires changing the Dutch constitution and therefore, approval of two third of the Second Chamber and the Senate is required. Thirdly, a clear picture of the well-functioning National and International city networks in the Netherlands will be given.

I do not believe that directly elected mayors will improve policies of local governments in the Netherlands. If Dutch mayors were to be elected directly, their responsibilities and tasks would change enormously within the municipality. Mayors should have a steering function in local government but they will be obligated to spend valuable time on politics and re-elections if mayors are elected directly. Mayors can be seen as presidents of local government, uniting councillors within their municipality and therefore I believe that they should not engage in political discussions between different political parties.

In many different occasions, cities proved that they are better than nations in tackling cross border issues such as environment and safety. Over the last decades, nations have had the tendency to work counterproductive. The reason for that behaviour is relatively easy to explain. Nations do not need each other to achieve a national goal because their main interest is the growth and sustainability of themselves. Cities however, cannot do much apart from each other but they can constitute a great power in global partnership.

A Parliament of Mayors, as a deliberative body that influences each other by using soft power, could become very important in our future. I believe that a Parliament of Mayors should use meetings as a way to share best practices, stay connected with each other and extend collaborative achievements of different city networks. If this is how Barber's Parliament of Mayors will function, it would not be significantly different from international organisations such as UCLG and therefore it would not be that different from the work that mayors all over the world are already doing on a daily basis.

A democratically elected mayor could improve policies of the local government and the perception of its inhabitants to a small extent but I do not believe that it would significantly change the level of democracy in the world. Hence, I believe that local governments and their networks are key. Collaborations between cities and municipalities through international communities and city networks such as UCLG can improve policies of the local government.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	6
Methodology.....	7
Chapter I – ‘ <i>If Mayors Ruled The World</i> ’.....	8
Chapter II – <i>Leading work</i>	11
<i>II:I – Bottom-up citizenship</i>	11
<i>II:II – ‘Glocality’</i>	12
<i>II:III – Parliament of Mayors</i>	13
<i>II:IV – Mayors in perspective</i>	14
<i>II:V – Decentralisation</i>	14
Chapter III – <i>Interim conclusion</i>	16
<i>III:I – Local spheres of governance</i>	16
<i>III:II – Representation</i>	17
<i>III:III – Participation</i>	18
<i>III:IV – Mayoral elections</i>	19
<i>III:V – Global challenges</i>	19
Chapter IV – <i>The Netherlands</i>	22
<i>IV:I – Social Support Act</i>	22
<i>IV:II – Directly elected mayors</i>	23
<i>IV:III – Different models of appointment</i>	24
<i>IV:IV – City networks</i>	25
<i>IV:V – Dutch mayors rule</i>	26
Chapter V – <i>Discussion</i>	27
<i>V:I – Democratic character</i>	27
Chapter VI – <i>Conclusion</i>	29
References.....	30

Appendix I: Research proposal.....36

Appendix II: Student Ethics Form.....42

Appendix III: Complete summary.....43

Introduction

Last year, a Dutch newspaper published an article on a book of American political scientist Benjamin R. Barber. This article ventilated Barber's opinion on the growing importance of cities. As I was looking for a suitable subject for my thesis, I was very interested to discover why and how cities could become more important than nations. I believe that it would be interesting to discuss and elaborate further on the ideas and theories that Barber points out in his book. Therefore, his book *'If Mayors Ruled The World'* will form the central source of this thesis. The concept of globalisation has always been important in the programme of European Studies and I believe that the subject of my thesis will show my knowledge and research skills. Moreover, I believe that the governmental aspect of this thesis perfectly suits my public specialisation. Due to my public specialisation, I believe that I have knowledge and insight in different processes of decision making on national and supranational level. Completing my thesis, *'Dysfunctional Nations and Rising Cities'* successfully, will allow me to graduate European Studies and show that I am a European professional.

The discussion on growing importance of cities is hardly anything new. Due to decentralisation the emphasis has been placed on cities and their inhabitants for the last decades. Different leading theorists and authors have written work on how globalisation is changing our society. When it comes to challenges and problems in an international orientated world, cities are more important than ever due to the decreasing power of nations. Nowadays, globalisation is causing nations to lose a significant amount of their power, but somehow cities maintained their power and it is even growing over time. The aim of this thesis is to discuss how to improve policies and democracy and therefore, the following central research question has been formulated: "To which extent could an elected mayor of a European city improve policies of the local government and the perception of its inhabitants?"

To understand the context of the research question, the process of answering it has been divided in four different areas. Firstly, a short summary of American political scientist Benjamin R. Barber's book *'If Mayors Ruled The World'* will be given. Barber's book is the central source of this thesis and will be summarized briefly to explain on which foundations, developments and arguments the ideas and theories of political scientist Barber are based. Secondly, the relationship between de findings of Barber and other leading theoretical work on the same subject will be explained. The third part of this thesis will focus on the essentials of the discussed theories. The differences, conflicting arguments and conclusions will be discussed here. The fourth area is a case study on local government and decentralisation in the Netherlands. The aim of this case study is to see what the current situation in the Netherlands. Moreover, the discussion of this thesis will focus on how and if a direct elected mayor will improve policies of local government in the Netherlands.

Methodology

To complete my thesis successfully, the following research methods have been selected. Benjamin R. Barber's book '*If Mayors Rule The World*' forms the central source of this thesis. To understand the ideas and theories of Benjamin R. Barber's book a literary research has been conducted. The aim of this research was to create a clear picture of Barber's view on a Parliament of Mayors. I believe that I have collected the core information and analysed it throughout this thesis. I have collected the core information in Barber's book according to the required research ethics. Moreover, Barber published a paper with answers to frequently asked questions regarding his idea of a Parliament of Mayors. This paper was published in April of this year and I believe that this thesis refers clearly towards Barber's paper.

Desk research forms the second research method of this thesis. Different opinions of journalists, politicians, authors and theorists have been collected and analysed throughout this thesis. The work of other leading theorists are used to discuss and elaborate on the most important theoretical areas of Barber's book. Due to the fact that I merely focussed on the most important theoretical areas, the incompleteness of that overview needs to be emphasized. The discussion on my central research question is ongoing and therefore, an enormous amount of information can be found. I believe that this thesis includes all important theories and views to answer the central research question to the best of my abilities.

A case study on the Netherlands will form the last research method of this thesis. This choice of research methods will demonstrate my understanding of the complex information gathered through previous research. I believe that the case study will emphasize a detailed analysis of the effects of implementing a Parliament of Mayors in the Netherlands. I decided to include a case study on the Netherlands since I am born and raised in the Netherlands. I believe that the mayoral appointment by Royal Decree could cast a different light on my research on a Parliament of Mayors.

I believe that the choice of these research methods demonstrates a very good grasp of the central research question of this thesis. Moreover, I believe that these methods are aligned with the aims and objectives of this thesis.

Chapter I: Benjamin Barber, *'If Mayors Ruled the World'*

Benjamin R. Barber's *'If Mayors Ruled The World'* is the central source of this thesis. This chapter consists of a summary of Barber's book, to create a concise but clear picture of the core thoughts and opinions that are important in the next chapters. Logically, it is impossible to summarize six hundred pages into three without losing important information. However, in view of the proportions and readability of this thesis, a sufficient amount of information is given. Moreover, a complete summary of *'If Mayors Ruled The World'* is added in Appendix III. To avoid ambiguities, the further text contains clarifications of essential ideas and theories in the most minimal way in this chapter.

In a world of too many differences and too little solidarity, democracy is in a deep crisis. The nation-state had a long history of success, but today it is failing its citizens on a global scale. Over the last hundred years, nation-states focussed on maximizing internal unity and jurisdictional sovereignty. Therefore, they were more likely to create rivalry instead of cooperation among themselves. The world is facing many problems that cross borders such as air pollution and global warming. Due to the resistant behaviour of nations towards cross-border collaboration, solutions for many of these issues are not found. The city could become democracy's best hope, since the city has always been the first resort of human habitat (Barber, 2014, p.2). Benjamin R. Barber, American political theorist and author states in his latest book *'If Mayors Ruled the World'* that "nation-states have never actually governed the world or shown much capacity to do so. The social contract helped democratize nations from within but actually impeded the development of democracy *among* nations" (Barber, 2014, p. 74). The aim of Barber's book is to focus on the ability of cities to cooperate across borders and govern globally in ways that nations cannot. Barber believes that "our foremost political challenge today is to discover or establish alternative institutions capable of addressing the multiplying problems of an interdependent world without surrendering democracy" (Barber, 2014, p.4). In his book, Barber claims that true democracy can be achieved if we let cities do what states cannot. "Let mayors rule the world" (Barber, 2014, p. 4). Barber describes how nation-states became too large to allow meaningful participation and remain too small to address centralized global power. Nations are unable to grow without diminishing other nations. They are dysfunctional in their ability to collaborate across borders. Cities however, are likely to grow with each other through cross border collaboration. Therefore, Barber envisions a world governed by cities that will place the emphasis on bottom-up citizenship, civil society and voluntary community across borders. In the current new age of globalization, the city is at its peak. Trade, art, manufacturing, innovation, creativity and entrepreneurship revolve around the city's diversity. Today, the key to urban sustainability is diversity. Cities prefer problem solving, and

their inclination to networking is their core strength. Barber outlines a body in global governance that can be effective in a world where “power is shared at the several levels by inter-state regions, states, provinces, and local authorities” (Barber, 2014, p. 320). This body, a Parliament of Mayors, could meet three times a year in different cities – to create an ongoing feeling of engagement. Every meeting includes a different set of cities to make sure that every city has the option to participate. Given the fact that there are a numerous amount of cities, Barber imagines three classes of cities, based on population, eligible to be represented in the parliament by their mayors. This “three-trance structure would include (1) Megacities with populations of 10 million or more (50 seats), (2) Cities with 500,000 to 10 million population (125 seats) and (3) Cities with a population of 50,000 to 500,000 people (125 seats)” (Barber, 2014, p. 354). The Parliament of Mayors only serves a useful deliberative and symbolic purpose and therefore, all policies and measures remain voluntary. Obviously, cities could decide to pursue ideas and policies whether or not these ideas won a majority in the parliament. Furthermore, mayors are required to appear in person during the first meetings of the Parliament of Mayors so that they can represent their communities. To include citizens, each mayor has the option to bring a citizen as informal advisers and colleagues.

To make sure that the meetings from the Parliament of Mayors are productive, a session from the Parliament may be limited to 300 cities per session. Otherwise, since cities represent millions of individual citizens, the meetings may become vague. Moreover, to make sure that cities from each category can engage, selection of participants of each meeting will be chosen arbitrary. Even though implementation of decisions remains voluntary, the Parliament of Mayors will have the option to vote. “The vote count whether by city or demographic units would be exclusively for purposes of information and public opinion. Cities would participate in opting in or out of decisions of the mayors parliament though referenda. Mayors would retain the possibility for their own city’s deliberative position in the parliament but also have the responsibility to gain the city’s assent” (Barber, 2014, p. 353). The success of this project, according to Barber, lies in the fact that cities remain local but have an opportunity to act global – “glocal”. This means that cities are aware of requests and needs of their citizens at the bottom (local) and share this specific information at the top (global). “As nations grow more dysfunctional, cities *are* rising. (Barber, 2014, p. 359).

In this chapter, a short introduction to the ideas and theories discussed in Benjamin R. Barber’s book *‘If Mayors Ruled The World’* has been given. Due to declining nations and rising cities, Barber’s Parliament of Mayors could be a good solution. Key ingredients for the idea of a Parliament of Mayors are dividing cities according Barber’s “three-trance structure” and ensure that mayors meet three times a year in different cities. The goal of these mayoral meetings is to share public opinions and

information. Implementing a Parliament of Mayors according to Barber's key ingredients could become a useful deliberative body. According to Barber, cities are our future. Hence, "when it comes to democracy, cities command the majority. They define interdependence and public culture and thus reasons enough- good reasons- why mayors and their fellow citizens can and should rule the world" (Barber, 2014, p. 359). The next chapters of this thesis will elaborate further on Barber's idea of a Parliament of Mayors and opinions and viewpoints of other leading theorists, politicians and journalists will be included.

Chapter II: what is the relationship between the findings of Barber and other leading theoretical work on this subject?

To create broad perspectives and give insight in the position that Barber takes, it is important to clarify the theoretical framework of this thesis. However, whether mayors should or should not rule the world is not easy to answer. The ongoing central question engages lots of politicians, political theorists, publicists and journalists. Naturally, there are numerous reactions on Barber's work. Nevertheless, elaborating on all the details, would ignore the function of this chapter. Therefore, a selection of the most important theoretical areas, according to Barber's book has been made. This chapter will highlight where, by whom and how supporting and different views are argued. At last, the incompleteness of this overview needs to be emphasized. However, this thesis includes all the information that is needed for a good understanding of the central research question.

II.1 Bottom-up citizenship

One of the main foundations on which Barber's book is based, is the concept of bottom-up citizenship. Barber believes "that the political is grounded in the civic, that democratic governance whether local or global must first find its corresponding spirit and character in democratic civil society. The failure of political constitution making, often originates in a failure to recognize this bottom-up character of democracy" (Barber, 2014, p. 299).

Political engagement of citizens and other non-state actors has always been a major point of discussion. "There are organizations and institutions that play a role in global civic relations and chief among them are nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and multinational corporations (MNCs). Such non-state actors are patently significant" (Barber, 2014, p. 310). It is noteworthy that the United Nations itself has increasingly recognized the role of non-national actors in global affairs. Former secretary general Kofi Annan thus allowed: "The United Nations once dealt only with Governments. By now we know that peace and prosperity cannot be achieved without partnership involving Governments, international organisations, the business community and civil society. In today's world, we depend on each other. That is the meaning of an interdependent world based on true democracy" (Annan, 2014).

For this bottom-up-theory, Barber receives support from Janne E. Nijman, author of the paper '*Cities in a global setting: the growing autonomy of cities in the global legal order*'. She believes that globalisation contributes to the growing independent role of cities at the global stage. In her paper, she states that cities "increasingly develop independent global economic relations and compete for direct foreign investments to spur their local economy and the number of jobs. Cities are the loci of our

global challenges: air pollution, migration and the protection of human rights show their human dimensions in the cities” (Nijman, 2013, p. 2).

Barber believes that strong bottom-up citizenship will arise naturally due to the sense of closeness and trust that defines a city. In April of this year, Barber published a paper with answers on questions, which he said were frequently asked. Here he explained how he envisions the functioning of his idea of a Parliament of Mayors. Barber describes his Parliament as a “virtual platform that engages citizens in horizontal networks of cooperation with one another, and a vertical connection to mayors and their parliament” (Barber, 2014).

However, the idea of bottom-up citizenship contradicts with the vision on local politics of Doug Saunders, columnist of ‘Globe and Mail International Affairs’ and author of ‘*Arrival City*’. Saunders believes that strong bottom-up citizenship is facing a major obstacle: the lack of interest in local politics, what makes local politics less democratic than national politics. According to Saunders this is due to the fact that “there are fewer people voting, fewer citizens aware who their representatives are, fewer media outlets watching the politicians and their deliberations and fewer high-profile watchdog bodies” (Saunders, 2014).

II:II ‘Glocality’

To describe the kind of city-based cosmopolitanism in cities that Barber believes we should aspire, he uses the term ‘glocality’. This term implies the relationship between the global and the local and it is based upon the interconnectivity of cities all over the world. Cities can be described as ineluctably interdependent and they rather define themselves through “bridging capital – hooking them up with domains outside their boundaries, than through bonding capital – unifying them internally” (Barber, 2014, p. 113). Cities are deeply politically and civically connected to work towards a global economy and a global culture. City networks are doing major work in the settings of transnational cooperation. These networks are equally as important as cities themselves.

For this specific theory, Barber finds support in the work of leading theorists that have worked on the same topic. In an interview with Jonathan Derbyshire, journalist from ‘*Prospect Magazine*’, Barber states that he finds a great deal of support in the work of Castells since he believes that cities are connected through the kind of services they provide. (Derbyshire, 2013). Castells has shown that the connection of cities is much deeper rooted than nation states can ever be. These types of cities are also known as global cities, which Saskia Sassen defines as inter-connected and inter-dependent cities that cooperates with other cities. Sassen’s work offers important information about how globalisation takes place in cities all over the world and therefore, Barber finds support in her work. In her essay on ‘*New Mobility of People and Money*’, Sassen describes how globalisation takes place in globally connected cities and explains that globalisation is not an abstract, de-territorialised phenomenon, but

something that takes place in our cities. Thus, instead of collaborating nations, the networks that cities generate are key in globalisation. In Barber's paper on frequently asked questions, Barber points out that global networks of partnership between cities already exist. Including, what he believes is the most important global institution of all: 'United Cities and Local Governments' (UCLG). This institution has "annual meetings of thousands of cities and already provides a kind of super structure or infrastructure of the many other, more siloed inter-city associations that co-operate around global issues." (Barber, 2014).

II:III Parliament of mayors

Barber believes that the world needs a government of collaborating cities and municipalities and therefore, he suggests a Parliament of Mayors since it is the best solution to create true democracy in the world.

Nevertheless, an idea of a Parliament of Mayors can be seen as a very controversial idea and thus, it naturally leads to criticism and discussion. Benjamin R. Barber presented his book at a non-profit TEDx event. This non-profit organisation is devoted to spreading ideas in communities around the world, usually in the form of a short presentation or talk. Several other contributors to the organisation are debating heavily on Barber's idea of a parliament of mayors. Theorists like Charles Montgomery, author of '*Happy City*', Doug Saunders, author of '*Arrival City*' and Alan Ehrenhalt, senior editor of governing.com continuously engaged in the debate on a Parliament of Mayors.

The idea of a parliament of mayors presents many logistical obstacles. As Alan Ehrenhalt, Senior Editor of governing.com states: "Barber wants to include mayors from each city with a population of more than 50,000. On a global scale, this means tens of thousands of jurisdictions. In the United States alone, there are 726 cities with populations of 50,000 or more. With just a few hundred mayors at each meeting, it would be decades before all the cities of sufficient size could participate in even one session" (Ehrenhalt, 2014).

As Charles Montgomery, author of '*Happy City: Transforming Our Lives Through Urban Design*' claims, mayors should have a larger role in national and international affairs. His argument basically comes down to the psychology used in the process of decision-making. According to Montgomery "humans often fail to maximize utility in the long run" (Montgomery, 2014). He believes that this is especially true for politicians since "local mayors tend to feel a greater sense of urgency around issues that barely register for national and even provincial decision-makers. Yet too often, mayors depend on higher-level politicians for permission even to make basic local decisions" (Montgomery, 2014).

The already mentioned Doug Saunders, one of leading theorists in this area, agrees with the idea of a global Parliament of Mayors in principle. He acknowledges that mayors are a crucial source

of policy making since the most important challenges, solutions and opportunities to global problems will be played out in cities. However, in practice Saunders wonders if “this would have much impact nationally or internationally, beyond its obvious value as a forum for mayors to share policy knowledge and best practices (which is valuable enough on its own)” (Saunders, 2014).

II:IV Mayors in perspective

In his book, Barber introduces the reader with several mayors of which he believes would set a perfect example for a Parliament of Mayors. Bertrand Delanoë, former mayor of Paris, who launched the largest and most famous smart bike-sharing system in the history of the city, is one of them. The importance of mayors that set an example, like Delanoë, is obvious. Their ideas and actions are indeed mentioned, explained and praised in other articles. For instance: ‘In less than “two years, Vélib (Vélo libre – free bicycle) has become a 24/7 high performance service with 20,600 bikes and 1,451 stations” (Midgely, 2009). The concept of bike-sharing became a large success and therefore, the bike-sharing systems are “currently operating in 78 cities in 16 countries using around 70,000 bikes” (Midgely, 2009).

The most outstanding example of a progressive mayor in Barber’s book is set by Michael Bloomberg. Bloomberg was the mayor of New York City from January 2002 until December 2013, and is well-known for his lack of political debts and therefore he created several innovative plans. It is interesting to see if Bloomberg became one of Barber’s favourite mayors by chance, or that his opinions, public performances and actions are based on a belief that matches with the opinions of Barber, which seems to be the case.

Bloomberg believes that mayors should work hard to tackle world issues such as global warming. Therefore, he promoted sustainable development to fight climate change. Bloomberg’s innovative plans “helped cut city’s carbon footprint by 19 percent” (“About Mike Bloomberg”, 2014). Bloomberg claims that collaborating mayors is what makes cities work whereas they can make a difference. This belief led him to launch “national bi-partisan coalitions to combat illegal guns, reform immigration and invest in infrastructure”(“About Mike Bloomberg”, 2014).

II:V Decentralisation

Ultimately, It is necessary to clarify that the sharp oppositions in this chapter are not always visible when put into practise: an important development in Barber’s vision is decentralizing power from nations to cities. Exactly this process of decentralisation is propagated by several national governments.

According to previously mentioned Janne E. Nijman, “decentralisation is seen as a key element in good governance, which stimulates democracy and political participation of citizens” (Nijman, 2013, p. 5). The majority of cities or municipalities is in search of a more prominent role and

since nations depend on cities and municipalities, they can demand more governmental and political power. Moreover, the concept of decentralisation also receives support from the European Union since it means that the gap between government and political decision making on the one hand and the populace on the other is closing. One of the national governments which is in favour of decentralisation is the Dutch government. The Dutch government aims to promote the autonomy of local governments since they favour the idea of what can be done locally should be locally. This approach is adopted in the Coalition agreement and therefore a very important feature of the Dutch political culture. The political situation in the Netherlands will be discussed further in Chapter IV.

As described in this Chapter, the concept of bottom-up citizenship is one of the main foundations of Benjamin R. Barber's book *'If Mayors Ruled the World'*. To describe the kind of city-based cosmopolitanism in cities, that Barber believes we should aspire, he uses the term 'glocality'. This term implies the relationship between the global and the local and it is based upon the interconnectivity of cities all over the world. Barber points out that global networks of partnership between cities already exist. Including, what he believes is the most important global institution of all: 'United Cities and Local Governments' (UCLG). An important development for implementing a Parliament of Mayors is decentralizing power from nations to cities. Exactly this process of decentralisation is propagated by several national governments. The relationship between the findings of Barber and other leading theoretical work can be found in cities' growing responsibilities and the growing interconnectivity between cities all over the world. However, Barber's idea of a Parliament of Mayors receives sharp oppositions. Alan Ehrenhalt's opinion on the logistical features, Charles Montgomery's opinion on local participation and Doug Saunders opinion on the (inter)national impact of a Parliament of Mayors will be pillars for further research. These will be discussed and elaborated in depth in Chapter III.

Chapter III: Interim conclusion

Essentials of theories, conflicting arguments and pillars for further research

The ongoing central question engages lots of politicians, political theorists, publicists and journalists. However, as described in the previous chapter, opinions about growing local governments are not significantly different. Most theorists acknowledge and support the growing importance of cities in global governance. This chapter will discuss the previously mentioned pillars for further research: logistical features, participation of citizens and the (inter)national impact of implementation of a Parliament of Mayors. Moreover, this chapter describes and elaborates the discussions on representation and mayoral elections. The incompleteness of this overview of theories needs to be emphasized since this chapter merely contains a selection of the most important theoretical areas, established on the basis of the discussed theories in Benjamin R. Barber's *'If Mayors Ruled The World'*. However, all the necessary information to continue the research on the central research question of this thesis will be given.

III:I Local spheres of governance

Cities are deeply politically and civically connected to work towards a global economy and a global culture. Barber's essential theory is based on cities which develop new direct relations and cooperate with global institutions through the empowerment of globalisation and decentralisation. Therefore, cities can actively claim a position on the global stage. Due to the new position of cities, the direct interaction between the global and the local spheres of governance increase.

To enhance the interaction between the global and the local spheres of governance, strong bottom-up citizenship is required. However, Saunders believes that bottom-up citizenship is facing a major obstacle. He states that municipal politics tends to be less democratic than national or supranational politics because of the lack of interest in local politics. Saunders believes that this is due to the fact that "there are fewer people voting, fewer citizens aware who their representatives are, fewer media outlets watching the politicians and their deliberations and fewer high-profile watchdog bodies" (Saunders, 2014). Saunders's criticism may be true since all the important decisions are still made on a national or supranational level and engagement in local government does not necessarily make any substantial difference. However, if the power shifts towards local governments, it seems only logical that the perception of citizens about local governance will change. It seems very likely that citizens will engage more in local politics because their participation will make a difference. Moreover, the connection between citizens and their mayor is a good reason for citizens to participate since they are more likely to connect to their mayor than to their president or prime minister. To

citizens, mayors may seem more significant due to their local behaviour. As Barber states in his book: “Mayors always loom large, personifying the traffic jam or the snowstorm and the imperative to address them. Mayors count nowadays, even more in the age of globalization than in the past” (Barber, 2014, p. 85).

III:II Representation

The execution of Barber’s essential idea, a Parliament of Mayors, can be seen as quite controversial. The parliament Barber envisions, will “operate the absence of sovereign coercive authority, agreed-upon common law, and any means of enforcement, would not exercise executive power by command. It would of necessity rely on persuasion and consensus” (Barber, 2014, p. 341). Therefore, it might even be assumed that the parliament could act as “a kind of Audiament – a chamber of listeners, where to hear is more important than to speak” (Barber, 2014, p. 341) Barber envisions three classes of cities, based on population, “eligible to be represented in the parliament by their mayors; to pursue representation, they would have to elect to join the group from which cities are chosen by lot: (1) Megacities with populations of 10 million or more (50 seats), (2) Cities with 500,000 to 10 million population (125 seats) and (3) Cities of 50,000 to 500,000 (125 seats)” (Barber, 2014 p. 353). However, representation might become a major obstacle. As demographic figures stand today, half the planet would not be represented since the idea of a Parliament of Mayors is city-based. Barber believes that there are realistic paths to enhance democratic legitimacy for his proposed kind of global governance. As mentioned in his book, he believes that there are six possible ways to reach accountability and representation in the best possible way.

III:II:I “Representing Commuters”

The first one is the concept of “Representing Commuters”. this would “secure a representative voice for those who work in but do not reside in cities. This concept would effectively incorporate suburbia and exurbia into the city. Commuters are often required to pay a city tax, with place of work trumping residence which is a good reason to offer them some form of representation in a global mayors parliament” (Barber, 2014, p. 345).

III:II:II “Including Regions within Urban Representative District”

The second concept is based on “Including Regions within Urban Representative District”. This concept would “include regions on the urban periphery within greater metropolitan areas and establish a modern equivalent of the medieval notion that the burg or walled town encompassed and belonged to the regional population for purposes of safety, jurisdiction, and military protection” (Barber, 2014, p. 345).

III:II:III “Extending the Electoral District”

The third concept is based on “Extending the Electoral District”. This concept could be implemented for “purposes of representation in the global parliament. The urban electoral district might be extended to include the region as an urban electoral district” (Barber, 2014, p. 346).

III:II:IV “Guaranteeing Opt-in/Opt-out Rights”

The fourth one is the concept of “Guaranteeing Opt-in/Opt-out Rights”. This would mean that “regional constituents can be empowered to opt in or out of decisions made by their anchor city or by the parliament of mayors without possessing voting rights in the city” (Barber, 2014, p. 346).

III:II:V “Establishing Direct Representation in the Global Parliament or in a Parallel Parliament of Regions”

“Establishing Direct Representation in the Global Parliament or in a Parallel Parliament of Regions” is the fifth concept and probably the most beneficial for regions. This concept means that “regions might elect their own representatives to the parliament of mayors or to a parallel body such as a parallel parliament of regions. Such a parallel body might be a second chamber in a global bicameral parliament” (Barber, 2014, p. 346).

III:II:VI “Representation as a Trusteeship”

The last concept is the concept of “Representation as Trusteeship”. This concept would allow regions to “treat representation as trusteeship and representatives as trustees” (Barber, 2014, p. 247).

III:III Participation

Another point of discussion, according to Alan Ehrenhalt is the fact that there will be just a few hundred mayors at each meeting. Ehrenhalt states that “it would take decades before all mayors of sufficient cities could even participate in one session” (Ehrenhalt, 2014). This may sound as fair criticism but the parliament that Barber envisions would rely on persuasion and consensus. Barber’s idea of a Parliament of Mayors, based on population, serves merely a “useful deliberative and symbolic purpose” (Barber, 2014 p. 354). Since everything that the Parliament of Mayors decides remains voluntary, it is not necessary that all mayors attend every meeting to reach a consensus. Each city remains free to pursue ideas and policies that they would like to implement. Moreover, in the current age of globalisation, it is relatively easy to collaborate online via conference calls. Therefore, it is not necessary for mayors to physically attend the meetings of the Parliament of Mayors.

III:IV Mayoral elections

Since the Parliament of Mayors will consist of mayors across the world, the election process of mayors might be another point of discussion. As Barber fairly states in his book, “In a number of countries, mayors aren’t directly elected by city burghers. Instead, they are appointed by party or state

authorities. In others, bureaucratic city managers run the show. Even when powerful elected mayors govern their own metropolises forcefully, they can scarcely be said to be ruling the world. The world is not being ruled by anyone, let alone democratically. It is pushed around by warring states and feuding tribes, dominated by rival multinational corporations and banks, and shaped by competing ideologies and religions that often deny each other's core convictions" (Barber, 2014, p. 84). To create a true democratic Parliament of Mayors, direct elections of mayors is a necessity. Mayors should act on what their cities need instead of acting on political or constitutional factors. Mayors are shaped by their city. They face common challenges on a daily basis and therefore, a set of common skills and competences adapted to their city is required. "Getting things done demands from mayors unique talents and personality traits not necessarily appropriate to other political offices. Among those that seem to mark successful mayors are (1) a strong personality marked by both hubris and humor, (2) a pragmatic approach to governing, (3) personal engagement in city affairs, and (4) commitment to the city as a unique entity and a possible and even likely career terminus" (Barber, 2014, p.88).

III:V Global challenges

Currently, the world is dealing with many diverse global issues. Great successes can be achieved through the use of cross-border cooperation. However, nations have the tendency to work counterproductive when it comes to addressing global issues. Cross-border collaboration is hardly new, cities have benefited from cooperating across the territorial border and solved many problems where states have failed. As Barber points out in his book, there are two vital categories of global networks where nations fail to succeed: security and environment. Some of the issues the world is facing today, are better tackled by cities than by nations. Safety issues such as weapons of mass destruction and global terrorism for example, require a intercity cooperation across borders and pre-empting necessary implementation in target cities. The highest concentration of population has always been in cities and therefore, they are especially vulnerable to attacks. Since cities are most at risk, they are most suitable to address these safety issues themselves. When it comes to terrorism for example, nations always concentrated on addressing the issues at the point of origin whereas municipalities work together and focus on the safety of the target cities.

III:V:I Mayors for Peace

One of the networks that generate cities' safety is the organisation of "Mayors for Peace". This organisation is based in Hiroshima, Japan and it consists of 566 cities in 157 different countries. The mission of Mayors for Peace is "to strive to raise international public awareness regarding the need to abolish nuclear weapons through close cooperation among the cities. To contribute to the realization of genuine and lasting world peace by working to eliminate starvation and poverty, assist refugees

fleeing local conflict, support human rights, protect the environment, and solve the other problems that threaten peaceful coexistence within the human family” (Mayors for Peace Secretariat, 2000).

III:V:II C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group

Furthermore, cities are very persistent about addressing the environmental crisis. The current environmental situation is the most catastrophic challenge cities are facing. However, since as much as “80 percent of human-generated carbon emissions come from cities” (Barber, 2014, p. 131), it seems only logical that cities address the environmental crisis. There are many city networks that focus on the environmental situation but it can be said the “C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group (C40)” is the most progressive organisation. C40 is based in New York City, America, and it consists of 58 global cities. The C40 is “committed to implementing meaningful and sustainable climate related actions locally that will help address climate change globally. C40 Cities are having a meaningful global impact in reducing both greenhouse gas emissions and climate risks” (C40, 2014).

III:V:III United Cities and Local Governments

The strength of cities is the fact that they share all their information with each other through different international networks. One of the most important networks for sharing best practises across the world is “United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG). The UCLG is based in Barcelona, Spain and founded in 2004, when the largest assembly of mayors and elected officials formed the organisation during a gathering in Paris. The organisation’s mission statement is “to be the united voice and world advocate of democratic local self-government, promoting its values, objectives and interests, through cooperation between local governments, and within the wider international community” (UCLG, 2014). It is very important for cities to share best practices with each other. Cities share best practices to share information on how and why something worked out well for a specific city. This makes it easy for other cities and municipalities to gain knowledge and implement that specific best practice in their city or municipality. Continues innovation of cities and municipalities is the aim of sharing this specific information.

III:V:IV City Visa’s

However, as critics have mentioned, there are also more complex and controversial issues that needs to be resolved. Global migration issues is one of the more complex issues that the world is facing. In many cases, nations would like to see these issues resolved but they cannot engage due to political reasons. Therefore, nations may be willing to have cities deal with these issues and from such a dilemma, perhaps one of the most controversial experiments arose: a proposal to implement “city visas” (Fuller, 2012). This is an idea which is developed by the Urbanization Project at New York University Stern. The idea of city visas would allow “a greater number of law-abiding immigrants into

the American cities that want them most, could do more for global welfare” (Fuller, 2012). It is understandably that not every city will welcome additional migration but the cities that can benefit economically from migration, could implement city visas. To avoid problems, the Department of Security could “accept or reject the applications of cities wishing to participate in the program” (Fuller, 2012). This will simplify the mapping of the clearing and distribution of visa holders. Moreover, it also will help to “ensure that only American cities meeting acceptable standards of governance would be free to sponsor immigrants and their families” (Fuller, 2012). The idea of city visas would be beneficial for both the visa provider and the visa holder. It could be a perfect solution for cities who need to stabilize their population and boost the economy. Visa holders will benefit as well since a ‘city visa’ could be “a path to permanent residency and eventually citizenship. Visa holders would be free to bring their immediate family members with them” (Fuller, 2012).

As seen in this chapter, five areas for implementation of Barber’s Parliament of Mayors (local spheres of governance, representation, participation, mayoral elections and global challenges) were explained in detail according to the ideas and theories of Benjamin R. Barber.

There are two main arguments that will show why the first area, local spheres of governance, will allow citizens to engage in local governance. Firstly, (1) engagement of citizens on local governance will arise naturally due to the shift of power towards cities. Secondly, (2) citizens are very likely to connect with their mayor. I believe that (1) “Establishing Direct Representation in the Global Parliament or in a Parallel Parliament of Regions” is the most suitable solution to the area of representation because it will secure the interest of regions. There are two main reasons that will explain why the area of mayoral participation does not require that all mayors attend meetings of the Parliament of Mayors. Firstly, (1) everything that the Parliament decides remains voluntary. Secondly, (2) it is relatively easy to collaborate via internet and therefore, mayors are not required to physically attend meetings. The fourth area, mayoral elections, remains the most difficult area to answer due to the differences in the world. However, Barber believes that directly elected mayors are a necessity for implementation of a Parliament of Mayors. The last area discussed in this chapter, global challenges, have a high (inter)national impact due to (1) the organisations Mayors for Peace, (2) C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group, (3) United Cities and Local Governments and due to concepts such as (4) City Visas. Due to the differences in the world on the election or appointment of mayors, I have decided to focus merely on the Netherlands. Therefore, the next chapter of this thesis will elaborate on the existing situation in the Netherlands. A conclusion on directly elected mayors in the Netherlands can be found in the discussion of this thesis.

Chapter IV: Case study The Netherlands

As mentioned in Chapter II, decentralisation is a growing concept in the Dutch culture. A clear description of changed laws on social support will be given. Moreover, an introduction to discussions on mayoral elections will be issued. The final part of this chapter will elaborate on existing (international) city networks in the Netherlands and their value. Throughout this thesis, a clear vision on the ideas and theories of Barber's book *'If Mayors Ruled The World'* has been given. One of the main foundations of implementing a Parliament of Mayors is electing mayors democratically. However, I believe that it would not be beneficial for the Netherlands to elect mayors democratically. To explain why I believe that the concept of directly elected mayors is not applicable in the Netherlands, a clear overview of the current situation in the Netherlands will be given in this chapter.

IV:1 Social Support Act

The Dutch national government aims to promote the autonomy of local governments since they favour the idea of what can be done locally should be locally. This approach is adopted in their Coalition agreement and very visible in the Dutch society.

On the 8th of July, the Dutch government revised a social law which makes a clear example of decentralization in the Netherlands. The law WMO (Wet Maatschappelijke Ondersteuning, Social Support Act) stated that the Dutch Government was responsible for the social support of their citizens but that has been revised recently. In 2015, the responsibility of social support will be in the hands of Dutch municipalities. This may not seem as an enormous change but the change in law means that the Dutch municipalities are also responsible for the care of citizens with disabilities and citizens in need of extra and/or special care. The Dutch national government believes that municipalities can make a better estimation of what their citizens need and how they are going to provide their citizens with this extra care. The ultimate goal of the change in law is that citizens will receive better and more personalized help based on their specific needs. According Otwin van Dijk, care councillor of political party PvdA (Partij van de Arbeid, a moderate left party), the revised WMO law "will be an enormous progress in the Dutch healthcare system" (van Dijk, 2014). People in need of specialized care will have more ownership over their own care, they can receive care in their own neighbourhood and they will save a substantial amount of money. The Dutch national government implemented the changes to the Social Support Act as an economy measure. Therefore, the adoption of the changes in the Dutch WMO law will benefit citizens, municipalities and the Dutch national government.

IV:II Directly elected mayors

The Netherlands strive for a decentralized and democratic country. However, mayors in the Netherlands are not directly elected. The Dutch constitution states that mayors get appointed by Royal Decree based on recommendations from city councils. Thus, Dutch mayors get appointed by the King or Queen instead of being elected by citizens. Mayors wear a chain of office and get appointed for a six year period. After the first six years, they can be reappointed. According to one of the major political parties in the Netherlands, the procedure of appointing mayors is not very democratic and therefore, they have been advocating for direct elected mayors since the beginning of their existence. D66 (Democratisch '66, a moderate right party) made enormous progress in their political fight for implementing directly elected mayors. Since 2000, discussions started in both the First and the Second Chamber to change the constitution, wherefore mayors would be directly elected. However, to change the constitution, it is necessary that two third of the Second Chamber and the Senate need to give their approval. Former D66 councillor De Graaf proposed implementation of elected mayors in September 2003 but his idea was heavily criticized by other councillors of different political parties. De Graaf kept lobbying for the idea of elected mayors but his proposal was officially rejected by the First Chamber in March, 2005 and De Graaf resigned as councillor. The official reason for the rejection of the idea of direct elected mayors is because De Graaf wanted to change the constitution too fast and because of the expected low voter turnout. However, as mentioned in previous chapters, local elections does not necessarily mean a low voter turnout. Citizens would need some time to adapt to the change from national to local government.

IV:III Different forms of appointment

Due to the continues discussions on how mayors are appointed, it would be interesting to research both the disadvantages and the advantages of different models of appointment. The two models of appointment that are relevant for the Netherlands are appointment by Royal Decree and direct elections.

IV:III:I Royal Decree

Appointment by Royal Decree means that the King or Queen of the Netherlands appoints the mayor. This has been the case in the Netherlands since 1848. Logically, due to the lack of democracy in this process, there are numerous arguments in favour and against this model of appointing mayors. An advantage of appointment by Royal Decree is that (1) the King or Queen could appoint a mayor according to his field of expertise or administrative power. This would mean that the most suitable mayor will be appointed in the region where he is most needed. Secondly, (2) the King or Queen could appoint a mayor that has no specific interest within the municipality. This would prevent any kind of conflict of interest. The last argument in favour of appointing mayors by Royal Decree is based on the

fact that (3) the King or Queen could appoint a mayor that does not engage in political parties and therefore, he can be considered as neutral.

A disadvantage of appointment by Royal Decree is that (1) the appointed mayor is not familiar with the local culture and customs in the region in which he works. This could mean that a mayor does not develop a connection with that specific region. Secondly, (2) the local population has no influence on the process of appointment. This could cause friction between the local population and their mayor. Moreover, (3) the procedure is not transparent for the local population due to the Royal Decree.

The advantages and disadvantages of appointment by Royal Decree came into view when a Dutch singer, bar-owner and lifelong resident of Utrecht, recently applied for the job of mayor in his city. His application was turned down by Royal Decree: Westbroek has no administrative experience, so his expertise and capability are very questionable. On the contrary, polls have shown that Westbroek was the favourite candidate among Utrecht's citizens. However, Royal Decree appointed one of the other 26 candidates.

IV:III:II Direct elections

As previously mentioned, discussions around democratically electing mayors started in the Netherlands in 2000. However, the concept of direct elected mayors was never fully implemented. Due to the continues discussion on direct elected mayors, there are both arguments in favour and arguments against democratically electing mayors in the Netherlands. The main argument in favour of electing mayors directly is based on (1) the connection between the mayor and the local population. Due to the influence that the local population has on electing mayors, it will be very likely that the elected mayor suits the needs of the local government and therefore, the local population could have a connection with the elected mayor. Secondly, (2) elections could mean that the local population will engage more in local governance. This could be highly beneficial for both local government and its inhabitants. Another major advantage about directly electing mayors is (3) that the process can be perceived as highly transparent due to its democratic character.

A disadvantage of electing mayors is that (1) the local population could base their vote on popularity. Therefore, mayors could lose valuable time on re-elections instead of spending it on actually governing their city or municipality. Secondly, (2) it is very likely that mayors are will be dependent on the support of local political parties. This could mean that mayors are obligated to make specific political decisions to remain support of local political parties. The last argument against directly elected mayors is based on the fact that (3) it will be highly unlikely that every citizen will feel represented by the elected mayor.

IV:IV City networks

Even though Dutch mayors are not directly elected, it does not mean that they do not have the best interest of their citizens at heart. For example, Annemarie Jorritsma – mayor of Almere prioritizes city relations and cross-border collaboration. Jorritsma believes that municipalities need to work together to establish a strong and united front. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that mayor Jorritsma has been Director of the Board of the Association of Dutch Municipalities since 2008. The Association of Dutch Municipalities (VNG) is an umbrella organisation which represents the interest of Dutch municipalities. The VNG is a service organisation which offers a platform for sharing and discussing information with the aim to stimulate innovation. The direction of the VNG consist of mayors and councillors of both big and small municipalities from different political backgrounds to guarantee objectivity. VNG represents their municipalities not only at a national level, but also at international level because the VNG believes that cross border collaboration benefits local and regional authorities. Therefore, they participate in numerous international oriented organisations and networks such as UCLG, CEMR, Committee of the Regions, and the Congress of the Council of Europe.

By becoming a member of the United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), the VNG shows that their organisation is supporting the global agenda to promote local and regional governance on a global scale. The European section of the UCLG is the Council of European Municipalities and Regions (CEMR). CEMR is the European umbrella organisation of national associations of municipalities and regions. It consists of members in 35 different countries with more than 100.000 affiliated municipalities. Therefore, CEMR is the largest European organisation to represent local and regional governments from the European Union. Other important organisations in which the VNG participates are the Committee of the Regions and the Congress of the Council of Europe. The Committee of the Regions (CoR) has its main focus on local and regional authorities in the European Union and tries to forward their points of view on European legislation. CoR functions mostly as an advisory body by issuing reports on Commissions proposals. Due to CoR's legislative character, being a member is helpful for the VNG and therefore also for Dutch municipalities. This way, the CoR can lobby for the VNG and Dutch municipalities. The Congress of the Council of Europe is an intergovernmental European organisation and has its main focus on creating and supporting unity, democracy, the rule of law and human rights in Europe. The Congress of the Council of Europe consists of 47 member states. The reason why membership is important for the VNG and Dutch municipalities, is because the Council of Europe encourages both decentralisation and regionalisation processes. Cross border collaboration between cities and regions is another core focus of the CoR. To maximize the utility of Europe and organisations such as UCLG and CEMR, the VNG opened an office in Brussels in and a European Centre of Expertise in the Hague; Direction Europe. The

Direction Europe informs Dutch municipalities about European legislation and subsidiaries. Thus, The VNG took major steps in representing and defending the interest of Dutch municipalities.

The Dutch government highly values the input of municipalities and therefore, it remains very important for the Dutch government that the interests of municipalities are being represent in the best possible way. Hence, the importance of city networks. Even though Dutch mayors are not elected directly, they collaborate very productive through organisations such as the VNG.

IV:V – Dutch mayors rule

When decisions made on a national level conflict with local interests, Dutch mayors are not afraid to speak up. A clear example of the progressive attitude of Dutch mayors can be found in reactions on implementation of ‘de wietpas’ (the weed card). ‘De wietpas’ is a system in which only registered Dutch citizens can go to a coffeeshop for weed and hashish. The national government implemented this card to exclude weed-tourists. The aim of this card is to minimize drug-tourism and nuisance. Mayors however, pointed out that weed-tourists still visit the Netherlands, but due to the implementation of ‘de wietpas’, tourists go to dealers on the street. This will cause even more nuisance. Moreover, it harms local inhabitants who visit coffeeshops. This example of mayors standing up for local interest and decision making, is a clear Dutch example of ‘Mayors ruling the world’.

This chapter explained the current situation in the Netherlands, based on three different areas. Firstly, the concept of decentralisation has been discussed. The Netherlands is very progressive on decentralising national governance. The recent changes in the Social Support Act set a perfect example of decentralisation in the Netherlands. Secondly, the discussion on implementing direct elected mayors has been explained. Implementation of direct elected mayors requires changing the Dutch constitution and therefore, approval of two third of the Second Chamber and the Senate is required. This chapter gave insight in the arguments in favour and against electing mayors directly. Thirdly, this chapter created a clear picture of the well-functioning National and International city networks in the Netherlands.

In sum, due to the progressive process of decentralisation in the Netherlands, the well-functioning (inter)national networks that Dutch cities generate and the different arguments against direct elections, I believe that the concept of direct elected mayors will not improve the current situation in the Netherlands.

Chapter V: Discussion

The previous chapters in this thesis explored why and how a Parliament of Mayors would increase democracy in the world, according to the ideas and theories of political scientist Benjamin R. Barber. Throughout this thesis, different perspectives and theories were compared and discussed. However, to discuss these elaborated theories again, would ignore the function of this research. Therefore, this chapter will focus on putting the idea of a Parliament of Mayors in practise in the Netherlands. The core focus of this chapter is highlighting why I believe that a Parliament of Mayors, in the current form that Barber envisions, will not improve democracy in the Netherlands.

V:1 Democratic character

As Benjamin Barber made clear in his book, his main idea is not so much based on mayors who rule the world but more on civic engagement. Barber believes that growing collaboration between local government and their citizens will create true democracy. He believes that one of the main virtues of cities is the engagement of citizens in the work of local governance. Barber claims that “the sense of closeness and trust that defines city government must be reflected in the arrangements for a Global Parliament of Mayors, which will thus also offer a global platform for citizen-to-citizen communication and collaboration across borders and brings citizens and public officials closer” (Barber, 2013). I believe that an important debate has begun. Decentralisation is happening and therefore we need to take a look at current situation and possible changes to it. The world’s population is growing fast, Over the last 30 years, decentralisation policies have become the norm even if systems and the extent of democracy and local self-government vary. However, it is necessary to discuss how democratic Barber’s idea for a global Parliament of Mayors is in practise. As seen in the previous chapters, there are many different reasons why a global Parliament of Mayors should or should not be implemented. One of Barber’s main conditions for implementation of a Parliament of Mayors, is that mayors should be elected directly. I believe that this is the exact point what causes the Parliament of Mayors to lose its democratic character. Throughout his book, Barber emphasizes the fact that mayors are capable of ruling the world because they do not engage in political fights. Mayors should focus on their cities and what is best for their citizens instead of focussing on elections and popularity among their citizens.

As seen in the previous chapter, the current appointment of mayors in the Netherlands is done by the Royal Decree. However, since 2001 city councils gained more influence in the process of mayoral appointments. Each city council creates a profile of the desired mayor and recommends those mayors to the King or Queen. The Royal Decree never deviates from the council’s recommendations. Since elections for city councils are held ones every four years, the process of appointing a mayor in

the Netherlands is actually very democratic embedded. A Dutch mayor depends on his city council and therefore, Dutch citizens elect their mayors indirectly.

As researched in the previous chapter, there are enough arguments in favour of a directly elected mayor such as maintaining a mayor's legitimacy through democratic elections and because it will improve citizens' engagement. However, I do not believe that directly elected mayors will improve policies of local governments in the Netherlands. If Dutch mayors were to be elected directly, their responsibilities and tasks would change enormously within the municipality. Mayors should have a steering function in local government but they will be obligated to spend valuable time on politics and re-elections if mayors are elected directly. Mayors can be seen as presidents of local government, uniting councillors within their municipality and therefore I believe that they should not engage in political discussions between different political parties. As mentioned in the previous chapter, I strongly believe that the concept of electing mayors directly, would not improve the current situation in the Netherlands due to the fact that the Netherlands is already decentralising power in a very progressive way. Moreover, the Netherlands has very progressive city networks that focus on sharing information and best practices that allow cities and municipalities to continue their process of innovation.

Therefore, I do believe that it remains significantly important for mayors to participate in international communities and city networks. Mayors could use these networks as a platform for sharing best practices and information among each other.

Chapter VI: Conclusions

The world's population is growing fast and decentralisation will continue. Globalisation and decentralisation are causing nations to lose a significant amount of their power but cities will continue growing and therefore, they are becoming more important. In many different occasions, cities proved that they are better than nations in tackling cross border issues such as environment and safety. Over the last decades, nations have had the tendency to work counterproductive. The reason for that behaviour is relatively easy to explain. Nations do not need each other to achieve a national goal because their main interest is the growth and sustainability of themselves. Cities however, cannot do much apart from each other but they can constitute a great power in global partnership. According to Barber, the cities attitude towards collaboration "is perhaps the chief rationale for a global Parliament of Mayors" (Barber, 2014, p. 331).

A Parliament of Mayors, as a deliberative body that influences each other by using soft power, could become very important in our future. I believe that a Parliament of Mayors should use meetings as a way to share best practices, stay connected with each other and extend collaborative achievements of different city networks. If this is how Barber's Parliament of Mayors will function, it would not be significantly different from international organisations such as UCLG and therefore it would not be that different from the work that mayors all over the world are already doing on a daily basis.

Throughout this thesis, it became clear that nations are too large to solve problems locally and too small to act globally. Decentralisation is inevitable and hence, cities and municipalities are becoming more important. The world is facing different global challenges which will hit first and hardest on local level.

Therefore, I believe that it is a necessity to give cities and municipalities enough space and freedom to work together in cross border collaborations. An democratically elected mayor could improve policies of the local government and the perception of its inhabitants to a small extent but I do not believe that it would significantly change the level of democracy in the world. Hence, I believe that local governments and their networks are key. Collaborations between cities and municipalities through international communities and city networks such as UCLG can improve policies of the local government.

References

About Mike Bloomberg. (n.d.). *Mike Bloomberg*. Retrieved August 20, 2014, from

<http://www.mikebloomberg.com/index.cfm?objectid=E689D66F-96FD-E9F6-B1AF64B8DAE78A69>

Annan, K. (2014, January 1). NGO Liaison Service. *United Nations Office at Vienna*. Retrieved March 20, 2014, from http://www.unvienna.org/unov/en/ngo_liaison_service.html

Barber, B. R. (2013). *If mayors ruled the world: dysfunctional nations, rising cities*. New York City: Yale University Press.

Bottery, M. (2003, January 1). The End of Citizenship? The Nation State, Threats to its Legitimacy, and Citizenship Education in the Twenty-first Century. *Cambridge Journal of Education*. Retrieved March 2, 2014, from

<http://faculty.kutztown.edu/richards/380/Futures/End%20of%20Citizenship.pdf>

Bozikovic, A. (2014, March 14). What makes a city work: Former New York mayor Michael Bloomberg thinks he knows. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved August 18, 2014, from

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/what-makes-a-city-work-former-new-york-mayor-michael-bloomberg-thinks-he-knows/article17497915/>

CEMR. (n.d.). *Vereniging van Nederlandse Gemeenten*. Retrieved May 10, 2014, from

<http://www.vng.nl/vereniging/platform/europese-en-internationale-vertegenwoordiging/cemr>

Committee of the Regions. (n.d.). *European Union*. Retrieved May 10, 2014, from

http://europa.eu/about-eu/institutions-bodies/cor/index_en.htm

Derbyshire, J. (2013, November 22). If mayors ruled the world: a conversation with Benjamin Barber.

Prospect Magazine. Retrieved February 21, 2014, from

<http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/derbyshire/if-mayors-ruled-the-world-a-conversation-with-benjamin-barber/#.U615gfmqmy5>

Dijk, O. v. (2014, April 24). Meer zeggenschap met nieuwe WMO. *Partij van de Arbeid*. Retrieved

September 1, 2014, from

<http://www.pvda.nl/berichten/2014/04/Meer+zeggenschap+met+nieuwe+Wmo>

Ehrenhalt, A. (2014, February 1). Would We All Be Better Off If Mayors Ruled the World?.

Governing the States and Localities. Retrieved March 23, 2014, from

<http://www.governing.com/columns/assessments/gov-down-with-the-middlemen.html>

Fuller, B. (2012, August 1). City-Based Visas. *NYU Stern*. Retrieved June 3, 2014, from

<http://urbanizationproject.org/blog/city-based-visas#.VAmLUqm-1cY>

Galdorisi, G. (2013, June 30). Global Trends 2030: Nonstate World. *Alternative Worlds and Hedging*

Strategies. *Defense Media Network*. Retrieved January 10, 2014, from

<http://www.defensemedianetwork.com/stories/global-trends-2030-nonstate-world/>

Gerken, H. K. (2013, July 16). States Get Things Done, Affecting National Policy. *New York Times -*

The Opinion Pages. Retrieved March 2, 2014, from

<http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2013/07/16/state-politics-vs-the-federal-government/states-get-things-done-affecting-national-policy>

History of the C40. (n.d.). *C40 Cities Climate Leader Group*. Retrieved July 12, 2014, from

<http://www.c40.org/history>

- Katz, B. J. (2013, June 3). Bruce Katz on "The Metropolitan Revolution". *Governing the States and Localities*. Retrieved March 10, 2014, from <http://www.governing.com/columns/col-metropolitan-revolution.html>
- Khanna, P. (2013, October 12). The End of the Nation-State?. *New York Times*. Retrieved February 4, 2014, from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/13/opinion/sunday/the-end-of-the-nation-state.html?_r=0
- Lautenbach, S. (2012, September 5). 'Invoering wietpas Amsterdam in overleg met gemeente'. *Volkskrant*. Retrieved September 29, 2014, from <http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2686/Binnenland/article/detail/3311445/2012/09/05/Invoering-wietpas-Amsterdam-in-overleg-met-gemeente.dhtml>
- Marsh, A. (2013, October 29). Towards a Global Parliament of Mayors. *Policy Bristol Hub*. Retrieved January 20, 2014, from <http://policybristol.blogs.bris.ac.uk/2013/10/29/towards-a-global-parliament-of-mayors/>
- Midgley, P. (2009, January 5). The Role of Smart Bike-sharing Systems in Urban Mobility. *JOURNEYS*. Retrieved August 15, 2014, from <http://app.lta.gov.sg/ltacademy/doc/IS02-p23%20Bike-sharing.pdf>
- Mission. (2001, January 1). *Mayors for Peace*. Retrieved July 12, 2014, from <http://www.mayorsforpeace.org/english/outlines/objective.html>
- Montgomery, C. (2014, March 22). Mayors get things done. Should they run the world?. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved April 14, 2014, from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/ideas-lab/should-mayors-lead-the-world/article17275044/>

Nagourney, A., & Martin, J. (2013, November 9). As Washington Keeps Sinking, Governors Rise.

The New York Times. Retrieved February 23, 2014, from

<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/10/us/politics/as-washington-keeps-sinking-governors-rise.html>

Nijman, J. E. (2009, April 1). Cities in a global setting: the growing autonomy of cities in the global

legal order . *European Challenge*. Retrieved May 2, 2014, from

http://www.europeanchallenge.eu/media/papers/ws2_Paper2_Nijman_Cities_global_setting.pdf

NOS. (2005, March 9). Gekozen burgemeester stapsgewijs. *NOS*. Retrieved July 14, 2014, from

http://web.archive.org/web/20061108000721/http://www.nos.nl/nieuws/achtergronden/gekozen_burgemeester/Burgemeestersontwikkeling.html

Pastreich, E. (2013, March 29). - U.S. Academic Promotes 'Global Parliament of Mayors'. *The Chosun*

Ilbo (English Edition): Daily News from Korea. Retrieved March 1, 2014, from

http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2013/03/29/2013032901075.html

Raad van Europa. (n.d.). *Europa Decentraal*. Retrieved May 10, 2014, from

<http://www.europadecentraal.nl/onderwerpen/europees-recht-en-beleid-decentraal/instellingen-en-organisaties/raad-van-europa/>

Reijner, T. (2013, October 23). Henk Westbroek wordt geen burgemeester van Utrecht. *Elsevier*.

Retrieved September 29, 2014, from <http://www.elsevier.nl/Politiek/nieuws/2013/10/Henk-Westbroek-wordt-geen-burgemeester-van-Utrecht-1395566W/>

Sassen, S. (1998). Globalization And Its Discontents: Essays On The New Mobility Of People And Money. *New Press*, 77(3), 1197-119. Retrieved August 8, 2014, from

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/sf/77.3.1197>

Saunders, D. (2014, March 22). Mayors get things done. Should they run the world?. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved April 14, 2014, from [http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/ideas-](http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/ideas-lab/should-mayors-lead-the-world/article17275044/)

[lab/should-mayors-lead-the-world/article17275044/](http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/ideas-lab/should-mayors-lead-the-world/article17275044/)

UCLG - About Us. (n.d.). *UCLG The Global Network of Cities, Local and Regional Governments*.

Retrieved July 5, 2014, from

<http://www.uclg.org/en/organisation/about#sthash.98RVLyMw.dpuf>

Volkskrant. (2012, September 28). Burgemeesters Limburg vragen uitstel wietpas. *Volkskrant*.

Retrieved September 29, 2014, from

<http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2686/Binnenland/article/detail/3323682/2012/09/28/Burgemeesters-Limburg-vragen-uitstel-wietpas.dhtml>

Volkskrant. (2000, September 13). Burgemeestersreferendum komt er. *Volkskrant*. Retrieved

September 6, 2014, from

<http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2844/Archief/archief/article/detail/553320/2000/09/13/Burgemeestersreferendum-komt-er.dhtml>

Volkskrant. (2012, September 28). Geen gemeente lijkt de wietpas nog te willen. *Volkskrant*.

Retrieved September 29, 2014, from

<http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2686/Binnenland/article/detail/3323613/2012/09/28/Geen-gemeente-lijkt-de-wietpas-nog-te-willen.dhtml>

Volkskrant. (2012, September 5). Maastricht wil stoppen met verplichte registratie voor coffeeshops.

Volkskrant. Retrieved September 29, 2014, from

<http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2686/Binnenland/article/detail/3311693/2012/09/05/Maastricht-wil-stoppen-met-verplichte-registratie-voor-coffeeshops.dhtml>

Wouters, J., Bijlmakers, S., Hachez, N., Lievens, M., & Marx, A. (2013, September 25). Global governance and democratic legitimacy: a bottom-up approach. *The European Journal of Social Science Research*. Retrieved February 10, 2014, from

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13511610.2013.771898#.U48EQVKKDcs>

Appendix I: Dissertation proposal Form

Dissertation/Final Project Proposal Form

Personal details student	
Name	Aniek Dianne Maria
Family name	Poelhekke
Mobile number	0655761755
E-mail address Haagse Hogeschool	a.d.m.poelhekke@student.hhs.nl
E-mail address private (optional)	aniekpoelhekke@hotmail.com
ES3 () ES4 (x) Public (x) Private ()	Give reasons why you would like to write your final paper in another specialisation:
Purpose of the form	This form is designed for you to channel your final project/dissertation ideas into a coherent plan that progresses logically from research question to your choice of methods for tackling the research question and concludes with a timeline for completion.

<p>Brief description of the theoretical or practical puzzle at the heart of your proposal</p> <p>What is the central problem that you hope to address with your dissertation? Problem here refers to any theoretical or practical concerns that you believe would benefit from further research.</p> <p>At this stage, you have to formulate a central research question that indicates what you intend to find out about the problem you have identified.</p>	<p>Central Research Question</p> <p>‘To which extent could an elected mayor of a European city improve policies of the local government and the perception of its inhabitants’</p>
<p>Use the adjacent box to reflect on key social, political or economic issues as well as any historical events or general circumstances that define the context of your research question.</p>	<p>Context of the Research Question</p> <p>The following questions define the context of the research question:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Summary ‘if mayors ruled the world’ by B.R. Barber On which foundations, developments and arguments are the ideas and theories based?

	<p>2. what is the relationship between the findings of Barber and other leading theoretical work on this subject?</p> <p>3. Interim conclusion What are the essentials of the discussed theories? Are there conflicting arguments and conclusions? What are the differences? What are important pillars for further research?</p> <p>4. Case study: Is the main idea applicable in the Netherlands? (<i>Field research</i>) Could the main idea be realized on a governmental, economic and environmental basis? What is the perception of the people?</p> <p>5. Conclusions</p> <p>6. Discussion Explanation of remarkable theories, criticism on research and theories</p>
<p>Use the adjacent box to formulate and briefly discuss your central research question by reference to the most important one or two academic sources that have enabled you to sketch out your puzzle.</p>	<p>Scientific justification for the Research Question</p> <p>Ideas on how cities will gain more power in the future and how nations will lose power are nothing new. Different important authors have written work on how globalisation is changing our current society.</p> <p>Last year the Dutch newspaper ‘De Volkskrant’ published an article on political scientist Benjamin R. Barber and his new book ‘if mayors ruled the world’ (2013). http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2844/Archief/archief/article/detail/3366173/2012/12/20/Stad-wordt-belangrijker-dan-staat.dhtml</p> <p>In this article Barber explains that due to the current speed of globalisation, we cannot ignore the growing importance of cities. The last decades decisions that are being made at a national level are declining for example due to the European Union. In his book Barber</p>

	<p>points out different ideas and theories on why and how cities should take over the role of nations.</p> <p>Nowadays, cities are more important than ever due to the disappearance of nations. Nations are losing a significant amount of their power due to globalisation but somehow cities maintained their power and its growing over time. A crucial point in the growth of well-functioning cities is a strong and healthy government. The search for a perfect way to govern a city is described in 'De zucht naar goed bestuur in de stad – Lessen uit een weerbarstige werkelijkheid' from F. Hendriks and G. Drosterij</p> <p><i>(translation title: the need of a good government in cities – learning from a unruly reality)</i></p>
<p>Relevance of the proposal to one or more topics that are part of the European Studies programme</p> <p>Briefly outline how you expect your final project/ dissertation fits into one or more areas of academic and/or public debate that fits into the field of European Studies.</p>	<p>The role of the city is mostly due to globalisation. The concept of globalisation has always been important in the European Studies programme.</p> <p>The governmental aspect of my dissertation (power to the cities or the nations?) perfectly fits my public specialisation.</p>
<p>Methodology</p> <p>What are the research methods you will use and how will they enable you to answer your research question? In the adjacent box, describe your methods and justify their suitability for your</p>	<p>Literary research: reading the work of political scientist Barber to gain knowledge on the topic and being able to discuss his work during my field research.</p> <p>Desk research: familiarize myself on the topic to answer the sub questions</p> <p>Field research: interviews, and conducting survey's to see if the main idea is applicable in</p>

research	Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
<p>Submission timeline What is your timeline for completion? Describe the key steps in your progression to the successful submission of your final project/ dissertation. What do you plan to do, when and why?</p>	<p>04-10-'13 : Start reading Barber's book to gain more knowledge regarding his ideas and theories on how and why cities are more important than nations.</p> <p>Conduct more desk research on the same topic from other authors with different perspectives.</p> <p>Start writing the body of my dissertation by answering my sub questions.</p> <p>Field research by conducting surveys and interviews to if the idea of 'ruling cities' could be applicable in Amsterdam, the Netherlands.</p>
<p>Proposed table of contents Use the adjacent box to provide a chapter-by-chapter outline for your final project/dissertation. This is not the final outline and it may be amended at a later stage in writing up process.</p>	<p>Ch.1 If mayors ruled the world</p> <p>Ch.2 A different perspective</p> <p>Ch.3 Interim conclusion – contrasting ideas</p> <p>Ch.4 Case study</p> <p>Ch.5 Conclusions</p> <p>Ch.6 Discussion</p>
<p>Tentative bibliography Use the adjacent box to provide a tentative list of</p>	<p>Non-academic work:</p> <p>1) United Nations Parliamentary Assembly, Andreas Bummel – Cities and their role in</p>

<p>academic (3) sources and non-academic reports, articles or books (3) that you plan to use in your final project/dissertation.</p>	<p>global governance, an important debate. (Article) http://blog.unpacampaign.org/2013/02/cities-and-their-role-in-global-governance-an-important-debate/</p> <p>2) Neal Peirce – Cities as global stars (Article) http://citiwire.net/columns/cities-as-global-stars/</p> <p>3) PricewaterhouseCoopers – Cities of the future (report) http://www.pwc.com/en_GX/gx/government-public-sector-research/pdf/cities-final.pdf</p> <p>Academic work:</p> <p>1) Benjamin R. Barber – If mayors ruled the world (book) http://benjaminbarber.org/books/if-mayors-ruled-the-world/</p> <p>2) Frank Hendriks and Gerard Droserij – De zucht naar goed bestuur in de stad (book) http://www.boomlemma.nl/bestuurskunde/catalogus/de-zucht-naar-goed-bestuur-in-de-stad-1</p> <p>3) Edward Glaeser – Triumph of the City (book) http://www.triumphofthecity.com/</p> <p>http://www.groene.nl/2013/13/de-stad-als-branieschopper</p> <p>De groene amsterdammer</p> <p><i>Prof. dr. Jouke de Vries, hoogleraar bestuurskunde en decaan van de faculteit Campus Den Haag/Universiteit Leiden</i></p>
--	---

Appendix II: European Studies – Student Ethics Form**Your name:** Aniek Poelhekke**Supervisor:** Mr. P. G. Nixon

Instructions/checklist

Before completing this form you should read the APA Ethics Code (<http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx>). If you are planning research with human subjects you should also look at the sample consent form available in the Final Project and Dissertation Guide.

- a. Read section 3 that your supervisor will have to sign. Make sure that you cover all these issues in section 1.
- b. Complete sections 1 and, if you are using human subjects, section 2, of this form, and sign it.
- c. Ask your project supervisor to read these sections (and the draft consent form if you have one) and sign the form.
- d. Append this signed form as an appendix to your dissertation.

Section 1. Project Outline (to be completed by student)(i) Title of Project: **Dysfunctional nations and Rising cities**

(ii) Aims of project: Research to which extent an elected mayor of a European city could improve policies of the local government and the perception of its inhabitants?

(iii) Will you involve other people in your project – e.g. via formal or informal interviews, group discussions, questionnaires, internet surveys etc. (Note: if you are using data that has already been collected by another researcher – e.g. recordings or transcripts of conversations given to you by your supervisor, you should answer 'NO' to this question.)

YES / NO

If no: you should now sign the statement below and return the form to your supervisor. You have completed this form.

This project is not designed to include research with human subjects . I understand that I do not Guide for Final Project / Dissertation 2013-2014

European Studies 4 24

have ethical clearance to interview people (formally or informally) about the topic of my research, to carry out internet research (e.g. on chat rooms or discussion boards) or in any other way to use people as subjects in my research.

Student's signature _____ - date _____

Appendix III: Complete summary '*If Mayors Ruled The World*' – Benjamin R. Barber**If Mayors ruled the world***Benjamin R. Barber***I. WHY CITIES SHOULD GOVERN GOBALLY*****CHAPTER I. IF MAYORS RULED THE WORLD - Why They Should and How They Already Do***

In a teeming world of too much difference and too little solidarity, democracy is in deep crisis. Today, after a long history of regional success, the nation-state is failing us on the global scale. The city, always the human habitat of first resort, has in today's globalizing world once again become democracy's best hope. Urbanity may or may not be our nature, but it is our history. It defines how we live, work, play and associate. Politics starts in the neighbourhood and the town. More than half of the world's people live in cities. Given the state's resistance to cross-border collaboration, our foremost political challenge today is to discover or establish alternative institutions capable of addressing the multiplying problems of an interdependent world without surrendering the democracy that nation-states traditionally have secured. The solution stands before us: let cities do what states cannot. Let mayors rule the world. Since, as Edward Glaeser writes, "the strength that comes from human collaboration is the central truth behind civilization's success and the primary reason why cities exist". Cities are increasingly networked into webs of culture, commerce and communication that encircle the globe. These networks and the cooperative complexes they embody can be helped to do formally what they now do informally: govern through voluntary cooperation and shared consensus. The challenge of democracy in the modern world has been how to join participation, which is local, with power, which is central. Nation-states became too large to allow meaningful participation even as it remains too small to address centralized global power. A world governed by cities will place the emphasis on bottom-up citizenship, civil society and voluntary community across borders. The call to let mayors become global governors and enable their urban constituents to reach across frontiers and become citizens without borders does not then reflect a utopian aspiration. It asks that we recognize a world already in the making; that we take advantage of the unique urban potential for cooperation and egalitarianism unhindered by those obdurate forces of sovereignty and nationality, of ideology and inequality, that have historically hobbled and isolated nation-states inside fortresses celebrated as being "independent" and "autonomous". If mayors are to rule the world, however, it is clear they will have to pay dues to prime ministers and presidents. Cities may already constitute networks of collaboration that influence the global economy and bypass the rules and regulations of states, but they lie within the jurisdiction and sovereignty of superior political bodies. Governance is about power as well as problems, jurisdiction as well as function, so the relationship of cities to states is of critical concern

here. Two critical questions: Are the interests of cities and of the states to which cities belong in harmony or in conflict? And can cities do what they do in the face of national governments that are not merely indifferent but hostile to their global aspirations? The answers to both questions can be found in Chapter 6. The interdependence of cities may erode their ties to nation-states and draw them toward collaboration with one another, but no state will let cities annul subsidiarity and escape the gravitational pull of their sovereign mother ship. National communities are important markers of identity that allow urban residents to share citizenship beyond town limits. The tension between urban identity and national identity shows that we need to demonstrate and elaborate the pragmatic, problem-solving character of cities. Examples are networks such as “the United Cities and Local Governments”, “International Union of Local Authorities”, “Metropolis” and the “C40 cities”. These constructions are birthing an exciting new cosmopolis whose activities hold the secret to fashioning the global processes and institutions that states have failed to create. Nowadays, cities have little choice: to survive and flourish they must remain hospitable to pragmatism and problem solving, to cooperation and networking, to creativity and innovation. A McKinsey study estimates that in the next ten to fifteen years, 136 new cities will join the world’s 600 cities with the largest GDPs, all of them from the developing world. The concentration of urban populations into ever more complex systems continues to accelerate. Saskia Sassen argues in her study of New York, London and Tokyo that these cities become service centres for the new “global economy”. They function as one trans-territorial marketplace. They serve not just one by one but “function as a triad”. This represents a new network composed of the intersecting and overlapping “global city” functions. There are weird new city hybrids as well. New corporate “instant cities” or proposed cities like Lazika on a wetland site on the Black Sea. Then there are unplanned refugee camps-cum-cities which, over time, function as a actual city. There are also those imagined worlds; seaworlds to be set adrift in the ocean. For some time, idealists dreamed of a global village, and today an abstraction being realized not only in digital and virtual forms but in global economic markets and in het complex urban networks that are our focus here. Global village indeed!

It becomes clear that we need an alternative road forward because in this fiercely interdependent world the demand for global governance has become the critical challenge of our times. Democracy must be as infectious as the latest pandemic and as viral as the World Wide Web. States will not govern globally. Cities can and will. A global league of cities is, to be sure, not the same thing as a global central government. But this is probably a virtue, since it means that a league of cities will be able to act glocally through persuasion and example, and allow citizens to participate in their neighbourhoods and local urban communities even as their mayors engage informally with on another across the globe.

CHAPTER 2. THE LAND OF LOST CONTENT – Virtue and Vice in the Life of the City

The city promises a form of corruption that feels like freedom. Freedom from history, family, religion, gender, it doesn't matter, it is freedom from all the involuntary markers of identity that define and constrain where we come from. For those who prefer to define themselves by where they are going, urbanity is deliverance, the promise of liberation. However, the rural idyll about life on the countryside remains potent, memorialized by a long line of romantic naturalists. For all the lures of urbanity, at least as it is imagined by contented country folk, the city is still a synonym for loss, less a liberation than a prelude to decadence. However, cities were magnets whose force field grew as the demographic and economic importance of the agricultural countryside declined. According to Ebenezer Howard cities lured people from the country because they were no longer needed at the countryside. We must understand the critique and be able to defend the possibility of moral, egalitarian, and democratic versions of urban living and specify the conditions under which the prospect is realistic this means we must fathom the dialectic of urbanity and grasp the deeply normative distinctions it generates: distinctions between city and country that turn out to be distinctions between artifice and nature, human association and wilderness. If, as I propose, mayors are to rule the world and cities are to become the building blocks of a global democratic architecture, then we must show why their defects and deficiencies will not undermine and bring down the new structure. How are their endemic corruption and inequality as centres of inequality, poverty, and injustice, of crass commercialism and punishing anomie, to be countered as cities become modalities of global governance?

Cities collect people into dense communities where street politics and free speech are natural, as long as there is an open-space, an agora to sustain them. But they demand public space. Parks, squares and commons are about more than just nature. They are emblems of the public character of urban space and represent the deeply democratic meaning of the commons. Think of what the Tuileries meant to the French Revolution, what Hyde Park represents for free speech in London, the role of Tahrir Square in Cairo and Green Liberty Square in Tripoli in the Arab Spring. The First Amendment to the American Constitution and the rights to free speech and assembly protected by it have little traction in the absence of public spaces where citizens can assemble and listen to one another. One of the most devastating consequences of privatizing space in the suburbs has been the construction of shopping malls that are the only "common" spaces residents have. But they are private property and afford their owners the right to ban political leafleting and speech making, and so are not really public at all. Public and open spaces refresh the soul of the city, but they also empower citizens and facilitate democracy. For most of the human race that now make their homes in cities, however, rusticity is not an option. The green lands they have forsaken must follow them to town, or wither and die.

CHAPTER 3. THE CITY AND DEMOCRACY – From Independent Polis to Interdependent Cosmopolis

The story of cities is the story of democracy. To retell the city's history from polis to megaregion, is also to tell the story of the civic from citizenship to civilization. Urban life entails common living; common living means common willing and common law making, and these define the essence of political democracy. Democracy, however, is more than political. As John Dewey insisted, it is a way of life. The democratic way is then more about process than about an end state: it is about the processes by which power is shared, equality secured and liberty realized- within and not against the community. The institutions embodying the process- polis, nation-state, nongovernmental organization, international organization, and city- are forever in flux, making their relationship to democracy problematic. But what is it that we mean when we speak of the city? Or when we describe what is not the city? Can what it is not help us discover what it is?

Understanding the City: Some Preliminaries

The city's compass extends from settlements and small town (if not quite village sized) of several thousand to imposing modern megacities with tens of millions. As I hazard generalizations about "the city" throughout this book and explore the moral debate that surrounds its evolutions, there must be some agreement on the meaning of the word.

Little towns are morphing nearly overnight into big cities, and people everywhere are migrating into town. Size and wealth, important as they are, perhaps are not as critical to the meaning of the city as density, however, and there is probably a population/wealth/density threshold under which many of the functions of the city simply cannot be carried out. The ancient village, for example albeit a commune or community, scarcely exists as a town, let alone a city, and it lacks many key functions and the infrastructure of a city. Even in older cities, new suburban developments quickly become minicities of their own, as imposing as their mother metropolises. Yet some American cities are quintessentially suburban, a collection of suburban mushrooms gathered together into an urban field without a true centre. Many older cities in the developed world, locked into a vanished age of urban manufacturing, are insignificant with respect to GDP and have little relevance to the governance issues we address here, while score of unheralded newer ones are crucial. Cities are in any case undergoing constant change, as Daniel Brook's fascinating "history of future cities" makes evident. Smaller "middleweight" cities are today outperforming many megacities in terms of overall household growth. These realities give the urban its seemingly ineluctable character and allow us to treat cities as potential global democratic building blocks. There is no need to retrace here the remarkable history of towns and cities that has been narrated by eminent sociologist and historians from Max Weber, Lewis Mumford to Peter Marcuse Saskia Sassen and Eric Corijn. Yet we do need to recall that this history, for all its variety, has been marked by relentlessly progressive development, not just change but seemingly purposeful and "progressive" change: a growth in population density, in diversity, and in specialization of function; and hence in complexity. Like the jungles to which they are sometimes contrasted (or compared), cities grow, often rampantly and anarchically, even when they are hemmed in and

hampered in unnatural ways. These permutations make clear how difficult it is actually to define the city on whose cross-border potential I put so much store. Yet though definitions of the city are contested, and populations thresholds subject to debate, there are measures of the urban widely acknowledged as critical that fortify our argument for networking and cross-border governance. Putting aside the key question of the city's moral valence, there are a number of core elements that, in combination, yield a compelling portrait of the city and its defining urbanity. In some cases, the terms define the city only indirectly, by suggesting what it is not. Indeed, what the city is not is a useful place to begin.

What the City is Not

As a social and geographical form, the city may be seen as a generic antonym to all that is not urban: to suburbia and exurbia; to the rural, the "country"; or even the uninhabited natural wilderness. What communities or individuals in the countryside tell us what cities are not- and what, instead, they can be. In the countryside, communities are small, sparsely populated, and dispersed, but also "thick" in the sense of being intimate and grounded. In contrast, urban communities are sociologically "thin" but densely populated and encompassing. Where rural villages and towns are often isolated, cities are naturally interconnected. The economies of the countryside are agricultural or pastoral and are inclined to self-sufficiency. Cities are dependent and hence interdependent, tied to food and commodity supplies from outside, and to each other by trade and commerce. At the same time, cities are workplaces and centres of trade and commerce and this places them at the centre of the capitalist and industrial economy- today, the information and service economy- in ways that bar real autarky or self-sufficiency. How different from agricultural and pastoral society is simple wilderness, understood as pure nature without a human presence. Indeed, wilderness living is as distant from farming and herding life as it is from city dwelling. Where do we then place the sprawling suburbs and exurbs, strange hybrids that appear to be neither city nor country, often possessing the vices of both and the virtues of neither? Using indirect features of the not-city to help define the city puts us then in the right state of mind but cannot take us very far. It is helpful to recognize that cities, neither dispersed nor isolated, are not-wilderness. But to say what cities are not still cannot fully reveal what cities are. Competing typologies suggest how vexing the definitional question can be. For example, in his introduction to Max Weber's *The City*, Don Martindale references "the crowding of people into small space" that "bears with it a tremendous increase in specialized demands" for things like "streets, public water supplies, public sewage systems, garbage disposal, police protection, civic centres, schools", and of course the "more complicated system of administration" needed "to handle the complex problems of engineering, law finance and social welfare". In the world of economic globalization, cities have also come to be defined by new functions related to markets, especially in what Saskia Sassen denotes as global cities. Jane Jacobs long ago observed that cities rather than nations are the ultimate producers of wealth through innovation and trade activities. Sassen elaborates on how global

cities have evolved, functioning in four new ways as “highly concentrated command points in the organization of the world economy”; as “key locations for finance and for specialized service firms, which have replaced manufacturing”; as “sites of production [especially] production of innovations”; and finally “as markets for the products and innovations produced.” She focuses on how such novel global cities service the changing global economy, but she recognizes that the changes “have had a massive impact upon... urban form” to a point where a new type, the global city, has appeared.

Typology and Defining Features of the City

What then are the commonalities that allow us to talk about the urban and contrast it with the many distinctive varieties of the nonurban? It is not the individual features of the urban environment taken one by one, but their accumulation and aggregation that capture the city’s essential meaning. Together they paint a picture of human society where people live in relative proximity and fashion communities that are naturally connected to other similar communities. It is a *Gesellschaft* association—an impersonal society made up of individuals freely covenanting to live together in ways that allow urban neighbors to remain anonymous and hence free and opportunistic, to live unconstrained by tradition, kinship, or hierarchy even though forced into intense proximity. The aim is to focus on those characteristics that point to why the city promises cooperation across borders and global governance in ways that the country, and national governments (as they reflect at least in part the country’s disposition), cannot. In depicting that disposition, the city’s relational, interdependent character is most important and speaks to the essential features of urban life that serve their global potential. Their openness, for example, is a prelude to their potential for networking; in the same fashion, that they are both voluntary and mobile enables their citizens to choose additional identities across borders and to move easily among cities, as do so many of the new service employees of the world economy, whether they are taxi drivers or bankers and lawyers. Secularism and tolerance mean urban denizens are not divided from others around the world by deeply held religious and cultural principles, which hobble relations among more monocultural nation-states; they also provide a platform for multiculturalism that is linked to immigration and that entails not only the presence of different cultures and traditions but their willingness and ability to live and work together. Trade depends on easy commerce with others beyond the city’s borders, but art too, both in its reliance on imagination and in its capacity for cosmopolitan exchange, fosters a defining spirit of interdependence. The city’s defining diversity is more than economic. Cities diversify around finance, trade and manufacturing, but also around innovation, creativity, and entrepreneurship. Diversity is quite simply the key today to urban sustainability. The seeming indifference of cities to power politics and sovereignty is critical to their inclination to outreach and networking. They prefer problem solving to ideology and party platforms, which is a core strength critical to their networking potential. Adept as cities are in networking and cooperation for reasons associated with some of their core features *qua* cities, they also are deficient in some essential ways. The deficiencies are glaring. We do not have to read Marx to grasp that

although they may promise a relief from traditional hierarchy and aristocratic pretention, cities generate their own novel forms of inequality born of the forms of capitalism, industrialism, and class intimately associate with the urban. And that these inequalities are hardly less stubborn than the old-fashioned feudal and agrarian inequalities cities leave behind. Add to these powerfully consequential deficiencies the urban disposition to corruption, a disease that often seems endemic to the density and informal relations of city life. Corruption not only poisons local politics and undermines urban democracy, it makes a mockery of the rule of law that must undergird democratic life. If democracy is not simply the government of men but the government of laws made by men and women, it must reflect common or general will enacted in laws whose authors are equally subjects of the law. Were these not enough, there is a final flaw, more likely to be fatal than the others when it comes to the prospect for global democratic governance: the city's unrepresentative character. More than half of the world's population ay live in cities, but the slightly less than half who don't will be largely unrepresented in a world dominated by mayors and those who elect them. How are these missing three billion people to find a vote or a voice I, as a consequence of urban virtues, mayors actually do come to rule the world? The obstacles to the city's potential for global governance arising out of inequality, corruption and representation must then be addressed. Cities are bound together by common attributes but also united by common values. That so many of these values are liberal and democratic gives cities their promise as building blocks of global democratic governance. There is then ample support in the character of cities for the argument that mayors can and should rule the world. Further evidence can be found in the failures of their rivals. Cities should rule the world for a good reason: nation-states haven't and can't.

States as Global Actors?

Over the last four hundred years, in the era of nation-states, nation acting in concert have never actually governed in the world or shown much capacity to do so. Nation-states were fashioned to maximize internal unity and jurisdictional sovereignty and hence tended to foster rivalry rather than cooperation among themselves. The social contract helped democratize nations from within but actually impeded the development of democracy *among* nations. The sovereign nation-state succeeded in rescuing democracy from its thrall to polis life and a scale so diminutive that it had made democracy in the real historical world impossible. Yet the very features that allowed it to adapt to the scale of the new and invented territorial nation prevented it from making the transition from nation-state to global governance. Although they succeeded for more than four hundred years in securing both liberty and justice from within, democratic nation-states once again today risk the defeat of their aspirations to freedom by the still vaster scale and greater illegitimacy of our new age of globalization. As the town polis once lost its capacity to protect liberty and equality in the face of the scale and complexity of an emerging society that was outrunning the participatory narrowness and insularity of its polis institutions, so today the nation-state is losing its capacity to protect liberty and equality in the

face of the scale and complexity of an interdependent world that is outrunning the nationalism and sovereign insularity of its institutions.

CHAPTER 4. MAYORS RULE! – Is This What Democracy Looks Like?

In a number of countries, mayors aren't directly elected by city burghers. Instead, they are appointed by party or state authorities. In others, bureaucratic city managers run the show. Even when powerful elected mayors govern their own metropolises forcefully, they can scarcely be said to be ruling the world. The world is not being ruled by anyone, let alone democratically. It is pushed around by warring states and feuding tribes, dominated by rival multinational corporations and banks, and shaped by competing ideologies and religions that often deny each other's core convictions. To the extent urban networks actually comprise some degree of soft and informal global governance, it is cities and their networks, not mayors, that are key.

Cities work and Mayors Count

In a world cynical about politics, mayors remain astonishingly popular, winning an approval rating of two to three times that of legislators and chief executives. To citizens, mayors may seem more significant than prima ministers or presidents. Mayors always loom large, personifying the traffic jam or the snowstorm and the imperative to address them. Mayors count nowadays, even more in the age of globalization than in the past. Given that mayors are in a position to help rule the world and are possibly the best hope we have for the survival of democracy across borders, there is every reason to look at them closely.

Even as the European Union loses steam as a post sovereign collective of (dis)integrating nations and lurches back toward monocultural recidivism and southern-tier bankruptcy Europe's cities continue to network and collaborate, oblivious to brooding fears of German hegemony and the immigrant Muslim "other". Europe's Cultural Cities project, which nominates an annual "cultural capital", is but one instance of a broader trend signalling urban cooperation in the face of nationalist contestation

Who Mayors Are

Whether elected or appointed, whether abetted by city managers or left to govern alone, whether operating under democratic or autocratic state regimes, mayors face common challenges that can be addressed only with a set of common skills and competences adapted to the city. These turn out to look quite different from the skills and competences needed by politicians exercising power in sovereign and self-consciously independent central governments driven by national ideologies. Getting things done demands from mayors unique talents and personality traits not necessarily appropriate to other political offices. Among those that seem to mark successful mayors are (1) a

strong personality marked by both hubris and humor, (2) a pragmatic approach to governing, (3) personal engagement in city affairs, and (4) commitment to the city as a unique entity and a possible and even likely career terminus.

(1) A *strong persona* closely identified with the cities they govern is found in many successful mayors. Think of New York's Mayor Ed Koch, who managed to secure a burial plot for himself in Manhattan's Trinity Cemetery long after Manhattan burials were no longer allowed. Mayors define cities as much as cities define them, and in ways that national leaders cannot and do not define the nations they lead. An occasional Mandela or de Gaulle or Roosevelt come to incarnate a nation at war or otherwise in extremis, but ordinary prime ministers are ordinary politicians, whereas mayors in ordinary times are often extraordinary, bigger than the cities they govern and able to dramatize the city's character and amplify its influence. If a mayor can incarnate the courage of a city, he can also embody its putative sins. Corrupt cities are the creatures of corrupt mayors, but corruption as a vice with special affinities to the city makes mayors especially vulnerable. For every charismatic mayor, there is one in jail. To assail what cities do, critics go after the mayors even when there is no corruption and the issues are not about them. The National Rifle Association focused its critique of the "handgun-ban movement" on mayors, not cities.

(2) A *preference for pragmatism* and problem solving over ideology and principled grandstanding is a second feature of successful mayors. There is, realists will say, no liberal or conservative way of picking up the garbage. It's mayors who have to get things done. The mayor is hardly everything, but pragmatism and a preoccupation with problem solving rather than posturing can make a crucial difference. This lesson was well learned in the United States, where a century ago, machine politics and corruption grew sufficiently ugly to put democracy in question and the office of mayor in jeopardy. If elected mayors couldn't deliver efficient governance, then progressives would replace them with city managers, dispassionate organization-and-management specialist not necessarily even subject to the vote. In re-establishing their legitimacy in subsequent years, mayors had to make themselves over into managers. Since then, the difference between city mayor and city manager has become hard to discern: managing simply is what mayors do when they govern. It cannot be otherwise. However grandiose the personalities of city leaders, to govern the city is an inescapably parochial and pedestrian (literally!) affair: traffic rather than treaties, potholes rather than principles, waste management rather than wars. Fixing stuff and delivering solutions is the politics of urban life. According to an authoritative book called *The European Mayor*, In bigger cities "there is a greater number of medium and large-sized private enterprises and a wide spectrum of public and private actors that are called upon to cooperate" so that the "mayor of a great city has less scope for an authoritarian leadership style" and must work hard to create consensus. The mayoral politics of outsized personalities that we see in global cities is often a compensation for the need to reach out to and compromise with diverse constituencies that cannot be steamrolled.

(3) *Personal engagement* in the affairs, crises and problems of the city seems to come naturally to mayors and is a third feature of what makes cities run. On the way (literally) to their jobs, these neighbourhood chieftains pull people from burning buildings. Chasing police cars and ambulances, acting like urban heroes, and empathizing with urban victims show how deeply personal being a mayor can be. Lives are affected because the turf on which mayors play is relentlessly local- always a neighborhood or a complex of neighborhoods, never a territory or a domain. Mayors ride subways and buses, and miss little of the local flora and fauna. Demonstrators are in their faces, literally. The personal character of being mayor can add to the tension between politics and the demands of good government. Personal governance can tip over into corrupt governance, while efficient management may undermine personal engagement. As Richard C. Scragger has suggested, “unlike the presidency or the governorship, the mayoralty has been suspect because it seems to pose the starkest choice between democracy and good government.” What we find at the centre of intersecting circles in the city is a *homeboy*. Mayors have homeboys-“homies” if you like. “People know who we are, they see us on the street,” notes Philadelphia’s Mayor Nutter. “I never have to wonder what’s on the Philadelphians’ mind, because they are going to tell me.”

(4) *Commitment to the city as a unique civic entity* keeps mayors in town. The city is not a divine responsibility or a historical telos but a place where a mayor grows up and gets defined by local circumstances and homegrown fights not of his own choosing. For him as Christopher Dickey observes, the city is above all a home rather than an abstraction. National leaders rule over invented national abstractions- each province to some degree like every other province, each nation a complex of functions and interests, associations, and subsidiary governing units. Yet while cities also resemble one another in function and purpose, they have unique personalities that are rooted less in the cultural particulars of ethnicity or nationality than in geography, local history and urban character.

How Cities Shape Mayors

The diverse understandings of what it means to be a mayor in different cultures and political systems, as well as the distinctive histories and political constitutions that shape the mayoralty in individual cities, certainly make generalizations problematic. Nonetheless, a number of the features highlighted here seem to hold up across political systems, whether mayors are elected or appointed, whether they have ample or limited powers. In comparing the city manager and mayor-council forms of government recently, for example, Kathy Hayes and Seemong Chang found that “there is no apparent difference in the efficiency levels of the two municipal government structures,” and that changes in the structure have almost no impact on taxing or spending levels. For all their problems, cities retain the confidence of citizens in a way other levels of government do not. Mayors and the urban institutions they lead retain remarkable levels of popular support. While confidence in political institutions has plummeted throughout the Western world, local government is the exception, leaving cities as “the last remaining redoubt of public confidence.” The crucial takeaway from these gray but revealing facts is simply this:

the local, consensual, problem-solving character of the office of mayor seems to override differences in political landscape, ideological intensity, and the formal method of governing (mayor or city manager). This suggests quite compellingly that cities have essential features that trump the usual political and ideological factors that otherwise shape and constrain politicians. In sum, *mayors act as they do because they are governing cities rather than provinces, cantons, or national states*. Mayors are shaped more by what cities are and need than by factors inherent in a constitutional or political system but extraneous to the city. Cities make mayors. Mayors can rule the world because cities represent a level of governance sufficiently local to demand pragmatism and efficiency in problem solving but sufficiently networked to be able to fashion cooperative solutions to the interdependent challenges they face. It is not just that cities lack that proud sovereignty that cripples nation-states in their efforts at cooperation, but that they are defined by communication, creativity and connectivity, the foundation for that effective collaboration they need in order to survive. The nation-state is an overweening “it.” Cities are us. No one wants some monumental “it” to rule the world. The “we” can and must do so. A parliament of mayors is really a parliament of us.

CHAPTER 5. INTERDEPENDENT CITIES – Local Nodes and Global Synapses

Cities once favoured walls, but even when under siege, never allowed themselves to be defined by borders. Their natural tendency is to connect, interact and network. This interdependence is crucial to what makes an urban community a city. There are many reasons for the city’s safety record since then, but city-to-city intelligence cooperation is among the most important; and it is a testament to city leaders’ preference for working directly with one another rather than funnelling their efforts through regional or national political authorities. However, mayors are still relying on cooperation with federal authorities for intelligence on international terrorism.

Historically Networked

Cross-border police collaboration is hardly new. In fact, information flow and intelligence collection, along with many other goods and services vital to urban life, have run across oceans and through cities for a very long time. Nearly seven hundred years ago, seafaring and river cities along the North Sea and the Baltic created the Hanseatic League, conspiring to protect the economic power they acquired when they acted in concert. The dozens of trading cities that eventually joined the Hansa established a trade corridor that worked its way along the North Sea from London and Brugge, via the Baltic to Riga and Novgorod. Over forty cities with Hansa trading posts. Not quite a European union, but a remarkable exercise in collaboration before there was a Europe. From the end of the Middle Ages into the early modern era, leagues and bunds were widespread. These leagues and bunds suggest how cities have benefited from cooperating across the territorial border intended to keep them apart. Borders that were laid down by “superior” authorities with little sympathy for local democracy or

global comity. In 2004, the largest assembly of mayors and elected city officials gathered in Paris and formed United Cities and Local Governments. The UCLG is the world's largest and most influential organization nobody has ever heard of. It represents half the world's population. With 300 delegates from cities in more than 100 countries having participated in its 2010 World Congress, it may be in a better position to nurture global cooperation better than the World Trade Organization and the International Monetary Fund ever will be. But what makes cities so interactive and interdependent? It is often hard to see the networks for the cities. City association function as artificial organisms at a fairly high level, but are less visible than the cities that are their vital organs. Higher organisms have both nodes and synapses, cores and connectors. Cities can and do govern globally because they are organisms in which local urban nodes naturally assimilate and integrate via global synapses into glocal networks defined by their local needs and global interests. The urban synapse is not just a connector; it is an outgrowth of the city node itself. Node and synapse grow together, part of one organism. This metaphor stretches ordinary understanding, for unlike the individual organisms they emulate, which are integral wholes whose nodes cannot stand alone, social organisms are often visible only as they manifest themselves in their nodes. Their synapses are often out of sight. It is easier to think of cities structurally, in terms of walls and portals, than infrastructurally, in terms of functions and shared interests. We see Gdansk, Hamburg and Copenhagen before we see (if ever we do) the Hanseatic League. We "get" Europe and can't forget its constituent states, but we are less mindful of what might be its most successful and enduring manifestation, its networked cities. Working together in entities such as the European Union's Committee of the Regions, an entity comprising 344 regional and local governments, these networked cities reflect, in Eric Corijn's words, "an important shift of emphasis [in Europe] to regions and metropolitan zones" in which newly "competitive regions and cities undermine national solidarities and favour glocal growth strategies."

Naturally Networked

Cities are ineluctably interdependent and naturally relational, not just in the modern context of global interdependence but by virtue of what makes them cities. They define themselves more through "bridging capital," hooking them up with domains outside their boundaries, than through "bonding capital," unifying them internally. The glue that bonds a community makes it sticky with respect to other communities. Because cities are sticky, they do not slide or bounce off one another the way states do. States collide because their common frontiers define where one ends and another begins. This necessarily turns territorial quarrels into zero-sum games. One state cannot grow without another being diminished. Not so cities, which are separated physically and hence touch only metaphorically and virtually, in ways that do not take up space or put one another at risk. Trade is a crucial piece of the puzzle. To speak of "trading cities" is nearly redundant, since trade is at the heart of how cities originate and are constituted. Communities gather so that people can live in proximity and harvest the fruits of commonality, but they gather *where* they do so they can reap the rewards of interdependence

with other communities. Trade literally made the city- as it did Amsterdam, Hong Kong, to name but a few. Their interdependence gives cities a distinct advantage over nation-states. Too often, internal bonding capital of the kind prized by states is built on exclusion and fear, a national identity, and pride in sovereign independence that can overwhelm bridging capital. State-based nationalist patriotism affords integral unity only by diminishing or nullifying the “other” or the “stranger” just the other side of the common border. But in cities, where flags and anthems are less useful than tourist promotions and love songs, it is bridging capital, not bonding capital, that is paramount. Cosmopolitanism trumps patriotism. Trade is paramount and culture primary, but today’s myriad city networks encompass a remarkable diversity of functions and purposes.

Real Networks Today

Urban synapses and the networks they generate, although less visible, are then as much a feature of the new global landscape as the prominence of cities themselves. Such networks are doing real work in the setting of transnational cooperation, work that is too easily overlooked because it is voluntary and cooperative and rarely takes the form of a state treaty or international compact. The list in table 1 offers a vivid reminder of how important city networks are and how their number has grown.

Table 1: Major Urban Networks (only several global networks)

Organization Name	Headquarters	Membership	Year Est.	Primary Issue Area’s
C40 Cities http://live.c40cities.org/home/	New York, USA	63 “global cities”	2005	Climate; energy efficiency
ICLEI – International Council for Local Environmental initiatives http://www.iclei.org/	Bonn, Germany	1,012 municipalities and associations from 84 countries	1990	Climate; energy efficiency
Mayors for Peace http://www.mayorsforpeace.org/english/	Hiroshima, Japan	5,092 cities in 152 countries	1982	Peace, human rights
SCI- Sister Cities International http://www.sister-cities.org/	Washington, D.C ., USA	2,000 partnerships in 136 countries	1956 /1967	Cultural exchange; town twinning
UCLG- United Cities and Local Governments http://www.cities-localgovernments.org	Barcelona, Spain	1,0000+ cities (+112 national governments)	2004	Networking

In the interest of our core focus, let me concentrate on two vital categories of global networks that through cross-border cooperation have achieved at least some success in controversial areas where states have failed: security and environment.

Security

National security has always stirred global anxieties and more or less defines traditional international relations. In contrast urban security has traditionally been a matter for city police departments addressing conventional local crime. But when it comes to nuclear proliferation, weapons of mass destruction, and global terrorism a new imperative for intercity cooperation across borders has emerged unlike anything before. Table 2 lists a few important intercity organizations that address security issues. The proliferation of such associations suggests that security cooperation among cities is no longer discretionary.

Table 2: Urban Security Networks

Organization Name	Headquarters	Membership	Year Est.	Mission, Purpose, Aim (key issues)
European Cities Against Drugs (ECAD) www.ecad.net	Stockholm, Sweden	262 municipalities in 31 countries	1994	"ECAD is Europe's leading organization promoting a drug free Europe and representing millions of European citizens... ECAD member cities work to develop initiatives and efforts against drug abuse."
European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS) www.efus.eu	Strasbourg, France	300 local authorities from 17 countries	1949	EFUS "fosters multilateral exchanges throughout Europe, but also with other continents, about locally-developed practices and experiences..[It] has built a unique body of know-how, competences, and field reports on a wide array of themes linked to crime prevention and urban security"
Global Network on Safer Cities	Undetermined	Undetermined	2012	Advisory panel established; constitution still being formulated
Mayors Against Illegal Guns www.mayorsagainstillegalguns.org	New York, USA	600 mayors from more than 40 U.S. states	2006	A coalition of mayors working together to: punish offenders; hold irresponsible gun dealers accountable; oppose federal efforts to restrict cities' rights to collect, access and share data about gun owners; develop technologies to aid detection and tracing; support state and federal legislation

<p>Mayors for Peace www.mayorsforpeace.org/</p>	<p>Hiroshima, Japan</p>	<p>5,66 cities in 157 countries</p>	<p>1982</p>	<p>that targets illegal guns. “The Mayors for Peace, through close cooperation among the cities, strive to raise international public awareness regarding the need to abolish nuclear weapons and contribute to the realization of world peace by working to eliminate starvation and poverty, assist refugees, support human rights, protect the environment, and solve other problems that can threaten world peace.</p>
---	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------	---

There is also a deeper asymmetry between the broad counterterrorist’s’ goals of nation-states and the narrower concerns of cities. The United States or France will seek a Taliban-free Afghanistan but that is no guarantee that Mumbai, London or New York is safe from al Qaeda’s marauding offshoots. Cities will be less concerned with addressing terrorism at the point of origin (which states focus on), and more interested in pre-empting its implementation in target cities (the responsibility of municipalities). The concentration of population that makes cities urban, makes them especially vulnerable to attacks in which a minuscule cell of conspirators holding one weapon can eradicate a metropolis of millions. In combating this kind of attack, the first line of defence may be intelligence and counterterrorist cooperation among cities, although in the long term the control of nuclear proliferation and bans on biochemical weapons of mass destruction is of equal importance. Among the more revelatory intercity networks are those that actually do focus on weapons of mass destruction. Most important among them is the Mayors for Peace organization. They have been calling worldwide for solidarity among cities; conducting a “2020 Vision Campaign” to eliminate nuclear weapons by the year of 2020. Urban security goals centring on global nuclear weapons are likely to be frustrated for some time to come. But when we move form spectacular threats to ordinary realities like controlling handguns, urban action may have a better chance of political realization. The struggle is ongoing. National political leaders seem more moved by lobbyists than by citizens, given that polls show over and over that ore then 90 percent of the American public favours forms of gun control their representatives refuse to legislate. When it comes to security, global or local, cities are likely to remain the key players.

Environment

The environmental crisis is the most persistent and potentially catastrophic challenge cities are facing. In this ecologically challenged era, sustainability is the condition for survival, and ecological interdependence means there will be no survival without cooperation. With up to 90 percent of the world’s cities on water, urban populations are on the front banks of ecological risk. In fact climate change is quickly morphing into the ultimate security issue, with urban cooperation in addressing the

underlying causes of climate change a necessity of survival. Where states can be said to have done the least, cities have done the most. Keeping in mind that many broad-spectrum city networks include environmental and climate change activities as significant parts of their programs. The networks mentioned in table 3 focus exclusively on sustainability and environmentalism (there are many more networks). As much as 80 percent of human-generated carbon emissions come from cities and hence can be addressed in cities, whether or not their host states wish to cooperate.

Table 3: Environmental Intercity Networks

Organization name	Headquarters	Membership	Year Est.	Mission and Activities
C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group www.live.c40cities.org/c40cities	New York, USA	58 "global cities"	2005	The C40 is "committed to implementing meaningful and sustainable climate related actions locally that will help address climate change globally." It engages a broad array of environmental and liveable city issues, including energy efficiency, emissions and urban drainage.
ICLEI- International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives www.iclei.org	Bonn, Germany	1,200 municipalities and associations from 84 countries	1990	"ICLEI is an international association of local governments as well as national and regional local government organizations who have made a commitment to sustainable development." ICLEI provides consulting, training, and platforms of information exchange to build capacity and support local initiatives to achieve sustainability objectives.
World Mayors Council on Climate Change http://worldmayorscouncil.org/home.html	Bonn, Germany	113 member cities in 32 countries	2005	"The World Mayors Council on Climate Change is an alliance of committed local government leaders concerned about climate change. They advocate for enhanced engagement of local governments as governmental stakeholders in multilateral efforts addressing climate change and related issues of global sustainability."

Cities also work together across borders one on one. For example, 4,806 French municipalities have been engaged in overseas cooperation in 147 countries over the past several decades, or that more

than 500 German municipalities are cooperating with cities in Africa, Latin America and Asia. Even when cities act alone, they are often reacting to global trends and intercity viral networks. Formal intercity organizations and enlightened urban officials continue to play a leading role. Such individual actions, taken voluntarily by cities acting in common, are a significant part of how cities may in time “govern the world” without ever possessing top-down executive authority or the ability to legislate for all cities without even necessarily constituting themselves into formal government-to-government networks.

Toward a Global Mayors Parliament

It is crucial to recognize that cross-border cooperation and informal governance are not the products of top imperatives from “superior” authorities. Innovative programs often spread virally rather than legislatively, via civic buy-in, enacted public opinion, and mayoral leadership rather than collective executive fiat. Citizens don’t have to wait for civil society; they can work with one another and impel civil society and leaders to act. Moreover, the web stands ready as a newly ubiquitous tool, bypassing traditional forms of political association; it is an informal global network in waiting that can be as formal over time as we choose to make it. The questions becomes how far cities can go together to solve problems that have proved intractable when confronted by individual competing states. Voluntary bottom-up civic cooperation and consensual intercity networking, limited as they may seem legally and institutionally, can lead to quite extraordinary feats of common action, solving real problems urban and global.

CHAPTER 6. CITIES WITHOUT SOVEREIGNTY – The Uses of Powerlessness

While nation-states are talking and posturing, cities are doing much of the heavy lifting. Relations between big cities and the states under whose sovereign jurisdiction they must live are nonetheless complicated. The technical sovereignty of the state is hardly the only factor. The lack of sovereignty among cities turns out to both disable and enable their engagement in cross-border cooperation. Cities need states, but states also need cities. There is then a powerful irony in the city’s lack of sovereignty and the state’s defining sovereign character- in the state’s power and the city’s relative powerlessness. States are not necessarily dysfunctional as national political systems, but they are dysfunctional in their inability to cooperate across borders. Here then is the paradox: sovereignty, the state’s defining essence and greatest virtue, is defiant in the face of the brute facts of our new century’s interdependence. In the world of independence, sovereignty works; in the world of interdependence, it is dysfunctional. As nations fall prey to rivalry and dysfunction, cities are rising and find themselves in the ironic position of being empowered globally by their lack of sovereignty nationally. Their interdependence makes them likely building blocks for a viable global order. The ambiguous relationship to power that is the key to the city’s cross-border potential can also be an

obstacle to its ultimate success. Cities may be acquiring new capacities for soft global governance, but states are hardly disappearing. While the nation-state has not itself been very successful at cooperating across borders, it can and often does try to prevent cities from doing so. Unless this dilemma can be overcome, the question will be whether a natural urban aptitude for piecemeal and episodic collaboration can be translated into a sustained strategy for achieving democratic global cooperation. Similar jurisdictional battles are being fought around the world, both in federal systems like Canada, the United States and Germany where localities have significant autonomy, and in centrist and unitary regimes like France and England, where there is little vertical separation of powers, and mayors may even be appointed from above- leaving cities with little freedom to act on their own. Thus, when nation-states –often driven by lobbies and corporations- say no, cities are compelled to listen. In formal terms, the city is an odd foundation for global governance. Cities are naturally inclined to soft power and soft governance. Yet while soft power works well in tandem with hard power, it is not a substitute for hard power. We need an account of how cities can treat with power without losing that political innocence that protects them from the rivalry, conflict and isolation typical of states. This raised three more concrete questions; (1) The first question is whether states really are existentially incapable of significant cooperation. What obstacles have prevented them from founding and grounding sustainable global governing institutions? Is there something in their nature that prevents them from doing so? (2) Second, are cities really free of the encumbrances that shackle states? Can they achieve sufficient autonomy to do what states have not done? If they succeed where nation-states fail, is it that they lack the state's fatal flaws of sovereignty and nationality? If the cooperative inclinations of cities are produced by the absence of sovereign power, do they have to govern without power or do they create a substitute- a participatory politics of consensus that is effective? (3) Third, if it can be shown that cities can do what states cannot, the paradoxes of power notwithstanding, will states permit cities to act on behalf of a global commons? Or will their sovereign jurisdictional claims be decisive and return what should be global issues to national courts and to the court-empowering sovereignty of the state, where cities are likely to lose the battle?

Why States Can't Rule the World

The early modern nation-state, though it rescued democracy, was from the start too large for the purposes of participation and neighbourliness, but too small to address the developing realities of interdependent power that have today become paramount in our own globalized market world. The modern metropolis retrieves the capacity to empower neighborhoods and nurture civic engagement, but at the same time holds out the prospect of networked global integration: that is the promise of glocality. As the scale of national societies once outgrew the polis, today the scale of global problems is outgrowing the nation-state.

The Failure of Nationality

Nationality was the artificial creation of early moderns seeking a new home for identity during the period of transition from small city-states and principalities to new and abstract national states in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Democracy, which in the era of the polis had presumed communal face-to-face citizenship and common social capital, might easily have vanished. But the new national states provided a kind of synthetic community and representative citizenship in the name of which a “people” could define and defend its liberty. For it was the idea of a people that allowed social contract theory to envision “popular sovereignty,” and to claim that the right to make laws (sovereignty’s essence) must be rooted in the consent of those who live under the laws. By thus defining itself as a home to a people freely contracting to obey a sovereign representing it, the new nation-state rescued democracy from the challenge of scale. The transition from networked cities to independent nation-states did much to conserve democracy, rendering it less participatory but giving it a foundation in original consent (social contract) and representation. But the challenge of a needed transition from democratic nation-states to some form of supranational democratic governance suitable to the challenges of interdependence has proven much more problematic. Getting around nationality is no easy task: nations moved by nationalism are hard to unite across their distinctive national cultures, as the United Nations has learned and even the European community is beginning to understand. It’s little different with the state’s second essential trait, sovereignty.

The Failure of Sovereignty

If nationality is an improbable foundation for securing supranationality, the concept of indivisible sovereignty is even more suspect. It is folly to try to cross borders politically on the backs of associations defined in their philosophical, ideological, and territorial essence by sovereign political frontiers, folly to seek in independence a formula for interdependence. Nonetheless, nearly every attempt to think across borders in the last century is founded on exactly this folly. The League of Nations and the United Nations both failed to prevent war and genocide or to generate systematic international cooperation in areas where individual states were unwilling to cooperate. The otherwise promising story of the European Union points to some of the same difficulties. Inaugurated in hopes of fashioning a true European civic identity, the E.U. points to how hard it is to fashion common citizenship in a world of self-consciously sovereign nations. Much more about economic prudence than civil religion, and preoccupied with currency rather than citizenship, the European Union today seems only as durable as its economic and currency arrangements are useful. It is the independence of the sovereign regime that guarantees the individual liberty of persons otherwise insecure in their freedom in the state of nature. But when this formula is applied to nation-states, and it is suggested that states too can and should surrender some portion of their national sovereignty and independence in return for global peace, the logic fails. Historical practice clearly tracks theory in this domain and should make believers of those who imagine sovereignty can somehow be divided or pooled without undoing its essential character. For where their vital interests are engaged, states in fact never have

surrendered any significant portion of their sovereignty other than under the duress of war. Boundaries may be traded or “adjusted,” but they will not be willingly shrunk or forfeited. Not, at least, as long as a state has the power (which undergirds its sovereignty) to resist. Sovereign states make poor “natural” building blocks for global governance under the best of circumstances. Deploying them as tools for overcoming their defining features, sovereignty and nationality, seems a desperate and futile strategy. Sovereign nation-states can’t forge post-sovereign, multicultural global democratic institutions. Can cities?

Why Cities Can Rule the World

The modern metropolis is multicultural, systemically unbordered, and networked into the world in a way that renders inside and outside meaningless. Cities are alike in the creativity, trade, openness, and variety that sustain their interdependence, but unique in the distinctive origins and historical character that define their differences. Cities are more likely to unite around their common aims and interests, facilitated by diversity and multiculturalism, that make them cosmopolitan. Mayors don’t talk like presidents and prime ministers about autonomy and sovereignty and self-determination. Declaring not their independence, but their interdependence, they build not walls but ports and portals, guildhalls and bridges. The absence of sovereignty becomes their special virtue. Yet the fact that neither sovereignty nor independence defines their character also poses a dilemma for cities that can thwart the aspiration to cooperation. Cities can cross borders easily, but they exist only within borders as subsidiary civic entities inside of states, subject to statist powers, sovereignty, and jurisdiction. Does this mean cities really cannot realize transnational forms of soft governance? Not necessarily. A survey of the CityNet association revealed that city networks facilitated information exchange, international exposure, and technical support; moved relationships with other cities “beyond friendship”; led to better policies and programs and better partnerships with other urban stakeholders.

Why States Can’t Stop Cities from Ruling the World

There is no question that, from a legal perspective, cities are bound to obey the sovereign laws, the national policy edicts, and the court decisions of the countries to which they belong. In practice, however, cities are at liberty to at in cases where superior jurisdictions are indifferent. The greatest freedom, lies in the domain where the laws are client. Cities are also free to at where there is no direct conflict between their networking goals and the sovereign interests of the state. Finally, cities can also be protected in their actions by constitutional guarantees securing their autonomy in the face of limited national governments. In the United States, the relative autonomy of local political authority is still granted by the ninth Amendment to the constitution, stipulating that the enumeration of federal powers

does not “deny or disparage others retained by the people,” and by the Tenth Amendment, ensuring that powers “not delegated to the United States...nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.” Yet the reality is that our century can belong to no one nation; that this will be the world’s century in common, or belong to no one people at all. It is not that states are weak but that their strength is without bearing on so many cross-border challenges- problems of immigration, disease, terrorism, climate change, technology, war and markets. This makes cities relatively functional. In the space between eroding national power and the growing challenges of an interdependent world, rising cities may find their voice and manage together to leverage change. Today with nation-states being dominated by forces of terrorism, pandemics, climate change, and predatory markets, and with the power of money over politics, it begins to seem that sovereignty is a thing precious only to posturing politicians and paradigm-preoccupied political scientists. The impact of these lessons on the delicate dance of nation-states and cities is hard to absorb for academics whose curriculum is organized around *national* peoples, sovereign *states*, and inter-*national* relations. Mayors do not have the luxury of this self-serving inattention to reality. To govern their cities they need to be able to participate in governing the interdependent world where most of the city’s challenges originate, even as they struggle to accommodate the state governments under whose jurisdiction they live. It is the paradox of sovereignty that, when it comes to addressing interdependence, at least with respect to cooperation, it makes strong states weak and weak cities strong mayors understand they need one another. Technically powerless, cities have in fact more than ample room to play in the spaces being vacated by a sovereignty that is disappearing or minimally is being displaced by economic power. Alexis de Tocqueville always believed that at its most compelling, liberty was local and municipal, and this remains true today. In the end, optimism about the future arises out of the nature of cities themselves. They are already networked and naturally disposed to creative interactivity and innovative cross-border experimentation and collaboration; they are relational, communal, and naturally interdependent. They embody local liberty and promote participatory engagement by citizens.

II. HOW IT CAN BE DONE

CHAPTER 7. PLANET OF SLUMS – The Challenge of urban Inequality

No one needs to tell the billion poor people living in the more than 200,000 urban slums around the world that rapid urbanizations has not been an unmitigated good. We need here to assess the

indictment through the lens of modern economics and culture to determine the extent to which the city is crippled by inequality and to measure inequality's effect on the argument for urban global governance.

Assessing Urban Inequality

I opened this study citing new figures showing that more than half the world's population is urban. Now comes the unsettling news that while only 6 percent of those dwelling in developed cities live in slums, an astonishing 78 percent of city dwellers in the least developed countries inhabit ghettos- about a third of the planet's urban population or one of every six human beings. Poor neighborhoods represent unsavoury and dangerous living conditions rooted in a material reality that contributes to fundamental urban inequalities. The United Nations Human Settlements Programme (U.N.-Habitat) focuses on the material, and defines a slum household simply as a "group of individuals living under the same roof in an urban area who lack one or more of the following:" durable housing, sufficient living space (not more than three per room), easy access to safe water, adequate sanitation, and security of tenure. By these measures U.N.-Habitat suggests there is little evidence that things are improving or that the underlying conditions are being addressed. If we compare figures from around the world with those from the United States, it suggests that there is not one planet of slums, but two. The first is made up of developed countries, where slums account for less than 10 percent of city populations. The second slum planet comprises the third world, where the largest and newest megacities, growing at a lightning pace, account for the great preponderance of slum dwellers. The inequality we see around the world is more than a function of difference: it is deeply unjust- irrational and thus inexplicable other than as a function of private interest, along with greed, narcissism, and exploitation. Redressing *inequality* may sometimes compromise liberty, but the redressing of *injustice* is liberty's very condition. Before any convincing argument can be made on behalf of global governance by cities, we are obliged to ask whether such a development is going to improve or depress the condition of people in either the developing world's "planet of slums" or the first world's planet of radical inequalities. Surely we would prefer to believe that mayors can improve the current situation, despite the harsh realities of urban life, cities over time can ameliorate the challenges of inequality as sites of experimentation and progressive innovation, cities continue to contribute new approaches to mitigating and overcoming inequality. The truth is that urban inequality is a persistent and distressing feature of modern cities and the contemporary world, above all in the developing world, where most slums are found, and which have been hardest hit by the global financial crisis and the global economic inequities occasioned by the self-serving "austerity" policies of the wealthy (austerity for you, profits for us). It can be argued that the density, multiculturalism, diversity and immigration patterns usually seen as virtues typical of cities nonetheless exacerbate and deepen inequalities of the kind spawned by state and global capitalism. Mike Davis references Patrick Geddes's grim prophecy that over time the evolution of cities will manifest itself mainly as "slum, semi-slum and superslum".

However, modest progress has been made in the first decade of the new millennium in meeting the already modest Millennium Goals set by the United Nations in 2000 for 2015 (and described earlier). The percentage of third world peoples living in slums is down from 39 percent in 1990 to 33 percent in 2012, for example, although it is not clear exactly what the benchmark is for this improvement, given the controversy about the definition of a slum. The main, remaining problem of the urban dilemma is that even where causes of inequality are local, remedies may not be available to local authorities.

Segregation as a Tale of Two Cities

Segregation is a common feature of inequality throughout the urban world, yet there is no one global segregation model that can be universally diagnosed and addressed. Mike Davis's "planet of slums," we have seen, is really a tale of two cities, one in the developing and the other in the developed world. Slums in the developed world exist in considerable tension with the putatively democratic character of both city and nation, an affront to achieved civil rights and hence demanding attention. Slums in the developing world, on the other hand, are much more encompassing and seemingly endemic to new megacities, often define urban life. Amelioration is hard to effect. Over a dozen years ago, David Harvey warned that the "problems of the advanced capitalist world pale into insignificance compared to the extraordinary dilemmas of developing countries, with the wildly uncontrolled pace of urbanization in Sao Paulo, Mexico City, Lagos, Mumbai and now Shanghai and Beijing." Their urbanization, moreover, is less voluntary than the West's. While historically, the West's big cities *pulled* people off the land and into the city filled with economic opportunities. Much of the rapid population growth in the developing world's megacities has been the result of people *pushed* off the land by unemployment and the kind of global market competition local agriculture can't combat. It is the negative profile of the rural economy rather than the positive profile of the city that sends people scrambling to the metropolis. Yet jobs are low paying in an unstable and lacklustre informal urban economy. However, there is still something to fight over. These pale but seductive opportunities have led to astonishing growth in third-world megacities in the absence of either mobility or genuine hope.

Segregation, whether residential, economic, educational or natural must then be appropriately addressed in both worlds of this binary system of urban planets. Segregation reflects power realities on both planets: "by dividing the city into physically separate racial zones, urban segregationists interpose four things- physical distance, physical obstacles, legal obstacles and people empowered to enforce the legal obstacles." Despite the undeniable impact of forces helpful to integration. Segregation persists. Carl H. Nightingale has wisely remarked on the contradiction: "Despite centuries of segregation," he writes, "cities have always been the site for the largest-scale interactions between people from different parts of the world, and they are responsible for most of the mixing of peoples and cultures in world history." In the face of the global recession's impact, it may then seem excessive to announce "the end of the segregated century" as the Manhattan Institute recently did. Yet as its new study demonstrates, by most standard segregation measures, American cities are more integrated

than at any time since 1910. These trends inspire the hope that segregation will continue to wane and turn developed-world cities into more egalitarian building blocks for global governance. The same economic trends are everywhere evident in the developing world, but they too play out in distinctive cultural and religious settings. In Europe, it is not skin color but Islam, both as religion and culture, that occasions segregation, bigotry, and inequality. Muslims have not been as completely ghettoized by geography and polarization as African-Americans once were in the United States, but the inequalities attending their economic, educational, and residential status have made for sharp divisions and an insidious reactionary politics of fear that creates ghettos of the mind and more perverse than physical ghettos. The greater divide, however, remains the one *between* “the West and the rest,” the developed world’s modest planet of slums and the developing world’s limitless, revolution-inciting megacity megaslums. As segregation fades on the first planet, it explodes on the other.

The Manifestations of Inequality

It is apparent that in its more egregious manifestations and compounded by segregation, urban inequality distorts access to housing, transportation, jobs, security and education. In less obvious ways, it also skews how people enjoy nature and experience sustainability.

Housing

Where people live and the conditions under which they are housed are clearly critical factors in the quality of their lives, as well as in determining their access to schools, transportation, jobs, and nature. Even under the best of circumstances, residential segregation by race and economic status makes it hard for residents to feel part of a larger metropolis or have access to its goods and services, even when they possess a clear sense of stakeholding and homesteading. The challenge for mitigation is clear, then, though anything but simple: equality without deracination, and anonymity without the loss of community: which is to say, community and neighbourhood without de facto segregation and without the loss of equal access to all city resources; and desegregation without uniformity and without the loss of diversity and freedom.

Transportation

It might seem that transportation that is public is by definition a universally accessible public good relatively immune to the distortion of wealth or segregation. But what is public in theory can be less than public in practice. For example, where public transportation is planned to serve poorer neighborhoods, it may eliminate express stops in rich neighborhoods, further “protecting” wealthier residents from “invasion” by the “wrong” persons. Moreover, the cost of public transportation can obviously also be critical. The takeaway from transportation issues is that there are subtler ways to

reinforce or exacerbate inequality, if inadvertently, than residential segregation. What appear initially as “solutions” to problems of sustainability and “public” goods can become impediments.

Jobs

Political partisans jaw about unemployment and who is to blame for it, but no one doubts the role of jobs in securing equality. Working is the condition for lived citizenship, conferring dignity, responsibility, and power on the job holder in a fashion that makes voting seem relevant. Given that inequality is the first instance economic, an urban economy that can provide stable, well-paid jobs with benefits also represents the most obvious and direct route to redress. Joblessness is a problem for the jobless, who need full economic rights first and liberation from bigoted neighbors only afterward. Racist slurs are demeaning, but redlining neighborhoods of color to exclude residents from receiving bank mortgages or business loans not only offends dignity but cripples economic opportunity. Given these discouraging data, the role of public sector jobs looms large in the city, where in both the developed and developing worlds between 15 and 25 percent of urban jobs are public. City jobs are, to be sure, vulnerable to the perils of corruption, urban corruption is an unmitigated disaster for democracy in the long term. Corruption's multiple downsides are obvious. Yet there are many cities where the alternatives to it may seem worse: indigence, poverty, and irrelevance. Not that there is ever an argument that corruption can seriously mitigate injustice, since by definition it is unjust and usually affects the least advantaged most egregiously. Nonetheless, immigrants and newcomers may be benefited by inefficiency and even by mild workplace corruption. Corruption undermines community and impedes democracy long term, but in the short run it can appear as an equalizer. Ideally, of course, reforming urban inequality in jobs and other domains calls for systemic if not revolutionary change. Yet as this discussion suggests, partial and contextualized solutions that work under the constrained circumstances of an unfair global society look like a better bet.

Security and Crime

The dialectic of urban life is not equally shared: the poor are victimized by its vices far more than others, while the wealthy are better able to enjoy its virtues. As a response to crime, the presence of effective policing is sometimes inversely correlated with the crime it is meant to combat. Ghettos may see more of the special units and gang- and drug-busting programs, but less of the ordinary attention and street patrols that makes neighborhoods safer through preventive policing. Slum residents will be stopped and frisked more often, but have their complaints about crimes perpetrated against them investigated less frequently and effectively than other wealthier denizens of the city. If there are so few cities in the world where policing is color-blind and justice truly even-handed, it is hard to imagine how urban injustice is going to be fully overcome.

Education

Residential segregation has devastating effects on the economic prospects of the poor, but its impact on class en employment comes first of all through its impact on education opportunity. Moreover, democratic citizenship and thus civic empowerment depends on education. We know that political participation correlates directly with years spent in school. Dropouts don't vote, people in prison can't vote, and the poor generally won't vote. Democracy depends on voters being educated in order to be motivated to vote, but it also depends on educated voters capable of deliberation and debate, of assimilating data and making informed judgments, in order to make self-governance a reality. If this commitment is to ensure equality, educational institution such as museums, libraries, universities and research bodies must be public and free, paid from general revenues rather than through private compensation and admission fees. Public education and public institutions of science, research, learning, and culture remain an indispensable condition of equality, and without them neither democracy nor justice is likely to be achieved.

Nature

In a world of interdependent water supplies, global agriculture, and cross-border pollution, the impact of cataclysmic climate change falls unevenly on the backs of the poor. Food is so intimately tied up with climate that the two can no longer be disentangled. These large issues are the backdrop to every discussion of nature and justice in the urban setting. But my focus here is not on the sustaining of nature but access to it. Parks are the lungs of the city, and hence crucial in establishing a rural presence within the urban. This is true literally as well as figuratively. Eric Jaffe suggests urban parks can "enhance your brain" while trees can impact crime rates. In theory, these spaces are public and open to all, but topography, transportation, and cultural use can skew the reality, leaving the poor feeling short-changed in their own residential neighborhoods.

Poverty, injustice, and segregation in every relevant urban sector in both slum "planets," first-world and third-world, remain major obstacles to urban equality and hence the role of cities in nurturing democratic global governance. Too many of the urban advantages we celebrate, from creativity and culture to trade and diversity, have consequences that accrue to the middle and upper classes at the expense of the poor. Only if the underlying and intransigent realities of urban segregation in all its forms can be addressed are we likely to instigate mitigation successfully.

CHAPTER 8. CITY, CURE THYSELF! – Mitigating Inequality

Inequality and injustice appear as intractable features of the city because they are endemic to its urban character- its density, its topographical and demographic inclination to segregation, its "natural"

ghettos, its susceptibility to economic stratification. This is cause for deep pessimism. But the sources of mitigation and amelioration, I will argue here, are also endemic to the city, and this offers grounds for hope. Those features that contribute to urban inequality can be the consequence of particular cultures and histories as they shape the development of different metropolises. But they need not be specifically urban and often are the product of a global market society that affects cities and nations alike in both their rural and urban regions. Yet whatever poverty's sources in the last half century inequality has urbanized right along with the world. Today, it threatens to leave the majority world population that lives in cities in destitution, and to obstruct and undermine the city's prospective role as a facilitator of cross-border civic cooperation and informal global governance. Mitigation in the more challenging because, we have seen, cities often cannot control their own destinies. They are too dependent on sovereignty and fiscal dominion of central governments. This leaves cities reliant on solutions to their problems that can at best only be partial and hence never altogether satisfying. Nonetheless, diminished power has its advantages, inasmuch as it leads to greater pragmatism and a makeshift but effective focus on getting done whatever can be done within prevailing limits. As a tactic of the relatively powerless, mitigation gets things done, permitting progress toward networking and informal cross-border governance to continue. If cities are to act democratically in seeking solutions to inequality from within, then there are two realistic urban strategies: make the city's core urban traits sources for addressing its inequalities; and ask democracy to overcome its deficiencies democratically. To the city and democracy alike, the demand must be cure thyself! But how to do that?

Ameliorating Poverty: City, Cure Thyself!

I want to explore pragmatic best practices that can affect segregation and inequality, and perhaps even ameliorate market fundamentalism down the line. Ma or Nenshi of Calgary worries that "great cities have inequality and wealth by definition: the reason they are cities is because people come from different parts of the income scale." Yet there is a corollary: great cities also have characteristics that permit them to combat and overcome inequality. Despite the crucial difference between inequality in the developed and developing worlds, these characteristics suggest common (glocal) approaches to the problems of inequality and injustice available to cities everywhere. The abstract idea of "glocality" takes on concrete meaning in the city, where government is local, about neighbors and neighbourhood democracy, but also about universal urban issues and global intercity networks. The mobility, innovation, entrepreneurship, and creativity typical of cities allows them to experiment and reform themselves, and borrow and adapt the best practices from others. Nations are, to be sure, different from one another: Switzerland as a landlocked alpine nation cannot borrow Holland's sea-based trade policies. But Zurich and Amsterdam can exchange drug policy information and borrow bike-share and anticongestion programs. Urbanization is driven and thus defined in part by the concentration of resources and such economic forces as immigration, mobility, proximity, and creativity, all features that give cities their entrepreneurial attractions and draw in people both from the countryside and from

the larger world beyond. Cities make economic, social, cultural and political sense. Cities make economic sense and can be reformed through economic policy, but in no small part because they make civic, social, cultural and political sense. Cities create jobs, but jobholders like cities. The poor need new economy jobs, but cities are where new economy jobs are being created. The attractiveness of cities and their compelling civic logic of creativity and innovation make the challenge of distributing work equally in the city easier to address. The jobs are there, the job seekers are there, economic modernization is there: the question is how to ensure they find each other, and do so equitably and justly across class, race, and segregated neighborhoods. Nations appear and fall, but cities endure and rediscover how to succeed. Their longevity gives them time to develop free institutions and a loyal citizenry. This is not to say that cities can simply will themselves immune to corruption and class division, or that the absence of educational opportunity, adequate housing, efficient job training, and accessible transportation will not continue to seriously curb development and place limits on opportunity for urban dwellers. The persistence of economic segregation walls off too many from the advantages of urban generativity. Cities are not merely creative but capable of generating and nurturing hope, innovation, and a sense of possibility and hence of breaking the vicious circle in which segregation, poverty, and inequality feed off one another. In pursuing practical and particular remedies associated with the city's core virtues, it is easier to break the vicious circle in the city than anywhere else. These remedies include recognizing and restoring a public sector that is less likely to be demonized locally than nationally; recognizing and formalizing an informal economy that, above all in cities, is ripe with unexploited opportunity; making urban education, civic education, and job training a foundation for equal opportunity in the city; exploring best practices in housing, transportation, and cultural affairs that rest on public-private ventures and have been shown to work in more than one city; and finally, using new technology to spur "smart cities" that through cooperation and technology can mitigate if not overcome inequality (chapter 9).

Addressing Injustice: Democracy, Cure Thyself!

The remedy for the ills of democracy, Jefferson quipped, is more democracy. Citizen reformers have not waited for the collapse of capitalism or constitutional revisions to engage in direct action on behalf of social justice. Social movements, nonviolent actions, and civic protest are not just efforts at reforming democracy, they are democracy in action. Even normal democratic politics in the city helps to combat the bias against government and the public sector that has gripped national politics in the United States and the West. The three-decades-old assault on the public sector that has accompanied market fundamentalism has made the battle against inequality and injustice at every level of government more difficult. The corrosive de-democratization in the political sphere that attends market fundamentalism nationally makes much less sense where government is neither big nor bureaucratic and where mayors are seen as fellow citizens struggling to address common problems. Built on civility, cooperation, and common work, on traits that depend on a sense of affinity between individuals and

neighbors and between citizens and their elected representatives, the city feels more like a genuine commons than its regional and national counterparts. The antidote to market fundamentalism and political alienation is not less government but more transparency, more accountability, more public oversight and regulation; also more public interaction and consultation. In a word, more democracy. Strengthen the bonds with city government so that civic alienation is not an option. Given the city's scale, its immediacy, and the local character of city politics, cities have a better chance to do this temperately than any other level of government, both through intervention and public employment, and through public-private partnerships and collaboration with the business and NGO sectors. Cities are theatres of strong democracy and civic and entrepreneurial creativity, and as such the last, best hope for real civic empowerment. Participation is always in the mix, and democracy is still the best bet for remedying the ills of democracy.

Making Capitalism Work: Formalizing the Informal Economy

The renewal of the alliance between citizens and their local government, rooted in the government's capacity to provide jobs, regulations, and private-public cooperation and in the citizen's inclination to participate in local decision making and neighbourhood affairs, is the urban key to ameliorating inequality. Social observers and civic advocates like Hernando de Soto, the director of the Institute for Liberty and Democracy in Peru, have long recognized, however, that urban economics is as much about informal power as about city government, as much about the invisible economy as about public jobs or formal corporate institutions. It is the informal economy that minimally keeps the poor from expiring, and if elaborated, formalized, and made legitimate, it can help overcome radical inequality and foster mobility- in time, greater civic integration as well. "The problem with poor countries," de Soto writes, "is not that they lack savings, but they lack the system of property that identifies legal ownership and therefore they cannot borrow." De Soto's theory, which he has applied in practice in many parts of the developing world, has shown some significant results, although it is flawed by its treatment of the "legal" economy as a wholly neutral marketplace. For in the absence of real civic and political equality, legalizing invisible capital can subject it to exploitation and expropriation of a kind not possible when it remains "dead." In settings of relative civic equality, unlocking dead capital can succeed, but this involves breaking the circle from inside the circle. It means overcoming political inequality through exploiting an invisible economy, which can happen only in the context of relative political equality. It thus is likely to work best when coupled with political and democratic reform. Microfinance, a strategy pioneered by Muhammad Yunus, the founder of the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, also seeks to bootstrap women out of poverty by recognizing their economic potential when catalysed by small loans that allow them to turn creativity into new local business ventures. By

acknowledging and facilitating the special role women play in family and neighbourhood in stabilizing society, microfinance becomes a fiscal strategy for urban integration. My own view is that innovative ideas, especially those impacting “normal market capitalism,” almost always come under assault from those representing the standard capitalist paradigm, often through personal libels against the authors of such ideas. Global finance has yet to receive anything like the scrutiny unleashed on Yunus, and it does not pretend to serve the poor.

An Example of Mitigation from Los Angeles: Pro and Con

On the West Coast of the United States, to take one instance, microfinance, “illegal” jobs, and invisible economy street vending activities have impacted inequality significantly. Jobs also grow out of the informal economy in ways that indicate how it is already linked to the formal economy through practices in which the wealthy and the poor are complicit, often outside the law, but softening the impact of segregation. Those who work in larger cities, whether legal or undocumented, actually get a better wage. When government steps in to provide health, education, and good transport, or offer “urban visas” (see Chapter 11), these integrating synergies actually make a difference. They do not have to be legislated into existence but do need to be legislatively protected and legally secured. Jobs are not enough. The problem with the informal economy is that wages are very low and work itself uncertain, while benefits and pensions are non-existent and upward mobility circumscribed. Perhaps the most important but also troubling element in the informal economy in both the developed and developing worlds is street vending- sometimes legal, mostly illegal but overlooked, always in the shadows of the real economy, invariably critical to survival for the poor. It is thus one of city’s government’s most urgent tasks to find ways to legitimate and underwrite street vending, to turn careers of desperation in tension with licensed businesses and conventional practices into legitimate occupations that can support whole families. Just how difficult this can be is shown by the good-willed attempts of the City of Los Angeles. The dramatic story related by Jesse Katz of trying to sanction and support street vending by establishing an “Art-Agricultural Open Air Market” on Little Street cannot be retold here, but the effort nearly destroyed the neighborhood’s traditional unlicensed but thriving vending economy, which, Katz writes, was a “hodgepodge that sustained an ecosystem, an entry-level marketplace in which anyone could afford to participate, as buyer or seller.” This is the very definition of the informal economy’s potential for creative entrepreneurship, which, if harnessed, can impact inequality significantly. This example described with such nuance and sensitivity embodies both the bold promise of the informal economy and the extraordinary difficulty of transforming it through political policies without destroying its vitality. This is a puzzle I cannot begin to solve. I can only point again to how the promise of the informal economy can pay off when formalized effectively and how it makes more sense to allow capitalism to work for the poor rather than trying by some miracle of a historicity to abolish it.

A Best-Practices Approach to Mitigation

It would require an encyclopaedia to enumerate the experiments and policies developed around the world to address urban inequality in each of the domains discussed in Chapter 7 in different cities on different continents. Instead, I hope to recommend continuous urban experimentation with new and shared practices of the kind regularly reported on the City Protocol or C40 or Sustainable Cities Collective websites, practices that may be specific to distinct sectors and sensitive to cultural and historical differences among cities but that can nevertheless be accommodated to cities everywhere. This means that they can be compared and shared, especially in a new virtual world in which smart cities defy the walls, maps, and time zones in which they were once trapped and can coexist and cooperate in a “cloud” of commonality that is no longer a metaphor for their imaginative capabilities but the reality of a digital planet.

CHAPTER 9. SMART CITIES IN A VIRTUAL WORLD – Linking Cities with Digital Technology

A host of enthusiasts, from the early pioneers of *Wired Magazine* and the Electronic Frontier Foundation to the newest innovators of City Protocol, are persuaded that digitally linked, so-called smart cities are on the cutting edge of urban innovation. Many observers are sure that “the new digital age” is “reshaping the future of people, nations and business.” Integral to this idea of a digital world is the notion of smart cities, which are presumed to have the potential to give new meaning to the idea of digital rights and to promote intercity cooperation. Do they? Let me pose the question this way: Can the ubiquitous technology that everywhere promises digital Nirvana actually further the goal of global networking and the governance of mayors?

To start with, we need to understand the phrase “smart cities.” It may reference little more than novel gadgetry and the impulse to try to conduct conventional business unconventionally- electronically, digitally and hence virtually. This understanding, though important, is trivial. Smart cities are in the first instance simply tech-savvy towns that utilize digital innovation to do their business. But smart cities are also self-consciously interdependent cities that use technology to enhance communication, hoping to make smart cities wireless nodes in a global network and reinforce their natural inclination to connectivity and collaboration. For civic entities defined as much by interaction, creativity and innovation as by place, maps, and topographical boundaries, the cloud isn’t a bad place to be. By digitally escaping the limits of space and time, cities embrace and realize- they literally *virtualize*- the metaphors and constructs that define them. The new global space of flows is profoundly urban. Increasingly, cities are depending on technology as the key to sustainability, economic vitality, and commercial and cultural exchange. They hope to be able to turn the abstract notion of flows into concrete interconnectivity. The question we need to ask today is whether efficiency in communication and information access will improve urban services or merely centralize surveillance and control and infringe privacy. The digital world encompasses thousands of cable and satellite broadcast channels, 600 million Internet sites,

almost a billion Facebook users and, and perhaps 70 million bloggers, along with storage for all photos, piles, programs, and all that “bid data” in a virtual cloud no longer safely inscribed on our own hard drives. Almost all of these public technologies are privately owned by quasi monopolies. Because the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 passed in the Clinton years allowed the privatization of all such new media, cities cannot become smart without forging public-private-partnerships. So-called Big Data inundates us with information more useful to marketers or security officials than to policy makers trying to make prudent judgments and looking for knowledge and wisdom. I will argue, then, that technology can both facilitate and compromise what cities are doing to enhance their interdependence, but way too often, those employing it don’t know the difference. Corporations have a fiscal obligation to their shareholders to make money off their urban technology, but cities need to be aware that the smart-city portion of the business sector was estimated to have earned as much as \$34 billion in 2012 and has been projected to be able to earn \$57 billion by 2015. Tech companies do not embrace smart-city initiatives disinterestedly in the name of public goods, though that certainly does not mean their partnerships cannot also serve such goals. The partnership of tech firms and cities on which the new urban “smart” is predicated is quite real but needs to be scrutinized as well as celebrated. Real change is taking place. Digital technology is minimally making cities more efficient, communicative, sustainable, and liveable, qualifying them as smart. According to former San Francisco mayor Gavin Newsom, it is far from being just about efficiency, ITC can be “a gateway drug for civic engagement.” Elaine Weidman, the vice president for sustainable and corporate responsibility at Ericsson Broadband, agrees: “Today you get a much more global conversation, whether it’s climate change or an issue within your local city government. Today you have the possibility not to just tell the government what you think but to get others involved in your cause and to share your views.” Digital technology and its most significant social product, the World Wide Web, have unquestionably revolutionized communication and how we live socially but have also produced effects that distort human relations, undermine deliberative democracy, enhance aggressive commerce, and trivialize and privatize our life-worlds. Among reasonable sceptics open to change but suspicious of uncritical ardour, these are significant questions to be raised before we embrace the promise of smart cities as a path to constructive interdependence.

Smart Cities: Dumb and Dumber or Better than Ever?

We can hardly be surprised that the new digital technology pushes partisanship more diligently than it catalyzes civility. It sells goods more effectively than it cultivates citizenship, though, ironically, the puzzle of how to monetize the Internet has yet to be solved. As the technology is today applied to urban interaction, questions remain about whether the consequences will be wholly constructive. When commerce and markets overshadow technological architecture, the results are not inspiring. Are smart cities really civically smarter? Or dumb and dumber?

The effects of evolving technologies have been both constructive and destructive. Every technological innovation in history has elicited caveats and warnings. The new technology allows us to assemble and masse anywhere and at the speed of light, but the billion on the internet gather only as individuals in small coterie of friends and family; others, aliens, and enemies are not welcome. The web removes all physical limits from deliberation and common decision making but seems to reinforce social ghettoization and groupthink. Yet the speed that accelerates global democratic interaction overruns democratic deliberation, obliterates democratic judgment, and undermines the slow pace of democratic decision making. Participation is encouraged but participants, undated by big data and enamoured of and encouraged in their own private judgments by wiki-process crowdsourcing software, are ever less public and civic in their inclinations. Critics remain disquieted by the web's capacity for surveillance, its indifference to privacy, its mirroring of the manipulative commercial society. These content providers and hardware and software producers, along with their archive in the "cloud" are all you need to live, think, and breathe digitally. The fraught ideals of net neutrality and privacy do not stand much of a chance against the realities of monopoly power in the hands of a few global corporations. Yet everyday consumers and enthusiastic urbanists alike shower applause on these companies and the innovators who founded and run them, teaming up with them without subjecting them to scrutiny or questioning. The web that knows what books you might like to read and which sites you like to visit, knows how you think politically. With such empowering knowledge it can put appropriate books in your hands but also find reasons to put your hands in manacles. It can help you think through for whom you should vote, or help those who want your vote to get it regardless of what you think. Knowing the pitfalls, the aim must be to do not merely what technology allows but what we choose and want to do with technology's help. What cities want to do is secure technology's assistance in augmenting interdependence and promoting intercity cooperation. But first a word about how technology is changing the way cities do their *own* business.

Smart Uses of Smart Technologies Inside Cities

The most important, as well as (literally) revolutionary, entailment of new technology is to enable opposition and dissidence in corrupt or illegitimate regimes. Democratic technology has also been a friend to democratic protest and democratic rebellion in fully democratic nations, having, for example, played a key role in Occupy Wall Street. Digital technology's role in already-democratic societies has been less confrontational and more conventionally instrumental- an aid to efficiency and clear communication and an invitation to greater participation. In recent years, the new role of new media became to enhance traditional campaigning. Technology has essayed to transform politics but that is not happening. Following the contested 2000 presidential election in the United States, the Help America Vote Act pointed the nation toward online voting. But digital divide issues of access aside, it eventually became clear that security questions made the option less desirable than many hoped it would be. The result has been a pretence of participation that has spread thinly across what is little

more than a participatory gloss on traditional top-down, one-way politics. It is once again clear that new technology is used first of all to conduct old business. Shopping is still the web's main activity today, and about one-third of net traffic follows the road to porn. No surprise then that the promised interactivity of the web too often turns out to be a cynical cover for promoting unilateral top-down politics. Yet these realities should not obscure the genuinely new uses of digital tech that make cities more energy efficient, more citizen friendly, and more participatory. A number of American states, including California and Nevada, are experimenting with "self-driving cars" that are far more energy efficient than traditional vehicles and are intended primarily for cities. Smart thermostats save electricity and make heating and air-conditioning more efficient. Remote health exams via the web can offer improvements in urban health care, especially for those without regular access to doctors. And electronic record keeping is a money-saving boon to public health that improves patient care and helps cities deal with new global pandemics. There is, in short, a great deal to be said about what cities are doing currently to employ technology as a creative means to improve efficiency, sustainability, governance, and citizen outreach. For our purposes, however, the most crucial aspect of smart-city programs are those involving the role of technology in affording enhanced citizenship and civic exchange *among* cities and across national borders. Unfortunately, in this domain there is less innovation, and the way forward is genuinely hard.

Really Smart Cities: Connecting City Networks Electronically

The difficulties notwithstanding, proponents of intercity cooperation and cross-border participatory democracy continue to innovate. In France, Le World e.gov Forum is dedicated to providing a web space for public debates among decision makers, elected officials, private actors, and members of civil society across the world, who can access the space via teleconferenced mobile phones. The project is fully in the spirit of informal cross-border communications to public and private civic communities alike. As such, it offers a useful digital prototype for a parliament of mayors hoping to connect virtually to cities around the world. The web has achieved the greatest success in linking cities around common action through its role in virally sharing city indicators and disseminating important urban initiatives in sustainability and democracy. Through the City Indicators project, U.N.-Habitat, ICLEI, the World Bank, and other global partners are helping cities to share data about key performance figures with one another, a first step to more effective collaboration. There can be little doubt that cities are getting smarter and finding ways to use digital technology for outreach, information, and education and for involving citizens in neighbourhood business, mainly within but also among towns. The possibilities of crowd sourced knowledge developed on the horizontal and disintermediated terrain of the Internet has powerful democratic implications. Innovations like participatory budgeting, though spread by the web, are rooted not in high tech but in traditional citizens' assemblies and boards or participatory councils exercising meaningful budget control through co-planning processes. Such experiments may have resulted in an "empowerment of civil society and, most notably, of the working class," but these results

are unrelated to technology. Technological implementation of participatory ideals among cities remains aspiration. And for good reason. It is generally acknowledged that online communities are rarely invented on line but are initiated in the real world and then pursued and sustained virtually. If we are not interested in politics, e-politics won't help. It is for this reason that a true intercity civic commons online- a "citzster" civic file-sharing program- will likely have to follow rather than precede a civic campaign to establish intercity governance and the establishment of a parliament of mayors. Indeed, the fashioning of such a digital commons might even become a high purpose of a global cities secretariat. With respect to the democratic uses of the new technology, I remain today what I was twenty-five years ago, not a sceptic, certainly not a technophobic, but a realist the promise of the web's democratic architecture remains. E-participation and computer-supported cooperative work (CSCW) are now as current as e-government once was. While much of the technological innovation has occurred within cities and national systems, organizations like City Protocol and OneWorld (online) and e-gov Forum have begun to point the way to intercity collaboration via the web, even if they are unlikely to be able to *lead* the way. The virtual always mimics the real. Citizens do not need a gateway drug for civic engagement, they need to take their citizenship cold-sober seriously. If they do so, technology can certainly help them engage across time and space. Where cities go and citizens lead, there technology can follow, reinforcing and augmenting their progress in significant ways. But as in the past, truly smart cities will rely first not on instrumental technology but on the primary intelligence of citizens and the judgment of mayors in solving the (not just urban) problems of an interdependent world.

CHAPTER 10. CULTURAL CITIES IN A MULTICULTURAL WORLD – The Arts of interdependence

Culture defines the city and is critical to urban interdependence and to the democratic imagination. Some even insist that to speak of art *and* the city is redundant. Quite simply, art *is* the city. Urban space is free public space that facilitates public communication, civic imagination, and intercity cultural exchange. Creativity, imagination, collaboration, communication, and interdependence are essential constituents of what we mean when we speak of both the urban and the cultural, of both democracy and the arts. I want here to advance this argument both conceptually, through an exploration of art and imagination, and concretely, through a survey of cultural networks. In the process, it should become apparent that the very notions of the "urbane" and "urbanity" we use to capture the disposition of the city also evoke the civilized and cosmopolitan- what I understand as the interdependent creative commons. In associating urbanity with culture, I do not mean to suggest an instrumental, let alone commercial, relationship in which the arts are subordinated to other purposes of the city. Culture certainly generates economic benefits in the neighborhoods and towns in which it flourishes, and it more than "earns" what it costs city government and taxpayers. Yet it should not have to justify itself

by economic payoffs. If one must choose, it is more appropriate to treat the city as the instrument of the arts rather than the other way round, for it exists in a certain sense for art. I want to consider three specific contexts for urbanity that help mediate art and the city: the idea of the public, the idea of democracy, and the idea of interdependence. These mediating ideas provide a context that helps render the abstract practical, the invisible transparent. The three contextualizing ideas, briefly elaborated are these:

The Idea of the Public, which points to the “us” of art- to communication, community, common space, and shared ground, and hence to a richer conception of audience;

The Idea of Democracy, which points to the ideals of equality, participation, and justice, and identifies in imagination a fundamental affinity between the arts and democratic life;

The idea of Interdependence, which points to the cosmopolitan and the universal, a world without boundaries or border that demands to be recognized but has been largely neglected, even denied, by the parochial and insular for whom walls are a form of security.

In mediating the city and the arts, these three notions suggest how culture can advance the civic and collaborative interests of the city without reducing the arts to mere instruments in service to the urban. As it makes its case for public life, democratic citizenship, and constructive interdependence, art practice makes a case for itself and its indispensability to the life of free democratic societies. But it is a hard slog, with big money and corporate organization too often on the other side. Nonetheless, in essaying to *create* a public, to *imagine* equality by accessing and sublimating otherness, and to *subvert* boundaries and build bridges among generations, traditions, and nations, art forges the conditions it needs in order to flourish.

The City as Public Space and the Perils of Privatization

Of the three contextualizing ideas, the idea of the public is perhaps the most at risk, above all in those cities in the developed world where the arts have traditionally flourished. The idea of a “cultural community” is in a sense redundant, since culture always presupposes and fosters community. A culture is by its very nature collective, common, and public in character. In offering a creative vision, art invites spectators and listeners to join a community. Cities flourish where art thrives because the arts help create the public space cities need. The historical priority of public over private space, of the non-profit civil sector over the private market sector, was evident in the traditional architecture of our towns and cities but is today endangered. In traditional townships, centred around a commons or public square were once found the non-profit symbols of the *res publica* and a robust and pluralistic civil society: an art gallery, town offices, a community theatre, and a church or synagogue or mosque; and of course those emblems definitive of our public lives, a public, school, a public library, a public town hall etc. in town today, however, public architecture is being overtaken and displaced by private

buildings: corporate towers and bank-sponsored skyscrapers. In the new suburban mall spaces, defined often as private rather than public, political leafleting, playing, praying and even people-watching are discouraged if not outlawed. In destroying public space, privatization undercuts the conditions that nourish culture. With the corporatization of cities and the malling of towns, we can hardly be outraged or even surprised when art both mimics and mocks the commercial culture on which it depends by making its price tag the measure of its worth. Modern artist, from rappers to painters, work hard to rationalize their sellout to commerce as a form of subversion. Subversion and cashing in turn out quite conveniently to be more or less the same thing. It is perfectly true and more than important to recognize that the arts help create and sustain communities, and they pay back to cities far more than cities pay to support them. While cities should be transparent, they should perhaps only be subject to standards applying to all corporations. At the international conference Florens 2010, a featured study showed that for every \$100 invested in arts and culture, \$249 was added to GDP; that every three jobs created in the arts sector yielded two more in the private sector. Yet focusing on the economic arguments for supporting civic art shifts the ground from culture to commerce. Artists and arts producers represent the soul of the city yet are too often driven by scarce resources to become reluctant urban pioneers in developing or restoring unprofitable neighborhoods abandoned or neglected by commercial interests. All too often, the instigators and cultural catalysts become the homeless detritus of newly chic new neighborhoods where they cannot longer afford the exorbitant rents they have made feasible. The arts are surely viable sources of economic productivity for cities. But neither artists nor politicians should be forced to offer only these instrumental arguments in campaigning for culture. So the arts benefit the urban economy, because to benefit the commons, to enhance the community, to help create common goods and public space, *is* economically beneficial. Demanding that artists “prove” their value to the city in commercial terms can only be counterproductive. It means treating the public space that culture sustains as private commercial space, which corrupts art and robs the city of its defining commons. Art loses, but we lose more.

The City as Democracy and the Power of Imagination

Democracy, our second crucial cultural construct, is closely related to the idea of the public and equally vital to the arts. It invokes equality and participation, but it begins with a deep regard for the human rights that generate the egalitarian ideal. “freedom of expression is the foundation of human rights, the source of humanity, the mother of courage and truth.” Such human rights, in theory the human birthright, are in fact a product of human association and democratic citizenship. The faculty that ties art to democracy and democracy to art is imagination. Citizens have in common with artists a capacity to envision: to look beyond apparent borders, to see beneath appearances, to apprehend commonality where others perceive only difference. Democracy’s paramount norm is equality. Equality is above all a product of imagination. Immediate perception and blunt reality reveal only the

distinctions of race, gender, accent, class, religion, and ethnicity that divide us and turn us into potentially hostile “others,” dividing the world into warring tribes. Equality demands an imaginative faculty that sees through walls and beyond otherness to underlying human sameness. The democracy I am invoking here is not democracy as a formal governing system but, in John Dewey’s phrase, democracy as a way of life. In this notion of democracy, it is not just talk but silence that defines democratic life. For imagination’s most precious tool is listening, apprehending what can be gleaned from stillness. As Gilligan has said, “There’s a patriarch so-called notion of care, which is care as self-sacrifice and selflessness. And there’s a democratic notion of care, which is: to care is to be present, it’s to have a voice, it’s to be in a relationship.” The city’s affinity for democracy grows in part out of this notion of care, this disposition for relationship, for voice as listening no less than speaking. Likewise, city council members and mayors are more disposed than officials at higher levels of government to use their ears as well as their lips as instruments of governance. In art and democracy alike, imagination is the supreme virtue. Art thus nurtures democracy, and democracy embraces art. Civic education is as much arts education as social science. Before imagination, bigotry withers, “others” melt away, and obstacles to community both within and among cities fall.

Urban Interdependence and Cosmopolitan Culture

Like art, democracy enlists imagination to cross boundaries, allowing individuals to become citizens and letting citizens forge common ground with others despite alien identities and origins. Yet also like democracy, art is necessarily rooted, embedded in culture and nationality, to a degree even imprisoned in the independent nation-states that contain it. Yet the more culture inflection, the less universality. Anthems and songs of battle and conquest reflect and celebrate a particular history that can exclude, diminish, or deny the history and cultures of others and turn the “other” into an enemy. Democracy’s capacity for empathy and taste for equality has often evaporated at the democratic nation’s frontiers. Although the old cliché insists that democracies never make war on one another, the democratic community, so free from boundaries within, can nurture hostility to “foreign” cultures. I do not wish to suggest that the art of a nation’s cultural roots and urban art are wholly contrary, but interconnected cities laced with multiculturalism are less constrained in their cultural self-definitions and democratic outreach than nation-states. Their virtue is to cross border rather than secure and fortify them, to define themselves in cosmopolitan rather than parochial language. Cities compromise both walls and bridges, but it is the bridges that stand out when we speak about urban art or urban democracy. Build on water, cities flow. They too seek local identity in rooted art forms, but theirs is a dialectic of art in which both a rooted culture and a multicultural commons stand in healthy tension. Art both creates and subverts identity and is probably most successful when it is doing both. It succeeds in being cosmopolitan only inasmuch as it grows out of a particular place, a parochial *politeia*. I can think of no artist who puts the unique gifts of his native culture to more cosmopolitan and democratic purposes than Walt Whitman, a man for whom poetry and democracy are twins. Whitman was no lazy idealist,

blind to democracy's faults. From him we learn that ambivalence is democratic art's calling card. Whitman's democracy was a congeries of everyman and everywoman unbounded: "I acknowledge the duplicates on myself, the weakest and shallowest deathless with me,/ What I do and say the same waits for them, / Every thought that flounders in me the same flounders in them." Whitman's equality feels real and palpable and speaks still today to the endless variety of America, to its now-global cities, to cities everywhere teeming as ever with immigrants who are the hardy new specimens of an emerging global civil society. Whitman celebrates not government buy society, and a pretty rough society at that. Whitman's democracy, like the city's, is finally a democracy of hope, a democracy that looks forward because its history "remains unwritten...[and] has yet to be enacted." It is a democracy that responds to terror fearlessly by refusing to yield its liberties to security or sacrifice equality in the name of surveillance and profiling. To the degree democracy overseen by anxious nation-states is at risk today (and democracy is always at risk), it may be because we have neglected the spirit of poetry and have turned imagination into guardian of our fear and a prognosticator of catastrophe. Whitman knows the tasks of democracy are more than governmental and greater than the vouchsafing of security. In *Democratic Vistas*, he writes: "Did you, too, O friend suppose democracy was only for elections, for politics, and for a party name? I say democracy is only of use there that it may pass on and come to its flower and fruits in manners, in the highest forms of interaction between men, and their beliefs- in religion, in literature, colleges, and schools- democracy is all public and private life." Whitman embraced a democracy that could contain multitudes. This was the special gift of the city: its pluralism. Yet it is today imperilled by the spirit of our age: the shrunken, greedy animus of the imperious corporate banker of the grasping consumer with whom the citizen is too often confounded. If ever a market-obsessed world needed democratic voices, ardent dreamers, and lawless artists, it needs them today.

Art and the City: Institutions and Networks

Production and performance institutions within cities often become nodes for cultural exchange and networking, exploiting the global character of theatre, opera, music and dance in today's world. A mere listing does not do justice to the role these institutions play in introducing artist cross-culturally, linking cities, and in helping to establish an independent global culture. But the myriad organizations linked together in the International Society of Performing Arts, are examples of producing and presenting organizations that ensure culture also means multiculturalism in global cities everywhere and that cultural relations also entail personal relations among artists. ISPA is a "global network of more than 400 leaders in the performing arts with representation from more than 50 countries and all regions of the globe." In the words of David Baile, ISPA's executive director (CEO), cities are "hubs of cultural activity" so that art is "urban-centric." Nonetheless, Baile notes, cities are set in regions and neighborhoods that need to be understood as "underserved areas" requiring attention. Inequality turns out to be an affliction of culture as well as economics. Big cities with culture overshadow small cities

without. As a consequence, the differences that divide cities are too often mirrored in access to cultural and artistic funding. Associations like ISPA manage to offer some common ground but can hardly overcome the divide on their own. To fill the gap, public funding of the arts is essential. Its role is to equalize where the market excludes and segregates. The arts also are the subject of policy in a number of international organizations, though in contrast to culture within and among cities, there is a pronounced instrumentalism in their approach. The best known United Nations agency, UNESCO, promises in its cultural mission statement to develop “operational activities that demonstrate the power of culture for sustainable development and dialogue.” It also aspires to “promote the diversity of cultural expressions and the dialogue of cultures with a view to fostering a culture of peace.” The virtue of cities, as creators and consumers of culture, is that they are less driven by explicit political agendas and are more interested in demonstrating culture’s self-referential attributes that mirror what is best about the city. Artists and cultural organizations can nevertheless hardly afford to turn away from institutions that are, of necessity, bureaucratic and utilitarian. International institutions like UNESCO may treat art primarily as a vehicle for achieving other goals that presume and exploit rather than foster culture and its creation. Cities have little choice but to walk the line separating art for its own sake from art as a vehicle of related urban and democratic goals. Thus, UNESCO takes a lively interest in cultural programs that manifest both cultural identity and artistic expression, both of value to the arts community. Its current works include efforts “to promote dialogue among cultures and increase awareness of cultural interactions, through flagship projects.” These projects make clear that underlying UNESCO’s work is an awareness of the key relationship between art and democracy.

Table 4: Global Cultural Organizations

Organization Name	Headquarters	Membership	Year Est
Association of Performing Arts Presenters (APAP) www.creativecity.ca/	Washington, D.C., USA	1,400 members worldwide	1957
European Capitals of Culture http://ec.eurpa.eu/culture	Brussels, Belgium	All E.U. States	1985
International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies www.ifacca.org	Sydney, Australia	69 national members, 50 subnational or NGO affiliates	2000
International Society of the Performing Arts (ISPA) www.ispa.org/	New York, USA	Over 400 cities from 50 countries	1949

Table 4 is a list of global cultural organizations with an urban-centric character.

City authorities often worry about whether art is for the city or just “out for itself,” a burden the city must carry or a resource it can exploit. But this question turns out to be reflexive and unproductive. For in truth, art and the city, if not exactly synonyms, reflect a common creativity, a shared attachment to

openness and transparency and a core commitment to play and playfulness- in short, reflect the creative commons that is the fruit of their collaboration and intersection.

CHAPTER 11. CITIZENS WITHOUT BORDERS – Glocal Civil Society and Confederalism

Our aim has been to show why mayors can and should rule the world, if ever so softly. To speak of “rule” or “governance” is to focus on the mechanics and institutions of the political order. I have always believed, that the political is grounded in the civic, that democratic governance whether local or global must first find its corresponding spirit and character in democratic civil society. The failure of political constitution making often originates in a failure to recognize this bottom-up character of democracy. Because working top-down is so much easier and quicker. By engaging citizens directly in one of the most mundane but significant functions of urban governance in a part of the world long accustomed to authoritarian politics and the rule of economic elites, participatory budgeting has become a notable urban instrument of both democratization and social justice in the world. In other words, participatory budgeting as a democratic process has at times been thwarted not because it was democratic but because it put democracy in service to social justice ends opposed by ruling elites. An unconventional process is one thing, a radical outcome is another. Yet, experiments suggest that, at the municipal level, citizen participation is feasible even in decisions where the questions are fairly technical and citizen competence and experiment knowledge are required, and where the commitment of time is a prerequisite of success. It also offers evidence for the claim by deliberative democrats that debate among citizens can affect value rigidity and open the way to common ground. It also seems likely that the practice can produce enhanced citizen participation and enhanced trust between citizens and local governors in ways that not only improve local democracy but create a hospitable context for greater intercity cooperation involving both citizens and their elected representatives. Mayors wishing to endow their global leadership in a prospective parliament of mayors and in other theatres of intercity cooperation with greater legitimacy and efficacy could do worse than embrace these participatory budgeting practices. Given our discussion of smart cities, it is worth noting that technology can play a salient role in participatory budgeting and civic consultation more generally. Although most towns utilize a real-time process, combining online and off-line practices can offer significant advantages. As the size of cities and the scale of participation increase, technology becomes more crucial. Participatory budgeting is, of course, only one experiment in urban democracy and cannot by itself either make the case for participation or prove that urban governance is capable of more effective, strong democracy than other levels of government. But as a spreading best practice that has persisted in the face of critics, it offers hope for those who believe there may be a little less distance between mayors and citizens than between voters and state authorities and it sustains those who argue that as mayors come to rule the world, if only informally, they are likely to bring citizens with them.

Cross-Border Strong Democracy: Global Civil Society – NGO's and MNCs

Municipal democratic practices contribute importantly but only indirectly to global civil society because they unfold *inside* cities; the practices of networks *among and between* cities contribute directly. There are, however, other organizations and institutions that play a role in global civic relations and deserve brief scrutiny. Chief among them are nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and multinational corporations (MNCs). Such nonstate actors are patently significant despite the fact that academic political science and the media have focused almost obsessively on states and state-based international relations. There is an extensive literature already devoted to these nonstate players, so I will simply note their relevance to fostering a robust cross-border civil society that can undergird the proposed mayors parliament. Their chief defect compared to intercity networks is they are notably undemocratic in their structure and organization. NGOs have hierarchical organizational structures, with members acting as passive funders and supporters of self-selected leaders rather than their proactive agents or sovereign masters. Thus it may be worth considering the idea of a formal global assembly of NGOs, something already portended by the World Assembly convened annually by CIVICUS, to act as a “second chamber” to the assembly of mayors recommended in the final chapter, but only as long as its role is advisory. To do so would effectively place global civil society not just under the new parliamentary political body as a foundation but next to it as a parallel political body. Multinational corporations, more influential by far in an anarchic global marketplace than nongovernmental organizations, are even less democratic. Although they may dominate the anarchic global world today, MNCs are private and market based, and, compared with civic and clearly public NGOs, are surely more appropriately regarded as potential subjects of rather than constituent participants in democratic global governance. As products of independent and sovereign nation-states, other traditional organizations like the international financial institutions (IFIs⁰ and United Nations agencies reproduce the limitations of their creators. It is noteworthy that the United Nations itself has increasingly recognized the role of non-national actors in global affairs. Former secretary general Kofi Annan thus allowed: “The United Nations once dealt only with Governments. By now we know that peace and prosperity cannot be achieved without partnership involving Governments, international organisations, the business community and civil society. In today’s world, we depend on each other.” That is the meaning of interdependence. Pertinent, traditional governance groups of large ambition that operate globally also include the quite active inter-Parliamentary Union and the largely symbolic old-style United World Federalists. The IPU works toward communication and cooperation among national parliaments, while the World Federalists dream of true global government. The IPU is a functional organization, “the focal point for world-wide parliamentary dialogue [that] works for peace and co-operation among peoples and for the firm establishment of representative democracy.” Its specific purposes are worth citing, since they suggest what a framework for parliament of mayors might look like: In pursuing its goals, the IPU

- Fosters contracts, co-ordination, and the exchange of experience among parliaments and parliamentarians of all countries;
- Considers questions of international interest and concern and expresses its views on such issues in order to bring about action by parliaments and parliamentarians;
- Contributes to the defence and promotion of human rights- an essential factor of parliamentary democracy and development;
- Contributes to better knowledge of the working of representative institutions and to the strengthening and development of their means of action.

As the IPU, working in close cooperation with the United Nations, a parliament of mayors might work to yoke the work of cities to global participatory democracy. There are many United Nations-related associations, of which UNESCO is perhaps the archetype. Although I have been critical of state based international organizations like the United Nations, the success of its many agencies that manage to operate outside the daily scrutiny of interfering states in addressing global challenges from poverty and hunger to immigration and urban life can hardly be overstated. All such organizations and groups treat people as citizens of the planet and encourage them to work on behalf of global goals. This survey about cross-border associations and movements is not complete without a word about the Occupy movement. Perhaps most pertinent to our global concerns, Occupy quickly reached out from Zuccotti Park in Manhattan to cities across the world. It quickly became an intercity and thus a global movement with sympathizers sponsoring actions in dozen of urban capitals across the world and maintaining a loose communications network among engaged cities that allowed some degree of common planning and activity. Their spirit thus helps define global democratic civil society and holds some more important lessons for a democratic global parliament of mayors that aspires to be participatory as well as representative, to govern as much by consensus as by command.

Cross-Border Strong Democracy: Global Civil Society and City Networks

There are, then, myriad examples of global civic associations and citizen movements that exemplify the capacity of citizens to work across borders and prepare the ground for the novel idea of cities and their mayors acting globally and in concert around their common interests. Returning to our core concern with city-based associations, however, I want to focus on the networks that I described in Chapter 5 (UCLG, CityNet, U.N.Habitat etc), which are expressly city based. Given that cities, towns, and local authorities that qualify as local governing entities number more than a million, none of these networks can be regarded as truly universal. However, these networks do pursue global civic ends through effective intercity cooperation, and many are dedicated to addressing specific challenges to which states have responded badly, if at all. The traditional nation-state perspective and the *international* strategies it propagates have produced little more than aggravation, pessimism, and ultimately a sense of deep futility. There are obviously limits on just how much cities can do without the cooperation of states and international organizations, however. Intercity organizations are no less

vulnerable to rivalry and politics than other political associations. Yet rivalries aside, the reality of effective city-based action locally by groups like the C40 and ICLEI, complemented by smaller organizations such as EcoCity, is a game changer with respect to both democracy and climate change. Intercity associations are of a different order than NGOs and other international organizations, carrying democratic legitimacy into an arena of policy and action where change can be implemented and the real world affected in ways that hold promise for city governance globally. Their growing influence in the new interdependent world suggests the political efficacy of dispersed and decentralized power exercised collectively but from the bottom up, through cooperation, rather than top down, by executive command. The political architecture this system of dispersed power embodies is *confederalism*, which enables decentralized cities to interact forcefully with intermediate and higher governing bodies like the state and federal government. It thus offers an inviting environment both for the autonomy of cities and for the establishment of a global parliament of mayors.

Confederalism and Municipal Authority: Financial Autonomy and City Visas

Intercity networks exist in this distinctive terrain of vertically divided power where rival levels of government (local, provincial, national, and interregional) vie for authority in the effort to address novel global challenges. Cities are solving problems across borders in part because the informal confederal infrastructure within which they operate allows them a certain liberty to do so. This infrastructure offers theoretical legitimacy to what cities are doing in practice. I argue here for the practicality of a global parliament of mayors. But the role of such a body in global governance can be effective only in a confederal world in which power is shared at the several levels by inter-state regions, states, provinces, and local authorities. Moreover, because in this setting cities are both local and global – “glocal” in the sense that they are civically potent at the bottom and the top- they claim a privileged normative status. They bridge the participation/power divide by affording local engagement by citizens even as they permit some access to global power through intercity collaboration and the possibility of a global mayors parliament. Two examples will serve to show how delicate and complicated the new power relations are likely to be in the setting of a not yet fully established global confederalism.

Urban Autarky: Meeting the Challenge of the Financial Dependence of Cities

Cities are well endowed with creativity, productivity and other resources that make them the source of a large portion of a nation's collective wealth. They also are home to a majority of the world population. Yet the legal and fiscal jurisdiction of states over municipalities means that it is the state and not the municipality that determines how these urban resources are taxed and how revenues are distributed. Although the city provides the fiscal vehicles that drive the nation, the city is hardly in the driver's seat. Nonetheless, acting as economic engines of the nation gives cities a singular advantage in negotiating greater financial autonomy: they provide the very resources with which nations dominate them. In this reality can be found the potential salvation of the city. For if cities can more than care for themselves

with their own resources and over the long term hold the demographic potential to be a majority, then democracy and demographics alike favour the eventual fiscal self-sufficiency of the city. The coming political struggle will be to persuade cities, once they are more empowered, to feel responsible for the planet generally and not just their own citizens. When fiscal crisis does overwhelm cities, usually as a consequence of economic forces beyond its control, justice, if not power, will favour its interests and demand more, not less, autonomy. This claim to autonomy is not merely a theoretical validation of the city's status: it is a premise for political action and, if necessary, a rationale for extra-political action of the kind associated with protest and rebellion- some may even call it revolution. But if provincial and national governments hold cities hostage, cities may feel constrained to entertain strategies of resistance. Today, when national governments are so vulnerable to money and so remote from the public interests of their citizens, municipalities have taken on the defence of public goods and the promotion of a sustainable future. The new confederalism, and the ability of cities to cooperate across borders to pursue their common goods, is creating a new global landscape whose full implications for civil rights and public goods have yet to be revealed. Though nations can still trump what cities do, today it is the planet that embodies the good of humankind and cities embedded in global networks rather than rival nations caught up in special interests that appear positioned to represent common human goods.

City Visas: Responding to the Challenge of Immigration

The state may be willing to have cities deal with controversial issues it would like to see resolved but for political reasons cannot itself resolve. Immigration is a prime example of a problem that may leave cities some room to manoeuvre. Cities are brimming with immigrants whose legal (state-based) status is problematic. With or without documentation, they come in search of jobs. The reality from the urban perspective is that they are there and likely to stay unless caught and forcibly evicted- something national authorities often have little motivation to undertake. From such dilemmas arise one of the most intriguing experiments in confederalism in recent times: a novel proposal for "city visas." City visas is an idea advanced by the Urbanization Project at New York University's Stern School. The INS has the formal responsibility to issue visas and will presumably insist on authorizing the visa arrangements cities might make. A city visa program aspires to take advantage of confederalism by shifting to cities the practical responsibility for dealing with "illegals" already in residence. Cities might also use a visa program to attract immigrants to fill vacant jobs. As described by Brandon Fuller: "The visa could be temporary and renewable, with a path to permanent residency and eventually citizenship. Visa holders would be free to bring their immediate family members with them. Presumably, the sponsoring cities would have to adequately address some of the primary concerns of immigration opponents, ensuring that visa holders do not receive means-tested transfers from the federal government, commit crimes, or disappear into non-participating cities. A participating city could choose to sponsor undocumented immigrants, provided the city is willing to take on the responsibility

of making them legal residents and eventually citizens.” Some critics have suggested the idea would be feasible only if applied to skilled immigrants with proper ID, and no one has yet explored the full legal implications of a scheme where cities issued visas recognized as valid by national authorities. But the crux of the idea is a system for dealing constructively and pragmatically with a bad situation – undocumented foreign workers – which is otherwise not being dealt with at all. What is truly novel and important about the city visa idea is that it visits a kind of global citizenship/residency on immigrants, whatever their previous status, and demonstrates how cities can act in domains where the politics frightens off other actors. One can imagine an ideal city visas program undertaken not by one city at a time but by a network of cities working together. Indeed, this kind of cooperation is probably a necessity if one or two brave cities inaugurating the plan are not to be overwhelmed by immigrants from all over flocking to them. The great virtue of a confederal system that enjoys the support of both local and national authorities is that it can assist in solving problems at the municipal level that states cannot solve; or it may relieve states of having to lead on issues where they prefer to follow. For example, a well-designed city visa program could become the proving ground for those wishing to change their status from illegal to legal. Holding a city visa responsible over, say, two years might be certified by a national government as a valid step in applying for permanent residence or even citizenship at the national level.

The Right of Cities to Act Autonomously in a Confederal World

As I have acknowledged repeatedly, states are here to stay, their claims to jurisdiction have compelling normative and legal legitimacy, even when they fail to produce cooperative international outcomes. Nonetheless, cities are of growing consequence for global relations and it is the virtue of confederalism that it can distribute power to the advantage of those best able to exercise it – more often than not, cities. For in dispersing power vertically over local, regional, provincial, national, and international governing bodies, democratic confederalism tends to favour the local on the theory that power grows bottom up and democracy is generally constituted from local building blocks. A new confederalism obviously must respect the legal principle of sovereignty; but it can also claim greater legitimacy for cities acting on their own behalf and on behalf of the planet – especially where states have been derelict in upholding values and pursuing goals dear to the city and its cosmopolitan citizens. Cities can be understood as possessing a potential right to claim jurisdiction in domains where states fail to act on behalf of safety and survival. This, I will argue in the final chapter, is perhaps the chief rationale for a global parliament of mayors. Rebel town and insurgent cities can do little one by one, but in global partnership they constitute a formidable power. Cities obviously must advance such provocative claims with extreme care and must proceed with the knowledge that though states may not have the power or will to solve new global problems, they retain the power to impose their ancient jurisdictional prerogatives over “inferior jurisdictions” such as cities. Nations have the power still to bully and silence cities; but unless they also deploy that power to solve the global

problems that imperil citizens everywhere, the legitimacy of state power will be increasingly challenged. So the message for nations becomes this: Do the job or stand down and let cities do it. On the foundation of global civil society, global social movements, and an emerging conception of global citizens, proceed they can and proceed they will – down a path if they choose to follow it, that can lead to a global parliament of mayors.

CHAPTER 12. CITIZENS WITHOUT BORDERS – Glocal Civil Society and Confederalism

Every argument offered in this book has pointed to a pressing need for global governance with both a democratic and a local face. And every description of extant and working intercity networks suggests we are already well down the road to this desired world of interconnected cities and citizens without borders. I will offer a political argument for a global parliament of mayors and lay out some guidelines for how it might be organized and what I might do. To exert influence, using soft power, not hard, a global parliament of mayors need only find a voice to announce and share best practices, need only act forcefully in connecting and extending the collaborative achievements of existing networks, need only actualize the enormous potential of what mayors are already doing. In short, a global parliament is no more than a final step down a road already well travelled. My proposal for a parliament of mayors is no grandiose scheme, no mandate for top-down suzerainty by omnipotent megacities exercising executive authority over a supine world. It is rather a brief for cities to lend impetus to informal practices they already have in place; to give institutional expression and coherence to emerging cooperative relationships; to amplify their collective voice and by focusing on the bottom-up role cities already play in deliberating and deciding and voluntarily implementing policies and reforms that meet the interdependent challenges of the twenty-first century. The aim is not to add the burdensome job of governing the world but it is only to understand that to govern their cities effectively, mayors may have to play some role in governing the world in which their cities fight to survive. Most importantly, a global parliament of mayors will give the metropolis a megaphone and allow its voice to be heard. When the best practices by which cities define themselves can be shared and implemented in common, we can take intercity cooperation to the next level – a mayors parliament. Existing networks constitute a foundation for the establishment of an assembly of cities. Taken as an integral and associated complex – a network of networks – they are what a global parliament of mayors should be. I urge only that we raise the bar, make cooperation truly global by empowering cities to deal with and act in lieu of the sometimes obstreperous national forces that impede the urban quest to secure justice and security of their citizens. There are many crucial reasons to convene a parliament of mayors. None is more important than establishing a proactive cosmopolis able to intervene on behalf of cities – but also on behalf of humankind and its right to collective survival at a moment when it is no longer clear nations can guarantee either survival or sustainability.

A Global Parliament of Mayors

As a starting point for giving institutional expression to the need to realize some form of constructive democratic interdependence, I propose then the convening of a global parliament of mayors – call it a World Assembly of Cities. To begin, such an assembly would represent a modest first step toward formalizing the myriad networks of cities already actively cooperating across borders around issues. A global assembly of cities, meeting as a parliament of mayors, offers a fresh approach to global governance because in my conception it would seek progress through voluntary actions and consensus rather than through executive or legislative mandates. The parliament I envision, operating the absence of sovereign coercive authority, agreed-upon common law, and any means of enforcement, would not exercise executive power by command. It would of necessity rely on persuasion and consensus. For this reason, we might even wish to conceive of a parliament of mayors as a kind of “Audiament” – a chamber of listeners, where to hear is more important than to speak, where participating cities and the people they represent act by opting into policies they agree with rather than being subject to mandates on high from which they may dissent. As a starting place, voluntary compliance with consensual policies makes much more practical sense. It is an inducement to cities to participate without fear of being coerced, and it also affords a partial solution to the problem of a global body that formally represents only half the world’s population. For though it leaves suburbs and rural regions without formal representation, they too are free to comply or not as they wish. Making compliance voluntary also permits mayors to see themselves, in the manner imagined by the great eighteenth-century Whig political thinker Edmund Burke, as representatives not just their metropolises but of the common interests of the planet. This approach, where participation is bottom-up and voluntary, but actions – once consented to by cities – are universal, is the essence of “glocality”. Moreover, because the assembly-of-cities- approach is focused on solving the real and common problems that vie cities a natural common agenda and that invite pragmatic solutions rather than ideological diatribes, its capacity for genuine transformation is considerable, even though it would lack the executive authority we associate with transformative change. The “strong democratic” approach I have long urged for nation-states becomes far more practical in the context of cooperating cities.

The Challenge of Representation

Before trying to envision the concrete form a parliament of mayors might take, we need to address the problem of representation. As urban demographics stand today, if mayors indeed ruled the world, half the planet would not be represented. Furthermore, given that urban denizens are generally more liberal and progressive than their rural counterparts, representing cities globally could unbalance the

planet's political equilibrium. It seems self-evident that there can be no democratic form of globalization without finding ways for cities to represent more than their own residents. As realist, of course, we have an easy way out. We can respond to the question of how democratic city networks really are with the sceptic's counter query, "as compared to what?" The current alternatives are utterly undemocratic and unrepresentative. Reflections on the alternatives leave city-based networks as prospective global governing mechanism looking quite promising, both more efficient than states and a good deal more democratic than corporations. This realist argument alone is enough to justify the quest for a city-based global governance that is both quasi-legitimate and moderately efficient, even though it fails the test of full accountability and representativeness. Fortunately, there are realistic paths to enhancing democratic legitimacy for city-based global governance that can render it more accountable to and representative of those dwelling outside cities.

Representing Commuters; securing a representative voice for those who work in but do not reside in cities effectively incorporates suburbia and exurbia into the city. Commuters are often required to pay a city tax, with place of work trumping residence – a good reason to offer them some form of representation in a global mayors parliament.

Including Regions within Urban Representative Districts; it is a characteristic of cities that they are interdependent not only with one another but within the local regions and counties in which they find themselves. Cities are embedded in their local regions in ways that tie together urban and regional interests and give rural residents a stake and interest in city policy – and vice versa. Treating cities as representative of the regions in which they find themselves will thus make a good deal of sense to regional residents.

Extending the Electoral District; for purposes of representation in the global parliament, the urban electoral district might be extended to include the region as an urban electoral district. Formalizing the implicit relationship by extending voting to the region would create a sense of regional representation in a mayors parliament.

Guaranteeing Opt-in/Opt-out Rights; even without possessing voting rights in the city, regional constituents can be empowered to opt in or out of decisions made by their anchor city or by the parliament of mayors. Thus, noncity authorities could present ideas in the hope that the parliament might act on them. The voluntary and consensual character of the parliament might help disarm critics insisting they were not represented.

Establishing Direct Representation in the Global Parliament or in a Parallel Parliament of Regions; Rather than being represented through cities in a global mayors parliament, regions might elect their own representatives to the parliament of mayors or to a parallel body such as a parallel parliament of regions. Such a parallel body might be a second chamber in a global bicameral parliament. Because the entire process recommended here is consensual, such processes are easily tried out and

amended, or withdrawn, as experience dictates and protagonists choose. The ultimate safety limit on any global assembly envisioned here, whether urban or regional, is its voluntary and consensual character.

Representation as Trusteeship; Inasmuch as they belong to a global parliament, mayors must understand themselves as trustees of the planet – past and future as well as present. Representatives are by definition bound to speak on behalf of their constituents. But constituents also owe their representatives a degree of independence in judgment and leadership by conscience in reading the public good. A mayors parliament can be a global deliberative body whose delegates as trustees are responsible equally to their constituents and to the planetary good. The very meaning of interdependence is that electoral boundaries are less consequential than the aims of elected representatives. Effective mayoral representatives in a global parliament who see themselves not merely as keepers of the interests of the city but trustees of the global public good will regard themselves not simply as mandate representatives and delegates of city dwellers but as trustees of the public interests of cities, their regions, and the world as a whole. However, none of the proposals here fully addresses the defect of a world in which global governance is undertaken by representatives of cities alone. This being said, in an imperfect political world where democracy within nations is at risk and democracy among nations nonexistent, a parliament of mayors convened by global public trustees whose decisions are voluntary and nonmandatory seems like a very good place to start.

Implementing Urban Global Governance

Giving institutional form and political reality to a parliament of mayors involves both an inaugural process of convening interested mayors and cities to plot a way forward and the development of a working blueprint for the desired institutional arrangements. The start-up process calls for the leadership of cities on the forefront of cooperation and cross-border networking, and it might include Western world cities, whose mayors have long embraced outreach and global cooperation, as well as cities in the developing world, where inequality is so prevalent, makes their participation mandatory. A prudent planning process would also invite visionary and already networked mayors of smaller developed-world cities, honouring the reality that to speak of cities is not just to speak of megacities. The makeup and inclusiveness of the planning body will be critical to counter what will be a natural tendency to suspect the project is one more big-city plan to dominate lesser cities. Taking advantage of the reality that cities already are working together informally and voluntarily around a great many global issues, and already are learning from one another and achieving practical results through voluntary cooperation, the parliament of mayors might ideally begin as a voluntary gathering, meeting perhaps three times a year in different cities, dedicated to listening and deliberation and the undertaking of voluntary actions by agreement of a majority or more of cities participating. A city's consent to the parliament's decisions would be the only warrant needed for action in that city. For example, if 500 of 900 cities decided to act on climate change by enacting mandatory recycling,

common congestion fees, or limits on carbon emissions within their own jurisdictions, significant action could occur without formal legislation by any national or global sovereign body and without the need for universal consent by participating cities. Since it would exercise no metasovereignty of formal hard power, its influence would rest exclusively on global public opinion and on the force of example. The parliament of mayors would also have a significant deliberative role that would contribute to its persuasive power on global public opinion. Its debates and thoroughly deliberated decisions, voluntary and rooted in listening as much as in talking, could be broadcast on television and radio and streamed on the web throughout the world. In time, technology might allow virtual participation in listening, deliberation, debate and even voting, by cities and citizens not in attendance. Smart cities would become virtual participants. Technology would also permit immediately, “deliberative polling” in which individuals, groups, and cities not participating in a given parliament could express (and change) their point of view through remote or virtual deliberative and voting venues in their own localities and municipalities. Because all effective action would be the result of voluntary engagement by mayors and their cities, there would be no reason for cities – represented at given parliament or not, present or absent – not to concur in and implement any particular measures approved at a particular session of the global parliament.

The Unique Role of Mayors

For mayors to govern the world, they must play a unique role that both reflects their role as bottom-up representatives of their local constituents and also embraces their potential as our global conscience. Mayors convened in a global parliament must also see themselves as deliberative judges of global public goods. This can help them see themselves as something more than flatterers of local citizens and mouthpieces of parochial interests, and permit them to convene as members of the deliberative assembly of a single and common planet.

A Parliament of Mayors: Institutional Forms and Practices

Since 300 to 400 members is a rough limit on a productive deliberative body, especially if each member may represent millions of individual citizens, the parliament of mayors might be limited to 300 cities in any one session. To create a sense of continuing engagement and maximize the number of cities involved, the parliament could meet three times a year in different cities (perhaps chosen by lot from a pool of cities willing and able to host the parliament), each time with a different set of cities. Selection of participants by lot (sortition) might be considered, given that there are far more cities than seats in the parliament, even when multiplied by three sessions a year over several decades. To ensure that cities of every size are included in each session, the parliament could offer seats to each of three tranches of cities based on population: 50 seats to megacities of 10 million whose participation is crucial; 125 seats to cities between 500,000 and 10 million in population that stand for the great majority of cities; and 125 seats to cities under 500,000 whose participation ensures more

modest towns have a stake. Given that the objective of the parliament would be voluntary action in concert on behalf of “participating” cities whether present at given session or not, voting in the parliament by cities regardless of their size, though hardly representative of a popular vote would be acceptable. However, for purposes of counting citizens and of the effect on public opinion, cities might also be weighted according to population and be counted in a second supplementary accounting in weighted terms – each 500,000 citizens represented comprising one vote. The mayor of a megacity of 20 million would cast one “city vote,” but also be counted in the supplementary allotting as casting 40 demographic votes worth 500,000 citizens per vote. A city of a million would cast one city vote but two demographic votes. A city of 250,000 would cast one city vote but only one-half a demographic vote.

In any case, because compliance would be voluntary and city by city, the vote count whether by city or demographic units would be exclusively for purposes of information and public opinion. Cities would participate in opting in or out of decisions of the mayors parliament through referenda, whether or not their mayors were currently represented. Mayors would retain the possibility for their own city’s deliberative position in the parliament but also have the responsibility to gain the city’s assent. To summarize, one might imagine three classes of cities, based on population, eligible to be represented in the parliament by their mayors; to pursue representation, they would have to elect to join the group from which cities are chosen by lot:

1. Megacities with populations of 10 million or more (50 seats)
2. Cities with 500,000 to 10 million population (125 seats)
3. Cities of 50,000 to 500,000 (125 seats)

The tree-trance structure serves useful deliberative and symbolic purposes. All policies and measures remain voluntary, however, and compliance is by choice of each individual city, whether present and voting, or observing and deliberating virtually at home. Measures with a simple majority of a given parliamentary session’s vote in, say, each of three annual parliaments might be given official status as a common policy. The “three readings” requirement obliging policies to win simple majorities in three successive parliaments would mean 900 rather than 300 cities were deliberating and voting. Cities could obviously pursue ideas and policies they agreed with, whether or not such ideas won a majority in the parliament. Given the voluntary and deliberative character of the parliament, mayors would be required to appear in person to represent their communities. At the same time, each mayor might bring one or two citizens – perhaps also chosen by lot from a voluntary pool – to parliament as colleagues and informal advisers.

In sum, a parliament of mayors would be chosen three times annually by lot from cities in a global cities association according to three categories based on size. Compliance would be voluntary and opt-in, except in the case of policies receiving a majority in three reading in three successive parliamentary sessions; these policies would be opt-out, based on a referendum or other procedure

prescribed internally by cities (with the approval of the global association) Key principles of the parliament include the following:

Listening: Listening rather than talking is emphasized, with empathy, sharing, and attention to the other.

Deliberation: Deliberation which entails listening, changing one's mind, and seeking common ground.

Sortition: Choice of delegates and sites is by lot for fairness and true representation under conditions of too many units for all to be represented at any one time.

Glocality: Glocality is a product of integrating bottom-up and top-down approaches and eliminating the dysfunctional middle occupied by regional and national governments.

Voluntary Action: Consent is the basis for cooperation while avoiding top-down fiat.

Leading by Example: Exemplary function of alternative approach; teaching democracy.

Opt-in: Policies not receiving a three-session reading and simple majority vote would require active consent.

Opt-out: The opt-out choice for adopted measures preserves freedom not to comply, yet creates momentum for cooperation

Mayors as Global Trustees: Mayors realize their responsibility as leaders and symbols of universal goods and global cooperation.

Starting Up

A trial run for the idea of a parliament of mayors will require that several (self-selected) host cities step forward, ideally from both the developed and developing worlds, say, Seoul and New York and convene a planning assembly. The planning meeting might invite a few dozen mayors to convene and take up the procedural issues prerequisite to establishing the new institution, endorsing a provisional set of rules, and determining planning, logistical, and financial specifics for perhaps the first three years or nine sessions of the parliament. It might also establish and finance a modest secretariat overseeing the formation of a "Global Association of Cities" and participating in creating the parliament and developing a communications strategy. To finance the process leading to a parliament and fund the parliament itself might be tithing by participating cities, but a more creative approach could use the so-called Tobin Tax on international financial and currency exchanges (a tiny tax of circa .01 percent on each transaction). Finally, an inspirational mayor or mayors dedicated to building a new global governance edifice will be enormously important in giving real life to what is only a paper idea. I have proposed in these pages that much of the difficulty lies with the traditional sovereign state, too large to engage local civic participation, too small to address global power, its traditional independence now an impediment to coming to terms with interdependence. I have recommended we change the subject: from states to cities, from representative to strong democracy, from top-down formal global governance as an impossible ideal to bottom-up informal global governance as an unfolding intercity

reality that asks only for a stamp of approval. Cosmopolitan mayors have shown an ambition to write the achievements and best practices of their cities into a promissory note for the planet. The city is now our future as a demographic and economic fact. The urban future is not, however, without its risks and dangers. The myriad features of the city we have explored here, features that condition its origin and define its essence, make urban living seductive, productive, and perilous. They are responsible for its abrasive creativity, its generative imagination, its fractious mobility, and its discomfiting diversity. They endow it with its affinity for risk and innovation, for speed and collision, as well as its dedication to a rough civility not always as far removed from spirited barbarism as we might like to think. The city is democratic but subject to corruption and inequality. Our task is to embrace and exploit such traits and learn to hold their tensions in equilibrium.

As nations grow more dysfunctional, cities *are* rising. When it comes to democracy, they command the majority. They define interdependence and public culture and thus reasons enough – good reasons – why mayors and their fellow citizens can and should rule the world.