



Global Compact
Cities Programme

World Vision



Towards the Ethical City

Briefing paper for the
'Ethical Cities - Locking in Liveability' Urban Thinkers Campus
Melbourne, Australia, February 16, 2016

**URBAN
THINKERS
CAMPUS**
THE CITY WE NEED

 **RMIT**
UNIVERSITY

Towards the ethical city

Introduction

We are living in the urban century. A dizzying array of adjectives is used to brand and define cities, such as 'smart', 'resilient', 'sustainable', 'green', 'multicultural' and 'creative'. This positioning paper sets out an agenda for the 'ethical city'. It is inspired by the principles of the United Nations Global Compact in the areas of human rights, labour, the environment and anti-corruption and associated dialogues around both the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the New Urban Agenda (a UN-Habitat III initiative). A case is made for a distinct emphasis on the ethical city as an urgent urban objective.

Everyone recognises the rapid urbanisation phenomenon. Currently 54 percent of all people live in cities, up from 38 percent in 1976, the year of the inaugural UN-Habitat conference HABITAT I, and this is set to rise to 66 percent by 2050 (UN, 2014). However, less attention is given to the startling inequality of the urban century. If you live in a city, you have a 1 in 3 chance of living in a slum (Davis, 2006). Ninety-five percent of urban growth to 2050 will occur in the developing countries of Asia and Africa, much of this in informal settlements. Meanwhile, in richer cities of the Global North, inequity is worsening. Addressing inequality on multiple scales is an important task of an ethical city. What can, and should, be done, especially for the most vulnerable groups such as migrant youth and children, or the elderly?

Cities are the result of a complex interplay of places, people and power, which in turn shapes and is shaped by dynamics of technologies, materials, and social and cultural phenomena. Given these practical realities that cities face, what ethical frameworks guide city-shaping actions and how can these be attended to in order to enhance urban life for all?

The paper is presented in four parts. Section I outlines the need for the ethical city and charts areas of consistency and contradiction with current city movements. Section II defines the key tenets of the ethical city as a response to contemporary urban challenges. While recognising that each city is unique and faces, therefore, a unique range of challenges and a unique set of possible ethical city 'pathways', cities also share common attributes that present both obduracy and dynamism. Acknowledging this, Section III sets out an approach to ethical city self-assessment and multi-stakeholder engagement. In conclusion, Section IV sets out an agenda for purposive action towards ethical cities.

I. Why do we need the Ethical City?

Cities face many common overarching, generational issues — variously called mega-trends, wicked problems or key challenges — including land, air, water, and energy resource matters; climate change; digital and other disruptive technologies; post-industrial restructuring and the transformation of work; rapid economic change associated with globalisation and marketization; as well as migration and population change. The city is part of a globally connected network with flows of people, ideas, technology, trade, resources, finances, as well as negative externalities such as CO₂ emissions embedded in production or waste generated from consumption of goods.

Undoubtedly, there has been progress on these issues in some cities. Over the past century, clean air legislation, land use planning and the rise of the welfare state have mitigated the worst excesses of uncontrolled urbanisation and capitalism in some regions and, in recent years, there are signs of limited progress on climate change, most recently in Paris at COP21 where a number of city level initiatives were clearly visible.

There is much work going on to secure sustainable water and energy resources for cities, with much more still to do. The idea of the 'smart' city in contemporary terms is in its infancy but there is great promise held forth for the post-digital urban era.

However, urban inequality remains an endemic and worsening phenomenon. Barber (2013) argues that inequality is the key challenge facing cities. Across the globe we see high levels of urban poverty, unemployment and slum dwelling, contrasting with wealthy shopping districts in the city centre and gated communities in the suburbs.

At the same time, cities are the primary incubator of the cultural, social, and political innovations that shape our planet. This has profound implications for all efforts to secure smart, sustainable, resilient and/or liveable cities.

The most vulnerable people in society (e.g. low income, disadvantaged and elderly, children and youth) are most at risk when disasters occur (whether natural such as extreme weather events or man-made such as an economic recession). It is through the social inclusion of these vulnerable groups that we can work towards enhancing their resilience. It follows that addressing inequality and social inclusion is a prerequisite for all efforts towards sustainable or resilient cities.

The need for the ethical city, however, extends beyond the need to tackle worsening inequality. Urban life is intensely social and necessitates living and getting on alongside our fellow citizens. We cannot accept a situation, for example, where the youth in the city is marginalized without voice and opportunities. Rather, this urban sociality should be harmonious, respectful, reinforcing and, thus, economically and socially rewarding. It should not be characterised by conflict, suspicion and mistrust. The latter risks social breakdown, terrorism, mass shootings, and the vilification of cultures and communities in need of asylum and protection. In opposing these anti-social trends and beliefs — as Ignatieff (2014) points out when exploring the experience of Los Angeles — the global-urban phenomenon of multiculturalism is central to the ethical city and there is an urgent need to counter regressive trends while strengthening urban cross-cultural solidarity.

A key starting point for the ethical cities initiative is that cities that fail to build ethical futures, social inclusion and citizen engagement become less attractive, less sustainable and more vulnerable to the negative effects of shocks and mega-trends over time. They become dysfunctional and anti-social as communities begin to prioritize their narrow short-term interests over those of their community. They fracture as inequality soars and along with it, crime and anxiety. They lose the talent all cities badly need in a post-industrial, knowledge-driven, global economy, as people vote with their feet and leave for better places.

This leads us to ask the following key questions:

- How can we build social inclusion, care and respect for all city dwellers especially the most vulnerable and marginalized?
- How can we maximise benefit from growth and migration to our cities while also meeting other important goals such as decarbonizing the local economy or enhancing local food sovereignty?
- How can we safeguard and promote urban culture and heritage and ensure our cities are distinctive, unique and attractive?

Our central argument is that the ethical city is sustainable and resilient. It follows that ethical cities will engage with the many and varied initiatives towards sustainable and resilient cities. In addition, social inclusion, respect, care and justice are at the heart of the ethical city and we need to ask how can each sector contribute towards greater good and benefits as well as consider the principle of shared value in the city?

Emphasis and action means responding to multifaceted, complex, dynamic and rapid change. Informed ethical city responses will build social capital, particularly focussing on children and youth, (who are the future generation) and address insufficiently recognised rapidly rising inequality within cities — within and between all cities and regions in the Global North and South.

II. Defining the Ethical City

Ethics is concerned with what is ‘right, fair, just or good’, not necessarily what is most accepted as normal or expedient. In the ethical city, where justice, care and inclusion are center-stage. But it is possible to argue that accountability, engagement and respect must also be central. The ethical city is, in many ways, a logical next step for human progress in the urban age. Although not everyone may agree with him, Pinker (2011) argues that there are five forces underpinning human progress to date: the rise of the nation state and judiciary reducing lawlessness; the rise of commerce that interconnects us; increased respect for women; the rise of cosmopolitanism (literacy, mobility, mass media); and the rise of mass-education, knowledge and rationality in human affairs. Pinker discusses extensively in his book the impact of the “rights revolution” around the world in terms of civil rights, women’s rights, gay rights, children’s rights and animal right. One right that he does not discuss is “right to the city” and the importance of social inclusion that lies at the heart of the notion of the ethical city.

In the 21st Century, as Ignatieff (2014) argues, we require shared moral codes that enable the millions of people from different races, origins, and social backgrounds to live together on a daily basis. When races, religions and ethnicities share space in the city and interact on a daily basis, they do not suppress their primary loyalties to their group. It is ‘shared ethics’ that enable people to find common ground when their interests collide.

Needless to say, there is much ‘good’ to be had from the above-mentioned megatrends, whether digital and other disruptive technological change, or economic change. Worthwhile work is essential and economic activity is critical to human welfare and progress. Moreover, the future success of post-digital globalised cities

is tied to successfully co-existing across cultures and social groups. This, in turn, requires sustained focus on: resource allocation, social justice and mutual aid (such as Kohlberg, 1984 emphasises in moral development terms); principles of caring for others (Gilligan, 1977); and, the social structuring of human agency — both ethical conduct and moral behaviour (Bee, 1994; Giddens, 1984).

As highlighted in the seminal work by Harvey (1973), and more recent work on the ‘just city’ by Fainstein (2010), through pursuing deliberate urban development strategies focussed on equality, democracy and diversity, city governance systems can — at least in principle — shape particular environments that enable social inclusion, justice and care relative to others.

In this context, let us focus on the rights of children. They often experience serious limitations to their participatory rights, where these restrictions are due more to prejudiced adult attitudes rather than children lacking the ability to participate and engage in decision-making processes. Evidence from World Vision’s Urban Research Initiative reaffirms the ability of children to contribute to just cities by influencing urban policies, processes and institutions to better reflect the diverse needs of children. By working closely with children and their parents in identifying and designing solutions that shape our future cities, World Vision has seen greater social inclusion at the local and city levels, leading to the introduction of formal participatory structures aimed at strengthening child rights (World Vision 2014)

Another interesting example here is the new plan for New York, OneNYC — The Plan for a Strong and Just City. It includes measures aimed at raising 800,000 New Yorkers out of poverty, providing 200,000 new affordable homes and measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80 percent by 2050.

It can also be argued that cities that emphasise public transport over private transport enable those of us who cannot drive, or cannot afford to live near work and services, to have more urban access. Cities that provide universal, high quality, critical education for all are not only investing in their own future; they are providing a system of care that is just and equitable.

The ethical city, however, is also about how each citizen is involved, engaged and respected. Giving everyone a ‘fair go’ is universally regarded as a laudable aim for modern society. For example, post-industrial restructuring leaves behind whole communities devastated by rapid globalisation-led change. Different urban economies have very different capacities to anticipate and/or respond to such shocks. In rich countries, communities can be cushioned to some extent where there are resources, political will, strength of urban governance, and insight, say, into the wider social benefits of avoiding multi-generational poverty caused by mass-unemployment.

Children and youth are also citizens. Traditionally, their role in shaping our cities has been unrecognised. As current and future leaders of our cities, children and youth bring diverse perspectives and solutions on key urban issues and must be regarded as valued contributors in local, national and regional decision-making processes.

Transitions are required if cities are to generate new industries without losing existing communities to poverty, drugs or socio-economic breakdown. In the US, these transition mechanisms have been referred to as part of a Metropolitan Revolution where local leaders are doing the hard work of growing the job market and making their communities more prosperous (Katz and Bradley 2013). This requires physical resources and political will to ensure that ethics of justice, care and inclusion take a central role in city development.

This raises the question of who does the shaping of cities and how. In his manifesto for city leadership, Barber (2013) argues that mayors and local executives can exhibit a non-partisan and pragmatic style of governance that is lacking in national and international halls of power. This gives credence to ideas of democratic glocalism, of horizontalism rather than hierarchy, and of pragmatic interdependence rather than outworn ideologies of national independence. Cities and their leaders have emerged as alternatives to nation states in tackling global problems, although many questions remain about the ability or likelihood of mayors to deliver ultimately on inequality agendas, or on the extent to which the fate of cities remains tied to the fact that nation states often still do the policy heavy-lifting for cities, in areas such as health care, education, environment.

Undoubtedly, accountable mayors can harness citizen engagement in countering inequality, injustice and poverty, and the idea of a global parliament of mayors has currency as a means to propagate innovation. However, in an increasingly globalised and marketised economy, city autonomy is relative, and relies upon co-operative and collaborative actions, not only with other cities, but also across geo-political regions and systems of governance. Questions remain about the inter-competitiveness of cities over time and how spaces for inclusive solutions can be created and propagated.

Questions also remain on how our future cities can ensure the equitable distribution of wealth and opportunities to all of city dwellers, especially to the most vulnerable and marginalized. Two critical issues to highlight include child labour and youth unemployment. Estimates suggest that tens of millions of children, some as young as 5 years old, live or work on the streets of the world’s towns and cities. Children growing up in families who do not have access to decent work opportunities are often at higher risk of leaving school early

and exploited in the informal labour workforce. Additionally, youth unemployment is a chronic issue within informal settlements. For example, in Kenya, youth account for approximately 80% of the unemployed 40% of the population, who predominately live in urban areas (Oketch and Mutisya 2012).

From minimum wages, employment opportunities, to pro-affordable housing policies, across a wide range of innovative interventions, a range of cities can make, and are making, a positive difference for their communities.

However, cities cannot do this on their own; national policy settings, influenced by global policy settings, are imbricated with city policy and opportunity. Increasingly globalised economic systems are profound in their influence on cities and city governance in shaping and constraining the spaces of innovation in which cities must operate if ethical cities are to emerge and be sustained. Hence, without focusing directly on the city scale, economists such as Piketty (2013) and Atkinson (2015) nevertheless make critically important contributions to the debate on inequality.

For example, through forensic research, Atkinson reveals how rising income gaps have accelerated since 1980 so that even those who manage to work full-time often fall behind. Current dominant neo-liberal policies can unfairly punish those who suffer bad luck and undermine economic growth and social cohesion, causing profound negative impacts on quality of life for everyone.

Making space for each other, literally and figuratively, is a central concept for the ethical city. It follows then, that cities that pursue ethical policies to minimise inequality and propagate mutual respect and social justice offer more resilient, safe and prosperous living environments. Those that focus, instead, on short term, utilitarian, partisan or private economic or political objectives are at risk of escalating social disaffection, poverty, corruption (within city governments and/or corporations). In other words, they risk spiralling social breakdown and rapidly declining liveability.

III: Ethical City Progress to date

Although the specific term ‘ethical city’ has been rarely used to date — see, for instance, Barrett (2015) and Barrett (2016) — much is already being done to contribute in various ways to realising ethical cities, in policy and programme development, and practically within cities. Key initiatives and some examples are summarised in this section.

The UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), adopted September 2015, are a set of 17 intergovernmental aspirational goals for 2030 (see below and Appendix 1), including: ending poverty; improving human health, inclusion, food security, education, access to water and sanitation; and addressing sustainability by combatting climate change and protecting biodiversity. Interestingly, only one goal (11) is overtly targeted at cities, although, with the majority of us living in cities and the majority of resources being consumed by cities, they are implied throughout.

Figure 1: Sustainable Development Goals

The SDGs are a bold agenda and reflect many ingredients of the ethical city. Needless to say, there is little at this stage about how they are to be achieved, by whom, with what resources or through what processes. Clearly,



there is an urgent need to flesh out responsibilities, accountabilities and actions. This, in part, must be the task of the thousands of organisations across the world involved in activities and events tied to the New Urban Agenda, an influential outcome document of UNHABITAT III, to be held in Quito (Ecuador) in October 2016. This document will guide urban efforts and processes amongst a wide range of stakeholders — nation states, local governments, regional leaders, UN programmes, donors and civil society — for the next 20 years.

Numerous existing city initiatives implicitly aim to realise aspects of ethical cities, for instance, from C40 tackling climate change and Rockefeller 100 Resilient Cities building resilience in communities to the UN Global Compact, including the Cities Programme, engaging across sectors in principled, socially-engaged action (see the Ten Principles of the Global Compact in Figure 2).

Smart cities are increasingly advocated, although the more techno-efficiency-led models are of limited relevance here, since they are somewhat narrowly conceived in ethical terms. There are, of course, numerous other urban networks and initiatives contributing to rethinking urban development in ways that overtly highlight the importance of inequality, inclusion, justice, respect, care, resource allocation and accountability.

Figure 2 – The Ten Principles of the United Nations Global Compact



HUMAN RIGHTS

- Principle 1: Businesses should support and respect the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights; and
- Principle 2: make sure that they are not complicit in human rights abuses.



LABOUR

- Principle 3: Businesses should uphold the freedom of association and effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;
- Principle 4: the elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labour;
- Principle 5: the effective abolition of child labour; and
- Principle 6: the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.



ENVIRONMENT

- Principle 7: Businesses should support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges;
- Principle 8: undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility; and
- Principle 9: encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies.



ANTI-CORRUPTION

- Principle 10: Businesses should work against corruption in all its forms, including extortion and bribery.

Forward-thinking initiatives such as the Ten Principles of the UN Global Compact (see Box 3) are not founded solely upon avoiding the nightmare scenarios of unfettered climate change, fundamentalism-inspired conflict or rampant globalised corporate monopolies. There is also a strong, positive agenda for cities that are innovative, future-thinking, open to change, embracing of minorities and many cultures, and able and willing to give a ‘fair go’ to all.

While recognising that each city is unique and faces, therefore, a unique range of challenges and a unique set of possible ethical city ‘pathways’, cities also share common attributes that present both obduracy and dynamism. In other words, there are things that do not appear to change, but rather are fixed and need to be worked around. This may include city infrastructure — the pipes and wires, the roads and layouts of cities. Others are changing and can be harnessed in various directions, as in the following four, briefly described, examples.

Activist Mayor Ada Colau, in Barcelona (Spain), was elected following a crowd-funding campaign and a wiki-developed code of ethics process, and a platform of civic assembly voting as a form of direct democracy. After

years of post-GFC austerity measures, inclusion, respect, jobs, transparency and anti-corruption were logical goals for direct action to ‘change the rules of the game’ in Barcelona.

In Shenyang, China, the environmental protection civil servant Li Chao played a crucial role in turning the tide on local air pollution. Engaging citizens, by establishing a blog and citizen complaint line, led to the first ever pollution regulation of its kind in China. Subsequently, air pollution became the number one issue at the communist party elections.

Once dominated by drug cartels, the last ten years has seen Columbia’s second largest city of Medellín embark on an extraordinary transformation. Transparency and accountability was central to the tenure of Mayor Aníbal Gaviria (2010–2015), enabling investment into new public infrastructure and food security programs. Respectful engagement at the grassroots, with a vulnerable and shocked post-trauma populace is neither quick nor easy, but has proved essential in the transformation of the city into an increasingly safe and successful urban center.

Porto Alegre (Brazil) has a long history of inclusive political participation and has pioneered participatory budgeting where open assemblies of local community groups debate and decide their priorities for the local government budget. With Porto Alegre’s municipal democracy processes being adopted in New York, Chicago, Melbourne and Madrid, the need for city leaders to develop trust and respect, and to prioritise inclusion as a pre-requisite for deciding how the city’s money is spent, provides a stark example of the gulf between tokenistic periodic elections and calculations, and a real, engaged, accountable, transparent and trusting engagement process.

IV: Towards the Ethical City

The ethical city is a principled concept. There is no blueprint. To state the obvious; every city is different and must create its own future. In this paper, we have sought to outline some key starting points for this principled concept. In this final section, we propose directions for debate and action towards the ethical city.

All ethical city initiatives should be environmentally, socially and culturally sustainable, and utilise transparent, accountable, respectful, democratic, inclusive mechanisms of engagement. All ethical city strategies should explicitly articulate how a city — given its resources and unique characteristics — will advance the following three interlinked thematic priorities:

- Resilience: Build social capital, preparedness, confidence, skills, infrastructure and capacity for all citizens to engage and be sustained, in response to both sudden shocks and longer term changes.
- Inclusion and the right to the city: Advance social inclusion and eradicate all forms of inequality involving: youth and children, gender, income, all minorities. Ensure basic rights of access to 21st century urban services.
- Ethical city development: Demonstrate accountability, multi-sectoral engagement, leadership of ideas and by example, innovation, mutual respect, care, social justice, sustainability and reflexive governance.

In this way, the ethical city embraces dimensions of the resilient cities agenda and overtly sets out two further priorities. However, as pointed out, each city must approach this in the ways that are most appropriate. Yet, it is interesting to note that the OneNYC plan uses four lenses with obvious similarities to our points, i.e.: growth, equity, sustainability and resilience.

A deeper engagement with inclusion and rights is needed. This builds upon SDG1 on poverty eradication, and requires clear metrics on economic allocation and distribution. Relative poverty is just as stark in a ‘rich’ city as it is in a ‘poor’ city. Hence, the ethical city will see inequality trends shifting in ways that reflect making space for each other and increased access to the city for all. To paraphrase: the city we need is the city that cares, one where there is broad recognition that urban life cannot be sustained through markets alone, but requires strong attention to citizenship, engagement and enshrined rights to basic services including:

- Sustainable energy
- Sustainable water
- Clean air and environment
- Mobility for all
- Quality housing for all
- Childcare, health, education, open and green space

- Feeling safe to move around the city
- Decent work and pay and the means to provide for loved ones.
- Opportunities for youth

Since money is invariably a key enabler, in one form or another, it follows that financial inclusion is a key measurable indicator of the ethical city, as are considerations of gender, race and minorities. This does not discount growing the social enterprise and sharing economy sectors, where trust rather than cash is the key currency.

Ethical city development is about conduct and the ‘how’ of the ethical city, which links to the resilient city agenda, in that engaging and building capacity of urban citizens is central to the process of ethical city development. This ranges from conveying the message that everyone can provide a different and useful personal contribution to supporting trusted mediating local institutions that can enable citizens to make sense of their actions, future plans and ‘place’ in the city and globe. Promoting ethical conversations, reflections, and expressions in arts and culture are important as ethical city practices shape, and are shaped by, ethical citizenry.

Also, there is a need to focus on good conduct of city leaders and good processes of city governance. Most cities have ethics codes, and model codes have been advanced (e.g. <http://www.cityethics.org/>) as a useful starting point. Using tools of reflexive governance (Voss, 2006), city leadership and governing must necessarily involve: multi-stakeholder, engaged processes of learning from current experiments, sharing the results of initiatives, and revising plans and actions to constantly re-adjust the course towards the ethical city. One such tool set is being promoted by Transparency International, under its strengthening local government integrity initiative (http://www.transparency.org/whatwedo/activity/strengthening_local_government_integrity).

While these approaches are not foolproof, and the future course of any city is neither fully steerable nor can be known, nevertheless, ethical city development indicates a need for openness and inclusion in the businesses of: governing; building cross-sectoral coalitions; monitoring progress and reflecting upon it; being open to changing tactics and experimenting along the way.

Cities should advance, test and publish ‘successful’ city engagement strategies, sharing knowledge on progressive private, public and NGO/civil society organisations to include in engagement, and techniques for engagement with communities. Cities should work with partners to evaluate city progress, assessment methodologies and tools; to develop recommendations and guidelines for direction; and to explore the implications of ethical city policies, programmes and models.

Cities should engage with researchers to co-produce a range of scholarship and reflective conversations about resilient ethical city models and future implications for wider academic, policy and public discussion. Furthermore, they should advance ideas about transitions to the ethical city, where sustainability transitions include the notion of ‘inclusiveness’ as a social goal.

Ethical cities practice open urban governance, transparency and accountability while weeding out corruption, conflicts of interest and the abuse of power. They promote measures designed to maintain public trust and fairness in local government action. They use their financial spending power and leadership to promote ethical practices within their boundaries so that the local economy including social enterprise can flourish. They recognise and engage in the role of the individual citizen and their civic duties and responsibilities.

They also seek to overtly build the urban professions’ capacity, conduct and processes for ethical city development. In an era of unprecedented urbanization, there is a monumental opportunity to influence the fate of cities through well-designed, well-planned, well-built sustainable and co-designed, co-managed infrastructure, housing and urban places. The city is in a position to advance ethical design, ethical planning and ethical developer communities through education, participation, good governance and accountability, often by simply using tools and resources that already exist (e.g. the principles for responsible real estate development – RICS, 2015).

Last but not least is the thorny issue of measurement. How do cities measure progress towards the ethical city? This is a major question requiring significant work, but initial points are as follows. Income equality is as mentioned above a logical key meta-indicator, although care is required in how measures are aggregated across populations and over time. Both ‘objective’ quantifiable measures and more qualitative measures involving engagement, judgement and discussion have their valuable places in measurement. For example, The UN Global Compact – Cities Programme encourages use of the City Scan for cities to self-analyse progress across the 10 principles and to set out targets for City Development, City Sustainability and City Governance. It is of course important that the measures that cities use to monitor ethical city progress are given due weight in resourcing, decision making and policy priority setting across the city.

In conclusion, the ethical cities agenda is designed to raise the profile and advance a principles-based and collaborative approach to urban development and city management for government actors, private sector, civil society and citizens. Each stakeholder gains; from the Mayor to the citizen.

The Mayor gets a more harmonious and inclusive city, clearer agendas through negotiated and mediated dialogue, informed communities, plus more transparent and accountable governance, which is increasingly popular amongst the voting public.

Business sectors, professional and peak bodies, and city bureaucrats all get an operating environment where it is clear what conduct is expected. Open Governance, accountability, transparency, and anti-corruption all provide a solid foundation for good business and policy conduct and outcomes.

Communities are less alienated, better engaged in participatory democratic decision making, have access to fair work practices, enjoy equality in the workplace, and are part of and therefore more trusting of collaborative governance processes.

The ethical city is an idea whose time has come.

References

- Atkinson, A.B. (2015) *Inequality: What can be done?* Harvard University Press, 384pp.
- Barber, B.R. (2013) *If Mayors Ruled the World: Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities.* Yale University Press.
- Barratt, B.F.D. (2015) 'Ethical Cities Are the Future' *Our World*, 28 May, accessed 6 February 2016 — <http://ourworld.unu.edu/en/ethical-cities-are-the-future>
- Barrett, B.F.D. (2016) The ethical city: an idea whose time has come, *The Conversation*, 27 January, accessed 8 February 2016, <https://theconversation.com/the-ethical-city-an-idea-whose-time-has-come-53385>
- Bee, H. L. (1994) *Lifespan Development.* HarperCollins College Publishers.
- Davis, M. (2006) *Planet of Slums,* Verso.
- Fainstein, S. (2010) *The Just City.* Cornell University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration.* University of California Press, 402pp.
- Gilligan, C. (1977) In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and of morality. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47(4), 481-517.
- Harvey, D. (1973) *Social Justice and the City.* Johns Hopkins University Press
- Ignatieff, M. (2014) *The Moral Operating System of a Global City: Los Angeles.* Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs.
- Katz, B. and Bradley, J. (2013) *The Metropolitan Revolution: How Cities and Metros Are Fixing Our Broken Politics and Fragile Economy,* Brookings Institution.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984) *The Psychology of Moral Development: The Nature and Validity of Moral Stages (Essays on Moral Development, Volume 2).* Harper & Row
- Pinker, S. (2011) *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined.* Viking.
- RICS (2015) *Advancing Responsible Business Practices in Land, Construction and Real Estate Use and Investment.* June, Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors/UN Global Compact. https://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues_doc/RICS/GC_RICS_Resource.pdf
- UN (2014) *World Urbanisation Prospects, 2014 Revision.*
- Voss, J-P., Bauknecht, D. and Kemp, R. (2006) *Reflexive Governance for Sustainable Development.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Oketch, M. & Mutisya, M. (2012) *Education, training and work amongst youth living in slums of Nairobi, Kenya,* UNESCO.
- <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002178/217885e.pdf>
- World Vision (2014) *Just Cities for Children: Voices from Urban Slums,* World Vision International
- <http://www.wvi.org/urban-programming/publication/just-cities-children-voices-urban-slums>

Appendix 1: The Sustainable Development Goals

1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere
2. End hunger, achieve food security and adequate nutrition for all, and promote sustainable agriculture
3. Attain healthy life for all at all ages
4. Provide equitable and inclusive quality education and life-long learning opportunities for all
5. Attain gender equality, empower women and girls everywhere
6. Secure water and sanitation for all for a sustainable world
7. Ensure access to affordable, sustainable, and reliable modern energy services for all
8. Promote strong, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and decent work for all
9. Promote sustainable industrialization
10. Reduce inequality within and among countries
11. Build inclusive, safe and sustainable cities and human settlements
12. Promote sustainable consumption and production patterns
13. Promote actions at all levels to address climate change
14. Attain conservation and sustainable use of marine resources, oceans and seas
15. Protect and restore terrestrial ecosystems and halt all biodiversity loss
16. Achieve peaceful and inclusive societies, rule of law, effective and capable institutions
17. Strengthen and enhance the means of implementation and global partnership for sustainable development