

# FOUR EDUCATIONAL PERSPECTIVES OF URBAN SUSTAINABILITY IN SPANISH CITIES

P. Montero-Souto<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Theory of Education, History of Education and Social Pedagogy, Faculty of Education Sciences, University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain, [pablo.montero.souto@usc.es](mailto:pablo.montero.souto@usc.es)

## ABSTRACT

The goal of the *United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development* (2005-2014) is to integrate the principles, values, and practices of Sustainable Development into all aspects of education and long-life learning. Particularly, Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) engages with such key issues as Human Rights, poverty reduction, sustainable livelihoods, climate change, gender equality, corporate social responsibility, protection of cultures in an integral way, etc.

In the direction of ESD, we propose a matrix of the relations between two sources of interaction: on the one hand, learning and educating cities; on the other, economic, social, environmental, and cultural dimensions of sustainability. At this point, we underline the central position of Urban Networks and City-to-City (C2C) cooperation in order to promote local educational policies, services, and programs in the goals of Human, Social and Sustainable Development, Social Inclusion, Cultural Diversity, and Democratic Citizenship.

**KEYWORDS:** Urban Education, Pillars of Education, Pillars of Sustainability, City Networks, Urban Development

## THE FOUR PILLARS OF SUSTAINABLE CITIES

Sustainability is a controversial concept. Pol (2002) notes that various definitions have been typified as vague, inoperative, and technocratic. Nonetheless, the concept of Sustainable Development can represent a meeting point for groups and sectors representing different and opposed interests. In order to underline some of the focal meanings, we recover the review by Binde (1998), *Director of the UNESCO Office of Foresight*, to underline three perspectives on Human, Social and Sustainable Development. Complementary, we take from Hawkes (2001) a fourth pillar of sustainability for the inclusion of an integrated framework of cultural evaluation in the methodology of public planning.

According to the definition given by the Brundtland Commission, in the Report *Our Common Future* (Brundtland & World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987), formally the *World Commission on Environment and Development* (WCED), Sustainable Development is “the capacity to respond to the needs of the present without jeopardizing the possibility for future generations to satisfy their own needs”. On this way, is well known that environmental problems are global in nature and it is in the common interest of all nations to establish policies for Sustainable Development.

Concerned about the accelerating deterioration of the human environment and natural resources and the consequences of that deterioration for economic and Social Development, UN agrees with the Commission that while seeking to remedy existing environmental problems, it is imperative to influence the sources of those problems in human activity. It also concurs with the Commission that the critical objectives for environment and development policies which follow from the need for Sustainable Development must include preserving peace, reviving growth and changing its quality, remedying the problems of poverty and satisfying human needs, addressing the problems of population growth and of conserving and enhancing the resource base, reorienting technology and managing risk, and merging environment and economics in decision-making. Urbanizing world must be included in this list.

Emphasizing that education is an indispensable element for achieving that goals, General Assembly decided to proclaim the *United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development* (DESD), designating the UNESCO as the lead agency for the promotion of the long 2005-2014. The aim of the UNESCO agency is to integrate the principles, values, and practices of Sustainable Development into all aspects of education and learning. For this, UNESCO settled the global objectives for the DESD in order to connect the relation between the goals of the sustainability and the educational process. Those objectives are to:

1. facilitate networking, linkages, exchange and interaction among stakeholders in ESD;
2. foster an increased quality of teaching and learning in education for Sustainable Development;
3. help countries make progress towards and attain the millennium development goals through ESD efforts; and
4. provide countries with new opportunities to incorporate ESD into education reform efforts.

In a second perspective, education is one of the most important bases for Human Development. According to the UNDP official definition, Human Development is the process aimed at extending the range of choices for individuals, while taking account not only of income but of other factors, which in fact have an impact on the quality of urban life. Also is well known that Human Development is about creating an environment in which people can

develop their full potential and lead productive, creative lives in accord with their needs and interests. To Amartya Sen, Professor of Economics, Harvard University and Nobel Laureate in Economics, 1998, Development is thus about expanding the choices people have to lead lives that they value, and it is thus about much more than economic growth, which is only a means —yet a very important one — of enlarging people's choices.

Works by Amartya Sen (Sen, 2001) and others provide the conceptual foundation for an alternative and broader Human Development approach defined as a process of enlarging people's choices and enhancing human capabilities and freedoms, enabling them to: live a long and healthy life, have access to knowledge and a decent standard of living, and participate in the life of their community and decisions affecting their lives. In a whole picture, that is concerned with the basic development idea: namely, advancing the richness of human life. Some of the issues and themes currently considered most central to Human Development include:

- *Social progress* – greater access to knowledge, better nutrition and health services.
- *Economics* – the importance of economic growth as a way to reduce inequality and improve levels of Human Development.
- *Efficiency* – in terms of resource use and availability, Human Development is pro-growth and productivity as long as such growth directly benefits the poor, women and other marginalized groups.
- *Equity* – in terms of economic growth and other Human Development parameters.
- *Participation and freedom* – particularly empowerment, democratic governance, gender equality, civil and political rights, and cultural liberty, particularly for marginalized groups defined by urban-rural, sex, age, religion, ethnicity, physical/mental parameters, etc.
- *Sustainability* – for future generations in ecological, economic and social terms.
- *Human security* – security in daily life against such chronic threats as hunger and abrupt disruptions including joblessness, famine, conflict, etc.

For many reasons, we need to add educational performance to the conceptualization of Human Development. Indeed, educational rates is a component of the *Human Development Index*, comprised for adult literacy rates and the combined gross enrolment ratio for primary, secondary and tertiary schooling, weighted to give adult literacy more significance in the statistic, although the literacy figures are far from capturing all of our capabilities. Nevertheless, Human Development is equally concerned with how capabilities are used by people who can participate freely in social, political and economic decision-making and who can work productively and creatively for

development. At this point, education and social learning is the way to expand the human capabilities.

In a different but complementary approach to development, Social Development represents an extension of the collective dimension of development. The Copenhagen Declaration, adopted by the *World Summit on Social Development* in 1995, recognized the significance of Social Development and human well-being for all and to give to these goals the highest priority into the twenty-first century.

Once more, a UN declaration noted that economic, social and environmental issues are interdependent and mutually reinforcing components of Sustainable Development, which is the framework for our efforts to achieve a higher quality of life for all people. Indeed, Development Goals cannot be secured in a sustainable way without the full participation of women and that equality and equity between women and men is a priority for the international community and must be at the centre of economic and Social Development. So, people are at the centre of our concerns for Human, Social and Sustainable Development and they are entitled to learn to have a healthy and productive life in harmony with the environment.

In summary, Copenhagen Declaration ratifies the public action committed to a political, economic, ethical and spiritual vision for Social Development that is based on human dignity, human rights, equality, respect, peace, democracy, mutual responsibility and cooperation, and full respect for the various religious and ethical values and cultural backgrounds of people. Thus, Social Development gives the highest priority in national, regional and international policies and actions to the promotion of social progress, justice and the betterment of the human condition.

In a fourth perspective, Hawkes (2001) underline the cultural pillar of sustainability. In his paper prepared for the Cultural Development Network of Victoria (Vic), he calls for the examination of the potential value of a specifically cultural perspective to the planning, service delivery and evaluation activities of local government. Basically, he argues that cultural vitality is as essential to a healthy and sustainable society as social equity, environmental responsibility and economic viability. Thus, in order to public planning to be more effective, its methodology should include an integrated framework of cultural evaluation along similar lines to those being developed for social, environmental and economic impact assessment.

In fact, a society's values are the basis upon which all else is built, and cultural background is a big support to important values, like participation, engagement and democracy; tolerance, compassion and inclusion; freedom, justice and equality; peace, safety and security; health, wellbeing and viability; creativity, imagination and innovation; love and respect for the environment. Obviously, the formation of a Cultural Framework is linked to education systems and training activities to learning and formation.

Many other remarks can be added to Development. Here, we must remind the *Declaration on the Right to Development*, proclaimed by General Assembly resolution 41/128 of 4 December 1986. Just then, Development was conceptualized as “a comprehensive economic, social, cultural and political process, which aims at the constant improvement of the well-being of the entire population and of all individuals on the basis of their active, free and meaningful participation in development and in the fair distribution of benefits resulting there from”.

Complementary, we can also remember the previous debates that came at UN Headquarters in New York to adopt the *UN Millennium Declaration*, in September 2000, committing their nations to a new global partnership to reduce extreme poverty and setting out a series of time-bound targets – with a deadline of 2015 – that have become known as the *Millennium Development Goals*.

But the conclusion is always the same. Development is a complex and multifaceted picture. So, according to UN-Habitat’s Conferences, we have to confront the need for convergence between these various approaches to development, by considering that cities should become both “inhabitable”, which required due respect for the ecosystems on which the city was founded, and “livable”, that is to say, respectful of the dignity of the human beings living there through a citizen’s culture of city life, composed of solidarity and participation. That is because sustainability has to do not only with ecological concern but also – and not less important – with solidarity and equity to build a better life similar to environmentally sustainable, economically productive, politically participatory, culturally vibrant, socially just and globally connected. Education is at the heart for all of these goals.

## THE FOUR PILLARS OF LEARNING CITIES

In November 1991, Federico Mayor Zaragoza, in that moment UNESCO Director-General, requested Jacques Delors to chair the *International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century*. This Commission was formally established at the beginning of 1993, and three years later UNESCO published the report “Learning: the Treasure Within” (Delors, International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, & International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1996).

Simply speaking, the Commission Report suggests that education throughout life is based upon four pillars: (1) learning to know, (2) learning to do, (3) learning to live together and (4) learning to be. This Four Pillars of Education cannot be anchored solely in one phase in a person's life or in a single location. They should complement each other in any time and any place, and be interrelated in such way that everyone can get the most out of their own specific educational environment all through their lives.

Reading literally the UNESCO’s Report, the four pillars are:

- (1) *Learning to Live Together*. Develop an understanding of others and their history, traditions and spiritual values and, on this basis, creating a new spirit which, guided by recognition of our growing interdependence and a common analysis of the risks and challenges of the future, would induce people to implement common projects or to manage the inevitable conflicts in an intelligent and peaceful way.
- (2) *Learning to Know*. Given the rapid changes brought about by scientific progress and the new forms of economic and social activity, the emphasis has to be on combining a sufficiently broad general education with the possibility of in-depth work on a selected number of subjects. Such a general background provides the passport to lifelong education, in so far as it gives people a taste – but also lays the foundations – for learning throughout life.
- (3) *Learning to Do*. In addition to learning to do a job of work, it should entail the acquisition of a competence that enables people to deal with a variety of situations, often unforeseeable, and to work in teams, a feature to which educational methods do not at present pay enough attention. In many cases, such competence and skills are more readily acquired if pupils and students have the opportunity to try out and develop their abilities by becoming involved in work experience schemes or social work while they are still in education, whence the increased importance that should be attached to all methods of alternating study with work.
- (4) Last but not least, *Learning to Be*. This was the dominant theme of the Edgar Faure report *Learning to Be: The World of Education Today and Tomorrow* (Unesco, 1972), published by UNESCO in 1972. Its recommendations are still very relevant, for in the 21<sup>st</sup> century everyone will need to exercise greater independence and judgment combined with a stronger sense of personal responsibility for the attainment of common goals. The new report signed by Delors stresses a further imperative: none of the talents which are hidden like a buried treasure in every person must be left untapped.

#### 4X4 PILLARS OF THE EDUCATING CITIES FOR SUSTAINABILITY

Based on the previous notes, we can focus the major issues in the formation of citizen and human capacities for Urban Development crossing the 4x4 pillars of education and sustainability. On the one hand, we can situate the

different dimensions on sustainability – Economic, Social, Environmental, and Cultural – in order to get a comprehensive overview. On the other, we can underline the need to extend human capacities on the base of learning to live together, learning to know, learning to do and learning to be. In the intersections of this matrix, we can identify a diverse of City Networks running to cooperate each other in the goal to build better places to live. A provisional propose is represented in the picture, according to the networks of cities where Spanish local governments are mostly represented.

4x4 Pillars Of The Educating Cities For Sustainability

4x4*	Learning to Live Together	Learning to Know	Learning to Do	Learning to Be
<b>Economic</b>	European Network of Cities and Regions for the Social Economy (REVES) <sup>i</sup>	The European Urban Knowledge Network (EUKN) <sup>ii</sup> Techno & Digital Cities	Cittaslow network <sup>iii</sup> European Cities Network for Conciliation	The Creative Cities Network (UNESCO) <sup>iv</sup>
<b>Social</b>	Child Friendly Cities Initiative (UNICEF) <sup>v</sup>	AICE – International Association of Educating Cities <sup>vi</sup>	The Mayors for Peace <sup>vii</sup>	The Inclusive City Initiative (Habitat’s Global Campaign)
<b>Environmental</b>	C40 Cities - Climate Leadership Group <sup>viii</sup>	ICLEI – International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives <sup>ix</sup>	Walkable Cities Network Bicycle Cities	International Healthy Cities Foundation (WHO) <sup>x</sup>
<b>Cultural</b>	SPIDH – The international permanent Secretariat Human Rights and Local Governments <sup>xi</sup>	Network of Local Authorities for the Information Society (IT4ALL) <sup>xii</sup> Knowledge and University Cities	UNESCO World Heritage Cities	Les Rencontres - Association of European Cities and Regions for Culture <sup>xiii</sup> Cities of Arts and Science

\*This is a provisional and tentative proposal. I would appreciate very much if you can send me your comments via email <pablo.montero.souto@usc.es>.

C2C COOPERATION

To compose an interpretation from *4x4 Pillars Of The Educating Cities For Sustainability*, we need to consider the various papers that validate the importance of urban networks in development. Besides presenting the previous proposal, this is the purpose of the last part of our work.

Over the last few decades, transnational city networks have gradually evolved and grown to become more effective and influential players. Even though the strategies and aims among the networks vary greatly. Newer research offers a more critical view that balances the initial euphoria in transnational city networking. Recently, Keiner & Kim (2007) point to the large gap existing between regions active in networking and others. In their speaking, networking has transformed how we view and deal with topics of global relevance. In this new context, issues such as urban management and local governance have been able to take on new dimensions.

In truth, the relevance of this development to perceptions of territory, their governance and reorganization in larger and more diffuse spheres of influence has been the topic of previous research. Lately, critical perspectives have been mounting, which attempt to assess the impact of transnational networking in tangible ways. However, few studies have been conducted to date, which take a closer look at city networks on sustainability and the fruit of their efforts.

Despite the lack of research, cities are responding to urban crises in several ways. One opportunity is networking among cities to share knowledge, collaborate to find new solutions, and learn from good practices elsewhere. Pfeiffer (2000) emphasizes the potential of networks for facilitating mutual learning processes among cities through the transfer and transformation of sustainable innovations (technical and organizational) and knowledge.

To UN-HABITAT (2001), cooperation typically refers to a long-term partnership between cities in different cities or towns based on mutually and equity. More than 70% of the world's cities have been engaged in some of this forms of international cooperation with another city, be it a sister-city or friendship city relationship. Approximately 68% of these linkages have been through international associations.

Also the *European Commission White Paper on European Governance* recognized that policy development within the EU (and in member states) can no longer be horizontally and vertically segregated. Actually, there is an explicit recognition that problems cut across different levels of government as well as sectoral and institutional policy domains. To Atkinson (2002), this goal requires a holistic and strategic approach that integrates different policy domains and levels of government, one that places subsidiarity and proportionality at its heart and which gives a central role to sub-national government and citizens in the policy process.

White Paper reflects that the issues of good governance, a stronger role for regional, urban and local government, subsidiarity, partnership and local empowerment have been central to the debate. Related to the above is the White Paper's argument that citizens should have a greater role in the policy process. But, most important is the White Paper's idea that networks should play a more relevant role in the future, because governance needs to be more holistic and bring together policy formulation and implementation (Atkinson, 2002).

Certainly, City-to-City (C2C) cooperation networks reflect growing awareness of cities as players in regional, national, and international affairs. Campbell (2009) suggests that the style and rate of learning can be observed in cities, that cities engage in learning to make deliberate and strategic change, and that this learning process can lead to improved performance and may be one of the mechanism that increases competitiveness. To him, several kinds of learning systems can be observed, that the process of learning may be as important as the product in contributing to competitiveness, that policies can helpful to facilitate learning, and that a radical departure from customary policy, especially in donor institutions, may be needed to effectively meet requirements of institutional capacity building in cities of the developing world.

Finally, Campbell (2009) report to main dimensions of learning emerge from his analysis. One concerns the learning modality that cities generate in the learning process. A second dimension is soft infrastructure. The learning process itself seems to generate an emerging quality in the city that may be as important as the aggregated lessons a city learns. In this sense, a typology of cases could be formed to observe the processes of learning in cities networks: (1) Type 1 is learning by individual cities that take a proactive stance about learning and commit resources over long periods to gather and make use of knowledge. (2) Type 2 is learning by clusters of cities that are self-defined as member of a class, for example cities of cultural heritage or sustainable cities. (3) Type 3 is composed of individual cities (or communities within cities) that have a somewhat narrow mandate to increase capacity in specific areas of policy or practice, for which they engage in binary exchanges sometimes over long periods of time, but usually intermittently with other cities in order to transfer technical skill, as in nuts-and-bolts practices. (4) Type 4 refers learning in which organizations or associations that have cities as members and for which informational services are provided on a “passive” basis.

In a complementary overview, Johnson & Wilson (2009) consider how peer exchange and learning can extend beyond the initial boundaries of cooperation, and suggest how research on mutuality and social learning can be further progressed from an institutional standpoint. In their study, the main baseline themes to evaluate the nature and mechanism of practitioner-to-practitioner learning were:

- (1) the history of how the partnership was formed;
- (2) how it was maintained over time, and the key factors in maintaining the partnership;
- (3) the situation before the partnership (problems faced and who was affected);
- (4) the aims of the projects, their conceptualization and achievements;
- (5) who learnt what from the partnership;
- (6) evaluating mechanisms for ‘technology transfer’ and learning;
- (7) institutionalization of learning;
- (8) governance issues;
- (9) anything else reported by informants.

From this study, we need to rescue that partners claimed that different knowledge, experiences, practices and contexts were respected and formed the basis of dialogue. Officers used phrases such as: ‘we spoke the same language’; ‘treated the problems at the same level’; ‘you are peers on the same side’; ‘you can share ideas’; ‘you have people who share common problems’; ‘each party comes with some knowledge’. According to the authors, this common frame is linked to a shared learning space allowed for the multiple cross-cutting interactions, events, histories and experiences that influence learning and knowledge production. Consequently, we assumed that shared learning and peer

teaching is one of the cardinal points of the urban cooperation. So, learning C2C matters.

Another approach is offered by Tjandradewi & Irawati (2009). Based upon a survey of local governments in Asian countries, they find that C2C is seen as more appropriate in some areas and not in others. Governments consider four features critical to successful C2C collaboration including: (1) free flows of information, (2) reciprocity, (3) understanding and (4) leadership. At the same time, local governmental decision makers did not see community participation as an important element in C2C success. In terms of areas where C2C is most applicable, local governments in Asia identified the areas of environment, health and education and cultural issues. Urban infrastructure also received support. Asian managers, however, found C2C cooperation less applicable in the areas of gender empowerment and poverty reduction, housing and shelter, municipal finance and economic development. Results were somewhat mixed for security and disaster management. In brief, they suggest that C2C has important, but limited usefulness in a region where community participation in increasingly seen as vital to good governance and poverty reduction, gender and economic development are high priority areas.

Taylor (2005) distinguishes three types of world city networks based on their initiators: an inter-state city network with state departments as network-makers, a supra-state city network with United Nations agencies as network-makers, and a trans-state city network with NGOs as network-makers.

Analytical model designed by Keiner & Kim (2007) is formed to: network name, abbreviation, website, year founded, headquarter, main themes, members (individual, private, universities, institutions, organizations...), and area (national, international, world...). We translate the model of analysis into the next table.

Typology of city networks (analytical model)

Spatial scope	Sectoral/thematic issues	Members/member ship	Founding/leading organizations	Other characteristics
Global Transregional (i.e.: EU) Regional National City partnerships	Ecology/enviroment Energy Policy issues Urban issues (poverty/urban development/regeration) Social issues (i.e. social inclusion and cohesion/gender/human rights) Cultural issues Communication/technology transfer (e-/IT)	Number of members Membership requirements/fees Member privileges/benefits Cities/local governments Scientific institutions/univerisities Business/private sector NGO/CBO Individuals	UN EU University Sponsors Membership Partner	Year founded Organizational structure Location of headquarters Budget size/sources Website information Databases/resources Type and frequency of communication/information exchange Projects/awards

Source: (Keiner & Kim, 2007).

Tjandradewi & Marcotullio (2009) offer other model to analyze key elements in C2C cooperation. At least, they are: (1) commitment to link, (2) community-wide participation, (3) understanding, (4) reciprocity, (5) results through real examples, (6) political support from higher levels of government, (7) consistent leadership, (8) cost sharing and cost effectiveness, and (9) free flows of information.

As we can observe, most approaches highlighted C2C cooperation as an effective way of mobilizing large-scale development resources, to actively exchange best practices and to improve the management capacity of cities in the developing world. In fact, C2C is often overlapped by the work of thematic networks supported by a growing number of bi-lateral and multi-lateral agencies. All of this is because C2C represents the most basic building block of city networking, in which “city” is understood to include local communities of all types and sizes and their cooperation refers to a wide range of processes whereby local government practitioners work together, often with support from external agencies, to exchange experience and expertise and seek solutions to shared problems. According to Keiner & Kim (2007), C2C is vital for exchanging, sharing and transferring technical know-how, expertise and experiences, and to explore the possibilities among the various partners in the field of urban management. The most common reason why local governments take part in C2C is to learn from peers or cities facing similar challenges and experiencing similar conditions.

Of course, C2C cooperation deserves further investigation. But this course of action is essential for progressing to the goals of the *United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development* (2005-2014) at local level, and to achieve urban sustainability.

## REMARKS AND FURTHER

In many parts of the world, decentralization, democratization and participation are now a local reality. Thus, the role of local governments in human, social, environmental, and cultural development is growing quickly. That is normal if we taking into consideration the rediscovery of local government as the layer of government closest to the people, where we can generate a meeting place between the state and civil society in which a new social contract can be negotiated. It is at the local level that many of the changes required for development need to take place. In this context, C2C networking is an interesting way to promote the learning of urban sustainability.

Actually, we can identify C2C networking for learning to sustainable development. Crossing the 4 Pillars of Education and the 4 Pillars of Sustainability, we build a model for discussing based on recent literature about C2C cooperation. Now we are more prepared to the next step. In future work, we must evaluate how the networks of cities are characterized by the following issues of the analytical model: (1) autonomy of member cities and voluntary membership; (2) polycentric, horizontal and non-hierarchical organization; (3)

decentralized cooperation among member cities; (4) non-hierarchical decision-making; (5) formalized organizational and communication structure; (6) collaborating together for mutual attention and benefits, with or without external support; and (7) shared values and common interest.

We expect that the correspondence with this model could represent a progress for networking in urban development.

## REFERENCES

- Atkinson, R. (2002). The white paper on european governance: Implications for urban policy. *European Planning Studies*, 10(6), 781-792.
- Binde, J. (1998). Cities and environment in the twenty-first century - A future-oriented synthesis after habitat II. *Futures*, 30, 499-518(20).
- Brundtland, G. H., & World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, T. (2009). Learning cities: Knowledge, capacity and competitiveness. *Habitat International*, 33(2), 195-201.
- Delors, J., & International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within*. Paris: Unesco.
- Hawkes, J. (2001). *The fourth pillar of sustainability: Culture's essential role in public planning*. Australia: Common Ground.
- Johnson, H., & Wilson, G. (2009). Learning and mutuality in municipal partnerships and beyond: A focus on northern partners. *Habitat International*, 33(2), 210-217.
- Keiner, M., & Kim, A. (2007). Transnational city networks for sustainability. *European Planning Studies*, 15, 1369-1395.
- Pfeiffer, U., & Germany. Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau-und Wohnungswesen. (2000). *Urban future 21: A global agenda for twenty-first century cities*. London, New York: E & FN Spon.
- Pol, E. (2002). The theoretical background of the city-identity-sustainability network. *Environment and Behavior*, 34(1), 8-25.
- Sen, A. (2001). *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, P. J. (2005). New political geographies: Global civil society and global governance through world city networks. *Political Geography*, 24(6), 703-730.
- Tjandradewi, B. I., & Marcotullio, P. J. (2009). City-to-city networks: Asian perspectives on key elements and areas for success. *Habitat International*, 33(2), 165-172.
- Unesco. (1972). *Learning to be: The world of education today and tomorrow*. Paris: London: Unesco ; Harrap.
- United Nations Centre for Human Settlements. (2001). *Cities in a globalizing world: Global report on human settlements 2001*. London: Earthscan Publications.

- 
- <sup>i</sup> <http://www.revesnetwork.net/>
- <sup>ii</sup> <http://www.eukn.org/eukn/index.html>
- <sup>iii</sup> <http://www.cittaslow.net/sezioni/Rete%20internazionale/>
- <sup>iv</sup> [http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=24544&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=24544&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)
- <sup>v</sup> <http://www.childfriendlycities.org/>
- <sup>vi</sup> <http://w10.bcn.es/APPS/eduportal/pubPortadaAc.do>
- <sup>vii</sup> <http://www.mayorsforpeace.org/english/index.html>
- <sup>viii</sup> <http://www.c40cities.org/>
- <sup>ix</sup> <http://www.iclei.org/>
- <sup>x</sup> <http://www.healthycities.org/>
- <sup>xi</sup> <http://www.spidh.org/en/home/index.html>
- <sup>xii</sup> <http://www.it4all-regions.org/it4all/index.jsp>
- <sup>xiii</sup> <http://www.lesrencontres.org/>