



Multicultural and Secure Urban Areas

The Importance of Global and Local Social Connectedness

Derya Dilara Akguner

Edited by Ahmet Sözen and Jared L. Ordway

March 2017

Abstract

Nicosia was once a flourishing meeting point of cultures, ideas, art, and culture. It was home to many and the light of the Island. Yet urban diversity and the continued socio-cultural expansion have ignited pivotal questions regarding how best to manage diversity and plan urban growth, while developing community projects and government policies that ensure sustainable, harmonious, inclusive, and secure shared urban public spaces. This is particularly true for the Cyprus case, with Nicosia.

Experts from social science, psychology, urban sociology, urban planning, architecture and a range of disparate fields have insights into the subjects of social cohesion / connectivity and the design of public spaces. These are informed by research. Users of such spaces also have insights. Today these volumes of knowledge remain largely in their private realms. Furthermore, current approaches and policies of multiculturalism, integration, and social cohesion have not entirely created a sense of belonging and socially connected spaces and societies. As such, innovative approaches when designing urban public spaces and managing diversity are necessary to foster social harmony within these re-created and shared spaces.

Urban global cities worldwide house diverse societies and are the focal point for the economy and international standing. Unused and forbidden spaces that hold precious memories scar the cultures that bear the burden of their shared past. However, they are also a path – a road to opportunity when it comes to what the future may hold. This paper shows that a multi-disciplinary and multi-level approach when urban planning – for creating socially sustainable and peaceful future societies, framed within the theories of social connectedness and omniculturalism – is necessary to building secure and peaceful diverse urban spaces. It is also pivotal for engaging with and empowering Nicosians to recreate their own shared and growing city after their desires, wishes, and dreams.

Contents

1	Introduction.....	3
2	Re-creating/Re-building the City	4
3	Sharing the City.....	10
	3.1 A Multicultural Society.....	10
	3.2 The Cohesive and Connected Society	12
	3.3 Social Connectedness in the Urban Sphere	13
4	Summary/Conclusion/Future Research	15
5	Cited Works	19
6	About this publication	21

To cite this publication:

Derya Dilara Akguner 2017. Multicultural and Secure Urban Areas: The Importance of Global and Local Connectedness. Security Dialogue Project, Background Paper. Edited by Ahmet Sözen & Jared L. Ordway. Berlin: Berghof Foundation & SeeD.

Online at: <http://www.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/Publications/SecurityDialogueProject/Akguner.pdf>

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the Berghof Foundation and SeeD or their project partners.

1 Introduction

When we speak of multicultural and secure urban areas it is usually within the perspective of outsiders and insiders, locals and foreigners, newcomers and locals, “us” and “them”. These conversations are generally marked within linear and static frameworks, which limit the omnicultural nature of truly cosmopolitan, secure, globally linked, and socially connected urban societies.

These transformations are best observed within urban cities / spaces because of the magnetic social and economic pull of those spaces locally, and what they represent internationally – in a global sense. Thus, the city is as much a study of concern as is the citizen for the exploration of the importance of sustainable, multicultural, and secure urban areas. When observing issues of multiculturalism, co-existence and security within urban spaces, it becomes apparent that as the city changes (as a reflection of the country), its citizens change. Upon closer examination, we notice that in fact both the city and its citizens propel changes upon one another.

Citizens change with the demands of their time and their city. The city is constantly growing to house many different groups within it. As the city grows, it changes, it accommodates newcomers and new ideas / ideologies, as well as power structures and dynamics. Consequently, urban dwellers’ conceptions of urban public spaces and the freedoms / security within these change alongside tangible and perceived changes. The global social, cultural, and political impacts felt both within urban public spaces and citizens’ daily personal, public, and private lives impact upon the core aesthetic of urban areas and the very use, creation, and understanding of those spaces.

As urban public spaces expand, the question of the city’s / country’s identity and its people is challenged because of the fusion of cultures morphing into an all-together new public identity. Their adaption of these ever-new spaces is further deepened with globalisation – making *social connectedness* both an internal and an external construct.

This is because it highlights the level of cosmopolitanism, security, and multiculturalism within these urban areas – which most cities thrive upon; and perhaps more pressing – the degree to which those spaces are connected on a global scale and how they are perceived internationally.

How we share and re-create / re-build changing spaces is at the core of the debate not only within Cyprus, but for how Europe and its wider region is dealing with its own internal dynamics in relation to particularly the Syrian refugees, and also for countries like Lebanon and Turkey, which struggle with external pressures as well as managing their own internal populations and the sustainability of these syntheses.

The major political events within Cyprus during this era are bringing to the surface already existent issues in Cypriot political and social history, but with even greater fervour, considering the possible solution and unification of the Island and the merging of common public spaces – a shared local and global identity. The heightened awareness of these spaces becomes a fight for the right to the city / urban public areas: to be present in the city and the freedoms and security issues associated with them. The possible sharing and re-creating of these spaces by differing ideologies underscore the struggles between societies with polarised views on the way Cyprus should be: culturally, socially, politically, and regionally. It also exposes the fragility of the heterogeneousness and multicultural nature of Cypriot society and politics.

The creation of those spaces within an urban perspective, if we are to take Nicosia as a case study here, highlights the dream of what that place could be, and speaks to the core of the politics surrounding public, private, and personal spaces – and the security that is felt in them. The importance of having a place and a say in the changing nature of the city’s urban public sphere is related to how

citizens desire their city and themselves to be. It is about their values and principles within the city that they live in.

This paper ultimately seeks to address the consequent impacts of political changes during this transitional phase, on the re-created and re-built urban public spaces in Cyprus and on Cypriots' public, private, and personal spheres; those very spaces that will be redefined, re-created, and shared. The paper will do so by incorporating the relevant literature on multiculturalism, urban public spaces, social cohesion and security – including the policies and projects that have been conducted and implemented in the Cyprus case, along with my own ethnographic observations and recommendations.

The paper has been divided into two main sections. The first is titled *Re-creating/Re-building the City*, which discusses the Cyprus situation within the framework of the existing literature on urban transformation, public and private contested spaces, urban sociology, and urban planning of the city to ensure healthy diversity and sustainable security. It also highlights the need to emphasise global social connections; to not only secure and bridge communities, but to also stay competitive and attractive regionally and connected economically and socially in global settings.

The second section is titled *Sharing the City* and discusses several multicultural, governance and social cohesion policies – via the existing literature, projects, and recommendations. Moreover, this section focuses on the importance of grassroots level social politics / policies, and speaks of the need for social connectedness within urban public spaces. This takes a step deeper into the social cohesion approach – via the use of social psychology recommendations for diverse settings.

As such it will provide recommendations based within this school of thought, which argues that sustainable urban policies in relation to the formation of public urban spaces require a multi-disciplinary approach, as much as they should also focus on a grassroots / local level that speaks to the heart of actual, organic, and long-lasting connections.

The paper will then offer a summary of the above and discuss what has been done in Cyprus to achieve the goal of multicultural and secure areas. The final part of the paper will offer suggestions on what can be done, researched, supported for the future of Cyprus, and in the re-building and re-creating of diverse, safe, and sustainable shared urban public spaces.

2 Re-creating/Re-building the City

To return to a city in which you used to live – especially if the gap is a long one – to be made sharply aware of the passage of time, and the changing fabric of cities congeals that process of the passage of time in a way that is both concrete and somehow eerie or ghostly.

(Wilson, 1997, p. 128).

The meanings that we make of ourselves are directly related to how we perceive the spaces that we lived in and left behind, and those that we currently live in. Yet urban change, urban diversification, and globalisation is next to inevitable. Whether that change be in response to external pressures or internal movements, it ultimately reorganises the way in which citizens use and make sense of these spaces.

The process of re-building and re-creating spaces together is an important one. This is because “(t)he vibrancy...” of places depends on the “stimulation and challenge” that people give it (Holland, Clark, Katz & Peace, 2007, p. xii). According to Holland et al., for the “regeneration” process to be “effective” both “... users and potential users, particularly those living locally...” should be a key factor within the creation of that place (2007, p. xii). As they rightly argue: “(w)hile regeneration can provide pristine public spaces, it is the people that make the places” (ibid.).

David Harvey – influenced by Robert Parks’ work *On Social Control and Collective Behaviour* states that the city is “man’s most consistent and ... his most successful attempt to remake the world he lives in more after his heart’s desire” (Harvey, 2012, p. 3). In this light Harvey states:

... the question of what kind of city we want cannot be divorced from the question of what kind of people we want to be ... [t]he right to the city is, therefore far more than a right of individual or group access to the resources that the city embodies: it is a right to change and reinvent the city more after our hearts’ desire. (ibid., p. 4).

As such, claiming a “right” to the city one lives in is related to how citizens want to shape that city and how they see themselves and wish to exercise and live out their values, principles, and lifestyle choices. Harvey argues, that this “collective right... [is] ... [t]he freedom to make and remake ourselves and our cities, [and is] ...one of the most precious yet most neglected of our human rights” (ibid.).

It is the claiming and reclaiming of this space that is at the core of urban public identity politics. Holland et al. also suggest that “(c)laiming social space and being seen in public becomes a way for social groups to legitimate their right to belong in society” (2007, p. 1). However, the question of whose city / space is it, is a question of power and negotiation of the meanings of public, private, and personal spaces – essentially making them “contested”. Holland et al. also note that “... because they can be used by everyone, public spaces are frequently considered contested spaces; places where opposition, confrontation, resistance and subversion can be played out...” (ibid.).

The public spaces within newly created and contested urban areas are important because of the different meanings that all users associate with them and how these can be negotiated over time and differing areas – based on memories and the way we imagine those places / spaces to be. Holland et al. interestingly note that these spaces “...draw on deeper struggles about social representations, or collective ‘myths’, about spaces.” (2007, p. 1).

Consequently, the right to ‘be’ not just ‘in public’, but also ‘a part’ of that public is an important way in which different groups can assert their own legitimacy to belong. To be part of the public sphere, it has been argued, is thus at the heart of any inclusive democracy. (Holland et al., 2007, p. 1-2).

The notion of what determines the spaces that are considered private, personal, and public have been debated for millennia by various theorists. It is important to make these definitions in order to highlight the public element of lifestyle changes experienced by citizens in changing urban spaces and the politics surrounding their psychical presence and expression within both realms.

According to Ali Madanipour (2003) there are two approaches to defining the public sphere: descriptive and normative. The descriptive focuses on the presence of the individuals in public and how they interact and influence one another. The second approach discusses “how this interaction should be conducted...the key word... [being] power...” (Madanipour, 2003, p. 110). What is of chief concern here is “the necessity for protecting part of our life from the intrusion of others” (ibid., p. 3). As Madanipour put it:

Public and private spheres in the city entirely depend on the boundaries that separate them. Both for those who defend the private sphere from public intrusion and those who defend the public sphere from private encroachment, the erection of boundaries signifies an act of delimitation and protection. (ibid., p. 59).

Madanipour (ibid., p. 41), states that the personal, the private, and the public are three separate but interconnected realms of one’s life. For Madanipour, “(t)he relationship between the public and private has overlapping economic, social, cultural, and political dimensions and has a clearly visible physical

manifestation, perhaps more than any other form of structuring the city” (ibid., p. 3). When discussing the public sphere, the private sphere is equally important because essentially one is exploring what should be conducted inside (where only few can see) and outside (where others are). Furthermore, there is another element that concerns the person within the public and private spheres: the personal sphere of oneself (the mind, body, and soul) within both of these spaces.

...we see and hear a constant tension between what may or may not be defined as public or private... This is a tension that we observe all around us, the distinction between the public and the private being one of the key lenses through which we see and interpret our daily lives.
(Madanipour, 2003, p. 6).

Moreover, the psychological presence of the body within public spheres holds great meaning because of what it represents politically, culturally, and socially. This holds greater meaning within multicultural urban spaces because of the differing understandings of accepted norms and tolerated private and public practices.

Holland et al., (2007, p. 2) argue that “(w)ho uses which spaces and how can influence societal attitudes to what is appropriate and who has ‘ownership’ of particular places at given times”. They note that as “(p)laces have their own identities and histories”, this can affect the way the citizen feels. If they for example are not familiar to those spaces it “... may (create) a range of emotions from curiosity to uncertainty to insecurity, which can also affect behaviour” (ibid.).

Rapid urbanisation has often been unplanned. As noted by Pinto, Remesar, Brandão, and Nunes da Silva the growth and unplanned nature of these spaces has led to “... several problems concerning the urban structure, namely, those related to territorial cohesion fragilities” (2010, p. 1). Some of these include “... lack of physical and social connectivity in the urban structure; (and) (s)ocial exclusion and marginalization problems” with “spatial fragmentation” as being one of the pivotal areas of concern regarding urban cohesion (Pinto et al., 2010, p. 1).

Although sustainability in urban contexts is generally linked to the economy and the environment, much of what takes place locally is linked to “... social factors, seeking to promote social inclusion and to generate integrative dynamics. (Moreover, to) ... the continuity of space, ... promoting a better understanding of the area, and its functions, facilitating peoples circulation and allowing to establish the necessary links to the proper functioning of the urban network” (ibid., p. 1-2). As such, the creation of this “urban network” from the very beginning of the process of urbanisation and creating shared spaces is key to the success of the peace and social connections within those spaces. In this light, key urban-developing areas in Cyprus stand at an advantage point, when compared to larger, already urbanised areas worldwide. A clean slate to draw and re-draw according to the needs and wishes of how its populations wish their city, their country, and their interactions to be – again a point necessary for grassroots public communication and participation – a place for the people led by the people combined (The Nicosia Master Plan, NMP, n.d.).¹ Much of the initiatives within Cyprus also note the importance of grassroots movements, which is pivotal in this debate (Lordos, Kaymak & Tocci, 2009).

Moreover, the nature of those spaces change and are redefined with who is in power at that particular time. This means that it is subject to change over time according to the ruling elite and depending on the escalating demands of the public within contemporary society. As such, it is not just the social interactions at grassroots levels, but also the way a space is planned and designed from above and together that is extremely important for the well-being of its users.

Pinto et al. (2010, p. 3) note four elements to the success of urban cohesion when planning:

¹ The Cultural Heritage Preservation Circle project, and The Nicosia Master Plan (NMP) team, are great examples of what can be achieved and what projects should be emphasised for joint rebuilding / recreation initiatives.

Table 1 – Indicators for programming planning and designing public spaces networks promoting urban cohesion

Indicator	Inputs for public spaces networks
Mobility / Accessibility / Connectivity	<p>Creation of mobility and accessibility conditions that endorse cohesive urban spaces, connecting the different public spaces and making possible the easy access to all the population.</p> <p>Promotion of the existing networks of flows (such as roads, pedestrian circulation, etc.) continuity, in order to allow easy access to the entire urban network, avoiding the creation of barriers.</p>
Land uses / Activities	<p>Promotion of multifunctionality in the network of public spaces, ranging from commerce and services to facilities and entertainment / recreational activities. Promotion of functional complementarity between several public spaces in the city, always keeping the principle of proximity in mind.</p> <p>The development of socio-economical dynamics through the creation of new land uses and activities can also contribute to regenerate a space.</p>
Social Dynamics	<p>Generation of social dynamics through the complementarity between public spaces and the activities available. These dynamics promote the arising of urban experience capable of regenerating a site or even minimize the phenomena of social exclusion and marginalization.</p>
Comfort / Safety	<p>Promotion of safety and comfort in the movements within the urban network. Promotion of security conditions in all modes of movements (road, pedestrian, cycling, rail, etc.). Promotion of comfort, especially at the level of circulation in green transport modes. Thus, it is possible to contribute to the success of the socio-economic dynamics generated.</p>

Source: Pinto et al., 2010, p. 3

According to the table, all factors of urban space regeneration have been taken into account and this can only be achieved through the combined effort of urban planners, architects, urban sociologists, social psychologists, professionals from other disciplines, government officials, and the public combined (Pinto et al., 2010, p. 3). The public's input should not be undermined at any cost. In a recent forum in Barcelona, titled *Ethical Cities: Urban Innovation Forum*, some projects were outlined to involve the public. For example, one of those was a project titled *Decide Madrid*, which is an online tool where individuals can propose their suggestions for the city. There is a voting system and if others vote the project in with at least 2% it will be considered. In this way, "(n)ew models of direct, individual citizen participation without intermediaries are being tested in Madrid" (Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology 2016).

According to the 2015 World Migration Report by the International Organisation of Migration, IOM:

Urban governance is a collaborative political and policymaking process where individuals and institutions, both public and private, plan and manage the city together. Through the governance process, diverse interests may be accommodated and cooperative action taken (IOM, 2015, p. 189).

Although the report specifically focuses on migrant integration, it is a useful guide for all areas grappling with connected, cohesive, and secure diversity within urban areas. The report also emphasises the need to foster local interactions because inclusion in the entire process is “... an essential part of urban governance...” (IOM, 2015, p. 189-190). These include “... formal institutions as well as informal arrangements which tap into the knowledge, connections and resources of migrants” (ibid.). What the report terms as “urban partnership” – requiring “(p)latforms for exchange, consultation and cooperation...” – then becomes a guide to deal with inclusion “...one of the major urban challenges of our time ...” (ibid.).

Holland et al. (2007, p. 4). write about a study they conducted in Aylesbury, England which observed social interactions in urban public places – ... *the rhythms of public life in the town? Who participates in these rhythms? When can they be observed? And who is missing from them, and consequently hidden from the public life of the town?* The research was appealing and vital to the study of shared urban public spaces within diverse settings because it surveyed “... how different social groups interact in key public spaces within a closely defined urban area; (and) analyse(d) whether interactions differ with age or with place; and whether the presence of particular people or groups affects the use of public space by other people or groups” (Holland et al., 2007, p. 5). The study also focused on the “... analysis of social interactions to the emerging policy agendas concerning shared and contested use of space; intergenerational interaction; safety and security in public areas; management and maintenance of public space; and developing community research; to influence local initiatives to develop the use of public space by diverse users” (ibid.).

Holland et al., (2007, p. 5) used a mixed-method approach where non-participative observation was used, and stakeholder interviews and street surveys were conducted. The interesting factor in this research was that observation was used so the researchers could “... *get a little closer to ‘what really happens’* in public spaces as an expansion on more commonly researched aspects of what people think happens, or what people say happens within them” (ibid.). This is an extremely important factor when studying human relations within and with contested spaces – because what happens naturally and organically overtime is the real essence of that place, and if one is successful in capturing it then actual bottom-up grassroots movements can be achieved.

Anything else in comparison is relatively limited, partly controlled, and mediated, which affects the outcome and remains rather top-down in its approach. The study can be taken as a topic of research in the coming years of integration on the Island to decipher how the urban public spaces are shaping and forming organically and what the key points of need and further encouragement are.

Some of key findings of a further report in this context, which are useful to Cyprus, are as follows (Hudson, Phillips, Ray & Barnes, 2007, p. 1):

- 1) “Racial tensions were often driven by struggles for resources such as employment and housing. Respondents talked about the ‘unfairness’ of resource allocation.”
- 2) “Sports, music and employment enabled interactions across communities, while barriers to cohesion included language issues, perceptions of cultural difference and stereotyping, unemployment, fear of crime and racial harassment.”
- 3) “Population turnover made it difficult for service providers to give appropriate support and could contribute to people feeling negative about their neighbourhood.”

- 4) “A sense of community was identified only in small pockets within the neighbourhoods, often where populations were the most stable.”
- 5) “People’s sense of belonging to their local neighbourhood resulted from a complex mix of emotional and material factors. Many felt emotionally attached to the neighbourhood, but also drawn to other areas that seemed to offer a better environment for families and greater chances for social mobility.”

Points 1) and 2) relate to the creation of spaces using both governance policies and grassroots community projects. The youth’s role in creating and being able to create, access, and use public spaces for art, music, and the like, is part of the soul of the city. This not only organically allows for the flourishing of strong networks, but also gives the city, and accordingly the country, an attractive international brand – its own unique fingerprint. The points have been key findings in already existent research on Cyprus and continue to be a common theme within this field. As such, it should remain as one of the key focal points of sustainable urban spaces.

Points 3), 4), and 5) however, bring us to the next and final point of this section – the importance of global social connectedness. All three points essentially point to the same conclusion – if a society, a country, a city is not globally linked / connected then it cannot be stimulated enough to be sustainable, secure, and stable. This factor will not only affect the economy, but also social relations within urban public spaces.

Surveying the wide literature, it became apparent that one of the most important points for both sides was to be respected internationally. Cyprus is again here at another vantage point because of the years and numerous projects – efforts for fostering peace and social cohesion / connections on the Island. **It is important to, as the saying goes, “think global but act local”, but here the point to emphasise is that keeping a global perspective locally will further foster social links – a common goal to build a stronger Cyprus that is internationally attractive, respected, and competitive.** This is not just an important factor for tackling unified problems like regional security, the refugee crisis, or the environment, but to utilise Cyprus’ already existent strengths to offer the world.²

The IOM migration report confirms this point:

Effective cities of the future need to be open and diverse, socially integrated, linked to other cities and global markets, and resilient to climatic, environmental and economic shocks. (2015, p. 189-190)”

However, the report also notes that this task is not an easy one. Not all cities are equipped or ready “...to become truly inclusive” (ibid.). This makes them lay dormant, and “(t)hey remain socially and economically fragmented and exclusionary, and far from being able to become engines of global growth.” (ibid.). As such the report suggests that it is important to: “... balance knowledge, capacities and commitments towards good policymaking and practice for inclusive urban governance across countries and what roles international communities and organizations should play, while bearing in mind that the good practices of more advanced countries might not be globally applicable” (ibid.).

Cities are becoming more vital in playing a major role in the world economy and security. Findings from the Stockholm Security Conference on Secure Cities also note that in order for a city to “...compete, (they) will have to convince investors and inhabitants that they offer a safe and secure environment where people want to live and investors want to place their resources”(SIPRI, 2016, p. 1). This should remain a unified goal and one that is widely supported in the efforts and talks regarding the future of Cyprus and its main shared city – Nicosia.

² This was also a factor noticed in much of the literature on Cyprus. Many of the reports note the significance of the role that Cyprus could play internationally. The event “The World We Want – Global Civil Society Symposium: Food Security and Nutrition” in the Post-2015 Development Framework, the “Peace it Together” network of peace-building NGOs, the “Power of One” inter-regional conference, are prime examples of this (see Louise & Morgan, 2013, p. 52).

Further findings of the conference add that even though states will be the main responsible parties for maintaining security, it will be “... cities and municipal authorities (that are) increasingly examining what role they can play as security providers, not only beneficiaries” (ibid.). Cities, as the findings argue, will be able to assure security by:

- a) “Urban resilience – lessen the impact of an unavoidable shock, and respond effectively so that disruption to the city and its inhabitants is as little as possible and as short as possible.”
- b) “Urban inclusiveness – ensure that religious, sectarian, tribal, ideological, gender and racial identities live shoulder - to - shoulder without becoming fragmented. Win public trust that resources and services are provided in a fair and equal way.”
- c) “Urban violence – reduce the fear of residents and visitors in that they may be the victims of violence of any kind.” (SIPRI, 2016, p. 1).

By re-building and re-creating the public spaces, urban areas, the city, and the country, as a result we directly deal with the how-to of growing places together. This is a starting point that should come at the fore of planning and arguments in relation to Cyprus. The following section deals with how to manage the spaces by exploring issues of multiculturalism, social cohesion, and social connectedness via the theme of shared spaces. It is the next vital ingredient to ensure multicultural and secure urban areas in Cyprus.

3 Sharing the City

Most countries today are culturally diverse. ... the world's 184 independent states contain over 600 living language groups, and 5,000 ethnic groups. In very few countries can the citizens be said to share the same language, or belong to the same ethnonational group.

(Kymlica, 1995, p. 1).

Phil Cohen states that “[s]ince the eighteenth century the city-as-container has been assigned its own special chemistry, even an alchemy, in which different classes and ethnic groups learn to co-exist and contribute their separate identities to the making of a common cosmopolitan culture”. However, Cohen argues that “[t]his imaginary is, of course, haunted by the fear that the elements will prove too combustible to be contained in this way” (Cohen, 1997, p. 78).

The literature on multiculturalism, social cohesion, and security is extensive and has been gaining fervency over time. It is particularly relevant to Europe and other diverse countries and regions like Canada, America, Australia, and New Zealand. Yet, the struggle that these places experience is equally shared throughout the Middle Eastern, African, and Mediterranean regions. It has become a global phenomenon and an unstable force – the internal and external movement of populations worldwide. Whether places are witness to historical diversities or they are rapidly experiencing an influx of recent newcomers – the narrative is essentially the same. Accordingly, this section will first go over the relevant understandings of the multicultural, socially cohesive, and connected society.

3.1 A Multicultural Society

Rex argues that in the “... ideal multicultural society, ... all individuals are equally incorporated and ... have equality before the law” (2010, p. 221-222). This society and “civic culture” can only work if all individuals are protected and respected by authorities and the system – the state they live within. (Rex,

2010, p. 222). Kymlicka also argues that governments can ensure that “... two or more societal cultures (can be maintained) within a single country ... (using the examples of) ... Canada, Switzerland, Belgium, or Spain” (2002, p. 347). He argues that this integration can be achieved when “... nation (is) understood in a ‘thin’ sense, ... (and is) pluralist and tolerant; (where groups) ... are allowed to engage in their own nation-building, to enable them to maintain themselves as distinct societal cultures (ibid., p. 362).

Parekh contends that a multicultural:

... good society cherishes the diversity of and encourages a creative dialogue between its different cultures and their moral visions. Such a society not only respects its members’ rights to their culture and increases their range of choices but also cultivates their powers of self-criticism, self-determination, imagination, intellectual and moral sympathy, and contributes to their development and well-being. (2010, p. 240).

For Parekh one of the main themes to multiculturalism is that cultures “... (need) other cultures to help it understand itself better, (and to) ... expand its intellectual and moral horizon, ... (in short) ... to guard it against the obvious temptation to absolutise itself ...” (2010, p. 238). He also argues that “... every culture is internally plural and reflects a continuing conversation between its different traditions and strands of thought. (Making it essentially) ... porous and subject to external influences which it assimilates in its now autonomous ways.” (ibid., p. 238-239).

Rex however states that this does not ensure against conflict as such, but that it is vital for the system’s sustainability that “... no individual or group should find the rules governing such a conflict disadvantageous” if it were to occur. (2010, p. 222). As such, he argues that “(p)articipation in such a political system is a part of the multicultural ideal” (ibid.). For Rex a society where members “... receive differential treatment in the public domain is a move away from the multicultural ideal towards the plural society of colonialism” (ibid.).

Furthermore, for Rex a multicultural society should draw clear boundaries between the public and the private realms. He draws out four options of how this may be achieved. The first involves the distinction to be made where the different groups can be united in public but use the private realm to freely express what may be deemed as “private or communal”. This style would be thus encouraged to flourish in this manner. The second alternative is similar to the first in making these distinctions for expression of one’s diversity, but also “...enforce(s) or at least encourage(s) unity of cultural practice in private or communal manners” (Rex, 2010, p. 219). The third option is to allow for diversity to flourish publicly and to “...encourage or insist upon diversity of cultural practice by different groups” (ibid., p. 222). The final option is that the society in question could be one where diversity is public and at the same time unified via “cultural practice(s)” to some extent among other units in society. (ibid., p. 220) Yet, Rex argues that “(t)he crucial point about our multicultural ideal is that it should not be confused with (3)” (ibid.).

Rex notes that the distinction between the private and public realm becomes important when looked at via education, where “... the objection to its interference in matters considered to be private or to involve individual choice” (ibid., p. 224). This becomes evident when regarding matters considered private by some groups – for example, in relation to “... sex, marriage, the family and religion” (ibid.). Even though Rex agrees that it can be argued that these matters should remain private, it could become problematic as the state “... has to uphold individual rights even against the family” (ibid.). This has, as Rex states, become a problem in Britain with for example Asian families and their perceptions toward “... arranged marriage and the relative exclusion and modesty of females” (ibid.). Rex calls this a “clash of values” which can be viewed in societies that seek to have both equality and a “... toleration of cultural diversity” (ibid., p. 225). Other issues of concern in multicultural societies relate to religion, multicultural education, and the teaching of and in mother tongue languages.

For language however, Rex argues that although groups should be able to use their own languages amongst each other in a multicultural society, "... it cannot ever attain anything like equality with the main language in some sort of bilingual state" (2010, p. 225-226). Rex continues "... once the inherent tensions of the education system are recognized, it is possible to envisage a balance of control because education belongs to both the public and private domains" (ibid., p. 226). In Rex's view, the school can overlook matters regarding skill set and "civic morality", and the private domain – the "community" should be concerned with language, religion and other family culture related matters, for which the "... state should provide financial support in a multicultural society" (ibid., p. 226).

The emphasis on the definition of multiculturalism for education has been made here because of what this could mean for the future of shared urban public spaces in Cyprus.

Parekh rightly contends that albeit "... equal citizenship is essential to fostering a common sense of belonging, it is not enough" (2010, p. 241). One can be a citizen of say Germany or Australia and benefit from all the rights included with it but not necessarily feel at home in that space – or fully accepted and a part of the urban public sphere.

Citizenship is about status and rights; belonging is about acceptance, feeling welcome, a sense of identification. The two do not necessarily coincide. One might enjoy all the rights of citizenship but feel that one does not quite belong to the community and is a relative outsider ... (Parekh, 2010, p. 241).

Whether the community in question is a migrant minority population within another country or a shared common space within a territory, the result is in effect the same, and can have drastic effects on the community and the sustainability of that place. Parekh sums it up well by stating that: "(t)his feeling of being fully a citizen and yet an outsider is difficult to analyse and explain, but it can be deep and real and seriously damage the quality of one's citizenship as well as one's sense of commitment to the political community" (ibid., p. 241-242).

It can be caused by numerous things but as Parekh argues, the definitions of the society in which it finds itself in and the rhetoric used, may lead some groups to avoid "... public life, ... for fear of rejection and ridicule or out of a deep sense of alienation" even when they "...are in principle free to participate" (ibid., p. 241-242). Kymlicka also contends – in a chapter he titled *The Ties That Bind* – that the concept of civic citizenship / culture "... is not enough" (1995, p. 173-174).

The importance of social connectedness / cohesion for sustainable multicultural / omnicultural and secure urban areas is unsurmountable. Considering questions like how we are fully connected to the urban public areas – integrated, and secure while sharing those re-defined spaces – is key to social cohesion and social connectedness.

3.2 The Cohesive and Connected Society

A multicultural society cannot be stable and last long without developing a common sense of belonging among its citizens. The sense of belonging cannot be ethnic and based on shared cultural, ethnic and other characteristics, ... but must be political and based on a shared commitment to the political community, ... a shared community. They ... are bonded together by the ties of common interest and attachment. (Parekh, 2010, p. 240).

As such, regardless of their pre-existing views of one another, "... their mutual commitment and concern as members of a shared community remain unaffected" (ibid.). Social solidarity is another term used within the existing literature. This also refers to the sense of "mutual responsibility" that members of a community feel toward each other (Spicker, 2014, p. 95). Spicker argues that this is the "... connection

(that is)... a form of social bonding; mutual support, reciprocal obligations and moral commitments are the ties that hold us together” (ibid., p. 97). Spicker contends that solidarity comes about when the “... whole society... (forms)... links developed through many interactions at a more personal and local level, ... a network of networks...” (ibid., p. 95). He notes that social cohesion is the way in which collective action is utilised by the public concerned. In this way, it is their ability to “... respond collectively to achieve their valued outcomes and to deal with the economic, social, political or environmental stresses (positive or negative) that affect them” (ibid., p. 100).

In order to form these “shared” notions of space, more emphasis needs to be given to grassroots projects that foster a real sense of social connections so that social cohesion emerges, in itself a process that develops “...social bonds – relationships that define the pattern of social interaction, that continue and last” (2014, p. 101). The importance of stronger bonds beyond the realm of multiculturalism or social cohesion is also noted by Spicker. He states that obligation – a sense of responsibility – is more personal than it is universal and, “... obligation is not enough” (ibid., p. 102). Furthermore, cohesive societies do not necessarily increase the quality of life according to Spicker (ibid.).

Trust is also a major concern amongst surveyed publics. Hooghe, Reeskens, and Stolle comment on literature that contends:

(i)f many people have the feeling that most others cannot be trusted, it will be more difficult for a community to pursue collective-action efforts ... We find it easier to develop trust when we are familiar with the people around us, and particularly when they seem similar to us.

(2007, p. 2-3).

Some studies point to the risk that this may cause as the more diverse a society becomes the less socially cohesive it becomes, generally because of trust.

Consequently, while socially cohesive strategies are necessary in urban areas for reducing any tension or for the future security of those places, there needs to be a focus on also securing local social connections.

3.3 Social Connectedness in the Urban Sphere

The concept of *social connectedness* is critical to ensure the functioning of a secure and multicultural Cyprus. Both local efforts and global perceptions are pivotal for successful and sustainable urban spaces. The necessity of local grassroots efforts to form / re-build and re-create shared spaces – with a focus on urban areas – and the importance of globally focused combined efforts within Cyprus are both pivotal to further forge social connectedness.

The concept of social connectedness is at the core of individual and community relations. It is essentially “... the measure of how people come together and interact”. When taken at an individual level, it refers to the nature and depth of, as well as amount of connections. Upon a wider outlook, social connectedness refers to intra- and inter-communal relations. As such, social connectedness can be understood as a deeper sense of social cohesion – the foundational layer of multicultural, interfaith, intercultural, and omnicultural societies. Social connectedness can be measured by several ways, but generally the “duration of the relationship” including the “(f)requency of interaction” determine the level at which one feels connected (Ministry of Social Development, MSD, 2005, p. 1). Furthermore, “(s)ocial connectedness also refers to people joining together to achieve shared goals which benefit each other and society as a whole...” (MSD, 2005, p. 1).

A person’s number of close friends, frequency of interactions with family and friends, trust in neighbors, and level of participation in volunteer activities or community events all play a role in

supporting well-being and can also influence health, both directly and indirectly. Together, these examples begin to describe social connectedness - the extent to which people interact with one another, either individually or through groups. (Wilder Research, 2012, p. 1)

Feelings of trust, belonging, safety, and general well-being and health have all been linked to social connectedness. The literature focuses not only on multicultural societies but also on the ill and elderly. This is where it differs from literature that only focuses multiculturalism – essentially making the issue about individuals and not ethnic or religious groups. This keeps the focus on the internal dynamics of individual and group behaviour. Although, social cohesion projects within and outside of Cyprus have focused on projects that build community networks and trust, the theory surrounding social connectedness stresses the importance of social psychology within the debate – and is often overlooked within political debates.

However, as some reports show, there are various barriers that should be overcome first. Relevant to this debate, “(t)he tendency to make connections outside the family varies between cultures and communities. (Also) ... language differences, high levels of inequality and tensions between ethnic groups can create barriers between people.” (MSD, 2005, p. 1). Furthermore, “(bonding ... (can also create) inward-looking, tightly-formed groups that support and nurture their own members”. Thus, the element of social capital, or what Frank Eckhart calls “urban empathy” is key to its success. Other reports show that “(b)ridging social capital reflects more intermediate relationships, such as among coworkers or community residents. This type of social capital can result in likeminded people from different social networks working together to address common concerns or achieve shared goals” (Wilder Research, 2012, p. 2).

... not all close social bonds support positive behavior. Exclusive social networks can have negative consequences. For example, high social connectedness among some residents in a geographic area can exacerbate social divisions based on race, class, and other social features... (ibid., p. 3).

Eckhart (2016) describes the concept he termed “urban empathy” to understand how diversity within urban settings can be sustainable. Eckhart describes “urban empathy, the creation of spaces beyond the visible” as the “... need for emotional expression, response and merging (which) ... enables living together with strangers” (ibid.). Empathy can relate to individual and social needs where the urban space can be “virtualized” essentially “(b)lurring the private-public border (and) ... socializing the individual need for empathy” (ibid.). This can construct “communities of perception” whereby spaces are repositioned through “common action” and “social control” which creates “competition / conflict on spaces of narratives” (ibid.)

A study conducted in 2009 at the Minnesota Department of Health outlined a number of factors to enhance social connectedness. The report argues:

... by improving the physical conditions and safety of neighbourhoods, involving residents ..., and creating or establishing programs that provide opportunities for interaction between residents of all ages, cultures, and socioeconomic classes (bridging social capital), including: Use community planning and design elements that encourage active living, creating opportunities for greater interactions between residents. Establish recreation programs for youth, as well as gathering opportunities for residents of all ages and cultures. Support community efforts to address and encourage economic opportunity, supportive work environments, and integration and appreciation of the community’s diverse cultures. (Wilder Research, 2012, p. 6).

The report also offers other interesting approaches to enhance social connectedness including – “investing in existing community “hubs” ... that serve as linkages to information and resources; connecting civic and political institutions to give residents greater influence on decisions; recreating public space in both physical and online settings to encourage social connections; involving residents in ... policy decisions through ... impact assessments or other community-driven processes; and using planning approaches that focus on enhancing community strengths.” (Wilder Research, 2012, p. 7). The report further offers the role that the community itself can play and suggests that the community should “... consider what encourages or discourages positive interactions between people in a specific community” (ibid., p. 6). The community, it suggests could ask the following (ibid.):

- ≡ “What events, community gathering places, and programs are available to residents?
- ≡ Are they equally accessible, welcoming, and appealing to all residents?
- ≡ Do crime or safety concerns deter residents from spending time outdoors, using parks, or participating in community programs? If so, how can these problems be addressed?
- ≡ In our community, who tends to be isolated? What changes can be made to ensure all residents are welcome to participate in the community?”

Social connectedness is one of several components to cohesion, which uses all levels of society and a multidisciplinary approach to forge ongoing and lasting societal bonds. In order to promote deeper connections, which are ongoing over time, urban planners, social psychologists, and urban sociologists, along with government and grass-roots organisations need to develop strong ties and work together in recreating diverse and secure urban areas.

4 Summary/Conclusion/Future Research

Come, come, whoever you are, wanderer, worshipper, lover of leaving. Ours is not a caravan of despair. Even if you have broken your vows a thousand times, it doesn't matter. Come, come yet again, come (Mevlânâ Celâleddîn Belhî Rumi).

The 13th century Anatolian Sufi³ poet Rumi's well known poem, mentioned above, refers to, among other things, the peaceful acceptance of all living creatures. It was written at a time when Sufi poetry and its spiritual understandings were at their height. Yet its meaning is equally as important in urban, cosmopolitan, and highly globalised societies today. It speaks specifically of the social cohesion, co-existence, peace, and tolerance that should be prevalent and fostered in liberal democracies worldwide.

Cyprus's diverse nature is what makes it so incredible and there is now a real chance to create the social foundation for an environment of co-existence promoting all sides, all worldviews in the country. Focusing on the urban public sphere will allow the research to highlight the necessity of promoting diversity and stressing the need to use a language of acceptance to alleviate much of the tension felt between groups. From countless conversations and personal observations that took place whilst in Cyprus, it became easy to understand that many groups sharing the social and public spaces felt uneasy; that there was an element of tension; and that the cohesiveness and familiarisation of the public spaces was still rigid, perhaps needing time to soften. There also seemed to be an element of distrust from all angles on a wide range of topics, which was very clear and added to the tensions felt in public spaces.

The region that Cyprus finds itself within has long been a cosmopolitan hub, embracing a wide array of cultures, languages, religions, and worldviews. As the regional importance of

³ Sufism is a spiritual and mystical Islamic school of thought.

Cyprus has increased, so too has the mix of cultures within it. However, some have often grappled with the visible diversities in the public and political sphere. This factor is magnified in urban centres, with social media, technology, and internal and external migration, among other factors, feeding a level of at times hostility and tension in the daily lives of ordinary city dwellers.

The paper has delved into the issue of how multicultural and secure urban areas can remain peaceful, progressive, and sustainable over time, ensuring that the omnicultural nature of those spaces flourish. The point that this paper has tried to make is two-fold and flows out of a multidisciplinary approach: a social psychology perspective needs to be fostered to work with a multitude of professions and publics to ensure the creation of safe, diverse and accessible spaces that are open and accessible, and created for sharing. This creation should also take place from grassroots initiatives that form organically over time, ensuring sustainable and actual social connections within and between communities.

The paper was divided into two main sections to emphasise the following key points:

- 1) Conversations and perceptions which only focus on “us” and “them” limit the actual omnicultural and diverse beauty that is already existent in Cyprus.
- 2) More focus needs to be given on re-building and re-creating spaces together.
- 3) If the focus begins from “the city” – Nicosia / Famagusta (fenced area of Varosha) – this will empower many different groups within society and enable them to work on projects that sustain and charge those spaces – linking them to others locally and globally (socially and economically).
- 4) Here, much more focus has been given to social cohesion projects, which is important, but this paper has shown that equal weight needs to be given to other projects and other dynamics that re-build and re-create spaces – essentially giving power back to the people – to design unified spaces to their “heart’s desire”.
- 5) This then will also assist social connectedness and the creation of secure societies – because this creation and ownership will form organically over time. Unified creation projects dispel the negative results of individual or separated group “claims” of space – essentially making them void and defunct – unusable, somewhat forgotten spaces.
- 6) Projects should start with the cities – urban spaces, because this is where the future is. Section one emphasised this point by showing that cities are becoming a major power in governance, global political economy, international security, and foreign politics. They are as Tavares (2016) argues, the “...economic and political powerhouses” of “paradiplomacy”. As such, the mayors of these cities have as much importance and clout as do nation-state leaders.
- 7) Further support should be given to global / regional awareness programs / initiatives – “think global, act local”. These should emphasise the importance of being globally connected and competitive and also as a regional player that can support the overall security and growth of the region. The formation of an international brand and respected image ensures that Cyprus is moving forward with the rest of the world and that it is in some respects – leading by example – being followed, not being “left behind”. Projects that focus on imprinting these truths will lighten the weight and hold of past communal memories.

The first section titled *Re-creating/Re-building the City* discussed the existing literature on urban transformation, public and private contested spaces, urban sociology, and urban planning of the city. It did this to highlight the importance of a multidisciplinary approach and one that focuses on building urban shared spaces to ensure healthy diversity and sustainable security. As such, it offered a starting point to think about how Cypriots can grow these places together. The other important questions that this section raised were:

- a) How can people share and be a part of this process of change?

- b) What does this change in the city mean for the definition and use of public, private, and personal spaces?
- c) What governance, policy, and other future projects can we commence to focus on the rebuilding of these cities – and which professionals can aid the path of creating unified spaces?
- d) What do we share in the public sphere? What is to be considered public?
- e) What should be left for the private sphere? Will this change with the creation of these shared spaces and different understandings of them?
- f) How can we ensure the protection of the personal sphere? (The personal sphere as the “innermost”, the “mediator” between the public and private spaces, the mind and the body.)
- g) What do we dream those spaces to be like? How do we see ourselves within those spaces – “who do we desire to be” – what kind of society / community? What could our joint / fused identity be?⁴
- h) Are we really connected within our own community?
- i) How can we feel safe and “at home” in diverse changing spaces?
- j) Are we really ready and open to fusing and remoulding spaces together, despite external global pressures for urbanisation and globalisation?
- k) How do we wish to represent ourselves internationally? How do we vision the future of Cyprus?

This section showed that as change is inevitable so is urbanisation and globalisation. The point that this section of the paper was trying to make was that – if the focus is not on social and economic “growth” for the future – then the country and its people cannot realise their full potential and may a) get left behind (forgotten) like the unused spaces of the country today and / or b) suffer from mass brain drain and emigration, particularly from the youth – this point will also stop international visitors from investing their time and money. This section accordingly aimed at showing that making Nicosia an international brand will increase its attractiveness and link it globally thereby not only allow for it to utilise its own potential but also ensuring that the people within it stay connected locally and globally.⁵ Cyprus stands at a vantage point from other urban growing spaces because it has the opportunity to start from the beginning together – in creating and sharing newly arranged spaces. It is also important to return “... to the city as a base, and then rebuild a richer and more nuanced depiction of life in the most important and ethnically mixed urban space of the city” (Bakshi, 2016, pp. 110-111).

The second section titled *Sharing the City* focused on how to manage the city following its growth. As such, it discussed several multicultural, governance, and social cohesion policies – via the existing literature, projects, and recommendations. Moreover, the section focused on the importance of grass-roots level social politics / policies, and speaks of the need for social connectedness within urban public spaces. This takes a step deeper into the social cohesion approach – via the use of social psychology recommendations for diverse settings. What this section attempted to emphasise was that the focus on grass-roots civil society projects already existent in Cyprus should continue with more force and with the aim to extend the reach of these projects so that they can be formed organically over time. This will ensure that they are all-encompassing and not limited via a timeframe or space restrictions. Once the rebuilding / re-creation of shared urban spaces has begun, and while it is going on, the actual peaceful sharing of those spaces – especially through public projects – will form naturally, securing social connections. This section has highlighted the following points:

- 1) More focus needs to be given to fostering social connections, not socially cohesive and multicultural societies. Many cosmopolitan cities like Berlin and Istanbul are still struggling with societal tensions

⁴ A report on the Cyprus issues noted: “One stakeholder envisages that with a solution, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots will slowly start forging a distinct identity for themselves that will be ‘purely Cypriot and significantly differentiated from both Greek and Turkish’ national identities.” (Beyatlı et al., 2015, p. 71.)

⁵ For a detailed historical account of how specific spaces in Nicosia used to be, see Bakshi, 2016, p. 107.

and disconnections. Thus, projects and policies that aim to foster and measure how people can come together and interact is just as important as resolving exclusion, marginalisation, and focusing on belonging and trust. Feelings of belonging and trust are just as individual as they are collective and occur over time from within. Belonging to a space via citizenship is not enough to ensure that that a citizen feels “safe” and at “home”, as this section has outlined.

- 2) As such, this section has stressed the significance of addressing the issue from a social psychology stand point, and that more weight should be given to this school of thought when approaching the issue of security within diverse settings.
- 3) Consequently, sustainable urban policies in relation to the formation of public urban spaces, not only require a multi-disciplinary approach, but should also focus on a grass-roots / local level, that speaks to the heart of actual, organic, and long-lasting connections.⁶
- 4) Furthermore, this section has tried to magnify the point that real safety comes from being connected and linked locally and globally.⁷ These connections then lead to feelings of well-being and “home”. However, these need to form organically with time – meaning that they should not be limited to space and time via projects, which can also be construed as top down projects. These feelings come from the public, created by the public, while working on rebuilding and recreating those spaces together.
- 5) In this light, projects that foster and support the creation of shared spaces – with a vision of “let’s build this city together!”, with the support of urban sociologists, urban planners, social psychologists, youth, artists and so forth – should be at the fore.
- 6) Spaces that allow for the creation of an alternative urban public social culture should be established.

For future research, it is important to focus on polarisation – sharing spaces, negotiating spaces – and what this means for different groups in Cyprus, perhaps different age groups, or different professional and / or cultural backgrounds. It is also essential to investigate the effect of external migrants, refugees, and students in Cyprus, and on their views of the changing urban public sphere and the future in Cyprus. Also, documenting their experiences, along with their views on Cypriot and their own culture will be shedding further light on issues related to multiculturalism and secure urban areas.

Moreover, the impact / influence of regional relations on people within Cyprus should also be delved into. For example, the effects of MENA region activism and (and stalled EU relations) can be furthered surveyed to decipher any future opportunities or adverse developments.

Furthermore, the effects of guarantee states on urban politics is extremely important. The politics of the country of ethnic ties is an important factor in the debate among cohesive and connected spaces. For example, Els de Graauw and Floris Vermeulen noted that Berlin’s community organisations supporting integration are numerous, yet have had considerable difficulty among the Turkish population of Berlin because “Turkish organisations suffer from a high degree of polarisation and rivalry because of the ongoing influence of transnational ideological movements from Turkey. As a result, Turkish organisations do not have a strong tradition of working together, and their internal fragmentation has undermined their ability to promote the collective interests of Turkish immigrants in local politics and policy-making” (Graauw & Vermeulen, 2013). It is not within the scope of this paper to delve into such large topics, but it is important to note here, because of the impact that these can have on diaspora populations both within and outside of Cyprus (e.g. the Cypriots in Melbourne, Australia). Nevertheless,

⁶ In a report on the Cyprus issue, one stakeholder was mentioned stating that both time and familiarity are important in this debate: “The more ‘Cypriots’ act together and get closer, the less will be the possibility of a conflict. This is a long process which will eventually lead to the dissociation of the communities within each other and the creation of a Cypriot nation.” (Beyatlı et al., 2015, p. 73.)

⁷ In a report on the Cyprus issue, one stakeholder was mentioned stating: “The more ‘Cypriots’ act together and get closer, the less will be the possibility of a conflict”. (Beyatlı et al., 2015, p. 73.)

as this paper has argued, focusing on local and global social connectedness in creating and sharing urban public spaces should be the main common goal that alleviates and eradicates all other previous limitations to Cyprus' internal and external growth.

The public sphere is not always a free, safe, open, and public space for all. Even though cities in the region are rapidly globalising and cosmopolitanism is increasing, we have increasingly been reminded that grassroots street level politics can at times be rather rigid. International and domestic politics play a major role in shaping and influencing public thought and even action. It will only be through an adequate democratisation processes, that a fully functioning and all-encompassing public sphere may be possible – and vice versa. However, the issue is too complex to be easily solved by democratisation processes, particularly via electoral democracy in use today. Tensions surrounding personal, private, and public spaces, is a global condition that occurs in many cities, in varying degrees of course – very much dependent on other grass-roots factors. The question of whether there are any current solutions, and whether they are applicable to the case of Cyprus, is an important one for the beauty of diversity in the urban public sphere to thrive. Further research and initiatives into creating local and global *social connectedness* will ease the some of the tensions felt, and nurture an environment of lasting peace, economic growth, and global strength.

5 Cited Works

- Bakshi, A.** (2016). Trade and Exchange in Nicosia's Shared Realm. In R. Bryant (ed.). Post-Ottoman Coexistence. Sharing Space in the Shadow of Conflict. New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 107-126.
- Beyatli, D., Papadopoulou, K. & Kaymak, E.** (2015). Solving the Cyprus Problem: Hopes and Fears. A Report By The Cyprus 2015 Initiative. Cyprus: Interpeace / 'Cyprus 2015'.
- Cohen, P.** (1997). Out of the Melting Pot into the Fire Next Time, Imagining the East End as a City, Body, Text. In S. Westwood and J. Williams (eds.). Imagining Cities, Scripts, Signs, Memories. London: Routledge, pp. 73-86.
- Dietzel, I.** (2016). Sharing Traditions of Land Use and Ownership. In R. Bryant (ed.). Post-Ottoman Coexistence. Sharing Space in the Shadow of Conflict . New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 41-58.
- Eckhart, F.** (2016). Urban Empathy. The Creation of Spaces Beyond the Visible. Presentation at Humboldt University Conference, Humboldt University, July 2016.
- Graauw, E. & Vermeulen, F.** (2016). Cities and the Politics of Immigrant Integration: a Comparison of Berlin, Amsterdam, New York City, and San Francisco. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(6), 989-1012. doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2015.1126089.
- Harvey, D.** (2012). *Rebel Cities, From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*. London: Verso.
- Holland, C., Clarck, A., Katz, J., & Peace, S.** (2007). *Social Interactions in Urban Public Places*. UK: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Hooghe, M., Reeskens, T. & Stolle, D.** (2007). Diversity, Multiculturalism and Social Cohesion: Trust and Ethnocentrism in European Societies. In K. Banting, T. Chourchene, F. Seidle (eds.). *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada*. McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 1-24. Retrieved from <https://lirias.kuleuven.be/bitstream/123456789/84600/1/20100708110945526.pdf>.
- Hudson, M., Phillips, J., Ray, K. & Barnes, H.** (2007). *Social Cohesion in Diverse Communities*. UK: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

- International Organisation for Migration (IOM)** (2015). World Migration Report. Migrants and Cities: New Partnerships to Manage Mobility. Commissioned by International Organisation for Migration, IOM. Geneva, Switzerland.
- Kymlicka, W.** (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship, A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. New York: Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Kymlicka, W.** (2002). *Contemporary Political Philosophy, An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lordos, A., Kaymak, E. & Tocci, N.** (2009). *A People's Peace in Cyprus Testing Public Opinion on the Options for a Comprehensive Settlement*. CEPS Paperback Series. Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies.
- Louise, C. & Morgan, T.** (2013). *Citizen Peacemaking in Cyprus: The Story of Co-operation and Trust across the Green Line*. Cyprus: United Nations Development Program.
- Madanipour, A.** (2003). *Public and Private Spaces of the City*. London: Routledge.
- Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi** (2014). Welcome to the website dedicated to Rumi. Retrieved December 10, 2016, from <http://www.mevlana.com/>.
- Ministry of Social Development (MSD)** (2016). *The Social Report 2005 – Social Connectedness*. Wellington, New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://socialreport.msd.govt.nz/documents/2005/sr05-social-connectedness.pdf>.
- Parekh, B.** (2010). What is Multiculturalism? In Guibernau, M. & Rex, J. (eds.). *The Ethnicity Reader, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Migration* (2nd edition). UK: Polity Press, pp. 238-242.
- Pinto, A. J., Remesar, A., Brandão, P. & Nunes da Silva, F.** (2010). *Planning Public Spaces Networks Towards Urban Cohesion*. 46th ISOCARP Congress, Nairobi, Kenya. Retrieved from http://www.isocarp.net/data/case_studies/1798.pdf.
- Rex, J.** (2010). The Concept of a Multicultural Society. In Guibernau, M. & Rex, J. (eds.). *The Ethnicity Reader, Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Migration*. (2nd edition.). UK: Polity Press, pp. 217-229.
- Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology** (2016). *Ethical Cities: Urban Innovation Forum Summary Report*. Commissioned by Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, RMIT. Barcelona, Spain. Retrieved from <https://www.santpaubarcelona.org/sites/default/files/report-ethical-cities-urban-innovation-forum-web28129.pdf>.
- Spicker, P.** (2014). Cohesion, Exclusion and Social Quality. *International Journal of Social Quality*, 4(1), 95–107. doi:10.3167/IJSQ.2014.040107.
- SIPRI** (2016). *Stockholm Security Conference on Secure Cities*. Stockholm, Sweden: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.
- Tavares, R.** (2016). Forget the nation-state: cities will transform the way we conduct foreign affairs. World Economic Forum. 4 October 2016. Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/10/forget-the-nation-state-cities-will-transform-the-way-we-conduct-foreign-affairs>.
- The Nicosia Master Plan** (n.d.). *A Bi-Communal Initiative to Change the Image of the City*. Retrieved from <http://www.thepep.org/en/workplan/urban/documents/petridouNycosiamasterplan.pdf>.
- Wilder Research** (2012). *Social Connectedness and Health*. Saint Paul, MI, USA. Retrieved from <https://www.wilder.org/Wilder-Research/Publications/Studies/Social%20Connectedness%20and%20Health/Social%20Connectedness%20and%20Health.pdf>.
- Wilson, E.** (1997). Looking Backward, Nostalgia and the City. In S. Westwood & J. Williams (eds.), *Imagining Cities, Scripts, Signs, Memories*. London: Routledge, pp. 125-136.

6 About this publication

About the author

Derya Dilara Akguner (BA, MA, PhD) is a creative academic / practitioner working in the fields of urban sociology, global cities, and social cohesion / connections in diverse public spaces. She is currently the Strategy, Growth, and Integration Advisor and a SCORE (Social Cohesion and Reconciliation - Resilience Index) Expert at the Centre for Sustainable Peace and Democratic Development (SeeD), Cyprus. Her thematic areas of interest include: social sustainability, urban diversity, global movements / migration, European / Mediterranean / Middle Eastern politics, society, and culture, urban sociology, global cities, social psychology, the public sphere, social / political art, documentary, poetry, and ficto-critical writing.

About the editors

Ahmet Sözen has been working in the field of peacebuilding and democratization processes over the last twenty years. He has participated in first-track peace-negotiations in Cyprus, has been actively involved in second-track peace and democratization initiatives, has been providing training and education in the areas of conflict resolution, mediation and peacebuilding and has designed policy recommendations based on objective participatory research with the societal stakeholders and polling. Apart from his Research Director position at SeeD, he is a Professor of International Relations and the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs at Eastern Mediterranean University, Director of the Cyprus Policy Center and member of the Greek-Turkish Forum. He holds a PhD in Political Science from the University of Missouri-Columbia (USA).

Jared L. Ordway is currently a member of the International Peacebuilding Advisory Team at Interpeace. Between 2016-2017, he served as Senior Dialogue Facilitator for Berghof Foundation where, among other duties, he provided technical and advisory support to the joint Security Dialogue Project in Cyprus. His previous work encompasses practitioner and educator roles in conflict transformation initiatives by governmental and non-governmental organizations. Dr Ordway is an active expert on the UNDP roster for Rapid Response in Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding, and with the Vilson Groh Institute, where he advises on issues of conflict and urban violence affecting periphery communities in south Brazil. He is an adjunct faculty member at American University's School of International Service in Washington, DC and with Champlain College's Mediation and Conflict Studies Graduate Program in Vermont (USA), and has held previous adjunct appointments at Columbia University of New York and Costa Rica's Universidad Nacional. He holds a PhD in Peace Studies from the University of Bradford (UK).

About the publication

This publication was produced in the framework of the Security Dialogue Project, a jointly implemented project by the Centre for Sustainable Peace and Democratic Development (SeeD), Interpeace and Berghof Foundation. The project aims at supporting the Cyprus Peace Process by contributing to the identification of informed, creative and viable security options that could enable all communities in Cyprus to simultaneously feel secure and, ultimately, at supporting the recent developments of top political leadership initiatives on both sides to move beyond entrenched positions. Drawing upon examples from similar and/or applicable scenarios and lessons learned, and by developing an understanding of possible approaches to the respective issues in transitional Cyprus, this paper aims at supporting the project's goal. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the Berghof Foundation and SeeD or their project partners. For further information please contact the programme director Luxshi Vimalarajah, at l.vimalarajah@berghof-foundation.org.

More information:

☰ **Seed**, www.seedsofpeace.eu, **Executive Report New Security Architecture**

<http://www.seedsofpeace.eu/index.php/where-we-work/europe/cyprus/security-dialogue-project/executive-report-on-a-new-security-architecture-in-cyprus>

☰ **Berghof Foundation**, www.berghof-foundation.org, **Security Dialogue Project**

<http://www.berghof-foundation.org/programmes/dialogue-mediation-peace-support-structures/peace-support/cyprussecurity-dialogue-project/>