Integrating Migrant Youth in the City:
Lessons from New York and Nairobi

David Driskell, Cornell University

> In the center of Fedora, that gray stone metropolis, stands a metal building with a crystal globe in every room. Looking into each globe, you see a blue city, the model of a different Fedora. These are the forms the city could have taken if, for one reason or another, it had not become what we see today. In every age someone, looking at Fedora as it was, imagined a way of making it the ideal city, but while he constructed his miniature model, Fedora was already no longer the same as before, and what had been until yesterday a possible future became only a toy in a glass globe…
>
> On the map of your empire, O Great Khan, there must be room for both the big, stone Fedora and the little Fedoras in glass globes. Not because they are all equally real, but because all are only assumptions. The one contains what is accepted as necessary when it is not yet so; the others, what is imagined as possible and, a moment later, is possible no longer.

This passage from Italo Calvino's *Invisible Cities*—in which Marco Polo engages in a meditative dialogue with Kublai Khan—seems a fitting introduction for a Venetian exploration of our Cosmopolitan topic: the social and spatial integration of international migrants in the city.

Leonie Sandercock uses the same passage in the introduction to her book, *Towards Cosmopolis*, in which she points to the crumbling pillars of modernist planning and disrobes the false dreams and homogenizing practices of the Rational City. She looks in her crystal globe and sees not only a blue city, but also a green city, a city of women, a city of international migrants: a rainbow city that is multi-ethnic, multi-racial, and multi-cultural. In response, she proposes an insurgent planning theory and ethical planning practice that values multiple ways of knowing—in addition to scientific and technical knowledge—in what she terms an epistemology of multiplicity, including knowing through dialogue, knowing from experience, learning from local knowledge, and learning by doing. For Sandercock and other progressive planners, the age of migration and its accompanying cultural politics of difference is ushering in a new Cosmopolis. Indeed, in New York and other hyper-global cities, it is already here. This opens the possibility for a transformative politics that embraces difference, and the emergence of new forms of socio-spatial planning practice, even as it poses considerable challenges, and makes us face our many fears of "The Other." As Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen (2003) pose in their introduction to *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism*, the rise of the multicultural city—and the fear of its potential (and sometimes realized) excesses, requires that we urgently pose

two basic cosmopolitan questions: Can we ever live peacefully with one another? And, What do we share, collectively, as human beings?

In response to these questions, and to illustrate the transformative potential of "politics in place" as well as the "epistemology of multiplicity," I draw upon the experience of working with migrant youth in two cities, New York and Nairobi: two cosmopolitan centers that are literally and figuratively worlds apart. On the one hand, New York: the hyper-global city, the capital of global capital, the mecca for millions of international migrants seeking economic salvation. And on the other, Nairobi: the capital city of Kenya, a center of the global aid industry as well as a poster child for globalization's less glamorous side effects, where the majority of residents fend for themselves in some of Africa's largest slum settlements.

Yet for all their difference, they are also alike: both cities slap you in the face with the glaring gap between the Haves and Have-Nots; both illustrate too well the failures of modernist planning, with the needs of a few carefully considered while the voices of everyone else are unheard or unheeded; both challenge traditional notions of citizenship, its rights as well as its responsibilities; both are outrageously polyglot, whether in the multi-national neighborhoods of New York or, equally profoundly, in the multi-tribal settlements of Nairobi; and both are homes to a myriad of migrant hopes and dreams—millions of cities in glass globes, accepted as necessary or imagined as possible.

This paper briefly describes what we have learned in working with young people in both these places. While it dwells primarily on New York, a project that has been in process since 2005, it also draws upon the early lessons emerging from Nairobi, which got underway in January 2007. It then attempts to draw some lessons pertinent to the topics of urban policy and socio-spatial integration in cosmopolitan cities.

An Epistemology of Multiplicity, and a Pedagogy of Actions-in-Place
In both New York and Nairobi, the work I describe has been framed and implemented as part of the international Growing Up in Cities project, under the auspices of the UNESCO Chair for "Growing Up in Cities" at Cornell University.[1] Using the epistemological framework of action research, the project aims to engage young people as co-researchers in understanding and responding to issues they face in their communities. In doing so, it not only seeks to understand the ways in which young people relate to their physical, social and cultural environments, but also hopes to simultaneously transform that relationship through youth-led research and youth-led action. Through their participation in exploring their local area, discussing issues and taking action, young people not only begin to *understand* how they see, use and value the local area, but also begin to *change* the ways in which they see, use and value the local area. The project thus embodies Sandercock's epistemology of multiplicity in its embrace of multiple ways of knowing: locally, through experience, dialog and action.

---

[1] For more information about Growing Up in Cities, see Lynch 1977, Chawla 2002, Driskell 2002 and visit the project website at www.unesco.org/most/guic. The project has been active in 60 sites in over 20 countries.

In addition to its epistemology of multiplicity, GUiC explicitly connects to place and the spatial lives of young people. It builds on guidelines developed by Kevin Lynch for the original Growing Up in Cities four-country research project (Lynch 1977) that were subsequently expanded (to emphasize collective action by youth) in the contemporary reincarnation of the project in the mid- to late-1990s (Chawla, 2002; Chawla et al, 2005). As Lynch explained in his original research guidelines:

> "Our purpose is to help document some of the human costs and benefits of economic development by showing how the child's use and perception of the resulting micro-environment affects his [*sic*] life and personal development.... In doing so, we hope to suggest policies and programs for improving the child's spatial environment…or for improving the way he [*sic*] uses or learns from that environment…." (1977, p. 81).

In both New York and Nairobi, the local GUiC initiatives were carried out as university-community partnerships involving the author and students from Cornell University working in close collaboration with community-based groups in each location. Importantly, these groups were the locus of the project's decision making and management, with the university participants providing training support, documentation and partial staffing in the form of student interns. In Nairobi, our role stretched further to include the provision of planning and design services in response to youth- and community-defined priorities, and assistance in raising funds.

Community partners ranged from social justice NGOs and youth development agencies in New York, to self-help youth groups in Nairobi. While representing groups of different size, resources, purpose and agency, they share a core commitment to the inclusion of youth (including migrant youth) in community development. To be a part of the project, each group committed their own resources of staff, time and facilities. Material costs were minimal. In this manner, we sought to embed the project as part of these organizations' ongoing operations, not to position it as an external activity for which they were the hired help. We know from previous experience that projects which are externally organized and managed face significant challenges in project sustainability and limited chances for meaningful change in the local landscape (see Chawla et al, 2005).

In both cities, project parameters were developed through a series of collaborative workshops with community partners. These workshops articulated goals for the project and identified a core set of neighborhood-based action research activities drawing on the field-tested methods of the Growing Up in Cities project (Driskell 2002), including an initial one-on-one "ask the (youth) expert" interview, walking tours led by young people, photography, and youth mapping. In addition, every site committed to ensuring that some form of youth-led action would take place as a result of young people's research and engagement. The resulting focus on actions-in-place as a pedagogy of personal and collective learning proved to be a powerful vehicle for confronting issues of exclusion as well as developing group cohesion across traditional divides.

Growing Up in Jackson Heights, Queens

3

To illustrate the socio-spatial process of GUiC's "pedagogy of actions-in-place," I focus specifically on the experience of the project in Jackson Heights, Queens[2]—one of the most diverse neighborhoods in the US, where two-thirds of the population is foreign-born and only slightly more than half are US citizens.[3] Indeed, with residents from over 70 countries and over 80 percent of households speaking a language other than English at home, Jackson Heights is emblematic of a new New York: where immigrants and non-Europeans now constitute the majority, neighborhoods are intensely heterogeneous, and immigrant groups are beginning to flex their considerable political muscle.

Jackson Heights' development history, not to mention its position within the city and diverse demographic profile, makes it a particularly intriguing case for exploring issues of cosmopolitanism. Founded in 1909 as a private real estate venture, and physically modeled after the garden cities concept popular in Britain at the time, Jackson Heights responded to the strong desire of the city's new middle class to distance themselves from the growing influx of new immigrants in lower Manhattan, and the chaotic, unhealthy living conditions there. In this sense, Jackson Heights' roots were firmly non-cosmopolitan. Its developers, and early residents, sought to create a bourgeois utopia separated by both covenant and cost from "the other."[4]

However, as New York entered the post-World War II era, many of its neighborhoods—including Jackson Heights—underwent significant change. Under pressure from both political and economic forces, exclusionary covenants gave way: first to middle income Jewish families in the 1950s—beneficiaries of the city's growing economy looking for a retreat from the congested confines of the Lower East Side—and later, to migrants from South Asia and Latin America (see Sanchez, n.d.). This trend quickened in the 1980s as the neighborhoods of a reinvigorated New York experienced ever-higher levels of non-European immigration.

Due to both its location (neither inner city nor suburb) and its diverse housing stock, Jackson Heights evolved into a heterogeneous mix of races, nationalities, incomes and languages differentiated at the level of the block and building rather than at the larger scale of neighborhood. While one street of single family Tudor-style homes remained upper middle class and white, the next street might be a 1950s cooperative of older Jewish residents, and the street after that primarily apartment buildings with immigrant families arrived in the last ten years from India, Pakistan and Colombia. Thus, while race and class continues to define large-scale spatial patterns of residential segregation, the finer grain of segregation in Jackson Heights has led to expectations of higher levels of interaction between different groups, or at least higher levels of tolerance. Some hailed Jackson Heights as "embodying all the qualities that the ideal neighborhood should have:

---

[2] Queens is one of the five boroughs that comprise New York City, the other four being Manhattan, Brooklyn, The Bronx, and Staten Island.

[3] US Census 2000, as reported by American Factfinder for zip code 11372 (accessed 11/03/2006).

[4] Sánchez (n.d.) drawing on Robert Fishman's (1987) classic text, *Bourgeois Utopia: the rise and fall of suburbia* (New York: Basic Books).

diversity, tolerance, cooperation, stability, and economic success."[5] However, a 2005 study by student researchers at the CUNY Honors College of Queens College concluded that the neighborhood was more indicative of a "separate togetherness,"[6] or what Lehrer and Sloan (2003) described in their oral history exploration of contemporary Queens as "the choreography…of chaotic but polite cohabitation."

It is in this neighborhood that the Growing Up in Queens program (hereafter GUiQ) was launched in the summer of 2005.

Confronting Mutual Exclusion and the Adultification of Space
The story of the young people involved in GUiQ is one of collective confrontation with multiple forms of exclusion, including—importantly—their systematic exclusion as young people from most community spaces.

One of the first things they began to discuss as they explored their neighborhood was that there are few places to go where they feel safe, welcome, and free from "adult repression" (i.e., while they respected the need for adult controls, they construed many rules and regulations as being unnecessarily anti-youth). As a key example, the local park presented a quandary for many. Almost every participant identified the park as both their "favorite" place to go to hang out and as a "dangerous" place of drug dealers, fights, dirt, and crowds. They spend time there because it is the only place to go, though they point out that it is designed mostly for younger children and the elderly, with little space for teenagers. Even the basketball courts, handball courts and weight lifting area, places and activities that attract this age group, were being replaced by an expansion of the playground for younger children.

The overwhelming absence of youth space became a central theme for young people as they explored the landscape of Jackson Heights. Not only did they *feel excluded* from the only public park in a 30-block area, they were in fact regulated out and thus *officially excluded* from many of the smaller spaces closer to home, such as the garden courtyards of their apartment complexes (many of them off-limits to young people except when accompanied by an adult, according to building regulations) and their neighborhood streets (off-limits due to parental concerns about safety, and city police concerns about loitering). Apart from the problematic park, one of the few favorite hang outs was McDonald's, where for the price of an ice cream cone young people said they could sit and talk with friends without being hassled. This theme of official exclusion was captured by a group of the young people in a photo collage showing the many regulatory signs in the neighborhood: "No Playing," "No Children," "No Loitering," etc.

The central theme of an absence of youth space in Jackson Heights carried over into their second summer of action research in 2006. During this summer, the

---

[5] Professor Jeff Maskovsky's course-produced website, "The Peopling of New York," http://web.honorscollege.cuny.edu/student-projects/2005/neighborhoods/5/home.php.html (accessed 11/19/2006)
[6] Maskovsky course website (Ibid.)

project participants sought to better understand the historic reasons for the lack of youth space. In conducting interviews with adult residents who had grown up in Jackson Heights, and reviewing historic maps of the neighborhood at the public library, they were surprised to find that previous generations had enjoyed a rich diversity of youth-friendly spaces. Neighborhood green spaces, play yards, ball fields and even a small amusement park had all been part of the neighborhood's landscape through the 1950s. Streets were used as play areas and places to hang out. Even shared interior courtyards in large apartment complexes had originally been intended (and used) for play and social interaction, but had since been fenced, divided and restricted to ensure adult-friendly environments of privacy, relaxation and contemplation.[7]

The systematic "adultification" of public and private spaces has resulted in increasingly restricted youth space in Jackson Heights. Young people in Jackson Heights seem to have few to no options for places they can call their own or, at a minimum, where they can feel welcome and safe. They are ordered off the street and the sidewalk by parents and authorities, regulated out of historic green spaces and recreation areas under the guise of urban management and by the forces of development and privatization, pushed out of apartment courtyards by building regulations, and turned away from public park areas by inappropriate design, lack of management and poor maintenance. Even spaces presumably dedicated to serving the needs of young people—schools, libraries, and youth-serving organizations—are controlled and regulated with the primary goal of meeting adult needs and expectations of order and security. While the participants placed an equally high value on issues of safety and security, they took issue with regulations and enforcement practices they saw as either ageist or unreasonable, from rules of strict silence even in the youth area of the public library to being told by school security officers that they can't stand as a group and talk on the sidewalk in front of their school building.

Seen from a youth perspective, while most formal public spaces have always had adult presence, they have been defined, managed and controlled by adults as they see fit. Separating customary forms of youth exclusion (under the rubric of supervision and guidance) from institutionalized hostility, which has narrowed available public spaces where young people can assert some freedom and autonomy, is important but difficult. GUiQ's youth participants approached these questions by documenting the limited youth spaces of the neighborhood, and learning about the spaces and freedoms afforded previous generations of neighborhood youth. The discussions left many young participants feeling frustrated and angry, but also united in common cause against institutionalized exclusion by the many processes of adultification. Their spatial marginalization and their sense of being marginal members of the community were co-constitutive, and mutually reinforcing.

---

[7] For further information regarding the changing social life and spatial division of common space in Sunnyside Gardens, see Ferguson 2007.

Mutual Exclusion Leads to a Choreography of Collaboration, and a "School of Democracy"

A defining feature of GUiQ was that half of the participants were recruited from the Latin American Integration Center, a local community-based nonprofit working on immigrant rights issues, while the other half were from the Renaissance Charter School (a publicly funded school with a semi-autonomous governance structure). The administrators from both the community-based organization and the school felt this would create a new opportunity for them to work together, leaving the door open for further collaboration beyond the initial summer program. While the community-based group provided the staff and took the lead in organizing the project, the school provided space as well as help in recruiting interested students. The school also helped recruit four high school age staff persons, who were then employed by the community-based group using city-sponsored summer youth employment funds.

The result of this partnership was that the participant group (twenty in all) reflected a broad range of the area's socio-economic diversity. While participants recruited through the community-based organization were primarily from immigrant households, predominantly Latino, and generally lower income (with their parents typically being members of the community-based rights group), participants from the charter school were more likely to be from second- and third-generation households, representing a broader range of national origins as well as higher socio-economic status (though with some important exceptions). They all were between the ages of 11 and 14 years, and were almost evenly split between boys (11) and girls (9).

These young people shared a connection to the locality of Jackson Heights, but represented a profound diversity of personal backgrounds and identities. While some participants were intensely preoccupied by the legal status of their non-citizen parents, and therefore hesitant to develop strong connections to the area or any sense of their future there, others were deeply rooted in the neighborhood, with a strong pride of place and clear ideas about their trajectory within it.

The sense of common identity that emerged—one based on a shared sense of youth exclusion and powerlessness despite significant differences in levels of social exclusion based on legal status, language, race and income—laid the foundation for collective effort in researching the local area and working for change. Building on the neighborhood ethos of valuing diversity while maintaining separation, the boundaries that typically delineated and defined group interactions were noted, discussed and transgressed.[8] As they engaged in their interviews, walking tours, photography and mapping activities, numerous points of convergence emerged in their evaluation of what worked, and what didn't work, in their neighborhood of Jackson Heights. While points of difference remained the subject of ongoing discussion and debate, this new "choreography of collaboration," rooted in a shared youth identity and place of residence had already taken hold.

---

[8] As discussed in Chawla and Driskell (2008) open discussions on public topics where young people have the opportunity to listen, clarify and evaluate a range of perspectives different from their own, are central to both their moral reasoning and development as well as their later involvement in political life.

As group dynamics developed further through the summer, the sense of cohesion and belonging overlaid boundaries and difference. While friendship groups clustered by age (older participants tended to become closer friends with other older participants, and similar for younger participants), strong relationships developed across the boundaries of race, ethnicity, nationality and income. Friendships and close working relationships across gender lines, however, were more complicated, with a dynamic typical of early adolescence.

The group's collaborative spirit manifest itself in multiple program outcomes. During their first summer of action research, young people in GUiQ organized a neighborhood clean-up, designed and painted a "mobile mural" about youth issues that they could carry from place to place to display (due to restrictions on mural painting by the local adult-controlled beautification committee), and lobbied a local politician to successfully obtain two solar-powered "compacting" trash cans for an area near their school that they had identified as having excess litter. In the subsequent school year, participants from the charter school lobbied to create an after-school club to continue their work into and through the school year, on the condition that their non-school friends could also fully participate. As the school year got underway, young people from the community organization's group not only participated in the weekly after-school meetings of the Growing Up in Cities club, but also invited their friends from the charter school to join them for activities such as candidate forums and immigrant rights marches organized by the community organization. They also worked during the school year to plan for their second summer in which they researched the history of youth space in their neighborhood and worked with a group of local artists to design and paint a permanent mural about the neighborhood's history on the side of a building just outside the historic district's boundaries (where anti-mural restrictions were not in place). They also wrote petitions to request changes to building regulations that restricted their use of apartment courtyards, and began work with a local business owner to develop a temporary youth garden on a small patch of vacant land.

Theirs was a pro-active practice of citizenship, which draws on the Tocquevillean tradition of voluntary associations and civic engagement serving as schools for democracy, even as it engages Dewey's (1916) philosophy of an education for democracy. For scholars of youth participation such as Roger Hart (1992) such active citizenship is the defining feature of effective youth engagement and empowerment.

Two processes were particularly important to GUiQ as a school for democracy: first, the focus on open discussion and deliberative debates to negotiate difference and find common ground; and second, the emphasis on a bedrock skill of democratic citizenship: practicing collective action in the immediate environment of the neighborhood. [9] The project's deliberate stance towards engendering civic identity is important (Younnis, McLellan and Yates, 1997). However, it is the interplay of research and action, action

---

[9] For a longer discussion on the project's role as a school for democracy see Chawla and Driskell (2008). There is also an interesting parallel with the idea of political apprenticeship in feminist political theory. For example, Cornwall and Goetz (2005) argue that political apprenticeship in arenas both formal and informal is an important but neglected dimension of political effectiveness.

and reflection (central to Dewey's philosophy of education for democracy) that embodies the project's spirit and guiding principles: "Don't just talk about it—do something!", followed by, "Don't just do something—talk about it!" (Chawla and Driskell, 2008). The questions that will remain open, for now, are whether the experience of having engaged in building solidarity and transformatory action will survive the vicissitudes of growing to adulthood, and whether the young participants in the program will become actively engaged adult citizens able to reshape the city to meet their desires?[10]

Meanwhile, in Nairobi…
The story of young people engaged in community evaluation and action in the Growing Up in Nairobi (GUiN) project has many similarities to that of their compatriots in Queens, but significant differences as well. In Nairobi, as in New York, young people articulated their sense of exclusion, worked across lines of difference, and have begun a choreography of collaboration to make change in their local settings.

As a story very much still-in-the-making, the picture emerging from GUiN is more impressionistic. While it is evident that the pedagogy of actions-in-place holds value here as well (both in giving form to multiple ways of knowing and engaging young people across lines of difference), several factors have quickly come to the foreground as both challenges and opportunities, three of which I will discuss here (briefly) as they are pertinent to our discussion of the spatial and social integration of migrants in the cosmopolitan city: weak governance mechanisms, economic exclusion, and limited (though fast-developing) local capacity for action.

First, a caveat: while the focus of this meeting's discussions is on international migration, the story from Nairobi is primarily one of internal migration (though with international components). However, given the still-strong tribal affiliations of most groups in the relatively young Kenyan nation-state, migrant relations in Nairobi have more similarity to the dynamics of international migrant enclaves than one might suppose. For most Nairobians, affiliations are first defined by tribe, then religion, and only third by nationality. We might both be Kenyan, but you are Kikuyu and I am Luo. Don't forget it. While one could argue that Nairobi migrants' more frequent movement between urban settlements and rural origins alters their social, political and economic context (and perpetuates the strength of tribal ties), the dynamics of spatial and social exclusion for residents of informal settlements are strong and persistent. Thus I would argue that the case study has relevance for our cosmopolitan topic.

Since January 2007 the GUiN project has been working with young people in two self-built settlement areas to conduct research on their local areas with the aim of defining key issues and informing action. For the most part much older than their GUiQ counterparts (most participants were in their late teens and early twenties), these young people were previously involved with one or more local youth groups, through which they became

---

[10] Research based on two large surveys of civic education (Torney et al 1975; Tomey-Purta, 2001) report increased political engagement over time. Another survey (Flanagan et al 1998 a 1998 b) pointed to community volunteering as strongly correlated to civic interest. Despite these indications and other studies, the longevity of these interventions remains difficult to theorize and act on.

engaged in the GUiN initiative. As in New York, these groups committed time and resources to the project and helped define the project's collective goals, processes and outcomes. The youth involved in GUiN were from the self-built settlements (through "Action for Life" in Kibera, and "Mukuru Youth Association" in Mukuru), supported by young people from a variety of other youth organizations (Youth for Habitat, Galaxy Players, and others). Many of these are "self-help" groups organized by young people in an effort to improve their lives. Galaxy Players, for example, is a drama-based youth group that works in another self-built settlement area of the city. All of these groups had come into previous contact with each other, and learned about Growing Up in Cities, through their involvement in the Nairobi One Stop Youth Centre.

The experience thus far in Nairobi has echoed some of the same themes that emerged in New York over the past three years: young people's mutual experience of being excluded based on their age; the power of "place" as a loci of engagement, action and empowerment; the value of local knowledge and of multiple ways of knowing and learning (including learning by doing); and the potential for "schools of democracy" as a means of stimulating collective action.

As mentioned, the project has also experienced a number of challenges that were less evident in New York. These are just touched upon here, as questions more than answers or directives, as critical areas of discussion regarding inclusion in the cosmopolitan city.

➢ *Weak governance mechanisms* create both opportunities for citizen-led action and significant obstacles. When excluded migrants organize themselves to make a claim for their rights, who do they demand it from when the local authorities are absent, powerless, corrupt, or unjust? The vacuum of leadership in Nairobi's self-built settlements has created complex and opaque processes of power and decision making. This makes it both easier to stake claims and launch initiatives (assuming you know the right person or people to talk to), but also makes such claims and initiatives more tenuous and troublesome. Informality—the predominant form of urbanism for most international migrants throughout the world—is both boon and bane. In such environments, inclusion strategies must be firmly embedded in "the local," and the savvy knowledge of community residents and leaders (who are often not the people sitting behind the desk). The strong state mechanisms presumed in most inclusion strategies of European and North American cities simply do not exist.

➢ *Economic exclusion* is certainly a critical issue for international migrants in most cities, but particularly profound in the cities of the global South. In the informal settlements of Nairobi, economic exclusion is pervasive. The most significant issue articulated by young people (as well as many adults) in Nairobi is "idleness"—the result of limited economic activity and opportunity. As a result, any and every project aimed at promoting social, political or spatial inclusion must take into account the necessity of economic inclusion as well. This was a factor of some consideration in New York (especially for older adolescents who needed summer employment income), but was consistently, and understandably, the top priority in Nairobi.

➤ *The limited (though fast-developing) capacity of civil society groups,* especially youth-serving and youth-run groups, has made it more difficult to rely on local organizations to carry the project forward. While groups in New York were able to quickly and effectively engage as partners and take the lead in implementing key activities, our partner groups in Nairobi have needed greater levels of support and capacity-building, sometimes at levels beyond those we have been able to provide. This is slowly shifting, as leadership within the groups solidifies and their capacity grows to undertake and sustain change efforts.

Citizenship and Inclusion in the Cosmopolitan City
For some time now, it has been recognized that cities—not just nation-states—are the locus of an expanded citizenship. As Holston and Appadurai have written,

> … with their concentrations of the nonlocal, the strange, the mixed, and the public, cities engage most palpably the tumult of citizenship. Their crowds catalyze processes which decisively expand and erode the rules, meanings and practices of citizenship. Their streets conflate identities of territory and contract those of race, religions, class, culture and gender to produce the reactive ingredients of both progressive and reactionary political movements. Like nothing else, the modern urban public signifies both the defamiliarizing enormity of national citizenship and the exhilaration of liberties (1996: 188)

The evidence from New York and Nairobi indicate that this paean to urban citizenship is not misplaced. Both cities exemplify global cities where migration, difference, multiculturalism, inequality and racism/tribalism break open formal conceptualizations of the rights and duties of citizenship, especially when viewed through the lens of youth. Neighborhoods like Jackson Heights and settlements like Kibera and Mukuru are urban places that "engage most palpably the tumult of citizenship." However, the form and substance of this citizenship is under contestation and in flux. Even as new social movements work locally, nationally and transnationally to shape these contestations and articulate citizenship at a global, universal scale (Tarrow, 2005), the role and rights of specific groups, such as young people, is less clear.

It is our contention that programs like GUiQ and GUiN, with their action-oriented pedagogy of place change, can play an important role in helping articulate youth identity, voice and citizenship, forcing a departure from traditional notions of citizenship (Castles and Davidson 2000) to create a new definition at "the intersection of the themes of citizenship, community, democracy and empowerment" (Rocco 1999, 99).

The inclusive city is achieved when its many citizens claim their right to it while simultaneously acknowledging the rights of others. The tumultuous and exhilarating Cosmopolitan City is a place where heterogeneity is valued, and the epistemology of multiplicity is habit. It is the crystal globe of a thousand Fedoras, including the Fedora of the young Kikuyu, the undocumented Mexican family, and the eleven-year-old daughter of Pakistani migrants. It is a city in which difference is not only acknowledged, but embraced, and the socio-spatial practices of planning are guided by the twin goals of equity and inclusion.

As our young friends in New York and Nairobi have shown, the two basic cosmopolitan questions have potential answers, if indeed we are prepared to undertake the commitments and processes to realize them. Ironically, or perhaps (in hindsight) understandably, the young people in GUiQ and GUiN found the answer to one question within the answer to the other: What do we share, collectively, as human beings? *The experience of exclusion.* Can we live peacefully with one another? *Yes, by crossing boundaries in our collective work to create an inclusive and just society.*

References Cited

Calvino I, 1972 *Invisible Cities* (as translated by W Weaver, 1974) (Harvest/HBJ, New York)

Castles S, Davidson, A, 2000 *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging* (Routledge, New York)

Chawla L, 2002 *Growing Up in an Urbanising World* (Earthscan, London and UNESCO, Paris)

Chawla L, Driskell D, 2008 (forthcoming), "Democracy by design: giving young people a say about where to play", in *Where Do the Children Play?* Ed. E Goodenough (Wayne State University Press, Detroit)

Chawla L, Blanchet-Cohen N, Cosco N, Driskell D, Kruger J, Malone K, Moore R, Percy-Smith R, 2005, "Don't just listen—do something! Lessons learned about governance from the Growing Up in Cities project", *Children, Youth and Environments* **15**(2), 53-88

Cornwall A, Goetz A M, 2005, "Democratizing democracy: feminist perspectives", *Democratization* **12**(5) 783-800

Dewey J, 1916 *Democracy and Education* (Macmillan, New York)

Driskell D, 2002 *Creating Better Cities with Children and Youth: a Manual for Participation* (Earthscan, London and UNESCO, Paris)

Driskell D, 2007 (forthcoming), "Growing Up in NYC: reflections on two summers of action research", *Children, Youth and Environments* 17(2)

Edwards R, Usher R, 2000 *Globalisation and Pedagogy: Space, Place, and Identity* (Routledge, London and New York)

Ferguson S B, 2007, "Sunnyside Gardens: changing views for common ground", Master in Landscape Architecture and Master in Regional Planning thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY

Flanagan C, Bowes J M, Jonsson B, Csapo B, Sheblanova E, 1998(a), "Ties that bind: correlates of adolescents' civic commitment in seven countries", *Journal of Social Issues* **54**(3) 457-475

Flanagan C, Jonsson B, Botcheva L, Csapo B, Macek P, Averina I, Sheblanova E, Bowes J, 1998(b) "Adolescents and the 'social contract': developmental roots of citizenship in seven countries", in *Community Service and Civic Engagement in Youth* Eds Yates M, Youniss J (Cambridge University Press, New York) pp 135-155

Fox C, 2006, "Speaking our minds. Engaging young people in participatory research and collective action for community change", Master in Regional Planning thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY

Hall T, Coffey A, Williamson H, 1999, "Self, space and place: youth identities and citizenship," *British Journal of Sociology of Education* **20**(4) 501-513

Hart R, 1992 *Children's Participation: From Tokenism to Citizenship* (UNICEF Innocenti Essays, Florence)

Holston J, Appadurai A, 1996, special issue on Cities and Citizenship, *Public Culture* **8**(2)

Holston J, 1998, "Spaces of insurgent citizenship", in *Making the Invisible Visible, A Multicultural Planning History* Ed. L Sandercock (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA)

Lehrer W, Sloan J, 2003 *Crossing the Boulevard: Strangers, Neighbors, Aliens in a New America* (W.W. Norton & Company, New York and London)

Low S, Smith N, 2006 *The Politics of Public Space* (Routledge, New York)

Lynch K, 1977 *Growing Up in Cities: Studies of the Spatial Environment of Adolescence in Cracow, Melbourne, Mexico City, Salta, Toluca and Warszawa* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA)

Mitchell D, 2003 *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space* (Guilford Press, New York)

New York City Department of Planning, 2004 *The Newest New Yorkers: Immigrant New York in the New Millennium,* http://www.nyc/gov/planning

Rocco R, 1999, "Citizenship, culture and community: restructuring in Southeast Los Angeles", in *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space and Rights* Eds. W Flores, R Benmayor (Beacon Press, Boston)

Sánchez A I, no date, "The socio-historical development of Jackson Heights, 1909-1965", Queens Community Board 3 website, http://www.cb3qn.nyc.gov/page/1625/index.v3page?fi_v=lst&fi_fid=27946

Sandercock L, 1997 *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multi-Cultural Cities* (John Wiley and Sons, London)

Tarrow S, 2005 *The New Transnational Activism* (Cambridge University Press, New York)

Torney J V, Oppenheim A N, Farnen R F, 1975 *Civic Education in Ten Countries* (Halsted Press of John Wiley, New York)

Torney-Purta J, Lehmann R, Oswald H, Schultz W, 2001 *Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries* (IEA, Amsterdam)

Vertovec S, Cohen R, 2003 *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism* (Oxford University Press, New York)

Younisss J, McLellan J A, Yates M, 1997, "What we know about engendering civic identity", *American Behavioral Scientist* **40**, 620-631.