

**The Trauma of Modernity and
its Well-Being of Disparity**

Dr. Ian Morley

Department of History, Chinese University of Hong Kong

International Conference

on

“Happiness and Public Policy”

United Nations Conference Center (UNCC)

Bangkok, Thailand

18-19 July 2007

Abstract

The United Nations' (UN) annual *The State of World's Cities Report* has highlighted, amongst other things, multiculturalism and the fruits of urban-centred economies. Yet concomitantly it and other such accounts have revealed an unprecedented expansion of economic and social stresses in the urban milieu, and their impact upon well-being. Although the rise of sustainable development has valiantly tried at a plethora of spatial and political scales to address the matter of burdens hindering people's ability to enjoy a good quality of life via, for instance, promoting social equity as a right for all and not just a privilege of wealth, the problem of quality of the life and insalubrious environments for the economically unassimilated urban poor is not improving to a degree accepted as being satisfactory. In light of such a context this proposal for conference intends to provide an historical overview and evaluation of the phenomenon of post-industrial urban expansion upon well-being. Questioning not the nature of cities as the engines of economic growth but instead focusing on issues of modern city efficiency in dealing with physical and mental comfort this paper shall reveal how, amongst other things, fetid and abhorrent slum environments reveal not only a means to personal insecurity for slum dwellers, e.g. by unemployment, poverty, lack of tenure, pollution, disease and crime, but a tension within the urban situ as a whole – a pressure that is not inherently new but is now of an ever-expanding scale. This anxiety, based on intra-urban disparities in income, social and economic opportunity and contentment will be shown to be an agent fundamentally shifting the character of the cities of the world, changing them from social and cultural melting points to latent boiling pots. Taking into account the increasing entrenchment of the slum and general stresses of modern city life this author asks whether problems of well-being and happiness established by economic and social inequality ultimately provide for metropolitan dissolution, and how events from the past reveal that individual stresses have the ability under some circumstances to enlarge to become social conflicts.

Keywords: Urbanisation, industrialisation, culture, health, poverty, history, modernity.

Introduction

It is widely acknowledged that a plethora of variables affect a person's cognitive and communicative level of contentment. Despite being quantifiable through a number of instruments accurately comprehending well-being is an incredibly complex matter that necessitates the connecting of a diversity of branches of learning and their distinct approaches so as to appreciate how happiness is forged, sustained, developed or indeed, in some situations, eroded. While the provision of welfare has now established itself as a major component of a government's remit its importance has taken on unprecedented meaning in some instances. For example, in 2006 authorities in Xi'an, the capital of Shaanxi Province in China, crafted a 'happiness index' to gauge whether the yields of economic development had produced a socially harmonious society. In Bhutan the security, peace and comfort of citizens is similarly considered an imperative, and owing to the manufacture of the holistic concept of Gross National Happiness (GNH), Bhutanese national development measures people's material, spiritual and emotional needs in conjunction with the nation's Gross National Product (GNP). Likewise in Bogota, Columbia, Mayor Enrique Peñalose appreciated the value of having happy citizens and imposed a pragmatic policy to make them feel joyful and respected. To achieve this end Peñalose attempted to make the public comfortable again with and within their home city. Showing that Bogota was not just for cars or business but for the people Peñalose instituted a pedestrianisation infrastructure so as to return the city to the people, to provide urban spaces for people to socialise, walk, sit or play.

In generic terms an individual's welfare has been widely accepted as being calculable through the employment of two principal indicators. The first, Objective Well-Being (OWB), relates to life aspects such as income levels, amounts of savings a person has and the size of the residential unit they reside in, 'cold fact' matters which can be measured across time or space. The second, Subjective Well-Being (SWB), is a broader idiom which is said to comprise of people's multi-dimensional evaluation of their lives, including their cognitive assessments of fulfilment. It, SWB, can be used to measure the extent of global judgements (e.g. fulfilment), domains of life (e.g. work, marriage, etc.), and ongoing emotions in relation to unfolding experiences. Although OWB and SWB habitually form the basis of works that strive to measure well-being, and so matters such as happiness, the terminological debate as to what well-being is said to be is litigious as it is can be influenced by many seemingly rational facets. Accordingly when examining needs and satisfiers numerous studies have thus leant upon other fields or concepts in order to unearth a more suitable

means to determine happiness and life satisfaction, and in such a framework this paper has been produced.

In this paper an abstract historical appraisal of urban development and well-being is put forward. Utilising information within the genres of Urban and Cultural History this work refers to notions of how a good living environment has been perceived as a rational mechanism to establish health and the contentment of citizens, and deal with the complications of rapid urbanisation and industrialisation. The work by this means shall outline the longevity of issues of encumbrance like diminishing health (health being defined by the World Health Organisation as physical, mental and social well-being), comfort, personal security, and happiness levels that have resulted despite society's globally employing the metaphor of advancement due to the local emergence of capitalism, and manufacturing and tertiary sectors. Putting forth the rather contentious perspective that global society as a whole has still not come to terms with its inability to universally provide efficient physical and mental urban environments for people to live and work, the urban past is utilised to reveal how industrial shifts and their association with modernity present in effect contrasting urban life images based on a detachment of socio-economic circumstances between social groupings. Taking into account how globalised economics have entrenched these images based on disparities in income, opportunity and contentment into deep psychological and spatial forms, a modern urban mosaic has been formed that needs to be accurately appraised in what is an epoch characterised by unprecedented urban expansion, conspicuous patterns of urbanisation and the majority of humans living in towns and cities for the first time in history. In such a milieu the question has to be asked as to whether matters of well-being and happiness, mixed with say the growth of slum populations, social and territorial exclusions ultimately provide solid grounds for the breakdown of urban society. In any case, whether this pessimistic perspective is to be adhered to or not, there is always the need to constantly evaluate the safeguarding of welfare.

In the following section an historical backdrop to the philosophy and practice of environmental well-being by public administrations is given.

History's Examples of Establishing Exultancy as a Human Right: From the Ancient to the Modern

The idea of governmental authorities trying to amplify citizens' personal contentment

is not new, and in truth has a long history. The intellectuals of Ancient Greece, by way of example, guided the rulers of the city states, the *Polis* (πόλις), and suggested through means of promoting viewpoints like Stoicism that happiness was a personal good to be sought. In the Polis, where religion, politics and culture concerns were meshed, philosophers like Epicurus, who commented on the different values of personal habits and the need to structure behavioural tendencies so as to generate pleasure and enjoyment, held great sway. Aristotle, Socrates and Plato, famous Greek thinkers, also presented similar viewpoints through the construction of ethics like *Eudaimonia* (εὐδαιμονία), happiness from doing things well, *Ataraxia* (αταραξία), a state of mind based on joy from being at peace with oneself, and *Hêdonê* (Ἠδονή), a quest for pleasure that has good consequences. Such philosophies reinforced the perspective that the life of the Polis, and ultimately by this it is meant the individual citizens of a city, should be filled with *Apatheia* (απαθεια), a condition defined by a lack of worry, fear or suffering, and moreover that people should have opportunities to be put themselves in disposed positions to acquire pleasure whenever possible. The Roman civilisation, following on from the Greeks, also placed a great deal of emphasis on achieving the supreme good of happiness, albeit through means of political and cultural tolerance after subjugating ethnic groups, and acquiring personal wealth, power, fame and respect. For the urban masses decrees were issued to support their levels of happiness which at the very same time allowed Roman authorities to directly deal with the pragmatics of large-scale, comprehensive urban living and the essential infrastructures needed to keep people healthy (e.g. bread and water was issued gratis) and amused (e.g. by free entertainment). In other words the Romans understood the need to make people content with their lot, in part so that they wouldn't engage in some form of insurrection.

While one may argue as to the relevance of Ancient History to the early twenty-first century given the differing social and cultural constructions between the past and the modern industrial age a number of straightforward points should be taken notice of. Firstly, the rudimentary concept of welfare should be seen to be as old as the large city, and the 'democratic' state. Secondly, through the development of Philosophy happiness was understood by political elites to be a basic human and societal right, for society could not operate efficiently without happy citizens. Thirdly, the political legacy of ancient societies like Greece or Rome should not be underestimated for they, amongst other things, provided paradigms and empirical knowledge that shaped subsequent societies, their core moral principles, e.g. regarding civil rights, as well as governing structures like the checks and balances between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. To cite Thomas Jefferson's diktat on the pursuit of happiness, a

clear extension of past philosophical principles which he placed within the Declaration of Independence in 1776, ensured contentment became an unchallengeable human right within the newly formed United States of America. Yet as this work now highlights as a fundamental human right well-being has become eroded since the onset of industrialisation, the phenomenon that has come to define the modern age. To demonstrate this point attention must turn to nineteenth-century England, the world's first industrial and urban society, the world's first nation where modern public health came together, a nation where social issues were stated as issues of health.

In July 1842, some 60-70 years after the initial onset of the Industrial Revolution, a privately financed report written by a British civil servant, Edwin Chadwick, noted the association between the urban environment, poverty, health and the inveterate squalor of life in the industrial context. Chadwick's account, the *Report on an Enquiry into the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great Britain*, hereafter known as the Chadwick Report, was in many respects groundbreaking vis-à-vis the preservation of happiness within a new form of human civilisation, that is to say industrial society. Following Chadwick's revelation that ascribed disease with social problems, analogous to positive psychology which alliances health with happiness, public health emerged in Britain to counteract the negative impacts industrialisation had on society. In this context formative public health was founded as a piece of bureaucratic architecture to ensure the physical, mental and social well-being of the population, and this was to be achieved by condemning and confronting the respective opposites to well-being, namely disease, pain and suffering which most greatly affected those with the weakest economic footing (i.e. the poor). Although it is not necessary to summarise all of Chadwick's findings a number of key points must now be raised.

To place attention upon the Chadwick Report it should be observed as being the first document in the industrial era that ascertained how the modern environmental and social system did not give quality of life as a right for all, and how previous living arrangements for urban living were rendered as deficient by the rise of industrial society. Recognising a socio-environmental affinity that is so much for granted today given our extensive empirical comprehension of cities, their development and life within them, Chadwick exposed how the environment can impact upon a person's well-being and so their happiness. Secondly, the Chadwick Report exhaustively noted the hardships ('evils') of industrial living and the loss of healthful existence chiefly amongst the labouring classes who in many cities resided in districts typified as being

‘fever beds’ where the average lifespan could be as low as just 15 years. The removal of a good quality of life as characterised by decent health and few hardships it seemed were a cost of progress. However this was not strictly true. Pre-industrial cities were not especially clean and in some cases were so dirty they were known to be ‘devourers of men’. What industrialisation did that was different from before was, to all intents and purposes, make good health a luxury only affordable to the means of the affluent. Poor health, not a new problem but now on a new scale, was shown to be a new adversity for the contentment of the masses. Thirdly, to follow on from the previous point, Chadwick revealed that industrialisation and rapid urbanisation were not agreeable for the well-being of people (if well-being is to be understood as ‘good for’). Industrial and urban culture had an inherent incapability to provide social equity in the form of salubrious living conditions for all. So, despite the noted increased national economic prosperity in British society, a basic cultural bequest of the Industrial Revolution, the fast growth of British/industrial cities were officially recognised for the first time to have unleashed a growth of avoidable ill-health and mortality, a lowering of life expectancies and pleasantness to urban living.

As significant as the aforementioned findings were, and to not make light of them at all, the key to Chadwick’s account of modern society and the effects of urbanisation is arguably his most disregarded finding. Like the urbanist Doxiadis some hundred or so years later, Chadwick presented a terminology of the future, and this was to allow the reader to subjectively define how society will be based on the unchecked existence of urban problems initiated by past cultural evolution. Obliquely stating that the future shall be created through a continuation of past trends Chadwick in this way presented the argument that the prospect of society and its people is definable not just by looking forward but through also not turning away from the past. In other words, the outlook of society hinged upon an understanding of continuity and consequence. This line of thought when commenting upon issues of quality of life was compelling.

A noted supposition of Chadwick’s work was that insanitary conditions appeared to cause psychological obloquy. Although Chadwick and his peers perceived the mental anguish of living in poor housing and/or environmental conditions solely in terms of being a cause of family breakdown, criminal tendencies, the provision of hope in alcohol and maybe even social unrest too, it nonetheless is noteworthy. The conclusion was thus drawn that industrialisation, the bad physical and mental health and the reduction of salubrious environments it instigated, consequently had political, social and cultural costs. From a governmental viewpoint improving sanitation was imperative if a docile, non-rebellious population was insisted on and would be

achieved through national policies modifiable to suit local conditions and contexts. From a humanitarian standpoint health and well-being in the industrial age was so wretched for some that a welfare system was also an imperative in order to be a guarantor of some basic form of social justice for those trapped by the socio-economic circumstances of 'progress'. As R.A. Slaney, MP articulated in the parliamentary debates leading up to the passing of the Public Health Act (1848), the legislative response to the Chadwick Report and the Cholera epidemic of 1847-8, the pitiable condition of industrial places and the life within them essentially hinges upon four factors: health; social class; the disparity between the health of the rich and the poor; the elites willingness and ability to deal with this health inequality. Whereas the affluent classes at that time enjoyed the financial means to safeguard their health and SWB by buying into, for instance, suburban building processes (from capital hitherto invested at the urban core – hence post-industrial suburbia was built from the slum) once urban problems at the core became so pronounced and severe – shown in an objective fashion by local mortality rates and statistics showing the numbers of slums, the poor so as to protect their health enjoyed no such luxury. They were totally reliant upon governmental support. Hence the call for betterment in the 1840s, just as it is now, was an appeal to the elites' sense of compassion. Moreover it was a call to their sense of justice: "If they did not protect that property [health, well-being], did they do the poor man justice?" asserted R.A. Slaney in 1840, a comment germane to the rapidly evolving cities of today. So, as Chadwick first found in analysing the state of England, industrial culture defines itself not only by urban growth, or manifestations of increased national wealth brought, but also by fragmenting social justice between social groups. Industrialisation thereby was noted to characterise itself by inequity and by experiences in which the poor can at worst own little more than their humanity and health, and even then only in a distressed form.

Parallels

As has been shown in the previous section the tonality and conclusions of the Chadwick Report, the world's first investigation into industrial living conditions, still have much relevance to contemporary forums that consider well-being, happiness and urban satisfaction. While the legacy of nineteenth century England may be dissected and questioned the efforts of the British to deal with the 'Condition of England Question' provided the earliest inkling that life under industrialisation was not beneficial for everyone. In fact the 'condition question' was the world's first governmental acknowledgement of urbanisation and industrialisation being destroyers

of the social fabric of a country, demoralisers of the working population, and manufacturer of social by-products like slum housing, poor health and well-being. Accordingly the hands of the British then, similarly to administrations today, were forced to deal with what Simon Szreter has labelled as being the '4 Ds' (disruption, deprivation, disease and death) – negatives upon health and happiness. Although the ensuing British policy of urban improvement was a OWB housing-health paradigm in concurrence with their scientific understanding, social and economic principles and governmental frameworks at that time, the problems the '4 Ds' still persist in many regions of the world. In this light the experience of history has shown that a government must be completing aware of their responsibility to offset a number of fundamental, transforming issues if they wish to be a guarantor of social equity once industrialisation has begun. These concerns include being equipped to mitigate a lowering of the age of labour force, a degradation of housing stock and size, a low wage economy, issues of access to resources plus environmental unpleasantness. At the very same time administrations must deal with transitions in SWB among all social classes. The lesson of history is once more beneficial in this respect in comprehending the allegories of societal progress, wealth and happiness. By way of presenting a point in case, just because the middle classes of Victorian England were wealthy didn't mean they were necessarily happier in the urban situ than their poorer peers. Until the 1860s, for instance, the wealthy were known to reside in fear within their socially exclusive enclaves because of the unscheduled presence of Cholera, a home-bred 'shock disease' that defied conventional medicine. Additionally due to their spatial and psychological fragmentation within the industrial city once Cholera was conquered the middle classes sense of alarm and anxiety focused on other currencies, like crime, sedition, vagrancy and family values in part due partly to their skewed perceptions of people different to themselves given their spatial-cultural isolation. Today, this notion of protection and remoteness endures and has indeed been encouraged by the gated community, a pragmatic solution that is believed to provide a cocoon from the dangers of the modern city. A brief mention of this phenomenon is given subsequently.

Gated communities with landscaped gardens and properties costing many hundreds of dollars per square metre have tapped into the aforementioned modern age's fragmented financial-spatial mind-set. For those that can afford it they provide comfy residential units, leisure facilities and accordingly a high quality of life. Yet it is accepted that these communities are well beyond the economic means of much of urban society, and in many cases are designed to be so. A schism prevails for that reason in terms of where people live, work and behave. For instance, those in the

secure gated communities who tend to be highly educated, work downtown in the city's skyscrapers and drive cars live and work in a purposefully constructed image and environment of modernity. On the flip side those working on the breadline are frequently transient residents, commonly consisting of poorly educated migrants who herald from the countryside. They toil in cheerless factories at the urban fringe, reside in run down housing and their only form of automated transport is the bike – a mode of transport becoming banned from many urban cores in places as it represents a symbol of the past unbecoming of a modern city. These urban residents live and work in an image and environment based on the costs of modernity. Hence the presence of the gate and high-rise architecture belonging to gated communities are to them vehicles by which alienation is actualised.

The Urban's Health and Contentment: Sustainable Solutions?

Modern global society is said to be currently in a state of cultural transferral. One of the major patterns of this change is urbanisation although in effect the world has been in cultural and urban flux since the arrival of the Industrial Revolution in Britain in the 1700s. Along this line it is nearly 250 years since the world entered into this fundamental phase of alteration, a stage of transition considered to be the modern age, and the rise of urban populations and problems throughout this era has led to cities becoming stigmatised given their status as the seats of powerful, sometimes socially implosive dynamics unleashed by economic advancement. In this way the question of city achievement in terms of the equity of OWB and SWB has had great meaning, and has in recent years taken on increased priority so that city performance can be raised. This performance-based concern is a result of existing settlements rapidly growing in spatial and demographic extent, augmented tensions within the urban situ emerging and these stresses having new expressions and justifications, maybe a result of metropolitan society becoming more polarised and misconstrued. While differences and discords existing within societies is evidently not unusual, worryingly urban stresses are still not shrinking even though urban empiricism is ever-more extensive. In such a milieu an argument of city under-achievement and under-performance has arose, one centring on the struggles of our time and conflicts based on ever widening intra-urban disparities in income, social and economic opportunity, and satisfaction too. As such the ability of cities to supply national development and a good quality of life is being appraised. To this end the paper momentarily turns to the matter of growing slum-lands within cities.

Although slums and cultures of hardship are not new happenings it is widely understood that their disengagement from mainstream society and the populations found within them have risen massively since the onset of industrialisation. Their widespread presence, a consequence of forces within the industrial city, has in turn led to the slum being at the crux of the post-industrial urban challenge. This placing of slums at the centre stage of strategies to manage urban-based predicaments demonstrates that as much as progress is quantifiable since the Industrial Revolution in terms of general increases in wealth, health and quality of life modern urban living is far from salubrious for many, too many. It shows as well that the problems created by the onset of industrialisation and rapid urbanisation do not rectify themselves without fundamental assistance, and that as much as countries employ economic determinism to societal advancement the symbolism of the urban as a promise of the progressive world still falls flat. It additionally illustrates how industrialisation has generated a proclivity of universalism with regards to the urbanisation of low qualities of life that override local chronological, political, cultural and geographical contexts. Given this understanding urbanisation is rightly viewed as a cause of many of society's ills, but through the application of 'integrated' social policies relating to sustainable development, for example, it can also be its own cure.

Ever since the commissioning of the Brundtland Report in the late-1980s sustainable development has covered a broad and complex range of ideas and placed great attention on matters of economic, social and environmental significance, of which quality of life has been seen to be integral. In this regards the evolution of sustainability to the pursuit of happiness is immeasurable. For instance, sustainability's urban-focused rhetoric about how betterment of a social and environmental kind can be begot has provided a globally accepted framework for urban health improvement based and the development of political, economic, social, environmental and institutional conditions. Significantly too, sustainable development has brought to the fore the imperative of social equity and justice. Adopted on scales ranging from the local, regional to national, sustainable development has as such provided guiding principles to enhance well-being and in many pragmatic respects it has been successful. Yet this overall level of achievement has not been forceful enough to negate the sometimes violent effects of industrial and economic transitions, in part due to the potency of these impacts being fuelled by social factors like poverty and in-migration. As a result the environment and the infrastructure needed to sustain well-being accordingly comes under massive stress and sometimes breakdown. Problems of health and welfare associated with urbanisation remain and, somewhat ironically, as much as sustainable development has been premeditated to tackle affairs

degrading social, economic and environmental affairs head-on the stresses of urban living have got worse in many parts of the world. It seems the capability of sustainable development cannot suppress the circumstances of the modern age. The means at the disposal of administrations to give shape to modern and just urban society city does not presently meet humanitarian and political ambitions.

Need for New Approaches

The contest for any government in attempting to deal with aspects of well-being and contentment is hugely complicated and has been made even more convoluted in recent years by matters like globalised economic activity. Globalisation has, to be brief, made the entire challenge more multifarious and has separated it from a purely national frame of reference. However this in itself is not an excuse for the longevity of urban-based social concerns. Pertaining to nearly 250 years of industrial experience the time may be right to suggest that the urban intellectual project's ability to grasp the post-industrial urban phenomena is in disarray. The urban facts are unmistakable. Dissonance has grown at the expense of discourse and economic distresses have been complemented by declining social cohesion. The expansion of modern-age variations in intra-urban wealth suggest people are increasingly disjointed in urban cultural terms, an apartheid-type situation propagated in the expressions of where we live, where we work, what we buy, the cell phone model we own, whether we access the internet and or whether we experience territorial exclusion has arisen. In such a backdrop, what can be said to sustain urban societies in the future and the happiness of their citizens?

To provide an answer to such a question is, of course, problematical and has been since Edwin Chadwick's day as local, regional, national and now global forces all impact in different ways upon the city and its inhabitants, who each react in accord with their levels of wealth, race, experiences, socialisation, etc. This in turn affects their OWB and SWB. However certain key issues prevalent in history have never been adequately solved and must be better addressed. This is only achievable once we as a global community, both in civic and state terms, have formulated a new relationship with the city. Action guidelines by the likes of *Cities Without Slums* have blazed a trail in this regards and accordingly the urban future looks progressively more optimistic. Nevertheless as admirable as such strategies are there is a monumental gap between need and ambition in bringing about better qualities of life. We should use the occasion of the doggedness of urban predicaments, the hardships

and inequalities in making people happy and safe to thoroughly re-examine the kind of cities we have, where we wish to go, and how we can guide society to get there. In such a milieu the GNH of Bhutan is not as radical a concept as it may seem. It is quite pragmatic if truth be told and reiterate what History has shown: to link progress with happiness for everyone requires deliberate policy manufacture. Without such action no government can guarantee happiness and while strands that influence OWB and SWB have been dealt with independently by political strategies relating to either health, education, housing, crime, pollution, employment, etc., the example of Bhutan, or Xi'an or Bogota for that matter, is that it can be considered as an umbrella course of action. Maybe it has to be considered if hope and aspirations are to replace disparity, fear, distress and antagonism. To date no other plan has come close to sponsoring universal happiness.

As the core of this paper has emphasised human happiness in cities by design does not emanate solely from economic development. In fact the detriments of development can lead to the creation of unhappiness when administrative mechanisms are unable to cope with the strains unleashed upon urban society. Yet this does not lessen at all the potential of cities for they can provide live-able environments, and can too through the use of calculated policy help provide solutions to their own problems. Accordingly the time is rife more than ever to re-invest in the city and the anti-urban polemic of our era obscures the real issues and causes of urban-based problems. The city as an entity is, quite simply, not the engine responsible per se for the ills of our time and considering the strains placed upon them cities work well. In many respects cities are victims of cultural circumstance and development that has made them the sites of risk, and considering how little direct aid goes to cities (2-3 billions dollars for cities in over 130 countries, in comparison the US Government has spent \$430,000,000 to date on funding its campaign in Iraq and has outlined \$10,000,000 to rebuild Ground Zero in New York) they are casualties of the political agendas of world leaders.

In summing up, the question of citizens' happiness is complex but when examined through the lens of Cultural and Urban History it becomes broader than commenting upon one human feeling and reflects ultimately on the quality of governance. Utilising empiricism it is relatively easy to discern that well governed cities are large-scale urban settlements where the social economy thrives, infrastructures touch all, good health is common-place, and one where the citizens can identify and act upon their own priorities. A well governed city is therefore an environment in terms of space and mind where the various goals of the inhabitants and the commercial sector are met, but importantly it is a place where they are met without passing on costs to others.

Under such conditions people are acknowledged to be content. Their environment is humane. In the absence of good governance cities are known to be unhealthy, unsafe and disjointed places. They are a liability to people's happiness. Their environments are human not humane. At the Public Policy Development Conference in Bangkok the opportunity has been established to ordain the conception, definition, specification and shape of the humane city is to be commended. The philosophy of the human city is no longer tolerable.

References

- Ashton, J. (ed.), *Healthy Cities*. Open University Press: Milton Keynes, 1992.
- Cohen, M.A., 'The City is Missing: Sustaining Urban Culture in an Era of Globalisation' in *Proceedings of the 11th International Planning History Conference* (2004)
- Doxiadis, C.A., *Anthropopolis: City for Human Development*. W.W. Norton and Co. Inc.: New York, 1974.
- Hamlin, C., *Public Health and Social Justice in the Age of Chadwick*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1998.
- McGranahan, G., Jacobi, P., Songsore, J., Surjadi, C., and Kjellen, M., *The Citizens at Risk: From Urban Sanitation to Sustainable Cities*. Earthscan: London, 2001.
- Morley, I., 'Social and Economic Integration of Economic Areas' in *Proceedings of the INTA 28th World Urban Development Congress* (2004).
- Morley, I., 'Urbanisation's Costs under Capitalism: Victorian Britain's Annual War and the Surfacing of the Garden Solution' in *The Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific Economic and Business History Conference* (2007)
- O' Brien, C., 'Planning for Sustainable Happiness: Harmonizing our Internal and External Landscapes', in *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Gross National Happiness* (2005)
- Robeets, B., and Kanaley, T., *Urbanization and Sustainability in Asia*. Asian Development Bank: Manila, 2006.
- Royal Government of Bhutan, *Bhutan National Human Development Report 2000: Gross National Happiness and Human Development – Searching for Common Ground* (2000)
- Satterthwaite, D., *The Earthscan Reader in Sustainable Cities*. Earthscan: London, 1999.
- UN-Habitat, *The State of the World's Cities 2004/2005*. Earthscan: London, 2005.
- Wu Zhong, 'I bring You Glad Tidings', *The Standard*, March 27th 2006.