

Chapter 2. Sustainability and Sustainable Cities

VISION promotes the idea that social work is ethically bound by a responsibility to take an active role in producing sustainable cities and communities. Facing global climate collapse and extreme urbanisation, doing so requires an updated understanding of what sustainability means for social workers, and what constitutes a sustainable urban community. We must, therefore, ask: What role do social workers play in creating, growing, and supporting sustainable urban communities? In this chapter, we present a possible answer to this question. We show how social, economic, and environmental dimensions of sustainability are equally important and in what ways perspectives on sustainability have inspired the VISION method. We conclude this chapter with an overview of how VISION can be used to promote sustainability.

Co-building inclusive social transformation

The role of social work in the transition towards a more just and sustainable world has been increasingly emphasised in recent years. As mentioned, sustainability is a major theme within the Global Agenda for the Social Work & Social Development Framework for 2020–2030, captured under the headline *Co-Building Inclusive Social Transformation* (IFSW et al., 2020). The mandate for social workers actively promoting the transition to a more sustainable future also aligns with the Global Social Work Statement of Ethical Principles (IFSW, 2018). Nevertheless, for the profession more broadly, working from a sustainability perspective remains relatively new. As Boetto (2019) claims, social work from a sustainability perspective requires future social workers who can initially think differently, which further requires the formation of a new ontology for the profession. A new ontology must involve more holistic and critical ways of understanding the role and position of human beings in the world, and, over time, allow practitioners to realise in which ways they can play an important role in creating a more sustainable world.

The formation of a new ontology is impossible to outline in a short introduction to sustainability. That said, the following elements could very well count as pieces of a larger puzzle in the broader ontological picture. Within VISION, inspiration stems from definitions of sustainability, growth, critical theory, and eco-social work, with a specific focus on social work in urban development and the research conducted within the URGE project.

Three pillars of sustainability

Understanding the role of social workers in relation to sustainability begins with a definition of sustainability. Definitions of sustainable development and sustainability in general often take their starting point from the Brundtland Report (World Commission on Environment and Development [WCED], 1987), which presented the theme from an international perspective. In a process led by Gro Harlem Brundtland, the resulting report, *Our Common Future*, was published by the United Nations (UN) in 1987 and is now commonly referred to as the Brundtland Report. Therein, sustainable development was described as ‘(...) *development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*’ (WCED, 1987, p. 41). Based on this report, sustainable development was further divided into three pillars: economic, social, and environmental sustainability (Purvis et al., 2018). Applying this definition, social work quite easily fits into the economic and social sustainability pillars. The statement of ethical standards provided earlier generally promotes taking responsibility for engaging people in achieving social justice in relation to society; for working towards the equitable distribution of resources; for

challenging unjust policies and practices; for building solidarity; for holistic approaches to understandings and interventions; and for promoting the right to participation (IFSW, 2018). Therefore, considering the social, and perhaps even the economic dimensions of sustainability, are naturally embedded within the practice of social work. This may be accomplished through, for instance, work couched in inclusion, self-determination, and the redistribution of economic resources through welfare services and taxation to name just two examples. Yet, viewing this work as part of a sustainability agenda might require additional adjustments to our thinking.

That said, the environmental pillar requires a bit more analysis in relation to the profession. A rather simplified way of illustrating this might be that, without the sun, the planet, and photosynthesis in nature, neither the social nor the economic dimensions would exist. Through this perspective, we must include environmental dimensions in social work practice (or any practice for that matter). In what follows, this basic notion is explored more deeply through a more substantial argument justifying why the environmental dimension of sustainability—just as the social and economic dimensions—is relevant to social work. We also introduce the ontological and methodological consequences of a holistic understanding of sustainability.

Growth-critical theory

Since the Enlightenment period, societal development and wellbeing in the global North has been based on the pursuit of growth. For centuries, this growth has centred on the extraction of wealth, lives, and natural resources from the global South. But, with environmental collapse and the continuing and staggering lack of social justice, growth has been identified as our most fundamental problem. Economic anthropologist Jason Hickel provided a striking description of our relationship to growth:

We tend to take growth for granted because it sounds so natural. And it is. All living organisms grow. But in nature there is a self-limiting logic to growth: organisms grow to a point of maturity and then maintain a state of healthy equilibrium. When growth fails to stop—when cells keep replicating just for the sake of it—it's because of a coding error, like what happens with cancer. This kind of growth quickly becomes deadly. (Hickel, 2021, p. 19)

Thus, to survive and create a more just setting, we must transition to a post-growth world. A simple way of understanding the transformation the profession relies on, we turn to the work of macro-economist Timothée Parrique, known for his work on degrowth and growth-critical theory. According to Parrique (2019), for a long time the planet has been telling us to reduce our production and consumption and to transition to a steady-state economy where planetary boundaries, rather than the pursuit of growth, guide our development. This transition—called degrowth—must be planned democratically and rely on considerations of social justice and quality of life to reach balance and sustainability—known as post-growth.

Parrique's (2019) research offers concrete examples of our disruptive consumption patterns: the emissions connected to our information and communications technology emit 830 million tonnes of CO₂ per year. To break it down a bit further, the International Energy Agency estimates that one hour of Netflix streaming alone is equivalent to driving 0.5 km in a car. Furthermore, the total number of YouTube videos streamed in 2016 emitted 11 million tonnes of CO₂—equivalent to the yearly carbon footprint of a city the size of Frankfurt, Germany. CO₂ emissions cause issues such as drought, extreme weather events, rising sea levels, the acidification of water, and wildfires amongst others, which in turn carry severe consequences for human wellbeing. We

are more interconnected to the natural world than many of us think, justifying why social work must revitalise and rethink its concept of holistic social work.

Economic anthropologist Jason Hickel expressed this interdependence and connectedness when stating that:

We've forgotten how to pay attention to the relationships between things. Insects necessary for pollination; birds that control crop pests, grubs and worms essential to soil fertility; mangroves that purify water; the corals on which fish populations depend: these living systems are not 'out there', disconnected from humanity. On the contrary: our faiths are intertwined. They are, in a real sense, us. (Hickel, 2021, p. 9)

The core values of growth-critical theory

The core values identified in the field of growth-critical theory correspond quite well with the Global Social Work Statement of Ethical Principles. These core values in growth-critical theory are *autonomy, sufficiency, and care* (Parrique, 2019; see also the International Degrowth Network [n.d.]). Let us look a bit more closely at these values.

- 1) Autonomy. People need to feel as if they have a say in the kind of world in which they want to live, preferably on an everyday basis. We need participation, a voice, and a sense of agency when planning which sectors should scale down production and which sectors should be allowed to grow. Approaches to this kind of democracy can be rooted in decentralisation, critical collective empowerment, and de-privatisation.
- 2) Sufficiency. We need a more nuanced approach to wellbeing. Consuming, earning, and owning more are not equivalent to an improved wellbeing or quality of life. Naturally, a certain degree of economic freedom is nice, but a de-selection of products and services damaging to the environment is not equivalent to a decline in wellbeing. Most of us can do nicely with less.
- 3) Care. Without the social infrastructure upheld through noneconomic and non-commercial transactions such as reciprocity, care, and trust, a market-based economy could not exist. The often invisible and sometimes precarious work and efforts put into upholding the social infrastructure supporting a global economy should be recognised as equivalent to so-called formal work in the production spheres.

According to existing research—ranging from the first large-scale computer-simulated calculations of the implications of continued worldwide growth carried out in the 1970s (Meadows, et al., 1972/2004) to the current critical growth theories such as those represented by Parrique and Hickel—sustainable development must never decouple from environmental, economic, and social sustainability. Acknowledging that the planet's natural resources are finite, we must debunk the economic growth model that has dominated our thinking since the Industrial Revolution and the Enlightenment period. Sustainable development should, therefore, be carefully designed and planned to avoid a chaotic recession or economic meltdown leading to further inequality. Recognising social justice means promoting equitability whilst simultaneously addressing the systemic failures that led to our very different circumstances and possibilities in the first place. We have a shared albeit very different responsibility for contributing to a more just world, depending upon our socioeconomic position—some of us must produce and consume far less and relinquish certain privileges, whilst others amongst us must profit from the transition to a more sustainable future.

Conviviality

To connect all of this to social work, we turn now to some of the core values of the profession, such as democracy, social justice, and wellbeing. The argument for infinite economic growth has relied on the notion that we need growth to reduce poverty and inequality. Typically, we tend to think of economic growth as something that benefits the general population—growth is necessary for wellbeing. However, according to growth-critical theory, economic growth has not been accompanied by the redistribution of resources one might expect. Specifically, when looking at the correlation between wealth and environmental strain, justice seems compromised. According to the *World Inequality Report* (Chancel et al., 2022), the world's top 10% wealthiest households owned 76% of the planet's resources and held more than 50% of the total global revenue in 2021. According to Oxfam, the wealthiest 10% of people carry the responsibility for half of the world's emissions (Khalfan et al., 2023). Thus, there is an imperative and urgent need to rethink how the good life that growth has granted a few can instead be distributed to a shared good life, which includes all human beings and even other beings and the planet itself.

The concept and value of conviviality, often linked to growth-critical theory, comprises a possible way forward in a single word (Krüger, 2019). The literature often attributes the use of the term conviviality to Ivan Illich (1973/2021, p. 20), who referred to it as *'individual freedom realised in personal interdependence and, as such, an intrinsic ethical value'*. Originally, the term related to the act of eating together and enjoying the preparation and consumption of a meal, and the company of others taking part in it. In relation to a critique of growth, conviviality uses this as a metaphor for other kinds of sharing and being together, emphasising the enjoyment of the process.

Thus, instead of being filled with uncomfortable restrictions, depriving people from the good in life, degrowth, and the idea of taking less from shared resources become something to enjoy, finding other ways to obtain a joyous life other than those based on mass consumption.

Eco-social work

Social work can significantly contribute to fostering a democratic and inclusive transition from growth to post-growth, without undermining the right to growth for those who have yet to benefit from the prosperity experienced in recent decades. Such an approach to social work is found in what associate professor of social work Heather Boetto (2019), amongst others, has referred to as eco-social work. This approach aligns with the principles of conviviality and growth-critical theory, outlining ways of thinking and doing social work inclusive of nature's rights alongside other rights the profession aims to protect, focusing on reciprocity, understood as co-dependency and coexistence between all beings.

Boetto (2019) describes social work as a profession shaped by modernity, demonstrating how values such as rationality, independence, and self-reliance have been adapted into much of conventional social work. Whilst the mandate to think holistically has always pervaded within social work, this has traditionally meant including a person's entire environment when decisions about help, care, and support are made. The dark side of this perspective means that anything nonhuman can be considered an objective entity—awaiting human dominion and consumption—and encouraging alienation from the natural world. However, the current collapse in sustainability tells us that the natural world and its resources are not separate from humans. Thus, to speak of holistic social work *is* speaking to our deep interdependence with the natural world. As beautifully expressed by Boetto (2019), social work may be a human-centred profession, but it must also be a human-in-systems-centred profession. At the heart of eco-social work lies an understanding of

the delicate balance of the planet's ecosystems and their ability to sustain humanity—and an acknowledgement that the disruption and destruction of healthy ecosystems threaten life on Earth for all living organisms. Moreover, eco-social work echoes ecological feminism whereby they share a view of the world that respects organic processes, holistic coexistence, intuition, and collectivity. Finally, Indigenous knowledge and wisdom is juxtaposed with scientific knowledge—as outlined in the Global Definition of the Social Work Profession adapted in 2014.

There is something quite hopeful in the realisation that we do not need to innovate and invest our way out of the sustainability collapse, but can instead begin by rediscovering what is already in the world. We can learn from those who came before us. In his research, anthropologist Enrique Salmón (2000) argues that part of the solution to the many crises capitalism and the Anthropocene have caused lies in a kin-centric worldview—that is, a connected or kin-based worldview upon which many Indigenous perspectives are based, and which is also part of eco-social work.

In social work, we already have well-described methods suitable to sustainable development, including community work, multidisciplinary work, rights-based approaches, anti-oppressive practices, dialogue, and advocacy to name a few. In other words, for social workers, the most pronounced transition lies not in the acquisition of completely new knowledge about the environment or traditional natural sciences, but rather in a shift in orientation regarding the place and position of humans in the natural world. This represents a shift from a human-centred (Anthropocene) orientation to a more eco-social, holistic orientation where values such as democracy, participation, and social justice are considered in relation to the preservation of the planet's ecosystems. Within this framework, humans are not viewed as owners of planetary resources but as stewards responsible for their care and continuity (Parrique, 2019).

This perspective resonates with the principles articulated in the Brundtland Report (WCED, 1987) and is central to many Indigenous philosophies, such as *buen vivir*, often translated as living well or in harmony with nature, and *ubuntu*, which emphasises mutual responsibility and solidarity. In *buen vivir*, for example, individuals' rights to own, sell, or possess are subordinated to the rights of nature and the collective wellbeing of communities.

Taken together, these Indigenous and sustainability-oriented perspectives suggest that social work already possesses many of the conceptual and practical tools necessary for an eco-social transition. At the same time, they reveal a persistent gap between global ethical frameworks and everyday professional practice. This gap is particularly apparent where social work—especially at the micro- and clinical-levels—remains insufficiently connected to broader international, ecological, and relational debates. Challenging this disconnect highlights the importance of situating routine practice within a broader understanding of justice, responsibility, and interdependence.

Social workers, then, have the potential to act as key agents in the transition to a sustainable future. This requires a recalibration of our mindset and values to include a more holistic understanding of our tasks and the professional ethos. The good news is that the role in this is much like the role we normally associate with that of a social worker: to think and reflect critically, to facilitate, to communicate, to involve diverse actors, and to act responsibly on knowledge in pursuit of collective wellbeing.

Eco-social work in practice

In numerous European countries, the sustainable development initiatives we have outlined may not be explicitly included in a social worker's primary responsibilities or formal job descriptions. Nevertheless, there are many instances in which individuals successfully make significant strides towards what we refer to as eco-social work. For instance, the research conducted within the URGE project, which focuses on sustainability, democracy, social justice, and wellbeing across various scales, provides a pertinent example (Hoborg Gammelgaard, 2024).

In one of the cities involved in our research, a team of social workers from the municipality's department of social services is dedicated to assisting individuals who have experienced homelessness to transition to more permanent housing solutions. Whilst individuals are allocated affordable housing within the nonprofit housing sector, it is important to recognise that securing shelter does not always equate with the ability to create a home or foster a sense of belonging. The team, therefore, focused on how to re- and upcycle furniture, household appliances, and other essential items rather than purchase new products to create a sense of home. In this way, they could promote sustainable production and consumption practices on a larger scale. At the same time, the project provided and developed meaningful employment opportunities for individuals engaged in social employment at the city's recycling centres, thereby fostering inclusion, purposeful work, and an improved overall wellbeing. Furthermore, they actively engaged in establishing social and professional networks amongst professionals and citizens committed to sustainable development, enhancing the sharing and redistribution of knowledge. As part of their project, the team also used the insights from individuals accustomed to critically evaluating their consumption patterns to actively engage in degrowth by design.

Naturally and importantly, here we must avoid romanticising scarcity or suggesting that individuals in vulnerable situations should bear the responsibility for sustainable development whilst others continue to advance without consideration. However, when social work interventions incorporate the perspectives, knowledge, and values of those most accustomed to reflecting on their consumption patterns, these voices often provide a sophisticated understanding of our interconnectedness with the natural environment. Indeed, those individuals engaged in social employment in our example embody growth-critical perspectives which align with the theoretical insights of researchers such as Parrique, Hickel, and Boetto, even if they did not refer to the approach as 'eco-social work'. What the method can offer is a more systematic focus on and reflection of one's practice, integrating sustainability into all phases of social work interventions, illustrating a way forward which recognises and acts upon the state of the world.

Sustainable cities and social work

Following from this and inspired by social work pioneer Jane Addams, ethics and sustainability can be viewed as deeply intertwined, including in relation to urban development, a focus of the URGE project. Addams (1902) focused on creating better life circumstances for the urban poor following the wave of industrialisation at the beginning of the twentieth century. In 1902, she emphasised how a socially diverse city, with space for the marginalised and vulnerable citizens as well as the wealthy and resourceful, is a place where humanity and democracy can thrive. As Addams (1902, p. 7) put it, it is necessary to '*at least see the size of each other's burdens*' to have a democratic society. Absent contact with people different from us, we risk living in segregated and conflicting urban spaces.

We argue that social workers must take part in urban development, which is further underscored by research demonstrating how cities have developed from welfare to wealth cities, creating a need to understand the role of social work in urban development in new ways. The different welfare states developed in the 1900s became a primary resource for tackling urban poverty and conflicts. The term ‘welfare cities’ has been used to describe how the public sector planned, and at times built, its way out of urban social problems such as poor housing, health, and infrastructure. However, today we face a different situation. The private sector is a powerful player in urban development, whereby we are witnessing a transition from welfare cities to ‘wealth cities’ (Bärnheim et al., 2020). Too often, the public is not co-producing cities (Sennett 2018). At the same time, urban social problems such as poverty, loneliness, and substance misuse amongst others are dealt with as individual problems rather than as expressions of structural injustice. Thus, we face an ethical challenge in the development of cities. As described by UN-Habitat (2024), we are currently facing a global environmental collapse, largely related to these new waves of urbanisation. The deindustrialisation of European cities accompanies widespread commercialisation and marketisation of the urban landscape. Vulnerable citizens, who are not included in co-producing the city, are being pushed to the margins, both geographically and in the form of marginalisation and discrimination (Stiglitz, 2019; Sassen, 2018).

Such issues are directly addressed by institutions of social work. In *The Global Agenda*, as described above, the IASSW specifically states: ‘*Social work and social development practitioners and educators have an essential role to connect people, communities, and systems; to codesign and co-build sustainable communities and to promote inclusive social transformation*’ (IFSW et al., 2020, p. 6). On city development, the Brundtland Report further states:

Good city management requires [the] decentralization of funds, political power, and personnel to local authorities, which are best placed to appreciate and manage local needs. But the sustainable development of cities will depend on closer work with the majority of urban poor who are the true city builders, tapping the skills, energies and resources of neighborhood groups and those in the ‘informal sector’. (WCED, 1987, p. 23–24)

This highlights the important role social workers play in the development of sustainable cities.

Sustainability-related values within URGE

The URGE project was based on research completed during a previous project, which established that social workers lack access to communicative spaces where decisions about urban development are made (URBAN SOS, 2019). Ethnographic research completed in that earlier project’s European cities demonstrated how this is a genuine problem for social workers, who are ethically bound by the mandate to strengthen inclusive, sustainable communities. Consequently, social workers are tasked with advocating for vulnerable urban populations, embedding values of sustainability into community-building efforts, whilst lacking the tools to do so. Therefore, the URGE project aimed to identify ways to empower social workers to advocate for vulnerable urban populations and equip them with tools, perspectives, and methods to become agents of change for a sustainable future. Beyond developing VISION as a method that can be used for this purpose, research has been completed in the five cities involved in the URGE project, each focusing on different issues relevant to the local settings. Per the objective of the entire project, the research had a shared focus on *sustainability, inclusiveness, vulnerable populations, and voices not usually heard in development processes*. Moreover, the overarching objective of the research process lay on developing a digital map of the different conflicting values in the data (see www.urbanurge.eu). Based on this research, 12 values with specific relevance to sustainability in urban areas were

identified. These values are presented in the values catalogue in Chapter 9, each with suggestions for dialogues and activities which can serve as focal points for students, groups, and communities working with sustainability and sustainable cities. Those values from the URGE project are *participation, inclusion, safety, protection, agency, power, community, self-determination, sustainability, belonging, diversity, and equity*.

Sustainability and VISION

In combination, the VISION method and social work provide a powerful framework for creating sustainable cities through inclusive and participatory urban development. VISION fosters values-based conversations that prioritise human dignity, social justice, and ecological responsibility, and can be used to create opportunities for the inclusion of marginalised voices in decision-making processes. By promoting systems thinking and co-production, VISION can be used to bring social workers, planners, and communities together to design socially grounded solutions, countering market-driven ‘wealth city’ trends. In practice, social workers play a crucial role by planning and facilitating community workshops, during which residents, officials, and professionals collaboratively shape public spaces, housing, and green areas (City of Helsinki, n.d.-a). Advocating for social work representation on municipal planning boards embeds social equity into urban policy, whilst initiatives like mixed-income housing prevent segregation and promote empathy and democratic values, as documented in Helsinki’s efforts to end long-term homelessness (City of Helsinki, n.d.-b). At the grassroots level, social workers lead projects such as urban gardens, recycling programmes, and energy-saving campaigns, complemented by digital tools like participatory budgeting apps that amplify marginalised voices. Together, these approaches transform sustainability from a top-down policy into a lived practice, making cities more democratic, inclusive, and resilient—where sustainability is understood as both social and environmental, not merely economic growth.

This chapter was about...

VISION can be used to promote sustainability through:

- Knowledge-building. Social workers and social work educators can use the reference list and selected parts of the information in this chapter in classes, workshops, groups, and seminars about sustainability. Participants will gain a deeper understanding of sustainability and reciprocity.
- Awareness-building. Through examinations of values related to sustainability, students, groups, and communities can gain a deeper awareness of their role in creating a more sustainable future. This is a crucial element to becoming agents of change.
- Shift in focus. Teaching and practicing VISION in relation to social work methods that are collectively and eco-oriented can create a foundation for future social work professionals, which will naturally and systematically focus on sustainability in their practice.
- ‘Self-gravity’. The examination of values related to sustainability and sustainable cities can help individuals and groups to create a rootedness or gravity to their values and is needed when advocating for sustainability.

- Social sustainability. When social workers create spaces for VISION dialogues in groups, this can serve as a sustainability action in itself, creating interactions and an exchange of ideas amongst participants who would not otherwise have had the opportunity to meet or listen to one another. Recognising that such encounters are scarce, the dialogue itself becomes an important action, with the meeting of diverse perspectives contributing to the social dimensions of sustainability.

Chapter 2 references

- Addams, J. (1902). *Democracy and social ethics*. Macmillan Co.
- Boetto, H. (2019). Advancing transformative eco-social change: Shifting from modernist to holistic foundations. *Australian Social Work*, 72(2), 139–151.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2018.1484501>
- Bärnheim, M., Bøggild, S., & Weiss K. L. (2020). *The welfare city in transition*. Arkitektens forlag.
- Chancel, L., Piketty, T., Saez, E., Zucman, G. (2022). *World inequality report 2022*. World Inequality Lab. <https://wir2022.wid.world/>
- City of Helsinki. (n.d.-a). *Helsinki is preparing an application to establish a National Urban Park – views on the preliminary content of the application to be collected through an online survey*.
<https://www.hel.fi/en/news/helsinki-is-preparing-an-application-to-establish-a-national-urban-park-views-on-the-preliminary>
- City of Helsinki. (n.d.-b). *Ending long-term homelessness in Helsinki*. <https://www.hel.fi/en/decision-making/city-organisation/divisions/social-services-health-care-and-rescue-services-division/project-ending-long-term-homelessness-in-helsinki>
- Hickel, J. (2021). *Less is more. How degrowth will save the world*. Penguin Random House.
- Hoborg Gammelgaard, L. (2024). *Tilbage til fremtiden! Øko-socialt arbejdes potentiale i socialrådgiverprofessionens praksis*. [Back to the Future! Eco-social works' potential in the practice of social workers] [Unpublished bachelor's thesis]. Urban Age Ethics and Social Inclusion (URGE), Københavns Professionshøjskole.
- Illich, I. (2021). *Tools for conviviality*. Marion Boyars Publishers Ltd (original work published in 1973).
- International Degrowth Network. (n.d.). *Values & principles, values and degrowth*.
<https://explore.degrowth.net/degrowth/values-principles>
- International Federation of Social Workers. (2014). *Global definition of the social work profession*.
<https://www.ifsw.org/what-is-social-work/global-definition-of-social-work/>
- International Federation of Social Workers. (2018). *Global social work statement of ethical principles*.
<https://www.ifsw.org/global-social-work-statement-of-ethical-principles/>
- International Federation of Social Workers, International Association of Schools of Social Work, & International Council on Social Welfare. (2020). *Co-building inclusive social transformation*.
<https://www.ifsw.org/2020-to-2030-global-agenda-for-social-work-and-social-development-framework-co-building-inclusive-social-transformation/>

- Khalfan, A., Nilsson Lewis, A., Aguilar, C., Lawson, M., Jayoussi, S., Persson, J., Dabi, N. & Acharya, S. (2023). *Climate equality: A planet for the 99%*. Oxfam International. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21201/2023.000001>
- Krüger, O. (2019). The paradox of sustainable degrowth and a convivial alternative. *Environmental Values*, 28(2), 233–251. <https://doi.org/10.3197/096327119X15515267418548>
- Meadows, D. H., Randers, J., & Meadows, D. (2004). *Limits to growth. The 30-year update*. Chelsea Green Publishing Company (original work published in 1972).
- Parrique, T. (2019). *The political economy of degrowth*. [Doctoral dissertation, Université Clermont Auvergne; Stockholms universitet]. HAL Open Science. <https://theses.hal.science/tel-02499463/>
- Purvis, B., Mao, Y., & Robinson, D. (2018). Three pillars of sustainability: in search of conceptual origins. *Sustainability Science*, 14(3), 681–695. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-018-0627-5>
- Salmón, E. (2000). Kin-centric ecology: Indigenous perceptions of the human-nature relationship. *Ecological Applications*, 10(5), 1327–1332. [https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761\(2000\)010\[1327:KEIPOT\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761(2000)010[1327:KEIPOT]2.0.CO;2)
- Sassen, S. (2018). *Cities in a world economy*. (5th Ed.). Sage.
- Stiglitz, J. (2019). *People, power, and profits: Progressive capitalism for an age of discontent*. W. W. Norton.
- UN-Habitat. (2024). *World cities report 2024: Cities and climate action*. <https://unhabitat.org/wcr/>
- Urban Age Ethics and Social Inclusion. (2023). *Erasmus+ project application*. University College Copenhagen Research Portal. <https://forskningsportal.kp.dk/en/projects/urban-age-ethics-and-social-inclusion/>
- Urban SOS. (2019). <https://www.urbansos.eu/>
- World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Report of the world commission on environment and development: Our common future*. United Nations General Assembly document A/42/427. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/139811?v=pdf>