



THE RESOURCES OF MULTI-ETHNIC ENVIRONMENTS IN ITALY: PLANNING IN THE “CITIES OF DIFFERENCE”

Paola Briata¹

Abstract

Immigration is a “hot issue” in many European countries and the cities represent the main gateway for the majority of the newcomers.

From the spatial dynamics and policies’ point of view, the debate on urban space and immigration has been dominated by the topic of the problematic aspects of the newcomers’ concentration in specific neighborhoods. In this direction, space policies have always been characterized by a dominant approach aimed at mitigating forms of concentration, breaking up the immigrants settlements’ territorialities, or dispersing the newcomers groups across the urban territory.

In the last twenty years these forms of intervention have mainly resulted in the promotion of “social mixing” initiatives that this paper puts under critical observation.

In this direction, a main objective is considering some core concepts and narratives that underpin analysis and forms of intervention in multi-ethnic neighborhoods as “assumptions” that, far to be proofed, play a large part in conditioning the public debate and policy agendas on this issue, but also in orientating the researchers’ ways of seeing. This objective implies a reframing of the descriptions and of the forms of intervention in multi-ethnic settlements, considering the “concentration/segregation” issue as a powerful “assumption” that is at once both descriptive and prescriptive, leading to “mixing” policies as an embedded answer to descriptions based on concentration.

Italian multi-ethnic settlements are “deeply” multi-ethnic, as people from different countries live in these areas, including the prevailing presence of Italian citizens. They are not ethnic enclaves, but “cities of difference” in the multicultural sense given by Fincher and Jacobs (1998).

Despite these peculiarities, innovative ways of intervention have not be developed, and planning in multi-ethnic contexts works with the same means and rationalities seen in other countries where the concentration phenomena are more significant.

Based on the most recent findings of some “out of the mainstream” literature aimed at describing multi-ethnic settlements in an innovative way, as well as on some case-studies, the paper aims at pointing out how much the peculiarities of the Italian environments may be useful to consider them as “urban labs” to discover the “resources” of multi-ethnic environments, and to develop new forms of research and action: challenging existing descriptions of multi-ethnic settlements, discussing innovative methodologies and intellectual approaches to these neighborhoods, and detecting alternative modes of interventions in such urban environments with a particular attention to the role – provider, enabler, conflicts’ mediator, ruler – that the public hand may play in the face of the welfare restructuring.

¹ Dipartimento di Architettura e Pianificazione, Politecnico di Milano, Milano, and Università IUAV Venezia, Venice, Italy; paola.briata@polimi.it



1. Introduction

Over the last fifteen years the increasing number of foreign immigrants in Italy has led to a growing body of urban studies whose first aim is to describe how the newcomers' presence has changed the major cities and their neighbourhoods. These are mainly descriptions on how the immigrants settle, "use" and change Italian cities. Despite the variety of these settlements, a common aspect could be found in the Italian multi-ethnic environments: the absence, excluding some exceptions, of "ethnic concentration" in specific neighbourhoods. This aspect could be observed both from the "quantitative" point of view – as the immigrant's share is rarely over 20-25 per cent over the residents' population – as well as from the nationality point of view – as multi-ethnic settlements are "deeply" multi-ethnic, as people from different countries live in these areas (including of course the prevailing presence of Italian citizens). They are not ethnic enclaves, but "cities of difference" in the multicultural sense given by Fincher and Jacobs (1998).

The most common form of ethnic concentration is related to some commercial areas, and a number of sociological and economical studies have underlined how the natives tend to leave to the newcomers *labour-intensive* jobs. In this sense, immigration is also presented as a resource (Ambrosini, 2010).

From the spatial dynamics' point of view, urban studies have underlined how the newcomers' economic activities have been able to adapt to spaces left empty from the Italian entrepreneurs, assuring the neighbourhoods' vitality with reference to the services that they provide (for example the corner shops), and to the uses of public spaces (Grandi, 2008).

These studies try to construct "out of the mainstream" descriptions of the immigrants' presence, presenting it as a resource, and deconstructing a pervasive public discourse focused on the problematic aspects of the newcomers' concentration.

Given this general context, this paper carries on a research path focused on spatial policies in multi-ethnic environments in Italy. This research has made possible to focus on three main spatial forms of intervention where the immigrants' presence is significant and/or visible (Briata, 2010; 2011b):

- where an "intensive" use of public spaces by the immigrants could be found, forms of intervention based on "*breaking up the newcomers' territorialities*" (Yiftachel, 1990). This is possible through forms of urban renewal aimed at introducing functions and services able to attract also the Italian population;
- where the immigrants' share is significant in the residential buildings, *public-led forms of "rehabilitation"* aimed at enhancing the real estate pressure. These forms of intervention may imply the weaker groups – not only immigrants, but old people as well – moving to other places;
- where the ethnic economies are significant, visible or able to attract foreign clients, forms of intervention based on (a) *rules, restrictions and ordinances* – including forms of zoning that introduce "special" regimes for some areas – that may have a negative impact mainly on the immigrants' shops (b) "*commercial development*" policies aimed at attracting new Italian shops and services.

This means that, despite the urban studies have underlined the absence in Italy of "pathological" forms of concentration that could be found in other countries, spatial policies have mainly used the same tools that have been used in other more problematic realities to reduce concentration.

This paper aims at exploring the possible reasons for these choices starting from an analysis of the rationalities that usually guide these forms of intervention, exploring similarities and differences between Italian and other Western countries, and pointing out how much the peculiarities of the Italian settlements may be useful to consider them as "urban labs" to discover the "resources" of multi-ethnic environments, and to develop new forms of research and action.



2. The problematic aspects of concentration

Debates on planning in multi-ethnic contexts have been dominated by the topic of the newcomers' concentration/segregation in specific neighbourhoods (Marcuse & Van Kempen, 2000). This "label" covers a wide range of phenomena felt to be problematic: a large number of immigrants in a certain area, a high percentage compared to the total number of inhabitants in a neighbourhood, and specific forms of settlement such as the ethnic enclaves. The *spatial dimension* is most closely connected with the *urban visibility* of immigration and plays a large part in conditioning the public intervention in the issue (Tosi, 2000). In the mainstream visions of public debate and policies "ethnic neighbourhoods" are considered as "worlds apart" which create barriers to interaction with the rest of the society, hindering the integration of individual immigrants (Mustered & Andersson, 2005). For these reasons, urban and spatial policies have often been characterized by a dominant approach that aims to mitigate forms of concentration, by dispersing immigrants and/or problematic groups across the urban territory and/or breaking up their settlements' territorialities by introducing people of different ethnic, social and economic background (Home, 1997; Yiftachel, 1990). And yet the assumptions of presence and absence of concentration and diffusion that underpin this dominant narrative often remain unquestioned by academics and policy-makers.

In the last twenty years these forms of intervention have been adapted by policy discourses to changing conceptions of the role of the state in public provision, as well as to new development scenarios of the post-industrial cities that have to be attractive for business services, creative industries, knowledge-based economies and tourism. In this way, the promotion of "diversity" at neighbourhood level in terms of social class, income, ethnicity, and lifestyle has been proposed as a precondition for socio-economic upgrading of people living in deprived and "segregated" neighbourhoods (Donzelot, 2006), as a way to counteract stigmatisation putting these places "on the map" of the urban territory, and as key factor to stimulate innovation, creativity and economic growth (Fainstein, 2005).

In these directions, policies aimed at stimulating diversity or "social mix" in social housing estates, inner city areas or decaying historical centres have been carried out in a wide range of countries – e.g. United Kingdom, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Belgium, United States, Canada and Australia – becoming a sort of *mainstream approach* to "problematic" neighbourhoods, including those characterized by a significant presence of immigrants (Mustered & Andersson, 2005). In most cases, urban policies aimed at reducing ethnic concentration have resulted in actions aimed at attracting in specific neighbourhoods people of different background to "dilute" the immigrants' presence and/or in actions aimed at the newcomers' dispersal across the urban territory (*ibid*).

Despite the absence of an academic debate on these issue, this approach has influenced also the forms of intervention activated in Italy: social mixing is considered a good thing *tout court*, a sort of "magic word" able to justify different forms of intervention carried out in different "problematic" environments: from the historical centres to the outskirts areas (Briata, 2011a).

At the international level, in the last years a growing body of literature has critically analyzed social mixing policies, focusing both on the *principles* that underpin these initiatives, as well as on the *results* that have been observed where they have been implemented. A brief summary of these positions is provided in the next paragraphs.



3. Principles and problems of social mixing policies

3.1. Ways of pursuing social mix

Despite the different patterns of socio-spatial segregation that characterize the different countries – e.g. anti-segregation policies have mainly been promoted to deal with the problematic aspects of the *banlieues* in France, while in United Kingdom there is a strict, relationship between the narratives of social mix and the inner cities’ regeneration – a number of common aspects in conceptualising and pursuing objectives of diversity could be underlined. In particular, social and functional mix are presented as strictly interrelated objectives, and policies aimed at stimulating diversity should involve housing, retail business, services and public spaces (Urban Task Force, 1999). Despite this, in many countries social mix objectives have mainly resulted in policies aimed at promoting mixed tenure, housing price level mix, or building type mix to attract wealthier and/or middle-class residents in deprived and problematic areas (Bolt, 2009). In the last years, a growing body of literature has critically analyzed anti-segregation policies focusing both on their principles, as well as on the results that have been observed where they have been implemented.

3.2. Social mix to stimulate local development, upward social mobility and cohesion

Analytical works by planners, geographers, sociologists and political scientists have been helpful to underline that social mix is considered in public discourses and policy agendas as a key factor to enhance individual and groups’ opportunities for upward social mobility at least for three main reasons²:

- a “local development” perspective (from the “insiders point of view) – as social mix may be helpful to change the perception of deprived and problematic neighbourhoods “from outside³”, counteracting stigmatisation, attracting new (less problematic) inhabitants, and stimulating new broader relationships and socio-economical opportunities for people living “inside” these places;
- a “social upgrading” perspective – related to the supposed “civilizing” influence of wealthier and middle-class residents, whose presence could motivate problematic individuals and groups, thanks to the contacts with role models from a different socio-economic background;
- a “social cohesion” perspective – as the exposure to “the other” can lead to mutual understanding, learning or, at least, tolerance.

3.3. Spatial proximity between “diverse” groups and socio-economic upgrading: critical views

Analysing the three perspectives listed above, one major objection is linked to the fact that considering social mix as a key factor for change in residents’ behaviour thanks to the wealthier or middle-class residents’ influence, means reducing these people’s problems to “social pathology”, neglecting that poverty and social exclusion depend also on structural social and economical

² Based on international planning, geographical and sociological literature on social mixing initiatives, this “classification” has been done directly (cfr. Briata, 2011a).

³ The reference to “internal” and “external” descriptions and dynamics is proposed having in mind that what is “inside” or “outside” a place is never something “absolute”: this is a strategic construction operated by the local and not-local actors (including the researcher that embraces these distinctions) to simplify complex situations, and to prefigure some course of research and actions, excluding others.



factors, and that the single persons or groups' know-how/will/exposure to "the other", as well as the local level initiatives may be not enough to reach socio-economic upgrading (Raco, 2003).

At the same time, based on the outcomes of anti-segregation policies, the assumption of a strong link between social mix and housing mix is far to be proofed. A lack of evidence for this link where housing mix was realised has been underlined by a number of studies carried out in different countries (Kearns, 2002; Whitehead, 2002; Musterd & Andersson, 2005). At the same time, tenure mix practices have demonstrated that these policies may result in spatial proximity between different socio-economic/ethnic groups, but that this condition doesn't necessarily translates into social interaction between people of different background in public spaces, schools, services and shops (Butler, 2003; Allen *et al*, 2005). In this direction, also the thesis that the exposure to "otherness" leads automatically to mutual understating and tolerance is far to be demonstrated. Moreover, *from the methodological point of view*, it has to be said that these researches have been useful to highlight how complex is understanding what kind of social mix is taking place in these neighbourhoods, due also to the *slippery nature of this concept*: all neighbourhoods are, in fact, "mixed", but from anti-segregation policies' point of view some seem not to possess the "right" mix (Cole & Goodchild, 2001). Is then social mix a way of intervention aimed at creating the "right" mix? What are then, in these policies rationales, the characters of a "balanced" conception of mix? May "social engineering" create it?

3.4. Development agendas, public-led gentrification, social control: critical views

Other studies have analyzed social mixing initiatives in the context of new development scenarios of the post-industrial cities. In this direction, anti-segregation policies may be seen as strategies to change the deprived neighbourhoods' role, image and population in the broader cities' contexts, putting them "on the map" of the urban territory. These dynamics may be more common in the inner city areas or in some European cities' historical centres, where the relationships between the real estate pressure and urban renewal may result much more clear (Diappi, 2009). For these reasons a growing body of literature has underlined how social mixing initiatives may be seen also as forms of state/municipality-led gentrification, that may carry with them significant threats of displacement for the weaker groups (Lees *et al*, 2008). Other perspectives have underlined that anti-segregation policies may be read also as a means for the states or local authorities to break up the "world apart" characters and territorialities of these neighbourhoods, having back the social control of places that seem to have only their own rules (Atkinson & Helms, 2007). In this vision, anti-segregation policies may be seen also as a "spatial declination" of security policies.

4. Why not ghettos?

A completely different point of view has been analysed by studies less interested in the "external" exclusion of "segregated" neighbourhoods and more focused on the internal dynamics among the inhabitants of these places. The debate on the limits and on the potentialities of segregated places has a long history that goes back at least at Park studies' (1925) in the context of the Chicago School of Urban Sociology. Despite this, the interesting aspects of the recent rediscovery of these issues is due on the one hand, to their connotation as "a reaction" to social mixing initiatives and, on the other hand, to the strong link that they establish with the current situation of the welfare state restructuring. These perspectives have tried to look at segregated neighbourhood not only as dangerous environments with their own rules, but also as places that could have a potential in stabilizing the cities (Cattacin, 2006). In this views, these places' function in contemporary societies



would be underestimated because here immigrants and people of low socio-economic status can find a warm and loyal surrounding and, considering the shrinking capacity of intervention of the welfare state, *self-regulated spaces of mutual-help and solidarity*. These relationships have a strong capacity to act and to solve concrete problems, and “mixing” policies may weaken or brake established networks, without giving any other kind of resource back. These perspectives do not suggest to consider the spaces of segregation in a positive way *tout court*: their potential “integrative role” in the cities is in fact strictly connected with the welfare state’s financial crisis and the related difficulties in the implementation of redistributive policies. In this general context, combating these places may create more problems than solutions.

5. Concentration and public policies’ role

Despite the vast amount of critical academic literature, social mixing initiatives still remain the main form of intervention in the immigrants’ settlements, revealing a sort of disjunction between research and policy agendas. At the same time, this disjunction may be helpful to stimulate reflections on the weak aspects of research that has focused on these issues.

In particular, as underlined in paragraphs § 3 and 4:

- There are critical views of social mixing policies that, despite their criticism towards anti-segregation actions, seem still to be linked to a negative and problematic image of the immigrants’ and weaker groups’ spatial concentration. These negative views appear in some way embedded also in the researchers’ analysis and narratives, and may condition the research point of view, not being useful to explore innovative approaches and ways of action;
- There are studies that underline the public hand’s will to re-establish control on “problematic” neighbourhood, considering this issue mainly in a negative way. In these perspectives, social mixing initiatives have been seen mainly as place-focused declinations of security policies, implying forms of “repression”. Due to the physical, economical and social conditions of decay that often characterizes these neighbourhoods, the public hand’s will to establish forms of control is far to be illegitimated. A negative view *tout court* in this sense may not be helpful to explore innovative approaches related to the “control” issue, for example declined also in terms of care and not only in terms of repression;
- There are studies that suggest to reconsider the potentialities of “segregated places” with a particular attention to their self-regulating capacity, due to the shrinking redistributive capacity of the welfare state. The welfare restructuring is without any doubt a reality, but this does not mean that the public hand shouldn’t and couldn’t have any kind of role in these places, for example managing situations of conflict or integrating and/or sustaining existing networks. Underestimating the state’s or the local authorities’ possible role in these places may not be helpful to explore innovative paths of intervention.

Existing literature’s gaps may create “open spaces” for further research and analysis based on two main families of problems related to:

- the connections between the *descriptions* of “problematic” neighbourhoods and the consequent *forms of intervention*;
- the *role that may be played by the public hand* in these kind of places.

In the next paragraphs the paper aims at pointing out how much the peculiarities of the Italian environments (a) may represent a good research field to observe the international literature’s less explored aspects (b) may be useful consider them as “urban labs” to discover the “resources” of



multi-ethnic environments, and to develop new forms of research and action: challenging existing descriptions of multi-ethnic settlements, discussing innovative methodologies and intellectual approaches to these neighborhoods, and detecting alternative modes of interventions in such urban environments with a particular attention to the role – provider, enabler, conflicts’ mediator, ruler – that the public hand may play in the face of the welfare restructuring.

6. Descriptions and “solutions”

A wide range of literature, studies and data have underlined that ethnic concentration is an uncommon phenomenon in the Italian context. Despite this, policy agendas did not invest in original and innovative spatial policies in these kind of environments: the main objective is contrasting concentration through social mixing initiatives as in other Western countries where this phenomenon is much more significant.

The very aggressive public debate on immigration in Italy (Rivera, 2009) could be the first reason for the administrations to act in this way. A public debate that seem to be able to influence even the more “progressive” policy agendas. “Based-on-fear” planning (Paba, 2010) is the other side of a dominant approach towards the newcomers, an approach fuelled by the media that, where the immigrants’ presence becomes visible, label as *banlieues* historic and central areas or as *ethnic ghettos* places where the Italian born resident are still the majority.

These narratives of multi-ethnic environments seem able to affect policy agendas more than the “out of the mainstream” descriptions of academic literature and research when the immigrants’ presence in a place is presented as an urban resource.

In this direction a core point in this paper is considering some core concepts and narratives that underpin analysis and forms of intervention in these places – in particular the problematic aspects of concentration – as “assumptions” (Raco, 2009) that, far to be proofed, play a large part in conditioning the public debate and policy agendas on this issue, but also in *orientating the researchers’ ways of seeing*. For example, all the “distinctions” to look at the immigrants’ presence as a resource or to see in the different typologies of ethnic economies a service for all the residents of a neighbourhood, are used to demonstrate that *ethnic concentration is not an issues* in those kind of places. The same could be said of the descriptions of the immigrants’ presence in terms of share or percentages as it was introduced in this paper: we have to be aware that an “absolute” index con concentration does not exist. Concentration is defined both by perceptions and by relationships of the local with the global, the neighbourhoods with the rest of the city, a place with other places where the immigrants presence is in the policy agenda in Italy or in other countries.

This implies a reframing of the descriptions and of the forms of intervention in multi-ethnic settlements considering the “concentration/segregation” issue as a powerful “assumption” that is at once both descriptive and prescriptive.

As underlined by policy analysis and social sciences, analysis and problems’ framing are strictly linked with existing tools that decision makers may mobilize to cope with them (Bobbio, 1996; Crosta, 1998). In this case it seems as if, as researchers, we try to frame problems in a way that cannot lead to existing tools and “solutions”.

In this perspective, social mixing policies may be seen not as *one of the possible answers to concentration*, but as an *embedded answer* to descriptions based on concentration. This means that not only policy agendas should be reframed as literature has underlined until now, but that also our ways of looking at the immigrants’ settlements – as researchers – should be subject to challenge and put under critical and auto-critical observation.

7. From immigration as a resource to the multi-ethnic neighbourhoods resources

Observing the immigrants' settlements in Italy, and concentrating on their multi-ethnic and multi-cultural aspects, may lead to some open aspects for further research and action. For example, the neighbourhoods' Italian born residents usually do not feel comfortable with the descriptions of the places where they live made by the media and policy makers. Descriptions made "from outside" are quite different from those made by people living "inside" these neighbourhoods (Briata, 2011b).

These differences may be related to different reasons:

- a multi-ethnic co-existence *de facto* – that of course may bring problems, mistrust and prejudices – but that in some circumstances may lead to consider the "outsiders" as "established";
- a vision of ethnic concentration as an opportunity for commercial development or other kind of business also for the Italian people;
- the consequences that Italian traders have to face in their everyday life due to the negative image of the place where they live and work built up from media and actors that see the problems from outside – a fact that generate forms of place stigmatization, rendering the areas less attractive, and weakening the position of the local economies. Be described from outside as "otherness" in the face of the rest of the city, risking to be put out of the maps of the city itself.

These are only some examples of the problematic issues to work on in the perceptions of the Italian residents, traders and workers of multi-ethnic settlements.

In the last years the Italian multi-ethnic settlements and their descriptions as ghettos or *banlieues*, have stimulate the insurgence of some literature that has tried to focus not only on the problematic aspects as they are perceived from outside, but on everyday life and coexistence problems as they are perceived and described by Italian and foreign residents – people, community groups, users of services in those particular neighbourhoods. This is the rationale that guides description such as those of Torpignattara (Rome) by Fioretti (2011) or for Via Padova (Milan) by Arrigoni (2011) and Gadda (2012).

This attempt to catch "the insiders point of view" may be seen also in a number of pioneer actions carried out by public administrations in a number of cities where the guides for the analyses of multi-ethnic environments were a number of associations and community groups rooted at the local level. Social realities that carry on everyday activities in these places, trying to cope with concrete problems. An example could be the "participated analysis" carried out in the Padua train station area by Mimosa – an association rooted at the local level that works on social exclusion issues. This action was carried out in cooperation with the Municipality and Confesercenti (the traders association), involving the local entrepreneurs (including a large number of foreigners), workers and residents. This work aimed at establishing some core points to be followed in the area regeneration. The project was characterised by different types of field analysis: ethnographic observation, interviews to relevant actors, discussion with community groups, interviews to different "categories" of people living in the area (young/old; workers/residents; Italian/foreign entrepreneurs; men/women). Among the more significant outputs:

- the differences between the perception of the place "from outside" and "from inside" (inside life seem to be better than how it is perceived and described from outside);
- the differences between the daytime and night time perception of the area;
- the differences between the women and men perceptions' (independently from the immigrant/not-immigrant origin);
- a vision of the immigrants' presence from the Italian residents' point of view that does not hide problems, but at the same time that is not a stereotypical one – there is not a negative



perception of immigration in general, but a number of deviant behaviours are associated with the foreigners;

- a vision of security that does not seem to be complacent with the narratives based on “emergencies” proposed by the media, but that claims for the restoring of a “lost normality” though initiatives able to bring regeneration, vitality, a different positive visibility of the area that “should be much more similar to the city centres” (Banca Etica, 2008).

This survey was the first step of a project that led to the opening of a “zero kilometre” market (based on the residents’ proposal for a quite problematic square); the promotion of a number of events to bring people in the area also in the evening; the “adoption of an ethnic shop” from the Italian entrepreneurs to build up bridges between different economic realities.

The Aldermen for the trade in the Padua Municipality has decided to propose this approach also for another problematic area close to the train station, but not so close to the city centre as the previous one. This experience has been described not for the still weak outputs in the area, but for the unusual way to “build up the problem” that seem to individuate: describing a place that “from outside” is always considered a problematic one based on the insiders perceptions. A description made also of “voices”: micro-stories that tell of concrete problems, and of the local capacity (or not) to cope with them; resistance by the local groups to the existing dynamics; tactics that render everyday multi-ethnic and multi-cultural coexistence possible; awareness of what kind of problems could be faced at the local level, and what kind of problems require a not local approach or/and the public hand intervention.

Such a way of looking – less focused on immigration as a resource, and more focused on the resources of multi-ethnic environments – may be helpful also to understand the role that the public hand may play in these kind of places.

Considering the welfare restructuring, the public hand may have a different role, less focused on breaking up ethnic/problematic groups concentration through social engineering, and more focused on managing the coexistence of people with different (and not only ethnic) backgrounds, potentially but not necessarily conflictual.

These ways of looking may be more helpful to understand some strengths and weaknesses of these places such as the capacity of some local association to strike root and cope with everyday life problems, or the level and nature of some conflicts. A comprehension of these aspects could be helpful also to understand what kind of role may be played by the public hand – provider, enabler, conflict mediator, regulatory. This does not mean that all the resources to cope with the problematic aspects of these neighbourhood could be found inside them, but that in the comparison between the insiders and the outsiders images some new paths of research and action may be explored.

References

- Allen C., Powell R., Casey R., Coward S. (2005), *Mixed Tenure, Twenty Years On: Nothing Out of the Ordinary*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Ambrosini M. (2010), *Richiesti e respinti*, il Saggiatore, Milano.
- Arrigoni P. (2011), *Terre di nessuno. Come nasce la paura metropolitana*, Melampo, Milano.
- Atkinson R., Helms G. (2007), *Securing an Urban Renaissance*, The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Banca Etica (2008), *Progetto di riqualificazione e miglioramento della qualità della vita della zona adiacente alla stazione FFSS*, Banca Etica, Padova.
- Bobbio L. (1996), *La democrazia non abita a Gordio*, Angeli, Milano.
- Bolt G. (2009), “Combating residential segregation of ethnic minorities in European cities”, in *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 24, pp. 397-405.



- Briata P. (2010), “*Dar spazio. Il governo dei territori dell’immigrazione in quattro città italiane*”, in *Foedus* n. 28.
- Briata P. (2011a), “Oltre la mescolanza. Le politiche contro la segregazione spaziale in un contesto di crisi del welfare”, in *Archivio di studi urbani e regionali* n. 100, pp. 9-29.
- Briata P. (2011b), “La ‘normalità perduta’ dei luoghi del commercio etnico. Governo del territorio tra stereotipi e sperimentazioni”, in *Archivio di studi urbani e regionali* n. 101-102, pp. 32-53.
- Butler T. (2003), *London Calling. The Middle Classes and the Re-making of Inner London*, Berg, Oxford.
- Cattacin S. (2006), *Why Not “Ghettos”? The Governance of Migration in the Splintering City*, Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations 2/06, Malmö.
- Cole I., Goodchild B. (2001), “Social Mix and the Balanced Community”, in *GeoJournal*, 51.
- Crosta P.L. (1998), *Politiche, Quale conoscenza per l’azione territoriale*, Angeli, Milano.
- Diappi L. (2009) (ed), *Rigenerazione urbana e ricambio sociale*, Angeli, Milano.
- Donzelot J. (2006), *Quand la ville se défait. Quelle politique face a la crise des banlieues?* Seuil, Paris.
- Fainstein S. (2005) “Cities and Diversity: Should we want it? Can we plan for it?” in *Urban Affairs Review*, 41 (1).
- Fioretti C. (2011). Torpignattara: banlieue italiana o spazio della coabitazione multietnica?”, in *Abitare l’Italia: territori, economie, diseguaglianze. Atti della XIV Conferenza della Società Italiana degli Urbanisti, Planum, The European Journal of Planning on-line*.
- Gadda A. (2012), *Via Padova: un territorio di-segnato dalle pratiche delle differenze*, Tesi di laurea in Pianificazione territoriale, Politecnico di Milano.
- Grandi F. (2008) (ed), *Immigrazione e dimensione locale*, Angeli, Milano.
- Home R. (1997), “Ethnic Minorities and the Planning System”, in *Rising East*, vol.1, n.1, pp. 59-77.
- Kearns A. (2002), “Response: From Residential Disadvantage to Opportunity? Reflections on British and European Policy and Research”, in *Housing Studies* 17 (1), pp. 145-150.
- Lees L., Slater T., Wyly E. (2008) (eds), *Gentrification*, Routledge, London.
- Marcuse P., Van Kempen R. (2000) (eds), *Globalizing Cities*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Musterd S., Andersson R. (2005), “Housing Mix, Social Mix, and Social Opportunities”, in *Urban Affairs Review*, 40 (6), pp. 1-30.
- Paba G. (2010), *Corpi urbani. Differenze, interazioni, politiche*, Angeli, Milano.
- Park R. (1925), *The City*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Raco M. (2003), “New Labour, Community and the Future of Britain’s Urban Renaissance”, in Imrie R., Raco M. (eds), *Urban Renaissance ?*, The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Raco M. (2009), “A growth agenda without growth: English spatial policy, sustainable communities, and the death of neo-liberal project?”, in *Geojournal*, published online 12.11.2009.
- Rivera A. (2009), *Regole e roghi. Metamorfosi del razzismo*, Dedalo, Bari.
- Tosi A. (2000), “L’inserimento degli immigrati: case e città”, in Marcetti C., Solimano N., Tosi A. (eds), *Le culture dell’abitare*, Polistampa, Firenze, pp. 63-86.
- Urban Task Force (1999), *Towards an Urban Renaissance*, Spon, London.
- Whitehead C. (2002), “Response: Housing Tenure and Opportunity”, in *Housing Studies* n. 17 (1), pp. 63-68.
- Yiftachel O. (1990), “State Policies, Land Control, and Ethnic Minority: The Arabs in the Galilee Region, Israel”, in *Environment and Planning D*, 9.