

WELFARE SPACE IN EUROPE

S. Munarin & M. C. Tosi***

*University IUAV of Venice, Ex Convento delle Terese, Dorsoduro 2206, Venice, Italy,
Email:stefano.munarin@iuav.it

** University IUAV of Venice, Ex Convento delle Terese, Dorsoduro 2206, Venice, Italy,
Email:mariachiara.tosi@iuav.it

ABSTRACT: This essay deals with the spaces of *welfare*, which were constructed during the 20th and at the beginning of 21st century in Europe as spaces for socialization, collective activities, services and infrastructure. To work on this topic with the broadened perspective of the Europe Union is deemed urgent because public space constitutes one of the strong characteristics of contemporary European cities and one of the key areas in which citizens can form their very spirit and sense of citizenship.

To investigate the space of *welfare* means to work out themes of *urbanity*, of *mixité*, and the construction of urban fabrics that are livable, comfortable, sustainable, healthy and safe.

The necessity to go back and reflect upon a forgotten topic also suggests the idea of constructing a comparative atlas of Welfare spaces in Europe and organizing an outline of the different strategies and directions adopted in order to enhance the quality of urban space, reduce disparity, help in governing conflict and contribute to the effective progress of civil daily life.

KEYWORDS: welfare, city, Europe, comfort safety, health, atlas

1 A DIFFERENT POINT OF VIEW

The object of this essay regards the spaces of *welfare* that were constructed during the 20th and at the beginning of 21st century in Europe as spaces for socialization, collective life activities, services and infrastructure. Despite their many limitations, these spaces aimed to guarantee comfort, health and safety to the city, while also giving a spatial form to *welfare state* policies¹.

To work on this topic with the broadened perspective of Europe is deemed urgent for three distinct reasons:

- firstly, because the arrangement of infrastructure and services, and the widespread presence of these public services (schools, hospitals, parks, sports fields, and libraries), even if not always correctly situated or constructed, in our view, constitute one of the key characteristics of the contemporary European city as one of its main factors of identity. In other words, if our cities historically inherited certain identifying elements such as public squares, theatres, churches or castles, the European city of the 20th century instead started to distinguish itself from other cities in the world with the presence of the *products of welfare* – as the physical translation of the *welfare state* and its policies.

- secondly, because the spaces of *welfare* are one of the areas in which citizens can determine their very identity and form a spirit of citizenship. And it is these factors that are even more important today, as Europe prepares itself in receiving the many immigrants who arrive in hopes of obtaining not only home and employment but also the new rights (as well as the duties) that come with citizenship.

- thirdly, because to investigate the space of *welfare* means to work out the themes of *urbanity*, or a *mixité*, through the construction of urban fabrics that are livable, comfortable, healthy and safe. An effective assessment and comparison of experiences and *best practices* regarding such themes can contribute to improving the overall quality in the design of social and welfare services at a European wide level and open up a European debate on the connections between the quality of the spaces of *welfare* and the quality of

¹ Some of the first results deriving from these reflections and studies were published in:_[32]

urban life in European cities.

The following notes attempt to illustrate a potential research topic, which we believe to be important for a possible mobilization of a variety of professional fields and their expertise and interests in the subject matter.

Being involved in the space of welfare means coming to terms with the difficulty of living in many parts of cities and territories that were constructed after World War II, given the hostility that extensive areas of developed land have in relation to their inhabitants, especially in regard to the young, elderly or physically impaired.

In considering this point of view, a strategy of attention emphasizes the importance of a return to observing the city of daily life [1], to inquire about the reasons and the causes of such difficulties and hostility. Much of the strain is partially due to the absence of services, equipment and space for socialization; and in the majority of cases, it seems instead that difficulties and hostilities are due to ill managed organizations, faulty operations, or to the discontinuity of service systems and equipment, which tends to generate uneasiness, a lack of comfort, insecurity and sometimes peril.

Children's day-care or a nursery that is too far from home, the discontinuity of a sidewalk or bicycle path, the absence of a nearby baker, the insufficient shelter of the bus stop, the negligible presence of green spaces and the difficulty to maintain those existing, the inefficiency of drainage systems for roads: all these aspects may be considered a short list in which we can begin to specify what makes for laborious living in our territory.

Starting from a set of characteristics and elements responsible for the difficulty of living, it may be possible to highlight the urban infrastructure, namely that component which does not directly produce individual wealth, but contributes to the wellbeing of a group or community.²

It is therefore necessary to establish a relationship between the difficulties and the hostilities of daily life in the city and the policies and projects aimed at ensuring a higher degree of wellbeing and to rethink urban infrastructure as a possible result, or physical repository of urban *welfare policies*.

This surveying activity is useful in deconstructing the welfare concept that can perhaps be declined with other parameters like comfort, security-safety and health.

When we started this series of reflections it seemed that we had gone a bit past the due date: "*welfare* is in the past" and "there is no sense in researching something that no longer exists". However, it remains true, as Nadia Urbinati stated in June 2008, that we are undergoing a continuous procedure of reducing political policies of the welfare state; so much so that, with the introduction of measures like the so-called "poverty card", there will no longer be a Social State, but rather a series of substituting policies of sporadic relief and aid for the needy [2]. The only path that seemed left to follow was for the State to retreat and leave everything to the rules of the market.

After only a few months, it seems to be a completely different story: State interventions have returned to trend and no government is at all ashamed to dole out billions of Euro in this and that direction, as we now find ourselves with a paradoxical "State socialism for the wealthy and Neo-liberalism for the poor" [3]

Even the idea of a *welfare state* seems to suddenly come back into play and is casually put to practice by unexpected agents of "public power".

It is precisely in facing these contradictory signals that the necessity emerges to investigate such topics. Because, when facing the obsession of fear and the apprehension of the "other", to work with the themes of welfare and the city means also to speak of the research strategies on "wellbeing" operated in articulated and numerous ways by people practicing their daily activities and by the many forms of conviviality and peaceful co-habitation taking place in everyday life; practices that are sometimes obfuscated by the strategies of self-segregation, which is often discussed in the media and also in some higher literary circles.

² Infrastructure is: " the furnishing of a space (community, settlement, region) with public facilities provided by public money conducive to an increase in productivity as well as social security, and thus, in the broadest sense, to promote optimum opportunities of competition and living standards for society and its members" [33]"The totality of public infrastructure and material goods that serve the community (e.g. roads, water distribution, schools, hospitals, etc.) which don't directly produce wealth but form a basis for the economic and social development of a nation [34].

2. FORGETFULNESS

This area of interest has gradually been outlined and developed, starting with observations and acknowledgements regarding the lack of consideration or the merely technical attention with which the space of socialization and collective life is often addressed; while it is precisely such spaces, including services and infrastructure, that should guarantee certain levels of comfort, security and quality to cities, and hence shape their very policies of *welfare*. This insufficient attention is expressed with a plurality of attitudes, ranging from a total ignorance and negation of the physical characteristics of such spaces to treating them simply as a need to be fulfilled³ or as a technical problem to be resolved through a compliancy of standards. While aiming to guarantee minimum quantitative levels, the tendency of such attitudes and approaches often leads to unfavorable simplifications of the relational aspects of these spaces and the issues regarding their spatial character.

Urban projects and policies for the livable city in most European developments, constructed over the past few decades, have often avoided dealing directly with a definition of new space patterns, service, collective infrastructure and social interaction⁴, thus foregoing the possibility of measuring up to more widespread and higher quality goals and objectives, which should instead characterize sectoral politics (health, education, subsidies, housing, etc.) and promote a greater collective wellbeing.

At times, when engaged in the relationship between welfare and the city, attention has almost entirely been focused on the tools and procedures that enable higher conditions of well being, the characteristics of urban standards, the quality of implementation [4], the alignment with urban and social politics, and the need to change from descriptive to performance models, while there tends to be little focus instead on the physical implications of these policies and tools. Moreover, there is implicit recognition of the incapacity of such policies to intercept the link between actions and daily-life experience [5], as they scarcely address the characteristics that urban infrastructure takes on and its ability to make a developed area habitable.

We know that modern urban planning has always held a tight relationship with its coeval public political policies and with policies of the *Welfare State* in particular; so much in fact that, according to Bernardo Secchi, for example, "patient research on the physical and concrete dimension of individual and collective wellbeing... has left a rather solid deposit in the cities of the 21st century" [6]. And perhaps even today, it is for this reason that urban planning appears to be brought back into discussion from the myth of the intangibility of the free market and the exasperated individualism of the "society of opulence" [7]. At the same time however, it is also charged with new expectations connected to the continuous processes of society's re-organisation, facing the risks of globalisation and environmental issues. Therefore it may be useful to go back to thinking of the relationships between urban planning and the public (so to speak) policies of *welfare*. We are well aware of the fact that the policies of a *welfare state* can be interpreted as forms and instruments of a 'biopower' [8], while we also understand that the *welfare state*, as Federico Caffè stated, is not "a failed encumbrance from which to free ourselves" [9]. This provides the courage to think of a *welfare* that presupposes non-return investments, and one that has uncertain benefits that are often posthumously realised.

The other fact that is often forgotten, is that the majority of people that live in a city desire a normal daily existence made up of comfortable and secure spaces [10]. So, if on one hand, the idea has been forgotten that every city dweller can reasonably aspire to wellbeing, comfort and security, as their due rights as citizens, on the other hand, there is a continual and increased mobilization and reorganization of citizens to ensure that these characteristics are updated, and that their future is ensured. [11]

Researching a "normal" existence seems to be the aspect that ties together different population mixes which make up contemporary European society; a society with a strong practical competency of daily living that requires a configuration of spaces characterized by decency, well being, security, health and

³ The criticism expressed in relation to the administrative theory of needs clarifies the idea of associating a service object that is capable of responding to each recognizable need. [35], [36]

⁴ "the contemporary project has avoided a more thoughtful process in relation to daily inhabited space, made up of a dark crowd of houses, workshops, stores, markets and industrial areas, of garden patches, parking lots and playing fields, open land and apparently disproportionate shopping malls in relation to the surrounding context". [37]

independence.

In reflecting on a “new” *welfare* and in recognising the many factors there are to deal with, Anthony Giddens affirmed that “in the society of post-industrial wellbeing” there is urgent need for “a *welfare* that is conceived to increase solidarity... to contribute to a reconciliation of cultural diversity and styles of life within a general social cohesion; while the main social issue is in creating such an equilibrium between the multitudes and social cohesion itself” [12]. Therefore, what we note in frequenting public parks, kindergartens, civic centres, libraries, etc. is that these are, on one hand, the spaces and services produced by the “fruitful seasons of the welfare state”, and, on the other, that this functional equipment, without which the lives of millions of people would be rendered very difficult, are “free” places, of “free access”, wherein the activities of socialisation and sharing are practiced freely.

3. COMFORT, SECURITY-SAFETY, HEALTH

It seems to us that research and engagement in welfare requires observation of the European city in an attempt to construct pertinent technical descriptions regarding the characteristics that these spaces assume today. These descriptions are required in order to express judgments and evaluations regarding the conditions of comfort, safety and health that define urban space, as well as to initiate planning investigations that stem from the same objectives. Therefore, it is perhaps necessary to restart from the description of urban space, while maintaining the physical dimension of welfare as the focus.

Naturally investigating these themes means coming to terms with the real possibilities that have been available over the last few years to construct new urban infrastructure; with the norms, the policies, the projects, but also and above all, the standing that the physical character of these projects has had in the investment programs for increasing social wellbeing. In other words, the spaces, the places, the services and public infrastructure of public interaction will be observed as a dimension and physical translation of *welfare politics*.

Today welfare is frequently reduced to a synonym of sanitary expense and social pensions, so it seems useful and necessary to reassert that it is not the single structure (a hospital or school), but the city with its complex articulation which must be the place in which collective welfare is effected; and it is therefore also the place of funding and public investment.

To study welfare space for us also means engaging in topics regarding security, a phenomenon closely linked to (if not derived from) weakened or lacking urbanity. This encourages the role of those projects and policies that have made heterogeneous and continuous urbanity their strong point to be rehabilitated, attempting to create distance from the all too frequent condition of adjoining cordoned off spaces, or small distinct fortresses in which “people value physical and spiritual independence, as opposed to a feeling of belonging and the identity of place. In the cityscape, the spaces which are excluded become milestones that mark the disintegration of community life that was founded and shared there.” [13]

One other issue that should be addressed, is the fact that the themes of security, and conversely fear, resulting in a growing number of enclaves and enclosures, have become dominant issues. Numerous books, doctorate theses, and seminaries are dedicated to these topics. Our impression however is that, through their proliferation, such research and inquiry regarding different forms of insecurity/fear, can end up collectively and involuntarily painting a dramatic situation without escape. This is why we think it’s more useful and constructive to observe the topic from a different perspective: without emphasizing fears and insecurities, to investigate instead what has been obtained and what can be accomplished in order to construct a comfortable and healthy civil space, a place of encounter and exchange, of coexistence and of social interaction, and one that is consequently “secure”.

Investigating the difficulty of living also means relating to the characteristics that comfort has assumed in the contemporary city, in addition to themes regarding health.

Wellbeing in a space, enjoying it pleasurably, is certainly one of the objectives that have had an important role in considerations made by people involved in urban space. The difficulties associated with living the city have led increasing numbers of people to find individual solutions to the issue, to search for comfort inside their own home, or abandon urban space all together.⁵ The transfer of the city toward

⁵ “Comfort is a central theme throughout the 19th century, and the results that doctors, hygienists and engineers had obtained for the entire city fall into the domestic sphere”[38]

suburban areas, toward dispersed living conditions, also leads to the theme of the search for individual comfort. Today then, we must enquire as to the reasons for this want, and the lack of comfort that characterizes important parts of the city built after WWII. Such enquiry should also avoid all generic or superficial attitudes in order to effectively identify the diverse conditions and the specific reasons for that lacking. With the conviction that it is no longer possible to use the veneer of time as an explanation for this lack of ease, we should aim to better understand the reasons and the causes of inconvenience and difficulties generated by moving through, stopping in, and the general use of urban space.

The stress related to daily life in the city at times takes on a detrimental aspect. In recent years local communities have made the effort to communicate the particular importance of widespread environmental quality as a common wealth to be preserved through apt welfare policies.⁶ In this case also, it is necessary to show and clarify the relevance that certain methodologies relating to this issue take on: a wooded area, sound proofing, flood mitigation measures, alternative transportation networks, reclamation of landfills all have value, but it is the method and the way that they are planned in the area which requires attention. A focus on wellbeing means to go beyond the obtaining of minimum or maximum quantities, and effectively reply to questions, with the mindset of carefully considering an objective, man made or other, in order to avoid later intervention for the mitigation⁷ of difficulties with which all this is accepted and experienced by citizens. [14]

Looking into these topics, one wonders about what creates common well being today, and the possibility of re-gaining the fixed social assets that have been used and consumed over the past decades. How common welfare can be reconstructed in order to be both a product and a prerequisite of any real and meaningful welfare policy (it is no use building hospitals to cure cancer if the city itself generates the disease, and it is not sensible to worry about the required increase in subsidies if the conditions to encourage an increase in births is not promoted).

It is along this path that the debate involves certain “densified” concepts (“wellbeing”, “common-good”, “public realm”, etc), and one may encounter certain reflections of those, like Cristina Bianchetti, who point out the “inactuality” of some ideas about the public realm [15], as well as the “fragility” [16] of the very idea of public realm/public space, and even the re-discovery of a long-standing tradition of relationships between modern projects and collective spaces. [17]

Reflecting on the relationship between the spaces of welfare and social practices, it may be interesting for us to consider the concepts of “social capital of reciprocity” and “relation-based goods” in particular. [18], [19]

In other words, this research should encourage us to observe the intense use and consumption of existing fixed assets generated by the developmental models of the contemporary city, which leads us to ask with a sense of urgency: what is the new fixed asset and how is it being generated? What are the new collective goods, the “common happiness” that recent urban phenomena have been able to construct?

Perhaps also some environmental improvement programs, the promotion of regional parks, the rehabilitation of roadways, a richer and more varied offer of common public open space, or, more generally speaking, a different environmental policy could be interpreted as a new *welfare policy*, the search for a more hospitable and habitable place, one that is less demanding and hostile, where collective and not only individual wellbeing is possible.⁸

4. AN ATLAS OF WELFARE SPACE IN EUROPE

In keeping in line with the above mentioned contents and objectives, we are considering certain

⁶ In many of the cases, regarding large environmental disasters, a change in public sensitivity and opinion emerges regarding air, water, soil, or the nature that surrounds us; a common idea whereby the environment should not be consumed, but needs to be respected as a common good.

⁷ In this case we are referring to frequent mitigation measures, which are required following large environmental conservation projects, such as the Mose Project in Venice, or large-scale infrastructure, such as high speed trains.

⁸ Similarly, Arturo Lanzani suggests we view landscape politics similarly to welfare politics. Recently he wrote: “In this way landscape politics acts as a type of welfare politics; the search for a more hospitable and livable space, less tiring and hostile, where one can ‘feel good’ seems to be significant in our nation, and it almost becomes the central element of a reform policy”. [39]

actions which aim to keep the attention focused on social policies, the physical dimension of such policies, the ways in which these are translated into concrete livable spaces, the dimension of identity and the aesthetic aspects of such spaces in relation to each other.

In recognizing the fact that European countries have each had different traditions and experiences of *welfare policies and services*, it may be interesting to establish a comparative description and analysis in considering the infrastructures and overall interventions in the spatial and urban fabric of European cities, which attempted to provide responses to the needs of *welfare* policies, such as comfort, security and health. In addition, the more recent changes, which affected the urban and architectural spaces of these premises under the re-configuration of contemporary welfare policies, should also be investigated.

Among the numerous attempts to “define” Europe and its “identity”, a recent and supple book by George Steiner proposes considering the relevant significance of five main characteristics in the history of the European continent, proposing “five axioms to define Europe: its *caffés*, a practicable landscape at human scale, roads and neighbourhoods that take on the names of statesman, scientists, artists and writers..., the double lineage to both Athens and Jerusalem and ultimately the awareness of a conclusive chapter” [20].

We may perhaps recognise, as Steiner did, that some places (like the *caffés*) have carried out important roles in the definition of European culture. And taking from Maria Malatesta, we can say that “democracy, as a form of policy and rule of living... did not start off as an abstract option... (but) was the concrete expression of ways of living... which presented itself in the folds of everyday living”, and hence that “Democracy was born in society’s clubs, *caffés*, around card games or billiards, in reading and discussing the daily news with friends” [21]. Therefore, today it may be just as relevant to observe the role carried out by the spaces of *welfare* in the formation of European citizens.

It seems particularly pertinent at this point to add a sixth axiom to the list, in recognising that Europe is characterised (also) by the presence of social equipment, intended as the spaces and material produced by the modern policies of *welfare*.

This is why we have attentively focussed on observing the places of *welfare* in these decades; for it is within these places that a considerable part of social relations take place in Europe: parks, sports facilities, schools of various levels and types, hospitals and clinics, civic centres, libraries, etc. are the places within which space and time are shared, people meet and encounter one another, rules and compartments are acquired, and European citizenship is formed.

We are also seeing that this characteristic is not simply something that we inherit from the past, but rather something that we have created ourselves. This is a recent occurrence and still in its processes of definition; while it tells us what we have been looking for throughout modernity, it also shows us a brighter side of our last century.

In using a critical point of view regarding Europe, the city and modernity, one that embodies the considerations developed in this essay, this activity could lead to the production of an “Atlas of welfare space in Europe” in which the different branches of “urban fabrics” and infrastructures are represented in the sample of European cities, with a focus on the different approaches to the themes of comfort, security and health. In addition, a comparative analysis may be conducted with regard to the projects, policies, norms and regulations that have been applied in various European countries where there has been a central focus on the spatial dimension of such themes. This activity could lead to a better understanding of *best practices*; also because, even with certain limitations, in modern and contemporary cities, one can recognize the cases in which this theme has been handled effectively, such as those virtuous situations in which there was an attempt at giving form to urban infrastructure, and to using the outfits of welfare to build new and interesting parts of cities.

The idea of compiling an Atlas, to shape themes relative to the city, a systematic compilation of information relative to a specific theme, that in this case is the space of welfare, is closely tied to the idea that to be able to abandon conventional views, particularly interpretations regarding cities, it is necessary “to avoid abstract typologies, and analyze more concrete situations” [22].

This requires a return to exploring and carefully describing parts of the city, to truly interpret them, and avoid all inward references.

In light of this task, the Atlas is to be considered a tool that attempts to reestablish a geography of logical consequences between events in urban spaces, while also eliminating reductive interpretations that have been established on welfare policies and the city.

The Atlas is to be a living document containing systematic and partial readings, as well as a majority

of compilations of events and processes. The methodology with which the significant cases are investigated may not necessarily be consistent, but can vary in relation to the desired meaning of the term *welfare*. It will make it possible to effectively investigate spatial use practices while providing detailed descriptions of functional and morphological organizations: diverse descriptive forms that will converge toward a common and unitary expression.

5. SOME REMARKS

As we have tried to specify at the beginning of this essay, the question motivating our interests regards the methods and the configurations that city infrastructure would have to assume in order to make daily life easier.

Starting a reflection and discussion regarding these issues, which we have only begun to delineate, seems useful for many different reasons:

- To allow more visibility to the relevance at an urban level of policies regarding the *welfare state*, which are instead often only viewed with reference to healthcare, in order to help the emergence of a plurality of spatial configurations that can and should adopt more ample social policies.

- To shift the attention from the recognition of a single or networked common good and /or commodity, to a more attentive consideration of the spaces of welfare in their entirety as a common good.

- To deal with the spaces of welfare with a more articulate approach with an amplified look at Europe and its additional single nations with their specific traditions of *welfare state* policies.

- To sustain a multi-disciplinary approach which allows us to deal with the spaces of welfare from different viewpoints through which continuous and reciprocated interrogations can be developed, and also to favor a dynamic circulation of ideas and expertise. In this sense, the photographer's, the citizen's, the technician's, and the administrators' perspectives and viewpoints will all be considered tools that can be used to activate a more effective cooperation between countries. This therefore attempts to favor a trans-disciplinary exchange within a trans-national context.

- To establish some informal welfare networks, recognizing the methodologies by which single individuals form alliances to supply collective answers to the absence or to the lacking operation of urban infrastructure. These alliances are functional to the improvement of the quality of collective life and the capabilities⁹ or substantial freedom of every individual, that have to be seen as active agents of transformation and no longer as passive recipients of benefits. [23], [24]

- To start a reflection that could extend toward extreme conditions, towards those contexts in which the absence of comfort, security and health prevail. Here we refer to the settlements described in "Planet of Slum" by Mike Davies [25] in which uneasiness and difficulties dominate; and this could constitute the future direction of this inquiry.

- To better understand the spaces of welfare, meant as a space in which groups can collectively recognize one another and within which they can construct their own sense of identity with the necessary infrastructure for carrying out the tasks of daily life.

All these themes interest us greatly especially because they allow us to reflect upon the city as a "support system" which is able to host and activate social relations. As urban planners we tend to think that we can conduct research and work through project-design directly on those "spaces of the public" which allow/help (without of course obliging or causing) the development of practices of sociality.

It may be useful here to develop a better understanding of the concepts of reciprocity and relational dynamics, because, if its true that urban planners, in studying the distribution and allocation of land use values, are also occupied by "positional goods", today it is important to see if and how lived-in spaces, considered as "infrastructure", are capable of hosting and encouraging relational activities [26].

This is perhaps simply a new way of bringing back attention to an old question that is however still of fundamental importance: i.e. the city as an "instrument of impersonal lives, and as the structure in which the diversity and complexity of persons, their interests and lifestyles become usable as social experiences" [27] .

Yet again, what interests us in particular about the city is its being an "instrument of co-habitation", a place where, through the obligation of sharing one's own life experience with others, people learn to live

⁹ "The perspective of human capability focuses, on the other hand, on the ability -the substantive freedom- of people to lead the lives they have reason to value and to enhance the real choices they have".[40]

together. This does not guarantee automatic results, however it does allow for the roles of players in the game to unfold.

In thinking that “urban spaces are environments for the practice of democracy through a trusting citizenship” and that today “many pleasures simply derive from established relations with others” [28], it seems useful to go back to observing the social practices of public interaction and, for urban planners, to observe those places where such relations are developed. However, we should always start with the assumption that what holds us all together must be an objective, a “goal”, or an idea of the future rather than something that we have inherited from the past [29].

It is therefore with this perspective that careful observation and attention are placed on the given practices that develop within public spaces intended as “platforms for the practices of socialisation” and where the processes of social interaction are free and at no cost. Such spaces are at the basis of these practices, but at the same time, they can also become a sort of “materialisation” of their own physical expression. Moreover, such prospects can be a productive means to set forth pertinent critiques on urban policies, which, in recent years, have affected the European city. Although many of such policies have succeeded in conferring dignity to the city in generating a sense of pride to live therein, the question remains about what they have done in order to “favour active citizenship” and develop universal rights of citizenship.

We know quite well that we are reworking an old discussion, and maybe only renewing claims on the “right to the city”, but we feel that today this has become *necessary*. On one hand, to investigate the relationship between welfare policies and the city, intended as a “structure of impersonal relations”, is an issue of great social relevance that cannot sufficiently or easily be exhausted; and on the other hand, if it is true that the “worst illness that afflicts welfare today is its loss of legitimacy due to the delegitimization of its visionary core” [30], it may be of use, also in the field of urban planning, to investigate and explore what tools and which projects (as ideas of the city) we can imagine in order to propose improving “*the logistic essentiality*” and the “*sustainable spatiality*” of our cities [31], to reduce disparity (not differences), while helping in governing conflict and contributing to the positive development of civil life.

REFERENCES

- [1] Certeau, M. de, “L’invention du quotidien”, tome 1: Arts de faire, coll. «10-18», (1980), Paris, Union générale d’éditions.
- [2] Urbinati, N., «Dal welfare alla carità», la Repubblica, 20 giugno (2008).
- [3] Beck, U. «La Merkel e il sogno di Churchill», la Repubblica, 16 marzo, (2009).
- [4] Pasqui, G., “Città, popolazioni, politiche”, Milano, Jaca Book, 2008.
- [5] Karrer, F. e Ricci, M., (eds) “Città e nuovo welfare. L’apporto dell’urbanistica nella costruzione di un nuovo stato sociale”, Roma, Officina, 2003.
- [6] Secchi, B., “La città del ventesimo secolo”, Roma-Bari, Laterza, 2005.
- [7] Irti, N., “La tenaglia. In difesa dell’ideologia politica”, Roma-Bari, Laterza, 2008.
- [8] Negri, A., “Fabrique de Porcelaine”, Paris, Editions Stock, 2006.
- [9] Caffè, F., “In difesa del “welfare state”. Saggi di politica economica”, Torino, Rosenberg & Sellier, 1986.
- [10] Balbo, L., “Friendly”, Milano, Anabasi, 1994.
- [11] Mc Kinney, C., “A Park for Every Neighborhood”, in Byles J. And Kazi O., The New York 2030 Notebook, New York, Institute for Urban Design, 2008, p. 15.
- [12] Giddens, A., “Europe in the Global Age”, Cambridge, Polity Press 2006.
- [13] Bauman, Z., “Fiducia e paura nella città”, Milano, Mondadori, 2005.
- [14] Bobbio, L., Dansero, G., “La TAV e la Valle di Susa. Geografie in competizione”, Torino, Allemandi, 2008.
- [15] Bianchetti, C., “Urbanistica e sfera pubblica”, Roma, Donzelli, 2008.
- [16] Innerarity, D., “El Nuevo Espacio Publico”, Madrid, Espasa Calpe, 2006.
- [17] Avermaete, T., Havik K., Teerds H. (Eds), “Architectural positions. Architecture, modernity and the public sphere”, Amsterdam, Sun, 2009.
- [18] Pizzorno, A., “Perché si paga il benzinaio? Per una teoria del capitale sociale”, AA. VV., Il capitale sociale, Bologna, il Mulino, 2001.
- [19] Zamagni, S., “Gratuità e agire economico: il senso del volontariato”, Working Paper n. 9, Facoltà di

-
- Economia dell'Università di Bologna – sede di Forlì, Marzo, 2005.
- [20] Steiner, G., "The Idea of Europe", Amsterdam, Nexus Publisher, 2005.
- [21] Malatesta, M., "La democrazia al circolo", M. Agulhon, "Il salotto, il circolo e il caffè. I luoghi della sociabilità nella Francia Borghese", Donzelli, Roma, 1993.
- [22] Tafuri, M., "Ricerca del rinascimento", Torino, Einaudi, 1992.
- [23] Sen, A., "Development as Freedom", Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999.
- [24] Cottino, P., "Competenze possibili. Sfera pubblica e potenziali sociali nella città", Milano, Jaca Book, 2009.
- [25] Davies, M., "Planet of Slums", London, Verso, 2006.
- [26] Negri, A., "Fabrique de Porcelaine", Paris, Editions Stock, 2006.
- [27] Sennett, R., "The Fall of Public Men", New York, Knopf, 1976.
- [28] Amin, A., Thrift, N., "Cities. Reimagining the urban", Cambridge, Polity Press, 2001.
- [29] Cacciari, M., "La città", Villa Verucchio (Rn), Pazzini, 2004.
- [30] Habermas, J. "The New Obscurity. The Crisis of the Welfare State and the Exhaustion of Utopian Energies" in *Philosophy Social Criticism*; 11: 1-18, (1986).
- [31] Bollea G., "Genitori grandi maestri di felicità", Milano, Feltrinelli, 2005.
- [32] Munarin, S., Tosi, M.C., (eds) "Lo spazio del welfare in Europa", in *Urbanistica* No. 139, Agosto (2009), pp. 88-107
- [33] Jurgen Evert, K., "Dictionary Landscape and Urban Design", Berlin, Springer, 2001.
- [34] De Mauro, T., "Il dizionario della lingua italiana", Milano, 2000).
- [35] Pinson, M., "Besoin et habitus. Critique de la notion de besoin et théorie de la pratique", Paris, CSU, 1978.
- [36] Tosi, A., "Piano e bisogni: due tradizioni di analisi", *ASUR* No 21, 29-54, (1984).
- [37] Secchi, B., "La città europea contemporanea e il suo progetto", P. Viganò (ed), *New territories*, Roma, Officina, 2004.
- [38] Secchi, B., "La prima lezione di urbanistica", Roma-Bari, Laterza, 2000.
- [39] Lanzani, A., "Geografie, paesaggi, pratiche dell'abitare e progetti di sviluppo", *Territorio* No 34, 19-36, (2004).
- [40] Sen, A., "Development as Freedom", Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999.
