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1. Introduction

1.1 Subject of the thesis

Segregation has become an important issue on the political agendas of European nations and over the years it has obtained quite a negative connotation (S. Musterd & M. De Winter, 1998 p: 666). Even in the European Commission’s “Cities of Tomorrow” report a view on European cities as places of advanced social progress is promoted: “… with a high degree of social cohesion, balance and integration… with small disparities within and among neighbourhoods and a low degree of spatial segregation and social marginalisation…” (DG Regio 2011, Cities of Tomorrow). European cities have always been characterised by a differentiated social topography. As a result of their location, history, urban structure and housing stock a city’s neighbourhoods are shaped by quite different social milieus. Many of them have a broad mixture of inhabitants others appear quite homogeneous, especially the neighbourhoods of the rich. This is normally seen as a reflection of the varied living conditions. However, the spatial concentration of poverty is considered a lack of social cohesion and results in serious disadvantages for the inhabitants and the city as a whole. Most of the time the focus is on poor residential areas and on areas with a large ethnic minority population. Frequently in Europe, segregation is regarded as a political issue only when it is associated with deprivation (S. Musterd & M. De Winter, 1998 p: 666).

Spatial segregation implies spatial concentration of a certain group in an area (Kempen and Özuekren, 1998 p: 1632) it is really visible in the cities and can have many consequences linked to migration problems, parts of cities that become “ghettos”, cases of gentrification where improvement has pulled out the poorest people and social homogeneity (URBACT Workshop “Against divided cities”). The aim of the research is to analyse the way two European Countries (Sweden and Italy) perceive and are approaching the issue of segregation. In order to do this I will use case-study approach. Thus, I will focus on four case studies based on two cases in Sweden, Malmö and Jönköping, and two cases in Italy, Milan and Naples and find out how the cities are dealing with the problem. The intent is to analyse case studies with the same goals but different kind of policy approaches. Some cities apply “horizontal” or “people based” policies which are not linked to any particular spatial level but the focus is on improving the situation of people through sectoral policies as education, health, housing and public services; others apply “area based” policies which, on the contrary, focus on improving a defined area through urban and social regeneration programmes.

In the second chapter of the thesis I am going to describe theories and perspectives that I found during the literature review about segregation, and thus provides a theoretical background, as it contributes to the understanding of the problem and the different ways it can be perceived.

For many politicians in fact, the core of the problem is not the spatial dimension of deprivation but deprivation itself (Musterd 1998). Another view is associated with the theories of American scientists such as Lewis (1966), Wilson (1987) and Denton (1993) which describe negative effects of living in a disadvantaged
neighbourhood on opportunities of individuals in that neighbourhood. Positive arguments for segregation exist as well. For Polanyi (1944) spatial concentration of a particular group of people can be of benefit for ‘market exchange’, ‘redistribution by the welfare state’ and ‘reciprocity’ (S. Musterd & M. De Winter, 1998 p: 666), allowing members of the minority group to fortify their cultural identity. However many politicians in Europe see segregation as a problem, rather than creates unified spaces for cultural interaction, exchange and adaptation it presents a risk to render it cities a series of distinct, self-contained but ultimately dislocated communities. I would support as well the negative view of segregation.

The research question guiding the thesis is:

How are two European Countries (Sweden and Italy) perceiving and approaching the issue of social and spatial segregation in their cities?

1.2 Structure

- **Theoretical Background**

The second chapter of the thesis is going to describe theories and perspectives that I found during the literature review about segregation. Thus, provides a theoretical background, as it contributes to the understanding of the problem and the different ways it can be perceived. I analyse definitions from different perspectives and look at different concepts. For instance segregation can be seen as a deprivation problem, when the focus is on the concentration of impoverished people, ethnic and cultural minorities that are socially excluded, or as a spatial problem associating this view, for example, with the “neighbourhood effects” theory; spatial concentration of poor people tend to reduce opportunities in society and the risk of becoming a victim of crime in a disadvantaged neighbourhood is higher (Musterd, 1998 p:666).

- **Policy Study**

In addition to the theoretical background, with the intention to increase the credibility of my research, in the third chapter an investigation of EU, Italian and Swedish policy were conducted. With the focus on the national level an overview of the municipalities policy approach to segregation helped to contextualize the issue.
1.3 Methodology

The aim of the research, as I already mentioned, is to analyse the concept of segregation, different views on perceiving the issue and how two European Countries, Italy and Sweden, are trying to tackle the problem. In order to answer to my research question I used case study approach as a method to conduct the research: literature review helped me to collect and analyse the data, both for the definition of segregation and for policy approaches. I started to study more broadly the concept of segregation, giving a theoretical overview about the issue, and by focusing on the debates around it. I looked at articles and reports of European researchers that have analysed the problem in the latest years, European theories as well as American theories of the Twentieth century and compared them with the analysis of policy approaches in order to have a framework that would help me later with the case studies. For the policy approach I used mostly reports and planning acts by municipalities and EU.

The research is based mainly on the RESTATE Reports “Large housing estates in European cities” in particular the Swedish and Italian cases. This is because I found really hard to find projects (especially regarding the swedish case) in English and get interviews from the people involved. The RESTATE Reports were really useful to have an overview on policies and practices for the two countries and then make me able to compare Italy and Sweden and conclude giving similarities and differences.

Case Studies

I choose the case study method in order to answer at my research question of how segregation take place in specific contexts. The author Yin (1994) points out that case studies are the preferred strategy when “how” and “why” questions are posed and he define them as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context and addresses a situation in which the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident”. For those reasons I found it the most useful approach to answer to my research question. However, there are criticisms related to the weaknesses of this approach. For example that it provides little basis for scientific generalization, but I would support what Yin states: “the real business of case study is particularization, not generalization” (Yin 1994).

Italy and Sweden are representative cases for segregation in the European context as they can represent different Countries that are dealing with the issue of segregation. I choose these Countries mostly because I wanted to analyse two Countries that can be considered different from many point of view. They represents different examples of welfare states and that led me to think of their possible different views and kind of approach to segregation, according to Musterd “segregation levels are lower where welfare state models are characterized by strong redistribution regimes and more moderate social inequality” (Musterd, 2005 p: 342). I am going to verify this statement through the research and including it in the conclusion chapter.
2. Segregation: Theoretical background

2.1 Segregation as a problem

It is difficult in the research literature to find a clear and common definition on what segregation is, there are different ways of perceiving the issue. Segregation is defined as: *the separation or isolation of a race, class, or ethnic group by enforced or voluntary residence in a restricted area, by barriers to social intercourse, by separate educational facilities, or by other discriminatory means* (Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary Tenth Edition).

To help my research I choose a question that will guide my literature review:

- Why and how do we define segregation as a problem?

In this research I used mostly articles by European researchers that have analysed the issue of segregation during the last years, debates around policies that have been implemented but also theories of American scientists of the twentieth century. Already in 1920s, the human ecology model of segregation, developed by a group of sociologists known collectively as the “Chicago School”, explained residential patterns of segregation by analysing the city as a “separate entity” rather than as a “reflection and manifestation of the wider society”. The Chicago school views cities as representations of migrant flows, which created “… a chain reaction with each preceding immigrant wave moving outwards and being succeeded by more recent, poorer immigrants (Kemper, Ozuekren 1998 p: 1637).

In the sociological tradition of the United States, the concept of segregation was seized mainly through indicators related to ethnicity of individuals, while in Europe generally through the socio-economic status and composition of social classes, for the genre, the level of education of the resident population and housing quality.

Most of the European researchers seem to agree on the fact that the emergence of urban decay and deprived neighbourhoods is connected with social segregation, which tends to concentrate the poor in the least attractive parts of a city, mostly peripheral areas. But it is not always obvious why some neighbourhoods have initiated a process of decline and others have not. They are the visible signs that cities are subject to special socio-spatial forces that create social and physical inequality, unstable conditions and sometimes destruction (H. Andersen, 2002 p: 154). There is much debate about whether and to what extent spatial segregation in turn reproduces or reinforces social segregation and inequality.

Segregation means separation, and more specifically the spatial separation of different groups of population (Martinson 1995). Segregation is visible in cities but cannot be understood exclusively on the spatial level. It is related to geography and can be categorized into different types, e.g. social, economic, demographic and
ethnic segregation. Often used synonyms are marginalization (Wacquant in “Urbanoutcast”), exclusion, polarization, dynamic and multiscalar process of production of socio/spatial inequalities (Massey et al. 1988). The spatial concentration of certain groups in a specific area is not per sé problematic, the problem is if it is a result of choice or constrain (URBACT Workshop “Against divided cities”). Segregation in fact, can either be voluntary, e.g. people preference of living, people from certain country would prefer to live in a place where there are other people of the same background. As noticed spatial segregation has various causes and Massey concludes that, “in any single neighbourhood, whatever its overall qualities, we might find that some residents are trapped within it, others use it as a temporary base from which to rise, and others- those with the most choice prefer it as a culturally agreeable environment (Logan, Wenquan 2002 p: 320).

This can be also a voluntary decision that may be due to easy communication and sharing common values. Or forced segregation, like for instance when an ethnic minority is not allowed to certain public goods such as schools etc. Voluntary segregation has become a new force, with the proliferation of gated communities in both northern and southern hemispheres. This trend seems to have several motivations, including both supply and demand factors. On the demand side, residents might be attracted to the perception of security or a new lifestyle.

The concentration of impoverished people, ethnic and cultural minorities in disadvantaged neighbourhoods moreover, intensifies the existing social disparities. Especially the social exclusion of some ethnic and cultural minorities is a main driver for spatial segregation (Conet’s guide to social cohesion, 2011). Spatial segregation is undesired; a variety of population is desired (according to income as well as according to ethnicity) (Musterd, De Winter, 1998 p: 673). One common element in policy today, in Europe and elsewhere seems to be that the economic restructuring as well as the welfare state impacts on social and spatial inequality are key factors to the understanding of division in cities (Musterd, Priemus, Kempen 1999 p: 575). What comes out is that in general, segregation levels are lower (but still present) where welfare state models are characterized by strong redistribution regimes and more moderate social inequality (Musterd, 2005 p: 342). People’s poverty, it is argued, is partly improved by welfare policies which have a role in alleviating the effects of poverty (Musterd, 2005; Wacquant 2008). But how differences in welfare state regimes affect the degree of social segregation and social exclusion is still unanswered.

From the research emerge two different views on segregation that I would argue (as we can further notice from the case studies) may influence policy approaches:

- Segregation as a deprivation problem
- Segregation as a spatial problem
2.2 Segregation as a deprivation problem

For many researchers (Musterd, De Winter, Anderrson et al.) segregation is regarded as a political issue only when it is associated with deprivation. The spatial concentration and exclusion of people who are well off hardly receives attention, in spite of the fact that “divided cities” result from the isolation of the rich as well as the poor. That means that the core of the problem is not the spatial dimension but deprivation itself. According to Musterd “the only reason to target deprived areas is related to the fact that so many deprived people can be found there together ” and this intensifies the existing social disparities. According to Hans Skifter Andersen “deprived neighbourhoods are mainly understood as just spatial concentrations of poor people - ‘pockets of poverty”. As a consequence of this understanding area based initiatives to reduce deprivation of neighbourhoods often are regarded as just efforts to combat social exclusion at a local level”.

Deprived urban areas are mainly understood as another aspect of deprivation stemming from the general exclusion of people in globalised cities (Andersen, 2001 p: 768).

2.3 Segregation as a spatial problem

This view is associated with the theories of American scientists such as Lewis (1966), Wilson (1987) and Massey & Denton (1993). They describe, in fact, the negative effects of living in a disadvantaged neighbourhood. The most well-known theories highlight possible negative effects through socialization processes that are regarded as negative (Wilson 1987). A spatial concentration of unemployed people, for example, would provide negative role models for youngsters, and this would reduce their efforts to improve their skills and subsequently reduce their labour market opportunities. Regarding this theories it is of crucial importance if social ghettos “have a negative influence on upward social mobility for the residents of the neighbourhood” (Ostendorf, Musterd, 2001 p: 372). If neighbourhood effects are substantial there are good reasons to consider spatial pockets of poverty as a special problem that should be encountered by public measures.

In many contexts, for example in the UK, Sweden, the Netherlands and elsewhere, there is also a belief that diversification of the population helps to ‘enrich’ the social networks and to create new interaction opportunities, particularly for low-income households. Tenure mixing and social mixing are regarded as appropriate policy strategies to overcome the risk of neighbourhood effects. Spatial segregation of the population on the basis of economic and ethnic characteristics can, moreover, have harmful effects on the social participation of the individual (S. Musterd, M. De Winter, 1998 p: 666).
Commonly urban decay and the creation of deprived neighbourhoods is understood as a consequence of segregation. The relationship between these phenomena is, however, more complex and the connection, to some extent, also works the other way around in the sense that urban decay creates segregation (H. Andersen, 2002 p: 155). In the figure below H. Andersen gives a representation of the interaction between segregation and deprived neighbourhoods. It is an attempt to illustrate these considerations. The model does not include the basic causes for social and spatial inequality but only looks at the connection between segregation and deprivation of neighbourhoods (H. Andersen, 2002 p: 155).

The main consequence of segregation is the concentration of poverty, two aspects can be considered at the same time as consequences and causes of segregation, social inequality and spatial inequality. The “exclusion of people” creates social inequality as the “exclusion of places” creates spatial inequality both are causes and consequences of the segregation process.

**Figure 1.** Segregation model.

![Segregation Model](image)

**Source:** Andersen 2002.
2.4 Consequences of segregation

In my view, two important and interesting consequences of segregation’s process to include in this study are neighbourhood effects and stigmatization.

The so called “extra negative effects” of living in a disadvantaged neighbourhood is associated with the theories of American scientists such as Lewis (1966), Wilson (1987) and Massey and Denton (1993). They describe the risk of living in such areas on the opportunities and aspirations of the residents, the risk of becoming victim of crime, quality of education, lack of social participation and low integration in the labour market. The literature suggests that certain neighbourhood characteristics (mainly deprivation) have a negative effect on a range of individual social, economic, and health outcomes. Wilson (1987; 1991) is generally regarded as the starting point of the neighbourhood effects debate, he developed his notion of negative neighbourhood effects within the context of the labour market and the problem of long term unemployment. He suggested that concentrations of individuals experiencing long term unemployment in certain neighbourhoods can lead to outcomes that include “negative social dispositions, limited aspirations, and casual work habits” (Wilson, 1991 p: 642). He posed the idea that certain neighbourhood contexts facilitate the development of an urban underclass whose central problem “is joblessness reinforced by increasing social isolation in impoverished neighbourhood” (Wilson, 1991 p: 650). The ‘neighbourhood effects’ theory suggests that the geographic propinquity of large numbers of disadvantaged households creates a social or cultural dynamic at the local level which compounds and perpetuates their disadvantage, while conversely ‘social capital’ is understood as the form of social interaction/relationships which leads to or sustains economic well-being, through role modelling, networking and civic participation. Social capital is thus commonly associated with ‘face-to-face’ relationships and interaction in the ‘non-economic’ sphere of local neighbourhoods or communities, and so also has a spatial character. For these reasons the development of mixed income communities has become central theme of public housing policy across Europe. Living in mixed areas, poor people will learn skills and build social networks that will improve their lives. Creating neighbourhoods with a balanced socioeconomic mix of residents is an often used strategy to tackle assumed negative neighbourhood effects. Mixed housing strategies and creating a more diverse socio-economic mix in neighbourhoods, often involving large scale demolition of social housing estates, have been explicitly adopted as part of neighbourhood improvement schemes by many governments including those in the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Finland, and Sweden (Musterd, 2002).
When visible signs of social and physical decay appear in neighbourhoods, and especially if they get a bad press, a rapid change will occur in how the places are perceived by outsiders. It is therefore reasonable to talk about that these places get excluded from the mental maps of possible living environments for the majority of the urban population. We could talk about an exclusion of these places (Andersen 2004). This create negative social identities and social image. Associate for example urban areas to issues of drugs, crime, violence and antisocial behaviour creating in this way a bad reputation. Furthermore, there is a clear relationship between changes in image of estates and in the composition of residents, the increase of bad reputation make the well-off people leave the area and be replace by poor and excluded people. The effects of territorial stigmatization are also felt at the level of public policies. Once a place is publicly labelled as a ‘lawless zone’ or ‘outlaw estate’, outside the common norm, it is easy for the authorities to justify special measures, deviating from both law and custom, which can have the effect – if not the intention – of destabilizing and further marginalizing their occupants, subjecting them to the dictates of the deregulated labour market, and rendering them invisible or driving them out of a coveted space. (L. Wacquant, 2007 p: 69).

In this framework my research will focus on two Countries, Italy & Sweden. In the next pages I will analyse how they perceive the issue of segregation and how they decided to tackle the problem.

3. Segregation : Policy approaches

For many Europeans who are involved in urban development and housing, spatial policy and housing policy offer the appropriate instruments to prevent population segregation. There is also a consensus today among evaluators and researchers that the goal (to stop segregation) itself is overly ambitious and unrealistic in relation to the instruments created (Persson, 2008 p: 8).

I decided to divide my literature review into two parts as it makes more clear my research and the steps I did to study the concept of segregation. In this part I am going to analyse literature review regarding policy approaches.

3.1 Segregation as a deprivation problem

In Countries where segregation is viewed mainly as a deprivation problem the aim is to reach people who are unemployed or have other socio-economic problems through the designation of target areas for concentrated allocation of resources. This policy is called “area based” and promotes an effort to regenerate deprived areas by the state, the municipalities involved, residents, the private sector and civil organizations.
Area-based plans should emphasize the topics of employment, education, safety, care and livability (Musterd 2006). Typically they include urban and social regeneration programmes whose main goal is to improve the situation of the people living in the given areas. According to the URBACT Tribune-Nov.2012, area-based policies rest on the assumption that by focusing on places with specific problems, the situation of the people in these areas will improve. In disadvantaged neighbourhoods facilitating a broader social mix of residents is often at the top of an urban renewal project’s aims. This can be reach through the differentiation of housing stock (home ownership and rental units), by setting requirements to prospective inhabitants and by creating ‘islands’ of homogeneous blocks in a mixed environment. A general criticism to each of these strategies has been however that goals related to equity, a higher socio-economic status or increased quality of local services cannot be realised by this single measure alone. A rather direct approach consists of demolishing run-down houses and building higher standard new houses. This type of measure has given social mixing the negative connotations of gentrification and displacement. More often no possibilities for original inhabitants to return were planned, or land values rose significantly, so that many residents found themselves pushed out.

Area-based interventions try to achieve a more mixed population composition in terms of socio/economic and/or ethnic background through tenure diversification is no automatically the appropriate strategy. In Country like Sweden for example, neighbourhoods with the highest percentage of poor people are already heterogeneous (Musterd and Pinkster, 2005).

3.2 Segregation as a spatial problem

Those who view segregation as a spatial problem are likely to support an explicit “dispersion policy”. Housing policy for example becomes an useful instrument in this regard. Germany and Sweden are adherents of such policy measures. In short, the idea is that housing mix (a mix of housing types and tenure types) for example, will create social mix (a mix of households according to their socioeconomic position) and that this will create better social opportunities for individuals. Therefore, politicians tend to use housing policy tools instead to reach their goals. The dominant idea is that there is housing (type and tenure) homogeneity that creates social homogeneity (concentration of poor people) that reduces social opportunities for those who are living there (Musterd and Andersson, 2005). However, the procedure of building higher standard new houses sometimes has no positive effect on reducing poverty, but mainly only keeps the households concerned moving from one disadvantaged neighbourhood to another (Conet’s guide to social cohesion, 2011).

It is also possible for segregation to be viewed as both a spatial and a deprivation problem, resulting in a blend of policies.
3.3 Policy strategies in practice

There are different debates around policy approaches that cities have or should implement. The most popular strategy at the moment both in the U.S. and in Europe is the area-based intervention (R. Persson, 2008 p:10). The main difference between Sweden and many other countries, like for example Italy, according to Andersson, Brämå & Hogdal is that in Sweden the physical quality of the housing has not come into question for policy makers or researchers, while in other countries, like Italy, social problems are being addressed with direct physical measures. Andersson, Brämå & Hogdal say that physical quality is not a problem in the Swedish “deprived areas” and support the view that no major physical interventions should be attempted in Sweden (Andersson, Brämå & Hogdal 2007 p: 65-66). According to Musterd & De Winter area-based policies are not so effective, they should be replaced by sectoral policy targeted for instance at the unemployed, to reach in this way everyone in need of assistance creating employment opportunities, educational improvements and prevent a negative stigmatization of the areas targeted for policy intervention. On the other hand the URBACT Tribune supports the idea that areas facing extreme social and urban decline are in need of spatially targeted interventions in order to prevent the formation of ghettos and to provide anyone living there access to the full range of opportunities that cities have to offer (The URBACT Tribune Article-Nov. 2012). However, there is a consensus on the limitations of area-based policies to solve wider structural problems that underpin social problems at the local level. As Andersson & Musterd (2005) state: “Area-based interventions might well be considered as a complement to more universal and sector policies” (Andersson, Musterd, 2005 p: 387). Furthermore, “since the processes underlying spatial segregation are taking place throughout the society, the remedy will also have to be applied throughout the society” (Musterd, 2005).
4. Segregation in Sweden & Italy

4.1 National policies – Sweden

When the Swedish state introduced the “national metropolitan policy” (Storstadsutredningen, concerning Göteborg, Malmö and Stockholm) in 1998 one of the two major goals was to stop social, ethnic and discriminatory segregation. So, the problem of segregation is part of the national policy (at least) since the nineties. Since the mid 1990s, the Swedish government has worked with different national area-based programmes and initiatives to counteract segregation and to improve the conditions for long-term sustainable growth (SOU 2007:104). It started with the Blommansatsningen followed by the National Examples and Local Development Agreement, also called The Metropolitan Initiative, which was launched in 1999. Regarding the Swedish context it is still characterized by a strong welfare state. That implies interventions in situation of inequality and many efforts to realize full employment (Andersson and Musterd, 2010 p: 29). Swedish housing policy, moreover, has a general character with the aim to provide good and affordable housing to all rather than being responsible only for people with special needs. Referring to Andersen (2003) the problems of segregated neighbourhoods were initially found in the oldest urban areas with the lowest quality housing area since the beginning of the 1980s. Considering housing standards, Sweden is an exceptional; the housing standards are very high compared to other European countries. The flats built in the Million Programme are modern and of high standards, but the houses are often high and densely built and the environments are often “poor” without adequate services (Cars & Martinson, 2001).

Sweden has about 4.5 million dwellings, i.e. 486 dwellings per 1,000 inhabitants (Bostads-och byggnadsstatistik årsbok 2010). There are three dominant tenure forms; owner occupation, cooperative housing and (public and private) rental housing. Sweden does not have social housing. The share of owner occupied (single family) housing in Sweden is about 41 per cent, cooperative dwellings 20 per cent, private rented dwellings 17 per cent and public rented dwellings 22 per cent (Anderssson, Magnusson, Holmqvist 2010 p: 12).

Table 1. Tenure type in Sweden, per cent (Statistic Sweden). Source: Andersson 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Cooperative</th>
<th>Public rented</th>
<th>Private rented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Statistic Sweden, Estimated housing stock 2006-12-31
In 1965, the Swedish Parliament decided to launch the ‘Million Dwellings Programme’ (in Sweden simply known as the Million Programme, MP) in order to remedy an increasingly severe lack of housing. This was a ten-year programme that also succeeded in delivering one million new dwellings in a period of ten years. Never before had so much been built in such a short time (Öresjö, 1999 p: 11). Public criticism was massive and was not only aimed at the physical design of the buildings but also towards the people who lived in them. Living in one of the program’s most identifiable areas became socially stigmatising, and all those who could move away did so (Öresjö, 1999 p: 11). Between 20 and 25 per cent of the Swedish housing stock are now from this period (1965-1974). About half of the MP scheme is multi-family housing, and far from all multi-family MP neighbourhoods are large housing estates. However, in the big cities and in many medium-sized cities like Malmö and Jönköping, a substantial part of the MP multi-family housing stock did take the form of rather densely built, large scale estates where most houses were owned by municipal housing companies (public rental housing) (RESTATE Report 2003).

In Sweden, the so-called deprived areas are often related to the modern suburbs from the 1960s and 1970s, such as the Million Homes Programme areas.

In the Swedish context, segregation implies a lack of social relations between different sections of the population, deficiencies that may result in a distance between different groups manifested in their physical separation (SOU 1997:118, 23). During the last decade, residential segregation has increased in most Swedish municipalities (Integrationsverket 2007). Urban segregation is considered a major social problem in Sweden and several national anti-segregation initiatives have been launched to decrease social and ethnic segregation but so far only with marginal effects (SOU 2005:29). National reports have concluded that inequalities with respect to living conditions in different geographical areas have increased during the 1990s (Socialstyrelsen 2001). According to Andersson, the increasing geographical concentration of many immigrants in Sweden has triggered the contention that ethnic integration failure is linked to housing segregation (Andersson, 2007 p: 62).

In 2006, 144 neighbourhoods in Sweden had a majority of foreign-born residents. Eleven years earlier (1995), the number was 58. This means that 25 per cent of the expansion of foreign-born in the country fell into high immigrant dense areas (Andersson, Magnusson, Holmqvist 2010 p: 18). According to Eurostat, in 2010, there were 1.33 million foreign-born residents in Sweden, corresponding to 14.3% of the total population.

The proportion of foreign-born is really high in Sweden comparing to other Countries, even the other Nordic Countries have lower immigrants. The issue of the integration of immigrants in the Swedish community is always present in the political agendas.

“Immigrants should have the same housing standard as the native population. This has not always been the case so far; the development has sometimes resulted in a concentration of foreigners to special districts,
especially in the larger cities. This trend must be reversed” (Translation of Government Bill 1968:142 cited in SOU 1982/49:80).

Welfare State

Sweden is identified as a typical representative of a social democratic welfare state. This implies a strong public service sector distributing welfare goods to all families having needs, such as work, housing, day care, elderly care and so forth. One of the ideological cornerstones of the Swedish welfare state is the idea of equality between different families despite demographic, socio-economic and ethnic characteristics as well as geographic location (Andersson, Magnusson, Holmqvist 2010 p: 4).

Housing has traditionally been a core element of the Swedish welfare state, characterised historically by tenure neutrality and a “unitary” rental system. Sweden belong to a group of OECD countries characterised by ‘very low’ income disparities. The social security system in Sweden has a strong effect on individuals’ welfare and more than in any other EU-Country; the system clearly reduces the risk of poverty (Andersson, Magnusson, Holmqvist, 2010 p: 9).

The effect of social security system is the opposite in Southern Europe, in countries like Greece, Italy and Spain (Andersson, Magnusson, Holmqvist, 2010 p: 9).

Over the past decades, however, the welfare state has tended to withdraw from a number of spheres, which has resulted in greater differences in Swedish society. Nevertheless, inequality is moderate according to international standards, state interventions are still quite frequent, and public services are rather uniformly distributed. Social problems and issues related to immigrants are most clearly associated with the three largest metropolitan areas. Immigrant- dense areas in these regions have been targeted by State-funded area-based interventions since the mid-1990s (Andersson and Musterd, 2010 p: 29).

Segregation is especially compromising for Sweden since its glamorous history as a welfare state and this creates a lot of discontent with the increasing segregation among policy makers.

The contemporary urban policies include certain ‘exposed areas’ and within these areas there is primarily a focus on the labour market as well as on educational, cultural, and health-related interventions. Only to a very limited extent do the policies involve physical regeneration in these areas, an approach unlike what exists in many other countries (Andersson, 2006 p: 787).

Sweden is a country that have long historical traditions of autonomous local government and that lead the municipalities launch policies that can have great impact on large housing estates in their territories. The municipalities and (at the regional level) the county councils, run most welfare services in Sweden. For what concern physical planning and social policies the municipalities have a much greater role. There are around 300 national boards in Sweden, each one is subordinated by the government in terms of guidelines, rules
and directives, but enjoy a rather high degree of autonomy. State initiatives are mostly oriented towards national programmes for financial support that actors at the local level can apply for.

4.2 The Case of Jönköping

Jönköping is strategically located at the southern tip of the big Lake Vättern. It has excellent communication links and is close to Stockholm, Copenhagen and Gothenburg. With a population of 128,300 (2011) and an area of 1,486 square kilometres, Jönköping is one of the ten largest cities in Sweden. Jönköping is well-known as being the home of the match. It was in the 19th century, that the Swedish safety match became an export commodity and Jönköping became the match capital of the world. Now the match factory is closed, but the reputation of Jönköping as an innovative region is still strong. In fact, the Jönköping region is recognised for its many successful small and medium size enterprises. Its trade and industry are dynamic and multifaceted. Jönköping estates have been affected by general state policies and by selective municipal interventions. The Jönköping policies have been initiated and funded by the municipality. Special ‘integration programmes’ have been carried out (1995-2004) in four residential areas with the objective to reduce problems related to segregation. A success factor is a factor that produces outcomes with respect to the targeted estate. Since most interventions are of an integrated character (involving both physical and social measures, and a range of different social measures aimed at job creation, education, safety, health, culture etc) In many cases, area-targeting policies do not clearly state the real objectives (RESTATE Report 2005).

A particular part of an area-based programme might thus lead to more people being successfully employed but these individuals can then be expected to leave the relatively poor neighbourhood and move somewhere else. This could of course be seen as a success for the intervention provided that the aims regard improved integration of individuals but it might not show up in employment statistics for the targeted area, leading to the wrong conclusion that the labour market intervention as such was inefficient (RESTATE Report 2005).

Jönköping is one of the city analysed by the researchers of the RESTATE project. The city has been object of area-based intervention with the goal of overcome the segregation in large housing estates of poor and immigrants. In this process the Municipality was really important because it started and funded the policies. Special “integration programmes” have been carried out in four residential areas with the objective to reduce problems related to segregation, one of this is the neighbourhood of Räslätt.

Within this programme more than 100 projects have been implemented focusing on:

- labour market and employment;
- education and language skills;
- culture;
- public participation;
- sports and other leisure activities.
The programme has been managed directly by the city council and a project manager has done the administration. Different municipal committees and organisations have had to apply for funding for each particular project. The projects that have been carried out within the Integration Programme should be considered as a type of mobilising effort in purpose of influencing the routines in the different committees and organisations in the municipality. Since the integration programme has been managed directly by the city council, there has been a close link between policy makers and the different activities. This means that the implementation process has worked fast (RESTATE Report 2005).

There are also strategic policy documents for the ordinary work in the municipality that are important for the local work and the progress in the estates. For example the Municipality Comprehensive Plans, the Municipal Programme, the School Plan and Special Working Plans for the local schools and also plans for Social Services and Leisure Activities.

The Municipal housing company moreover, initiates different projects and policies, for example, to evaluate and find out how the tenants like their estate and they perform projects about safety in the estates and the neighbourhoods. The police have done a survey about the safety in Jönköping municipality. In the estates you also can find other projects that have been funded from EU (RESTATE Report 2005).

**The Neighbourhood of Råslätt**

Råslätt is a large suburban housing estate, built between 1966 and 1972. It is one of the examples of a large suburban area built during the Million Programme in order to remedy an increasingly difficult lack of housing (Öresjö, 1999 p: 1). Råslätt is situated about 5 km south of the city centre of Jönköping and is geographically isolated from the rest of the urban environment and constitutes a small society of its own. It consists of 30 uniformly built 6-8-storey buildings with around 2,200 flats and is owned by one of the municipal housing companies, Bostads AB VätterHem. There are only rental flats and the housing stock is dominated by flats that have 1 or 2 bedrooms (RESTATE Report 2005).

Råslätt has 4,966 inhabitants (2011) of whom 47 per cent are born in other countries. The employment rate and the income level are the lowest in the region. The employment rate for men is 34 per cent (2011) and the employment rate for women is 25 per cent (2011).

When Råslätt was built, homes in central Jönköping where people with large social problems lived were demolished. Both the problems and the people moved into Råslätt, this created a negative image of the area and gave way to bad rumours. Råslätt has been stigmatised nearly from the beginning, and still has the reputation of a problem area. Because of this, the various activities and organisations that existed in the area were forced to cooperate to solve the problems that popped up.
The problems in Råslätt are linked to the social and economic conditions of the families who live in the area more than to the physical construction. The municipality and the municipal housing company pay much attention to managing Råslätt with the purpose to reduce problems related to segregation and to improve living conditions in the estate. There have been a number of renewal activities in Råslätt focused on improving the outlook of the estate and adding important service facilities. The first renewal of the area was focused on constructing various types of commercial and public buildings for services. Later on the green areas, with parks and playgrounds have been renovated and also the fronts of the buildings. The housing company has had a key role for the reconstruction and renovation of the housing areas. In Råslätt there is no private actor at all. During 1996 the municipality and the housing company started a comprehensive project-program directly controlled by the City Commissioner and was focused on increasing employment, improving of Swedish and rebuilding of the shopping centre (Oresjö, 1999 p: 5).

One of the project considered very important and that showed good results after the evaluation of the RESTATE researchers, is “Work as a Replacement for Allowance or the 100 work”. The focus of the project is on employment, which is an area that has given a high priority in Sweden on all levels. The employment rate in the area of Råslätt has been very low compared to the average in Jönköping. The project has been carried out in five different phases. The overall goal for the project has been that 70 per cent of the ones who get employed in the project should get a job or start with targeted studies. The goal of this project is to give a possibility to long-term unemployed and people outside the labour market to have a job during a 12-month period and be given an opportunity to benefit from this in the search for an ordinary job, in particular immigrants. The philosophy has also stressed the importance of using an ‘ordinary’ search process, with formal application and interviews, etc (RESTATE Report 2005).

The evaluations (RESTATE Report 2005) shows good results and the overall goal is reached and 70 per cent of the ones who get employed in the project has got a job or has started with targeted studies.
Another effect that can be related to the project is that new forms of educational programmes have been initiated in the municipality. These programmes particularly target immigrants’ specific situation on the labour market, like for example making some types of higher education more accessible for immigrants by relaxing various forms of restrictions (i.e. English language) that otherwise prohibit immigrants from applying to the programmes. Many of the projects have not only strengthened the social infrastructure in the estates but also build bridges between the estates and the surrounding community (RESTATE Report 2005).

What comes out from the projects is that the municipality of Jönköping has been working actively for ten years with an Integration Programme that has targeted the large housing estates in the city. The municipality has been a key actor concerning the policy efforts, but also other actors and the residents participation has been given priority. This reflect also the high degree of autonomy that the municipalities have in Sweden. The municipalities have strong fiscal power, as well as opportunities to form their own policy within several important policy fields (education, social service, spatial planning..).

4.3 The case of Malmö

The city of Malmö is located in the south-west part of Sweden, in the region of Skåne. It is the third largest city of Sweden with a population of about 300,000 inhabitants (Malmö stad, 2012). The city of Malmö turned from an industrial city to ‘a city of knowledge’. A new university college has been established in the city and the local leadership has made efforts to develop biotechnology and IT industries. In addition to that, many large-scaled architectural and urban renewal projects are taking place in some parts of the city.

Most people lives in high standard apartment houses owned by municipal or private property owners. 14% of the apartments in the city are owned by the municipal housing company in Malmö (MKB), which is the largest housing company in the city. Today Malmö has the highest proportion of immigrants in the country (40 percent of the population, representing 174 nationalities speaking 147 different languages, has a migrant background). A third of inhabitants are born abroad. Malmö is a city in which segregation is rising and its most evident form is the ethnic segregation in key neighbourhoods.

The statistics show that the highest percentage of immigrants is located in areas where the problems linked to integration, insecurity and unemployment are the most important. In the mid-20th century the most deprived area was located next to the port. However, the closure of some large industries was the main factor behind the change that was strengthened by the building of residential areas on the site for the old industries. The Öresund bridge with the good connection to Kastrup and Copenhagen further stimulated the interest for settling in Malmö and massive investments were made into urban renewal. The harbour zone for example has turned from brownfield into a trendy residential and mixed-use area including offices, restaurants and university departments. As a result, disadvantaged groups moved to other areas of the city. This led to an ethnically and socio-economically segregated city. Middle class neighbourhoods are in the west and working class neighbourhoods in the
south and east (URBACT Conference 2012- Workshop “Against divided cities” ). Increasing rate of unemployment, higher crime rates and growing number of households in need of social benefits contributed to further segregation. High proportion of immigrants causes some social problems, this probably reflect the fact that they cannot easily integrate into Swedish society. To some extent, they are segregated in some areas of the city such as Rosengård district. They are in relatively disadvantaged position in job market especially in economic crisis. So these people may become unsafe factor of the society.

It is reported that in Malmö, ‘violent crime has tripled in the last twenty years. Rapes are now common, some even occurring in broad daylight…9 out of 10 violent crimes in Sweden was committed by ethnic minorities’ (Gelbart, 2007).

The neighbourhood of Rosengård

Rosengård is the district with the highest unemployment rate where low income people end up living. They dream of moving out whenever there is a chance to catch a better working opportunity and higher income. It is a monofunctional residential area built during the Swedish million homes policy and it is difficult to adapt to new circumstances. Rosengård is a large-scale residential area in the north-eastern part of Malmö with an area of 331 hectares, 7,613 apartments and 21,955 inhabitants (Malmö Stadskontor, 2007). It is a typical production of ‘Million Programme’, which was built during 1967-1974 and mainly consists of high-rise residential buildings. Half of these apartments are owned by the Malmö municipal housing company (MKB) and the others are owned by Private landlords. Rosengård when it was build, aimed to provide sufficient and high quality apartments with recreation areas, public spaces and schools for its inhabitants. Rosengård is segregated from other parts of Malmö from physical, ethnical and social perspectives. The railway and main road of Inre Ringvägen represent major physical barriers that separate Rosengård from other parts of Malmö from physical, ethnical and social perspectives (Malmö stadsbyggnadskontor, 2008). In Rosengård, we cannot find the typical feature of Swedish aging society. There are fewer old people, but more children and middle-age inhabitants than in other districts. 86% of the inhabitants have a foreign background. They are from about 111 nationalities with different kinds of religions (Malmö stadsbyggnadskontor, 2008). These immigrants are not well integrated in Swedish society with a low employment rate (32%) and a high rate of social welfare dependence. They have no alternative but to live in Rosengård, when they improve their situation and can afford other places they will soon leave Rosengård. Therefore, the mobility of residents in Rosengård is really evident. It is reported that 9800 people moved to this district, while nearly 10500 people moved out from 2002 to 2006, which is about half of its entire population. Another research shows the employment rate of people aged from 25 to 64 years who moved to Rosengård between 2000 and 2004 was 24%. The same statistics for people moved out was 49% (Malmö stadsbyggnadskontor 2008). In this condition, Rosengård drops in a vicious circle and turns out to be a district for underclass people with high crime rate and bad reputation. The municipality carried out many projects in this area, but they have not solved these problems so far.
Herrgården is the oldest part of the whole area. Nowadays, Herrgården is a subdivision within the district Rosengård with an area of 46 hectares, 1360 apartments and 4660 inhabitants (Malmö Stadskontor, 2011). The City plan of Herrgården was established in 1967 by Gabriel Winge and it was planned to have 31 residential buildings in three, six, and nine floors with a similar design of yellow brick facades, flat roofs and suspended balconies. Herrgården is very densely populated and even overcrowded. The whole area was planned for 3000 residents, but now police estimates there are about 8000 people within the area. 96% of population has a foreign background, 15% of people is working, while 9% of people has a car (Malmö stadsbyggnadskontor, 2008). Many residents living in Herrgården just rely on social welfares. Young people with low education level feel depressed about their lives, and generate some anti-social emotions. Therefore, we can often read news about riot and crime in Herrgården. In addition, the maintenance and management of Herrgården is very poor and insufficient. Unlike other areas in Rosengård, 88% of apartments in Herrgården are owned by private housing companies, which do not take much care of this area. Gröningen Bostads AB have more than half of the Herrgården apartments, but it was named as the fourth worst landlord in Sweden. In the last years few projects of improvement took place in Herrgården, which can really solve the problems and satisfy people’s needs.

"The problem in Rosengård is that many people are unemployed and that many kids leave school without enough results to study further. Another problem is the rumour which Rosengård is connected with, stigmatizing the whole area. Other problems are the way Rosengård was built, in the sixties, during the million program period. And another problem is that has been many unserious stakeholders and landlords here, not taking responsibility. A severe problem is the mindset – if you look upon Rosengård as an area of existing problems, you don’t see the opportunities and the potential."

(Sabina Dethorey - Urban Development Strategist and Coordinator /City District of Rosengård)

The city of Malmö work in different ways, both strategically and operative to strengthen and give effort to Rosengård and other areas development. For instance there are the area programs and the commission for a social sustainable Malmö.

The Municipality of Malmö with the “District Programme for a socially sustainable Malmö” (Områdesprogram för ett socialt hållbart Malmö) combines structural changes to the urban environment and measures that focus on education and creating employment opportunities. This can be made by the coordination of the work of all municipal agencies that has been delegated to the local City District Administration (stadsdelsförvaltning).
In Malmö, there are major gaps in terms of economy, education, employment, and health. Rosengård is one of several neighbourhoods in Malmö with poor school results, low employment numbers, and low disposable incomes (Dorothy 2013). It is one of the five geographic areas that have been selected for the initiative. Each City District Administration (stadsdelsförvaltning), based on the Municipal Executive Board’s directives, is to organise the planning work required to formulate and implement its district programme. Each programme is thereby customised to the local conditions of the respective area. This also means that the District Administration coordinates the work of central municipal departments (fackförvaltningar) in the area. The task of the central municipal departments is to support the effort by allocating resources.

Like with so many other Million Homes Programme areas in Sweden, there are physical and mental barriers between Rosengård and the surrounding city. Given that Malmö is a dynamic city in an expansive growth region, Rosengård – with its central location – has a great investment potential. There is also an untapped potential in the population. A large proportion of the population are children and young people; this is an important resource on a future labour market, as Swedish demography in general is facing a continuously ageing population (Dorothy 2013).

**The District Programme for Rosengård**

The District Programme for Rosengård concerns, among other things: education, employment, public health, physical planning, neighbourhood safety, residential environments, culture, and leisure.

Since 2010, important improvements to Rosengård’s school and kindergartens have been made. The goal of these developments has been to achieve completion grades for all students, and actions have included organisational changes, competence and methodology improvements, development of activities, supportive activities for children and young people based on individual needs, and the improvement of preventive measures (Dorothy 2013). When it comes to increasing labour market opportunities for citizens living in Rosengård, the district programme has involved business from the start as players in the process. An example of such involvement is Rosenkraft (“Rose Power”), a market survey of competences, purchasing power, and consumption demand in Rosengård.

The aim of the project is to, in market conditions, show business, politicians, and opinion leaders the businesses for which a customer base exists, the skills that are available to companies in need of recruiting staff, as well as the demands for goods and services that exist within the district (Dorothy 2013).
What comes out from the two cases, Jönköping and Malmö, is that both Municipalities have had a key role and are still working hard towards different goals to make these “large housing estates” better and improve the quality of life of their inhabitants, mostly immigrants and unemployed. This is made mainly by special measures with a focus on the social sphere, education, employment, etc..

In the case of Råslätt the problems were tied to social and economic conditions of the people that live in the area, more than the physical quality of the buildings. The focus of the project was thus on increasing employment, education and the services in the area, like the example of the project “Work as Replacement for Allowance of the 100 work”.

In the case of Rosengård the problem is quite similar, unemployment and the education for young people.

4.4 National policies – Italy

Although Italy was unified more than a hundred years ago, the geographic division into the north, centre and south remains very strong and it is important to take it into consideration in a general picture of the development of Italy. Italian cities have developed at different rates have had different processes of urbanisation as a result of the social and economic contexts in which each has developed (RESTATE Report 2003). Although the number of immigrants has grown very fast, the immigration phenomenon is still not very large (8 per cent of the entire population in 2011).

The specific feature of the migration phenomenon is the high turnover and the short migration period of the immigrants. The tendency of such short-term immigration implies targeted housing interventions for immigrants especially in the Italian context where there is a market immobility of the housing market (especially the social housing and the private sector). (Mezzetti P., Mugnano S., Zajczyk F. 2003).

More recently Italian emigration has been marked by a sharp decline in the outgoing flows while many former migrants have returned to Italy. At the same time, the country has become a destination for thousands of immigrants, mainly from developing countries. Considered as an accessible harbour because of its morphology and geographical position, Italy is regarded as a good place to live and find a job, or use as a gateway to other EU countries. Pursuant to the legislation, all migrants entering Italy, should apply for a permit of stay. However, often migrants ignore this regulation, thus increasing the ranks of illegal migrants. In an attempt to carry out a migrant census and remedy the situation, the Italian government periodically passes special laws. This requires that migrants meet certain pre-requisites such as a job or housing to obtain a permit of stay. The permit may be issued by the Italian government on different grounds: for employment (each year the quotas of migrants who can be accepted by country of origin are established), family reunion, elective residence (only for EU citizens who have decided to live in Italy), political asylum, study, tourism and other purposes (including religious). Compared with other EU countries, Italy is not a
major destination: Germany, France and the United Kingdom have the highest foreign migration rates (Cristaldi, 2002 p: 82).

As for the migrants’ distribution over the national territory, the greatest concentrations are to be found in Rome and Milan, where EU and US citizens rank well above the national average.

Since World War II Italian housing policy system has focused its attention on developing the housing ownership sector (it has increased from 40.0% to 71.1%) limiting the social rental sector to a maximum 10%. Therefore, the house has always been considered an economic good and a form of investment.

Some national policies oriented towards the social rental sector were designed in a way that the tenants were able to redeem their dwellings after a certain period of time (RESTATE Report 2005).

**Welfare State**

The Italian welfare state is also known as “family welfare”, because of its strong role of the family. The family is seen as a social actor able to directly support its members and to substitute the state. In particular, social assistance intervention has been developed as a subsided to the family and community organisations. As a result, Italian social assistance has been traditionally poorly financed and it is very fragmented. The private and public social assistance programmes can be activated only in case the family and social networks are absent or very weak (RESTATE Report 2005).

Italy is following a more general trend that is spreading across most European countries, which can be characterised by a mixed-welfare system in which the non-profit sector and the state play a complementary role in public policy (RESTATE Report 2005). This make the role of the state not so clear. The privatisation of the services and intervention process and the collaboration with the non-profit sector became an unclear, uncoordinated and casual answer to the crisis of the welfare system. The result, until now, has been an increasing fragmentation of policies and institutions.

In Italy, from an administrative point of view, we have in three main levels of government: the region, the province and the municipality. An important shift at the national level was the passage of competence from the state to the regions, this played an important role in the governance issue. The regions have full powers on “social aspects”, and with the revision of the Vth title of the Constitution, for the first time in Italy “urban governance” is defined by law that was passed in 1942 (Law n. 1150), still valid, but in practice urban governance is not yet a reality. In Italy problems are solved with special laws and sectorial interventions (transport, environment etc.) even for urban renewal programmes. The projects in general have not a multi-dimensional approach that could include the quality of life, environment, the quality of public space and social cohesion (RESTATE 2005). They are mostly focused on “physical aspects”.

- 26 -
4.5 The case of Milan

The city of Milan is the second largest city in Italy with a population of 1,247,379 inhabitants (2012). It is the capital of the province (the entire province population amounts to 3.7 million inhabitants) and of the region of Lombardia (9 million inhabitants). Milan is one of the most important and populated areas of southern Europe, and is the location for most of the financial and executive activities of the private sector of the Italian economy. It performs a crucial economic role for the southern European market and is the Italian city that best represents the main features of the so-called post-industrial economies.

In 2011, the Italian national institute of statistics Istat estimated that 236,855 foreign-born residents lived in Milan, representing almost 20% of the total resident population, a rapid increase from recent years levels. After World War II, Milan experienced two main distinct epochs of massive immigration: the first period, dating from the 1950s to the early 1970s, saw a large influx of immigrants from poorer and rural areas within Italy, especially from Southern Italy; the second period, starting from the late 1970s, has been characterized by the preponderance of foreign-born immigrants from different countries, mostly from Philippines, North Africa, China and Albania.

The unemployment rate, comparing to the national one is still low and the rate of male and female employed is higher than the national, as we can see in table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Milan</th>
<th>Italy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rate (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66,5%</td>
<td>56,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58,9%</td>
<td>46,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate (2011)</td>
<td>5,8%</td>
<td>8,4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The city of Milan is the country’s economic and financial heart, it is ranked first of the Italian cities in terms of income per head and it is less affected by unemployment than other Italian urban cities. Furthermore, in the last twenty years it has witnessed the processes of de-industrialisation and transformation to a service economy. Milan is a prosperous city and a symbol of innovation and progress. The downside of this image is the fact that Milan is an expensive and selective city, which excludes and rejects vulnerable groups. Milan selects its residents throughout the cost of living, particularly the cost of housing (RESTATE Report 2005). It is not an affordable city for newcomers and young families, in the last few decades it has in fact experienced an important exodus phenomenon towards the hinterland of the city.
The stability of the housing market that has characterised Milan for a long time (high percentage of private properties, rental sector subject to rent controls, low turnover in the social housing sector) has given way to a slow transformation of neighbourhoods. As a result, families on low incomes are at high risk of falling into a vulnerable position.

Housing issues in Milan according to Zajczyk (2003) are related to social exclusion, marginalisation and social polarisation in the following respects:

- The process of the forced expulsion of economically vulnerable groups from the centre of the city towards the city outskirt or satellite municipalities;
- The lack of a housing policy for the scarce supply of dwellings for low-income households;
- Low standards of social housing, especially in the central neighbourhoods where private properties occupied by prosperous homeowners are close to old and dilapidated social housing stock occupied by the elderly and immigrants;
- Homelessness.

The effects of all these trends on poverty and social exclusion are relevant: social tensions increased and reinforced an on-going process of social fragmentation, through the weakening of the traditional class structure. Moreover, the problem of housing in Milan has also had a negative effect on the poor. The combined effect of high rents and the transformation of the historical centre into a business and financial district has resulted in the worsening of living conditions of people who were forced to move to peripheral areas (RESTATE Report 2005). At the planning level, Milan has started to promote integrated renewal programmes with a strong intervention of the regional level in collaboration with the council to facilitate coordination between private, public and non-profit sector.

Social inequalities are scattered across the city, without an evident concentration of poverty in specific areas. In the periphery there are a few areas with more social problems than others — mainly where social housing is present — but in general there is not a single neighbourhood in which poverty and unemployment rates are significantly higher than those of the rest of the city (Andreotti, 2006 p: 330).

As far as public welfare is concerned, public social assistance in Milan is residual, relatively meagre and short term, with no specific focus either on social integration or job insertion. Although there is a rather wide range of public social services compared to the rest of the country, particularly targeted to families with children, income support measures seem to be conceived for a population perceived as being either in a short spell of bad luck, or too marginal and beyond hope to deserve sustained effort (Andreotti, 2006 p: 330).
In Milan, according to RESTATE Report two typologies of interventions can be traced for neighbourhoods that are involved in the renewal process:

- Neighbourhoods where the renewal process is the consequence of function transformation of the area. In specific, a passage from an industrialised to a residential or services area;
- Neighbourhoods in decline where the renewal is a strategy to combat poverty and social exclusion;
- Peripheral neighbourhoods which are not considered particularly in crisis, but which do suffer a diffuse sense of social exclusion and isolation. For these neighbourhoods the strategy is to activate new focal points of socialisation.

In Milan, the housing issue is very much a problem of affordability. During the housing expansion period (1945-1960) Milan's general policies, as well as all over the country, was to invest in the private housing sector leaving to social housing a very limited amount of investments due to two national programmes: PIANO INA-CASA (1949-1963) and later GESCAL funds (1963-1998). Regarding the social housing sector this is inadequate, because of the lack of an investment strategy and also because the housing stock is being sold off or falling into disrepair. Social housing represents 11.2% of the total dwellings in Milan (Andreotti, 2006 p: 331). The Regional Agency of residential social housing ALER, owns only 45,000 dwellings and in the last ten years has annually sold 800 units. The result is that in Milan the issue of affordability is a combination of high house prices, especially in the central neighbourhoods, and the fact that in the rental sector social housing is now limited while the private rental sector is very highly priced (RESTATE Report 2005). Due to budget difficulties of IACPM (Istituto Autonomo Case Popolari Milano-Social Housing Institute) in 1992, in Milan 38,000 social rental dwellings were put on the market. Where tenants did not take up this opportunity, the Management company could not evict them (Law 498/92) (Zajczyk, Mugnano 2003). However, in 1993 new set of laws were passed to accelerate the selling process: minimum 50% of the entire Regional social housing estate sector should be sold and the dwellings of reluctant tenants could be sold after two years from the law implantation (Forced eviction). (Law 560/93). Since 1996 Lombardy social housing management company has become an enterprise/Agency (ALER) developing business and privatistic managerial drives (Zajczyk, Mugnano 2003).

This selling policy led to an erosion of public rental sector (ALER has sold 800 dwellings annually for the last 10 years) (Zajczyk, Mugnano 2003). At the same time increasing problems of "cohabitation" between tenants and the homeowners in respect to the use of the public and semi-private space.

In 2000, the region Lombardia has launched a new social housing programme that is aiming to move away from the traditional approach of maintaining the social housing stock. The regional programme is promoting:

- Strategies of social mix by renting available dwelling in social housing estate to specific social groups (students, policemen and temporary workers);
• Strategies of public space reclaim;
• Strategies to combat social and physical isolation for elderly tenants.

One of the most important problems that affect social housing estates is the concentration of disadvantaged groups: elderly residents; immigrants; households supported by social services and low-income families. It is the result of different factors. First of all, the lack of social housings and allocation criteria have made the social housing estates available only for poor and excluded groups. Secondly, according to the allocation mechanism, applicants can refuse up to 3 times, and the ‘better off’ usually try not to choose the worst districts. Most of the temporary renting for students and special categories has been promoted to increase the social mix of the neighbourhoods. The policy is attempting to combat and prevent segregation and at the same time gives the opportunity to vulnerable groups to access to affordable rents (RESTATE Report 2005).

In the last years there was a shift of goals in the national and regional housing policies. The social transformation and the pressing housing demands led to a growing attention to integrated housing policies, but this is quite a new approach still in an experimental phase. In the Milan context the role of the region in coordinating and programming the general strategies is increasing, even if the private contribution is still quite consistent and the citizens’ involvement in urban renewal programmes is still very low.

Milan is however, featured by the lack in political strategies. The local government seems unable to play a supervising role in the city urban reconstruction process. This can be traced both at a strategic and at a planning level.

The district of Comasina

Comasina is located in the northeast part of the city where traditionally there was the highest concentration of industry. In 1953 IACP started to plan the Comasina estate, a self-sufficient neighbourhood consisting of 84 apartments blocks and nearly 11,000 rooms. According to IACP, Comasina was “Without any doubt the biggest project carried out by IACP, not only in Milan, but in other cities (until 1954). Comasina was the first self-sufficient district in Italian urban planning history (RESTATE Report 2005 p: 11). The projects lack homogeneity with the architectural fragmentation of the different buildings. The project was jointly financed by INA Casa and the city council.

In 1971, the share of the working population in the area employed in the factories was 61.7 per cent. Within ten years the area started to be more white-collar oriented. The area still appears to be poor working class in character with many economically vulnerable people. This picture is confirmed by the fact that the area is suffering from an unemployment problem. Although Comasina is situated in an administrative zone with one of highest ethnic concentrations, the perception of immigration is very low. Only 2.3 per cent of the tenants are non-EU compared with 96.8 of Italian origin (RESTATE Report 2003).
What is interesting to note in the neighbourhood is the tenure distribution, the Comasina estate is mostly owner-occupied (62.04 per cent of the housing stock). This percentage is high in comparison with the city average (50 per cent) and the previous social rental dwellings. This can be explained by the fact that in the last 15 years, almost 75 per cent of the lodgings have been redeemed, usually by former lodgers who became owners.

Figure 4, 5. Buildings of the social housing estate in the neighbourhood of Comasina, Milan.

Although it was designed with attention to the zoning system of services and places of socialization (squares, public parks and meeting places), Comasina is an estate with a negative image and this has contributed to its isolation. It is known as a no-go neighbourhood, stigmatised as petty crime area. There have been several cases of violence and the problem of crime is still present.

“A case of short-term and fragmented policy”

Comasina estates were built during the 1950s at the extreme periphery of Milan as an ideal working class district. It would have been an innovative self-sufficient neighbourhood, but soon went into a rapid decline that lasted more than 20 years (several of the planned facilities and services had never been built). From the end of the 1970s, Comasina has been stigmatised as a dangerous quarter, because of the presence of criminal bands involved in drugs dealing and international criminal networks.

Since the early 1990s, the neighbourhood has experienced an upward trajectory, due to two main interventions: 1) the demolition of the case minime; 2) the selling out process.
During the 1950s the case minime – prefabricated one bedroom - were built to house the poor families evicted from the city centre and the immigrants coming from the south of Italy who were on the waiting list for a social house. Progressively, this settlement in Comasina became a concentration of social problems and criminality. Several times, the case minime were evacuated but they were immediately illegally re-occupied by residents. In the early 1990s, the municipality decided their demolition. This decision had a strong impact on the social composition of the neighbourhood, because the criminals were definitely 'exiled' from the zone. Furthermore, this action had a positive affect on the reputation that the Comasina residents have on the institutions that have finally fought back the criminality.

At the same time, ALER was promoting a selling-out policy of the Comasina estate. This decision according to the researchers had two kinds of positive effects. First of all, a large number of households have bought their homes and become owners; the shift to the owners condition has increased the inhabitants’ attention and responsibility for the buildings and more generally for the neighbourhood; so the neighbourhood has increasingly become more secure and several apartment blocks have been renovated. Moreover, new households have arrived and a gradual increase in the number of middle-class groups living in Comasina can be noticed (RESTATE Report 2003).

4.6 The Case of Naples

Naples is the third largest city of Italy. It’s the capital city of the Campania Region , the metropolitan areas of Naples counts a surface of 117.27 km2. The number of inhabitants of the metropolitan area is around 3 millions (2011) with a density of 2630,45 inh/kmq while the number of inhabitants in the city area is around 1 million (2011) with a density of 8.158,43 inh/kmq. It has a young population –one of the highest in Europe- which represents a major resource for the economy (URBACT II Conference, Workshop “Against divided cities”).

The urban territory is subdivided in 10 “Municipalità” (Municipalities) which have a wide functional decentralization and administrative autonomy. The port of Naples is one of the most important ports in Italy and in the Mediterranean basin in terms of goods and passengers traffic and it’s going to become the most important one for cruise traffic. Revenue obtained from tourism and cultural activities is an essential part of the economy’s growth. Naples, a large city considering the resident population, is a little city if we refer to its small territorial surface that stands out as an indicator of one of the problems that characterize it, i.e. the record density of about 8315 inh/sq km. Along with this problem there are many others, such as: the high rate of unemployment (17,8%, metropolitan area 2011- persons aged 15 years and over); the severe status of the labour market directly linked to the lack of private activities; the low levels of education. Naples’ challenge for the historic urban landscape is its sustainable revitalisation (strong rehabilitation needs), avoiding gentrification and preserving at the same time the cultural identity of the area.
The neighbourhood of Scampia

The plan for Scampia was conceived as functional, it foresaw the residential separation of residential, administrative and commercial areas, and high tower blocks divided up by parks and gardens. The first development in the area was the construction in 1957 of the Ina-casa (social housing) neighbourhood. The first settlement had some positive features: houses no more than four stories high and plenty of green areas. The buildings, in the form of “sails” (called for this reason “Vele”) were built around large inside areas that according the arguments of the architects, were supposed to re-construct the “street life” of the old city centre (Morlicchio, 2001 p: 12).

However, the result was a lower class neighbourhood pushed out into a ghetto area, also because of the architectural choices, poor services and lack of public transports. Furthermore, the earthquake of 1980 created an emergency situation in the city and increased the pressing need for houses.

Nowadays the district is a complex reality, within a very deprived context there are several vital worlds in the Rioni (lots) and different levels of segregation. After the second world Housing Urban National Policies have strongly changed in Naples, especially neighbourhoods all around the ancient town. Around these neighbourhoods, since sixties, grew up almost illegal sprawl. The level of degradation of the areas at the margin of the consolidated city is increasing (URBACT II Conference, Workshop “Against divided cities”). The serious lack of public transport which makes it difficult to reach the centre from Scampia, turning the area into a separate and ‘mythical’ district, precisely because little is really known about its daily life; the break with the gradual settlement of the area, following the illegal occupation of houses after the 1980 earthquake (Morlicchio, 2001 p: 13).
Together with the ZEN neighbourhood of Palermo and the Corviale of Rome, Scampia is an example of building policy that developed in Italy between the Sixties and the Seventies, inspired by Le Corbusier, based on huge, high-rise buildings leaving space for green areas and public services. Over half of the buildings in the neighbourhood (55.1 per cent) were built in the decade 1972-81 and the vast majority of the buildings (88.6 per cent) were built after 1961. Only 2.5 per cent of the buildings were constructed before World War II. Now the 72.9 per cent of the buildings in Scampia are public property. Scampia is an economically and socially depressed neighbourhood in difficulty. The special residential nature and history of the neighbourhood have seen waves of settlement by sectors of the population already in a marginal position in the urban context, with a higher density of young, disadvantaged families who have mainly suffered from a process of gradual exclusion from the labour market over the years. The high unemployment rates in the neighbourhood (56 per cent of the active population consists of unemployed people and of these a striking 81 per cent is in search of a first job) can also be linked to the growth of cheap, social housing, with a high concentration of the poor sectors of the population (Morlicchio, 2001: 53). In the table above we can see that the rate of rented dwellings is very high in the district, this is quite unusual in the Italian context where the rate of owned dwellings is really high. This can be related to the presence of young and unemployed people in difficult situation that live in the area.

The combination of poor families produced a widely varying community with internal conflicts, linked only by their low or inexistent income and desperate need of accommodation (Morlicchio, 2001: 13).

The prevalence of Rom immigrants is due to the fact that they constitute the only resident immigrant population in the district. Because this is an area of public housing destined for Italian citizens, the other immigrant communities present in Naples have not been able to settle here, with the exception of the nomads who have, instead, taken advantage of the large spaces available in the district to set up illegal nomad camps.
Program for the redevelopment of Scampia district (2012)

The program includes the removal of some of the “Vele”. New construction of buildings located on the edge of the lots, with plinths for businesses. It is still open the debate about the demolition of the remaining Vele. The change of use and assignment of public spaces to local Cooperatives is one of the planned interventions. Others include public spaces intended use former “pole craft”, the location in of a service center, Centre for Employment and other departments of the Municipality, Cultural centers, managed by NGOs such as the theatre Arrevuoto. Intervention of connection to the metro station. Building of a new faculty of Medicin and Surgery (Accordo Regione Campania Comune e Università). Rehabilitation of the area now occupied by a Rom camp in Cupa Perillo and opening of a participative process for the project of new housing.

Figure 5. Demolition of a building in the Rione “Le Vele”

The main interventions, as we have seen, are focused on physical measures like the demolition of the buildings “le Vele” that are considered the core of the problem of segregation in Scampia. The main goal is thus to improve the housing of disadvantaged people that are often forced to live in public social housing of poor quality or even unfinished. The case of Scampia together with the case of Comasina are representative cases of how policies in Italy about the issue of segregation are very often connected to town planning measures instead of social or institutional measure.

4. Segregation in Italy & Sweden

4.1 Results – Similarities/Differences

In this study the influence of different perspectives on segregation has been investigated. By analysing the data collected and as expected, segregation has different kind of approaches in the two Countries. This is shown especially in the cities that I have analysed. From the analysis of literature two views of perceiving the issue comes out, segregation as a deprivation problem and as a spatial problem. However it is also possible for segregation to be viewed as both a spatial and a deprivation problem, resulting in a blend of policies and I would argue this emerged in the case of Sweden. These views were important to investigate the case studies, as they lead me to give similarities and differences of the Countries I took as case examples.
Other relevant factors to consider in the research were the “neighbourhood effects” and “stigmatisation” that I have already mentioned (in the second chapter) as consequences of segregation. American scientists (Wilson, Massey & Denton) from the twentieth century had already included in their studies, defined them as: “extra negative effects of living in a disadvantaged neighbourhood on the aspirations and opportunities of an individual resident in that neighbourhood”. Spatial concentration of unemployed people, in this view, would for example provide ‘unwanted’ role models for those who still have to enter the labour market. This was the case for both the Countries, were we could notice in specific neighbourhoods a concentration of vulnerable people, especially in large housing estates located in suburban areas, that are sometimes trapped and cannot afford to move away. However, the Countries have implemented different policies to deal with the same issue.

Sweden has a long history of welfare policies and that comes out not only from this research. However, over the last decades the Country has experienced a more pronounced polarisation between richer and poorer housing estates in metropolitan regions. In the case of Råslätt the Municipality of Jönköping had a key role in dealing with policies and projects with the aim to improve the quality of life, especially for the large numbers of immigrants concentrated in particular areas. Through specific measures focused on social and economic sphere, and residents are getting involved through participatory processes.

This is however, a feature of the Swedish context where Municipalities have a significant role due to the high degree of autonomy. As also in the case of Malmö where the concentration of poor people (almost 90 per cent with foreign background) mostly unemployed and with low education, created a difficult situation within the district of Rosengård. Sweden in fact, in the last decades had to face a very complicated immigrant situation, while in Italy on the contrary the rate of immigrants is still moderate.

The general understanding in Sweden is that segregation is primarily a social and not a physical problem. The goals of the policies analysed in the neighbourhood of Råslätt and Rosengård were thus mainly related to the social and economic sphere.

Looking at the policy social mixing is regarded as appropriate strategies to overcome the neighbourhood effects, but in the case of Italy this is a quite new approach.

The main difference between Sweden and many other countries, like Italy, as we could see, is that in Sweden the physical quality of the housing has not come into question for policy makers or researchers, while in other countries social problems are being addressed with direct physical measures like in the Italian cases. The physical quality is not a problem in the Swedish “deprived areas” that’s why policy makers support the view that no major physical interventions should be attempted in Sweden. And that is one of the main difference between Sweden and Italy too. Social housing in Italy is very often of bad quality, for this reason I would also add that segregation in Italy is mostly linked to the aspect of deprivation.
Another big difference is the housing market. In Sweden social housing do not exist. The municipalities for this reason are even more involved and responsible for such problematic areas. On the contrary in Italy, the role of the state is limited, and the opportunities for income support offered to the families by the Italian welfare is really scarce. Furthermore, another big problem is the lack of social housing.

5. Conclusions

I start the paper with the aim to give a definition of segregation and study the debates around it. I think that it’s impossible to formulate one clear definition, each city can have its kind of segregation. The issue reveals to be quite complex as it results from different views on it and it has always to be contextualized. We could see in the case studies of Italy and Sweden how segregation can depend on different situation and it can be approached in different ways. Even if Sweden has a strong welfare state its cities presents increasing cases of social inequality and spatial segregation. In the case of Jönköping the large amount of immigrants made the district of Råslätt the place for them to live, the most affordable area. The Municipality of Jönköping with strong efforts, but not yet visible results, is trying to make the area more livable with different projects mainly with a focus on social sustainability. In the case of Comasina in Milan I would argue that it was the result of a bad planned area, that made the district as a “dormitory ghetto” and the demolition of the worse buildings didn’t change or resolved the social and physical problems that the district have.

In Jönköping the few “million programme” areas sank quickly to the bottom of the housing market. The differences in levels of segregation are partly explained by the operation of social housing policies. The cases of Milan and Jönköping underpin the hypothesis of Murie and Musterd that there are unique context-related combinations of market opportunities, welfare provisions, social networks and neighbourhood features which offer potential means to reduce and overcome the negative effects of segregation and exclusion. On the other hand, I assume that in the case of Italy the effect of the welfare state is clearly visible. The “negative effects” mentioned in the introduction chapter was confirmed for both the cases. The concentrations of individuals without work, with little education further compromise the inhabitants and gives the negative image to the area. The level of socio-spatial segregation in these cities is not among the highest in Europe but is on the rise. In the case studies analysed mixed use working class areas close to the inner city and large scale housing estates at the periphery are where disadvantage tends to concentrate. The evidence is that segregation cannot be solved in the short term and area-based policies should be integrated with sectoral policies.

In conclusion there are not standard strategies to bring disadvantaged areas into attractive neighbourhoods and trying to stop segregation is a long process. According to Öresjö: “There is no panacea which once and for all solve the problems in the most unpopular estates. It is like swimming against the tide” (Öresjö, 1999 p: 7).
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