SOCIOLOGIA, ECONOMIA E TERRITORIO

8

SOCIOLOGIA, ECONOMIA E TERRITORIO

Sociologia, Economia e Territorio è una collana di studi di impronta multidisciplinare e di carattere internazionale che guarda al cambiamento socio-economico con l'obiettivo di analizzare e comprendere le dimensioni, le cause, gli impatti e i rischi ad esso connessi soprattutto a livello territoriale.

La Collana è aperta al contributo di studiosi diversi per natura disciplinare, approccio e metodo di analisi. Verranno privilegiati studi critici sui modelli di sviluppo economici dominanti e contributi capaci di diffondere pratiche innovative di rigenerazione urbana.

I principali ambiti di studio, analisi e ricerca sono:

— azione pubblica, considerata nel contesto di un più ampio cambiamento sociale, politico ed economico;
— sviluppo locale, evoluzioni e ridefinizioni dei percorsi di crescita territoriale;
— economia regionale, piccole medie imprese, innovatori locali;
— europeizzazione delle politiche pubbliche (lavoro, welfare, sviluppo);
— sistemi locali di welfare, governance e istituzioni;
— povertà, inclusione, coesione e giustizia sociale.

Nello specifico i contributi della collana dovranno:

— descrivere, offrendo chiavi di lettura originali, lo scenario socio-economico italiano alla luce dei cambiamenti comunitari e degli effetti prodotti a livello locale;
— osservare, privilegiando l'analisi critica, le implicazioni sociali che le attuali politiche pubbliche, di impronta neoliberista, hanno sulla vita quotidiana, sul sistema produttivo, sul sistema domanda–offerta nel mercato del lavoro, sugli impatti nella struttura sociale delle famiglie e cittadini;
— studiare modelli alternativi di economia locale, welfare, mercati del lavoro interni, ecc., guardando al policentrismo delle politiche comunitarie;
— favorire studi comparati a livello regionale, nazionale ed europeo a partire da evidenze empiriche raccolte mediante studi di caso che diano testimonianza delle diversità territoriali e che allo stesso tempo possano aiutare a ricomporre il sistema unitario del fenomeno indagato.

Governing Inequalities

Inclusion and Exclusion Processes
in the Mediterranean Area, from National to City Level

edited by
Massimiliano Crisci
Silvia Lucciarini

Contributions by
Angelo Bertoni
Giovanna Campanella
Eleonora Canepari
Massimiliano Crisci
Alessandra Fasano
Rossana Galdini
Orazio Giancola
Deborah C. Lefosse
Silvia Lucciarini

Aracne editrice

www.aracneeditrice.it
info@aracneeditrice.it

www.gioacchinoonoratieditore.it
info@gioacchinoonoratieditore.it

via Vittorio Veneto, 20
00020 Canterano (RM)
(06) 45551463

ISBN 978-88-255-0163-6

I[st] edition: December 2019

Contents

Governing Inequalities
ISBN 978-88-255-0163-6
DOI 10.4399/97888255016361
pag. 9–21 (December 2019)

Mediterranean Inequalities

The Causes and Territorialization of Inclusion and Exclusion Processes

Massimiliano Crisci, Silvia Lucciarini

This volume has been developed in the framework of the International Associated Laboratory (LIA) MediterraPolis "Urban spaces, mobility, citizenships. Southern Europe and the Mediterranean, 15th–21st centuries", funded by CNRS (France). The LIA aims to study and explore changes in Mediterranean urban areas, mapping the impact of exogenous and endogenous phenomena on the territory using comparative tools and a multilevel analysis. Modern and contemporary historians, sociologists, demographers, urban planners, geographers and anthropologists collaborate with and take part in the LIA with the aim of developing a multidisciplinary and long–term approach to the study of urban phenomena in Southern Europe in relation to the Mediterranean.

The book presents a series of papers that demonstrate some of the manifold aspects of inequality in Mediterranean social systems, in an attempt to identify the challenges but also opportunities for implementing inclusive pathways towards growth. By using multidisciplinary approaches, we aim to identify elements of convergence and divergence in dynamics of exclusion and inequality, referring to a variety of temporal and spatial contexts at both national and local levels and including a comparative perspective.

Although the Southern European countries bordering the Mediterranean each have their own specific institutional, regulatory and cultural systems, they do display a number of common elements (Leontidou, 1990). From an economic point of view, they share the characteristic of being "latecomers" to the three industrial and technological revolutions that have swept across European systems in the second half of the "short century". These countries underwent second industrialization in manufacturing in the 1950s, were late to

convert from secondary to advanced tertiary sectors in the 1970s and have been slow and uneven in digitizing in the contemporary era of industry 4.0. Other aspects shared among the countries on the Northern shore of the Mediterranean consist of certain structural arrangements linked to their systems of rights, social stratification and opportunities for social mobility (Sørensen 1983, 2019). Systems whose "corrective" measures can be considered embryonic as compared to those of other European countries that developed social protection models during the first phase of the industrial boom (Goldberg & Rosenthal 2002). Indeed, this historical backwardness of the Mediterranean economic systems has led to a misalignment of social protection schemes that continue to be heavily characterized by gender asymmetry, a logic of privileging core production sectors over peripheral ones, and a significant gap between the conditions and safeguards enjoyed by workers in large and small enterprises and by employees and self–employed workers. In the continental and Nordic countries, the move to expand rights and protections was fueled by a longer–lasting positive economic trend as well as individual countries' ability to redistribute effectively, resulting in more all–encompassing and generous welfare systems (Arts & Gelissen 2010).

During the long season from the second post–war period to the 1970s, scholars focused on redistributive issues and the dynamics of the progressive, albeit slow, reduction in economic disparities and increase in opportunities within western capitalism, thanks to the expansion of social protection systems (Esping–Andersen, 1990). The following phase, which began in the 1970s and is still ongoing, instead involved a reversal of the trend characterizing the previous period, with inequalities increasing in all countries, particularly Southern Europe ones characterized by more fragmented and less extensive social protection systems and fluctuating economic conditions (Iversen, 2010). Starting with the oil crises, the process through which global economic geographies are being reconfigured has been accelerated, with international markets saturated to an unprecedented degree and post–Fordist production logics coming up against the traditional logics of mass industry. Socio–economic and political processes known by shorthand terms such as globalisation, financialisation, marketisation, privatisation and individualisation have progressively taken hold. The state redistributive capacity that once served as the motor for reducing inequality has lost power and economic considerations have

slowly come to prevail over social ones in the European framework. Driven by increasing disparities in income, wealth and access to opportunities that undermine growth and governability, only recently policies, ideas and rhetoric have begun to spread and seek to achieve both economic development and social cohesion (Mulè 2016).

These new European narratives are also motivated by a growing concern with the political and social acceptability of forms of inequality. In the well–known Marshallian theory, structuring the relationship between citizens and states in three typologies of rights — civil, political and social, — the extent of rights was not set once and for all. Rather, such rights could be re–negotiated and expanded, with the state offering more comprehensive services and protections as it enjoyed the economic growth produced by market capitalism (Olson 2006). Long–standing supranational and national policies have interjected the idea that economic disparity between areas and countries serves to spur on the weaker areas, pushing them to engage in competition. Take for example the string of programs related to the pursuit of European convergence objectives. One of the main ideological drivers of this logic was a "blame the victims" system that framed weaker territories (and subjects) as responsible for their conditions of backwardness and pushing them to try to "catch up with" more virtuous areas through isomorphic mechanisms, the medium–long term results of which have been modest at best (Boldrin *et alii* 2001). Other, more complex visions have also arisen involving more intricate architectures for the distribution of resources according to logics of conflict and power management, logics which can certainly only be curbed by looking to the mechanisms that produce and shape them (Korpi & Palme, 2003). As the functional distribution of wealth has changed over the last fifty years, traditional corrective measures have gradually become less and less effective. The increase in economic inequalities has gone hand in hand with a growth in annuities and profits as well as a wage squeeze (Pizzorno, 2001) that reduce opportunities for social mobility (Franzini, 2015).

The boom in forms of socio–economic inequality gained speed in the 2000s in all western capitalist countries, moving along occupational and geographical boundaries (Lamont, Molnar, 2002). On one hand, differences within professional groups have taken root with the cognitive class enjoying advantages that were much more deeply–rooted and widespread in the central–northern European countries than in those of the Mediterranean. On the other hand,

gaps have also sprung up at a sub–national level, not only between economically advanced and backward areas but also between small cities and metropolitan areas. Cities as a whole are more competitive, but they are also plagued by greater levels of inequality (OECD 2014, 2017 and 2018). In particular, cities of the Northern shore of the Mediterranean are located in national contexts with lesser redistributive capacities and more selective social protection systems, offering a valuable point of observation for understanding disruptive and unequal local processes and dynamics, as well as the mechanisms through which disparities and cohesion and inclusion policies are being reformulated. Such disparities are considered to have been generated by complex processes, both macro and micro, entailing ambiguous dynamics which may involve the impoverishment of socio–economic heritage but also a chance for the cities themselves to innovate (Florida, 2017). In fact, cities are on the front lines in facing a great many challenges: from global economic competition to the regeneration of local areas, from international migration to environmental sustainability, from poverty to security issues (Crisci, Lucciarini, 2018a). Having to do with both national and supranational regulations and forces, these themes are often governed by supra–local policies. However, it is at the urban level that they must be tackled on a daily basis, often in a climate of emergency response and without the aid of systemic interventions reflecting broader lines of action (Andreotti & Kazepov 2001). It is precisely this configuration that makes cities such interesting laboratories. Change arrives quickly and from multiple directions, and city administrations seem to be experiencing a moment of intense stress as they scramble to develop solutions. Actors' responses, be they institutional, formal or informal, include a wide range of measures that do not always seem to reflect coherent logics of action or local administrative visions (Donzelot, 2003). Indeed, local policies and practices often involve exclusive, inclusive and selective logics of action and they tend to produce a new framework of regulations, statutes and rules that in turn give rise to participatory values through which the concept of citizenship is associated not only with the state, as in the past, but also with residential belonging (Pizzanelli, 2010). This new frontier of citizenship is the outcome of governmental proximity, and it relates to such proximity in a dialectical key: social context and local history deeply influence the functioning of the institutions involved (Putnam, 1993). In response

to this tension, several social disciplines have been tried out: from *urbs* (the "bricks" of the city in a physical and spatial sense) to *civitas*(the citizens and inhabitants) and a continuous (re)negotiation of these two dimensions (Zelizer, 2010; Crisci, Lucciarini, 2018b).

In order to grasp these aspects, the essays of the book stress the institutional dimension (Pellizzoni, 2012) in order to understand how agendas for action are formed in different local areas. In keeping with this perspective, in order to understand the elements that condition and structure inequality the papers focused on the logics behind the action and interaction of local and national actors (institutionalized or informal, public or private, single or collectives), the institutions involved in regulation processes and policy production, both sectorial and integrated, and micro social practices and bottom–up actions in the Mediterranean cities.

The collected articles presented in this volume are divided into three sections that explore different aspects of the dialectic between exclusion and inclusion: economic forces and innovation, spatial and social issues, and urban mobility.

The essays in the first part of the volume, "Economic inequalities between opportunities and barriers", examine dynamics of inclusion and exclusion on different scales, focusing in particular on the dynamics of integration into the labor market and local socio–economic innovation, and reflecting on the "genius loci" of new sites of work and entrepreneurship (Boltansky, Chiappello, 2002). The top–down component of the system of opportunities and access to work and training displays a certain rigidity, especially compared to the vivacity and alliance–forming abilities of locally–rooted movements from below; such movements are animated by communities which are local but positioned in institutional contexts that appear ill–equipped to combine development and cohesion.

The paper by Giancola and Lucciarini examines the impact of institutional complementarity between education and labor market insertion, in relation specifically to immigrant populations in Italy, France and Germany. Their goal is to grasp the differences in educational attainment and labour market outcomes between natives and non-natives within countries characterized by different migratory models, educational systems, labour markets and degree of impact of the economic crisis. The article takes into account the main points that have been made both in theoretical literature and through empirical verification, such as the key role played by family

and education in social and economic achievement during the individual's life–course, the problematic transition from school to work, and the risks of discrimination and social marginality.

The findings presented in this chapter confirm that employment regimes are not neutral with respect to the ethnic variable, and that this disadvantage is common in both old–immigration and new–immigration countries. Segmentation is two–fold, found in both education and labour market integration. Although there is a common trend involving the relative penalization of non-natives, the Italian system appears to be sufficiently universalistic at the level of basic education.

Campanella's article reflects on employment insecurity, family policies and work–life balance policies from a gendered perspective. It analyzes the case of a Mediterranean country, Italy, in the broader European context, highlighting some points of weakness and political short–sightedness in responding to changing and new needs. Especially for female workers in conditions of income and employment precariousness, Italian policies for supporting parents and reconciling care and waged labor are still in their infancy and relegated to the margins in a setting characterized by deep political immobility. The article reveals the limits of these policies and identifies the innovative aspects of practices developed from the bottom up, analyzing the relationship between work schedules and family care time in the case of female freelancers in Rome. In the era of the digital revolution, the spread of shared workspace options such as co–working projects represents a potential virtuous way forward, but such projects often come up against forms of institutional weakness that reduce them to grassroots experiments, susceptible to the volatility of local administrations. The author reflects on the need to avoid fragmentation and particularism and to deploy a democratic form of governance that involves a plurality of subjects, manages the complexity of local co–planning and acts for the collective good.

The article by Fasano and Lucciarini analyzes some threads of socio–economic innovation typical of the so–called "collaborative economy", investigating the case of co–working and fab–labs in the Mediterranean country of Italy analyzed as part of the European context. Italy hosts a lively array of structures and diverse local partnerships, part of a global movement that is redefining places, content and approaches to work. The authors reflect on the possibility of building socially and economically competitive and inclusive tra-

jectories of local development through innovative approaches to work. The economic crisis has depleted the entrepreneurial fabric of Mediterranean cities and made it more difficult for freelance knowledge workers to reside in the central urban areas that usually offer a greater number of opportunities and events. Coworking and fablabs allow these workers to meet and network in environments that, as professionalized spaces, serve to agglomerate opportunities and attract the attention of public and private entities. The way such spaces are spread across the country displays a substantial divide between the Italian North and South, a divide that echoes the historical pattern of such inequality. This disparity reflects the weakness of the institutional system and professional and entrepreneurial fabric of the economically less well–developed areas.

The second section, "Spatial inequalities between public action and informality", includes several case studies showing how fragmented local projects are setting the stage for an argument about possible pathways of development and social innovation. Such developments take place through the involvement of local, political and civil arenas involved in building what Zanfrini (2011) calls "government of coexistence". It is by looking at this relational yet also micro–local dimension that we can make out processes of social–spatial segmentation operating on social and geographic levels.

A *comparative urbanism* approach combined with a historical perspective allows Crisci and Lefosse to interpret current urban changes, identify legacies from the past and detect the roots of transformations in the Mediterranean metropolis of Rome as well as Buenos Aires. Using such a methodology, their paper analyses urbanization processes and the gradual transformation of the "informal city" into a "formal city". From the end of 19th century onwards, the two capitals have similarly experienced prolonged inconsistency in the housing policies developed to meet the mass urbanization demand and dealt with the diffusion of large informal settlements with responses ranging from *laissez faire* to repression and even inclusion. Town planning regulations have been deeply variable in terms of their stringency and given rise to "states of exception" that have enhanced some elite situations of informality and criminalized other, subordinate ones. An in–depth analysis of two largely similar present–day cases of self–made urbanism — the Idroscalo in Rome and Villa Rodrigo Bueno in Buenos Aires — highlights the processual relationship between informal settlements and institutions, evolving over time and produc-

ing opposite outcomes: eviction in one case, legalization in the other. These divergent results can be explained by different historical phases in terms of local authorities' stance on the informal phenomenon.

Galdini's essay considers practices of reusing public space in Mediterranean cities and investigates the case of Genoa, which in the 1980s faced a serious crisis affecting the most important sectors of the local economy. According to the author, one of the most significant changes in the city's morphology has been the transition from expansion to reuse, which is a strategy for granting new life and meaning to existing parts of the city. This article presents a series of projects that enabled Genoa to redefine its identity and relaunch itself on an increasingly competitive national and international scene. An urban panorama heavily conditioned by a climate of "city marketing", i.e. the ability to promote the image of a city by organizing events, exhibitions and sports and cultural events. Also through a comparison with the case of Marseille, this essay stresses the importance of cultural interventions in urban regeneration programs as factors of economic and social development. Although such processes are also characterized by conflicting dynamics, Galdini finds that it's possible to achieve positive outcomes and that the use of symbolic policies associated with a city's cultural brand constitutes a Europe–wide benchmark.

The essay by Bertoni considers the process of transformation that swept over the Mediterranean cities of Western Europe beginning in the 1980s looking at the role played by public spaces in the urban regeneration policies of large port cities such as Marseille, Barcelona, Genoa and Valencia. In particular, the projects carried out on the Marseille waterfront show that such interventions bring the focus back to culture as a factor of economic and social development in cities in crisis, a factor that is increasingly linked to building a renewed image of the city. Organizing a large–scale international event puts the city under the spotlight in today's globalized economy and brings about major social and spatial changes in urban and metropolitan areas. In a city like Marseille, these logics do not seem to match the needs expressed by the inhabitants of the neighborhoods surrounding the port, areas characterized by a compact urban structure, few public spaces and buildings that have been repeatedly overhauled in the past to adapt to migratory flows. Looking ahead, it would be desirable if public actors developed policies for upgrading public spaces, taking into account existing social practices. To build the

city in a harmonious way, the real challenge therefore seems to be simultaneously considering economic and social inclusion logics in protecting and respecting diversity.

The third section focuses on "Urban mobility and social inequalities" and includes two studies of mobility in Rome in different historical periods, namely the 17th century and today, highlighting how the consideration of urban mobility practices can reveal dynamics of socio–economic and residential inequality. It was not until the 1990s that scholars began to recognize the impact of daily mobility on inequality and social exclusion, understood as people losing the ability to connect up to functions and services necessary for them to participate fully in society (Church, Frost, Sullivan, 2000; Gaffron, Hine, Mitchell, 2001). In particular, the vast and unregulated urban spreading (so–called *sprawl*), produced by the choice to privilege automobiles in organizing transportation, has brought with it a mobility model that leads to new forms of exclusion (Camarero, Oliva, 2008). Addressing the issue of urban accessibility in a spatial and individual perspective sheds light on the social side of inequality in terms of involvement in the city, as well as its repercussions in the arena of public policy (Fol, Gallez, 2014).

Canepari's article examines relations between two different types of "rural" areas found in 17th century Rome, the *suburbium* and the Roman countryside. The analysis maps the dynamics characterizing the temporary and intermittent mobility of agricultural workers in order to show the key role mobility played in the process of defining spaces and city limits. In that period, the city ring walls were not an effective factor of separation between the "middle class" vineyards of the suburbium and the elitist *latifundia* of the Roman countryside and did not preclude relations between the two areas. Indeed, the boundaries distinguishing *intra* from *extra–muros* were made fluid by the constant mobility of those who lived and worked there. This mobility was intermittent, triggered in part by the malaria that still infested the Roman countryside, and generated by a large seasonal population varyingly drawn by the availability of job opportunities. The paper considers the case of the two largest Roman neighborhoods, Trastevere and Monti, which enclosed large portions of *intra–moenia* countryside and hosted populations in precarious occupational conditions, whose socioeconomic structure was more similar to the *extra–muros* than the city centre (the *habitato*).

Several centuries later, the Roman area can still be said to be characterized by a sort of fluid border between the urban core and countryside, which has shifted to a few kilometers away from the ancient Aurelian walls. This border is the GRA, the great ring road surrounding Rome which, in Crisci's article, is used to delineate a spatial grid for interpreting the city's current dynamics of residential and commuter mobility. The essay explores the tension between center and suburb in Rome, underlining how historical social factors weigh on the changing processes of the city. The intense redistribution of the population taking place in the last few decades in the urban area represents a significant case of Mediterranean sprawl, that is, of chaotic city spreading, unplanned and characterized by low density housing, discontinuity, and intense land consumption. In this paper the historical evolution of such a process is explained, underlining some of the effects on the citizens' quality of life. Sprawl in Rome is a selective phenomenon involving especially young families with children leaving the city center, while the center hosts a population increasingly ageing. The weaknesses of local planning and the rapid population growth of new districts ensures that new peri–urban citizens often do not have access to even a minimum range of services. Therefore, the peripheral location of one's house is likely to add up to a condition of social marginality.

The issue of democracy in capitalist countries has once again become the focus of debate in recent years. A number of socio–economic and political tensions have triggered discussion of this topic from various perspectives and in diverse disciplines (Iversen, 2010). Both right–wing parties and populism are on the rise in Europe, and the constant growth of inequalities in a context of welfare downsizing and recessionary cycle have led scholars to question whether European capitalist countries are really capable of creating and redistributing resources (Van Treeck & Sturn, 2012), encouraging them to look for elements that might make democratic capital in European countries more "dense" (Silver, 2003). This seems to happen in particular in those countries — like the Mediterranean ones — where welfare benefits are not universalistic but occupational and where labour markets are fragmented and polarized between good and bad jobs.

Bibliographic References

Andreotti A., Kazepov Y. (eds.), *The Spatial Dimensions of Urban Social Exclusion and Integration: the Case of Milan*, «Urbex series», 16, University of Amsterdam, 2001.

Arts W., Gelissen J., *Models of the Welfare State*, in Castles F.G. *et al.* (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Welfare State*, Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 569–583.

Boldrin M., Canova F., Pischke J., Puga D., *Inequality and Convergence in Europe's Regions: Reconsidering European Regional Policies*, «Economic Policy», 16(32), 2001, pp. 207–253.

Boltanski L., Chiappello E., *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme*, Gallimard, Paris 2002.

Camarero L.A., Oliva J., *Exploring the Social Face of Urban Mobility. Daily Mobility as Part of the Social Structure in Spain*, «International Journal of Urban and Regional Research», vol. 32(2), 2008, pp. 344–362.

Church A., Frost M., Sullivan, K., *Transport and social exclusion in London*, «Transport Policy», 7, 2000 pp. 195–205.

Crisci M., Lucciarini S., *D'une précarisation à l'autre. Mobilité résidentielle et politiques du logement à Rome*, in E. Canepari, C. Regnard (eds.), *Les logements de la mobilité (XVIIe–XXIe siècle)*, éditions Karthala, Aix–en–Provence, 2018, pp. 163–181.

Crisci M., Lucciarini S., *Transformations urbaines, développement local et cohésion sociale*, in E. Canepari, B. Marin, L. Salmieri (eds.), *Gli entroterra delle città di mare/ Les arrière des villes de mer*, L'Harmattan Italia, Torino–Paris 2018, pp. 172–186.

Donzelot J., *Fairesociété*, Seuil, Paris 2003.

Esping–Andersen G., *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*, Polity Press, Cambridge 1990.

Florida R., *The New Urban Crisis*, Basic Books, New York 2017.

Florida R., *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It'sTransforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*, Basic Books, New York 2002.

Fol S., Gallez C., *Social inequalities in urban access. Better ways of assessing transport improvements*, in E.D. Sclar, M. Lönnroth, C. Wolmar (eds.) *Urban Access for the 21st Century. Finance and governance models for transport infrastructure*, Routledge, New York 2014, pp. 46–86.

Franzini M., *Inaccettabili disuguaglianze*, il Mulino, Bologna 2016.

Gaffron P., Hine J.P., Mitchell F., *The role of transport on social exclusion in urban Scotland*, Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, Edinburgh 2001.

Goldberg G.S., Rosenthal M.G. (eds.), *Diminishing Welfare: A Cross–national Study of Social Provision*, Auburn House, Westport 2002.

Iversen T., *Democracy and Capitalism*, in *The Oxford Handbook of the Welfare State*, F.G. Castles, S. Leibfried, J. Lewis, H. Obinger, C. Pierson (eds.), 2010.

Korpi W., Palme J., *New politics and class politics in the context of austerity and globalization: Welfare state regime*, «American Political Science Review», 97, 2003, pp. 425–446.

Lamont M., Molnár V., *The Study of Boundaries Across the Social Sciences,* «Annual Review of Sociology», 28, 2002, pp. 167–95.

Leontidou L., *The Mediterranean City in Transition*, Cambridge University Press 1990.

Lucciarini S., *I luoghi contano: immigrati e città in Europa e Stati Uniti*, Studi Emigrazione, 2008.

Lucciarini S., *Le città dell'immigrazione*, FrancoAngeli, Milano 2012.

Lucciarini S., Violante A., *Donne e disagio abitativo*, «Autonomie locali e servizi sociali», n. 1, 2009.

Mulè R., *The South European Welfare State in the New Millennium. Challenges, constraints and prospects for Europeanization*, «World Economy and International Relations», 7, 2016, pp. 25–36.

OECD, *All on board, making inclusive growth happen*, 2014.

OECD, *Divided cities. Understanding intra–urban inequalities*, OECD Publishing, Paris 2018.

OECD, *Inequalities in household wealth across OECD countries*, 2018.

OECD, *Inequality: A hidden cost of market power*, 2017.

Olson K., *Reflexive Democracy: Political Equality and the Welfare State*, MIT Press, Cambridge 2006.

Pellizzoni L., Ylonen M., *Neoliberalism and Technoscience*, Critical Assesment, Ashgate, Farnham eds., 2012.

Pizzanelli G., *La partecipazione private alle decisioni pubbliche per le politiche ambientali*, Giuffrè, Milano 2010.

Pizzorno A., *Natura della disuguaglianza, potere politico e potere privato nella società in via di globalizzazione*, in «Stato e mercato», rivista quadrimestrale, n. 2/2001, pp. 201–236.