United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
Division for Social Policy and Development
In collaboration with the Government of Finland

Expert Group Meeting
"Promoting Social Integration"

Convened in preparation for the 47th session of the Commission for Social Development

8-10 July 2008, Helsinki, Finland

THE CITY:

AN ARENA FOR INCLUSION AND INTEGRATION

(Draft)

Mohamed Halfani & Sarah Toner
Urban Development Branch
UN-HABITAT

Introduction

Cities are viewed as the 'territory and experiential texture for half the global population,' and are the stage on which diverse peoples settle, interact and transform urban space and where practices of exclusion and segregation are so acutely felt in places where people live.[1] As a place where strangers have always converged, the city is the site of continuous contestations over who belongs in the city and to whom the city belongs.[2] The axes of division and exclusion are many and have multiplied over time; moreover new forms of migration and urbanisation have brought together new groups generating novel complexities and conflicts. Thus the interface between urban policy and issues of social inclusion thus takes on a critical dimension for the future of cities

UN-HABITAT recognises that if we want to build inclusive societies, we have to pay attention to building inclusive cities. Cities face distinct challenges and specific responsibilities - it can be argued that the success and failure of issues relating to social integration and inclusion are first and foremost experienced at the city level, and in this regard local authorities find themselves at the frontline. It is at the local level of municipalities and cities that tensions between national and local government policy becomes visible and the need to understand the great variety of local dynamics, requiring a multifaceted approach that is cognizant of the diverse needs, specific situations and vulnerabilities of particular groups becomes apparent. The challenges that arise are considerable and cut across all areas of urban governance. Recent events in both Kenya and South Africa have thrown into sharp relief the multiple challenges faced and the urgency of addressing these issues.[3]

However, it is important to recognise that stating social and spatial integration as our broad objective is far simpler than defining what integration is in practice and the context sensitive interventions and processes to accomplish it. Centering on the complex dynamics of separation and interaction and the social interactions and relationships within and between groups, the reality is that some forms and degrees of segregation and separation between communities and residents will continue to shape the pattern of life in some cities.[4] This complexity is underlined by the fact that spatial proximity or integration does not automatically result in social interaction or social integration. Moreover it has been argued that, '…segregation is a universal phenomenon, which is as old as the city itself. The socio-spatial structure of the city can be read like a map recording the structure of society…' [5] Thus the reality in many of our cities is a complex picture of partial segregation co-existing with practical accommodation of difference and everyday social mixing.[6] However, it is nonetheless important that segregation does not become polarization that identities are not built on exclusionary grounds and that

---

[1] Ninety five per cent of the world's urban population growth in the next two decades will be absorbed by cities in the developing world, and other cities in the developed world to which people migrate. It is estimated that almost half (46.5%) of Africa's projected population will live in cities by the year 2020.

[2] Cities can become a site of deep contestation over ownership, belonging and identity.

[3] Rinus Pennix, *Integration: the role of Communities, Institutions and the State*, Migration Policy Institute:2003.,3

[4] Hudson et al., *Social cohesion in Diverse Communities*, (London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2007)

[5] Haubermann & Siebel (2001), quoted in Alonso Alfredo Ayala Aleman, *A theoretical framework of the integration process of barrios in Caracas, Venezuela* (n.p., n.d.), 1.

[6] Hudson, Op cit., 10

separation does not express itself in ignorance, prejudice and fear of other people and it is crucial that these issues are addressed in urban policies and practices.

Managing diversity, difference and division– a critical dimension for the future of cities[7]

Exclusion is a multifaceted phenomenon and there is often a causal link between exclusion in one area, and experiences of exclusion and disadvantage in others. Furthermore exclusion is usually not limited to the experience of a particular individual, more often that not it is long term and replicated over generations, providing us with a key challenge and call to action. However given the multifaceted nature of social exclusion, the vast bulk of the disparate range of perspectives and approaches toward issues of social inclusion tend to concentrate on one element. For example if social inclusion is seen in terms of establishing mechanisms for integration, then factors such as employment opportunities and housing conditions tend to be more relevant. On the other hand, if social inclusion is premised on developing social relations between different groups, then attention to social networks and community interaction will be prioritized and the development of social capital viewed as important. However the goal must not be inclusion in one, but in all of these spheres. Not inclusion in the labour market but living on the margins of society, nor socially included, but unemployed.

A key challenge in policy development therefore, is to address and grapple with the complex web and interrelationships between issues of social, structural, sectoral, spatial and institutional dimensions of exclusion. Inclusion is a process and not an end-state and how we engender social inclusion depends in large part on the nature of the barriers, in each society to overcome. Achieving greater social inclusion and equity demands multiple policy 'solutions' as at the heart of this challenge lies the cultural and social diversity, plural circumstances and fluidity that characterise our cities and societies.

Given the preceding discussion there is clearly a need for a combination of two politico-institutional shifts.[8] First, purposeful action on the part of the state to meet basic needs as well as encourage open and 'dialogic' urban governance; and, second, a participatory civic democracy centered around creating real opportunities for those impacted and communities to develop voice and self-determination.[9] Moreover, an emphasis on social inclusion must not shift the focus away from addressing issues of structural inequality. The social inclusion agenda without this focus runs the danger of leaving the structural foundations of exclusion intact. Based on this analysis, a key priority at both local and national level is securing the material security of urban dwellers across the social spectrum. Since we do not have the space here to elaborate the details of what this might include, the point we wish to stress is that no talk of social justice/social integration can detract from the problem that without material security, it is enormously difficult to

---

[7] Jorge Gaspar, *Cities of Promise & Cities of Success: Migration, Cities &Urban Policy,* (Policy brief presented at the EU Greek Presidency Conference on Managing Migration, Greece: 2003), 4

[8] Ash Amin & Stephen Graham, *The Ordinary City,* University of Durham, United Kingdom, (n.d.)

[9] Ibid., 21

sustain urban solidarity or promote sustainable urban development. Responding to the needs of the most vulnerable is thus a central feature of an inclusive city representing a litmus test of good urban governance. It is even suggested in some quarters that the challenge of mobilising diversity and creativity in the city is less a matter of finding the most appropriate model of urban governance than a matter of encouraging an active and participatory urban politics.

In addition, for UN-HABITAT the current and developing discourse on open/ inclusive cities, the right to the city and urban citizenship provide an overarching framework and contextualisation in the discussions about 'managing our co-existence' [10] in the shared spaces of cities, dealing with the complex issues that social inclusion/integration engender. While belonging in many cases may be fragmented, cohesion or inclusion partial, and identities multi-layered in our cities, we need to engage with issues such as what does it mean to have an increasing population that does not envision itself as belonging to the city's future, or is excluded from participation. [11]

Some of the issues addressed in this realm include what kinds of planning, supported by what forms of urban governance and modes of citizenship, are best able to accommodate difference and have a beneficial impact on exclusion and marginality? Moreover how might marginalized or excluded communities become organized to make effective claims on the urban political economy and how might 'difference' best be respected in policy formulation and decision making?

Therefore underlining the importance of equity and equal access for all and participation of all urban residents in decisions that impact on them, these focus areas also address processes for the integration of urban diversity in urban development and the participation of 'groups of difference' in the process of urban governance. For UN-HABITAT these are key issues in sustainable urbanisation.

Participation by all underlines the concept of social integration and participation by urban citizens in urban democratic processes is important in order to promote sustainable urban development. UN-HABITAT recognise that sustainable urban development is inclusive and equitable development, and that learning to live with diversity and flux and managing exchanges among people, organizations and institutions and dealing directly with inequities and discrimination are prerequisites for equitable and sustained growth.

As public policies influence the conditions, probabilities and opportunities for social and spatial integration and also for social exclusion and marginalization, managing this complex relationship in and between cities requires new responses and necessitates a rethinking of urban strategies, policies and importantly practices in order to meet these new urban challenges. Therefore a key focus in current policy discourse is what potential

---

[10] Healy quoted in Leonie Sandercock, W*hen Strangers Become neighbours: Managing Cities of Difference,* Planning Theory & Practice, Vol 1, 13-20, 200, 13

[11] Charles Landry & Phil Wood*, The Intercultural City: Planning for Diversity Challenge,* London, 2008, 317

policy interventions cities can pursue in order to foster urban environments in which inclusion rather than exclusion and conflict are the norm.[12]

Social exclusion and spatial segregation in informal settlements

A critical question therefore for UN-HABITAT is what are the consequences of social and spatial exclusion for sustainable urban development? Recognising that marginalising any group undermines a cities ability to improve all residents safety, welfare and development, UN-HABITAT recognise that inclusive urban governance makes a difference at the scale where social inclusion is lived and negotiated on a daily basis. Cities hold the distinction of organizing and regulating many activities of daily urban life and the countless interactions that occur among the variety of individuals, social groups, and institutions that exist in a city that are mundane, but are nevertheless crucial in shaping social and spatial integration pathways and the daily negotiation of difference.[13] In this respect, city governments have a responsibility to develop local policies and practice that manage diversity and address issues of social and spatial integration involving those who live and work in the city, the relevant public and private institutions on the ground, the legal and planning framework and the physical and natural environment.[14]

Discrimination like other arbitrary forms of exclusion undermines the objective of sustainable urbanisation in two primary ways[1]. First, populations that do not feel welcome in urban society are unlikely to respect the rules and institutions dedicated to governing it. Indeed, they may actively subvert regulatory agencies they feel are more likely to prey on than promote their interests.[1]. Those who feel excluded are also unlikely to participate in participatory planning exercises. Such self-exclusion makes government policies all the less likely to address city residents' priorities and needs.[1] Secondly, and taking migrants as an example , xenophobic sentiments and targeting of migrants also has an insidious effect on realizing accountable and responsive public institutions. The willingness to accept that migrants are responsible for continued insecurity and unemployment distracts people from the fundamental structural and institutional issues behind these pressing social concerns.[1]

While a socially and spatially integrated society is desirable, we also need to reflect that these characteristics may have to exist in some sort of creative tension.[15] Integration in all its forms may simply imply the existence of a stable community in which people can find a niche. This may be lacking in a mobile, ever changing city, particularly so in informal settlements throughout the world. Indeed for UN-HABITAT, one of the one of the most challenging development issues is the socioeconomic and spatial integration of people living in informal settlements. The year 2007 was a significant landmark in urban history as the point where the number of slum dwellers in the world reached the one billion

---

[12] Jorge Gaspar, *Cities of Promise & Cities of Success: Migration, Cities & Urban Policy,* (Policy brief presented at the EU Greek Presidency Conference on Managing Migration, Greece: May 2003), 1.

[13] Sandro Cattacin, *Why Not Ghettos? The Governance of Migration in the Splintering City,* 2006

[14] Brian Ray, *The role of cities in immigrants integration*, Migration Policy Institute, Washington, October 2003

[15] In most societies, there is an ever-present tension between tolerance, prejudice and racism, and cohesion and conflict.

mark. In reality, this means that on average one in every three city residents will be living in inadequate housing with none or few basic services.

People living in informal settlements (slums & squatters) often feel a sense of dislocation from the surrounding formal city and must struggle not only with the daily realities of their living environment, reflected in the lack of access to basic urban services, but also with insecurity of tenure, ambiguous citizenship status, unemployment, high crime rates and a lack of participation or power in the decision making processes that affect their lives.[16] This combination of social and political isolation and geographical segregation is therefore a powerful mechanism of exclusion. [17]

Through exclusion from access to justice, security, political representation and citizenship, slum dwellers are often seen as 'spectators of a city' [18] that denies them the right to socioeconomic opportunities and political participation.[19] This leads in many instances to independent services and self-governing initiatives that are neither planned nor provided by the local government being provided for in informal settlements; in essence a parallel world of urban existence and alternative lifeworlds.[20] This 'splintering of the city;'[21] of independent networks re-producing services, or in a sense partial rights for specific groups, poses major challenges to urban policies that address issues of social integration and has important implications for urban governance and sustainable urbanisation.[22] While invisibility may be a crucial feature of modern inequality, there is also a need to recognise the contradictions of exclusion and that exclusion can become a resource due to the fact that there are certain advantages to remaining an outsider, autonomous and invisible from the state. However when viewed from the objective of building inclusive cities, this sense of isolation or dislocation is problematic. Moreover self-alienation—adopted as a defence against discrimination—may exacerbate division, fragmentation and violence that may serve to justify further discrimination.

Inclusive Cities – the challenge of difference, the challenge of conflict

UN HABITAT recognise that becoming what is commonly termed an open or inclusive city requires the active construction of new ways of living together, new forms of spatial and social belonging and inclusion. This is linked to an increasing awareness of the urgent need to include and address the differences that shape the social contemporary

---

[16] Alonso Alfredo Ayala Aleman, *A theoretical framework of the integration process of barrios in Caracas, Venezuela,* (n.p., n.d.) 3.
[17] Ibid., pg 2
[18] Villanueva & Baldó (1995) quoted in Alonso Alfredo Ayala Aleman, *A theoretical framework of the integration process of barrios in Caracas, Venezuela,* (n.p.,n.d.),3
[19] Ibid., 2
[20] Sandro Cattacin, *Why Not "Ghettos"? The Governance of Migration in the Splintering city* (Malmo University, Wily Brandt series of working papers in international migration and ethnic relations: 2006), 8
[21] Graham and Marvin (2002), quoted in Sandro Cattacin, *Why Not "Ghettos"? The Governance of Migration in the Splintering city* (Malmo University, Wily Brandt series of working papers in international migration and ethnic relations: 2006), 7.
[22] Ibid.,

urban environment.[23] The challenge of difference and of conflict also raises important questions such as, what might it mean to 'manage difference' in ways that could be transformative rather than repressive and how can planning practices and urban policy respond to the challenges of difference in the city?

While diverse populations may present challenges to city governments, to citizens and to city planners, as well as to traditional notions of citizenship, urban governance and planning should be based on the active involvement of groups representing such "differences."[24] To achieve this there has to be the social and political context that allows differences to coexist and indeed flourish alongside each other – this is difficult to achieve in a mobile and ever changing city. Also important to note – challenge to urban inclusion which assumes that most residents wish to tie their destiny to the city and have a vision of their futures that includes the city. In this discourse, contestation centres not only on the right to reside in the city, but also on actively shaping its future in accordance with peoples needs and values. But for example among many cross border migrants, the battles are for the right to stay and earn, but without the encumbrance of claiming ownership of the city and its future. However this constant eye towards home does not preclude the importance of associational life in the everyday. What implication does this have for social integration and urban governance?

Correspondingly there is also a need to address the conflicts and tension that arise; whether that is over appropriate use of space or access to material resources and the emotions that drive these conflicts, whether that is fear of the other or fear of the status quo changing, or fear of exclusion. From a migration perspective this is easy to say, but difficult to do: difficult politically, while xenophobic feelings are on the rise; and difficult to implement, precisely because it means dealing with those xenophobic feelings as well as with the more obvious material needs of immigrants as well as the local community, such as housing and jobs etc. Addressing theses issues is an important part of an 'inclusive city' project, as the insecurity that is generated by conflict exerts a profound influence over social relations and the fabric of life.

In many cases the avoidance of conflict is simply a complacent 'turning a blind eye' to the build-up of pressures that inevitably exacerbate in our cities. In the UK it has been suggested that one of the issues with many of the places that experienced riots in the past decade was that the local government had settled into a pattern of governance that avoided or suppressed debate and conflict and denied the space and forums to enable disagreement to be heard[1]. It has been argued that this distorted the understanding of why the riots took place and may well have distorted the response to them. Arguing that it is wrong to portray them as race riots – he puts forward that they were instead 'civic riots' initiated by a group who felt invisible and disenfranchised and who made a statement of their presence and need for the state to respond to and accommodate them

---

[23] Leonie Sandercock, *Integrating Immigrants: the challenge for cities, city governments and the city building professions,* Metroplis Working Paper Series 03-20, 2003, 15

[24] Limited interaction can also have also have negative consequences at the community level, since it means that, when tensions do develop, there are unlikely to be existing trusted channels of communication by which such issues can be dissipated.

Therefore a focus on social inclusion without addressing issues and instances of conflict, maintains a misunderstanding that social and economic advances can be achieved through the 'avoidance of conflict'. The misguided aim of harmony at all costs and the avoidance of disagreement or dispute, seems to require the imposition of a blanket set of communal values and viewpoints on what is increasingly 'diverse and hybridizing communities.'[25] Disagreement and dispute, far from being avoided, is a vital component of a healthy and vibrant democratic community. Therefore while it is necessary to address the material factors that threaten social inclusion as well as promoting policies that foster interaction and engagement across diverse communities and identities, there is a need to provide spaces where the inevitable tensions and conflicts that spring from everyday life in diverse areas can be managed and resolved and having collective mechanisms of developing solutions to problems. The danger is that without addressing the issues of what has been termed the daily negotiation of difference in our cities, that difference may further fracture, fragment, and splinter the fragile urban social fabric as new demands for rights to the city emerge: rights to a voice, to participation, and to co-existence in the physical spaces of the built environment.[26] Much greater emphasis should therefore be placed on the skills and resources necessary to manage the confronting, negotiating and active resolution of difference and conflict. This underscores the need to find more communicative, less adversarial ways of resolving conflicts, through participatory mechanisms which give a voice to all those with a stake in the outcome[27] and where 'dialogue and prosaic negotiations are compulsory.'[28]

'The ultimate test of a good city is whether the urban public culture can withstand pluralism and dissent. This is not to provide licence for gratuitous protest or the violence of those bent on harm. Instead it stands for 'participative parity' in a public sphere, such that new voices can emerge, the disempowered can stake a claim, ...and a future can be made through a politics of engagement rather than a politics of plan.'[29]

The Right to the City (RTTC)

Mention needs to be made at this point of the collaboration between UNESCO and UN-HABITAT on the Right to the City. Although not explicitly protected under international law, the Right to the City is viewed as an extension of a social process through which individuals and social groups engage in claiming, expanding or losing rights. It is viewed at a basic level as the right to presence, to occupy public space and to participate as an equal in public affairs and urban democratic processes – the emphasis less on legal rules and more on norms, practices, meanings and identities but which have political

[25] Charles Landry & Phil Wood, *The Intercultural City: Planning for Diversity Challenge,* London, 2008
[26] Sandercock, op cit.,
[27] City of tolerance for difference, urban citizenship and hybrid shared spaces also has a positive economic contribution to make. The 'open city' is not ridden by debilitating social and spatial barriers and rising cots associated with the threat of criminality, insecurity and social breakdown.(Amin)
[28] Leonie Sandercock pg 9
[29] Ash Amin quoted in Charles Landry & Phil Wood, *The Intercultural City: Planning for Diversity Challenge,* London, 2008, 278.

implications and urban policy consequences.[30] The Right to the City is therefore based on common values where respect for diversity means that no group or individual lacks legitimacy to express their concerns or to influence decision-making and that there is a sense of shared responsibility.[31]

A number of cities such as Porto Alegre and Montreal have already formulated their own notion of the Right to The City. Indeed the UNESCO Coalition of Cities against Racism network and other regional based initiatives are examples of other urban social justice and rights based initiatives that address issues of exclusion. Brazil in particular has enacted an innovative binding legal instrument, the city statute which acknowledges the obligations of municipalities toward the provision of human and urban rights. Alongside the increased powers of municipalities, the city statute emphasizes the need for municipalities to open urban planning, legislation and management and to democratize local decision making in order to enable broad based community participation. In addition, Montreal has also adopted a municipal instrument, the charter of rights and responsibilities, which calls for concrete commitments from the city itself and its personnel to the ongoing improvement of public services while fostering closer ties among citizens, elected officials and the municipal administration. Beyond shared values - rights, responsibilities and commitments are established for the reciprocal relationship between citizens themselves, as well as their city. Despite the complexities in advocating a rights based approach, the Right to the City is particularly important as it deals with the demand to voice, and to social, civil and economic participation in our cities and in essence the right to participation in decisions that shape the city.

Inclusive cities and the emerging debate on urban citizenship

UN-HABITAT recognises that where a significant proportion of the population do not have the right to participate in certain social, economic and political activities, the emphasis on the city and the local as the location which provides the space for testing and expanding notions of citizenship is important and in a sense demands the creation of a civic culture from among the interactions of multiple publics.[32] However important to remember that the provision of rights of membership to all sections of the urban community, which is what the above amounts to, is no automatic guarantee of urban social solidarity and mutual respect.

Citizenship as a legal status with a bundle of legal rights and duties attached marks a distinction between members and outsiders and poses significant challenges to building inclusive cities in this era of globalisation and migration. The elaboration of new notions of citizenship –urban and glocal – that are more responsive to claims of rights to the city and more encouraging of political participation at the local level[33] has led in essence, to a

---

[30] Isin (2000), quoted in Sandro Cattacin, *Why Not "Ghettos"? The Governance of Migration in the Splintering City* (Malmo University, Wily Brandt series of working papers in international migration and ethnic relations: 2006), 8.

[31] Leonie Sandercock, "*Sustainability: a dialectical tale,*"(online paper), 2004. Accesses 19 September 2007. Available at : //www.scarp.ubc.ca

[32] Barrow Cadbury Trust, *Cities in Transition,* (London: Global Exchange Forum Report: 2006), 23

[33] Charles Landry & Phil Wood*, The Intercultural City: Planning for Diversity Challenge,* London, 2008, pg 27

return of the citizen' to the center of debate and research.[34] The idea that the local matters and might even have an active role to play in defining a more inclusive form of citizenship and identity is a new and still quite radical one.[35]

The concept of urban citizenship, viewed as a sense of individual and collective belonging which is mediated by the built environment and its socio-spatial relations, is understood as everyday practices of life in the city where people demand and take upon themselves a 'glocal' citizenship' - guaranteeing basic rights for everybody, based on the social bond of belonging to and participating in the local community or city.[36] Highlighting the boundaries of formal citizenship and the exclusion generated by the identification of citizen and non-citizen, urban citizenship provides a space for marginalised and excluded communities and groups of difference to participate in and shape the city by proactively inculcating a sense of ownership of the city among all who live in it. Given that civic activation may be viewed as a defining element of social integration, the concept of urban citizenship involves both rights and responsibilities:

"There is the right to the city and the right to participation in decisions that shape it as home to everyone. There is the responsibility for extending these rights to one's fellow citizens, for participating…sharing the common living space. As distinct from the more familiar notion of citizenship as an act of becoming (arriving at voting age, or acquiring the legal status of citizen)… the idea of urban citizenship focuses on being a citizen, on the daily acts which reproduce the cosmopolis.'[37]

The production of partial (and informal) rights outside the sphere of the state therefore is seen as transforming the logic of citizenship[38] and the idea is increasingly being discussed in transnational municipal networks. For example, a joint statement issued by the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe and the Council of Europe (COE/CLRAE 2006) called for a challenge to governments to bring about a redefinition of the rights and responsibilities associated with effective 'glocal civic citizenship'.[39] They explain that:

'Glocal citizenship means guaranteeing basic rights for everybody, based on the social bond of belonging to and participating in the local community redefining the concepts of nation, redefining validity periods (moving from a bureaucratic approach to a social

[34] For example, Stephen Castles and Mark Miller (1998:252) have argued that 'multicultural citizenship appears to be the most viable solution to the problem of defining membership of a nation-state in an increasingly mobile world'. Their multicultural model is a combination of a set of social policies to respond to the needs of new settlers – language policies and culturally sensitive social services provision - and a statement about the openness of the nation to cultural diversity.

[35] It has been argued that it is not the social glue of 'shared values' that will hold cities together, but the social bridge of 'shared futures.'

[36] Leonie Sandercock, *Dreaming Cosmopolis: practicing utopia in Birmingham,* City of Birmingham, public lecture, 2002, 4

[37] Ibid., 5

[38] Leonie Sandercock. *"Sustainability: a dialectical tale,"* (online paper), 2004. Accessed 19 September 2007. Available at: //www.scarp.ubc.ca.

[39] In addition, at the European Council in Tampere, in November 1999 the EU Commission put forward the concept of 'civic citizenship' including a number of core rights guaranteed to migrants over a period of years so as to afford them treatment closer to that of nationals in their host state without naturalisation.

approach better tuned to reality) and redefining geographical scope (international-local:glocal) with the emphasis on multilateral civic citizenship permitting participation and governance by all those living in a territory in whatever manner.'

Conclusion

For UN-HABITAT responding to the diverse fragments and complex relational webs of the contemporary city requires the development of context sensitive interventions that address the multidimensional aspects of social integration in urban policies and practices. As highlighted previously, a key focus within UN-HABITAT is what kind of planning, supported by what forms of urban governance are best able to accommodate difference and have a beneficial impact on exclusion and marginality? Recognising that discrimination and exclusion undermines the objective of sustainable urbanisation there is also a need to comprehensively address the structural inequalities that underpin the exclusion, alienation and marginalisation that exists in many of our cities. To devise multiple and disparate policies addressing social inclusion without addressing this issues, is fundamentally including excluded people into an essentially unequal society. How we address the underlying structural inequalities and, at the same time, unlock the social capabilities 'through the empowerment of autonomous groups'[40] through the promotion of an active and participatory urban politics represents a key challenge for urban governance.

---

[40] Ash Amin & Stephen Graham, *The Ordinary City,* Department of Geography, University of Durham, United Kingdom, (n.d.)