



Res

Ricerca e Sviluppo
per le politiche sociali

Nuova Serie - Numero 1-2
Numero speciale

2008

***Territorial
Intelligence***

ReS-Ricerca e Sviluppo per le politiche sociali

Semestrale

Nuova Serie n. 1-2/2008

Numero speciale

Direzione Scientifica

Natale Ammaturo

Comitato Scientifico

Salvatore Abruzzese, Giuseppe Acone, Yves Alpe, Andrea Barbieri, Roser Boix, Salvatore Casillo, Vincenzo Cesareo, Michele Cesaro, Pierre Champollion, Costantino Cipolla, Consuelo Corradi, Lucio D'Alessandro, Vincenzo Esposito, Giovannella Greco, Jean-Jacques Girardot, Antonio Iannaccone, Pierfranco Malizia, Blanca Miedes Ugarte, Aniello Montano, Giuseppe Moro, Achille Maria Notti, Serge Ormaux, Mihai Pascaru, Luigi Reina, Annamaria Rufino, Tullia Saccheri, Domenico Secondulfo, Maria Antonietta Selvaggio, Wilhelm Zoltan

Redazione

Emiliana Mangone, Virginia Nunziata, Silvana Panza, Giovanna Truda

Direzione redazionale e amministrativa

Via Vincenzo Alfano, 35 - Loc. San Vincenzo, 84085 Mercato San Severino (SA)

email: redazioneres@libero.it

Contatti

C.E.I.M. Editrice, Via V. Alfano, 35 (Loc. S. Vincenzo)

84085 Mercato San Severino (SA) - email: ceimsas@gmail.com

ISSN: 1970-9080

Aut. Trib. Salerno n. 753 del 10 ottobre 1989 – Sped. In A.P. art. 2 co. 20/DL 662/96 Reg.

Campania – Contiene meno del 70% di pubblicità - © C.E.I.M. Editrice s.a.s, Mercato San Severino (SA)

Authors

Natale Ammaturo, Professor of Sociology - University of Salerno, Italy

Andrea Barbieri, Senior Researcher - IRPPS-CNR of Salerno, Italy

Jean J. Girardot, Lecturer in Economics, caENTI scientific coordinator - CNRS and Université de Franche-Comté, France

Emiliana Mangone, Researcher in Sociology of Cultural and Communication Processes - University of Salerno, Italy

Cyril Masselot, Lecturer in Information and Communication Science - Université de Franche-Comté, France

Blanca Miedes Ugarte, Associate Professor of Labour Economics and Active Employment Policies - University of Huelva, Spain

Serge Ormaux, Professor of Geography - CNRS and University of Franche-Comté, France

Tullia Saccheri, Associate Professor in Sociology - University of Salerno, Italy

Giovanna Truda, Researcher in Sociology - University of Salerno, Italy

TERRITORIAL INTELLIGENCE

Jean-Jaques Girardot

Evolution of the concept of territorial intelligence within the coordination action
of the European network of territorial intelligence

11

Natale Ammaturo

The Cultural Dimension of Different Development Models

30

Andrea Barbieri, Emiliana Mangone

Social Politics of the State and Territories

38

Giovanna Truda

Deviant territories and deviancy on the territory

55

Tullia Saccheri

Territorial Intelligence e Partecipation

66

Serge Ormaux

Landscape and Territorial Intelligence

83

Cyril Masselot

Territorial Intelligence Communicational and Community System (TICCS)

90

Blanca Miedes

Territorial Intelligence: Towards a New Alliance between Sciences and Society in
Favour of Sustainable Development

105

Andrea Barbieri, Emiliana Mangone¹

Social Politics of the State and Territories

Taking into consideration the reality of the territory, we are presented with a particular sharpness in the field of social politics². Since the social politics of the state are about fundamental rights, essential for social cohesion and individual well-being (health, occupation, training and insertion into society, etc.), we cannot see their effectiveness if we are looking at the place of people's lives: this headline the territorializing of the state in the social field should be carried out in an exemplary way³. At the same time this field comes across multiple problems which give several different politics. These services have been placed historically, culturally and operatively but have nothing in common with one another. In this way what we evidently see in the public sector the inter-ministerial approach rather than the global approach to situations which are associated to this most of the time. Overall, it is important to estimate that the territorializing of state action risks, in a social way, appear at a brutal breaking point with major inheritance, building up over tens of years of intervention which answered to the approach by (population) (people who suffered handicap, people with similar pathologies, and those whose social position had those connections.) We can therefore see at first sight that it would be potentially risky for the effectiveness of the politics in question and also for the population it is addressed to. The promotion of territorializing levels out and upsets the naturalization of such matter⁴. It would be better if we could manage the two approaches together rather than separating them. It is therefore clear that we are faced with a difficult task to collect a *fortiori* for the Ministers whose ways are often seen as being too weak compared to the depth of their mission. This would result in problems for the organizations whose task would be to pull out the best of both logics.

It is from this point we would like to start our paper. The paper is logic and does not take on board the political side of things in which the sustainable level of decentralization is about and is an example of engaged debates on extensions of new competences to be transferred to the occurrence or case-for-case, to the collective territories.

¹ This paper is the fruit of a common reflection of the authors: however, in the specific one, Andrea Barbieri has written up the introduction and paragraphs 1-2, while Emiliana Mangone has written up paragraphs 3-4.

² Torchia L., *Welfare e federalismo*, Bologna, il Mulino, 2005.

³ De Leonardis O., *In un diverso welfare. Sogni e incubi*, Milano, Feltrinelli, 1998.

⁴ Ferrera M., *The Boundaries of Welfare. European Integration and the New Spatial Politics of Social Protection*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Thinking about the present equilibrium of those competent in this area, and without breaking away from the field which is to be looked at, the paper is essentially limited to examining the coming together of the levels of pilot schemes and putting into action the politics that can help bring them closer to adapting to the characteristics of the territory in which they will be implemented. It will touch on better ways to answer the needs of the citizens and the local actors. To be more precise, two questions go through the paper: local services and central, which are competent in social fields, if they have managed to integrate the first evolutions linked to the territorializing of the politics and are they prepared to manage to get over the new steps that are more probable.

The important point of view is that of the politics of the state: the depth of covered areas in social politics, the multiplicity of the politics, the number of the partners interested, and the variety of the devices which make them unrealistic to ambitious choices. To this, the thought politics put into being from the collective territory are not treated in the studied argument; on the other hand, for each time the state and the collective territories put forward prerogatives in the same field, the tie is evidently established. One of the key elements of the problem of the territorializing is the influence which it has managed to have on decentralization and on the adaptation of the territories of the state politics⁵.

Two series of consideration have dictated the way of understanding and treating the matter (social politics of the state and territory): (a) its complexity, linked to a character, at the same time globalized and pro-informed and (b) the particular *betting* it represents for the Social Ministries, in the eye of adapting to a heavy evolution, which was possible and will be probable. Our paper (which is a work in progress) tends to describe these choices and focus on the work and analysis of certain aspects judged and discriminated and not to define absolutely the best way to carry out a territorial work, but to think clearly about the capacity of Social Institutions and their Services and how they adapt in a better way to the evolving ways which are to come.

Taking into consideration the reality of the territory in which it operates, in a general context is shown by its complexity. We can assist the elimination of the traditional model in which there was homogeneity (i) in the districts to which the State refers to, to carry out its actions and (ii) the districts used from the collective territories to decentralize politics. The country, today less predictable, is characterized both by the growth of the territory that is better from the best legislative definition (to the Towns, Provinces and Regions we add Cities, the agglomerations and the Institutions of intercommunity) and from the concept of projects of the territory. To these distinctions we can add the differences between the areas mentioned to assure the different phases of the public action: the observation, the strategic piloting, the operative piloting, the co-ordination of the actors, the derogation of work, the valuation, etc.).

The simple programming, which comes from the idea of « *a subject of competences* », becomes uncertain from the point that each collectionist has the

⁵ Ferrera M., *Modelli di solidarietà. Politica e riforme sociali nelle democrazie*, Bologna, il Mulino, 1993; Ferrera M., *Le trappole del welfare*, Bologna, il Mulino, 1998; Ferrera M., *Le politiche sociali. L'Italia in prospettiva comparata*, Bologna, il Mulino, 2006.

capability to take care of each question he thinks is important to face. The backing up of a contract (social) often allows such evolution to be legitimate.

Even managing the objectives of the territory come hand-in-hand with this. Originally the managing of the territory was incarnated in the making of great plants which gave a structure to the territory and helped by large companies furnishing them. These were placed in areas (desert) (marginal and/or poor areas). In this way the different territories were given equality. Last but not least, progressively, the object of managing the territory has moved on and today it is the agglomeration and the countries that are central to the debate which are looked at. When this is activated the biggest problems which emerge come from the fields, socially and politically and managing the territories.

Introduction

Moving away from centrality of political action we must look at social institutions and keep in mind a similar point of view to those commented on before so that we can value the performance of the institutions.

We therefore need to choose different points of approach, those of the territory and those of the capabilities of the social politics and take them both into consideration. There are various things which need to be done for reasons which are significant: (a) for territorial politics to fight against unemployment over a long term and social exclusions, (b) to place the projects on the territory of the State Regions, (c) for the politics of the city, (d) the observers and the functioning of the observations, (e) for the pilot scheme regionally in the health, and not least, (f) for the central administrative strategies in the process of territorializing of public action in the field of social acts and employment.

What comes out from this immersion into the territory? The concrete firmness and progress of local administration, but varying advancement depending on the questions taken into consideration by the territories. This is because the progress and advancement depends on the co-operational work of the local actors, factors which are contemporary, essential, fragile and incidental.

Other things have also been contested like the extraordinary complexity of the institutional schemes which have been put into being for «squares them» with the territory, the singularity and simplicity given, having an effective locally opposed to reproductively, the complexity of the structure and the parameters and damage from adaptability. These are in synthesis, the lessons which we can extract from the meeting of state social politics and the territory: this is because the local reality is often complex, often different and it needs the constitution of different acts which all depend on the place and politics.

Going against certain assumptions in central administrations and public administrations we have gained experience from the necessity to renew the pilot schemes deeply from social politics to local measures. The results are still unequal and most of them try to fully pull the consequences towards their own organization and to their own functioning. This is also a sign that the territory is on a backwards path towards administration and politics which have been put into being and the capacity of continual observation in the field of space where they grow. These

organizations, far too dispersed at present, are those of power. If the state, which guarantees equality of rights, must provide the means for diagnosing, checking, and valuating it must put everything together on the territory and it must all be shared. Faced with these reflections and these valuations characterized as being unfinished, two new «in the pipelines» are formed which are able to unbalance the fragile balances already existing:

- there is then a new step towards decentralization, the bringing together of simpler forms of competences between the state and the collective territory: the need to stimulate and reinforce experiences by transferring duties to local country administration which in the past were not part of territorializing
- the debate on (federalism), which brings with it logics, well thought of, responsibility and clearness. It must introduce itself into a pilot administrative scheme, but it is to be founded on a logic which is too vertical to identify the competences and value the public politics. From this point of view comparing it to a more horizontal logic, that of the territory, we are giving a greater question to the institutions.

1. *Proximity, equity and quality*

If we want to carry out a valuation, that implicitly needs also the need of controlling of the social/political it is necessary that we pay particular attention to the conditional exams and answers to the needs of the population where they are evident. Public action cannot be judged only by its own intentions and neither on the quality of the tests that express the objectives it gives: it has been the results of these public actions that have relevance.

It is then in this *esprit* that the relational themes are connected with the use of social politics. The objective is that of describing the difficulties and the success registered in the adapting to the State social political characteristics of the territory, until it answers in the best of ways to the citizens and the local actors.

The choice of this argument has also been chosen for its actuality. Taking into consideration, the reality of the territory is however built on a component which is obligatory to public action, since it is in three main sectors for the citizens they found a judgement on political activity to their needs: (a) the proximity, (b) equity, (c) quality.

1. *Proximity*

Citizens hope that public powers give up on the ideas of uniformity of the procedures and also that they adapt to what is available in the territory characteristically and that they co-ordinate with major importance to the diversity of their hopes. There is a very strong social question in favour of the closing of the pilot schemes and putting them into being by the politics in favour of that that the language is technocratically -designed under the name of territorializing: from an action carried out with major closing and attention to the territory we hope that there is a major realization to the objectives, a major mobility to the actors, a major adaptation to the action taken. For this reason it is better not to re-address the proximity of an excess to virtue: it is not always enough to assure the knowledge of the

public to a fine level that we would hope or want and without trying with a social and geographical administration put in place in proximity of the citizens works automatically in a more satisfying way and more respectful of their rights. We could also take into consideration a question about the guaranteeing of equality that they must integrate; every public action must not be carried out with a minimum of distance in relation to the social question.

Even if, the objective of a public action closer can be reached by other means that to introduce the different concepts that they can have from the territorializing and the role of the State:

1. taking into consideration the reality of the territory, and their diversity, and the reduction of the inequality between them can, in a certain way, operate in a State that defines its objectives together with the responsibility and priorities that it is given, organizing the adaptation of its politics approaching local needs starting from its criteria and with its method, and answering with its advice;
2. in virtue to another model, that derives from a conception that we can qualify like «ascending», the initiative starts from the local actors that identify their needs and organize and take on the action which allow them to be answered to, and the role of the State consists in the articulating of these projects, which have come from the territory with its objectives and furnishing them with a correct support.

Most of the time territorializing follows certain ways which are clearly seen in both conceptions but they depend on the different types of combinations, at times they are more realistic and withhold ambiguity. These are applied, in first place, to different public sectors carried out by the State: what would it be about? In this case, it would be about measuring to a greater extent the needs of the people, organizing an authentic concept, to that of live power of the sector chosen and taking into consideration every thing before putting the strategic objectives into action. This would enable provision of local diagnostics and give important marginal moves to the authorities which are decentralized and give the power to apply them.

The summing up of such political sectors, even if they were fully decentralized, are not enough to answer to the needs of collectively which the territory needs. These are not satisfied through the only way of using State instruments and, until local development, there is the necessity to have a road of mobility with a project together, that is then associated to the state, the collective territories, organizations of social protection, associated movements, the habitants

What is important is the capacity to organize their complementing one another, and the systems of the relationships which put the means into synergy with the means which are used by the other actors, in proximity of durable dynamics. From this there is an importance of using new instruments like: organized information and mutual, divided analysis, and conventions.

These condensations can guide and address preparatory works that aim at putting them into light:

3. the way in which it is taken into consideration the diversity of the territory and their social economic characteristics:
4. the level and the way of concept with the local, public and private actors, who are also dealing with the same field of state intervention, and who give disposal to their own dynamic and a legitimacy which is often strong;

5. the grade of consistency, measured mostly to the land intervention of different services – that are from the State to public institutions or to the collective territory, or in particular, dealing with the same politics.

b) *Equity*

Two movements go together and are comforted by one another: the best knowledge of the diversity and the unacceptability of the inequality. On the contrary to what is suggested by *Jacobin* argument currently admitted, the uniformity in applying the public politics do not guarantee the equality of treating and, overall, they do not bring with them remedies to any unequal structures that on the contrary call on measures of positive discrimination. Since the lining of all territories on the only model of development contradicts the heterogeneity of the situations and are revealed as being unproductive when faced by the necessity of reducing the unusualness, we await from the territorializing that it helps to identify the local needs and that they contribute to give adapt answers and not monolithically. This supposes an evolution in the concepts that nature can have from public intervention on the territory:

6. in a central vision, a national territory is cut down to homogeneous zones to which the same disposals are applied. All the cutting and putting together of the national space in homogeneous zones (for example, in areas of employment – the local job systems) can be the starting point of a more convincing analysis in the needs of equality if what needs to be highlighted is the potentiality and the needs of every territory, if this local diagnosis brings the adoption of differentiated measures from one area to the other in function to the specific characteristics observed. This process is, for example, that which is adopted and contrasted politically against long-term unemployment;

7. in another optic the objective is no longer to cover the national territory but to disseminate and individualise areas that must make up the object of a particular backup which is destined to fill up the handicaps which are suffered. This is the optic adopted by the politics of the city;

8. the mechanism of the recognising of the countries, affirms the concept that is radically different in the central level, understands the general picture and incentivises and/or gives mobility of the legitimate actors to identify the global components of development and to leave and/or stabilize and/or decide for themselves the area to apply it to.

To understand the dangers of being put into action the politics of every point of the territory, cannot be significant that the State renounces the principal of an equal access to all social rights. On the contrary, the territorializing must allow an adaption to classical politics to explore, examine and study deeply ‘the local margins’.

c) *Quality*

What is awaited from the actors of the territorializing?, since it is closer to the question and so more sensible to the necessity to public action directly, that must be particularly careful to the needs of the transversal and the coherence in the work of administrations. Since the excessive vertical political segmentations (for the Ministries and their internals, for the Directions, for Services or Offices) bring dysfunctions or contradictions and harms legitimacy and the wellness of public action,

the “territorializing” is understood like a means to better the quality of the services taken. To this title, it is one of the components of State reform and the modernization of the administrations.

Territorializing and modernisation have growing opportunities and radicalise in the *esprit* and in the facts only if there is a strong political will to address it in this sense.

In this way it is understood and accompanies the decentralization of carrying out the public action. In this optic, the way in which the central structures have faced the logics of decentralization and of territorializing is not different. Have they effectively organized the decentralization, growing significantly in local responsibilities (clear directives, put at hand and performing means of observation and the collecting of needs and manoeuvring margins), with an accompanying which favours the effective exercise of these new responsibilities (balancing procedures and human managing)? have the central Administration Directions of the agencies and of the National Public Institutions put into action the instruments which allow them to carry out the mission that they compete in, of strategic piloting, of accompanying, of regularization and of valuation?

2. *The territories of social politics*

To ask oneself about the adaptation of the social policies of the State to the diversity of the territories imposes a preliminary reflection on the same concept of territory. According to a more frequent meaning it is about an organized space with fixed limits, where an authority has put into practice a power, a competence: the territory and, from here, founded on the idea of a coherency in services. So since the balancing or the equity are absent or not well-assured it is necessary for there to be *management* of the territory.

Since then this first definition would be better distinguished in different ways, the territories that the existence is guaranteed from the Constitution or the laws (the Town hall, the Province, the Region) and to those whose limits are not changeable and can only be done by complex procedures to those on the territories *ad hoc* that reflect a real homogeneity. This real homogeneity can be built upon starting from quantitative dates:

- *places ex-measured*: those that make such an area different from its neighbour and builds a certain territory; for example, having a density of old people (or doctors or long-term unemployed people, etc.) for a certain number of habitants and will be significantly different from the density observed in the areas near by;
- *fixed ex-ante* in an optic which is planned: for every territory that makes up a certain number of habitants, there will be the need for the same amount of beds for surgery or psychiatric places to answer to the needs of the population;
- *descriptive*: when we are talking about the being part of a certain lifestyle this is measured by the number of people who are in such an *hamlet attractive* to make such an acquisition or activity (work, free time, cures, etc.)

More than even quantifying data, the homogeneity can be built around a project: that distinguishes a territory from a simple space and then the existence of a project that is founded on certain similar conventions, divided by the local actors and

shown through the regularity of the behaviour of co-operation of these actors. Until the project is not ultimate, the territory remains as a 'work in progress'. Opposed to this is the conception that the territory as space as living or space that makes social cohering to the geographical territory made, fixed, and undergone.

Little by little, the territory is often made up of a reserved space, if not exclusive, and assimilates a field of action to a zone of attraction or influence. The territory then makes a placed game and pulls on strategies, meaning conflicts, as long as the legislation gives the rules to the game (like the plant bot h for the selling of the activity of the pharmaceutical products that the chemical pharmaceutical industries, for example). Everything is subjectable, but seen positively, and it is the being of a territory of a population that has its identity referrals and makes its life-style.

Facing the existence of authorities' territory, project territory, proximity territory and management, planning and co-operation of territories are we capable of providing examples which testify a cohering research of public action? How could the State be positioned in this research and help it without be suspected before?

The general characteristics of the norm being defined at national level distinguish often the stair of elaboration of strategies of intervention (the Region) and the space of a proximity that is that of the action (the Province or, more recently, the inter-provincial). The result would be that of making necessary proximity-respecting strategies which are defined by different methods.

Overall, this concept of proximity must be reinterpreted to the dimension of the space lived: everyone belongs to a place even if it moves – even more, and in always further. The dimension of the area can no longer be restrained to the space of the habitat: it must also integrate all the relational functions.

The difficulty arrives with the development of public transport which brings with it its own 'territory'; depending on the place it attends for its buying (the hypermarket or small groceries in the proximity), the cinema where one prefers to go («art et essai») in the centre of the city of complexes, with multi-cinemas in the suburbs), the school where people send their children (public or private, non-religious or religious), the health centre one chooses (hospitals in the area, university – the furthest away but the best, private clinics), etc. This tendency to create its territory in function to one's own choices is not only lived as not having a remedy, because it is linked to individual means of communication, but it is encouraged in that which testifies the passive use gives way to the active use on the consumer.

In these conditions we cannot be afraid of a distancing which grows progressively between, at one side, devices that answers problems which are collective and take into consideration the national norms, and from the other side, individual behaviours that are not forced. How could these means of intervention of organization that must no longer be limited to offer every one the same services which are founded on the norms but must be made up and come to agreement with the needs expressed by every individual?

To organize the national territory together with coherent territories in the area could imply that there would be two roads meeting that cannot be united:

- from one side, the voluntary action of central public powers that are willing to subscribe to the space of public objectives that outlines, draws – to do this – some

districts that can themselves be defined by frontiers of zones which are already institutionalized or defined by zones ad hoc;

- from another side, some local dynamics that also adopt their own areas of development in the name of autonomy of the voluntary and strategic development of local actors who are willing to lie in such a territory, to live and hope for their business, to give them an identity that is also theirs.

Can we imagine that, everywhere, the pertinent territory for the rational central organization is both at the same time a territory of projects for the local actors? It is on this level that the question of the social territories is argued.

The difficulties to individualize the «pertinent territory»

If we remember that the territorializing follows the objective of adapting public politics to that of the local realities we immediately measure the importance that is given to research, in public politics and that of local realities connected to 'pertinent territories': What appears like the most adapt to making this phenomena, we want and observe or those we desire and want to intervene on, will be the most appropriate to organizing the answers and the needs identified to a more homogenous method of making and carrying out collective projects.

The necessity to give a sufficient framework to the action of the State brings us to consider that this pertinent territory must be, except for some exceptions, a higher size to that of the Council. On the contrary, the worries of being accessible to the people who use them and available to locals must adapt to understanding and warning the different *lands*. This pushes for the need to look for a reduced scale of the of the Province. It is in this way that the question of the pertinent territory has an importance at infra-provincial level.

At the point where public action is fragmented in too many political sectarian numbers, nothing assures that the territory which is known as being pertinent for such politics will equally be for the putting into action of other politics. On the contrary, everything brings us to think – for example – the health services should be limited in function to certain data like the question and the offers which can help while the occupational sectors will be referred to by the moving of work and home. When the themes considered are so far and distant one from the other little is the heterogeneity of the subdivisions of the districts. In compensation their diversity can make a convenience which is greater when complementary politics is at hand that aim at similar politics, identical.

Does *an inflation of territories*, that would be able to multiply the risks of incoherence and stop the action, exist? If we were to occupy ourselves in a movement of rationalization of the areas used from the services of the State, could we understand it independently from the movement which operates parallel to the side of local collectively with the creation of land and agglomerations, with the development of the inter-community?

The previous demands bring up two questions: Do the political natures of the social field, and the conditions of their putting into being, allow us to project a more rational schema of the territories of intervention? Must the operative zones fixed by services by the State evolve to coincide with the new project territories that draw the managing of the territory and the inter-communality?

The conditions that the putting into operation of the territorial politics have been organized bring us to conclude that it is certainly possible to rationalize some of the territories. The exercise supposes that there should be a double equilibrium found, in the first place the equilibrium of the State services. Since every zone is politically linked with its general politics and the picture out into being are defined from the central administration and to this last mentioned must return the initiation of reflexion on a harmonization of the territories. This must then be a supplementary occasion to interrogate internally: the closing between the management that make the functioning possible such as «*canne d'organo*» and is brought into question. At the same time the necessary implications of the central administration must not bring a recentralization of the places where the previous directives were managed and had certain margins of manoeuvres for the decentralized authorities, which also include the subdivision of the public territories and then at a second glance the equilibrium of the relation between the State and the collective territories. The State services cannot ignore the impact of the recomposing of the territory, brought on by laws which are relative to the managing of the territory and to the intercommunality.

All this conforms to the spirit of these norms, this composition is founded on the voluntary action collectively and on the concept of territorial projects. The present state of things does not guarantee that the new space created covers the all-togetherness of the territory equally and does not adopt subdivisions that are pertinent and will weigh including the putting into action state politics. This last mentioned must be more careful because the evolution in progress in politics is carried out by the decentralized collectives are more complementary to its own. The State cannot carry out the principal of the coincidences of the research between the areas that have already been created and those which come out as progression and development of intercommunality.

In this area we do not want to formulate precise arguments which are related to the possible rules which must be followed to modify the areas surrounding which have already been used politically. Vice-versa, it appears clear that the State services, central and de-central, build together and quickly, a vision which is linked to what comes from a real strategy of territory. The developments which follow draw the boundaries which could build on this reflection:

- giving up on a *universal* operative territory could have the need for a unique picture to the declination of the togetherness of the politics launched by ministries that are busy with and or have competences socially;
- find the right place for what is questioned for the harmonization of the area used for public action;
- not to ignore the development and dynamics of the new territories produced by the norms, relative to the management of the territory and the intercommunality.

Giving up on a "universal" operative territory

Among the different possible schemes which are added to simplify acts that are put into the territory by the ministerial politics that deal with and or have social dealings, there is also the hypothesis of *finding* the unique territory, which seems to have been put aside from the start. The different nature of the followed objectives brings us to an approach and a different utilization of territories; the central ad-

ministration would be right in critically saying that if it were to decide to let pass the *territorilazione* through the way of the only districts of “common rights” (for example the neighbourhood) or only through an inter-provincial district. In other terms, it is firmly held that the different areas for each politic, that for which the central administration shows its aptitude to recognize that local realities are expressed differently from one area to another. The ambition must be that of simplifying and harmonizing, and not unifying.

The different functions that are carried out help us eliminate the concept of a unique territory. If certain functions of observation, strategic piloting, coordination of locals - only if they stay the same at regional level and otherwise - and, in particular, the treating of individual situations, keep the evidence of an interprovincial level. This point pushes us to highlight that a *surplus of territorilazione* does not have to pass through a *surplus of proximity*, for the services of the State whose mission is founded on equality of citizens and guaranteeing balanced economic macros and its knowing how to do this, is expressed, moreover, in its coordination of works.

If it is urgent for the central State powers to deeply reflect on their own territorial strategy, whose importance has been underestimated up till now, we must make sure that there is not a downfall in the inverse situation and we must measure that the reflection of the territorial pertinence does not become its own.

3. *Federalization and participated programming*

The new configuration of the territorial dimension that will be obtained with a full activity of federalization will put forward a series of questions. Will still the priority function of an administration be the coordination of all social actors locals and institutions of territory for the reaching of the objectives of general growing? Will the future plans that will have to include the different articulations of the types of regulations of the territory, both in terms of socio-political integration and in terms of capabilities to act, still configure like the result of an active participation that involves, in a certain way, even the social parts?

The administrative perimeter of a territory with its federalization will broaden, going along the lines more and more often like a place of intersection of two structures: the one formal (the institutions), and the other informal (the relational nets), not legitimate⁶. It is not in the interests of the present paper to stabilize what should be the margins of operation and responsibilities of one or the other. We do not believe that there can be a unique solution, but what does count is that the possible mediation between them can come through forms of plan of inter-institutional keeping in mind that the latter, when managed by a responsible political class, certainly represents the signal of progress and modernization of democratic life.

⁶ For a more in-depth discussion of this please refer to E. Mangone, ‘Identità, comunità e sviluppo locale’, in N. Ammaturo and E. Mangone, *Locale-gobale verso quale sviluppo? Il caso del comune di Laviano*, Mercato San Severino, C.E.I.M. 2008.

The new scene of government in the territory will not only have to give life to a *strong partnership institution*, but will also have to have a strong research method using new instruments of legitimacy which represent overall bases for the re-launching of the programming of the political welfare in different sectors. These types of initiatives are first brought by the actual phase of the “new programming” of political development that involves, on the one hand, the central government as long as it keeps to general strategies of modernization and, on the other hand, the local governments relative to the reform of the federal process and from the gradual decentralization of the responsibility in the re-organizing and managing of the new territorial systems.

In the last few years, as well as consultation processes, a process of participation has developed, which has widened the area of subjects that intervene in the process of *decision making* and programming; it is about subjects that represent a fundamental part of civil society (associations, third areas, consumers, etc.)⁷ and which contribute to the reinforcement of model of “common goods” and of “shared administration”. For the adoption of this method, government procedures must be adopted from an administration that allows the continuous involvement of social forces, even if this process is presented as hard and/or inconclusive, for an efficient individualization of the problems and the relative decision making, as well for the start of processes and interventions which need consent, sharing and collaboration between the different actors in the territory. In such a situation we are faced with what Altieri has called macro dimensions of participation, which are “political”; this happens «when the citizens (or their representing agents or associations) intervene, directly or with a process of indirect influence, on the choices which discuss standards. They try to influence the decisions about the localization of the resources, they propose new services or interventions to better the services and they tend to practice checking or vindication or negotiations»⁸.

In the actual political contest, the subsidiary is the aspect of political government of a territory that permit bigger spaces for participation; the new modalities for distributing of the services will not only have to underline the actions of the citizens in defining their needs but will have to recognize the role that they must carry out even with those who join them (informally or formally) as active partners rather than passive receivers of services. The role of the institutions will have to be developed by organizing of subjects, that are particular and specific stakeholders; those who are specifically interested will have to interact according to the social question and needs, with the finalization of building an organic “political territory” through the participated programming and the principals of proximity, equity and quality. What must be revised are the traditional logics of public intervention in favour of a development of integrated services and interventions, overall in sanitary and socio-sanitary sectors, like products of the territory’s actions to then be able to

⁷ For a more in-depth discussion of these arguments of participation of the subjects of civil society please see: Accorinti M., *Terzo settore e welfare locale*, Roma, Carocci, 2008, and Ciocia A. (a cura di), *Per un welfare dalla parte dei cittadini. Aspetti territoriale della domanda delle politiche sociali*, Roma, Carocci, 2007.

⁸ Altieri L., *Ascolto e partecipazione dei cittadini in sanità: dimensioni, modelli, prospettive, problemi*, in “Salute e società”, 1, 2, 2002, pp. 9-21, p.11.

arrive at expressing what the demand was and identifying the priorities of intervention.

The classic tri-participation of the phases to defining the policies (planning, programming and projecting) cannot be mutated; all this must give a greater attention to the prospective application of a normative for the integration of a project of welfare intervention, and they must involve communication between participated programming and characteristics of the territory. The participated programming has the role of valorization and reinforcing the positive existing realities (empowerment): The territory is no longer a physical space that receives the intervention and services, but becomes, itself, the protagonist of the actions taken.

An important element of participation is surely the aspiration of the specific subjects who participate in the process and who weigh their presence and identify interests in the choices that belong to a specific territorial context. This condition highlights the dialectal equality/inequality: in fact, we talk of participation only when certain groups of people who have roles and/or institutional powers or resources in inferior measures to those who are considered responsible in the managing of a determinate institution, and who want to bring their own orientation to the choices that they would take on. In other words, the participation would be subsidized in an artificial reduction of the inequality of power; so the term of participation will not come from referring to situations in which those who compete to make a communal decision will all have the same juridical powers. Looking at this last consideration we ask ourselves what will happen to the federalization, considering that those who will take part in the participation process will all have the same juridical title and competences to administrate a territory (region, province and commune).

The paths that the administrations must take are all up hill; the most meaningful change that must be fulfilled is in the relationship between institutions and citizens, and consequently in the relationship between participation and institution. The passage from *ideology of participation to participating for objectives* is the new step for the administrations; it is, therefore, necessary to foresee structures and procedures finalized to individualization and choices about the institutional objectives rethinking about participation processes in function to the proximity of the territory and the principals of equity and quality that they hold should be placed from and to the institutions. The administrations will have to categorically guarantee to the citizens the *rights of word, to be informed and to have citizenship* through a direct protagonist and the taking on of responsibility.

The reflections that have been proposed highlight how the participation builds up, at the same time, an objective towards political welfare and a methodological aspect. It is, therefore, possible to think about participation on different operative terms identifiable on the basis of different but complementary⁹ functions: a) the participation as *the possibility of contributing to the elaboration of public politics*; b) the participation as *a right of democratically influencing* the relevant processes

⁹ For a more analytical description of the functions individualized please look at the concluding paragraph of the chapter from the title *Gli strumenti della programmazione partecipata* di Mangone E., in T. Saccheri, G. Masullo and E. Mangone, *Sociologia della salute. Fondamenti e prospettive*, C.E.I.M. editrice Mercato San Severino, 2008.

of ones own and others; c) participation as *a right of being included, to take on rights and responsibilities* in everyday life.

The administration in front of them have a great fight for federalism that can be defined as an opportunity; it is their job to diminish the perception of distance that the citizen experiences in order of cities, to the services, to their accessibility, favouring the civil sense and renewing the interest for a “agreement between citizen and institutions” and also always awaiting a difficult job of overcoming the faith that has been “lost” through the building of opportunities for which the citizens “hear themselves” and “perceive themselves” as being “active citizens” and part of a territory that expresses idealistic and future perspective.

In this sense the relaunching of interest in the participation of the programming holds a certain willpower of different subjects, to be able to develop in the citizens a process of political, civil and economical alphabetization, at obtaining the basic knowledge about the functioning of the mechanism of the institutions and the society, not the mechanism of regulating the social and economical life, conditions necessary for the training and the expression of interests and options, and to organize in function to the realization of their social desires.

4. *The politics of welfare of the territory and plans*

The building of a new agreement for a new territory cannot bring actions together from various decisional and institutional levels, and at the same time the demands promoted by the territory; what must continue is a renewing model of the development of *basic plans*, focusing most of all on the taking back of the territory and on the valorization of the resources at hand. In the 1980s there were models of endogenous development that brought to the attention the politics and economy the plans, often spontaneous and regulated by *best practice* more than standardized norms, that the reality of the economy of the territory can be seen. The plan has come to have a meaning less “central” and has the advantage of a spectrum of instruments more linked to the experience and culture of the individual territories and then creating “opportunities and synergies” than to ties and norms. The plan must not become *the arena of the strife*; it must be “a foot ahead” in the process of innovation: at every level of representatives of different subjects, the plan process must conclude with relevant acts from clear procedures and responsible positions where the role and function of each represented must be clear.

The politics of welfare for their specific involve a multiple private or public subjects, as associated with one another or singly with the need to activate instruments able to use even economic and social plans and institutions: this makes us consider the role of the instruments of the *negotiating plans*¹⁰, the first priority of which, as we note, are the regulations agreed on by those publicly and privately interested in carrying out these different interventions referred to an only aim where there is the need for a complex valuation of the competent activities. In each way that political welfare is looked at we cannot consider the worthiness and the different points of view and interests and the integration of the different instruments and

¹⁰ Granata F., *Gli Strumenti della programmazione negoziata*, Napoli Liguori Editore, 1999.

behaviours. This means that we need a renewed commitment and capacity, and, overall, the willingness of those involved in the planning while not taking away the responsibility that such a process needs regarding the representatives of the community (territory).

The strategies must base themselves on an “integral logic” which manages to coherently collect the objectives where there is the safeguard of the wellbeing of the territory. The social and environmental problems in the economy of wellbeing can no longer be considered as external and nor be treated exclusively with public intervention; the integrated reading of the objectives will not find an easy ground, free from resistance linked to “positional profit” and they will definitely note the difficulties caused by contrasts, even in the administrative camp and management, so there will then be the need for a political mediation from the administration sections taken from the involvement of all those interested. This process is not immune to conflicts between objectives and those interested. It is necessary to define, accept and share criteria to be able to manage and overcome such conflicts. The introduction of the complexity in the strategic picture of welfare politics and in decisional processes so that the most recent generation and most advanced instruments of planning reflect a weak rational and takes on a complex dimension and uncertainty and not the plurality of interests such as values to protect and as opportunities to build common grounds of objects. No more than ever in Italy you must outline for administrative purposes the passage from the dimension of *government* to the dimension of *governance* like a regulating negotiation of interests, with the dimension of consensus (*consensus building*) co-essentially to the phases of the process of defining politics. Specific attention to an innovative prospect of the integrated planning in political welfare will be paid to the link between planning and the characteristics of the territory (from geomorphic to socio-demographic and cultural). The planning of political welfare in an integrated logic has the role of highlighting the potentialities of the territory and valorizing the existing realities, concentrating the attention on risk factors reducing the effects; this type of planning must be able to take action even on *conditions of possibilities* of the same interventions especially in the territories where a series of downfalls or where system relations and the articulation of social, productive and administrative fabric seem particularly destructed.

The present federalization has not yet defined an asset which is complete or organic in terms of the territory roles both in relation to the rights of the citizens and to central government and to the administration of these territories, looking at, overall, the form of social security of the citizen and the complete citizenship. Using subsidiaries as the main principle of the new political welfare at the territory level asks that the main aims of the local administrators become those that help the people to become active or to remain productive members of society. The new distributing modalities of the services will not only have to highlight the users’ participation, defining their needs, but will also have to know, overall, the role that they and their families can have as active partners more than those of the passive receivers of benefits and services.

The correct application, both with the vertical subsidiaries (between public institutions) and those of horizontal subsidiaries (between public institutions and civil societies — individual and collective subjects), keeps and reinforces the role of the

administrations when, on the one hand, they guarantee solidarity principles between the citizens in the help to civil society and the collecting of the exercise of public responsibilities and when they are carried out with an adequate surveillance on the complete offer and guarantee partially and completely the network of events and present services in the territory. In this prospect the Plans of Zone and the Plans for Health¹¹⁶ must be redefined starting from the territory if they must continue to be the fundamental instruments to govern the health politics and socio-health politics of a territory; the role of the administrations will have to be developed in the coordination and the organization of different subjects, with particular and specific interests, that will interact according to the needs and the social demand with the aim of building organic *territory political welfare*.

The territories are considered as open spaces in which the social and environmental networks find their closest interrelationship depending on the logic which the integration of the intervention for health and wellbeing will be put into through the conjugation of environmental, social and economical aspects. It will not only be guaranteeing and looking after health biologically but it will be necessary to assure a global bettering of the quality of life focusing on the objectives of the reduction of the “social pathologies” that will afflict the territory of modern life and give the idea of the necessity of making “territories to man size”.

The political welfare of a territory will have to distinguish itself for the building of an integrated system of services and interventions. For this we highlight the difference between the concept of *service* that is a stable unit of offer in time, structured and regulated from functional and organized standards, and the *intervention* that indicates a part of a project realized through an adequate coordination of the resources of the times of the means at hand. The complete transformation of the welfare system will be redone by an important event, which is that of *valorizing the territory as a resource*, able not only to put into contact the citizens by formal means (the services) and informal (relational)¹² but also to sustain and promote all the communicating networks of solidarity and reciprocity that will be managed spontaneously in a territory.

It is then confirmed that the choice of political welfare which is not residing but founded on a citizen's idea in which the principle of the horizontal subsidiary is interpreted as a support to give widened responsibilities and not as an abdication of the public part of taking the wellbeing of the citizen.

Bibliography

Accorinti M., *Terzo settore e welfare locale*, Roma, Carocci, 2008.

Altieri L., *Ascolto e partecipazione dei cittadini in sanità: dimensioni, modelli, prospettive, problemi*, in “Salute e società”, I, 2, 2002, pp. 9-21.

¹¹ Cfr. Mangone E., *Gli operatori sociali tra innovazione e rassegnazione. La riforma dell'assistenza pubblica a Salerno*, Milano, FrancoAngeli, 2005, e Corposanto C., Fazzi L., e Scaglia A., *Costruire Piani di Salute. Una sperimentazione di programmazione sanitaria della Asl 1 di Venosa*, Milano, FrancoAngeli, 2004.

¹² Cfr. Donati P., *Introduzione alla sociologia relazione*, Milano, FrancoAngeli, 1989 e *Teoria relazionale della società*, Milano, FrancoAngeli, 1991.

- Ciocia A. (a cura di), *Per un welfare dalla parte dei cittadini. Aspetti territoriali della domanda delle politiche sociali*, Roma, Carocci, 2007.
- Corposanto C., Fazzi L., e Scaglia A., *Costruire Piani di Salute. Una sperimentazione di programmazione sanitaria della Asl I di Venosa*, Milano, FrancoAngeli, 2004.
- De Leonardis O., *In un diverso welfare. Sogni e incubi*, Milano, Feltrinelli, 1998.
- Donati P., *Introduzione alla sociologia relazione*, Milano, FrancoAngeli, 1989.
- Donati P., *Teoria relazionale della società*, Milano, FrancoAngeli, 1991.
- Ferrera M., *Modelli di solidarietà. Politica e riforme sociali nelle democrazie*, Bologna, il Mulino, 1993
- Ferrera M., *Le trappole del welfare*, Bologna, il Mulino, 1998.
- Ferrera M., *The Boundaries of Welfare. European Integration and the New Spatial Politics of Social Protection*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005
- Ferrera M., *Le politiche sociali. L'Italia in prospettiva comparata*, Bologna, il Mulino, 2006
- Granata F., *Gli strumenti della programmazione negoziata*, Napoli, Liguori Editore, 1999.
- Mangone E., *Gli operatori sociali tra innovazione e rassegnazione. La riforma dell'assistenza pubblica a Salerno*, Milano, FrancoAngeli, 2005.
- Mangone E., *Identità, comunità e sviluppo locale*, in Ammaturo N., Mangone E., *Locale-globale verso quale sviluppo? Il caso del comune di Laviano*, Mercato San Severino, C.E.I.M. editrice, 2008.
- Mangone E., *Gli strumenti della programmazione partecipata*, in Saccheri T., Masullo G. e Mangone E., *Sociologia della salute. Fondamenti e prospettive*, Mercato San Severino, C.E.I.M editrice, 2008.
- Torchia L., *Welfare e federalismo*, Bologna, il Mulino, 2005.