

Contemporary Urban Space and the Intercultural City

SSiIM Unesco Chair¹

Diversity

In the contemporary context of growing exchange and encounters among people with different cultural traditions, the way in which diversity is approached is at the root of how cities will position themselves in front of the gateway to the realization of the intercultural city. In fact, as the setting for the flow of capital, goods, people and, by consequence, ideas and innovation, cities are at the center stage of this diversity and the process of globalization.

In the North, and increasingly in the South as well, the presence of people born elsewhere, or who remain somehow tied to places of origin different from where they live, reinforces the role of the contemporary city as a place of encounter, exchange, and confrontation. Though neither simple to grasp nor easy to manage, the growing ethnic mix and socio-cultural diversity in today's cities is a condition destined to rapidly evolve in the next few decades, due to the expanding number of migrants who will look for a way out of the widening economic, social, and political disparities among countries worldwide

As underlined by many authors (Jacobs, 1960; Sennet, 1970; Morgan, 1989; Lofland 1998), the encounter of cultures and the capacity to create new ideas this entails have always contributed to socio-economic development. Nevertheless, few countries actually see cultural encounter as a condition worth being explicitly embraced. With few exceptions, practically nowhere is the cultural diversity which necessarily accompanies immigration considered positive. Quite the contrary, in recent years most countries have adopted increasingly restrictive immigration policies, to the point of erecting physical barriers.

In most cities the majority of residents perceive cultural diversity as a detrimental effect of globalization. Differences in language, ways of dressing, use of public space, and even hairstyles and cooking smells are synonymous with distrust, simply because these unfamiliar behaviours question the sensory landscapes of everyday life which have been long-since taken for granted (Garfinkel, 1967; Goffman, 1971). The impact of the cultural differences that migrants bring with them on a national identity, i.e. on the 'nation's cultural self-understanding (Koopmans et al., 2005), is particularly jarring at the city level where the concentration of individuals with different origins materializes into cultural diversity.

¹ Marcello Balbo, Adriano Cancellieri, Giovanna Marconi, Mirko Marzadro, Elena Ostanel

On the other hand, this all propels a surfacing of identities and values never claimed before by native residents, together with an adoption of specific policies to validate them. The emergence of these new localisms is what those people afraid of being 'left out' see as the most effective response to the exclusionary character of the forces of globalization (Bauman, 2001). In this frame, in many western cities sorts of "revanchist" policies against minorities are emerging with regard to public spaces (Smith, 1996; Atkinson, 2003; Mitchell, 2003). Uncertainty about the future or, more exactly, about what the future may no longer be like, is the primary reason for erecting defence mechanisms based on the assumption that local culture and local traditions are superior to the ones coming from 'the outside'. In this view, the 'outside' is far away, but it may very well include nearby territories with consequences that range from the manipulation of history to the rise of exclusionary behaviour and xenophobic political organizations.

The city is where encounter takes place daily. It is sensory and emotional, as well as cogent and serendipitous. In small and medium-size cities tensions tend to become more explicit, since uncertainty about the future is the strongest, the presence of the other is more visible and explicit, and native residents are less used to it. The coexistence of multiple cultures brings to light different ways of living, whose different uses of the urban space act in accordance with the values and functions assigned to each type of space, i.e. the space for the family, for encounter with the community, or for inter-group relations.

Just the same, complexity as a substantive feature of today's cities is ever more evident. In the urban space, cultural diversity is everywhere: in restaurants, shops, markets, workplaces, housing and public spaces. It emerges continuously, be it in schools where the children of immigrants are outnumbering those of the local population, in public spaces where Muslim women wear the *hijab* (head-scarf), or on the Sunday gatherings of Peruvians and Bolivians for their large barbecues in the city parks next to the Pakistanis' cricket matches, the Filipinos highly voiced badminton tournaments, and the Eastern -European women's impromptu peer hairdressing salons.

As a consequence of the increasingly complex nature of urban society and the time-space system of relations engendered by globalization, communities of belonging and related ties of allegiance considerably loosen. Migrants are certainly unwilling to abandon 'home' and even less inclined to embrace the cultural values of the country and the city they end up in. Indeed, migrants maintain and develop translocal and transnational networks and identities that span across both local and national borders (Glick et al., 1992).

Citizenship

Strictly related to the notion of cultural diversity is the issue of citizenship. One of the primary objectives in the building of nation-states consisted in replacing social and political integration based on elements of exclusion (such as religion, kinship, and territorial proximity), with forms based on a system of rights and obligations equal for all individuals who belong to the same sovereign territory –the nation. In this framework, the way in which discourse on national identity is forged has a

direct impact in shaping how the phenomenon of immigration is perceived and, as a consequence, on how open urban policies and societies are with respect to migrants' inclusion and citizenship.

Within the 'container' model of society presumed by the modern nation-state system, immigrants inevitably tend to be considered as problematic 'outsiders' and a politically dangerous potential security risk, cultural 'others' who are socially marginal and an exception to the rule of sedentariness within the boundaries of the nation-state (Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002). To foreign residents, "the border is not something they have left behind, it effectively follows them inside the state, denying them many of the rights enjoyed by full citizens or making their enjoyment less secure" (Bosniak, 2006). This discourse on national identity establishes

"which points of view on the relation between immigrants and the majority society are considered sensible, which constructions of reality are considered realistic, and which claims and collective actors are held as legitimate within the polity. Together, these institutional and discursive opportunities facilitate the mobilization of some collective actors with certain types of collective identity and specific types of demands while constraining the mobilization of other actors and the expression of other identities and demands" (Koopmans et al., 2005, 6).

In the construction of a national identity, the nation-state eroded the ideas of the city and of citizenship as a dimension of belonging to the city space and involvement in its social fabric. In fact, citizenship has come to mean the set of rights and duties that relate citizens to the nation-state. Yet, the relationship citizenship/city has not waned; on the contrary, cities remain at the core of citizenship development (Holston and Appadurai, 1996) and they are the main stage for engagement among different cultures. Today's cities are places where different cultures may cooperate, enter into conflict or disregard each other, however they cannot completely ignore each other. They are thus compelled to coexist, making cultural difference and its corollary, multiculturalism, intrinsic conditions of contemporary urban space.

The complex nature of the contemporary city brings about a complete change in the notion of citizenship as the relation between the individual and the state. "In some places, the project of a national society of citizens, especially liberalism's twentieth-century version, appears increasingly exhausted and discredited" (Holston and Appadurai, 1996, 188). The notion of one-man, one-state citizenship rests on what is referred to as 'methodological nationalism', i.e. "the assumption that the nation/state/society is the natural social and political form of the modern world" (Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002, 302).

As already mentioned, technological innovation in communication and transportation has severely shifted the meaning of citizenship away from an affiliation to the country of destination and its subsequent values and identity. At the same time, "[e]ven those [migrants] who are not ready to join the wider political community of their host country feel that they have a stake in the city" (Bauböck, 2003, 151).

Many if not most international migrants link to distant places more than to their present community and local space, which results in a growing "mismatch

between citizenship and the territorial scope of legitimate authority”, with governments obliged to be accountable to citizens living outside the country, along with those living inside its borders (Bauböck, 2008, 31). This is not only a migrants’ condition, since communication technologies enhance a space of currents that evade the control of any locale, reducing the commitment to the city of globally-networked elites as well. However, for migrants this results in formal citizenship, i.e. becoming a member of the destination state, becoming far less important an objective than in the past when maintaining ties with the country of origin was arduous.

The revival of urban citizenship (Isin, 2009; Appadurai, 1996; Amin and Thrift, 2002) vs. national citizenship in the urban space of globalization is linked to the much higher value granted to substantive aspects of membership as opposed to formal ones (Holston, 1998). The needs of everyday life place migrants’ priority on substantive citizenship as fully entitled members of the urban community, i.e. on being recognized as a constituent part of the city’s cultural and physical space which they contribute to making work, thus actually converting cities into the genuine space of citizenship. What is of interest to individuals and families arriving from distant places is primarily their right to access the opportunities the city has to offer in terms of jobs, housing, and services rather than the rights related to the nation-state citizenship, such as voting, taking an active part in politics, and serving in the army. The priority for international migrants, who largely add to the poor segments of the urban population, is not so much membership in the nation-state, which produces only limited tangible benefits; but a substantive access to the ‘right to the city’.

Such a different notion of citizenship is reinforced by the often only temporary relationship with the country, and the locality, of destination. Temporary and circular migration make the sense of belonging to institutions and society much more fragile than it was in the past when the perspective for many was to never go back to their countries of origin. In a globalized world, migration is typified by its multiple characteristics - those permanent, temporary, circular, individual and family-wide - all aspects that change the way migrants perceive the issues of citizenship, loyalty, and identity.

For this reason, in the contemporary city citizenship takes on multiple meanings that can be addressed only by adopting multiple responses tailored to each migration course, or by following unconventional approaches aiming to overcome the dichotomy between citizens and non-citizens. Among the latter, the concept of “denizenship” (and “denizens”) (Hammar, 1994) is an interesting field of enquiry, an “in-between” category entitling foreign residents to multiple social and legal rights, up to the ability to vote locally, though they are not granted full political rights. Whether the quasi-citizenship status of denizenship entails the risk of confining foreign residents into a second-class membership still framed within the paradigm of the national State remains an open question.

A further step ahead is needed to overcome the concept of citizenship as an unchangeable discrete entity and instead grasp its multidimensional and processual character. According to Stasiulis (2004, 296) “citizenship is more fruitfully regarded in *relational* terms, as an unstable set of social relations actively negotiated and contested between individuals, states, other political communities, territories, and between the realms of the private and public”. “In order to make sense of the implications of [contemporary] developments for

citizenship we require new concepts rather than recycling of old categories” (Isin, 2009, 368). This means a shift from citizenship conceived as a static status (be it inherited, acquired by birth or obtained through ‘naturalization’ processes) to citizenship as a practice and a process; from citizens conceived as ruled subjects to citizens as claimants of rights (Isin, 2009)--first and foremost that of full access to urban assets and opportunities on the equal basis of *ius domicili*. Multi-level and transnational citizenship regimes and forms of hybrid citizenship (Stasiulis, 2004) that decouple citizenship from nationality should be explored.

From this viewpoint, the recognition of migrants’ legal status seems to be one of the first items to be included in a tentative agenda towards a real urban citizenship, since it significantly eases the degree of confrontation with local residents. At the same time, by reducing the centrality of community-based local and transnational networks for coping with day-to-day necessities, it facilitates interaction with the other residents as well as political and social engagement in the pursuit of collective development. This seems all the more necessary in light of the fact that contemporary migration is a “a world-wide archipelago of ethnic/religious/ linguistic settlements – oblivious to the trails blazed and paved by the imperialist-colonial episode and following instead the globalization-induced logic of the planetary redistribution of life resources” (Bauman, 2008), which questions many of the traditional binary relations such as identity/citizenship, individual/place, neighbourhood/belonging.

Accommodating this social and cultural mix, however, often conflicts on the one hand with drawing together cultural diversity and the different values it carries, and, on the other, with reconciling community rights and the individual rights on which modern urban societies are based, as well as with the set of shared values that lies at the heart of urban social cohesion. Citizenship and cultural diversity can only subsist if a set of basic values are shared, thus defining the community of allegiance among individuals who are at the same time equal and diverse, born locally and new residents, nationals and migrants. Nevertheless, such values cannot rest on cultural requirements, behaviours or, worse yet, religious followings.

This is a particularly onerous issue at a time when the liberal social contract on which the modernity of western countries rests is being confronted and contested by other ideas of modernity (Appadurai, 1996). For this reason, the notion of citizenship as a community of allegiance to common moral and civic values is increasingly replaced by an idea of citizenship as an association of people with the right to adequate living conditions, primarily employment, housing, health services, schools, and collective space.

The new meaning citizenship takes up in the context of cultural diversity and growing international migration brings to the fore the issue of the “politics of difference rather than [...] a politics of universalism, or equalization of rights” (Taylor, 1992, cit. in Holston and Appadurai, 1996). In most cases, the objective of urban policies is at best to address the needs of (legal) migrants on the basis of equal rights with respect to the rest of the urban population. This means essentially fighting discriminatory rules and procedures in order to guarantee equal access to primary urban goods and services. Though under democratic rule equality of access does not seem to be a particularly progressive stance, its actual achievement is in no way immediate.

Local resistance to such an equalization of rights is often strong and loudly-voiced on the basis of a right to priority of 'natives' over newcomers, legitimized by the idea of their being entitled, as members of the nation, to an exclusive set of rights and privileges. An arbitrary logic underpins the opposition between 'national' and 'non national' and all discriminations against immigrants are linked back to this fundamental differentiation by law, supreme justification of all other distinctions. "The fact that the immigrant is not a citizen of the nation, justifies the limited needs that are recognized to him in terms of equal treatment before the law and in the everyday practices." (Sayad, 2008). Equalization of rights, and the subsequent equality of access to urban services is also strongly opposed on the fundamentally erroneous assumption that migrants pay less taxes than locals and by consequence have less rights to access public housing, schools and health services.

Such resistance is all the more striking when considering how the universalist model started to be questioned at the end of the 1980s and the notion of 'differentiated citizenship' was introduced (Young, 1989), stressing how the disadvantages people intrinsically suffer from their ethnic, gender, and religious affiliation prevent their equality and full integration. For this reason, in the 1990s many countries acknowledged the idea that "some forms of cultural difference can only be accommodated [...] if their members have group-specific rights" (Kymlicka, 1995, 26). Acknowledging that the presence of different cultures is an asset for the national as well as local society, in order to preserve and encourage cultural diversity equal treatment may require differential treatment. The notion of differentiated citizenship encompasses the idea that it may be necessary to grant additional rights to specific groups and individuals, including international migrants, whose culture is at a disadvantage compared to the dominant one. Additional rights are necessary not only to make migrants equal to other city residents while preserving their cultural background, but also to facilitate their integration into urban society thus promoting social cohesion and spatial inclusion (Parekh, 2000, 262). The assumption behind this reasoning is the recognition that the culture of the dominant majority can create disadvantages for minorities that trigger the need for support and protective measures for their cultures. This view reflects the idea that only through full recognition of their presence, culture and traditions will international migrants be ready to become part of and be involved with local society. Thus, to make migrants equal residents with a common sense of belonging in the greater interest of society at large, it could well be necessary to give them specific and additional rights, if only temporarily.

This argument in favour of positive discrimination does not come without criticism, in particular as regards the possibility of constructing a shared idea of society that cuts across differences and extends beyond self-interest. In the view of Habermas (1994), measures intended to equalize the conditions of specific groups such as women and migrants to the rest of the population "turn into new forms of discrimination and instead of liberties being guaranteed people are deprived of freedom". In addition, this type of "legislation and adjudications are oriented to traditional patterns of interpretation and thus serve only to strengthen existing [...] stereotypes". Differentiated citizenship may generate a weakening of the sense of collective belonging, and affect citizens' willingness to accept sacrifices to the benefit of others. Differentiated citizenship policies may also reinforce the image of migrants as a problematic population in need of public support, and foster social segregation as well as spatial fragmentation.

Furthermore, it is hard to design policies that are at the same time equitable and supportive of differentiated citizenship. In contrast, universalist policies addressed to deprived segments of the population without distinction of their ethnic, gender, or religious conditions is seen as more equalizing. Beyond their intrinsic character and the weakness, or sheer lack, of public discourse on migration stressing the benefits to society offered by cultural diversity, universalist welfare policies, as opposed to more group-targeted policies, remain the only foreseeable response to the difficulties more and more sectors of the urban population have to face in the context of the current economic crisis that many destination countries are experiencing.

Space

Cities reflect the pattern of dynamic relationships among individuals and groups who behave according to the cultural values they were born within and are familiar with, even when they have left that context behind and disengaged from it. It is this system of relationships that constitutes the social and cultural context within which the citizens of a city, “willingly or not, conduct the ethical-political discourse in which they attempt to reach agreement on their self-understanding” (Habermas, 1994, 126). Fostering encounter and exchange among different cultural groups, on the basis of equal respect, is the essence of the city.

Cultural values and a sense of collectivity are two aspects often at odds, and reconciling them may prove quite difficult. This is particularly true when it comes to urban space and its use, since public space is the main arena of encounter, exchange, and confrontation among different cultures. It is in public space that individuals meet and groups of people from the same community congregate, engaging with other groups that utilize the same space at the same time, occasionally clashing over the others' uses. Urban public space is the stage for unremitting encounters of individuals, and their cultures, where people interact and negotiate in the “spaces of interdependence” (Amin, 2002, 967) such as the squares, streets, and parks that make up the specific character of urban space.

The question of space is at the core of the construct of difference. Through the formation of ‘spatial identities’ stereotypes contribute to the fragmentation of urban space. This gives rise to the emergence of areas specifically allocated for the use of local populations and various migrant communities:

“ethnicity is constituted through the manipulation of urban space in order to provide room for living, all the way from parcels of actual land or protocols about who gets out of the way on the street to the smallest body movements that betray an expanded or contracted body image. The point is that different cities provide different resources for particular ethnic groups to construct themselves in space, and these groups therefore do so differently” (Amin and Thrift, 2002).

The presence of diverse cultures involves uses of space that may be unfamiliar to residents, and are thus often perceived as a potential menace to the well-being of the local urban society. In reality public spaces are neither deterministic places of fear nor automatically places of encounter (Balbo, 2012). They are open social and political fields, within which both physical as well as symbolic dimensions play a fundamental role. They are spaces where diverse people meet, talk,

perform and assist different practices, interact or avoid doing so, observe, imitate and take inspiration, participate, negotiate, criticize, enter into conflict. Public space is not neutral, it is the corollary of democracy: Conflict is not something that befalls an originally, or potentially, harmonious urban space, but rather urban space is the product of conflict (Deutsche, 1996). It is filled with signs, symbols and markers that are variously interpreted by socially positioned and culturally distinct people. As a result, “public spaces mean completely different things for different groups” (Lownsborough and Beunderman, 2007).

When looking at the contemporary city, the question appears to be to what extent the notion of public space fits into the growing diversity and multiplicity of ‘public spaces’ inherent in the culturally diverse globalized city. Given that “newcomers reveal the limits of the public sphere as constituted and imagined by the society and its legislators at a given time” (Göle, 2006), the presence of different cultures demands a redefinition of what collective space is, and of the public sphere in general. “By bringing [minority cultures] in from the margin, they can bear on and reshape the dominant culture, contributing to remaking a shared public culture in an intercultural way” (Bloomfield, Bianchini, 2004, 42).

Public space is not a static concept. It is not limited to the formal areas of gathering planned and built for this purpose by city leaders and urban planners. The increasingly complex and heterogeneous mix of the urban population has multiplied the demand for public spaces, which often stop being places of freedom and opportunity to end up being ‘defended’ through lines of demarcation, no go areas and front lines. Even when a space apparently seems to be free-for-all and accessible to whoever wants set foot on it and spend time there, intangible lines of division between isolated ‘cultural public spheres’ may fragment it. At worst, people – be they natives or migrants - may seek to translate their cultural public sphere into physical territory necessitating the exclusion of those who do not fit into it, do not ‘belong’ to that specific group, or those perceived as breaking established conventions of behavior and norms which are taken for granted.

One outcome of the inadequacy of the public sphere is that, under the pressure put on safety by public authorities through controls and physical barriers, undocumented as well as legal migrants often choose to be ‘invisible’ by going unnoticed and limiting their encounters with the local population. Safety concerns result in shearing migrants from urban society and hampering their social and spatial inclusion. Their lives end up being somehow surreptitious, conducted exclusively in the only places that make them feel relatively safe: home and work. Their use of public space is limited mainly to those activities that they themselves create and feel as protective, such as walking with a toddler, chatting in small groups or holding a community dinner. Alternatively, sites of ‘insurgent citizenship’ may emerge, marked by new identities and practices that, bring to the forefront the heterogeneity of lived urban experience by disturbing established histories (Holston, 1998). Exclusion from public spaces serves the dual and inter-related functions of rendering those not included invisible and allowing those included to feel as if they make up the entire population. At the same time, spatial exclusion is “[...] a quiet, subtle way to protect and produce moral communities that situate themselves at the intersection of (present) survival and (future) realization” (Madsen, 2004).

As a consequence of the weakening of a sense of belonging, along with claims to the right to preserve their identities, migrants identify themselves only partially with the hierarchy of places and their use inherent in other residents' perception,. Markets, even temporary, selling ethnic food and products, or the places where religious events, celebrations and festivals take place may be far more significant in the migrants' imaginary map of the city than High Street, City Hall or Cathedral Square. Unless this diversity in the physical use as well as the symbolic perception of public space is accepted, local residents will display suspicion and fear, while migrants will adopt practices of resistance through rendering themselves invisible and intangible, becoming spectators instead of actors of the city (Ostanel, 2010).

Where they make up sizeable portions of the resident population, migrants may shape urban space to their own needs by opening shops supplying ethnic goods and offering services tailored to their culture and traditions not provided for by the host society. Frequently these new activities are highly concentrated within limited areas and give rise to a specialization of space that did not exist before, thus changing the feel of that portion of the urban space. What is modified is the sense of the collective place, those "deeper and even subconscious feelings that people have about the place where they live and those they share it with" (Wood, 2008, 249), which color with a peculiar hue the different parts of the city.

The settling of foreign populations may prompt local residents to relocate to new residential areas, in turn allowing an entirely different population to settle in the area they fled from. This process of reverse gentrification transforms traditionally attractive and well-located neighbourhoods into areas that city residents look at with suspicion and resentment and to which they generally avoid going. Furthermore, a lack of accessible dwellings drives people of the same origin to concentrate in the same areas where they are able to re-create community-based networks which they can rely on in their daily struggle. Such 'defensive' enclaves themselves become the cause of seclusion, hampering the integration of migrants in the wider urban community and fueling the social and spatial fragmentation of space typical of many contemporary cities. Surprisingly however, the 'ethnic' neighbourhoods may again become new areas of activity and encounter in the city, attracting populations from all quarters including the affluent residential areas to which the well-to-do had previously relocated. Ethnicity, in many cases, is part of the 'urban branding' that serves for the construction, communication, and management of the city's image on the local as well as the international level.

Such a partitioning of the urban space into a sort of mosaic with multiple tiles reflects and at the same time materializes a representation of society based on stereotypes that reaches well beyond being a superficial representation of society to become *the* social reality. In a society of stereotypes the allocation of space mirrors social, economic, and institutional differences, triggering a process of the tacitly-agreed-on domination of certain areas over other parts of the city (Balbo, 2009).

Whether the ethnic appropriation of specific parts of the urban space translates into a process of acceptance and recognition or motivates separation and conflict depends essentially on the urban policies adopted and how effective they are in promoting the necessary mix of peoples, lifestyles and uses of space that are at the basis of a dynamic urban society. Public space is where the physical, as well

as cultural presence of the *other* becomes more visible, and the encounter and strain across diverse communities is most explicit. For this reason, a policy of public space is critical to building a common culture and overcoming the stereotypes that foster social and spatial exclusion. The intercultural city rests on a concrete social construct where the various components of urban society come to preserve their own cultures within the framework of a shared understanding of civic culture and sense of urbanity (Zijderveld, 1998).

The predicament of the intercultural city

From the discussion presented above it follows that creation of the intercultural city would require the fulfilment of a variety of conditions. The following is a tentative list of the issues that need to be addressed in the perspective of edifying the intercultural city.

1. Granting substantial citizens' rights and equal respect to international migrants in order to dismantle a collective imaginary in which diversity catalyzes the feelings of anxiety of the 'ordinary global citizen' and poses a threat to daily life. Diversity must become a 'concrete realization' built on a common understanding of sense- and place-making that goes beyond the family and the community.

Recognizing migrants as full citizens, entrusted with the same rights and duties as all other members of the urban community is the first step towards rejecting all notions of 'otherness' and the pervasive negative stereotyping which result. Urban policy should rest on the idea that immigration constitutes a major contribution to growth and innovation.

2. Recognizing that the co-existence of cultures having different backgrounds within the same public space demands that the public sphere, as defined by the society and its rules, be redefined.

Based on the principle that all individuals have the same rights, in particular the right to the city, governments must assume diversity is a substantial component in the process of city-making

3. Acknowledging that the intercultural city hinges on the elimination of all material and immaterial partitions, and that urban society gains from accepting the intermingling of different groups and cultures..

The intercultural city is a city where differences are perceived but merge on the basis of equal respect, thus generating a new urban imaginary through a collectively accepted use of space where equivalence of differences is acknowledged as the starting point for a new sense of belonging.

4. According equal power of negotiation to the different cultures and groups within the urban society, guaranteeing the possibility to preserve their cultural heritage, and recognizing that migrants cannot be compelled to dismiss their original cultural values and take on those of the host urban society is absolutely fundamental.

Equal power of negotiation means granting migrants the resources and voice needed to gain equal conditions with the rest of the urban population and capacity to achieve the goals or values (s)he regards as important.

5. Accepting that unfamiliar uses of space do not represent a menace to the well-being of the local urban society and that they should be seen as an essential part in the process of the social and spatial inclusion of international migrants

The multiplicity of uses of public space should be perceived as a constituent part of urban life and become a constant component of urban policies.

6. In cities where adjustment and innovation lie at the basis of their success or failure, willingness and ability to encounter and exchange with diversity are crucial.

The growing diversity and the multiple meanings 'public space' takes on in the intercultural city should be acknowledged by adopting urban policies that use cultural diversity as a criterion on which to base decisions.

References

- Amin A., 2002, 'Etnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity', *Environment and Planning*, vol. 34, No.6, pp. 959-980
- Amin A., and N.J Thrift, 2002, *Cities: Rethinking the Urban*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Appadurai A., 1996, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Atkinson R., 2003 'Domestication by Cappuccino or a Revenge on Urban Space? Control and Empowerment in the Management of Public Spaces', in *Urban Studies*, vol. 40, No. 9, pp. 1829-1843
- Balbo M., 2009, 'Social and spatial inclusion of international migrants: local responses to a global process', *SSIM Paper Series*, No. 1, Venezia: Università luav di Venezia
- Balbo M., 2012, Cities with migrants: rights and fears, in Boniburini I., Moretto L., Smith H., *The right to the city. The city as common good. Between social politics and urban planning*, Bruxelles: Cahier de la Faculté d'Architecture La Cambre – Horta
- Bauböck R., 2003, Reinventing Urban Citizenship, *Citizenship Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 139-160
- Bauböck R., 2008, 'Stakeholder Citizenship: An Idea Whose Time Has Come?' in *Delivering Citizenship. The Transatlantic Council on Migration*, Gütersloh: Verlag Bertelsmann Stiftung
- Bauman Z., 2001, *Community. Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Bauman Z., 2008, 'Culture in a Globalised City', *Occupied London*, <http://www.occupiedlondon.org/bauman>, accessed on 18/01/2012
- Beck U., 2006, *Cosmopolitan Vision*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Bloomsfield J., Bianchini F., *Planning for the Intercultural City*, Stroud, UK: Comedia
- Bosniak, L., 2006, *The Citizen and the Alien. Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership*, Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press
- Deutsche R., 1996, *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Garfinkel H., 1967, *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Glick Schiller N., Basch L. and Szanton-Blanc C. (eds.), 1992, *Toward a Transnational Perspective on Migration*, New York: New York Academy of Science
- Goffman E., *Interaction Ritual. Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*, Garden City NY: Doubleday
- Göle N., 2006, *Islam, European public space, and civility*, in Michalski K. (ed.) *Conditions of European Solidarity, vol. II: Religion in the New Europe*, Budapest, New York: Central European University Press

- Habermas J., 1994, Struggles for Recognition in the Democratic Constitutional State, in Taylor C. and Gutman A. (eds), *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, Princetown: Princetown University Press, pp. 107-148
- Hammar T., 1994, Legal Time of Residence and the Status of Immigrants, in Bauböck, R., (ed.), *From Aliens to Citizens. Redefining the Status of Immigrants in Europe*, Aldershot: Avebury, pp. 187-198
- Holston J., 1998, Spaces of insurgent citizenship, in Sandercock, L. (ed.), *Making the invisible visible: a multicultural planning history*, Berkeley: University of California Press, p. 37-56
- Holston J. and A. Appadurai, 1996, 'Cities and Citizenship', *Public Culture*, Vol. 8, No.2, pp. 187-204
- Kymlicka W., 1995, *Multicultural Citizenship*, Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Koopmans R., Statham P., Giugni M., Passy F., 2005, *Contested citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Isin E. F., 2009, 'Citizenship in flux: the figure of the activist citizen', *Subjectivity*, Vol 29, No. 1, pp. 367-388
- Jacobs J., 1961, *Death and Life of Great American Cities*, New York: Random House.
- Lownsbrough H., Beunderman J., 2007, Equally spaced?, Report for Demos, <http://www.demos.co.uk/publications/equallyspaced>
- Lofland L., 1998, *The Public Realm. Exploring the City's Quintessential Social Theory*, Chicago: Aldine Transactions.
- Madsen M. L., 2004, 'Living for home: policing immorality among undocumented migrants', *Johannesburg, African Studies*, Vol. 63, No. 2, pp. 172-192
- Mitchell D., 2003, *The Right to the City*, New York: Guilford Press
- Ostanel E., 2010, 'Practice of citizenship, practice of resistance: Mozambicans in Johannesburg', South Africa, *SSIM Paper Series*, N. 3, Venezia: Università Iuav di Venezia
- Parekh B., 2000, *Rethinking Multiculturalism. Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*, Houndmills and London: McMillan Press
- Sayad A., *The suffering of the immigrant*, Cambridge: Polity
- Sennet R., 1970, *The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity and City Life*, New York: Knopf
- Smith N., 1996, *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*, London: Routledge.
- Stasiulis D., 2004, 'Hybrid citizenship and what's left', *Citizenship Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 295-303
- Taylor C., 1994, The Politics of Recognition, in Taylor C. (et al.), in Taylor C. and Gutman A. (eds), *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, Princetown: Princetown University Press, pp. 3-73
- Vertovec S., 2011, 'Migration and New Diversities in Global Cities: Comparatively Conceiving, Observing and Visualizing Diversification in Urban Public Spaces', MMG Working Paper 11-08, Göttingen, www.mmg.mpg.de/fileadmin/user_upload/documents/wp/WP_11-08_Vertovec_GlobaldiverCities.pdf, accessed on 10.03.2012
- Wimmer A., Glick Schiller N., 2002, 'Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation-state building, migration and the social sciences', in *Global Network* Vol.2, N. 4, pp. 301-334
- Wood P., Landry C., 2008, *The Intercultural City. Planning for diversity advantage*, London – Sterling, Va: Earthscan
- Young I. M., 1989, 'Polity and Group Difference. A Critique to the Ideal of Universal Citizenship', *Ethics*, vol. 99, No.2, pp.250-274
- Zijderveld A. C., 1998, *A Theory of Urbanity: The Economic and Civic Culture of Cities* New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers