"Social Exclusion and Space"

from Ali Madanipour, Goran Cars, and Judith Allen (eds), *Social Exclusion in European Cities: Processes, Experiences, and Responses* (1998)

Ali Madanipour

Editors' Introduction

Exclusion of groups of city residents from access to all that the city has to offer on the basis of race, class, religion, income, gender, national origin, disability status, sexual orientation or some other characteristic has been and continues to be a pressing problem in cities throughout the world. University of Newcastle urban design professor Ali Madanipour's observations on spatial aspects of social exclusion in contemporary European cities is relevant to understanding social exclusion in cities everywhere in the world both nowadays and in the past.

Throughout history many of the most dynamic urban societies have welcomed foreigners and included them in the life of the city. H.D.F. Kitto notes that twenty-five centuries ago foreigners (*metics*) participated in most aspects of the life of the Greek polis (p. 40). They lived throughout the polis rather than in geographically segregated foreigners' neighborhoods, worked as merchants and trades people on an equal footing with Athenian citizens, and contributed significantly to the philosophical, scientific, literary, and artistic achievements of Athens' golden age. But they were not Athenian citizens and were excluded from participation in Athens' otherwise extraordinarily inclusive and democratic political institutions.

In his magisterial study titled *Cities and Civilization*, British planning professor Sir Peter Hall argues that the presence of a diverse group of foreigners or outsiders from the dominant culture has been a crucial ingredient in short periods of great cultural and technical efflorescence that characterize cities' golden ages. Hall describes, for example, how Jewish entrepreneurs who had previously worked in New York City's garment industry, were largely responsible for creating the motion picture industry. They were able to transfer understanding of how to respond quickly to the changing tastes of the United States' large lower income urban immigrant population they had learned in New York City's garment industry and quickly turn advances in technology to good advantage. Migrating to Hollywood, they created a new industry providing silent movies to a mass audience willing to spend a hard-earned nickel for Saturday night entertainment. Another of Hall's examples involves Blacks from the impoverished Mississippi River Delta. As they migrated up the Mississippi River to Chicago during the twentieth century, Blacks from the Delta brought blues music with them. Little blues clubs in Chicago's Black belt helped them cope with discrimination and the unsettling conditions of urban life. Blues music morphed into rock and roll and made a huge contribution to popular culture worldwide. Nowadays, Indian programmers in Silicon Valley, Chinese scientists in London, and Latin American novelists in New York City continue to enrich their host cultures and the entire world.

In many cities law and/or cultural norms have excluded some social groups at some time in history, including the present day. Racial discrimination was, and remains, an acute problem in many cities throughout the world. Black sociologist W.E.B. Du Bois describes in painful detail how Blacks in late-nineteenth-century Philadelphia

were spatially isolated in just a few wards of the city and systematically barred from white schools, most public facilities, and well-paying jobs for which they were well qualified (p. 110). Friedrich Engels describes the brutal effect of class discrimination on working-class people in Manchester, England in 1844 (p. 46). Members of the Chicago school of sociology like Louis Wirth (p. 96) described the psychological damage, spatial separation and social exclusion immigrants from central and southern Europe experienced in early-twentieth-century Chicago. Mike Davis describes discrimination against poor people, minorities, and immigrants in contemporary Los Angeles (p. 195). Discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, religion, gender, and national origin continues in Europe and North America against Algerian, Pakistani, Turkish, East European, Mexican, and other groups.

As globalization continues to bring people from throughout the world into closer contact, and as the pace of immigration increases, the issue of exclusion becomes ever more pressing. In what different ways are some people excluded from participation in the life of the cities where they live? How is exclusion expressed in urban space? What can be done about it? These are questions Madanipour addresses.

Madanipour distinguishes between economic discrimination, in which members of a group are excluded from employment, political discrimination, in which they are excluded from political power by being denied voting rights or full political representation, and cultural exclusion in which the group members are marginalized from the symbols, meanings, rituals, and discourses of the dominant culture. Just as Sherry Arnstein (p. 238) sees citizen participation in decision-making as a "ladder" with rungs ascending from degrees of non-participation to full citizen power, Madanipour sees social exclusion as a continuum from complete lack of integration at one end of the spectrum to full integration into society at the other.

While some societal rules about exclusion are benign – the right of strangers to enter a person's home at will is unacceptable in almost all cultures – Madanipour argues that exclusion of groups from the opportunities and advantages that cities possess is both painful to members of the group and damaging to the society at large, which fails to take full advantage of talent available to it and wastes resources on conflict and social control.

Exclusion frequently has a spatial dimension. Members of a group are sometimes excluded from areas of a city by law as when medieval Venetian Jews were restricted to the city's ghetto and Chinese were prohibited from entering some parks in the European areas of nineteenth-century Shanghai. Even when people are legally free to enter areas of the city, as Mike Davis (p. 195) points out, subtle and not-so-subtle signs and cues may signal that members of a particular group are not welcome.

Madanipour suggests two potentially promising theoretical approaches to promote greater inclusion of marginalized groups into urban space: decommodifying space so that the private real estate market plays a less decisive role in where different groups are located within the city and deliberate city planning to despatialize social exclusion. Building inclusionary housing units for low- and moderate-income households in neighborhoods they could otherwise not afford is an example of the first strategy. In new inclusionary condominium developments in the United States, for example, sometimes some percentage of the units are reserved for sale to low and moderate-income households at below market cost. Mixed-use zoning to promote social diversity is an example of the second strategy Madanipour suggests. Some cities, for example, encourage a mix of market and below market rate housing units in the same area.

Madanipour concludes his analysis by advocating inclusionary practices, to assure that outsiders are more fully included in urban societies. He wants to break the trap of socio-spatial exclusion and provide more possibilities for inclusion.

Ali Madanipour teaches architecture, urban design and planning at the School of Architecture, Planning, and Landscape at the University of Newcastle in England. He is a founding member of Global Urban Research Unit at the University of Newcastle. Madanipour was born in Iran and practiced architecture before his academic career. His interests include design, development and management of cities, the social and psychological significance of urban space, processes that shape urban space, agencies of urban change, and implications of change for disadvantaged social groups and the environment. Madanipour's writings have been translated into German, Mandarin, Japanese, and Persian.

This selection is from *Social Exclusion in European Cities: Processes, Experiences, and Responses* (London: Jessica Kingsley, 1996), which Madanipour coedited with Goran Cars and Judith Allen. Madanipour's other books include *Whose Public Space?* (London: Routledge, 2010), *Tehran: The Making of a Metropolis* (New

York: Wiley, 1998), *Design of Urban Space: An Inquiry into a Socio-spatial Process* (New York: Wiley, 1996), *Public and Private Spaces of the City* (London: Routledge, 2003), and two coedited anthologies: *The Governance of Place*, coedited with Angela Hull and Patsy Healey (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 1996), and *Urban Governance, Institutional Capacity, and Social Milieux*, coedited with Goran Cars and Patsy Healey (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2002).

For historical background on social exclusion in the United States, see Elizabeth Cobbs-Hoffman and Jon Gjerde, *Major Problems in American Immigration and Ethnic History*, 2nd edn (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 2006). Studies of contemporary race, class, and gender issues in the United States include Margaret L. Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins, *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology*, 7th edn (New York: Wadsworth, 2008), Roberta Fiske-Rusciano, *Experiencing Race, Class, and Gender in the United States* (New York: Wadsworth, 2008), Conrad Kottak and Kathryn Kozaitis, *On Being Different: Diversity and Multiculturalism in the North American Mainstream* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2008), and Paula S. Rothenberg, *Race, Class, and Gender in the United States: An Integrated Study*, 7th edn (New York: Worth, 2006). A classic study of European immigration to the east coast is Oscar Lewis, *The Uprooted* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1951). Ronald Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore* (Boston, MA: Back Bay Books, 2003) is an excellent study of the Asian American immigration experience. Takaki, *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*, revised edn (Boston, MA: Back Bay Books, 2008) expands and elaborates on his earlier work.

This chapter concentrates on the relationship between social exclusion and space, exploring some of the frameworks which institute barriers to spatial practices. Its particular emphasis is on the way these barriers to movement are intertwined with social exclusionary processes. This shows that exclusion should be regarded as a socio-spatial phenomenon.

[. . .]

DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION

There is little disagreement on some of the major problems facing European cities. Challenges of competition from a global economy marked by a multiplicity of competitors and the European response in the form of moving into an integrative partnership are both aspects of globalization which have reshaped the social and spatial geography of cities. The restructuring of cities and societies, however, has been a costly exercise, as it has been parallel with a growing social divide, long-term unemployment and joblessness, especially for men, and casualization of work, undermining the quality of life for large groups of the population. These symptoms have led to concerns for the fragmentation of the social world, where some members of society are excluded in the 'mainstream' and where this exclusion is painful for the excluded and harmful for society as a whole.

Yet the concept of social exclusion still appears to be in need of clarification due to the variety of the cultural and political contexts in which it has been used. For some it is the question of poverty which should remain the focus of attention, while for others social exclusion makes sense in the broader perspective of citizenship and integration into the social context. Social exclusion, therefore, is not necessarily equated with economic exclusion, although this form of exclusion is often the cause of a wider suffering and deprivation.

As a concept, social exclusion still suffers from a lack of clarity, as it is interpreted and analysed differently. We come across a degree of ambiguity especially between poverty and social exclusion. Some researchers, who have concentrated on the problems of poverty, find social exclusion a vague concept which, for whatever reason, takes attention away from poverty and deprivation. Furthermore, it is argued that the concept of social exclusion is rooted in a certain intellectual and cultural tradition (Catholic, solidarity) and a particular welfare regime (corporatist) and as such is not shared by other (especially liberal) cultures and welfare regimes. On the other hand, those who find social exclusion a useful concept criticize an emphasis on poverty as too narrow. They seek to open the discussion to accommodate the general issues of social integration and citizenship. To confront this ambiguity and contradiction, we need to clarify the concept of social exclusion first.

The overall constitution of the social world is such that different forms of exclusion are fundamental to any social relationship. For example, the division of social life into public and private spheres means drawing boundaries round some spatial and temporal domains and excluding others from these domains. In this way, exclusion becomes an operating mechanism, an institutionalized form of controlling access: to places, to activities, to resources and information. Individual actions as well as legal, political and cultural structures rely heavily upon this operating mechanism and reproduce it constantly. Institutionally organized or individually improvised, it appears that we are all engaged in exclusionary processes that are essential for our social life.

Yet we know that, whatever their importance, these exclusionary processes work in close relationship with inclusionary activities to maintain a social fabric. Maintaining the continuity of the social world is only possible through a combination of and a fine balance between these two processes. At the individual level, seeking privacy without seeking social interaction would lead to isolation. At the social level, exclusion without inclusion would lead to a collapse of social structures. What is a negative state of affairs, therefore, is not exclusion in all its forms but an absence of inclusionary processes, a lack of a balance between exclusion and inclusion.

But what are the dimensions of the social world in which inclusion and exclusion take place? It is often mentioned that social exclusion is multidimensional. To be able to identify and analyse these dimensions, we should look at the dimensions of the social world in which exclusion and inclusion take place. We can identify economic, political and cultural arenas as the three broad spheres of social life in which social inclusion and exclusion are manifested and, therefore, can be analysed and understood.

In the economic arena, the main form of inclusion is access to resources, which is normally secured through employment. The main form of exclusion, therefore, is a lack of access to employment. Marginalization and long-term exclusion from the labour market lead to an absence of opportunity for production and consumption, which can in turn lead to acute forms of social exclusion.

Exclusion from the economic arena is often considered to be a crucial and painful form of exclusion. Poverty and unemployment are therefore frequently at the heart of most discussions of social exclusion, to the extent that poverty and economic exclusion are equated with social exclusion. There is a tendency in the literature to use these terms interchangeably. It is true that long-term economic exclusion can break down the political and cultural ties of the affected individuals and social groups. It is important, however, to note that there are other forms of social exclusion in political and cultural spheres.

In the political arena, the main form of inclusion is to have a stake in power, to participate in decision making. In European liberal democracies, inclusion is often ensured through voting and other processes associated with it. The most obvious form of social exclusion, therefore, is lack of political representation. This may take various forms: from the underrepresentation of women in parliaments and governments, to the complete exclusion of immigrant groups from political decision making; from the argument by smaller political parties for a new system of representation which would allow them a fairer share of power, to a withdrawal from political participation by those excluded in the economic and cultural arenas.

In the cultural arena, the main form of inclusion is to share a set of symbols and meanings. The most powerful of these have historically been language, religion and nationality. Some of the new sets of symbolic relationships include the way individual and group identities are formed through association with patterns of consumption, from necessities of daily life to cultural products. For example, in what has been termed a visual culture, aesthetics of social behaviour has become an essential part of social life. The main form of exclusion in the cultural arena, therefore, becomes a marginalization from these symbols, meanings, rituals and discourses. The forms of cultural exclusion vary widely, as experienced by minorities whose language, race, religion and lifestyle are different from those of the larger society.

Different social groups may experience varying degrees of these different but highly interrelated forms of social exclusion. The most acute forms of social exclusion, however, are those that simultaneously include elements of economic, political and cultural exclusion. The other end of the spectrum is occupied by citizens who are fully integrated in the mainstream of society through these three dimensions. Between these two extremes, there is a wide range of variations in which individuals and groups are included in some areas but excluded in others. A major trend is that more

and more people suffer from anxiety and uncertainty, as there are ever larger numbers in transition from inclusion to exclusion.

SPATIALITY OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION

Social exclusion, therefore, should be understood in its political, economic and cultural dimensions. Exclusion from the political arena, i.e. the denial of participation in decision making, can alienate individuals and social groups. In the cultural arena, exclusion from common channels of cultural communication and integration can have similar effects. The exclusion from work and its impacts are widely known as undermining the ability of individuals and households to participate actively in social processes. When combined, these forms of exclusion can create an acute form of social exclusion which keeps the excluded at the very margins of the society, a phenomenon all too often marked by a clear spatial manifestation in deprived inner city or peripheral areas . . .

[. . .]

In the past, this spatiality of social exclusion had led to attempts to dismantle such pockets of deprivation without necessarily dismantling the causes of deprivation or the forces bringing them together in particular enclaves. The dismantling of spatial concentrations of deprivation has been a continuous trend: from Baron Haussmann's wide boulevards in the middle of poor neighbourhoods in the nineteenth century, to the slum clearance programmes and more subtle forms of housing management in the twentieth century. These have been attempts to despatialize social exclusion, which is evidence of its inherent and re-emerging spatiality. The latest form of despatialization and re-spatialization of social exclusion is homelessness, a process in which some groups are cut off from their previous socio-spatial contexts and are apparently without a home base. They, however, have clustered in particular parts of cities, spatializing again what was thought to be despatialized.

SPATIALITY AND DIFFERENCE

The absence of homogeneity is most apparent in cities, as they are sites of difference. Large cities have often grown by attracting people from around the country in which they are located or even from around the world. Cities have always been known as the meeting places of different people. As Aristotle noted: 'A city is composed of different kinds of men; similar people cannot bring a city into existence.' The unprecedented growth of cities since the nineteenth century has permanently brought forward the issue of difference in the city as a feature of urban life. Wirth, in his celebrated theory of urbanism, saw heterogeneity as a determining feature of the city, along with population size and density. For him, the city was a 'melting-pot of races, peoples, and cultures, and a most favourable breeding-ground of new biological and cultural hybrids'. In the city, individual differences have 'not only [been] tolerated but rewarded'. Such emphasis on the heterogeneity of cities has led to conceiving it as a world of strangers.

Two sets of reactions to the diversity in the city can be identified: there are those who have tried to impose an order onto it so that it becomes understandable and manageable and those who promote a celebration of diversity. However, both these reactions, which indeed represent modernist and postmodernist thinking, have been unable to deal with the issue of social marginalization and exclusion. Concentrations of disadvantage have remained in cities, despite the large-scale redevelopment schemes of the rationalist tendency and the more sensitive spatial transformations which followed. On the one hand, emphasis on the eradication of difference and seeing the city as a melting pot has led to undermining sensitivities and to disruption of lives. On the other hand, the emphasis on difference has led to social fragmentation and tribalism. Both have failed to cure the wounds of those living on the edge of the society.

BARRIERS TO SPATIAL PRACTICES

But how do we analyse space? There are many gaps and dilemmas associated with understanding space. From the centuries-old philosophical divide between absolute and relational space, to the gap between mental and real space, between physical and social space, between abstract and differential space, to the relationship between space and mass, space and time, and the variety of perspectives from which space can be studied, all bear the possibility of confusion and collision. It is possible to show, however, that to avoid the gaps and dilemmas associated with understanding space, we need to concentrate on the processes which

produce the built environment. By analysing the intersection between space production and everyday life practices, we will be able to arrive at a dynamic understanding of space. We will then be able to understand and explain material space and its social and psychological contexts and attributes.

The question of social exclusion and integration, it can be argued, largely revolves around access. It is access to decision making, access to resources, and access to common narratives, which enable social integration. Many of these forms of access have clear spatial manifestations, as space is the site in which these different forms of access are made possible or denied. There is a direct relationship between our general sense of freedom and well-being with the choices open to us in our spatial practices. The more restricted our social options, the more restricted will be our spatial options, and the more excluded we feel or become. On the other hand, if we have a wide range of social options, we would have a wide range of places to go to, places for living, working and entertainment. Two extreme cases of the existence or absence of spatial freedom may be jetsetting executives versus prisoners. Whereas for one, the world may be shrinking to seem like a global village open for communication and interaction, for the other the world outside is large and out of reach. For most of us, however, our spaces are a continuum from accessible to non-accessible places. The space around us is a collection of open, closed or controlled places.

But how is the urban space organized and how are spatial practices controlled and regulated? We all have an understanding of the places where we can or cannot go, as over the years through our spatial practices, we have accumulated a knowledge about places and their patterns of accessibility. The physical organization of space, using elements from the natural or the built environment, has been socially and symbolically employed to put visible and strict limits on our spatial practices. For example, topography has always been used to institute difference and segregation, from ancient times when the hilltops were the place of gods for Greeks and Mesopotamians, to our own time when they are the living places of the rich and powerful. There is also a mental space, our perceptions of space. This may be regulated through codes and signs, preventing us from entering some spaces through outright warning or more subtle deterrents. Mental space may also be controlled through our fears and perceptions of activities in places. For example, we may be hesitant to enter an expensive-looking shopping centre if we do not have access to the resources needed for the activities there, even though there may not be any physical barriers which would prevent us from going there. A third form of barrier to our spatial behaviour is social control, which can range from legal prohibitions on entering places to constructing formal barriers along publicly recognized borders. National borders and public–private boundaries are examples of this form. A combination of formalized rules and regulations, informal codes and signs, and fears and desires control our spatial behaviour and alert us to the limitations on our access. Through these, we have come to know whether we can enter a place, are welcomed in another and excluded from others. More restrictions on our access to our surroundings would bring about the feeling of being trapped, alienated and excluded from our social space.

Space has, therefore, a major role in the integration or segregation of urban society. It is a manifestation of social relationships while affecting and shaping the geometries of these relationships. This leads us to the argument that social exclusion cannot be studied without also looking at spatial segregation and exclusion. Social cohesion or exclusion, therefore, are indeed socio-spatial phenomena . . . We know that all human societies have their own forms of social and spatial exclusion. So exclusionary processes per se are not the source of social fragmentation and disintegration. It is the absence of social integration which causes social exclusion, as individuals do not find the possibility and channels of participating in the mainstream society.

GLOBAL AND NATIONAL SPACE

National borders are the largest means of socio-spatial exclusion. The modern nation state exerts an exclusionary process along its boundaries, from lines on maps to barbed wires on the landscape. Those who are left outside need to go through special checks and controls to be allowed in. The same applies to those who are in and want to go out. The control of cross-border movement by the nation state, or by blocks of nation states as in the European Union, is a form of exclusion legitimated openly through political processes. A national territory, therefore, is a spatial manifestation of an institutionalized exclusionary process.

Other administrative boundaries, although potentially exclusionary, do not have such a forceful character, nor are they associated with such a degree of public awareness, such historical significance, or guarded by military might. No other form of exclusion has been associated with such high costs in human life, sacrifice and misery. Attempts to change or to protect national borders have inflicted the highest cost in human lives in the twentieth century, as experienced by two world wars and many regional conflicts. The birth of a nation state, when the multi-ethnic empires and states break up, can be a bloody process in which every means is used to exclude others. The surgical subdivision of national space, whether through external forces as in postwar Germany or by exploding internal forces as in the former Yugoslavia, has been equally difficult for those excluded from what they have regarded as their home.

In the national space enclosed within these boundaries, narratives of nationalism have been employed to legitimize the exclusion of others beyond these boundaries. Indeed, exclusionary narratives, which determine how 'we' are different from others, are often essential in binding individuals together as a group. The most dangerous of these narratives has been the rhetoric of hatred against other nations, races and groups. But there are many such exclusionary narratives which do not necessarily promote violence and hatred and still have a binding power. With these narratives, which often rely on a common historical experience, large groups of people have been associated with each other. The focal point of this association has been the nation state, which holds the power of controlling the national borders.

The narratives of nationalism attempt to create homogeneity out of an enormous diversity. As individuals have come together to create a democratic civil society, such narratives have helped the organization of modern democratic states . . .

[. . .]

NEIGHBOURHOODS, MARKETS AND REGULATION

At the local level, by following two processes, land and property development on the one hand and spatial planning on the other hand, we can see how a socio-spatial geometry of difference and segregation, which is the foundation of exclusion, emerges. We come across the term neighbourhood in a variety of distinct but interrelated usages. In one sense, the term is used loosely to address a locality. This daily usage is based on the images and understandings by individuals and groups of their surroundings. This is a view from below and, as such, can lead us to see a city as a collection of overlapping neighbourhoods. Research on people's perception of neighbourhood shows major differences according to age, gender, class and ethnicity. At the other end of the scale, there is a concept of neighbourhood from above, from the viewpoint of such experts as managers, planners and designers. Here neighbourhood refers to a particular part of a town and is used to understand urban structure and change in urban society. It is also used as a tool for management. From this viewpoint, the city is seen as a collection of segregated neighbourhoods.

Neighbourhoods as constituent parts of cities have long been the focus of attention by urban designers and planners. Drawing upon historic precedents and for practical reasons, neighbourhood has provided them with an intimate scale of the urban whole to understand and to deal with. Historically, neighbourhoods have been the sites and physical manifestations of close social relationships and so have been praised by town planners, especially those who have looked nostalgically to the feudal bonds of the medieval towns and the communal bonds of working-class neighbourhoods in the industrial city. A dichotomy emerged as a result of the unprecedented growth of the cities: between *gesellschaft* and *gemeinschaft*, between the alienation of the big city and the romanticized, small communities of towns and villages. To recreate the social cohesion of these small communities, it was thought, cities should be broken into smaller parts, into neighbourhoods. On the other hand, it was thought that the communitarianism of small neighbourhoods could overcome the individualism of the suburbs, those bourgeois utopias.

It is this association of neighbourhood as a physical entity with neighbourhood as a cohesive social unit that led to a series of reformist ideas throughout the twentieth century. From the widely used, and discredited, concept of neighbourhood unit, to Lynch's districts, which are still promoted to make cities legible, and today's urban villages and new urbanist neighbourhoods, there has been a long line of managerial attempts to promote social cohesion by spatial organization.

Along with this promotion of spatial subdivision by town planning, there has been a promotion of socio-spatial segregation by market forces through the ways in which space is produced, exchanged and used. The producers of space, such as volume housebuilders, tend to build in large-scale housing estates, creating an urban fabric which is a collection of different subdivisions. The land and property markets have operated so as to ensure the segregation of income groups and social classes. Commodification of space has led to different patterns of access to space and hence a differential spatial organization and townscape. Wherever there has been a tendency to decommodify space, as in the postwar social housing schemes, town planners and designers have ensured that a degree of spatial subdivision still prevailed.

We can therefore identify two processes: a land and property market which sees space as a commodity and tends to create socio-spatial segregation through differential access to this commodity, and a town planning and design tendency to regulate and rationalize space production by the imposition of some form of order. When we look at these two processes together, the picture which emerges is a collectivization of difference, of exclusion, which can lead to enclaves for the rich and the creation of new ghettos for the poor.

[. . .]

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SPACE

Another form of socio-spatial exclusion, which is enforced with a rigour somewhat similar to the protection of national borders, is the separation between public and private territories. We guard our private spheres from intruders by whatever means, in some countries even legitimately by firearms. Privacy, private property and private space are intertwined, demarcated through a variety of objects and signs: from subtle variations of colour and texture to fences and high walls. Those who are in are entitled to be, excluding those who are not. This is an exclusionary process legitimized through public discourse, through custom or law. Violation of this exclusionary process is regarded as, at best, inconvenience and, at worst, crime. Public space, which is one of the manifestations of society's public sphere, is maintained by public agencies in the public interest and is accessible to the public. Access to public space, however, is subject to exclusionary processes. Public space is guarded from intrusion by private interests, a process which is regarded as essential for the health of the society. Some of the main currents in social and political thought that offer concepts of public space appear to stress the need to keep the public and private spheres distinctive and apart, despite the criticism that this idealizes the distinction.

[. . .]

The changing nature of development companies and the entry of the finance industry into built environment production and management has partly led to what is widely known as the privatization of space. Large-scale developers and financiers expect their commodities to be safe for investment and maintenance, hence their inclination to reduce as much as possible all the levels of uncertainty which could threaten their interests. This trend is parallel with the increasing fear of crime, rising competition from similar developments, and the rising expectations of the consumers, all encouraging the development of totally managed environments. What has emerged is an urban space where increasingly large sections are managed by private companies, as distinctive from those controlled by public authorities. Examples of these fragmented and privatized spaces are gated neighbourhoods, shopping malls and city centre walkways, under heavy private surveillance and separated from the public realm by controlled access and clear boundaries. This total management of parts of the city is in part an attempt to control crime. Crime acts as a counter-claim to space and as such is itself an exclusionary force, keeping many groups vulnerable and marginalized.

CONCLUSION: SOCIAL INTEGRATION AND SPATIAL FREEDOM

Social exclusion combines lack of access to resources, to decision making, and to common narratives. The multidimensional phenomenon of social exclusion finds spatial manifestation, in its acute forms, in deprived inner or peripheral urban areas. This spatiality of social exclusion is constructed through the physical organization of space as well as through the social control of space, as ensured by informal codes and signs and formal rules and regulations. These formal channels act at all scales of space. Global space is fragmented by national spaces, which have a tendency to deny difference and homogenize social groups. At

the scale of local space, spatialization of social exclusion takes place through land and property markets. These markets tend to fragment, differentiate and commodify space through town planning mechanisms which tend to fragment, rationalize and manage space, and also through the legal and customary distinctions between the public and private spheres, with a constant tension between the two and a tendency for the privatization of space.

To break the trap of socio-spatial exclusion, one strategy could be to challenge these deep-seated forms of differentiation. We know, however, that wholesale challenges can be problematic themselves, as exemplified by attempts to redefine the public–private relationship in Eastern Europe. Furthermore, we know that any human society is likely to have some form of exclusionary process in its constitution. Nevertheless, it is true that the form of these exclusionary processes changes over time. A reflexive revisiting of the processes of differentiation is therefore a constantly necessary task. At the same time what is necessary and urgent is to institute and promote inclusionary processes, to strike a balance between exclusion and integration, to provide the possibility of integration and to break the trap of socio-spatial exclusion. We have seen that space is a major component part of social exclusion. Revisiting spatial barriers and promoting accessibility and more spatial freedom can therefore be the way spatial planning can contribute to promoting social integration.