

Introduction

1st of January 2018. New Year's Day speech. Addressing the nation, Denmark's Prime Minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen announced: 'We must set a new target of phasing out ghettos altogether. In some places by breaking up the concrete. By demolishing buildings. By spreading the inhabitants and rehousing them in different areas. In other places by taking full control over who moves in. We must close the cracks in the map of Denmark and restore the mixed neighbourhoods where we meet people from every walk of life' (Statsministeriet 2018).

In spite of a consensus that residential segregation is a multidimensional and complex phenomenon, an oversimplified assumption that spatial segregation¹ mirrors social inequality² persists. This is especially the case concerning forms of segregation referring to ethnicity, nationality or race.³ In other words, *spatial* concentration is considered a proxy indicator of *social* division attached to poverty, marginalisation or exclusion. Metaphors such as ghetto and neighbourhood effects have helped to reinforce this belief since they carry pejorative connotations that have resonated within the media, with policy makers and even in academic circles outside the (North American) context from where they originated. Likewise, *spatial* desegregation and mixing are equated with *social* integration, inclusion or upward mobility; a more optimistic version of the same assumption that echoes in debates about processes (dispersal) as well as policies (anti-concentration).

Paradoxes of Segregation?

Yet, this is not the case in many parts of the world, in particular in Southern Europe, the focus of this book. At least since the 1990s, cities such as Milan, Rome, Madrid and Lisbon have presented an apparently paradoxical phenomenon that challenges these assumptions: while urban inequalities and residential marginalisation are traditionally high, spatial segregation among both native and foreign groups has been low and moderate. And this has declined even further during the 2000s. This phenomenon has intrigued me since my migratory journey across this region started in the early 1990s. Ethnic concentration patterns and urban processes seemed very different from those depicted in North American and Northern European cities; are these patterns an exception, or a transitory phenomenon about to change with increasing migration? Are processes of ethnic and class-based segregation distinct across places? If so, what drives these? After a century of research in segregation, dominant theories could not fully explain this phenomenon, and this part of the continent was overlooked in the European debates on segregation burgeoning in that period. Indeed, it was surprising to realise how little was known about Southern European multi-ethnic cities.

Similar paradoxical phenomena have been happening in other parts around the world, but have only recently drawn considerable attention. Despite the worsening of social inequality, several cities are not becoming more spatially segregated. Even with the surge of new mass migrations or the escalation of the housing affordability crisis, the forecast process of ‘ghettoisation’ has not materialised in a systematic way across cities. In several places residential segregation has even decreased among immigrants and native groups across the city and its metropolitan area, and some neighbourhoods are becoming more ethnically diverse and socially mixed.

This is particularly striking in the United States, where the latest census revealed an unparalleled decline in spatial division between White and Black in 53 metropolitan areas, especially ‘in cities long divided by race, including Detroit and Chicago’, with San Francisco becoming one of the least racially segregated cities in the United States (Lee 2015, p. 1). Is this mainly because of changing demographics, due to the unprecedented variety of immigrant inflows and ethno-racial mobility associated with globalisation? The dispersal of households from Hispanic origin, in particular, is claimed to be reducing segregation in US cities (Frey 2014), driving the ‘global neighborhoods’ phenomenon, ‘where Hispanics and Asians are the pioneer integrators of previously all-White zones, later followed by Blacks’ (Logan and Zhang 2010, p. 1069). Importantly, some scholars may see this decline in segregation as a sign of assimilation into

US society (Pais, South and Crowder 2012), even though poverty and divisions are escalating, and racial unrests returning. For many, it is just a temporary phenomenon because neighbourhoods are expected to resegregate ‘organically’, mirroring individuals’ racial preferences (Clark 2009); only a few consider that this phenomenon contradicts established North American segregation theories (see discussion in Lumley-Sapanski and Fowler 2017).

On the other side of the Pacific, the role played by local and national institutions seems to matter more in studies of spatial segregation. Yip (2012, p. 89) stresses that local housing policies and the planning system in Hong Kong have been indispensable to ensure social mixing in such a divided city. For Fujita and Hill (2012, p. 37) the Japanese national political economy and its legacy is crucial to understand why residential income inequality ‘does not translate into class-based segregation in Tokyo’.

Is this phenomenon the by-product of distinctive historic conditions? This seems to be the case in most post-Socialist Eastern European cities that saw the upsurge of class inequalities after the late 1970s combined with a decrease in spatial segregation (which then stabilised throughout the 1990s). This has been unsurprisingly termed the ‘paradox of post-Socialist transition’ (Sýkora 2009) or ‘post-Socialist segregation’ (Marcinićzak, Gentile and Stępiak 2013). A key argument, as suggested for Tallinn, is that it was state Socialism that engineered cities around low levels of socio-spatial differentiation; and this remained so thereafter because of the residential immobility of the lower classes combined with the slow mobility of the upper classes (Ruoppila and Kährik 2003). Yet moderate segregation levels should not be ‘ascribed solely to the period of post-Socialist development’ but to ongoing gentrification and middle-class suburbanisation, as claimed for Prague (Ouředníček et al. 2016, p. 26).

Also here the paradox is considered by some as a transitory phase. Residential segregation is ‘inevitably’ expected to rise when the neoliberal ‘reform’ of the labour and housing markets is completed: central areas will then be colonised by wealthier groups, suburbs by the middle classes, and the rest squeezed in between (see discussion in Sýkora and Bouzarovski 2012). Conversely, others predict increasingly finer patterns of segregation due to a ‘variety of processes, sometimes apparently contradictory, at work’ (Haase et al. 2011, p. xvi), unclear regulation on tenure rights and property restitution, and a ‘complex intermix of investment-disinvestment’ (Kovács and Szabó 2016, p. 256; see also Lowe and Tsenkova 2003).

The simultaneous escalation in class inequalities and fall in segregation indices seems, instead, a recent occurrence in various Northern and Central European cities. The explanation regarding changing

demographics posited in the United States reverberates in the United Kingdom with Catney (2015, 2016) suggesting that the growing ‘super-diversity’ of the population, in particular due to the complex composition of recent waves of migration (Vertovec 2007), is driving the (ethnic) desegregation of London and other British cities. In Vienna, Hatz, Kohlbacher and Reeger (2016) associate these processes with the desegregation of the wealthiest groups, while in Dutch cities these are linked to neoliberal housing policies and tenure-mixing regeneration programmes (Bolt, Özüekren and Phillips 2010). Critically, none of these explanations consider low segregation levels or desegregation processes as unequivocal indicators of social upward mobility and improved life chances.

Equally intriguing is the ‘reverse of the paradox’ encountered in Scandinavian cities. Copenhagen, Stockholm, Oslo and Helsinki are among the least socially unequal cities of the world (Barr 2017), but their levels of spatial segregation are considerable; part of the reason seems to lie beyond the city boundaries, within the action of Scandinavian welfare states (Arbaci 2007; Andersson et al. 2010; Andersen et al. 2016).

This mosaic of cases does not necessarily portray a trend or a universal phenomenon (oscillations and rises in segregation indices can be simultaneously traced in many multi-ethnic cities; Tamaru et al. 2016). But it suggests that correlations between the spatial and social dimensions of inequality are not as straightforward as often implied by mainstream metaphors of segregation. Simply put, these patterns do not reveal a paradox, but rather indicate that the relationship between segregation and inequality is far from linear. How can we make sense of these patterns? How can we unpack this complex relationship to better understand (and address) the possible social problems or issues sometimes associated with segregation? Perhaps the concept of segregation should be abandoned altogether since, as van Kempen (2002) mentioned, it cannot be explained by one single theory.

Certainly, the variety of explanations put forward, while limited, expose radically different approaches to segregation (a discussion furthered in Chapter 2). They differ greatly in how segregation is perceived: is it an organic and inevitable outcome resulting from individual preferences and/or global forces or, conversely, is it a structural, systemic process? Should it be seen as an issue attributed to individuals, the neighbourhood, the city or society as a whole? Ultimately, is it a problem and for whom, and what are the solutions? At the heart of this contested debate is the way segregation is conceptualised (theory formation) and addressed (policy formulation).

This book embraces this debate through an international investigation of patterns of ethnic residential segregation across eight Southern

European cities – Lisbon (Portugal), Madrid, Barcelona (Spain), Rome, Milan, Turin, Genoa (Italy) and Athens (Greece) – from the early 1990s to the global financial crisis of the late 2000s. The study is embedded within broader debates and analyses on segregation patterns in Western European⁴ societies. It is the outcome of two decades of comparative research exploring a region that offers a rich ground for advancing our understanding of segregation processes (Arbaci 2002, 2007, 2008; Arbaci and Malheiros 2010; Arbaci and Tapada-Berteli 2012).

Recentring the Debate on the Production of Urban Inequality

The way of conceiving and perceiving social reality is moulded by the concepts themselves, making the use of vague and ill-defined terms an obstacle to the eventual solution of social problems that are outwardly specified or implied by them. At the same time, however, vague concepts can be politically attractive if they can successfully accommodate different meanings appealing to different audiences. Clarifying the theoretical background and the preconceptions inherited in a concept is thus essential for putting up clearer, but not necessarily more appealing, political projects. (Maloutas and Pantelidou-Malouta 2004, p. 450)

This book outlines an understanding of segregation in relation to the broader organisation of society and calls for a recentring of the debate on the role of the state–market(–family) nexus⁵ in the production of urban inequality. Segregation is a multiscale process driven by a variety of systemic mechanisms and contextual factors, their legacies and transformation, and not by inevitable global forces, individual behaviour or pure market logics. I argue that the way societies are organised and produce, transform and distribute resources, plays a key role in the social division of space; segregation is thus an embedded product of – and should be understood in relation to – the wider society. Central to these processes is how social institutions⁶ – state, market, family and non-profit sector underpinning civil society – intertwine in the deployment of resources and (welfare) services.

The focus of this research is not solely on patterns of ethnic residential segregation (describing outcomes); it is mainly concerned with the mechanisms, processes and changes (identifying causes) that drive these patterns and forms of socio-ethnic differentiation. Critically, there is an effort here to distinguish and unpack the spatial and social dimensions of segregation. The attention is thus placed on social inequality and residential marginalisation⁷ and the spatial forms they take (segregation). Contrary to the traditional notion of ‘poverty’, these are all concepts

that reveal the *relational positioning* (stratification, differentiation and segmentation) of a group within a society and/or a city. This book aims to steer the segregation debate where it matters: the production of urban inequality.

This is a radical departure from the reductive notions of segregation that permeate – and dominate – mainstream theory and policy formation. Ethnocentrism(s) is arguably an issue in segregation studies. As Robinson (2002, 2011, 2016) and Maloutas (2013) put it, ethnocentrism is a hegemonic narrative constructed by core centres of scholarship that tends to universalise theories and findings from their own contexts, and steer interpretations in other geographic contexts, neglecting the value of the ‘ordinary’ and the ‘periphery’ in theory formation. Despite the wealth and diversity of scholarship on segregation around the world (Sabatini 2003; Njoh 2008; Colombijn and Barwegen 2009; Fujita 2012), US-based theories have been clearly dominant in exporting influential metaphors that became worldwide normative references: the ‘underclass’ and the ‘ghetto’ in the 1980s, ‘polarisation’ and the ‘hyper-ghetto’ in the 1990s, and the ‘dispersal consensus’ and the ‘neighbourhood effects’ since the 2000s. Grounded on a century of North American scholarship, these notions have funnelled the focus primarily on race – ethno-racial divisions (especially between Black and White) – and poverty (the urban poor). Ethno-racial segregation per se is often perceived as negative and primarily ascribed to racial preferences and behaviours, or market discrimination; it is not seen as a societal process but as an issue of individuals and neighbourhoods.

Approaches from urban, housing, welfare and immigration studies, previously explored in isolation from one another, are brought together in this book to examine *how* (ethnic) residential segregation is produced in society across dimensions and scales. Through *contextual divergence perspectives*, a comparative approach that bridges context-bound perspectives (drawn from urban studies) and comparative divergence perspectives (drawn from housing studies), I propose to explore the variety of ethnic residential patterns encountered in the cities examined in relation to welfare regimes, housing systems, immigration waves and division of labour, and the socio-spatial structure of the city and their changes. This is an attempt to advance multiscalar approaches and systemic thinking in segregation studies by exploring how macro-scale principles of stratification and mechanisms of differentiation translate at the city level and differentiate social and ethnic groups across cities. This approach is operationalised through a new interpretative framework drawing on White’s (1999) ‘contextual structural model’ (see Chapter 2).

Contextual divergence perspectives are crucial in this research. Rather than seeking convergences in paths and universalised explanations, this comparative approach interrogates differences among patterns and systems, seeking to reveal and comprehend the distinctiveness and contextual diversity of each case. Why are Lisbon and Athens more ethnically segregated than Milan, Rome and Madrid? Why are some foreign groups more spatially concentrated than others, especially the wealthiest such as North Americans and Japanese? Why are Moroccans highly segregated in Brussels, slightly less so in Amsterdam, dispersed in the periphery of Turin and Madrid and moderately predominant in the centre of Genoa? This approach helps to identify the role of certain key features – mechanisms and changes – that would not be revealed using a single case study, but also establish wider comparative frameworks by contextualising Southern Europe in relation to other regions of Europe (Northern, Central and Scandinavian).

The approach taken here relies, in part, on quantitative analyses which adopt simple statistical methods (e.g. Indices of Segregation, Location Quotients), and data has been processed to ensure comparability (as databases differ significantly between countries and cities; more details in Chapters 2, 3 and 5) and accessibility to the reader. However, because I regard quantitative data as limited in capturing the underlying mechanisms of social and spatial differentiation analysed here, I use this segregation data mainly to reveal differences in geographies and degrees. This is to prompt questions on the diverse spatial forms that social processes take, in particular those driven by residential marginalisation, housing segmentation and socio-ethnic differentiation. This is not a book that will entirely satisfy a reader eager to delve into sophisticated statistical methods to understand how segregation works. Moreover, despite the effort to overcome data constraints (especially on immigrants and housing) and the technical limitations of cross-comparative analyses (e.g. in terms of statistical regularity and classification, scale and unit of analysis), these persist and were complemented when possible with secondary data and a degree of caution in data interpretation.

A key point of departure here is that the broader vision of society that each country holds – whether based on principles of social equity, economic liberalism or conservative familism – informs its welfare regime⁸ and patterns of stratification. But how do mechanisms of differentiation embedded in the welfare pillars (education, labour, housing, etc.) influence the social and spatial division of cities and neighbourhoods? Studying Western Europe is particularly revealing given the variety of welfare regimes (social-democratic, corporatist, liberal and familistic)⁹ which are representative of different positions of the role of the state along the universalism/residualism spectrum.

Starting with an analysis of these four welfare archetypes (Chapter 3), we will see throughout the chapters that the degree of redistribution¹⁰ is central not only in preventing or reducing social inequality, but also in shaping patterns of (ethnic) spatial segregation. There is thus a far-reaching relationship between segregation and redistribution than needs to be explored but that is almost absent in mainstream segregation studies.

To this end, a view across European housing systems takes central stage in this book. Housing is a major engine for the production of wealth but also of inequality (Edward 2002); its potential redistributive value is tremendous. But its extent depends on the fundamental question of whether housing should be considered a right, a good or an asset (see the contentious debate on the 'wobbly pillar' in Chapter 2). The way housing is conceived and organised 'in a sense can come also to shape, if not actually define, different types of welfare systems' (Lowe 2011, p. 140; see also Kemeny 1980, 2005). Sadly, despite its fundamental role *within* society (Allen et al. 2004), housing is a field nearly systematically neglected in welfare studies. Furthermore, because of this oversight, welfare studies have been at odds with understanding welfare regimes in Southern European countries, and have disregarded the distinctiveness of a 'familistic' welfare capitalism (considered at best a conservative variation of the corporatist one). But it is, in fact, 'a model of national political economy prevalent in many regions in the world (Southern Europe, Latin America and Asia), where the family plays a double role as the key provider of welfare and a key agent in the model's socio-economic and political reproduction' (Papadopoulos and Roumpakis 2013, p. 204).

Housing is certainly a major feature that differentiates Southern European societies from European counterparts given, for instance, the traditional dominance of homeownership, the role of family and patrimony¹¹ within the supply system, and how these influence urban development and urban policies (Leal 2004a). This distinctiveness, however, has been overlooked in previous interpretative frameworks on segregation that were developed from specific contexts (mainly Northern European) and thus slightly biased to the relevant aspects of those cases. I sought to overcome this limitation by shifting the conventional emphasis on housing market and social housing towards the broader concept of housing system, which includes the tenure policy system and the supply system (as presented in Chapter 3). Throughout the chapters it will emerge that in particular the housing supply system, since it encompasses provision, production and especially the land system, is fundamental for understanding how urban inequality is produced, filtered or prevented (as discussed in Chapters 2, 3, 7 and 8).

We will see how each sphere of the housing system (tenure policy and supply) distinctively influences how groups are stratified socially and spatially across the cities examined. The degree of (de)commodification¹² emerges as a key determinant. As housing operates across scales, we will also discover in our investigation across the eight cities, the ways in which (changes in) the national housing system influences local strategies of urban growth and renewal programmes (local urban political agendas), underpins profound societal transformations (e.g. 'monetary revolution', Emmanuel 2004), and triggers particular socio-urban processes of marginalisation (e.g. gentrification, embourgeoisement or peripheralisation; Chapters 8 and 9). Moreover, a comparative focus that triangulates between the geographic distribution of housing tenures, the segregation patterns of a large variety of foreign groups and those of native groups (thus reflecting the socio-spatial structure of the city) is key to further reveal important mechanisms at play in forms of socio-ethnic differentiation (e.g. religious affiliations, spatially entrapped social mobility, the so-called 'belt effect'; Chapters 6 and 7).

Although it may be surprising, migration studies have had little bearing on segregation studies, with these two fields developing mostly in isolation. I consider migration of critical importance to understand ethnic segregation processes. Migration flows, immigrants' characteristics and migratory projects play a crucial role in the settlement patterns and residential mobility of ethnic groups (White 1999). At the same time, migration systems inform, and are greatly influenced by, the broader transformations of societies (King 2000; Ribas-Mateos 2005; Castles 2010; see debates on the 'Mediterranean caravanserai' and 'social transformation perspectives' in Chapter 4). I will thus identify distinct migration waves across Southern Europe (since the mid-1960s) and scrutinise how these, by intersecting urban processes, have led to diverse patterns in the settlement, housing trajectory and geographic distribution of immigrants, while being instrumental in the socio-economic reproduction of the receiving society (e.g. through the provision of social care and dependency on low productivity sectors).

Longitudinal thinking is key to capture these transformations and their effects on segregation. We will discover that during the 1990s, complex processes of spatial, social and ethnic differentiation working at different scales were at play, with divergences in patterns and paces of change, linked for instance to self-production, intergenerational mobility *in situ* and contrasting socio-spatial structures visible between port and continental cities (Chapters 6 and 7). However, since the late 1990s, the relationship between segregation and inequalities has become increasingly difficult to interpret. Incrementally, ethnic desegregation and metropolitanisation, and the blossoming of homeowning

societies has perniciously disguised new forms of residential marginalisation and more complex mechanisms of social and ethnic division in the cities studied (Chapter 8). For instance, the expansion of homeownership among immigrants is paradigmatic: in many cases, it does not necessarily indicate residential upward mobility but entrapment in marginalised conditions and over-indebtedness, and masks a stark and widening divide along social and ethnic lines. In different forms and to different extents, these patterns are a product of the neoliberalisation of the state–market nexus filtered by Southern European familistic welfare regimes and channelled through national policies and local programmes (Chapter 9).

Throughout this comparative journey across cities, I put forward an alternative metaphor of segregation – the ‘urban diaspora’ – to capture the macroscale dimension of processes of (forced) centrifugal expulsion from the central municipal areas into the successive rings of the metropolitan area. In most cases, the resulting patterns of ethnic desegregation, dispersal and metropolitanisation reflect processes of exclusion, segmentation and urban marginality rather than dynamics of upward social mobility and housing career. This underlies the ‘paradox’ seemingly witnessed in the cities concerned whereby the increase in social inequality entails processes of dispersal, and thus a decrease in spatial segregation. I aim to move away from traditional metaphors of the ethnic ghetto and neighbourhood effects, and conceptualise this new geography of inequalities outlining a more systemic understanding of segregation.

Some of my arguments are not entirely new. An (alternative) notion of segregation as a context-dependent and societal process has been burgeoning in the European literature at least since the late 1990s, triggered by the worldwide transformations of the 1980s, and the critique of the polarisation thesis and convergence theories (further discussed in Chapter 2) in urban and housing studies thereafter (Kemeny and Lowe 1998; Musterd and Ostendorf 1998; White 1999; Maloutas 2004a). Since then, a growing group of European scholars joined forces in developing comparative studies that offered new interpretative frameworks to explain the diversity of (ethnic) segregation patterns across Western European multi-ethnic cities and laid the ground for (what I would like to consider) a European school of thought on segregation (Musterd, Ostendorf and Breebaart 1998; Maloutas and Fujita 2012; Tammaru et al. 2016). This book builds and expands on the contributions of this body of scholarship.

While this European literature presented a paradigm shift in the conceptualisation and theorisation of segregation, its contributions hardly resonate in the core of the discipline, led by the long-established North

American scholarship, and is often seen as peripheral in international debates. There is a rift between North American and European approaches – presenting contrasting lexicons, foci, interpretative lenses and solutions – which have been consolidating in antithetical directions with little dialogue and uneven footings in the international scholarly and policy debate, often influenced by a US-rooted ethnocentrism, as already mentioned.

How segregation is conceptualised is not just an academic debate; it has an immense impact on policy and ultimately on the life chances of urban residents. Policy makers and the media have been regularly seduced by dominant metaphors which, by inferring that the spatial and social dimensions of segregation are interchangeable, may carry a simplistic assumption that social problems can be solved by spatially reordering those ethnic or social groups concentrated in allegedly problematic neighbourhoods (Darcy 2010). This assumption has provided the theoretical justifications for the revival of ‘area-based urban programmes’ designed to de-concentrate certain groups and foster forms of social mixing, as well as residualist housing policies to increase owner-occupation – often both effective back doors of neoliberalisation and recommodification of welfare pillars (Lupton and Tunstall 2008; van Gent, Musterd and Ostendorf 2009; Pinson and Journal 2016). Despite growing opposition from academics and grass-roots organisations, this assumption continues to dominate the urban policy discourse across Western Europe and the Global South (Porter and Shaw 2009), including in contexts where indices of ethnic segregation are low or decreasing, as in Southern and Eastern Europe. Sadly, this discourse is also pervading Scandinavian and Central European countries where long-established practices of universalism and ‘people-based programmes’ effectively kept urban inequalities at bay and built less divisive societies during the Keynesian Fordist era.

The implicit point I would like to steer with the metaphor of the ‘urban diaspora’ is that the policy response to segregation needs to be reframed through systemic thinking (the exploration of the multidimensional link between segregation and redistribution is an attempt in this direction), rather than assuming spatial interventions will solve social problems by desegregating and mixing people, as implied in many traditional metaphors. This is not to entirely disregard the focus on issues such as racial prejudice and market discrimination as entangled with segregation processes, but to stress the need for a more sophisticated understanding that recognises (the production of) urban inequality as the essential issue to tackle. It entails reconsidering which principles and policies within the universalism/residualism spectrum can effectively attain a less unequal society. Those who still believe that

social equity, universalism and decommodification of welfare services – once beacons of post-War, Fordist equalitarian societies – were and still are part of the solution, are left with a main challenge: how can universalism be rethought today within a post-Fordist regime of accumulation? This is a crucial question, more so given the new challenges posed by massive immigration waves and the increasing financialisation of the state and everyday life, and with austerity and rising populism based on post-evidence rhetoric and anti-immigration discourses, both pledging simplistic solutions to complex problems.

The Value of the (European) Periphery

European scholarship has contributed to counteract ethnocentrism in segregation studies by expanding its empirical basis and challenging dominant US-based theories. However, this scholarship, particularly Northern European research dealing with housing and immigration, has also revealed some tendency to apply accounts and theorisations from some parts (e.g. the Netherlands, the United Kingdom) to other regions of Europe such as Southern and Eastern Europe. The latter are often considered ‘variations of’ or ‘in transition to’, respectively, and expected to converge with Anglo-Saxon or Central European models. These convergence assumptions obscure the distinctiveness and diversity of national, regional and urban contexts, making these peripheral to the debate and neglected in the theorisation process. This book brings to the fore one of these peripheral regions.

There are reasons that explain the marginality of Southern Europe in the international debate on segregation. On one hand, the European debate on segregation was anchored in the experience of fully industrialised Fordist economies, post-War mass migration and Keynesian welfare legacies that shaped Northern European countries. Except in a few regions, none of these aspects were present in Southern Europe. On the other hand, the key societal transformations that triggered an interest in ethnic segregation were different. In Northern Europe it was the transition from a Fordist to a post-Fordist regime of accumulation and the deindustrialisation process, while in Southern Europe it was the new wave of mass immigration (that started in the mid-1980s with the so-called ‘international migration turnaround’, King, Fielding and Black 1997) and its impacts on cities.

In spite of the limited attention to Southern Europe in international debates, a rich literature examined this region and its cities especially after the 1990s, but its influence on broader debates has been curtailed by the lack of publications in English. In this book, I combine two main research streams developed by this strand of scholarship: comparative

studies in welfare, housing, urban and immigration studies (which, however, did not focus much on ethnic segregation), and a body of single-city case studies on patterns of ethnic residential segregation.

An in-depth comparative account of ethnic urban segregation across Southern Europe is long overdue. This region has distinctive features that provide an opportunity to advance our conceptualisation of segregation processes. How does segregation work in cities with a very large proportion of owner-occupation and highly diverse neighbourhoods, exhibiting patterns that theories and frameworks drawn from other contexts cannot fully explain? The cases explored here offer rich and varied examples of how segregation operates in residualist and familistic societies and the (paradoxical) spatial-social forms it takes revealing some well-known but also new mechanisms of differentiation by interrogating their ‘contextual diversity’ (Maloutas and Fujita 2012).

The findings of this research are not limited to Southern Europe and can also shed light on transformations taking place elsewhere. Particularly across Europe, some of these features are emerging in societies traditionally based on universalism and people-based policies (e.g. the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Denmark, Poland) that are moving towards residualist welfare arrangements with the recommodification of housing and use of area-based programmes, whose cities are witnessing new patterns and processes that have long existed in Southern European cities: starting with the paradoxical patterns presented earlier or, more broadly, with the increasing centrality of ‘parental wealth’ in processes of residential segregation since ‘the intergenerational transmission of inequalities has become more pronounced with regard to housing’ (Hochstenbach 2018, p. 1). Beyond Europe, as mentioned earlier, ‘familistic’ forms of welfare capitalism are also prevalent in Latin America and Asian societies where family and patrimony are key social institutions in the reproduction of national political economies and in the provision of welfare (Allen 2000, 2004; Saraceno 2016; Aspalter 2017).

It is important to stress that theorising from Southern European cases is not about generalising from the periphery, or – yet again – exporting new universalised findings; it is about expanding and refining our understanding of segregation as a complex systemic process, which is multidimensional and, above all, context-dependent. It is timely to give the periphery a more central role in the process of theory formation.

Structure of the Book

As segregation is multiscalar and multidimensional, the book is organised along and develops through a series of comparative analytical chapters that examine patterns, processes and causes of ethnic urban

segregation in Southern Europe from the macro- to mesoscale, while intertwining the welfare, housing, urban and immigration dimensions. First, macroscale perspectives provide the basis for a wider comparative dialogue across Western European societies contrasting Northern, Central, Scandinavian and Southern regions and understanding each context in relation to the others (Chapters 2–5). This sets the key conceptual and contextual references for the in-depth mesoscale analyses across the eight Southern European cities which follow (Chapters 6–9). This multiscale structure also aims to trace how mechanisms identified at the national level play out at city level and contribute to differentiate social and ethnic groups differently across cities.

Chapter 2 provides the theoretical and methodological foundations for the book. It traces how the (European) reconceptualisation of segregation, which took place in the 2000s, did not emerge from segregation studies but from the ‘transatlantic debate’ on ‘polarisation’ theory and the ‘dual city’ order posited from the US context, and from key contentious debates in urban, housing, welfare, and (partly) immigration studies framed in Europe in the 1990s within the broader critique of convergence theories. It discusses the emergence of a paradigm shift in segregation studies driven by what I describe as a scholarly movement that laid the ground for a burgeoning European school of thought on segregation. Its fundamental premises, contributions and gaps are reviewed to build the contextual divergence perspectives and the interpretative framework for this book. A review of the relevant literature on Southern Europe further exposes the value of, and need for, expanding research on segregation patterns in this region.

Macroscale comparative analyses begin in Chapter 3, which examines the relationship between welfare regimes and segregation by focusing on the diverse housing systems found in Western Europe up to the mid-1990s. Drawing on a taxonomy of four welfare clusters (social-democratic, corporatist, liberal and familistic), patterns of ethnic residential segregation in more than 30 cities across 16 countries are compared to explore whether and how each welfare type differently affects social inequality and spatial segregation among low-income and vulnerable groups. The value of this chapter is twofold: it demonstrates how degrees of (de)commodification and principles of stratification embedded in each housing system (tenure policy and supply), and the respective planning and land systems, make a difference in processes of social and spatial differentiation; and it devises a broad conceptual framework that explores the link between segregation and redistribution along the universalism/residualism spectrum. Both outlooks inform the narrative that unfolds throughout the book.

Chapter 4 moves into migration studies, whose theoretical and empirical advancements have developed in isolation from, but are of significant importance for, segregation studies. In the context of worldwide global changes and the (Southern) European 'international migration turnaround', a review of contentious theoretical debates (e.g. about the post-Fordist model of immigration, or Europe's 'Rio Grande') that spurred the reconceptualisation of immigration in the 1990s reveals ground-breaking approaches to analyse migration in relation to wider societal processes (e.g. through the notion of a 'Mediterranean caravan-serai' and through social transformation perspectives). Drawing on these perspectives, historical and taxonomic analyses are developed through two sections: (1) (pre)conditions, drivers and changes in Southern Europe migration flows are explored in relation to wider societal transformations and welfare restructuring, revealing the vital role of (im)migration in Southern European societies in reproducing familistic welfare path-dependencies while permitting the modernisation of societies; (2) comparative analyses of immigration in Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece from the mid-1960s until the late 2000s identify three types of migratory flows and three waves. The findings question a set of convergence arguments stemming from the globalisation debate(s) in migration studies and the theory of a uniform Southern European migratory system. The diversity of waves, flows and roles will prove crucial for understanding divergences in segregation patterns examined later in the eight cities.

Chapter 5 complements the analyses developed in previous chapters by interweaving the urban sphere. Features of ethnic segregation are explored in relation to those national and urban systems that distinguish the Southern European region from its Western European counterparts. Accounts on North versus South models of ethnic segregation are critically reviewed to place the segregation analysis within wider societal and urban contexts, drawing on the contextual structural dimensions of White's model (1999). These reveal the roles of the dominant ideology in the host society, labour market segmentation, socio-urban processes and local urban political agendas as key mechanisms of differentiation as well as structural drivers of ethnic marginalisation. The deductive analysis suggests two main arguments which are further tested in the subsequent chapters: across Southern Europe, the layering of these (and other) mechanisms of differentiation have led to processes of marginalisation associated with ethnic dispersal, rather than ghettoisation and polarisation; and the housing affordability crisis and residential marginalisation are systemic and chronic wherever welfare regimes, housing systems and local urban political agendas are residualist.

Moving to mesoscale comparative analyses of the eight Southern European cities, Chapters 6 and 7 look at patterns and mechanisms until the mid-1990s, and Chapters 8 and 9 examine their changes until the late 2000s.

Chapter 6 provides a comprehensive overview of ethnic segregation patterns in the mid-1990s revealing a complex and diverse mosaic across the Southern European region regarding geographic distribution and degrees of ethnic residential segregation, among cities, among foreign groups (by continent and country of origin) and vis-à-vis native groups (by occupational categories). While there are no signs of polarisation, it shows a stark difference between port cities (Lisbon, Barcelona, Genoa and Athens) and continental cities (Madrid, Rome, Milan and Turin), and significant cases of correlations and mismatches between ethnic and social lines. The socio-spatial structure of the cities, the geography of upper strata, ethnic affiliations, labour segmentation and the welfare regime's social care arrangements broadly account for these divergences. However, these mechanisms did not fully explain some of the differences found, suggesting instead housing arrangements and mechanisms as potential explanatory factors.

Chapter 7 furthers the analysis of the patterns identified in the previous chapter by looking at mechanisms of differentiation embedded in the local housing systems, and the way in which the segregation-redistribution nexus plays out at metropolitan and municipal level. Dissimilarities among cities in the form of housing production, patterns of urban development and land development control (formal/informal), weight of rent control and the (un)even geography of tenures play a fundamental role in differentiating along social and ethnic lines. Historical and georeferenced analyses explore the distribution of the social groups across the owner-occupation and rental sectors to look at (1) how both components of the housing system – tenure and supply – affect respectively the socio-tenorial differentiation and the socio-spatial divisions found in each city, and (2) why these differ significantly among the eight cities, despite sharing familistic welfare arrangements. The paradoxical and exclusionary process of what I termed the 'belt effect' is captured here, offering insights into how successive waves of internal and international migration have negotiated their residential insertion in the city differently because of changing housing contexts.

After the mid-1990s, changes in housing systems, local urban political agendas and socio-spatial structure of the city have altered or consolidated some of the conditions, processes and mechanisms of differentiation. Chapters 8 and 9 look at how these transformations interplay with patterns of ethnic residential segregation.

Chapter 8 gives an account of the major transformations brought by the liberalisation of the credit and housing systems (e.g. the ‘monetary revolution’ and changing means of access to owner-occupation; new forms of housing supply and commodified access to land; rental recommodification). These had multiplying effects at municipal and metropolitan level, which the chapter explores in relation to (1) policy-led strategies of urban renewal and metropolitan growth, (2) socio-urban processes (e.g. gentrification, intergenerational social mobility *in situ*, etc.) and (3) socio-urban legacies (e.g. ‘belt effect’, low residential mobility, patrimonial values, etc.). These reveal how housing and socio-urban changes have generated new structural mechanisms of differentiation and exacerbated residential marginalisation, hindered immigrants more specifically, amplified forms of socio-ethnic differentiation, and created new geographies of diffuse segregation. The changes have also intensified the housing affordability crisis, persisting as a structural problem and spreading across middle-income strata too.

This narrative continues in Chapter 9 with more detailed analyses of emblematic examples to further explore the impact of current mechanisms of differentiation on patterns of ethnic residential segregation. First, it examines changes in the socio-residential conditions of the diverse ethnic groups since the mid-1990s to reveal how residential marginalisation and socio-tenurial differentiation has intensified across the ethnic groups and widened between natives and immigrants. Housing hardship grew, residual segments of the rental sector and owner-occupation markets became more ‘ethnicised’ and the expansion of homeownership among immigrants disguised new mechanisms of marginalisation. Second, it explores the spatial dimension of these processes, in particular: how the increase in socio-residential marginalisation is associated with processes of microsegregation, desegregation, peripheral dispersal and diffuse segregation; how the geographic distribution of successive waves of immigrants followed centrifugal paths; and how these new patterns of segregation stemmed from structural mechanisms of differentiation (and stratification) driven by the housing systems and urban renewal strategies. This diversity of patterns and transcalar processes is captured in the metaphor of the ‘urban diaspora’ – a fresh attempt to conceptualise this new geography of urban inequality.

Chapter 10 brings together the main arguments developed throughout the book and discusses their implications for wider debates in housing, planning and urban studies. It concludes with some reflections on emerging challenges for segregation studies.

A paradigm shift that focuses on role of the (welfare) state in the production of urban inequality has long been advocated by a European scholarship on segregation burgeoning since the 1990s, as explored in Chapter 2; this is the starting point for recentring the segregation debate on redistribution, which is the core aim of this book.

Notes

- 1 Segregation is both a process and a concept. It is a *relational concept*, since by definition segregation refers to ‘the residential separation of groups *within* a broader population’ (van Kempen and Özüekren 1998, p. 1632; italic added), whereby residential separation expresses solely the spatial dimension of this process, representing spatial differentiation, separation or distance between groups. ‘By definition, spatial segregation implies *spatial concentration*. If an area (neighbourhood) displays an overrepresentation of a certain group (compared to, for example, the share of the group in the city as a whole), we speak of a concentration area for that group’ (van Kempen and Özüekren 1998, p. 1633). Thus, segregation, residential segregation and spatial concentration are synonymous terms, which are interchangeably used also in this book.
- 2 Generally, social inequality refers to the differentiated positioning of socially defined categories of persons or groups (based on income, wealth, class, race/ethnicity, age or gender, among other categories) *within* the larger society with regard to access to social goods, such as labour market and other sources of income, education and health systems and forms of political representation and participation (Walker 2009). In this book, social inequality refers broadly to the social stratification of socio-economic groups (native groups), associated with income, class or occupational categories according to the sources used.
- 3 These are socially constructed concepts that vary across countries, and are often used to refer to immigrants or foreigners. See debate in Bhopal (2004) and explanation of the terms used in this book in Chapter 2.
- 4 Western Europe refers to the Western part of Europe and does not include Eastern European countries of the former Soviet/Comecon bloc. It comprises the Northern, Scandinavian, Central and Southern regions of the European Union; regional subdivisions are at times adapted to reflect historical settings or welfare models, to encompass geographical and political meanings. In this book, Central Europe often denotes the Franco-German speaking countries (or Bismarck’s social market model), while Southern Europe includes only Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece. When a Northern/Southern divide is mentioned, Northern refers also to countries of Central Europe and Scandinavia to account for their shared history of Fordist industrial economies, post-War mass migration and Keynesian legacies, which distinguish them from the Southern counterpart.

- 5 The term ‘state–market(–family) nexus’ adapts Abrahamson’s metaphor of the ‘welfare triangle’ (1992, 2002; which comprises state, market and household) to encompass also family (and/or non-profit sector) as key welfare providers, as originally stated by Esping-Andersen (1990) even though only the relationship between state and market was then subject of analysis (Minas et al. 2014). The triangle, or nexus, is a framing device introduced for conceptualising welfare regimes, later becoming of great relevance for defining housing systems in Europe (see Kemeny 2001; Allen et al. 2004), based on the role and relationships of these key social institutions in the provision of housing and land (supply side of the system) and (re)distribution of benefits/taxes (tenure policy side of the system).
- 6 Social institutions are the significant social structures and practices that organise societies, through a complex, integrated set of social norms, formal or informal rules, and standards that structure interactions between groups and individuals. Social institutions are densely interwoven and enduring.
- 7 Residential marginalisation refers to the marginalisation of a group *within* the larger society in terms of housing accessibility, affordability, security of tenure, quality and conditions. ‘Generally in urban studies “marginality” has arguably become one of the most used concepts in the last decade. (...) It has also become a central point of reference for studies which use “marginality” as a relational approach for the analysis of urban inequalities’ (Bernt and Colini 2013, pp. 15–16) and, in housing studies, for the analysis of housing differentiation/segmentation.
- 8 For simplicity in this book, I privilege the term ‘welfare regime’, since it is broader than welfare system and welfare state, and thus may encompass both principles of stratification and redistribution. ‘A [welfare] regime is understood as a particular constellation of social, political and economic arrangements which tend to nurture a particular welfare system, which in turn supports a particular pattern of stratification, and thus feeds back into its own stability’ (Taylor-Gooby 1996, p. 200). A welfare regime is organised upon a variety of systems of service provisions for the reproduction of society, often referred to as welfare pillars (e.g. education system, health system, housing system, etc....).
- 9 I make use of the classification introduced by Esping-Andersen (1990) regarding ‘ideal-types of worlds of welfare capitalism, [which] referred to particular types of welfare systems – universal, conservative and residual – embedded in their respective welfare regimes – Social Democratic, Corporatist and Liberal’ (Papadopoulos and Roumpakis 2013, p. 205). Welfare regimes are classified according to their degree of decommodification – see note 12. ‘The greatest level of decommodification is in the social democratic (universalist system), the least in the liberal welfare (residualist system). The corporatist is somewhere in between (conservative system)’ (Minas et al. 2014, p. 136; parenthesis added).

However, I adopt the term ‘familistic’ to refer to the type of welfare regime and advanced capitalism that distinguishes Southern European countries. This is the terminology currently used by Southern European

scholars in welfare and urban studies, who refute earlier classifications developed in the Northern European literature that described the Southern Europe welfare model as underdeveloped, rudimentary or late-comer (see discussion in Moreno 2006; see also Andreotti et al. 2001; Naldini 2003; Ferrera 2007; León and Migliavacca 2013; Mari-Klose and Moreno-Fuentes 2016). ‘The term *familistic* describe[s] the centrality of family in the totality of the welfare capitalist regime in Southern Europe and not only its welfare and care aspects, which often in the literature are described as *familialistic*. (...) It adds one important dimension in the role of family as a key institution for the reproduction of the familistic political economy’ (Papadopoulos and Roumpakis 2013, pp. 204 and 208).

- 10 Welfare regimes ‘embrace distinct redistributive principles, some of which may promote more equality of outcomes or of opportunities, while others may actually work in the opposite direction’ (Esping-Andersen and Myles 2011, pp. 640–641). The relationship between welfare and redistribution is complex and multidimensional (Esping-Andersen 2016a). Here the degree of redistribution of a welfare regime is seen through the (de)commodification programme and stratification principles of its welfare pillars. More about this in Chapter 3.
- 11 As explained by Allen et al. (2004, pp. 5–6), patrimony ‘refers directly to the specific stock of housing and land owned by a family. (...) It is something which is not exchanged or traded on markets. Rather, patrimony is something that the family conserves and keeps. (...) Patrimony, as a social institution associated with the family, is seen as being eternal, lasting, continuing much longer in time than the life of any individual within the family’.
- 12 Esping-Andersen (1990, p. 21) conceived the decommodification (e.g. allocation of a good and a service is guaranteed as a social right)/commodification (e.g. transformation of goods, services and people into commodities, or objects of trade) paradigm and classified welfare regimes accordingly, whereby ‘[d]ecommodification occurs when a service is rendered as a matter of right, and when a person can maintain a livelihood without reliance on the market’. Within the same welfare regime, the extent of decommodification of each welfare pillar may vary and change over time. The decommodification/commodification paradigm is reflected in the universalism/residualism spectrum.