



Urbanistica n. 125

September-December 2005

Distribution by www.planum.net

Angela Barbanente

The social function of territory and of town planning: demands, projects, and problems

edited by Elio Trusiani

Elio Trusiani

Raquel Rolnik

Gislene Pereira

Maria do Rocio Morais do Rosario

Elio Trusiani

Cristina de Araujo Lima

Yara Vicentini

José Pessôa

Problems, policies, and research

Urban policy in Brazil: national strategies and local practices

Institutional innovations and social-spatial differences

Lula's government and the Ministry of Cities

The City Statute: new avenues for urban management

Curitiba: the challenge of the sustainable city

Three questions to Jaime Lerner

The Metropolitan Region of Curitiba

Brazilian cities between modernization and marginality

Preserving historic centres in Brazil: ideas and practices

Alberto Magnaghi

Projects and implementation

Exercises in statutory and participatory planning: the Prato TCP

edited by Sandra Bonfiglioli

Marco Mareggi

Gisella Bassanini

Luc Gwiazdzinski

Maurizio Vogliazzo, Decio Guardigli

Marco Albini

Alberico B. Belgiojoso

Lorenza Perelli

Gian Carlo Calza

Alain Guez

Profiles and practices

The city of time and the culture of planning

The spillovers from urban time policies

Women's views of the transformation of the city. A research workshop

The city of the night

Festen. A memorandum for the workshop *Architecture of festivity*

The places of mobility, or the design of temporality inhabited public spaces

Events, museums and paths for urban renewal

Art transforms public spaces

Les Halles. A time architecture workshop

Time aspects in the design of Les Halles in Paris

Mario Sechi

Methods and tools

City centres and peripheries in Pier Paolo Pasolini and Paolo Volponi

Pierluigi Properzi

The reformist governance of the territory. The need for a project

Giovanni Circella, Mario Binetti,

Margherita Mascia

The Prospect Theory and the prediction of traveler behaviour

Received books

The reformist governance of the territory. The need for a project

Pierluigi Properzi

In various sectors and for different reasons the lack is periodically emphasized of a reformist project, but also the need to ponder on its nature, with reference to the central importance it assumes in constructing a progressive alliance. But then it comes about that this centrality corresponds to a necessarily faded vision of reformism, comprehending as it does the various traditions and the divergent objectives that 'have to coexist' in this progressive alliance; while conversely it determines also its excessive characterization in the rhetorical dimension of traditions (it is the limit of bipolar policies); and it tends to become fossilized in stereotypes and thus not to put into a new project its essential nature which is, and remains, that of improving the conditions of the society to which it refers. This converging requirement on the part of the reformist project of being and at the same time of not being tends to block its actual dialectic conditions, of participation and of control which substantiate local democracies; a process that may obviously be read also in specular terms, in the sense that only formal democracies do not practise reformist policies. A point of view 'inside' reformism but strongly characterizing it is that of planning, of 'territorial governance'; this is 'inside' in two senses: as part of a broader reformist project, but also as an ontological factor of a reformist dimension, there is no plan that does not make the reformist question central and, even in its various connotations (minimum project, maximum project), planning does not appear to

be able to exist unless it is placed in a reformist logic; outside of that there is only constraint and narration, which are not a plan.

The doubts of a town planner-reformist

Federico Oliva in his "solitary way" as a reformist (1) wonders (rhetorically) about the existence of the theory and the practice of a truly reformist town planner. It is worthwhile dwelling a moment on this 'truly'. The doubt stems, according to Oliva, not so much from the continuing disciplinary uncertainty between innovation and tradition, as from the 'crisis' of reformist plans in the face of a stressful procedural and conservative 'reconfirmation' thereof produced by the twofold attack: maximalist on the one hand and deregulatory on the other, which foreshadow a defeat of the reformist line in the left. In substance this doubt invests the capacity of reformist town planning to be incisive in the present institutional political set-up. One can agree with this argument, which is supported by Oliva on the basis of the most recent events both from the legislative (national and regional) standpoint and from that of plan-environment relations, even though to me it seems too unbalanced on the 'political' side of the question and influenced by the in some ways paradoxical events that have accompanied the Veltroni phase of the plan of Rome. But I am less in agreement about some of the 'technical' causes that Oliva puts, in order, at the basis of the crisis: the relative incomprehensibility of the '95 proposal (splitting up of the plan and equalization), the constant 'privatistic' interpretation of ordinary and constitutional law relating to the constraints, affection towards the centralist and

'garantist' (over-protective) habits of the past (retaining instruments and practices that are clearly contradictory with each other and with innovative ones), and regarding the fact that reformist town planners are in a minority position even inside INU.

It is not so much these specific causes that fail to convince me: they are in fact 'part of' the disciplinary world and the juridical tradition that has accompanied the history of town planning, and some of them are a bit too pessimistic, as rather that the relation between reformism and plan outlined by Federico Oliva, but without arguing it, to me does not seem sufficiently clear.

It is in fact true that making reformist plans (but not only them) has become increasingly more difficult and laborious (Oliva calls them extremely hard and ineffective labours) and that the fragility of that reformist model is revealed also in the Tuscan-Emilian Vulgate (2), which does not want to abandon 'protective' centralism and takes pleasure in 'newism', but this means tackling from a different standpoint the substantial nature of Reformism and not limiting oneself to observing, as Oliva does with intellectual honesty, that also the experiences (which he, too, regards as 'non reformist') of Milan and Bologna (3) are instead 'not trivial indepth studies', which attempt to construct 'theoretical justifications' of substantially innovative planning processes.

Probably the very concept of reformist plan over and above its 'real and instrumental divisions' will have to be taken up again. We cannot be pleased only with the separation (possibly ratified by a national law) between structural and operational, nor with the

sanctification of equalizing and compensatory practices. From Oliva's doubt, the utility of the plan (4) re-emerges, with all its contradictions, with respect to which it is necessary to reconsider the sense that a reformist approach can assume in an ever more evanescent dimension of the state.

The absence of the state as an institution, in its most recent characterizations (welfare) but also its basic ones (money, sword, balance and feluka) or to put it more clearly, its fragmentation into other budding institutions, necessarily involves reformism and the interpretation that has given of planning. The uncertainty of the development model (Europe's is weak and bureaucratic, Italy's introverted and slave to freebooting finance) does not permit the construction of a reformist perspective with features of homogeneity and sharing. Against this there is no reformism without development, as there is no surplus to be redistributed unless one understands by reformism a sterile exercise of legislative engineering.

The problem is then that of understanding whether a reformist governance of the territory is possible, that is, whether forms of reformist planning as such exist, and whether they can 'produce' reformist effects.

In this sense some questions arise that are connected with the actual 'utility-necessity' of reformist planning in a critical dimension of the state and a stagnant one in development. Is a plan still needed, and if so, what plan?

Federico Oliva in substance considers that the assertion of a reformist town planning coincides with the assertion of the Structural Plan as a cohesive idiom, both of the various subjects and of the

various territorial and urban policies, and more generally as the shared 'visioning' of a development project whose management and implementation become the real reformist perspective. This conceptual system can be shared, but it in any case again brings up the limit to be referred to a 'urban' dimension, in which the new forms of income and the new market rules are not often resolved and where the themes-problems of ecological and functional networks and those of development are not always exhausted.

Also the other questions posed (implementation of the public part, residual plan absorption) cannot be resolved by merely upgrading the tool-kit (overcoming zoning, overcoming standards, integration of transformation-mobility) and by the parallel reconfiguration of the state and regional legislative system.

Oliva's is a reformist proposal, but strongly oriented towards a reformism of the means (plan-institutions) and less heedful of the ends. Today I consider it essential for reformist town planning to pay attention to the ways of carrying out the development project and its contents, and while sharing the centrality of the objectives of certainty and feasibility of construction by the public part of the city, I consider however that it is necessary to study thoroughly the themes relating to what is today intended by city and territory in a reformist urban planning, and what the ways are to appraise the coherence and compatibility of the plan choices.

In fact, the problems connected with the role of the 'new knowledge' in the concerting processes are not addressed. The partial and segmented readings made of the processes by

the various institutional interpreters are definitely insufficient, just as the procedures on which the assessment is based are insufficient (planning conferences). Probably a reformist model cannot be (pre) defined and perhaps it 'should not be' predefined; it breaks down in fact in the various situations into a plural and particular dimension, often coinciding with partial forms of rationality.

The problem is then that of interpreting these partial rationalities and making them converge in the 'construction' of the plan understood as development project; and these conditions, external to the toolkit, impose a reflection on new even spatial forms of income, new rules of the real estate markets, new forms of citizenship, new social alliances, new forms of guarantee. All new things, but also little studied.

A number of unresolved questions

The traditional model of interpretation, based on the plan as the 'engine' of building-real estate cycles, seems by now outdated, the (apparent) decrease in demand and the structural crisis of the building sector (fragmented and family structure of the company - mechanism of tenders) have caused fractures in the building cycle; investors are still attracted by a property market drugged by the uncertainties of the financial market and in particular by the tertiary sector, which in spite of its inferior profitability, presents a growing demand (5). But this is not matched by any corresponding new organization of the building sector which remains far removed from the European target and which, unable to gain a foothold in the system of major works, is trying to obtain shock-absorbers (objective law for

cities) for an economic phase that will foreseeably be long and uncertain but above all without strategies; the new city-builder is not the small and medium-size company.

Against this the processes of ethnic concentration and the formation of new pockets of hardship in the big cities (the rental market and borrowing so as to buy), the appearance on the urban scene of the international trust funds (6), interested however in operations of long-term development, and the selling-up of public property (7), cause appropriations and segmentations in urban spaces which tend to elude any control, especially that of the master plan.

In the territory, the decisionist and centralistic logic of the Objective Law (8) has interrupted a laborious and fertile process of recomposition (started through the Vast Area plans and the best PRUSST), of the fractures which infrastructural works, viewed as exquisitely and overly technical solutions, have made, and make, in the meshes of settlements and in those of ecology and landscape. The Territorial Project and the Landscape Project (9) in this efficientistic interpretation remain mere academic exercises. Infrastructures have to be made, but 'how to make them' remains the discriminating factor between colonialist modernization and a modern country.

Furthermore Vast Area planning itself shows its limits, both with respect to the capacity to intercept the real development processes and to integrate them in Territorial restoration (10), and with respect to the capacity to form Coherence Frameworks, accepting an often specialist residual dimension or one of mere formalization of separate safeguards (11).

To these themes I would add a by now irrecoverable gap between Centre and North with respect to the South of the country, a gap bound to worsen with the progressive application of the amended art. 119 of the Constitution, a question one of whose central nodes is precisely the absence of planning.

These are some of the current problems that neither the proposed reform under discussion in the 8th Commission, nor the regional laws, fully address, in the sense of combining plan and development. These are thus complex questions and largely 'new' with respect to the *Programme-Document* proposed by the INU in '95. Then there was at all events a 'reformist' policy project, in which INU's proposal filled a space which some saw, perhaps with a bit too much enlightenment, as part of an orderly, progressive scenario, and others as one of the possible intersections with other reform projects whose results could not all be taken as assured (12). We know that precisely this part of the Centre-Left's reform programme ended up neither as a piece of the jigsaw, nor as a virtuous intersection.

Against this, *Documento '95* has in any case triggered other, newer avenues of reform in the local authorities. New regional laws that have made people speak of an 'INU model', less prescriptive and more strategic Vast Area plans, widespread experimentation by the Municipalities, which have interpreted the separation between structural and operative in different ways, and have patched up the fractures between plan and project, between public and private, in the new modalities of 'concertation' and 'equalization' (13). But this 'little reform' of the facts, which is certainly a result of

reformist policies, risks being overwhelmed, as Oliva rightly fears, by a 'restoration' of the conservatives of the right or of the left unless it finds some sort of stabilization in the national legislative system. Recently it has been stressed in several quarters that behind the Lupi DDL, being debated in the House, there is not a 'reformist' conception of territorial governance, but that it is characterized rather as an imperfect evolution of the town-planning law of 1942, another 'span' of the 'Bridge' law, than as a 'new' law for territorial governance. The terms are in fact not clear in the Lupi DDL in which the major themes of providing territorial infrastructures link up with urban ones; the relations are not clear between the 'European' themes: environment-sustainable development-cohesion, and 'territorial governance'; and lastly the link between separate 'safeguards' (landscape-the waters-environment) and local governments is not clear. Instead an equalizing model is well outlined, although to function it needs dynamic property markets which are not homogeneously distributed through-out the country. These are problems that have for long been dragging on within an unfinished institutional reform and which, for at least two reasons, are again put forward with the coming into force of the Urbani Code (1st May 2004) and with that of Community Directive 42/01 VAS (30 June 2004). Substantial questions that influence the relations between government agencies ('concertation' versus separate safeguards) and the nature of the instruments (planning versus evaluation) and which produce direct effects on territorial governance, more

than can be done by the new law itself, whose iter already today appears heavily conditioned by these 'separate' legislations that have cropped up. Quite apart from the outcome of the legislative activities, the picture will in any case be very different from the present one, also in relation to a number of basic trends having a reduced regulative and 'building' dimension, in part absorbed by the Bassanini provisions and by the above regional DIA, and a bigger dimension of the 'construction modalities' of the 'strategies' of development within the planning Conferences, through the definition of frameworks of coherence and the verification of their compatibility with respect to strong systems of shared knowledge (14). These trends, which have moreover already had more or less virtuous results, in the various contexts and in the different interpretations given them in regional legislations, come up however against substantial limits precisely in the absence of a national outline law, which limits cannot be resolved by a mere reference to national interest. The crux of the matter is the ambiguousness that is characterizing, in this transition phase, the plan model, its weak coherence with the development processes, its scant capacity to produce added value. An 'unbalanced' scenario, with weak guarantees and agreements, on the one hand, and frameworks that are overly generic, on the other. With respect to these processes of redefining the planning model, in the legislative systems that are in progress one can in fact recognize elements of noteworthy and substantial convergence (statement of principles already forming part of administrative

practice, separation of programme contents from regulative ones), but against this a number of questions, although important, remain still hardly defined: singleness-unitariness of territorial governance (planning sectors and subjects); the nature of minimum services (latitude of urban rigour) but above all there is a lack of clarity as to the 'town planning' regime produced by planning. All of which does not make it possible for the plan to assume a role in the construction of the various development processes. Local companies prefer to try more direct forms, to construct less deterministic and less structured routes, the twofold nature of the plan (regulative-predictive) tends to evaporate into light forms, which above all are hardly interactive with any real development processes. Very briefly, it is not clear in what way the public part of the city and of the territory 'defined' in the plans interacts with the development processes and at the same time with the rights/duties of citizens, it is not clear how to construct the new system of guarantees for its implementation-management (with what resources and with what contractual commitments). Between general principles (obviously generic) and operative practices (adaptive and minimal) there is an indefinite, undefined space to which the plan, the plan of the public city, should give a form and contents, should give concrete form to the principles. It is then the minimum services (rights of citizenship: accessibility-safety and security-dwelling levels, etc.) that are not defined, the practices of consensuality (public hearings-agreements-contracts) based on systems of shared knowledge and on

coherent frameworks and scenarios, that have to emerge from a phase of fertile albeit scattered and threatened experimentation that has characterized these years.

Town planning and reformism

With respect to this incomplete list of themes not resolved what can an agenda of reformist planners be?

Reformism is defined more clearly with respect to the context in which it is placed than by its own characteristics, not being able in fact to refer to an ideological system of its own, to a perspective and utopian, or affirmed and prevailing idea of the world, but it must nonetheless derive from these, indeed precisely from their conflicting nature and their reciprocal negations, its own accidental dimension but also its own substantial contents.

Reformism then becomes a process of verification-falsification of models of society and can be characterized by its more utopian or more substantial contents, in relation also to the various political contexts and to the existence of the (democratic) conditions for exercising this role of verification and of advancement.

In this sense Reformism once more coincides with the concept of 'progress' proper to the Modern, but it also suffers from the contradictions that are associated with it.

From another point of view Reformism may be defined in relation to a dialectic between the maximalist perspective (which remains that of the reform of the capitalist system, to the point of its negation) and the liberist perspective, which takes advantage from the weakness of the institutions (15).

The question then arises,

and more and more often in the last few years, as to what 'real' reformism is, or who its authentic interpreters are (historically and/or substantially). The question, apart from its implicit rhetorical value: reformism as over-coming the viscous features of the systems in being (reformism of the institutions), as redistribution of goods and opportunities through reasonable and shared means (reformism of ends), is posed for two other reasons: one purely tactical, which is that of distinguishing a good reformism opposed to one that is not so good, in the banal game of role-playing opened by the bipolar system, and the other, in part symmetrical to this, which characterizes a centrist or 'terzist' attempt to dodge the schematism implicit in bipolarism, that addresses the difficulties of an interpretation of the current themes of reformism without the ideological cover of historically opposed traditions. Hence a 'false' coincidence between 'terzism' and reformism, which there-by risks, in (again) hitting its objectives, toning down its political identity and reducing the effectiveness of its actions. It is thus necessary to construct a project that will go beyond a 'terzist' dimension but also the substantially 'garantist' one linked to tradition that adapts the plan to the institution. If in fact one contents oneself with cultivating the tradition of just a 'garantist' role of progressive reformism, anchored on the one hand to the dimension of the Authorities and of the Services Charter, and on the other hand to the rites of participation, without assuming the responsibility of a project, this means reproposing the old scheme in which capital makes the

development project and reformism acts as a brake, limits, guarantees a social redistribution of the effects of development. This, which has been the 'historical' role of garantist and redistributive Reformism, is certainly still an important role, which cannot be renounced, but subordinate and often functional to the 'capitalistic' project when such exists. Capital knows in fact how to convert rules and constraints into economic 'motors'; it builds its own most substantial advantages on the unforeseen results of the good intentions and of the extracted interditive rules of the reformists of the institutions. Capitalism and reformism, but also reformism and maximalism, have nourished the antitheses through which a large part of the history of the short century was declined. The very story of planning, itself short, has been shaped by the different interpretations that national societies have given to these dualisms; but the pivot around which this history has turned has at all events always been the state, as the absolute institution, as the functional counterweight to the weaknesses of capitalisms, but the cradle also of the degenerations of totalitarianisms. It is the state, the central institution, that in this logic has guaranteed to reformism its existential and operative dimension. This schematization has involved also those dealing with the territory. The territory and its governance become in fact a central junction of reformist policies. Policies that can no longer pivot on welfare, in which the territory has often been only a marginal element, split up in the standards of needs, which have been wellnigh the absolute objective of reformist urban planning

policies, an objective however partly a failure and a modest vindication (in combination with expropriation) vis-à-vis the return of position. The necessity then occurs of studying what territory today constitutes the dimension to which the new reformist policies can refer. This study can be developed according to the three traditional lines that have characterized the disciplinary reflections: territory-institutions, territory-plan; territory-development. In a wholly particular history, in Italy these three models of interpretation have substantially coincided in a single institutional and planned development process. Producing improper forms of plans, specular to the institutions and often in support thereof, forms that have interpreted a strongly centralistic development model and on a moderately redistributive basis. Entry into Europe shattered this model with its negative features (bureaucratic centralism, inflation, assistentialism, etc.) but also with its immune self-defences (elasticity, adaptability, localism of districts, etc.). Today a feeble, hardly competitive economy split up into a myriad of individual enterprises, finds itself 'protected' by a European stability, but without markets and weighed down by the more 'conservative' parts of its welfare and by the public debt accumulated to form them. So it seems that a redefinition of reformist policies for the territory must start from a rereading of the relations between institution, plan and development and in particular from the last named. The first question is thus the new conception of development, which is no longer 'given' but stems from the correct resolution in

projects of the questions 'well posed' by the reformist plan, a surplus value consisting of livability, accessibility, security, which, to put it in extremely brief form, is a real value added to that development model, and which will make the real difference in the scenarios of global competitiveness. Precisely to make this system function it is necessary to leave aside conceptions according to which the public function of planning is the equivalent of generalized expropriation, not having been able to invent anything better in hundred years, and which have covered with rhetorical and often de-responsibilizing plans institutions incapable of safeguarding landscape and territory and of producing development. It is public evidence of the choices, of the evaluations, of the relation between private projects and projects of the urban armature that should be guaranteed by the administrations through the plan. This 'new'? utility is the appreciation of the new public goods produced by carrying out the plan, the recomposition in it of the various minimum, and today ever more separate if not conflictual, interests proposed by citizen users that have to be the contents and the practices of the new reformist plan. A reformism capable therefore of drawing up projects in a dimension of multilevel governance and no longer castled in defence of a general (institutional) project stemming from a single, preconstituted rationality. It might seem dangerous, and passively subordinate to the market logic, to abandon the security of a single, predefined rationality (rule number one) and the 'precedence' of the public over the private, for the uncertain dimension of partial rationalities and of negotiating with the private

sector, but it is against the capacity to project in society and with local societies that the very nature of reformism will be measured. It is clear that in a society in which no-one can reasonably think of reducing the conquests of the social state by pulling in its rights, it is easier to tackle a false battle about Article 18 (or to put it better, to follow in a false clash a slyboots capitalism intent on window dressing) than to address problems locally different of the break-up and often the extinction of the various development models and trying to concretize new citizens' rights that are not predefined and not theoretical but object-related, substantially different from place to place, hard to recognize and hard to negotiate. But with respect to all this there is not yet any disciplinary convergence, and even less any political convergence, and in this I agree with Oliva. Let us then try to construct this convergence around the plans (the planning and management activities) which interpret this new conception of development, and are not limited to 'modernizing' standards, and around their results let us try to confer a full sense to the word Reformism which is not 'sick' as S. Cofferati recently stated, nor 'inflated' 16, but which should simply but laboriously be more practised and less exhibited. A second question is the nature of the plan today, a question already addressed before, but which it is advisable to resume, starting from its clearest opposite: the conservative plan. In what way is a reformist plan different from a conservative plan? If by conservative plan we mean adhering to traditional forms, by reformist plan we could mean an innovation of forms and then a large part

of the experiences of these years can be included therein, when many forms of 'falsification' of the traditional system of the plan produced by disciplinary research have taken shape and substance, but we know that often it has been a mere question of nominalistic pseudo-reformism which can be said to have accompanied the history of the Master Development Plan from the very beginning (17), in a story of individualistic protagonism and of political 'gattopardism' (the belief that the status quo can best be preserved by superficial reforms). These are the ephemeral 'forms' (plan of projects, soil project, standard cards, etc.) which in these years have been applied to the traditional plan without addressing the key questions of the lack of resources for construction of the public part of the plan and of the corresponding difficulty in orienting the remains of the urban economy based on private resources and on the rusty land mechanisms towards substantial, pragmatic, progressive new objectives. But if by conservative we understand a more substantial conception, which involves the maintaining of the social systems and those political ones that support them and in particular today, in the post-capitalist world ever less globalizing and ever more imperialistic, a conception that justifies, when it does not actually pursue, development processes based on the continuation of social injustices and imbalances, then reformism, the reformist plan, has to address these problems and cannot limit itself to a reformism of the institutions and of the forms that correspond to them. It is the local societies that have to resolve, in their

limited dimension, consisting of real confrontations, between real forces, the imbalances and the new demands of citizenship that are made. In this sense the 'reforms of the institutions' carried out by the Centre-Left government have turned out to be very weak: while on the one hand they have constructed a new and timid equipotent institutional architecture, on the other they have cancelled out the 'garantist' system of hierarchical control but without introducing a new system on a neocontractual basis, to curb the demands of a mounting, aggressive and not very liberal utilitarianism, which manages to get along between the construction of 'new monopolies' and the fragmentation at individual level of the enterprise (18). It has ingenuously been thought that it was the institutions, no longer hierarchically ordered that are responsible for governance and that government, no longer in fashion, should be entrusted to the responsibility of private parties (certifications, DIA) in a banal albeit mistaken 'translation' of the two terms. The Plan, the reformist plan, has to link these problems together again and has to furnish possible solutions, but above all it must also undertake to recognize or to construct the conditions of 'substantial democracy' for the debate, for the assessment and for the choices relating to concrete development projects. The most complex problem faced by today's reformist town planner is therefore that of constructing planning processes that are aware not only of the imperfection of the plan model based only on balanced demand/supply (of sites and services) and of the accompanying equity, this also imperfect, (the

traditional plan), but above all aware of the real need to overcome these limits, which is not too unbalanced, either with respect to an ecologist and neocentrist rigidity (structural invariants) or towards an efficiency-oriented deregulation that then manifests itself as the most negative element for the construction of real development projects. Precisely from an understanding and resolution of the 'limits' can come the main connotation of the new reformist plan: that of recomposing fragments of negativeness and imperfection in scenario of positiveness, where and when this is possible, and with partial, progressive balances but strongly project-oriented; an incremental approach that loses nothing of what has been acquired, but reprojects it into the future. It is the metaphor of the mountain climber, both in its finalistic component (the peak) and in the strategic and adaptive one (the foothold, the grip, the choice of the way up or down) or if you prefer that of the surfer: both demanding, very demanding, activities. But if the nature of planning in relation to the construction of new development processes (not models) has changed, the subjects also change, and their relations change the role of the institutions in the Plan process. In this perspective, the role of the institutions changes and in the long run their very nature changes, but it is the actors who change above all around the forms and the contents of the Plan: the institutions retreat on the legislative-regulatory front, but in what remains of the norm they have to assume total responsibility (of its public evidence and of its implementation). The various and often conflicting development projects are required to interpret a

'public' rationality, proposed by the plan, but 'receivable' by private operators, who thereby assume a new civic and substantial responsibility. In this logic the organizer/regulator of reformist policies is no longer the state, and to many this is a problem, but paradoxically it is not the institutions, either, in a broader sense, nor is it the regions or the cities, but it can be the various local societies that characterize the ones and the others in a balanced mix of governance understood in the terms with which it is proposed by C. Donolo (19) and of multilevel government in the interpretation that the new Title V of the Constitution today permits. Governance 'accompanied governing' understood as a "process for which the local government and its apical expressions stand surety for are the guarantor in the final instance with regard to rules and standards, 'but' not coinciding everywhere with local government activities". Government as real cooperation between the various actors who for their respective competences interact in the government of the territory according to shared systems of knowledge and rules of use and of intervention. Within the framework of governance thus understood the local societies construct development projects by activating concerting mechanisms among the various stakeholders and forming consensus between also, and I would add above all, not involving in ambiguous authoritative and/or concessive forms the subjects for whom a government function is reserved, which has to be expressed always in terms of public evidence. The contamination moreover greatly in fashion of fragments of governance within moments of

government tends, in a logic of novelties, to confuse roles, phases and responsibilities which precisely due to their differentiation can be particularly useful in the Italian case in constructing new development processes and around these new forms of plan and also, probably, new institutions. Projecting development, without starting necessarily from the institutions, applying governance knowing that also constructing new institutions on the new development projects, can be a prospect of the progressist reformist plan in addition to being 'garantist' and conservative. It therefore means accepting also a project dimension of reformism, abandoning or rather contaminating with it that of safeguarding and of the sole 'rules - first'. A progressist reformist approach must necessarily learn to address the themes of the development project, no longer 'limiting itself' to guaranteeing equity, participation and sharing; it cannot be merely anchored to the defence of rights. It is Reformism's job to 'correct' the risky project making typical of the new global capitalism, G. Ruffolo's 'turbocapitalism', caring more about the financial game than the consolidation of production, but even more it is up to Reformism to 'work' within the various development projects of the local societies, to propose coherence frameworks, to verify their compatibility, anticipating in this new institutions and constructing cohesion (sharing) and not being satisfied merely with providing the various development projects with often abstract rules and constraints, which produce results that are the opposite of those intended, nor, against this, with conferring a false institutional value on them with only deregulatory agreements.

In this sense there is a further question, a more disciplinary and less political one, centred around a separation necessary for the actual dialectic perfection of the plan processes, but 'denied' in the stubborn search for a unity, by now merely academic, between the world of networks and nodes, that which Clementi (20) calls netscape and selfscape, the world of frameworks and of scenarios (Territorial projects), and that of the 'land', of the soil viewed in the terms in which Mazza (21) reminds us of our disciplinary origin, but also our utility as town planners. Behind this duality there is not only the road of Berkian ambivalence, frequently called upon to resolve in positive but often opportunistic terms a divarication that is ideological rather than disciplinary, but there is the possibility of rereading the binary scheme, by now widespread, although little practised in its original complementarity: structural (but basically made up of networks and nodes) and operative (largely made up of soil). This conceptual separation which today takes the form of a dangerous rupture between structural, light in strategies and heavy in descriptions, and operative, literal land translations of the structural, scantily projectual and very 'public', surpassed on the 'right' by such instruments as Complex Programmes, which are more efficient but often having little effect as they are scarcely verified. In this way the utility of a 'separation at home' tends to peter out (22), although when it was proposed it was thought that it could correspond to the need to recast, mainly in the municipal dimension, the plan times (long-short) and the effectuality of the constraints (ablative conformative in the short

term, recognitive and as a safeguard when timeless), while safeguarding its at least apparent unitary and consequential nature. Behind that proposal there was still a unitary and rational vision of the plan and of the world which today no longer seems all that much shared. Current interpretations witness a tendency to adopt structural plans and a difficulty in managing operative plans (Tuscany: 158 structural, 7 or 8 operative); and thus also the slogan: 'the mayor's plan = operative plan' goes by the board, the mayors preferring the rhetoric of the structural, light in commitments and narrative, descriptive, recompositive of identities, and reconstructive of ecological networks, 'beautiful and impossible'. Reformist town planning, of the true, laborious type, linked to the construction of real development projects and not just to procedural guarantees or to residual land dimensions, is again left high and dry. So it is worthwhile reflecting on the sense of the other possible 'separation', perhaps even more radical and profound, but practised elsewhere and viewed as a fracture of that disciplinary unity that corresponded indeed to the justifying roots of a totalizing rationality assumed as the sole disciplinary paradigm. This is a 'separation', for some time however already proposed by some regional laws (23) and implicit in some evaluative practices; a necessary separation, in being based on a dialectic and revealing interaction between the cognitive systems, to be made 'stable' and shared, and the plan schemes constructed around urban and territorial meshes, which have to be assessed with respect to a necessarily 'other' shared knowledge, not self-referential, nor implicitly

justificative.

It is a working hypothesis that calls for experiments, but which starts from a number of problems that structural/operative separation has encountered, and from others that a lexical coincidence between structural scheme-structural invariant has unfortunately proposed, linking together in a falsely environmentalist embrace (again self-justificative) knowledge that cannot be negotiated and development project, compromising the former and often preventing development. In this 'new' possible, dialectic separation between basic knowledge (the regulatory dimension) and planning schemes (the foreseeing dimension), the 'stable' part of the latter which can be limited even to only the Urban Mesh (as a town-planning type of interpretation of the three-year programmes as per Law 109/94) vies in terms of coherence with other schemes and interacting frameworks, and in terms of compatibility with a 'Charter' that is likewise stable and shared, viewed as a place of interaction of institutional knowledge, local identity type knowledge and project, intentional knowledge.

This separation that takes concrete form in a separation of the means (the maps of knowledge) from the ends (the development projects, the layouts corresponding to these) but also in a separation of the dimension of the techniques (of planning) from that of the analyses and lastly of the knowledge of decision from the action of the operator, is very appropriate for the proposed alternation of the majority bipolar system which prefigures a necessary stability-sharing of certain values, in this case those of the territory-landscape-environment, with respect to the diversity-

conflictuality of development projects, justifying both of them.

Planning thus does not evaporate into rhetorical forms, but takes concrete form in certain orders and layouts (coherent and compatible) on which the development projects of the local societies are based, but above all it interacts with the solid, traditional dimension of the town planning of the soil and of the earth both through sharing a basic knowledge and through a 'way of working' that can assume partial, adaptive, planning forms, made up of land register, of property rights, of equalization and perhaps also of expropriation which is not an improper weapon if used as an instrument interacting with others and not as a collectivist threat. To be very succinct, and going beyond its contingent opposition to maximalism or its inadequacy to act as counterweight to a 'turbo-capitalism', reformism may be interpreted as a capacity on the part of local societies to regard innovations as fresh opportunities of development within a framework of cohesion and sustainability.

Notes

1. *Urbanistica* no. 123, p. 93. Oliva proposes a reform scenario open on three fronts: Legislative framework, instruments and model for implementing the plan, In reality it is a single reform process based mainly on the municipal plan and on the difficulty of managing it.

2. Law 5/95 of Tuscany and Law 20/2000 of Emilia and Romagna, although in different terms, fully represent an uncertain reformist model, open to innovation but against this rigidly anchored to procedural rules and to authoritative relations.

3. L. Mazza at Milan but also U. Baldini and G. Crocioni at Bologna have proposed innovative roads of the

traditional reformist model (Structure plan and equalization) introducing 'light' guideline documents and criteria of assessment in the case of Milan and a 'strong' system of urban logistics on the basis of explorative public tenders at Bologna. I do not however consider that the differences, although considerable, between the experiences of Milan and Rome can justify a simple identification of two opposed models.

4. G. Crocioni, *Piano Utile*, Gangemi, Rome, 1997.

5. After the boom of 2001-2004 in new private constructions, the most recent analyses of the building market (CRESME) record a negative economic trend also for 2005.

6. The presence in the real estate market of new operators such as investment trusts is producing two effects: a 'qualification' of the companies that are required to operate on very rigid specifications and for a long-term quality, and a 'disinvestment' of central sections owned by banks and/or insurance companies which become the main holders of the new 'closed' constructions of the Funds.

7. On the selling-off of public property, foreseen as 62,500 building units against the issue of 6.5 billion euro, see: G. Paterniti, A. Fodde, *Lo stivale di carta*, Editori riuniti, Rome, 2004, and on artistic property: S. Settis, *Italia S.p.A. l'assalto al patrimonio culturale*, Einaudi, Turin, 2002.

8. The 'Objective Law', passed to resolve in decision-making terms the procedural difficulties connected with carrying out major infrastructural works, has on the one hand been burdened with about a hundred 'minor' works, and on the other hand tends, through the figure of the general contractor, towards a neomonopolistic dimension.

9. The 2nd Conference on the Territory (Caserta 12-13-14 June 2003), marks on the one hand the end of the season of complex programmes, and on the other an attempt to mitigate the intrusiveness of the big infrastructural works (TNT corridors) with a reference to the themes of the territory and of landscape (see A. Clementi in *Lo sviluppo sostenibile del territorio nella prospettiva europea*, Ministero infrastrutture e trasporti-INU edizioni, Rome,

June 2004, p. 240).

10. P. Properzi (ed.), *Rapporto dal territorio 2003*, INU edizioni, Rome, pp. 103 et seq.

11. Op cit., p. 82.

12. See P. Properzi, "La riforma urbanistica", in P. Urbani (ed.), *La disciplina urbanistica in Italia*, p. 143.

13. On the evolution of regional legislative systems and in particular on the contents of innovative planning deriving from the assumption of new principles, also in the absence of a reform of State law, see: P. Properzi (ed.), *Rapporto dal territorio 2003*, cit., p. 14

14. Verifications (assessments) of coherence and of compatibility follow the passage from authoritative and hierarchical modalities (verifications of conformity) to processes of interaction between equal subjects on the basis of principles of subsidiarity and loyal collaboration. In this logic the Conferences (first of services, then of planning) and the Agreements constitute the junctions of a substantial reform that concerns also the form of the instruments. It is in fact 'structural' idioms that permit coherence and the institutionalization of knowledge (Maps, State of the Places and Information Frameworks) to be assessed, enabling compatibility to be assessed. See in particular Regional Law 23/99 of Basilicata which first introduced the two terms.

15. See R. Terzi, "Riformismo", con l'obiettivo della socialità organizzata, in *Tempo Reale*, p. 19. "Reformism is not the minimization of the objective but is the concrete practical policy that gives reality and materiality to the project of social transformation".

16. See R. Terzi, op. cit., p. 18, with a probable reference to S. Cofferati. A quick but interesting rereading of reformism with reference to Utopianism, Populism and revolution but also to Communitarianism.

17. See P. Properzi, "Il piano non è più regolatore", *Urbanistica Informazioni* no. 186, p. 3.

18. While a proliferation of individual enterprises is taking place it is clear that the government is in difficulty in achieving competitive dimensions in the European scenario where financial,

banking and company agglomerations at a level decidedly greater than the national structures have to be contended with. The 'Objective Law' itself can be viewed as an attempt to overcome these difficulties.

19. C. Donolo, "Notizie sul governo di Babilonia: sui territori urbanizzati e sulla loro governabilità", *Urbanistica Informazioni* no. 195, p. 89.

20. A. Clementi, "Mutamenti del territorio e innovazioni negli strumenti urbanistici", *VIII Conferenza SIU*, Florence, 29-30 January 2004.

21. L. Mazza, "Funzioni e sistemi di pianificazione degli usi del suolo", *Urbanistica* no. 106, 1996, p. 104.

22. The question of the 'separation' was brought up in the 19th INU Congress (Bologna, 1995) and was stated more clearly in the subsequent documents of the Institute's Board, but in any case always in problematic terms and open to a number of 'formal' solutions, although clear on two questions: conformation of town-planning regimes (constraints -'buildability') only at the moment of implementing the plan, and the prevalence of equalization in regulating urban transformations. The Tuscan law had in parallel given a very specific interpretation thereof which, in its novelty and official form, absorbed other possible interpretations: Structural plan (art. 24), Town planning regulation (art. 28), Integrated action programme (art. 29), the role of knowledge (Statute of Places) being toned down into a structural component, whence the coincidence, full of implications and not just linguistic ones, with the 'structural invariants' that cannot be negotiated. Remaining open in any case are the problems of the nature and cogency of the constraints (concerning town planning, temporal, indemnifiable, morphological, atemporal, not indemnifiable) and hence of the cogency of the instruments that impose them but also of their strategic nature and negotiability. Hence also the false question, often never asked and of little weight, of the strategic versus the structural and of their propaedeutic nature. The recent revision of Tuscan Regional Law no. 5 does not resolve these modal points.

23. Regional Law. 23/99 of

Basilicata introduces as the main basis for planning activity the 'Map' (regional soil map, CRS, art. 10). Derived on the one hand from the intuitions already present in other contemporary laws (Tuscany: Statute of Places; Liguria: Basic Knowledge; Emilia-Romagna: Factual Frameworks, etc.) and on the other from the growing weight that structured forms of structural assessment were taking on in Community practice (VIA, V.INC, VAS). The Map of Basilicata however assumes a central institutional position, both because of its co-operative procedures of formation (improvement) acceptance, and because of its autonomy (separation) with respect to planning processes, both ordinary and complex, making it a wholly original document. It must unfortunately be observed that the Region, although it approved the law without any votes to the contrary and with considerable enthusiasm, has been guilty of noteworthy material delays and only today has drawn up three prototypes of the Map, and does not yet possess a basic technical map for its elaboration.