

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

The commodification of territorial stigma: How local actors can cope with their stigma

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Marelli, C.M. (2021). The commodification of territorial stigma: How local actors can cope with their stigma. URBAN RESEARCH & PRACTICE, 14(3), 243-263 [10.1080/17535069.2019.1683600].

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/709108> since: 2024-11-28

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2019.1683600>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

The commodification of territorial stigma. How local actors can cope with their stigma

Carolina Mudan Marelli

Department of Sociology and Business Law, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy; Member of Laboratoire Architecture Anthropologie (LAA)– UMR 7218 LAVUE, École Nationale supérieure d'architecture de Paris la Villette - ENSAPLV, Paris, France

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an analysis of three area-based initiatives' in a stigmatized neighborhood of Naples (Scampia). It is based on ethnographic material collected between 2013 and 2014. We focus on the relationship between territorial stigmatisation and local actors within these initiatives. The aim is: to contribute to the debate on the «coping» strategies that the local actors of a disadvantaged territory put in place with respect to the stigma of their context; to broaden the framework of the debate on the processes of commodification of stigma. Finally, this contribution could also add to the debate surrounding the effects of area-based initiative.

KEYWORDS

Commodification of territorial stigma; area-based initiatives; local actors; Naples

Introduction

Some of the actors in the neighbourhood «feed» on Scampia and its problems.
(interview with Elena, Mar 2014)

Beginning with the context of a diverse set of area-based initiatives for a disadvantaged neighbourhood in the north of Naples (Italy), this contribution focuses on examining the relationship between territorial stigmatisation and local organised actors within these socio-urban development initiatives.

This paper has two aims: (i) to contribute to the debate on «coping» strategies, which local organised actors of a disadvantaged territory (not individuals) implement with respect to the negative attributes of their neighbourhood; (ii) to broaden the framework of the debate on the processes of commodification of stigma, which can also occur in social and political urban processes and through the instruments of action that make them operational, particularly focussing on local, national and supranational area based initiatives to tackle socio-urban problems. Finally, this contribution could also add to the wide scientific debate surrounding the effects of area-based initiatives in disadvantaged contexts.

Territorial stigma and its commodification

The notion of territorial stigma emerged along with studies on contemporary «urban outcasts» (Wacquant 2008). One such study is Wacquant's (2008) concept of territorial stigmatisation, which is based on the assumption that «the advanced marginality tends to be concentrated in isolated and clearly circumscribed territories increasingly perceived, both externally and internally, as places of perdition». According to the author (Wacquant, Slater, Pereira 2014: 1273–1274), territorial stigma has three main characteristics, which have been listed as follows:

“First, territorial stigma is closely tied to, but has become partially autonomised from, the stain of poverty, subaltern ethnicity (encompassing national and regional ‘minorities’, recognised or not, and lower-class foreign migrants), degraded housing, imputed immorality and street crime [...] Second, territorial stigma has become nationalised and democratised, so to speak, in every country, a small set of urban boroughs have come to be universally renowned and reviled across class and space as redoubts of self-inflicted and self-perpetuating destitution and depravity. Their names circulate in the discourses of journalism, politics, and scholarship, as well as in ordinary conversation as synonyms for social hell [...] Third, the stigmatised neighbourhoods of the post-industrial metropolis are pictured as vortexes and vectors of social disintegration, fundamentally dissolute and irretrievably disorganised, whereas the ‘counter-world’ of the classic industrial bas-fonds was seen as «a powerful and hierarchised counter-society» (Kalifa 2012, 61–66), an «inverted double, a counterfeit and caricatural version of the organised society» (Kalifa 2012, 61–66) surrounding it”

It should be noted that the notion of territorial stigma includes two other central issues. On the one hand, it is a dynamic and partisan process (not politically and socially neutral) and not a «static» condition. This is due to the fact that territorial stigma, like any stigma, is the result of a relationship between an entity that embodies normality and the holder of negative attributes. Moreover, the process of territorial stigmatisation is influenced by the way in which the stigmatised is associated with the stigma itself. Stigmatisation internalises the negative reputations of neighbourhoods.

This theoretical proposal combines Bourdieu's (1991) theory of «symbolic power» and Goffman's (1963) theory of «spoiled identity»¹. According to Goffman, physical signs that are associated with unusual and critical aspects of a person's moral condition can be considered as a stigma. However, as the author highlights, the meaning of this notion has evolved. The term ‘stigma’ was coined by the Greeks who associated it with slaves, criminals and/or traitors. These people had signs engraved on their body to make their social status apparent. But as Goffman has pointed out, with Christianity, two metaphorical levels were added, namely, the «body signs of Grace» (a visible outburst of the skin) and the body signs of a physical disorder.

Stigma is an attribute that produces deep discredit, representing a fracture between virtual social identity and current social identity². The term “stigma’ not only refers to a derogatory attribute but also to the relationships that are created among the stigmatised and their own society. The concept of stigma contains a double perspective: the *discredited* perspective, where the stigmatised subject assumes that his diversity is already known and evident at first sight, and the *discreditable* perspective, where the stigmatised individual assumes that his diversity is not known by those around him and is not immediately perceivable³. According to Goffman (1963), these two perspectives

encompass three types of stigma: stigma related to physical deformation (e.g. blindness, deafness, etc.); criticisable aspects of one's character, such as a lack of will and passion, as well as dishonesty (other aspects may include one's sexual orientation [e.g. homosexuality], mental health, alcoholism, etc.); the tribal stigmas of race, nation, religion, which are passed on from generation to generation (racial minorities, other minorities, subcultures, etc. are usually associated with such stigmas). In all these cases, an individual possesses a characteristic on which others tend to focus, deviating attention from his positive characteristics. A stigmatised person is considered to be non-human and is thereby subjected to different forms of discrimination, which reduce his life possibilities. The way in which stigma is treated is justified by a sort of social «theory of stigma», which has been formulated to explain the inferiority associated with the stigmatised and define the danger they represent.

Wacquant (2008) attempted to produce an analytical and interpretative framework that would be appropriate to the notion of territorial stigma, proposing to read and interpret Goffman's (1963) social notion of stigma through a spatial reading key. In this approach, the spatial dimension, according to Bourdieu's theory, embodies a symbolic and violent power. As Wacquant, Slater and Pereira (2014: 1275) argue by citing Bourdieu (1991), territorial stigma, as a notion of *symbolic power*, is:

“a deeply consequential form of ramifying action through mental and objective representation (Bourdieu 1991, 220–221) [...] it affects how myriad agents feel, think, and act as it percolates down and diffuses across the social and spatial structures of the city”.

According to the author (Wacquant, Slater, and Pereira 2014), a stigmatised individual or group tends to have the same beliefs as «the normals», perceiving some of their own attributes as an infamous trait. Similarly, Bourdieu's theoretical approach, mutated by Wacquant (2008), affirms that the strength of symbolic domination lies in the acceptance of domination by the dominated, which thus allows this domination to continue. Based on this assumption, Wacquant (2011) has defined a set of possible strategies, which have been implemented by stigmatists to cope with stigma (Table 1).

Although the theory proposed by Wacquant (2008) is central, highlighting and naming a phenomenon of social discredit through space, we need to integrate this theoretical perspective with new empirical elements from studies conducted in stigmatised territories. In this paper, we focus on coping strategies. To elaborate, we address one specific question: How do local institutions of a hyper-stigmatised Italian neighbourhood such as Scampia cope with territorial stigma?

Our principal hypothesis is that Wacquant's typologies about how to cope with territorial stigma (2008; 2011) don't take into account the strategies of local “organised” actors (associations, public authority, public institutions, etc.); it only focusses on individual ones. Furthermore, they don't consider the fact that actors' strategies to

Table 1. Wacquant's strategies to cope with territorial stigma (Source Wacquant 2011).

Submission ←	→ Recalcitrance to resistance
1 – dissimulation	6 – studied indifference
2 – mutual distancing and elaboration of microdifferences	7 – defense of neighborhood (individual or collective)
3 – lateral denigration	8 – stigma inversion (hyperbolic claiming)
4 – retreat into the private (family) sphere	
5 – exit	

cope with stigma can result in a dynamic of commodification of territorial stigma, in which the actors of local organisations *temporarily* use (or *temporarily* accept) negative attributes of their own territory to easily obtain public and private funding (the 'economic value' of the stigma). Moreover, these strategies of commodification, which are implemented by local stigmatised actors at the local level, become necessary in the face of a series of economic and structural crises, which all advanced capitalist countries cyclically encounter (Bonnet 2009). Furthermore, it should be noted that the local level is more affected than ever by the competitive rhetoric pressure (Bifulco 2012; Le Galès 2002). Additionally, local organisations can be forced to value the stigmatising attributes they would like to fight to attract all forms of investments (European, national, local funds). In other words, the process of commodifying territorial stigma refers to the way in which local actors in a highly stigmatised space deal with both stigma and the context of stigma, which is characterised by economic and structural difficulties that reduce public funding in favour of a private one based on the logic of competitiveness and results.

The number of references in the existing international literature about the commodification of stigma⁴ is scarce, with almost all focussing on the transformation of social, (sub) cultural and religious processes. These references never consider the case of the commodification of territorial stigma and the action of local organised actors with respect to this stigma. These set of contributions, if compared to the case that will be presented in the following pages, only consider cases in which a stigmatising practice (such as having tattoos, watching porn movies, etc.) is commodified in order to normalise it and make it socially acceptable. Moreover, the concept of commodification is not always unambiguously mobilised. While for some authors, it is a synonym of «visibility» (Larsen, Patterson, and Markham 2014; Nasir 2018; Ragusa 2005) for others, it represents the act of creating a «new market niche», starting with a group of people with stigmatising attributes (Ragusa 2005). For the rest, the commodification of stigma is the «touristisation» of a context that was previously marginalised (Rausenberger 2018). Therefore, this contribution aims to broaden the framework within which this debate has been developed.

Methodology

The neighbourhood to be studied was selected based on the definition of a stigmatised neighbourhood. Scampia was chosen as the district of investigation, as it is undoubtedly one of the most stigmatised districts of Italy. Moreover, this neighbourhood, which is situated in the north of Naples, reflects the three main characteristics of a stigmatised territory, as identified by Wacquant, Slater, and Pereira (2014). First, the stigma associated with Scampia is nationalised and democratised. Scampia has become the quintessence of a socio-urban problematic situation to the point of being known as a «paradigm of discomfort» (the press has declared almost 40 cities as either «to have a Scampia too» or to be «not like Scampia»⁵). Second, the territorial stigma of Scampia is closely related to poor housing and street crime. Spatial degradation in Scampia is symbolised by a series of famous post-war modernist buildings, which are known as «le vele» (the sails). This symbol is often used as a concrete example of the inhabitants' immoral conduct. Third, the neighbourhood of Scampia is defined as a place where no one wants to live and a place no one can easily escape.

To investigate how local organised actors cope with territorial stigma, a varied set of area-based actions and policies in the territory under study were considered. When using the term «area-based initiatives» (ABIs), we are referring to all policies and programs that emphasise «*spatial dimension*» in defining and prioritising the allocation of *special* funding to combat a large spectrum of social and urban problems (Andersson and Musterd 2005; Atkinson 2000; Avenel 2010; Béhar 2000; Lawless 2006; Stewart and Lane 2001; Parkinson 1998; Smith 1999; Lupton and Tunstall 2003; Turok 2004). In this sense, we can also include a range of territory-based social policies, such as the local use of European Structural Funds to implement policies that adopt a cohesive area-based approach to define where and why extra funds need to be allocated. Funding aims to improve the living conditions of inhabitants and spur the territorial development of deprived urban areas. We also include a whole range of local initiatives, which provide special funding to specific spaces that are «*emblematic*» of a social problem. This type of area-based initiative represents a moment in which selected local organised actors (schools, municipalities and associations) are forced to confront themselves in a dominant and stigmatising narrative and take a position through their own description of the neighbourhood, which is mandatory for two initiatives of the three analysed.

To answer the scientific question pertaining to coping strategies, we utilised the material that we collected during ethnographic fieldwork in Scampia, which was conducted for over a year and a half between 2010 and 2015.

This period was spent living in the neighbourhood and participating in its daily life. Furthermore, this period offered the opportunity to participate in and observe some of the processes relating to area-based initiatives, which have been developed by and within three spheres: the schools, the local municipality and the associations at work on the ground. We were faced with a variegated range of area-based initiatives, which were being implemented in the neighbourhood around these three spheres. Some of these have been listed below:

- A national area-based initiative at the school level (projects for schools in *Areas at Risk*)
- A mix of national and European area-based funding and policies at the municipal level: The *Cohesion Action Plan* (PAC) funded by Italy and the EU;
- A local area-based intervention described by the city mayor as the «Scampia Model of Intervention» and financed by the city government and a private foundation, which locally funds associations working against the augmentation of crime in Naples.

For this reason, we focussed on these three spheres of intervention and actors. Between 2010 and 2015, two long periods of field research (in 2010–2011 and then in 2013–2014) were conducted. In the first half, we conducted fieldwork for seven months, and in the second half, we conducted fieldwork for eight months. This was accompanied by shorter visits of a few days or a week. The material that will be utilised in this article was collected during 2013–2014. During this period, a total of 40 interviews were conducted: 7 interviews with institutions (schools, law enforcement agencies, municipalities); 10 interviews with associations in the area; 14 interviews with the inhabitants of social housing where we resided during this research period; 9 informal interviews with people living in

the neighbourhood who were not included in the group of people to be interviewed. In addition, 10 meetings between local associations and between associations and actors outside the neighbourhood were transcribed. Finally, like any ethnographic research, a part of the material was collected in the form of field notes that were taken every day, in which many of the situations experienced in the field were transcribed. These have been combined with data from documentary sources (reports, resolutions, official documents, videos, local books, etc.).

The implemented methodology to collect and interpret the data in this study pays particular attention to one of the major problems of ethnographic research studies (Duneier 2007; Jerolmack and Khan 2014; Ortner 2003) and more in general of social sciences' (Mills 1940). It is an issue that the literature has defined as «aptitude fallacy» (Jerolmack and Khan 2014). In this context, Jerolmack and Khan (2014: 178) have stated the following:

«[...] many interview and survey researchers routinely conflate self-reports with behaviour and assume a consistency between attitudes and action. We call this erroneous inference of situated behaviour from verbal accounts the attitudinal fallacy. Though interviewing and ethnography are often lumped together as 'qualitative methods', by juxtaposing studies of 'culture in action' based on verbal accounts with ethnographic investigations, we show that the latter routinely attempts to explain the 'attitude-behaviour problem' while the former regularly ignores it. Because meaning and action are collectively negotiated and context-dependent, we contend that self-reports of attitudes and behaviours are of limited value in explaining what people actually do because they are overly individualistic and abstracted from lived experience».

In concrete terms, this means that it is not only necessary to collect official documents where local actors describe the neighbourhood to obtain various types of funding (what they do) but also to conduct ethnographic interviews (informed by long permanence in the neighbourhood), focussing on a stigmatised neighbourhood outside of a relational context animated by economic and political interests (what they think). This caution has led us to not only favour an ethnographic approach from the beginning but also to structure the collection of field material based on this binary perspective. The general question about how these subjects confront themselves with the stigma associated with the areas in which these actors operate has been operationalised. This general question was adapted to the local actors active in the neighbourhood and restructured as follows: How do the schools located in a neighbourhood that is identified as «sensitive» or problematic «write officially and talk informally» about the territory? How does the municipality «write officially and talk informally» about the space in which its actions take place? How do the associations in the neighbourhood deal with the stigmatising rhetoric of the city council of Scampia that emerges from public speech and justify the resources allocated to these actors? Do they build a connection between their social activities and the negative attributes of their neighbourhood?

First, we collected internal documents about area-based policies and initiatives through which these actors were seeking to obtain funds to understand how they described their neighbourhood to achieve their goal. At the school level, we looked at the «area description» of the policy surrounding areas at risk, which was contained in the first section of the application, also known as ALL. 1-AR, for the years 2012–2013. For the municipality, we looked at the community profile that was used to obtain a mix



of national and European funds for disadvantaged urban areas in 2013. For the associations, however, we used as our reference a different area-based process and its related documents. We looked at the political discussions and the discussions in the media that gave birth to a new kind of area-based intervention. Advocated and advanced by the Mayor of Naples, De Magistris, this new intervention was based on fighting against urban and organised crime from a «social perspective», mixing socio-urban and military intervention in an area that was considered to be a human reservoir for criminal activities. This program hypothesised that this area was divided into ‘pockets’ of potential criminality that, as Atkinson pointed out regarding the policies on poverty, generated «small-scale supplementary action to remedy any deficiencies» (Atkinson 2000, 221). For this reason, this program was defined as an area-based initiative.

Second, we interviewed the local actors who were involved in these area-based processes: 3 teachers who were involved in the area at risk of a funding procedure for 4 schools in the neighbourhood; the person in charge of writing Scampia’s community profile that was used to obtain supplementary funding for the municipality from the «national social fund for social policies» and from the «national-European» funding for development (PAC); 10 out of 16 associations that were involved in the coalition of local associations in the neighbourhood project proposed by the Mayor of Naples and financed with the aid of a private national foundation.

Third, we compared the description of the same neighbourhood that was submitted internally to an official «funding setting» with the one that was proposed during interviews outside a «performative context» to understand whether the way in which the actors «officially depicted Scampia» is equivalent to «how they actually perceive and describe the neighbourhood» outside official and institutional positions. In the third sphere of area-based policies, the methodology changed again. In this specific case, a comparison was drawn between the public and political discourses of the mayor, which resulted in the «Scampia model» of intervention (the political framework), and the interviews describing the neighbourhood’s characteristics, as conducted with various local associations engaged in activities funded within the political framework of the «Scampia model».

Comparing the documents with the interviews allowed us to gain a more complex understanding of the reasons that compel these actors to apply for such supplementary funding (such as facing budget cuts, the impossibility of otherwise funding standard welfare services, helping keep the social activities of an association alive and running). Furthermore, it allowed us to formulate several initial critical considerations about the consequences these types of area-based initiatives can have on the coping strategies implemented by local organised actors.

The context

The urban history of Scampia’s neighbourhood is directly associated with the attempts of Naples, in its historical development, to expand inland from the coast to provide relief to its overcrowded historical centre where housing conditions had been compromised. The city’s unique topography, with the sea to the south and a chain of hills to the north, has prevented a more traditional linear or radial expansion from its centre, instead creating

conditions for the emergence of a concept based on development poles (Dal Piaz 1985). Scampia was built in accordance with this concept. Created out of a natural extension of a historically owned church property up until around 1793⁶ (De Seta 1984), Scampia came to be immediately identified as a centre for potential residential development, particularly for some of the poorest parts of the population. This came about after the end of the 1960s, which was a period of economic boom. It was a period when social rights came to be increasingly recognised as important, allowing a welfare state to gradually consolidate. The issue of housing emerged as one of the principal social problems to be addressed, especially in a city like Naples with its average concentration of two people per room and with cases of up to seven people living in a room. Although population growth remained stable, it was essential to relieve the pressure the city's historic centre was being subjected to. These dynamics legitimised the city's massive affordable and working-class housing program, which was implemented with the aid of funds that were made available by the passing of Law 167/62⁷. Within a decade, two major urban development projects had been carried out, creating Ponticelli and Secondigliano (now Scampia). These neighbourhoods shared the negative characteristics of almost completely lacking transportation services and being cut off from the city centre by hills (Figure 1).

Although the construction of the district seemed to be going according to the initial plans, on 23 November 1980, Naples and much of the region were struck by a devastating earthquake that irremediably damaged many historic properties. In January 1981, the City of Naples announced that 10% of its population was without accommodation (111,997 inhabitants) and that 5,641 buildings had been declared



Figure 1. The Scampia neighbourhood under construction (in the late '70s). Photo by Mimmo Jodice. (No permission required to post photos taken more than twenty years earlier. The author died in 2016.).

uninhabitable (with 4,030 more classified as only partially usable). It was at this time that many of those displaced by the earthquake, as well as those already homeless in the region, began illegally occupying the apartments still under construction in the brand- new residential area. This wave of improvised occupation topped out in 1981 (Andriello 1983; Pugliese 1999), but not before having drastically increased the population of the district, which increased from 53% to 91% from the end of 1980 to the end of 1981. This abusive wave particularly affected the lots T, H, S, M and L (M and L are known as the so-called «sails» of Scampia), which witnessed a population rise from 4% to 86% in just a few months. However, with the Extraordinary Residential Building Plan of 1981 (Law n.219/81), the situation improved significantly. This plan allowed building «park- ing houses» as they have come to be known – a sequence of towers and small buildings of two to three floors, which were completely prefabricated. These houses were designed to last twenty years, but they are still standing nearly forty years later. Despite this and other rehabilitation interventions, the housing problems of the neigh- bourhood remained manifestly present, and it is these problems that resulted in protests being organised by the neighbourhood's residents. The *Comitato di lotta delle Vele di Scampia* (The Sails of Scampia Fighting Committee), active since 1988, rejecting the life of constant housing discomfort existent in the neighbourhood, gave rise to various pressure groups that were able to arouse the attention of wider Naples in the beginning and gradually that of the entire nation's. «In successive stages, they managed to focus institutional attention of the highest levels onto the dramatic problems of the «sails» of Scampia, creating the conditions necessary to obtain funding that would allow for a recovery operation» (Siola 1994, 6). These efforts and struggles, however, had unfore- seen consequences, decisively contributing to identifying Scampia with many, if not all, of the socio-urban problems in Naples and quickly simplifying the debate concerning its redevelopment based on the question of whether or not its megastructures, designed by the modernist architect Di Salvo, should be demolished. The attention Scampia received led to Pope John Paul II visiting it in 1990, after which the square where this event took place was renamed in honour of him. The Italian President Francesco Cossiga subsequently visited the neighbourhood on July 1991, spending time at the «sails» in particular. Cossiga committed to prioritising the redevelopment of the neighbourhood, giving rise to the 1995 plan, in which the demolition of the «sails» began and new residential buildings began being constructed. High-profile athletes, actors, benefactors, politicians and members of institutional departments continued visiting throughout the early 1990s. Scampia and the iconic image of its «sails» had become a political, social and urban priority, not just for Naples but also for Italy.

Being able to effectively influence the decisions and the decision-making process affect- ing the neighbourhood, the *Comitato di lotta* indirectly contributed to the foundations for the stigmatisation of Scampia. They included the public to conceive and discuss the urban problems of Naples as Scampia problems. Scampia became the principal example of «urban disease» – a stigmatisation that continues to engulf the neighbourhood even today. Scampia has come to be envisioned in a particular way through its constant depiction in the media – a depiction that has focussed on just a part of the whole. Scampia is above all the «sails», which are above all crimes which, in this place, are above all Camorra; thus, Scampia is equal to Camorra. In this depiction, metonymic logic is clearly at work, in which one phenomenon present in a neighbourhood comes to represent everything. The features and

characteristics of a specific space of the «sails» become paradigmatic, widening its signifying space to encompass the entire neighbourhood.

According to a report on Scampia (Pugliese et al. 1999), the neighbourhood comprises «too many» young people, «too many» unemployed, «too many» criminals (both real and potential) and an overall population with a low level of education whose income only sometimes exceeds the poverty line (Morlicchio, Orientale Caputo, and Pugliese 2007). However, if we look at a side of Scampia, which is much less well-known, we can see that the area hosts the largest number of non-profit associations in Naples (more than a hundred according to Corona and Sanzone 2010). Furthermore, it has the third-largest green space⁸ and is the recipient of a significant percentage of priority investments, the Scampia Regions being among the most extra-subsidised areas in Italy under the allocation of special school funding⁹.

In recent years, despite a significant reduction in the number of illegal activities that are reported, the stigmatisation that has affected the territory and its inhabitants remains unchanged. Newspapers systematically describe it as a problem to be solved¹⁰. Moreover, local actors are not always able to operate outside the stigmatising rhetoric surrounding the neighbourhood. According to a prevailing discourse, it remains a «problematic» neighbourhood, one which largely comprises a potential pool of criminals who are ready to be exploited for the profit of the local Camorra Mafia. Furthermore, this neighbourhood's inhabitants get quickly lost in this perception, encountering problems whose nature is very different and much more complex than perceived.

The rhetoric of stigmatisation continues to spread and grow, circumscribing and defining a spatiality of social problems at their occurrence. Within this framework, it becomes possible to better understand the over-attention Scampia received during the violent *faida*¹¹ of the Camorra in 2012. During this period (2012–2014), a new wave of interest in Scampia, prioritising it for intervention, began. This happened despite the fact that the majority of the injuries and deaths related to the *faida* happened outside the neighbourhood. Seven years earlier, in 2004–2005, another *faida* affected a part of Scampia's neighbourhood. Seemingly, whenever a *faida* takes place, speeches and projects for intervening in Scampia take on a new life.

The survival of schools

Among the privileged points of view from which it is possible to observe possible processes of spatialisation of social problems (Tissot and Poupeau 2005), establishing the priority of specific geographical contexts over others, the school is undoubtedly one of the most profitable. Moreover, from this point of view, it was possible to understand how actors cope with the stigmatisation of Scampia.

As in France (Zones Éducatives Prioritaires) and England (Educational Priority Areas), Italy has had instruments in place for over a decade to prioritise more deprived districts over others, which have taken as their starting point the educational sector.

The projects surrounding areas at risk [*progetti aree a rischio*] are among the few national policies in Italy that are based on the idea of prioritising areas for public intervention. To receive funds, each school has to submit a program and justify its need



for it through an overview of the *territorial* (non-individual) «risk» to which the project intends to respond along with the requirements it will entail.

«Since 1985, the year the district of Scampia was born, the neighbourhood [...] is presented as [...] being primarily a dormitory area, existing in a condition of marginality and degradation compared to the city territory [...] and manifests itself more and more frequently through episodes of deviant behaviour and violence when not of organised crime. [...] Throughout the neighbourhood, school dropouts are frequent, demonstrating the deep unease that many families experience. It is from these assumptions that the project idea was born for the students [...] that the risk of dispersion [...] identifies a social risk more serious than elsewhere, higher than the official figure for the area because it sometimes goes unreported, as lived of disintegration and family discomfort [...] they cloak themselves with an aura of normality that ends up making our students assume dysfunctional and stereotypical attitudes that condemn them to personal destinies coercively repetitive of the family and social stories of origin. Hence, the need for training intervention [...] aimed at balancing against the lack of opportunities for development and growth [...] caused by the lack of a socio-economic and cultural context of the origin of our students» (Areas-Risk Projects, School Year 2012/2013, ALL. 1-AR).

With respect to the Scampia district, its problematic aspects are emphasised here to render «*the need for training intervention*» unquestionable. If we compare this description with that of a teacher's from the same school whose in a position to have a more detached view of the national funding institute, then the apparent homogeneity of the previous description is definitely called into question.

«One part of our audience [...] is much more qualified than the other [...] In a sense, it is not a question of types of problems, but while in one pole, we have some isolated cases, in this pole, they are more widespread – dispersion, more chaotic family situations and social workers. But in recent years, the situation has worsened, economic difficulties have increased, there have been many victims of the economic crisis, but families still send their children to school, but with significant sacrifices. There is a good percentage of our children who go to work in the afternoon and on weekends in order to buy books [...] I think that the problems that we find here, in addition to those of the economic crisis, are the same as those found in all major Italian suburbs. I do not think that there are special features. There are no community centres. Apart from the parishes that do a lot [...] here, there exists no opportunity to meet and play [...] there is a strong stigma [...] here, I mean in Naples, not Scampia [...] if you think that the institute fund (the national one) has decreased from 104,000 to 40,000 in the last three years, we must do what we did with 104,000 with 40,000. Then we participated in the European funds [...] the FESR building fund was 790 thousand euros [...] we still have to see the money connected to the «areas at risk» [*Area a rischio*], which ended last year [...] it was the first year that we were entitled to funding [...] we do side activities. I do what I should be able to do during school hours; in theory, I should be able to do these things during school hours [...] but you can't do it» (interview with Vipre, March 2014).

The description of Scampia presented here differs from the official description of the area. This description informs us of the following: the weight the economic crisis places on family situations; young people who work to pay for their books; families making sacrifices to send their children to school; the lack of gathering spaces (and not the lack of desire for them); the mobilisation of local authorities. In short, the representation that emerges from this description is that of a neighbourhood that embodies a more nationally found dynamic, namely, the growing impoverishment of already weak economic groups but

who are at present nonetheless able to create temporary solutions to their problems (working in the afternoon, for example). Moreover, this description highlights the strong link between increasing impoverishment and national budget cuts (from 104,000 to 40,000 in the previous three years) and the search for funding elsewhere, particularly through ad hoc funds, which are available for disadvantaged areas, both nationally and from Europe. In other words, if in the official description, the «spatial dimension of social problems» is made the centre of focus, seeking to justify the need for funding, in the interview, this emphasis on spatial dimension loses its weight. Instead, a more general degradation is placed at the centre – a degradation of economic conditions experienced by inhabitants of «major Italian suburbs» and the economic situation of schools in Italy, which are severely affected by the austerity policies that were put in place following the great recession of 2009–2014 (Mattagami's and Leventi 2014) as they were across Southern Europe (Greece, Spain and Portugal), affecting all public sectors.

The municipality's *Piano Azione Coesione* (PAC)

In analysing the Italian perspective of area-based initiatives, the second case we looked at was the *Piano Azione Coesione* (PAC) or Cohesion Action Plan, which was initiated by the national government in 2011. It was implemented as a response to the requests by the EU to reorganise the use of its European Structural Funds in prioritised Italian regions (the so-called «objective 1» regions or «convergence zones»). This plan takes place within a greater European political framework and operates following a spatial prioritising approach, identifying the more disadvantaged areas and giving them the opportunity to apply for additional economic support to help redress their problems. Just like in the case of the schools, a description of the area was required when submitting a request for supplementary funding to help implement new social policies. For Scampia, this neighbourhood description was produced by mainly using data provided by local social services (PLISS 2013–2015).

«(Scampia) exhibits problems of poverty along with low amounts of schooling, early parenthood, high rates of leaving school early, lack of parenting skills and lack of care for the elderly [...] a population living in large public housing complexes [...] whose architectural configuration does not help conceal illegal activities or the existence of groups dedicated to organised crime [...] The stories of loneliness, exclusion, and architectural barriers are often present. Another aspect that characterises the territory is the phenomenon of drugs [...] production, sale (shops), and consumption. The first two follow the lines of illegality, both activities being prohibited by law, and controlled by organised crime. From the third, consumption, socio-psychological aspects arise that need to be taken into consideration [...] From this brief analysis of the context, we can deduce that we move/evolve in a territory characterised by a high rate of illegality, configured as a control room in the hands of organised crime organisations [...] The low level of schooling and the cultural trends of the territory are not conducive to social change, especially in comparison with the priority [...] of overcoming the culture [...] of organised crime» (VIII Municipality profile 2013, Naples).

The description of the wider municipal area, comprising four different neighbourhoods (Chiaiano, Marianella, Scampia and Piscinola), is produced through a problematic focus on Scampia. It is problematic in the sense that it describes the entire VIII Municipality of Naples by focussing on the data provided by the social services of Scampia. Furthermore, it



risks reducing the other three adjacent neighbourhoods into being perceived as pure copies of Scampia¹². As explained by the official responsible for drafting these applications (interview with Paolo, 14 October 2013, Scampia), «this strategy is more likely to lead to additional funding, without which everything would collapse». This was stated in reference to the European funds and their standard use.

“This is a neighbourhood where if you take away the ‘sails’ and the gypsy camps, it would not be one of the best in Europe, but neither one of the worst. But here there are these symbols, negative symbols, which cause the funding to arrive ...” (interview with Paolo, 14 October 2013, Scampia)

When the perceptions about Scampia are placed side by side – the perceptions that came to light while interviewing the person in charge of the funding application and a politician working in the neighbourhood – a contradictory vision emerges, a contradiction that highlights the influence that symbolic dimension has had not only on Scampia itself but also on its adjacent areas:

“There is not much difference between Scampia, Ponticelli, Sanità ... the difference is in the pressure exerted by the media because the social layers are the same, and the problems too. We have imposed a sole identity that of Gomorra onto this place, and it is an icon that has worked against us, even though Scampia has almost no more dealers. Poverty, however, is not a problem in Scampia while it is in many places, in many cities, it is not here ...” (interview with Marco, member of the Democratic Party – PD – November 2013).

“The nearby neighbourhoods that have the same problems as Scampia have been penalised. If before they were considered suburbs of Naples, like Secondigliano, today, they are considered the periphery of Scampia. The whole world focusses on Scampia, so imagine the nearby neighbourhoods ... with universal [ordinary] national funds decreasing from year to year and lower and lower quotas for welfare ... but it is clear that if it is only pure welfarism, as soon as the funds run out, we are back to square one” (interview with Paolo, a politician of the municipality, 14 October 2013, Scampia).

Similar to when area-based initiatives were pursued in the sphere of schools, here too emphasis on the specificity of the spatial dimension in funding applications diminishes in importance in depicting those that are interviewed informally. These interviewees attribute a fair amount of responsibility for the existent social conditions to the economic state of welfare services in Italy in general, which have been severely affected by budgetary cuts at a national level. However, the interviewed also highlighted a crucial point to understand this political approach, that is, the marginalisation of great sections of city areas by grouping them based on perception by attributing to them characteristics and problems of specific places within the surrounding area where these characteristics and problems are more clearly evident. This is a typical consequence of area-based rationale (Turok 2004).

The city's area actions

The third and last case we looked at concerning Italian area-based policies was the initiative that was set into motion by the Mayor of Naples, Luigi de Magistris, in 2012 during the phase of internal struggle within the mafia (*faida*). As part of this specific area-based program, the city council, in collaboration with a private actor, launched an open call for additional priority funds to help establish a socio-urban project in Scampia's neighbourhood, which was considered spatially emblematic of criminal activities.

When the *faida* began in 2012, Scampia once again became the centre of attention in the media, even if much of the violence and murder were taking place in other neighbourhoods. The public authority's offensive intent on fighting and ending these organised crime conflicts resulted in identifying the Scampia neighbourhood as its priority area of intervention. The report of a journalist during the *faida* stated the following:

«The mayor, Luigi de Magistris, appeals to a massive intervention by the police to counter the *faida* disrupting Naples [...] proposing 'a strategic operational plan [...] in which we must physically see the massive presence of law enforcement in the city. Scampia is a territory that must not be left to its own devices [...] We are about to pass a revolutionary resolution, outlining a *Scampia method*, which I will then put to use in other neighbourhoods'» (Ciaramella 2012, Espresso Online, September 13).

«Militarisation» of the neighbourhood began with the deployment of innumerable police and military forces. However, it was apparent that this type of security action could not reduce the problems of Scampia by itself and, thus, the mayor decided to supplement military action with socio-urban action. Alberto, a member of a local association, stated the following about this period:

«they thought of intervening in Scampia to attack its problems! In that period of great media attention, formally and informally, the institutions were called upon to intervene. It was so obvious and mediated that in public opinion; there was a growing feeling of dissatisfaction because there was this situation of war, in which it seemed no one was intervening [...] It was at this stage that the administration passed a resolution in which it decided to pursue a social intervention in the neighbourhood rather than a military one. The military intervention was already present» (interview with Alberto, October 2013).

Thus, it becomes apparent that the idea of establishing an additional project for funding the neighbourhood came about as a result of the *faida* outbreak. Subsequently, the focus of the media shifted to Scampia despite the fact much of the violence was occurring in other municipalities and neighbourhoods. It was a media deception, following which the city government attempted to remove itself from criticism stemming from it by «doing something» for this most emblematic criminal neighbourhood. Meanwhile, it was within the context of this «social problem» that organised actors operating within Scampia were called upon by the administration to collaborate with a private actor, *Fondazione con il Sud*, who was already involved in financing other projects in the neighbourhood.

«However, the municipal administration and the FcS say, 'we want to localise this intervention in Scampia', an initiative that will deal with the most important social and urban problems of Scampia, but 'we don't want to be the one to say how you should do it', and so they develop and start a process of consultation, of co-determination ... they initiate the process and guide this process where the local stakeholders take part ... Three areas of intervention came to the fore: educational interventions for minors in disadvantaged conditions; another area was everything related to facilitating job placement, job grants, facilitation activities, etc., and the other was that of improving and restoring existing structures in Scampia» (interview with Alberto, October 2013).

«Welfare community in Scampia» (Comune di Napoli 2013) was the name that was given to the supplementary «social» project funding that accompanied this period of militarisation brought about by the *faida*. This project was divided into three axes of development. The first focussed on social and educational activities, combating the

leaving school early phenomenon. The second focussed on educational training and work orientation while the third aimed to redevelop space. While the first two axes were entirely managed by the VII Municipality of Naples, the third axis witnessed a collaboration between local associations, the municipality, the Planning Department of Naples University *Federico II* and *Fondazione Con il Sud*, as they all aimed to help stimulate urban regeneration. Many of the most active associations in the neighbourhood participated in this collaboration, which was dubbed *Valorizziamo Scampia* (Let's Valorise Scampia). However, what exactly local actors act toward or away from is a very relevant issue. In Scampia, many actors involved in area-based projects don't favour the rhetoric of stigmatisation that is produced and reproduced in their neighbourhood. They would never themselves envision the neighbourhood through the lens of criminality and would choose not to act within such a framework. But these facts notwithstanding, many organisations took advantage of the opportunities given to them through the perception of the neighbourhood as overrun and controlled by the Camorra, for which something must be done. A close analysis of this process has been useful in understanding how these local organisations simultaneously approached their funding and how they conducted their actual projects, seeing how the image of Scampia itself created an interpretative framework from which these instruments emanated.

Far from a feeling of fighting the specific problems linked to the *faida* which, in the vision of the media, the neighbourhood was enveloped in, I observed during my fieldwork while attending meetings inside the *Valorizziamo Scampia* project that the 'original' rationale – the problems that had acted as the rationale behind the additional funding – had disappeared. It had been replaced by the concrete intentions of the various actors who were involved. The idea of attacking the principal social problem of the neighbourhood, which was viewed as the area-emblem of all criminal activities in Naples, disappeared. At the conclusion of my observation in the field (October 2014), it was difficult to ascertain a common objective shared by the different actors involved. The area-based approach of fighting crime advocated by the municipal government never really translated into a concrete implementation of the project.

The Planning Department of Naples University *Federico II* was responsible for drawing up the general lines of intervention. During the process, they expanded upon strategies that were summarised, as Alberto recalled, utilising a *communicative approach*. It was made clear that they were aiming to respond to problems that were associated with the bad reputation of the neighbourhood. The entire project, along with the intervention of the public actor, grew precisely out of this logic of stigmatisation the territory had long been subject to. It is here that the connections between the neighbourhood, the social and political problems that emerge again with the *faida* and where the arrival of additional funding becomes contradictory. Scampia, as generally depicted and not necessarily as actually lived, becomes the underlying prerequisite by the actors involved in the neighbourhood to conceive its future. In other words, the following can be stated:

«it is [Scampia] at the same time the *a priori* of the intervention, its framework of reference, and the expected result *a posteriori*, a potential effect, a fabric of economic and social relations in which the individual can find his own place» (Bergamaschi 2003, 43).

This dynamic, which I have defined as the commodification of territorial stigma, entails carrying a «value of use» and a «value of exchange» to the stigma through which funds can be obtained, projects can be conceived and joined and so on. This dynamic also emerged indirectly (outside interviews and outside the situations that were prevalent during the fieldwork) during the fieldwork, that is, through discussions between actors. One, in particular, reported in the form of a field note, is emblematic of the existence of a process of commodification of territorial stigma by some local organised actors.

«A group [Cadca] composed of American authorities for the prevention of drug addiction has arrived, with some representatives of the Department of Sociology of the University of Bologna [...] have presented their proposals and their role [...] It is not clear to anyone why they have chosen Scampia, but it's clear they didn't rely on precise data to choose the neighbourhood, certainly because it is the emblem of social and urban evils; they know almost nothing about Scampia [...] nevertheless they have (almost all) tried to understand if there is money at stake to do activities, to pay volunteers, in short for the associationism. P., who has a vast knowledge of drug addiction in Naples and lives in Scampia, intervened [...] it was P. himself who strongly affirmed that there are no real reasons justifying this proposal with respect to the characteristics of the neighbourhood, the data and knowledge he has, he says, do not go in the direction of those who are presenting the project [...] but A. of the other association seems much more interested in the project than P. [...] so P. at the end of the meeting [...] came to the point of asking A. «Since they were no longer in the same boat», which meant «since when are we in disagreement in front of someone who is loaded with stereotypes about the neighbourhood and we let him do it»? [...] referred to the fact that A. was winking at possible funding [...] Shortly after, in the car with A. the speech continued [...] was irritated and offended «perhaps it is he who came down from my boat [...] for me nothing has changed [...] but if we want to move things forward, we have to find resources [...] I have a lot of people here who work and take nothing [...] like volunteers [...] resources are missing [...]» (Field Note #019_2014).

One of the people involved in this project with the Americans later reported the following:

“There was no preliminary analysis; we had to come to Scampia. It had been practically imposed ... clearly, this choice was made for the celebrity of the neighbourhood. We absolutely had no data before choosing the place” (discussion with Maria, February 2019).

If it's true that area-based initiatives for «disadvantaged» territories (often chosen according to their «bad reputation») render territorial stigma commodifiable by assigning the «negative attributes» a value and by ranking them (because the same initiatives available implicitly attribute this exchange value to the stigma), then it is equally true that the process of commodifying territorial stigma does not only emerge from a gap between what is written and what is thought. It also emerges from the way of relating to the same stigmatising narrative when it is reproduced by an *internal actor* and pre-sented to another *internal actor* in the territory (again outside a context animated by economic interests of various kinds).

«It is true (talking to another person from the neighbourhood involved in the management of the Roma camps in the neighbourhood), a few days ago, I made one of my usual tours of the neighbourhood with a person just arrived, and I was with S. of another association in the neighbourhood [...] if, by mistake, I described something by highlighting the negative dynamics of the neighbourhood, S. intervened and corrected me, intervened immediately ... » (intervention of Salvo during a public presentation of the research, July 2015).



This opposite attitude regarding the negative attributes of the neighbourhood, which belittles the problematic nature of Scampia, is typical of the internal operators who are extremely upset by the divergent stance (this is the case of those associations that internally adopt the stigmatising rhetoric).

«Why did you go to interview Carmine, too? Almost no one gets along with him because he speculates on the neighbourhood, uses the dominant speeches ... it is useless to interview him. I do not know what he can tell you ... » (interview with Alice, April 2014).

Theoretical and practical consequences of the commodification process

If we look closely at Scampia again, these dynamics come into better focus. The associations that are at work within its neighbourhood accept to proceed within an overall framework that depicts their neighbourhood in stigmatising colours, tacitly accepting the public opinion and calling for intervention while amongst themselves rejecting such a depiction, even though it is distant from their daily lives and real experiences, as it has become the only way to guarantee funding.

Schools in Scampia, facing public funding cuts and operating within an increasingly competitive system to obtain additional funds, have managed to discover extra sources of funding through these policies. Thus, the area's bad reputation is used to guarantee financing for student activities, whereas, in daily teaching, the complexities of territorial dynamics are progressively abandoned.

Similarly, the municipality has attempted to maintain economic funding for its essential services in the face of overall public investment reductions in welfare. The competition that characterises both European and national-level applications for funding almost inevitably leads local applicants to attempt to limit and structure their own «field of competition» by emphasising peculiarities that go beyond the «normal» needs of a territory and upon which to base and give added weight to their candidacy. Therefore, emphasising the stigmatising attributes of a territory directly responds to an almost imposed requirement.

Compared to Wacquant's perspective borrowed from Bourdieu, in which those who suffer from the stigma of a territory would reproduce it more or less consciously, in the presented case, there is a lack of a real process of «internalisation». If it had existed, it would have essentially shown a greater juxtaposition between «what they write and what they think». The «symbolic violence» (to use the notion of Bourdieu) of an economic and political system seems to be internalised. On the one hand, it places the organised actors more and more at the centre of local, national and European socio-urban policies (Bifulco 2012: 4)¹³, asking them to act on the territory in an increasingly complex way and in tune with other local actors. On the other hand, it asks them to do so with increasingly reduced resources. The question underestimated by the theoretical debate is that the way of relating to stigma also very much depends on who the stigma is in question. Observe the relationship between individuals and their territory and consider the relationship between local institutions and the stigma of their space of action (in this case, municipalities, schools and the most active associations in the territory); you will find that it is not the same framework with respect to the contextual dimension – it is completely different.

Moreover, in the case under discussion, it is extremely important to underline that this reproduction of the stigma is possible due to a series of political instruments that explicitly ask to clarify the link between the territory of intervention and social problems. The official documentation of the areas at risk (Annex 1 AR), for example, first asks to define the link between risk and neighbourhood and not just the territory. This is also true for official documentation required by European policies from the municipality where the profile of the community is not configured as a simple description of the district but a description of its disadvantage. This is a necessary requirement for renewal, and it has resulted in encouraging descriptions of the entire municipality entirely based on data from the social services of only one district out of three, which constitute the area of intervention of the municipality.

Certainly, among the most problematic consequences from a political and sociological point of view is the very type of relationship that exists between stigma and local organised actors. This issue is supported by the area-based approach, which makes a territory competitive through its problems, ensuring a financeability of disadvantaged territories based on the presence of negative attributes. According to one of the interviewed, this requirement leads many actors to «feed on Scampia and its problems» (interview with Elena, March 2014) which, in turn, becomes essential in the economic survival of these organisations and their activities (Avenel 2010). It is difficult to say whether this process of commodification determines an increase in the territorial stigma of Scampia. Certainly, processes of reproducing stigmatisation are still underway although, as we have tried to show, they are linked to an external projection of the neighbourhood. In its daily internal dynamics, the local organised actors, in fact, tend not to use this negative rhetoric, instead preferring their strong knowledge of the place and the dynamics that cross it. This process of commodification, which is favoured or produced by area-based programmes and policies, in fact, renders irrelevant a deep and less homogeneous knowledge of the neighbourhood of which all the actors interviewed are certainly bearers. However, it has no political margin to assert itself.

Notes

1. According to a scientific debate (Wacquant, Slater, and Pereira 2014; Jensen and Christensen 2012), the juxtaposition of Goffman and Bourdieu in Wacquant's approach is problematic (Jensen and Christensen 2012), even if this problem, for Wacquant, arises from a superficial reading of the characteristics of the two authors. But as Wacquant, Slater and Pereira (2014: 1272) have pointed out, «The common view that Bourdieu and Goffman are discordant social theorists [which Jensen and Christensen (2012) consider to be a problem for Wacquant's concept of spatial taint] arises at the confluence of conventional misreading of each of them: Bourdieu is often misinterpreted as a mechanical 'structuralist' who cannot accommodate creative action at the microlevel (when his core conceptual dyad of habitus and social space handles it fluidly) while Goffman is typically mistaken for a 'symbolic interactionist' in the mould of Blumer when he is a hard-nosed Durkheimian intent on uncovering the social morphology and collective representations specific to the 'interaction order'. (No wonder Bourdieu was a keen reader, intellectual admirer and personal friend of Goffman whose works he arranged to have translated into French in his book series with the avant-garde publisher Minuit.) ».
2. In his preliminary remarks, Goffman distinguishes two kinds of identity. On one hand, we have the virtual social identity, which represents what we attribute to a person and the



requirements we set. When we come across a stranger, it is likely that his immediate appearance will allow us to establish in advance which category he belongs to and what his negatives attributes are. We trust the assumptions we make, and we turn them into a sort of regulatory system and therefore into unequivocal claims. On the other hand, based on Goffman's model, we have the «current social identity», which allows us to demonstrate to which category a person belongs and gauge the attributes that can be legitimately assigned to her/him.

3. It is probable that a stigmatised individual will undergo both situations (Goffman 1963).
4. A systematic literature review (SLR) was conducted on the Web of Science's (WOS) database. After crossing a few key words, a total of 33 articles were found to be relevant on the subject of the commodification of stigma, of which 11 were removed because they were found to be not really relevant.
5. Using *Google Alerts*, we analysed national and local news about Scampia that appeared in both the major national and local Italian newspapers, as well as on the web and blogs, in the last nine years, more precisely from March 2010 until today. Unlike a sample of control provided by the news about other districts, which are generically assumed as problematic (Zen, Centocelle, Quarto Oggiaro, Librino) and whose news were monitored from March 2014 to September 2014, Scampia was the only one to be found to be able to boast of 39 other neighbourhoods/cities, located both in the north and south of Italy, which claim to have 'their own Scampia' or 'be like Scampia' or at the 'risk of becoming like Scampia' or 'not being absolutely like Scampia'. From Rimini to Parma, from Bitonto to San Salvario, passing through Milan, Torbella Monaca, Centocelle, Librino, Tor Vergata, all compared themselves to Scampia in terms of socio-urban drama. To affirm that Scampia is a model, Scampia must not simply be emblematic; rather, its emblem should go beyond the boundaries of the neighbourhood itself to become the term, based on which the state of health of other contexts is understood. Scampia enables representing phenomena and processes 'other' than the neighbourhood. In other words, if we had to imagine a scale of discomfort in an urban environment, Scampia would be placed in an extreme position. Furthermore, like the ideal types, it is compared to this imagined 'Scampia', which is more than real, that the discomfort or the reality of other suburban districts would be defined.
6. The exact date of Scampia's beginning has not been precisely identified, but it was first identified in the 1793 map of Rizzi Zannoni.
7. This law was created with the intention to encourage the acquisition of building areas for economic and social housing. It was implemented by the City of Naples in 1964 and officially approved through Resolution No. 11 in 1965 with the 'Urban Plan in application of Law 18/04/62 No. 167 – neighbourhoods of Ponticelli and Secondigliano' (Monaco 1995).
8. <http://www.occhiodinapoli.it/verde-napoli-elenco-parchi-urbani-napoli/>.
9. http://www.areearischio.it/_file/documenti/2018/NOTA%20%20UOSSRR%20AREEA%20A%20RISCHIO%205094_16-10-2017.pdf.
10. We Looked at both the national and local news, which were printed in both major and minor newspapers (Repubblica, Corriere della Sera, Corriere del Mezzogiorno, Il Mattino, PeriferiamoNews, etcetera), as well as on the web and blogs (Adnkronos, InterNapoli, MaXso Magazine, JulieNews, etcetera), related to the neighbourhood from March 2010 until October 2015 and in contrast to a control sample of other neighbourhoods monitored in the news from March 2014 to September 2014.
11. The term *faida* is used in the context of the mafia, or Camorra in Naples, to describe conflicts between mafia families or groups seeking to maintain or gain control of criminal activities, which cause numerous deaths, injuries and damage.
12. The description of the context that is given has only been derived from the data provided by Scampia Social Services; in fact, almost all data used in the text was derived from here. «The above percentages do not differ much from the neighbouring districts of Piscinola/ Marianella and Chiaiano. In fact, the only difference between their data and that of

Scampia is that they do not show, like Scampia, a clear difference with respect to the Neapolitan 'normality'».

13. As Bifulco (2012: 4) points out, «One of the most significant aspects of this development of cities and regions as a political space is the so-called local welfare. For the most part, local welfare indicates: the role that local (regional and municipal) authorities, public- private networks and cities themselves play in decision-making processes as collective actors that can be recognised externally as such». To better examine this argument, read Le Galès(2002).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

References

- Andersson, R., and S. Musterd. 2005. "Area-based Policies: A Critical Appraisal." *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie* 96 (4): 377–389. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9663.2005.00470.x.
- Andriello, V. 1983. *Vivere E Cambiare Nella 167 Di Secondigliano*. Napoli: Centro di ricerche economiche e sociali per il Mezzogiorno.
- Atkinson, R. 2000. "Narratives of Policy: The Construction of Urban Problems and Urban Policy in the Official Discourse of British Government 1968–1998." *Critical Social Policy* 20 (2): 211–232. doi:10.1177/026101830002000202.
- Avenel, C. 2010. *Sociologie des quartiers sensibles*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Béhar, D. 2000. "Les nouveaux territoires de l'action publique." In *Territoires sous influence*, edited by D. Pages and N. Pelissier, 83–101. Paris: l'Harmattan.
- Bergamaschi, M. 2003. "Prove di Innovazione: Territorializzazione delle Politiche Pubbliche e Intervento Sociale." *Sociologia Urbana e Rurale* 71: 41–55.
- Bifulco, L. 2012. "Governance E Territorializzazione: Il Welfare Locale in Italia Tra Frammentazione E innovazione". [Italian translation of *Governance territorialização: o Welfare Local na Itália Entre Fragmentação e Inovação*." *Cadernos Metrópole* 14 (27): 41–57. <https://revistas.pucsp.br/index.php/metropole/article/download/14780/11835>
- Bonnet, F. 2009. "Managing Marginality in Railway Stations: Beyond the Welfare and Social Control Debate." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 33 (4): 1029–1044. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2009.00920.x.
- Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Comune di Napoli. 2013. "Bollettino Ufficiale Della Regione Campania [BURC]." http://burc.regione.campania.it/eBurcWeb/directServlet?DOCUMENT_ID=00064102&ATTACH_ID=88194
- Dal Piaz, A. 1985. *Napoli 1945–1985*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- De Seta, C. 1984. *Casali Di Napoli*. Bari: Laterza.
- Duneier, M. 2007. "On the Legacy of Elliot Liebow and Carol Stack: Context-driven Fieldwork and the Need for Continuous Ethnography." *Focus* 25 (1): 33–38.
- Goffman, E. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Jensen, S. Q., and A.-D. Christensen. 2012. "Territorial Stigmatization and Local Belonging: A Study of the Danish Neighbourhood Aalborg East." *City* 16 (1–2): 74–92. doi:10.1080/13604813.2012.663556.
- Jerolmack, C., and S. Khan. 2014. "Toward an Understanding of the Relationship between Accounts." *Sociological Methods & Research* 43: 236–248. doi:10.1177/0049124114523397.
- Kalifa, D. 2012. *Les Bas-fonds. Histoire d'un imaginaire*. Paris: Seuil.
- Larsen, G., M. Patterson, and L. Markham. 2014. "A Deviant Art: Tattoo-related Stigma in an Era of Commodification." *Psychology & Marketing* 31 (8): 670–681. doi:10.1002/mar.20727.



- Lawless, P. 2006. "Area-based Urban Interventions: Rationale and Outcomes: The New Deal for Communities Programme in England." *Urban Studies* 43 (11): 1991–2011. doi:[10.1080/00420980600897859](https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980600897859).
- Le Galès, P. 2002. *European Cities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lupton, R., and R. Tunstall 2003. "Is Targeting Deprived Areas an Effective Means to Reach Poor People? An Assessment of One Rationale for Area-based Funding Programmes". *An Assessment of One Rationale for Area-Based Funding Programmes (June 2003)*. LSE STICERD Research Paper, No. CASE070.
- Mills, C. W. 1940. "Methodological Consequences of the Sociology of Knowledge." *American Journal of Sociology* 46: 316–330. doi:[10.1086/218649](https://doi.org/10.1086/218649).
- Monaco, Alessandro. 1995. 1965–1995. *La Vicenda Urbanistica Di Napoli*. Monteroduni: CEP.
- Morlicchio, E., G. Orientale Caputo, and E. Pugliese. 2007. *Inchiesta Su Scampia. I Giovani E Le Loro Famiglie in Un Quartiere Di_cile*. Roma: Istituto ricerche sulla popolazione e le politiche sociali.
- Nasir, K. M. 2018. "Hip-hop Islam: Commodification, Co-optation and Confrontation in Southeast Asia." *Journal of Religious and Political Practice* 4 (3): 374–389. doi:[10.1080/20566093.2018.1525902](https://doi.org/10.1080/20566093.2018.1525902).
- Ortner, S. 2003. *New Jersey Dreaming: Capital, Culture, and the Class of '58*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Parkinson, M. 1998. *Combating Social Exclusion Lessons from Area-based Programmes in Europe*. Bristol: Bristol Policy Press.
- Pugliese, E. 1999. *Oltre Le Vele. Rapporto Su Scampia*. Napoli: Fridericiana editrice universitaria.
- Ragusa, A. 2005. "Social Change and the Corporate Construction of Gay Markets in the New York Times' Advertising Business News." *Media Culture & Society* 27 (5): 653–676. doi:[10.1177/0163443705055721](https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443705055721).
- Rausenberger, J. 2018. "Santurismo: The Commodification of Santeria and the Touristic Value of Afro-Cuban Derived Religions in Cuba." *Almatourism-Journal of Tourism, Culture and Territorial Development* 9 (8): 150–171.
- Siola, U. 1994. Relazione di coordinamento e di sintesi." in *Progettazione urbana. Argomenti* 1: 3–18.
- Smith, G. 1999. *Area-based Initiatives: The Rationale and Options for Area Targeting*. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network.
- Stewart, M., and C. Lane. 2001. "Area-based Initiatives and Urban Policy." Paper presented at Area Based Initiatives and Contemporary Urban Policy Conference, Copenhagen, May 17–19.
- Tissot, S., and F. Poupeau. 2005. "La spatialisation des problèmes sociaux." *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 4: 4–9. doi:[10.3917/arss.159.0004](https://doi.org/10.3917/arss.159.0004).
- Turok, I. 2004. "The Rationale for Area-based Policies: Lessons from International Experience." In *Urban Reconstruction in the Developing World: Learning through an International Best Practice*, edited by P. Robinson, J. McCarthy, and C. Forster, 405–412. Sandown: Heinemann.
- Wacquant, L. 2008. *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Wacquant, L. 2011. "Territorial Stigmatization Revisited: Symbols, State, and Space", Keynote Address to the International Conference on *Territorial Stigmatization and Advanced Marginality*, University of Porto, Portugal, 22 June.
- Wacquant, L., T. Slater, and V. B. Pereira. 2014. "Territorial Stigmatization in Action." *Environment and Planning A* 46: 1270–1280. doi:[10.1068/a4606ge](https://doi.org/10.1068/a4606ge).