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A methodological premise on the content of globality: the general order of the society is corporate by his "net of negotiations," by his discourse/social exchange; the frame of such negotiations is developed (it is cause and caused) by the technological systems.

The net of the social processes is leavened, today, of different forms of "sovereignty", of different contents of the "power" (normal and recurrent phenomenon in the west society with the diffusion of new means of production) that works like control on the interaction macroprocesses/social negotiations.

In this sense there are, among the others, two peculiar considerations: first, globality, in effect, consists in the diffusion of a technical setting geared to the technological/economic macrosystems; second, this process of ordering bestows on her the structure of general system of the local nets on which she acts.

In reality, the apparent inevitability of the macroprocesses, in this technique, suffers of quite a lot necessity of adaptation to the characteristics of the local nets, that see, even, enhanced their capability of interaction using the carriers and the forms of exchange of the same global processes.

The problem is all in the substantial difference among local net and local aggregate: an inferring distinction not by a separate observations but only by the social exchange code of the local area, through the capabilities/abilities that the social actors of the area have to put themselves in conditions of reciprocity, of feedback, of movement respect their personal nets.

In substance, to build a local net means to put in order the equilibrium of interaction and exchange of the subjective nets extending the effects of opportunity and development; to govern the local net means "to check, to balance for guarantee" the interaction among his complex and the general processes.

Just this function of balancing among local and global delineates the technical passage from government, from the upright intervention, contained and canalized, to the governance, to the coordination of the individual and institutional, public and private processes, coaching collective based actions on the cooperation among the different subjects.

Governance in effect, is formatted by the general relations net that includes whether the institutional actions, whether the formalities of interaction among public institutions, private
organisms, collective movements, up to the same social actors that, in this process of continual feedback, are constituted like subjects of citizen.

The objective content of citizenship, then, is defined by the "ability" of consistence (subjective motivations, shared representations.) that characterize the identity of the subject and by the "capability" of autonomy and movement that he realizes in the own social surrounding (formative capability, techniques, financial.).

But there is an other passage: the reality appears us, then, like a system of interactions/relations, corporate from other nets, his distributions of weights determines the difference among actor and subject.

The individual is characterized for a substantial difficulty to govern the complexity of his relations: he possesses all the informative data from his nets, but he is not in degree, alone, to develop the adequate logic to categorize and govern this kit of experiences.

It is in this rarefaction that the process of loss of the reliability is disposed: the actor sees to increase his capability of position and of movement (his social syntax) but he is not in degree to attribute his changes in the nets an own choice of significance. He is not in the face of a division of space/time of different activity across which he goes in contact with other fonts of meaning, he locates in an antagonistic presence of other social dimensions, each with the own space and time of relation; the report with the institutions becomes, then, rigid and fragmentary, devoid of feedback until to attribute them the role of "other from oneself," of antagonist. He is in difficulty engaging functions and role of awake subject of the context of interactions in which he is: the traditional concept of liberty is deprived in the aporia of his social presence, in the loss of meaning of the own relations: his personal liberties belong to the space of social possible exchanges in his everyday life, they constitute this space and modify it with the condition that he succeeds in regulating the complex syntactic and semantic differences. It is this ability of putting in order to constitute him like collective subject, to articulate the identity of citizen.

The present global processes, with their trends to homogenize expectations and behaviors, give more a complex ground to entrust the defense of individual and social liberties on democratic procedures applied to "traditional" citizen. We are obliged in more ways to point out an analytical definition of the individual like that one who is – subjectively – in position to select and sort out own personal terms of access and exchange to general processes (Gros, 1997).

Coexistence, competition and concourse between juridical, social, economic different systems oblige to modify essentially the direct branches of subjectivity and to modify the architecture of citizenship. Any country escapes the global trend of cultural fragmentation, which weakens political institutions. Indeed its peculiar characteristics give special structural effects between individual rights and society. (In Italy, the welfare theme considers directly the rearrangement of the means and ways (quantity and quality) for being subjects with real, effective, institutional and social representation (Censis, 1998)).

In substance, we are facing the choice between a really democratic model of society in which the subjects have real common space of opportunity by deciding own exchanges and own expectations. On the other hand we find a model of society based on regularly horizontal lines,
but hierarchical in so far as the own economic and social functions proliferate exclusions and social rigid separations. What in recent past was decided by the affiliation of class or order (having the organisation of the industrial work and the distribution of his productive effects as motor) is decided today on grounds of capability and the access to processes of communication and exchange. In fact, these constitute the new motor of production.

To organise and maintain elevated ability and capability to use such access (dues and opportunities of the subjects in respect of to their functional subordination under the productive exchange in the market) coincides with a welfare system technically turned to this purpose. This welfare system is based on the interaction of sequential legal norms, works of economic intervention and processes of formation, rather than separate and vertical communication.

We think that the diffusion of conscience of this reality, the construction of this system of self-government of the subjects, efficient respect to the actual system of economic functionalism, constitutes the sense of the politics, today.

The relation between production and market radically changed. The limits of availability of resources for employment in production, in regard of the traditional organisation of the market are ascertained. These limits are to be seen as well in regard of the qualitative and quantitative change of the "physical" structure of the production by the new technologies. On this basis the decline of welfare requirement as regulator between work and consumption is forced. Furthermore the costs of welfare would decelerate the rearrangement of the same relation as strictly subordinate regulator the characteristics of impermanence and of territoriality contemplated by the new type of production.

We delineates the risk to propose again traditional and new subordination, a society with large disjunctions between citizens (profits without productive growth, least redistribution...). We remember that productive and financial organisation is – today – based on communication and depends on continual exchange: in this booming and aggregate process, the "local" unemployment is a physiological, normal tool. The characteristic feature of this system, then, is the crucial and wide-ranging economic marginality, which derives for finite periods and for decided territories. It is inevitably concerned with the sufficient (thus not residual) condition of wide bands of social dropouts, unless the subjects do not succeed to "enter" the productive and communicative circuit with points of normative value, producing obliged effects of solidaristic exchanges for the economic processes and real relapses, not exclusively monetary, on the needs (Fitoussi, 1997).

A new division of the social work arose. In effect the spaces and the times, the hierarchies, the meanings, the openings respectively closings of the relations among subjects have to be redrawn. This process of redrawing is concerned with the substance, works and objective functions of society in large. In the current transition the market system shows mechanisms that distract from the subjects, easily subordinating them under continued mobility; if they do not follow this process they are excluded from the strong communications – with the risk of increasing conditions of anomie on the local level.

The necessary reform of welfare is, then, constituted like a complex of relational and political causes, whose carriers are of juridical and economic type and the effects of social type.

In synthesis we have to ask: who has the real responsibility for economic and social government? Who delegates it and in which way is it carried out with which results? The
current debate has to consider questions like these rather than being aimed on a financial reform or on institutional adjustments of parliamentary type.

We could assert, even, that the political differences are composed, essentially, of the ability to build an efficient model, in which productive communication and social communication (opportunity and integration) correspond which each other.

In other words, the alternative is looking at the capabilities of the subjects. It has to ensure that they are in a condition to choose, govern the times and the objective expressions of the own needs, the own expectations, the own ability to respond to them and a custom of total subordination to the functional clockworks of the productive organisation.

The way of Italian welfare is already defined: 1) The immediate post-war period to the first half of sixties was characterised by a shift from residual assistance to an increasing offer of public services. 2) From 1970 to 1980, we find the generalisation of the welfare system, marked by the universality of services with the emergence of bureaucracy and particularism (with further separations between north and south). 3) The following and lasting period sees the crisis of the model of general redistribution, and tires to overcome the weaknesses by introduction of procedures of partial selection, of management and of diversification of the proposals. This trend refers again to the change of hierarchy of social prevalent needs: the first phase sees basic needs, widespread economical poverty, defective protection for workers and subjects. This is the defensive phase turned toward fundamental rights for a citizenship of broad type. The following periods develop processes of adjustment for consolidated social needs, which are gradually compared with new needs and forms new models to respond on these challenges (the birth of the "social private"). Compared with the perception of the disparities determined by density of the geographical and social context a new system is set up. This is characterised by the adjustment of "traditional" social relations to post-modern changes. Thus it is aimed on overcoming the persistence of disparities in the same area (different but adjacent to other similar areas).

There is a social mosaic where times and roles of local changes have strong, even if secularised, anthropological ties and use advanced functions and socio-economic carriers. Their financial communications of the market and processes of organisation of post-industrial type jobs aim on the maintenance of the Sardinian clan society (a feminine hierarchy) and the adaptation of the Venetian social stratification, for supporting the Emilian co-operative network and to adapt the instruments of relationship North and South.

The general expectations of social politics as normative model of citizenship are produced by this "regional" plurality of codes of perception of inequalities and social justice. It is a prevailing and disseminated conviction that the mechanism of social protection must have institutional nature but that, however, their exercise on the grounds like public politics must be replaced by systems centred on local networks of direct type, i.e. interpersonal, decentralised, self-regulative mechanisms.

In the general and disseminated perception, citizenship-rights and social politics are products of the combination of public guarantee and social-private organisations. This is designed as the guideline toward a multifunctional model of citizenship that is characterised by the balance between individual freedom and equality. It focuses on reference values. These are characterised by finalisation of the qualitative (not extensive) selection and definition of public beneficiaries and by elements of competitiveness in the welfare system. From here derives a normative model of integration between public and private, able to differentiate the
offer of services that produce an adequate procedure of distribution of performances (Donati, 1997).

Seemingly the crushing efficiency of the monetary style and the aggregate system of markets to dictate the new constitution of the law, the economy, the social organisation according the own technical norms prevail. However, just now and by this the need to redefine the meaning of and relationship between systems of subjective relations and systems of macroeconomic connections becomes deeper. Furthermore it demands more than ever need of politics, which guarantee the space of access to the new forms of production, the space of conservation of the capabilities and collective ability to use of the benefits of the global market.

It is a general paradox (as extreme example, we can relate to the economic-social system of Singapore, to his comfort and to the custom of the whip for hygienically respectively sanitary crimes) that presents itself in Italy with distinctive characteristics. It remains, however, assembled on the necessity of turn upside-down the conceptual report with the welfare making firm the democratic rule of its foundation. It is the growth of opportunity and social productivity of welfare are the conclusive reason for the levels, the ways and the controls on interventions of economic relations and of fiscal dynamics rather than the opposite. (Accornero, 1997).

We are not very ahead in the diffusion of this conscience. Indeed, we have even large verifications that a large group of subjects – also those who are socially not marginalised – perceive the reduction of their ability of institutional and social representation in a confused and particularistic way. Now the search of the – particularly political and institutional – consent across easy performances has to be generalised. This stands against as system orientated across risks and costs of the participation. The effects of the latter are marked by undermining the functions of representation (Caporale, 1997). Usually the breach of the forms of citizen’s integrity by part of institutional subjects – even for positive purpose (area magistracy and area services) – reduces the differences among behaviours of jurisdiction (that – normally – is set up to conserve the subjects) and deviants behaviours. In addition otherwise jitter is distributed in the country and generally and constantly causes social uneasiness as normalcy.

The welfare reform that is proposed for many times is nothing else than the faucet of control of this uneasiness. This has to be seen namely in regard of the rearrangement and maintenance of levels of production and consumption. They are canalised from institutions reduced to the function of interface among subordinate subjects and accelerators of power almost invisible for the citizens, since coverts in the folds of the technical functions of the economy. On the other hand, for those accelerators an alternative is set among capability of multiplication of the own ability of control and risk of survival. The means of production that have replaced the industrial engine is communication. If this is not considered they resolve conditions of separation well decided on who can accede and govern the complex economic organisation of the communication and who can consume the commodities in the ways and in the limits to her functional. However, the same accelerators could find themselves in an abhorrent society with the present controls due to mobile, articulate, and authentic on the personal autonomies and on the collective responsibilities.

In substance, the conceptual problem is the transformation from the conservative system, which aims on of the destitute, “minor” subject to a system of reciprocity among subject and institutions. This could provide a net of real, practical, efficient actions. It would aim on the constitution of citizenship for each subject (institutions as services of guarantee of reciprocity
between "local" citizens and total markets). Of crucial importance is the orientation on effectual and real acts, because now – in the national frame of the Constitution – the citizen is endowed of rights and duties "to vindicate" natural laws, which should coincide in the social structure, the conditions and the institutions that realise the and make the claim of such dues possible. The existing net of the Welfare should constitute the system of exercise of this capability.

The Italian constitutional norm in this could not be more complete. The individual is defined as worker, component of a democratic society that recognises and guarantees the fundamental rights, included that to work, and that – at the same time – requires to the citizens "the fulfilment of the unalterable duties of political, economic and social solidarity" (art.2 of the Italian Constitution). The following article accentuates the main assignment of the State to prevent economic and social obstacles that undermine the liberty and autonomy of the citizen's. As well, the State has to secure high development of subjective and real ability to participate. In substance, the rights of the subject are only insofar recognised as the community respectively state considers them and they become effective because the same state recognises them as own reason of identity. But this harmonious normative exchange has been broken by an administrative habit contradictory in respect to the constitutional pact. In the formal frame, made without the institutional, cultural, foresights of conservation and of self-government, it has consolidated the beginning of the brokerage, of the arrangement, without respect the welfare of the citizen who is not applying the law. The breaches, legalised by stronger forces, by corporate connections, by "kinship" social relations have given birth to a twofold normative system – one being theoretically valid, the other in practical terms. Both are cohabiting and always more conflicting as soon as the organisation of the society becomes more complex. The consequence – for the subjects – is the uneasiness of the continual uncertainty on which normative orders follow for the attainment of own aims, to find response to the own needs and to the own expectations. This uncertainty becomes a general culture not only to level of private choices, but of public behaviours in the positions of administrators, magistrates, contractors, and politicians.

In this frame, the necessary change assumes the features of a normative and behaviourist passage from defence of connection work and consumption to the integrity of the citizen, in his subjective forms defined by the nets of appurtenance (sex, age, family, condition, formation, work).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework of social processes to be activated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Cultural™</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Economic →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Essentially, the social transition we currently are going through is directed by four "strong" characteristics:

a) Structural mobility of work (impermanence, territoriality, specialisation);

b) Structural changes of the enterprise (mobile on the territory, supported by local interventions of service for the production);

c) Exhaustion of the social pact that had been characteristic for industrial democracy (centrality across delegation for institutions);

d) Metamorphoses of the functions of the nation state (exhaustion of the function of social rules across the relation fiscal lever/public expense; growth of the function of disbursement others than social services to attract facilities of production and capitals, infrastructures, normative claps etc.).

Our attention is particularly turned to the last two characteristics (c/d), i.e. on the transformation from a state of representation and delegation to one of participation, aimed on the formulation of norms and behaviours of reciprocity as breeders of associate citizenship.

Politics build own identity and asset own specific functions if they are able to propose an associative pact (a guarantee of relations) among subjects respectively citizens, in which just the economic functions of the market amplify and balance opportunities and levels of participation accommodation. This is fundamentally different to the prolongation of the current pattern, i.e. accommodation of a contract among partners (shareholders however well separated from the management of the social ownership). Anyhow, the question remains with which tools and with which direct aim this can be done?

We retain that the political knot is situated primarily in the area of the goals and the methods of the general legal framework:

a) Unlawful of separation and exposed to follow normative brokerage (no law without rule and expenditures distribution);
b) Fixation of the legal rules in regard of integrative intervention for the state and for administrations;

c) Rearrangement of the fiscal framework, i.e. reduction of the magnitude of dues, fiscal federalism, passing to charges on wealth and consumption.

In this sense, it is not a realistic hypothesis to connect services with challenges for more efficiency and to balance them according to income until the indicator of income is squared with actual systems. However, even in specifying income as a sole criterion it is necessary to respect the actual heterogeneity. In regard of such a sole unit of measurement, it is necessary that it can be calculated in several dimensions. The level of income, which has to be considered changes according the circumstances of the subject and the nature of service, even if it is always in a frame of homogeneous computation. It is right to support this transformation concerned with services next to citizen’s control because of the immediateness of intervention. Connected with this is the necessity of decentralisation of management – not only for services (Guenno-Tiezzi, 1996).

Besides, there is a technically specific patrimony of socio-economic culture that occurs again in the normative planning (where our monetary culture commonly ignores it). However, they are absent from the systems of evaluation to determine costs and benefits of welfare:

| a) Non-market activities. | b) Changes in the life circumstances that have impact of the structure of domestic capital services. | c) Changes in the sustainability and use of the environmental resources and the services to connect them. |

The absence or restriction of these variables makes the system of measurement disproportionate (although it is used in other countries with different economic structures and different systems of welfare). A wider approach has to relate government services, centres of the market and social groups. Furthermore, a distinction has to be drawn in relation to expenses for health and that for education respectively formation aimed on defensive values. This aims not least at the reduction of the real effects of these chapters on productivity, above all in the area of the environmental costs on health and in that defined by the mobility of the work.

The obligation to rearrange the fiscal and jurisdictional normative system is preliminary and its operativity is contemporaneous to model-interventions on the welfare. Thus, it is not realistic to think modifications of distributions of the expenses based on present rules and references. In distinction, the machine of rigid and automatic expenses (to day isolated as root of the malformations of the system) has to be substituted by management flows, which have to consider the terms of needs and availability. Anyhow, that is only in a frame of efficient guarantees practicable.
The objective to make social expenses flexible and targeted (for example, in the basic theme of work) it is possible to fix intervention (subsidy and services) according to real search of work, to participation in courses of formation or a minimum of achieved results. Such mechanisms are not feasible with the current methods and normative frames – above all is not believable the planning of efficient, flexible programs of reemployment, formation and study. They are at risk because of the ability of the local autonomies on the mobile market of enterprises and work to counteract. On the one hand this danger would make the exchange of reciprocity among citizens and institutions (democratic, adequate, substance) impracticable. On the other hand, it would twist against the subsidiarity machine, i.e. the relation between government and local autonomies. Moreover, it seems that, once the frame of political method is fixed, our operational target coincides with the construction of the autonomies starting with the citizens.

Here, we do not want to evoke abstract social rights. We intend, rather, to refer to a precise and concrete model of citizenship and models of social politics.

One side of the given frame of opportunities and conditionings in the Italian society still attributes the traditional task to reduce differences of income to central government. Furthermore, it assigns the function of guaranteeing the balance of opportunities and programming defensive acts for lowest incomes there as well. On the other hand, it puts these areas of guarantee as frame-network of normative exchange balancing between citizens and local governments. Normative exchanges (decentralisation, efficiency, reciprocity on controls) are addressed to single out actors of public intervention and to insert competitive elements in the welfare making nets of co-operation among public sectors and the social ”third sector” (co-operative boards). The subjects get the impression of a motor ruling crossroads among the public dimension, the private dimension and the third sector, thus appearing as a motor able to make fair and plural the offer of services, to adjust procedures, i.e. to produce objective cultural, behaviourist, economic effects.

There are conditions for an effective deputation, which are adequate to economic and social change as long as politics would answer with an adequate model balancing rights and duties, a model of adequate citizenship. Expectations in this sense are orientated on an ”associative citizenship", where an associate subject is able to practice own relations in an autonomous manner, based on an institutionally networked security, which co-ordinates the citizenry – neither monopolistically nor residually – through social politics in which the same citizens directly participate.

Citizenship of associative type

Public/private relations of reciprocity: the individuals belong to different social microsystems among which a balanced relation is aimed at; the local administrations are vectors though the social politics and the state is the guarantor though the politics of subsidiarity (fiscal balance between consumption and distribution).

In this transformation, we stake an adequate and fundamentally democratic society. On one side it is an architecture caused by new relations between macro and micro economic processes, rather than more between proprietors and producers and users. Instead of these traditional differences of the levels of subjectivity the new pattern is based on the participation in economic exchanges (whole subjectivity) on the one hand and who only functions (temporary subjectivity) on the other hand. On the other side, the new architecture
is a network of subjects with distinguished roles, bound together by the guarantee of access to exchange parts and functions.

If the net coincides with the joints of citizenship, social politics are the main system of ensuring this connection. They need, then, to settle an own statute with particularly precise determinations in regard of a substantial and efficient way of defining a sense of its identity. Social politics are the carrier of a societal frame from a centralist view, and not anymore simple normative acts for a formal management, which produce only abstract nominal rights (or, worse, rights arranged to fit in a welfare market). Instead, they are acts of relation. Thus, they shift from politics supporting functions of mechanic solidarity (institutional management of needs) to relations co-ordinating the machine of organic solidarity (subsidiarity and guarantee on self-management of needs). Therefore, politics carry out a welfare system where third the sector (articulated in public/private association) acts through participative programming and decentralised services. A presupposition of this process is the – factual and not just legal – opportunity to decide on aspects and differences of services by and for citizens. In the frame of subsidiarity and guarantee by central and local governments this type of social politics has the belongings of subjects as its foundation of interventions, so that results are effective in contextual areas concerning conditions of life as age, sex, family, and status.

The logic is, then, concerned with the reciprocity of rules (attribution of benefits to observable subjects, bounded to costs and results, implying a distributive choice) and causes of inclusion respectively exclusion activated at time (positive selectivity).

In the sketched frame, a state of citizens among their partners, the "natural" law is founded by real exercise of subjective opportunities. This has to be acknowledged as a natural right, then, that could operate exclusively through associative forms. The citizen endowed with subjective belongings according to his life circumstances, age, sex etc., is bound to his local nets and he can select the own opportunity to access the general processes. This selection takes place in different forms according to mobility and different times of belonging. Make politics in the transition of these processes means to build the associative network of subjective nets through the political and institutional system of welfare:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health→</th>
<th>Health enterprises→</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work→</td>
<td>Employment→</td>
<td>Permanent formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Alphabetic computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection→</td>
<td>Family, peer groups→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration of the subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The net of health is based on a principle of subsidiary redistribution of expenses in proportion of its characteristics, distinguishing in terms of efficacy among its dimension (organisation of prevention/sanitary typology of interventions/organisation of services) and its effects on the relation with other nets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>→</th>
<th>Pharmaceutical production →</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevention ←</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Nets of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>Environment (formation, new work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aids →</td>
<td>Services →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This net, then, has succeeded by all forms of social activity of the citizens (the only act of feeding is developing its effects in relation to the net of environmental safeguard, of control of production, of administration of territorial services, furthermore, of course to cross with the other systems of economy, culture, nature etc.). The central point is that the citizen is the real subject of feedback and control by own action through the net, rather than – as to day – economically instrumental object. The operative logic of this net – that becomes then, also, the logic of economic productivity – is the reduction of needs according to efficacy and responses to interventions like targeting.

The complex net of work bases its architecture on new means of production and the new man-engine relation, emerging as consequence of new technologies. These consequences do not occur just on the quantitative level with reduction of operators, but on the qualitative level alike. Here we observe the passage from mechanic-physical action on the machine on to digitalisation by use of the keyboard. This anthropological effect distributes the change of productive organisation (in substance and in form). The centre is not the "construction" respectively the "assemblage" programmed for a market in continuous expansion, but the "exchange" of the product with the temporary profitability of a zone of the market to glut passing to others with different exchanges.
In consequence, it is impossible for the new industrial model, impossibility and furthermore the lack of necessity to aim to full employment, or better, technical game is articulated – synthetically – in a scaled sequence of the following type:

a) Control and flexibility in the production, in relation to sections of the market;

b) Diminution of the number;

c) Growth of productivity;

d) Increasing gains.

This sequence, then, functions only through the control of two correlating, but deeply different nets: the first is typical for enterprises, with reduced hierarchies, reduced stocks, adaptation of skill according different periods and forms of production for specific targets (necessity of conscious, incentive, participation of workers). Above all, this type of enterprise install itself (with rapid shifts to other areas) on a territorial distribution of subsidiary incentives (detax, environmental) and of social incentives (third-sector nets, social defence and control to load of territory). The relations of the workers give the second net. This net interacts with the social general net of the territory).

The conscience of these processes by subjects is particulary important for their emergence (in this phase, the guarantee to get the opportunity acquisition).
In substance, enterprise functions if it coincides with and centres on the following elements of the overall web:

a) Territorial incentives;

b) Guarantees of subsidiarity;

c) Territorial services;

d) Fields of mobile workers;

e) Connections with the third sector;

f) Supportive local normative frame.

It appears as evident for taking part in the competition in global processes that the companies structure leans back on local nets. Then, it is desirable for them to control these nets indirectly. In Italy, the given frame still draws on a complex vertical system (north/south) with its regional and horizontal articulations and a series of fragmentary micro systems on the local level. The features of their interconnection and crossing are not yet regulated. In this knot we find a central point of political identity: to guarantee the necessary flexibility, to defend opportunities and to relapse on subjects (ruling the association of subjects to a process) necessitates a model with rules for feedback between the public and the private. It is the control on the crossing point of enterprise and local networks which gives the opportunity build up an order with a new juridical framework. This has to rule effectively the function of balancing public/private responsibility, which is a necessary condition for a democratic society. Such functions are feasible only in a political culture proposing a model of state as guarantor of associative nets through the control of balancing subsidiarity and articulating local autonomy. The responsibility of programming the subsidiarity principle in regard of interventions and incentives, of managing their feedback through the net of services and professional training has to be orientated on these features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central government</th>
<th>→</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local governments</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>← →</td>
<td>Permanent training → ←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>→ ←</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The centrality of the system of autonomies as a functional focus is evident: it constitutes the carrier of the balance at the cross-point between enterprise net and social nets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers fields</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territory</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The natural qualification, yet, is taking conscience that this administrative work is practicable only as feedback on grounds of reciprocity rules (ethical adequate value of politics). Their applied balance becomes "the function" of politics and expresses the responsibility. In this sense, social politics assume the status of "normal" tools, adequate to govern the complex network of relations among associated citizens. Moreover, we have to underline that this pattern does not posses the requisite of realism and practicability outside a welfare associated method working through tools of opportunity and access, specifically in the area of professional training – this complies with any other attempt of containment of unemployment.

The basic feature of work in industrial society is the transformation of the subjects’ life according to measures of mobility, for many with the prospect of permanent challenge throughout their life. It is the necessity of professional training that became a permanent issue as adaptation to periods and opportunities of the productive market (maintenance of opportunities of access and reduction of the marginality field).

The training method to be installed presents himself like distributive vector that "puts order", that creates the functions. It balances the processes of interaction among territorial nets of subjects (school, informatics...), of the opportunities of enterprises (3rd sector, new trades etc.) and of enterprises (training periods and forms corresponding to territorial incentives). It assumes the value of applied processes of real democracy, adequate to the actual ways of global market and social work because it functions by normative actions that activate, accompany and balance economic and social effects. Actions of government practised by bodies in interaction and reciprocity are associated to the citizens. With this ability to govern, to transmit the crossing of associated citizens on the effects of productive structure, the institutions are not fixed anymore on the process of reduction like control interface of the social uneasiness, recovering the own status of democratic government. In this sense, the training method connects the areas of opportunities with the areas of social defence.
Throughout the country we find a real emergency for civil rights, a real reduction of subjective integrity by expropriating forms of autonomy and civil liberties (no reciprocity in administrative jurisdiction, legal oppressive adaptations of tariff type, subordination in the management of services, personal customs of justice....). The general political culture seems to have conscience that the skills to answer are fundamental for the own identity. However, we find only a poor conscience in regard of the need for a general plan diffusion of computer training, without which we have radical disablement of access to the work, reduction of its quality, loss of ability of social participation. Such a plan is necessary for sections of age and the whole territory. Besides, we have to underline that sprain in use of the resources in this area (above all, by part of public administration) recreates – in adequate terms to the current processes – traditional socio-economic division between the North and the South of the country. Particularly in the areas of social security and aids, we have to fix the border between civil rights and structural functionality. This is the zone of frictions between a model of society where the works of financial resources are direct to shelter productive organisation from excesses of mobility in the global market on the one side, and a model where variability of market has balanced by opportunities for subjects on the other side. Both models refer to the same pattern of economic structure, but they are divided by a thin line that reveals a genetic difference not in an ideological conception of the state, rather than in the attributions of resources for subjects-citizens. In the first model real power has been held by controls of productive macro-exchanges, almost invisible in its complexity, and institutions have only functions in respect of social availability to consumption and to mobility (control of social effects of economy). In the second model, the institutions remain responsible and their role is aimed on balancing the exchanges through the association of citizens (control on the causes of economic and social feedback). This role is, still, to safeguard the real, applied, meaning of the community-state the identity for the subjects. Thus, there is not any effective reform of welfare without reform of the associative finalities and of the framework of ways and norms of the state. Finalities cannot be achieved easily by adjusting the institutional parliamentary form. The parliament has the basic function to build the normative platform supporting associative nets of citizens particularly by fiscal reform, defence of personal integrity, balance between public and private. The redistribution of relative expense to aids and prevention is rationalised on this carriers, not on those of "onus of fixed costs to transform in managing flows", functional to the control of least levels of marginality. In a loyal measurement of benefits and costs of the welfare, the change from waste and rigidity must be included in a normative frame that assigns the management of the net’s resources and of the national funds for aids to the guaranteeing institution. This has to aim on targeting all current finances for interventions. By managing on a central level, it constitutes the font of subsidiarity and verification of regional planning and articulates the managerial autonomies of local municipalities. This logic is flexible and, furthermore, modelled on differences expressed by local networks. Remaining a single base for the measurement of income, the process to determine right to
services works with same method. In this way, it is possible to convert a part of currently disbursed costs for invalidity and disables (training to familiar management, to domestic trades’ etc.) into effective services.

The vital minimum for the subjects that have lost employment has, however, to correlate with programs of professional training toward reemployment. It could not be substituted by the constitution of interventions to the generality of citizens by replacing family allowances (i.e. to load the contribution on the only dependent workers.

Apparently bookkeeping patterns are particularly employed in regard of pension and it focuses not in general on the social and institutional performance but on the management of resources. Despite the effects of stabilisation of the expense about Pil (in absence of a normative framework of social nets) caused by the reform of 1995 the pensions remain a privileged passage for a monetary model of state. Again we underline that the guarantee of their cutting and effects takes settlement by rearranging the general fiscal and normative frame, as applied welfare method for a community of citizens. In this sense, we can produce (out of this paper) an analytic scale of rational expense for pensions.

Thus, clearly the necessities, targets and ways of change emerge. Expectations of consumption, shelter properties, increasing difficulties of personal welfare added to problems of employment decline throughout the country – all in a frame of complexity, of institutional transition, finishing to decelerate, to make the capacity of autonomy for subjects fragile. At the same time, the process of remodelling the patterns of work and production accelerates social mobility. Of course, there is space for social training and politics. Furthermore, there is an objective need of building networks of reciprocity between citizens and institutions (after the 95/96 phase, when local managers were a lot more active but substantially imprisoned by their bureaucracies). This process of restructuration has to be founded and secured by adequate functions of political organisations where the building a community-state as network of associated citizens assumes the sense of social constituency.
The central points of this work are in: M. Ampola, "A sustainable welfare system: tensions between globality and locality"; in P. Herrmann (ed) "Challenges for a global welfare system" 1999, Nova science publ. New York.
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## Appendix

**What changes and must be governed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy Productive system</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>Form and substance of ownership; meaning and organisation of work; relationship of working time and social time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law System of institutions</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>Reciprocity subject - institutions and public - private; Income for goods and consumption; Normative grounds and ethics of the fiscal system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivity System of learning of the complex of formative relationships</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>Reciprocity of information exchange; Interaction of individual and collective expectations; Ethical simplified behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society System of balance and feedback of relations among subjects</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>Control of exchange; Efficiency of services; Measure of solidarity; Phenomenon’s of social crossbreeding (changes in male and female identities).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>