

## Networking collective knowledge to foster change. The case of Sansheroes network (San Siro, Milan)

Elena Maranghi

*Politecnico of Milan, [elena.maranghi@polimi.it](mailto:elena.maranghi@polimi.it)*

**Abstract:** The aim of the following paper is to offer a reflection on the role that the co-production of knowledge assumed in the development of a local network of rooted social actors in the context of San Siro neighbourhood, one of the biggest Milanese public housing complexes. The paper will analyse the different phases of the development of the network, underlining the main strengths and the critical aspects related to the role that it assumed in promoting a new vision for the transformation of the neighbourhood. It will especially focus on the role that Mapping San Siro - Politecnico of Milan action-research group - played in the creation and progression of the network, particularly in relation to the involvement of the institutional actors and in the governance of the network. The contribution will set up some reflections regarding the role that governance, time, spatiality and planning play in this kind of processes.

**Keywords:** local knowledge, knowledge co-production, local network, community of practice

### **Setting the scene: Mapping San Siro finds its place in the neighbourhood**

In November 2016 Mapping San Siro (Department of Architecture and Urban Studies - Politecnico of Milan) – the interdisciplinary action-research group which I take part in as a researcher – gathered around the same table a number of social actors (both formal and informal, yet organized, ones) active in San Siro neighbourhood (Milan), one of the largest and most problematic public housing districts in the city<sup>1</sup>, to discuss about its future.

The convocation was the result of a long process of engagement, started by the research group in 2013, the year of the realization of Mapping San Siro workshop. Promoted by Francesca Cognetti and Beatrice De Carli, Mapping San Siro was first conceived as a residential workshop aiming at studying

---

<sup>1</sup> Located in the North-West part of the city, not far from the city center, San Siro is composed of about 6.000 housing units and with a population of about 10.000 inhabitants, the neighbourhood is characterized by the presence of fragile populations and by strong socio-spatial inequalities and intercultural/intergenerational conflicts (around 50% of the population are immigrants, with about 85 nationalities represented). Despite being also characterized by the presence of diverse and strongly committed local actors (associations, cooperatives, groups of inhabitants), San Siro has always been heavily stigmatized in public discourses with the effect of worsening its exclusion from urban dynamics. More information on the website: [www.sansirostories.it](http://www.sansirostories.it), developed by Master in Journalism of Università Cattolica of Milan together with Mapping San Siro; [www.mappingsansiro.polimi.it](http://www.mappingsansiro.polimi.it)

and representing the complex dynamics that characterize the neighbourhood, challenging its stereotyped and negative image (usually promoted by the media discourse). One of the main objectives - but also one of the assumptions of the workshop - was the involvement of local actors in the co-construction of shared and *usable* knowledge that could effectively tackle local change. Considering the conditions of the workshop (which was organized as an intensive, yet short, work in the field), local actors were assumed as the main sources of knowledge, able to ease the relationship with dwellers but also to introduce themselves local perspectives and understanding to the group.

At the end of the period of intensive work, a mixed group of students, teachers and researchers decided to *stay* in the neighbourhood; first of all, precisely because challenged by the responsibility of multiple issues and demands that emerged from the local dimension. After a year being hosted by several associations, in 2014, Mapping San Siro obtained from Aler – the Regional Agency for Public Housing of the Lombardy Region, which owns and manages the public housing stock – the possibility to re-open a vacant shop, located on the street level in via Abbiati, which became the headquarter of the group and was named Trentametriquadri – 30 square meters – in virtue of its size<sup>2</sup>.

In the absence of a definite commissioning for the research (at the very beginning the majority of the group was composed by people who were volunteers and there wasn't any stable fund available), Mapping San Siro identified the local actors as the main clients of the research, with whom to try to develop a co-designed research path, on the basis of continuous exchanges and interactions, and to whom to return the outcomes of the fieldwork. When the group established itself in the neighbourhood, there was no real network of local entities. On the contrary, the situation was highly polarized because of the existence of two local committees of residents: one composed by the elderly, mainly Italian, dwellers, disoriented by the changes occurred in their environment, and the other one referring to a right-to-housing activist movement, *legitimizing* squatting practices in the neighbourhood for people in need. For its very nature, the research group decided not to take anyone's side, but to place itself in a *third* position, building a solid relationship with the different actors. A central element was the intention of the group of becoming a local actor, interested in building a rooted knowledge, capable to produce some kind of change. We as a group had the understanding that – facing the distrust in changes or either in participation policies (the neighbourhood was part of a Neighborhood Contract which wasn't considered successful) shown by dwellers and local groups – there was a pressing need, on one hand, to show that transformation was possible, on the other hand, to get the institutions closer to the neighbourhood, since there was a widespread sense of abandonment (Grassi, 2018) which nourished distrust and social tension that tended to pour out in everyday relationships. In this sense, we were aware that we could play a role as planners and as researchers, not in projecting and proposing new *solutions* for urban regeneration – even in a participatory way – but first of all in activating ourselves locally, building open and accessible

---

<sup>2</sup> It was the beginning of a new phase: inhabiting a space and *becoming* a locally rooted actor, on one hand developing embedded research and teaching activities on three main topics – home and dwelling conditions; courtyards and public spaces, non-residential vacant spaces – and, on the other hand, trying to tackle the urgent issue of promoting participated local change, in a neighbourhood characterized by abandonment, exclusion, dis-trust and inertia. See Cognetti and Padovani, 2017.

knowledge frameworks, promoting planning platforms capable to involve both local and institutional levels. Our perspective was engaged and rooted (I refer here to the concept of *situating*, elaborated to describe Mapping San Siro methodology, see Castelnuovo and Cognetti, 2019), but at the same time as part ourselves of an institution (University) we were playing a key role. On one hand, because we were somehow *neutral* in relation to local conflicts and – being there – capable of building meaningful local relationships: dwellers and associations were positively struck by the fact that *the University was going to the city and staying*; on the other hand, because we were in the condition of interacting with other institutions: we were conscious in this sense that we would have needed time but we could have been able to become a local reference for them to interact with, in an easier way.

### **Sansheroes: the origin and the development of a local network based on the collective knowledge**

Made possible by the relational capital built and nurtured in the previous years, the convocation which took place in November 2016 was the result of a shared frustration in seeing how the neighbourhood was once more excluded by public policies addressing urban peripheries in the city (Piano Periferie, promoted by the Municipality). As Mapping San Siro, we interpreted this shared feeling among local actors as a favourable condition to try to overcome, not denying their existence, local conflicts and giving a significant impulse to the possible co-design of a shared vision of the neighbourhood and of its possible transformations (physically, socially, culturally speaking). We considered the field ready for experimentation of collective design of possible regeneration strategies, able to enhance local competencies and resources and to recall for a significant investment from the institutional level. The efforts made by projects promoted by the third sector organizations and NGOs were not enough, indeed, to tackle structural problems of the neighbourhood, especially the ones regarding the quality and uses of different spaces (vacant spaces, public spaces, dwellings, etc.). Moreover, there was also a matter of involving different – and sometimes conflictive among themselves – public institutions: Municipality of Milan (with different departments), local administration (Municipio), Aler, Lombardy Region).

The first step of this possible path had to be, to our opinion, the one of building a collective understanding of the context which, from different fields of actions and perspectives, we were all working in. Together with the participants – at first representatives of around ten entities active in the neighbourhood<sup>3</sup> – to the roundtable, held in Trentametriquadri, we decided to structure a sequence of meeting to discuss different topics: social and demographic situation, housing and spatial issues, existing bottom-up policies and practices, previous policies promoted and their macro-effects etc. The aim was to build a common framework in which everyone could be able to identify himself and the same time going deeper in the understanding of emerging or either structural phenomena, of which different entities were *experts* in virtue of their different roles in the neighbourhood. The entities involved were very heterogeneous: a local school (represented by the parents' association), social cooperatives, little associations, a church, micro-local social services (managed by social

---

<sup>3</sup> In January 2017 this was the list of the twelve entities participating to the meetings: Mapping San Siro - Dastu Politecnico di Milano; Associazione Alfabeti Onlus; Associazione La Banda dei Pirati Onlus; Centro di Ascolto Parrocchia Beata Vergine Addolorata; Comitato Abitanti San Siro; Commissione Intercultura Istituto Cadorna; Cooperativa Sociale Tuttinsieme; Emergency Onlus – Programma Italia – Politruck; Servizio di Custodia Sociale del Comune di Milano (Cooperativa Sociale Genera Onlus together with Cooperativa Tuttinsieme, Azione Solidale e Comunità Progetto), Sindacato As.i.a. Milano - Associazione Inquilini e Abitanti; Progetto “Velo’ce mente”; Comitato di quartiere San Siro.

cooperatives), tenants' committees, etc., and it was exactly the added value of the process of delving into local knowledge.

After a few months, in January 2017, the group, which was meeting once a month, decided to informally structure itself into a local network, giving itself the name of Sansheroës.

Looking back to the development of the local network from then on, we have identified four different phases, characterized by the milestones achieved:

1. Collective understanding of the neighbourhood (November 2016 - December 2017)

Through five meetings and a following elaboration of the contents emerged, the local network elaborates a first *sketch* of the neighbourhood in the form of a document. The objective of this phase is to bring out a collective latent capital of knowledge, emerging from everyone's daily activities in the context. The document also includes a first set of statements on possible actions that could foster a positive change. The result of this step is the publication online, in December 2017, of *Fotografia del quartiere* (Picture of San Siro neighbourhood)<sup>4</sup>.

2. Sharing the path (January 2018 - June 2018)

The local network organizes a series of focus groups and dialogues aimed at sharing the document with some target-groups, representative of relevant populations in the neighbourhood (women with a foreign origin, elderly, youngsters, etc.). Several observations, suggestions and critics enrich the *picture*. Aim of this phase is to verify whether the understanding of the neighbourhood could be validated by inhabitants or not. The decision is to structure this phase in a qualitative way to be able to gather deeper perspectives. The result of this step is an extended version of the previous document. During this period, the network expands itself<sup>5</sup>.

3. Planning together (June 2018 - December 2018)

The network works together to co-design a vision for the future of San Siro, outlining possible policy-areas to foster. It identifies five areas: Intercultural development, Education, Local skills, Housing and support for social vulnerabilities, Quality of the lived environment. The development of these fields declined in possible strategic actions integrates a new version of the document, which also takes a new name: *Istantanee di San Siro. Presente e futuro del quartiere* (Snapshots from San Siro. Present and future of the neighbourhood)<sup>6</sup> and is published online in December 2018. The document is furnished by maps, elaborated by Mapping San Siro, showing the existing situation and the possible future one.

4. Involving the city (January 2019 - March 2019)

---

<sup>4</sup> [https://issuu.com/52340/docs/fotografia\\_del\\_quartiere\\_san\\_siro\\_2](https://issuu.com/52340/docs/fotografia_del_quartiere_san_siro_2)

<sup>5</sup> Six more entities join Sansheroës network: Associazione Itama Onlus; Associazione Punto.it Onlus; Associazione La Fenice; Associazione Mamme a Scuola Onlus; Associazione Il Telaio delle Arti, Cooperativa Sociale Comunità Progetto.

<sup>6</sup> [https://issuu.com/52340/docs/istantanee\\_2019](https://issuu.com/52340/docs/istantanee_2019)

The network decides to share the process and its results with the city and with the institutional level, in order to recall responsible entities to their role of taking care of emerging and pressing issues concerning the neighbourhood, but also letting them aware of the existing resources and the capabilities of local actors working in the field. Meanwhile, indeed, Sansheroes becomes also a network able to project together and to attract resources locally. Three relevant projects (financed by private institutions but also by public calls) are developed or started between the end of 2018 and the beginning of 2019 (one on education, one on intercultural development and the third one on social services are developed within the network, directly involving different actors and supported by Sansheroes as a whole). In order to share the result of its work, Sansheroes organizes a public presentation at Triennale di Milano (an important cultural institution in the city), inviting public institutions (Municipality, Region, Aler, local administration, etc.) but also private ones (Fondazione Cariplo, Casa della carità) to intervene. The presentation is a success in terms of inhabitants (of San Siro neighbourhood) and citizens involved, but, at least at first, it doesn't seem to raise the awaited awareness of public institutions. After the presentation, the local network decides to continue to work together in order to reinforce the strategic actions to foster local change and to find possible partnerships to promote additional projects. The network furtherly expands itself<sup>7</sup>.

Nevertheless, in the following months, due also to the involvement of the Municipality in a pilot project on public space<sup>8</sup>, taking place in San Siro and promoted by Mapping San Siro with the collaboration of other local actors, Mayor Giuseppe Sala publicly declares his will to open up a working table on the neighbourhood together with Lombardy Region (also as responsible for Aler) with the participation of Politecnico di Milano, as an actor able to guarantee a sort of scientific and technical but also local perspective.

The statement<sup>9</sup> is positively received by Sansheroes, even though the local network will not be formally included in the announced working table. However, Mapping San Siro group involves the local network in the writing of a brief document, identifying priorities and possible roles for responsible institutions, which is sent both to the Region and the Municipality. The document also identifies possible spaces to develop pilot actions within the neighbourhood.

### **Collective knowledge as an elaboration of relational and active capital**

As could be noticed, the process is still ongoing and, actually, undergoing a crucial point. Even though, as part of Mapping San Siro group, I would like to propose some reflections here, moving from this experience which on one hand could be useful to discuss this very experience with the local

---

<sup>7</sup> Two more entities join: Fondazione Soleterre and Associazione Zucche Ribelli. Laboratorio di quartiere, the neighbourhood lab which is actually a public service provided by the Municipality, starts to join the meetings, even though it doesn't become part of the network.

<sup>8</sup> GreenLivingLab San Siro and its related Collaborative Pact. <http://www.mappingsansiro.polimi.it/3-progetti/3-1-spazio-pubblico-e-rigenerazione-urbana>

<sup>9</sup> While the author is writing this paper, the Municipality and the Lombardy Region have publicly stated their commitment on a shared project on San Siro, to develop in the following months. [https://www.comune.milano.it/-/quartiere-san-siro-milano-incontro-tra-presidente-regione-e-sindaco.-lavoriamo-per-migliorare-la-qualit%C3%A0-della-vita-dei-cittadini?fbclid=IwAR2USNJGpg1knXFBQWVzYI0P1IXIH8V\\_-GzcyrvhkevNLXnxLRZe3wEUZp8](https://www.comune.milano.it/-/quartiere-san-siro-milano-incontro-tra-presidente-regione-e-sindaco.-lavoriamo-per-migliorare-la-qualit%C3%A0-della-vita-dei-cittadini?fbclid=IwAR2USNJGpg1knXFBQWVzYI0P1IXIH8V_-GzcyrvhkevNLXnxLRZe3wEUZp8)

network itself, and on the other hand could inspire a broader discussion on the role of actionable knowledge, collective learning (among so-called experts and non-experts) and the role of planning research and practice rooted in local communities.

To do so, I will briefly introduce some reflections regarding the learning process that involved both our group and the network itself and the role assumed by Mapping San Siro *in* the local network.

First of all, it could be stated that Sansheroes network could be somehow identified as a community of practice (Wenger, 1998; 2010). A community of practice is, first of all, a learning context, characterized by the belonging to a certain community identified by a given field of practice. In this case *the practice* could be recognized as the field of local welfare production, in which the different entities of the network are involved. Like other similar cases (Ranzini, 2018), Sansheroes network is a particularly rich one in this sense since it is composed by very heterogeneous entities which are active in diverse fields of the welfare sector, with different competencies, but also with diverse roles: volunteers, professionals, researchers, activists. The element that profoundly links them is a common aim: to collaborate for the local development of a marginalized neighbourhood. The fact that welfare policies and practices are more and more rooted in a territorial perspective (Vitale, 2007) made it possible for some professionals to tie to certain specific territories, while at the same time the withdraw of public policies opened up the field to local activation (which has overcome participation), both in volunteering activities and political activist practices (Pellizzoni, 2008).

The beginning of an empowering process in the case of Sansheroes network was generated by the misrepresentation of the neighbourhood (as already mentioned, more and more stigmatized in media and public discourse) and, at the same time, the inertia of responsible institutions in activating structural policies. These aspects directly struck local actors, which were not seeing an adequate acknowledgement of their work and their daily struggles in the field; on the contrary, their voice, claiming urgent and substantial interventions, seemed not to be heard. So, at a certain point, they were ready to react.

I will deal in a while with the role of Mapping San Siro group in facilitating a common and organized *reaction*, but before I would like to point out an aspect that made the difference in terms of empowering, cohesion and duration in time of the network. Social networks are investments of time and resources: to be successful and to last, they must be sustainable and useful (Conte and Laffi, 2019) for the ones who participate. The element that has kept the network together is precisely the process of co-construction of knowledge and the ability of the community of practice, as a learning context, to convert itself in a community of planning. The co-construction of an actionable knowledge and the process of mutual and collective learning has played a key role since on one hand, it was a factor of mutual acknowledgement of local actors – even the ones that have different or opposite positions regarding certain issues such as squatting – which recognized one to the other the fact that they all belonged to a local community of practitioners with complementary competencies; on the other hand actionable knowledge is the basis to promote projects with a higher quality, more aware of the complexity of local need and of the potentiality of integrating competencies and perspectives. So, more *competitive* and effective. As stated by Barbier when referring to action-research, changes start only when action and discourse are complementary and when the actors involved in a common path carry out a concrete action together (Barbier, 1998). In the case of Sansheroes, these actions were, on one hand, the projects that the network was able to start and promote and on the other hand the public



presentation of the work produced (at Triennale di Milano). These were fundamental steps that allowed the network to recognize itself collective identity and a set of expertise. In other words, to recognize itself as a *competent community* (Iscoe,1974).

Showing a strong internal cohesion and the ability to plan and develop projects collectively was a key aspect also in relation to institutions and their involvement. As partially underlined above, it was precisely the development of pilot projects that contributed in creating a sort of trust of public institutions towards the local network and that brought them into the neighbourhood.

This aspect leads to talk about our role as Mapping San Siro in the whole process. Even if, from the very beginning, we assumed an inclusive, open, collective position, the propulsive role of Mapping San Siro has been fundamental – and still is – for the endurance and progress of the network and for its governance. And it poses an issue in terms of possibility to emancipate from a leadership.

More specifically, Mapping San Siro, in virtue of its research role, played a crucial role on the one hand in proposing the construction of knowledge as a *common ground* from which each actor was able to recognize as part of a collective subject, despite or rather in virtue of the existing differences. Secondly, it played a decisive role in the governance of the process through a lead role based on: giving a constant rhythm to the meetings, calling the shots of the different phases (also through the constant production of reports and updates through mailing lists), promote an active role for the participants, enhancing their skills and promoting a vision of knowledge oriented to give value to a mix between expert and non-expert (yet rooted) knowledge. It also carried out the production of materials (collective documents and maps), coordinating the different phases of the process, without forgetting to include the other actors in the decision-making phases.

It was a quite hard and awkward task that, nevertheless, resulted in the establishment of a social climate based on trust in the group, which, for instance, has allowed, even the most *extreme* actors to accept a dialogue with institutions that in the past had never recognized their value or existence.

Mapping San Siro also had the role of promoting a strategic and complex vision of the transformation of the neighbourhood, starting from the transfer of *spatial (analytical) skills* (beyond technical skills related to the ability to structure projects, which were mostly relevant in the case of little associations) and a planning vision to local actors. This proved to be another key aspect, not only because it showed the ability of local actors to converge beyond their individual interests and fields of action, but also because it was the crucial point for the engagement of institutions, through their more local branches. Mapping San Siro in fact, contextually to the work with the local network, developed a series of micro pilot projects in the framework of SoHoLab project. These projects (especially one related to the regeneration of public spaces and the other one to the reactivation of vacant shops) were the chance to start little collaborations with the main public institutions (on the one hand, the Municipality of Milan and the local municipality, on the other hand, Aler and Lombardy Region). These experiences were able to progressively *lead* institutions into the neighbourhood since Mapping San Siro acted as a sort of guarantor and mediator of a certain kind of relationship with the context. In the next months, we will see if and how this relationship will develop and where it will lead the neighbourhood and the local network itself.

**Open issues: three main open questions to investigate**

To conclude, I would like to outline three critical points that I intend as open issues I would like to further explore and discuss.

1. The development of a local network based on collective knowledge requires time. But how much?

As can be noticed, this experience has required a serious investment of resources made by several actors, first of all in terms of time. On the one hand, Mapping San Siro has spent years in developing its role of locally rooted actor, able to gather together heterogeneous entities. On the other hand, the development of the local network has required years to obtain a partial and not yet clear commitment from public institutions and to start to develop projects together. More generally speaking, an approach that has the aim of tackling structural transformations through a local and bottom-up empowerment process requires the possibility to invest time and social resources. As Mapping San Siro, we didn't link our stay in the neighbourhood to specific project duration, nor our role of governance of the local network and mediation with institution to a specific time. However, we question ourselves on the investment of time a process like this requires, first of all, because we were not able until now, to promote shared governance which goes beyond shared decision-making and includes a sharing of organizational tasks and duties. Secondly, because we more broadly question the possibility to transfer this process elsewhere, with certain restrictions in terms of time and investment. Moreover, this case is peculiar in terms of leadership because it involves a University, which is rarely conceived as a local actor. This characteristic has potentiality in terms of acknowledgement of the leadership role of an actor which is not seen as a *competitor* by other organizations or by institutions. Is this condition however sustainable in a long perspective?

2. We act as a third-party mediator. But is our mediation-role always a good choice?

At the beginning of our work with and in the local network, we were able to act as mediators in order to gather together different actors. More recently, in the process of engagement of public institutions, we were able to benefit of our position of researchers belonging to an institution as a sort of warranty for their involvement. But is mediation always a good choice? We question ourselves if in some cases a more conflictive and disruptive position could lead to more effective changes. In this sense, we would like to investigate how different roles in the network could be more effectively employed to interact more strategically with certain actors. We also wonder how we should position ourselves, as well as part of an institution, towards the broad area of social conflicts: to what extent does our institution allow us to assume a conflictive position?

3. We criticize participation and promote activation. But how could we guarantee inclusion?

At the very beginning of our work, we implicitly avoid to mention the concept of participation or participatory planning: there were too much frustration in the local community and, in many cases, not enough resources to effectively take part of certain processes. We decided to access the field by inhabiting a space in the neighbourhood (ours headquarter and the portion of the street just in front of it), interacting on an everyday level and to work with practitioners and more or less structured local actors: it was our first tool to gather knowledge of the context and doing research. Later, as a local network, we founded our discourse on the fact that we were not representing inhabitants, but we were speaking as people who inhabited the neighbourhood in a different way and who have stable and deep



relationships with certain groups or populations. Even if specifying these issue, we are aware of the risk of being identified (even on purpose) with the voice of the so-called *inhabitants*. And at the same time, we are conscious of the necessity (and the complexity) to guarantee their inclusion in future development projects (if they will take place). So, the issue of *real* participation is still open. I will conclude this reflection with a provocation: is the production of responsible knowledge on a specific context enough to ensure the recognition of certain populations?

## References

Barbier, R., 2007, *La ricerca-azione*. (Roma: Armando)

Castelnuovo, I., and Cognetti, F., 2019, *Mapping San Siro Lab: experimenting grounded, interactive and mutual learning for inclusive cities*. In publication.

Cognetti, F., and Padovani, L., 2017, *New meanings for public housing through the co-production of knowledge. Policies for everyday life in marginal neighbourhoods*. In: *New developments in Southern European housing* edited by E. Bargelli and T. Heitkamp. (Pisa: Pisa University Press), pp.

Conte, M., and Laffi, S., 2019, *Prendiamoci un caffè. I luoghi del welfare nel Programma Welfare in Azione*. Report, Codici Ricerche e Intervento.

Grassi, P., 2018, *L'angosciosa resistenza: decostruire la categoria dell'“abbandono istituzionale” nel quartiere di edilizia popolare di San Siro (Milano)*. *Archivio antropologico mediterraneo*, Anno XXI, n. 20 (2).

Iscove, I., 1974, *Community psychology and the competent community*. *American Psychologist*, 29.

Pellizzoni, L., 2008, *Politiche pubbliche e nuove forme di partecipazione*. *Partecipazione e conflitto*, 0, pp. 93-116.

Ranzini, A., 2018, *Troppo competenti? Riflessioni sull'abilitazione delle competenze degli attori locali nei processi di rigenerazione urbana di contesti marginali*. *Tracce Urbane*, 3, pp. 115 - 133.

Vitale, T., 2007, *Integrazione e territorializzazione del welfare. Alcune implicazioni per i servizi sociali*. *Voci di strada*, XIX (3), pp.91-113.

Wenger, E., 1998, *Communities of practice: learning, meaning and identity*. (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Wenger, E., 2010, *Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems: the Career of a Concept*. In: *Social Learning Systems and Communities of Practice*, edited by C. Blackmore (London: Springer).

