# "Social diversity *versus* local solidarity in Warsaw. Two districts – two worlds?"

Ewa Korcelli-Olejniczak

Filip Piotrowski

eko@twarda.pan.pl; piotrowskif@twarda.pan.pl

*"it is interaction, not place that is the essence of the city and of city life"*

(M. Webber 1964)

*"The cross-links that enable a district to function as a Thing are neither vague nor mysterious. They consist of working relationships among specific people, many of them without much more in common than that they share a fragment of geography"*

(J. Jacobs 1961)

## 1. Introduction

The only hypothesis about cities and urban societies that can never be falsified is the one about the continuity of change. As concepts and theories rise and fall it is the unchangeable that is searched for in the regularities that stand behind urban development. In the early 1960s, M. Webber (1963, 1964) announced the birth of a *non-place urban realm* and of a *community without propinquity*. He perceived this as a consequence of the development of communication technologies in the US, and the diminishing role of 'place' as a physical setting. A. Giddens (2007) confirms the relevance of such understanding by saying that a community today should be not necessarily identified with a physical neighbourhood. Still, the city as an entity and an idea has survived as carrier of spirit and values (Bell, de Shalit 2011), whereas networks of relationships decide about its character and sustainability. De-territorialization is followed by re-territorialization and by new forms of concentration (Sheller, Urry 2006) within defined or flexible physical borders. Broadly understood, a city is both place and connectivity, both territoriality and flows (Buttimer 1969; Castells 1996); sometimes more of one than the other, but permanently it is the character of interaction which decides about its social integration, cohesion and economic performance.

Growing migration flows are a challenge to cities is many ways, specifically, to cities or parts of cities as places with their established communities and values. They bring positive development impulses and social diversity, but at the same time contribute to a decomposition of existing structures and are a challenge to planning understood as "*managing co-existence in shared space*" (Healey, 1997, p. 3) According to rather

extreme views, diversity weakens social capital (Putnam 2008), and challenges social solidarity (Goodhart 2004), since the glue of a community are common values. Any opinion notwithstanding, growing urban diversity should be treated as a *signum temporis*, a fact in the development of contemporary cities. At the same time, the question should be posed whether under conditions of hyper-diversity (Tasan-Kok et al, 2014), urban places can still sustain their interactive local identity based on social solidarity, mutual support and trust.

It is argued in the present paper that there is a clear interdependence between some latent elements of hyper-diversity generated by migrations and such components of Tönnies' (1929) 'community' as social solidarity and place awareness. It is claimed that in-migration and spatial mobility within cities can be as strong a factor shaping the area's *genius loci* and its psychosocial structure, as any other primary characteristic, such as socio-economic, social or family status of the residents. The inflow of new residents and their mixing is in principle a challenge to local solidarity understood as *"Unus pro omnibus, omnes pro uno"*, irrespectively of the socio-economic status of the in-migrants, or of the destination area. It is a challenge even if the inflow involves population representing a similar socio-economic status as the population of the arrival area. This is related to the fact that the development of a community is a process which requires time, common goals and emotions.

The hypothesis is tested on the example of Warsaw, capital city of EU's largest country in East-Central Europe. An illustration is provided from two districts – Praga Północ and Ursynów, both experiencing in-migration, mainly from other parts of Warsaw and other regions of Poland. In both cases, the inflow concerns predominately representatives of the broadly defined middle-class, which in the case of Praga Północ introduces more socio-economic diversity than in the case of Ursynów. In search for regularities in the relation between the level of in-migration and mobility based diversity on one side, and community awareness, integration and social solidarity on the other, the analysis focuses on the areas characterised by fundamental differences in their historic development, built environment and social structure.

The paper consists of five sections. In section two, following the Introduction, Warsaw's emerging hyper-diversity is pictured from various angles; its universality and

specificity are presented and interpreted. Sections three and four focus on the sub-local level presenting images of two different districts of the city, their development potential, course and prospects. Qualitative categories of residents are introduced, abstracting from social and demographic patterns. In the case of both districts, the relation between their social structure and in-migration based diversity on one side, and the level of social solidarity and specificity of interaction on the other, is discussed. In section five a discussion is presented which, with reference to both examples, shows the relation between diversity and social integration. Also, Conclusions are drawn and further research questions posed.

The present paper is based on the results of research carried out in Warsaw in 2013-2015 in the framework of EU 7 FP DIVERCITIES[1] and other complementary sources. The questionnaire prepared within Work Package 6 – fieldwork inhabitants was used to interview 50 residents of Praga Północ in the period of October 2014 – February 2015, and 20 residents of Ursynów in the period of February-April 2015. The results are confronted with earlier studies carried out in Ursynów by the present author which include interviews with local experts, as well as with results of another international project[2].

## 2. Cosmopolitan Warsaw – between socialist heritage, neoliberal policy, neo-conservatism

The development of civil societies in countries of East-Central Europe reveals rather clear spatial patterns. It is in principle the state capitals - as primate cities - and other larger urban areas that are national leaders with respect to economic transformation, globalization, social restructuring and diversification processes. The belated and

---

stepped-up modernization is more intense in larger urban areas, with smaller towns and peripheral, rural parts being usually less advanced in this respect. The political and socio-economic transition in East-Central Europe is steadily accompanied by an ideological turn, the societal change following the rules prevailing in advanced market economies and late modern societies, with their 'liquidity' of values (Bauman 2000). These processes vary in time and space making the region anything but homogenous.

Where traditional, conservative values still prevail within communities, for example in smaller towns and rural areas, place identity and the level of local social solidarity tends to be higher. In such areas globalization and hyper-diversification with respect to ethnicity, lifestyles, values and attitudes seems to be less evident. Conversely, there are urban areas in East-Central Europe which distinctly reflect the spirit of late modernity imbedded in a scenery of ongoing transition. On top of the systemic change, the development of these cities is shaped and challenged by in and out-migration, both interregional and international, the rise of civil society, the importance of the ideology of meritocracy, the growing acceptance of diversified both individual and group identities, by 'individualization' and demographic change.

Along with the increase of social and spatial diversity, the set of cities referred to, as well as their individual parts differ strongly one from another regarding spatial design and social structure, attractiveness as places of residence and places of work. Individual areas within the cities unveil different patterns of diversification, with either social inequality or the heterogeneity of lifestyles and identities creating their specificity. While becoming diverse, cities experience growing spatial polarization. Their process of functional and social change is very uneven, which is related to the areas' inherent socio-spatial characteristics and their dynamics, as well as to the overall development and city-level policy.

Like many other urban areas, Warsaw can be considered a city of places. Most of its districts are undergoing functional and social change, whereas in each case the pre-conditions and process is different. The new inner-city experiences constant transformation with respect to its residential and commercial structure, gaining the function of a modern CBD, while the old inner-city due to its historical character plays mainly the role of touristic, recreational and educational centre. Żoliborz, Mokotów,

Ochota - the predominately middle-class residential districts with pre-war traditions, situated on the left bank of the Vistula and, Saska Kępa on the right bank, sustain their stable character, while the inflow of migrants, including temporary residents focuses on newer districts, especially in the south and north-east of Warsaw. The old part of Praga Północ district situated on the right river bank, believed to be the most neglected, deprived but at the same time diverse and dynamic area of Warsaw, is undergoing a process of gentrification due to the inflow of new residents, infrastructural investments and revitalization policies introduced. The residential districts of Ursynów and Wilanów are the area of a constant population exchange due to housing developments, infrastructural investments and migration processes.

The human potential and socio-spatial structure of the individual districts, as well as the processes of change observed correspond with the areas' character, the patterns of social relations and the level of social capital. While in older, more established areas the level of mutual support and solidarity seems to be relatively high, diverse areas with a considerable share of in-migration, are usually characterized by disconnected social ties, anonymity and lack of local identity. This process is observed irrespectively of the social structure of the in-migrants.

What generally focuses attention of a beholder in the 1.7 million capital of Poland is a stunningly low level of ethnic diversity. At first glance Warsaw seems to be a very homogenous city. This is more a reflection of the fact that Poland is the least ethnically diversified country of the European Union, than a characteristic of the city itself, as at the national scale Warsaw constitutes the main magnet for internal and international migration flows[3]. Still, when compared with most of the large cities of the 'old' European Union, ethnic and cultural diversity is low. According to recent estimates the share of foreigners living in Warsaw for a period longer than three months equals 3 percent, i.e. approx. 50 thousand, but immigration is expected to intensify in the coming

---

[3] Out of the total number of foreigners who received work permit in Poland in 2011 (40,808 persons), the region of Warsaw (the Mazowieckie voivodship) accounted for more than 55 per cent (Central Statistical Office, 2012, p. 174). With respect to some immigrant groups the share is much higher – 85 per cent in the case of Vietnamese for example (Rządowa Rada Ludnościowa, 2012, p. 186). Warsaw also attracts a disproportionate share of migrants coming to Poland from the EU countries. The same applies to the category of foreign students

years. The largest nationalities represented, according to official registration are: Ukrainians, Vietnamese and Belarusians (Urząd M.St. Warszawy 2013).

It can undoubtedly be claimed that social diversity in Warsaw is marked by a symptomatic specificity, related not only to the character of the city itself, but to the concomitance of growth and change (Korcelli-Olejniczak, 2012). Warsaw is the habitat of intensifying diversification caused by post-1989 political and socio-economic transformation, the re-opening to the world, by the growth of population mobility and internationalization of the economy, as well as by growing social stratification, spatial polarization and emerging urban conflicts. The belated and stepped-up modernisation of economy and society, the combination of traditional values and cosmopolitan flair, the burden of the past and the strongly future-oriented ambitions are among the factors, on the basis of which the specific character of Warsaw can now be defined.

Warsaw attracts in-migrants from other regions of Poland, being the largest, most dynamic labour market and, socially, the most open and tolerant metropolitan city in the country (Łukasiuk 2007). Generally there are two main patterns of such migration. The first is related to the search for 'solid modernity' based on traditional foundations (stability, work, family, carrier), the other reflects the search for a 'liquid modernity' that the city offers (Bauman 2000), i.e. anonymity, tolerance, diversity. The two patterns of migration also correspond to growing social pluralism based on lifestyles, attitudes and options. Next to the generational (age-related) diversity there is a specific social dichotomy developing: more established households showing a trend towards suburbanisation and modern urbanites occupying more central city areas.

While keeping this in mind, it should be claimed that the essence of social diversity is grounded predominately in the notion of *urban divisions* (Bridge and Watson, 2013) relating to such identities as class, economic and social status, sex/gender, age, disability and religious affiliation. The political discourse reflects the subordinate role of ethnicity and weakly articulates the phenomenon of *differences* related to potentialities and possibilities of individuals, local communities and social groups. It explicitly deals with *urban divisions*, as the discussion concerning *differences* requires evaluation and assigning values, while their mutually contradictory nature is a condition under which the diversity policy in Warsaw is being developed.

The search for both 'solid' and 'liquid' modernity, as well as the economic and political debate of interventionist and neo-liberal forces form the foundations of society, economy and state within the city which are far from representing a consensus. This finds reflection in a non-conciliatory dispute over those aspects of social diversity and such issues of diversity policy which are sensitive to religious and political affiliation, worldview and ideology.

Warsaw's specificity with respect to diversity issues finds an expression in the predominance of socio-economic diversification expressed by growing economic disparities, which results in the appearance of negative socio-economic phenomena, such as social exclusion and poverty. These are also reflected in spatial patterns. There are distinct areas in Warsaw where there is a tradition of poverty – these have recently become subject to cross-sectoral place-based policies such as the new Integrated Revitalization Program (ZPR 2015) related to solving social problems within, as well as radical disparities between individual neighbourhoods. The previous revitalization program (LPR 2004) had mainly focused on urban regeneration not supported by a long-term social policy, which contributed to a growing socio-spatial polarisation resulting, on the one-hand, in area gentrification, on the other, in the escalation of social marginalisation. There are also areas in Warsaw with a positive image deriving from a higher level of human capital, investments in public space, where a stability with respect to the social status of the inhabitants is among distinctive characteristics.

The analysis below focusses on two seemingly contrasting areas. One of the districts is fairly homogeneous with respect to socio-economic status of the inhabitants, the other very diverse. What they have in common is the temporary and permanent in-migration from other districts and regions of Poland. It its argued herewith that there are in a way parallel patterns developing in the areas which concern interaction and social solidarity. Such patterns may unfold irrespective of the level of socio-economic heterogeneity, while spatial mobility alone may be perceived as their main generator.

### 3. Praga Północ – deprived, diverse, dynamic

The Warsaw case study area within DIVERCITIES research is located on the right bank of the Vistula river. The district has 67.984 inhabitants (Statistical Yearbook of Warsaw

2012) and can be considered as one of the most diversified areas in the city in terms of socio-economic and social status. Its diversity is reflected in both physical and social dimensions. Pre-war neglected tenements are neighbouring with new buildings constructed by private developers. There is an extreme accumulation of social dysfunctions (physical and mental disability, unemployment, delinquency, alcoholism etc.) and a simultaneous gentrification related to more recent in-migration of residents representing a higher income- and educational status.

Social diversification in Praga Północ derives to a great extent from changing urban policy – the post-war 'intentional exclusion' [4] of the district by state authorities and the new post-1989 approach represented by the City, including place-based urban regeneration projects, infrastructural investments and the creation of a '*vogue for Praga*'[5]. The Praga Północ of today is therefore developing as a kind of a 'dual city' ( Mollenkopf, Castells 1991) – a mélange of new public and private investments, a specific 'creative-cultural' milieu with bohemian atmosphere against a background of socially deprived environments, devastated pre-war housing stock, cheap tenement buildings and a touch of folklore. This diversity is considered to be a general pull factor that attracts new residents, generally well-educated representatives of the middle class.

## 3.1. Residents of Praga Północ. A qualitative typology

Owing to the qualitative character of the analysis conducted, we insisted to distinguish specific categories of residents of Praga Północ according to other criteria than basic demographic and social patterns. The criteria applied included: the length of residence, functional perception and emotional perception of the neighbourhood. According to the length of residence a clear dividing line was drawn between two categories. The first consists of the inhabitants who have lived in the area for at least 20-25 years, those who were born in Praga or are off-springs of long-term residents. The second category refers to those inhabitants who have moved to the area after 1989. The basic differences

---

[4] In contrast to the districts situated on the left-bank of the Vistula river, the pre-war architectural and partly social structure of Praga Północ survived World War II. Due to the fact that its characteristics did not correspond to the concept of an 'ideal socialist society', large parts of the district were neglected by the authorities and underwent a slow physical deterioration and social deprivation.

[5] The 'Local Revitalization Program for the City of Warsaw 2005-2013' and the 'Integrated Revitalization Programe 2015-2022' have introduced a new way of approaching Praga Północ, which reflects a change in the authorities' perception of the district's problems, challenges and assets.

between these two social groups identified, besides general socio-economic, social and demographic parameters ('new' residents are usually better educated, on the average younger and in a better economic situation), are associated with the social networks they establish.

The 'new' residents establish wider and more diverse social relations - "bridging networks" (Putnam 2000), while the 'old' residents' networks are less diversified but the bonds between its members are stronger. Most of the long-term residents feel endangered by external influences related to the inflow of new residents. The members of the group have developed strong ties, that are not physical but rather cultural – related to the tradition of the district, a common understanding based on unwritten rules of local social solidarity, expressed by a resident's statement: "*don't listen too much, don't ask questions, be nice to everyone*" (interview with an 'old' resident). Most of the representatives of this category share an overall negative attitude to diversity introduced by the 'new' residents, as it is a danger to their secure world. The following words exemplify this point of view: "(…) *these new people, they come here with large money and drive their cars out of their garages. They are different. Their behaviour is questionable*" (interview with a 'new' resident). The category of 'new' residents is more diversified.

There are generally three basic ways of how people establish relations with others and the physical surrounding i.e. the public and private space. The first approach is based on a high level of social activity, interest in the development of the immediate and more distant neighbourhood. The representatives of this group have a diverse network of relations which, however, usually includes members of the same category – well-educated professionals. Some of them, however, are treated as *good angels* by the 'old' residents. This is exemplified by the following statement: „*Some people have assimilated with old Praga. Here we have a neighbor who fights for the rights of tenants. He represents first of all the old Pragians who have lived in these buildings since the war, and now these people are at risk of forced eviction*" (interview with an 'old' resident).

Another group are people who feel isolated and unsecure in their neighbourhood. In many cases this is related to one or more of the following factors: their length of residence which is usually short, scarcity of friends and relatives in the area (absence of strong ties), unstable financial situation. The sense of diversity is related to the lack of physical rootedness, belonging or understanding of local principles and rules: "*Now that I think about it, this is not my secure environment, where I feel comfortable*" (interview with a 'new' resident).

The third group are residents who don't seem to care about their neighbourhood, and perform their lives outside of its borders treating the area as a dormitory. While their social networks rarely include any neighbours, they lead an exterritorial life within the walls of their flats and their cars – they work elsewhere and drive their children to school to other districts. For this group 'sharing' the area with 'old' residents is rather a problem. They consider Praga Północ to be stigmatized, associated with inherited poverty, deprivation and low life quality in general. In many cases, the representatives of this group emphasize the temporary character of their residence in the area, characterized by the following statement: "*As soon as it is possible, we desire to move out. We have nothing in common with this place*" (interview with a 'new' resident).

The second criterion that was used in the analysis to classify the area's residents is the functional perception of the area, related to how, with whom and for what sake the space of the neighbourhood is used. According to this principle the categories of parents, elderly people, students, dog owner and wanderers are distinguished. To characterize them shortly:

a.      the category of *parents* is related to both old' and 'new' residents. The people share the feature that their main activity performed in the area concerns their children – walking or driving them to school or kindergarden, social encounters with other parents in parks or playgrounds;

b.      the category of *elderly people* is mainly characterized by 'old' residents, though there are some examples also among the more recent inhabitants. This category is very attached to their place of residence, performing most activities in the immediate surroundings, predominately within public space;

c.      the category of *students* or young people is generally represented by 'new' residents, who's search for a cheap flat or the availability of a dwelling inherited from a

family member has brought them to Praga. They usually spend time outside of the neighbourhood, when performing activities in the area of residence more often than other groups identified, they use commercial space – cafes, bars and clubs.

d.      the category of *dog owners* is distinguished as a separate case, as it unites 'old' and 'new' residents and is a very specific example identified in the studies conducted. *Dog owners* seem to perceive the limits of their neighbourhood via walks with their dogs, the latter becoming a way of meeting people who share similar values and lead a specific lifestyle.

e.      the category of *wanderers*– mostly older, rarer middle-aged people, more frequently 'old' residents. For them the neighbourhood is delimited by the walking parameters. They are not local activists, just people, who have a lot of free time and walk around. They differ from *flâneurs* in terms of their sentimental attitude and direct relation to their neighbourhood as their place on earth.

The third criterion used in the analysis to classify the residents of the area is the emotional perception of their surroundings. The following groups are identified:

a. the categories of *flâneurs* and *local activists* concern practically all age groups, family and socio-economic statuses but predominately 'new' residents, in many cases artists. A common characteristic of the people is their high level of education and the engagement in the area's affairs. These people participate in local social initiatives, they treat their neighbourhood as part of the city, without defined boundaries, they like to experience it with all their senses and spend time in the area: *"I am interested in what's happening here in the surrounding, I look at buildings, enjoy (...) I move all over Praga. My space is much larger than just two streets, it's the whole of Praga, related to my social engagement"* (interview with an 'old' resident);

b. the category of *loiterers* is represented by long-term residents with vocational to secondary education, often unemployed or retired. Their surrounding is their courtyard, gate: "(…) *where my neighbours live, where my door is, is my home, my neighbourhood*" (interview with an 'old' resident). They spend most of their time there, doing practically nothing;

The categories identified are conceived of as defining some specific features of space, social relations exiting between and among residents, as well as their attitude towards the space occupied.

*3.2. Living in the neighbourhood – interaction, trust and solidarity in Praga Północ*

The categories presented above play a crucial role in evaluating the character of interaction, level of mutual trust and social solidarity in Praga Północ. The main differences between the inhabitants' relations are observed with reference to the divide between the 'old', long-term or inborn residents and the 'new' ones i.e. the 'gentrifiers'. Within these groups similar socio-economic characteristics are shared respectively, in spite of a variation in age and family structure. It can generally be claimed that the level of integration between the two groups is very low and that encounter proceeds along some specific functional and emotional paths expressed by the categories presented – during walks with dogs in the park (*dog owners*), or while spending time on the playground (*parents*), when a common goal is identified that is important for neighbors irrespective of the length of residence (*local activists*). A common goal creates bridging networks between people from different backgrounds.

The group of residents which can be considered as the 'new integrators', that is those who bring people together or whose networks are composed of both 'new' and 'old' residents are artists. Many of them are at the same time local activists, although the latter group is more diverse, both in terms of the length of residence, socio-economic status or education.

Usually people trust their neighbors, in some cases they trust them more than other persons they know. The scale of trust usually increases with the length of residence in the neighborhood. People usually trust one another in the following three cases: if they have spent their childhood together, when their children are the same age, when they share interests and values. The first situation is related to the length of the relation and the strength of ties within bonding networks – "*residents with common backgrounds trust each other. This trust happens in personal relationships that are strong and frequent. Personal experience builds strong trust*" (U of M 2008). In the second case

the trust is more functional, but, also, it is related to common goals and obligations. People tend to trust even those who are different from them if they share goals. The third case is the most typical one, but has the least effect on integration between diverse groups of residents: As expressed by a 'new' resident: *"undoubtedly, I wouldn't trust just anybody only because he is my neighbor. I think that trust is based on how you picture people. You probably trust those who are similar to you"*. The research conducted shows that parents tend to trust other *parents, dog owners* trust other *dog owners* in the neighborhood, 'new' residents, in spite of creating bridging networks usually trust other 'new' residents with a similar socio-economic status.

There are opinions that there is a specific kind of trust among 'native' residents of Praga, while the level of social trust in general has fallen in Poland and in many other countries. This trust derives from a local identity which has developed among the residents of Praga after the war and was inherited by next generations. The following statement of a local activist exemplifies this idea: „*Among the autochthonic residents of Praga there are people who have known each other all their lives, went to school together, sometimes even broke the law together. The solidarity there is stronger. The newer residents limit their existence and also trust to the nearest surroundings, sometimes even their flat. The door is a barrier that isolates them from the world. This concerns the affluent residents to a greater extent"*.

Last but not least, trust is built on positive experience related to social solidarity. The residents interviewed in Praga have often made positive experience related to mutual support. The notion of 'good angels' is recalled in a few statements, concerning people who help others on a regular basis, without a special reason. This refers to elderly people much more often than to younger residents: *"There are people I call good angels in our building. Elderly folks, they help everybody. They water flowers, people give them keys to their flats. Everybody trusts them"* (interview with 'new' resident),

The most helpful are people who are engaged in all kinds of social activities, which are directed at supporting the local disadvantaged. There are many artists among this group. *"Neighbors help each other as much as they can. When you need help, they help you.*

*When you see that someone needs help, you go on and help. I have such a specific profession that my level of sensitivity is a bit higher than the average"* (interview with a 'new' resident). The local organisations active in Praga engaging public, social and private actors are stimulators of social solidarity, creating linking networks[6].

The level of social solidarity seems to be considerably lower among 'new' residents, especially in case of private buildings, or there, where a lot of people rent flats. "*These flats are sold, residents change, new tenants come, they don't integrate. They are not helpful at all*" (interview with an 'old' resident). In the newer buildings, where there are many new residents, the support is more casual: "*(…) they lend me a cup of sugar, or help me with my car (…)"*(interview with a 'new' resident).

Despite the fact that examples of ignorance and disinterest are rare, it seems that local solidarity does not lead to a social integration between the residents of the diverse area and to the development of bridging networks between representatives of different social categories. The two phenomena occur on parallel levels of interaction and the divide between 'new' and 'old' residents, the native and the migrants still seems to be too deep. A lot of time and effort is needed to use this diversity for the benefit of the area. Whereas general trust and the will to help each other are related to basic human instincts, which is present among diverse communities, a social integration requires more.

## 4. Ursynów – a district and its sense of place

*"Place may be said to have 'spirit' or 'personality', but only human beings can have a sense of place" (*Yi-Tu Tuan, 1977)

Local identity depends on the combination of three components: physical surroundings (the natural and built environment), the activity of people, as well as

---

[6] In an interview with one of the leaders of the Praga Resident's Association 'Michałów', the local activist focuses on the tradition of social solidarity in the area, deriving from the times of the philanthropist Prince Michał Piotr Radziwiłł. He and his wife Maria were known for their engagement in supporting the local poor and building the area's *genius loci.*

meanings, values that people attach to the place (Lisowski 2003). Meaning may be related to the specificity of place, which can result from a mixture of socio-spatial factors (urban functions, architecture, social composition, landscape) but also from the historic or cultural specificity of the area. In the following section the identity of Ursynów and its residents is searched for, their diversity identified and the level of integration and local solidarity evaluated.

The plans were promising, as the housing estates about to be constructed in the area known today as the district of Ursynów were to become a model case under conditions that prevailed in Poland of the 1970s, and for the state of its planning system. The Scandinavian-type of project, elaborated by a team led by M. Budzyński, represented a clean break with all previous schemes. The settlement was planned for more than 100 000 residents, and was to be friendly and intimate despite its large scale (Mazur 2012). The concept presented a 'human approach', which accounted for a multiplicity of functions and spaces.

Although formal conditions of the time prevented the full implementation of the project, Ursynów has become a relatively attractive location, with a considerably variegated architecture (differentiated shape, density, height and size of buildings, playgrounds, open green space, irregular street network. The area, mainly of residential character, was to a large extent inhabited by relatively young and well-educated population groups – the *intelligentsia* (Majewski 2010) which determined the district's socio-spatial patterns. During the 1980s and, later, the 1990s, Ursynów was expanding at a fast rate. From the 1980s onwards it became extended southwards, now reaching the Kabaty Forest – a large wooded complex situated at the administrative border of Warsaw and Powsin. The development of Ursynów was accelerated by public infrastructural investments. In 1995 the district was connected with the city center along its full length by an underground railway line. The central axis (the KEN avenue) was open ten years later, and a network of bike lanes have crisscrossed the whole area. The most recently constructed housing estates, in the vicinity of the Kabaty Forest, are considered to be one of the most attractive residential locations in Warsaw. Numerous

of the estates are gated and guarded. In spite of this, its residents, mostly well-educated, predominately young families form a relatively open community.

Today, the area of Ursynów covers 48.6 sq km, and the population size amounts to 148 876 inhabitants (District Office 2009). The district as a whole is characterized by diverse architectural styles and arrangements and has an image of the home to Warsaw's 'creative class'. Ursynów is far from homogeneous with respect to the age structure of the inhabitants. There is a family life cycle visible, with the northern parts of the district being inhabited to a large extent by older generations, and the southern area by younger residents, in many cases by their off-springs, as well as new inhabitants, mainly in-migrants from other parts of Poland. As much as 30% of the residents of Ursynów have tertiary education (District Office 2009). In addition to its mainly residential character, Ursynów is now gaining new urban functions by generating workplaces and developing public spaces – sports facilities, coffee shops and restaurants –  which serve the role of spaces of social encounter. According to common belief, the educational composition of Ursynów comprises the decisive factor in the evolution of civil awareness and behavior of the inhabitants. The performance of residents related to civil society development, when measured by election participation rates can be evaluated as active considering Polish and Warsaw standards.

*4.1. Residents of Ursynów. A qualitative typology*

The identification of certain categories of residents and the discussion concerning social integration and local solidarity is a result of three enquiries. The first was a survey study containing three questions carried out in 2010 at the time of the local elections in Poland. The questions concerned the origin of the respondent (whether born in Ursynów, in Warsaw or in another place), the role of the district-level government and the emotional relation to the slogan: "*Ursynów – my place on earth*". Out of the total of 300 respondents  60 per cent declared that Ursynów should have its own representatives in the Warsaw Council, and that its interests were not the same as the interests of the whole city. Half of the respondents claimed that they could identify themselves with the slogan "*Ursynów – my place on earth*". Interestingly enough, in the case of 70% of the interviewees, Ursynów was not declared as the place of birth.

The second analysis was a pilot study carried out in the frame of the ReNewTown[7] project concerning life quality, development perspectives and local engagement in an area burdened by socialist heritage. The study unveiled a high level of place awareness and social engagement of the residents, but, at the same time, has indicated that there is a considerable diversity of attitudes among them. This pertained to differences between those who moved to Ursynów in the 1980s and residents who arrived more recently from other parts of Warsaw or other regions of Poland.

The third enquiry which provided the most knowledge concerning the qualitative classification of inhabitants comprised 20 interviews carried out with residents of Ursynów in 2015. The analysis was conducted on the basis of the same questionnaire which was elaborated within the DIVERCITIES project, designed for the case study – Praga Północ.

The qualitative classification of the residents of Ursynów was based on the same three criteria as in Praga – length of residence, functional perception and emotional perception of the area.

According to the length of residents two categories were distinguished: 'old' residents who have inhabited Ursynów in the late 1970s and early 1980s and their off-springs, who as the second generation of 'Ursynovians' carry on certain traditions and social behaviours. On the average, the category consists of persons with tertiary education – the that-time *intelligentsia*, performing creative-cognitive jobs (teachers, medicine doctors, scientists). This group occupies flats within housing cooperatives in the northern part of Ursynów. In some cases they, or their children have moved to newer buildings constructed in the vicinity or in the southern parts of the district. The 'old' inhabitants are more attached to a traditional model of social relations based on strong family ties, social integration within neighbourhoods and solidarity among the neighbours.

The 'new' residents are a generally more diverse category, either consisting of people who have moved to Ursynów from other districts of Warsaw, or temporary and permanent in-migrants from other regions of Poland, also from different countries.

---

[7] New Post-Socialist City: Competitive and Attractive (in short the ReNewTown project) has been implemented through the Central Europe Programme co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund in the period of 2011-2014

There are basically three groups of 'new' residents distinguished. The first group are those who have moved to Ursynów from another district, typically in the middle and late 1990s, occupy flats within housing cooperatives, rarely in buildings constructed by developers, in the area of Kabaty. The representatives of this group are predominately middle-aged (40-50 years old), have teenage children, are well-educated and in a differentiated financial situation, with some signs of status decline. The second group consists of more recent in-migrants from other regions of Poland, who are predominately younger than the other group, are either childless, single or have smaller children. In many cases these people treat Kabaty as a temporary place of residence.

The third group are residents of so called *Green Ursynów*, who have built single-family houses in the outskirts of the district. These are usually young families with children, affluent by Polish standards, representing a more traditional lifestyle than the residents of Kabaty on the average. The social relations within the category of 'new' residents are more diverse than of the 'old' residents, though generally less family and place bound. There is a clear dependence observed between the length of residence and the intensity and depth of relations in the neighbourhood, which is, however, also related to generational issues - life cycle, as well as to an ongoing transition of values and lifestyles accompanying the 'individualization' of societies.

According to the functional perception of the neighbourhood the following three categories of residents are identified:

a. *parents* – concerns mainly 'new' residents within all three groups mentioned. Their basic activity related to their district and neighbourhood concerns the children, mainly school, after-class activities, kindergarden, playgrounds, parks etc.: "*our life and social relations focus on children and their life and social relations at school and after school*" (interview with a 'new' resident');

b. *modern urbanites* – in many cases childless or with grown-up children; they usually work outside of the district, while performing some selected activities within their neighbourhood (jogging, biking, tennis, meeting friends in local beer gardens): "*I do what and where I chose, I'm independent, but there are some things I can do here, as the place offers a lot*" (interview with a 'new' resident);

c. *older people*, are a category comprising predominately of 'old' residents, who are generally quite active in making use of open space and public facilities in their district.

According to the emotional perception of the area the following two categories are identified:

a. *local activists* referring to both 'old' and 'new' residents, are a rather numerous category of people who are engaged in all kinds of activities related to the local development of the district or their own environment (schools, housing cooperatives etc.). This category concerns people aged 30-60, although the number of younger people is more and more evident: "*Ursynów is like a bee hive. Everybody wants to be active here*" (interview with an 'old' resident);

b. *fit for fun freaks* are people who spend most of their leisure time making use of sports facilities and the Kabaty woods. This category is growing in numbers, as a specific *vogue for sports* is an intensifying process in the area, related to the appreciation of the district's qualities with respect to nature and new investments within the built environment: "*the main spaces of social encounter here are the woods, fitness clubs, tennis courts, and the bike lanes*" (interview with a 'new' resident). This category concerns 'old' and 'new' residents, also *older people* who participate in nordic walking classes and play chess.

*4.2. Living in the neighbourhood – interaction, trust and solidarity in Ursynów*

The residents interviewed in 2010, 2011 and 2015 in the framework of research mentioned above differed with regard to gender, age and family status, and, as indicated, with respect to the length of residence. The differences in their social status were much smaller than in the case of Praga Północ. Most inhabitants, experts and entrepreneurs interviewed within ReNewTown market research and all respondents of the DIVERCITIES study declared they had full tertiary education, the differences in their economic status were distinct, though in general the monthly household income declared was considerably higher than that of the residents in Praga Północ.

Like in the case of Praga however, the analysis of the interviews shows considerable differences between the sense of local identity and the intensity of relations between the 'old' and the 'new' residents. Whereas the 'older' residents point to the existence of

more integrated networks within their immediate social environment – relations between neighbours, friends and stronger identification with the place of residence – the 'newer' residents claim to have developed more intense interactions with individual persons from their surroundings. In the case of the latter group, most contacts were related to common interests and shared recreational and sports activities, club memberships, or a similar professional background. The former group developed relations referring to mutual support concerning daily activities, the organization of family celebrations and the like.

The current relations between the two categories distinguished are limited by generational differences - the 'old' residents are usually older than the 'new' residents – and are reflected by contrasting lifestyles and needs. A 70-year old woman says: "*When my children were small, we were leading a social life here. Now I know these people I once knew. But the new residents are usually temporary*". While in the interviews the 'new' residents generally focus on their children and on their professional career, the 'old' residents talk about their retirement, their grandchildren and their hobbies. The main difference between the two categories, however, lies in the way they refer to the patterns and mechanisms of social integration in the district and neighbourhood.

The 'old ' residents usually describe their social networks as dense and based on local bonds. The relations with neighbours tend to be close, trustful and mutually supportive. Interestingly, most of these relationships have sustained this character for many years, while changing in terms of lifecycle. A 70.-year old man states: "*We have known each other with some neighbours since we moved in and our children were small. We celebrated parties together. We trusted each other. With those who are still here I feel as if we were family. I helped a few people. They helped me as well. Now times have changed. Those new people who move in are different. I don't think I could trust them, although they look ok*". A similar reflection is expressed by a 50-year old man living in a single-family house in *Green Ursynów'*: "*These new people are different, the relations between them are not frequent. We live a different life. The only thing that integrates us are common investments in the neighbourhood*" .

Within the group of 'new' residents the level of social integration and local solidarity depends on the length of residence, the age of the respondents and their family status.

Like in the case of Praga Północ functional networks developed between neighbours within this category are more frequent than emotional relations, although in some cases the bonds become stronger with time: "*mutual functional support related to children and social contacts focusing on the kindergarden or school sometimes develop into deep and permanent friendships. I trust my neighbours. I helped so many people. Now that I need help, I feel the Good that I have done is coming back to me*" (interview with a 'new' resident). The category of *parents* seems to be the most integrated among all functional groups identified. In most cases, however, the bonds become looser with time, as the children get older: "*my children are 16 and 20. I don't spend time in schools and on playgrounds any more. Now I chose the people I want to spend time with, not necessarily those that live close to me or have children*" (interview with 'new' resident).

The category of *modern urbanites*, like in any district and city is not especially place rooted or socially bond (Gusfeld 1975). Their social relations are not tied to the place of residence more than to any other place. In some cases, however, common interests and hobbies, the encounters in a sports or music club, or a clear common goal to be achieved are factors which raise the level of local integration between members of this category. A 28-year old business consultant and a tennis enthusiast states: "*My tennis club here around the corner is my second home, or rather, my first home. I have come to know so many people there. We are like a community know. Not only playing tennis but celebrating together. Yes, I can even say I have friends there. I trust them and think, they would help me if I needed help. Those are very diverse people, but usually well-off, well-educated and very ambitious*".

As indicated while distinguishing the emotional categories of residents, the glue between the two categories are local initiatives which integrate many residents of Ursynów, and, numerous sports and recreational activities in the district[8]. All interviewees declare that a common problem to be solved, or an initiative responding to the interests of the locals, creates linking and bridging networks and integrates people, while the Kabaty Forest with its facilities are the most popular space of social

---

[8] An example of a cross-generational project is the activity of the association 'Our Ursynów' which integrates practically all categories of inhabitants notwithstanding age, origin or length of residence in the area. The place which integrates all *fit for fun* enthusiasts are the Kabaty Forest, an area of 902,68 ha designed for all kinds of recreational activities arranged for children, grown-ups and elderly people.

encounter. There is evidence of various social actions undertaken with the participation of different groups of inhabitants 'against' some decisions of the local government and 'for' the development of facilities serving the local community. The most recent initiative supported by numerous local organizations raises a protest against the expansion of the Tesco supermarket into a 'community destructive' gigantic shopping mall. In this case, despite the overall tendencies that weaken physical rootedness and social bonds, the signs of local social solidarity are very clear.


## 5. Discussion and Conclusions

In order to identify individual types of socio-spatial behaviour we chose two extreme examples of city sub-areas. At this point the question can be posed, to what an extent the two examples provided introduce representative knowledge concerning the way in which mobility-based social diversity in Warsaw have an impact on social integration and local solidarity. In this concluding section three sets of arguments are presented which support the hypothesis, according to which the inflow of new residents, irrespectively of any socio-spatial characteristics of the area, weakens social integration and represents a challenge to social solidarity. It is also claimed that this challenge can be taken up once the necessary material, natural and social capital is available.

Firstly, the results presented concern two different, in fact extreme cases. In Praga Północ, socio-economic, as well as cultural diversity is primarily an outcome of the co-existence of population of different socio-economic status and education, augmented by the inflow of new residents. Migration inflow is caused mainly by the availability of inexpensive dwellings, recent public investments and the *vogue for old Praga*, evoked by its character. The area is undergoing a gentrification process, but still, it exhibits an evidence of social exclusion and dysfunctions, leading towards a persistence of social inequalities. The existence of strong ties between the 'old' residents can be interpreted as part of a defense strategy against social and economic change (Berger, Luckmann, 1966). There are relatively few organizations or informal groups that could build the necessary linking networks, so as to improve living conditions of those in need.

Ursynów has been a scene of numerous new housing investments offering higher living standards since 1990. Its attractiveness for investors and new residents results from the

district's advantageous situation. Public transportation facilities and the availability of green infrastructure provide it with the best of both urban and suburban functions. Differences in socio-economic composition between the two areas presented unveil a diverse picture of contemporary Warsaw. A more comprehensive portrait would require the inclusion of districts of intermediate character among study areas.

Secondly, it can be observed that the similarities in socio-economic status between long-term and 'new' residents, as in the case of Ursynów, is not a factor which necessarily contributes to a social integration and supports social solidarity. In a more general sense, the social divide which disturbs these processes runs predominately along three axes:

a.    generational differences between the long-term residents and the newcomers,

b.    lower level of local identity of 'new' residents, as well as differences in lifestyle, values and attitudes among them, stemming from diverging backgrounds, including place of origin, level of education of parents etc.

c.    overall social changes, i.e. societal roles, neoliberal 'economisation' of the society, rising level of tolerance, demographic change.

It can be argued that the processes as observed in Ursynów may be interpreted on the ground of the concept of hyper-diversity (Tasan-Kok et al, 2014) were social divisions between groups of residents and individuals are rooted much deeper than within simple differences in social or ethnic status, and concern lifestyles, values, life experience and attitudes cross-cutting traditionally understood social categories. While in the case of Praga Północ, a simple dependence can be found between social diversity and inequality on one side, and disintegration and limited social solidarity on the other, in Ursynów the processes are more varied and complex.

Thirdly, the challenge of migration and spatial mobility related diversity in different urban places can be taken up if two basic conditions are present. The first condition concerns the material as well as natural resources. As Curley (2010) argues, it is not only socio-economic mix, but the resources of the neighbourhood, that are strong predicators of social capital. The creation of neighbourhood facilities and the investment in spaces of encounter such as the Kabaty Forest in service to a functional variety of people (Jacobs 1961) are a contribution to social integration. Place attachment, building

of community identity and the feeling of safety, in consequence, also alter the perception of the neighbourhood, change its negative, or support its positive image. In Ursynów a potential generator of social cohesion could be the level of cultural capital which is not much different between the long-term and newer residents. The enhancement of social cohesion is, however, hampered by a sense of 'temporality' and the search for anonymity among the latter group, which restricts the formation of social networks within the place of residence. This, in fact, tends to be a general characteristic of large urban centres.

The second condition is related to the common goal, at city, district or neighbourhood level. In both Praga Północ (Korcelli-Olejniczak et al, 2014b) and Ursynów (Korcelli-Olejniczak, 2014) there are examples of organized, as well as spontaneous, institutional and informal initiatives which, in response to a place or group-related need arose to what was considered a common danger or a joint opportunity. Such initiatives can be identified as a sign of social solidarity. In the case of Praga Północ it was the solidarity with children from Brzeska street that initiated the Social Street Circus project, or the solidarity of these who have access to books with those that are excluded from cultural assets. The latter has given birth to the Local Libraries project. In Ursynów, the motto: "*Nothing about us without us*" started a long story of public engagement in the frame of the association 'Our Ursynów' in the district's current and longer term issues.

**Literature:**

Bauman Z. (2000) *Liquid modernity*. Malden: Polity Press

Bell D.A., de Shalit A. (2011) *The Spirit of Cities: Why the Identity of a City Matters in a Global Age*. Princeton University Press

Berger P.L. and Luckmann T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise its the Sociology of Knowledge* Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, pp. 227-241

Bridge G, Watson S. (2013). Reflections on division and difference in: G. Bridge, S. Watson (eds) *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell

Buttimer, A. (1969). Social Space in Interdisciplinary Perspective. *Geographical Review*, 59,  417-26.

Castells, M. (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society: The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture* Volume. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Curley A. M. (2010) *Relocating the poor: social capital and neighbourhood resources.* Journal of Urban Affair, Volume 32, Number 1, pages 79–103.

District Office. (2009). Data on educational structure. Retrieved from http://ursynow.pl/page/index.php?str=401.

Giddens A. (2007) *Debating Diversity.* The Guardian. Tuesday 30 October 2007

Goodhart (2004) *Too diverse?* PROSPECT magazine. February 04

Gusfield, J. R. (1975). *The community: A critical response*. New York: Harper Colophon.

Healey, P. (1997) *Collaborative Planning.* London: Macmillan

Jacobs J. (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities.* New York: Random House

Korcelli-Olejniczak E. (2012) Marked by Dynamics: Berlin and Warsaw in the process of functional change. In: B. Derudder, M. Hoyler, P.J. Taylor, F. Witlox (eds.), *International Handbook of Globalization and World Cities*, pp. 517-529. Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Korcelli-Olejniczak E.  (2014). Partycypacja nauki i jej instytucji w kształtowaniu przestrzeni miasta. In T. Markowski, Stawasz D. (Eds.) *Partnerstwo i odpowiedzialność w funkcjonowaniu miasta* (pp. 52-63). Warszawa: KPZK PAN

Korcelli-Olejniczak E., A. Bierzyński, M. Grochowski and G. Węcławowicz (2014). Report 2n: urban policies on diversity in Warsaw, Poland.

Korcelli-Olejniczak E., Bierzyński A., Węcławowicz G., (2014b). Report 3n: governance arrangements and initiatives in Warsaw, Poland

Lisowski, A.  (2003). *Koncepcje Przestrzeni w Geografii Człowieka*. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski.

LPR (2004). *Lokalny Program Rewitalizacji Miasta Stołecznego Warszawy na lata 2005-2013* Urząd M.st. Warszawy (2004) Warszawa [*Local Urban Renewal Programme for the City of Warsaw 2005-2013*]

Łukasiuk (2007). *Obcy w mieście. Migracja do współczesnej Warszawy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Żak.

Majewski, J.S. (2010). *Spacerownik. Warszawa Śladami PRL-u* [Book of Walks. Landmarks of People's Poland in Warsaw]. Biblioteka Gazety Wyborczej. Warszawa: Agora SA.

Mazur, M. (2012). *Witajcie na Ursynowie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Myśliński.

Mollenkopf J.H., Castells M. (eds) (1991) *The Dual City: Restructuring New York*, USA: Russell Sage Foundation

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Putnam R. D. (2007) *E Pluribus Unum : Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture*. Scandinavian Political Studies, Vol. 30 – No. 2, pp. 137-174

Sheller, M., and J. Urry. (2006). *The new mobilities paradigm*. Environment and Planning A 38: 207–26

Tasan-Kok T., Kempen van R., Raco M., Bolt G. (2014). *Towards Hyper-Diversified European Cities. A critical Literature Review*. Utrecht: Utrecht University

Tönnies F. (1929). *Soziologische Studien und Kritiken*, 3 vols, Jena: Fischer

Tuan, Y.F. (1977). *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

U of M (2008). *Social Capital and our Community*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota

Webber M.W. (1964). *The Urban Place and the Nonplace Urban Realm*. In M.M. Webber, J. W. Dyckman, D. L Foley, A.Z. Guttenberg, W. L.C. Wheaton, C. Bauer Wurster (Eds.) *Explorations into Urban Structure* (pp. 79-153). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Webber  M. W. (1963). Order in Diversity: community without propinquity in: Wingo, Lowdon Jr. (ed) *Cities and Space: The Future Use of Urban Land*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press


ZPR  (2015). *Zintegrowany Program Rewitalizacji Miasta St. Warszawy* Warszawa: Urząd M.st. Warszawy [*Integrated Urban Renewal Programme for the City of Warsaw*]