Culture as Exclusion? Migrants and Exclusive Spatial Demarcation in the City

Matjaz Ursic

EURODIV PAPER 45.2007

DECEMBER 2007

KTHC - Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital

Matjaz Ursic, *Centre for Spatial Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences University of Ljubljana*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Series Index:
http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/EURODIVPapers/default.htm

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

Corso Magenta, 63, 20123 Milano (I), web site: www.feem.it, e-mail: working.papers@feem.it

The special issue on *Cultural Diversity* collects a selection of papers presented at the multidisciplinary and multinational Marie Curie project on "Cultural diversity in Europe: A series of Conferences" (EURODIV).

EURODIV focuses on cultural diversity in Europe and aims to understand the ways of dealing with diversity and its dynamics in the globalisation era. Its primary objective is to provide top-level training opportunities to researchers in the first years of their research career. EURODIV is a four-year project (2006-2009) co-ordinated by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM) and supported by the European Commission, Sixth Framework Programme, Marie Curie Conferences and Training Courses (contract no. MSCF-CT-2004-516670).

Schedule of Conferences:

- **First Conference "Understanding diversity: Mapping and measuring"**, 26-27 January 2006, FEEM, Milano, Italy. Contact person: Valeria Papponetti, valeria.papponetti@feem.it
- **Second Conference "Qualitative diversity research: Looking ahead"**, 19-20 September 2006, K.U.Leuven, Leuven, Belgium. Contact person: Maddy Janssens, maddy.janssens@econ.kuleuven.ac.be, and Patrizia Zanoni, patrizia.zanoni@kuleuven.ac.be
- **Third Conference "Diversity in cities: Visible and invisible walls"**, 11-12 September 2007, UCL, London, UK. Contact person: Valeria Papponetti, valeria.papponetti@feem.it
- **Fourth Conference "Diversity in cities: New models of governance"**, 16-17 September 2008, IPRS, Rome, Italy. Contact person: Raffaele Bracalenti, iprs.it@iprs.it
- **Fifth Conference "Dynamics of diversity in the globalisation era"**, 15-16 September 2009, FEEM, Milan, Italy. Contact person: Valeria Papponetti, valeria.papponetti@feem.it

EURODIV goes in parallel with SUS.DIV, the Network of Excellence on sustainable development in a diverse world. For further information on EURODIV and SUS.DIV, please visit the web site: www.ebos.com.cy/susdiv.

This batch of papers has been presented at the Third Conference "Diversity in cities: Visible and invisible walls"

Culture as Exclusion? Migrants and Exclusive Spatial Demarcation in the City

Summary

The main intention of the paper is to analyse the relationship between different groups of migrants and urban (public) spaces/places and environments in which they live. Some of the basic and simplified questions that could be formulated at this point are: How do the migrants 'use' urban space, for which purposes, with what intentions and why? What kind of resources (cultural, symbolic, ethnic, class) do they use when they try to penetrate into different segments of society and urban space? It is to discover the processes of cultural empowerment in an urban space – which culture actually dominates over different urban spaces and which are the potentials to develop diverse cultural identities in an urban space/place. These issues are presented on the case of Slovenia and especially its capital Ljubljana. Paper includes empirical evidence collected in various researches that were performed at the Centre for Spatial Sociology and other institutions dealing with urban and socio-cultural transformations in Slovenia.

Keywords: Migrants, Cultural Diversity, Heterogeneity, Urbanity, Exclusive/Inclusive Spatial Demarcation

JEL classification: Z1

Address for correspondence:

Matjaz Ursic
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ljubljana
Kardeljeva ploscad 5
1000 SI Ljubljana
Slovenia
Phone: +38615805349
E-mail: matjaz.ursic2@guest.arnes.si

Conference: Diversity in cities: Visible and invisible walls: EURODIV – Cultural diversity in Europe. Marie Curie Series of Conferences. University College London (UCL), 11th -12th September 2007, London, UK.

Title of the paper:

CULTURE AS EXCLUSION? MIGRANTS AND EXCLUSIVE SPATIAL DEMARCATION IN THE CITY

Matjaz Ursic,
Centre for Spatial Sociology,
Faculty of Social Sciences,
University of Ljubljana

1 Introduction – Immigrant Social Groups and the Transformation of Urban Space

Cities are not only the most densely populated pieces of land in a country but also present the most common surrounding where the majority of today's migrants have or will find their future home. According to the UN projections (2006) intense urban-rural migrations nowadays represent a powerful trend that is transforming the structure of (post)modern metropolis.[1] The approach adopted in this paper on migrations will be orientated on the inherent connection between cities and migrants which represents one of the most important elements in the processes of contemporary urban formation but is often put aside as less important or even latent, hidden characteristic of the city.

Ravenstein already in 1885 formulated several migration laws, which distinguish city and its urban environment as an important feature in the processes of migrations. Ravenstein for example identified that longer distance migration favours big city destinations. Larger cities thus represent migrant magnets, which largely attract population from other areas. Cities are often imagined as territories of opportunities and an ideal place where everybody can express his lifestyle or elevate his potentials and education. He also came to the conclusion that large towns grow more by migration than by natural increase. One of his most important findings

[1] In the year 2006, for the first time in history, more than 50 per cent of human population lived in urban areas (UN, 2006).

was the law of counterflow, which explains that every migration produces a movement in the opposite direction (although not necessarily of the same volume) (ibid.).

Despite the age of these ‘urban migration laws’, some of them still compatible with modern migration flows that occur in today’s world. Especially the law of counterflow can be translated into micro and macro analysis of migrations. If macro analyses of migrations largely depend on international, intra/intercontinental, interregional migrations processes, the purpose of micro analyses of migrations lies in detecting the sensible equilibrium between the ‘newcomers’ and their influence, effect on the urban environment and everyday life in a city. The law of counterflow could then be explained through a process of continuous transformation of urban environment which includes migrations as a necessary and useful element in the development of a city.

2 ‘Exclusive’ vs. ‘Inclusive’ Spatial Demarcation

Many classics of sociology describe migrants as an important element of the so-called city ‘urbanity’ or urbanism. Lefebvre (1974/1991, 1996) describes urbanity or “urban centrality” as a wide spectrum of elements that include numerous personal encounters, contacts, cultural and ethnical heterogeneity, arts and artistic artefacts, unpredictability, playground, exchange of diverse impulses etc. Simmel (1901) states that the city indeed represents an area of more reserved and at first glance insensible individuals but at the same time adds that this is rather a consequence of extremely rich and diversified impulses that the individual must take into consideration. Due to the richness of impulses the city resident has to form a special defence mechanism that looks like a mixture of emotional and perceptual insensitiveness, indifference, restraint and sometimes even rudeness. Parallel to formation of individualized processes of defence, the city offers a large number of positive qualities, which are best described as the increase of individual freedom and action. Contrary to small, traditional and rural communities,[2] the city enables to an individual to develop his hidden, individual agenda and supports/tolerates specialisation and uniqueness.

[2] Mumford (1968) describes how the specialisation of functions helped the cities to concentrate social and economic resources and establish hierarchy in confront to villages. Similarly, Tönnies (1887/1999) describes the differences between rural and urban communities on the basis of duality »gemeinschaft« - »gesellschaft«.

When Wirth (1938/2000) describes the “urban way of life” by three most important dimensions (size of population aggregate, density and heterogeneity), he asserts that by leaving out just one of those dimensions, the city looses its urbanity. In this sense, leaving out or diminishing heterogeneity by excluding various migrant groups that represent important cultural and ethnic elements of city heterogeneity, would also result in the diminishment of urbanity in the city. Edensor (2000) asserts that we should put more effort to differentiate between “exclusive” and “inclusive spatial demarcation” (2000:124) in order to expose the mechanisms of exclusion. The first one extracts and marginalizes bodies that are defined as external, different, inappropriate and tries to control them by limiting them into certain city areas - “far from the eye far from the heart”. By establishing cognitive boundaries in the city, the areas loose heterogeneity and standards are set in order to mediate only ‘clean, disinfected’ urban impulses, experiences to individuals and visitors.

Urban environments are a product of continuous discourse between various interest groups, which beside inhabitants, visitors, politicians, economists, town planners, sociologists include also various non-empowered social groups. One of those groups are also immigrants, which with their socio-cultural background that differentiates them in relation to the host and dominating socio-cultural structure, undoubtedly introduce new, confusing and potentially conflicting elements in the city. These ‘non-standardised’ elements in the city immediately trigger the process of dialogisation and negotiation with the dominating culture. In some cases the confrontation between immigrant and host socio-cultural spheres is so tense that produces negative effects in the society but in majority of cases immigrants represent an important part of heterogeneity that stimulates the development of the city.[3] Because of this reason it is necessary to include heterogeneity as an important element of local environment and assign it a place of importance in the problematic of urban structuration. Non-balanced or exclusive strategy of socio-spatial development without co-ordinated comprehension, inclusion of various social, cultural, economic and political factors can provoke asymmetrical urban development, diminish heterogeneity and cause segregation i.e. limitation of certain ethnic groups to a specific city district.

[3] Cultural diversity may very well be an important aspect of urban diversity with consequences on local production and/or consumption. For example, Jacobs (1961/1994) sees economic diversity as the key factor of a city’s success. Sassen (1994) studies ‘global cities’ (London, Paris, New York, Tokyo) and their strategic role in the development of global economic activities. A key feature of these cities is the cultural diversity of their populations. Similarly, Bairoch (1998) sees cities and their diversity as the engine of economic growth. One of today’s most influential socio-economic writers Florida (2003) argues that ‘diverse’ and tolerant cities, are more likely to be populated by creative people and to attract industries such as high tech and research that rely on creativity and innovative ability.

The main intention of this paper is to unfold and analyse some of the elements of the relationship between different social and cultural groups of migrants and the urban (public) environment in which they live. It is to discover the processes of empowerment in an urban space - who actually dominates over different urban spaces and which are the potentials to develop socially, culturally and ethnically heterogeneous i.e. inclusive urban spaces in the city.

3 Exclusion on the basis of cultural differences

When analysing relationships between various social and cultural groups in a city, we should not consider only visible or transparent reasons which force some group to behave in a certain way but also pay regard to the broader issues which derive from political, ideological, economical and cultural decisions of the society. We should take into account all possible elements of "social ecology" (Davis, 1998) i.e. socio-political environment in which various groups of inhabitants are living. In other words, certain unofficial rules, principles and laws that the individual does not even perceive but function as 'soft' coercive measures, may govern i.e. organize the routine of his everyday life in his environment.[4] Mutual interaction between physical, institutional and various soft/hard socio-cultural elements is realised in a specific and unique organisation of urban environment.

In this sense it is important to make a clear distinction between legality and legitimacy in organisation of urban space. Although modern societies introduced legality as a constitutive and formally necessary element of democratic decision-making that does not mean that legality represents a sufficient form of support for the implementation of these decisions. If legality i.e. normative judgements were sufficient for the implementation of democratic decisions, then exclusive spatial demarcation of specific cultural groups, their lifestyles, artefacts and symbolic representations, would not function in contemporary cities. Many legally accepted democratic decision about interventions in space cannot be implemented due

[4] Giddens (1984: 173-177) mentions "structural constraint" which derives from contextuality in which the individual or a group are embedded. Structural constraint represents a situation where an individual is in a position to choose between different options but due to certain personal and societal motives immediately narrows the choice. This mechanism of self-censorship (cost-benefit analyse) is a product of social processes and specific spatial circumstances in which is embedded.

to low legitimacy i.e. lack of support and open/hidden opposition on the level of important actors (local inhabitants, opinion leaders) in specific urban environments. It is clear that non-legitimacy does not diminish or cancel the legality of democratic decision-making. However, it has to be acknowledged that non-legitimacy i.e. strong opposition by the civil society can prevent implementation of certain democratic decisions and subordinate legality to legitimacy.[5]

The concept of multiculturalism which emerged in 1970s and 1980s is a good example how legally approved democratic decisions can in the phase of implementation, due to low legitimacy in the sphere of civil society, transform into a mechanism that marginalises foreign elements from the dominating culture. First policies of multiculturalism were orientated towards the diminishment of material i.e. distributional elements of social exclusion such as access to social resources, labour market and financial support. Multiculturalism was understood as an "attempt to use cultural differences as a way to gain leverage for state recognition of minorities, resource allocation and equality" (Babacan, 2003: 3). Cultural diversity was used as a tool to identify various ethnic communities within a given territory and recognize their cultural claims. The new forms of multiculturalism that have emerged in 1990s and 2000s questioned the validity of such claims and tried to "separate out issues of social justice and equality from that of cultural difference" (ibid.). New policies of multiculturalism are an attempt to redirect the focus from distributional to relational dimensions of stratification and disadvantage such as recognition of identity, racism at societal level and the nature of relationships between communities, governments and others.

Incirliogu and Tandogan (1999: 135) wrote that the limited understanding of multiculturalism still represents and obstacle to the betterment of multicultural human contact. The problem originates in the prevalence of multiculturalism over cosmopolitism in the discussions of cultural diversity among both policy-makers and academicians. Cosmopolitanism is understood as an attitude which enables the individuals to "develop an understanding of other cultures which are not Other any more as they have become an integral part of a cosmopolitan

---

[5] There exist a number of cases of NIMBY syndrome in which local inhabitants (civil society groups) by open or hidden opposition prevented the installation of certain socially, culturally, physically 'non-acceptable' groups (immigrants, people with special needs) and services (social centres) in their environment. One of the most famous NIMBY cases that was/is related to ethnic minorities in Slovenia is the problematic of mosque construction in Ljubljana. Regardless the law which permits the construction of religious buildings in Slovenia, due to strong public opposition by local inhabitants, the local authorities did not yet define the exact location of the first mosque that should be built in Ljubljana (for details see Kos 2002).

identity" (ibid.).[6] In confront to multiculturalism, cosmopolitanism to a greater degree emphasises the importance of harmonious coexistence of diverse cultures and does not try to extrapolate cultural differences in order to isolate them in society. Incirliogu and Tandogan emphasise the significance of the concept of 'cultural autonomy' in European countries and point out that although policies of multiculturalism long for the betterment of human relations in society, they still leave a lot of space for isolation, discrimination and marginalisation of foreign elements from the European culture. In this sense, the authors note that: "the notion of multiculturalism which seems to be politically correct, at least for liberals and democrats, has not yet become an integral part of everyday practices. In fact, there is more evidence indicating disintegration rather than integration." (1999: 137)

Inconsistency between the discourse of multiculturalism and the common forms of open and subtle discrimination on the level of everyday life call attention to the fact that cultural diversity and cultural disintegration may be inevitably linked. There exist many forms of social exclusion based on cultural differences; some of them are more 'open' i.e. easy to percept, while the other seem to be more hidden and subtle. Hollingsworth (1998) and Baldessar (1992) mention the following forms of social exclusion: Distancing, Indifference, Stigmatisation, Objectification, Exoticisation, Differential Citizenship.

The presence of various cultural groups on the same territory automatically raises some questions and possible conflicts which are directly linked to space and expression of 'placeness'. Placeness is best presented by symbols, signs, pictures and may be described as "economy of signs and space" (Lash, Urry, 1994) in a public space. Visualisation of culture in a public place is an important element of (post)modern cities and is performed by all social groups without any exceptions. Incirliogu and Tandogan (1999) not only describe the forms of social exclusion that can be put in the category of visual (aesthetic) discrimination but also give examples of social restrictions which are auditory and olfactory (picture 3.1). Discrimination on the basis of taste, smell and food is one of more the more subtle and frequent forms of social exclusion in present societies.

[6] Hannerz (1996: 103) asserts that: "cosmopolitanism is first of all an orientation, a willingness to engage with the Other. It is an intellectual and aesthetic stance of openness toward divergent cultural experiences, a search for contrasts rather than uniformity."

Picture 3.1: "Burek" – a dish originating from east and mainly sold by the Albanian community in Ljubljana

Source: http://www.bregar.si/gimi/images/burek_340.jpg (5.9.2005)

Still more, sometimes the result of the internalisation of this exclusion is that "powerless individuals censor themselves and self-impose limitations" (1999: 139) not to expose their cultural affinity. Whether forced, subtle or internalized, social exclusion is readily explained by cultural differences which are usually reformulated in more acceptable arguments and presumably base in an objective position. For example, the cultural differences can be translated into health-related arguments (less hygienic, less healthy) or aesthetic arguments, assuming that there exists some sense of universal aesthetics that applies to all humanity beyond culture. These very subtle forms of discrimination or marginalisation of foreign cultural elements result in social exclusion of powerless groups from supposedly all inclusive public spaces and can in worse cases lead to enclavisation, reification and sometimes also ghettoisation of immigrant communities from the majority. In the next paragraph we will try

to illustrate how are these subtle forms of social exclusion represented in the case of Ljubljana.[7]

4 The case of Ljubljana

People tend to organize their everyday activities on the basis of certain cognitive spatial hierarchies i.e. ideologies which form the "cognitive image of the city" (Lynch, 1974). This cognitive image represents how visitors and inhabitants think of the city, how they function in it and what is important for them; in short – how they constitute the 'cognitive cultural hierarchy' of the city. The inhabitants of Ljubljana are not any exception in this case. A Slovenian sociologist Braco Rotar in 1985 identified eight 'ideological registers' which constituted the cognitive image of Ljubljana. The registers are:

1) nationalism and familiarity,
2) moral, philanthropy and social peace
3) organicism and mechanicism
4) technicism and progress
5) health and hygiene
6) elitism, aestheticism and individualism
7) ideology of symbolic and
8) utilitarianism.

Some of this urban ideological registers, especially under the numbers: 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7 are directly linked to the treatment and inclusion of immigrants in the urban structure. There exist several reports and researches which deal with the perception i.e. cognitive image of the city and immigrants in Slovenia. For example, Mežnarić (1986) carried out a research with the title: "Bosnians" - Where do Slovenians go on Sundays?". The research results indicated that there might exist a cultural gap between the communities of immigrants[8] and Slovenian

---

[7] Ljubljana is with approximately 280.000 people (450.000 in the whole city region) the biggest city and capital of Slovenia. Ljubljana account for 28 per cent of the total urban housing stock, followed by Maribor (the second largest city) and Koper (SURS, 2002).

[8] In majority of cases, we refer to groups of immigrants that come from ex-Yugoslavia. The total number of immigrants from former Federal Yugoslavia in Slovenia was according to population census in 2002 approximately 150.763. The most numerous groups include both first and second generation immigrants that mainly originate from Bosnia (aprox. 68.000 people), Croatia (aprox. 50.000) and Serbia (aprox. 30.000). More

population. The results showed that some segments of immigrant population are much more 'urbanizened'[9] and 'city oriented' in confront to Slovenian residents.

Another useful research has been made by the Centre for Spatial Sociology on the Faculty for Social Sciences. In the research: Sights of Ljubljana (Kos et al, 2001), a group of important city 'actors' (persons from politics, economy, culture and science) were interviewed to freely express their ideas about the social structure of Ljubljana. The result showed many positive but also negative (mis)perceptions i.e. ideological registers in the concepts of some highly educated Ljubljana citizens. These results also indicate that there exists a very high level of stigmatisation of immigrants and other marginal groups, although they are not so numerous in the city.

The data from the research project Re-Urban Mobil (2004) in which we analysed the structure of the population in the centre of Ljubljana showed a very homogenous ethnic composition of the city centre. The large majority of respondents were Slovenians (98%) what indicates to a very homogeneous ethnic structure of the city centre neighbourhoods. Larger communities of immigrants are found at the outskirts of the city, where the most numerous groups include both first and second generation immigrants that originate from ex-Yugoslavia. In general the overall ethnic structure in Slovenia is very homogeneous. Population Census data (2002) show that 83% of Slovenia's population declared themselves to be Slovenians. The ethnic composition in Ljubljana does not change significantly when observing the other members of the households (the share of non-Slovenians never exceeds 4%). Compared to other capital cities in Europe the heterogeneity of population in Ljubljana is rather low (table 4.1).

---

than a third of these immigrants lived in Slovenia for more than 30 years, which correspond to the most intensive industrialisation migration flows in the 1970s (Mandič et al, 2004: 26).

[9] In this case the idea of urbanity is linked with the engagement in free time activities. The research for example indicates that Slovenian ethnic population prefers to spend weekend activities outside of the city (walks in the nature, work around small cottages) while the immigrant groups prefer to stay and engage in activities that take place in the urban environment.

Table 4.1: Population in Ljubljana by mother tongue

	Per Cent
Total Population	100
Albanian	0,5
Bosnian	3,4
Croatian	3,9
German	0,1
Hungarian	0,1
Italian	0,1
Macedonian	0,5
Romany	0,1
Serbian	4,1
Serbo-Croat	3,8
Slovene	78,9
Other	0,5
Unknown	4,1

Source: Re-Urban Mobil, 2004; Rapid Reports, 2003

Although the total number of immigrants and other foreign groups is not so big, there still exist some larger city districts which are due to a higher number of non-slovenian ethnic communities highly stigmatised and subtly marginalised. In this context we have to mention the case of neighbourhood Fužine,[10] which is an estate with a particularly heterogeneous ethnical structure and is in contrast to other estates in Ljubljana to a great deal stigmatised and marginalised. The results from the research Re-Urban Mobil (2004) showed that a big number of interviewers chose Fužine and Moste (neighbourhood in vicinity to Fužine) as places where they would definitely not prefer to live. Fužine and Moste were ranked as first and second area on the list of places where the residents of Ljubljana would definitely not like to live. Although the overall quality of life and access to services in those neighbourhoods is not low, it happens that they are stigmatised on the basis of presence of cultural diversity.

[10] The development plan for the Fužine neighbourhood was drawn up for approximately 4.500 dwellings with accompanying services for approximately 15.000 inhabitants. The construction of housing complex started in 1977 and was completed in 1981.

Especially the neighbourhood Fužine (picture 4.1), where the housing standard is pretty high but the prices of apartment never achieve high prices on the housing market in Ljubljana. It seems that the actual quality of life in this neighbourhood is not proportionally reflected in the prices of the apartments due to negative image of the neighbourhood in public.

Picture 4.1: Housing units in the estate of Fužine

Source: http://www.restate.geog.uu.nl/conference (access on 25.6.2007)

The ethnic structure of the neighbourhood Fužine is more heterogeneous that some other parts of Ljubljana, but not also not so different from other very homogenous districts in the city. Unfortunately it is not possible to possess reliable data about the ethnic origin of the residents, so the majority of information are mainly gathered on the bases of interviews from the research project RESTATE (2003). Even though the ethnic structure is very diverse with predominating groups of Serbs, Croats and Bosnians, according to interviewees there are no significant conflicts arising from these ethnic differences. One of the important links between the different national groups present "the children who attend the same school, so the parents learn to know each other and interrelate through the friendship of their children" (Černič et al, 2003: 49). One of more interesting characteristics of the estate is the structure of free-time activities of residents. In interviews was mentioned that sporting activities were somehow specific for the members of other ethnic groups (mostly Bosnians), as they often go bowling, or play football, while Slovenians are said to prefer walking in the countryside (ibid.).

Although the estate does not have significant ethnic problems, it is facing other socio-economic problems. Especially the high rate of unemployment which is 20 per cent higher that for Ljubljana as a whole, drug abuse and drug dealing are usually stated as the most important related problem. However, the experts in different fields, such as police officers,[11] sociologists and social workers "stress that the levels of criminal activity in Fužine are no significantly higher than in other estates in Ljubljana" (Černič et al, 2003: 51) the estate is not favoured by the indigenous population and has been stigmatised as a residential area for the 'southerners' (as the original Slovenes derogatively refer to them). In the case of Fužine it is important to state that it represents the largest and most densely populated estate in Ljubljana and Slovenia but when occurrences of criminal offences are reported in numbers, people do not connect them with the population density. Instead they tend to stigmatise the neighbourhood on the basis of frequent media reports, which seek scandalous and shocking news stories.[12]

The bad reputation of the neighbourhood is unjustified in many respects as the physical condition of the buildings and dwelling is fairly good. The negative image of the estate has not yet caused any problems but due to the diminishment of market value of housing units in confront to other parts of Ljubljana, it is expected to trigger the effect of outward migration from the estate of more affluent residents. Some indicators of this trend have already been noticed as the affluent residents stated that they feel uneasy about living in a stigmatised neighbourhood. The consequence of this is the increase population mobility in the estate of Fužine.[13] With affluent residents moving out the problems of managing and maintaining the buildings and individual dwellings are in increase and the circle of possible gradual deterioration of the neighbourhood is closed.

In general, we may assume that most of the problems mentioned by the stakeholders on the estate relate to its stigmatisation. In this sense it is important to mention the overall high level

---

[11] According to police data, the occurrence of criminal behaviour in Fužine is no exceptional in comparison with similar housing estates. Crime rates are no higher than in any other neighbourhood in the town and the area is not the most problematic (Černič et al, 2003: 52).

[12] Horvat, Verscueren and Žagar in The rhetoric of refugee policies in Slovenia – The pragmatics of legitimisation (2001) describe the results of a research project that analysed how Slovenian media report about illegal immigrants and refugees. The results showed that the ideological process of subtle marginalisation of foreign, non-indigenous elements is deeply rotted in Slovenian media.

[13] The study showed that fluctuation in Fužine was 20 per cent higher that the level in comparable neighbourhoods both for owner-occupiers and for those exchanging apartments within the social sector (Černič Mali, 1991, 2003).

of stigmatisation of foreign cultural elements in Slovenian society. According to the data from periodic i.e. longitudinal research project Slovenian public opinion, the residents of Slovenia are highly intolerant in relation to various ethnic and cultural groups. The question – "Who would you prefer not to be your neighbour?" revealed that the majority of respondents would prefer not to have any neighbour with characteristics that differ from dominating cultural standards (table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Who would you prefer not to be your neighbour?

Categories of people	**In percent**
Drug addicts	79,1 %
Drinkers	75,8 %
Homosexuals	55,1 %
Right-wing extremists	51,3 %
Left-wing extremists	48,4 %
Roma	48,3 %
Judicially punished	46,7 %
People with aids	46,4 %
Emotionally unstable people	40,9 %
Muslims	29,0 %
Immigrants, foreign workers	28,8 %
Jews	22,1 %
People of other races	20,1 %
People with big families	10,4 %

Source: SJM 2000

The highest on the list of unwanted neighbours are drug addicts (79,1%) and drinkers (75,8%), followed by homosexuals (55,1%), right-wing (51,3%) and left-wing extremists (48,4%). Roma people rank the highest between the ethnic groups (48,3) and are followed by the group of judicially punished, people with aids and emotionally unstable people. What is particularly interesting is the high rank of Jewish people which do not represent even 0, 01 % of the total population in Slovenia (see table 4.3). Particular is also the rejection of people

with big families (10,4%) what can be explained by extremely low tolerance of any noise in street.[14]

Table 4.3: Population by ethnic affiliation

	1953	1961	1971	1981	1991	2001
Declared ethnical affiliation						
Slovenes	96,52	95,65	94,04	90,77	88,31	83,06
Italians	0,06	0,19	0,18	0,12	0,15	0,11
Hungarians	0,75	0,66	0,53	0,48	0,42	0,32
Roma	0,12	0,01	0,06	0,08	0,12	0,17
Albanians	0,01	0,02	0,08	0,11	0,18	0,31
Austrians	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,01
Bulgarians	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Bosniaks	…	…	…	…	…	1,10
Czechs	0,06	0,04	0,03	0,02	0,02	0,01
Montenegrins	0,09	0,09	0,12	0,17	0,23	0,14
Greeks	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Croats	1,23	1,97	2,47	2,93	2,76	1,81
Jews	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Macedonians	0,04	0,06	0,09	0,18	0,23	0,20
Muslims	0,11	0,03	0,19	0,73	1,39	0,53
Germans	0,11	0,05	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,03
Poles	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
Romanians	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,01
Russians	0,04	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,02
Russinians	0,00	0,02	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Slovaks	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,01
Serbs	0,77	0,86	1,20	2,27	2,48	1,98
Turks	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,01
Ukrainians	...	...	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,02
Vlachs	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Others	0,02	0,03	0,02	0,03	0,05	0,08

*Data for the years 1971, 1981 and 1991 recalculated according to the 2002 Census methodology. So called "migrant workers" are covered. At 1953 and 1961 censuses the category of "migrant workers" did not exist. Declaration for a Bosniak as a nation was enforced by the Constitution of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1994. In 1953 and 1961 censuses the Russians and the Ukrainians appear under one item.

Source: Population census 2002

The data from various research projects show that the overall number of immigrant population in Slovenia is not proportional to extremely negative perception of indigenous

[14] In the research project RE-Urban Mobil (2004) the majority of respondents in Ljubljana mentioned noise in the street as one of the most disturbing elements in their living environment.

majority. The problem of marginalisation of foreign elements from the dominant culture may in the following years lead to severe conflicts and possible further stigmatisation and degradation of immigrant communities. The population projections of Slovenia and inverted population age pyramid[15] indicate that the deficit in the number of population will result in the need to increase the number of working population by migrations. After some estimation, by the end of 2036 Slovenia might need/have up to 290.000 net migration increase (table 4.4).

Table 4.4: Number of inhabitants and net migration increase (MI) in Slovenia - projection 2001- 2036

Projection Year		Possible migration scenarios		
		Low	Middle	High
2011	Number	1.969.205	1.970.986	1.976.612
	MI	**32.407**	**34.188**	**35.571**
2021	Number	1.908.769	1.936.316	1.971.876
	MI	**71.101**	**87.860**	**102.203**
2036	Number	1.748.679	1.877.436	2.008.483
	MI	**146.214**	**217.943**	**292.819**

Source: Malačič, 2003, pp. 352-360.

Projections in table 4.5 show three possible scenarios of migration needs of Slovenia – low, middle and high. If the scenario of low migration increase gets realized, than Slovenia will in 2011 need up to 32.407 people to keep the current level of population.[16] On the other extreme, if the scenario of high migration increase gets realized, Slovenia will need approximately 35.571 new inhabitants by the year 2011, 102.203 by the year 2021 and more than 290.000 in the year 2036. Whatever scenario, low, middle or high gets realised in the following years, Slovenia will undoubtedly need at least 140.000 new inhabitants by the year 2036 if it want to preserve the present number of inhabitants. New immigrants will introduce new cultural elements into a momentarily highly homogenised society what may result into conflicts, isolation and marginalisation of immigrant communities if their needs for social inclusion are

[15] Similarly to other economically developed European countries, Slovenia is experiencing the trend of diminishing net population increase. The rate of mortality and net population increase are almost proportionate (for details see SURS, 2005). The population age pyramid is inverted, with increasing number of people in older generation groups.
[16] The total number of population in Slovenia is 2.011.374 (SURS, 2007).

not adequately met. In the end these leads to a more general question - what kind of elements must a city develop/support in order to be or become a more socially inclusive and culturally diverse structure?

5 Conclusion - From 'Ideological Urban Structuring' to 'Open Urbanism'

The prevailing opinion of many city municipalities is that efforts to decrease social and cultural exclusion and support diversity rely on national and state social policies of public education, health care, and income support. Contrary to this opinions social inclusion also depends on the quality of the countless small and subtle interactions that occur on the level of everyday life and includes not only various empowered individuals, social groups, and institutions but also marginalised social groups that exist in a city. City municipalities have a difficult and responsible task to develop local policies that manage diversity and integrate immigrants and long-established residents into a dynamic social, economic, and political environment. In this context, they can mitigate the practices of exclusion and segregation that can be especially felt in public city spaces.

Cities have the possibility to organize and regulate many activities of daily urban life which at first glance seem prosaic, but are in fact of crucial importance when trying to establishing inclusive spatial policies for all groups of residents. Two of the most important ways of encouraging the two-way integration between immigrants and receiving communities are undoubtedly the access to public spaces and access to public services and goods. The assurance of inclusive building codes, management of social housing, police, schools and transportation services for a range of social groups are issues that can make a big difference on the level of preventing isolation, enclavization and marginalization of immigrant communities.[17]

According to social scientist like Jacobs (1961/1994), Sassen (1994), Bairoch (1998) and Florida (2003), cities will be on the long-term scale able to draw many benefits from the

[17] Ray (2003) identifies a number of urban elements that can foster urban environments to become more inclusive: street design, pricing and availability of public transportation, location and accessibility of employment, management of schools, economic development that benefits a range of social groups, enforcement of employment codes, commercial regulations, and by-laws, pricing and servicing industrial land etc.

policies that support cultural and social inclusion. Places that built their strategy on polices of soft i.e. subtle exclusion will on the other hand "struggle with urban landscapes and social environments that seem ill-equipped to capitalize on the opportunities commonly associated with cultural diversity in a post-industrial economy" (Ray, 2003). If the process of exclusion of migrations (immigrants) from the urban environment continues, the more difficult will be the revitalisation of the city and its surroundings. In some societies, the reply to this ideological urban structuring is found in the concept of open i.e. 'inclusive urbanism' (Chase, Crawford, 1999), which enables to restore the urban community and form an equilibrium between the immigrants and the local community. Open urbanism consists from participatory regulation and spatial planning that tries to avoid/soften structural constraints that derive from outside the local community (from formal legal system, various interest groups). The development of open urbanism mechanisms will be possible only if a common interdisciplinary discursive field (especially between urbanism, architecture and sociology) is to be constituted and which will succeed to combine i.e. take under consideration not only various scientific (social, technical) disciplines and members of culturally dominant interest groups but also various socially and culturally marginalized groups that are in fact latently already involved in the process of spatial planning and urban management.

References:

(2000). SJM – Slovenian Public Opinion Research. Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences.

(2002, 2004, 2006, 2007). SURS (Statistični urad Republike Slovenije). On: http://www.stat.si/ (1.6.2007).

(2004). Reurbanizacija stanovanjskih območij v mestnih jedrih (skupni raziskovalni projekt Re-Urban Mobil): Zaključno poročilo. Ljubljana, Fakulteta za družbene vede (IDV) in Mestna občina Ljubljana (Oddelek za urbanizem).

(2006). United Nations. Dept. of Economic and Social Affairs. Population Division. World urbanization prospects: the 2006 revision. On: http://www.un.org/esa/population/unpop.htm (24.6.2007).

Babacan, H. (2003). Cultural Diversity - Striving for Social Inclusion (Conference Proceedings). Melbourne, Common Ground Publishing.

Baldassar L. (1992) Italo-Australian Youth in Perth. In R. Bosworth and R. Ugolini (ed.): War, Internment and Mass Migration – The Italo-Australian Experience, 1940-1990, Rome: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale, pp. 207-224.

Bairoch P. (1988) Cities and Economic Development: from the Dawn of History to the Present. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Chase, J., Crawford, M. et al. (1999). Everyday urbanism: featuring John Chase. [et al.]; edited by John Chase, Margaret Crawford, and John Kaliski. New York, N.Y., Monacelli Press.

Černič Mali, B., Sendi, R. et al. (2003). Large housing estates in Slovenia: overview of developments and problems in Ljubljana and Koper (RESTATE report). Utrecht, Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University.

Davis, M. (1998). Ecology of Fear: Los Angeles and the Imagination of Disaster. New York, Metropolitan Books.

Edensor, T. (2001). Moving Through the City. In: City Visions. D. Bell in A. Haddour (ed.). Harlow, Pearson Education Limited, pp. 121-140.

Florida, R. (2002). The Rise of the Creative Class. New York, Basic Books.

Giddens, A. (1990). The Consequences of Modernity. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Hannerz, U. (1996). Transnational Connections. London, Routledge.

Hollinsworth D., (1998) Race and Racism in Australia, 2nd ed., Katoomba Social Science Press.

Horvat, M. D., Verschueren, J. and Žagar, I. Ž. (2001). The rhetoric of refugee policies in Slovenia – The pragmatics of legitimisation. Ljubljana, Peace Institute.

Incirlioglu, E. O. and Tandogan Z. G. (1999). Cultural Diversity, Public Space, Aesthetics, and Power. In: City and Culture - Cultural Processes and Urban Sustainability. L. Nyström (ed.). Kalmar, Lenanders Tryckeri, pp. 135-147.

Jacobs, J. (1961/1994). The Death and Life of Great American Cities. St. Ives, Penguin Books Ltd.

Kos, D., Hočevar, M., Trček, F., Uršič M. (2001). Pogledi na Ljubljano - Ideje o razvoju: esejistična anketa. Ljubljana, Urbanistični inštitut Republike Slovenije.

Kos, D. (2002). Sociološke podobe Ljubljane. Ljubljana, Fakulteta za družbene vede.

Lash, S. and Urry J. (1994). Economies of Signs and Space. London, Sage.

Lefebvre, H. (1974/1991). The production of space. Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass., Blackwell.

Lefebvre, H. (1996). Writings on Cities. Oxford, Blackwell.

Lynch, K. (1960). The Image of the City. Cambridge, Massachusetts, The MIT Press.

Malačič, J. (2003). Demografija. Teorija, analiza, metode in modeli. (5. izdaja). (Population aging in Slovenia in the population projection 2001-2036: The case of natural increase and complete projection). Ljubljana, Ekonomska fakulteta.

Mandič, S., Boškić, R. et al. (2004). Policy Measures to Ensure Acess to Decent Housing for Migrants and Ethnic Minorities. Ljubljana.

Mežnarić, S. (1986). "Bosanci": a kuda idu Slovenci nedeljom? Ljubljana, Krt. Knjižnica revolucionarne teorije.

Mumford, L. (1968). The Urban Prospect. New York, London, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Ravenstein, E. 1876. The birthplaces of the people and the laws of migration. The Geographical Magazine 3:173-77, 201-6, 229-33.

Ray, B. (2003). The Role of Cities in Immigrant Integration. Washington, Migration Policy Institute.

Rotar, B. (1985). Risarji: učenjaki - Ideologije v urbanizmu in arhitekturi. Ljubljana, Delavska enotnost.

Sassen, S. (2002). Global Networks, Linked Cities. New York, London, Routledge.

Simmel, G. (1901, 2002). The Metropolis and Mental Life. On: http://www.scholars.nus.edu.sg/writing/ccwp11/simmel/metropolis.html (20.2.2002).

Tönnies, F. (1887/1999). Skupnost in družba: temeljni pojmi čiste sociologije. Ljubljana, Fakulteta za družbene vede.

Wirth, L. (1938/2000). Urbanism as a Way of Life. In: The City Reader - Second Edition. R. T. Le Gates in F. Stout (ed.). New York, London, Routledge, pp. 97-105.