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Summary

The report *Cities and Social Cohesion* popularizes the results of Social Polis with regard to the theme “Cohesion of the city as a whole”. It draws mainly on the two survey papers which deal with this theme (EF0 and EF12) but highlights from the other themes have been picked up as well. The report presents Social Polis as part of the current re-contextualisation of science where science and society has started to “reach out” to one another. The relationship between the researchers and the stakeholders serves as a red thread throughout the report. First of all, the report tries to gain a foothold in everyday European life by questioning the use of the concept of social cohesion. Is it really a general issue and is the issue everywhere known as social cohesion? If not, stakeholders do not know what the researchers are talking about. Moreover, the report makes sense of the European dimension by presenting results from Social Polis which explains differences and similarities respectively. It highlights to what extent practitioners working in urban neighbourhood around Europe face the same problems. It provides reasons for stakeholders to be interested in each others’ work and learn from each other. Furthermore, the report explains the approach to social cohesion maintained by Social Polis, understanding it as a problématique. The profound change of attention that this approach urges on means that problems have to be redefined, but not on the basis of the very powerful approach, called inclusive liberalism, which has come to dominate so much of thinking, policies and problem-solving in the last decades. Instead, a new approach is needed that treats the existing order as something created and temporal. Finally, this new approach has to be developed jointly with stakeholders. Social Polis favours a continued re-contextualisation of science by involving stakeholders on an equal footing.
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According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 27: “Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.” However, such a share in scientific advancement and its benefits has been obstructed by barriers and the autonomous position of science. A recent report from the European Commission by the MASIS Expert Group called *Challenging Futures of Science in Society* associates this position of science with a particular regime which emerged after World War II. In this regime, scientists were in a way protected from society and universities being funded for basic research, without any questions asked about relevance.

This regime has come under pressure during the last decades. According to the MASIS-report, “the old division of labour between fundamental and applied or problem-oriented research has almost disappeared, and with it, the functional distinctions between universities, public labs and industrial and other private research.” To a large extent, the context of science has changed. Science is in the process of being “re-contextualised”. Due to this process, science has started to “reach out” to society. In fact, science and society have started to reach out to one another as an increasing number of actors show an interest in science.

Currently, such actors are commonly called “stakeholders”, which means any person or organization that has legitimate interests in the interplay between science and society. In this report, I will use the term in this way. Stakeholders include practitioners in general, public sector workers, citizens, policy makers, young people, politicians, voluntaries etc.

Parallel to this trend of dismantling scientific barriers, involving stakeholders and making science more relevant to society, there is also another trend which reaffirms the autonomy of science under the traditional notion of “excellence”. This revival of “excellence” has been strengthened by the continuing emphasis on publication indicators (and
ISI journal publications) in assessments and evaluations. The MASIS-report criticises the one-sided emphasis on excellence, which runs the risk of endangering the pursuit of relevance and favours “decontextualized and globalised science while context-related and more local research, dedicated to specific problem solving, is disadvantaged. Sciences could lose their link to practice resulting from the pressure to publish in international journals instead of engaging in local environments and problem solving.”

However, relevance does not have to be regarded as contradictory to excellence. The MASIS-report underlines the compatibility and urges for a research “able to combine problem-solving capacities at a context-bound level and at a more general theoretical level”. This is of course not an easy task as the involvement of stakeholders in science challenges the role of science in society and the traditional academic freedom of researchers. Thus, it requires a change of “research cultures”, also underlined by the MASIS-report.

In line with the move towards making science more relevant and favouring the re-contextualisation of science in society, the European Commission issued a call in December 2006 for “a Social Platform on Cities and Social Cohesion”. At that time, the Social Platform was a new instrument which was to be tested for the first time in the area of urban development and cohesion. The proposal selected was called “SOCIAL POLIS - Social Platform on Cities and Social Cohesion” and the project started at the 1st of December 2007 with duration of 2 years (extended later with 1 year).

I was invited to one of the first conferences in Social Polis (SP), in February 2008. Subsequently, I became one of the stakeholders and visited most of the conferences opened to stakeholders. Furthermore, I involved other stakeholders in SP, particularly by organising a workshop in Malmö (November 2008) together with representatives from a local NGO called Drömmarnas Hus (the House of Dreams) and the Region Skåne. The three of us, jointly with two young people that had taken part in the Malmö workshop, also organised a workshop at the SP conference in Vienna (May 2009). At the end of the project, I was given the task to write this report, described by SP as a “production of educational resources for stakeholders”.

By writing this report, I take part in the fourth of what is described as four substantive contributions made by Social Polis. In total, many reports have been written, culminating in a focused research agenda and 13 survey papers on key issues of social cohesion in the city (corresponding to 13 Existential Fields). These papers will be published in the journal Urban Studies, but not until 2012. This indicates the
tension existing between the two trends referred to above. SP has been reaching out to stakeholders in line with the new regime of science, emphasising relevance. In contrast, the publication of the survey papers accords with the other regime mentioned by the MASIS-report, underlining excellence. Consequently, stakeholders will not be able to read, use and learn from these excellent papers produced by SP until long after the expiration of the project.

This makes the task of writing this report particularly difficult as I have got access to this wealth of research which I am asked to uncover, but of course not disclose fully and run the risk of spoiling the interest in reading the published articles. I am fully aware of this problem and full of respect for all the amount of work behind the survey papers, I have struggled to find a balance. For this reason, I have tried to make sure that this report does not look like a research report. Thus, I have not embarked on making judgements of the research. This is not intended to be a review.

Instead, I have tried to present highlights from the survey papers as appetizers, hopefully stimulating the interest of reading them. Thus, I have had to make selections and of course, these selections will not do justice to the survey papers. Indeed, this is not supposed to be a summary of them. In order to make the report accessible, I have been careful not to overburden it with too many concepts and ideas. The 13 survey papers are enumerated in the reference list. In this report, they will be referred to by number (EF0 to EF12).

The position I have chosen in writing this report can perhaps be described as one at the centre of the re-contextualisation referred to above. I have tried to approach the joint arena from the point of view of stakeholders. This means that the relationship between the researchers and the stakehold-
ers will serve as a kind of underlying theme throughout the report. By using examples presented at the workshops, I will try to provide a foothold in everyday European life. References will be made in accordance with the list at the end of this report to the reports and documentation from the international workshops organised by stakeholders (WA), local stakeholder meetings & workshops organised by lead partners (WB) and thematic working groups at the conference in Vienna (WC). More information can be obtained at the Social Polis website (http://www.socialpolis.eu/).

1. **Why social cohesion?**

Is social cohesion really an issue? For whom? Where is it regarded an issue? In Swedish it corresponds to “social sammanhållning” and that is not an issue. To be sure, related terms like integration are used, but not “social sammanhållning”. The term “social sammanhållning” is not on the political agenda. What about the rest of Europe? I have consulted some of the participants in SP to hear about the use of the term social cohesion in their country and language.

Andreas Novy from the Wirtschaftsuniversität in Vienna reports that social cohesion can be translated into both “Sozialer Zusammenhalt” and “Soziale Kohäsion”, the latter used only by a tiny part of the population. However, none of these terms is on the political agenda. In Spain, as Rocío Nogales from the European Research Network EMES relates, the term is on the political agenda, translated as “cohesión social”, and also quite uniformly understood by Spanish citizens, but it is mostly used by officials in public administrations and not frequently by practitioners. In the Netherlands, the term “social cohesion” has been widely used for about 8 years by politicians, administrators, policy makers, local professionals and others, according to Vasco Lub from Movisie:

*In Dutch we also refer to “sociale samenhang”, both terms are used interchangeably and are very common. This whole idea about social cohesion stems from a renewed interest in the problematique of deprived urban areas, a supposed lack of informal social control amongst residents and ethnic segregation. As a result, in hundreds of Dutch neighbourhoods social professionals are working on “social cohesion”. Social cohesion in the Netherlands mainly focuses on reviving relations between residents in the neighbourhood. It therefore has a narrow meaning. The idea is that a revitalization of social cohesion (relations among residents) increases informal control and therefore leads to less neighbourhood disorder, more informal care and support and less crime.*
Just these few examples show the difficulties with the term. In some parts of Europe it is more known than in others. Some use it and others do not. And even the ones that use it may understand it differently. This was made clear at some of the workshops, for example the one in Leuven:

_The Stakeholders asked for a clear definition of social cohesion. It seems to be a container concept, which is used and defined by many different actors in many different ways and thus seems to fit many different logics. New public funds have been created in order to subsidize ‘socially cohesive’ projects without really defining the concept of social cohesion. As a result, a whole number of projects are financed under the umbrella of social cohesion, while they actually have very little in common._ (WB2)

The point then is that stakeholders do not know what the researchers are talking about. SP invites stakeholders to a discussion with researchers, but the subject has already been set by the researchers. That would not necessarily be a problem if the stakeholders were familiar with the subject. But if they are not? What does the issue of social cohesion include?, a stakeholder would ask. Is the work that I do as a stakeholder included? Do my experiences count? What problems and experiences am I allowed to discuss in SP? The lack of familiarity with the issue creates uncertainty among stakeholders. How should they know what the issue includes? They would regard social cohesion an academic issue, as it does not stem from everyday life or even the public debate, and feel alien to it.

In fact, the concept of social cohesion seems problematic even for the researchers. Some of the EF survey papers admits this, in EF8 we read that it is “impossible to define social cohesion in a strict and definitive way”. However, when the researchers mention the reasons why social cohesion has become such a burning question, stakeholders certainly know what they are talking about. EF0 refers to the failure of existing integrative mechanisms through the labour market, the family, public institutions and the social networks. Stakeholders know a lot about these failures and would probably regard them as the burning questions, not social cohesion.

A term like social cohesion needs experiences to refer to. Otherwise it will not get a foothold in discussions and de-
bates. And for that reason, it may be difficult to use. I asked one of the other stakeholders in SP, Jim Segers from the international network City Mine(d) about its usefulness:

As an “activist/campaigner/do-er” I admit that I avoid those terms, but doing that is also very problematic; do things not come more fiercely into being by being named? And are we then dumbing down by not using the labels science has given to phenomena broader society only looks at in amazement without being able to interact with them? A related experience I had recently with City Mine(d): we are working a lot on public space, until only recently we became aware that for the majority of people the term “public space” is far too abstract. So now we communicate about “the streets, parks and squares we share with people we don’t know.” It speaks to more people. I don’t feel like we dumbed down, but rather, we took the long way round. We are trying to reach our audience a bit like Columbus tried to reach India (with the risk of reaching a completely different continent than the one we aimed for).

Integrative mechanisms through the labour market, the family, public institutions and the social networks have largely failed. This is universally perceived. But it is not universal to describe this failure in terms of social cohesion. That is why it is so important to stick to the experiences and descriptions of failure. All the failures mentioned by SP are burning
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Social Polis has resulted in four substantive contributions to research on urban dynamics in Europe:

1. A focused and critical overview of the state of the art in research on cities and social cohesion;
2. A focused research agenda, suitable for being used in five calls within the 7th Framework Programme in Social Sciences and the Humanities;
3. Establishment of a social platform uniting the research and stakeholders communities in furthering urban social cohesion; and
4. The production of educational resources for analysing the challenges of urban cohesion.

issues which stakeholders in general have a lot of experience of. But to call it a lack of social cohesion is something else.

This means that stakeholders have a lot of experience of what social cohesion is not, although they do not necessarily call it that. They know a lot about the problems which social cohesion is supposed to be a solution to. They know about the problems but they are not necessarily familiar with that particular naming of the general solution as social cohesion. If social cohesion is the solution, what is the problem?

2. THE LACK OF SOCIAL COHESION

Young people in many French suburbs know what a lack of social cohesion means. At the end of October 2005, two teenagers in the suburb Clichy-sous-Bois outside Paris were burnt to death at a transformer station. According to a rumour, the police had hunted the two boys and thereby caused their death. The very same evening, young people reacted on the rumour and the first cars were set on fire. Within a week, it had turned into a riot and spread to suburbs all around the country. Riots of young people have taken place in many cities across Europe in recent years. Besides setting cars, containers and buildings on fire, it has become increasingly common to attack fire prevention crews.

In November 2008, young people from areas in Malmö similar to the ones in France attended a workshop organised on behalf of Social Polis. The two most outspoken of these young people, Samira Hack and Bledar Zuta, worked at a place called the Green House, a meeting place for young people in the city district of Fosie in Malmö. The Green House offers a variety of activities for youngsters between the ages of 16 and 25 and is run by a group of young people, employed by the City District.
The location of the Green House is Hermodsdal, one of the most disadvantaged and multicultural neighbourhoods in Malmö, characterized like many other similar areas by a lack of opportunities for young people. There is little for them to do. Some become restless, hanging out in the streets during night-time. This in turn leads to disturbances and perhaps even crime. Young people feel excluded because of their background. In Hermodsdal, 54% of the population is born abroad.

Stakeholders all around Europe probably recognize this very well. They know that a lack of social cohesion often equates with deprived areas characterised by poverty, high levels of unemployment, overcrowded households, low housing standards and despair. In such areas, the frustration and tensions are often easily felt. And suddenly, cars are set on fire, as well as property and containers. What is the problem? The general public tends to blame the young people in these areas, as this is how they appear on the TV screen. They appear as problems. Otherwise, they do not appear at all and do not seem to exist. The young people could certainly feel that and that is another reason for them to react. Who wants to be non-existent?

And that is how young people have been perceived in Hermodsdal as well. In early 2006, the area became known all around Sweden. After several years of vandalism, fires, shattered windows and burglary, the disturbances reached its peak as a large part of the compulsory school was burned down in a supposed arson. The politicians and administration in the City District responded with a decision to close the school’s upper classes 7 to 9 (age 13-15) and the pupils were to be transferred to other schools. The decision caused general criticism among pupils, parents, teachers and the public. But despite protests, the upper classes were closed and for the first time in Swedish history, a school had been closed down in reaction to turmoil and disturbances.

But did that really solve the problem? And to what extent did it solve the right problem? Taken into consideration the findings of EF7, the closure of the school might just as well have worsened the problems. In multicultural cities, mainly in the most problematic urban areas, “the school is the only open door for the families to ask for diverse types of assistance”. This is one of two main challenges for schools in these areas referred to by EF7:

The second challenge is related to the difficulty to turn upside down the destiny of excluded communities through the education of children and young people. In most cases, instead of improving local communities’ life patterns schools seem to reproduce the deprivation of the area where they are located: degraded buildings.
If policy-makers do not fully understand this increased significance of schools as crucial agents of local development processes, it is not surprising because, as EF7 states, “the connection between the learning process and the local community is barely focused in the literature”. This relationship between learning as a mean to achieve social cohesion and the city as the active context of that process is regarded by EF7 as the main lacunae in the research literature. There is a lack of theoretical discussion, methodological reflection and empirical analysis.

3. **Context-sensitive approaches**

Thus, there might be many problems, but only a few of them appear on the TV screen. To understand the others, you need to live or work there. This means that the problems can’t be taken for granted, which EF0 also reminds us:

> To define what is to be considered as a problem is no simple, value-free decision. It implies deep insights into the life world of urban inhabitants as well as structural knowledge about causalities, contexts and time-space-regularities. (EF0)

In other words, problems are context-dependent. Therefore, the approaches need to be context-sensitive. That makes it crucial to understand differences between cities and countries across Europe. An important difference concerns the housing systems which, according to EF3, can be identified with regard to their place on a continuum between unitary and dualist models:
Unitary housing systems treat public and private sectors in a co-ordinated and flexible way to encourage affordable housing provision across tenures. Dualist systems typically privilege home ownership and operate systems of subsidy and access to social housing which emphasise its separation and stigmatisation as housing for the poor. (EF3)

EF3 highlights the widespread fragmentation experienced across Europe of previously more unitary housing systems. Arising from neo-liberal policies, privatisations and a withdrawal of the state has led to a convergence of housing systems towards the dualist model, associated with growing inequalities and insecurities. In terms of housing systems, cities across Europe tend to become less socially cohesive. Yet, significant differences remain between for example a city like Malmö and cities in Eastern Europe, where patterns of new housing inequalities have been particularly strong.

In Eastern Europe, fragmentation can appear in one and the same house. Iván Tosics from the Metropolitan Research Institute in Budapest expressed his worries in a thoughtful New Year card, containing the photo and the explanation below, which he has permitted me to use.

On the picture below you can see a prefabricated building in a Romanian city. Looking more into the details some peculiarities can be discovered. The guy in the upper left corner made a decision to insulate the walls of his flat. For the moment he is the only one in this part of the house. The colour became pink and the design of the facade panel has gone – but at least he sits in a bit warmer flat…

Some of the other owners, however, are also active. On the right hand side, just behind the corner you can see white pipes standing out of the wall. The families in these flats decided to quit district heating. Not having chimney in the house, they bought gas ovens and punched out their walls for the installation of their individual, horizontal chimneys…

These pictures illustrate my WORRIES. In eastern European cities, after full privatization of flats, families are very active and want to improve their lives. Some of them invest in insulation, others to introduce individual heating. However, these individual efforts prove to be counter-productive. The pipes deliver CO2 directly to the air (towards the flat above) and air quality on the housing estate deteriorates dramatically. Besides, the privately installed gas ovens increase the risk of gas explosion in large buildings.

Another dualism has appeared in immigration policies. According to EF2, it means that highly-skilled immigrants are provided work permits while simultaneously others are relegated to the status of undocumented workers, destined
to work in the informal economy. This dualism becomes particularly devastating for social cohesion in countries with deregulated labour markets.

This is perhaps the most important, policy-related conclusion of the social science literature on social polarisation: the interaction between deregulated labour markets and dualistic immigration policies, within the context of economic restructuring, poses a particular threat to social cohesion by exacerbating trends towards polarisation, labour market segmentation, social segregation, by increasing the pressure on wages and encouraging the criminalisation of immigrants. (EF2)

Yet, the devastating effects of these interactions between deregulated labour markets and dualistic immigration policies tend to be made issues of ethnicity. This is highlighted by EF9 as one of the shortcomings in the debates:

Cultural differences between different ethnic groups are often seen as the most decisive factor when trying to explain social problems. However, a cultural focus only is insufficient for understanding the problems in marginalized areas, as actually a whole range of differences produces unfairness and inequality. (EF9)

Due to increased migration, European cities are becoming more and more diverse. And yet, the role of the local ad-
ministration (municipality, public services) as an employer for migrants is underestimated, even though it is often the largest employer in the city. At the conference in Vienna, Hubert Krieger from Eurofound presented the result of a study which showed that “migrants are not only underrepresented in the urban workforce, the quality of their employment is also of a lower standard” (WC6a). Such findings show how cities may become part of the problems that they aim to solve.

4. **So what is social cohesion?**

A stakeholder would probably expect a solution to be defined. If burning cars and throwing stones indicate the problems, what characterises the state of social cohesion that could solve these problems? SP does not answer such questions but defines instead social cohesion as a problématique, which means a range of questions and challenges. Thus, stakeholders expect a solution, but get a problem. This is another serious challenge in the communication between researchers and practitioners. The reason for it, I think, is that the stakeholders deal with reality and the researchers with the concept. To the stakeholders, social cohesion means a reality urgent to work for. To the researchers, it means a concept; i.e. what SP calls a problématique.

It is like the ornithologist, using a pair of binoculars to watch birds. It is one thing to be interested in the birds; i.e. what to see. It is another thing to be interested in the pair of binoculars; i.e. how to see it. However, both the “what” and the “how” are of course important. It is the pair of binoculars that makes it possible to watch the birds and a stakeholder would of course be concerned to get hold of a good pair of binoculars. But the main interest is watching birds.

What do the researchers see in front of them when they talk about social cohesion? Do they have particular examples in mind? Are there particular cities or areas that have succeeded in achieving social cohesion and which could exemplify what it means? What would a socially cohesive city look like? However, this is not what the researchers have been pre-occupied with. They have mainly been concerned with the pair of binoculars, i.e. how to see it.

The problem has a lot to do with the particular term, social cohesion. It sounds so attractive and as EF2 puts it, “conjures up the image of a society that ‘hangs together’, that has sufficient unity to avoid continual conflict and division.” Who does not want to live in a socially cohesive city? Who wants the cars to be burned and stones to be thrown? The term carries a temptation that makes stakeholders inclined to understand it as a solution. In their practical reality, this is what
they are looking for, although they perhaps do not call it social cohesion. They are looking for solutions to problems. And suddenly somebody comes and talks about social cohesion. And it is not just anybody but a whole bunch of European researchers. They ought to know, stakeholders would probably think. They have the authority and legitimacy. But instead of talking about reality, the researchers seem to talk about a concept and not in terms of a solution but as a problem.

Indeed, the researchers have a lot to say about social cohesion as a problématique. It has its background in the emergence of capitalism. How is social cohesion possible in capitalism as a socio-economic order based on class cleavages and constant transformation? This question summarizes the problématique of social cohesion. Social cohesion is the solution to problems caused by capitalist modernisation. Because of capitalism, society is a contradictory whole. For that reason, social cohesion cannot be taken for granted. It is not something that exists naturally but has to be created in the shape of different approaches and these approaches have to be explained.

5. Blaming the Victims

In recent years, many stakeholders have experienced how the approach to individuals affected by unemployment, illness and poverty has become tougher. SP reveals the background of this particular approach, called inclusive liberalism. It draws on one of the classical sociologists, Emile Durkheim. In fact, Durkheim was the one that introduced the term social cohesion in a reflection on the social implications of modernisation. He tended to take the existing order for granted, blaming individuals for not adapting to it and thereby causing a lack of social cohesion.

This is the approach that has become the mainstream and it makes the existing social order appear as natural. As EF12 states, “the current concern for social cohesion came together with a world-wide policy shift towards a ‘caring neo-liberalism’”. It was a new concept within social policies for dealing with the negative consequences of the current capitalist development. In its pure form, neo-liberalism has been on the retreat since the late 1990s.
The failure of the finance-capital-based accumulation strategies to achieve anything near to stability has caused a terminal blow to market fundamentalism. This has accelerated the shift of the European political right from neoliberal to neoconservative policies, away from market fundamentalism and adhering more openly to the second element of neoliberalism: a strong, authoritarian management of the economy and society. For achieving urban social cohesion, this implies a return to law and order as the prime solution offered to the victims of 'creative destruction'. (EF12)

But wait! There is a difference between the approach and the name of it. Many stakeholders would probably recognize the approach, described in concrete terms. But again, it is not everywhere referred to in terms of social cohesion. The approach seems to be universal, but the term is not. Would it be possible, then, to describe the approach in general terms but without using the term social cohesion? Of course it would, because although policy-makers everywhere do not use the word social cohesion many seem to believe in the existence of a natural order and more exactly, that the current social order is natural. Thus, vandalism, fires, shattered windows and burglary are not caused by this order, but by external disturbances of it.

And what becomes the solution on the basis of such an approach? Of course, more law and order. But once again, without in any way altering the present social order. Society is perceived as in itself socially cohesive. This existing social order is not the problem. The problem is regarded as something external to the existing order causing a lack of social cohesion. If such a lack of social cohesion appears as riots, they have to be counteracted and defeated. However, it can also appear as unemployment and poverty, thus causing a burden on the tax-payers. Then it has to be treated with so-called activation policies.

Taking the existing order for granted is perhaps the core characteristics of this approach. This means taking the problems for granted as well. Therefore, stakeholders who pay attention solely to the solutions, runs the risk of becoming agents of this approach. It is so easy to get involved in solu-
tions that treat for example young people as the problem. They disturb the existing order, do they not? And as the existing order is taken for granted and perceived as natural, they must learn to obey it and adapt.

Hence, when SP defines social cohesion as a problématique, it urges on a profound change of attention. Stakeholders may perceive this as the usual obsession of researchers who do not need to put their ideas in practice. Such a criticism would seem quite justified because social cohesion in the whole of the work of SP is treated in such an abstract way. There is an urgent lack of references to concrete events, living conditions, experiences etc. Also, SP is such a word-bound effort, based on an academic language. Stakeholders use words in other ways and communicate by the use of images as well. Images may represent experiences, just as words.

If the researchers want to involve stakeholders and realise their potential, this difference in communication has to be taken into consideration. To let one single term, social cohesion, carry the whole message of the project conceals the message for those who are not familiar with the term, although they might be very familiar with the concrete urban reality that this term refers to. Alternate and complementary tools of communication like images should be used to carry the message as well.

If this is what researchers need to improve, stakeholders need to understand the crucial message involved in defining social cohesion as a problématique. The profound change of attention that it urges, implies not taking the problems for granted. Problems have to be redefined, but not on the basis of the very powerful approach, described above and called inclusive liberalism, which has come to dominate so much of thinking, policies and problem-solving in the last decades. Instead, a new approach is needed that treats the existing order as something created and temporal. The order of society does not necessarily have to be like the existing one. Previously, societies were ordered in other ways and that will be the case also in the future.

6. Hidden potentials

SP urges us to rethink the problems in order to enable other solutions. Many of those excluded from the existing order would probably be happy about such a rethinking as it leads to another perception of them. Instead of treating them as problems and disturbances of a natural order, it would allow their potential to be used.

Indeed, that was the purpose of the workshop in Malmö (WA1); namely to turn the usual problem-oriented approach to young people upside down and instead learn from their
potentials, in particular the one called intercultural competence. According to EF7, the notion of interculturality “describes mechanisms aiming to promote the communication and the positive interaction between the various cultural groups (ethnic but also generational or linguistic), which are present in a society”. Frequently, the practical implementation of these intercultural principles in schools has taken the shape of compensation policies:

All in all, the instrumental implementation of intercultural policies in schools seems to privilege more a line of fighting the specific disadvantages of immigrants and particularly their offspring – following diverse strategies, as we have seen - than the effective promotion of the intercultural dialogue. (EF7)

EF7 refers to interesting experiences on the promotion of intercultural contacts in schools, conflict and cultural mediation, but highlights the lack of comparative analysis of the results. Intercultural pedagogies promote “new and recognized competences in terms of linguistic skills or relational capacities that are more and more important for all students”. In addition, EF9 highlights that “cultural diversity is often merely approached negatively and hardly as an opportunity”. EF9 concludes that the added value for society of diversity should be taken as the point of departure.
In line with such a conclusion, the workshop in Malmö was based on the presumption that young people already have such a competence. They have to acquire it, simply in order to become and stay friends with each other, but also to cross the barriers to society. As EF8 states, social exclusion is about “setting up barriers which distance some within the local population from participation in mainstream society”. These are the barriers that young people have to learn how to cross, i.e. those that do not remain excluded.

According to EF7 there is an urgent need for intercultural competence, but the fact that many young people have it is almost not recognized at all. Intercultural competence could be regarded as one of these tacit and collective forms of knowledge, “that is produced and reproduced by socially excluded groups and communities, in the context of, and as a consequence of, their coping strategies in the city”.

Intercultural competence solves problems of social cohesion. That was made clear at the SP workshop in Malmö, where the participants defined intercultural competence in terms of mutual respect as well as an ability to adapt, build bridges between old antagonisms and cross social and cultural barriers. After the workshop in Malmö, the two young people, Samira Hack and Bledar Zuta, were then also invited to the SP conference in Vienna to present their views on intercultural competence and their work with the Green House. In this way, SP has taken a huge step forward favouring the “re-contextualisation” of science and the development of a new regime. The MASIS-report urges for a change of research cultures and a touch of that was definitely felt at the SP conference in Vienna when high officials from DG Research in Brussels were seen to be absorbed in substantial discussions with the two young people from Hermodsadal, one of the most deprived neighbourhoods in Malmö.

EF10 refers to many experiences indicating the particular potential of cultural creation in promoting social cohesion, “provided that artistic creation is conceived as a process and not as a product”. Such a process can promote communication between different social groups and encourage residents to cross their own internal boundaries within the city, thereby breaking with ghettoization. Processes of cultural creation are likely to increase self-esteem, individually as well as collectively.

A wide range of processes others than the ones included in the capitalist economy play a crucial role to achieve social well-being and cohesion. EF11 puts forward an approach that analyses local initiatives in terms of a plural economy or an economy of diversity. Such a broadened approach to the economy highlights the “hidden and alternative economies,
such as the economy of care, the non monetary economy, the social economy and third sector, the ecological economy, and local and complementary currencies”.

Another hidden potential was exposed at the Vienna conference by Felicitas Hillmann and Jana Taube. They presented the results of a study carried out in the deprived district of Nord-Neukölln in Berlin. The study focused on the contribution of migrant entrepreneurship for local urban cohesion. It turned out that migrant entrepreneurship concerns more than the economy in its narrow sense and can contribute to social cohesion on different levels, for example by also providing work and educational opportunities to local residents as well as meeting places.

7. **Why cities?**

But why confine the issue of social cohesion to cities? For stakeholders the answer would be quite obvious. It is in the cities that the divisions and lack of social cohesion have become so apparent. For the researchers, social cohesion is a societal issue. As SP states in *Transversal themes*, “social cohesion concerns society as a whole, at multiple spatial scales, beyond issues of inequality, exclusion and inclusion, and across public, market and voluntary sectors”. Then, what makes the researchers interested in confining it to cities?

---

**ACTIVITIES**

In 2008-2009, the Social Polis platform has initiated the following activities:

- Production of 13 Survey papers on key issues of social cohesion in the city (Existential Fields)
- Collective formulation of the Focused Research Agenda
- Opening conference with 80 participants in May 2008, Brussels
- 1-3 local stakeholder workshops organised by each of all 11 partners with their local networks of social practitioners, policy makers and researchers in each city
- 8 stakeholder workshops in 8 different cities funded by small grants of Social Polis with topics like intercultural competence, social cohesion in Latin America, Microeconomics and socio-economic initiatives fostering social cohesion
- Social Polis Vienna conference in May 2009 with over 170 participants with a dialogical and interactive setting as well as active participation of partners and stakeholders
- Monthly newsletter for exchanging information between partners and stakeholders
EF1 shows how crucial the local dimension has become in the welfare policies. The role of local actors has increased in both the design and the implementation. New types of welfare systems have emerged which EF1 calls Local Welfare Systems (LWS) and defines as “a mix of formal and informal services provided by public and private actors, which are integrated in different ways at the local level, in order to respond to the specific configuration of social needs in a local context”. As a main characteristic, these LWS do not look like one another. Local welfare is becoming increasingly diversified.

In general, the Local Welfare Systems have emerged in response to the crisis of the nation state. Moreover, the European Union has put an institutional pressure on regional and municipal administrations to increase their responsibilities for local development and social cohesion, due to the principle of territorial subsidiarity. However, the great socio-economic transformations are emphasized as the underlying cause, creating a new global economic order in which cities are in competition, more than nation states.

EF10 describes the effects of globalization as twofold. On the one hand, globalization has put cities to the forefront, strengthening them with regard to their regional and national territories, generating new prospects. As EF8 puts it, “every employment basin, city or region, has to compete with the others to attract and keep investments in its area”. On the other hand, globalization has created a lot of inequality and casualization of life; “while fractions of the population manage to integrate into performing networks at the economic level, others are excluded, which keeps them from benefiting fully from their rights as citizens” (EF10).

8. Increasing polarisation and inequality

As EF2 shows, the socio-economic transformations have increased polarisation, most obviously with regard to the unemployed. The experience of unemployment entails a process of “social disqualification”, including low moral and damage to personal confidence and self-esteem.

But polarisation has increased within the labour force as well. Temporary work contracts, low wages and inferior conditions amongst young people, female workers and immigrants have an impact on working conditions more generally. It gives rise to a stretching downwards of the distribution of wages and employment conditions, posing considerable challenges for unions and workers. That impairs social cohesion because “in all European cities, access to high-quality jobs remains the most important factor in reducing the risk of exclusion and promoting social cohesion”. In addition,
the union movement does make a difference, according to EF2 as “not only the state, but also the strength of the union movement and the structure of collective bargaining have an important influence on polarisation”.

The increasing polarisation and inequality is reflected spatially in terms of segregation. According to EF8, segregation is on the rise generally and the survey of the literature reveals a lot of studies concerning the emergence of areas characterised by social exclusion. In contrast, “the literature remains nearly silent on problems of social cohesion at the scale of the whole urban community”.

Whereas social exclusion is widely described and demonstrated to be locally bound, the geographies of social inclusion – and social cohesion as a matter of fact – are left hanging. (EF8)

And yet, there has to be a focus on the city as a whole if inequality is about to be tackled and social cohesion fostered. The potential effect of area-based policies on overall levels of deprivation and exclusion is very limited. Increasing polarisation and inequality has brought about a need of more complex and tailor-made approaches to welfare:

Social policies are no longer called upon to protect only against unemployment, illness, and traditional poverty …. It is actually the ordinary working and family life of a much larger portion of citizens that has become vulnerable. (EF1)

The local responses differ due to the national traditions of the central states. EF1 describes the differences on the basis of the theory of welfare regimes making a distinction between corporative regimes in continental countries, social democratic regimes in Scandinavian countries, liberal regimes in the UK, familialistic regimes in Mediterranean countries and regimes in Eastern European countries, still in transition. Decentralisation has occurred across Europe but due to the differences between the welfare regimes, the central governments have kept a degree of control in the Scandinavian
countries while in the Southern European countries Local Welfare Systems have emerged in the absence of a framework of rules to guarantee homogeneous access to services across the country. As a consequence, remarkable differences have appeared.

In cities like Turin or Genoa, the presence of a highly homogenous and well structured civil society (which emerged from the structured tradition of workers’ unions) allowed its organizations to play a stronger role in the negotiations with the public administrations, while in other cities of the north, like Milan, the weaker and more fragmented civil society diminished the function of advocacy that civil society organization might play and led to a different configuration of the relationship between public and private actors across the country. (EF1)

Thus, the actual outcome of the polarisation processes caused by globalization depends on the existing welfare regime and how it has been adapted. An absence of national rules to fair provision of services for those who cannot afford the market prices worsens polarisation. EF1 concludes “that social cohesion cannot be reached without a public regulatory framework through which citizens’ social rights may be effectively guaranteed all over the country”.

9. Taking initiatives

There are good reasons to act. And indeed, stakeholders have acted for decades, but as EF11 explains, the activity has changed. Previously, stakeholders were mobilised in urban social movements on the basis of a strong collective identity constructed in a relationship of social conflict and aiming at transforming society. Local initiatives expressed the needs of local populations and demanded services from local government authorities.

Whereas the “urban social movements” were opposed to bureaucratic action with centralised urban planning managed by political leaders, public administration, and town planners, “grassroots initiatives” have been gradually integrated into the urban policies aiming to resolve the growing problems of unemployment, social exclusion, neighbourhood decline, and others. (EF11)

A shift has appeared towards entrepreneurial and managerial concerns in the modes of action, financing, and organisation. Local initiatives have themselves often become the instigators of economic activities and jobs. They help mobilise resources for local economic development. Stakeholders in local initiatives tend to be mobilised “for” a common project instead of as previously “against” the establishment.
The increasingly entrepreneurial character of local initiatives has led to the emergence of the social entrepreneur. EF11 describes the social entrepreneur as a “catalyst of a vision and a project, of a coalition of stakeholders and local institutions, as well as for mobilising resources from several scales in the local geographical area”. The driving forces behind the economic activity consist of values such as solidarity, social justice, and sustainable development. The economic activity has a social purpose and aims to benefit the community as a whole rather than its individual members.

However, the mainstream approach to social cohesion, referred to by EF12 as ‘caring neoliberalism’, has tended to reduce local initiatives to the insertion of the disadvantaged without any perspective of reducing inequalities. Conflict has been replaced by negotiation and partnership in the vision of the city. EF11 highlights a trend towards de-politicization of non-profit and collective action, or even instrumentalization of local initiatives by public authorities.

This trend also expresses itself in “localism”, which means the limitation of local initiatives to neighbourhoods. Because of this localism or “the localisation of the social”, local initiatives have little impact on the structural forces that harm social cohesion. The limitation of local initiatives to certain
neighbourhoods may even weaken social cohesion as the jobs created contribute to the deterioration of wage conditions. As EF8 concludes, “policies wanting to tackle spatial segregation should tackle the exclusion mechanisms, not simply assist the poor in targeted areas”.

Above all, EF11 emphasises the lack of knowledge concerning local initiatives. It is difficult to assess their socioeconomic impact.

Given the performativity of statistics in the public debate, the absence of indisputable and reliable statistics at the European level on local initiatives inevitably prevents them from being recognised as a subject of research and as public policy. (EF11)

Several workshops highlight the need of new indicators. How can the impact of these initiatives on urban social cohesion be evaluated (WA4)? Too much emphasis is put on indicators like GDP, “for which waste and toxicity are activi-
ties as any” (WC5). GDP needs to be replaced by social indicators produced collectively by stakeholders and researchers. At the workshop in Paris (WA4), Jean-Philippe Magnen (elected representative from the city of Nantes) highlighted the potential of the social and solidarity economy to enable an understanding of urban areas which is not based solely on the number of jobs, unemployed and enterprises.

10. **Urban citizenship**

Cities have assumed state functions and become arenas for the decisions on societal issues of crucial importance for social cohesion. The increasing importance of local decision-making has been reflected in the emergence of the term governance. A transformation of statehood has occurred as a part of the global transformation of capitalism. According to EF6, the concept of governance has been used “to describe new ways of management based on consensus, including private agents, public administrations and civil society representatives”.

The emergence of governance mechanisms, instead of hierarchical government policies, makes the issue of citizenship crucial. Who is allowed to take part in these new decision-making processes, referred to as governance and on what conditions? EF1 highlights the problematic aspects of participation as these “governance arenas, not only those focused on welfare issues, are often chaotic, rules not properly defined, power distribution uneven, information lacking. Therefore the main features that seem to emerge are ambiguity and lack of transparency in decision-making responsibilities”.

EF6 underlines the multi-scalar character of governance as “social citizenship – that is, the redistribution of wealth that allows inclusion of all members of society in the mainstream way of life of society – is taking place increasingly at different governance scales, with sub-national and local scales playing key roles”. As a consequence, urban citizenship has emerged in the literature on governance as a distinct form of citizenship. A challenge for future research, highlighted by EF6, “is what kind of political structures are necessary to counterbalance the ‘undemocratic and nonparticipative processes’ of neoliberal economic restructuring which produce inequalities in the access to citizenship rights”.

According to EF1, “research on governance shows that social cohesion cannot be built without entitlements and capabilities for all civil society actors to effectively participate in the policy making process at the local level.” Furthermore, the existence of different scales requires what SP calls scale-sensitive approaches. The success of initiatives depends on the capacity of local stakeholders to be committed in multi-
level governance, as EF11 puts it, “to become part of trans-territorial networks and to mobilise monetary and nonmonetary resources from beyond their immediate geographical area”.

11. **Reclaiming social cohesion**

One such multi-level and trans-territorial initiative is Micronomics (WA8 and WC7) launched in 2006 by City Mine(d), itself an international network of individuals and collectives, from over 13 European countries, involved with city and local action. City Mine(d) took its pink caravan to the street in Brussels to ask people there what they thought about the state of the economy. It resulted in a DVD with interviews, reports, short stories and a scanning of the socio-economic fragmentation of Brussels. This led to the first Micronomics Festival in 2006, combining debate and documenting with nice food, parties and street action.

*Micronomics aims, on the smallest level, to put the spotlight on micro-initiatives, so that they can be known and recognised for what they do, but also to allow them to network and build structures of mutual support. On a larger level, Micronomics challenges the top-down understanding of economy in which the majority of citizens are consumers, and whereby the success of creators is measured only by their financial turn-over. It wants to open up a discussion about the economy that takes into account exchange, education and happiness in addition to money. (WA8)*

EF10 argues for putting creativity and innovation at the basis of governance. The link has to be made between creativity and innovation on the one hand and the building of social cohesion in the city on the other. Creativity differs from innovation by preceding it, while innovation resides in the social acceptance of creativity. Often creativity is associated
with individual action but such individual creativity may also become social creativity, “thereby laying the foundation for a whole set of new strategies, experiments, ideas, and organizations likely to become social innovations that respond to non-resolved or insufficiently resolved social needs”.

The concept of “social innovation”, mentioned above, has become significant in scientific research, business administration and public debate during the last 15 years. According to EF11, satisfying needs not covered by the market is a key aspect of social innovations. Thus, the scope is not limited to the creation of local or regional markets, but social innovations “aim to strengthen other aspects of the economy, such as the public sector, the social economy, cultural activities, and community action”. True social innovations generate a social change which includes the transformation of the institutional local framework. Social innovations can consist of new coalitions and mobilisations of local stakeholders, new forms of solidarity between inhabitants and new activities to respond to the urgency of needs.

However, as EF10 claims, “the cohesive effect of creativity as a means of development cannot be taken for granted. This is because the localization of social creativity in neighbourhoods can easily become a factor of gentrification rather than social cohesion. To achieve a cohesive effect, creativity must be an integral part of the overall vision of the city’s governance”. For that reason, new forms of governance have to be created, characterised by enabling both confrontation and consensus-building; anchored in local contexts, responding to local problems and able to be re-appropriated by the local actors. EF10 puts a lot of emphasis on reinvesting in public spaces to be open and accessible, allowing for interaction, meetings and activities as well as generating the social creativity needed to rebuild social cohesion.

In order to be reclaimed, social cohesion has to be regarded as a source of economic development and not as a subsidiary consideration, Vincent Ricolleau (National Liaison Committee for Neighbourhood Associations, CNLRQ) underlined at the workshop in Paris (WA4). As Eric Lavillunière put it at the same workshop “the solidarity economy is not an economy that costs money, rather it generates wealth that is beneficial to the highest possible number of people”.

12. FROM SOCIAL POLIS TO KNOWLEDGE ALLIANCES

So in sum, what can we learn from SP? If we want to learn anything at all, we first need to make the distinction between social cohesion as a term and as a phenomenon. The phenomenon is well known everywhere, but the term is
As a term, social cohesion is just one way of referring to the phenomenon. There are many other ways and terms to use. Thus, the term social cohesion has to be supplemented by other terms and by all means also for example images to make sure that we know what we are talking about.

SP defines social cohesion as a problématique. In a way, every locality has its own problématique, i.e. range of questions and challenges to tackle, but SP does not necessarily refer to problems as they appear. Rather, SP means by problématique the underlying problems, what EF2 calls the “generative mechanisms”, which cause the apparent and immediate problems. For example, young people attacking fire crews have become a serious problem but the more general mechanisms underlying this problem need to be identified. These problem-generating mechanisms are what SP includes in the definition of social cohesion as a problématique. As EF2 explains it, the generative mechanisms may “combine in different ways to produce similar as well as varying outcomes in different cities”.

These outcomes are what stakeholders experience and know so much about. The generative mechanisms give rise to problems that stakeholders have to handle. Thus, the apparent problems, like for example young people attacking fire crews, are one thing. Another thing is the underlying problems, the problem-generating mechanisms, which cause the apparent ones. It is about the latter we can learn a lot from SP.

Among such underlying problem-generating mechanisms which tend to make cities less socially cohesive, I have in this report mentioned the employment restructuring that has had particularly negative consequences for young, low-skilled workers, women and undocumented immigrants; the fragmentation of housing systems; the dualistic immigration policies; the narrow definitions of diversity limited to ethnicity; the way schools reproduce deprivation; the compensation policies towards interculturality; the increasing diversification of local welfare; the polarisation processes; the undermining and de-politicization of local initiatives; the insistence on GDP at the expense of social indicators; and the emergence of a multi-scalar governance which strengthens citizenship for some at the expense of others.

The mainstream approach to social cohesion, called inclusive liberalism by SP, treats these developments of the existing order as something natural which people have to adapt to. If they do not, they become the problems, not the existing order. Thus, the development of the existing order makes cities and societies in general more polarised and yet the mainstream approach treats people as if they were equal and have
the same opportunities. This is the approach that SP reveals and criticizes. If stakeholders do not want to remain agents of this approach, treating the excluded as problems instead of the structures causing their exclusion, it has to be replaced.

In the words of EF0, an alternative approach “politicises the problem and stresses the systemic deficiencies and insists on structural change to permit those currently excluded to be integrated into the socioeconomic and political order”. Thus, SP insists on structural change but how and in what direction? What structural changes would be needed to make society more cohesive? What does such a society look like? We return to the question of what social cohesion means. To define it as a problématique has been proven necessary.

But defining social cohesion as a problématique can not be regarded as a final goal. For stakeholders it has to serve as means to improve the solutions. This is what stakeholders are being paid for or at least it is perceived as such. Stakeholders in areas associated with a lack of social cohesion would probably not get paid to dwell on the problems. Something needs to happen. A stakeholder would ask “what can I bring back home to my work in the community?” Restless kids need to be taken care of. Schools have to be kept open despite vandalism, fires, shattered windows and burglary. Many of these stakeholders probably ask themselves: Are we doing the right things? For some, the answer is clear. They know that they do not do the right thing, but given the circumstances they can not do anything else.

A fundamental reason why wrong things have to be done is the dominating approach to social cohesion. Even if it does not appear by the same name everywhere, it certainly takes shape in thinking, attitudes, modes of organization and policy-making. Therefore, it has to be brought to light, questioned and discussed. SP offers an alternative to this approach, which implies a redefinition and rethinking of the problem as a first necessary step to take. But for a stakeholder, it is just as necessary to take one more step and work for solutions. Regarding solutions, what is on offer from SP?

Culturally, society has to overcome a single-language, mono-ethnic norm and embrace a society which accommodates diversity, equality and order. Socio-economically, society has to proceed from market fundamentalism to a plural economy which experiments with the adequate mix of markets, regulation and planning and private, communal and public ownership. Politically, the challenge consists in advancing from an essentialist and exclusionary concept of national citizenship to a scale-sensitive and inhabitant-centred conception of citizenship. (EF0)
This is indeed a general guidance that probably many would subscribe to, but what does it mean in concrete terms? A utopian perspective has to be introduced, SP claims; a concrete utopia of social cohesion that “has to advance towards a society which accommodates freedom, equality and solidarity”. In this respect, stakeholders know better. They have an experience-based knowledge of many efforts and attempts, some of them successful, at least in some respects. For them, in their every-day reality, what the researchers regard as utopia has perhaps already been made real. But perhaps nobody else knows about it and it existed just for a short while, in a very limited context.

Stakeholders in general have a lot of experience and a kind of knowledge that can be called experience-based. This makes it necessary for researchers to reach out to stakeholders and involve them in research, as stakeholders have something to contribute. SP underlines in *Transversal themes* that “the quality of knowledge is improved by research techniques which mobilize the tacit, experience-based knowledge of policy makers, activists and concerned groups in the city”. The challenge is to continue the re-contextualisation of science by involving stakeholders on an equal footing, enabling them to take part on conditions favourable also to them and not only to the researchers.
On the basis of the experiences and lessons from the project SP a new term has been coined. SP has paved the way for the development of knowledge alliances. This new term aims to stress the mutuality needed in the further work. Scientific knowledge is important, but so is the experience-based knowledge of stakeholders, the one not necessarily better than the other. They are simply different, but in principle complementary. And many different kinds of knowledge have to be mobilised in the struggle to make the cities more cohesive and democratic, a place where people are allowed to be different and yet able to live together.
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“Social Polis derives its name from the antique Greek city which was organized as a democracy, although in a slave-owner society. From its origins onwards, democracy has remained a contested term with ever changing rules of decision making as well as rules of membership. Today, social cohesion calls for a democratic polis with equal rights for its inhabitants (independent from gender, class or culture as has been normal until the 20th century). While national citizenship is clearly defined, no such understanding exists for urban or European citizenship or the challenges of citizenship in transnational spaces. More conceptual and comparative research on the relation between political and social citizenship in cities is needed.”
This report popularizes the results of the project Social Polis, supported by the European Commission, DG Research, under the “Socio-Economic Sciences and Humanities” theme of 7th Framework Programme. Social Polis is an open social platform for dialogue between scientific and policy communities and civil society practice networks. It has had the overall objective of developing a research agenda on the role of cities in social cohesion and key related policy questions. This report associates Social Polis with the current re-contextualisation of science where science and society has started to “reach out” to one another. Results are presented which make sense of the European dimension by explaining differences and similarities respectively. The report highlights to what extent practitioners working in urban neighbourhood around Europe face the same problems. Furthermore, it provides reasons for stakeholders to be interested in each others’ work and learn from each other. The approach to social cohesion maintained by Social Polis means that problems have to be redefined. A new approach is needed and this has to be developed jointly with stakeholders.