

Migrants as Urban Actors. Interrelations of Urban and Migration Processes: Introduction

ANNA FIŃ¹

ORCID: [0000-0003-0366-6652](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0366-6652)

Department of Sociology of Culture, Pedagogical University of Krakow

ANETA KOSTRZEWA²

York College, City University of New York

Preface

The key theme of the presented volume are the mutual connections and relations between the migration processes and the city. The case studies collected herein aim not only at showing the parallels between the migration and urban processes, but above all they focus on two fundamental issues: first, they show the specificity of the city as a living environment for immigrants, together with the consequences of this presence for the transformation of urban space (both in the historical and the contemporary dimension); secondly, they describe various aspects of the presence, social organization and social practices of members of immigrant groups in the urban space.

The history of migration processes basically overlaps with the history of the development of the cities and the formation and transformation of large metropolises. From the time of the first mass migrations, which we dealt with from the mid-nineteenth century, emigrants headed mainly to industrialized and urban areas, and the scientific literature emphasizes their important role in the transformation of urban space and the development of the cities (e.g. Foner et al. 2014)³. The present days do not differ much from the past in this respect. Masses of migrants choose cities and large metropolises

¹ annafin@interia.pl, anna.fin@up.krakow.pl

² Akostrzewa@york.cuny.edu.

³ The indicated issue has been presented in a very comprehensive way, i.a. on the example of the history of Chicago, described, among others, by Dominic Paciga see. Dominic A. Pacyga, *Chicago: a biography*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2009

as their destinations. According to the estimates of the International Organization for Migration (IOM), almost one fifth of the world's migrant population lives in the area of the 20 largest metropolises in the world, including New York, London, Berlin, Tokyo, Los Angeles, Toronto, Sydney, etc. (IOM 2015). For example, in New York, a city with a very long-lasting tradition of the influx of immigrants, they constitute nearly 40% of the population (MOIA Report 2019) and there has been an upward trend in this area for several decades. Other examples concern European cities: in London the share of immigrants in the total number of inhabitants is 36.7%, in Vienna 31.4%, in Dublin 21.1% (*Urban Europe* Eurostat 2015). In Brussels, the percentage of inhabitants born abroad reaches 43%, while in Milan, the number of immigrants has doubled in the last 15 years, now accounting for 20% of the population (Patuzzi 2020: 4). The influx of immigrants is experienced not only by large cities and capitals, but also by smaller urban areas, an example of which may be Torrevieja, located in south-eastern Spain, where nearly half of the inhabitants are newcomers from other countries (*Urban Europe* Eurostat 2015). Moreover, in the recent years immigrants have become to be admitted in Europe by countries previously considered as sending and/or transit states, such as Poland or Czechia. Thus, the immigrant population of Prague, Warsaw and Krakow began to grow. Detailed data on the share of immigrants among the population of selected cities are presented in the latest OECD report (IMO 2021 see page 9).

Particular reports and opinions of experts of the main organizations monitoring international population flows clearly indicate that the number of migrants in the cities keeps growing and will continue to grow, more and more interconnecting and linking together migration and urbanization processes. This aspect is a challenge not only for migrant and urban researchers, but also for urban policies, which in principle will have to take into account the close relationship between migration and urbanization in their postulates and actions. Additionally, immigrants' prominent role as urban entrepreneurs is evidenced by the growing number of immigrant businesses in cities around the world and cannot be overlooked by policymakers. For example in 2017, immigrants owned 52% of NYC's small businesses and contributed 22% (\$195 billion) of the city's total Gross Domestic Product (MOIA, 2018). Similarly in London, migrant entrepreneurs make up nearly 30% of all small business owners (Sepulveda *et al.*, 2011). And in Mexico City the growing economic and cultural presence of migrant entrepreneurs considerably bolsters the city's image as Latin America's creative hub (Cave, 2013). This clearly indicates that immigrants impact cities not only residentially, but also economically by actively participating and bolstering urban economies.

Migration and urban processes

8 By experiencing all possible consequences of migration: political, economic, cultural, social, and ethnic ones (Babiński 2018: 17–18), the cities change their condition and character. Moreover, just as migration processes undergo changes, similarly, the cities

Table 5.1

Share of foreign-born according to geographical classification in selected OECD countries

	Capital or largest city		Other cities		Other areas	Total
Australia, 2016	Sydney	35,2%	Other capital cities (7)	29,6%	13,3%	25,4%
Belgium, 2019	Brussels	28,6%	Other FUAs (10)	15,7%	11,9%	17,2%
Canada, 2016	Toronto metro area	49,0%	Other CMAs (34)	24,6%	7,6%	23,9%
Chile, 2017	Santiago Province	8,3%	Largest cities at Northern border	10,7%	2,3%	4,5%
Colombia, 2020	Bogota	5,4%	Largest cities at border with Venezuela	13,0%	4,5%	4,9%
Finland, 2019	Helsinki	12,4%	Other FUAs (6)	5,4%	4,4%	6,8%
France, 2014	Paris	21,5%	Other FUAs (83)	10,6%	7,6%	11,7%
Germany, 2019	Berlin	22,0%	Other large cities (14)	23,9%	15,3%	17,0%
Japan, 2018	Tokyo Metropolitan	4,0%	Capitals of other prefectures	2,1%	1,8%	2,1%
Korea, 2015	Seoul Capital Area	3,6%	Other cities & province capitals	1,4%	2,3%	2,7%
Mexico, 2020	Mexico City	1,1%	Largest cities at Northern border	2,9%	0,8%	1,0%
Netherlands, 2019	Amsterdam	19,8%	Other FUAs (35)	13,4%	7,2%	13,3%
New Zealand, 2018	Auckland	42,4%	Other major urban areas (6)	26,4%	27,3%	27,1%
Spain, 2019	Madrid	19,3%	Other FUAs (72)	13,7%	11,7%	13,9%
Sweden, 2019	Stockholm	24,8%	Other FUAs (11)	19,8%	14,5%	18,5%
United States, 2018	NYC-Newark-Jersey City	28,8%	Other MSAs (389)	13,9%	4,0%	13,5%

Note: European countries data for the capital city relate to the functional urban area (FUA). Australia: Greater Capital City Statistical Areas (GCCSA) are geographical areas built from Statistical Areas Level 4 and are designed to represent the functional extent of each of the eight State and Territory capital cities. Canada: Census metropolitan areas (CMA) are formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100 000 of which 50 000 or more must live in the core. New Zealand: Besides Auckland, the other major urban areas are Christchurch, Wellington, Hamilton, Tauranga, Lower Hutt and Dunedin. the United States: Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) are defined as one or more adjacent counties or county equivalents that have at least one urban core area of at least 50 000 population, plus adjacent territory that has a high degree of social and economic integration with the core as measured by commuting ties. Japan: Data on nationals and foreigners from registers of the resident population; Tokyo Metropolitan refers to the 62 municipalities of the whole metropolitan prefecture of Tokyo. Korea: Data on foreign and total residents by municipality; Seoul Capital Area refers to the whole metropolitan area, including the cities of Seoul and Incheon and Gyeonggi Province. Colombia: Cucuta, Riohacha and Valledupar are the capitals of the three densest departments bordering Venezuela (La Guajira, Norte de Santander, Cesar). Chile: Santiago Province is the province of the capital; Arica, Iquique and Antofagasta are the capitals of the three northernmost regions of the country (Arica and Parinacota, Tarapaca, Antofagasta). Mexico: Mexico City refers to the federal entity Ciudad de Mexico; the largest cities of the Northern border states are Tijuana (Baja California), Hermosillo (Sonora), Juarez (Chihuahua), Saltillo (Coahuila), Monterrey (Nuevo Leon) and Reynosa (Tamaulipas).

Source: International Migration Outlook 2021, OEC

and their spaces change, requiring even their ongoing redefinition. Already now, in the literature on the subject, we can meet various attempts to build a typology of cities, based on differences in history and the patterns/profiles of migration they experience. For example, Peter Scholten lists the following types: new cities of migration; minority cities; immigrant cities; and superdiverse cities (Scholten 2018). With regard to European cities, Liam Patuzzi, additionally taking into account such factors as the geographical location of cities, multilevel governance, the size and the nature of the immigrant population, distinguishes: frontline cities; cities that are both destinations and transit hubs whose immigrant populations are becoming more diverse; smaller admitting communities; and newer immigrant destinations (Patuzzi 2020: 5–6).

The transformations that cities undergo as a result of the influx of immigrants include a number of changes, such as: (a) changes in their ethnic/racial and linguistic structure; (b) changes in their socio-demographic structure, (c) changes in their spatial structure/spatial arrangement, i.e. various material elements of the living environment; (d) changes in the symbolic structure related to, among others, their symbolic space, climate, the specific character of a place/city; and finally (e) the specific transformation of the city's social system, perceived in terms of social relations. Changes taking place on the psycho-social level: attitudes and identities related to the need to respond to diversity, strangeness or foreignness, are significant as well. The latter aspect is particularly related to the increase in the heterogeneity of the city (Hannerz 2006) and, consequently, the formation of multiculturalism, which is part of the urban landscape and public space; in other words: the multiculturalism that makes up the image of the city (Wojakowski 2021)⁴. Without going into the definitional and theoretical considerations of the phenomenon of multiculturalism, we wish to emphasize the (well known) fact that multicultural cities arose as a result of migration processes. This is how the multicultural cities of the Western world, such as Los Angeles (Waldinger 1996) or New York (Foner et.al 2014), were formed. This is also how at least some multicultural cities of the East were formed (about which we already know much less). A good example here is Mariupol, located in the historical Novorossiya, now in Ukraine, which history resembles that of settlements in the immigrant countries of North America (Wojakowski 2015), thus pointing to certain universal factors in the formation of multiculturalism of the cities, independent of political systems.

Perhaps the most visible aspect of the transformation of urban space and the increasing cultural diversity of the cities are the processes of shaping and functioning of immigrant/ethnic neighbourhoods, often referred to as “ethnic enclaves” or “ethnic islands”. A model example of functioning of such places can be the ethnic districts of New York and other North American cities (see more: Frong, Berry 2017). In the 21st century US, the ethnic enclave is no longer the dominant model of immigrant incorporation. America’s immigrant population—now largely non-European – is increasingly

dispersed and more likely to live in the suburbs than just a decade ago. Li (2008) argues, that in some metropolitan areas spatial segregation persists in the form of “ethnoburb”, a spatial concentration of ethnic residents and businesses in suburban areas. And when immigrants do concentrate in inner-city they do so by forming hyperdiverse neighborhoods, rather than distinct enclaves. Despite these new patterns of settlement immigrant enclaves, just as the skyscrapers, have permanently inscribed into the American urban landscape. The persistent continuity and uniqueness of the enclave has been marketed as cultural attraction in various city branding campaigns strategically orchestrated by local officials to attract tourists and investors. As ethnic groups shrink and disperse residentially, the tendency to maintain commercial presence (shops, restaurants) in old neighborhoods promotes ethnic commodification or the branding and marketing of ethnic communities as tourist destinations. For example, New York’s Little Italy or San Francisco’s Chinatown have morphed from ethnic enclaves to “ethnic theme parks” (Krase 2006) and “landmarked heritage sites” (Lin 2008), important more for their significance to the tourist industry than to the ethnic community that once inhabited them (Zukin 1995; Wang 1999). Promotion of ethnic neighborhoods as tourist destinations is well integrated into urban policies that seek to advertise the city’s cultural vibrancy and multiculturalism.

In the age of hyper-globalized economy, diversity ranks high on the list of top urban qualities necessary to attract foreign direct investment and to foster economic growth. While city officials promote diversity in political discourse and media campaigns, in real life immigrants struggle against different forms of social inequality inherent in the structures of urban economy of the host country. One such source generating urban inequality is widespread gentrification. Urban scholars around the world examined urban redevelopment and gentrification as a strategy to make cities more appealing and to hone advantage in the worldwide competition to attract capital investment. Yet, literature on gentrification in US cities presents evidence that urban revitalization and neighborhood reinvestment accelerates displacement and dissolution of ethnic communities, including some of the oldest and most prominent Polish settlements in the US. A recent example is the dissolution of Greenpoint, a long-established Polish enclave in Brooklyn, New York, an area that starting in early 2000s has experienced a massive wave of capital reinvestment and urban redevelopment. As a result of these changes, between 2000 and 2014, Greenpoint experienced 44 percent increase in average rent values—the highest increase among all gentrifying New York City neighborhoods. This rapid real estate appreciation impacted the Polish enclave in three adverse ways: 1) it forced lower-to moderate income Polish tenants out of the ethnic community; 2) it incentivized aging property owners to sell buildings and relocate to the suburbs or resettle in Poland; and 3) the rapid increase in commercial rents led to the closure of numerous ethnic shops and small businesses resulting in the erasure of the neighborhood’s vibrant ethnic character. But Polish community’s response to neighborhood transformation is also an example of immigrant resilience

and adaptation in the face of structural change. Motivated by private interests, Polish property owners participated in and even promoted neighborhood change by actively courting more affluent gentrifiers as new tenants, and by selling buildings to non-Poles, including to corporate developers (Kostrzewa 2020). In this sense, young Polish entrepreneurs embraced neighborhood change and helped forge Greenpoint's new "hipster" identity, which now served as a visual platform for the expression of their own changing values (Kostrzewa 2020). Far from acting as passive by-standers, immigrants co-author the changing city one block and one store at a time. They redefine urban space according to the dictates of the real estate market and local policy and in the process gain a cultural standpoint as participants of the cosmopolitan place-making (Kostrzewa 2020). As gentrification expands and intensifies in New York, a city known for its distinctive ethnic diversity, and in other cities across the US and the world, immigrant and ethnic neighborhoods are increasingly the battlefields between real estate-driven economic development and immigrants' right to the city (Hum 2014). Under the existing neoliberal model of urban governance, in which the needs and interests of the working class are swept aside in favor of tourism and real estate developers, the future of ethnic and immigrant communities remains uncertain and contingent on the dynamics specific to those very communities as well as on the changing social, political, and economic characteristics of the receiving countries. We also deal with the concentration of immigrants in particular districts in many European cities (see more: Shönwälder 2007). The ways of functioning of ethnic neighbourhoods in the cities, the variety of social situations taking place in their areas and the habits of immigrant groups created (and/ or recreated) contribute to the uniqueness and unique chartering of the given cities.

Global migration has always been one of the major social forces spurring the growth of cities. The impact of immigrants on urban centers in the United States, Europe and the Global South is well documented. Moving to cities migrants hope to find work, educational opportunities and to improve their lives on the whole. In the process, they change urban space physically by investing in home and business ownership and symbolically by refocusing local narratives on cultural diversity, inclusion, cosmopolitanism, and the willingness to encounter, and to engage with, the 'other'.

In order to facilitate research on this topic, the editors propose a research agenda that addresses the manifold interrelationships between the twin processes of immigration and contemporary city building in both socioeconomic and symbolic aspects of this complex phenomenon. The crux of the argument is the fact that immigrants themselves mould and shape urban processes as much as they themselves are being reshaped and redefined by the urban life of the host country. As a result, the collective meaning of the city becomes imbued with local political outcomes as well as different cultural nuances and symbolic values as the city absorbs the growing complexity and undergoes a profound transformation. Furthermore, by

and cultural impacts of this process on the urban transformation, we can arrive at a clearer understanding of the forces driving urban and social change in general in the first decades of the twenty first century. Finally, immigrants, as actors of the urban scene, contribute to the history and contemporary social reality of cities. Thus, it is impossible to outline and capture the image of a contemporary city without grasping its migratory contexts. We trust that some of these contexts will bring closer the issue we are handing over to the reader.

The structure and content of the volume

The examples presented above are just a few remarks on the migration-and-the-city relationship and its contexts. They have been developed and detailed in the texts collected in the presented book. As the phenomenon described herein is multidimensional and multifaceted, its analysis was carried out by an interdisciplinary group of specialists: sociologists, historians, geographers, art historians, cultural scientists, linguists, educators and anthropologists. Taking into account the different histories, traditions and patterns of migratory movements in individual cities and regions, the collected papers have been compiled into three main parts. The first one is devoted to the migration processes and the phenomena in the cities of both Americas: North and South America. Three articles in this part, written by Anna Jaroszyńska-Kirchmann, Dorota Prasałowicz, Adrianna Seniów and Nina Pielacińska, introduce a diachronic perspective into the issues of migration-city relations, thus making it possible to capture the process of changes taking place not only among specific groups of immigrants, but also in urban areas themselves. An article by Anna Rudek-Śmiechowska, showing the fate of a specific group of immigrants – the artists in the New York metropolis, is of historical nature. Two other articles by Monika Machowska and Kamila Ziółkowska-Weiss provide an insight into the situation of specific groups of immigrants in the two North American metropolises of Los Angeles and Toronto. The following six articles of the book refer to migrants in European cities. The following cities were subjected here to analysis: Reykjavik in Iceland (by Małgorzata Budyta-Budzyńska), London (by Katarzyna Winiecka), Lisbon (by Magdalena Gąsior) and Trondheim (by Agata Kochaniewicz). The issue is dealt with differently by Tomasz Padło oraz Małgorzata Krywult-Albańska i Łukasz Albański, whose methodological approach diverges from the conventional focus on a single city. Instead, T. Padło focuses his attention on the attitudes and preferences of college-bound students with regard to different European cities to obtain college degrees. The article by M. Krywult Albańska and Ł. Albański, centers on the largely understudied issue of child migrants and links critical urban discourse with scholarship on children's rights in the spatial context of refugee camps. Taking into account the phenomenon of the intensification of migration processes into the areas that had been so far sending and/ or transit ones, observed in recent years,

the third part of the book is devoted to cities in the process of migration transition. The articles collected there are specific case studies and relate to three Polish cities, currently admitting immigrants: Krakow (by Janusz Mucha), Łódź (by Marcin Gońda) and Warsaw (by Urszula Markowska-Manista and Marta J. Pietrusińska). It can be assumed that these cities can become a specific research laboratory on the current processes of urban change and the formation of multicultural cities as a result of the influx of immigrants into Central and Eastern Europe. This is a new issue. It is so because the multicultural nature of Central and Eastern European cities is discussed more often from the perspective of the cultural heritage and history of this area, and less from the perspective of immigration processes.

The presented book is not intended to become a complete and comprehensive analysis of the urban-migrations relationship. The intention of the redactors is to make it become an inspiration to undertake more detailed and in-depth research in this field. One can get the impression of a specific separation of these topics by migrant and urban researchers. The former treat cities as destinations for immigrants, focusing their attention on the situation of the newcomers, the consequences of the migration process for the ethnic group, often not taking into account the broader urban context: everything that changes in urban spaces as a result of the influx of immigrants. The latter, when examining the urban space, less frequently include migrants as urban actors, actively influencing urban forms, urban lifestyle, and processes taking place in urban spaces. We are convinced that this publication will shed light on those aspects of research practice that should be complemented in order to enable multidimensional description of this issue.

References

- Babiński, G. (2018), *Konsekwencje migracji międzynarodowych*, Studia Sociologica, no 1, p. 16–24
- Cave, D. (2013), *For Migrants, New Land of Opportunity is Mexico*, New York Times.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/22/world/americas/for-migrants-new-land-of-opportunity-is-mexico.html>. Retrieved October 20, 2021.
- Frong E., Berry B. (2017), *Immigration and the City*, Cambridge UK, Malden, USA: Polity Press.
- Foner, N., Rath, J., Duyvendak, J.W. and van Reekum, R. (eds.) (2014), *New York and Amsterdam: immigration and the new urban landscape*. New York: NYU Press.
- Hannerz U. (2006), *Odkrywanie miasta. Antropologia obszarów miejskich*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Hum, T. (2014), *Making a Global Immigrant Neighborhood: Brooklyn's Sunset Park*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- International Migration Outlook 2021*, OECD (2021), https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/international-migration-outlook-2021_29f23e9d-en#page1.
- Kostrzewa A. (2020), *New Business in the Old Neighborhood: Young Polish Shopkeepers' Responses to Commercial Gentrification in Greenpoint, Brooklyn*, [in:] Krase J., DeSena J. (eds) *Gentrification around the World, Volume II*. Palgrave Studies in Urban Anthropology. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41341-5_3.

- Krase, J.(2006), *Italian American Urban Landscapes: Images of Social and Cultural Capital* [in:] Borer, M.I. (Ed.), *Varieties of Urban Experience: The American City and the Practice of Culture*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Li, W. (2008), *Ethnoburb: The New Ethnic Community in Urban America*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, Retrieved from <http://www.ebrary.com>.
- Lin, J. (2011), *The Power of Urban Ethnic Places: Cultural Heritage and Community Life*, New York, NY: Routledge Press.
- MOIA (2018), *The New York City Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs Annual Report*. <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/immigrants/about/annual-report.page>.
- MOIA (2019), *The New York City Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs Annual Report*. <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/immigrants/downloads/pdf/MOIA-Annual-Report-for-2019.pdf>.
- MOIA (2020), *The New York City Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs Annual Report*. <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/immigrants/about/annual-report.page>.
- Pacyga, D. A., (2009), *Chicago: a biography*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Patuzzi, L. (2020) *European Cities in the Front Line. New and emerging governance models for migrant inclusion*, Migration Policy Institute Europe and International Organization for Migration <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/publications/MPIE-LocalGovernance-FINAL.pdf>.
- Scholten, P., (2018), *Cities of migration: towards a typology*, [in:], Caponio T., Scholten P., Zapata-Barrero R. (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of the Governance of Migration and Diversity in Cities*, Abingdon, New York: Routledge, p.242–250.
- Sepulveda, L., S Syrett and F. Lyon (2011), *Population Superdiversity and new migrant enterprise: the case of London*, *Entrepreneurship and Development* (23): 7–8, 469–97.
- Shönwälder K.(ed) (2007), *Residential segregation and itegration of immigrants: Britain, the Netherlands, Sweden*, Berlin: WZB.
- Urban Europe – statistics on cities, towns and suburbs – foreign-born persons living in cities*, Eurostat (2015) https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statisticsexplained/index.php?title=Urban_Europe_%E2%80%94_statistics_on_cities,_towns_and_suburbs_%E2%80%94_foreign-born_persons_living_in_cities.
- Waldinger R., Bozorgmehr M.(1996), *The Making of Multicultural Metropolis*, [in:] Waldinger R., Bozorgmehr M. (eds.), *Ethnic Los Angeles*, New York: Russel Sage Foundation, p. 1–37.
- Wojakowski D., (2015), *Naród ukraiński jako przedmiot powszechnego niezrozumienia*, *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* no 2, p. 63–84.
- Wojakowski D., (2021), *Wielokulturowość polskich miast: perspektywa rozwoju czy promocyjna wydmuszka*, [in:], Dolińska K., Makaro J., (eds), *Wielokulturowość polskich miast. Teoria, polityka, praktyka*, Kraków: Nomos, p. 25–36 (book in the process of publication).
- Wong, B. (1998), *Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship: The New Chinese Immigrants in the San Francisco Bay Area*, Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- World Migration Report 2015 – Migrants and Cities: New Partnerships to Manage Mobility*, International Migratiof for Migartion (IOM), (2015) <https://publications.iom.int/books/world-migration-report-2015-migrants-and-cities-new-partnerships-manage-mobility>.
- Zukin, S. (1995), *The Culture of Cities*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.