

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: GLOBALISATION AND SOCIO-SPATIAL STRUCTURE

International trends

In the economically advanced countries of West-Europe (as well as in the USA and Japan) since the 1960s and 70s an economic and social centralization process has been going on with the urban concentration of skilled labour, the domination of multiregional, interregional and later on multinational and transnational firms with an intensive development of cities and their urban peripheries as an impact (Veltz, 1996, 33).

The development of global economy, global economic integration and accelerating metropolitan development have shaped new urban spaces and urban systems (Enyedi 2003). The global economy created metropolitan spaces and urban regions have been analysed by several researchers. Hall in the 1960s (Hall, 1996), Castells and Godard in the 1970s (Castells–Godard, 1974), Friedmann, Wolff and Enyedi described the economic processes playing key role in the formation of global cities in the 1980s (Freidmann–Wolff, 1982; Enyedi, 1988). In his comprehensive study published in the early 1990s Sassen investigated the intensive urban and metropolitan concentration of global capital and its institutional system as well as their fragmentation as an outcome of evolving peripheral areas (Sassen, 1991, 17–35).

The world's more than 300 metropolises with over one million inhabitants are not only oversized urban settlements but they are rather more multifunctional, multi-centered and new-structured urbanized regions. One of their important features is that they are representing a diversity of urban forms (Enyedi, 2001). By Castell's interpretation global cities are the special urbanisational forms of our age (Castells–Godard, 1974, 442). By now it has become clear that metropolitan regions and global cities are getting more and more important for world economy by their functioning as innovation, manufacturing and service centres (Hall, 1996, 19–31). It is mostly big metropolises that can guarantee the dynamic operation of post-fordist economy, the growth of services, the quaternary sector. These growth poles are the steering wheels of economic development. They are the main locations of international capital, of skilled labour force, of the development of informatics, of organising international relations and of the diversity of social cultures (Sassen, 2000, 152). It is also metropolises that can offer real competitive advantages for global firms.

Our researches have revealed the dark sides of metropolitan life as well. The growth of metropolises increased regional disparities everywhere in the economi-

cally advanced industrial societies. According to the relevant analyses in France, in the United Kingdom and in Japan regional income differences due to the decentralized industrial development have decreased in the 1950s and 60s but they increased again from the mid-1970s due to the globalisation of economy, to the concentration of multinational firms in metropolitan areas and to the concentrated presence of the top-manager classes of the leading global firms (Veltz, 1996, 51).

In the USA, Japan and the countries of Europe increasing spatial differences as a result of the concentration of metropolitan regions have become a general trend. Veltz is of the opinion that the French urban space having been formulated by the metropolitan concentration of global economy is bipolar: it is characterised by strong regional inequalities between the region of Paris and the other regions (especially the southern parts of France (Veltz, 1996, 33). Philippe Cadene says that the 117 settlement groups with over two million inhabitants are concentrating the biggest organisations, the richest families as well as a part of the poverty that is characteristic for the given countries (Cadene, 2000, 139).

Mollenkopf és Castells used the term of dual society for labelling inequality problems (Mollenkopf–Castells, 1993). By this term they mean globalization generated socio-spatial inequalities; the advantages of territories and social groups involved in global economy and the disadvantages of those having been excluded. The term „société duale,” or „dual city” expresses the economic and social discrepancies between the world of groups linked to global economy in big metropolises, urban agglomerations and the world of old industrial towns, urban areas suffering from crisis, big urban residential areas inhabited by poor classes and the world of small towns and declining small rural areas (Ascher, 1995, 126).

However the concept of dual society is criticised from several sides as dynamic urban spaces are also structured and high classes are available in declining areas as well. Starting from this assumption Ascher for example proposes to introduce the term of three grouped society on the basis of positioning it into the post-fordist wage structure. By this interpretation the first group covers those who are employed in the public sphere or those having a secure job and consolidated social positions at big private sector companies. The other group covers those having uncertain career perspectives or being excluded from the labour market. The first group could further be differentiated from security aspects. Thus, people with uncertain existence would create the third group. The members of these three groups are living three different manners of life leading different urban lifestyles (Ascher, 1995, 130).

Inequalities occur not only between metropolises, global urban regions and the remaining regions but also within the internal structure of metropolises and big cities: there are spatial and economic disparities between the city centre and its surrounding urban peripheries as well. Veltz for example is demonstrating the

relationship between the core Paris region and its environment by a pyramid of spatial hierarchy (Veltz, 1996, 33).

The development chances of urban networks created by globalising world economy and of cities and their environment (and of their involved societies) are strongly differing from each other. Social polarization with gradually increasing social inequalities manifesting in space has increased between core areas and peripheries and within settlements themselves. In global cities – defined simply as ‘shop-window cities’ by Boltanski and Chiapello – social tensions have become more and more apparent. The differences between the urban quarters populated by the elite – i.e. the management and expertise of multinational firms, economic and political decision-makers and skilled middle classes – and the residential areas of socially handicapped and unemployed classes became quite apparent (Boltanski–Chiapello, 1999).

Sassen’s analyses are also confirming the spatial disparities of inner city areas, the differences between urban core areas and peripheries originating partially from historical reasons, partially from the spatial features of the corporate location of global capital and partially from the social background and lifestyles of the local residents of urban areas. In this way really the top global corporations (and their new classes top managers, high-qualified professionals, stakeholder employees) are located in central urban quarters while standard national-level companies (mostly national-level middle classes) are rather located in the peripheral parts of urban areas (Sassen 2000). The investigations of Savitch and Kantor for ten big cities ended with similar results. West-European (covering such cities as Paris, Marseille, Napoli, Milan, Liverpool and Glasgow) and North-American (covering such cities as Toronto, Detroit, Houston, New York) comparative researches show a very low rate of active elite groups (professionals and managers) compared to the total number of economically active wage earners (except in Napoli with a rate between 40–80%) (Savitch–Kantor, 2004).

In economically advanced industrial societies the growing concentration of economy and population in big cities and global cities has produced an increasing spatial separation between the location of residential and work areas and a quicker expansion of residential areas than workplaces towards urban peripheries. It determines the spatial direction of capital investments, infrastructure development projects, the siting of commercial and other services from city core areas towards urban peripheries (Hall, 1996). This will generate a quick spatial expansion of urban peripheries consuming up free territories with the increasing trend of short- and long-distance commuting, an increasing demand and capacities of transport, the expansion of environmental damages, decreasing territories of green areas and the transformation of urban socio-spatial structure. The out-migration of urban middle classes from the city centre into the urban periphery is already a part of this trend.

During the past 15 years OECD countries have faced a dramatically accelerated economic and social suburbanization process. As a result – although in a varying amount by countries – the number of city centre residents only slightly but the population of urban peripheries has significantly increased. For example in the USA according to the 1990 census data more than half of the total population lives in 39 metropolitan regions having over one million residents each. The growth rate of the suburbs of these 39 metropolitan regions was 55 % between 1970 and 90 while the population growth rate in their inner quarters was 2 % only (Innovative Policies... 1996, 26).

Suburbanisation was accompanied by a ‘structural deficit’ i.e. wealthy social classes moved out to the peripheral areas of the city while social classes with moderate or low income remained in the central parts of the city (Innovative Policies... 1996, Territorial Development...1999). This trend was further intensified by the fact that due to the suburbanisation of middle classes the poor classes of certain suburbs are back-migrating into slumming inner city quarters (*Caldeira*, 1996, 71).

This is all accompanied by a rising European segregation trend with the growth of ‘underclass’, i.e the socially excluded groups living in low quality urban districts in residential areas of social housing. In West-European global cities and metropolises the number of declining urban centres and deteriorated urban quarters providing handicapped living prospects, concentrating poor social classes with marginal and deviant lifestyle, accumulating social problems and conflicts unable to provide any facilities for social integration is growing everywhere (*Berger*, 1998).

There exists another segregation trend which is called as ‘enbourgeoisement’, or gentrification: this is the growth of middle-classes in central urban quarters, the cocentration of high social classes. Researches in France have pointed out that in the early 1980s in the region of Paris the residents’ social polarization was much weaker than in the 1990s the period of intensifying residential segregation (*Tabard*, 1990). These changes have been generated by urbanisation processes, residential and urban housing policies and international labour market trends. The latest analyses have also revealed that aristocracy and upper middle classes (just like in the historic past) live in Paris in the city centre, in the western urban quarters and in the southern and southwestern suburbs (*Rhein*, 1995, 54). The wealthy households are located in the so-called ‘Beaux Quartiers’, i.e. in the elegant parts of the city with manager or highly qualified or skilled free-lancing family heads. The elite suburbs are different from the social content of city centres as they have more old-aged inactive and less immigrant family heads. (This is true for American suburbs as well having fewer immigrants (*Alba et al.* 1999). French workers (since the beginning of the 20th century) have been living in the eastern and north-eastern quarters of Paris and in its eastern, north-eastern and south-eastern

industrial outskirts (*Rhein*, 1995, 57). Unskilled workers live in cheap housing estates while skilled workers in private houses in the suburban villa zones or in the new cities (having been built in the 1960s and '70s) of Paris region (*Szirmai*, 1998, *Haumont*, 1996).

The rapid concentration of economy and high classes with their spatial segregation can very easily be recognized in the Paris Region. The signs of poverty are less spectacular there. The poorest social classes are not concentrated in the economically most advanced Paris region (*Preteceille*, 1997, 107). The French researcher is on the opinion that several other important French cities such as Marseille, Lyon and Strasbourg have similar trends (*Preteceille*, 1997, 107).

In his book comparing New York, London and Tokio Sassen claims that by the impact of globalisation the so-called 'new class' i.e. elite qualified professionals, rich and young managers have articulated their new demands for changing the traditional patterns of their living habits and creating new forms of urban lifestyle. These new demands are associated with global cities functioning as organisational units of consumer society manifesting in buying fancy goods, the costly spending of leisure time, going to elegant restaurants, theatres and visiting exclusive cultural and entertainment programmes. These lifestyle attitudes have not 'suburban' or 'periurban' but rather 'ultraurban' character and closely associated with city centres. The consumer demands of the global economic elite are attracting artists into the city centre with those groups of the cultural elite who by the traditional features of the urban social structure would not live there and would have no contacts with the actors of economy. These trends are also contributing to the formation of elite social structure of global cities (*Sassen*, 1991, 250–283).

Other researches are also confirming the existence of the high social classes' new residential attitudes. According to a representative survey in France a growing number of urban citizens give up their private car based suburban or periurban lifestyle and formulate their demand for the development of core city areas (including the application of new architectural solutions for a more community targeted life with two or three-storey buildings instead of living in isolated gated communities). They are also urging for elaborating a sustainable public transport development concept. 60–70% of the suburban citizens and 30–45% of periurban citizens of the total participants of research (investigating the differences between flat property and rental forms) claimed that they would prefer living in cities than in suburban or periurban environment (*Kaufmann*, 2002, 56–62).

Although American and European socio-spatial location and the segregational models were always differing from each other the latest trends show changes both in the European and the American segregation models. In the American model the well-off classes had greater inclination for living in suburbs and the poor classes tend much more to living in the slums or 'derelict' sites of inner urban zones. In European cities the out-migration rate of middle classes was never as high as in

America; historic city centres were always preserving their high reputational values for middle classes.

Preteceille denies the assumption that segregation would be more intensive in American cities. He is on the opinion that ethnic segregation is stronger and more spectacular in the United States than for example in France. But comparing it with London, Madrid, New York and Paris, he found that the degree of the segregation of elite classes is higher in European cities. At the same time the concentration of working classes is lower in Paris than in New York (Preteceille, 1997, 104–105).

The increasing social prestige of inner city quarters, the gentrification process can be perceived in the central parts of North-American cities as well (see Sassen's description). New York's example also proves it as Manhattan also has elegant urban quarters. The intensive office building boom in the city centres of the USA between 1960 and 1990 the regeneration of metropolitan city centres the building of new hotels, commercial centres, the recreation and congress centre development projects halted the deterioration process of city centres. All these filled up the inner parts of American metropolises with new content (Ascher, 1995, 30). Despite these changes American high classes still assign much higher social value to suburban settlements.

The increasing appreciation of suburban zones is perceivable in European cities as well. In the suburbs of London, Paris (south-east and west) high social classes have settled down (Rhein, 1995; Preteceille, 1997, 105). It was already seen in the 1982 census that 60% of high class intellectuals were living in suburbs (Haumont, 1996, 55). Of the eighty urban quarters of Paris twenty-seven are inhabited by high social classes as well, and eighty four satellite settlements of Paris have high class residents in high percentage (Preteceille, 1997, 105).

Segregation schemes have several origins such as historical background, the spatial structure of economy, the periods of global urbanization, social demands and possibilities, socio-ecological processes, changes in societal structures. According to international literature the different data sets (statistical analyses, incomes, life perspectives, summer holiday spending habits, leisure time and sporting patterns) are showing a homogenization process on a long-term period, indicating decreasing differences among different profession categories. Lower social differences have been manifested in a lower polarisation degree of residential areas during the 1980s.

However we are facing now a new kind of socio-spatial disparities (Fitoussi–Rosanvallon, 1996, Galland–Lemel, 1998). Globalization, global economy, macro- and micro-economic impacts, the everyday fights for defending our interests in the global economy, the economic impacts of success or failure have revealed several contradictions having been hidden so far, such as massive unemployment, the defencelessness of individuals, new dependencies and they have completely reshaped traditional structures. They have halted the processes facili-

tating the homogenisation of middle classes having been a typical phenomenon in the welfare societies of the past. And all these questioned the hopes of social equalisation as well (*Fitoussi–Rosanvallon, 1996, 71*). Compared to the earlier differences among social and employment status categories today the differences are much greater but limited to certain profession categories only with special regard to their spatial location (*Fitoussi–Rosanvallon, 1996, 67*). The differences in the quantity and quality of goods and fancy goods consumption are serving as a providing a new basis for social differentiation (*Ascher, 1995. 125*).