



17

Adaptation, Marketisation or Resilience? Multiculturalism in Local Practices at the Polish-Ukrainian Borderland

Dariusz Wojciech Wojakowski

1 Introduction

According to the sociologically acclaimed perspective of Ulrich Beck (1992), we presently live in societies of great risk. Risk appears both in the life of individuals and societies. The policy of resilience is promoted as the most suitable answer to this risk experience (see Levine et al. 2012; Valdes et al. 2012), though the omnipresence of risk indicates the ambiguity or multifacetedness of such policy. It is worth noting that the default understanding of risk and resilience is related to natural or technological disasters (Beck 1992, pp. 21–26; Levine et al. 2012, p. 1). However, Beck notes that the majority of problems related to risk concern interpersonal relations. Such risks may be a consequence of individualisation, since it necessitates taking autonomous decisions concerning the future in increasingly changing conditions (see Beck 1992, pp. 90–92 and pp. 105–106). This indicates that numerous challenges for local and regional communities are connected with the management of unexpected social changes (Building Resilience 2012, p. 5).

D. W. Wojakowski (✉)

AGH - University of Science and Technology, Kraków, Poland

© The Author(s) 2019

G. Rouet, G. C. Pascariu (eds.), *Resilience and the EU's Eastern Neighbourhood Countries*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25606-7_17

In that general theoretical framework of the risk society, multiculturalism arises as the category in which the European sociopolitical discourse evokes a variety of emotions. On the one hand, it is a term referring to the central values of the European Union (EU), the realisation of which is embedded in the systems of social integration and cultural activation at all levels of social life in the EU's member countries. On the other hand, this term comes under public criticism not only from the radical opponents of European integration but also in the mainstream of European politics. The failure of multiculturalism was proclaimed by top European politicians several years ago (see Illmer 2010; Malik 2015).

Despite these renewed declarations and the huge differences of opinions, the issue of multiculturalism is still a part of public debate in all European countries, regardless of the scale of their actual cultural diversity. This means that the question of multiculturalism is also considered an important issue in the societies of Central and Eastern Europe, which are presently less ethnically and culturally diverse than the Western countries. The debates which have appeared at the level of European nation-states influence the perception of multiculturalism within the European Union's institutions. Established in 2007, the goal of creating a cultural policy by the Council of the European Union is described as "the promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue". These categories have been opposed to multiculturalism, which is explicitly indicated on the European Commission's website:

Intercultural dialogue is, essentially, the exchange of views and opinions between different cultures. Unlike multiculturalism [underlined—D.W.], where the focus is on the preservation of separate cultures, intercultural dialogue seeks to establish linkages and common ground between different cultures, communities, and people, promoting understanding and interaction. (European Agenda for Culture¹)

These sociopolitical notions of multiculturalism do not match the concepts of multiculturalism used in social sciences. As Kenan Malik (2015) comments: "But the truth about multiculturalism is far more complex

¹European Commission. Intercultural dialogue. https://ec.europa.eu/culture/policy/strategic-framework/intercultural-dialogue_en.

than either side will allow, and the debate about it has often devolved into sophistry.” The author points out that multiculturalism, as a certain state of social reality, has significant implications for all aspects of social life, both locally and globally. He also stresses the heterogeneity of multicultural policies in European countries, which are mistakenly interpreted as describing this “state of social reality”.

This chapter describes multiculturalism as both the social reality and an element of policy, but not at the macrosocial level of the European Union. This is the mezzo-social perspective of local values and practices realised in Poland and Ukraine—on both sides of the EU’s eastern border. Such multiculturalism creates the social reality of the inhabitants of that border region. From that perspective, multiculturalism encounters both individual’s and group’s choices and risks, which allow multiculturalism to be described as the context of the local policy of resilience. The object of the analysis is the recognition of the meanings of multiculturalism that are used in the interpretations and practices of people who decide on local culture: self-governors, cultural activists and local artists from bi-ethnic and multireligious towns—two located in Podkarpackie Voivodeship (province) in Poland² and one in Lviv Oblast (province) in Ukraine³ The goal of the analysis is to show the extent to which and in what form multiculturalism is a resource or element used in the local policies of resilience in those towns located on two sides of the

²The article refers to research undertaken during the two phases of the project “Ceremonial creation and propagation of brands (national, local, regional) in local communities. The role of people and cultural institutions”, which took place in 2013 and 2014 under the umbrella of the Polish Academy of Sciences (at the request of the National Centre of Culture). The project was led by Hanna Bojar. The research team consisted of D. Wojakowski, A. Karnaukh, A. Fiń, Ł. Kapralska and A. Nijander-Dudzińska. Twenty in-depth interviews with people engaged in organisation of cultural events in the two towns in Poland comprised the base for the analysis. In 2016 and in 2018, short research explorations were done in both towns, which allowed for gathering of some field data (interviews, observations, photos) by D. Wojakowski, D. Porczyński and M. Stopa. In the main text, I do not use the towns’ names.

³The research was a part of a project funded by Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education “Antagonism and reconciliation in multicultural environments” (N N116 230436), conducted between 2009 and 2012. The leader of the project was J. Kurczewski. The research team consisted of D. Wojakowski, S. Dyjak and A. Karnaukh. Apart from field research and surveys, 14 in-depth interviews with town authorities and members of ethnic and non-governmental organisations were carried out. In 2016 and in 2018, I also made short research visits to that Ukrainian town to gather field data.

Polish-Ukrainian borderland. The main research was conducted in 2009–2014, but these local communities are under constant observational research (research explorations were conducted in 2016 and 2018). The perspective of almost ten years allows for observations on how the main local practices oriented on multiculturalism have changed throughout the period of important macrosocial changes in Ukraine and Poland. First of all, there are the processes of democratisation and internal migration in Ukraine resulting from protests in 2013–2014 (Euromaidan) and the Ukrainian-Russian conflict, which started in 2014. In Poland, a major external factor for local communities was the political change after 2015, which has been associated with restrictions on the activities of non-governmental organisations, including minority organisations, and social protests against violations of the democratic rule of law.

2 The Idea of Multiculturalism in the Context of the Policy of Resilience

Multiculturalism as the cultural context of resilience is presented in the literature mainly as an issue of immigrant societies. This context of resilience is especially stressed in Australian social sciences (Grossman 2013). Three views on the relation between multiculturalism and resilience could be distinguished in social sciences. The first one connects multiculturalism with reactions to natural and technological disasters. The ability to communicate in multi-ethnic and multi-linguistic local communities is one of the most important aspects of their effective response to those dangers. Carolyn Waddell (2013, p. 1) writes that

the very definition of resilience is exhibited passionately by members of our diverse community either through community connectedness or the willingness to volunteer for an emergency service organisation.

This type precisely fits the idea of resilience as a kind of reaction to potential dangers, which should be used in culturally and linguistically diverse communities. Waddell also appeals to the primeval roots of human cooperation, as she points out that such volunteering is based on

the willingness to ‘give back to their community’ and the satisfaction that comes with being able to assist a person in need. At this grassroots level, what is sought is a sense of belonging. It is an innate human condition to want to be a part of something or to be a valued member of a team and/or group. (Waddell 2013, p. 1)

This type of relation between resilience and multiculturalism focuses on the questions of intercultural risk communication or disaster resilience communication. It is also used in European sociology (Lucini 2014, pp. 152–153). In a similar way, however, very narrowly, the idea of resilience appears in the borderland studies literature, where it is also described as the reaction to natural and technological disasters (Haselberger 2014, p. 516). The context of such thinking about resilience and multiculturalism is the increasing role of the migration processes in recent times, which makes most of the European and Middle Eastern states the immigrant ones (Castles et al. 2014, p. 211, p. 213).

The second kind of thinking about resilience and multiculturalism is the idea of resilience of ethnicity, which is described by Will Kymlicka (2013, p. 99) as the process in which “people contest, contain, subvert, or appropriate neoliberal ideas and policies to protect the social bonds and identities they value”. In that perspective, multiculturalism is an element of resilience of minority groups against the external and dominant policies of modern states and capitalist markets. According to the author, there are three forms of such resilience. The first one concerns blocking neoliberal reforms influenced on minority groups. The second form is based on capturing and subverting those reforms for the realisation of own goals of minority groups. In these forms of resilience, there is a kind of defensive reaction against changes which may arise within ethnic minority groups under the influence of external (global) factors (the first one) or adaptation to social environment (the second one). Only the third form represents the wider understanding of resilience. In that sense,

minority ethnic actors embrace the logic of global competitiveness and integrate this with their earlier commitments to democratic citizenization. In this view, minorities can adopt neoliberal multiculturalism, not in place of a social liberal multiculturalism that aspires to citizenization but as a

supplement to it and indeed as a way of extending it. (Kymlicka 2013, p. 115)

The separation of these forms cognitively seems very attractive because it shows the components of resilient activity. Those components may be adapted not only to minority resilience, but it also describes all the different types of policies of resilience. The basic form of resilience is a simple reaction against the external influences, as in the concept of resistance identity described by Castells (1997, pp. 65–66). The second form stresses the components of adaptation in the resilience, which means the ability to adapt to external patterns and develop a structure to face external challenges. This component reveals a long-recognised element of social system's relations with the environment recognised in functionalism as a fundamental functional imperative (see Parsons 1991, p. 17). In recent research, the process of adaptation—despite the fact that it is not so fundamental—is still recognised as one of the observed processes in relations between social systems (see Kurczewska 2008; Wilken 2012). These two forms of resilience are only its components, not the essence of that term. Defensive reaction focuses on the maintenance of the social system's status quo in a changing environment. Adaptation is the reaction on the environmental pressure (dangers or risks) which takes changes in the social system into account. Resilience, however, should be understood as a reaction that affects changes into the social system which is resilient, as well as into the environment which “produces the problem”. In such thinking, resilience is the process in which the social system (local community, society, ethnic minority, etc.) recognises and reacts to challenges which appear in the environment. But—what is constitutive for that process—it finally solves the problems by introducing changes both to the structure of the system and to the structure of its environment.

This general character of the resilience may be used to the description of cultural resilience, which is the third type of description of relations between multiculturalism and resilience. The cultural resilience is a broader term than the resilience presented in the previous two perspectives. Firstly, it has been used in psychology. According to Caroline Clauss-Ehlers (2010, p. 324; cited in Grossman 2013, p. 1), cultural resilience means

that people can manage and overcome stress and trauma based not on individual characteristics alone, but also from the support of broader socio-cultural factors (culture, cultural values, language, customs, norms).

Michele Grossman (2013, p. 1) effectively uses this term in cultural science and describes it as the potential “that cultural background plays in determining the ability of individuals and communities to be resilient in the face of adversity”. Grossman stresses the fact that in the culturally diverse communities

the combination of both valuing one’s culture as well as learning about the culture of the new system produces greater resilience and adaptive capacities, serious problems can arise when a majority tries to acculturate a minority to the mainstream by taking away or not recognizing important parts of the minority culture. In terms of resilience, if cultural factors are denied or diminished in accounting for and strengthening resilience—in other words, if people are stripped of what they possess by way of resilience built through cultural knowledge, disposition and networks—they do in fact become vulnerable. (Grossman 2013, p. 2)

This means the cultural resilience assumes multiculturalism because Grossman writes that individuals and groups which characterise that kind of resilience have a different cultural background from the culture of their social environment. Cultural resilience is the process which appears in multicultural societies. In some sense, the idea of cultural resilience postulates an equilibrium between the preservation of the cultural traditions of minorities and the assimilation of the culture of the social surroundings. However, the crucial point of the resilience is not the equilibrium, but rather how it is used to “solve the problem”—positively react to the challenges of the global world.

The question of equilibrium is a matter of the theory of multiculturalism. This is the question of relations between the dominant society and ethnic minorities and their cultures. It is not the only connection between multiculturalism and (cultural) resilience. These terms are both connected with the organisation of immigrant societies (see Rex 1997), which is why they are better developed in immigrant countries. The idea

of multiculturalism appeared in Canada and Australia in the 1970s and was transferred to the social conditions of the European Economic Community in the 1980s. The policy of multiculturalism has been integrated throughout the entire European Union, so it has also found its way into Central Europe along with its incorporation into the EU's structures. In my opinion, the effectiveness of this policy should refer to two significant resilience principles: multiculturalism should be rooted in the local society and multicultural actions should provide some long-term effects (Building Resilience 2012, p. 16).

From the perspective of the policy of resilience, multiculturalism in European circumstances may be considered (1) as a "state of reality" and thus treated as a local or ethnic resource used to increase ability to be resilient (as in Grossman's view) or (2) as part of the resilience policy—as the way of being resilient (as in Kymlicka's concept). In the case of Central European local communities, multiculturalism may additionally be treated as the external factor, an element of the environment of the social system. This relates to the fact that the EU programmes adopted by new member states, or in the EU's direct proximity, guarantee the incorporation of the idea of multiculturalism into activities of local and regional governments.

Multiculturalism means different things not only from the perspective of social sciences or policy of resilience. It is also very flexible in common usage as the term basically denotes "one of social values [...]. Thus, its concept may abstract from specific ethnic systems, multicultural relations or political practices" (Wojakowski 2015, p. 73).⁴ The focus on notions or "local interpretations"⁵ of multiculturalism allows for a precise recognition of the extent to which multiculturalism may be an important factor that increases resilience of local borderland communities. From this perspective, multiculturalism is a cultural phenomenon (Znanięcki 1980, p. 132) which might significantly affect forms of multicultural contacts, the pursuit of cultural equality and integration of an ethnically diversified society.

⁴The character of this value and its position in reference to other social values of a local society are already the subject of my analysis of gathered material (see Wojakowski 2015).

⁵This term refers to Clifford Geertz's concept of local knowledge (Geertz 1993).

On this basis, it is possible to state that social interpretations concerning multiculturalism are out of touch with the actual systems of ethnic relations. This is notably observed in monocultural communities (see Bieniecki 2005; Dolińska and Makaro 2013). In Polish local communities, multiculturalism, as an acknowledged (desired) value, relates to very superficial multicultural contacts or practices of the dominant group regarding their multicultural past. However, other research shows that a similar phenomenon of abstracting from the actual ethnic diversity with reference to multiculturalism is present in communities of the borderlands (Wojakowski 2015). In such a context, it is worth mentioning the observations of a Slovakian anthropologist, Juraj Buzalka. He noticed that on the Polish-Ukrainian borderland, the category of multiculturalism is used by Polish elites (teachers, politicians, academics) in the context of the creation of their own vision of tolerance that does not refer to direct multicultural contact (Buzalka 2007, pp. 152–154). The significant element that substitutes such contacts is the interpretation of multicultural past, which—as I indicated elsewhere (Wojakowski 2015, pp. 76–77)—is a factor that hinders rather than supports proper multicultural relations. Buzalka interprets such an implementation and understanding of multiculturalism in a similar manner. According to him, it creates an attitude described as “artificial tolerance”, which itself is not sufficient to create proper social relations (Buzalka 2007, p. 156). Moreover, according to the author, such an understanding of tolerance “implies the possibility of the undesired reproduction of religious-national tensions” (Buzalka 2007, p. 157).

3 Multiculturalism as a Local Resource in the Global Struggle

The first step in reconstructing the “local models” of multiculturalism in the researched communities is to present the moments in social activities when the category of multiculturalism is brought out. For now, it is not a question of how such a category is interpreted, but rather in which context it is used by the respondents. The first factor that causes

multiculturalism to appear in their activities is the fact that, in the communities of the borderlands (although in Poland generally in all local communities), cultural diversity itself is a component of the communities' heritage. Heritage is every kind of output of the past generations. This output exists "regardless" and, if it is deemed valuable for a group or a unit, it becomes a part of their tradition (Chłopecki 1989, pp. 242–245). It means that the heritage of other cultures is a resource, which may be used by representatives of that community in various goals.

It is worth paying attention to Marian Kempny's suggestion that these types of resources are significant for the local community, especially under the condition of globalisation, since they allow it to take part and compete in global economy (Kempny 2004, p. 186). However, it is not just a simple accommodation to the rules of globalisation, but rather a simultaneous creation of a new cultural autonomy of locality (Kempny 2004, p. 189). The intertwining of economic and cultural aspects is not just a reduction to the former. Some processes within the European Union can be similarly interpreted. Referring to research on the borderlands, Jerzy Bartkowski shows that there appears a specific "marketisation" of cultural resources under the influence of the European Union funding programmes. The author states that it has definitely positive results linked to a higher activity of local subjects and an increase in quality of projects concerning the field of culture. At the same time, the field of culture is treated as a product and a mechanism of the town's promotion (Bartkowski 2009, p. 146). As a result, "local cultural resources have become significant in competition for funds" (Bartkowski 2009, p. 147). In activities oriented towards acquiring funds, the cultural diversity and the borderland localisation has become a "strong asset" and a "calling card of local homelands" (Bartkowski 2009, p. 147).

Thus, the second factor that influences local references to multiculturalism has an external character. It consists of certain global and European mechanisms for the implementation of local cultural resources. Moreover, Tomasz Zarycki notes that multiculturalism is at the same time an element of an external ideology, which suggests local resources have a particular value. The author calls it the "new liberal discourse of the borderland" (Zarycki 2013, p. 199). Such discourse is oriented towards the transformation of the identity of the inhabitants of the borderland,

while encouraging them to “fully utilise the intercultural contact and multiculturalism that turns out to be a peculiar resource just waiting to be unveiled” (Zarycki 2013, p. 199). According to Zarycki, such discourse has the characteristics of a controlling mechanism, Foucault’s governmentality. From that perspective, certain interpretations of borderlands and multiculturalism may be treated as an external idea that dictates the framework for local interpretations.

These specific global and European processes change the meaning of local cultural resources and positively valorise the elements of cultural diversification. At the same time, their course is traced by a broader phenomenon in the European culture, a process recognised by anthropologists as the commoditisation of culture. According to Igor Kopytoff (1986, pp. 87–88): “In all contemporary industrial societies, regardless of their ideology, commoditisation and monetisation tend to invade almost every aspect of existence.” Such a process, however, should not be perceived in a simplified way. In Kopytoff’s analysis, it is connected with the distinction of numerous spheres of exchange that are relatively controlled by both cultural rules and the actions of individuals oriented against commoditisation (Kopytoff 1986, pp. 78–80). In reference to the processes observed in the local culture of the borderland, commoditisation can be described as the distinction of a specific sphere of exchange that consists of cultural events and initiatives in the local community. In such a sphere, individuals operate on specific material, social and symbolic resources, according to broader globalisation (competition of the local community in the global space) and European (the utilisation of the EU funding programmes) rules.

Commoditisation of culture is a foundation for the marketisation of cultural activity because it promotes thinking about cultural values and contents as commodities, which may be used in the “cultural market”. Multiculturalism—as described by Bartkowski—is one of such objects/commodities engaged in the complex process of exchange in the framework of “the cultural market”. It first appears as a resource that can be utilised to acquire funds for local projects from the EU funding programmes. The appearance of that link between multiculturalism and EU funds has been evident since the first decade of the twenty-first century. While describing attitudes of the openness of politicians and

self-government officials towards cultural diversification (multiculturalism), I observed that they appear in individuals who directly manage culture or are strongly engaged in this sphere of local life (Wojakowski 2013, p. 140). It seems that the orientation of the interlocutors towards multiculturalism is connected with its inclusion in the mechanism of funding self-government activities from the EU funding programmes. The research within the projects analysed here was carried out among people who professionally manage culture in local communities. The vast majority of interlocutors said that multiculturalism was a recognisable element of their activities, though it was not as directly associated with acquiring funds from the EU as in Bartkowski's description. In the case of officials and managers responsible for the organisation of cultural events in the town, European projects—or generally external subventions—did appear in a broader context of statements concerning multiculturalism. Foremost, interlocutors perceive all their cultural activity in the context of applying for funds:

If it's going to work out, because we tried to get the money. As I said, we wanted to apply to the Norwegian funds, the application deadline was the 15th of August. We asked the Norwegian partners, but no one replied. So we gave up. That's why we are going to try to contact the Minister of Culture. (P2_13, 27.08.2013)

The nature of international programmes in which they participate, thanks to the acquired funds, built or reshaped their personal and institutional international connections: "This year is generally, I even have to look it up, because this year... m'am... we even have people from Palestine, because we are realising such a project" (SKS5_14, 21.08.2014).

Such research allows one to follow the path of transformation of multiculturalism as a resource in the local community of the borderland. The majority of people associate multiculturalism with their professional work. This creates the assumption that the first exchange of multiculturalism in the local community is the appearance of job positions, which are connected with activities oriented on cultural diversification within the cultural sphere. However, it is not a precise interpretation, since it is difficult to identify the job positions that concern only the management

of multiculturalism. Yet, generally, every person who has a significant position connected with the management of culture is, in a certain way, oriented towards multiculturalism as a resource that generates external subventions.

The quasi-market rules of cultural activity mean that it stops being an autotelic activity, oriented solely on aesthetic impressions or creative expression. Funds for culture are associated with the category of effectiveness, and the donor has the right to describe goals of the taken actions (Bartkowski 2009, pp. 145–146). This means that the respondents—even if it is just their own convictions—expect a “measurable” outcome of the utilised resources (multiculturalism, in this case). There are several categories that are used to indicate such measurability: promotion, popularity, product or brand.

The phenomenon of marketisation of cultural practices and values may be interpreted as a kind of adaptation which effects some changes in social systems (here: local communities) under the influence of the environment (here: EU and global rules). This phenomenon is observed mainly on the Polish side of the borderland. The next part of this chapter presents detailed relations between multiculturalism and adaptation via marketisation.

4 Adaptation by Marketisation: Multiculturalism at the Polish Side of the Borderland

In both of the researched towns in Poland, culture is linked to promotion. One of them has an Office of Culture and Promotion. Multiculturalism is considered a specific way of thinking about culture, which has the ability to generate income from tourism:

So it used to be a truly multicultural town. (...) So it is a thing that is difficult to be distant from, it's even impossible. It is hard to imagine that we could suddenly opt for a different kind of activities [other than promotion of multiculturalism—D.W]. This is a town which somehow automatically influences the fact that the culture dominates when it comes to attracting

tourists. They are very important and welcome, aren't they? (P6_13, 27.08.2013)

The respondents often visibly associate multiculturalism and promotion, and it also appears in statements of organisers of cultural events who were not connected with self-government offices: "I think that when multiculturalism isn't properly promoted, it becomes lost in the crowd" (P3_13, 26.08.2013). Popularity is a measure of the importance of cultural agencies, thus multiculturalism (diversity) is valuable since it may raise their attractiveness: "The museum is so popular and eagerly visited, because you won't find such cultural diversity in any other museum" (SKA4_14, 18.08.2014).

The first researched town in Poland is a small regional centre in the southern highland part of Podkarpackie. There is a small Ukrainian minority in the town, while most Ukrainians live in the rural areas surrounding the town. The town is a cultural centre for Orthodox and Greek-Catholic Ukrainians from those villages. Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, the entire organisation of town's festivals has been based on multiculturalism. During the festivals—also during the research—a strong reference to various ethnic traditions have been observed, along with references to the region (Bieszczady Highlands) which undoubtedly has touristic potential.

The second researched town is a historical regional centre with the largest Ukrainian minority in the entire Polish part of the borderland and is located near the Polish-Ukrainian state border. In that town, connections between local traditions and multiculturalism are not deeply stressed during local cultural events. Multiculturalism is rather perceived as simply the potential to attract tourists, particularly foreign ones:

... they have visitors from Slovakia and the Czech Republic, and I think that this area is definitely expanding and I would go for multiculturalism.... (P3_13, 26.08.2013)

The open question is the extent to which such references to multiculturalism are important for the "promotion" of the local authorities as an element of election campaigns. This intriguing phenomenon appeared

only marginally and between interviews (during observations of cultural events). During the researched events, local authorities used the term “multiculturalism” in speeches directed at the local public. However, the statements from the interviews are not enough to evaluate to what extent such people think that multiculturalism is a significant or a positive factor in the creation of the sociopolitical community of the townspeople.

The transfer of multiculturalism into the category of the local brand has also only appeared marginal. However, its lack of mention contrasts with practical references to multiculturalism. Such practices are especially common in the Polish town located in Bieszczady Highlands. It is also worth emphasising that in the interviews carried out in that town, an institution of a definitely “multicultural” profile is commonly referred to as the town’s brand. The exhibitions presented by that institution concern the past multiculturalism of the region. Also, the other events organised in the area surrounding the institution have a similar multicultural nature, including monthly antique fairs that have “multicultural” tourist attractions (Lemko dishes, Jewish organ-grinder). In this way, multiculturalism as an element of a broad tradition translates to a “commodity” whose purpose is to build up the place’s brand. The multiculturalism of the town’s festival is similarly “branded” in this community. Although the respondents did not say much about the multicultural products: “this multiculturalism was visible in the dishes” (SKA5_14, 18.08.2014), multiculturalism was expressed with ornaments, icons and “ethnic” clothing (Ukrainian) sold during the festival.

In the second Polish town, the connection of multiculturalism and brand does not have such direct, concrete expressions. It does not mean that such a connection is non-existent—multiculturalism is “sold” more discreetly. Above all, it appears in the materials that promote the town, for example, a special website for tourists.

This analysis explains why virtual multiculturalism has appeared in Poland. It is due to the fact that the phenomena associated with it (history, traditions, art, the architecture of local minorities) constitute an effective local resource—on the borderland or sometimes elsewhere— which means that results of referring to such resource can be easily evaluated. It concerns the translation of activities that “promote multiculturalism” into the evaluation of projects that are the source of

such activities. The results of such activities are concrete “measures” that can be pointed out in the evaluation and “commodities” (which include services or cultural events) that are offered to a specific category of receivers, mostly tourists.

The research shows that perhaps multiculturalism is not only an acknowledged value but also a pragmatic, beneficial one. I emphasise the fact that it is rather a conviction that such benefits exist, which may exclusively be supported by “measures” worked out inside the aforementioned sphere of exchange. However, the question how such an implementation of multiculturalism reflects the set of interpretations that commonly define such a term is equally important.

The very cultural practices of local authorities support multiculturalism, provided that it may be used as a resource that attracts tourists and generates money. It is an obvious form of the adaptation of local practices and discourses to the external—the European Union’s—conditions and opportunities. In these practices, multiculturalism appears both as the kind of local resource which has pragmatic value and as a part of local policy. In that second case, appealing to multiculturalism shows that policy is tied in with global factor—European and Polish values and goals. In 2014, those two elements—multiculturalism as a resource and an aspect of local policy—were more closely related in the town in the Bieszczady Highlands than in the second one near the Ukrainian border. After 2015, some nationalistic sentiments appeared at the level of state policy in Poland. It exerted some kind of pressure on local governments, especially in the researched towns, where the local authorities supported the state policy. But the changes, aimed at some form of impediment of relations with the Ukrainian minority and withdrawal of elements of minority culture from cultural activity of the local institutions, appeared only in the second town. What is interesting is that the evident support of the nationalistic organisations by the local authorities in that town resulted in the emergence of new forms of cooperation between Polish and Ukrainian NGOs there. The local Ukrainian minority received the support of Polish organisations, so far inactive in the previously observed “official promotion of multiculturalism”. Probably the adaptation based on the pragmatic appeal to multiculturalism created local resilient connections, which emerged when trying to move away from previous

practices. In 2018, in both Polish towns, the importance of multiculturalism was greater than four years earlier, regardless of the fact that it is associated with a more local and less official (not oriented to tourism promotion) cooperation of many dispersed social agents.

5 Resilient Usage of Multiculturalism in the Ukrainian Town

Another example of building an interpretation of multiculturalism is the case of the Ukrainian town which was researched. This town is located in the southern part of Lviv Oblast. It is a former industrial and regional centre inhabited by Ukrainians, Russians, Poles and Jews. Ethnic minorities comprise 5% of the town's population. Numerous similarities in actions and interpretations with the described Polish cases may be found there: orientation towards the multicultural past, treating it as a base for building a specific town brand and translating it into concrete "marketing" benefits. What is the difference? First of all, the idea of multiculturalism is formulated outside of political structures and local self-government. The main actors engaged in multicultural projects are non-government and academic organisations. Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, such associations have regularly introduced a number of initiatives oriented towards discovering and revitalising elements of the multicultural town's history. In this activity, burgess tradition and locality seem to be a basic value, since they are oriented towards so-called high culture (theatre, literature, fine arts), the creation of town brand, activation of civic potential. All the goals are linked to concrete activities: the organisation of Schulz festival, management of an art gallery (and a shop with local souvenirs) and the organisation of performances. Since the orientation towards locality is a natural turn to the past, which had been created by Poles, Jews and Ukrainians in the researched town, the contemporary Ukrainian environment in a natural way is oriented towards multicultural resources of town's culture. The symbol of such multiculturalism is Bruno Schulz, who was of Jewish descent, wrote in Polish and was focused on his town. He is a patron of locality and burgess tradition understood

in such a way. Simultaneously, such multicultural resources result in appreciation of locality without creating isolation and are a strong factor that opens the environment outside. Appreciation of such an understanding of locality is treated as a resource with a deeper local meaning. In that environment, the concept is sometimes expressed explicitly. Wiera Meniok (2016, p. 226) writes that:

we live in multicultural and multireligious land, in a cultural borderland, which is particularly sensitive to the need of dialogue and agreement between those who inherited different linguistic heritage and different religious genealogy, but live in one common cultural-historic universe.

Such mobilisation of local resources fits the observation of Kempny (2004, p. 186) regarding local culture in the globalised world: “when it is about creating (re-creating) locality—as happens frequently nowadays—it means a very complex network of determinants and an ambiguous area of social practices—on one side a battle for the chance to participate in the global economy fought by local communities, on the other—a sphere of identity shaping: a battle with uprooting, alienation, the feeling of a lost motherland.” In the practices of such associations, it is possible to observe—regardless of strong orientation towards high culture—the same thread of marketisation of local identity. Realisation of their projects is mainly based on subventions acquired from European and Polish funds. The range of external funding is significantly lower than in Poland, which results in support from local investors and private individuals, who try to benefit from the fact that the multiculturalism of the town is becoming an attractive product.

Despite a significant restraint in supporting such practices by local authorities, the form of multiculturalism’s promotion—town festivals—results in multiculturalism that becomes more rooted in the local community than in the researched Polish towns. More than half of the inhabitants acknowledge the multicultural character of the town (see Kurczewski and Wojakowski 2012). Yet, before 2013, multiculturalism appeared as a value rooted in the local community. Paradoxically, this broader attachment to multiculturalism is evident in the irregular and smaller financial support than the projects realised on the Polish side. In

the Ukrainian town, there has been an absolute lack of support from the self-government before 2016.

The Ukrainian-Russian conflict was a great challenge for the social situation in Ukraine, and thus in the town under investigation. Actually, the events in this town, since 2014, show how the earlier non-governmental initiative had been translated into the policy of resilience. Jacek Kurczewski describes it as a process of liberating social energy and democratisation, which was connected with the Euromaidan protests (which were also organised in the researched town; see Kurczewski 2016, pp. 306–314). The consequence of this was not only another change of local authorities but the emergence of a completely new perspective of the relationship between local government and the inhabitants of the town. It was expressed in the address of the new mayor:

The community wants justice and development. Yes, there will be. We came to build. I am calling everyone—let's bury the war axes and get to work. The Town is waiting for it. Transparency, rule of law, justice, development—this is the order of the day. Let's stay together hand in hand and then we'll do everything! (cf. Kurczewski 2016, p. 324)

One of the elements of democratisation was the opening up of local authorities to initiatives for cooperation between inhabitants of various ethnic backgrounds and the appreciation of the idea of multiculturalism. For the New Year 2016, the mayor submitted via media wishes for the town community and its guests in four languages: Ukrainian, Polish, Hebrew and Tatar (Kurczewski 2016, p. 325). Referring to local and democratic values, the local authorities began to use the popularity of the Bruno Schulz Festival—the icon of local multiculturalism—which has always been organised by independent, non-government organisations. The Festival has been supported by the new mayor since 2016. Also, the experience of Euromaidan caused a locally strong reorientation of inhabitant's identification. The number of inhabitants who declared European identity in 2014 doubled in 2010 (from 44% to 87%; see Kurczewski 2016, p. 326).

This town in the Ukrainian part of the borderland is an example of a completely different process of development of multiculturalism as a

resource and element of the policy of resilience than the Polish cases. Originally, multiculturalism appears as a value recognised by the local community and its informal organisations, and after that, it is used by local authorities as an element of its own policy of resilience. This policy is understood more broadly than multiculturalism because it is oriented towards democratisation and social development. Multiculturalism as an element of the policy of resilience is also important in the context of the observed migration from the East of Ukraine to its Western regions—that of the Polish-Ukrainian borderland. Those new inhabitants usually have Ukrainian origin but very different regional backgrounds.

6 Conclusions

The research was carried out in Poland and Ukraine in local communities, which are—despite the separation by the EU border—similar to each other because of their history and ethno-demographic features. It seems the difference in functioning of multiculturalism and the policy of resilience on both sides of the border is determined by the influence of the European Union. The EU's laws, procedures and funds create a completely different environment for communities located in Poland than in Ukraine. The social environment of the Polish towns contains different challenges and problems as well as chances than Ukrainian state's surroundings. However, the practice of multiculturalism on the Polish side of the borderland prior to 2014 had a very shallow and adaptive nature. Although references to multiculturalism on the Polish side are more frequent than on the Ukrainian side, it looks as if the EU factor has created a superficial version of multiculturalism in the researched towns. This phenomenon was not a policy of multiculturalism, but rather an “industry of multiculturalism”. Although in the opinions of the interlocutors—who are local cultural managers and people engaged in the realisation of cultural events—such an industry produces an interpretation of multiculturalism that significantly differs from the understanding of the term in social sciences, as well as in the guidelines for multicultural policy. Their idea of multiculturalism consists of practices that substitute

communication in culturally diversified local communities, in favour of building external relations and a picture of “artificial tolerance”.

Do such observations provide any conclusions that could be useful for the realisation of a policy of resilience at the local or regional level? Above all, intensive training of “particular social patterns”, understood in categories of financial and institutional support for the local community, brings much weaker effects than rooting of promoted cultural contents (in my research of multiculturalism, in particular) by active local groups that influence the local community on the whole. A second phenomenon has been observed in the Ukrainian town. Local agents and the resources created by them are now becoming an important element of social change promoted by the new local authorities in this town. However, since 2015, while Poland’s local authorities are withdrawing from supporting multiculturalism, similar “bottom-up” initiatives to build local identity in cooperation with ethnic minorities and referring to multiculturalism are immediately appearing on the Polish side. Probably even such shallow activity as the “industry of multiculturalism” realised before 2015 in that community have unexpected and more long-term consequences in that local system.

The differences between the examples from Poland and Ukraine may conceal the real similarity in attitudes towards multiculturalism in both parts of the borderland. It seems that the described activities in all towns are based on subjective conviction about usefulness of multiculturalism in the context of the construction of the local community’s position in the global or European competition. Multiculturalism is a commodity offered at the global cultural market. Thus, in the Ukrainian town, the culture of minority (Polish and Jewish) is strongly emphasised, since it is associated with bourgeois tradition, the West and Europe. Ukrainian traditions in Poland are rather associated with the East and folk culture. If the latter is generally perceived as a regional resource, as it is in the case of the town in Bieszczady Highlands, then the Ukrainian culture is promoted more frequently and eagerly. In that town, the new authorities (after 2015) have not decided to limit the presence of minority culture in their own cultural initiatives.

Perhaps such a pragmatic and “marketing” attitude of local authorities and cultural managers does not guarantee a permanent acknowledgement

of multiculturalism as a value, but without a doubt, it possesses a specific elasticity that for the time being takes the possibility offered by international and transborder cooperation into consideration. Multiculturalism allows a change of social and cultural structures of local communities, which fills one of the components' policies of resilience. According to the theoretical background presented earlier, adaptation is a component of resilience but the constitutive aspect of that term is the ability to solve problems that arise in the environment of a social system. However, it should be kept in mind that the researched towns, like all local communities in Central Europe, are in a specific global situation. Twenty years ago, Polish sociologists described the situation of that part of Europe as "a society before and after multiculturalism" (Kempny et al. 1997): before multiculturalism, because demographic phenomena will inevitably cause the emergence of migration to Central Europe, and after multiculturalism, because for most of the history of these societies (until 1945) they were very culturally and ethnically diverse. The presented research shows that in both Poland and Ukraine there is a possibility of maintenance and development of the past multiculturalism as a resource that can be used in the local policy of resilience. Recent times, and especially the consequences of the Ukrainian-Russian conflict, are an important factor which allows us to verify how the promotion of multiculturalism influenced the resilience of local communities. The existing practices for multiculturalism are based not only on immigrants but also on the traditional multi-ethnic community. The question is how they will face the new challenges related to migration shifts. Some attempts to use that tradition to new inclusions have been observed in the Ukrainian town, but with no measurable effects as of yet. What is maybe even more important is the fact that, on both sides of Polish-Ukrainian borderland, multiculturalism is linked with the pro-democratic activities and attitudes—official (in Ukraine) and very spontaneous (in Poland). In both aspects, it seems that the multicultural traditions of Central European societies are the crucial elements which could be used as the component of the policy of resilience that could positively reshape local communities. They also are tied in with pro-democratic attitudes and practices which appear on both sides of the borderland in different ways.

References

- Bartkowski, J. (2009). Instytucjonalizacja zarządzania projektami unijnymi – próba typologii. In J. Kurczewska & H. Bojar (Eds.), *Wyciskanie brukselki? O europeizacji społeczności lokalnych na pograniczach* (pp. 129–155). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society. Toward a New Modernity*. London: SAGE.
- Bieniecki, M. (2005). Włodawski Festiwal Trzech Kultur. Z notatnika badacza społeczności lokalnej we Włodawie. In J. Kurczewska & H. Bojar (Eds.), *Granice na pograniczach* (pp. 199–215). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.
- Building Resilience to Recurrent Crisis. (2012). *USAID Policy and Program Guidance*. Retrieved February 12, 2016, from <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/USAIDResiliencePolicyGuidanceDocument.pdf>.
- Buzalka, J. (2007). *Nation and Religion: The Politics of Commemoration in the South-East Poland*. Berlin: Lit Verlag.
- Castells, M. (1997). *Power of Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Castles, S., de Haas, H., & Miller, M. J. (2014). *The Age of Migration. International Population Movements in the Modern World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chłopecki, J. (1989). *Czas, świadomość, historia*. Warszawa: KiW.
- Clauss-Ehlers, C. S. (2010). Cultural Resilience. In C. S. Clauss-Ehlers (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Cross-Cultural School Psychology* (pp. 324–326). New York: Springer.
- Dolińska, K., & Makaro, J. (2013). *O wielokulturowości monokulturowego Wrocławia*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo UW.
- European Commission. (2007). *European Agenda for Culture*. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from https://ec.europa.eu/culture/policy/strategic-framework/intercultural-dialogue_en.
- Geertz, C. (1993). *Local Knowledge*. London: Fontana Press.
- Grossman, M. (2013). Prognosis Critical: Resilience and Multiculturalism in Contemporary Australia. *M/C Journal: A Journal of Media and Culture*, 16(5). Retrieved September 8, 2018, from <http://journal.mediaculture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/article/view/699>.
- Haselberger, B. (2014). Decoding Borders. Appreciating Border Impacts on Space and People. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 15(4), 505–526. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2014.963652>.
- Illmer, A. (2010, October 17). Chancellor Merkel Says German Multiculturalism Has 'Utterly Failed'. *Deutsche Welle*. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from <http://www>.

dw.com/en/chancellor-merkel-says-german-multiculturalism-has-utterly-failed/a-6118859.

- Kempny, M. (2004). Wspólnota i polityka tożsamości jako sposoby organizacji kulturowej różnorodności – o potrzebie nowej topiki teorii społecznej w dobie globalizacji. In M. Jacyno, A. Jawłowska, & M. Kempny (Eds.), *Kultura w czasach globalizacji* (pp. 179–200). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.
- Kempny, M., Kapciak, A., & Łodziński, S. (Eds.). (1997). *U progu wielokulturowości. Nowe oblicza społeczeństwa polskiego*. Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Kopytoff, I. (1986). The Cultural Biography of Things. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *The Social Life of Things. Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (pp. 64–94). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kurczewska, J. (2008). Europeizacja społeczności lokalnych jako problem badawczy. In J. Kurczewska (Ed.), *Oblicza lokalności. Ku nowym formom życia lokalnego* (pp. 25–53). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.
- Kurczewski, J. (2016). Drohobycz – miasto przechodnie czy wyzwolone? In J. Kurczewski, D. Wojakowski, & L. Tymoszenko (Eds.), *O Drohobyczu, trójmieście i zagłębiu. Polsko-ukraińskie studia z socjologii historycznej* (pp. 292–327). Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo UR.
- Kurczewski, J., & Wojakowski, D. (2012). O Drohobyczu, odkrywanej wielokulturowości i niewypowiedzianym pojednaniu. In J. Kurczewski & A. Herman (Eds.), *Antagonizm i pojednanie w środowiskach wielokulturowych* (pp. 177–213). Gdańsk: słowo/obraz terytoria.
- Kymlicka, W. (2013). Neoliberal Multiculturalism? In P. Hall & M. Lamont (Eds.), *Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Era* (pp. 99–125). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levine, S., Pain, A., Bailey, S., & Fan, L. (2012). The Relevance of ‘Resilience’? *HPG Policy Brief*, 49, 1–4.
- Lucini, B. (2014). Multicultural Approaches to Disaster and Cultural Resilience. How to Consider Them to Improve Disaster Management and Prevention: The Italian Case of Two Earthquakes. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 18, 151–156. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(14\)00925-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(14)00925-3).
- Malik, K. (2015). The Failure of Multiculturalism. Community Versus Society in Europe. *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 2015. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/western-europe/failure-multiculturalism>.
- Meniok, W. (2016). Drogi do Schulza w jego rodzinnym Drohobyczu zawsze są otwarte. In J. Kurczewski, D. Wojakowski, & L. Tymoszenko (Eds.), *O*

- Drohobyczu, trójmieście i zagłębiu. Polsko-ukraińskie studia z socjologii historycznej* (pp. 207–226). Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo UR.
- Parsons, T. (1991). *The Social System*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Rex, J. (1997). The Concept of Multicultural Society. In M. Guinbernau & J. Rex (Eds.), *The Ethnicity Reader* (pp. 205–218). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Valdes, H. M., Rego, A., Scott, J., Aguayo, J. V., & Bittner, P. (2012). *How to Make Cities More Resilient. A Handbook for Local Government Leaders*. Geneva: United Nations.
- Waddell, C. (2013). *Multiculturalism, Community Resilience and Emergency Management – The Power of One: Collaborative Approach*. Retrieved October 2, 2018, from <http://www.floodplainconference.com/papers2013/Alison%20Duff%20Full%20Paper.pdf>.
- Wilken, L. (2012). Anthropological Studies of European Identity Construction. In U. Kockel, M. Nic Craith, & J. Frykman (Eds.), *A Companion to the Anthropology of Europe* (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wojakowski, D. (2013). “Kresowe ideologie” w lokalnych społecznościach Polski Wschodniej. In T. Zarycki (Ed.), *Polska Wschodnia i orientalizm* (pp. 134–145). Warszawa: Scholar.
- Wojakowski, D. (2015). Wielokulturowość jako wartość w społeczności lokalnej pogranicza. In M. Bieńkowska & W. Żelazny (Eds.), *Pogranicza* (pp. 71–87). Białystok: Wydawnictwo UwB.
- Zarycki, T. (2013). Polskie dyskursy o ‘Wschodzie’ wewnętrznym i zewnętrznym – próba analizy krytycznej. In T. Zarycki (Ed.), *Polska Wschodnia i orientalizm* (pp. 186–206). Warszawa: Scholar.
- Znaniecki, F. (1980). *Cultural Sciences. Their Origin and Development*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Books.