KAROLINA
CZERSKA-SHAW

What Connects Us in a Superdiverse World?

A BROCHURE *to* STIMULATE THE MIND

KAROLINA CZERSKA-SHAW

What Connects Us in a Superdiverse World?

TRANSLATED BY SØREN GAUGER

Introduction

TOMASZ WŁODARSKI

A BROCHURE *to* STIMULATE THE MIND

Introduction

TOMASZ WŁODARSKI

To face up to the challenges of contemporary life, cultural institutions need not only the right tools and competencies but, above all, an understanding of the processes occurring in the reality surrounding us, in which we all, to a greater or lesser degree, take part. Regardless of the profile of the activity—whether we are a library, museum, philharmonic, culture center, or theater—our task is not just to present and promote a specific field of culture but also to help create a public space that is open and accessible for all. And here we arrive at a key question: for all—who is that, precisely?

When, in 2016, we joined twenty-three cultural institutions of the Małopolski Voivodeship to begin implementing the Empathetic Culture systemic program, we mainly focused on breaking down barriers that obstruct or outright prevent people with disabilities from participating in culture. Gradually, however, we grew to reflect that the legally-introduced accessibility concept of "special needs" is as imprecise as it is open-ended. What are these special

needs, and can we limit them to disability-related issues, or ought we to consider differing social statuses, ethnic and national identities, ages, worldviews, genders? In search of a model and operational philosophy of an institution to respond to various needs in our societies, we swiftly realized that this approach made operationalizing our activities practically impossible. How might an institution obliged to carry out a set, contractual program also be ready to meet various expectations and needs in our highly individualized society? How to build bridges between diverse—often conflicting—lifestyles, convictions, and aspirations?

When I meet with people managing cultural institutions, I always begin by asking them: "What is culture?" The answer to that question tells me how far they are ready to accept our social diversity. If we understand culture as a readiness to accept another person and their ideas, identity, worldview, and needs, and if both sides are ready for discourse, then we pave the way for shaping a public space that does not exclude. On the contrary, it takes into account and makes use of precious diverse social resources. Culture need not be agreement; it can arise through discussion: in fact, only then do we reach its source and significance. And on an institutional level, it means ably conducting and animating this discourse; a readiness to go beyond the framework of strictly events-related activities; a capacity to get involved in the lives of local societies.

This understanding of the role of cultural institutions is less an ideological declaration than a real response to

the challenge of building an audience. How do we make people want to visit us? We must seek our response along with them. To see them in their whole diversity of identities, convictions, living situations. We cannot prepare for openness in a theoretical way. Creating a list of needs to "check off" does not solve the real complexity felt when it comes to expectations of the accessibility of cultural services to all participants in social life. A positive response to diversity could only be a readiness to encounter it.

On the other hand, pursuing a superdiverse reality does not free us from making attempts to build a community, which cannot occur when we think of our societies as just collections of highly individualized people or polarized groups. I am convinced that, on a very basic level, we all converge in our needs for recognition, belonging, and safety as well as in our concerns about an uncertain future, the negative effects of global processes, and the lack or excess of real living capabilities.

How deep does diversity go in our human and social nature? Where to seek the key to our polarized and fragmented reality? Join Karolina Czerska-Shaw in looking at how the concept of superdiversity lets us describe and understand the present social reality and how we can negotiate relations between people of varying identities.

What Connects Us in a Superdiverse World?

KAROLINA CZERSKA-SHAW

NAVIGATING A LIQUID REALITY

A problem encountered by groups involved in shaping cultural policies—social researchers, staffs of public institutions, local governments, and state administrations, as well as numerous practitioners working to level out access to culture—is that, at present, it is hard for us to understand and describe social reality in a way that facilitates a reliable and accurate response to one question: "Who are we?" We speak a lot about inclusiveness, accessibility, creating chances, and using potential, yet for all these processes to combine, we need to know who among us they concern and to what extent. Who are we in our collectives—local, municipal, regional, national? What makes us distinct? In what do we agree, and where do we differ? How do we see each other? What relationships do we form, and where do the dividing lines run between various groups in social life?

The knowledge we get every day from the media, expert reports, or the conversations we have with friends is full

of the conviction that we live in a highly polarized world, in which opposing values and the interests of opposing groups are always clashing and the dividing lines between the feuding sides are seen as "culture wars," whose stakes are overthrowing or restoring a social structure.

To this simplified yet thoroughly emotional picture of social reality we might add our present anxiety about the rapid sociocultural changes we feel. We are—or should be—conscious that our societies are becoming increasingly multicultural and socially complex. Whether we like it or not, we all participate in global processes: economic, demographic, technological, climate-related, or political, which transform our everyday lives, regardless of whether we live in urban, multicultural, rapidly developing centers or in small, remote communities where the changes seem less tangible.

The paradox of this situation is that, on the one hand, we perceive ourselves as a highly polarized society, enclosed in our separate "bubbles" created by people who think the same, and on the other—especially when we hear about the growing numbers of people with migratory experiences in our country—we still tend to describe ourselves as a uniform society which, despite its many fundamental disagreements, many perceive as a cultural monolith, defined by a shared history, tradition, language, dominant religion, etc. Here we can clearly see a discrepancy between the sensed and true complexity of our social relations; between what is visible at a glance and what goes on beneath the surface of the phenomena we observe.

In the early twenty-first century, the great philosopher and sociologist Zygmunt Bauman introduced the concept of "liquid modernity" to pinpoint our sense of having lost the solid ground on which to base our choice of living strategy. "These days patterns and configurations are no longer 'given,' let alone 'self-evident'; there are just too many of them, clashing with one another and contradicting one another's commandments, so that each one has been stripped of a good deal of compelling, coercively constraining powers."[1] The stable and comprehensible frames of reference for our life decisions and choices have become shattered and diffused. This goes for our educational and professional choices as well as our decisions on where to live, starting up a family, getting involved in social and political activities, and our attitude toward a diversifying sociocultural environment. "Ours is, as a result, an individualized, privatized version of modernity, with the burden of pattern-weaving and the responsibility for failure falling primarily on the individual's shoulders. It is the patterns of dependency and interaction whose turn to be liquefied has now come."[2] In a liquid reality, culture no longer serves as a self-perpetuating social hierarchy; it focuses on satisfying personal needs and grappling with the challenges of personal life.

We live simultaneously in many different constructs, and though we each experience ourselves as an integral, conscious, distinct individual, our personal and collective identities are built on a sense of belonging to many various social categories, and so we are forever coming in contact with other groups. We "join"—temporarily or

for the long run—various networks: consumer, service, media, ideological, and political, blurring the boundaries between what we experience in a physical and virtual dimension. Both as individuals and variously-defined collectives, from families to citizens of countries, we are wrapped up in a network of ties and dependencies that go beyond state structures.

Sociologists and migration researchers point out the liquidity and malleability of ongoing social processes and question the practicality of the research approaches to date, which close societies in their nation-state borders. "Over the last decades the cultural, social, and political landscapes of diversity are changing radically, but we still use the old maps to orientate ourselves,"[3] warned German sociologist Ulrich Beck. His thoughts formed the basis for a new research perspective proposed by John Urry,[4] focusing sociological interest on "multiple mobility" processes experienced by today's constantly moving societies (both within state structures and on a global scale).

In this complicated network of ties and dependencies between various participants in social life, it is remarkably difficult to point to policies and tools that serve as a compass in navigating this liquid, shape-shifting reality.

SUPERDIVERSITY— VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE

The twenty-first century brought us an increased awareness of the complexity of our individual ways of describing and understanding our own identities and a sensitivity to every person's right to self-definition. This does not mean we do not also observe the negative effects of this "super-individualization"; that there are no challenges in building an integration strategy and maintaining social coherence. We learn to be open, and at the same time, the fragmentation of social space and the management of this whole diverse complexity of needs and expectations becomes a massive challenge.

As society diversifies along two lines, from national, municipal, and neighborly levels to the schoolroom, workplace, and local park, its attributes change. This includes ways in which we categorize each other, our attitudes toward those we consider to be "different," and the interactions and practices that result from our meeting with others. For these reasons, research on social diversity is a basic field of social studies. It encompasses an attempt to un-

derstand how we live together now and in the future as diverse collections of self-defining individuals.

To grasp the multidimensional social relations and multiplicity of individual identity constructs that crop up, acclaimed transnationality and migration scholar Steven Vertovec came up with the notion of superdiversity[5]. This includes not only easily observable traits that set apart members of various social groups (such as ethnicity, language, specific cultural practices, preferred clothing, or holiday events calendar) but also any and all aspects arising from our individual characteristics and affiliations. This makes diversity intersectional: it includes ethnicity, culture, creed, age, and gender identity as well as social status, education, and world view.

Research into the diverse statuses of migrant groups has brought a fundamental change in how we perceive and describe societies heretofore "closed" both within borders and separate state structures. Both those who migrate and those who remain in their places of residence elude rigid categories. Their diverse statuses, situations, life projects, and variously defined adherences to groups intersect and overlap—some are visible at a glance, yet much remains invisible on an everyday basis, even if it has a vital impact on our behavior and how we shape our relationships with other members of society.

Superdiversity is presently a key concept in research on cultural complexity and transnationalism. It allows us to grasp and describe the actual state of things, the high de-

gree of social complexity, as we no longer think in terms of social groups with set, stable, and uniform characteristics. The "super" prefix shifts our attention to a "meta" level, from which the image of our collectives—neighborhood, local, state, or transnational—appear less as a "puzzle" of elements with defined, permanent traits than as ever-changing configurations and constellations of highly individualized identities and variously experienced bonds of belonging, entering an array of interactions and attachments to form a network.

In the increasingly complicated contexts of superdiversity, we ought not to utterly abandon group categories, but we must be aware of the existence of a "plus category," which means remembering that individuals are always part of more than one category, each of which includes people that have more than one identity.[6]

STRATEGIC ESSENTIALIZATION

Each one of us might describe themselves with many social categories: I can be a woman, mother, sister, Pole, academic teacher, sports fan; I can define myself through faith, gender, age group, hobby, place of residence; I can be wealthy, a homemaker, and so on, but none of these traits signifies people of the same social characteristics. These are descriptive categories; not all of them are important to us and not all of them determine our capabilities and choices in life. Even if I consider myself to be a Cracovian, and this is where I pay my taxes, it does not mean I feel a sense of community with the other inhabitants of my city.

It is only when we begin to see a shared goal with a group of similar attributes that trust begins to emerge, a sense of belonging and solidarity—and then the boundaries of certain groups or societies become important as well. Here, too, the risk comes that we may easily be pigeonholed in certain categories—national, age-based, gender, or others—we can be stereotyped "from the outside," seen as representing certain identities, though none of us belongs

to only one group; we have an inner sense of coherence that is not a simple sum of the categories that describe us.

In response to the individualization and fragmentation of society we can sense and observe, the state introduces integration and accessibility policies, and similarly, various social groups lobby for their causes, sometimes even very individual ones that can be no less vital to the groups fighting for their recognition (usually minority or marginalized groups). We may then speak of strategic essentialism processes. The creator of this concept, Indian critic and cultural theorist Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, thus described a political tactic that involves mobilizing minority groups on the basis of shared identity traits. Although there may well be strong differences between the members of these groups and debates as to the uniform nature of their collective identity, those in favor of strategic essentialism will claim that sometimes it is advantageous for them to present their group identity in a simplified (essentialized) way to reach certain aims.

This process is understandable in its striving for clarity, uniformity, belonging—in these individually differentiated identities of ours we do need some frameworks for self-definition. This need is deeply rooted in our human nature: we desire recognition for our individual importance and uniqueness, but we also fear rejection, isolation, marginalization. We feel a need to belong to a group in which we can say we are "among our own people"—this is our basic level of integrating reality around ourselves, seeking a community of experiences, convictions, values.

Meanwhile, every such essentialized group shuts itself off and marks the boundaries of its collective, creating a division into "ours" and "not ours." In this sense, self-determination, speaking in one's own voice and in the name of a group, so that it is audible and accounted for, tends to cognitively enclose a group and make it hermetic, even if it is not made up of identically built identities, biographies, and statuses. Their narratives about themselves might appear oversimplified, radical, exaggerated.

So why do groups sometimes behave this way? What mechanisms stand behind processes of strategic essentialism? The point is to gain something for your group, to be visible, get access to social resources. This does not mean, of course, that their aims are constant, and satisfaction can be accomplished once and for all. No, these are endlessly running and transforming processes. This is good to know in studying diasporas—which are presently described not as set collectives but as processes of a diasporic formation, precisely because they cannot be described as uniform societies[7]. We observe the diverse individualized processes within a given national group living abroad (e.g., Ukrainians in Canada). Such a well-rooted population does, of course, have various layers, aims, and distinct living conditions, yet at certain points—confronted by the present war or other issues—they are mobilized around a particular cause to lobby for advantageous solutions and then, automatically, as it were, they come forward as a group with clear attributes, drawing from folk culture, tradition, the nation, or other important group symbols. Then it is difficult even for those involved to distinguish to what extent these are

the most essential components of their identities and to what extent they are tactical, a temporary choice allowing them to more effectively unite around a particular aim.

These processes take place all the time in every society, and when strengthened by a strong media (social and public) presence, they can confirm the faulty impression that we are dealing with uniform groups which then, from the outside, begin to be stereotyped and seen through biases and labels slapped on them by publicity concerning their demands for equality—positive or negative, depending on whether we feel solidarity with them or not.

Meanwhile, in terms of the public institutions whose mission and task is to make the conditions for the coexistence and cooperation of collectives of people in all their diversity and with all the contradictions and variously defined life interests they give rise to, it is necessary we understand that, on the one hand, they are a countless number of individual identities; on the other, self-essentializing groups demanding more visibility, freedom to choose, and the social recognition of their rights.

How to manage this? This is the key question: how to negotiate and manage claims to various rights, to acknowledging various identities? All the more in that we have limited resources when it comes to the availability of infrastructure, public services, finances and staff, and the competencies required for our social contacts to function smoothly and our needs to be met. How, then, are we to reach equal opportunity? Does this mean we have to cre-

ate regulations to support various social groups, based on ethnicity, religion, language, age, socioeconomic status, or disability? Indeed, how many statuses are there to protect and support?

MAIN-STREAMING—HORIZONTAL POLITICS

I would put the solutions to, on the one hand, this complex puzzle of users' expectations and needs and, on the other, the capacities and resources of social institutions, in the concept and practice of mainstreaming. In management and administration parlance, we speak of "horizontal policies." In terms of implementing public policies, this means a cross-section, holistic approach to service accessibility, without sector divisions into transport, education, health care, entrepreneurial support, professional counseling, etc. The point is that the needs of vulnerable groups requiring temporary or ongoing support—whether they are people with disabilities, foreigners, seniors, or families with small children—do not occupy just one specially marked cell (such as local department on equality or multiculturalism) but that they are constantly taken into account in all the spheres of urban, social, and local life.

Operationally, this is very hard to program and carry out, as we are dealing with needs on various levels: from

removing "technical" barriers—architectural, communicative (audio descriptions, language/sign-language translations)—economic ones (costs of attending and participating in an event), and various interests, cultural competencies, and levels of involvement in the activities proposed. This is why in this horizontal, mainstreaming approach it is crucial to focus on building long-term processes. This means not just effectively removing barriers in access to the programs institutions offer but also joining vulnerable groups in the process of designing them, expanding social consciousness, and building openness to superdiversity.

Taking such a mainstreaming perspective requires, on the one hand, that we design activities to introduce previously overlooked groups into society's field of vision and, on the other, a readiness to accept their presence and learn to respond to the needs they express. These are two sides of the same coin: including and supporting certain groups as well as developing an openness to their visibility and presence in everyday human relationships. A change like this does not happen overnight; neither our society nor our cultural institutions are ready for it "on demand."

We have to practice certain activities to teach each other this openness, understanding, flexibility. It is not just a shift in consciousness; it is also discovering and gradually transforming our practices and relationships. On an operational level, this could even mean a sort of "excessive" action, temporarily raising the priority to make certain needs accessible. For instance, it could turn out

to be essential to introduce translations during organized events (as was the case in the first phase of the mass influx of people seeking shelter from the war in Ukraine) or to demand accessibility in audio-descriptions—otherwise it would be impossible to develop new accessibility standards, as we would get mired in a negative rationalization of inactivity, justified by the low percentage of the population for whom these facilities are essential. It is then easy to be convinced that "you can't do everything for everyone," and so we stay with the old way of doing things, only organizing incidental offers for special-needs groups.

By the same token, we should remember that most positive action policies (adopting temporary or permanent solutions to equal out the opportunities of people and groups discriminated for their gender, ethnic roots, religion, sexual orientation, disabilities, or other traits) involve the risk of increasing the social isolation of the groups we support. Creating something specially for them could lead to unintended but near-inevitable labelling. If the event is described as being prepared with special-needs people in mind, there is a high probability that people without this sort of difficulty will not be interested. This means we lose the chance for integration. Levelling opportunities to participate in culture must not only be based on eliminating barriers but also on knowledgeable communication about accessibility and openness. We have to move away from thinking that accessible events are ones where we only invite people in wheelchairs, because we have a ramp, and toward the idea that we have a ramp, so everyone can participate in our event.

A positive example of mainstreaming is the actions of local centers supporting the integration of "superdiverse" local residents. These centers are already operational around Poland. They work as spaces that are open to the local inhabitants, where free athletics, health, language, crafts, activation, and integration courses are organized. Their work is not targeted at separate groups—foreigners, seniors, people with disabilities—they are thematically built, and diverse needs are considered when it comes to registering, help in communication, and individual care for participants, according to their specific needs.

If we take a serious approach to the issue of a broad, horizontal look at our social superdiversity, in time we will learn to introduce new standards to our old way of operating, mindful of the principle that we should do something until it becomes second nature.

COALITIONS AND SHARED CREATIONS

A basic condition allowing cultural institutions to adapt to increasingly complex and dynamic transformations of social reality is a readiness to flexibly respond to the changes and challenges, an openness to new ideas and ways of operating. These are long-running processes that demand great commitment, based on building trust—both from the organizers and the teams assigned with the mission of creating institutions open to diversity.

This sensitivity is essential on two levels. The first is an openness and readiness to perceive and understand the diversity around us. The other is reflection and attention to the dynamics of relations between various groups in social life. If we observe certain groups closing up or being essentialized, then first of all, we should ask ourselves (and others!) why they feel the need to come out as a pack. Perhaps they have a reason for this: Maybe an important need of theirs is being marginalized? Perhaps they feel unseen and unheard in this vital need? The point is not just to invite members of various communities and

groups to participate but to make sure that what we have on offer is not dominated by one particular group with the strongest social position.

Tending to these processes is a considerable challenge. We are touching upon extremely delicate material here, because human nature includes the desire to dominate or impose our own ways of understanding and structuring reality. Yet if we are to strive for its friendly shared creation, from the outset we should be geared toward both sides of the process being ready to learn something new, to go beyond a narrow understanding of their group interests. We need openness and an urge to cooperate, not just from the cultural institution but from all the groups of participants entering the alliances.

A KNOWLEDGE OF OUR SURROUNDINGS, OUR NEIGHBORHOOD

For many cultural institutions—libraries, museums, theaters, philharmonics—the main audiences of their program are those interested in the collections or the arts/education programs they have on offer. In this sense, we might say that the audience of the Czartoryski Museum is potentially the whole world, owing to the fame of Leonardo da Vinci's masterpiece *Lady with an Ermine*, which draws thousands of tourists and art lovers to Krakow each year. Yet every cultural institution also writes itself into the local society, with which it may be linked by more than an address.

Stepping out into the neighborhood and inviting it to be creative is a growing trend in Great Britain; you can find examples of institutions, such as the Tate Modern Gallery, which invite the local society to come and carry out their own projects, so that the local residents feel as though the space is theirs as well. This builds a sense of agency and belonging. People feel they are an important part of the place, that they are at home there. Growing numbers of Polish institutions think about their social missions in a similar vein.

We might take some interesting reflections here from the experiences of Ukrainian museum curators, with their numerous accounts of involving the local society in saving and securing their collections—people most actively gathered at those places which had, in various ways, reached out to them prior to the war. The institutions that are partly created by their neighborhoods have the greatest chance of survival: they anchor themselves in their surroundings, find support in them, and at the same time begin to understand them better.

A SPACE OF POSITIVE CONTACT

Breaking down prejudices and stereotypes is no longer practically possible without making direct contact, outside of virtual or media narratives. If we remain purely in the sphere of narratives we see or hear in the media, we take away the chance to verify our images of "others"; we succumb to the conviction that people who come from environments unlike our own are fundamentally

different. As many of our everyday activities and contacts have transferred to the web, we practically begin to see people of other age groups, worldviews, or cultures as members of different species; if our paths never cross, we begin to project our biases, fears, and concerns on others. We have a tendency (highly encouraged by Internet algorithms!) to enlarge the differences between groups and to emphasize other groups' similarities much more than our own. We then homogenize a group unlike our own, shutting it up in a certain set of characteristics, failing to notice a wide spectrum of attributes which, on the one hand, differentiate people of a collective and, on the other, could serve as a foothold in seeking connections between our experiences and values.

We need to create open spaces, in which people from the institution's nearby surroundings can have an interesting time outside the home and workplace. It is important to make them informal, so people feel invited and encouraged to spend time there without having to register for an educational or arts class. They should, at least in part, be free and designed so people can move about independently in them; this means eliminating architectural barriers as well as having a legible, comprehensible information system in which people of impaired vision, who are neurodivergent, or do not know the Polish language can find something to enjoy.

There are now many institutions and spaces on Poland's cultural map which succeed in serving as places to meet and rest—not just from work but also from routine dai-

ly activities. The idea of "third places," named by American sociologist Ray Oldenburg,[8] makes reference to the widespread human need to be in an informal space (other than the home, the "first place," and our job, which is the "second place"), where we can feel comfortable and relaxed, and where we can be active: participating and creating together. This is a neutral space to spend free time, meet with friends, rest after our professional job or housework, observe people, and be seen by others. This "third place" gives us a stronger sense of belonging to our surroundings and having bonds with others—present or potential acquaintances.

Libraries are also effective as natural catalysts of social relations, as places to get Internet access, read, or play a game with children, as are events in the public space, such as picnics, sports, and recreation classes, open to people of varying social and cultural competencies. A key issue here is attention to physical but also invisible thresholds and barriers that might be an obstacle in joining in.

SUPERDIVERSITY OF ARTISTS AND CULTURAL ANIMATORS

To achieve a mainstreaming effect, we need not only to introduce various types of activities for various groups but also to enrich our own resources with a range of experience. If we are striving to introduce a program that considers diverse needs, perspectives, and interests, we ourselves must reflect that diversity. It is not, of course, possible for a small (sometimes just two- or three-person)

team of workers at a local cultural institution to represent the whole diversity of a local society, which is why it is so important to maintain contact with the local residents and invite them to help create the program. Here it is easy to fall into the trap of "tokenism," thereby "ticking off" items on the list of "barriers to overcome"—the risk of mechanically responding to the needs and postulates of various groups involves adopting certain forced principles and often builds frustration, owing to the lack of interest from groups that are far from satisfied by such instrumental treatment.

Culture creators and animators who create opportunities to participate should have the imagination not just to perceive the real diversity around them but also to become part of it. In this way we reach out to a local society not by asking about its needs but by inviting them to help create a program. The essence of this sort of collaboration involves directly recognizing the real interests, possible barriers, potential commonalities, and subjects which will make concrete people from the concrete surroundings of the cultural institution want to congregate. This is not, therefore, about addressing all the possible expectations and needs in every possible configuration; it is about hearing and properly taking care of those who show up at a given place. If we are to attract people, they must know they are seen by the institution and recognized in their concrete identities and group affiliations.

*

We are now observing many processes that drive us to reject diversity and multiculturalism, preferring a vision of returning to an idealized safe and comprehensible world of the past, which Zygmunt Bauman's last book called a *retrotopia*.[9] His description of the mechanisms behind the creation of this nostalgic, utopian faith in "the good old days" is accompanied by a word of caution against spreading tendencies to deny reality and the desire to escape from the future, which prompts concern and unrest. Attempts to reject our multi-sided superdiversity can have violent and dystopian effects. Turning away from it means abandoning democratic values, which draw strength from a multiplicity and variety of views and identities.

Meanwhile, superdiversity, as the term's creator Steven Vertovec likes to stress, is not a theory, a posited path of development, or an ideological project; it is a social fact. This is a descriptive category which helps us not lose sight of all the complexity of our present-day relations in a globalized reality. Recognizing superdiversity involves the risk of scattering and fragmentation but also a chance to discover people's many points in common. In this sense, we gain access to a wealth of creative resources, mutually building our competencies and viewpoints.

The practical advantage that comes from recognizing and understanding superdiversity is visible in breaking through and shattering fossilized opinions, indifference, or even aversion toward people with whom we share our environment. Then the stress shifts in our human relationships: instead of closing people in stereotyped group

identities based on age, gender, origins, or language, we focus on the values, interests, and experiences we share.

There is no one good answer to the question “What connects us in a superdiverse world?” We will not find it through theory or ideological declarations. We have to seek it together—through dialogue, debate, alliances that come from first-hand conversations and meetings. If we want to find out who we are and what connects us, we have to ask each other.

ENDNOTES:

1 Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000), 3.

2 Ibid., 3–4.

3 Ulrich Beck, quoted in: Steven Vertovec, *Superdiversity: Migration and Social Complexity* (New York: Routledge, 2023), 1,967.

4 John Urry, *Sociology Beyond Society* (London: Routledge, 2002).

5 Steven Vertovec, *Superdiversity: Migration and Social Complexity* (New York: Routledge, 2023).

6 Ibid, 14.

7 Patrycja Trzeszczyńska, Grzegorz Demel, "From differences to relations: Towards diaspora-forming processes", *International Migration* 2025, vol. 63 (1).

8 Ray Oldenburg, *The Great Good Place: Cafés, Coffee Shops, Bookstores, Bars, Hair Salons, and Other Hangouts at the Heart of a Community* (New York: Marlowe & Co, 1989).

9 Zygmunt Bauman, *Retrotopia* (Cambridge–Oxford, 2017).

małopolski instytut kultury MIK

INSTYTUCJA KULTURY
WOJEWÓDZTWA
MAŁOPOLSKIEGO

MAŁOPOLSKA

Publisher:
The Małopolska Institute of Culture in Krakow
30-233 Krakow, ul. 28 Lipca 1943 17C
tel. 12 422 18 84, www.mik.krakow.pl
Director: Tomasz Włodarski

Editor-in-chief: Elżbieta Kaproń
Translator: Søren Gauger
Proofreader: Steven Hoffman
Graphic design: Aneta Sitarz
Typesetting: Anna Papiernik

ISBN online publication 978-83-67862-33-2

Kraków 2025

Małopolski Instytut Kultury w Krakowie [Małopolska Institute of Culture in Krakow, abbr. MIK] is an independent body set up by the Małopolska local government. MIK engages in many activities to study and promote cultural heritage of the Małopolska region. MIK provides workshops and training as well as organizes conferences and seminars for culture sector employees. We also research the evolution of cultural trends and development directions.

Three words describe us in short:
Region, React, Rethink!

MIK is a proud member of three international networks: Culture Action Europe, Interpret Europe, and the European Network of Observatories in the Field of Arts and Cultural Education (ENO).

www.mik.krakow.pl

culture ACTION europe

interpret europe
European Association for Heritage Interpretation

ENO

KAROLINA CZERSKA-SHAW – a PhD in Sociology, researcher of migration, integration policies, and diversity management; she works at the Institute of European Studies of the Jagiellonian University and collaborates with the Multicultural Center in Krakow.

ISBN online publication: **978-83-67862-33-2**

wydawnictwo mik