Summary. The aim of the study is to present the concept of resettlement multiculturality. The multiculturality of displaced persons, the kind characterising resettlement in Western Poland, was not brought about spontaneously and is governed by entirely different principles. At this point one should contemplate the methods that assisted in the management of a city that is multicultural in character due to residents having been resettled, a city whose identity has not fully formed. Such a measure could also bring empirical confirmation uprooting occurred in the fourth generation. Presenting the concept of resettlement multiculturality the author is making use of – among other things – memory studies, Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of capital and his concepts of habitus, field and game, and the research of Geert Hofstede.

Keywords: Resettlement multiculturality, cultural studies, uprooting.

Marcin Słowiński, Adam Mickiewicz University Poznań, Institute of Cultural Studies, Szamarzewskiego 89A, 60–568 Poznań, Poland, e-mail: marcin.slowinski@amu.edu.pl.

It would seem right to posit that the fourth generation descended from the people resettled from the Polish Kresy or Eastern Borderlands to areas of Western Poland has experienced uprooting.¹ By making use of – among other things – memory studies, Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of capital and his concepts of habitus, field and game, or

¹ Le déracinement.
the research of Geert Hofstede, I attempt to provide a clear justification of the above postulate.

In the minds of the original settlers, the revival of Polishness in the western territory that Poland received after World War II was to some extent like propaganda; it seemed like a settling of accounts with the occupier – that ‘historical justice’ had been achieved. Such a way of thinking, intended to further the settlers’ integration, was served by slogans originating from the Soviet Union, which thereby claimed to be providing help, liberating the nation; the absolute opposite to the German aggressor.

The end of 1945 brought the Regional plan for the resettlement of agricultural settlers in the regained lands, which anticipated the resettlement being carried out in a manner as non-invasive as possible for the settlers. All those people deprived of material goods, from beyond the Curzon Line, were to be the first to be resettled. Group resettlement was meant to proceed without widespread dispersal or cultural mixing. Even the landscape of the future territory was taken into account, so that it would not differ too much from home. But provisions explicitly bringing to mind the well-known Nazi process of ‘healing society’ are controversial, as for example with Kazimierz Dobrowolski – the request to take care of the “biological value of the population”, and Rajmund Buławski – the “absolute elimination of individuals burdened with disease and hereditary defects, particularly intellectual”.

The settling of these areas in the west was accompanied by media propaganda, which apart from having an integrative function was also supposed to generate among the settlers the sense that they were creating something great, of historic significance, which was, of course, the attitude desired by the prevailing political narrative. Thus the ‘western man’ figure was created – of the ideal settler, characterised by loyalty to nation and state, by a readiness to devote the ‘reclaimed’ land to the fatherland, and by appropriate historical awareness, perseverance and conscien-
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tiousness, etc. Maria Tomczak⁶ quite rightly argued that this concocted ‘western person’ was imbued with the ethos of Greater Poland region’s positivism of the latter half of the 19th century, and therefore was supposed to prove the legitimacy of his belonging to Poland via his work in the resettled areas of Western Poland, simultaneously building the western bulwark and defending the new lands from the Germans.

The resettlements took on an ideological character. The settlers became – with varying degrees of consciousness – the representatives of the new order in the Recovered Lands, and this order was to be the determining factor for the proper functioning of the new Polish reality. “At the end of the day, an important element of the propaganda charm was the solidarity of the communities forming in the west. In keeping with this, settlers were not only appointed for the same task on the same land, but were also intended to form a ‘national monolith’, a phrase that suggests a certain higher form of coherence in thinking and acting in the services of the ethnic collective”⁸

With this very general and brief picture of the situation of the people resettled from the Eastern Borderlands, at this point attention should be drawn to the mechanism of laying down roots, or ‘rooting’, a mechanism that would pertain universally to every social individual who, regardless of whether they are voluntarily resettled or not, would be subject to a similar process and would use similar tools. This should start with putting some order into the concepts that have proven problematic in describing the process of taking root. Namely, taking root has been treated in this paper as an individual finding their place in a culture different to their previous culture, and recreating the state of cultural comfort (whatever this may have been) that the individual experienced beforehand. A state of cultural comfort would mean here the individual being able to negotiate their way with ease around the norms and directives accepted or respected within a familiar cultural reality, even if this reality were not satisfactory with regard to how its desired form is imagined. What is important, though, is that the taking root begin with the recreation of that state of cultural comfort. The next stage of taking root would be the process of enculturation. Enculturation has to be contrasted with the concept of assimilation, which is all too hastily treated as identical to the process of taking root and enculturation. Enculturation is the process of acquiring cultural competence, of learning the culture⁹, while its subject-matter is the “(...)
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⁷ Wielkopolska.
set of convictions common to the group and applying to the understanding of reality, proper participation in the community, and common norms and values. Knowledge that is shared socially (accepted or respected) must demonstrate a high degree of stability, since this is precisely what ensures it with the ability to fulfil the role of guide for the individual’s proper conduct that is of significance to others. In contrast, assimilation is – to put it simply – the individual growing into the new culture, which often results in their own culture being abandoned. Assimilation may occur on a number of levels, starting with tolerance – which, if we follow Derrida and operate on the semantic level – is negative in character since its Latin root means the same as to stomach something. The next stage would be pluralism, which is the granting of the rights of a minority, following which they would be kept in a state of feeling inferior. The extreme conclusion to this process would ultimately be extermination. To summarise: taking root should occur through enculturation with the possibility of the newcomers’ emancipation and participation in the cultural reality, in a way that is non-invasive for the existing culture.

Reproduction of Promotional Capital – the Perspectives of Pierre Bourdieu

The quality of life among social individuals depends largely upon the influence of capital, types of which were diagnosed by Pierre Bourdieu. Without going into detail regarding economic capital, which is somewhat obvious, I shall focus to start with on cultural capital, which, due Bourdieu’s not providing an explicit definition of the concept, leaves much room for interpretation. However, when taking into account his works Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture and Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste, one should assume that the concept of cultural capital is strongly linked to the concept of class. In Reproduction..., which is an analysis of the French educational system from the perspective of the class dissonances that determine educational advancement and upward social mobility, or lack of, Bourdieu concludes that cultural capital in the shape of intellectual and lingual skills is a factor that provides social benefits to children and teenagers from class-privileged families. He points out that what cultural capital includes is decided above all by the process of initial socialisation, which also affects the ability

to multiply this capital (habitus). However, this does not mean at all that Bourdieu excludes the institutions of knowledge – such as schools or universities – from this mechanism, but simply that he believes secondary socialisation plays a smaller role in equipping one with cultural capital. In the case of the people resettled from the Eastern Borderlands it would seem right to assume that it was this process of secondary socialisation, following their arrival in the newly acquired lands of Western Poland, that could have had a much greater impact on their habitus. I have in mind here the fact that the habitus with which these resettled people arrived proved outdated, needing replacement in order to function efficiently in the new world, in a new field. Bourdieu defines the field as a “(...) network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions. These positions are objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions, by their present and potential situation (situs) in the structure of the distribution of species of power (or capital) whose possession commands access to the specific profits that are at stake in the field”.

The Eastern Borderlanders had to find their place in a field in which their previous habitus may not have guaranteed that they could win. And it was here that, once again, they developed new habits, they acquired new skills that would redefine their hitherto social and cultural identity in order to increase their chances of winning in the game.

Paweł Lewandowski writes: “The resettlers from the East indicated that they were simple people (not in the meaning of coarseness, so much as wearing one’s heart on one’s sleeve), modest and kind, and attached to tradition (...),” while on the other hand others saw them totally differently: “the resettlers from the east were accused of drunkenness, noisiness, living in squalor, idleness, destruction and superstitions”.

Yet immigrants from the west were also described as egoistic, and focused on earning a quick buck, on making careers, etc. Another difference was seen in how the Borderlanders took as much with them as they could, while migrants from the west relied on what they hoped to find in the post-German properties. Ultimately it turned out that what was brought from the east could not be put to productive use in the west (in technological terms). The dissonance between what was possessed and what was found, between habitus and field, did not favour the process of taking root.

Bourdieu splits cultural capital into three forms: incorporated, institutionalised, and objectified. Incorporated cultural capital embraces such predispositions as, for example, taste, upbringing, and etiquette. Institutionalised covers that confirmed...
with the appropriate documents such as diplomas or certificates, etc. And objectified in turn covers possessed goods, such as books, tools and machinery. Kazimierz Żygulski wrote about the lack of such resources that would have helped the Borderlanders' social advancement, clearly stating that the settlers differed in “language, habits and customs, views and aspirations, superstitions and prejudices, worldview and their standards of values”\(^\text{15}\), which, taken together with Tomasz Szarota's\(^\text{16}\) assertion concerning social classes creating divisions between the settlers, confirms to some extent Bourdieu's assumptions mentioned earlier. However, it must be pointed out that the incorporated form of cultural capital is the most valuable in the process of taking root, because it is axiomatic, normative and directive in character, and can be passed down to successive generations and the neighbourhood without incurring material costs. The incorporated form determines the shape of a particular culture, while for example the conversion of the institutionalised form of cultural capital cannot take place in such a simplified mechanism, and depends on the incorporated and objectified form, which undergoes easy accumulation due to its material character, the exchange of goods, and the building of economic capital.

The Eastern Borderlanders' chance of winning at the economic capital level was also small, if only because of the land the settlers came to cultivate, as this land required investment in new equipment, more irrigation and more fertiliser; while how they functioned in urban space proved startling for migrants from the west, for example due to their attire, and this only intensified the class divisions. The Borderlanders' approach to work also seemed suspect to the arrivals from the west. Those resettled from the Eastern Borderlands were accused of idleness; they put more effort into their socialising than their work. Economic skill and innovativeness were to be found among migrants from the West. One should also bear in mind that the Eastern Borderlanders were forced to resettle, while migrants from the West chose to change their place of living without coercion, guided only by purely economic calculations of the potential losses and gains. In addition the latter were able to migrate throughout the year, while the Borderlanders depended a great deal on the weather. This situation sheds an entirely new light on the process of taking root. There was no question of going back, as there was nothing to go back to, so there was no option but enculturation in the new areas of Western Poland, and intensified work on one's habitus in order to attain capital.

The next kind of capital described by Bourdieu – which seems the most ambiguous – is symbolic capital, which is a form of social capital. To be more precise, it
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“(...) is a form such as each of them dons when perceived with the aid of perception, which awards it a specific logic or, if you prefer, does not recognise its arbitrariness or accumulation.” This capital entitles one to affect how other individuals perceive. “The resources in question here should be broadly understood – their value, situation, and function changes; their list on the other hand should be considered always open. These are the stakes that, in the autonomous sub-fields of social games – scientific, artistic and legal, etc. – can be won. This also means that the division of these prizes is subordinate (qualitatively) to heterogeneous divisional criteria (and is carried out – as far as the procedure is concerned – in various ways).”

Treated as ethnic minorities, the resettled persons had a chance to rebuild their culture in the newly acquired territory of Western Poland – to a degree that at least enabled its conversion at the level of cultural capital by successive generations. Following Abner Cohen (1974), but expanding his thinking to embrace the social and cultural situation, the conditions for this can be seen as favourable: “(...) ethical identities reveal themselves when informal political organisation, the task of which is to create a cultural barrier against some rival group aspiring for similar or analogical goals, is essential. The ethnic bond thus generated constitutes a kind of ‘symbolic capital’ in the political fight”. A hint as to why uprooting would eventually be experienced in the resettled areas of Western Poland can be found in the following citation: “The way of achieving social position is written into the habitus. In other words, social entities themselves – via the socially and historically shaped categories of perceptions and appraisals – actively define the situation conditioning them. One could even say that social entities are only determined to the degree in which they determine themselves. But the categories of perception and appraisal that lie at the foundations of this self-determination are themselves largely determined by the social and economic conditions of the moment of their coming into being.”

Reproduction of Cultural Capital – the Perspective of the Memories of Aleida and Jan Assmann

Now that we know Pierre Bourdieu’s conception regarding the notions of habitus / field / game, which is of enormous importance in understanding the process of taking root, it is now time to tackle the issue of memory, which ties naturally to
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18 Ibidem.
Bourdieu’s concepts and as a result is the second fundamental component affecting this process. By using the distinction of memory – proposed by the married couple Aleida and Jan Assman – into communicative and cultural memory, as well as individual and collective, how these distinctions should be understood and how they pertain to the process of rooting shall be explained.

During his deliberations regarding individual and collective memory, Jan Assmann cites Maurice Halbwachs, a French sociologist of the twenties, starting from his emphasis that the axial thesis of Halbwachs’ work is the social conditioning of memory. In his contemplations, Halbwachs consciously omits the purely biological aspects of memory, at the same time evading the dualism of the body and spirit that Bergson writes of, and focuses solely on the social aspect of memory as mentioned above. Such a social dimension of memory studies thereby allows one to consider the influence of memory on the situation of the resettled people from the Eastern Borderlands in Western Poland.

Halbwachs believes that individuals ‘have’ memory because it is shaped by the collective, and that it would not be possible for the individual to have memory if this individual were to develop in isolation. By taking this line of thought, Assmann asserted that since the process of socialisation is so important in the formation of memory, then the term ‘collective memory’ can no longer be treated purely as a metaphor, and although “collectives do not ‘have’ any memory, they determine the memory of members. Memories, including personal memories, are formed only through communication and interaction within social groups”.

The concept of social frameworks (cadres sociaux) introduced by Halbwachs should also be added to the above considerations; he explains that “the entirety of experience takes place in the context of social semantic frameworks”. Halbwachs claims that the subject of memory and remembering is the collectivity, and focuses on the fact that the subject of remembering and memory is the individual dependent on the ‘frameworks’ organising memory. Assmann adds that Halbwachs’ assumptions have this additional value because they also explain forgetting. If an individual and society only remember that which is “reconstructable as the past within the frameworks of the proper references for a specific present, then only

20 V. H. Bergson 1896.
21 J. Assmann, Pamięć kulturowa…, p. 52.
that which in this present does not possess reference is forgotten”23. Change in the frameworks causes forgetting, which also turns out to be social in character, but this is not what we are interested in at this point. Let us focus on individual memory, or, in other words, on what the individual memorises. The way in which the choice of what is to be memorised is decided is also important. In this context, one should consider the influence of memory on habitus. The resettlers from the Eastern Borderlands did not expect the necessity of abandoning their cultural circles24, and as such what was memorised was something totally different to what would be memorised if the resettling had been expected a lot earlier. Perhaps then the memory of the individual would have contributed to the formation of such a habitus that would have been helpful during the process of rooting in the new areas of Western Poland?

Assmann clarifies the differentiation of individual and collective memory coined by Halbwachs. And so “memory is individual in the sense that it is a unique link between the collective memory (of the various group experiences) and the experiences specific to the person concerned. Strictly speaking, it is the emotions rather than the memories that are individual”.25

The problem starts when one looks at collective memory, which is the cause of theoretical disputes. According to Jan Assmann, “collective memory is ascribed to the members of a collectivity and is not arbitrarily transitional. One who has a part in it thereby confirms their affiliation with the group. Hence memory is specific not only in regard to space and time, but also in regard to identity (…) time and space as categories of collective memory are emotionally marked in this context, and they appear as history and fatherland (Heimat)”.26

The next feature of this category of memory is reconstructability, which is dependent upon the changeable frames of reference of the present. And on the whole the reconstructability does not give rise to doubt here, only its attribution to the doubtful theory of collective memory. Its frailty is recalled by Aleida Assmann, “(…) there are constantly those warning against the concept of collective memory, because it is pure mystification”27, thereby referring to Marck Bloch and his review of Halbwachs’ book. He asserted that the concept of ‘collective memory’ is “convenient though somewhat fictitious”.28 Institutions do not have the equivalent of individual

23 J. Assmann, Pamięć kulturowa…, p. 52.
25 J. Assmann, Pamięć kulturowa…, p. 53.
26 Ibidem, p. 55.
27 A. Assmann, Między Historią a pamięcią, antologia, Warszawa, 2013.
memory for the simple reason that they do not possess a biological component. Nevertheless, although institutions might not possess memory, they are capable of creating it, as it were, by utilising memory-related signs, symbols, texts, practices, rituals, places and monuments. As has been previously mentioned: a collective does not have memory, but it does influence the memory of a given collectivity’s memory – hence the question: is individual memory simultaneously collective memory? Taking it further – collective memory consolidates and standardises recollections in such a way that they may be handed down to and reconstructed by successive generations. Here we encounter a certain danger resulting from the incorrect formation of collective memory, which in the case of resettled people could have harmful consequences during the process of taking root. This refers to the view of Andrea Marskovits and Simon Reich regarding the mechanism of the memory’s concentration around an axis between injustice and the experience of the victim, due to which it is not important who the victim, the perpetrator, the instigator and the loser are. Marskovits and Reich write in this context of the memory of the nation, which is no less relevant to the context of the experiences of the resettlers from the Eastern Borderlands, who created – in a certain sense – a new society made up of diverse cultures in Western Poland. When taking into account the traumatic events of the resettling, it would be dangerous if, in the aftermath, those who participated in these events treated them as the main narrative, as a toxic myth, the reiteration of which would not favour rooting, even in successive generations. Perpetuating the memory of suffering, of wrongs performed, may only fan anxiety in relation to the ‘other’, and arouse a feeling of constant threat, distrust, xenophobia, and finally ghettoization.

In that case, what is communicative and cultural memory? Simply speaking, communicative memory is tales of events from the recent past of something that an individual witnessed. To understand it better, one can think intuitively of generational memory, which is a variety of communicative memory. Aleida Assmann recalls that “individual memory is a dynamic medium of the subjective working through of experiences” and explains that in this context she and Jan Assmann also use the concept of communicative memory. Communicative memory is ‘alive’, or in other words ‘active’, through the mechanism of living persons recollecting and passing on content. Its life span is limited, and only reaches the fourth generation. Communicative memory is less formal in character than cultural memory, which is
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29 A. Assmann, Między Historią..., p. 47.
31 A. Assmann, Między Historią..., p. 43.
much more institutionalised and certainly marked with a certain type of sacredness. As was previously mentioned, communicative memory is not everlasting, but it can exist for longer if it is transformed into cultural memory, which unlike collective memory is not unified or entangled in politics. However, bearing in mind that it may emerge as a result of transformation from communicative into cultural memory, one should wonder whether this is not sometimes and in some manner a result of other-directedness, which provokes connotations that are not necessarily desirable, for example political ones? No less important for cultural memory is materialisation in the form of digital media and books, etc. Everything that makes up cultural memory, such as rituals, holy days, artefacts, monuments and sculptures, requires constant adjustment, renewal and discussion for it to match the existing reality.\(^\text{32}\)

The problem with the fourth generation’s not feeling rooted in Western Poland may also result from the fact that communicative memory is not suitably nurtured, and as a result it may be the case that communicative memory cannot be transformed efficiently into cultural memory.

In the context of the above deliberations, one should also add the category of ‘other-directedness’ elaborated by David Riesman.\(^\text{33}\) And so it would seem legitimate to contemplate the reflectiveness of individuals entangled in all those categories of memory. A danger that arises from unreflective remembrance is distortion resulting from an other-directed type of personality. Yielding to the predominant narratives in society undoubtedly affects remembrance, and especially collective memory, which may be influenced by the fundamental narrative.\(^\text{34}\)

In the case of the Borderlanders in Western Poland, the other-directed actions affected the settlers’ ability to fully take root, for example due to the authorities keeping them in a state of uncertainty and with a sense of threat from Germany, in order to continue exercising effective power and to further their integration with the communist party. On the other hand, there was an aversion felt towards the party, and the pioneer figure was not identified with.

“The pioneer-conqueror from the nineteen-forties comes across today as a very ideologically-burdened figure, virtually the embodiment of the exemplary citizen of the Polish People’s Republic (PRL). And admitting to being the latter is not a desirable attitude in the Third Polish Republic. Thus by rejecting the PRL the heroic image of the settlers from the first post-war years is also rejected.

\(^{32}\) Ibidem, p. 56.


\(^{34}\) The fundamental narrative is the prevailing narrative of the past of a specific society, R. Koselleck, *Semantyka historyczna*, Poznań 2001.
“Perhaps this rejection would not be so explicit had the development of the Western Lands been acknowledged a success. (…) On the one hand, the authorities’ intention to build a better socialism than in the rest of Poland in the Western Lands, and on the other the continuing uncertainty regarding the future fate of these lands, had a terrible effect on their fortunes after the collapse of communism. The essential transformation resulted in significant desolation in agriculture – more intensely collectivised than elsewhere – and in the far-from-modern and under-invested industry. Unemployment appeared, and together with it, a sense of apathy and hopelessness. And the schema of the settler-victim, a passive figure – one devoid of the ability to take action, seems to fit them the best”.

The Mythologisation of Cultural Memory – the Perspective of Roland Barthes

Having put order into the basic categories of memory, we shall now deal with the issue of the mythologisation of cultural memory in the context of the formation of the Borderlanders’ roots, drawing primarily on the deliberations of the French structuralist Roland Barthes regarding the issue of myth. Our starting point will be the semiological theme connected to the deconstruction of the sign – as proposed by the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure – into the signifier (signifiant) and the signified (signifie). Barthes focuses above all on the signifier (signifiant), the “(…) signified element may contain a few signifiers, and such is the case in linguistics and psychoanalysis. Likewise with the mythical concept: it has an unlimited number of signifier elements at its disposal: I can find a thousand Latin sentences illustrating the rule of the predicate, a thousand images standing for French imperialism. This means that, quantitatively, the concept is poorer than the signifier; it frequently only reproduces it again”.

In Mythologies Barthes explains myth as a word that does not have to possess even a verbalised form. “Barthes asserts that every object may be utilised, appropriated by a speaking society, in other words it can pass from the area of inarticulate matter into the area that is culturally interpreted”. Thus the theorist points out

that a myth interpreted culturally may be historically marked, which may cause it to differ depending on the prevailing social and cultural conditions. “The meaning of a myth in itself, as the relation of the signifier and signified, is based on a distortion of the lingual sense”.38 Barthes explains the manner in which the meaning of myth is created; thus it is the “(…) unceasing circular motion that alternately reveals the sense of the signifier and its form, the language-subject and the meta-language, purely meaningful consciousness and purely illustrative consciousness.”39 The most important function in this mechanism is performed by the creators of the myth, the mythologist, and the myth’s recipients, and “only mythological reading, focused on a distinct differentiation of sense and form, enables shattering of the myth’s meaning, its demystification. This demystification should reveal the myth’s fundamental principle, which involves the transformation of history into nature, the naturalisation of concepts. Barthes distinctly claims that man in bourgeois society is constantly immersed within a false Nature, which demythologising activity should unveil, revealing deep alienation”.

Thus when asking about the reasons behind the uprooting experienced in the Western Poland, attention should be paid to the character of the myths present in the regions of resettlement under investigation, so as to be able to correctly interpret and understand the mythological status of these regions.

When investigating the problem uprooting in Western Poland, there are also three important factors that illustrate the situation of the region from a statistical point of view. They concern social mobility, the crime rate, and the level of economic innovation—an intuitive understanding of which should be completely sufficient at this stage of our deliberations. It may also prove helpful to transpose Geert Hofstede’s research to the issue of the resettlers taking root in Western Poland, the result of which could be a perfect way to achieve a cultural characterisation of the region in question. For 40 years this Dutch social psychologist investigated the models according to which IBM staff functioned in over 70 countries, commencing this work at the turn of the 1970s. Hofstede classified certain cultural dimensions as similar to one another yet existing in various countries, and which were measurable and as such enabled comparative analysis.41 His research identified four distinguishing cultural features: the Power Distance Index (PDI), Individualism (IDV), Masculinity (MAS), and the Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI). There is also a fifth cultural di-

38 Ibidem, p. 106.
40 M. Marciniak, Japonia – reżim idealny…., p. 106.
mension that was discovered by Michael Bond, who took Hofstede's research further. He also conducted research among IBM's workforce, avoiding western influences. His research findings coincided partially with those presented by Hofstede; Bond's research did not identify the category of avoiding uncertainty. Instead of this, he discovered another category: that of Long Term Orientation (LTO).

The uprooting in the Fourth Generation in the Context of Resettlement Multiculturality

Pierre Bourdieu's concept of capital and the notions of habitus, field and game prove extraordinarily helpful in understanding the phenomenon of uprooting. In their time, the Borderlanders found themselves in a situation in which their hitherto habitus was insufficient for them to be able to play the game for capital effectively in the new field. This problem intensified in successive generations, because the issue of the Borderlanders' memory had not been set in order (to be more precise, we are speaking here of the cultural memory that had not formed), and in confrontation with the problem of the mythologisation of cultural memory (making use here of Roland Barthes' assumption) the phenomenon of uprooting becomes yet more understandable, and the process itself of these roots forming becomes yet more complex. If only because of the three factors mentioned earlier that are detrimental to the process of taking root, or which to be more precise cause uprooting in later generations. Namely, this refers to the issues of social mobility, crime and economic initiative. All these aspects intermingle and mutually influence each other: excessive social mobility, or to be more precise the drain of the creative class, results from a low sense of security caused by a high rate of crime, which in turn may derive from a dissatisfaction level of economic capital, while unsatisfactory economic capital also causes a drain of the creative class.

Resettlement multiculturality is not the same as multiculturality generated spontaneously on the principle of intensified social mobility, which causes the arbitrary formation of a multicultural society. The multiculturality of displaced persons, the kind characterising resettlement in Western Poland, was not brought about spontaneously and is governed by entirely different principles. At this point one should contemplate the methods that assisted in the management of a city that is multicultural in character due to residents having been resettled, a city whose identity has not fully formed. Such a measure could also bring empirical confirmation uprooting occurred in the fourth generation.
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