

University of Economics in Katowice

Volume 10

2012

Journal of

**Economics &
Management**

Robert Pyka

**MINIMIZING THE SIDE EFFECTS
OF THE METROPOLIZATION
AS A CONDITION FOR MAINTENANCE
OF TRANSITION AND RESILIENCE IN
POST-INDUSTRIAL AGGLOMERATIONS**

Introduction

The globalization phenomenon is one of the main social processes that determine our contemporary reality. It may be analysed as a phenomenon by itself but today it is becoming a rather fundamental feature of most social phenomena which, under its influence, have completely changed their character. Globalization is a phenomenon that penetrates reality so deeply that it constitutes a new paradigm that must be used in order to comprehend present reality properly. One phenomenon that cannot be comprehended without taking global processes into consideration is metropolization which is globalization's elemental consequence in the city space. In this depiction, globalization might be defined as a phenomenon that relies on involution and the intensification of different kinds of flows and crossings of different processes which till now have been independent to a certain degree. Due to time and space compression, as indicated in the literature, a specific virtual global space was created in which interactions take place in unprecedented numbers through the actors that take part in it, and the subjects which are its content.

The global village described above constitutes immaterial space – Castells' space of flow or real virtuality (Castells, 2010). Searching for its manifestation in traditional or material space, in the space of places which are marked by the stamps left by globalization processes, big city agglomerations, also known as metropolitan areas, must be shown first. Net and nodal processes, described in these areas, touch material living spaces, modify peoples' surroundings, their life conditions and social relations in both desirable and undesirable, predictable and unpredictable ways.

In this context we can speak about new challenges for post-industrial agglomerations transition and resilience. We have almost left behind us the transformation process seen as restructuring of heavy industry, closing large industrial units. We step in to phase of transition where we still have to demonstrate our potential of resilience, but understand it in a different way. Transition and resilience can be recognized today as the ability to capture and control our development process making it more balanced in the context of global capitalistic economy affecting the biggest agglomerations and changing their social and physical space. Thus, one of the principal challenges of transformation and resilience in large post-industrial agglomeration, is the ability to control as much as possible the metropolization process by searching for appropriate conditions allowing agglomerations to use their potential fully and reduce unexpected side effects of metropolization. This means in fact balanced development of metropo-

litan areas by urban governance and creation of institutional solutions for metropolitan government.

As far as then main goal of this presentation is concerned is to show the metropolization process as a challenge form maintenance of transition and resilience in Raymond Boudon's theoretical view.

1. Metropolization and its results in Raymond Boudon's conception of unexpected consequences

Although the metropolization phenomenon has existed for a long time, globalization gave it a totally new dimension. "Metropolization is the local space system's response to the globalization phenomena" (Markowski, Marszał, 2006, p. 10). It is a process that changes the character and strength of the connection between the centre and a surrounding region, leading to modifications in the use of space, and it is manifested in the development of urbanized space (Markowski, Marszał, 2006, p. 10). In other words, metropolization is "[...] a process of taking over by some big cities managerial functions in post-industrial economy on the supranational scale" (Jałowiecki, 2000, p. 17). However, it doesn't mean that only the biggest cities with global reach might be called metropolis because they might also be national or regional and can in different, often not complete, ways meet ideal demands of its both, qualitative and quantitative, characters*.

Taking complexity, number, and interrelation or the clash of processes that determine present social reality on a global scale into consideration, the theories based on simple hierarchical structure – common for Westfal epoch – lose their explanatory force. To properly understand contemporary phenomena which in their structure approach the polyarchy conception of Robert Dhal, it is indispensable to reach for theories which have heuristic ability to embrace what in a classical approach might be described as chaos or disorder (Ascher, 1998). It seems that the conception of functional and interdependent systems, as well as Raymond Boudon's aggregation effects, possesses features of such a theory (Boudon, 2009).

Metropolization might be considered in a twofold way. Most often, it is treated as an elemental process which is the consequence of global phenomena transmitted to the level of urban agglomerations. In this depiction, it is a result of the aggregation of different global processes which are spontaneously and uncontrollably reflected in city space where metropolization means emergence of

* Bohdan Jałowiecki writes about quality and quantity features (Jałowiecki, 2000, p. 18).

new functional systems as well as interdependent systems that generate a lot of costly social side effects.

Metropolization might be also considered as an institutional depiction, seen as an effect of intentional actions taken by social actors who aim to take “control” of the metropolization process in the first depiction. It is made by creating different kinds of institutional solutions, resulting in the overlapping of functional space: the politico-institutional metropolization phenomenon overlaps functional space, and searches to determine it. Institutional metropolization in this context, meaning the creation of new instruments of metropolis management in the perspective of Boudon’s theory, is a pursuit to convert interdependent systems and negative aggregation phenomena into functional systems the effects of which are predictable and more easily modeled.

Metropolization in the first depiction of a phenomenon is a natural result of global processes acting in city space, and might be examined from the multiplication of interaction systems viewpoint. The space of metropolization action or metropolitan area is a type of space that is characterized by a high density of different kinds of interactions and network flows. These interactions, according to Boudon, might be divided into two varieties – interactions created on the basis of different functional connections between actors, which come as a result of their social roles and which might suggest cooperation and even lead to synergy. However, not all of the relations in which individuals are involved result from interactions between their social roles. In reference to social phenomena which do not have the features of a functional system, Boudon uses the term “a system of interdependence” due to the fact that activities of individuals do not cross as a result of functional correlation of the social roles they fulfil, but as a result of a general interdependence of social phenomena” (Pyka, Wódz, 2009, p. 16).

Looking at metropolization as a generator of new systems and functional correlations, we focus on its commonly recognized results as positive. Metropolis is treated here as a locomotive which propels the development of some areas due to the concentration of different capitals from which the richness and prosperity come. Spatial coexisting of services, institutions, supplies on the highest level, concentration of many actors from engineering, science, business, and authority produces huge innovational potential, and creates good conditions for cooperation and exchange. It was Alfred Marshall who noticed the positive phenomena in special concentration in his conception of “industrial district”, producing formal and informal customs, ethos of work, initiative, in which spillage of knowledge and capacities among the local companies might be observed, as well as the development of supporting and similar branches of industry, easier access and possibilities to gaining specialist equipment and a local market of speciali-

zed and highly skilled employees (Marshall, 1920, pp. 221-231). The rise of various functional connections on metropolitan areas is conducive to the fast circulation of information and knowledge between cooperative actors, which helps to create new knowledge according to the model of “a spiral of knowledge circulation” (Nonaka, Takeuchi, 2000, p. 96). Organizational or institutional signs of rising functional systems in metropolitan areas, based on network connections of correlated partners, might be scientific-technological parks, business incubators, whose function might be concerned with the clusters conception.

According to Michael E. Porter, the concept of clusters is described as a “[...] geographic concentration of mutually connected companies, specialized suppliers, units providing services, companies acting in similar sections and connected with them institutions (e.g. universities, standardization units and trade associations), competing with each other but also cooperating” (Porter, 2001, p. 246). This specific synergy effect can be compared to Boudon’s aggregation effect which displays amplified or intensified actions of particular actors, which are directed toward a vector of the same sight. Dynamic development in metropolitan areas of functional systems of interactions, characterized by an intensive flow of information, knowledge, competence and innovation between actors, who in different space conditionings would not have had the possibility to be in such good cooperation, may lead to a rise of something that in addition to the “learning region” conception, might be called the “learning metropolitan area” (Boekema, Morgan, 2000). The latter might be considered as the effect of synergic cooperation and exchange among the metropolitan actors, capable of auto-reflecting on their own action and projecting an optimal metropolitan cooperation network for themselves.

The metropolization phenomenon on one hand increases a chance for the dynamic development of some areas and for the growth of their competitiveness and innovation potential, while on the other hand it is the source of a great deal of problems which big agglomerations touched by this phenomenon must cope with*. These problems include all of the side effects that exaggerate big social costs and which are a result of the concentration of a large amount of interacting systems in a limited space. Only a certain part of the systems described above creates functional phenomena which lead to cooperation. A large number of interactions have the characteristics similar to Boudon’s “interdependent systems” in which individuals directed by their own strategies of actions “collide into each other”, leading to different kinds of aggregation effects, inversion or side effects

* Patrick Le Galès among others writes about double logics of the metropolization process (Le Galès, 1995, pp. 71-73).

which often stay contrary to the original intention of separate individuals (Pyka, Wódz, 2009, p. 18).

When transferring the above mentioned cognitive tools illustrated by Boudon to metropolitan areas, one can indicate from the expanded list of unintentional and frequently dysfunctional effects of metropolization that most often mentioned in the literature is the “expanding” of cities onto surrounding areas, which creates a number of challenges for ecology, such as shrinking of non-urbanized areas, and managing a surface that is transformed by individuals or companies in uncontrolled ways (Jałowicki, 2000, p. 43; Ładysz, 2009, pp. 67-68; Lackowska, 2009, pp. 23-24). The uncontrolled peri-urbanization phenomenon causes essential disparities as far as the costs of maintaining metropolitan infrastructure, which is often concentrated in the centre of a metropolitan area from which resident tax payers move out, thus paying taxes in their new places of residence located in surrounding areas.

The Peri-urbanization process is not only an effect of escaping from the difficulties of living in the centre of the city, but it is also, to some extent, the side effect of a rapid increase in real estate prices in the centre of the metropolitan area, which is caused by international investments targeted at convenient localizations. An increase in demand for real estate affects their prices, which often becomes an obstacle for the indigenous residents of the area, making it impossible for them to purchase flats and forcing them to look for better conditions at a lower price outside of the centre of agglomeration.

The phenomenon of the aggregation of individual strategies of particular individuals, collective actors or public and private subjects, leads to a rise in competition on functional metropolitan areas, resulting in the mutual weakening or even destruction of projects. It can lead to a duplication of particular investments, for example within the infrastructure or buildings of public usage, such as congress halls or exhibition centres.

Metropolization, manifesting itself with great intensity in social and economic processes within a limited physical space, also brings essential problems concerning transport. The problem of traffic jams and the capacity of metropolitan road structures, as well as proper solutions concerning collective public transport as a way of avoiding communication blockage are direct effects of metropolization. The side effect of the intensity and density of social-economic activities in metropolitan areas also creates the problem of massive community waste that is generated.

Various social pathologies may also be included into the undesired effects of the functioning of metropolitan areas, a number of which increases with number of residents and dynamics of the local market. On the one hand it concerns

the raise of crime and illegal activities rate (drugs, prostitution) while on the other hand it concerns the increasing phenomenon of social exclusion of social groups that are left behind on the margin of metropolization.

The occurrence of unintended consequences of the metropolization phenomenon on the metropolitan areas which constitute a very thick network of functional and interdependent interaction systems, has resulted in the rise of a thesis stating the general crisis of big agglomerations and the lack of controllability of metropolitan areas. A great number of authors indicate that life and environment standards have become worse in these areas and they point to the disappearance of a city as the area for social groups which is a result of global capitalism*.

2. Metropolis in an institutional perspective – a reply to undesired results of the metropolization phenomenon

The consciousness of complexity and multi-directivity of the metropolization process causes a search for institutional and management tools which will minimize the dysfunctional phenomena and amplify those which are favourable for the balanced development of metropolitan areas. What we mean here is metropolization in the institutional perspective, which generates instruments that create favourable conditions for transforming uncontrolled and impetuous interdependent systems of interactions, rich in collisions and contradictions, into functional systems based on developed information channels and that manifest themselves in domination of relations based on cooperation. The purpose of the institutional system of managing metropolitan areas is to try to subdue, to the highest degree, the process of metropolization and to take from it the possible advantages understood as a balanced social-economic development of the area (Markowski, Marszał, 2006, p. 23).

In this context, the conceptions mentioned before indicating chaos, crisis, lack of authorities or explosion of contemporary cities have a fatalistic character and do not supply us with the tools needed to enable and operate social processes in new conditions. What seems to be a proper point of view is the assumption that metropolization brings both positive and negative social effects, gives enormous potential the realization of which implies particular side effects which can be controlled to some extent, and in some situations may be transferred into Boudon's functional systems, which may be accompanied by the synergy phenomenon.

* The authors presenting a thesis of lack of governance of metropolitan areas are shown in (Le Galès, Lorrain, 2003, pp. 305-317).

The elementary question is how to manage complexity and correlation of social phenomena, understood in such a way, and how to operate within something which is mainly associated with chaos. Surely traditional forms of governing characterized for vertical hierarchized structures, based on a one-directional subjection, resulting from concentration in a decision-making centre the resources essential for government, do not suit the contemporary reality of the metropolitan areas. The areas are characterised by huge increases in the number of independent actors shaping the metropolization process. The resources indispensable for controlling the space of metropolization in the contemporary reality have been spread among all of these factors. Nowadays, public administration is not the only place with a concentration of resources as knowledge, capital, creativity and innovation or real power which are spread among the subjects functioning, to a great extent, in an autonomous way. Freedom and autonomy release their creativity but they can also cause the undesired phenomena of aggregation, which can be avoided by creating favourable conditions for the flow of information, platforms and forums where knowledge and information can be shared, hence enabling the coordination of activities due to which particular actors obtain in the consciousness of their individual strategies in the metropolization space.

In this way, we transfer from the phenomenon of power and administration in the classical sense of Weber (1998), to a polyarchic reality based on co-governing which in the literature functions as “metropolitan governance”. Governance means the flexible division of power among institutional individuals and various social groups that the task or project concerns. Governance may in practice mean the negotiating of public policies when there is a high multiplexing of actors and levels of decisions and the necessity of coordinating them and keeping cohesion when the state does not possess the monopoly for defining commonwealth, and simultaneously the notion of local wealth is being created. This notion indicates changes within forming decisions by decreasing the meaning of institutional membership and traditional political and administrative hierarchies for the benefit of more flexible and informal relations in which authority, initiatives and leadership are better divided. Finally, it also indicates the disappearance of borders between the state, civil society, local government units and the market (Pyka, 2011a). Governance is “[...] a flexible pattern of a public decision making process based on loose networks of particular actors” (Lackowska, 2009, p. 44).

The notion of governance inscribes, in a wider perspective, the problem concerning the condition of contemporary representative democracy, what in Western Europe is known as the crisis of representation (fr. *crise de la représentation*), the remedy for which might be met in local democracy and its variety

of deliberation. The crisis of representation questions the basic function of political elites whose aim is to transfer the citizens' expectations in the direction of political decedents. This phenomenon means a growth of distance between the technocratic political elite and common citizens who are pushed on the margin of decisive processes because of the low level of their political competence (Perribeau, 2002, pp. 28-31). Pierre Bourdieu defined this phenomenon as the tyranny of experts and demanded to return to real democracy which nowadays is referred to as the conceptions of governance and deliberation democracy (Bourdieu, 1995). The latter might appear after changing the attitude to the problem of political competences. In the traditional depiction, the political competences are treated as individual's attributes which are a consequence of its accumulated knowledge, information and opinions, to which level they might be exposed in individual verification. In the pole of deliberation democracy, the citizens' political competences acquire a collective dimension and political judgments and positions are consequences of communication and common units' interactions. In this sense, the basic knowledge level of citizens is not so important in the final effect of deliberation. Public opinion which expresses the common good is not just a simple sum of units' opinions but is also an aggregation which is the result of its confrontation and adjusting (Blondiaux, 2007, pp. 761-771).

Deliberation democracy's doctrine does not negate the meaning of experts' knowledge and competence, however it points at their roles in the pole of democratic processes as an enrichment of public debate with a real engagement of people instead of negating its efficiency because of a lack of proper preparation (Pyka, 2011b). In this context, the notion of governance might be treated as a new form of creating and shaping a decisive process by using proper tools for a local deliberation democracy which goes outside of the canon of a representative system. It is connected with the fact that our societies are more reflective, and participation and local democracy are an answer to the aversion to politics in today's form (Jouve, 2005, pp. 322-323).

The notion of "governance" does not mean a defined state or a system of procedures, it is a process which, in the Boudon's sociological perspective, is the effect of the pursuit of giving a functional character to those new and incredibly complicated social relations which emerge in the areas of metropolization conditioned by globalization, in order to avoid or minimize the phenomenon of collision as well as the undesired effects of aggregation.

In Western Europe the consciousness of challenges accompanying the phenomenon of metropolization resulted in pursuing various kinds of institutional solutions, the purpose of which was to reduce the negative effects of the process while taking advantage of its development potential. The essential problem of

managing metropolitan areas was maladjustment concerning territorial range and competence of already existing units of local authorities that were not able to deal with the functional metropolitan area, which was most frequently rapidly expanding.

In France, a response to the above mentioned challenges of the emergence of metropolitan areas is the dynamically developing inter-communal cooperation which creates convenient conditions for the development of co-governing processes (governance).

The cooperation among municipalities in its various institutional forms on the areas of metropolization processes aims at transforming these municipalities into areas dominated by functional systems, thus minimizing negative effects of the phenomena of aggregation. The first forms of cooperation among municipalities in France were in the form of one or multifunctional unions of municipalities, which date back to the XIX century. They were not a reaction to the metropolization phenomenon, but they were rather connected with the development of such public networks as sewage systems or power lines. In the 1960s, the biggest French cities were under the influence of far developed metropolization processes, the social and economic results of which began to be present also in field of politics. In this way, in 1966, the French State decided to create the first "Urban Communities" (fr. *Communauté Urbaine*) which constituted an obligatory form of cooperation among municipalities for the largest French cities (Bordeaux, Lyon, Lille and Strasburg). The metropolitan authorities created in such a way, possessing crucial obligatory and facultative competences among others within land, waste or transport management, the ability to institute their own tax system, were to accompany the harmonious development of French metropolitan centres.

Although the idea of imposing cooperation on the biggest cities was received with reserve by the local decision makers, the institutional solutions which were introduced were quickly accepted, and soon after, others big agglomerations of more than 500 thousand residents took advantage of this through creating Urban Communities. Today, there are 16 Urban Communities functioning in France which constitute the area of metropolization processes. Owing to metropolitan management structures, the communities are trying to control urbanization processes, carrying out a cohesive policy of land management and coordinated communication, transport, and waste management systems for the whole metropolitan area. An interesting aspect of the counteraction against the negative effects of metropolization was the introduction of a common tax rate for companies in order to avoid unhealthy competition among the municipalities of metropolitan community. The 1999 Chevènement Act which created conditions for developing cooperation among municipalities on a larger scale, and also introdu-

ced financial encouragements for urban centres that decided to cooperate in agglomerations below 500 thousand residents, turned out to be the key legal solution in France. As a result, today more than 80% of French society lives in an area where the communities of municipalities function. At present, there are works in progress in France concerning the next territorial reform which is to answer the challenges of metropolization to an even larger extent. The resolution of the project predicts the development of a “Metropolis” as a unit of municipalities in cooperation which will take essential competences of department and region in order to govern the metropolitan area in a more effective and cohesive way. The reform intends also to create Metropolitan Poles (Poles metropolitains) which would constitute a network connection of two metropolitan centres that are close to each other.

Units of management of metropolitan areas functioning in France constitute the instruments of harmonious development of these centres by “metropolitan governance”. In this context we cannot forget to mention a very important organ of inter-municipality units, the Councils of Development which gather local actors representing scientific, economic, cultural and other fields, hence creating a platform for discussion and coexistence with the actors who participate in the process of metropolitan governance (Pyka, 2010, pp. 134-136). Owing to such activities, the uncontrolled and impetuous process of metropolization is limited. However, one must bear in mind that there are many limitations of such mechanisms which frequently only allow for a decrease, to a crucial extent, but not an elimination of negative phenomena.

Additionally, it sometimes happens that the practical functioning of some deliberation tools, as mentioned above in Development Councils, which are the adviser bodies functioning in the large French agglomeration, lead to unexpected consequences. This phenomenon is indicated by French researchers who show that although Development Councils should have been gathering a representation of civil society when opening decisive processes to public debate, they have now become the cover for creating new semi-elitist regimes, where participation is to be closed to a classic frame and institutional logic.

Gilles Pinson focuses on this phenomenon, and describes this European form of governance as pluralistic and semi-elitistic at the same time (Pinson, 2006, p. 646). In public debate, which is in theory open to everybody, the same people often participate, those who have enough motivation and time and those who are noticed and are then always invited to different kinds of consultation groups and projects. Participation democracy, in an institutional version, causes its actors who come from civil society environment to participate against themselves in a reproduction of norms and hierarchies in the previous political order.

Bernard Jouve calls these deliberation elites “professionnels de la participation”, what might be translated as “professional activists” (Jouve, 2005, p. 326).

In this perspective, it is worth looking at the Polish situation, in which the biggest agglomerations also face positive, negative and unwanted effects of metropolization process. Although Polish agglomerations do not fully meet the definition criteria of a metropolis of international importance, some of them surely constitute regional metropolises, and are for sure a place of influence of global processes in a physical space. This includes: Warsaw, Cracow, Wrocław, Łódź, tri-city areas of Gdańsk, Gdynia and Sopot and the Silesian conurbation. Without going into the problems of defining and delimiting the issue of metropolitan areas in Polish space (Markowski, Marszał, 2000, pp. 23-25), we shall focus on the challenges connected with the functioning of the largest Polish conurbation which is the Silesia conurbation. Silesia conurbation constitutes an area with one of the largest development potential in Poland, and at the same time accumulates the largest number of threats resulting from the negative effects of metropolization. This is why a lack of mechanisms in order to limit the negative effects of aggregation may cause the biggest damage in this area, impeding the development of the area as a whole. The situation results from the exceptional territorial structure of the upper Silesia metropolitan region, which contrary to other Polish agglomerations concentrating around one strong urban centre, is constituted of several cities with less than 300 thousand residents (only Katowice is close to this number), which altogether creates a common, functional urbanized area, constituting one big urban organism with a population which significantly exceeds two million residents. The crucial problem concerning this area is the fact that this big urban organism, facing problems which most European metropolises have to face, is governed by separately functioning individual towns constituting the conurbation, so the institutional system is not adequate in any way to deal with the real social processes taking place in this functional area.

Although currently the upper Silesia metropolitan area is developing dynamically, as it is a very attractive location for investors, the lack of cohesive governance of the area causes the overlapping of the consequences of the development, weakening the dynamics of development which in the future, due to negative effects of aggregation, may be completely quashed. The most urgent problems requiring functional systems of co-governing (governance) are those connected with land management with regards to the uncontrolled movement of population and the irregular distribution of metropolization costs. Other spheres where this lack of thorough cooperation between particular cities in the agglomeration may weaken developmental potential are: the system of transport, community wastes management, and the system of city information on the metropolitan level which makes it easier to move around in the conurbation area.

There are two basic obstacles to face in creating a balanced development of the Upper Silesia conurbation. These are connected with eliminating the negative effects of metropolization while at the same time trying to use its increased dynamics.

The first obstacle is connected with the lack of appropriate institutional structures of metropolitan management able to transfer negative effects of aggregation into functional systems. Since 2007, although the Upper Silesia Metropolitan Association (Metropolia Silesia) has been functioning in the upper Silesia metropolitan area, it has been operating in a way that is characteristic for voluntary inter-communal systems with limited competences and financial resources, personnel which includes only about 15 workers and a scope that includes only 14 of the biggest cities of the agglomeration, which does not cover the functional area of influence in the metropolization process. In the Polish legal system there is no so called "metropolitan regulation", which would equip metropolitan areas with management tools adapted to their reality. Works on such a regulation have been carried out since 2006 but the process has not been completed successfully, mainly because of political reasons. Legal solutions and institutions constitute only some kinds of frames and tools, and their functioning depends on the people working there and their mutual relations. What matters here is some kind of social capital meaning the consciousness of the actors participating in this metropolitan game, based on compromise and trust. While observing the functioning of the Upper Silesia Metropolitan Association's political scene nowadays one can have the impression that in many cases the actors participating in the metropolitan game of interests, do not treat it as a positive sum game but as a field of competition where one can achieve something by taking advantage of others. One can ask a question here if the metropolitan regulation will solve the problem of cooperation. Surely this is the case only to some extent. Although the situation is alarming, similar experiences from Western Europe show that creating metropolitan areas, managed in a cohesive way by being conscious of actors' common interests, is the effect of a long-term social process of collective learning. What is crucial in this process are the institutions generating knowledge and creating specific metropolitan discourse in order to help the metropolitan area be present in the consciousness of both the residents of the area and most importantly, in the consciousness of local political elite. In France this is the role of Urban Agencies, functioning in the biggest metropolis, which employ architects, town planners, sociologists and other specialists involved in the balanced development of the metropolitan area. The lack of such institutions in Poland is significant and it increases the above-mentioned lack of cooperation.

Conclusions

The metropolization phenomenon, as one of the effects of globalization, creates an intensification of connections and interactions which take place among local and global actors, who have so far been functioning within relatively closed and spatially limited systems. The compression of time and space, characteristics of the globalization process, in turn create very complex, net and diverse interactions on both the global and local level. These configurations differ from the simple, hierarchic and limited to a few actors' relations, specific for the Westphalian era, in which the dominated role was played by states and their agendas. Although the notions of chaos and ungovernability appeared as the first reactions to the new reality at the beginning of 21st century, today we know that it demands a new approach on an explanatory level as well as on a new administrative process level. The changes mentioned above also result from an evolution in contemporary democratic political systems, in which the citizens are searching for a new, more effective and more direct form of political participation, whose reflection is deliberation democracy connected with the notion of governance.

The metropolitan areas are points which the phenomena characterized above focuses on. The multiplying of interrelationships and net interactions might assume the form of functional systems strengthening the development dynamics of metropolitan areas. But it may have also negative and undesired consequences because of aggregation phenomenon. In this context, the theory of unintended effects of social activities by Raymond Boudon is a theoretical approach that enables one to understand the complexity and multidimensionality of the contemporary reality and also allows to go beyond a simple statement of chaos. This theory supplies us with crucial analytical tools, by means of which the metropolitan phenomenon may be analysed and one can diagnose its course and possible institutional solutions which are favourable in order to create a balanced development of metropolitan areas.

These issues constitute one of the most important challenges for the biggest Polish cities because their dynamic development determines further modernization of the country as a whole. In order to make this possible, it is necessary for Polish political elites to take into consideration that all the changes of reality demand new forms of government. A centralistic approach and aspiration to control development processes from the capital city seem to be unsuitable with today's demands and development processes in which dynamics are transferred to the local and regional level and are connected with global actors and networks. This kind of changes made in France, a country famous for its centralism

and Jacobins traditions are impressive although the country might also be the source of negative experiences and side effects like elitism or the multiplication of institutional beings. The lack of similar changes in the Polish condition and the inertia of the government system can significantly reduce the potential to use all future possibilities to develop Poland as a country. Deficits of integrated metropolitan government and governance, of trust and cooperation in Upper Silesia retard the process of its transition into learning region. Learning region require resilience and appear as a result of various flows of knowledge, information between different actors which generate creativity and innovations. Maintenance of regional modernization means today transition in to learning region and control on results of high-speed development process. It means take advantage of multiplication of interactions systems characteristic for metropolization process, by avoiding collisions and clash of particular actions and transforming them into functional system producing cooperation and synergy.

References

- Ascher F. (1998): *Habitat et villes. L'avenir en jeu*, ed. Jean-Claude Driant Editions L'Harmattan, Paris.
- Blondiaux L. (2007): *Faut-il se débarrasser de la notion de compétence politique? Retour critique sur un concept classique de la science politique*. „Revue française de science politique” 2007/6, Vol. 57.
- Boekema, F. W. M., Morgan K. (2000): *Knowledge, Innovation and Economic Growth: The Theory and Practice of Learning Regions*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham.
- Boudon R. (2009): *Logika działania społecznego*. NOMOS, Kraków.
- Bourdieu P. (1995): *Combattre la technocratie sur son terrain*. „Humanité” 14/12. Accessed July 16, 2010, <http://www.humanite.fr/node/186758>.
- Castells M. (2010): *Spoleczeństwo sieci*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Jałowicki B. (2000): *Spoleczna przestrzeń metropolii*. Scholar, Warszawa.
- Jouve B. (2005): *La démocratie en métropoles: gouvernance, participation et citoyenneté*. „Revue française de science politique”, Vol. 55, No. 2.
- Lackowska M. (2009): *Zarządzanie obszarami metropolitalnymi w Polsce. Między dobrowolnością a imperatywem*. UW, Warszawa.
- Ładysz I. (2009): *Konkurencyjność obszarów metropolitalnych w Polsce*. CeDeWu, Warszawa.
- Le Galès P. (1995): *Du gouvernement des villes à la gouvernance urbaine*. „Revue française de science politique”, Vol. 45, No. 1.

- Le Galès P., Lorrain D. (2003): *Gouverner les très grandes métropoles?* „Revue française d'administration publique”, No. 107.
- Markowski T., Marszał T. (2006): *Metropolie, obszary metropolitalne, metropolizacja*. KPZK PAN, Warszawa.
- Marshall A. (1920): *Principles of Economics. An Introductory Volume*. The MacMillan Press, London.
- Nonaka I., Takeuchi H. (2000): *Kreowanie wiedzy w organizacji*. Poltext, Warszawa.
- Perrineau P. (2002): *La crise du politique. La politique a-t-elle encore un sens?* „La pensée de midi”, No. 7.
- Pinson G. (2006): *Projets de ville et gouvernance urbaine Pluralisation des espaces politiques et recomposition d'une capacité d'action collective dans les villes européennes*. „Revue française de science politique”, Vol. 56, No. 4.
- Porter E. M. (2001): *Porter o konkurencji*. PWE, Warszawa.
- Pyka R. (2010): *Wspólnota Aglomeracji Saint-Étienne Métropole, jako przykład postępującego w Europie procesu metropolizacji*. In: *Sposób na Metropolię. Idee a społeczne oczekiwania wobec projektu utworzenia śląsko-zagłębiowskiej metropolii*. Ed. Robert Pyka. RSS MSNP UŚ, Katowice.
- Pyka R. (2011a): *Lokalne gouvernance jako przejaw dehierarchizacji procesów decyzyjnych oraz nowa forma dialogu społecznego*. „Studia Regionalne i Lokalne” 2/2011.
- Pyka R. (2011b): *O niektórych źródłach ograniczonego uczestnictwa politycznego – kryzys czy metamorfoza demokracji*. In: *O pożytkach z badań z dziedziny socjologii i antropologii polityki. Próby refleksji*. Ed. J. Wódz. Wydawnictwo UŚ, Katowice.
- Weber M. (1998): *Polityka jako zawód i powołanie*. Znak, Kraków.