## 4.1 SOCIAL STATUS OF INHABITANTS IN INTERWAR PRAGUE



Petra Špačková

The interwar period in Prague was marked by very dynamic housing construction and population growth; in the 1920s, the population of Prague grew by almost 200,000 people. As a result of this dynamic development, the socio-economic differentiation was increasing, having an impact on spatial differentiation as well (Matějů 1980). The purpose of this map is to describe the differences in social status in Greater Prague in this period. To show the polarization of the urban environment, we were trying to identify those parts of the city inhabited by people with a high or, by contrast, low social status. We are using indicators that describe suitably the character of the social differentiation of Prague in that period. In the main map, we show the prices of rental housing in 1921. The areas with a higher social status are characterized by the presence of domestic servants in 1921 and 1930 (as also described by Moschelesová 1937). On the contrary, higher concentration of people with a low social status is illustrated on the presence of unattractive cellar and basement dwellings and certain institutions used as housing for the poor (in 1921). In the socialist period, most of the indicators used were no longer relevant; however, the map is loosely linked to map sheet section B 4.2 Level of education in Prague and 4.3 Work status in Prague, which describe the educational structure of the Prague population in the socialist period and nowadays.

The thematic map is based on three data sources. It uses census data from 1921 and 1930 (the former was adopted from a study by Boháč [1923]), and also data coming from the Prague housing census in 1921. The main map shows the average annual rent in 1921 in the cadastral territories of Prague (ancillary fees were included in the amount of rent). It also displays the structure of dwellings by social status of their inhabitants (self-employed and tenants, officials and clerks, workers and apprentices). In 1921, rental dwellings accounted for a vast majority of the Prague housing stock (87% of all dwellings on average). The greatest share of rental housing stock was in parts of the compact city (Žižkov, Vršovice, Vyšehrad, Smíchov or Vinohrady – more than 90% in all these neighbourhoods). On the contrary, the lowest share of rental flats could be found in cadastral territories on the outskirts of Prague (e. g. Malešice, Střížkov) or in neighbourhoods with a high number of official apartments (Bohnice, partially also Hodkovičky). Despite certain limitations, the amount of rent illustrates the housing costs of most Prague households quite accurately.

The other two maps deal with domestic servants, whose number is extrapolated to the number of dwellings in 1921 and to the number of economically active individuals in 1930<sup>1</sup>. Due to the growth of the capital city area and limited availability of data, it was

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In the 1930 census, domestic servants were not included among individuals having a gainful occupation (i. e. economically active population). However, in the map their number is compared with individuals having a

only possible show the data for the area of 14 core Prague cadastral territories and six other territorial areas whose were comprised of municipalities that became part of Prague on the basis of a 1920 law in 1921, and for the area of the existing city districts in 1930. The last 1921 map shows the share of cellar and basement dwellings in the housing stock and the distribution of institutions primarily used as housing for the poor. Among these were dormitories, shelters, almshouses and poorhouses. The distribution and capacity of such institutions in 1930 is described by map sheet section B 9.1 Quality of the housing stock in Prague.

		Avorogo		Share of flats' inhabitants by social status			
Area		Average annual rent	Share of rental flats	Self- employed and tenants	Officials and clerks	Workers and apprentices	
Highest rent	Josefov	CZK 1,907	88%	68%	27%	5%	
	Nové Město	CZK 1,231	86%	57%	24%	19%	
	Staré Město	CZK 1,204	87%	63%	17%	20%	
	Vinohrady	CZK 1,005	90%	50%	31%	19%	
	Bubeneč	CZK 872	85%	36%	37%	27%	
Lowest	Malešice	CZK 168	55%	14%	7%	80%	
rent*	Motol	CZK 161	59%	19%	3%	78%	
	Záběhlice	CZK 158	60%	24%	5%	71%	
	Střížkov	CZK 148	58%	14%	0%	86%	
	Jinonice	CZK 140	58%	21%	4%	75%	
<b>Greater Prague</b>		CZK 707	87%	40%	23 %	37%	

**Table 4.1.1:** Cadastral territories with the highest and lowest average yearly rent and structure of inhabitants of dwellings by social status in Prague in 1921

Source: Soupis bytů v Praze, 1921

Note: \* In cadastral territories with the lowest average annual rent, there was a greater share of households living in own houses, or official apartments (Motol, Střížkov).

The price of housing is a comprehensive indicator, which can identify areas with both low and high social status. In 1921, the average annual rent was affected by the situation on the housing market as the rental housing was relatively strictly regulated after the First World War. The impact of this regulation in Prague was quite significant considering the high share of rental dwellings (almost 90% of all dwellings). Despite this regulation, the housing market was highly differentiated in terms of prices of housing and quality of the housing stock, indeed. Moreover, in the 1920s and 1930s the rents were growing (Matějů 1977). Socio-economically strong individuals who could afford to pay the highest rent lived in attractive neighbourhoods of the city centre and adjacent residential neighbourhoods (see Table 4.1.1). The very highest rent were paid in Josefov, followed by slightly lower rents in Nové Město and Staré Město. The dwellings in these neighbourhoods were mainly inhabited by members of high social classes – self-

gainful occupation, and not with those competent to have an occupation, who besides individuals having a gainful occupation were also helping family members and individuals with no occupation (i. e. economically inactive population).

employed and tenants. The lower the average annual rent was, the higher the share of officials and clerks, and mainly also workers and apprentices was observed. The lowest rent was on the outskirts of Prague (Jinonice, Střížkov).

The presence of domestic servants is an indicator of a higher social status of the population (Moschelesová 1937). As opposed to the present situation and mainly the situation in the socialist period, in the period of the First Czechoslovak Republic, domestic servants were quite commonly present in the households of higher classes. In 1921, at least one domestic servant was present in 14% of Greater Prague flats. The spatial differentiation of domestic servants significantly depended on the national structure of the population of individual Prague neighbourhoods (see map sheet section B 5.2 Ethnicity in Prague). In fact, the social and economic status of the German and Jewish populations was generally higher, and members of these ethnic groups employed more domestic servants than those of Czechoslovak nationality (see Table 4.1.2). It is therefore not surprising that a higher share of dwellings with at least one domestic servant could be found in the central parts of the city. The by far greatest share of such flats was in Josefov (almost 60%), the population size of which was rather small. The reason for this was that before the First World War, this neighbourhood was renewed and reconstructed and rich population with a high share of Germans and Jews moved into the new, modern houses (Moschelesová 1937). Many households with domestic servants also lived in Staré Město, Nové Město, Vinohrady or Karlín (mainly the German minority). The 1930 map shows the number of domestic servants compared to the number of individuals having a gainful occupation. The spatial pattern is similar to the one in the preceding map. The by far greatest number was present in Prague V (Josefov), where the proportion was 100 individuals having a gainful occupation to 35 domestic servants. A high relative number of servants could also be found in Prague I (Staré Město), Prague II (Nové Město), Prague XII (Vinohrady) and Prague XIX (mainly Bubeneč and Dejvice).

Nationality of the owner of the dwelling		Number of domestic servants	Number of dwellings				Number of
			With one domestic servant	With two and more domestic servants	With no domestic servants	Total	domestic servants per 100 dwellings
	Czechoslovak	22,106	11%	1%	88%	156,009	14.2
Czechoslovak	German	3,960	36%	8%	55%	7,057	56.1
citizens	Jewish	954	55%	7%	38%	1,375	69.4
	Other	34	15%	3%	81%	151	22.5
Foreigners		531	20%	4%	76%	1,805	29.4
Greater Prague		27,585	12%	2%	86%	166,397	16.6

**Table 4.1.2:** Domestic servants by nationality of the owner of the dwelling in Prague in 1921

Source: Boháč, 1923

In contrast to the above indicator, we also show the share of poor-quality housing used by population with a lower social status: cellar and basement dwellings and institutions used as housing for the poor. It is important to note that the share of basement dwellings was (naturally) very low in neighbourhoods made up of single-family houses, where this type of dwellings was not common (Malešice, Jinonice). It is obvious that for these areas, this indicator is not relevant and it is only possible to identify the housing of lower classes in urban neighbourhoods (with blocks of flats). By contrast, the share of cellar and basement dwellings was high in cadastral territories with generally lower social status (Radlice, Veleslavín, Hlubočepy), but also in some relatively attractive neighbourhoods in more prestigious locations (mainly those with a higher share of officials); it was because in these areas, lower quality dwellings were the only affordable housing segment for workers (Hradčany, Vinohrady, Vršovice, Smíchov).

## **References:**

BOHÁČ, A. (1923): Hlavní město Praha. Studie o obyvatelstvu. Státní úřad statistický, Bursík a Kohout, Praha.

MATĚJŮ, P. (1977): Sociologické aspekty vývoje bydlení v Praze. Sociologický časopis, 13, n. 1, pp. 39–58.

MATĚJŮ, P. (1980): Vývoj sociálně prostorové struktury Prahy v letech 1930–1970 ve světle faktorové analýzy. Sociologický časopis, 16, n. 6, pp. 572–592.

MOSCHELESOVÁ, J. (1937): The demographic, social, and economic regions of Greater Prague. A Contribution to Urban Geography. Geographical Review, 27, n. 3, pp. 414–429.

## **Data sources:**

Soupis bytů v Praze podle stavu z 15. února 1921. Statistická komise hlavního města Prahy, Praha.

SÚS (1934): Sčítání lidu v Republice československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. Státní úřad statistický, Praha.