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PART ONE

1. Introduction

All societies produce strangers; but each kind of society produces its own kind of strangers, and produces them in its own inimitable way.

1. Cities respond to labour migrant settlement

1.1 The labour migrant as Stranger in our midst

The arrival and presence of immigrants has always raised fears as well as expectations in the receiving society. Indeed, our response to the presence of strangers in our midst -- a mixture of fear and fascination -- is a more sophisticated version of the 'fight-or-flight' instinct that is common to many animals. But humans go beyond this, by ascribing meaning to the stranger. By defining Otherness, who is one of us and who is not, we define ourselves. At the societal level, the label of Strangeness is applied to individuals (indigenous and foreign) as well as to entire populations on the basis of real or perceived differences from the host society. Often the label has been applied to newcomers in a continual process of re-definition by the host society of itself and its Strangers. European history illustrates how social perceptions of Strangers can endure for centuries but also how these labels evolve over time, for example in longstanding as well as changing attitudes toward Gypsies or Jews.

In postwar Western Europe the most common type of newcomer-as-Stranger has probably been the labour migrant. By 'labour migrants' I mean the foreign workers who arrived in northwestern Europe from the late 1950s to the mid-1970s including their families and offspring, followed by economically-motivated migrants arriving in the 1980s-90s (often as irregular migrants). I exclude economic migrants from wealthy countries from this category, for reasons elaborated below.

1 The number of postwar labour migrants who have settled in western Europe is unknown but the range is in the tens of millions. As with previous migrations, most labour migrants eventually settled in urban centres. Today, residents of non-EU origin make up between a tenth to over a third of the population of 'veteran' immigration cities in northern Europe, while the figure for 'new' immigration cities in southern European is usually below ten percent, but rising (Table 1.1).

Even in those cities where the percentage of labour migrants is low, their presence has become a major issue in part because of their geographic concentration in the poorer neighbourhoods. In short, a large and permanent presence of labour migrants and their families has changed the face of urban Europe (White 1993, Money 1999).

1 My definition of 'labour migrants' is elaborated in Chapter 3, section 1.
2 Castles and Miller (2003: 80-81) estimate the "foreign resident population" in fifteen European countries at just over 20 million. This figure excludes naturalised immigrants (particularly significant in France, the UK and Sweden) and immigrants from colonies or former colonies with citizenship of the immigration country (significant in France, the UK
### Table 1.1 Migrants/ethnic minorities in 25 cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Municipal population</th>
<th>% migrants/ethnic minorities</th>
<th>Migrant/ethnic minority population</th>
<th>Main ethnic groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWED</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>704,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>Finland, Yu, ME, Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERM</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>Tu, Yu, Pl, ME, EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERM</td>
<td>Cologne</td>
<td>1,013,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>188,000</td>
<td>Tu, It, Yu, Gr, Pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERM</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>Yu, Tu, It, Mo, Gr, Sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERM</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>566,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>Tu, Yu, Gr, It</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>961,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td>Pk, CA, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>457,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91,000</td>
<td>Pk, India, CA, Bangl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>501,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>Pk, CA, Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETH</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>735,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>340,000**</td>
<td>CA, Mo, Tu, SE, EU, AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETH</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>591,000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>191,000</td>
<td>CA, Tu, Mo, SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETH</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>Mor (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELG</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
<td>453,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>Mo, Tu, EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELG</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>953,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>Mo, EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELG</td>
<td>Liege</td>
<td>189,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>It, Mo, Tu, Sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAN</td>
<td>Lille</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>Mo, Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAN</td>
<td>Marseille</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>MA (mostly Alg).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAN</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>2,126,000</td>
<td>22-41</td>
<td>465-870,000*</td>
<td>EU, Al, Mo, Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWITZ</td>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>336,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>It, Yu, Sp, Pt, EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>91,000</td>
<td>Eg, Ph, Ch, Mo, EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>2,656,000</td>
<td>est. 7-5-9.8</td>
<td>est. 200-260,000</td>
<td>EE, EA, MA, AF, EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>915,000</td>
<td>2.8 - 3.5</td>
<td>26-32,000</td>
<td>Mo, Peru, EE, AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>1,509,000</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>30-45,000</td>
<td>Mo, Peru, EU, Gipsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORT</td>
<td>Oeiras (Lisbon)</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>est. 5</td>
<td>est. 8,000</td>
<td>CapVerde, AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREECE</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>772,000</td>
<td>est. 18-22</td>
<td>est. 139-170,000</td>
<td>Ab (over 50%), Pl, Eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>Tel Aviv</td>
<td>359,000</td>
<td>est. 8-17</td>
<td>est. 30-60,000</td>
<td>EE, EA, AF, SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
1. Municipal population figures are rounded to nearest '000 and exclude irregular migrants.
2. Definitions of 'migrant'/'ethnic minority' vary from city to city. Figures exclude irregular migrants except in estimates for Rome, Oeiras (Lisbon), Athens and Tel Aviv. A large irregular migrant population may significantly raise the figures for some cities noted here. + Paris: 465,000 registered foreigners and naturalised French residents. 347,000 total foreigners/ethnic minorities based on estimates including all second generation residents (see chapter 8). ++ Amsterdam: residents of 'ethnic minority' origin (including 2nd generation Dutch citizens with at least one parent of ethnic minority origin).
3. The accuracy of these numbers varies considerably from city to city (see above).
4. Definitions vary by source.

Sources: See Appendix 1, Table A1.
Two characteristics of labour migration have played a role in the reaction of the receiving societies. The first is the fundamental transformation that characterises their presence, from temporariness to permanence. "Guest workers" were expected to come for a while, and then go home. But contrary to the expectations of hosts and immigrants alike (the "myth of return"), a significant proportion settled in the receiving countries. The second characteristic of postwar labour migrants is their ethnic/racial and religious/cultural Otherness. Coming from far-away countries, they are often outwardly different in appearance and behaviour from the local host society. Labour migrants are also outsiders in economic terms, usually beginning and often remaining at the bottom of the class hierarchy.

Selected according to rational economic criteria, notably willingness to work for very low wages and under harsh or dangerous conditions, "disposable" workers are usually drawn from some less developed country or region, which belongs to the world of "others" in opposition to which the hosts have elaborated their identity; and the work they do in the country of immigration as well as the living conditions to which they are subjected ensures that the separation between the segments widens. (Zolberg 2000: xvi)

In this sense, labour migrants have replaced traditional ethnic minorities and the urban proletariat in the role of the threatening-yet-exotic Other. In the eyes of the host society they are the new "stranger ante portas", at the city gate (Bauman 1995b: 135).

1.2 Local policy reactions to migrants

The concentration of labour immigrants in cities, and within cities in particular (usually poor) neighbourhoods, creates specifically local problems and opportunities affecting the local housing and labour markets, demands on health, welfare and education services and urban development. But the arrival and settlement of labour migrants is not just another problem that the local authorities must cope with, on a par with e.g. the elderly or housing problems. Beyond its practical consequences, the settlement of newcomers with a very different background touches deep chords within the host city, which must adapt to the presence of these new Strangers. Patrick Ireland (1994) has termed the local policy response to this situation the "management of ethnic diversity".

More and more municipalities are coming to terms with the permanent presence of a large migrant population and reacting in different ways, often in the absence of a clear or effective national policy. Municipal responses to migrant settlement vary widely and involve most of the policy domains within local jurisdiction, applying traditional as well as innovative policies. In the political domain, local policies range from the deliberate exclusion of ethnic-based organisations, to setting up migrant/minority 'advisory councils'. In the socio-economic domain, municipalities may deliberately target, or deliberately ignore, the specific needs of migrants in local schools, health and welfare services. Regarding minority cultural and religious needs (e.g. places of worship), local authorities may ignore these, treat them as equal to the needs of the majority population, or allocate specific resources. Spatial policies can range from dispersal policies aimed at 'migrant enclaves' (through housing quotas or gentrification) to urban renewal policies that are sensitive to 'ethnic
neighbourhoods’. All these measures, whether inclusionary or exclusionary, targeting migrants or implied within general policies (e.g. on socio-economic exclusion, youth problems, urban renewal), may be termed local migrant policies.3

Whether complementing, contradicting or pre-empting national immigrant policy, local authorities are increasingly autonomous in their response to labour migrant settlement. Until the 1980s, local policies toward labour migrants were limited to cities in northwestern Europe where foreign workers had been arriving for several decades, e.g. Amsterdam, Frankfurt or Zurich. Since then, local migrant policies have spread to new immigration cities in southern Europe and elsewhere, e.g. Barcelona, Rome and Tel Aviv. Over the past two decades an upsurge in international migration (Koser and Lutz 1998), together with the devolution of migrant policy from the national to lower levels in most western European states have resulted in more and more cities developing their own policy responses to labour migrant settlement. We can thus speak of local migrant policies as a European-wide phenomenon, with different cities at different stages of policy development.

1.3 The significance of local migrant policies

Local-level migrant policies deserve our attention for several reasons. Although originating in particular circumstances they often relate to and magnify issues going far beyond the local context. In France, l’affaire des foulards escalated in 1989 from a local pedagogical dispute over the right of schoolgirls to wear headscarves into a nationwide debate on the place of Islam and the relevance of the French republican model of integration. In Rome the municipality’s failure to respond to the occupation of an abandoned building by irregular migrants in 1991 raised questions that went beyond the housing situation in that city (where squatting by indigenous residents is common), to the role of Italy as a country of immigration.

The (mis)management of such localised incidents often begins (although it may not end) in local policymaking. Thus, residents’ opposition to a proposed mosque building may remain localised in one case and become nationalised in another. Although local policies emphasising the positive side of migrant settlement (multicultural campaigns, ethnic festivals, etc.) also play a role in larger debates (i.e. on the future of the European nation-state as a multicultural democracy), it is usually negative incidents such as a fire in an overcrowded migrant hostel or a racially-motivated attack that have a greater ripple effect. Urban riots such as those in the early-mid 1980s in England and France, while related in part to ethnic tensions, often have more to do with high unemployment, poor housing and inadequate facilities that characterise particular neighbourhoods where the proportion of migrants is high.

In such events, local policymaking may be overtaken by national policies. Britain’s anti-racism policy and France’s Politique de la ville were both (very different) national policy reactions to the urban riots of the 1980s. But ultimately, national policies are tried, tested and articulated in ‘the real world’ of the local school and neighbourhood where local authority actions (or inaction) remain

1 Chapter 4 elaborates the term ‘local migrant policies’.

4
significant. In some cases local policies are a variation of national policies; in other cases they may develop as a reaction to national policies which have failed to solve local problems. The perceived success or failure of local initiatives presents alternative ways of dealing with problems that go beyond the specific context, and may serve as an example for further action at the national level. For example, a 'civic integration programme' developed in Tilburg and The Hague was later adopted by other cities in the Netherlands and eventually became a compulsory national policy.

Local policies toward migrants often reflect, and sometimes bring about, a transformation in city-state relations. The state's "relegation of the treatment of complex social problems to the local sphere" (Body-Gendrot and Martiniello 2000: 4) has taken shape in Europe since the 1980s. This process of devolution is especially noticeable in the area of migrant policy (Lahav 1998, Favell 1998). Focusing on policymaking toward migrants at the local level but within the context of national policy clarifies not only the local-national relation within migrant policy, but reveals in a more general sense the changing relationship between the city and the State.

Local policies toward labour migrants also articulate the interaction between local and global forces, sometimes called 'glocalisation' (Brenner 1999). Indeed, local migrant policies are a response of local actors (municipalities) to globalisation in its most potent aspect: the arrival and settlement of people from far-away places. As Keil (1998: 625) and others have pointed out, local authorities play a crucial role in the "increasingly important interfaces of different scales of governance in the global order". Indeed, decisions taken in European city halls are not only crucial at the receiving end of these global movements of people, they may also affect the points of origin, as chain migration channels migrants from particular villages in Africa or Asia to specific neighbourhoods in Brussels or Berlin. As cross-border flows become increasingly difficult to control despite state efforts, what happens after migrants settle in their new destinations (and these are almost always cities) takes on greater significance. At this point local policies have a crucial effect.

Nevertheless, while it is important to draw attention to the local level of policymaking, it is equally important not to overstate the case. As the case studies in this book demonstrate, the national context remains crucial in its effects on local migrant policy.

2. Existing theory

Despite the increasing relevance of local policy responses, most of the research and nearly all of the theorizing on immigration/immigrant policy has focused on the national level (Neymark 1998). These analyses (e.g. national citizenship regimes, cf. Brubaker 1992, Castles 1995) have opened up

---

4 Amsterdam's services policy targeting ethnic minorities (1980s-90s) is an example of the former (see Chapter 9). An example of the latter is Tel Aviv's recent (1999 - present) provision of local services to "illegal" labour migrants, contravening national policy (see Chapter 7).

5 Keil specifically points to local-level institutions as "where – to a large extent – this process of regulation of difference takes concrete shape."

6 In some cases, cities are bypassing the national level in their attempts to affect migration flows at the source. For example, the French municipality of Montreuil is investing in the development of a region in Mali where many of the city's residents originate, in the hope of minimizing immigration and encouraging return migration (Gaxie et al. 1998: 260-80).
migrant policy as a field of study in its own right and laid the theoretical background for further comparisons. But as many have pointed out, national-level models remain overly abstract and overlook differences between policy domains and local variations within countries. They do not relate to the local level and cannot explain local policies toward migrants. Nevertheless, the city is emerging as a distinct unit of study in this field (Brenner 1999). A few comparative in-depth studies have begun to shed light on policies toward migrants at the local level (Ireland 1994, Rex and Samad 1996, Boussetta 2000, Garbaye 2000, Moore 2001). But, most of these analyses focus on the juridical-political domain, seeing migrant policies as an institutional-political context for migrant mobilisation. This approach tends to disregard other policy issue areas affecting migrants, such as housing. Moreover, local-level comparisons are limited to a handful of cities. Broader (multi-city) comparisons are also scant, and tend to focus on specific issue areas (e.g. language education) and/or limit the comparison to a 'best practices' approach. Few attempt to develop a systematic generalisation of their findings, or propose a model as was done for national migrant policies.

Nevertheless, this gap in the literature calls for an analytical framework that will enable researchers (and policymakers) to follow and compare local policy reactions to migrant settlement across a wide spectrum of cities and policies, and to make some sense of it all. With this aim in mind, I propose adopting the concept of host-stranger relations as a theoretical framework for understanding local migrant policies, and offer a typology that makes comparison between different local cases possible.

### 3. A host-stranger relations approach to local migrant policies

#### 3.1 The model

'Host-stranger relations literature' is a name I give to various writings about the way in which we relate to Strangers, and thus define ourselves. These writings range from theories of interpersonal 'I-Other' relations and ethics (Sartre, Buber, Levinas, etc.) to writings on societal definitions of Strangeness and Strangers (Simmel, Elias, Wood, Foucault, Bauman, etc.), as well as writings focusing on the political, spatial and urban aspects of this relationship (Wirth, Meyer, Soja, Kymlicka, etc.). In the case of local migrant policies, I refer to "host-stranger relations" in a more specific sense, as the assumptions, expectations and attitudes of the local host society, represented here by the local authority, toward one type of Stranger, represented here by labour migrants.

The settlement of labour migrants is not just another urban problem to be 'solved' by the local authorities. As Money (1999: 59) notes: "When foreigners enter a community, they bring with them an alternative conception of society, thereby representing competition over the definition of the local community." The reaction of local inhabitants to the settlement of migrants may vary from acceptance to indifference to fear and hostility. Hostile reactions occur when residents perceive acceptance to indifference to fear and hostility.
migrant settlement as an 'invasion of strangers'. Such 'moral panic' may result in white flight, voting for anti-immigrant parties or acts of violence to "defend the territory under siege" (Bauman 1995a: 11). An important factor determining local host reactions is the relative power (or powerlessness) that residents feel in relation to migrant settlement.11

The migrants, too, do not remain passive if their stay extends. Over time, they assert themselves as entrepreneurs and political participants, with or without voting rights. At first they mobilise on an ethnic basis, establishing their own cultural, economic and sometimes political frameworks. Eventually they may be integrated into existing structures of the host society. If they are excluded (economically, socially, politically) for too long the result is usually expressed in various forms of protest, often in the second generation. The dynamics of migrant settlement, local reaction and counter-reaction often involve positive as well as negative interactions between the host society and the newcomers. Indeed, more and more European cities are characterised by a combination of these phenomena, displaying various forms of multiculturalism on one hand (from ethnic festivals to interracial marriages), and various forms of xenophobia and ethnic tensions on the other (from everyday discrimination to 'race riots' in extreme cases, e.g. Marseille in 1973, Birmingham in 1981, Brussels in 1991 and Bradford in 2001).

Local government reflects to varying degrees the local host society in its reactions to the settlement of newcomers.12 In the case of labour migrants, the local authority may regard them as a passing phenomenon best ignored, as a threat to stability, as a positive potential for the city, and so on. Using concepts developed in the host-stranger relations literature, it is possible to distinguish between several general assumptions made by the local authority. These relate to the temporariness or permanence of the migrant presence and their spatial segregation. The local authority also makes assumptions regarding the labour migrants' Otherness. It may assume their cultural differences will disappear through assimilation, or it may expect them to remain as distinct minorities. To some extent these assumptions reflect general attitudes in the local host society toward the presence of Otherness, often based on past experience with previous newcomers.

Local authority attitudes and assumptions are expressed in seemingly disconnected policies such as City Hall's relation to migrant organisations, access to local services, and urban renewal. I do not propose here that these attitudes and assumptions are the only variable explaining local policies toward migrants. Other factors, such as the political-institutional context (not least, national immigration policies), clearly play a role.13 Nevertheless, I posit that local host-stranger relations - specifically the attitudes and expectations of the local authority regarding the permanence, spatial separateness and Otherness of the migrant population - are an important factor shaping local migrant policies. Without dismissing other explanations, this study aims to reveal this (normally implicit) aspect of policymaking, and to explore its theoretical and practical implications.

11 Elaborated in Chapter 2.
12 Here I refer to the local authority as a unitary actor. This is qualified in Chapter 3.
13 Political-institutional explanations are reviewed in Chapter 3.
3.2 The typology

To operationalise the link between host-stranger relations and local migrant policies, I propose a typology that classifies policies in specific issue areas (housing, education, etc.) *according to local authority attitudes toward labour migrants*. This results in a classification system with two dimensions. The first dimension distinguishes between several types of host-stranger relations, expressed in several general ‘types’ of local policy reactions (‘Non-policy’, ‘Guestworker’, ‘Assimilationist’ and ‘Pluralist’ policy types). The policy types are based on a set of universal criteria (local authority assumptions toward the migrants in terms of their expected temporality, spatial separation and Otherness) that can be applied across different cities and periods. To some extent this resembles the deductive method used in national-level theories such as Castles’ (1995) models.14

However the typology presented here is also based on a large number of actual policies, gathered from a literature survey covering some 25 European cities (below). To put some order into the variety of policies found in the literature survey, the typology divides local migrant policies into domains (Juridical-political, Socio-economic, Cultural-religious and Spatial) and issue areas (housing, education, etc.). This second dimension of the typology enables a comprehensive comparison of local policy reactions *across* different domains, which previous models have failed to do systematically.

The analytical framework thus consists of a model linking host-stranger relations to local policies toward migrants, and a typology elaborating this across several policy ‘types’ and policy domains. While the model proposes a universal explanation (host-stranger relations), the typology links this to actual policies in specific issue areas (*Figure 1.1*). This connection is based on both deductive and inductive reasoning (see below), making it possible to test the model against actual policies observed in one or more cities, and to use the typology as a tool for comparison.

**Figure 1.1** The analytical framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Concept</th>
<th>Host-Stranger Relations ⟷ H-S RELATIONS TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real manifestation</td>
<td>Local authority attitudes ⟷ ATTITUDE TYPES / PHASES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed/described</td>
<td>Local migrant policies ⟷ POLICY TYPES / PHASES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elaborated as actual or potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>policies across different issue areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \downarrow = \text{corresponding to/associated with} \]

---

14 See Chapter 3, section 2.
Figure 1.1 proposes that a relation exists between host-stranger relations as defined above (local authority attitudes toward labour migrants) and observed policies. It does not suggest that this is a strict cause-effect relationship, nor that this dimension of policymaking is the only variable. It does hypothesise that this dimension should be taken into account in the analysis of policymaking toward migrants, and proposes how this can be done.

3.3 Theoretical relevance

This study is meant to fill a gap in the existing literature on migrant policy, between national-level theorizing and local-level research. Although the local-level context is increasingly significant in the field of migration policy studies, local migrant policies have not been systematically studied, remaining in the shadow of the national-level discourse. But as noted above, national-level theories tend to be overly deductive. By proposing a theoretical framework that focuses on the local level, I distinguish between the (often abstract) 'national objectives' on which national-level models are based, and their implementation (or not) in actual local policies. Since the typology is applied at the municipal rather than the national level, this makes possible a more inductive method of comparing migrant policymaking, and allows for local variations that are lost in the national-level theories. The result is a more grounded, specific typology than the national-level models, allowing us to translate general characteristics (attitudes toward migrants) into specific policies in particular domains and issue areas (see Chapter 4).

Local-level research, on the other hand, tends to be too case-specific. Clearly, a proper understanding of local policymaking demands qualitative research, city by city. However, any generalisations from the findings will necessarily be limited to the cases in question unless they are placed within a broader comparative framework. Until now this has not been available. Another problem of local-level research has been the tendency to focus on one policy domain, primarily political integration. But, focusing only on the local 'political opportunity structure' may present a distorted picture since different cities may emphasise different dimensions (e.g. labour market integration in many German cities) in their policy response to migrants (or, the same city in different periods). Comparison of migrant policies across different domains is vital, and for this reason the elaboration of policies into domains and issue areas is central to the typology.

What is missing, then, is a broader view of local migrant policies that goes beyond any specific city, domain or phase of policy development. The analytical framework proposed here links conceptually what may appear at first sight as unconnected policies, enabling the researcher to view the migrant policies of a particular city in a broader context. Such a view will provide new insights, raise new questions and point to directions for further research. The analytical framework proposed here is meant to be a first step toward multi-city, cross-domain analyses of local migrant policies. At the same time, the modular format of the typology enables users to focus on the policies relevant to them, without losing sight of the relations between their particular topic and other policy areas.
4. Aims of the study

4.1 Research aims

The primary aim of this study is to develop an analytical framework for analysing and comparing local policy responses to labour migrant settlement. Such a framework should allow us to generalise beyond any particular city at any particular time, while remaining grounded in empirical findings. Using this framework, it should be possible to follow the development of actual policies toward migrants over time and to relate the findings to a broader theme.

Second, this study will test the validity of host-stranger relations as an explanatory variable. The theme proposed -- host-stranger relations -- aims to deepen our understanding of local reactions to migrants by revealing a dimension that is usually hidden in policymaking. Through case studies in four cities (Rome, Tel Aviv, Paris and Amsterdam) this dimension will be explored as a factor accounting for and relating between empirically observed migrant policies in different cities and periods.

Third, this study will test the usefulness of the analytical framework as a tool for cross-city comparison. The proposed typology is meant to serve as a first step toward organizing the extant knowledge on local migrant policies. To date, available information is scattered among various sources, with no attempt to provide a comprehensive comparative overview. The typology presented here, illustrated with local policies taken from a literature survey of over 25 cities, serves as an example of how findings from different sources may be organised. While far from exhaustive, this is nevertheless a first attempt to create a multi-city, multi-domain data base for further theorizing on local migrant policies. The typology is then tested as a tool for comparison in the four case studies.

Finally, this study is meant to contribute to the pool of knowledge based on empirical studies of local migrant policies. The case studies of Rome, Tel Aviv and Paris provide insights into relatively unknown cities in this area. Local migrant policies in Amsterdam have been fairly well studied in several domains, but this study will attempt the first multi-domain analysis of these policies over a fifty year period.

4.2 Research questions

The above aims can be formulated in two sets of research questions: First, how do local authorities respond to the settlement of labour migrants, i.e. what are the policy responses at the municipal level to labour migrant settlement? This can be elaborated in a number of secondary questions: Can we identify general ‘types’ of local policy responses to labour migrants? Can we identify certain ‘trajectories of local policy responses’, evolving from one ‘type’ to another over time? Do these trajectories repeat in different cities? In which domains and issue areas are local migrant policies articulated, and which appear to be the most significant?

Second, how are local migrant policies shaped by what we define as ‘local host-stranger relations’? Secondary questions include: What is the role of local authority attitudes and expectations regarding the temporality of the labour migrant presence/their Otherness/their spatial separation, in
the development of local migrant policies? How do previous host-stranger relations (relating to previous newcomers or indigenous Strangers) affect the local policy response to labour migrants?

A third set of questions does not directly relate to the focus of this study but runs as a thread throughout the book, namely: What does the relation between local and national migrant policies reveal about city-State relations? Is there a clear top-down relationship in this policy field, or is the apparent predominance of the national level only apparent? To what extent is the policy response to labour migrant settlement and ethnic diversity a bottom-up process?

4.3 Policy relevance

The development of an analytical framework to understand and compare local migrant policies is of interest to social scientists, but also has practical policy relevance. It can enable policymakers to understand their problems better and improve policies by placing local challenges in a broader context. This can include reflexive learning from a new appreciation of their own past policy responses, as well as learning from others' experience. Applying the insights gained from policy comparisons with other cities and being able to identify comparable (as well as incomparable) situations should lead to the development of more suitable local policy responses, beyond a narrow best-practices ("this works, that doesn't") approach.

At the most basic level this study should show whether it is at all possible to learn from other cities' experience in this policy field. The typology proposed here, together with the case study findings, should demonstrate that beyond city-specific contexts there are similarities in municipal policy reactions to labour migrant settlement. In particular, this means that 'new' immigration cities may learn from the experience of 'veteran' cities, by understanding the process that the latter underwent in their policy responses to immigrant settlement. This should highlight the possibilities and pitfalls before cities in earlier stages of migrant policy development. The case studies cover two cities with long but very different experiences in migrant policymaking (Paris and Amsterdam), and two cities which experienced significant labour migration only in the past two decades (Rome and Tel Aviv). Despite the differences, generalisations can be made. The case of Tel Aviv demonstrates that the typology can also be applied to non-European cities.

5. Research design, process and methods

The overall research design was as follows:

- Participant observation in one city's policy reaction to labour migrant settlement, together with a preliminary review of the literature on migrant policies.
- Review of theoretical writings on host-stranger relations, development of an analytical framework (hypothetical model, typology).
- Literature survey of local migrant policies >> develop, test and revise the typology.
- Test analytical framework in case studies.
• Final typology, findings and conclusions from case studies.

The research process consisted of several stages utilizing different methods. While linear to some extent, the different research phases also blended into one another, as detailed below.

A host-stranger relations model of local migrant policies

The underlying notion of understanding local policy reactions to labour migrant settlement in terms of municipal attitudes toward Strangers first arose during my work at the Municipality of Tel Aviv between 1994 and 1999. The model linking host-stranger relations to local policies toward labour migrants was developed deductively as well as inductively. Deductively, it is based on concepts that I found in philosophical, sociological and geographical writings, with two essays by Zygmunt Bauman serving as an anchor (see Chapter 2). This 'host-stranger relations literature' was then connected to migrant policy, building on Castles' (1995) 'citizenship regimes' model and others (see Chapter 3). Inductively, the model is based on a preliminary literature survey of local policies in European cities, as well as participant observation as a planner in the municipality of Tel Aviv. This inductive process was equally important in development of the theory at that stage.

Literature survey of local migrant policies

Building on these theoretical exercises, the research project extended into a more comprehensive survey covering over 25 cities in northwestern and southern Europe, plus Tel Aviv (Table 1.1). The survey was based on extant literature describing local migrant policies, including studies of individual cities, comparative studies and national-level literature (see Chapter 3, section 3). Based on the literature survey, a data base was assembled of local migrant policies per city (see Table A1 in Appendix 1). While superficial, this data base established the range of actual policies with which cities have responded to the presence of migrants and ethnic minorities. It also served to define what constitutes 'local migrant policies'.

The typology

The typology of local migrant policies was constructed on the basis of the host-stranger relations theory and the findings from the literature survey. The first dimension of the typology, consisting of several 'ideal types' of local authority attitudes/policy reactions, is a variant of Castles' (1995) models of national-level policy (Exclusionary, Assimilationist and Pluralist regimes), to which was added a 'Non-policy' category, based on observations from the Tel Aviv case as well as findings from the literature survey. The second dimension of the typology, grouping specific policies into policy domains and issue areas, arose from the need to put some order into the numerous policies, programmes and projects that the literature survey produced. Thus the typology, too, is a result of deductive and inductive reasoning. The typology is presented in Chapter 4.

15 From 1994 to 1999 I worked as a planner in the Long Term Planning Department (City Engineer) of Tel Aviv Municipality. During these years I observed and participated in the preliminary phases of migrant policy formulation which are described in Chapter 7. In 1999-2000 I worked for six months in the new municipal aid and information centre for labour migrants, in the role of Information Coordinator.

16 The data base includes a textual 'profile' of each city, including a number of standardised contextual variables and the local migrant policies in each city. The latter were summarised in an 'inventory matrix' (Table A1) of migrant policies from the surveyed cities.
The case studies

Four case studies were carried out (June 2001 - March 2003) to provide a first test of the relevancy of the host-stranger relations theory, and to check the robustness of the typology by testing it in four cities. Rome was chosen to represent the Non-policy type, Tel Aviv to represent the Guestworker type, Paris to represent the Assimilationist type and Amsterdam to represent the Pluralist type of policy reaction. Each case study lasted some four months and included reading of secondary and primary sources and interviews with local academic experts, municipal officials and representatives of civic organisations, including migrant activists. The choice of these cities and the case study methodology is elaborated in Chapter 5. The case studies provided a more in-depth, qualitative analysis of local policy development over time, as well as throwing light on the relation between host-stranger relations and alternative explanations (e.g. the role of the institutional-political framework). The case studies are presented in chapters 6 to 9.

Revision of the typology, rethinking the theory

The typology underwent several revisions resulting in two versions. The first version, based on the findings from the literature survey supplemented by preliminary observations from Tel Aviv, Amsterdam and Rome, was finalised in August 2001.\textsuperscript{17} This is the version presented in Chapter 4. The second version is based on the Amsterdam case study, supplemented by findings from other veteran immigration cities in the literature survey, which led to the addition of a fifth category. This is presented in Chapter 10.

6. Structure of the book

This book is divided into three parts. Part I presents the theoretical background (Chapters 1-4); Part II presents the case studies (Chapters 5-9); Part III presents the conclusions (Chapter 10). In this introductory chapter I presented the problematic: the phenomenon of labour migrant settlement in cities and local policy responses; the gap in existing research on migrant policy, and the analytical framework to be proposed in this study. Chapter 2 elaborates on the meaning of host-stranger relations, clarifying key terms including the different types of strangers and different reactions to Otherness. Here I explore the links between interpersonal (I-Other) relations, social (host-stranger) relations, their urban and spatial manifestations, and local authority attitudes toward labour migrants. This is summarised at the end of the chapter (Table 2.1).

Chapter 3 presents the second half of the equation proposed here, by defining what I mean by 'local policies toward labour migrants.' Here I define the parameters of two key terms: 'local policies' and 'labour migrants'. The second half of the chapter presents a critical summary of the existing literature on migrant policy, at the national and local level. Chapter 4 presents the typology. The first dimension of the typology (local policy types/phases) is explained in section 2, the second dimension (policy domains/issue areas) is explained in section 3. Section 4 presents the integrated typology and its elaboration based on actual policies.

\textsuperscript{17} This version is presented in Alexander 2003.
Chapter 5 introduces the case studies: the purpose, methodology and choice of cities. The case studies are then presented: Rome (Chapter 6), Tel Aviv (Chapter 7), Paris (Chapter 8) and Amsterdam (Chapter 9). Each city chapter is organised in the same way with some 'local variations': an overview of the national context (host-stranger relations, immigration cycles and the national immigration regime) is followed by a section on the local context (local host-stranger relations, a summary of immigration to the city, characteristics of the migrant/minority population, and the political and institutional context of local policymaking). This contextual background is necessary to understand the following sections which describe the policy response in each city to labour migrant settlement. The evolution of local migrant policies is presented according to the policy phases identified in each city, and ordered by domains and issue areas relevant in each phase. The last section in each case study chapter summarises the migrant policy trajectory in that city.

Chapter 10 presents the findings and conclusions from each of the case studies, relating the trajectories of policy response identified in each city to the evolution of local host-stranger relations. This serves as the basis for a more general comparative analysis (section 3), addressing the research questions raised in the first chapter. In section 4 the typology is re-evaluated in light of the findings and a revised version is presented, with an additional category proposed. The final section discusses the theoretical implications of the study results and some directions for future research, as well as the relevance of the analytical framework to policymakers.