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2. Host-stranger relations theory

Few issues have exercised as powerful a hold over the thought of this century as that of 'the Other.' It is difficult to think of a second theme, even one that might be of more substantial significance, that has provoked as widespread an interest as this one; it is difficult to think of a second theme that so sharply marks off the present … from its historical roots in the tradition. (Theunissen, M., 1984, The Other: Studies in the Social Ontology of Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre and Buber, p. 1)

1. Introduction

1.1 Conceptualising the Other/Stranger

To understand local policies toward migrants as an expression of host-stranger relations, we must understand what is meant by the concept of the 'Other' or the 'Stranger'. Strangerhood/Otherness actually concerns a type of relationship between the Self and the Other. At the societal level, the Self is often defined as the Host society or dominant group, while the Other may refer to an individual or a community of Strangers. Host-stranger relations, then, means the relations between a host society (or the dominant group within it) and those individuals, groups or communities that the host society (or dominant group) defines/perceives as Others.

Georg Simmel (1908) introduced the concept of the Stranger in the sociological literature, noting that host-stranger relations are necessarily power relations, as the dominant group defines what and who is a Stranger. How societies have created and defined 'their' strangers through exclusionary practices ranging from physical segregation, to economic and political exclusion, to social stigma, remains one of the great themes of social science (and of fictional literature). Foucault, for example, has traced the development in Western society of definitions of 'madness', 'criminality' and 'sexual perversion' – all social definitions of abnormality versus normality, of Us versus Them.

The delineation of 'others' creates several often overlapping types of Strangers, including newcomers, ethnic minorities, indigenous marginal groups and subcultures. In this study, I consider one type of Newcomer -- the labour immigrants ('foreign workers') who arrived in European cities from the late 1950s onward (see below). I further narrow my focus to one representative of the host society -- the local authority, embodied in the municipality. However, the response of the local authority to labour migrants is often shaped by previous (or ongoing) interactions with other types of strangers, for example indigenous Outsiders (the urban proletariat in 19th century Europe, Arabs in Israel), newcomers from other regions in the same country ('southerners' in northern Italy, 'provincial' migrants in Paris), or 'repatriated' immigrants who were defined a priori as members by the host nation (Eurasian Dutch in the Netherlands, Jews in Israel).

The aim of this chapter, then, is to distinguish between the different types of host-stranger relations, by clarifying some of the core terms. Specifically, the concept of host-stranger relations will be analysed according to three dimensions of host expectations and attitudes regarding Strangers: their temporality, their Otherness and their spatial separateness. The first relates to the
host's expectations regarding how long the stranger will remain. The second relates to the host's attitudes regarding the Stranger's differences from host society norms. From these two, as well as from changing perceptions of urban space, follows the host's expectations regarding spatial separation from the Stranger (segregation). These three aspects are elaborated below and appear in the analytical framework that is presented in Chapter 4, linking host-stranger relations to local policies toward migrants.

To understand the changes in host perceptions of Strangers over the twentieth century in the three above dimensions, I adopt the distinction between modern and postmodern worldviews made by Bauman and others. Briefly, modern host-stranger relations see Strangerhood as a temporary phenomenon (either the strangers will disappear or their Otherness will disappear) and as spatially separable. Postmodern attitudes regard Strangers as a permanent and pervasive (spatially inseparable) phenomenon. This results in different host reactions. Local policies toward labour migrants express one aspect of these host attitudes.

In this chapter the theoretical conceptualisations of host-stranger relations are described. Besides revealing the shift from modern to postmodern attitudes toward Others, this theoretical survey serves to define the core terms in what I call the 'host-stranger relations literature'. Specifically, the writings surveyed below reveal how the definition of (and therefore relation to) Strangers is constructed by the host society. Section 1.1 distinguishes between modern and postmodern approaches to host-stranger relations. Section 2 follows this shift in the conceptualisation of Strangers through an overview of the philosophical and sociological literature (expectations regarding the temporary/permanent presence of Strangers and their Otherness). This also allows us to distinguish between various 'types of Strangers', specifically between newcomers and indigenous Outsiders, as well as the role of Strangerhood in the city. Section 3 follows changing conceptions of the spatial dimension of host-stranger relations and their urban manifestations, through the geographical literature. Section 4 summarizes reactions to migrant settlement in cities as an expression of host-stranger relations, linking them to attitudes and expectations of the local authority toward labour immigrants.

1.2 Modernity, postmodernity and host-stranger relations

Zygmunt Bauman (1988, 1995a, 1995b) has analysed attitudes toward strangers within the context of modernity and postmodernity (Box 2.1). Bauman defines modernity in terms of order-building: "Modernity is a rebellion against fate and ascription in the name of the omnipotence of design and achievement" (Bauman 1988: 13). The modern order-building urge was a rebellion against the traditional, pre-modern form of 'inherited identity' in which an individual's identity was defined by class, race, gender, etc. This traditional view was replaced by the modernist claim that identity-building should be a matter of self-development at the individual and collective level. The social order must provide a reliable setting for individual identity-building, with social, economic and political structures that are more-or-less stable over the span on an individual lifetime. Most of the modern era was in fact characterized by structures that "appeared to be endowed with enough
resilience and solidity to withstand all inroads of individual endeavours and survive all individual choice..." (ibid: 4).

Bauman’s definition of Strangers is based just on their ambivalence – on that quality which makes them so disturbing to the modern order-building:

What makes certain people ‘strangers’ and therefore vexing, unnerving, off-putting and otherwise a ‘problem’, is their capacity to befog and eclipse the boundary lines which ought to be clearly seen. (ibid.: 8)
The presence of Strangers disturbs the universalism that modernist values aspire to, by their “mere being around”. This makes the modern project of order-building “a war of attrition waged against the strangers and the strange” (ibid.: 2).

The modernist view implies two strategies toward Strangers. The first is the liberal option of assimilation, the possibility (and necessity) of “making the different similar”. The second is “the strategy of exclusion” whether by social exclusion, physical segregation, or in the extreme case – annihilation (ibid.: 2-3). Both strategies assume the eventual elimination of Otherness.

Under the pressure of the modern order-building urge, the strangers lived, so to speak, in a state of suspended extinction... The strangers were, by definition, an anomaly to be rectified. Their presence was defined a priori as temporary... (ibid.: 3)

---

**Box 2.1 Modernity/modernism and postmodernity/postmodernism**

**Modernity** is defined as an historical period which has unfolded over the past several hundred years through the development of capitalism. **Modernism** is “the cultural expression of the experience of modernity” (Cooke, p. 476). Modernist (or modern) values are based on the concept of progress (self-development and economic development) and reform that make up the subjective and objective experience of modernity. The primary value system of modernity stems from the Enlightenment: rationality, clarity, order, stability and predictability.

**Postmodernity** is often defined as corresponding to the stage of Global (or Late) Capitalism. Bauman (p. 5) dates the beginning of postmodernity to the end of the Cold War and “the new world disorder”. This period is characterized by economic uncertainty from the global to the personal level.

**Postmodernism** is described as the cultural expression of this latest restructuring. As a worldview, postmodernism is firstly a critique of the modernist values of order, truth, reason and logic, and a suspicion of the modernist ambitions of emancipation and progress. As a cultural construct, postmodernism offers “a message of the essential indeterminacy and malleability of the world” (ibid.: 7).

**Sources**: Bauman 1995a, Cooke 1988.

The postmodernist attitude to strangers according to Bauman (1995a: 5-12), is to be understood within the context of “the dimensions of the present uncertainty”, from the uncertain conditions brought on by global capitalism to the individual level of identity-forming. The permanence and
pervasiveness of Strangeness is regarded as part of the postmodern (dis)order. The postmodernist attitude toward Strangers, reflects this situation:

The essential difference between the socially-produced modality of modern and postmodern strangers is that while modern strangers were earmarked for annihilation [...], the postmodern ones are by common consent or resignation, whether joyful or grudging, here to stay. (ibid.: 12)

In postmodernity, then,

The question is no longer how to get rid of strangers and the strange, but how to live with them, daily and permanently. (ibid.)

2. From 'I-Other' to 'Host-Stranger' relations: a theoretical review

2.1 Defining the Other

The concept of Stranger has no meaning without a Self which defines what and who is 'strange'. By defining the Other, we in effect define ourselves. This is expressed at all levels, from the philosophical to the political.

A. The Other in modern philosophical thought

Derrida noted that the ontological bias of Western philosophy meant that the Other has, since Plato and until recently, been conceived of as a way to better define the Self or 'I' (in Kearney 1986: 122).1 Humanist philosophy began with the Cartesian approach placing the human 'I' as the starting-point of all understanding.2 In the 19th century the focus of the philosophical discussion on Otherness shifted from the metaphysical Other (Nietzsche announced the death of God) to a focus on others as human beings. Hegel laid the basis for the modern, dialectical definition of the I-Other relationship, by arguing that the Other is the basic category of human thought, for the I can only posit itself in opposition to the Other, to that which is outside itself, different from itself.

The Phenomenologists and Existentialists took Hegel's abstract concept of the I-Other and emphasized the asymmetrical nature of the relationship at the interpersonal level. According to Sartre (1943), this dialectical relationship is perceived as mutually threatening: either I objectify the Other, or am objectified by it. Thus, the Other, in the sense of another human being, is a menace to my freedom (Sartre 1943). Sartre's concept of the 'slimy' Other ('le visqueux') relates to the loss of control that I feel when confronted with some Other (person or thing) that threatens to overwhelm me. This view emphasises the feeling of relative power in the I-Other relationship.

Martin Buber (1936), while agreeing that most human relationships are objectifying ('I-It'), developed the option of a positive, non-objectifying relationship between the I and the Other, which he calls the 'I-Thou' relationship.3 At the inter-personal level, 'I-Thou' is a meeting between the I and the Other that is based on my experiencing an immediate, pre-instrumental knowledge of another

---

1 Western epistemology followed the same line: knowledge is based on self-understanding (Socrates' "Know thyself"). and knowledge of the Other is a means to better understanding myself.

2 Although Descartes claimed that the 'I' is dependent on a transcendent Other (God), one of the main criticisms of Descartes' philosophy is that he invented God in order to better explain Man.

3 According to Buber, although much of our existence consists of objectifying 'I-It' relations, it is in the 'I-Thou' relation with the Other (with another person, a work of art, or with God) that Man fulfills himself. The essence of human existence, then, depends on experiencing Otherness in a non-objective, positive way.
person. This relation goes beyond any individual elements of the participants and is based on the mutual recognition of a common humanity. The interpersonal I-Thou relation is also the basis for non-objectifying social relations at the community level ('We'). Most public life is also based on objective, instrumental relations ('I-It'), however, the experience of I-Thou at the personal level makes the “We” relationship possible as well, based on a mutual responsibility of the community’s individual members. Buber can be seen as bridging between modern and postmodern approaches toward Otherness, since his concept of ‘We’ contains the seeds of communitarian ideologies that characterize one reaction to the postmodern condition (see below).

B. The Other in postmodern philosophical thought

Postmodernist concepts of I-Other relations can be seen as a series of attempts to reveal and deconstruct the ‘Self bias’ of modern philosophy and to redefine the Other as totally separate from the I. Michel Foucault uncovered the social and political structures behind the changing relationship in the West toward Otherness, from pre-modern to modern and postmodern. As he notes, however, the advance of science (e.g. psychoanalysis and modern linguistics) has steadily eroded the very fundamentals of the order that it created, blurring the conventional division between categories of rationality and irrationality. This blurring between the Normal and the Other marks the beginning of the postmodern era (Foucault 1965).

If the modern attitude to Otherness consists of defining the Other through the I (and vice versa), then the postmodern alternative is in redefining the Other in terms of its total Otherness. Emmanuel Levinas (1961) attempts to create a complete ontological separation of the Other from the I, by placing it outside “the totality of the Self”, thus breaking with the modernist definitions of the Other. Positing an Other completely separate from the Self’s world, Levinas describes two types of I-Other relationships, one objectifying and the other non-objectifying. In the objectifying relation, the Other can be other objects, people, ideas, etc. used by the Self to create its own identity. In doing so, the Self lives from others. This ‘transmutation of the other into the Same […] is the essence of enjoyment (jouissance)’:

*Jouissance* names the process by which the subject makes itself at home in an environment where otherness is not a threat to be overcome, but a pleasure to be experienced. (Davis, 1996: 43)

Levinas’ *jouissance* can be seen as the basis for what is called the postmodern ‘embrace of strangeness’ (below).

According to Levinas, the non-objectifying I-Other relationship occurs when the Self recognizes the total separateness (Otherness) of the other in a real, face-to-face encounter with another human

---

4 In the modern era science replaced religion in serving the social interests of defining Order, at the cosmological as well as the social-political level. Thus, the notion of madness became increasingly scientific (“insanity”), and science justified a total separation -- physically and socially -- of the “mad” from “normal” society (Foucault 1965).

5 Levinas (1961) claims that Western thought could not bear the idea of alterity, and has always tried to incorporate Otherness within the “empire of sameness” -- in other words "a reduction of the Other to the Same" (pp. 33-34).

6 This is based on Levinas’ distinction between others (l’autrui) as perceived by the I, as a means for distinguishing itself from everything else in its world, and the truly Other (l’Autre) in the sense of a total ‘alterity’ that exists in every other person. Such thumbnail summaries however cannot do justice to Levinas’ theory.
being. This can only happen when I recognize Otherness in the face (visage) of another person and experience a revelation: the world is not uniquely mine, but is shared with the Other. Thus, the encounter with the Other is above all an ethical encounter:

The Other makes me realize that I share the world... and I do not like this realization. My power and freedom are put into question. Such a situation is ethical because ... I am confronted with real choices between responsibility and obligation towards the Other, or hatred and violent repudiation. The Other invests me with genuine freedom, and will be the beneficiary or victim of how I decide to exercise it. (Davis 1996: 48-9)

Bauman's modernist 'strategies' of dealing with Strangers, from assimilation to ghettoisation, express the second response noted above, while the first response is based on the Self's responsibility for preserving the Otherness of others. Levinas then proposes a postmodern ethical approach toward the Stranger, based not on preserving the freedom of the Self from others (Sartre), nor on love for others as human beings (Buber), but on respecting and preserving the total, independent Otherness that is revealed in other people. This attitude can be seen as the basis for what I later call 'Pluralist' approaches toward migrants (and other minorities).

2.2 Defining the Stranger: modern conceptualizations

A. Strangerhood as ambivalence (Simmel)

The subject 'I' in the philosophical literature is often replaced in the sociological literature by communal terms such as 'host society' and 'the Established'. The concept of the Other has been given various names in sociological writings: Stranger, Newcomer, Outsider, Marginal Man. These terms reflect different foci of the research as well as a certain degree of confusion around the concept (Gudykunst 1983). This confusion is partly due to the multiple meanings found in Georg Simmel's 1908 essay, "The Stranger", which introduced this concept as a topic of sociological discussion and research. Simmel's analysis refers at first to a certain type of relation, of simultaneous nearness-and-remoteness, which exists in all human relations but which is magnified in the Stranger: then to the social situation of marginality vis-a-vis the group; and finally to strangers as newcomers, in most of the examples he uses (Box 2.2).

---

7 The brief essay "The Stranger" (1908) by Georg Simmel, a German-Jewish sociologist, profoundly influenced subsequent sociological writings on the topic, and also created some confusion around the concept of Strangerhood (cf. McClemore 1970, Bochner 1982, Gudykunst 1983).
Box 2.2 Simmel’s "Stranger"

Georg Simmel’s Stranger is “not an individual but a relationship”, characterized by ambivalence concerning the Stranger’s permanence (Tabboni, 1995: 18). The Stranger is the person who comes today and stays tomorrow. He is, so to speak, the potential wanderer: although he has not moved on, he has not quite overcome the freedom of coming and going (Simmel, transl. in Wolff 1950: 402).

Simmel emphasizes the ambivalence of the host-stranger relationship due to the paradox of simultaneous nearness-and-remoteness. On one hand, the stranger’s remoteness means an alienation from the group. On the other hand, remoteness allows the Stranger an objectivity that other members of the group lack, which is in fact a kind of freedom. The group may fear or scorn the Stranger within its midst, but s/he is also an object of interest, admiration, even envy.

Simmel’s prototypical Stranger is the Wandering Jew, but this is just the starting point for an analysis of Otherness that goes beyond the circumstances of the immigrant. The Stranger’s status in the host group is not unique to the particular circumstances of the newcomer, rather it makes explicit the “unity of nearness and remoteness involved in every human relation.” Although Simmel’s Stranger is usually a newcomer, everyone of us is in some ways a Stranger.


B. The Stranger as Newcomer

Modern sociological literature on Strangerhood developed in several directions after Simmel. The writings of Margaret Wood (1934) and Alfred Schuetz (1944) extended Simmel’s concept of the Stranger as a newcomer, analysing the initial stages of social interaction between the host community and the newcomer and his/her acceptance or non-acceptance. Wood looked at the impacts of this encounter on the host society, focusing on the characteristics of host societies and how these determined their acceptance of strangers. Schuetz explored the process of encounter from the Stranger’s viewpoint. He defines the Stranger as a newcomer who seeks acceptance into the group, including not only migrants but anyone “...who tries to be permanently accepted or at least tolerated by the group which he approaches” (1944: 499). Both “view the Stranger-host relationship as a figure-ground phenomenon, with the Stranger always defined vis-a-vis a host” (Gudykunst, 1983: 403). This view reflects the modernist attitude toward Strangers, where the Newcomer is a marginalized figure, conditional on his assimilation into the dominant group or culture.

The abundance of theoretical literature has led to several attempts to summarize the concept of Strangerhood, including a “typology of stranger-host relations” by Gudykunst (1983) building on a previous typology by Levine (1979). Both Levine’s and Gudykunst’s typologies define Strangers as

---

8 The Stranger: A Study in Social Relationships (1934) comprised an extensive review of ethnographic studies and other literature on the reception of strangers in various types of societies, ranging from isolated communities to cities. Wood defined the Stranger as “one who has come into face-to-face contact with the group for the first time.”

9 Levine (1979) proposed a typology based on two variables: the stranger’s aspirations in regard to the host community (visit, residence, or membership), and the host response (friendly or antagonistic). From this he derived six types of Strangers: guest, sojourner, newcomer (in the case of a friendly host reaction) and intruder, inner enemy, marginal man.
newcomers, whose intentions (visit, residence or membership in the host society) correspond to three temporal possibilities: transience, temporariness or permanence. Both define the Stranger as a figure-ground relationship, and imply the ultimate temporariness of Strangerhood: if the newcomer fulfills his desire for permanent membership in the host society (dependent in part on the host society response), s/he ceases to be a Stranger.

C. The Stranger as indigenous Outsider/Marginal Man

Another strand of the sociological literature has focused on marginality, applying it to immigrants as well as native Outsiders. Park and Burgess (1921) and others (e.g. Stonequist, 1937) extended Simmel’s ideas on the marginal position of the Stranger in the group to their studies on the urban environment, ethnicity and social distance. Developing a ‘marginality theory’, the Chicago School focused on measuring social exclusion and its consequences (below).10 Elias expanded on Simmel’s concept of Strangerhood as a social relationship, stressing the inequality of status between what he termed the ‘Outsider’ and the dominant culture of the ‘Established’ (Elias and Scotson 1994). He notes that the Established feels threatened by Outsiders only when the latter appear to be infringing on the former and claiming equal status. This is the socio-political equivalent of Sartre’s observation regarding the ‘viscuous’ Other: the Stranger turns from enjoyably exotic to threatening when the Self feels it can no longer disengage from it at will. One response is to distance the threatening Other; another response (the assimilationist approach) is to offer Strangers equality at the cost of abandoning their Otherness. We can recognise the first approach, for example, in urban renovation policies in Paris aimed at distancing the "dangerous classes" (Chevalier 1958) from the city centre. The second approach is recognisable in policies aimed at educating the urban proletariat in early 20th century Paris and Amsterdam, e.g. through social housing designed to produce ‘proper environments’ (Chapters 8 and 9, below).

D. The Stranger as Urban Man, the subcultures approach

In contrast to the concept of the Stranger as a newcomer or marginal man, other writings refer to Strangerhood as a universal condition, at least among city dwellers. The idea of Strangerhood as a general urban condition developed with the increasingly urban focus of sociology. According to Louis Wirth, the main proponent of the urban ecological approach (along with Robert Park), the city produces certain behavior in its inhabitants, who must adapt themselves in order to survive in the urban environment. Wirth’s (1938) analysis of the city as a world full of alienated individuals captured something universal in the urban experience, and contributed to an eventual broadening of the concept of Strangerhood to encompass all city dwellers. Following Park and Wirth, urban sociologists (e.g. Meyer 1950, Jacobs 1961, Lofland 1973) linked the concept of the Stranger specifically with ‘urban man’, but Strangerhood was now used in a broader sense as a function of the

---

10 For example, Duncan and Lieberson (1959), measured the degree of residential segregation of several ethnic groups in Chicago between 1930 and 1950, in relation to their socio-economic position, as they became more assimilated to the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant majority. Other studies related to the ‘ecological pattern’ of various marginal populations such as delinquents and youth gangs (in: Jackson and Smith, 1984).

In Julie Meyer's analysis of the urban environment as a world full of strangers, she notes (1950: 478) that the city produces solutions to this anonymity, in the form of spatially-based 'communities' (neighbourhoods) and interest-based 'associations' which provide their members with a sense of common identity. Drawing from socio-psychological models, urban sociologists developed the concept of subcultures from the 1960s on. The subcultures approach to Strangerhood refers to interpersonal relations of anonymity, and the relationship between members of different groups (subcultures/communities/associations) (Bochner 1982).

The first two conceptualizations of Strangers noted above, as Newcomers or indigenous Outsiders, are based on the modernist assumption of a dominant, stable host culture. This implies that Strangerhood, as embodied in immigrants, minorities or indigenous marginal groups, is a potentially temporary phenomenon. In the typology presented below (Chapter 4), this attitude applies to local authorities that assume or expect the eventual disappearance of their labour immigrant population, or at least of their Otherness. In cases where the migrants/ethnic minorities are expected to remain and to retain their Otherness a modernist attitude will still imply that they are viewed as 'figures' on a stable, dominant background provided by the host culture.

The subcultures approach continues the conceptualization of Strangerhood as a fundamental social relationship, an insider-outsider, us-versus-them relationship. However, the view of Strangerhood as an assymetrical figure-ground relationship no longer applies here, for the Stranger is not necessarily associated with a marginalized group in relation to a dominant culture. The subcultures or groups may themselves be a part of the dominant culture. The concept of Strangers as members of urban subcultures can therefore be seen as a transition toward a postmodern and more pluralist approach to Strangerhood.

These different conceptualizations of Strangerhood are not limited to the academic literature. As shown in the case studies below, a municipality that views the city as a local polity in which the majority society 'hosts' a number of minorities, will either accept the 'temporary' marginality of migrants vis-à-vis the dominant host culture (e.g. in a guestworker regime, see Chapter 7), or if these Strangers are expected to remain, will aim at minimizing their Otherness, as expressed in assimilationist policies (see Chapter 8). A local authority that views its city as an amalgamation of overlapping subcultures in which Otherness is a permanent feature, will relate to migrants and minorities as one more manifestation of this diversity (see Chapter 9). This may be expressed in policies that recognise ethnic differences and possibly support the minorities' right to remain different (communitarian policies, see below). Or, local policymakers may adopt an approach to the presence of Strangers that is somewhere between the assimilationist and pluralist approaches. In cities such as Amsterdam, the recent policy shift (from a 'Minorities Policy' to a 'Diversity Policy')

---

11 This is not an entirely new idea: In 1916 Park noted that cities can be “mosaics of little worlds” (Krupat, 1985: 55).
can then be understood in terms of the changing conceptualization by the host society of itself and its relation to Otherness (see Chapter 10). The latter policies can be regarded as expressions of a postmodern approach to Strangerhood.

2.3 Postmodern views of Strangers

The basic premises underlying postmodern concepts of Strangerhood are an awareness of the permanence and pervasiveness of Strangers, and a sensitivity to Otherness. The belief that Strangerhood can be made to disappear through assimilation, has been abandoned. The modern background, characterized by a stable dominant culture, has been replaced by a postmodern context of multiculturality and instability, where individual and collective identity is constantly invented and reinvented. The postmodern search for communal identity is often translated into the reinvention of ethnicity, which means emphasizing the ethnic Other. As Tabboni (1995) points out, the postmodern context allows the individual to experience multiple individual identities (e.g. identifying oneself with an occupational group, a religion, a country), but makes long-term communal identification increasingly difficult and therefore more precious.

In this context ethnic minorities play an important part in the process of communal identity-building within postmodern host societies. Host-stranger relations may then be expressed in the postmodern ‘embrace of (ethnic) Otherness’, or in renewed emphasis on ethnic differences and calls for communitarian segregation (see below). In both cases, cultural Otherness is no longer considered transient or marginal, but an unavoidable (and possibly desirable) aspect of daily life. At this stage, attitudes toward Strangers become more complex. The literature on postmodern host-stranger relations highlights several points, summarised below, that will come up again in the findings of the case studies.

A. Genuine versus exploitative 'embrace of Strangers'

As noted above, for those powerful enough to not feel threatened by Otherness, the presence of Strangers can elicit a positive response. At its most genuine, this approaches the attitude toward Otherness described by Levinas (respect and empathy for Otherness). However, Bauman observes that the postmodern embrace of Strangeness is more often an exploitative relationship that objectifies the Other as an exotic presence to be enjoyed and exploited. This relates to what he calls the postmodern paradigm of (multiple) identity-building. In this context, Strangers are constantly re-invented as “indispensable signposts in the life itinerary without plan and direction” (1995a: 11-12). As the personification of plurality, Strangers have become esthetically in tune with the postmodern worldview, “...their Strangerhood is to be protected and caringly preserved” (ibid.). Thus,

...a new theoretical/ideological consensus is emerging, to replace another. more than a century old... postmodern times are marked by an almost universal agreement that difference is not merely unavoidable, but good, precious, and in need of protection and cultivation. (ibid.)
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This is expressed in postmodern politics where the New Left as well as the New Right (and even the Extreme Right\textsuperscript{12}) accept the permanence of strangers, without insisting or expecting them to assimilate. Instead, Bauman claims (1995a) that both the “new racism” and the new multiculturalism often advocate communitarian solutions which espouse some form of ethnically-based self-segregation. Thus the postmodern vision of society proposes a mosaic of distinct subcultures, to replace the modernist ideal of the melting pot.

**B. Communitarian versus individual-based Otherness in a multicultural society**

As Tabboni (1995) observed, Strangerhood is increasingly conceived within the debate on communal identity in a multicultural society, where the most salient Strangers are immigrants and ethnic minorities. In this postmodern multicultural game the Stranger is not necessarily a passive player and can also demand his/her collective rights:

In a multicultural society, the ‘invention’ of ethnicity…turns the stranger into a protagonist of cultural conflicts, an exploiter of a resource – collective identity – which s/he can deploy to defend him/herself against the material and psychological hardships of the immigrant. (Tabboni 1995: 23)

Much of the debate on multiculturalism deals with the proper relationship of the host society (through the liberal democratic State) toward ethnic minorities, and especially toward non-liberal minority cultures in its midst.\textsuperscript{13} In this debate we can discern two broad approaches. The first can be termed a communitarian approach which defines Strangers in terms of their communal, usually ethnic-based, identity (Box 2.3).

The communitarian approach to ethnic diversity has been criticized on several grounds, for example, that it fosters sectarianism. Raffestin (1993) claims that

…the defense of minorities and their rights can appear at first glance as a manifestation of multiculturalism…[but] it often leads in the opposite direction…of hermetically closed communities and as such hostile to the coexistence with different cultures. (cited in Racine and Mager, 1997: 4)

---

\textsuperscript{12} Bauman (1995: 13) provides an example of “differentialist racism” which espouses the existence of different cultural communities in Julius Evola, the “spiritual guide of the Italian neo-fascist movement,” who claims: “The racists recognize difference and want difference”.

\textsuperscript{13} Tamir (1995) distinguishes between “thin” and “thick” multi-culturality, with the latter referring to a society containing both democratic and non-democratic subcultures.
Box 2.3 Communitarian solutions for a multicultural society

Various writings propose communitarianism as a solution to the co-existence with Others. Proponents of communitarianism emphasize the communal basis of Otherness: they speak in terms of communities of Strangers, where the latter usually refer to immigrants and ethnic minorities.

Some multiculturalists (e.g. Kymlicka 1995) maintain that individual rights cannot be separated from the “cultural embeddedness” of the individual. To guarantee individual rights, the state must protect the cultural rights of minorities on equal terms with those of the majority (e.g. in language of instruction at school). This includes protecting the cultural autonomy of non-democratic minorities that infringe on their members’ individual rights. Kymlicka extends “cultural rights” only to indigenous minority cultures (e.g. American Indians), claiming that immigrants have waived their claim to cultural continuity. The host society must allow immigrants to assimilate, but is not obliged to perpetuate their original culture.

Others contend that the majority culture will always dominate if multiculturalism is based on negative freedoms (freedom from). According to this view, multicultural policies must proactively create conditions that promote the development of minority cultures. Fraser (1997, cited in Bruner and Peled) claims that multiculturalism must be extended beyond cultural rights, to a redistribution of territory and the financial resources needed for minority cultures to preserve their Otherness.


Another line of criticism comes from those who emphasise an individualist approach to Otherness. Bauman and others suspect that empowerment of communities of Strangers through “communal self-determination” can turn into a new tool of disempowerment. Emancipation from the majority may be replaced by oppression within the community, ultimately disempowering the Other as an individual (e.g. as a woman). Instead of communitarian solutions, Bauman proposes to accord further powers to the individual by “bringing to conclusion the ‘disembedding’ work of modernity” (1995a: 14). The final ‘disembedding of the individual’ means providing him/her with the freedom and the material conditions to construct his/her own life and take full responsibility for it. This (re)emphasis of individual Otherness over communal Otherness finds expression, as we will see, in a relatively new type of policy response to ethnic diversity that has emerged in some cities. This may be seen as a reaction to previous (ethnic based) multicultural/pluralist policies that advocated communitarian solutions. This is discussed in chapters 9 and 10.

3. Spatial aspects of host-stranger relations

As noted at the start of this chapter, a third aspect of host-stranger relations involves attitudes of the host society regarding the spatial separation from Strangers. Here too the distinction between modern and postmodern perceptions is useful. Briefly, the modernist approach conceived of host-stranger relations in quantitative, measurable terms, thus social distance could be measured in spatial
distance between different communities. From the 1980s onwards, host-stranger relations are conceived within the postmodern context where Otherness appears to be pervasive, spatial distance is assumed to be less important as an indicator of social distance, and socio-spatial exclusion appears more complex. This is due not only to the increasing ethnic diversity characterising large cities (partly due to globalisation processes), but also to changes in the perceived character of urban space. Spatial segregation is still possible in the postmodern city, but not as simple. These points are raised in the social geographical literature and summarized below.

3.1 Modern views of segregation: the social-spatial distance equation

The systematic measurement of residential patterns as a measure of social distance between different groups, and specifically of immigrants, is a twentieth-century phenomenon (Van Amersfoort 1992) and a characteristically modernist enterprise. Durkheim's original social-spatial distance theory claimed that a direct correlation exists between social and spatial relations, so that the measurement of spatial distance is an effective means of demonstrating social distance. Based on the growth patterns of early 20th century Chicago (a city undergoing massive immigration), Burgess (1925) developed the concentric zone model of urban development, according to which social/ethnic/economic stratification is expressed in spatial differentiation. A social distance theory was then applied by Park and the Chicago School sociologists to study marginality. In their studies, the socio-spatial distribution of different populations was seen as a direct reflection of host-stranger relations, whether applying to newcomers (e.g. the assimilation of immigrants) or indigenous marginals and subcultures (e.g. youth gangs).  

Following the Chicago School, the 'modern city' was described during much of the twentieth century as "neatly parcelled up into distinctive 'niches' occupied by distinctive human 'communities'" (the ecological approach) or as "fractured into 'suburb-slum' patterns reflecting a straightforward capital-labour 'class' divide" (the Structuralist/ Marxist approach) (Cloke et al. 1991: 177). In both approaches, space was conceived "essentially as a neutral medium for the operation of social and economic processes" (Sibley 1995: 73) and social/economic exclusion was equated with spatial distance. Within this paradigm, segregation indices were developed and became increasingly complex (e.g. Duncan and Duncan 1955; Lieberson 1981). This methodology is still used today to measure changes in the Stranger's social position (ethnic minorities or indigenous marginal populations) vis-a-vis the host culture in terms of spatial distance, and to draw conclusions about processes of marginalization or assimilation (in Jackson and Smith 1984: 159-165).

Two assumptions should be noted in these approaches. First, they relate to the spatial dimension as "fixed, dead and undialectical" (Soja's 1989: 7). The space of the city is a relatively clear field on

---

14 In the case of newcomers, Cressey (1938) and Ford (1950) 'demonstrated' the process of assimilation (that is, de-marginalization) of ethnic groups in Chicago, based on their progressive dispersal from the city centre over time. The environment which served as a basis for the model was Chicago in the first half of the twentieth century, a city undergoing massive immigration. Other early studies mapped the 'ecological pattern' of residence of delinquents, showing they were highest in the central slum areas and declining progressively outwards to the suburbs (Shaw and McKay), or the spatial distribution of youth 'gangs' in different areas of the city (in Jackson and Smith 1984: 159-164).
which these marginalisation/integration processes are played out, resulting in a "partial convergence" between socio-economic class and territory (Cooke 1988: 483). The spatial manifestation of this relationship (e.g. the ghetto) is seen as a relatively homogenous territory with objectively measurable boundaries.

Second, the social-political context is seen in terms of a stable society with a clearly dominant, relatively homogenous host culture. Strangerhood is measured in relation to this Order, both socially and in distance, a figure on the background of a fairly stable, dominant host culture. Many of the phenomena studied (e.g. slums) imply that Strangerhood is temporary, or potentially so, under the 'right' conditions.

3.2 Toward postmodern 'geographies of others'

The assumptions of this "consensualist view of society" were later criticized by Behavioural and Structuralist/Marxist geographers, however they too remained within the positivist, modernist view of host-stranger relations, as a figure-ground phenomenon (cf. Jackson and Smith 1984: 167-183). More recently, some social geographers (Sibley 1995, Racine and Mager 1997, Schnell 2002) display what may be called a postmodern approach to host-stranger relations and their spatial manifestations. This approach attempts to penetrate the "experiential environment" of the study area to present how the same space (e.g. ethnic neighbourhood) is experienced differently by different persons. It thus tries to understand the condition of Strangerhood from the Other's point of view and to demonstrate the variety of views within Otherness, in contrast to the more objectifying view of the modernist approaches. Host-stranger relations are manifested not only in measurable space but also in the symbolic meanings and identities given by different actors to the same spaces, emphasizing the Other's viewpoint.

In this approach, the spatial manifestation of host-stranger relations is more complex. Spaces are shown to have emotional weight that does not necessarily correspond with their 'objective' (economic or physical) conditions. Boundaries too are shown to be relative, rather than objectively measurable.¹⁵

3.3 The pervasiveness of Strangers in the postmodern city

As strangers are no longer as clearly separable, the spatial manifestation of host-stranger relations become more complex. The nature of postmodern urban space itself is changing, erasing the social-spatial distance formula. The postmodern city is characterized by the openness, fragmentation and multi-layering of spaces, a result of the unprecedented flow and mix of people, architectural forms, lifestyles, etc. Thus Burgess' 1925 description of Chicago in terms of "concentric circles" as the prototypical modern city, is replaced by Soja's description of Los Angeles as "an emerging postfordist landscape" made up of "seemingly paradoxical but functionally interdependent juxtapositions" (1989: 221, 193).

¹⁵ Jackson and Smith identify this as the Humanist approach, pioneered by Ley and Samuel's (1978) Humanist Geography (in Jackson and Smith 1984: 177-178).
Schnell and Benjamins (2001) describe the fragmentation of postmodern spaces at several levels: the same spaces are shared by different social groups; daily activity patterns of individuals are increasingly fragmented into many separate spaces; the infiltration of global information influences local spaces, changing local behaviour; the same space is assigned multiple identities and meanings by different social groups who also redraw its boundaries. Harvey (1989) describes this as ‘time-space compression’, a jumble of contrasting places in extreme proximity. Spaces and places are now perceived as multi-layered, their boundaries fluid, their character changing, their identity multi-dimensional.

In this context, Otherness is pervasive: strange people and unfamiliar forms, smells and sounds are no longer as clearly located within well-defined areas. Citing different studies, Racine and Mager (1997: 5) stress the subjective rather than objective delineation of ethnic neighbourhoods: “a neighbourhood only becomes ethnic once it is felt to be such by certain population groups, whether they be residents or not”. In the postmodern city the newly urbanized rich shoulders with the homeless, gentrified inner city blocks sit within old immigrant neighbourhoods and ‘heritage landscapes’ are developed in peripheral or marginal areas (e.g. brownsites and industrial waterfronts) whose ‘otherworldly’ character is recreated according to postmodern tastes. Davis (1985: 110) describes in Los Angeles “the burgeoning city of third-world immigrants that totally surrounds and lays siege to the sumptuary towers of the speculators”. Van Amersfoort (1992: 452) describes Amsterdam as a post-industrial city in which “all kinds of subcultures centred around a 'lifestyle' (the singles, the traditional families, the gay scene, etc.) exist side by side with little social contact and in different residential patterns”. In particular he notes how this makes the classic socio-spatial distance measurement of immigrants/ethnic minorities much less clear. In short, boundaries are not as measurable or visible as in the past but they still exist, albeit in different forms.

3.4 Postmodern responses to the pervasiveness of Strangers: spatial manifestations

A. Complex forms of exclusion

One response to the perceived pervasiveness (and expected permanence) of Strangers is the development of complex forms of exclusion that rely on architecture and technology, rather than geographical distance, to limit the contact with unwanted Strangers. This 'strategy' is expressed in the postmodern urban developments which are planned in close yet unbridgeable proximity to marginal populations. Thus, Short (1988) explains the “bunker architecture” of the London Docklands, Soja (1989) analyses the “urban citadels” of Los Angeles, and Davis (1985) analyses architectural strategies to guarantee the “segregation and security” of employees in the “skyscraper fortress enclaves” (p. 111) that characterize new downtown redevelopment projects. According to Cooke (1988: 485).

\[16\] Germain et al. (1995) study of neighbourhoods in Montreal shows that “there is no automatic correspondence anymore between physical space of the neighbourhood and the space of social relations.” Harney’s (1985) study of Toronto’s ethnic enclaves describes neighbourhood boundaries in terms of “ambience” and changing, subjective views of these areas. Battegay’s (1992) study of ethnic neighbourhoods in Paris speaks of “a configuration of ethnic territories which is no longer inscribed in the paradigm of the urban village” (in Racine and Mager 1997: 4-5, 10).
The postmodernist towers are, in such a context, fortresses protecting the new rich from the new poor whom they nevertheless need, but at arms’ length. Thus the hyperspaces to which access by pedestrians is all but impossible become comprehensible.

Other studies focus on 'gated communities' and indoor shopping centres which have come to replace the open street as the primary public social area, excluding unwanted Strangers from more and more public spaces.18

B. Exploiting Otherness in urban renewal

Other urban renewal projects express a different response already noted above: an ‘exploitative embrace of Strangeness’. The postmodernist urban fascination with Otherness has been noted by many, e.g. Harvey (1989), who observed that the role of exotic spectacle is as important in the postmodern city as it was in Nero’s Rome. After decades of suburbanisation, the rediscovery of urban Otherness is manifested in such phenomena as the gentrification of inner city ‘ethnic neighborhoods’, municipally-sponsored ‘ethnic festivals’ and waterfront development projects in former docklands.19 In his analysis of urban redevelopment Hall (1991: 11) notes that most of the visitors to inner city commercial/entertainment developments are suburbanites who are attracted by “an elusive quality of urban excitement” that these places create artificially.

Many of the writers dealing with postmodern gentrification, ‘festival marketplaces’ and other inner city redevelopments have raised questions on the authenticity of the Otherness carefully displayed for consumption. Relph (1987: 218) for example, speaks of residential and commercial gentrification as a “process of ambience creation… in which old buildings [are] sanitized and adapted for the needs of the late twentieth century”. Cloke et al. (1991: 182-3, citing Harvey's 1989 Condition of Postmodernity) note “an ‘aestheticising’ of poverty that renders the poor, the homeless and the oppressed more objects of cultural interest than objects for radical political action”.

This exploitative strategy of ‘embracing Strangeness’ can be recognised in several urban renewal policies observed in the case studies in this book. For example, it can be identified in planning proposals to upgrade a poor Tel Aviv neighbourhood where the labour migrant population is concentrated, by turning into a “touristic-ethnic magnet” (Chapter 7) and in an attempt by the municipality of Amsterdam to create an 'Oriental market' in the mid-1980s (Chapter 9).

3.5 Different types of Strangers, different kinds of segregation

Different types of segregation often reflect the relation of the host society to different types of Strangers, as well as the reactions of Strangers to host attitudes toward them. Exclusionary practices may differ if the Strangers are a community of newcomers (Turkish labour migrants in Germany or the Netherlands), a native ethnic minority (Afro-Americans in the United States), an indigenous marginalised subculture (New Age Travellers) or economically marginalized individuals (homeless) (Sibley 1995). Several writers have linked between different forms of segregation and different host-

18 See Sibley 1995 on the subtle exclusionary practices of shopping malls and other semi-public spaces.
19 For examples of residential and commercial gentrification of inner city areas, see Short 1988. For a survey of downtown waterfront developments, see Breen and Rigby 1994.
stranger relations. Boal (1978), for example, distinguishes between a "colony" (an immigrant community characterized by temporary segregation prior to their assimilation), an "enclave" (an ethnic community characterized by a certain degree of segregation, which is in part voluntary) and a "ghetto" (a stabilized socio-spatial form characterized by a high degree of segregation forced on it by the host society). Van Amersfoort's (1992) distinction between "ghetto", "ethnic neighbourhood" and "concentration area" is based more on quantitative terms (e.g. the ratio of one ethnic group to other groups in the area) but also contains elements of host-stranger relations.20

4. Summarising the host-stranger relations approach to local migrant policy

The writings reviewed above, which I loosely label 'host-stranger relations literature', provide several insights into why and how cities react to labour migrant settlement, and point towards a deeper understanding of local migrant policies, beyond the specific context of any city. The major points raised in this literature are summarized below.

4.1 Migrant settlement as the 'Stranger within the city walls'

The most basic insight provided by host-stranger relations theory is that the arrival and eventual settlement of migrants in the city is not just another problem to be addressed by the local authority. Beyond its practical effects (on the local housing market, public services and so on), the settlement of newcomers with a very different background from the local population touches deeper cords with the host society. The uneasiness that this encounter causes has its roots in the fundamental ambivalence of the host-stranger relationship: the presence of the Other destabilizes an existing order in the most basic way, forcing the host society to redefine itself. If the arrival of migrants is perceived as the 'Stranger at the city gates', then by the time migrant settlement is noticed, they are perceived as the 'Stranger within the city walls'. This is especially true in the case of newcomers whom local residents perceive as significantly Other.

4.2 Labour migrants as one type of Stranger

Host-stranger relations theory also allows us to differentiate between different types of strangers, i.e. between different types of host-stranger relations. The typologising of different newcomers will depend more on the Host society’s definitions of itself than on the characteristics of the migrants. The former will decide which newcomers are members, which are potential members and which will remain Outsiders. Different definitions of Otherness (and therefore different host reactions) will emphasize different criteria: citizenship, ethnicity, religion, etc. Thus, the question of who is regarded as a 'labour migrant' will change from one city to another and over time (see Chapter 3). As we shall see, the host reaction to labour migrants (one type of Stranger) are often shaped in part by previous relations with another type of Stranger, e.g. indigenous Outsiders.

20 The 'ethnic neighbourhood' and 'concentration area' are "the outcome of processes of differentiation effective throughout society" which are social as well as economic, while the 'ghetto' "can only be maintained by constant vigilance at the ghetto border" (Van Amersfoort 1992: 441-2).
4.3 Modern and postmodern perceptions of Strangerhood

Following Bauman, we distinguished between two basic conceptualisations of Strangers. The modernist worldview assumes a stable, dominant host society which serves as the 'ground' against which the 'figure' of the Stranger is drawn. According to this view, Strangerhood always contains the seeds of its potential disappearance, whether through physical disappearance (the Stranger moves on) or assimilation into the host society (paraphrasing Levinas: the Stranger loses his Otherness and becomes part of the Same). Meanwhile, Strangerhood is characterized by marginalization and exclusion. Another assumption is that Strangers are spatially separate/separable from the host society. The changing relation of the Stranger to the host society, from marginalization to assimilation, will be expressed in decreasing spatial distance.

In the postmodernist worldview, Strangerhood is conceived as permanent in a double sense: not only will strangers physically remain, but their Otherness will also remain. Globalisation and the changing nature of urban space (open, fragmented, multi-use) mean that strangers are no longer as easily spatially separable from the host society. This is the perceived pervasiveness of strangers characterising the postmodern condition.

4.4 Modern and postmodern responses to the presence of Strangers

Assuming the temporary nature of Strangerhood, modernist responses to the presence of migrants may be inclusionary or exclusionary. Inclusionary strategies will aim to assimilate them (erasing their Otherness), whether through laissez-faire or pro-active measures. In this case, spatial segregation will be seen as an obstacle to integration. Exclusionary strategies relate to cases where the newcomers are perceived as temporary, i.e. in the case of 'guestworkers'. In this case, spatial segregation may be considered tolerable or even desirable by the host society, as well as by the migrants themselves.

The postmodernist realization of the stranger's permanence and pervasiveness can also lead to inclusionary or exclusionary responses. Reactions to labour migrant settlement can range from embracing difference (multiculturalism) at one extreme to xenophobia at the other extreme. The different responses depend on different worldviews, but also on the subjective feeling of power(lessness) vis-a-vis these Strangers. The genuinely pluralist/multicultural attitude displays a sensitivity to Otherness, including a responsibility to protect and preserve the Stranger's right to remain different. This means accepting (or openly espousing) a certain degree of separation, in the name of respecting the stranger's right to his/her Otherness. This approach may extend to recognition and encouragement of the collective rights of Strangers. But, communitarian strategies may imply an acceptance of living next to instead of with Strangers.

4.5 The city as the context of local reactions to migrant settlement

Because labour migrants settle primarily in cities, and are usually concentrated within poor areas in those cities, these relations often play themselves out in particular local conditions. How local residents perceive the permanence and pervasiveness of the migrants/minorities will depend on their
relative feelings of power vis-à-vis those who are perceived as Strangers. Some who can afford it may opt for exit ('white flight'). For others who cannot easily separate from Strangers and feel powerless (in Sartre's terms: those who perceive Strangerhood as 'viscuous'), the reaction may be to "defend the territory under siege" (Bauman 1995a: 10-11), e.g. by supporting xenophobic parties. While some residents may feel trapped, others may empathize with the newcomers or accept their Otherness. For yet others, the response to the permanence of Strangers may be to welcome pluralism as enriching. However, the 'embrace of Strangeness' may often hide an objectifying attitude toward the Other.

The multicultural view is characteristic of those who feel free to distance themselves from strangers when they wish, while the xenophobic reaction characterizes those who feel threatened by an 'invasion' of strangers, e.g. inhabitants of poor neighbourhoods where newcomers tend to settle. This explains how the same city may breed anti-migrant parties or racial violence as well as genuine (and/or exploitative) expressions of multiculturalism.

Thus an outwardly pluralist approach may in fact be limited to symbolic policies that ignore the real problems of e.g. ethnic minorities, or an exploitation of Otherness at worst. Between these extremes, the reaction of local residents may be found in more sophisticated forms of separation such as the use of separate public spaces in the same neighbourhood or separate times in the same spaces.

4.6 Local migrant policies as one aspect of host-stranger relations

We can now view local migrant policies as one aspect of these host-stranger relations (as noted, other aspects include local residents' relation toward migrants and the migrants' relation to the host society). These policies may be seen as a response by the local authority to the reactions of local residents noted above. For example, gentrification policies in neighbourhoods of migrant settlement may be seen as an attempt by the local authority to stop local residents from 'white flight' or to preempt xenophobic responses. The same policies may also play to the desire of potential gentrifiers, those for whom the presence of a migrant population is viewed as an exotic attraction. City Hall will normally be aware of the relative power/powerlessness of different constituencies vis-à-vis the migrant presence when it formulates its urban renewal policies. But this aspect will normally not appear in local policy documents. Instead, policies will espouse 'neighbourhood upgrading' or 'social mixing'.

The previous paragraph shows municipal policy as reactive, but local migrant policies are often pro-active (or pre-emptive), as the Municipality attempts to set its own agenda in shaping the city's relation to the presence of migrants/minorities. Be they in social services, housing, relation to migrant organizations, etc., these policies will express certain attitudes toward the migrant population(s). Behind these attitudes are certain assumptions and expectations regarding the temporal and spatial aspect of the migrant presence, as well as attitudes toward their Otherness. These three dimensions of local authority attitudes toward migrants can serve as criteria for defining different types of local host-stranger relations, in which the host is represented by the local authority and the stranger by the migrant. These are summarised below and in Table 2.1:
A. Time: assumptions about the transience or permanence of labour migrants

The municipality may view the labour migrants as a transient phenomenon: they are just passing through. It may regard their stay as more than transient, but still limited to a certain period: they are temporary, 'guest' workers. Or it may perceive labour migrants as a permanent presence in the city. The temporal dimension of the host's attitudes toward these strangers can also be seen as an expression of modernist or postmodernist worldviews.

B. Difference: attitudes regarding the Otherness of labour migrants

Local authority attitudes will be related to differing worldviews and value systems, but also tied to the temporal assumptions. If the local authority regards the migrant presence as transient, it can easily ignore the migrants' Otherness. If labour migrants are regarded as temporary, their Otherness can be tolerated, rather as the peculiar behaviour of tourists is treated with understanding. If, however, the local authority assumes the migrant presence to be permanent, it must take a stand on the Otherness in its midst. One possibility is to wilfully overlook cultural and religious differences, in the expectation of eventual assimilation. This de-valuation of certain kinds of difference is based on the expectation that although the migrant will remain, his/her Otherness can and should be minimised. Local policies may then encourage migrants to abandon their Otherness, i.e. assimilate or suffer continued marginalisation.

Another possibility is to accept and even welcome the Otherness of the migrants. If City Hall defines itself as pluralist, the Otherness of the migrants will be perceived as one more piece in the multicultural mosaic of the city. Local policies will range from tolerance to support for (ethnic) Otherness as an integrative element. However, we have to distinguish between policies that express a true respect for Otherness, and policies that exploit it to sell a multicultural image of the city (or a particular neighbourhood). Policies of the latter kind disguise an objectifying relation to Otherness under the banner of 'embracing Strangeness': the former kind may be communitarian policies that seek to protect communal rights. Communitarian policies, however, may be perceived as emphasising the ethnic basis of Otherness at the expense of individual Otherness.

C. Space: attitudes regarding spatial segregation of labour migrants

Attitudes regarding the segregation of migrants will express different worldviews, but are likewise related to the above two dimensions (regarding the migrants' temporality and their Otherness). Segregation of the migrants can be ignored as a passing problem if the local authority assumes they are transient. An assumption of a longer but still temporary stay may lead to policies tolerating or even formalising segregation as a short-term solution to these Strangers. Expected permanence requires the local authority to take a stand on the issue of migrant segregation. Here again, different attitudes toward the migrants' Otherness will be expressed in different spatial policies (most clearly in housing and schools, but also in other uses of public space, etc.) These will be elaborated in Chapter Four.
Table 2.1 Host-stranger relations, as expressed in local authority attitudes toward labour migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOST-STRANGER RELATIONS</th>
<th>'MODERNIST'</th>
<th>'POSTMODERNIST'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stranger as temporary, spatially separable</td>
<td>Stranger as permanent and pervasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions/ expectations of local authority toward labour migrants</td>
<td>Migrants as transient</td>
<td>Migrants as temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re: temporal presence</td>
<td>Transient (a passing phenomenon)</td>
<td>Short-term stay (few years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re: Otherness</td>
<td>Otherness ignored</td>
<td>Otherness tolerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re: spatial segregation</td>
<td>Segregation ignored</td>
<td>Segregation tolerated, perhaps formalised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>