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PART TWO

5. The case studies

1. Aims

The four case studies presented in the following chapters are meant to test the analytical framework proposed in the first part of this book. First, the case studies test the robustness of the typology as an analytical tool for understanding the development of local policy reactions to migrant settlement in a given city. In other words, they demonstrate to what extent the division into policy domains and issue areas on one hand, and policy types/phases on the other, helps to organize and translate the empirical findings in each city into more abstract notions that go beyond the specificity of that case. They also explore the usefulness of the typology as a framework for translating empirical findings from a particular case into general policy types or phases and their development over time (policy trajectories). The case study chapters thus contain a 'thick description' of local migrant policies and their development over time in a particular city, with its particular historical context (the body of each chapter), followed by a summary section that identifies the policy types and the trajectory of policy development in that city.

Second, the case studies serve to determine the usefulness of the typology as a framework for comparative analysis based on in-depth research. The last section in each case study chapter demonstrates how a large mass of details can be summarised in a comparable way, using the framework (policy domains/issue areas, and policy phases). The actual comparison is discussed in Chapter 10.

At another level, the case studies are meant to test the relevance of the host-stranger relations model to understanding local policy responses to labour migrants. For this reason each case study focuses on the relations between changes in local authority attitudes toward labour migrants and changes in local migrant policies. As noted in Chapter 2, this is not a simple causal relationship. Instead, the case study chapters illustrate and highlight the links between host-stranger relations and local policymaking that are proposed in a more general form in Chapter 2: how labour migrants are perceived and therefore defined by the local authority, how previous perceptions (of other types of strangers) affect local policy responses, etc.

Finally, the case studies are meant to contribute to the existing knowledge on local migrant policies, by showing how four different cities (two 'new immigration' and two 'veteran' cities) have reacted to labour migrant settlement over time.

2. The choice of cities

To test the typology, a multiple case study approach was adopted in which four cities were chosen, one case to illustrate each policy type: Rome (Non-policy), Tel Aviv (Guestworker),
Paris (Assimilationist) and Amsterdam (Pluralist) policy. Clearly, a larger sample would be preferable, for example, two cities per country would allow us to better understand the relation between the national context and local variations in migrant policy. But effective case study research demands a thick narrative description of each relevant example, and constraints of time and resources limited the sample to one case for each ‘type’ identified in the typology.

Table 5.1 The case study cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Rome</th>
<th>Tel Aviv</th>
<th>Paris</th>
<th>Amsterdam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank in national urban hierarchy</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of local government</td>
<td>Mayor-led</td>
<td>Mayor-led</td>
<td>Mayor-led (since 1977)</td>
<td>Council-led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered foreign residents (% of municipal pop.)</td>
<td>169,064 (6.4%)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>308,266 (14.5%)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total migrant/ethnic minority population + (% of municipal pop.)</td>
<td>Estimated between 200,000 - 260,000 labour migrants / foreign residents (7.5 - 9.8%)</td>
<td>Estimated between 30,000 - 60,000 &quot;foreign workers&quot; (8 -17%)</td>
<td>Estimated 872,000 ethnic minorities (41%)</td>
<td>Official 340,000 “ethnic minorities” (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of migrants/ minorities from non-OECD countries</td>
<td>&gt; 90%</td>
<td>&gt; 95%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest migrant/minority groups</td>
<td>Philippines, Romania, Poland, Bangladesh, Albania, Peru, India</td>
<td>Philippines, Romania, Thailand, Poland, Ukraine, Ghana, Nigeria, Colombia</td>
<td>Portugal, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Spain, China</td>
<td>Suriname, Morocco, Turkey, Indonesia, Germany, Antilles, Ghana, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginnings of main labour immigration</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>late 1980s</td>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>1960s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ For elaboration on the different estimates see in Chapters 6-9.

Sources: Rome - see Chapter 6; Tel Aviv - see Chapter 7; Paris - see Chapter 8; Amsterdam - see Chapter 9.

The four case study cities were chosen out of the larger sample of the literature survey (Appendix 1). The latter helped to identify which cities appeared to be representative of which policy types (at least over a certain period of time). The case study cities had to be sufficiently different, in terms of representing one of the four types, yet sufficiently similar in other respects to make them comparable. Regarding their comparability, two considerations were foremost.

The first is the nature of migrant settlement in the city. To be comparable, all the cities must have experienced a minimal period of settlement by labour migrants. A city that experienced immigration of another type (e.g. repatriates who are defined by the host society as a different kind of stranger) would not fit the purpose of this study, since we would be comparing between
two different types of stranger (and therefore, of host-stranger relations), rather than different responses to the same type of stranger (see Chapter 2). Thus, for example, Tel Aviv could not have served as a case study in this book prior to the arrival of non-Jewish labour migrants in the 1990s, despite its previous decades of Jewish immigration. This has less to do with any objective differences between non-Jewish labour migrants who arrived in the past decade and previous Jewish immigration (some of it economically motivated). Rather, the Jewish immigrants are regarded by the host society as repatriates to be incorporated into their old-new ‘homeland’ (for which a comprehensive “immigrant absorption” system exists), while the non-Jewish immigrants are regarded as temporary ‘foreign workers’. This makes Tel Aviv’s response to the arrival of the latter comparable to other cities’ reactions to labour immigrants. The same reasoning applies to the other case studies. Thus, the response to ‘repatriated’ immigrants from the former Dutch East Indies is only a contextual variable in the Amsterdam case study, which focuses on policies toward labour migrants from the 1960s onward.

The character and size of the migrant population was also a factor in selection of the case study cities. All the cases relate to the settlement of a significant labour migrant population (as defined in Chapter 3), i.e. composed largely of newcomers from less developed countries. The current size of the migrant population varies, reflecting the different city sizes and immigration phases. In Rome and Tel Aviv, where substantial labour migration is recent (around a decade), this population is estimated at around 10 percent. Its ethnic composition and other characteristics are similar in both cities, reflecting the nature of the "new migration" (Chapter 3, above): extreme diversity with new labour emigration regions such as south-east Asia and the former Soviet bloc well represented, together with migrants from Africa and Latin America, etc. In Paris and Amsterdam, the total migrant/minority population is estimated at around 40% of the total population. In these ‘veteran’ cities the lines blur between classic labour migrants (including second- and third-generation children of foreign workers from the 1950s-60s from southern Europe, Turkey and the southern Mediterranean basin), post-colonial migrants, and the new labour migrants of the 1980s-90s. But what makes these case studies comparable is that in all four cities the labour migrant presence became at some point significant in the eyes of the local authority.

The second consideration relates to the character of the cities as autonomous and unitary players. The cases all involve large metropolises, each governed by one municipal authority. Although the city’s absolute size is important, it is the relative size (the city’s position in the national urban hierarchy in terms of size, economic activity and political importance) that determines the comparability of the cases. While Tel Aviv and Amsterdam are much smaller than Paris and Rome in terms of population, all four cities are at the top of the national urban hierarchy. The cities are also comparable in administrative and financial autonomy, i.e. in their

---

1 Regarding the smaller cases: Tel Aviv’s official population belies its ‘real’ size. As Israel’s economic and demographic centre, the city of Tel Aviv is the core of the Tel Aviv Metropolitan Area which contains 42 per cent of
capability and will to enact local migrant policy. In varying degrees, Tel Aviv, Rome, Amsterdam and Paris all display "secondary world city" characteristics in terms of their connections to larger international economic systems, including their function in the global labour immigration scheme (Friedmann 1986, Keil 1998).

Finally, the question of comparability between the four cases in terms of the national context (the ‘migration regime’ in each country) is addressed. The different national migration regimes are partly due to the condition that each case represent a different type of host-stranger relationship. But while they differ in many aspects the national context in all four cases is comparable, in that the four municipalities operate within some form of advanced capitalist, European-style democratic regimes.

An analogy to the different-yet-comparable features of the four local authorities may be found in their City Halls: reflecting very different architectural styles and building histories, all four Municipality buildings nevertheless perform the same function (Box 5.1).

Practical considerations also played a significant role in the choice of cities. Given the limitations of time, the feasibility of completing the field research in each city was a crucial factor. In choosing the case study cities from the larger set of the literature survey, I took into account the existing research on local migrant policies in that city, prior connections that would facilitate my research there, and the language.

The four case study cities were chosen as follows. Based on the survey findings, as well as preliminary knowledge regarding Tel Aviv and Amsterdam, those two cities were chosen to represent the Guestworker and Pluralist policy types. My prior research on Tel Aviv and previous work within the municipality (providing privileged access to documents and relevant players) made that city an obvious choice to represent the Guestworker type (especially as other candidates for this type were in German-speaking countries). Amsterdam, as the home base of the project, was both appropriate and feasible as the case study for a Pluralist policy. Rome was chosen over other candidates after an exploratory visit (May 2001) confirmed the feasibility of that city as a case study for Non-policy.

Israel's population. Similarly, Amsterdam's position in the Randstad 'enlarges' the city beyond its municipal population.

In the case of Rome, the limited capabilities of the municipality are one of the characteristics that make this a case study for Non-policy. In the case of Paris, the limited autonomy of the municipality before 1977 did not prevent the development of Parisian migrant policies, as will be argued in Chapter 8.

What is important here is the comparability of city-state relations in the four cases. Despite the 'non-European' circumstances of the Israeli context, Tel Aviv is comparable to Western European cities in regard to local policy responses toward labour migrants, as argued in Chapter 7.

In addition to Hebrew (my mother tongue) for the Tel Aviv case, my French and Italian were sufficient to conduct the research in Paris and Rome. Amsterdam qualified since interviews could be conducted in English and there was considerable material available in English. In the first year of the project I learned sufficient Dutch to read original documents.


The PhD was conducted at the Amsterdam study centre for the Metropolitan Environment (AME), University of Amsterdam.
Box 5.1 City Halls: different piles, different styles

The different styles of local government in the four case study cities are nicely demonstrated in the architecture of the city halls of Rome, Tel Aviv, Paris and Amsterdam. While the architectural analogy should not be taken too far, it does give food for thought on the different styles of local governance.

Rome's municipality is scattered haphazardly in buildings throughout the city while retaining its largely symbolic seat on the Capitoline Hill. The 12th century Palazzo Senatorio is perhaps the most architecturally prestigious City Hall in the world: foundations on the Temple of Jupiter Maximus, Renaissance facelift by della Porta and Rainaldi, overlooking the piazza designed by Michelangelo! But it is largely a façade serving a mostly symbolic function; the real administration of the city goes on in more banal settings.

Tel Aviv's Iria is an ugly modernist 12-story building towering over an equally ugly modernist plaza. The building appears to radiate bureaucratic invincibility, but at closer look its somewhat deteriorated condition reflects a more mundane reality. Following the assassination of Yizhak Rabin in 1995 on its steps, the Iria acquired a refreshingly democratic appearance as its base was covered by pro-democracy graffiti and pictures. This was eventually removed and replaced by institutional substitutes that commemorate the event, but remind the public that they are not the final arbiters of what goes on in the building.

Paris's Hôtel de Ville, an enormous 19th century neo-Renaissance-style building, expresses centralised power and inaccessible grandeur in the best French fashion. The Hôtel de Ville has localised the history of its country as perhaps no other city hall in the world. Paris's previous city hall at this site witnessed the effective dethroning of Louis XVI, the capture of Robespierre (ending the Terror) and the establishment of modern municipal administration in France by Napoleon in 1808. The current building was constructed under Baron Haussmann on the site and in the style of the city hall which was burnt down by the Communards in 1871. Mayor Chirac used it as his base to democratically capture the Presidency in 1995.

Amsterdam's postmodernist Stadhuis was designed as a "city hall for the people". Its ground-level conference rooms with glass walls face the city's flea-market, so that passers-by can see committee meetings as they scavenge for old clothes or come to the local Postbank. Unlike the policymakers in the city halls of Rome, Paris and Tel Aviv, who sit in top floors with a god-like view of their city, Amsterdam's stadhuis confronts local policymakers with a background of real people from all walks of life.
The selection of Paris for the Assimilationist type was to some extent a matter of eliminating the other candidates. The choice of a French city to represent the Assimilationist type was obvious, as France represents the prototypical Assimilationist-style immigration regime (Brubaker 1992, Castles 1995). Of the French cities covered in the literature survey, only Paris and Marseille were comparable in terms of size and national ranking to the other case study cities. Preliminary research in Marseille (May 2002) revealed two main problems regarding that city as a case study for Assimilationist-type policies. First, Marseille is considered atypical for a French city, in that it has a tradition of ethnically-oriented clientelist politics toward various migrant groups. Secondly, the city’s local migrant policies had just been described and analysed in similar terms elsewhere (Moore 2001). Paris, au contraire, is a surprisingly unresearched city in regard to local migrant politics and presented an interesting challenge.

3. Conduct of the case studies

The field research for the case studies was carried out between the spring of 2001 and the winter of 2002. Taking into account the limited amount of time for each case (about four months), the research strategy was based on making maximum use of existing research, e.g. studies carried out on policies in a specific issue area. However, extant research and analysis that specifically dealt with local migrant policies was quite limited. For many issue areas it was nonexistent.

The secondary analysis of existing material was then supplemented by interviews and collection of primary material. Interviews were conducted with local scholars, municipal officials at the professional and political levels, and representatives of relevant NGOs and migrant activists (see Appendix 2 for methodology and list of the interviews).

- This research process was repeated in each city, following the protocol below:
- Collection and analysis of secondary material on migrant policies and on the local and national context;
- Interviews with local scholars;
- Interviews with municipal officials at the professional level;
- Analysis of primary written material (policy papers, draft reports, memos, etc.). obtained from academic and municipal sources;
- Interviews with municipal officials at the political level;
- Interviews with representatives of civic organizations including migrants, and others (e.g. journalists);

7 Just in terms of size, Marseille, Lyon, Toulouse and Nice are comparable (800,000, 453,000, 398,000 and 346,000, respectively), but in terms of national ranking only Marseille and Lyon can be considered comparable to the other case study cities. Lyon however was not covered in the literature survey due to the scarcity of material on local migrant policies found for that city.
8 Personal communications with Sylvie Mazzella, Marcel Maussen and Cesare Mattina (Marseille, May 2002).
9 Thanks to Patrick Simon for raising this challenge!
• Summarisation in 'State and City Profiles'.

During the field work the written and verbal material was summarized in a City Profile, expanding on those begun in the literature survey (see Appendix 1). This summary Profile (together with the transcripts of my interviews) provided the empirical base for the descriptive part of the case studies.

4. Structure of the case studies

The four case studies presented here cannot compete in depth and breadth with case studies conducted over longer periods of time by local experts. The brief period allocated to each case study, compounded by my relative unfamiliarity with the city (with the exception of Tel Aviv) necessarily limited the scope of the research. In reading these case studies, it is important to remember that they do not claim to provide exhaustive descriptions, analyses or evaluations of each city's policy reactions toward labour migrants. Neither do they provide a detailed follow-up on the implementation of these policies. To do justice to such a task would demand a book-length study for each case. Indeed it is hoped that the gaps in the case studies presented in the following chapters will stimulate further research on those cities.

The primary purpose of the case study chapters is to serve as a testing ground for the proposed model, as a useful analytical framework. To this end, the case study chapters are structured in a similar fashion, to maximise their comparative value. Nevertheless, the particularities of each city led to variations in the structure and focus of each chapter as well. Thus, the description of Non-policy in the Rome chapter is the shortest in regard to the type this case study represents (due to the scarcity of material on that period, which in itself characterises Non-policy), while the following phase (1993-2002) receives more attention. In contrast, the Tel Aviv chapter provides the most detailed view on the policymaking process and how attitudes changed within the local authority, based on my familiarity with the city and 'insider's view' of the municipality (see Preface).

The particularities of the Paris case (the predominance of urban/territorial policy in social policymaking; the special relation between that city and the State; the absence of explicit migrant policies) resulted in a different structure for Chapter 9. The Paris chapter therefore begins, rather than ends, with the Spatial domain, while the other domains are considerably abbreviated. The French chapter also goes back much farther in time to present local policies as part of an historic host-stranger relationship that is not limited to labour migrants, but has significantly affected them. Of the four chapters, the Amsterdam case study covers the most policy phases across the most issue areas. This is due to the longevity and comprehensiveness of local migrant policy in that city, and its relatively comprehensive documentation, in comparison with the other cities. Finally, all the chapters devote significant attention to the city's latest phase in local policymaking toward migrants. The 'integration policies' initiated by new local administrations in the past

\[^{10}\text{For example, I was not able to conduct a systematic review of the local media, which could have served as a valuable supplement for following the changes in local policies and attitudes toward migrants.}\]
decade depart (sometimes radically) from previous policy. These new policy phases began in Rome in 1993, Amsterdam in 1994, Tel Aviv in 1999 and Paris in 2001. While not always fitting one of the ideal types which each case was intended to represent, they are no less important in demonstrating the use of the analytical framework, as well as pointing to future developments in local policy responses to ethnic diversity (see Chapter 10).