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PART THREE

10. Summary and Conclusions

1. Introduction

The arrival and settlement of labour migrants in cities and local policy responses to these newcomers present a European-wide phenomenon today. Beyond the practical consequences for cities, the settlement of labour migrants sets in motion actions and reactions at the local level that reveal what we have termed 'local host-stranger relations'. It is this aspect of local policymaking that this book has explored. By focusing on this dimension of local policies toward migrants I hope to have shed light on an aspect of policymaking that is often implicit, and has not been systematically developed in the local-level literature on migrant policy.

The findings from the literature survey and the four case studies that comprised this research project present a very complex picture of cities and their reactions over time to the settlement of labour migrants. The 'local migrant policies' (as defined in Chapter 3), are expressed in mayoral statements, council decisions and various policy documents, in organisational changes within the local authorities, and in various actions affecting migrants. The latter include a wide variety of local services provided directly by the municipality or indirectly through delegation to civic organisations; actions (or inaction) regarding ethnic-based mobilisation and other manifestations of cultural and religious Otherness; urban development policies, and more. This smorgasbord of espoused and enacted policies is thoroughly embedded in the particular context of each city, raising the question of comparability between the cases.

One aim of this book was to make sense of such variety, i.e. to test the plausibility of generalising from so many details. To this end an analytical framework was proposed, based on a model linking local migrant policies to the concept of host-stranger relations. In the model, "host-stranger relations" are defined as the attitudes and expectations of the local authority regarding the temporal and spatial presence of its migrant population (the time they are expected to remain, where they reside in the city) and regarding their Otherness (cultural/religious differences) (Table 2.2). Such attitudes and expectations are but one manifestation of a broader set of host-stranger relations, in which every society defines and relates to "its Strangers" (including indigenous Others as well as newcomers), as described in Chapter 2.

This research project sets out to explore the hypothesis, that local policies toward labour migrants can be understood as an expression local authority attitudes and expectations toward these newcomers, i.e. of local host-stranger relations. But this hypothesis remains at the level of abstraction characterising similar models, of immigration/integration regimes at the national level. Those national-level explanations (such as Castles' 'citizenship regimes' on which my model is
partially based), have been rightly criticised as overly deductive, too abstract and overlooking empirically observed variations in migrant policies (see Chapter 3).

To get beyond this level abstraction a typology is proposed, elaborating the link between local host-stranger relations (different attitudes/expectations of the local authority toward labour migrants) and specific local migrant policies (Chapter 4). The typology groups local policies toward migrants into four 'policy domains' (Juridical-political, Socio-economic, Cultural-religious and Spatial), subdivided into issue areas. This makes it possible to get an overall picture of a city's migrant policies at any one time. The second dimension of the typology proposes four general 'types' of local policy response to migrant settlement/ethnic diversity: a Transient (Non-policy) response, a Guestworker-type response, an Assimilationist-type response and a Pluralist-type response. These policy types or phases correspond to four types of host-stranger relations (Table 4.1). Based on findings from a literature survey as well as deductive reasoning, more specific policies are suggested as manifestations of each general 'type' of policy response in each issue area, creating the full typology at this stage of the study (Table 4.2).

Using this analytical framework, I followed the development of local policies toward migrants in four cities (Rome, Tel Aviv, Paris and Amsterdam) and analysed the findings (chapters 5-9). By grouping the observed policies in each case study into domains and issue areas, it was possible by and large to identify the general types/phases proposed in the typology, in each case. Following this over time revealed a trajectory of policy responses in each city.

In the following pages these findings are summarised in a condensed form, followed by more general conclusions and comparative analyses, again using the host-stranger relations model and the typology as the theoretical framework. The plausibility of this exercise will demonstrate to what degree the primary aim of this work has been achieved: to generalise from a large body of detail, compare between complex and 'contextually thick' cases, and arrive at some overall conclusions that shed light on this topic, pointing the way (and providing the means) for further research. The theoretical and practical implications of this are discussed at the end of the chapter.

2. Findings and conclusions from the case studies

The four case study cities were chosen to represent, at least at first glance, each one of the four types of local policy responses to labour migrant settlement. Rome and Tel Aviv are both 'new immigration cities' in that labour migrants have become a significant phenomenon there within the past two decades. Based on preliminary findings from the literature survey, Rome was chosen to explore the Non-policy phase; Tel Aviv was chosen to represent the Guestworker policy phase in part based on my previous participant observation in that city. Paris and Amsterdam, two 'veteran immigration cities', were chosen to represent the Assimilationist and Pluralist response types, respectively. The four cities were chosen from among several 'candidates' suggested for each type by the literature survey, for reasons elaborated in Chapter 5. However, beyond exploring and testing one of the four policy types, each case study followed that city's migrant policy development over time.
(from just over a decade in Tel Aviv to over a century in Paris), revealing a number of phases in addition to that first identified in the typology. The case studies also revealed where the typology does not exactly 'fit' the observed policy responses. This is summarised in the following pages.

**Rome**

Rome was chosen to explore what was identified in preliminary findings as a 'Non-policy' type of reaction (Chapter 6). A survey of municipal (in)actions up to 1990-91 verified this type of response, and the connection with what can be identified as Transient-type attitudes toward immigrants in City Hall. A political-institutional analysis would explain the municipality's lack of response to the migrant presence in terms of the weakness of Italian local authorities together with a relatively organised Third Sector. Thus Rome's inaction vis-à-vis the mounting needs of the migrant population throughout the 1980s is an extension of City Hall's habit of abdicating the responsibility for marginalised populations to civic society. This is a plausible explanation, but the host-stranger relations model allows us to add a further nuance: Rome was *particularly* unwilling to address the growing needs of labour migrants due to City Hall's persistent Transient-type attitude toward this population. This can be understood considering the historic presence of transient Strangers in Rome, and may partly explain why two internal reports in the early 1980s, which identified the beginnings of a permanent migrant presence in Rome and its implications, were ignored. The widening gap between the actual phase of migration in Rome and the continued Transient attitude in City Hall culminated in the 1990-91 Pantanella crisis, which forced an acknowledgement of the permanence of labour migrants at the local and national level.

Under the new centre-left administration, Rome's local authority appears to have adopted a genuinely Pluralist attitude toward labour migrant integration, but has only partially translated this into actions. Our review of enacted policies since 1993 across the various issue areas reveals that changes have taken place primarily in the Juridical-political and Socio-economic domains, but the municipal strategy consists of delegating nearly all of the actual work to civic organisations. Municipal actions in the Cultural-religious and Spatial domains have been largely symbolic. This raises questions regarding the extent to which City Hall is willing to take on the responsibility ensuing from its declared aims of Pluralist-type integration. Nevertheless, the past decade of local migrant policies cannot be described as a continuation of the old Non-policy dressed in a new Pluralist rhetoric. Instead, Rome's new integration policy may be best understood as an *intended* Pluralist policy.

The case of Rome demonstrates that despite a clear change in the 1990s from a Transient to a Pluralist attitude in the city's *espoused* policy, Rome cannot be regarded as having fully entered a Pluralist phase in its *enacted* policy. To explain this gap we can turn again to institutional-political explanations, specifically the relation between national government, local authorities and civic society in Italy. The weakness of Rome's municipality, in terms of management ability and resources (the latter stemming partly from problems in the channeling of government funding through the regional level) have meant that much of its espoused policy remains on paper, or is delegated to
NGOs. The presence of a strong, well-organised Third Sector in Rome means that City Hall can pursue its new integration policy using the proven method of delegating responsibility to (or simply depending on) civic organisations -- a characteristic of the Italian style of governance.

**Tel Aviv**

In the case of Tel Aviv (Chapter 7), the local authority reaction to labour migrant settlement evolved in less than a decade (and without any crisis) from a Transient attitude to a minimalist Guestworker attitude, to what may be called a liberal Guestworker attitude. The Tel Aviv case illustrates how the municipal bureaucracy awoke to the migrant presence and its policy implications in the first half of the 1990s, and eventually forced the political level to acknowledge this presence, at least as a 'temporary problem', in 1996. City Hall thus moved from a Non-policy response (which included some informal provision of services) in the first half of the 1990s to a characteristic Guestworker policy in the second half of the decade.

This was expressed across all the policy domains: in the Socio-economic domain the municipality accepted responsibility for providing minimal health, education and welfare services; in the remaining policy domains City Hall largely ignored migrant needs and did not concern itself with the migrants' self-organisation, manifestations of cultural Otherness, use of public spaces, etc. These were regarded as temporary phenomena and the ultimate responsibility for "the foreign worker problem" was left to the national government. In the Spatial domain, short-term solutions to the migrants' overcrowded housing situation were considered and found to be outside municipal jurisdiction. In sum, the municipality limited its migrant policy to short-term solutions while lobbying the government for a long-term solutions.

Tel Aviv's minimalist Guestworker policy can be understood in the context of Israel's exclusionary immigration regime. This results in a largely irregular/illegal migrant population that is ultimately liable for repatriation; the presence of legal 'guestworkers' is also assumed to be a temporary substitute for the Palestinian labourers. Nevertheless, expectations of a long-term labour migrant presence developed within the professional bureaucracy in the mid-1990s. Municipal attitudes toward this population changed in a bottom-up process which eventually resulted in the adoption of a new migrant policy in 1999, following the election of a new mayor.

The new municipal administration is outwardly critical of the national guestworker regime, but in its espoused as well as its enacted policy. City Hall presents an ambivalent position toward its labour migrant population. This can be summarised as acknowledging the probability of a permanent non-Jewish minority in the city, without fully accepting the consequences of such a development. Thus, Tel Aviv's new migrant policy remains premised on the need to make life as comfortable as possible for the migrant communities "as long as they are here", without actually taking on the challenge of their long-term integration in the local society, economy or policy. In particular, the possibility of a significant new non-Jewish minority in Tel Aviv is not addressed as yet in the new policy, reflecting the continued predominance of Guestworker-type attitudes within the municipality. The current local policy may thus be labelled a 'liberal Guestworker' response.
Paris

The case of Paris (Chapter 8) illustrates the continuity of an Assimilationist approach in local policy that stretches back to the mid-19th century. Historically, newcomers to Paris were accepted as permanent settlers (thus the absence of a Non-policy and Guestworker policy phase), but the French republican ideology demanded that their Otherness disappear in a one-sided process of assimilation. In Bauman’s terms (1995: 2), a “war of attrition...against the strangers and the strange” was waged by the authorities in their desire to replace social and spatial chaos with Order. This Assimilationist approach has been particularly dominant in Paris, where national and local policies often merged.

Another characteristic of the French context is the prevalence of policies in the Spatial domain. In Paris (and other French cities), territorially-based policies have served as a general framework in which implicit migrant policies are embedded. In this case study it was thus particularly difficult to determine what constituted "local migrant policies" as defined in this book. Nevertheless, two conclusions emerge. First, a continuous thread can be discerned in the urban development policy agenda of both national (prefectural) and local (council and mayoral) policymakers. This can be summarised as the *embourgeoisement* of the capital, i.e. distancing the poor and other undesirable populations progressively farther from the city centre, making place for middle class residents (and monumental spaces marking the new Order). A secondary agenda has been to upgrade the environment of the poor who were displaced, as well as those who remained. Beyond its practical aspects (e.g. sanitation), this too can be seen as an attempt to replace disorder (disease, social marginality, 'inappropriate urban forms', etc.) with a new social and urban Order befitting the status of France's capital city.

The second conclusion from the Paris case is that these policies significantly affected the dispersal of its resident migrant/minority population, most of which is now found 'outside the city walls', in the *banlieues*. The large number of migrants within Paris testifies to the city's historic and continuing role as a magnet for newcomers. There is still debate on whether the dispersal of ethnic enclaves in Paris was an unintended result of *embourgeoisement*, or if urban renewal policies contained an implicit ethnic agenda behind the universalist rhetoric of 'sanitation', 'renovation' and later 'social development of neighbourhoods'. What is clear is that despite the obvious impact of these policies on ethnic minorities, the ethnic element was explicitly ignored. In either case, this characterises an Assimilationist-type response to ethnic diversity. In the other domains, too, Paris consistently pursued Assimilationist-type policies. In contrast to the ethnicisation of policy that has occurred in some French cities over the past two decades, the universalist approach to integration prevails in Paris, in espoused as well as enacted policy.

The *politique d'integration* initiated in 2001 by the new centre-left administration appears to mark a real break from Paris's Assimilationist tradition. Especially in the Juridical-political domain, the establishment of an advisory "Citizenship Council of non-EU Parisians" is meant to signal the intention of City Hall to promote a "citizenship based on residency", until local voting rights are extended to non-EU residents. This directly contradicts the French republican model equating
political participation with French citizenship. However it is still too early to judge the seriousness of this measure. In the other domains, the new integration strategy appears to be based on making existing general services and policy frameworks ethnically sensitive, not on creating migrant-specific or ethnically-based services.

Regardless of what will emerge from the new integration policy, in its declarations the new administration has criticised the strict Assimilationist approach that characterised Paris up to now. However, it already appears clear that the new espoused policy does not conform to what we defined as a Pluralist-type reaction in the full sense. Thus 'migrant integration' continues to be seen in Paris as a purely individual process and City Hall avoids any hint of community-based integration. Although containing some Pluralist elements, the new rhetoric remains largely within the universalist discourse.

Amsterdam

Amsterdam was chosen to illustrate the Pluralist type of policy reaction (Chapter 9). This case study also best illustrates how the analytical framework can be used to follow changes in one city's migrant policies over a long period, identifying a policy trajectory that includes four different phases. Such a broad overview allows us to understand which local migrant policies have developed in accordance with objective changes in the phases of migration, in contrast to policy changes resulting from subjective changes only, i.e. shifts in host attitudes toward migrants that are not connected to any change in migration. In the case of Amsterdam the findings point to a strong correlation between the trajectory of actual migration phases and the local policy reactions, at least until the mid-1990s.

Thus, the shift that occurred in the mid-1960s, from a predominantly Transient phase of migration to a Guestworker phase, was soon followed by a shift from Non-policy to Guestworker policies (expressed mostly in housing). As the Guestworker phase turned into permanent settlement (a process beginning in the early 1970s and culminating in the late 1980s), Amsterdam's migrant policies shifted to what can be identified as a Pluralist phase. This change began in the mid-1970s in housing (opening social housing to labour migrant families) and was later expressed in the other policy domains during the 1980s. A Minorities Policy was instituted in the 1980s, espousing a clearly Pluralist approach to migrants/minorities, based on a communal rather than individual-based approach to integration and the importance of preserving the newcomers' Otherness. This was expressed in local migrant policies in the Juridical-political, Socio-economic and Cultural-religious domains. Municipal actions included encouragement of ethnic-based mobilisation, ethnically-targeted services, institutionalisation of ethnic-based representation, and support for cultural and religious Otherness in various forms.

The most recent shift in local migrant policy began in 1994 and was formalised in 1999. In contrast to the previous phases, it did not follow any substantial change in migration, i.e. we cannot identify a new migrant phase. The replacement of Amsterdam's 'Minorities Policy' by the new 'Diversity Policy' can be explained using a political-institutional approach. Focusing on the devolution of policymaking from municipal to city district level in the 1990s, the Diversity Policy
can be seen as an attempt by policymakers in City Hall to create a new framework for coordinating district-level policies toward migrants. But this explanation would only reveal part of the picture.

Using the host-stranger relations model we can identify a significant shift in host society attitudes toward the presence of Strangers in the 1990s. This can be summarised as a reaction in Dutch society to the avowedly Pluralist approach of the 1980s, toward a more restricted understanding of multiculturalism in which minorities are expected to conform more closely to host society norms. This can also be seen as a reaction against the perceived pervasiveness of Strangeness: after nearly two decades of Pluralist-style integration, minorities are perceived as 'still too different'. While Dutch society recognises the permanence of ethnic minorities as well as their right to retain a certain degree of difference, it also expects a degree of assimilation.

At the national level, this shift in host society attitudes gathered pace throughout the 1990s and culminated in the Fortuyn 'phenomenon' in 2001-2. At the local level, the findings of the Amsterdam case study show the change in the city's migrant policy to be a direct expression of a shift in host-stranger relations. However, they also reveal that enacted policy in several domains (primarily the Socio-economic domain) retains some of its Pluralist characteristics, e.g. minority-targeted and ethnically-based actions. This anomaly can be understood again in both the political-institutional context and in terms of host-stranger relations. The latter highlights a paternalistic tendency that has characterised Dutch attitudes toward Strangers, especially within the social policy profession (in brief: 'we know what is good for you'). This particular aspect of host-stranger relations, expressed in previous decades in Assimilationist policies toward indigenous Others as well as newcomers (e.g. repatriated Indonesian Dutch), was later expressed in the 'bear hug' approach of the Minorities Policy toward the ethnic minorities in the 1980s.

The Minorities Policy can thus be seen as the Pluralist version of Dutch paternalism toward Otherness. Especially in Amsterdam, where the social-democratic ideology was strongest, the (over)abundance of ethnically-targeted policies can be understood not only as an expression of genuine sensitivity for the Otherness of the newcomers, but also as an expression of this paternalistic approach in social policy. The findings of the case study (e.g. the persistence of ethnically-targeted measures emanating from the municipal Welfare Division) can be seen as a continuing manifestation of this attitude toward Strangers, despite the more universalist rhetoric of the Diversity Policy.

However the 'Diversity Policy' may not be specific to Amsterdam. This policy response, neither completely Pluralist nor Assimilationist, was also found in the literature survey in cities such as Birmingham and Stuttgart. Signs of this approach also appeared in the espoused policies of Rome and Paris in recent years. This suggests a new 'type' of local policy response to migrants/ minorities, which will be addressed below.
3. Comparative analysis and generalisation

The above summaries demonstrate the utility of the analytical framework at one level: as a tool for mapping out and comprehending complex local policy reactions, based on a detailed analysis of municipal actions in a given city over a period of time. The following pages relate to the usefulness of the analytical framework at a second level, as a tool for comparative analysis that allows generalisation beyond the particular cases.

Two sets of research questions were raised at the beginning of this book. The first set relates to the 'what' and 'how' of local policy reactions to labour migrant settlement, and the second set relates to the 'why'. In addition, I raised the possibility that local migrant policies may throw a light on the evolution of city-State relations. These question are discussed below in subsection 3.1 (the 'what' and 'how' questions) and subsection 3.2 (the explanatory value of the host-stranger relations variable, i.e. the 'why' questions). Subsection 3.3 discusses city-State relations.

3.1 Comparing local policy responses to labour migrant settlement

3.1.1 Identifying general 'types' of local policy reaction

The case studies have shown that despite wide variety in many contextual variables (including different national migration regimes, scales of city, governance style and migration histories), it is possible to identify the general types of local policy response to labour migrant settlement, as proposed in the typology, in particular cities and periods. Using the criteria of the analytical framework, the Non-policy type was identified in Amsterdam (early 1960s), Rome (1980s) and Tel Aviv (early 1990s). A Guestworker policy phase was identified in Amsterdam (mid-1960s - mid-1970s) and in Tel Aviv (from the mid-1990s in two variations). Assimilationist policy was identified in Paris in all the domains at least until 2001; Pluralist policy was identified in Amsterdam (mid-1970s - mid-1990s) and a variation of it was identified in Rome (1993 - 2002). Findings from Amsterdam from the mid-1990s raise the possibility of a fifth type of local policy response.

The case studies demonstrate that these general types can be plausibly identified by comparing the actual policies (espoused and enacted) in the case study cities with the policies proposed in the typology in those issue areas (e.g. Amsterdam's policy toward migrant organisations in the 1980s fits the Pluralist type in that issue area). Furthermore, they show that most policies in a given city more often than not fit in the same general policy type in a given period. It thus appears that despite very different contexts, cities go through similar phases in their policy reactions to labour migrant settlement. Naturally, these types or phases vary somewhat in their local manifestations, e.g. Amsterdam's Guestworker policy was expressed more in social housing while Tel Aviv's Guestworker phase is expressed more in social services policy. Nevertheless, they are identifiable as general types in that they are comparable across different cities and distinct from the other types of policy response, both in the attitudes that their policies express (e.g. labour migrants as a temporary
phenomenon) and in the characteristics of their enacted policies (e.g. short-term solutions within particular issue areas).

3.1.2 Identifying typical trajectories in the evolution of local migrant policy

Preliminary findings from the literature survey indicated that there may be 'typical' trajectories, or paths of local policy responses to migrant settlement, that repeat in different cities. Common sense as well as the findings from three of the case studies indicate that Non-policy characterises the first phase of reaction in most cities. But the case of Paris demonstrates that in countries with historically open immigration policies this phase is not relevant, as immigration is assumed to be a permanent phenomenon from the start. In this case, the typical trajectory would likely be from Assimilationist to some form of more Pluralist response, as noted in the national-level literature (and hinted at by Mayor Delanoë's recent integration policy in Paris). However, only a wider comparison with cities in, for example, North America and Australia, can answer this question.

In most European countries, labour migrants were originally perceived as a temporary phenomenon. Our case studies reveal several possible paths of local policy reaction: in countries that adopted national guestworker policies in the 1960s, cities moved from a Non-policy phase to a Guestworker phase, eventually developing their own brand of more-or-less Pluralistic policies in the 1980s-90s. This was clearly the case in Amsterdam. In the case of Tel Aviv, the local authority has followed the same trajectory but is not yet willing to move beyond the Guestworker phase. Meanwhile, Israel's exclusionary Guestworker regime limits the policy options of the local authority.

Rome presents an example of a city which did not pass through a Guestworker phase, moving directly from Non-policy to some version of a Pluralist-type policy. Rome's trajectory may characterise other new immigration cities which experienced labour immigration after the 1980s, when national Guestworker policies were no longer considered viable in Europe. Since the Assimilationist model of integration is also out of favour in most European countries, moving from a Non-policy phase to a Pluralist-type reaction (or a variation of it -- see below) may become the 'typical' trajectory in new immigration cities in Europe.¹

Regarding the transitions between policy phases, it appears that the change in municipal attitudes may be a bottom-up or top-down process. In Rome and Tel Aviv the first signs of change, away from a Transient attitude, occurred within the professional level, which tried to alert the political level to the apparent permanence (or at least non-transience) of the labour migrant presence. In both cases the warnings from below were ignored (in Rome much longer than in Tel Aviv). It appears that the actual shift to another policy phase may be precipitated by a crisis as in Rome. However a more common determinant of local policy change appears to be electoral change. In mayoral-led municipalities this means the election of a new mayor representing a new agenda (e.g. not from Chirac to Tiberi). This happened in Rome in 1993, Tel Aviv in 1999 and Paris in 2001, where new mayoral administrations initiated new phases of local migrant policy. In these cases the political

¹ In this sense, Tel Aviv is probably closer to other non-European cases (the Gulf States, Japan) where strict guestworker policies continue.
change was from a centre-right to a centre-left administration, but one cannot generalise from such a small sampling. Amsterdam shows that significant migrant policy change can occur after an election even if there is no significant change in local government: the same party (PvdA) continued to dominate city council. The Tel Aviv case illustrates how the shift in attitudes that precedes significant migrant policy change may occur prior to electoral change (within the municipal bureaucracy), but that electoral change may be necessary to realize this potential.

3.1.3 Relating between policy types/phases and policy domains and issue areas

Are certain types or phases of local policy response to immigration/ethnic diversity characterised by more municipal activity in particular issue areas? According to the typology, the local policy response in the Non-policy and Guestworker phases is characterised by municipal inaction or is limited to meeting some basic, immediate needs of the labour migrant population. In the case studies, municipal actions during these phases occurred primarily in the issue areas of social services and housing. Inaction largely characterised the other issue areas during the Non-policy and Guestworker phases, especially in the Juridical-political and Cultural-religious domains, as confirmed by findings from Amsterdam in the late 1950s-early 1960s, Rome in the 1980s and Tel Aviv in the 1990s and from the literature survey.

In the Assimilationist phase, it appears that municipal actions in the Juridical-political and Cultural-religious domains are primarily negative, i.e. discouraging ethnic-based mobilisation; similarly the Socio-economic domain is less important, except in the area of language education. The Paris case points to the Spatial domain as the main arena for local policymaking affecting migrants, but we cannot generalise since it is unclear if this derives from the Assimilationist type or from the French context. Findings from the literature survey cannot clarify this point without further contextual depth (e.g. why were dispersion policies undertaken in Berlin and Frankfurt in the 1970s?). If Paris moves to a Pluralist phase in the following years, it will be interesting to see if this will be expressed in more municipal activity in the other domains (as appears to have begun in the Juridical-political domain with the new advisory council).

In the Pluralist phase, migrant-related policies in the Socio-economic domain remain important, supplemented by municipal activism in the Juridical-political and Cultural-religious domains. This may be because the latter domains provide a low-cost, high-visibility way to demonstrate City Hall's multicultural attitudes. In a less cynical vein, these are also domains that were relatively neglected in previous phases. This is borne out by the literature survey as well as findings from Amsterdam and recently, from Rome and Paris.

In sum, it appears that the Socio-economic domain is the primary arena for local policy reactions to migrants in all the phases, whereas the Juridical-political and Cultural-religious domains appear to be more phase-sensitive. Spatial policies (including housing and urban development policies) are obviously crucial, but the extent of local policymaking in this domain may be more context-sensitive, i.e. dependent on national policies. These remarks should not be taken as definitive conclusions, but as preliminary observations and directions for further research.
3.2 The concept of host-stranger relations in understanding local migrant policies

The above shows that the analytical framework can be used to summarise and compare migrant policies across different domains and cities. But how relevant is the concept of host-stranger relations to understanding local migrant policies? Chapter 3 suggested a partial answer in that much of the national-level theorising on immigration policies is actually based on distinctions between different host-stranger relations at the nation-state level, even if other terms are used ('inclusionary versus exclusionary citizenship regimes', etc.) If this variable is important in determining different types of migrant policies at the national level, the same appears likely at the local level.

Indeed, this study has shown that the host-stranger relations concept can contribute to a fuller understanding of migrant policymaking at the local level. This approach is meant to complement, not compete with, the institutional-political explanations that are common in local-level analyses. In particular, the focus on host-stranger relations reveals a dimension of policymaking that is often concealed beneath 'pragmatic' policy discourses on improving or adapting services, meeting migrant housing needs, political representation, etc. This dimension is made explicit by recalling some of the points raised by the 'host-stranger relations literature' summarised in Chapter 2, in light of the case study findings.

The first point is that immigration -- in particular the settlement of newcomers with a very different background from the host society -- challenges the host society beyond the 'practical' impacts of such settlement. In trying to address these challenges, local policies reflect prevailing attitudes and expectations toward the presence of Strangers. This was revealed throughout the case studies in various ways.

In Tel Aviv this was perhaps most apparent, where the labour migrant presence was understood above all as temporary and problematic due to the newcomers being non-Jewish. From the beginning and until now, this perception of the migrants' fundamental Otherness (as defined by the host society) continues to shape the national as well as the local policy response. In contrast, in Rome it is not religious or ethnic Otherness, but the underlying assumption of migrant transience in that city (compounded by the local 'laissez-faire' attitude toward Strangers), that explains in part the decade-long Non-policy toward labour migrants. Once their permanence was acknowledged, a Pluralist policy response was fairly easily adopted -- although its implementation proves much more difficult.

In Paris, local policies affecting labour migrants can be understood as part of an historic approach toward Otherness, of trying to distance undesirable populations from the city or else assimilate them into the norms defined by the policymakers, e.g. by 'improving' their living environments. In Amsterdam, changes in local policies toward labour migrants (e.g. from the Minorities policy to Diversity Policy), express changing perceptions of the role that cultural differences should have in the local society.

Second, the way in which newcomers are perceived (indeed, defined) by the host society shapes migrant policies at least as much, if not more, than the actual characteristics of the newcomers. As
Bauman noted, each society creates its own categories of Strangers. The case studies show how this has affected local policies toward labour migrants. Thus, in Rome the legal status of migrants is crucial: local integration policy since 1993 is very inclusionary in regard to legal foreign residents but basically ignores the irregular migrants. In contrast, the local migrant policy of Tel Aviv ignores the legal-illegal distinction and defines its target population as the ‘foreign workers communities’ -- code words for non-Jewish migrants. In Paris the ethnic element is concealed, making the category of ‘migrant/ethnic minority’ in some sense irrelevant in local policymaking. Local migrant policies as we defined them (policies significantly affecting migrants/ethnic minorities) must then be understood in the context of French class-based definitions of Otherness, in which ethnic origin remains a background factor. In Amsterdam, the communitarian approach to dealing with Otherness (institutionalised through pillarisation) shaped the way the policies systematically defined different population groups as targets of different policies.

Third, a host society’s perceptions of one type of Stranger influence its reaction to the arrival of other types of Strangers. This means that the local authority’s response to labour migrant settlement should be seen in the context of historic and current local host-stranger relations, i.e. how the local society has interacted, and continues to interact, with different types of Strangers, indigenous as well as foreign.

In Rome, the traditional prevalence of various kinds of (usually transient) foreigners can explain the city’s Transient attitude toward labour migrants as well. In Tel Aviv, attitudes (and later migrant policies) were affected by the Israeli view of foreign workers as a non-threatening. temporary substitute for Palestinian workers. Conversely, the Israeli attitude toward newcomers (Jewish = permanent migrant, non-Jewish = temporary sojourner) has allowed City Hall to adopt a particularly tolerant approach: the assumption of the labour migrants’ temporariness, which is based not on their current civic or economic status but fundamentally on their non-Jewishness, allows the municipality to takes a liberal attitude toward its temporary guests. If and when labour migrants are no longer perceived as a temporary substitute for the threatening Other (the Palestinian workers), but as a new permanent minority, local attitudes may change. At that point the religious Otherness of the labour migrants may be perceived as fundamentally threatening the local host society, and the whole edifice of Tel Aviv’s liberal Guestworker policy may disappear.

In Paris, the historic experience of assimilating previous waves of French provincial and later European immigrants, and the relation to indigenous Outsiders (the “classes dangereuses”) served as a backdrop to the non-ethnic approach of the local authorities toward immigrants in the postwar period. Also, host society attitudes toward the Algerian immigration should be taken into account. The historical context of the bidonvilles as the ‘Second Front’ in Paris during the Algerian war and the displacement of their residents to housing estates beyond the city borders serves as an unspoken backdrop to the urban policies of the 1980s-90s which targeted ethnic enclaves (inhabited by largely Muslim minorities) for “renovation” and “mixité sociale”, i.e. gentrification. In Amsterdam, the
reformist zeal that drove local policies, previously aimed at indigenous "unsocial families" and repatriated Indonesians, was later redirected toward labour migrants.

Another point raised in the host-stranger relations literature directs our attention to the importance of local residents' feelings of relative power or powerlessness vis-à-vis the newcomers. The less that local residents feel in control of their lives, the more they feel 'trapped' in their neighbourhood, the more they are likely to react negatively to the settlement of labour migrants. These newcomers not only present competition (for housing, services, public spaces) but also present a threat to the local way of life. In contrast, wealthy residents who may choose when and where to come in contact with labour migrants are more likely to regard them as useful and exotic: their Otherness can be sampled at will. This results in a more tolerant (and possibly exploitative) attitude toward the newcomers.

Local migrant policies reflect City Hall's awareness of these situations. In Tel Aviv, for example, one of the reasons given for establishing the municipal centre serving labour migrants was to defuse potential tensions with indigenous residents, while the exotic potential of the migrants was explicitly mentioned in proposals for redeveloping the migrant 'core neighbourhood'. In Paris, the desire to avoid the kind of inter-ethnic tensions characterising some of the banlieues may be one reason behind the new integration policy.

The above indicates that the host-stranger relations approach can make an important contribution to our understanding of local migrant policies. Beyond raising awareness, however, this project aimed to make the link between host-stranger relations and local migrant policies explicit and theoretically useful. This linkage was made through the model and typology (illustrated in Chapter 1, Figure 1.1) which elaborate the abstract concept of 'host-stranger relations' into a usable theoretical framework. The case studies (as summarised in Chapters 6 - 9 and in section 2 above) illustrate how this framework was used to describe, analyse and compare the development of local policies toward migrants.

3.3 Local migrant policies and city-State relations

Although it is not the focus of the study, the relationship between city and State is a theme that runs through this book. Having looked at the broader context of host society reactions to migrant settlement and ethnic minority formation in each country, and then focused on local policymaking in this area, it is now possible to make several remarks on the interaction between local and national authorities.

The dominance of the national context does not exclude local variations

The case studies illustrate the extent to which local migrant policies are embedded in the national context. By this I mean that host-stranger relations at the local level broadly reflect those at the national level; similarly, the national immigration/integration regime, including immigrant policies but also the welfare regime and other national-level 'structures' (urban policy in France, the delegation of welfare services to the Third Sector in Italy, etc.) profoundly affects local policy reactions to labour migrant settlement. This not only means that shifts at the national level from one
phase to another (in host-stranger relations and migrant policy) stimulated similar changes at the local level. It also means that the different manner in which different cities act out these phases often reflects national differences.

Thus, the Pluralist phase in Amsterdam (1980s-mid 90s) and Rome (from 1993) was expressed in very different ways. In Amsterdam, Pluralist-type policies were expressed in a large variety of municipal actions targeting migrants/minorities as well as empowerment of migrant associations. This follows from the Dutch pro-active approach to dealing with social/economic problems (a developed welfare state), and continues the institutional/professional manner of dealing with difference. In contrast, the Pluralist phase in Rome is characterised by relatively few municipal actions (although still significantly more than in the past). Instead, the municipality prefers to delegate and supervise actions carried out by civic organisations (in which migrant associations play only a small part). This reflects the weakness of the State and relative strength of the civic sector (where indigenous NGOs dominate) in Italy. The case of Tel Aviv demonstrates the limits of a relatively liberal local policy toward labour migrants within the context of a strictly exclusionary guestworker regime at the national level. The Paris case illustrates the continued dominance of the French republican approach to integration.

However, the migrant policies adopted by Tel Aviv (since 1999) and Paris (since 2001) also show how local authorities with an independent agenda can change their approach in contrast to national-level policies. Without actually comparing other cities' policies in those countries, we may assume that such shifts in local migrant policy do not all occur at the same time in a given country. This means that there will be significant local variations within each country. A more complete answer to the question of local variations in migrant policy would require a multi-city comparison within the same country, far beyond the scope of this book. However, other studies show such local variation within states in particular policy areas (e.g. Ireland 1994, Gaxie et al. 1998, Rath et al. 2001). Comparing the findings from the Paris case study with those of Mazzella (1996) and Moore (2001) on Marseille, we also find variation in how these two municipalities implemented national urban policy: while the enacted policies in Marseille were effectively 'ethnicised', Paris stuck to the universalist model in its enacted as well as espoused policy, until recently.

**Migrant policy as a mirror of city-State relations**

Divergent trajectories in migrant policy also shed light on the relation between local and national government in this area. In Israel it is still early to tell, but there are signs that Tel Aviv's increasingly liberal policies regarding its mostly illegal labour migrant population is having some impact on government policymaking toward labour migrants. Paris demonstrates how City Hall under Chirac continued the Assimilationist approach in local urban policies throughout the 1980s-90s, even as the national *Politique de la ville* was starting to move toward some legitimisation of ethnically-sensitive policies. The Delanoë administration signals an even greater independence in Paris' migrant policy, but now toward a more Pluralistic approach than that of the (Chirac-led) national government. The case of Amsterdam shows an overall consistency between local and national migrant policies, based on the co-governance style of policymaking. In the Netherlands, what were often designated as
'national immigrant policies' were in fact initiated by local authorities and later adopted by the national government (e.g. the national 'Civic Integration' (Inburgering) policy which started out as a pilot programme by a number of local authorities). In the Dutch case, a clear (top-down or bottom-up) direction in migrant policymaking is not obvious. To a lesser extent this can be said of migrant policymaking in the other cases as well.

4. Rethinking the typology

The typology presented in Chapter Four was developed from preliminary findings gathered in the literature survey, together with the deductive reasoning linking host-stranger relations to local policies, as presented in Table 2.2. As shown above, the analytical framework appears valid on the whole, but a rethinking of the typology is now in order, based on the results of the case studies as well as further findings from the literature survey. Two points are considered below.

4.1 Distinguishing between espoused, intended and enacted policy

The case studies show that the typology can be used to describe complex and changing situations regarding local policy reactions in terms of general types or phases, as long as we are willing to amend these ideal types to fit local circumstances. Here the distinctions made in the case studies between espoused, intended and enacted policy are particularly important. This allows us, for example, to identify both Amsterdam's Minorities Policy and Rome's post-1993 integration policy as a Pluralist-type response to migrant settlement, despite their differences. While both cities adopted an espoused Pluralist policy, only Amsterdam followed this up with enacted policies. Rome's policies are described as 'intended Pluralist' to distinguish them from the enacted Pluralist phase, while indicating that City Hall's espoused policy since 1993 is not just a public relations exercise. In the case of Tel Aviv, local migrant policy since 1999 is labelled a 'liberal Guestworker policy' to distinguish it from the previous administration's 'classic' guestworker policy. But despite some elements of Pluralist policy, Tel Aviv could not be identified as having entered a Pluralist phase according to the criteria of the typology. The analytical framework has shown itself to be sufficiently robust and flexible to allow such variations in the general types without losing its fundamental quality of clarifying complex situations.

4.2 A new policy type/phase: Intercultural policy

The findings from the Amsterdam case study, specifically the appearance of Diversity Policy from the mid-90s, as well as similar policy reactions in other cities noted in the literature survey, demand the addition of a fifth general type to the typology (see Table 10.1). The 'Intercultural' policy response is relatively new, appearing only in the past decade. In several veteran cities such as Amsterdam and Birmingham, this type appears as a reaction to the previous phase of Pluralist

---

2 Although the literature survey ended with the beginning of the case study phase of the project, additional data from different cities was included as it came up along the way.

3 See Chapter 6, section 5 and Chapter 9, section 6.

4 See Chapter 7, section 5.
policies. In some new immigration cities such as Barcelona and Turin, recognition of a permanent labour migrant presence has been followed by a move from Non-policy directly to Intercultural-type rhetoric and actions.

The Intercultural vision of integration, although not reverting to Assimilationist-type goals, emphasizes the need for more common ground in a multi-ethnic city. This represents a reaction to Pluralist policies that are seen as overemphasizing the ethnic-communitarian element, unwittingly perpetuating the stigmatization and segregation of ethnic minorities. The dangers of sectarianism (especially of the Islamic type) are raised, hence the importance of interaction between individuals across different communities. But despite the universalist ambitions that characterise Intercultural policies, the need for ethnically-targeted policies may still be accepted in some policy areas as unavoidable, as seen in the Amsterdam case.

Interculturalism emphasises the possible differences within ethnic groups, e.g. gender and lifestyle differences. While acknowledging the role of ethnic identity in the integration process, the Intercultural attitude also recognizes the constraints that ethnic communities may place on their individual members, especially on women. Intercultural policies thus aim at empowering individuals to choose among multiple identities, including (but not limited to) their ethnic identity.

Intercultural policy is expressed in the Juridical-political domain by opposition to ethnically-based consultative structures, but allowing an integrated (‘mixed’) advisory council. Birmingham’s powerful, ethnically-based Standing Consultative Forum established in 1990 was replaced in 1999 with a mixed advisory forum. The Amsterdam case study described a similar process. In Stuttgart a mixed “Aliens Committee” was established in 1994. Municipal support for migrant organisations moves away from supporting activities that strengthen ethnic identity to activities that strengthen ‘integration skills’ (language, computer literacy).

In the Socio-economic domain, local policies remain sensitive to minority needs but steer away from ethnic-specific actions. In Birmingham, for example, ethnic-targeted policies first initiated in the mid-1980s are now being replaced with general policies in areas such as health, employment and housing. In the Cultural-religious domain, the emphasis is on strengthening inter-ethnic activity. Thus Stuttgart organises encounters between antagonistic ethnic minorities and established an inter-religious forum in 1994. Turin set up an Intercultural Immigrant Women’s Centre in 1996 which "aims to promote dialogue between cultures through a series of initiatives" (Allesino et al 1999: 29), and Rome’s Education Department established an Intercultural Unit in 1998 with similar aims.

In veteran cities such as Amsterdam, Birmingham and Stuttgart, as well as in new immigration cities such as Turin, Rome and Barcelona, the distinction between ‘Pluralist’ and ‘Intercultural’ policies is not always clear. In some cases the Intercultural response appears as a reaction to Pluralist policies, in others it is difficult to establish whether there is a significant difference or if ‘intercultural’

---

5 The designation ‘intercultural’ appeared in the 1990s in various policies, programmes and projects, see below.

6 “The most important characteristic of the Aliens’ Committee is that it is not a ‘body representing aliens’ but a joint body comprising members of the Municipal Council and elected foreign members” (Babel 1998: 170).
has simply replaced 'multicultural' in the labelling. Based on the findings, however, the Intercultural type can be proposed as a basis for further investigation (Table 10.1).

7 The 'intercultural' label became especially popular in Italian cities (Turin, Milan, Rome) after it appeared in national policy documents, e.g. an Education Ministry directive stressing the need for 'intercultural education'.
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Table 10.1: The revised typology
* This table repeats Table 4.2 with the addition of the last column (Intercultural policy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOST-STRANGER RELS: Attitudes/assumptions of local authority</th>
<th>Migrants as transient phenomenon</th>
<th>Migrants as temporary Guestworkers</th>
<th>Migrants as permanent; but their Otherness will disappear (Assimilation)</th>
<th>Migrants as permanent; their Otherness should be supported.</th>
<th>Migrants as permanent; ethnic Otherness should not be overemphasised.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLICY TYPES:</td>
<td>NON-POLICY</td>
<td>GUESTWORKER POLICY</td>
<td>ASSIMILATIONIST POLICY</td>
<td>PLURALIST POLICY</td>
<td>INTERCULTURAL POLICY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMAINS/ issue areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JURIDICAL-POLITICAL Civic status</td>
<td>Lobby the government to regularise illegals (Tel Aviv)</td>
<td>Facilitate naturalisation (Berlin, Cologne)</td>
<td>Support regularisation (Oeiras); Extend local enfranchisement (Turin, Bologna); Lobby govt. to regularise illegals (Paris '01)</td>
<td>Naturalisation contingent on minimal assimilation (Amsterdam mid-90s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative structures</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Reject, or mixed (non-ethnic) advisory councils (La Courneuve, Lille, Liege)</td>
<td>Initiate/support ethnic-based advisory councils (Frankfurt, Amsterdam 80s, Birmingham 80s)</td>
<td>Prefer 'mixed' councils with migrant and indigenous reps. (Stuttgart, Birmingham 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant organisations/ mobilisation</td>
<td>Ignore migrant associations (Rome 80s, Athens)</td>
<td>Informal cooperation with migrant associations on limited issues (Barcelona, Tel Aviv)</td>
<td>Co-opt or exclude migrant associations; delegation to migrant associations is implicit (Paris, Lille)</td>
<td>Support migrant associations as agents of empowerment (Amsterdam 80s, Birmingham); Delegate services to associations (Amsterdam, Birmingham)</td>
<td>Support migrant associations as agents of integration with host society (Amsterdam mid-90s, Birmingham '99, Cologne, Zurich)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIO-ECONOMIC Social services (reception/orientation, welfare and health, etc.)</td>
<td>Ad-hoc access to some services (Tel Aviv 90s, Athens)</td>
<td>Formalise access to selected local services.</td>
<td>Equal access to all services (ignore ethnic-based needs). (Brussels, Barcelona)</td>
<td>Reception/orientation service (Rome 90s Tel Aviv 00s); Ethnically-targeted specific services (Amsterdam, Birmingham, Stuttgart)</td>
<td>Sensitivity to minority needs (e.g. cultural mediators) but minimise ethnic-based measures (Amsterdam late 90s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour market</td>
<td>Ignore black market activity (Rome 90s, Tel Aviv)</td>
<td>Minimal regulation of legal work conditions. Limited vocational assistance</td>
<td>Anti-discrimination policy. General vocational training (non-ethnic criteria) (Lille)</td>
<td>Affirmative hiring policy (Antwerp). Ethnic-based vocational training and entrepreneurs policy (Amsterdam 80s)</td>
<td>Antidiscrimination policy. Minimise ethnic-based measures (Amsterdam 00).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Ad hoc access for migrant children (Rome 80s, Tel Aviv 90s)</th>
<th>Possible home-language classes (Berlin 70s)</th>
<th>Spatial dispersal (school desegregation) (Berlin). Support national-language tutoring (Zurich)</th>
<th>Extra support to schools based on ethnic pupil ratio (Turin, Amsterdam). Home-language classes (Berlin), religion/culture classes (Birmingham)</th>
<th>National language classes, home-language tutoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policing/Conflict resolution</td>
<td>Ad hoc reaction to conflict situations</td>
<td>Municipal police as agents of migrant regulation</td>
<td>Area-based policing (possible implicit targeting of migrants)</td>
<td>Police as social agents with migrant-targeted projects (Rotterdam). Pro-active anti-racism enforcement (Leicester)</td>
<td>Police as agents of inter-ethnic conflict management (Stuttgart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL-RELIGIOUS Minority cultural/religious practices &amp; institutions</td>
<td>Ignore ad-hoc places of worship</td>
<td>Informal acknowledgment of ad-hoc places of worship (Amsterdam 70s, Tel Aviv 90s)</td>
<td>Discourage institutions (e.g. mosques, religious schools). (Utrecht 80s, Marseille)</td>
<td>Support religious institutions as agents of integration and empowerment (Amsterdam, Birmingham)</td>
<td>Minimize support for religious institutions, emphasise inter-cultural activities (Stuttgart, Amsterdam late 90s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority religion in school</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Ignore/discourage religious practices (Paris)</td>
<td>Support religious practices (Birmingham)</td>
<td>Discourage religious practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness/Communication policies</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Anti-racism/anti-discrimination campaigns</td>
<td>Multi-cultural manifestations, projects 'celebrate diversity' (Berlin, Frankfurt)</td>
<td>Emphasize intercultural tolerance (Stuttgart, Turin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPATIAL Housing</td>
<td>Ignore housing problems, ad hoc reaction to crises (Rome 80s)</td>
<td>Possible short-term solutions (guestworker lodging (Berlin 60s, Amsterdam early 70s)</td>
<td>Equal access to social housing (universal criteria). Ignore ethnic-based discrimination in housing market (Marseille)</td>
<td>Anti-discrimination policy incl. ethnic monitoring (Bradford, Birmingham)</td>
<td>Equal access to social housing Anti-discrimination policy incl. ethnic monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban development, relation to ethnic enclaves</td>
<td>Ignore ethnic enclaves, disperse if crisis arises. (Rome 80s)</td>
<td>Ethnic enclaves considered temporary. (Tel Aviv '90s) (Berlin '70s?)</td>
<td>Ethnic enclaves seen as urban problem. Dispersal policy (Berlin, Frankfurt '70s). Gentrification policy (Cologne, Brussels, Paris).</td>
<td>Recognise potential of ethnic enclaves (Tel Aviv). Renewal with residents policy (Frankfurt)</td>
<td>Ethnic enclaves seen as problematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic uses of space, public spaces</td>
<td>Ignore in peripheral locations, discourage in central locations (Rome)</td>
<td>Ignore in peripheral locations, discourage in central locations (Tel Aviv)</td>
<td>Oppose physical manifestation of Otherness ('mosques w/out minarets') (Utrecht, Paris)</td>
<td>Support physical manifestations of Otherness (monuments, museums, minarets) (Amsterdam, Cologne)</td>
<td>Emphasise intercultural symbolic uses of space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Implications for theory, research and policy

As described in Chapter 3, national-level theorising on immigration and integration policies has been criticized as overly deductive, based on a priori explanations that are insufficiently grounded in actual findings and overlooking local variations. These criticisms are aimed especially at models emphasising cultural traits and national identity -- in other words, host-stranger relations. Local-level analyses of migrant policy, on the other hand, are rich in content but lack the level of generalisation that characterises the national-level literature. Lacking a model, theorising on local migrant policies has been rare, and limited almost exclusively to institutional-political explanations on policies in the Juridical-political domain.

This study has attempted to fill this gap in the migrant policy literature, by proposing an analytical framework at the local level with a general theoretical basis: host-stranger relations. The focus on the local level allows more grounded, empirically-based research. The host-stranger relations model relates the findings to a broader theoretical context, offering a link between local-level explanations and the national-level models.

The four case studies as well as the results of the literature survey demonstrate how the analytical framework may be applied, by defining 'local migrant policies', grouping them into domains and issue areas, and describing them in terms of several universal 'types'. This lays the basis for further research in this field (including comparative analyses of existing research findings, e.g. from individual case studies). While the typology proposed in this study is a first attempt in this direction, the results of the four case studies show its robustness as well as its flexibility. More importantly, it means that changes and adaptations of the typology resulting from further research are possible, e.g. adding policy types/phases or restructuring the policy domains/issue areas, without undermining its overall validity as a framework for further research.

What direction should such research follow? The findings of the case studies and the comparative analysis and generalisations made in this chapter raise several possibilities.

5.1 Theoretical implications and directions for future research

At the most basic level, this study's findings demonstrate the usefulness of focusing on the local level of policymaking toward migrants, adding to a small but growing number of studies on policy responses to immigration/ethnic diversity at the local-level. Beyond this general remark, a number of theoretical implications have been raised here, which could not be addressed sufficiently from such a small number of cases, but suggest further research possibilities.

First, the identification of universal types of local policy responses to migrant settlement (and consequent ethnic diversity) raises the possibility of additional types that were not identified in this study. The typology proposed here is a first step -- the next step would be to conduct more research in additional cities, to validate or adapt the existing typology. Some of this could be carried out by re-examining existing material (from other case studies, for example) using the analytical
framework. In particular, the ‘discovery’ of a new policy response type (labelled here ‘Intercultural’) requires further research to substantiate the hypothesis that this expresses a truly different approach to coping with ethnic diversity, and is not just a rhetorical variant of Pluralist policies. In keeping with the analytical framework suggested here, such a study would not be limited to charting changes in espoused and enacted policies in a particular city, but would link this to shifts occurring in the host society as a whole in its relation to strangers..

Second, the probability of common trajectories of local policy responses suggests the hypothesis that new immigration cities will follow the path of veteran immigration cities. To further test this hypothesis requires a comparative analysis of a set of ‘veteran cities’ (to establish a number of typical trajectories) and ‘new cities’ (after a minimal period of migrant settlement). This means collecting and analysing empirical evidence (in the form of espoused and enacted policies) in a given city, and identifying the various phases of policy response that the city underwent, from among the general types in the typology as was done here. This may be partly accomplished by using existing research findings, applying the typology to them, and ‘filling in the gaps’ with new research (on policy domains or periods of time not covered in the extant literature).

In order to make a convincing case for the existence of a ‘typical’ policy trajectory, the above exercise should be repeated in a sufficiently large set of cities. This could show, for example, that a number of veteran immigration cities have moved from an initial Non-policy response through a Guestworker response phase, followed by Pluralist-type policies and finally Intercultural-type policies, as was shown here for Amsterdam. Needless to say, such a research project would reveal local variations of these phases in each city. The strength of its argument would then depend on convincingly identifying the same general phases of local policy responses in the different cities, despite their contextual particularities. This would be done using the same criteria established in the typology, for all the cases. Another project could do the same for a set of new immigration cities.

Such research projects could then more fully examine one of the more intriguing questions which was raised here but could not be sufficiently addressed within the framework of this project: the role of host-stranger relations as a variable in the development of local migrant policies, in relation to other variables. The latter include the local political-institutional context, the role of the State and its frameworks (national welfare regimes, urban policy frameworks, etc.) as well as cultural-historical ‘constants’ (the Dutch pillar approach to ethnic diversity? the Italian laissez-faire approach to social problems?). Using the analytical framework, the relative importance of these and other factors can be explored. This would require first, identifying the phases of actual migration in a set of cities, the changes in local host-stranger relations (municipal attitudes/expectations toward the migrants/minorities), and the phases of local migrant policy responses -- as was done in this study. In addition, changes in other variables as noted above would also be charted (in-depth research of a city uncovers all these elements at the same time in any case). By looking at these factors across a number of cities, we may then begin to explore the causal relations between different contextual variables, and local policy responses to migrant settlement and ethnic diversity: are there common
characteristics of cities that explain certain policy trajectories? For example, are local factors determinant (e.g. do historic "gateway cities" follow one trajectory, versus more insular cities)? Or do national-level factors ultimately determine local-level responses (do French cities follow one trajectory, Belgian cities another)? The latter hypothesis would require a comparison of several cities within a number of countries.

Another question raised by the findings in this book relates to the predominance of certain policy domains and issue areas. Again, the small number of cases in this study did not permit more than preliminary observations regarding the relative importance of policymaking in certain domains and issue areas. One may ask: what determines the predominance of, say, Spatial policies within the overall local response to migrant settlement? For example, does a local authority in the Assimilationist phase favour the use of urban development and housing policies over policies in other domains, since territorially-based policies are useful in covering over ethnically-based problems/solutions? Or is the predominance of a particular domain in local migrant policies determined largely by the national context? A related question suggested by the case study findings is the apparent tendency of some issue areas to be more ‘flexible’ than others. It appears for example, that local social services may express shifts in local authority attitudes more rapidly than other policy areas. The analytic framework proposed here makes it possible to explore these questions with further comparative research, possibly by focusing on only two-three issue areas.

Finally, the findings of this study have theoretical implications regarding the interaction between local government, the State and civic society, as reflected in local policy responses to migrants/minorities. All four case studies have revealed specific local-level dynamics in how cities deal with immigrants and ethnic minorities, but they have also shown that this is closely connected to the national context. Focusing on the local level allows us to explore the relation between (often more vaguely formulated) national policies and (often more concrete) local policies, programmes and projects affecting migrants. Similarly, the case study findings point to the important role played in some cities by Third Sector entities in the development and implementation of local migrant policies.

This suggests that rather than seeing the policy response to immigrant settlement/ethnic diversity as a top-down, binary system (national government → local government), it should be understood as a recursive, interactive process involving several levels of government and civic society (including migrant/minority mobilisation) as well as supra-national actors. In short, future research on the policy response to immigration/ethnic diversity should regard this area of study more as an open system of governance, rather than a policy area dominated by the State (or conversely, as an area of relative autonomy for local authorities). This confirms Favell's (1999) observation noted earlier, that the state should be taken as one among several variables affecting migrant policy. Further, in such a system (or process), attention should be given to the tension between espoused and enacted policy.

---

8 The role that migrants themselves play in this process is the focus of considerable research, as noted in Chapter 3.
National-level explanations have tended to overemphasise the former, while local-level explanations have focused on the latter.

The theoretical implication is that a more integrative, holistic approach should be adopted in future research on migrant policy. This is easier to understand than it is to apply!

5.2 Policy implications

This book was not meant to address the question of ‘what works and what has failed’ in local policies toward labour migrant settlement. This would require an evaluation of the effectiveness of the policies described above, involving an effort equal to at least another PhD project! Such a ‘best practices’ approach raises various theoretical and methodological problems that draw attention away from this book’s focus: how local migrant policies reflect host-stranger relations.

Nevertheless, as immigration flows spread to a growing number of cities beyond the traditional receiving countries, local authorities are showing increasing interest in research on local migrant policies, especially when it is comparative. This is demonstrated by the growth of city-to-city research networks in this area. Clearly, cities can and are learning from each other’s experiences in dealing with ethnic diversity. As we have seen, in some veteran immigration cities a reaction against Pluralist policies has developed in the past few years, resulting in a new (‘Intercultural’) approach to the integration of newcomers as well as established ethnic minorities. Elements of this approach have appeared in Rome recently and in other new immigration cities (and possibly in Paris’s new integration policy). This suggests that cities that did not go through the Pluralist phase may be ‘leaping’ directly to an Intercultural-type policy response.

In light of such developments, the analytical framework proposed here may also have practical relevance. Using the model and typology can enable policymakers to more clearly compare their situation with that of other cities. First, it can be used to clarify where their city is situated, in terms of their own migrant policies, i.e. what phases of policy response have they undergone, in what phase are they now, toward what phase do they appear to be heading? The analytical framework thus enables policymakers to conduct reflexive learning based on their own past policy responses. Further, the analytical framework enables a comparison of their own attitudes and actions with those of other cities, providing insights which may be useful in formulating future policies.

The modular format of the typology allows such a comparative learning process to be carried out in one, in several, or across all the relevant policy domains. Especially in the case of new immigration cities, local policymakers (as well as others involved in migrant policy, e.g. civic organisations) can use such comparison to gain from the hard-earned experience of others. With the insights provided by the host-stranger relations model, and using the typology as an analytical tool, they can identify similarities (and differences) between their current situation and the past experience of veteran cities, in terms of migrant settlement phases and local policy responses. However, such comparisons are only useful if one can distinguish between the fit (or misfit) of a particular policy

---

9 See Chapter 3, Box 3.2. The growing number of local authority representatives attending the annual Metropolis conferences and other forums dealing with this issue is one expression of this.
response to a particular migration phase (e.g. family reunification), and other factors. The typology should help to make such distinctions in cross-city comparisons, which are notoriously complex. In short, it can help us to see the forest as well as the trees.

At the most basic level, the results of this study demonstrate that beyond city-specific contexts there are similarities between municipal policy reactions to labour migrant settlement. The case studies demonstrated that there were similarities between the veteran and new immigration cities, in terms of migrant settlement phases and local policy reactions. The Tel Aviv case demonstrates that the analytical framework proposed here may also be applied to non-European cities. This means that cross-city comparison is worth the effort to policymakers, particularly those in new immigration cities. Understanding the process that veteran immigration cities underwent in their policy responses to the challenges posed by the arrival of newcomers should highlight the possibilities (and pitfalls) open to policymakers in the earlier stages of migrant settlement.