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Summary

1. An analytical framework for understanding local policies toward migrants

Over the past half-century European cities have acquired a large, permanent presence of labour migrants, changing the face of urban Europe. By 'labour migrants' I mean the foreign workers who arrived in northwestern Europe from the late 1950s to the mid-1970s, followed by their families, as well as economically-motivated migrants arriving (often irregularly) in the 1980s-90s. The concentration of labour immigrants in cities, and within cities in particular neighborhoods, creates specifically local problems and opportunities for local authorities, as it affects the local housing and labour markets, local services and urban development. Municipal responses to migrant settlement have varied widely, involving most of the policy domains within local jurisdiction, with actions in the Juridical-political domain (e.g. migrant advisory councils), the Socio-economic domain (e.g. services policy), the Cultural-religious domain (e.g. policy toward religious practices) and the Spatial domain (e.g. urban development in migrant neighbourhoods). All these actions, as well as statements and decisions (enacted and espoused policy) may be termed 'local migrant policies' in that they are initiated or largely determined by the local authority and significantly affect the local migrant population, either through specific (migrant-targeted) or general measures.¹

Beyond the practical consequences, the settlement of newcomers with a very different background touches deep chords within the host city. Two characteristics of labour migration have played a role in the reaction of the receiving societies. The first is the fundamental transformation that occurs from expected temporariness (the 'myth of return') to de facto permanence. The second is the ethnic/racial and religious/cultural Otherness of these newcomers. Local authorities must cope with these challenges, for in some sense, labour migrants and their offspring have replaced traditional ethnic minorities in western Europe in the role of the threatening-yet-exotic Other. It is this often implicit dimension of local policymaking that this book explores, highlighting an aspect that has not been systematically developed in the local-level literature on migrant policy.

While not excluding other explanations, I propose that local policies toward migrants can be understood as an expression of host-stranger relations. Local host-stranger relations are defined here 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). 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. Host-stranger relations have served as the basis for explanations of national-level immigration policies, most famously in Castles' "citizenship regimes" models. But the national-level explanations have been criticised as overly deductive, insufficiently grounded in empirical findings

¹ The degree to which these are local 'labour migrant policies' also depends largely on the local authority -- see Chapter 3.
and overlooking local variations. Local-level analyses of migrant policy, on the other hand, are rich in content but lack generalisation. Theorising on local migrant policies is rare and limited almost exclusively to institutional-political explanations in the Juridical-political domain.

This project attempts 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 context, offering a link between local-level explanations and the national-level models.

According to the model, local authority attitudes toward labour migrants can be divided into several general types. Labour migrants may be seen as transient (and therefore their Otherness can be ignored), as temporary 'guests' (their Otherness can be tolerated) or as permanent, in which case their Otherness is expected to disappear (an Assimilationist attitude) or remain (a Pluralist attitude). Based on this model and using preliminary findings from a literature survey of local policies in some 25 cities, a typology is developed (Chapter 4). The typology proposes four general 'types' of local policy response to migrant settlement/ethnic diversity, corresponding to four types of host-stranger relations: a Transient (Non-policy) response, a Guestworker-type response, an Assimilationist-type response and a Pluralist-type response. The second dimension of the typology groups local policies toward migrants into four 'policy domains', subdivided into issue areas. Using deductive reasoning and findings from the literature survey, the typology suggests specific policies in each policy domain, as manifestations of each general 'type' of response.

To test this analytical framework, I follow the development of local policies toward migrants in two new immigration cities and two veteran immigration cities. Rome and Tel Aviv were chosen to explore the Non-policy and Guestworker policy phases, respectively. Paris and Amsterdam were chosen to represent the Assimilationist and Pluralist phases, respectively. In each case, general phases of local policy response were identified, in addition to the specific 'type' that each city was meant to represent, revealing several trajectories of policy response to labour migrant settlement.

While testing the viability of the analytical framework, this project addresses two sets of questions. The first relates to how local authorities respond to labour migrant settlement (and the resulting ethnic diversity). Specifically, can we identify general 'types' of local policy responses and typical 'trajectories of local policy responses' in different cities over time? The second relates to how local policies are affected by host-stranger relations. The study also explores indirectly the relation between local and national migrant policies, i.e. city-State relations.

2. Findings and conclusions from the case studies

In the case of Rome (Chapter 6), a survey of municipal (in)actions in the 1980s verified the Non-policy type of response and Transient-type attitudes toward immigrants in City Hall. 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. Instead, the past
decade of local migrant policies may be best understood as an intended Pluralist policy. To explain the gap between enacted and espoused policy we turn to the relation between national government, local authorities and civic society in Italy, i.e. the institutional-political context.

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, moving from a Non-policy response to a Guestworker policy in the second half of the 1990s. Tel Aviv's minimalist Guestworker policy can be understood in the context of Israel's exclusionary immigration regime, which regards non-Jewish migrants as temporary. Nevertheless, municipal attitudes toward its labour migrant population changed in a bottom-up process which eventually resulted in the adoption of a new migrant policy in 1999. But the new administration presents an ambivalent position in its espoused as well as enacted policy, acknowledging the probability of a permanent non-Jewish minority in the city without fully accepting the consequences of such a development. This reflects the continued predominance of Guestworker-type attitudes within the municipality. Tel Aviv's current phase may be labelled a 'liberal Guestworker' response.

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. Despite the difficulty of defining what constitute "local migrant policies" in Paris (a characteristic of Assimilationist-type policies), two conclusions emerge. First, a continuous thread can be discerned in the urban development policy agenda which can be summarised as the embourgeoisement of the capital, i.e. distancing the poor and other undesirable populations progressively farther from the city centre. Second, Paris's urban renovation policies significantly affected the dispersal of its migrant/minority population, most of which is now found 'outside the city walls' in the banlieues.

There is still debate on whether this was an unintended result or if urban renewal policies contained an implicit ethnic agenda. What is clear is that despite the obvious impact of these policies on ethnic minorities, the ethnic element was explicitly ignored. This Assimilationist-type response to ethnic diversity in Paris's Spatial policies is also found in the other policy domains, such as services.

An 'integration policy' initiated in 2001 by the new administration appears to mark a break, especially in the Juridical-political domain. However, it appears that Paris's new policy does not conform to what we defined as a Pluralist-type response in the full sense, as 'migrant integration' continues to be seen as a purely individual process and City Hall avoids any hint of community-based integration. While containing some Pluralist elements, the new policy retains many Assimilationist features.
The Amsterdam case (Chapter 9) identified a policy trajectory of four different phases, illustrating how the analytical framework can be used to follow shifts in one city's migrant policies over a long period. Amsterdam's migrant policies evolved from a Non-policy response in the early 1960s to a Guestworker phase (mid-1960s to mid-1970s) to a Pluralist-type policy in the 1980s and 1990s. In that phase espoused and enacted policy expressed a clearly Pluralist approach to migrants/minorities across all the domains. The most recent change in local migrant policy (the "Diversity Policy") expresses a significant shift in host society attitudes, toward a more restricted understanding of multiculturalism in which minorities are expected to conform more closely to host society norms. At the local level, however, the findings reveal that Amsterdam's enacted policy in several domains retains some of its Pluralist characteristics, e.g. minority-targeted and ethnically-based actions. This is partly explained as a continuing manifestation of the paternalistic attitude toward Strangers that has featured in Dutch social policy -- another aspect highlighted by the host-stranger relations model.

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 in a given city over a period of time. In Chapter 10 this framework is used to conduct a comparative analysis of the findings and reach more general conclusions. Some of these are summarised below.

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 general types of local policy response to labour migrant settlement, as proposed in the typology, in particular cities and periods. 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).

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. Findings from three of the case studies indicate that Non-policy characterises the first phase of reaction in those cities. The case of Paris demonstrates that in countries where immigration is assumed to be a permanent phenomenon, this phase is not relevant. However, in most European countries labour
migrants were originally perceived as a temporary phenomenon. The Amsterdam case demonstrates what may be a typical trajectory of local migrant policies in countries that adopted national guestworker policies in the 1960s: the city moves from a Non-policy phase to a Guestworker phase, eventually developing its own brand of more-or-less Pluralistic policies.

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. This trajectory may characterise new immigration cities which experienced labour immigration from 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, below) may become the 'typical' trajectory in new immigration cities in Europe.

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? Based on the findings from the case studies, 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 dependent on national policies. These remarks should not be taken as definitive conclusions, but as preliminary observations and directions for further comparative research.

The concept of host-stranger relations in understanding local migrant policies

This study has shown that the host-stranger relations concept can contribute to a fuller understanding of migrant policymaking at the local level, revealing several aspects of policymaking that are often not made explicit. First, we have seen that immigration challenges the host society beyond the 'practical' impacts of migrant settlement. In trying to address these challenges, local policies reflect prevailing attitudes and expectations toward the presence of Strangers. This was demonstrated throughout the case studies in various ways. 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. 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. The focus on host-stranger relations also reveals 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. Local migrant policies often reflect municipal awareness of these situations.
In short, the host-stranger relations approach can make an important contribution to our understanding of local migrant policies. This is meant to complement, not substitute for other explanations such as political-institutional explanations. The aim of this book is to make the link between host-stranger relations and local migrant policies explicit and theoretically useful.

**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. The case studies illustrate the extent to which local migrant policies are embedded in the national context, but also show that this does not exclude local variations. The dominant role of the national context 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 e.g. the Pluralist phase in Amsterdam and Rome is expressed in very different ways. While the case of Amsterdam shows an overall consistency between local and national migrant policies, the cases of 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.

**4. Rethinking the typology**

The appearance of the Diversity Policy from the mid-1990s in the Amsterdam case study, as well as similar policies in other cities noted in the literature survey, suggest the addition of a fifth general type to the typology. In Chapter 10 this was described as 'Intercultural policy', representing a type of local authority attitude and policy response toward ethnic diversity that has appeared in the past decade. The Intercultural vision of integration, although not reverting to Assimilationist-type goals, appears to be a direct reaction to the previous phase of Pluralist policies, at least in several veteran cities such as Amsterdam and Birmingham. In some new immigration cities it appears that recognition of a permanent labour migrant presence may be followed by a move from Non-policy directly to Intercultural-type rhetoric and actions. In the Socio-economic domain, for example, local policies will be sensitive to minority needs but steer away from ethnic-specific actions. However, the distinction between 'Pluralist' and 'Intercultural' policies is not always clear and it is sometimes difficult to establish whether there is a significant difference or if 'intercultural' has simply replaced 'multicultural' in the labelling. Based on the findings, however, the Intercultural type can be proposed as a basis for further investigation.

**5. Implications for theory, research and policy**

**Theoretical implications**

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. 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. 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 using the analytical framework. 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 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. The strength of the argument will ultimately depend on convincingly identifying the same general phases of local policy responses in the different cities, despite their contextual particularities.

Such research projects could more fully examine the role of host-stranger relations as a variable in the development of local migrant policies, in relation to other variables such as the role of the State and its frameworks. The findings of this study have theoretical implications regarding the interaction between local and national government 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 affecting migrants. Similarly, the case study findings point to the important role played in some cities by the Third Sector 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). In such a system (or process), attention should be given to the tension between espoused and enacted policy. National-level explanations have tended to overemphasise the former, while local-level explanations have focused on the latter.

Policy implications
As immigration flows spread to a growing number of cities, local authorities are showing increasing interest in research on local migrant policies, especially comparative research. Using the model and typology proposed here can enable policymakers to more clearly compare their situation with that of other cities. The analytical framework enables policymakers to conduct reflexive
learning based on their own past policy responses and 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. This means that cross-city comparison is possible and worthwhile, particularly for 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 before policymakers in the earlier stages of migrant settlement.