

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

The local dimension of migration policymaking. Introduction

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/77965> since

Publisher:

Amsterdam University Press

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

IMISCOE

International Migration, Integration and Social Cohesion in Europe

The IMISCOE Research Network unites researchers from, at present, 25 institutes specialising in studies of international migration, integration and social cohesion in Europe. What began in 2004 as a Network of Excellence sponsored by the Sixth Framework Programme of the European Commission has become, as of April 2009, an independent self-funding endeavour. From the start, IMISCOE has promoted integrated, multidisciplinary and globally comparative research led by scholars from various branches of the economic and social sciences, the humanities and law. The Network furthers existing studies and pioneers new scholarship on migration and migrant integration. Encouraging innovative lines of inquiry key to European policymaking and governance is also a priority.

The IMISCOE-Amsterdam University Press Series makes the Network's findings and results available to researchers, policymakers and practitioners, the media and other interested stakeholders. High-quality manuscripts authored by Network members and cooperating partners are evaluated by external peer reviews and the IMISCOE Editorial Committee. The Committee comprises the following members:

Christina Boswell, School of Social and Political Science, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom

Tiziana Caponio, Department of Political Studies, University of Turin / Forum for International and European Research on Immigration (FIERI), Turin, Italy

Michael Collyer, Sussex Centre for Migration Research (SCMR), University of Sussex, United Kingdom

Rosita Fibbi, Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies (SFM), University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland / Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lausanne

Albert Kraler, International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD), Vienna, Austria

Leo Lucassen, Institute of History, Leiden University, The Netherlands

Jorge Malheiros, Centre of Geographical Studies (CEG), University of Lisbon, Portugal

Marco Martiniello, National Fund for Scientific Research (FNRS), Brussels / Center for Ethnic and Migration Studies (CEDEM), University of Liège, Belgium

Patrick Simon, National Demographic Institute (INED), Paris, France

Miri Song, School of Social Policy and Sociology, University of Kent, United Kingdom

IMISCOE Policy Briefs and more information can be found at www.imiscoe.org.

Cover design: Studio Jan de Boer, Amsterdam
Layout: The DocWorkers, Almere

ISBN 978 90 8964 232 5
e-ISBN 978 90 4851 243 0
NUR 741 / 763

© Tiziana Caponio and Maren Borkert / Amsterdam University Press,
Amsterdam 2010

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owners and the authors of the book.

Introduction:

Maren Borkert

- 1 From the integration
- 2 The study where are
- 3 The conte

1. Naturalisation rates at the lo

Marc Helbling

- 1 Introducti
- 2 What is to Swiss mu
- 3 What is to
- 4 Looking fo in Europe
- 5 The argur
- 6 The impac
- 7 Conclusio

2. Grassroots m and Naples c

Tiziana Caponio

- 1 Integratio multicultu
- 2 Policies fo a compari
- 3 Policy net of practice
- 4 Explaining different c
- 5 Conclusio

Contents

Introduction: the local dimension of migration policymaking	9
<i>Maren Borkert and Tiziana Caponio</i>	
1 From the nation state to the city: the emergence of local integration as a European policy issue	9
2 The study of local integration policy in Europe: where are we and where we are going?	13
3 The content of the book	23
1. Naturalisation politics in Switzerland: explaining rejection rates at the local level	33
<i>Marc Helbling</i>	
1 Introduction	33
2 What is to be explored: naturalisation procedures in Swiss municipalities	35
3 What is to be explained: the rejection rate	37
4 Looking for explanations: local citizenship politics in Europe	41
5 The arguments and how to operationalise them	43
6 The impact of cultural and political factors	48
7 Conclusion	51
2. Grassroots multiculturalism in Italy: Milan, Bologna and Naples compared	57
<i>Tiziana Caponio</i>	
1 Integration models at a crossroad: a defeat of multiculturalism?	57
2 Policies for immigrants in Milan, Bologna and Naples: a comparison of official priorities	61
3 Policy networks and implementation: a reconstruction of practices	65
4 Explaining grassroots multiculturalism: actors' logic in different contexts	74
5 Conclusion	79

3.	Young immigrants' low participation in the German vocational training system: how local actors in Munich and Frankfurt/Main try to make a difference	85
	<i>Can M. Aybek</i>	
1	Introduction	85
2	The situation of young immigrants in the German vocational education system	86
3	Integration policy and local governance of vocational training	92
4	Introducing and establishing new approaches in VET	99
5	Conclusion	102
4.	Local policies concerning unemployment among immigrant youth in Amsterdam and in Berlin: towards strategic replacement and pragmatic accommodation	109
	<i>Floris Vermeulen and Rosanne Stotijn</i>	
1	Introduction	109
2	The policy paradox: the dilemma of recognition	110
3	Local integration policies in Amsterdam	113
4	Local integration policy in Berlin	116
5	Immigrant youth unemployment in Amsterdam and in Berlin	119
6	Conclusion	130
5.	Managing religious pluralism in Canadian cities: mosques in Montreal and Laval	135
	<i>Aude-Claire Fourot</i>	
1	Introduction: cities and the current challenges of religious pluralism	135
2	Issues and approaches associated with creating Muslim places of worship	136
3	Muslim places of worship: a configurational analysis of institutionalisation processes	140
4	Examples of institutionalisation processes	145
5	Conclusion	151

Conclusion:

Tiziana Caporali

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Looking for policy areas
- 3 The content of policy-making in Switzerland
- 4 Policy-making evidence
- 5 Conclusion

List of contributors

Conclusion: making sense of local migration policy arenas	161
<i>Tiziana Caponio</i>	
1 Introduction	161
2 Looking for commonality in extreme difference: local policy arenas in the migration field	163
3 The contexts: the role of local authorities in migration policymaking in Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Canada	166
4 Policymaking patterns in local migration policy arenas: evidence from case studies	172
5 Conclusion	187
List of contributors	197

Introduction

Maren Borkert and Tiziana Caponio

1 From the nation state to the city: the emergence of local integration as a European policy issue

Whereas international migration primarily concerns the territorial sovereignty of nation states, being defined as persons crossing national borders, integration touches upon the social boundaries of nations. These geographic and social boundaries constitute the nation state as a collective agent. Immigrants moving into the nationalised territories and societies raise questions about the permeability of established boundaries. Thus, immigration and the integration of newcomers are a national concern in most member states of the EU and abroad.

Lately, however, it has become increasingly accepted that the majority of immigrants, particularly in Europe, are living in cities and small towns in rural areas (Penninx et al. 2004). Consequently, the awareness that migrant integration takes place at the local level has entered current political and scientific discourses on integration.¹ In fact, the acceleration of international migration movements after World War II and increasingly since the mid-1980s, has pressured municipalities throughout Europe to adopt pragmatic solutions to emerging migration-related needs (Castles & Miller 2003: 4). However, not all local actors involved share the same experience and history in migrant integration: while non-governmental actors such as the German AWO or the Italian Caritas have a long-standing record in migrant-related social work, the issue has entered the political agendas of most European city councils more recently. Facing the local effects of globalisation, the transnationalisation of labour markets and an increase in international mobility, municipalities throughout Europe have turned to questions of social cohesion and the sustainable development of local markets and communities. Likewise, addressing key questions of today's societies, local integration strategies have increasingly attracted the attention of European institutions, particularly the European Commission. But emphasis on the creative power of local actors in matching migration policies with economic and social needs, though in line with the principle of subsidiarity, seems to be motivated also by hegemonic structures inside the European Union.

In this section we will first analyse local integration as a European policy concern, reconstructing the timeline of political events and publications that might shed new light on the emergence of this issue on the European agenda. Secondly, we will retrace the main developments in the scientific research dealing with local-level policymaking on migration-related issues. In the third section we will introduce the new contributions of this book to the existing literature on local policy and policymaking.

In recent decades, international migration movements have become a major political concern worldwide (see e.g. Thränhardt 2003). Simultaneously, these migration movements are a consequence and a sign of the increase in international interdependence provoked by processes of globalisation. Both globalisation and migration are putting nation states to the test. As Hollifield formulates it, modern states are currently facing a severe dilemma between globalised markets and national civil rights. The so-called liberal paradox stands at the very basis of most migration debates in contemporary Europe: While economic interests have a lasting effect on the opening of national borders, the international political order and internal political system are built upon differentiation and the exclusiveness of power (Hollifield 2003: 35).

The question of integration, i.e. who needs to be integrated into what and how, refers to the core of self-perception and self-identification of societies that are at the destination of persisting migration movements towards Europe. But how do Europeans identify themselves?

One of the most explicit statements on immigration was made by the European Council within the context of the 2000 Lisbon Strategy. Within the Lisbon Program, the Council expressed its intention of 'making the European Union the most competitive economy in the world and achieving full employment by 2010', identifying immigration as one potential approach to compensate for the negative impact of demographic ageing and labour-force shortages that the labour markets of many European member states continue to experience. The Open Method of Coordination (OMC) was introduced to enable the development of national action plans. But the OMC caused the European Council objectives to become muddled, and the results achieved by the national action plans did not satisfy the expectations (COM (2005) 24 final; SCADPLUS 2007). A local approach appeared to be more promising. In 2006, Rotterdam mayor Ivo Opstelten invited policymakers and practitioners acting at local and European levels to the conference *Integrating Cities: European Policies, Local Practices*. The stated aim of the conference was 'to find ways for better cooperation'. *Integrating Cities* was realised in close collaboration with European Commission vice-president and head of the Directorate-General Justice, Freedom and Security Franco Frattini. Representatives from EURO CITIES, a

network of 130 municipalities with the Commission members. The list of sub-national experts for the Migration Policy Group position paper in 2006 and challenges for new residents. A first 'integration is essential'. *Integrating Cities* was the conference *Integrating Cities II* on implementing the common goal of cities on immigration, signed on 5 May 2007.

The Milan Declaration on the attention of European cities of local migration strategies are considered new integration measures. European member states appear among the nation state agents for integration at EU level display, downwards to the cities. Yet, if we look at the

With the beginning of the Migration and Management of the European Commission, the prove management of solidarity between four dimensions. The of external borders. External Borders Fund. The dimension pertained to the Fund. The third of third-country migration. The fourth of migration and the reintegration of illegally in the EU, and Home Affairs

European
ents and
this issue
develop-
cymaking
duce the
cal policy

become
) Simul-
a sign of
cesses of
g nation
are cur-
and na-
ery basis
economic
ders, the
uilt upon
35).

into what
cation of
vements

made by
Strategy.
tion of
y in the
mmigra-
e impact
our mar-
nce. The
e the de-
European
ed by the
(2005) 24
ore pro-
ymakers
ference
d aim of
ating Ci-
mission
Freedom
TIES, a

network of 130 major European cities, attended the conference along with the Committee of Regions and other European High Commissioners. The list of participants showed a mixture of European and sub-national experts and practitioners. Following the conference, Migration Policy Group (MPG) director Jan Niessen elaborated a common position paper in which he highlighted opportunities for innovation and challenges for EU cities posed by the arrival of large numbers of new residents. A fundamental thesis of his position paper affirms that 'integration is essentially a local process' (Niessen & Engberink 2006). Integrating Cities was considered so successful it was followed up by the conference Integrating Cities II, held one year later in Milan.² Integrating Cities II explicitly addressed the city level as a major arena for implementing the 2005 European Common Agenda for Integration. The common goal of strengthening the city's voices in European policies on immigrant inclusion culminated in the so-called Milan Declaration, signed on 5 November 2007 (see Milan Declaration 2007).

The Milan Declaration and the conferences indicate the emergent attention of European institutions towards processes, practices and policies of local migrant integration. Local solutions and management strategies are considered crucial for identifying, developing and diffusing new integration models across Europe. Thus, specific funds are introduced to promote benchmarking and policy-learning processes across European member states and municipalities. Here, a pattern becomes apparent among European institutions: they address simultaneously the nation state and sub-national-level entities as implementation agents for integration and innovation. Some political statements at the EU level display, indeed, the aptitude to move integration matters downwards to the city level (and outwards to civil society associations). Yet, if we look at policy action, this trend appears to be far less definite.

With the beginning of 2007, a new Framework Program on Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows was established by the European Commission (COM (2005) 123 final), which was designed to improve management of migration flows at the EU level and to strengthen solidarity between member states. This Framework Program has four dimensions. The first one concerned the integrated management of external borders and was accompanied by the establishment of an External Borders Fund applicable from 1 January 2007. The second dimension pertained to asylum policy and prolonged the European Refugee Fund. The third related to the social, civic and cultural integration of third-country nationals and established the European Integration Fund. The fourth dimension concerned the fight against illegal immigration and the return of so-called third-country nationals who reside illegally in the EU, setting up a European Return Fund (see DG Justice and Home Affairs 2008).

The European Integration Fund (EIF), of special relevance for integrating so-called third-country nationals in Europe, is based on previous experiences made with the Integration of Third Country Nationals (INTI) programme. INTI was a funding programme for activities concerning the integration of people who are not EU citizens. On the basis of these (fruitful) experiences with INTI, the European Commission launched the idea of an European Integration Fund during the Dutch presidency aimed at: 1) facilitating the organisation and implementation of admission procedures for migrants, 2) contributing to the organisation and implementation of introduction programmes and activities for third-country nationals, 3) increasing civic, cultural and political participation of international migrants in the host society, 4) strengthening the capacity of national organisations for accommodating the needs of different immigrant groups, 5) strengthening the host society in managing increasing diversity and 6) increasing the capacity of member states to develop and evaluate integration policies. In total, financial resources allocated to the EIF amounted to € 825 million over the time period 2007-2013.³ Basically, the EIF is implemented in annual programmes laid out by the beneficiary member states⁴ (see DG Justice and Home Affairs 2008), while 7 per cent of the total annual resources are assigned to Community Actions, directly pursued by the EU Commission.

At first it seems that this implementation procedure contradicts the political affirmations that integration takes place at the local level, and reinforces the nation state as the main actor for integration concerns. Are we observing a discrepancy between political claims and policy programming at the European level? To answer this question we take a closer look at the establishment of the European Integration Fund. Before the current structure of the EIF was institutionalised, some regional governments, among them the Italian region of Emilia-Romagna, developed diverging ideas for managing integration in Europe. Their sketch of an integration model for Europe was strongly oriented towards the sub-national level and addressed regional and local authorities as main actors for implementing integration policies.⁵ However, these attempts were unsuccessful; instead the beneficiary member states designated national authorities as responsible for the European Integration Fund. But other factors – the process of European integration and the role that member states assume in it – may also have had an impact on integration policymaking in Europe. In the area of immigration policies the situation of individual member states has been marked by a shift of responsibilities up to the level of the EU. Indeed, Europe's external borders are officially managed and controlled in a joint effort with shared facilities (e.g. FRONTEX). But while member states experienced a net sovereignty loss with regard to the protection

of their own borders within national integration policies concerning the perception of migration (Brubaker) experiences highlight similarities in the and services in trends challenging instead ask for known as Cities European Four Conditions, structural areas of housing religious dialogue, CLIP shows that ing successful l failed integration ally, however, n European fram integration.

Even if the n strengthened by integrating mig national level co nal and Local A ject, led by auth and local policy prove informati the EU Policy a ERLAI⁶ membe ences in integr structured infor

2 The study and where

Throughout the nation state as t policies of immig oped to describe tive, for instance distinguished (

of their own borders, labour market concerns and social cohesion stay within national competence (see also Geddes 2007). Today's integration policies continue to be defined largely by national traditions and the perception of the 'imagined community' (Anderson 1983) of the nation (Brubaker 1992; Soysal 1994). However, local needs and experiences highlight some trends of convergence in Europe: There are similarities in the challenges that migration poses to local governments and services in the receiving communities throughout Europe. These trends challenge nation-bound policy programmes on integration and instead ask for local input on integration policymaking. The project known as Cities for Local Integration Policies (CLIP), financed by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, studies concrete integration measures and projects in the areas of housing, diversity management, intercultural and inter-religious dialogue, ethnic entrepreneurship in over twenty European cities. CLIP shows that the cities themselves have a great interest in developing successful local integration practices as they often pay the price for failed integration (Bosswick, Heckmann & Lüken-Klaßen 2007). Legally, however, municipalities largely depend on regional, national and European frameworks, each of which constitutes the basis for local integration.

Even if the nation state as integration policy actor has been recently strengthened by European institutions, regional and local activities on integrating migrants and on setting up dialogues structures at the sub-national level continue. On 13 and 14 March 2008, the European Regional and Local Authorities for the Integration of Migrants (ERLAIM) project, led by authorities of the Emilia-Romagna region, invited regional and local policymakers and practitioners to a conference intended to improve information flow from the EU to the sub-national level. During the EU Policy and Funding for the Integration of Migrants conference, ERLAI⁶ members reaffirmed the relevance of regional and local experiences in integrating migrants, pointing out the lack of detailed and structured information on the part of EU institutions.

2 The study of local integration policy in Europe: where are we and where we are going?

Throughout the 1990s, immigration scholars in Europe focused on the nation state as the key dimension for understanding processes and policies of immigrants' integration. Various typologies have been developed to describe national immigrant policies. From a juridical perspective, for instance, *jus soli* and *jus sanguinis* citizenship models have been distinguished (see Brubaker 1992); from an economic perspective,

Gastarbeiter systems have been opposed to *settlement-oriented* systems; and from a socio-political perspective, at least three different models of integration have been put forward: assimilationist, multiculturalist and pluralist (Soysal 1994).

However obvious these typologies of European integration models may seem, they have been criticised for being too simplistic (Favell 2001), with the risk of overshadowing how integration actually takes place in the different contexts where immigrants happen to live and work. When it comes to local integration practices and policies, these typologies certainly have to be treated with caution: They neither explain the variation in integration measures between different municipalities of the same nation state, nor elucidate observed trends of convergence and divergence in integration practices across European cities (Penninx & Martiniello 2004: 156). As a consequence, the local dimension of immigrant policy has emerged to the fore, attracting the attention of an increasing number of European researchers working in different countries.

Yet, not to throw the baby out with the bathwater, one has to acknowledge that typologies still represent a reference point in the debate on immigrant policy and policymaking, as well as in the emerging literature on its local dimension, as pointed out by most of the contributions collected in this book. This is why in the first part of this section we shall start by elucidating the main conceptual categories underlying research in this field, both classic concepts and new notions that have been emerging in local-level studies. In the second part, we will present the main lines of development of the existing literature on local immigrant policy and policymaking. A general trend can be highlighted, beginning with descriptive case studies (often collections of case studies) focused on policy content, to more recent theoretically oriented comparative research designs, addressing mainly issues of policymaking. However, being still at an early stage, the analysis of local policy processes on immigration-related issues reveals a number of gaps and inconsistencies. Critical nodes for future research in the field are also considered in the third part of this section, in an attempt to contribute to the further development of a promising perspective for the study of immigrants' contexts of daily integration in Europe.

2.1 *The debate on policy models: relevance for today's research on local policy and policymaking*

The phenomenon of migration is a rather complex discipline to study. Thus, in the course of time researchers have developed more or less complex models to compare and identify different social realities and to test empirical findings. With regard to integration, Anglo-American

researchers were studying the effects of migration. In the 1920s, the Chicago School of migration research adapted to the predominantly Western European migration patterns and Znaniecki's model would equalise national differences. It is likely to last for the Chicago School is a research destined to last over time and space.⁸

While the urban evolution of migration in Europe developed, the hope started to rise for a transformation of the ties that we live in their subsequent migration in the 1950s and 1960s states such as Italy, emigration', which movements in the are destined to be (Miller 2003: 7f).

In response to the European reality and adapted successively over, national policy influenced by counterculture or 'national' these models differ more appreciatively member states can model as more 'a cultural (United German *Gastarbeiter*

The assimilationist model which newcomers on the soil (*ius soli*) rules (*ius domicili*) model has been a process of adaptation model defines the

researchers were particularly influential in investigating and interpreting the effects of migration in receiving countries. As early as the 1920s, the Chicago School started theorising the process of how migrants adapt to a mainstream American society imagined as being predominantly White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP).⁷ Focusing on European migration in American cities, scholars such as Park, Thomas and Znaniecki recognised that the process of 'assimilation', which would equalise newcomers to the standards of the majority population, is likely to last for more than one generation. With this assertion, the Chicago School introduced two basic aspects to modern migration research destined to animate scientific debates even today: the matter of time and space.⁸

While the urban context has been a prominent one for studying the evolution of migration societies in the US, integration research in Europe developed in a different way. The level of immigration to Europe started to rise sharply after World War II and contributed to the transformation of European societies into the culturally diverse societies that we live in today. In fact, the immigration of workers and their subsequent settlement in Northern and Western Europe in the 1950s and 1960s was succeeded by the rising of Southern European states such as Italy and Spain, considered to be 'classic countries of emigration', which became the destinations of international migration movements in the 1980s. Today, Central and Eastern European states are destined to become Europe's new immigration lands (Castles & Miller 2003: 7f).

In response to the socio-political awareness that migration is a European reality and therefore needs to be managed,⁹ scientific tools were adapted successively to identify and reveal migration-related data. Moreover, national policy models on migration and integration developed, influenced by country-specific peculiarities such as the overall political culture or 'national' position on migration. Within migration research, these models differ from one another in being more assimilationist or more appreciatory in recognising ethnic-cultural differences. European member states can then be clustered according to their applied policy model as more 'assimilationist' (usually identified with France), multicultural (United Kingdom, Netherlands) or functionalist-pluralist (the German *Gastarbeiter* policy) countries.

The assimilationist model defines the nation as a political community which newcomers enter by will or by birth. Thus, whoever is born on the soil (*ius soli*) or willing to adopt the national culture and political rules (*ius domicili*) is admitted into the community. The assimilationist model has been criticised, however, as a policy based on a one-sided process of adaptation. On the other hand, the multicultural or pluralist model defines the nation as a political community constituted by cul-

tural-ethnic heterogeneity. This entails that newcomers be granted equal rights in all spheres of society, and by implication that they respect certain key values while keeping their cultural-ethnic heritage and autonomy (Han 2000: 287; Castles & Miller 2003: 249-252; Treibel 1999: 83-102). Castles and Miller identify two main variants of the multicultural model: the 'laissez-faire approach' typical of the US, where cultural diversity and ethnic communities are accepted, while it is not seen as a genuine task of the state to sustain and protect ethnic cultures and equality among ethnic groups. The second variant refers to multiculturalism as a government policy based on a societal consensus to accept cultural differences as well as on state policy to secure equal opportunities and rights for all. Castles and Miller attribute this variant particularly to Australia, Canada and Sweden (2003: 251). Last but not least, the guest worker policy model reflects, according to Castles and Miller, Germany's classic approach to immigration based on matching immigration with labour-market demands and needs. Nationhood is defined on the basis of birth and descent (*ius sanguinis*) and, as a consequence, naturalisation of newcomers is regarded as exceptional and dependent upon a difficult and demanding process.

It is questionable, however, how far these policy models actually reflect and display the reality of everyday interethnic interactions in societies. While this typology is an instrument for identifying and distinguishing ideological discourses at the national level, it shows certain limitations in distinguishing between nation states and sub-national actors in admitting and incorporating newcomers (Alexander 2004; Ireland 2007; Money 1999). In fact, as it has never been proved that the French model is more assimilationist than the British one, neither can we possibly verify how far these models have been implemented in their country of reference as such studies are largely missing (see also Borkert 2008). Here, research on the local dimension of migration policy and policymaking can help to reassess both concepts and models against the background of new empirical findings, referring not to macro-institutional structures but to policies and services implemented and carried out at a regional, provincial and/or city level.

This book provides some interesting examples of how traditional, state-level concepts can be revised and applied to the study of policymaking at a local level. For instance, Vermeulen and Stotijn (this volume), in order to make sense of policy practitioners' implementation strategies for immigrant youth employment, refer to De Zwart's (2005) dilemma of recognition. According to De Zwart, general policies aimed at combating group inequalities do not recognise groups as being relevant to policymaking, while targeted policies may run the risk of perpetuating differences and inequalities among groups. Assimilationism ('denial' in De Zwart's terms) and multiculturalism ('accommodation'),

are regarded as one another, as a result of this approach, replacing policies in such a way as to achieve official redistribution.

Another attention is given to local policymaking (ch. 2) of grassroots policy recognition can be conceived as an instrument to cope with perceived diversity. The background are the basis of a political strategy to address migration challenges.

As is clear, the turning a new chapter in exploring what policies. The model of reference in the of reference are amply provided in the mention of migration the rethinking a

2.2 Where we

First attempts to policies for immigration in the context of international policies and Modes and the OECD *Links* (OECD 1999). Local policy is more narrowly, administrations should be addressed to the Italian government at reviewing local

The main conclusion of large-N comparative non-European – effort to the spe

are regarded as alternative strategies which do not necessarily exclude one another, as pointed out by De Zwart's third proposed policy approach, replacement, which constructs the targets of redistributive policies in such a way as to avoid recognition while still allowing for beneficial redistribution among the groups.

Another attempt to revise 'old' concepts in relation to the analysis of local policymaking is provided by Caponio's discussion (this volume ch. 2) of grassroots multiculturalism. Apart from official discourse on policy recognition, this contribution points out how cultural mediation can be conceived more prosaically by street-level bureaucrats as an instrument to cope with the everyday challenges of immigrants' perceived diversity. Community workers and operators with an immigrant background are hired by Italian municipalities, not necessarily on the basis of a political programme open to cultural recognition, but rather as a strategy to avoid the stress of dealing with diversity and to minimise challenges to established bureaucratic routines.

As is clear, the particular aim and achievement of this book is that of turning a new eye on processes of policymaking at the local level, and exploring what we have called the local dimension of migration policies. The models debate lies in the background, setting the main terms of reference in the analysis of local policy trajectories. Yet, such terms of reference are neither static nor established once and for all: the examples provided clearly point out how the investigation of the local dimension of migration policymaking can provide interesting inputs for the rethinking and reformulation of classic concepts.

2.2 *Where we are: Local integration policy between networks and politics*

First attempts to collect systematic information and data on local-level policies for immigrants were carried out in the mid-1990s in the context of international projects such as the UNESCO Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities (MPMC), in 1996,¹⁰ and the OECD report *Immigrants, Integration and Cities. Exploring the Links* (OECD 1998), including cities in Australia, the US and Canada. Local policy is essentially identified with city-level policy and, even more narrowly, with the interventions carried out by local/municipal administrations. To this list, the later *Ethnobarometer* programme should be added. Launched in 2001 with a contribution from the Italian government and of a number of European foundations, it aimed at reviewing local policies in nine cities in Europe.¹¹

The main common feature of these studies was their promotion of large-N comparisons across cities in different national – European and non-European – contexts. To this end, each project devoted considerable effort to the specification of the main dimensions and/or variables for

data collection and analysis. Yet, the results hardly met such an ambitious goal; descriptive case studies adopting a vague comparative perspective prevailed. The main exceptions were the comparative studies carried out by Alexander (2003, 2004, 2007) who, based on the UNESCO MPMC programme, built up a comprehensive typology of European cities' different attitudes and policies towards their foreign population. However, his focus is on cities' official policy priorities, with little attention to implementation and policymaking processes.¹²

Still within the context of the programme, a number of small-N comparisons were also carried out.¹³ These studies yielded a far more complex picture, showing the interplay between official/formal local policy priorities and the various actors dealing with immigrant integration. Moreover, along with the UNESCO MPMC programme, other research studies have been undertaken in different local contexts, not only in cities but also in neighbourhoods and regions, thus contributing to the accumulation of an increasing corpus of data and knowledge on local policy for immigrants in Europe.

In this emerging literature, two research streams can be identified: the first is essentially concerned with bottom-up policymaking processes on immigrant integration, in order to account for the actors involved and the networks mobilised on the issue; the second looks at top-down implementation of legislative provisions on immigration, with particular attention to the practices adopted by the local branches/agencies of national/regional institutions such as the Home Office, the Labour Ministry, etc.

As for the first stream, two different approaches to the study of local policymaking on immigrants' integration can be identified: a pluralist approach, emphasising issues of immigrants and civil society participation; and a power approach, looking more closely at the role of politics and political actors. The pluralist approach actually began to develop in the early 1990s, when a few pioneering researchers questioned the primacy of national-level politics and argued for the increasing relevance of local governments in promoting institutional arrangements aimed at providing opportunities for immigrants' participation and inclusion (Joly 1992; Rex & Samad 1996; Vertovec 1996; Leggewie 1993). According to Mahnig (2004), these studies implicitly assumed that local governments are more inclined than national ones to pragmatically respond to immigrants' needs.

This pragmatic attitude of local policymaking has been also noted by more recent studies such as those carried out by Marques and Santos (2004) on immigrants' participation in Oeiras, a suburb of Lisbon, and by Moore (2004) on conflict mediation in Marseille, Toulouse and Manchester. Both studies show how immigrant policies are more the result of local-level mediation practices, than of official – national or local –

policy models. attempts to come much different link up immigrant presents an est town hall polic ularistic dema ciations are com interests and cl

Meanwhile, pointed out the and civil move political support cone 1998; Est has been noted migrants actual and partners in ing their own o

In contrast v gotiation, a nu development o is the research and Zurich th political issue political agend on immigration perception of i by the local so Nanterre and came an issue against the *bid* lived. Local aut ing the two cit tool to put pres

The role of p cities as well depth studies o the relevance o municipal serv tures and the c nisations seem legitimate actio ectly influencir least not overly

policy models. Moore (2004) illustrates how French cities, in their attempts to come to terms with immigrant-origin youth unrest, do not act much differently from English ones: if recruiting mediators in order to link up immigrant groups is officially pursued in the UK, in France it represents an established informal practice. In Oeiras, on the other hand, town hall policy does not officially recognise immigrant or ethnic-particularistic demands. Yet existing neighbourhood, sport and leisure associations are composed mainly of immigrants and actually represent the interests and channel the needs of the African resident groups.

Meanwhile, research studies on Southern European cities have also pointed out the crucial role played by autochthonous NGOs, charities and civil movement associations that provide various services and offer political support for immigrants' rights claims (Campomori 2005; Zincone 1998; Esteves 2008; Morén-Alegret 2002). A 'crowding out' effect has been noted wherein native associations mobilising on behalf of immigrants actually become the main recipients of municipal funding and partners in policymaking, thus preventing immigrants from forming their own organisations (Caponio 2005).

In contrast with pictures emphasising mediation and local-level negotiation, a number of studies have focused on power relations in the development of immigrant policies in European cities. A case in point is the research study carried out by Mahnig (2004) on Paris, Berlin and Zurich that looks at how the presence of immigrants became a political issue in these cities forcing the issue of integration onto the political agenda. According to this analysis, the first local initiatives on immigration were aimed essentially at responding to the emerging perception of immigrants as a threat to social peace and public order by the local society. A similar perception can be found in the cases of Nanterre and Champigny (De Barros 2002, 2004): immigration became an issue as early as the 1960s, after French residents' protested against the *bidonvilles* where Maghrebians and Portuguese immigrants lived. Local authorities and, in particular, the communist party governing the two cities, responded by joining the protest and using it as a tool to put pressure on the national government.

The role of political actors has been addressed in the case of Italian cities as well (Caponio 2006; CeSPI 2000; Campomori 2005). In-depth studies carried out in both southern and northern cities question the relevance of politics in the everyday programming and running of municipal services; the efficiency of established administrative structures and the capacity for networking with native and third-sector organisations seem to be more relevant. Yet, politics may set the frame for legitimate action in the development of immigrant policies thus indirectly influencing what can be done and what should be avoided (or at least not overly emphasised).

The second research stream identified above is implementation research, generally aimed at analysing how national/regional laws and policies are carried out by local responsible agencies and whether and to what extent the stated goals are achieved (Zincone & Caponio 2006). The classic top-down implementation framework has been adopted mainly for the investigation of immigration policies such as procedures of regularisation in Greece (Skordas 2000) and Italy (Zucchini 1998) or access to long-term residence permits in Austria (Jawahari 2000) and Italy (Fasano & Zucchini 2001). A chief finding of these studies is that administrative discretion is one of the main sources accounting for deviation from expected goals and policy failure. A number of studies have focused more closely on civil servants' behaviour and their administrative cultures, regarded as factors having a crucial impact on everyday implementation of labour-market provisions in Germany (Cyrus & Vogel 2003), residence permit renewal in Greece (Psimmenos & Kassimati 2003) and Italy (Triandafyllidou 2003) and access to protection for refugees in the UK¹⁴ (Düvell & Jordan 2003). What emerges is a substantial continuity among established administrative practices, directed essentially at controlling and restricting immigrants' presence.

A small number of implementation studies have also focused on national and/or regional social integration programmes. Gaxie et al. (1999), for example, analysed the implementation of the *contrats de ville* (city contracts) in nine French cities,¹⁵ to find out whether, and to what extent, the official goal of empowering local governance was actually pursued and achieved. The empirical evidence contradicts expectations, since the city contracts policy often resulted in routine and purely symbolic consultation on the part of regional/local political authorities, reluctant to lose control over potentially hot immigration issues.¹⁶

Between top-down implementation analyses and bottom-up approaches stand a number of studies looking at immigrant policies in the context of urban segregation processes. The study of majority/minority relations in metropolitan areas and of the related dynamics of segregation/separation in the urban environment is a classic topic in American urban sociology since the Chicago School, which has also attracted over the course of decades urban geographers, social anthropologists, urban economists and political scientists. The literature on the different aspects of segregation processes is huge, especially in the United States but, more and more, also in Europe, the UK being in first place.¹⁷ Some of these studies are concerned with the impact of urban regeneration programmes, usually targeting neighbourhoods suffering conditions of economic and social deprivation, but often leading to gentrification in the renewed districts and segregation in other peripheral areas (Fonseca

2008; Semi 2008). The relationship between urban regeneration and public housing is a topic that has been liberal, conservative, and radical. The contribution of the literature to the current research is mixed (Fonseca 2004; Malheir 2004).

Along with the literature on urban regeneration, the literature on urban migration has opened in the context of urban regeneration more broadly (Fonseca 2004; Tuts & Tuts 2005). The literature on urban migration also urban areas and urban migration.

2.3 Where urban migration

As is clear, the literature on urban migration approaches an urban migration approach and a coherent future for urban migration from this literature. The literature on urban migration contribute to the literature on urban migration.

The first critical issue is the convergence among urban migration and urban regeneration. The perceived 'convergence' between urban migration and urban regeneration is both in democratic and in urban migration (Fonseca 2007). However, the convergence is a common challenge for urban migration. The convergence, a common challenge for urban migration, is an assumption of urban migration. The convergence is more likely to be observed in urban migration 'not in urban migration' rather than to be observed in urban migration.

In order to understand the convergence can be observed in urban migration, it is recognised that the convergence may be observed in urban migration. The high-level of urban migration works and the convergence and divergence in urban migration level decision-making, political

2008; Semi 2006; Briata 2007). Other studies investigate the relations between urban segregation and welfare policies, especially as far as public housing is concerned. If initially scholars focused mainly on cities in liberal, conservative corporatist and social-democratic welfare states (see the contributions collected in Musterd and Ostendorf 1998), more recent research has also taken into account Southern Europe (Allen et al. 2004; Malheiros 2002; Arbaci 2008).

Along with urban policy, another emerging research stream developed in the context of the UNESCO UN HABITAT programme focuses more broadly on the impact of migration for urban governance (Balbo & Tuts 2005: 1-14), taking into account not only European cities, but also urban areas outside of Europe which are pivotal in different regional migratory systems.

2.3 *Where we are going: Key issues for future research*

As is clear, existing literature on the local dimension of policymaking on immigrants' integration is extremely diversified in terms of research approaches and theoretical perspectives. In order to develop a more coherent future research agenda, we identify here four key issues arising from this literature and envisage possible research paths that may contribute to the enrichment of the debate on local policy and policymaking.

The first critical point arises from the observation of a trend of convergence among local immigrant policies on some pragmatic solutions to perceived 'common challenges', i.e. the amelioration of housing conditions and residential concentration, and the improvement of diversity both in democratic bodies and municipal administration (Borkert et al. 2007). However, there is still a lack of systematic research on how common challenges pressure municipal policies towards convergence. On the contrary, as mentioned, a number of studies openly challenge such an assumption by pointing out that local policy on migration-related issues is more likely to respond to NIMBY (an acronym for the exclamatory 'not in my backyard') reactions on the part of national residents, rather than to the needs of the foreign immigrants living in the city.

In order to find out whether and to what extent a trend towards convergence can actually be identified, it should be first and foremost recognised that the intrinsic complexity of local policymaking processes may be observed at different levels in the institutions concerned, i.e. the high-level political arena, the middle-level implementation networks and the bottom-level bureaucratic practices. Patterns of convergence and divergence may differ across these different levels. In high-level decision-making arenas, where official policy priorities are envisaged, political actors are likely to play a key role in framing answers

in accordance with their perception of the electorate's preferences, which are not necessarily favourable to immigrants (see Helbling in this volume). In middle-level implementation networks, institutional pre-existing arrangements concerning relations between public administration and private/civil society organisations are crucial. Such institutional arrangements are likely to vary considerably across European cities, reflecting different welfare state traditions as well as different patterns in civil society mobilisation (see also Aybek in this volume). Yet, trends towards convergence appear particularly relevant as far as bureaucratic practices are concerned: in the context of access to services, immigrants' needs are often dealt with informally by civil servants, operators of NGOs and volunteers, leading to some pragmatic answers and solutions to everyday pressures (see Vermeulen & Stotijn and Caponio ch. 2 in this volume).

Multi-level governance is another key point for future research. Many studies mention the relevance of intergovernmental relations in setting opportunities and constraints for local-level administrations, but do not actually explore them systematically. There are exceptions of course, as pointed out by the implementation studies taking into account complex integration programmes (Damay 2002; Gaxie et al. 1999) and by some contributions in this book (see Fourot on Canada). Another example of analysis concerned with multi-level governance is the study carried out by Favell and Martiniello (2008) on the policy-making processes on immigrant integration in Brussels, also addressing the role of the EU. Yet, generally speaking, while there is wide acknowledgment of the relevance of supra-national, national and regional institutions in local immigrant policy, relations among these different institutions are only rarely investigated.

A third issue to be mentioned relates to the research-policy nexus. As far as local-level policymaking is concerned, this is a particularly relevant point as shown by a wealth of programmes entailing research on best practices, conditions for mutual learning across cities and transferability. The CLIP project is a case in point, since it seeks the direct participation of cities in identifying policy needs and shaping bottom-up an ongoing research design. However, there is still a lack of knowledge and systematic analysis of the role of experts in local-level immigrant policymaking: How are experts identified and selected? What role are they supposed to play? What are their relations with the other actors involved in decision-making and with politicians in the first place? If the research-policy nexus is still an under-explored field (Zincone & Caponio 2006), it is even more so in terms of the local level.

Finally, from a methodological point of view, a crucial area for future research is represented by the spreading of comparative systematic analysis, both cross-city and cross-country. Of course, research designs un-

dertaking con-
of Europe m
trol for a nu
models, whic
depends on t
and patterns
iance in ter
strengthen th
different citie
immigrant n
namics of mi

3 The co

This book is
IMISCOE Eu
the work of
multi-level g
programme o
of the main t
international
ing held in M

Four of the
sented at the
in the field to
researchers.
some 35 you
were selected
features – bu
and policyma
– The cruci
provinces,
into accou
– The growi
tergovernm
and as ho
organisati
– The lack
Eastern E
called 'po
processes.

dertaking comparison across different contexts, including cities outside of Europe might appear somewhat puzzling, since it is difficult to control for a number of crucial variables, not least the national integration models, which are central to European literature. Nonetheless, much depends on the research goal: if we are to identify common challenges and patterns of convergence in local policymaking, maximising variance in terms of selected cities and national contexts can only strengthen the argument. In any case, to explore how policymakers in different cities/provinces/regions cope with immigration pressures and immigrant needs would undoubtedly enrich our knowledge of the dynamics of migration decision-making.

3 The content of the book

This book is the result of activities conducted within the context of the IMISCOE European Network of Excellence. Specifically, it arises from the work of IMISCOE Cluster C9, a research group focusing on the multi-level governance of migration. The development of a research programme on local-level immigrant and immigration policy was one of the main tasks of the cluster's work in 2007, as highlighted by the international conference *The Local Dimension of Migration Policymaking* held in May 2007 in Turin.

Four of the book's six chapters are actually the result of papers presented at the conference, as it allowed early-stage researchers working in the field to present their work and discuss it with peers and senior researchers. The conference was based on a call for papers, to which some 35 young scholars responded and out of which twelve papers were selected for presentation. This selection revealed some interesting features – but also critical points – of today's research on local policy and policymaking. They include:

- The crucial relevance of comparison, especially across regions/provinces/cities in a single country, but also more and more taking into account local contexts within different countries;
- The growing interest in the issue of governance, intended both as intergovernmental relations between different layers of government and as horizontal network relations between public and non-public organisations;
- The lack of systematic research on local-level policymaking in Eastern European countries, especially of studies adopting the so-called 'policy approach', i.e. focusing on local level policymaking processes.

This final point is particularly relevant for developing a future research agenda on the local dimension of migration policy and policymaking. Local-level policymaking is rarely addressed by scholars in Eastern Europe, where research on migration is just gaining momentum. This may result from the highly centralised state structures characterising these countries, which is probably a legacy of the past communist regimes. However, the debate on convergence/divergence on local migration policy and policymaking could be newly enlightened by also looking at the policy process in Eastern European emergent immigration cities/regions.

This book intends to provide a contribution to the existing literature on local-level migration policymaking by presenting a number of studies carried out in very different national contexts: namely, Italy, Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands and Canada. We are fully aware that these countries do not exhaust the range of possible relevant cases in the study of the local dimension of migration policy and policymaking. A major gap exists not only in the lack of a contribution on Eastern Europe, but also in the lack of a chapter addressing a case study in the Nordic welfare-state countries. However, as pointed out in the final comparative chapter, this book is intended as a first attempt to explore the various dimensions of local policymaking. It starts from some interesting pieces of research already carried out in this field. More systematic and theoretically grounded research, though indeed needed, is beyond the reach of this book.

Though all the collected contributions deal with local-level policymaking, they address different dimensions of integration, i.e. citizenship, welfare services, vocational training and employment, and religious diversity. Moreover, the studies display a great variety in the theoretical and methodological approaches adopted by the authors. This regards first and foremost the theoretical point of view: whereas Caponio's (ch. 2) and Vermeulen and Stotijn's chapters aim to shed new light on policymaking processes and accounting for different local-level policy responses, Aybek and Fourot are more interested in policy legacy and institutional analysis. Helbling, meanwhile, deals with the factors at a local level that explain naturalisation politics and ground people's understanding of membership in a nation. Variations are evident from a methodological standpoint as well: while most chapters present comparative qualitative case-studies, Helbling adopts a large-N comparative research path. Such diversity in the theoretical focus and methodological approaches represents a characteristic feature of this book, that demonstrates how research on local policymaking is not necessarily confined to the 'thick description' of one case, but on the contrary draws its strength from comparison, either qualitative or quantitative.

The contribu
cal issue areas
domains: the le
tion of migran
domain, which
rious domain,
cultural practi
chapter of the
local policyma
ing a basic the
work of analys

The first dir
bling's contrib
ter takes a con
municipalities
others. Three p
nderstandings o
come a Swiss
ple's Party, nar
pact of direct
provide an opp
people. The an
impact on rej
factors such as
municipality a
no influence.
scarce literatur
how local/regi
has the right t
tion policy rese

Three contri
migration poli
ally at Italian o
of employmen
vocational train
deals with the
ing Milan, Bol
ent contexts in
tical traditions.
cal priorities
approach pursu
one promoted
ever, the recon
vergence towa

a future re-
and policy-
scholars in
ing momen-
structures char-
the past com-
vergence on
enlightened
an emergent

ing literature
number of stu-
ly, Italy, Ger-
e fully aware
relevant cases
and policymak-
tion on East-
case study in
at in the final
pt to explore
om some in-
d. More sys-
ed needed, is

level policy-
, i.e. citizen-
ent, and reli-
y in the theo-
authors. This
whereas Capo-
to shed new
ent local-level
policy legacy
h the factors
und people's
evident from
present com-
comparative
methodologi-
book, that de-
necessarily con-
ntrary draws
ative.

The contributions to the book, while not exhausting all the possible local issue areas as identified by Alexander (2007), address three key *policy domains*: the legal-political domain, which addresses the civic incorporation of migrants/ethnic minorities in the host polity; the socio-economic domain, which concerns social inclusion policies; and the cultural-religious domain, which includes policies related to minority religious and cultural practices as well as to inter-group cultural relations. The final chapter of the book intends to draw some comparative conclusions on local policymaking processes in these different domains, while providing a basic theoretical toolkit for a more unitary and consistent framework of analysis of the local dimension of policymaking.

The first dimension, i.e. the legal-political one, is dealt with in Helbling's contribution on naturalisation policy in Switzerland. The chapter takes a comparative perspective in an effort to explain why in some municipalities more candidates for naturalisation are rejected than in others. Three political and cultural factors are considered: different understandings of citizenship, i.e. diverging ideas of what it means to become a Swiss citizen; the strength at the local level of the Swiss People's Party, namely the major Swiss right-wing populist party; the impact of direct democratic decision-making procedures, which may provide an opportunity for right-wing populist parties to mobilise the people. The analysis reveals that these three factors have a significant impact on rejection rates, while socio-economic and socio-structural factors such as unemployment rates, the ratio of foreigners living in a municipality and the ratio of applicants from Muslim countries have no influence. The contextualisation of the Swiss case in the still very scarce literature on the implementation of naturalisation laws shows how local/regional authorities' attitudes towards the question of who has the right to become a citizen is a major neglected issue in migration policy research.

Three contributions address the socio-economic dimension of local migration policy and policymaking. Caponio (ch. 2) looks more generally at Italian cities' welfare policies, while Aybek provides an account of employment in German cities and Vermeulen and Stotijn discuss vocational training in a Dutch city and a German city. Caponio (ch. 2) deals with the accommodation of cultural difference in Italy by comparing Milan, Bologna and Naples, three cities that represent very different contexts in terms of economic situation as well as cultural and political traditions.¹⁸ According to the analysis, at the level of official political priorities an opposition emerges between the assimilationist approach pursued by the administration of Milan and the multicultural one promoted by that of Bologna, while Naples lies in between. However, the reconstruction of implementation strategies points out a convergence towards practices of formal and/or informal recognition of

cultural differences in making services accessible/available for immigrants, even though this does not necessarily coincide with a move towards inclusion and participation of immigrant organisations in policymaking.

Vermeulen and Stotijn, for their part, provide an interesting example of cross-city and cross-country comparison by looking at how Amsterdam and Berlin policymakers and policy practitioners deal with youth unemployment among immigrant groups. They argue that local policymakers are confronted with what De Zwart (2005) calls 'the dilemma of recognition', which refers to whether local governments should pursue general or targeted policies to combat group inequality. Vermeulen and Stotijn show how, in the two cities, policy practitioners working with unemployed immigrant youth have responded to the dilemma of recognition with their own pragmatic solutions, which are considerably independent of the official policy integration framework.

The issue of migrant youth unemployment is also dealt with in Aybek's contribution, focusing on local-level interaction in Germany between the highly institutionalised vocational education and training (VET) system and less-established networks on immigrants' integration. The study considers two local contexts – Munich and Frankfurt/Main – with the purpose of discovering which factors and governance dynamics may help the development of new approaches to implementing VET programmes aimed at catering to the needs of immigrant youth, currently the main beneficiary of VET in Germany.

Finally, Fourot's study deals with the cultural-religious domain. It investigates the settlement of new mosques in the cities of Montreal and Laval, both located in the Province of Quebec. This chapter looks at four sets of factors: intergovernmental relations in particular between provincial and municipal levels of government; the discourses surrounding the accommodation of ethno-cultural and ethno-religious demands in the two cities; relations among local actors, especially elected officials and municipal public servants; and the forms of mediation between municipalities and ethno-religious groups. Fourot points out how these factors have an impact on the processes of institutionalisation of religious pluralism in the two cities. A key element is represented by the degree of personalisation of mediation channels: whereas personalisation leads to a political process of institutionalisation, non-personalisation leads to administrative institutionalisation.

As is evident, the studies presented in this book not only analyse different dimensions of integration policy, but start also from very different research questions and theoretical perspectives. Yet, in the last concluding chapter, an attempt is undertaken by Caponio to provide a more coherent comparative framework aimed at elucidating the relevance and the main characters of the local dimension of migration pol-

icymaking in the
Germany, the N
tion policy arena
tured around sp
Local migration
and systems of s
works do not ap
migration policy
mising appear t
the local-level r
countries consid
analysed by the
and religious di

While tentativ
first important
matters. This s
oriented research
the countries co
models of centre
local dimension
tic and theoret
across cities in
many respects,
gration studies.

Notes

- 1 See, for instance, the workshop held in 2007 in the Discourse on Immigration and Migration Studies in the United States.
- 2 Integrating Cities.
- 3 In 2007 the EU had 25 member states and in 2009 €1.5 trillion, in 2012 €1.7 trillion.
- 4 With the exception of Ireland have opted for a more open approach.
- 5 These ideas are also discussed in the book.
- 6 European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) website: www.emiliaroma.it/laip/Presentation
- 7 This frequently occurs in the literature.
- 8 On this, see also the book.

ble for immi-
with a move to-
rganisations in

sting example
how Amster-
deal with youth
at local policy-
'the dilemma
ts should pur-
ty. Vermeulen
oners working
he dilemma of
e considerably

alt with in Ay-
Germany be-
and training
rants' integra-
and Frankfurt/
and governance
to implement-
of immigrant

domain. It in-
Montreal and
apter looks at
cular between
discourses sur-
o-religious de-
pecially elected
mediation be-
rot points out
stitutionalisa-
ment is repre-
annels: whereas
alisation, non-

ly analyse dif-
om very differ-
in the last con-
o to provide a
ating the rele-
migration pol-

icymaking in the five countries considered in this book: Switzerland, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and Canada. The notion of *local migration policy arena* is introduced, intended as a policymaking field structured around specific issue areas or dimensions of migration policy. *Local migration policy arenas* take shape in specific national contexts and systems of state-periphery relations. However, national legal frameworks do not appear to be sufficient in order to understand how local migration policy is actually worked out. To this end, particularly promising appear the analysis of patterns of similarities and differences in the local-level responses and policymaking processes across the five countries considered and in the three issue areas of migration policy analysed by the contributions to this book: citizenship, welfare services and religious diversity.

While tentative and provisional, such a comparative exercise yields a first important result: the local dimension of migration policymaking matters. This should be taken seriously by future migration policy-oriented research in the sense that it has an undeniable relevance in all the countries considered, despite differences in the state structures and models of centre-peripheral relations. Efforts to make sense of how this local dimension does currently take shape and operate require systematic and theoretically oriented research programmes. Comparisons across cities in different countries, although difficult and tricky in many respects, represent a crucial frontier for the development of migration studies.

Notes

- 1 See, for instance, 'Challenges for Local Integration Policy in Germany and the US', a workshop held in April 2006 in Berlin. The workshop was part of the Transatlantic Discourse on Integration conference programme organised by the European Forum for Migration Studies (efms), with the support of the German Marshall Fund of the United States.
- 2 Integrating Cities III was hosted by the City of Berlin on 2 April 2009.
- 3 In 2007 the EIF started with € 65 million. In 2008, the fund reached € 78 million and in 2009 € 98 million. In 2010, it will reach € 106 million, in 2011 € 132 million, in 2012 € 163 million and in 2013 € 183 million.
- 4 With the exception of Denmark, all member states participate in the EIF. UK and Ireland have opted in.
- 5 These ideas and concepts were articulated in personal conversations with one of the authors.
- 6 European Regional and Local Authorities on Asylum and Immigration (ERLAI), www.emiliaromagnasociale.it/wcm/emiliaromagnasociale/home/immigrazione/Er-lai/Presentation.htm.
- 7 This frequently used term is generally attributed to Baltzell (1964).
- 8 On this, see also Bommes and Morawska (2005: 224).

- 9 See, for instance, a speech by Frattini entitled 'Enhanced mobility, rigorous integration strategy, and zero tolerance on illegal employment: A dynamic approach to European immigration policies', which was delivered on 13 September 2007 at the High-Level Conference on Legal Immigration in Lisbon (<http://soderkoping.org.ua/pager15679.html>), the Commission Communication 'A common immigration policy for Europe', MEMO/08/402, issued on 17 June 2008 (<http://europa.eu/rapid/press-ReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/08/402>) as well as the report 'Moving Europe: EU research on migration and policy needs' by Giulia Amaducci, EUR 23859 (ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/fp7/ssh/docs/ssh_research_migration_20090403_en.pdf).
- 10 See www.unesco.org/most/p97. Seventeen cities took part in the project: Amsterdam, Antwerp, Athens, Barcelona, Birmingham, Brussels, Cologne, Liège, Marseille, Milan, Oeiras (a suburb of Lisbon), Paris, Rome, Stockholm, Tel Aviv, Turin and Zurich.
- 11 Brussels, Lisbon, Manchester, Mannheim, Murcia, Rotterdam, Stockholm, Toulouse and Turin.
- 12 To fill this gap, in-depth case studies on Paris, Amsterdam, Rome and Tel Aviv have also been carried out by Alexander (2007). However, he is much more concerned with changes in local-level migrant policy models than with reconstructing local policymaking processes and networks.
- 13 See the contributions in Penninx et al. (2004).
- 14 These have been published in a special issue of the *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* that was edited by Jordan, Stráth and Triandafyllidou (2003).
- 15 See also the study by Damay (2002), on the implementation of the Integration-Cohabitation Programme promoted by the Brussels region in 1990.
- 16 See also Borkert (2008) on the achievements of integration policies in Italy.
- 17 For a state-of-the-art report see Kohlbacher & Reeger (2005: 49-55).
- 18 This chapter is based on a paper presented at the 2007 Compass Annual Conference (held from 3-4 July in Oxford), in a workshop entitled 'Southern European integration models', chaired by Alessio Cagiano.

References

- Alexander, M. (2003), 'Local policies toward migrants as an expression of host-stranger relations: A proposed typology', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29 (3): 411-430.
- Alexander, M. (2004), 'Comparing local policies toward migrants: An analytical framework, a typology and preliminary survey results', in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Citizenship in European Cities. Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies*, 57-84. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Alexander, M. (2007), *Cities and Labour Immigration. Comparing Policy Responses in Amsterdam, Paris, Rome and Tel Aviv*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Allen, J., J. Barlow, J. Leal, T. Maloutas & L. Padovani (2004), *Housing and welfare in Southern Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Anderson, B. (1983), *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Arbaci, S. (2008), 'Housing and urban regimes in Southern European multiethnic cities: Structural mechanisms of ethnic residential marginalisation by spatial dispersal', in L. Fonseca (ed.), *Cities in Movement. Migrants and Urban Change*, 45-78. Lisbon: Centro de Estudos Goegráficos.
- Balbo M. & R. Tuts (2005), 'Introduction', in M. Baldo (ed.), *International Migrants and the City*, 1-16. Venice & Nairobi: UN-HABITAT.
- Baltzell, E. D. (1964), *The Protestant Establishment: Aristocracy and Caste in America*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bommes, M. & E. Morosini (2008), *Migrations and the promises of the future*. Berlin: Springer.
- Borkert, M. (2008), *Immigration and the city: The role of the state and the market in the construction of the city in the European Community*. Berlin: Springer.
- Borkert, M., W. Bosswick & T. Caponio (2008), *Cities for migrants in the European Community*. Berlin: Springer.
- Bosswick, W., F. Heckmann & T. Caponio (2005), *Immigrants in Europe. Struggles for recognition and integration*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Briata, P. (2007), *Sul filo della città. Immigrazione e città in Europa*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Brubaker, R. (1992), *The 'New' Americans: Assimilation and the Limits of Pluralism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Campomori, F. (2005), 'The city of Caserta', in T. Caponio (ed.), *Città e migrazione. Integrazioni locali*, 235-250. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Caponio, T. (2005), 'Poverty and migration in Milan, Bologna and Turin', in T. Caponio (ed.), *Città e migrazione. Integrazioni locali*, 251-266. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Caponio, T. (2006), *Città e migrazione. Integrazioni locali*. Bologna: Franco Angeli.
- Castles, S. & M. Miller (2003), *The Immigrant Dilemma*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- CeSPI (2000), 'Migrazioni e cittadinanza. Scenari e prospettive per il futuro della città'. Roma: Giubileo.
- COM(2005) 123 final, *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the Parliament on the implementation of the European Council's conclusions on the 'Solidarity and Active Citizenship' initiative*. Luxembourg: LexUriServ.
- COM(2005) 24 final, *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the Parliament on the 'Solidarity and Active Citizenship' initiative*. Luxembourg: LexUriServ.
- Cyrus, N. & D. Vogel (2003), 'The city and the migrant: An exploration of the city as a site of migration', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29(2): 225-240.
- Damay, L. (2002), 'The Brussels Region: Migration and Integration Policies', presented at Ecpr Joint Conference on Migration and Integration Policies, 22-27 April 2002.
- De Barros, F. (2004), 'The city and the migrant: The case of the 'social mix' project in Lisbon', in T. Caponio (ed.), *Città e migrazione. Integrazioni locali*, 267-282. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- De Zwart, F. (2005), 'The city and the migrant: The case of the 'social mix' project in Lisbon', in T. Caponio (ed.), *Città e migrazione. Integrazioni locali*, 283-298. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- DG Justice and Home Affairs (2005), *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the Parliament on the 'Solidarity and Active Citizenship' initiative*. Luxembourg: LexUriServ.
- Düvell, F. & B. Jordan (2005), *Migration in the European Community*. Berlin: Springer.

- Bommes, M. & E. Morawska (2005), *International migration research. Constructions, omissions and the promises of interdisciplinarity*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Borkert, M. (2008), *Integration von Zuwanderern in Italien. Gesetzliche Grundlagen, politische Akteure und die Umsetzung integrationspolitischer Maßnahmen in der Emilia-Romagna*. Universität Bamberg: PhD Dissertation.
- Borkert, M., W. Bosswick, F. Heckmann & D. Lüken-Klaßen (2007), *Local integration policies for migrants in Europe*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities VIII. www.eurofund.eu.int/pubdocs/2006/31/en/efo631en.pdf.
- Bosswick, W., F. Heckmann & D. Lüken-Klaßen (2007), *Housing and integration of migrants in Europe*. Straßburg/Dublin: Council of Europe.
- Briata, P. (2007), *Sul filo della frontiera. Politiche urbane in un quartiere multietnico di Londra*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Brubaker, R. (1992), *Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Campomori, F. (2005), 'Integrare l'immigrato? Politiche di accoglienza a Vicenza, Prato e Caserta', in T. Caponio & A. Colombo (eds.), *Stranieri in Italia. Migrazioni globali, integrazioni locali*, 235-266. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Caponio, T. (2005), 'Policy networks and immigrants' associations in Italy. The cases of Milan, Bologna and Naples', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31 (5): 931-950.
- Caponio, T. (2006), *Città italiane e immigrazione. Discorso pubblico e politiche a Milano, Bologna e Napoli*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Castles, S. & M. Miller (2003), *The age of migration* (3rd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- CeSPI (2000), 'Migrazioni e politiche locali: L'esperienza italiana nel quadro europeo', in *Migrazioni. Scenari per il XXI secolo*, 833-948. Rome: Agenzia Romana per la preparazione del Giubileo.
- COM(2005) 123 final, *Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and Council establishing the European Return Fund for the period 2007-2013 as part of the General programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows'*, [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52005PC0123\(04\):EN:HTML](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52005PC0123(04):EN:HTML).
- COM(2005) 24 final, *Communication to the spring European Council. Working together for growth and jobs. A new start for the Lisbon Strategy*. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2005:0024:FIN:EN:PDF>.
- Cyrus, N. & D. Vogel (2003), 'Work-permit decisions in the German labour administration: An exploration of the implementation process', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29(2): 225-255.
- Darnay, L. (2002), 'The integration-cohabitation programme of the government of the Brussels Region: Mutations of public action and construction of norms', paper presented at Ecpr Joint Sessions, Turin, 22-27 April 2002.
- De Barros, F. (2002), 'A contribution of local administration and courts to immigration related issues in France between 1945 and 1991: From a local shanty-town problem to a "social mixity" national key-word', paper presented at Ecpr Joint Sessions, Turin, 22-27 April 2002.
- De Barros, F. (2004), 'From the local to the national. Local Governance and the genesis of the 'social mix' policy from the 1950s to the 1990s', *French Politics* 2: 117-144.
- De Zwart, F. (2005), 'The dilemma of recognition: Administrative categories and cultural diversity', *Theory and Society* 34: 137-169.
- DG Justice and Home Affairs (2008), *Solidarity and management of migration flows*. http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/funding/intro/funding_solidarity_en.htm.
- Düvell, F. & B. Jordan, (2003), 'Immigration control and the management of economic migration in the United Kingdom: Organisational culture, implementation, enforce-

- ment and identity processes in public services', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29(2): 299-336.
- Esteves, A. (2008), 'Hosting policies in Lisbon and Washington DC: The role of local actors in the integration of immigrants', in L. Fonseca (ed.), *Cities in Movement. Migrants and Urban Change*, 107-124. Lisbon: Centro de Estudos Geográficos.
- Fasano, L. & F. Zucchini (2001), *L'implementazione locale del testo unico sull'immigrazione*, in Fondazione Cariplo-Ismu (ed.), *Sesto rapporto sulle migrazioni 2000*, 39-50. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Favell, A. (2001), 'Integration policy and integration research in Europe: A review and critique', in T. A. Aleinikoff & D. Klusmeyer (eds.), *Citizenship Today. Global Perspectives and Practices*, 349-399. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Favell, A. & M. Martiniello (2008), 'Multi-national, multi-cultural and multi-levelled Brussels: National and ethnic politics in the "Capital of Europe"', in L. Fonseca (ed.), *Cities in Movement. Migrants and Urban Change*. Lisbon: Centro de Estudos Geográficos.
- Fonseca, M. L. (2008), 'Immigration, urban change and new directions of social inclusion policies: The urban community development program 'K'CIDADE' in Lisbon', in L. Fonseca (ed.), *Cities in Movement. Migrants and Urban Change*, 11-44. Lisbon: Centro de Estudos Geográficos.
- Gaxie, D. et al. (1999), 'Les politiques municipales d'intégration des populations d'origine étrangère', *Migrations Études* 86, March.
- Geddes, A. (2007), 'The Europeanization of what? Migration, asylum and the politics of immigration', in T. Faist & A. Ette (eds.), *The Europeanization of National Policies and Politics of Immigration*, 49-70. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Han, P. (2000), *Soziologie der Migration*. Stuttgart: Lucius and Lucius.
- Hollifield, J. F. (2003), *Offene Weltwirtschaft und nationales Bürgerrecht*, in D. Thränhardt & U. Hunger (eds.), *Migration im Spannungsfeld von Globalisierung und Nationalstaat*, 35-57. Leviathan Sonderheft 22/2003, Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Ireland, P. (2007), *Immigration, integration and everyday life in Europe's neighborhoods*, Draft Workshop Paper. www.lse.ac.uk/collections/CIS/papers/Ireland_Immigration.pdf.
- Jawhari, R. (2000), *Wegen Überfremdung abgelehnt*. Vienna: Braumüller.
- Joly, D. (1992), 'Grande Bretagne: minorités ethniques et risques de ségrégation', in D. Lapeyronnie (ed.), *Immigrés en Europe: Politiques locales d'intégration*, 111-139. Paris: La Documentation Française.
- Joppke, C. & Morawska, E. (eds.) (2003), *Towards assimilation and citizenship. Immigrants in liberal nation-states*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jordan, B., Stráth, B. & A. Triandafyllidou (2003), 'Comparing cultures of discretion', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29 (2): 373-395.
- Kohlbacher, J. & U. Reeger (2005), 'Residential segregation, housing market and immigrants', in L. M. Fonseca & J. Malheiros (eds.), *Social integration and mobility: Education, housing and health*, 22-55. Lisbon: Centro de Estudos Geográficos.
- Leggewie, C. (1993), *Multikulti*. Berlin: Rotbuchverlag.
- Mahnig, H. (2004), 'The politics of minority-majority relations: How immigrant policies developed in Paris, Berlin and Zurich', in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*, 17-37. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Malheiros, J. M. (2002), 'Ethni-cities: Residential patterns in the Northern European and Mediterranean metropolises - implications for policy design', *International Journal of Population Geography* 8 (2): 107-134.
- Marques, M. & R. Santos (2004), 'Top-down and bottom-up reconsidered: The dynamics of immigrant participation in local civil society', in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Integration Policies. Milan Declaration 2004*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Money, J. (1999), *Feeling the Difference*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Morén-Alegret, R. (2004), 'Immigration and the city: The case of Barcelona', in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*, 17-37. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Moore, D. (2004), 'Migration and the city: The case of Barcelona', in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*, 17-37. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Mustard, S. & W. Ostle (eds.), *Immigration and the city: The case of Barcelona*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Niessen, J. & G. Engberg (eds.), *Immigration and the city: The case of Barcelona*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- OECD (1998), *Immigration and the city: The case of Barcelona*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Penninx, R. & M. Martiniello (eds.), *Immigration and the city: The case of Barcelona*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Penninx, R., K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Psimmenos, I. & K. Kraal (eds.), *Immigration and the city: The case of Barcelona*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Rex, J. & Y. Samad (eds.), *Immigration and the city: The case of Barcelona*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- SCADPLUS (2007), *Immigration and the city: The case of Barcelona*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Skordas, A. (2000), 'The politics of immigration: The case of Barcelona', in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*, 17-37. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Semi, G. (2006) 'Il ritratto di Palazzo', in F. D. L. (ed.), *Immigration and the city: The case of Barcelona*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Soysal, Y. N. (1994), *Immigration and the city: The case of Barcelona*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Thränhardt, D. (2003), 'Migration and the city: The case of Barcelona', in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*, 17-37. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- U. Hunger (ed.), *Immigration and the city: The case of Barcelona*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Treibel, A. (1999), *Immigration and the city: The case of Barcelona*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Triandafyllidou, A. (2003), 'Migration and the city: The case of Barcelona', in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*, 17-37. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Vertovec, S. (1996), 'The politics of immigration: The case of Barcelona', in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*, 17-37. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Zincone, G. (1998), 'The politics of immigration: The case of Barcelona', in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*, 17-37. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Zincone, G. & T. Caponio (eds.), *Immigration and the city: The case of Barcelona*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

- niello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Citizenship in European Cities. Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies*, 107-126. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Milan Declaration (2007), *Integrating cities. Milan declaration*. www.integratingcities.it/allegati/MilanDeclaration.pdf.
- Money, J. (1999), *Fences and neighbors. The political geography of immigration control*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Morén-Alegret, R. (2002), 'Gobierno local e inmigración extranjera. Aproximación a los casos de Barcelona y Lisboa durante los años 90', *Migraciones* 11: 25-81.
- Moore, D. (2004), 'Migrants as mediators in a comparative perspective', in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec, *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*, 127-138. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Musterd, S. & W. Ostendorf (eds.) (1998), *Urban segregation and the welfare state. Inequality and exclusion in Western cities*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Niessen, J. & G. Engberink (2006), *Position paper. Integrating cities: European policies, local practices*. http://integratingcities.nl/INTEGRATING_CITIES_position_paper.doc.
- OECD (1998), *Immigrants, integration and cities. Exploring the links*. Paris: OECD.
- Penninx, R. & M. Martiniello (2004), 'Integration policies and processes: State of the art and lessons', in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Citizenship in European Cities. Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies*, 139-163. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Penninx, R., K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.) (2004), *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Psirimenos, I. & K. Kassimati (2003), 'Immigration control pathways: Organisational culture and work values of Greek welfare officers', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29 (2): 337-371.
- Rex, J. & Y. Samad (1996), 'Multiculturalism and political integration in Birmingham and Bradford', *Innovation* 9 (1): 11-31.
- SCADPLUS (2007), *A new start for the Lisbon Strategy*. <http://europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c1325.htm>.
- Skordas, A. (2000), 'The regularisation of illegal immigrants in Greece', in P. de Bruycker (ed.), *Regularisations of illegal immigrants in the European Union*, 343-387. Brussels: Bruylant.
- Semi, G. (2006) 'Il ritorno all'economia di bazaar. Attività commerciali marocchine a Porta Palazzo', in F. Decimo & G. Sciortino (eds.), *Stranieri in Italia. Reti migranti*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Soysal, Y. N. (1994), *Limits of citizenship. Migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thranhardt, D. (2003), *Der Nationalstaat als migrationspolitischer Akteur*, in D. Thranhardt and U. Hunger (eds.), *Migration im Spannungsfeld von Globalisierung und Nationalstaat*, 8-34 Leviathan Sonderheft 22/2003, Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Treibel, A. (1999), *Migration in modernen Gesellschaften. Soziale Folgen von Einwanderung, Gastarbeit und Flucht*, 2nd edition; Weinheim and Munich: Auflage, Juventa Verlag.
- Triandafyllidou, A. (2003), 'Immigration policy implementation in Italy. Organisational culture, identity processes and labour market control', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29 (2): 257-297.
- Vertovec, S. (1996), 'Berlin multikulti: Germany, "foreigners" and "world openness"', *New Community* 22 (3): 381-399.
- Zincone, G. (1998), 'Illegality, enlightenment and ambiguity: A hot Italian recipe', *South European Society and Politics* 3 (3): 43-81.
- Zincone, G. & T. Caponio (2006), 'The multi-level governance of migration', in R. Penninx, M. Berger & K. Kraal (eds.), *The dynamics of migration and settlement in Europe. A state of the art*. IMISCOE Joint Studies. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Zucchini, F. (1998), 'Implementazione della politica pubblica per l'immigrazione: I casi di Torino e Brescia', in Fondazione Cariplo-Ismu (ed.), *Terzo rapporto sulle migrazioni 1997*, 173-189. Milan: FrancoAngeli.

1 N
expla

1 Introdu

The way one p
procedures in
only nation sta
level. Every m
habitants, is a
zen. As regula
are very sparse
dure and criteri
Given the high
policy field, th
sequently the r
pality to another

In the last f
Swiss system o
judicial debate
via were refuse
tion has decide
tem criticise t
cesses because
population and
dised and deci
by the executiv
the Swiss Fede
votes by ballot
tion. In May 2
assemblies hav
Court regards
has declared th
appeals against
These two righ
teed by the sys