



ENGIME
Economic Growth and Innovation in Multicultural Environments

“Governance Policies in Multicultural Cities: A Focus on Migration”

D33 - Policy Brief - Governance and Policies in Multicultural Cities

By:

Raffaele Bracalenti & Kristine Crane

Psychoanalytical Institute for Social Research (IPRS)

Passeggiata di Ripetta 11, Rome

Italy

An Introduction: What We Mean by Governance and Migration

Governance has multifarious definitions: It is a word, and moreover, a concept that has been used to describe and encompass many changes in contemporary society, namely those brought about by the process of economic globalization and the issues to which this has given rise, such as environmental problems and the trafficking of drugs, arms and humans. The general objectives of governance are ultimately to reduce social conflicts, improve the management of difference and balance the interests of various stakeholders. To this end, governance has been used *normatively*, in reference to how organizations—and nation states to some extent—should function in a non-hierarchical way. When we talk about the *governance of migration*, we refer to states' adaptive strategies in facing to the challenge of diverse types of migration—from highly skilled or economically empowered migrants migrating across borders but within multinational corporations to economic immigrants and refugees. As Saskia Sassen writes, the latter is a big component of the globalized world as a result of shifts in the labour market and reliance on cheap labour.¹ While governance has clear implications for cross-border issues, and intra-state coordination of migratory movements—namely the cooperation between countries of arrival and host countries—our main interest with this project regards dealing with migration within host societies and making sure that migrants are not perceived—by the host society, nor by themselves—as the outsider and enemy. In other words, the implicit aim behind this governance strategy is to ensure that integration processes are a success and not a failure.

Governing migration in Europe

Starting in 2000, Europe has evolved from the concept of “Fortress Europe” to opening up its borders, with the realization that immigrants are both an asset and a need, and indeed, the Europeanization of migration and asylum policy embodies precisely the manifestation of governance strategies beyond the nation state that links a structure above the nation state level to the local level. The recognition of immigrants as being an asset and a need follows from both the demographic situation in Europe as well as the labour market, and indeed, the European Commission's “Communication to the European Parliament on Integrating Migration Issues in Relations with Third Countries” defines migration as a strategic priority for the EU. But this premise is not a panacea for the changes that migration

¹ Sassen Saskia (2002), ‘Governance Hotspots: Challenges We Must Confront in the Post-September 11th World’, <http://www.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/sassen.htm>

causes, and the economic benefits' argument has a limited scope in underlining the broader benefits of migration. As Janina W. Dacyl writes, "It is not tangible stakes (profits, efficiency), but rather intangible values and principles (recognition, participation, equality, justice) which are (should be) at the centre of the discourse."² This emphasises the importance of *integrating* immigrants into the social framework of host societies—in other words, not excluding them from the norms and rights guaranteed to the autochthonous population—and recognising their differences and their right to participate fully in the host society. These differences can indeed have value for the host society, and recognition of this is one of the most formidable challenges of the governance of migration. As Dacyl continues, "This is true in spite of the fact that ultimately, in the context of implementation, these 'intangible' values and principles need to be translated into some more tangible implementation procedures, policy measures and partial stakes (goals)." In essence, this is the real challenge of "governing" migration within host societies—developing policies that are cognisant of immigrants' needs and moreover, their contributions to host societies. The idea is to move from aid-based policies to those that are pro-active and inclusive of immigrants' differences. Immigrants are themselves at the centre of a cultural shift towards a more open society, and they should feel like protagonists in this process.

Governing Migration in Europe's Cities

From a more theoretical perspective, the conceptual strength of the governance of migration lies in its ability to avoid creating direct causal links between migratory flows and some of the challenges that Western societies face as a consequence of migration such as poverty and the ghettoization of cities. Governance may in and of itself be considered a general policy recommendation because it does not invoke rigid top-down policies and has a global outlook, involving multiple actors on many different levels. Cities also take on a new and important role in this changed context. Indeed, The role that multiple actors may have is most visible in the context of 'global cities', what many scholars consider to be the locus of governance in which conflicting dynamics of immigration are played out. The ATMI notes that

² Dacyl, Janina W. (2000), 'Introduction: Selected Challenges of Diversity Governance' in *Governance of Cultural Diversity—Selected Aspects*, Janina W. Dacyl and Charles Westin (eds.):2.

Immigration in Europe presents a political problem because the growing economic need co-exists with major social rejection of the phenomenon. The economy needs immigrants, but society does not—at least this is how things appear.³

Tackling ‘social rejection’ implicates the involvement of different actors in new global cities. Sandercock has advised that

We need to start understanding our cities as bearers of our entwined fates. We need to formulate within our city a shared notion of a common destiny. We need to see our city as the locus of citizenship, and to recognize multiple levels of citizenship as well as multiple levels of common destiny, from the city to the nation to transnational citizenship possibilities. We need to see our city and its multiple communities as spaces where we connect with the cultural other who is our neighbour.⁴

The Metropolis Project focuses on the effects of international migration on metropolises. The project’s premise is that effective integration of immigrants requires a better understanding of immigration’s effects on local communities, and not least, local labour markets⁵. The project aims to create both a framework for the systematic analysis of these effects as well as a process for assimilating the analyses’ results.

Indeed, cities have taken on a greater role in governance strategies as a result of globalisation. Foreigners concentrate in large urban areas, and it is the task of the municipalities to tackle the challenge of diversity since the livelihood of both foreigners and the autochthonous population is determined at the local level. Rinus Penninx advocates “intensive and pro-active integration policies on this local level, where the citizen should regain its original meaning: an active and accepted participant in the daily life of these cities and thus both profiting from and contributing to the health of that city”.⁶

Some European cities have already begun implementing governance strategies on migration. For example, the city of Rome is experimenting with electing foreign Council

³ Guido Bolaffi (2003), ‘Immigration & European Economy’, policy brief for AMPI.

⁴ Leonie Sandercock (1998), *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities* (New York: Wiley): 181-182.

⁵ www.international.metropolis.net

⁶ Rinus Penninx (2002), ‘Migration and the city: local citizenship and integration policies’, paper presented to the conference *Cities in Movement. Migrants and Urban Governance*. Centro de Estudos Geograficos, Universidade de Lisboa, November 11-12, background reading for AMPI.

Members and representatives from each of the respective immigrant communities. The general idea behind this is encompassed by “The Pact for Integration” and is the mayor’s platform for recognising immigrants’ potential contribution to the life of the city. As City of Rome immigration specialist Claudio Rossi writes, “The political motivation of the local government’s interest in foreigners is no longer simply an expression of solidarity with those who are in need, a recognition of foreigners’ rights, which have only been partially satisfied. This justifies the City’s initiatives to take into account the rights of foreigners in governance processes. Foreigners are recognized as agents of local development insofar as they are consumers and producers of economic goods. And not only because they fill labour market needs that Italians will no longer fill, or because they pay taxes.”⁷

Governing Ethnic Entrepreneurship

The idea, which goes back to Dacyl, is to recognise immigrants for the positive contributions that they can make in society, and not only for the holes in the labour market that they fill. A significant component of this would be the recognition of what is known as ethnic entrepreneurship: In other words, not criminalising or stifling ethnic entrepreneurship, but reducing immigrants’ barriers of access to the formal labour market so that ethnic entrepreneurship may be recognised as a valuable contribution, not only to the local economy, but to the immigrant communities themselves.

Ethnic entrepreneurs have a highly visible presence in European cities, albeit one that is restricted to certain “immigrant” neighbourhoods such as Piazza Vittorio in Rome. Although the activities that they carry out are variable, they tend to focus on restaurants and grocery stores that cater namely to their own respective ethnic communities. The Chinese in Naples represent a successful and rapidly developing example of ethnic entrepreneurship. The Chinese were amongst the first ethnic entrepreneurs in Italy who came in the 1970s and acquired wealth as wholesalers in the production and sale of leather products. A decade later, at the beginning of the 1980s, they began arriving in the Naples area (San Giuseppe Vesuviano), where they were immediately recognised as capable entrepreneurs. The second influx of immigrants occurred in the 1990s and concentrated in the textile industry. Although

⁷ Rossi, Claudio (2003), “Foreigners, Immigrants, Host Cities: The Policies of Multi-ethnicity in Rome—Reading Governance in a Local Context”, paper presented at the 4th ENGIME Workshop “Governance and Policies in Multicultural Cities”, DIeS/IPRS, Rome 5-6 June, 2003.

Tuscany is the region in Italy with the highest concentration of Chinese immigrants, this area has experienced the most significant growth: Between 1996 and 2000, the Chinese population increased from 53 to 568 people. Their success may be largely attributable to the system of mutual assistance that characterizes what has become recognizable as their own ethnic model of entrepreneurship.⁸

Reflections on Other Areas of Governance in the City: Governing Urban Space

We focused on the governance of migration in this paper because it seems to us to be the most emblematic discourse of what is taking place as cities diversify and diversity issues have increasing salience in cities. Immigration is a recent and ongoing phenomenon that is changing the face of Europe and its cities. At the same time, other forces are at work in contemporary cities, which are likewise influencing the landscape of cities. For example, there has been internal migration—in other words, a general move from the countryside to the city. All of these movements are changing the use of public space and moreover, calling into question the conservation of cultural heritage and social cohesion in contemporary cities. This begins from the premise that cultural heritage has always had an important role in the development of national identities.⁹

Other lessons:

Several important points came out of the workshop presentations. We have grouped these according to the following categories: Ethnicisation; Representation: Governance and voting Rights; Border Effect.

Categorisation/ethnicisation

1. Secular society in Western Europe has maintained religion in the private sphere, following from the idea of religion as a pre-modern system. But following the September 11th terrorist attacks, religion has been brought into the public sphere and increasingly politicized. This has led to the categorisation of religious groups with the

⁸ Crane, Kristine. “Governing Migration: Immigrant Groups’ Strategies in Three Italian Cities—Rome, Naples and Bari”, paper presented at the 4th ENGIME Workshop: “Governance and Policies in Multicultural Cities” 5-6 June, 2003, Rome, Italy.

⁹ Riganti, Patrizia, “Cultural Heritage and Social Cohesion in Contemporary Cities: Tools and Methodologies for Assessing Public Differences”, paper presented at the 4th ENGIME Workshop, June 5-6, Rome, Italy.

corresponding use of labels. Instead, religion ought to be regarded as just one cognitive system by which people define themselves. It follows that religious affiliation is relevant insofar as it is a manifestation of the way in which people actually live their lives, and labelling religious groups can only be destructive to society as a whole and intercultural understanding in particular.

2. If religion is a cognitive system by which individuals may in part express their own identities, thereby acting as “agents of their own history”, it is also true that all individuals are social beings that identify with communities. It follows that all communities have representatives that must negotiate on an official level, and this should not rest on regulation, but rather on addressing the particular needs and problems that each religious group may pose, thereby creating spaces for discussion without affirming causal relationships between religion and problems in society. One of the main obstacles in this representation is internal fragmentation of religious groups.
3. Ethnic networks effectively provide for the material and psychological needs of immigrants as well as governance of their integration in host societies, particularly on an economic level insofar as ethnic entrepreneurship has become a salient feature of local economies. But these networks may also exist as “protective closed walls” that stifle the full participation of immigrants in their host societies.
4. National identity is still mainly based on citizenship, a concept rooted in the concept of the nation-state. This concept has been challenged by the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of Communism as an ideological and political force, as well as migration and the diaspora communities that have developed as a consequence. There is a general lack of preparation in dealing with this change, particularly in academia.

Representation: Governance and Voting Rights

5. The perception of governance and application of its strategies is contingent upon historical and political culture. A particular risk is that consultative councils—those for immigrants, for example—that are creations of local political leaders, remain dependent on these leaders, and thereby are without autonomous influence. Where

representation is not tied to explicit rights, but is symbolical or rhetorical, groups or individuals are characterised by limited consultative-making power, but not real decision-making power. Conceptually, governance introduces non-traditional participatory strategies in political life, but in practice, traditional political tools such as voting rights are ultimately what determine fair political representation.

6. Government and identity have been much more important at the local level rather than the national one in certain national contexts such as Italy's. since they are generally more autonomous than the central government. This model is useful for governing immigration at the local level as well. Indeed, local governments rather than the national government have been most effective in devising strategies for the integration of immigrants, and examples of successful integration are found on the local level since there is generally greater autonomy here.

Border Effect

7. The need to govern borders has become increasingly important with the process of globalization and its implications for migration flows, along with threat of terrorism. In Europe, an opposing process has taken place, which is manifested in erasing most barriers and where they do exist, making them "smart borders." Border enforcement creates a host of complex, and often overlapping issues, and produces dynamic interactions. Physical barriers such as fences may, for example, create the need to re-design roads and restructure social services, along with the development of cultural phenomena such as street signs in various languages.