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FOREWORD

The OECD Workshop on “Regional Development and Social Cohesion – Cities and Immigration” was held in Leganés on 2-3 July 2010 and co-organised with the Foundation “Instituto de Cultura del Sur” (FICS). The workshop focused on immigration trends in OECD urban areas and on the functional linkages between migration flows and regional development. These proceedings contain the 5 papers presented at the workshop. The papers assess various aspects of immigration and urban development, such as: migration trends in OECD urban areas, welfare and social cohesion, social acceptance and civic participation, and media narrative of the phenomenon. The executive summary briefly presents the main messages of the papers and the conclusions of the discussion. The workshop agenda is provided in the annex. The proceedings also contain materials from a second workshop, organized by FICS, which was held in Alcorcón, on 17-19 November 2010.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Raffaele Trapasso, Administrator at the Regional Development Policy Division, organised the workshop and supervised the preparation of the proceedings in collaboration with Gabriela Jacomella, Research fellow at Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, University of Oxford, United Kingdom. Erin Byrne provided editorial assistance. The OECD expresses its appreciation to all participants for contributing to the success of the workshop. The Secretariat would like to thank in particular the authors of the papers included in the proceedings, and FICS for financing the organization of the seminar and the publication of the proceedings. Special thanks to José Manuel Bravo, Vice President of FICS, and Elena Salas, Director of FICS, who assisted the OECD through this process and to H.E. Cristina Narbona, Ambassador of Spain to the OECD.
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### SECTION I

OECD WORKSHOP SOCIAL COHESION AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT  “CITIES AND IMMIGRATION” .............................................................. 6
ANNOTATED AGENDA OF THE WORKSHOP ........................................................................................................ 6
INTERVENTIONS ...................................................................................................................................................... 12
   Rafael Gómez Montoya. Mayor of Leganés ........................................................................................................... 12
   Alexander Penelas. Former mayor of Miami-Dade County ....................................................................................... 14
   Carlos Westendorps, Secretary General, Club de Madrid .................................................................................... 16
   Mario Pezzini, director of the OECD Development Centre ................................................................................... 19
   Cristina Narbona, Spain’s Ambassador to the OECD ............................................................................................ 21
EXPERTS’ CONTRIBUTIONS ....................................................................................................................................... 23
TRENDS IN URBANISATION AND URBAN POLICY IN OECD COUNTRIES ................................................................. 24
CITIES AND THE ETHIC OF CARE AMONG STRANGERS ............................................................................................ 45
CITIES AND IMMIGRATION: RECENT TRENDS, CHANGING CONDITIONS, INNOVATIVE RESPONSES ......................................................................................... 60
SUCCESSFUL STRATEGIES TO BUILD CONSENSUS IN PUBLIC POLICY: CREATING COALITIONS FOR IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION IN LOCAL COMMUNITIES ............................................................................................ 73
IMMIGRATION AND THE MEDIA: FROM EXCLUSIONARY POLITICS TO INTEGRATION ............................ 81

### SECTION II

CITIES AND IMMIGRATION: INTEGRATION AND SOCIAL COHESION GOOD PRACTICES IN THE SOUTH OF MADRID ...................................................................................................................................................... 96
SECOND SEMINAR ON SOCIAL COHESION AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: GOOD PRACTICES OF INTEGRATION IN THE SOUTH OF MADRID ...................................................................................................................................................... 118
ANNOTATED AGENDA OF THE WORKSHOP ........................................................................................................ 118
INTERVENTIONS ...................................................................................................................................................... 121
   José Manuel Gómez Bravo, Vice President, Foundation Instituto de Cultura del Sur (ICS) .................................. 121
   José María Ridao Mestres, journalist, writer and diplomatic ................................................................................ 122
   José Luis Pardo, Professor of Contemporary Philosophy, UCM, National Essay Prize, 2005 .......................... 124
   Guy Bajoit, Emeritus Professor of Anthropology Unit Sociology FOPES ......................................................... 125
Tomás de la Quadra-Salcedo, Former Minister for Administration Territorial (1982-1985), Former Minister of Justice (1991-1993) and Former President of the Council of State, Chair Professor of Administrative Law at University Carlos III de Madrid.................................................................126
Carlos Westendorps, Secretary General of the Club of Madrid and Former Minister of Foreign Affairs (1995-1996) .................................................................................................................................129
Claudio Aranzadi, Former Minister of Industry (1988-1993), Former Ambassador of Spain to the OECD.131
Gaspar Zarrías, Secretary of State for Regional Policy of the Spanish Government.........................133
Juan Hunt, Director of the Office of the International Labour Organization in Spain .........................134
Jean-Pierre Garson, OECD .................................................................................................................137
Cristina Narbona Ruiz, Spanish Ambassador before OECD .................................................................142
Miguel Ángel Aguilar, journalist, President of European Journalist’s Association ..............................143
Jordi Sevilla, Former Ministry of Public Administration Policies at Spanish Government .................144
Enrique Cascallana Gallastegui, Mayor of Alcorcón, President of Fundación Instituto de Cultura del Sur.144
SECTION ONE
The OECD, in co-operation with the Foundation “Instituto de Cultura del Sur” has organised a series of seminars to discuss about social cohesion and regional development, with a specific focus on urban areas. The first of these seminars will focus on integrating immigrants in cities.

Rationale

Over the past decade, close to three million immigrants entered OECD countries every year, and these figures do not include temporary and illegal immigrants. The large influx was justified by intense economic growth. Between 1997 and 2007 immigrants’ share in net job creation in OECD countries was above 35% (OECD, 2009). Skilled and unskilled foreign workers were promptly absorbed by the labour market. The large supply of labour also contributed to limit wage increases and to fuel the expansion phase. This situation has changed in 2008, with the outbreak of the financial crisis.

Nowadays, the call for a plural and opened society is muffled in the present climate of global recession, national retrenchment and cultural clash. Although it is too early to have a clear view of the impact of the recession on net migration flows, past experience has shown that immigrants are among those hardest hit in the labour market during a downturn (OECD, 2009). In this context, those countries that have recently witnessed the most rapid increase in migration flows (e.g. Ireland, Spain, the United Kingdom or, to a lesser extent, the United States) will experience the stronger deterioration in their labour market conditions. This will also impact labour migration policies, under the pressure of public opinion to reduce controlled migration flows.

Immigration is not only a national issue but a regional one, as it has a strong territorial dimension and poses specific challenges to local governments. The distribution of foreign workers across regions is asymmetric, and (large) cities are the places where the majority of them concentrate. In the recent decade immigrant arrivals accounted for 40% of the United States population growth and for 50-75% of the growth of its largest metropolitan areas. A similar situation can be seen in Europe. In London 27% of residents are foreign-born, while in Paris and Madrid the percentage of foreign-born residents is 17 and 13,
respectively (Peri, 2007; OECD 2007). Nevertheless, regional and local governments have no specific legal competency to deal with immigration. Regional communities face the challenge of integrating diversity and enhancing social cohesion among individuals, without having the right set of powers. During the economic expansion, local policies were focussing on attracting foreign workers and promote their access to the labour market. While no specific help was provided to avoid immigrants to cluster in deprived areas, or to facilitate their access to key public services. The lack of an integrated regional strategy to deal with immigration is a key challenge as a quietly brewing pathology of xenophobia, intolerance and fear of difference is an increasing issue in cities.

In this context, regional policies dealing with immigration should consider that wide economic growth depends not only on economic interdependencies but also on social cohesion, for which policies have to be designed. Deprived areas detached from the economy and labour market of a given urban region constitute a drag factor reducing the competitiveness of the region as a whole. Thus, acting to reduce or eliminate pockets of poverty and exclusion (e.g. insulated ethnic minorities) within urban regions should be considered as a basic part of an all-round regional development strategy. Especially if one considers that local disparities have been, in many cases, an offspring of economic dynamism. A region should have the capacity to make the most of its resources and its potential. But it should also provide support and public goods to individuals whose well-being is reduced by factors beyond their control. Social cohesion cannot be considered as a secondary effect of economic growth. The link between efficiency and equity is not automatic, even if synergies sometimes exist (social exclusion weighs upon the overall efficiency of a locality, but improvement to the local efficiency does not guarantee equity) (Barca, 2009). Evidence demonstrates that even the riches metro-regions within the OECD have pockets of poverty, unemployment, and exclusion.

Regional government should capitalise on political participation and key local stakeholders to promote an inclusive policy agenda to integrate immigrants in urban regions, and promote innovative approaches to social inclusion. There is an increasingly common narrative that portrays industrialised countries as ailing, under siege, crushed by difference and diversity (Amin, 2009). This political narrative has its roots in the events of September 2001 (and the following dramatic events of Madrid and London), and has been enhanced by the 2008 crisis. Immigrants, and the diversity they bring to OECD cities, are considered as a menace for the status quo rather than a possibility of improving multiculturalism and, eventually, innovation capacity and development. However, the choice of governing through fear is a complex phenomenon such as immigration cannot be a sustainable solution, and it may undermine social cohesion within a given urban communities, and eventually affect the well-being of all the inhabitants, natives and non-natives. For this reason, it is important to capitalise on the social and business relations that have promoted the integration of immigrants, so far. In several OECD urban regions a wide variety of local stakeholders have carried out activities to support foreign workers. These stakeholders are non-governmental organisations (NGOs), colleges, trade unions, not-for-profit enterprises, and employers. Local and regional governments may provide a common policy framework to such actors.

1. For example, cities which have faced strong industrial restructuring processes, like port cities such as Rotterdam, have experienced rapid losses of many basic port-related industries in the 1980s, contributing to increase significantly social cohesion problems in the area, in particular for ethnic minorities with little education. Dynamism produces losers as well as winners, such as those whose skills are made redundant by sectoral change. Further, dynamic areas attract population from other parts of a country or from other countries, who often have difficulty in adapting to a new life and making social connections. In many respects, Chinese cities are confronted with similar issues, with increasing inequalities in its cities and social challenges raised by in-migration from rural areas (Barca, 2009).

2. Regional branches of the employment services, particularly in Canada, have also developed innovative solutions to supporting immigrants into work.
There is the need for a new political agenda able to promote an inclusive and forward-looking idea of community. Urban communities should be able to share a vision about their development. This vision should be used to forge policies implemented within the region through effective multilevel governance. To achieve this result regional movement need unity, alignment, and partnership to influence decision making at other level of government. The movement has to be inclusive and allow late comers (e.g. immigrants) to participate to the construction of the regional vision. If these conditions are respected, local coalitions can also be used to empower people, thus creating a virtuous cycle in which individuals and communities are better equipped to react to external shocks, such as the current international crisis.

Objectives of the workshop

The objective of the workshop is to bring together a limited number of European and international experts and policy makers to discuss a political agenda that deals with the integration of immigrants and social cohesion with the aim of promoting regional development. The workshop will discuss the main challenges faced by urban and regional communities, with a focus on the current crisis, the various policies undertaken to answer to such challenges, and the possibility of setting new policy approaches.

Structure of the workshop

The workshop is a two-day event.

In the first day the discussion will focus on urbanisation trends in OECD countries and on immigration trends within the metropolitan region of Madrid. The discussion will be coordinated by the Foundation “Instituto de Cultura del Sur”. Local authorities and stakeholders will actively participate in the debate.

In the second day, the Foundation “Instituto de Cultura del Sur” will host an expert workshop limited to 30 people and moderated by the OECD Secretariat. The discussion is structured around a plenary session and three panels.

Plenary session – the next city: the urban landscape in 2020

The plenary session will introduce the discussion. All the experts and discussants will take part to the discussion. The aim is to set the scenarios of urban evolution in the next decades, based on the analysis on urban trends done by the OECD. The plenary session will also introduce the themes presented in the panels.

First panel – A new framework for regional development: integrate immigrants and promote social cohesion

The first panel will discuss policy approaches to promote an open and inclusive urban society. Due to a series of factors, inclusion and engagement towards the unfamiliar and unexpected is being replaced by a “catastrophe” approach based on exclusion and vilification of anything that threatens the customary way of life. The current crisis is adding to this reaction. People’s capacity to look at the future with courage, curiosity and a desire to evolve, has been replaced with fear, dread and an anxiety to preserve. This change may structurally modify the social model in OECD cities and reduce their capacity to attract people and integrate diversity, thus impacting their overall competitiveness. For this reason, it is important to restore cities’ capacity to integrate immigrants. Participants will discuss: 1) the need for restoring, through specific and tailored policies, a social environment that does not fear diversity and change; 2) how to promote identification and the capacity to integrate immigrants within a regional community; 3) media representations of difference.
Second Panel – How did the crisis impact urban regions?

Cities suffer the most from the current crisis. They are hit by high unemployment levels, usually higher than the national average, due to the high concentration of workers. A large part of the employment created over the past decade has been destroyed by the crisis. Stimulus packages provided by central governments have provided some workers with unemployment benefits. Yet, this is a short term solution, as public resources are limited and does not provide help to all workers. If the labour market does not re-absorb unemployed people in the next future, cities may be confronted with increasing urban poverty and social tension. There is the risk of creating pockets of exclusion within OECD urban regions, and immigrants are particularly exposed to this risk. Accordingly, regional and local authorities should have access to specific policy tools to be implemented at the local level. Interventions should aim at promoting investment, employment, and targeted social care for individuals particularly exposed to the current downturn, such as small business entrepreneurs, self-employed, and workers in specific sectors (e.g. constructions).

Third Panel – How to build consensus for public policies in cities

Finally, the third panel will focus on how building political consensus around issues such as social equity (or justice); integration of immigrants; and a shared vision for development. This panel will capitalise on the experience of policy makers, from different levels of government, to understand how it is possible to look at ways to create support and consensus around issues that suffer from misinformation or people’s perception rather than effective knowledge and direct experience. In particular, participants will discuss: 1) the challenge of a representing local instances within an international context (coupling global and local); 2) how to promote civic activism (bring people to fight against injustice); 3) how to match openness and belonging within coalitions.
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## EXPERT SEMINAR

### Session 1: The next city: The Urban Landscape in 2020

- **Welcome**: Mr. Rafael Gómez Montoya, Mayor of Leganés, Foundation ICS Board Member (5mns)
- **Floor to:**
  - Dr. Raffaele Trapaasso, OECD (15 mns)
  - Mr. Manuel Robles Delgado, Mayor of Fuenlabrada, Foundation ICS Board Member

### Coffee break

### Session 2: A New Framework for Regional Development: Integrate Immigrants and Promote Social Cohesion

- Mr. Alex Penelas, former Mayor of Miami-Dade County, Florida
- Prof. Ash Amin, University of Durham, UK
- Mr. Mathew Hodes, Director of Programmes, Club of Madrid

### Lunch break

### Session 3: How did the crisis impacted urban regions?

- Prof. Susan Clark, University of Colorado at Boulder, USA
- Mr. Mario Pezzini, Interim Director, OECD Development Centre

### Coffee break

### Session 4: How to build consensus for public policies in cities.

- Mrs. Kyrsten Sinema, Member of the Arizona House of Representatives, USA
- Mrs. Gabriela Jacomella, Research fellow at Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, University of Oxford, UK
- FICS’ Representative

### Conclusions and final remarks

- Mr. Mario Pezzini, Interim Director, OECD Development Centre
- FICS’ Representative

---
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<td>- Mrs. <a href="#">Kyrsten Sinema</a>, Member of the Arizona House of Representatives, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mrs. <a href="#">Gabriela Jacomella</a>, Research fellow at Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, University of Oxford, UK</td>
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<tr>
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<td><strong>Conclusions and final remarks</strong></td>
<td>- Mr. <a href="#">Mario Pezzini</a>, Interim Director, OECD Development Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rafael Gómez Montoya. Mayor of Leganés

Good afternoon to you all and those who are visiting the city for the first time, I welcome you to the city of Leganés. Let me begin by welcoming and thanking the OECD and the Foundation Instituto de Cultura del Sur, and especially Mrs. Cristina Narbona, Ambassador to the OECD.

I thank the organisers for choosing the metropolitan area of the community of Madrid as a space of reference to review the relationship between social cohesion and territorial development. A wise choice indeed, because cities like Leganés, Fuenlabrada, Getafe, Parla, Móstoles and Alcorcón share more than the territorial proximity in the south of the community of Madrid. They share a common history and a similar experience in the long struggle for the development of the cities themselves. It is for me, therefore, gratifying that Leganés is the host city of the first seminar which will address the subject: Cities and immigration.

For two days, representatives from the OECD, European and international policy makers, experts and members of the academia, will deliberate and debate on how 21st century cities, cities like Leganés, face the challenges of integration and social cohesion that the globalized world immersed in a worldwide economic crisis show us today.

In Leganés, as we know these challenges are not simple. The challenges that we face, especially at local level, such as the economic development of the city, urban environmental management, mobility, increased vulnerability of some groups in terms of social exclusion and of course, management of migration, involve the need to promote instruments that allow us to build, among all, the type of city we
want. Leganés is an open and historically receptive city to inner and outer migration. This is what the brand *ciudad abierta* stands for.

Historically, it has welcomed people coming from diverse places. During the 1950s and 1960s of the last century, Leganés received, with open arms, immigrants mainly from Andalucía, las Dos Castillas, Extremadura, Salamanca and Murcia. Since the 1970s, Leganés receives immigration from abroad.

Migration flows have shaped and continue to shape the physiognomy of Leganés. Even though immigration is not a new phenomenon in Leganés, now it remains undoubtedly a permanent phenomenon for two main reasons. First, the change of scenario in migration processes, and how that affects the configuration of the citizens of the municipality. This last decade, there have been years of massive inflows of migrants. Between 2000 and 2009, the foreign resident population in Leganés has grown from 3 000 to more than 25 000 people. Currently, Leganés has a 13% foreign population on a total population of 190 000 inhabitants. However, the scenario has changed; immigration has given way to a citizenship established in Leganés permanently, with rights and duties as an active part of the social life of the city. Work, schools and neighbourhood communities are already sharing spaces where there should be no differences between those who have always lived there and new neighbours.

Second, the presence of the immigrant population in municipalities like Leganés, involves not only changes visible in the image of cities and neighbourhoods, but changes in the actual management of resources and services that we provide from the municipalities. In fact, we can say that local governments, as they are closest to the citizenry, have become the authentic managers of the migration phenomenon.

This changing reality is presented as a challenge to coexist, as an invitation to find the common ground that will allow to share social space and to place new names to the collective identity that comes from diversity. In this new challenge, we are working with the involvement of various municipal offices and the participation of civic organizations, social partners and the general public for the preparation of the 2nd Plan municipal de ciudadanía y migración. It will be an expression of political and social commitment to build a city based on intercultural coexistence, diversity management, participation and equal opportunities. Allow me to share with you, briefly, which I think are the five essential keys to achieve this challenge at the local level.

The first one is knowledge; we must know the phenomenon, to realize what the causes of the migration flows are and the implications for the development of the sending countries, as well as the impact they have on their host societies. This is why it is so important, the development of projects like the one being launched with this international seminar.

Secondly, knowledge of emigration and immigration, will allow us to understand and accept that the future of societies goes through a mixed reality. The differences between new citizenship and native citizenship are diluted. All of them are active part of the social, economic and cultural life of the city, in this case of Leganés.

The third key is to face this reality as an opportunity and as challenge. As an opportunity, because our city will continue growing economically, socially and culturally thanks to the work and the contributions from all. From all of us and those who have arrived. As a challenge, not exempt of difficulties, to work for integration through the recognition of rights, duties and most of all, through the construction of a new concept of citizenship. It is understood as the set of rights, duties, possessions and feelings that we necessarily refer to the national legal status, and that are expressed, not in the broader areas of the country, but in the city, in the local community or in the neighbourhood. I am referring, as you can imagine, to a concept of citizenship that incorporates political citizenship but also the citizenship of residence. Individuals should be considered citizens because of their roots and their everyday life in their place of
residence. This is what creates the feeling of belonging to the city where you live, work or study, from a civic activity and criticism of the reality and with a sense of commitment and involvement in change processes. This feeling of belonging to a common project is the social cohesion that allows the construction of citizenship and of course, to build city.

The fourth key is awareness and education, raising public awareness and educating our children and youth of our cities into tolerance and respect. Education on tolerance and respect for diversity and the definition of collective identity that binds us are the pillars on which relays the work in progress of real integration and of which we are all part of. Managing diversity is not easy but is necessary to make a positive appreciation of diversity, to promote a positive change in relation to the social image of the immigrant population and to remove prejudices against the other, especially, if the other is a foreigner. Diversity enriches our city.

The last key that we cannot forget is that migration is a bridge with two shores. The impact of migration processes is reflected in the host societies but also in the development of the countries of origin. Therefore, it is necessary to combat the entrenched causes of forced migration, poverty must be tackled. No one can speak of migration processes without adding to the debate, poverty and human rights. Poverty must be taken as a cause of migration of millions of people and human rights as the axis around which, the fight against poverty needs to be structured.

As José Saramago said, the 21st century will be the field where the battle in real defence of human rights will be won or lost. This is not the job of writers, doctors, lawyers or politicians, but of citizens. We know the challenges and we have some clues, but especially local governments have the ability to be a source of development and have the obligation to transform, into reality, the political and social commitment to build cities based on participation and equal opportunities. And of course, promoting a model for managing diversity so that there is a dialogue from the multicultural society that places emphasis on what unites us, to build an even more enriching coexistence. After 10 years of the Europe of the regions, we are today, I think, in the Europe of cities. Cities are an incomparable frame to exercise equality, social justice and freedom.

Welcome back again to you all to the city of Leganés, you are all at home, I hope you will enjoy the city and I hope this meeting will be enriching for all.

Alexander Penelas. Former mayor of Miami-Dade County

It is common knowledge that the United States are going through very difficult times, like the rest of the world. There is, of course, the economic crisis. But we have also experienced an ecological disaster in the Gulf of Mexico. Furthermore, millions of people lost their homes through the subprime mortgage crisis, and unemployment rate is at a level not seen in years. All these different factors contribute to impact on immigrants.

The legislative aspect needs to be taken into account, too. Especially, it is mandatory to discuss the recent introduction of a very controversial law in Arizona: SB1070 made illegal immigration a State as well as a federal crime. Its introduction triggered a heated national debate, spanning over 2009-2010. Interestingly enough, right after their colleagues in Arizona, Conservative legislators from Florida decided to propose the introduction of a similar law for the next legislative sessions of our State.

Without a doubt, Miami is an example of how embracing diversity really works, a place where diversity represents a contribution and not a diminution. In fact, immigrants in South Florida are really integrated in all aspects of the community: economically, politically and socially. This diversity of cultures
is not a matter of fear, nor a polarizing issue as it might be seen in others parts of the United States. In too many places, diversity is something that people run away from. By contrast, in Miami-Dade County we see this diversity as our greatest attribute, as the major factor to promote our community. It is not a simple process though; managing a community so rich in immigrants is not easy. It takes work, courage – especially in the public sector -, determination and the willingness to take risks.

Occasionally, government officials have to invest significant political capital to really promote this agenda. It is difficult, since as we know issues concerning immigration can be very emotional. Some politicians simply prefer to talk to their base and take the position that is more politically convenient. “Playing it safe” by siding with a particular ethnic group or political base of support may, however, be politically expedient for the moment but very damaging in the long term.

In our community, this process has not been without pain. We have made many mistakes, and they are still being made, but that is part of the process. It is an evolving procedure. In that risk-taking process you have to accept that mistakes will be made and they will continue to be made. However, if handled correctly, the reward for supporting diversity and promoting social unity are undoubtedly significant.

Today, Miami-Dade is an international city. Furthermore, this metropolis is known throughout the world as the Gateway to the Americas, the “bridge” to the Americas. It has grown from a homogenous enclave of retirees and transplants to a vibrant multiethnic and cosmopolitan centre, for business and tourism. But even more important than that is that in cities like Miami, the master plan, the vision for the future, the plan for its growth and prosperity, must include diversity as its core and foundation. We must include the immigrant as a factor in the foundation for that prosperity and that growth; if this need is not accepted from the very beginning, the rest cannot work.

My approach to the challenges we had to face, the acknowledgement of our errors and our successes is extremely practical. It comes from the perspective of over 17 years of experience as an elected official at the municipal level, the last 8 of which spent as the executive mayor of Miami-Dade County, the largest municipal government throughout the south-eastern of the United States. Very specific steps were taken during my mandate in order to integrate immigrants, to promote social unit, to create public dialogue, and to build coalitions between different groups.

According to recent estimates, there are around 11 million illegal immigrants in the United States. As we already mentioned, Arizona promoted a new national law that makes being illegal a State crime, requiring papers to prove one’s own status. Its critics say this will ultimately lead to racial profiling. The issue has been widely debated, and there is indeed a contradiction between the push to protect the borders and a policy of providing immigrants a path to legalization and citizenship. However, we must underline that according to recent polls immigration is not seen as a top priority overall by US citizens; economic issues are. In an survey by NBC News/Wall Street Journal, dating to May 2010, 38% of US citizens see “job creation and economic growth” as the top priority for the federal government (+3% from January 2010), whereas immigration is seen as a key issue only by 7% of the people questioned.

Miami-Dade today covers 2,000 square miles, a surface that makes it larger than 16 States in the US. It has a budget of 8 billion dollars and a population of 2.5 million. Out of them, 62% are Hispanic, 20% black and 18% white non Hispanic. Less than a half of the Hispanics are of Cuban origin; among the blacks, there is a relevant presence of Caribbean and Haitian immigrants. All considered, Miami-Dade is home to people from 106 countries. Over 50% are foreign-born. The amount of languages spoken in the area reaches a figure of 60; to 6 out of 10 citizens, Spanish is the first language, whereas English is the first language only to 30% of the population. In Miami-Dade schools, we currently teach in 16 different languages.
This should by itself explain why integrating immigrant population has been key in Miami-Dade. However, Hispanic political strength hasn’t always been a reality. In fact, back in 1993 a federal judge had to intervene, ruling that Miami County system was illegal: there was, at the time, no equal representation of minorities. Today we have mayors, congressmen, senators, etc.

Miami-Dade example shows that in order to manage a multi-cultural community we need first and foremost to build credibility. We cannot always favour one group; a coalition building process can and must be established by involving ethnic and business communities, as well as the media. As a part of this strategy, we introduced radio programmes promoting the benefits of citizenship. The goal was to involve opinion makers in order to build coalitions (and therefore a dialogue) between different ethnic groups. Radios are very relevant especially in the Spanish community, whereas churches and pastors are key in black communities. Inclusion was tackled from the perspective of language, also with the repeal – again, in 1993 – of the anti-bilingual ordinance of 1980.

More recently, there has been a pressure to introduce so-called “street level policies”; namely, a request for street closures, as a result of NIMBY syndrome applied to immigration. There is an understandable desire to move political decisions at a local level, but this could also be a subtler way to promote exclusion. In Miami-Dade, by the way, it was more affluent realities trending towards incorporation.

Without a doubt, Miami-Dade County has had its share of problems in this maturing process. But it is my desire and my goal that some of these experiences may be of assistance, and that they could ultimately help other communities that are facing this challenge. But more than a challenge, it is even more than that, it is a great opportunity.

Carlos Westendorps, Secretary General, Club de Madrid

Good afternoon, my friends, Mr. Mayor, my dear friend Rafael Gómez Montoya, my dear friend Cristina Narbona, Ambassador to the OECD, José Manuel Gómez Bravo, who is the vice-president of the Foundation Instituto Cultura del Sur and Alexander Penelas, former Mayor of Miami Dade county; county, that I have visited and loved precisely because of its quality of a very mixed and welcoming society; and Rafael Simancas, another old friend and comrade-in-arms.

Thanks to the OECD and Instituto Cultura del Sur, for inviting me, in representation of the Club de Madrid, to participate in this first meeting. I hope that this first visit will be fruitful and will produce a solid and long-lasting marriage or civil union, as you will, that will generate, as descendents, many projects between that north, predominantly represented by the OECD and the south, represented by the foundation. When I was thinking on this north-south dichotomy, the desire of equality, which the Uruguayan artist Joaquín Torres García, expressed in that inversed map, where the South Pole is up and North Pole is down, crossed my mind.

Today, I come before you as Secretary General of the Club de Madrid, which is an organization composed by more than 75 former heads of state and democratic governments; making it the largest forum of former leaders that provides, to the leaders in exercise, a source of knowledge and leadership, so far unique. The president of the foundation, who is Felipe González, my old boss and always admired political and human personality, refers to the Club de Madrid as a museum of Chinese vases. He says that like the Chinese vases, the members of the Club de Madrid, are recognized, around the world, for their value but no one knows where to place them. In the Club de Madrid, in fact, we are dedicated to give value to the
political experience of these Chinese vases, our members, to support the development of worldwide democratic principles and democratic processes. We work on global issues like the political consequences of the crisis, an issue on which we collaborated with the OECD, the political participation of women, fighting terrorism, the process of G20 as a possible global institutionalization, but also, we work on specific issues and in specific countries such as East Timor and now we are going to participate in Haiti.

According to the subject that concerns us, which is integration and cities, social cohesion and regional development, I wanted to share with you, very briefly, because Matthew Hodes, Director of Programs of the Club of Madrid will be with you during the seminar and will make it much more accurately, one of our star initiatives, that we call Proyecto para una sociedad inclusiva. No need to justify the importance of this project. Ninety percent of the world's countries have at least a 10% minority in its midst: burkas are banned in France and in Catalonia, brutal racial attacks on Indians in Australia, brutal ethnic attacks in Kenya, bloodshed between Han Chinese and Muslims and Uighurs in China. Well, they are issues, news, some of them legitimate political decisions; in other cases, they are clear violation of human rights. But in all cases, they illustrate the tensions that exist between the different identities that inhabit the planet.

It seems, like Maalouf1 said to me a few weeks ago, responding to a letter congratulating him for the Prince of Asturias Award, that the world needs a calm and responsible conversation that respects values but recognize reality. The world also needs a reunion of those who assumed the responsibility of leading their country and have already taken a step backwards. In this conversation of former leaders lies a promise of lucidity, vision and effectiveness.

For more than 3 years, the Club de Madrid intends to be the forum for that conversation in order to mobilize the action of leadership in favour of social cohesion. We do this because we believe that the most direct threats to the coexistence and social cohesion are institutional rather than interpersonal. There are not the differences with my neighbour from a different culture that threatens the inclusion but exclusion lies, precisely, in excluding those who are different from the economic life, to prescribe them under certain cultural expressions, inequalities and unequal treatment or lack of political representation and participation.

If you agree with me that social cohesion is an institutional and political issue, rather than interpersonal relations, you will also consent that it is the basic responsibility of governments and political leaders to ensure that public policy and political discourse have a positive impact on social cohesion. It cannot be left to natural processes or invisible hands or pretend that civil society, alone, solves the problems, even though the contribution of society is certainly a fundamental factor. It is primarily a responsibility of governments and leaders and is now more important than ever.

In an era of proliferating global crises: financials, food, energy, ecological, which aggravate the tendency to seek scapegoats among those who are different from us, this work is more important than ever. In the introductory notes of this seminar, I read a sentence that I totally made mine “the choice to rule by fear a phenomenon as complex as immigration is not a sustainable solution.”

Since this meeting is with the OECD, organization for economic development, I cannot fail to mention what, in this project “inclusive societies” of the Club of Madrid, is called the economic argument for social cohesion. In Santander last week, the Club brought together a group of senior experts who worked and will work in the coming months, to create this economic argument in favour of inclusion. We firmly believe that a socially cohesive society is more stable and productive. Its members will feel confident of their role in society and their talents and contributions are recognized, nurtured and applied for further development of society as a whole. The economic contribution that immigrants make to the regions

1. Amin Maalouf is a France-based writer born in Beirut, who won the 2010 Prince of Asturias Award for literature.
and cities that host them clearly outweighs the cost of the policies that needs to be developed to facilitate their integration. Immigrants pay taxes, generate and create workforce, incorporate new businesses and business lines, which pay off the bill. But the argument does not and should not just be utilitarian, what will happen if the accounts won’t work and the bill is not paid?

It is important to recognize the benefits of a cohesive society that maximizes the contribution, creativity and talent that all its members can bring and makes diversity a plus, as the mayor of Miami-Dade said. If you separate a part of society, their contribution, skills and talents are lost to us all. There is certainly a moral argument for social cohesion, social inclusion is fairer than the exclusion, no doubt, but there is also an economic argument. Social cohesion is cheaper than division and social conflict. No matter the economic contribution of those who are included and cohered.

These series of seminar have been designed, as I read, with the idea that we need a new policy agenda to generate innovative policies that look ahead and promote inclusion. Well, let me give you some hints of what would be the contribution of the Club of Madrid. We have asked the Club members what they would have done to promote social cohesion when they were Presidents or Prime Ministers. We did not want to know what they did, this is already documented, but what should they have done or what they would have liked to do, when they exercised power. If economists are perfect futurists of the past, politicians are wise in the future and always know what they should have done when they cannot.

The response from the members of the Club, allowed us to generate what we called, 10 commitments to social cohesion. It is about 10 basic characteristics of a cohesive society, but they are not prescriptive mandates but descriptive ideas. For each of these 10 commitments, we have identified different ways of putting them into practice and as an example of how others have developed them in different countries and cities. I will list them very briefly:

1. An identity responsible for promoting social cohesion
2. Opportunities to consult minorities
3. Mechanisms to ensure that policies do not hinder social cohesion
4. Protection of individual rights
5. Ways to reduce the economic disadvantages
6. A physical environment that does not create ghettos
7. An educational system committed to social cohesion
8. A shared vision of society
9. Respect and appreciation for diversity
10. Less tension between communities

I hope I have encouraged your curiosity about the Club of Madrid and its initiative for inclusive societies. Finally, I would like to thank our hosts. First, the Mayor of Leganés, the Club de Madrid is for, of course, the world, for Madrid and for Leganés. I hope to bring to Leganés and to the south municipalities our activities and actions. And for that, I hope to count with the support of the Foundation
Good afternoon everyone. It's a real honour to be with you, to talk about a subject so important and so crucial. An important issue not only in OECD member countries; I was in a meeting with governors of banks, primarily from Africa, where we talked, in detail, about the importance of migration and its importance for the economic, social and political stability of this issue and how we treat it.

The economic development of new players, who are changing the international economic framework, moves the gravitational area of wealth production in the direction of the east of the world. The emergence of these players adjusts the general economic structure and the situation of inequalities. Of course, when development is produced in countries it will always create more inequalities that the ones existed before. These are caused because economic opportunities are created and because investments are made by employers, however, wages will not increase at the same proportion for the simple reason that there is a mass of workers demanding the opportunity to work in cities. Thus, wages are kept low when other social actors evidence their income increase.

These phenomena are taking place today. They are happening in many countries such as Brazil and China, and their extent is so great that in order to achieve full employment, which means a general employment situation that will allow wages to increase, is going to take a very long time. This is also happening in some large economies in Africa or Latin America. The result is that this great mass of workers, who often come to big cities, contributes to the creation, in these cities, of areas that are outside the economic and social mainstream and therefore, it becomes a centre of a large mass of poverty. Where poverty is concentrated in the city, it becomes extremely difficult to treat it. Also, it creates a mass of workers who demand, after having experienced in their own country the difficulty of economic integration, to find work elsewhere and then, they migrate. They migrate to OECD economies; economies that are affected by the crisis and its own consequences. First, it was a financial crisis and then an economic one that has turned into an important social crisis with unemployment phenomena, as we observe today.

It is also a crisis that directly affects remittances, an important source of insertion of resources for development in less developed countries. In this framework, overall inequality increases and takes a very territorial form. In Mexico City, in large African or Latin American cities, in OECD cities or in Europe, the inequality takes the form of a concentration of population in urban areas.

What can governments do to address this problem? National governments, of course, should have a role, a policy role towards migration as a part of the struggle against the economic phenomena we observe. This is very difficult, taking into account the level of deficit. Although, certainly, efforts in terms of investments to close the gap of demand that the crisis has created, was a very appropriate and timely intervention, the margins to boost the economy are now quite limited.

Are we just talking about national governments in this context? Of course not, because the phenomenon of migration, especially when concentrated in urban areas, has a particular characteristic that the classical sectorial policies of national governments can hardly play. This means that in urban areas, good policy work serves to address the problem of integrating immigrants, and of course, a good economic development policy for the country may help migration. The difficulty of integration in urban areas is not enough, because the integration of immigrants in urban areas, particularly, when they are concentrated in a
specific place, creates particular problems, which the social disintegration and inequality factors cannot be easily identify in one or two, there are multiple. To this, we can add the separation of one part of the city due to the infrastructure that cuts the social tissue; family problems and problems of integration of immigrants with different cultures. The combination of these problems creates a vicious cycle that causes a separation of a part of society.

I remember, in the OECD in the mid 1990s in which the economic situation was better; we tried to calculate how many urban areas in difficulty existed. Well, eventually, it resulted that in the 12 countries in which we had implemented the calculation, about 10% of the population used to live in metropolitan areas in difficulty. I am talking about England, the Netherlands, Sweden, and France; back then it is a very serious phenomenon when the economy was behaving well, but, today it is an even more serious one when the situation is more complicated.

On top of this, we have to place the problem of different cultures. A challenge against those who carry other values or a different culture, a difficulty to perceive the multicultural dimension of the society in which we live, which does not help, surely, to address the problem.

I think that, if this is the picture and interpretation, local authorities have a crucial role in this framework. Address the phenomenon, when it becomes multi-sectoral, needs exactly strong local actors in order to combine different national policies into a fine and appropriate combination to respond to local needs than the central government often lacks the capacity to do so.

Local actors are not simply at the forefront of this issue, because they are the first that the immigrants, and that the city dwellers will consult and contact, but also, secondly, because they have the knowledge of how to deal with this problem. This is the reason why of this conference, that is why, we are here. We are in an area that was interesting to immigration for many years that happened in an extremely positive way. Over a period of significant internal migration to the country, this area was able to integrate the people coming from other regions; integrating them not only in social policy issues or in the cultural atmosphere of the municipalities, but integrating them also with the economic action, through the creation of jobs and economic activity. Therefore, we're in a place that has experience to be shared with others. I believe it is an important and unique experience.

In addition, an area that also confronts a second wave of immigration coming from other countries. Also, in this case, it has known how to use European, national and local resources to define integration strategies for this immigrant. Now, this situation confronts us with another challenge, to prove that this experience of the past can be a useful tool, not only, for the southern part of Madrid, the city of Madrid, the metropolitan area Madrid, but it can serve as a good practice to analyze and study in detail in order to transfer it, teach it or tell it to others metropolitan areas that have had greater difficulty in carrying out this integration.

For all these reasons, the discussion we're doing here goes far beyond the Spaniard national perimeter and this is why the OECD’s implication is so important in this debate. The idea is to discuss with you and see how we can involve other realities in this problematic situation.

Tomorrow is an important day, because we have international experts to discuss with us. The problem is not just a problem of action or funding, but a problem of redefining public policy, how we do it and how we do it inclusive, by the integration of different actors, different parts of society, defining what should be done. There is no text book, nor a book on economics, nor a politician who has the answer. We must build it together and I will have the pleasure of doing it with you.
Cristina Narbona, Spain’s Ambassador to the OECD

Good afternoon, it’s a pleasure to be here with you today and discuss these pressing issues. Information is a key part of immigrant integration. It is needed to build consensus around the integration of immigrants with very clear ideas on how to be effective. We see this, for example, with some new technologies that can serve multiple goals related to immigration, like improving the quality of democracy, promoting a positive attitude toward immigrants, and facilitating participation and activism. These technologies – like websites that track government spending - allow citizens to be more responsible, to act in a responsible manner in their environment, while they can also be more demanding of their governments. As these technologies become more widespread, and citizens more engaged, it is important to avoid biased or incomplete information. For instance, it is hard for any citizen to fully understand the key elements of the economic, financial, social and political challenges we face.

Meeting these challenges creates a need for a better democracy, which embraces and supports the effort of globalizing not only the economy, but also the rights of citizenship enjoyed in industrialised countries. I had the opportunity to hear some words of what is being called the institutionalization of justice, that is, how we see what is right and what is not - how we cooperate with the authorities to instill greater responsibility for the construction of a global framework at national level, where not only the economy, but also rights, are globalized. We should work towards ensuring that no matter where a citizen lives, wherever they were born, they have the right to a dignified life, to an active participation in society, access to education, to health services, and a decent job. All these rights should be recognized.

While this goal is common to us all, the process of building a higher quality democracy and of immigrant integration in Spain is being pursued in a unique context. Spain’s immigration ratios have come in line with the OECD average in the last decade. In most other countries, this ratio grew more slowly, or much earlier on. Until recently, Spain was a country of outmigration. In such a short time, it is understandable, and maybe even unavoidable, that phenomena of this magnitude produce certain social impacts.

With this in mind, we in Spain are facing the crisis of the welfare state, where access to public services and access to work have become much more difficult, and we know that it is important to prevent social tensions from transforming into a xenophobic movement and then into legislative responses, as we observed in countries neighbouring Spain. To avoid such a dynamic, it is important that citizens can receive unbiased information and that they also participate in the generation of such information.

In this framework, I know that the proceedings of this two-day seminar will be extremely useful for those who believe that politics is not the art of the possible but the art of the possible that results from what is necessary, what is fair, according to our values. I think it is much appreciated that the mayors of the municipalities of the south of Madrid feel and have felt the need, and indeed demonstrated the determination to expand their field of vision, to know other realities and contrast their own experiences with the experiences of other countries. Globalization, I insist, does not limit itself to the economy and the financial markets; globalization happens in our daily life- it is the result of globalized information through the internet and through the construction of new democratic tools that integrate citizens worldwide.

I want to conclude by saying that diversity involves many different subjects, not only migration. For instance, there are gender and religious issues. Diversity can also be applied to physical conditions. The challenge is to integrate diversity in day-to-day politics to manage societies with more and more old people (hence with higher and higher dependency rates), with a more active role for women, and with an extraordinary concern for how young people will succeed in the future.
Spain is a country where there are now more young people between 15 and 24 years old who neither study nor work. There are young people in our country, children of immigrants and young immigrants who have arrived at the end of the economic euphoria. They represent a potential that it is not being used, yet they could represent a solution to the current recession provided that we integrate them into our society. So, with my most sincere thanks, most notably to all the people who have come from abroad, who have migrated to Leganés for a while, and that I hope have also enjoyed the hospitality of this town and the hospitality of City Hall. I also would like to thank, of course, very much the OECD and the Foundation, who have made possible this first meeting. Thank you.
EXPERTS’ CONTRIBUTIONS
Introduction

This paper presents a brief overview of trends in urban policies in OECD countries. It discusses the findings draw upon the various OECD Territorial Reviews of national, regional and urban areas conducted by the OECD, as well as on key OECD synthesis reports including Regions Matters (2009) and Competitive Cities in the Global Economy (2006). The policy concept used in this report is the OECD’s new paradigm of regional development policy. Globalisation confronts regions, whether urban or rural, with new opportunities and threats. The new paradigm’s objective is to reduce persistent inefficiency (under utilisation of resources resulting in income below potential) and persistent social exclusion (primarily, an excessive number of people below a given standard in terms of income and other features of well-being) in specific places. According to the new paradigm, regional policy aims at helping each region, whether wealthy or not, to maximise its own comparative advantages in a positive sum game that contributes to national objectives.

For urban areas, this means that concentration of resources in a place is enabled by forces set in motion by agglomeration economies but that does not necessarily translate into economic performance. Agglomeration economies are conditional on the existence of a pooled labour market, backward and forward linkages among firms, and knowledge spillovers. The key appears to be how assets are used, how different stakeholders interact and how synergies are exploited. The market may not always achieve this alone. There are also negative externalities associated with urbanisation, including congestion and environmental costs, as well as emergence of pockets of poverty and exclusion as the creation of jobs is not always commensurate to economic growth in urban areas. For these two main reasons, there is a rationale for urban public policies with a role of higher level of governments.

Urbanisation: a step-by-step evolutionary process

Experience in OECD countries shows that the process of urbanisation is essentially a function of a country’s economic development and diversification, driven in large part by such positive externalities as technological advances – notably the Industrial Revolution – and the democratisation of access to education. Strong urbanisation has been fuelled by rural-to-urban migration (and in North America by significant in-migration from abroad over the last two centuries), which in turn drove solid economic performance as the industrial revolution took hold by the middle of the 19th century. A century later, migration began to ease as congestion and other centrifugal forces grew. Urbanisation slowed, and was accompanied by a process of suburbanisation after World War II.

Since the mid-1990s, the rate of urbanisation has again been increasing in the majority of OECD countries. This process of re-urbanisation in the context of globalisation has been accompanied by the growth in the services sector in OECD countries and the concomitant out-migration of significant primary and heavy manufacturing activity of OECD-based trans-national corporations to non-OECD countries. This process of tertiarisation of the economy in the OECD is also a predominantly urban phenomenon: it has been driven by a concentration of human capital (especially highly qualified persons) and a large increase in the participation rates of women in the economy, almost exclusively in urban areas. At the
same time, this process has led to a more fragmented pattern of urbanisation with some urban cores regaining population and others showing decline.

These stages of urbanisation, de-urbanisation and re-urbanisation have not been uniformly felt across the OECD. Some countries urbanised faster than others: for example, France, Spain and Italy remained largely rural until as late as the 1950s, while the United States and the United Kingdom had begun their rapid urbanisation by the end of World War I. Moreover, rates of urbanisation can vary significantly within countries. The patterns of economic growth and diversification neatly map against these differing rates as well.

Factors influencing urban competitiveness

**Large cities: importance of, and limits to, their role**

Indeed, urbanisation is generally associated with higher income and productivity levels. Higher urban population shares are generally associated with higher per capita GDP than their national average, partly attributable to metropolitan areas. In many OECD countries, one single metropolitan area produces between one-third and one-half of the national GDP. Figure 1, shows the concentration of GDP in Europe. Similar trends can be observed out of the OECD. For instance, in China where metropolitan regions have become the principal engines of China’s fast-growing economy accounting for almost two-thirds of the country’s GDP.

**Figure 1. Economic concentration in Europe**

Economic density at TL3 level (GDP per square km) in 2005

![Economic concentration in Europe](image_url)

Note: OECD regions are classified at two levels: Territorial Level 2 (TL2) and Territorial Level 3 (TL3).

Source: Own calculations based on data from the OECD Regional Database.

However, the benefits associated with economies of agglomeration are not unlimited. Cities can reach a point where external diseconomies outweigh centripetal forces and become less competitive. At least one-third of OECD metro-regions, which are 78 urban areas with more than 1.5 million inhabitants, ranks systematically lower than their national average for almost all indicators, such as income, economic growth, productivity, skills, employment and unemployment. This is in large part due to negative externalities caused by historically unregulated/unmanaged urban growth and diminishing marginal returns: after a certain point, congestion and smog, land scarcity and sprawl, marginalised human capital
and infrastructure deterioration due to lack of financial resources begin to contribute to an urban area’s dysfunction and decline. Once-attractive urban areas become regions to avoid – and highly qualified talent, along with endogenous and foreign capital, can flee or decide to focus their business decision-making elsewhere. These negative externalities can therefore lead to diseconomies of scale, which can serve to illustrate the limits of urban agglomerations’ influence on economic development across the OECD.

**Medium-sized cities have potential.**

Among OECD urban areas, it is medium-sized ones that outgrow the rest in terms of economic performance, since the mid-1990s (Figure 3). Population grows faster in the larger the urban area, yet it is medium-sized cities that outperform the rest in terms of economic growth. Medium-sized cities are half the economic size (GDP) of large ones and less than one-third of those with more than 1.5 million people. Nonetheless, over 1995-2005, they grow by half a percentage more every year, in terms of GDP. Over time such growth differentials can compound to yield significant development gains and increase inequality across urban areas.

**Figure 3. Economic performance and city size**

Economic growth according to city size

1. This analysis was carried out using only predominantly urban (PU) areas.
2. Small cities are PUs with population between 100,000 and 500,000 people. Medium-sized cities are PUs with population between 500,000 and 1 million people. Large cities are PUs with population between 1 and 1.5 million people
3. GDP expressed in PPPs
Source: Own calculations based on OECD Regional Database

**Defining an optimum city size serves no purpose**

City size drives positive urban growth and economic performance only up to the point at which negative externalities begin to cause diseconomies of scale in the urban area. There is therefore no single optimum city size, but rather an efficient city size which depends on local circumstances (indeed, one country’s medium-sized city is another’s megalopolis). Not only that, but the nature and scope of the
Agglomeration effect on a city’s economic growth will vary strongly by economic sector. Growth in some sectors – the media and entertainment industries, for example – is sustained by highly skilled human capital, while others are dependent on technological innovation (ITC), while still others are dependent on both (biopharmaceuticals; banking and finance). The size and configuration of urban centres that specialise in particular economic sectors tend to reflect their sectors’ component make-up.

Trend analysis in OECD countries shows that those cities that attract firms and workers will continue to do so as long as the benefits associated with higher wages, productivity and employment continue to be positive. Moreover, preferences for different sized cities will vary by household. Some highly qualified people chose to live and work in large metropolises because they like the vibrancy, dynamism and choice of professional and leisure amenities such big cities tend to offer; other people, with the identical qualifications, will prefer smaller centres precisely because they eschew what they regard as congested, dirty, noisy, expensive big cities (Florida, 2002). So the driver is not size, but the efficiency with which a city or urban area operates – any sized cities will continue to attract and retain workers and firms so long as the benefits from living and working there continue to outweigh the costs associated with agglomeration, costs which will vary depending on the economic sector and area of specialisation.

Urban competitiveness is mainly driven by endogenous factors.

Whilst a sound macro-economic environment, efficient products and markets as well as performing regulatory and taxing environment are crucial elements to ensure productivity and growth, competitiveness (and decline) of the business sector increasingly depends on factors related to the regional business environment. Performance in the productivity level of urban regions (the main explanation of regional differences) is strongly associated with economic specialisation, as well as human and physical endowments.

OECD works on urban regions highlights the level of skills as a main determinant that influences their productivity level. This finding is corroborated by the OECD regional growth model which shows that human capital – mainly tertiary educational attainment - is the most explanatory factor whilst infrastructure has an impact on other factors in place (e.g. human capital, innovation, agglomeration). More generally, as countries integrate with the globalising economy, their competitiveness will increasingly be driven by the capacities of their urban regions to improve the productivity of enterprises in ever-widening supply chains. These urban capacities not only include the bricks and mortar of infrastructure, but also the knowledge and skills of workers, and the social capital needed to trigger and sustain innovation that is shared among firms.

The urban paradox: dynamic growth and social exclusion co-exist in urban regions

Although most urban areas in OECD countries appear to be characterised by high concentrations of wealth and employment, associated with leading sectors and the focal points of their national economies, they also tend to concentrate a high number of unemployed residents. In other words, wealth is not adequately translated into job creation. While employment and employment growth are typically higher in cities, urban areas also contain disproportionate numbers of people who are either unemployed or inactive (or who work in the informal economy). Among the main explanations for this paradox are the lack of affordable child care facilities, larger proportions of immigrants who generally have lower skills and who may be discriminated against, and in some cases, the presence of a sizeable informal economy, typically bigger in large cities. Consequently, cities in OECD tend to concentrate pockets of exclusion and poverty, so that these challenges have become urban phenomena.

Certain characteristics of dynamic post-industrial cities result in increasing socio-economic inequalities, which increase segregation and its consequent social stresses. Exclusion does not, of course, take the same form or intensity in every city but most urban regions, including the wealthiest ones, have
pockets of populations that have low standards of living and experience social problems. This creates a need to apply integration strategies to urban services, job opportunities, housing, and the like. Social exclusion in urban areas is generally associated with strong residential segregation between the prosperous and disadvantaged populations that concentrate in deprived neighbourhoods. Poverty, exclusion and spatial polarisation alter the pattern of employment and investment, therefore reducing the city’s capacity to pursue area-wide goals, such as competitiveness and sustainability. The repercussions are difficult to quantify, but a certain number of direct and indirect costs can be easily identified. They include the loss of human capital and diminished social capital, as well as a burden on public spending due to higher criminality and related destruction of public goods in distressed areas. This points to a need for policymakers to address social segregation and the needs of disadvantaged urban populations in order to keep the engines of local economic growth and competitiveness running smoothly.

Environment quality becomes key for urban competitiveness - urban policy can contribute to a global climate change agenda

Environmental quality has become a key factor in determining cities’ competitiveness. Climate change threatens cities’ growth, as more severe storms and coastal flooding, urban heat island effects, pollution and resource shortages threaten to damage infrastructure, reduce efficiency and exacerbate urban poverty. OECD modelling of metropolitan regions finds that low pollution levels will increasingly be a factor driving the attractiveness of urban areas, and therefore of competitiveness. Urban sprawl is related to the level of carbon emissions at the national level (Figure 4). Thus, policies to reduce urban sprawl and congestion can be effective in mitigating climate change. Furthermore, this policy can be implemented at the regional level without having a detrimental effect on long-term economic growth, particularly when coupled with incentives for innovation. The trade-off between economic growth and climate/environmental policy can actually be lower at the local level than at the national level, in part because more complementarities and synergies can be observed at this scale among the different policy objectives. As cities concentrate a large part of global GHG emissions, national governments in OECD countries now understand that an urban lens should be applied to climate change policies. OECD work has demonstrated that an urban climate policy agenda (densification/congestion tax) can halve the abatement costs of a global climate change policy (e.g. carbon tax).
Policy Approaches

Target an “Urban Development”, not an “Urbanisation” Strategy

An “Urban Development” approach might be more appropriate than an “Urbanisation” approach. City size matters but need not be a driver for developing the strategy’s framework. While urbanisation brings further growth and productivity, governments should not target an optimum city-size but rather aim at maximising the benefits of agglomeration economies and removing obstacles to their establishment, based on local comparative advantages and weaknesses. Although it should focus on long term outcomes, an Urban Development Strategy also needs to remain flexible and encompass a vision that is tailored to the specific stages of urbanisation that might vary across the country as well as to regional differences and city specificities.
An integrated, multi-sectoral, forward-looking approach is necessary

Urban competitiveness depends on several input factors; it is therefore important for national policymakers to adopt an integrated approach to urban development issues. What has become increasingly clear to OECD central governments as they become conscious of the key role cities play in sustaining their country’s national growth and international competitive position, is that a siloed, sectoral approach to solving place-based challenges does not work. Issues that play out in urban areas – indeed issues that all regions face – are far too complex and interrelated for a single order of government or a single government ministry to address effectively. On the contrary, across the OECD, evidence suggests that it is the multi-sectoral approach, for example linking land-use issues to housing, infrastructure, the fiscal framework and human capital integration, which produces the best results.

Recognising this principle, many OECD countries have complemented their traditional remedial policies (concern with remedying the decline of industrial cities and managing issues of decay, crime and social problems were often the automatic associations of the term ‘urban policy’ in the 1980s and even the 1990s) and infrastructure-based approach with forward-looking programmes for attracting firms in the most innovative and dynamic sectors, their associated highly skilled work forces (through human capital improvement, attraction and retention measures), as well as efforts to foster innovation. More recently, the environmental dimension is beginning to be included both as a function of the recognition of the impact of climate change on cities and of the potential for urban areas to contribute effectively to climate change mitigation objectives as well as their complementary impact on equity and efficiency objectives.

Policy planning needs to be grounded in the reality of the market

Whilst strategic planning for urban development can help manage demand for future public investment, it is important to ensure that it is sustained as a function of market forces. A main objective of strategic planning is to emphasise trajectories that maximise growth opportunities without overstretching public investment requirements. It is important to recall however that trends in OECD countries show that urbanisation has been driven by market forces, not by governments. However, the same evidence also demonstrates that active regional public policies as well as some sectoral policies (housing, fiscal, etc.) have had important effects on the development of urban areas. There is also evidence of urban regions having failed to realise their potential because of a lack of appropriate public policy and the fact that containment policies to limit urban growth have not produced expected outcome.

Urban development is a key component of the national spatial policy framework

Addressing long term strategic planning for urban areas within national spatial/regional planning frameworks is essential to avoid duplication and conflicts within and between regions and foster synergies. There are several reasons to ensure consistency between an urban development strategy (addressed to urban regions or cities only) and a national spatial/regional planning framework. First, it is a way to meet certain nationally agreed-upon objectives such as controlling regional disparities and working towards sustainable development. It is important however to recall that the new paradigm for regional development policies that is being developed in OECD countries addresses the equity issues among regions differently than in the past. Current approaches are based on the principles that opportunities for growth exist in the entire territory and across all types of regions and therefore departs from the old view of regional development as a zero-sum game aimed at responding to efficiency-equity trade-offs. Second, ensuring consistency with national spatial/regional planning can foster rural-urban linkages, which have strong economic interactions based on natural, human-capital, economic and financial interdependencies.
**A-spatial sectoral policies also matter**

Assessing the impact of national public policies in urban areas requires recognising the impact of implicit “urban” policies. The concept of urban policy transcends the confines of narrow definitions given that nearly all public policies directly or indirectly affect urban development. Central governments have a large impact on urban living conditions through a variety of policies, programmes and projects that are being implemented by a wide number of national ministerial departments and agencies. It is important for the success of urban policy that these ‘implicitly urban’ policies are recognised as such.

**Policy trade-offs need not include pitting one city-region against another**

An Urban Development Strategy needs to build up competitive cities whilst ensuring that others do not fall into neglect. Whether or not the identification of ‘national champion cities’ can produce positive spillovers for the rest of a country or prevent those other parts developing their own dynamism is of overwhelming importance to an evaluation of the strategy. The choice is not between using national policy to favour growth poles as opposed to regeneration and social repair of declining areas, but of putting the national eggs into a smaller or larger number of baskets. A national government that focuses strongly on its most promising cities runs the risk of producing very uneven development within its territory, with whole regions missing out on chances to enter the new economy; conversely, a government that tries to spread its urban infrastructure evenly may end up with no cities able to enter the competitive arena of global cities.

The importance of a national policy framework that focuses not only on producing urban champions is shown by the evidence that subsidiary/regional growth poles, while unable to act at the global level, may generate important autonomous dynamism for regions remote from a country’s main growth pole(s) and thus contribute effectively to overall national growth.

Goverments in many OECD countries have therefore tried to ensure that supporting champion cities does not compromise earlier policy goals of even-handed treatment of different regions. Experience suggests three potential ways out of achieving such a balance and creatively resolving this question:

- Even where a country has one clearly dominant metro-region, government and other policy actors can plan for a number of subsidiary strong regions, which, while they might not rival and may even be dependent upon the leading one, can have positive effects in parts of the country remote from the leading city.
- This approach will benefit even larger areas if potential wider positive regional impacts of key growth centres can be realised and encouraged.
- The policy of developing subsidiary growth poles can be extended to former deprived regions if the policy switch can be made from thinking in terms of regeneration and dealing with social casualty to a proactive and positive approach to urban economies.

**A statistical tool-kit is essential**

An adapted urban development approach requires developing appropriate statistical tool to assess trends and challenges of urban policies, both within a national context and to allow for international comparison. Defining what is urban has been a difficult task and there is no commonly agreed definition which makes international comparisons difficult; however, the OECD has developed powerful tools for the analysis of urban and metropolitan areas. OECD has taken a global lead in understanding functional characteristics of metropolitan regions. It has developed approaches for defining them as functional regions that capture the spatial extent of core economic and social dynamics in metropolitan areas.
Statistical tools, from outcome indicators to output measurements, are crucial to monitor progress toward achieving the strategic policy outcomes defined in urban development strategies. Based on reliable, comparable measurement tools, decision-makers can adjust plans over the medium term if the indicators demonstrate that the chosen policy and programming tools are not optimising the achievement of the urban development strategy’s outcomes. These tools are equally key to ensuring that each actor involved in the development and delivery of multi-sectoral, multi-government strategies can measure the impact of their contribution to the achievement of these outcomes.

Clear, reliable, and intelligible statistics are key to enhancing transparency and citizens’ participation. Through this information all community members can readily gain access to benchmark indicators that show progress (or lack thereof) in achieving the “vision” that they will have established for themselves and their community in the urban development strategies.

Identifying the Policy Focus

Unique assets tend to generate common challenges in most OECD urban areas

Unique urban attributes notwithstanding, most urban centres across the OECD tend to face a similar set of negative externalities. It is therefore not surprising that urban development strategies across the OECD tend to focus on addressing a similar set of policy challenges: land use and the related issues of urban sprawl and urban attractiveness and liveability, as urban land tends to be scarce and expensive no matter where the urban centre in the OECD, the economic behaviour of firms and industrial groupings in driving urban economic diversification and competitiveness, most notably cluster–building and innovation capacity, human capital development, attraction, retention and integration, particularly as a function of innovation and competitiveness, housing and strategic urban infrastructure, and more recently the relationship between urban development and climate change.

As well, since OECD governments have been addressing urban development challenges systematically since the end of the Second World War, trial and error has led to the adoption of methodological approaches that resemble each other across the OECD. One methodological feature common to the most successful urban development strategies in the OECD is their focus on policy outcomes. The most effective urban development strategies tend to be outcomes-driven, focussing on achieving clearly-defined long-term results. They also tend to identify concrete, practical plans to move forward, along with the fiscal, regulatory and programming tool-kit required to achieve results. Hence, the similarity of policy challenges in most urban centres across the OECD explains why, notwithstanding the uniqueness of a city’s specific strengths and attributes, public policy frameworks focusing on urban development tend to converge around a common policy-cluster focus and a common methodology.

Manage spatial development through land-use assessment, tax reform and growth plans

Many OECD countries have developed land-use policies to improve the cost effectiveness of public investment and address market failures linked with rapid urbanisation and unplanned growth. OECD governments employ a wide arsenal of tools to control the speed and the location of urban development. These can be divided into three categories: land assessments, property taxation, and growth management tools.

- Ongoing land assessments: Policymakers require information to measure and accommodate the demand for urban development. With these assessments, infrastructure allocation can be programmed to reduce long-term patterns of congestion and sprawl. Future land-use analysis and scenario modelling are useful in determining which lands are potentially developable to accommodate urban growth. They can also illuminate the spatial impact of public policies, e.g.
possible effects of changes in permitted density, zoning ordinances, and the construction of roads and public transportation facilities.

- **Property taxation:** The introduction of a property tax can reduce distortions on land markets and stimulate more efficient land use. As the most important tool for most OECD countries to recoup the increased land value due to development, the property tax is effectively used by many OECD countries to control excessive land conversion. Excessive reliance of local government revenue sources on revenues from land leasing may generate irrational investment spending given the fiscal incentive to acquire and convert agricultural land into developable areas.

- **Growth management:** The need to align urban growth and infrastructure allocation justifies urban growth management in OECD countries. These policies anticipate and incorporate the impacts of growth on local infrastructure and environment systems, and can also protect open space and farmlands in peri-urban areas. OECD member countries have developed policy tools to control the speed of urban growth and complement it with infrastructure development as well as tools to control where urban growth occurs.

**Address urban sprawl, which has long term economic and environmental costs**

The environmental and economic costs of sprawl can be avoided by developing a more extensive transportation system, by applying land-use policies aimed at increasing density and by linking economic success of metro-regions to the development of medium-sized cities. Urban sprawl not only increases carbon emissions due to transportation and longer commuting journeys, but it also imposes economic costs on workers and firms. The development of public transportation systems in metropolitan regions as well as in medium-sized cities are key to fostering mass transit commuting to employment centres and to encouraging housing development near public transit. In addition, land-use policies that favour denser urban areas through zoning and the provision of high-quality urban services can also help reduce the need to build housing in suburban areas. The development of medium-sized cities is also key to offering industrial location alternatives to firms, which would support an economic strategy for those cities and release the pressure for urban sprawl in metropolitan regions. The development of rail and bus services both within and between cities becomes an essential part of any new urban strategy designed to tackle increase public transit and reduce sprawl. This normally requires a strong role for central government, as local governments lack the power and resources to construct major transport systems by themselves.

**Target attractiveness and liveability as a main objective of dynamic cities**

Rapid change and increasing size are essential attributes of urban dynamism, but they are both associated with a number of negative phenomena, which together have led to invention of the term ‘liveability’ when contemporary cities are assessed; ‘liveability’ being in large part a question of public goods, this issue is a highly important one on the urban public policy agenda. One consequence of this is that a Urban Development Agenda finds itself including many of the issues of the more familiar agenda of coping with decline and symptoms of social stress. Economically successful cities declining in liveability constitute examples of how diseconomies of scale may set in, and as such demonstrate why it is very difficult for governments to stand back and let the market take its course. Much policymaking here devolves to local authorities, as they witness the emerging problems ‘on the ground’, but some of the issues concerned are beyond the reach of local governments, and central governments have a role in ensuring that city authorities are equipped with the legal powers and finances they need in order to improve urban infrastructures. The highly mobile groups and firms that constitute the dynamic sectors have a capacity to choose where they live, and they will avoid cities with poor environments; good physical and social infrastructure are aspects of the creation of dynamic cities, not just compensation for their consequences.
Innovation and cluster development: Build on local assets

Market forces alone may not always support a city’s pursuit of a particular economic activity. Markets sometimes fail – for instance, key factors in the innovation or production and commercialisation process may be absent in the urban region; educational and training institutions may be inadequate or lack the knowledge of the skills requirements in their urban region’s key economic sectors, or the urban labour force’s skills may not match the jobs available in the region’s key industrial sectors. There is therefore an important role for national governments in helping city and urban regional authorities identify potential new economic activities and in matching input factors to output requirements at times of rapid change.

In the past, regional policy initiatives aimed at stimulating a region’s economy have often focused on attracting foreign direct investment through direct subsidies, for example to encourage foreign investors to locate their firms in the region, under the assumption that FDI will automatically stimulate local input factors (such as the endogenous labour force) to produce dynamic economic activity in a way that endogenous investments could not. If a region’s business environment is not dynamic, if a region’s labour force is not well trained or if a region’s infrastructure is inadequate to meet the business community’s needs, no amount of FDI will change this state of affairs.

Having learned this sometimes expensive lesson through trial and error, governments around the OECD began to focus in the 1990s on how best to encourage endogenous firms to become more competitive, which led to the policy interest in cluster development and in how to foster inter-firm linkages. There are several example of this policy approach in OECD countries (Table 1). This in turn led to the now current focus on stimulating a region’s endogenous innovation capacity, along with recognition that there is significant policy interdependence between innovation capacity, human capital development, infrastructure and land-use.

Table 1. Examples of industry cluster policies in OECD metropolitan regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan region</th>
<th>Starting Year</th>
<th>Brand name of the cluster strategies</th>
<th>Targeted clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular regions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy by Boston Metropolitan Planning Council</td>
<td>Knowledge creation, IT, financial services, health care, traditional manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Charting our international future; building a competitive, attractive, independent and responsible community (overall metropolitan strategy)</td>
<td>Competitive clusters (aerospace, life sciences, information technologies, and textiles and clothing); visibility clusters (culture, tourism, and services); emerging technology clusters (nanotechnologies, advanced materials, and environmental technologies); and manufacturing clusters (energy, bio-food, petrochemicals and plastics, and paper and wood products).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Loosely structured cluster policy programs, including Bio³(1997) and Software-Offensive Bavaria (1998)</td>
<td>Mechanical engineering/automotive, ICT, finance/insurance, medical, biotechnology, and aerospace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital cities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Innovation Ottawa</td>
<td>Tourism, telecommunications, microelectronics, professional services, life sciences, software &amp; communications and photonics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Seoul Digital Media City</td>
<td>Digital media industry and related industries such as software and IT-related service industries, IT manufacturers, R&amp;D centres dealing with media and entertainment technology, as well as industries distributing and consuming digital contents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Regional Industry Revitalisation Project (for Northern Tokyo metropolitan area), Fostering Bioventures, and IT venture forum</td>
<td>Transportation and electric machine, biotechnology, and IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newer technology centres</td>
<td>2002 Community and Economic Development Strategy (FY 2002-2004)</td>
<td>Telecommunications, biomedical/biosciences, software, electronics manufacturing, financial and business services, and defense and space manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Turning Point: New Choices for the Future by Greater Phoenix Economic Council (GPEC)</td>
<td>Aerospace and aviation, high technology, bioindustry, software, and advanced financial and business services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, Minnesota, US</td>
<td>The Initiative for a Competitive Milwaukee (ICM)</td>
<td>Manufacturing, business process service centres, construction and development, and health services; and Additional two business environment issues to be addressed; workforce development and entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville, Kentucky, US</td>
<td>The West Louisville Competitive Assessment and Strategy Project (&quot;The Strategy Project&quot;)</td>
<td>Automotive cluster, transportation and logistics cluster, and life sciences (biomedical research and health care)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, New Jersey, US</td>
<td>Opportunity Newark: Jobs and Community Development for the 21st Century(Oppportunity Newark)</td>
<td>Education &amp; knowledge creation, entertainment, arts &amp; retail, health services transportation, logistics &amp; light assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, Pennsylvania,</td>
<td>Initiative for a Competitive Greater Reading (ICGR)</td>
<td>Entertainment, hospitality and tourism; food processing; and professional and shared Services and cross-cutting issues: innovation in manufacturing, economic development co-ordination, and inner city entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>City Growth Strategies (CGS) Pilot areas include St. Helens, Nottingham, Plymouth and four areas of London</td>
<td>Various clusters identified, for example, prioritised clusters in Plymouth includes advanced engineering, business services, creative Industries, marine industries, medical and healthcare, tourism and Leisure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although initiatives have tended to focus on innovation in research hubs, which have met with the most success, governments have shown an increasing interest in encouraging innovation capacity beyond leading-edge sectors by focusing on more traditional industries to encourage firms in these sectors to “move up the value-added food chain”. But encouraging innovation capacity as a component of cluster-building remains a popular policy response across the OECD. Despite a certain level of “cluster fatigue” in policy and academic circles, national innovation strategies using the cluster model continue to be popular and in some cases are featured prominently on the policy agendas of national governments.

Indeed, there are numerous examples within OECD countries of partnerships between central and local authorities that focus on identifying and building nascent clusters – starting with practical feasibility studies to define realistic possibilities that are market-driven rather than unrealistic. The identification of cluster potential is usually made at the city level, but central governments play a crucial role in providing macro as well as targeted help for nascent clusters, from creating a positive fiscal environment (including fiscal and regulatory incentives to encourage cluster development) to providing strategic infrastructure development support (for instance for transit and transportation, ITC networks, water/wastewater and solid waste systems and the like) or to giving local authorities guidance and training to pursue realistic approaches to development. Central to these partnerships is the identification by the central and local government partners of policy areas where they can see scope for targeted action in support of firms’ existing, market-based strategies. Another prominent way in which governments can provide general but targeted support for activities that are emergent rather than centrally planned is by building up universities as strategic hubs and by encouraging partnerships between the universities/colleges/vocational institutions and the private sector in the urban region to ensure that the training institutions are fully aware of the nature and scope of the skill-sets required by the urban region’s clusters.
Regionalise labour market policies

Although immigrants represent a resource for urban economies, cities will observe increased productivity from labour-market pooling only if these newcomers are successfully integrated in the local economy and they are given fair opportunities to move-up the social ladder. Experiences from OECD cities show that sudden increases in labour inflows do not need to have large negative effects on employment, earnings and security if local labour markets are flexible and resilient. Integrated strategies need thus to be developed in collaboration among levels of government to strengthen local labour markets, through regulatory reforms, workforce development, support to SMEs and business incubators. City governments have important responsibilities in the design and implementation of these strategies but strong coordination with higher levels of government is required. In recent years, the widening activism of local government authorities and local public employment services in OECD cities have lead to smarter prioritisation of employment programs and sharper targeting of those more in need. Job-creation programs should be pursued simultaneously with safety-net programs for those transiting into unemployment and integration programs for the migrants. Failure to avoid socio-economic segregation of immigrants would generate not only security and liveability costs in cities, but also reduce their competitiveness by hampering human capital development of the next generations.

Develop place-based “neighbourhood regeneration” strategies for distressed areas.

Stressed neighbourhoods in large urban centres present a challenge to central governments because they reduce a city’s attractiveness and liveability. This in turn affects an urban centre’s ability to attract and retain highly qualified talent, capital and technology. The more stressed the urban centre, the less competitive it is because key input factors for economic growth, starting with people, will chose not to live or invest there. The more stressed urban centres tend to constitute a drag on national productivity and competitiveness, which explains why central authorities in the OECD have begun to focus on these issues.

Neighbourhood regeneration in large urban centres across the OECD is primarily a social policy challenge due to the nature and scope of the factors underlying the neighbourhood’s decline: poor quality housing, low educational attainment, and social related issues. The concentration of poverty in stressed neighbourhoods is usually exacerbated by a lack of community infrastructure and the lack of businesses location. More recently, the public policy challenges in this area have been exacerbated across the OECD by the disturbing trend toward ethno-cultural concentration in stressed neighbourhoods. Recent immigrants to large cities in North America and western Europe, for a series of complex and interrelated reasons, have begun to concentrate in distressed areas in the urban core and in near and distant suburbs.

The policy response by central governments across the OECD has been as varied as the local circumstances which demanded it. That said certain common approaches are beginning to emerge. First and foremost, the recognition that addressing the needs of distressed neighbourhoods must be a part of any holistic urban development strategy is key. Indeed, given that the overarching policy objective is to foster the conditions for cities to drive national economic growth, recognising that the people who live in distressed neighbourhoods possess talent and skills that can be harnessed to generate sustainable growth becomes an operating policy imperative for governments across the OECD. Data shows that immigrants are often more entrepreneurial than their locally-born neighbours; immigrants can therefore become a vital source of job creation. The ability to speak more than one language and the networks of contacts that immigrants bring from their homelands to their adopted city are increasingly being seen by central governments as highly prized attributes upon which to build sustainable urban growth.

Second, policy and programming responses must be tailored to meet the specific circumstances of the local affected communities. Various urban Territorial Reviews have shown that it is the programming that has been specifically tailored to address local circumstances that work best, whether it is establishing
mechanisms to provide “bridging”, mentoring, apprenticeship and other credential-recognition initiatives for newcomers by local small and large firms in urban centres where the skills and training of the immigrant labour pool is being under-utilised or ignored, or by stimulating the provision of affordable housing in those neighbourhoods were housing is a key issue.

Third, governments are becoming increasingly aware that addressing stressed neighbourhoods effectively is as much a governance challenge as it is a policy one. Indeed, central governments have recognised that “going it alone” in a top-down, a-spatial fashion will not produce desired policy outcomes. Across the OECD, the development and implementation of place-based social policy initiatives by central authorities to address distressed neighbourhoods have become increasingly more decentralised. This means that the partnership role of local urban authorities, as well as neighbourhood and community leaders within the urban centre, is crucial if centrally-driven neighbourhood regeneration initiatives are to be successful.

Finally, OECD governments are recognising that the policy response must be multi-sectoral and integrated: at its most basic level, it is of no use to build housing in neighbourhoods where there are no jobs or schools or day-care centres. It is no use building affordable housing that is not near public transit - if the working poor cannot walk to and from work and their children cannot walk to and from school; efficient and affordable public transportation is often the only alternative, as the private automobile is often out of their financial reach. This integrated approach also implies governance mechanisms that are inclusive of the communities at which the policy response is aimed. Vertical and horizontal governance tools linking ministries within a single government to each other, linking governments to governments operating in the urban centre and establishing ongoing dialogue with the private sector, academia and community leaders have proven to be the most effective in achieving positive neighbourhood regeneration results across the OECD.

Ensure adequate, affordable housing for all in a rapidly growing urban environment

Across the OECD, national, regional and city authorities have developed a range of policy tools to address the supply of adequate affordable housing. This involvement dates to the end of World War II, when a massive influx of returning war veterans into OECD cities first prompted governments to act systematically to ensure that a steady housing supply could support rapid population growth and economic development. Some policy tools worked better than others, but key common best practices include a reliance on the private and not-for-profit sectors to build supply along with ensuring deep co-ordination between housing policies and those related to land-use, infrastructure development and fiscal frameworks. Here are some examples:

- **Monitor housing affordability regularly to identify the neediest households and to prepare for necessary action.** To support this monitoring, the development and maintenance of a reliable database on housing supply (e.g. new construction starts, number of stock, age, vacancy, etc.), housing quality (e.g. size, etc.) and other related problems (e.g. social segregation, crimes, illegal occupation, slums, etc.) is an important task for national and local governments.

- **Address housing supply inelasticity in order to cope with a growing housing demand and to avoid a sharp rise in housing prices.** Empirical studies in OECD countries show that low housing supply elasticity may cause a housing affordability “crisis”, because new construction will not meet an increased demand if housing supply is inelastic, leading to a sharp rise in housing prices. Measures to improve housing supply elasticity include: increasing the flexibility of zoning regulations; improving co-ordination of infrastructure and housing development policies; and increasing the predictability, consistency, simplicity and transparency of the planning permit processes.
• **Promote the affordable housing supply through the not-for-profit sector and create efficient private rental housing markets.** In many OECD countries, the government has retreated from the role of directly supplying housing and the private sector now provides most dwellings. However, for-profit housing providers tend to build for the top end of the market because there is more profit in high-end homes than in economy homes, which leaves many communities with an inadequate supply of moderately priced homes. Thus, the public or not-for-profit sectors are often called upon to fill the affordable housing gap. Measures to promote the affordable housing supply include: establishing mandatory quotas or voluntary targets for affordable housing provision by the private sector; enhancing the housing supply through facilitating affordable housing development by not-for-profit organisations; ensuring land availability for affordable housing development; fiscal incentives to promote the supply of rental housing; and encouraging the supply of housing for households with special needs, such as the elderly.

**Urban centres hold the keys to successful national climate change strategies**

Cities across the OECD have begun to take action to mitigate their contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to expected climate change impacts through urban sectoral policies and through co-ordination with national and regional governments. Experience in OECD metropolitan regions demonstrates that:

- **Cities have key competencies to act on climate change by optimising and are well-placed to seek policy complementarities and innovative policy solutions.** Cities and metropolitan regions’ influence on public transportation systems, the built environment, renewable energy and energy efficiency measures, and the sustainability of services delivery put them in a position to develop policy and programmatic solutions that best meet specific geographic, climatic, economic, and cultural conditions. They are equally well placed to develop innovative policy solutions that can be scaled up into regional or national programmes, or to provide a laboratory for national pilot programmes on the urban level. Important opportunities exist where cities are service providers, although cities generally are still reluctant to make full use of their regulatory authority to achieve climate goals. Effective climate policy packages should seek policy complementarities among and within urban sectors to implement policies that enhance each other’s effectiveness.

- **Strategic planning of land-use and transportation patterns is key to low-carbon, climate-adaptive development.** Policies to increase the concentration of urban areas in the long term and manage outward expansion have gained popularity across the OECD. Successful compact cities policies rely on well-designed strategic plans. While the higher residential densities targeted by these policies have the most direct effect on GHG emissions, transportation linkages—particularly between employment centres and residential zones—and a mix of land uses within neighbourhoods are crucial to ensuring that increases in density translate into reductions in personal vehicle use. High quality urban services and amenities, including open space, are also crucial to the long-term attractiveness and effectiveness of compact cities policies.

- **National governments can play an important role in supporting and removing barriers to urban climate change policies.** Key national roles include: providing funding and technical assistance to cities and regions; establishing climate mandates in national urban and regional policies to advance local climate action; and setting strong national adaptation and emissions-reductions targets to ensure successful local implementation through the country, prevent regional competition based on environmental regulations and even promote a “race to the top” through incentives. The need exists for a review of national urban policies in light of climate change priorities to identify potential national policy barriers to urban climate initiatives.
Governance and Finance

Just as the key components of the urban development policy focus tend to be replicated across the OECD, so too do the governance and fiscal tools that OECD central governments use – and adapt to their own circumstances. At the end of the day, repeated urban development policy failures since the end of World War II have taught OECD governments – and the citizens that elect them – some valuable lessons on how best to address fundamental challenges in urban centres. While success has been varied, of course, and in many cases hard-won, and while success has by no means been uniform across the OECD, what follows is a presentation of some of the elemental best practices in urban governance and finance that have met with success in most OECD countries.

Horizontal and vertical governance tools insure coherence in strategy development, planning and delivering for results

A key challenge in many countries has been to define the most effective and efficient allocation of functional responsibilities among various levels of government and between the key relevant public and private actors in a metropolitan area. Defining who does what provides the framework through which the structures and processes of metropolitan governance can be refined, realigned, or even entirely redesigned.

For national governments this issue has traditionally presented itself mainly as a question of whether to introduce measures of local and regional government reform. Extensions to city administrative boundaries must be considered, so that these correspond more closely to the shape of the city as an economic unit. While reforms of this kind will provide strategic capacity, attention also has to be given to the structure of municipal government below the level of the identified city or metro-region. Governments have to balance the administrative simplicity and lack of inter-authority conflict that can be achieved with single-tier local government against the alienation and remoteness that may be experienced by citizens if they have no more local level available to them.

An alternative approach to overall local government reform is the establishment of separate authorities for certain specialised strategic tasks – such as regional public transport authorities. These can avoid some, though by no means all, the conflicts that major boundary changes can involve, and can produce sets of authorities whose geographical boundaries correspond fairly closely to the functional needs of the task in hand. However, these goals may be achieved at the expense of ‘joined up government’, as it becomes difficult to co-ordinate the policy areas so organised with those remaining with various tiers of local government. This problem can be partly addressed if the specialised authorities are formed by the local authorities in the area concerned, but they can then become subject to rivalries between these.

At its most elemental, however, the issue of governance for effective urban strategies speaks to the need to harness the expertise, knowledge and policy “tool kits” of all key actors, both public and private, from all governments that implement policy and deliver programs and services in a given urban area, to the institutions that train human capital, the private sector that hires it and the citizenry itself, implicated in the development and implementation of a vision and its policy outcomes for the urban area. This need not imply huge institutionalised bureaucracies – in many cases in the OECD, a “light touch” has worked best, where actors come together in loose coalitions or under voluntary agreements to pursue commonly defined objectives for urban development.

Indeed, what has proven to be arguably more important than institutionalising vertical and horizontal governance mechanisms is the codification of the vision, outcomes and planning needed to implement the urban strategy over the long term. From France’s contrats de ville to Canada’s Urban Development Agreements, codified agreements that spell out clearly what the strategy is trying to achieve, who does
what to achieve it, how progress will be measured and how progress will be reported to the players themselves and to the general citizenry, seem to achieve the best results most efficiently.

*No two alike: city administrations differ, and some cope better than others*

It is essential to build strong capacity at the local level to design, implement, monitor and evaluate local public policies. Moving towards more proactive bottom-up urban policy requires more than designing a new territorial administrative structure. Equally important is capacity building at the regional level, so that public actors and a broad variety of stakeholders – private actors, SMEs, universities, NGOs, citizens – are able to co-operate to design regional and local development strategies that draw on untapped regional resources. Local governments need qualified public employees, as well as sufficient number of staff to be able to manage an increasing set of competencies. National governments have a role to play in enhancing local capacities, through a focus on staff mobility, training and performance management – although a balance has to be found between national governments’ involvement and local governments’ flexibility in its management of local public employees.

Moreover, it is important to keep in mind that local capacity will vary greatly between city administrations. While size is a determinant of course, so too are other local factors, such as the economic base of a particular city and the resulting labour pool available to the local authorities. For instance, a mining town may not have ready access to a pool of office managers required to run a city administration effectively, but a town of identical size whose economic mainstay is a university or a pharmaceutical company might.

*Multilevel governance – institutional co-ordination*

Horizontal co-ordination is indispensable for effective policy implementation. Horizontal co-ordination includes co-ordination across sectors, for example, transportation and land use, and co-ordination among neighbouring communities. For example, because urban sprawl often transcends a municipality’s boundary, regional-level (or metropolitan-level) co-ordination has often been identified as being the most effective means to achieve the desired policy results.

The need for effective horizontal coherence is not only vitally important between municipalities within a single urban region, but within all orders of government operating in a given urban territory. Indeed several of the Territorial Reviews on urban areas identified a lack of co-ordination between ministries in the central government as being as problematic as poor inter-municipal co-ordination in the achievement of positive policy outcomes in the particular urban region under review. Implementing climate-change adaptation and mitigation strategies is a case in point – central ministries, from those responsible for environmental policy to industrial policy, infrastructure, housing and municipal affairs and the fiscal framework, are key players in any climate change strategy; their activities must be co-ordinated closely if a coherent strategy is to emerge from the central authorities with which local authorities can engage. Other examples include human capital development or housing and land use: various central ministries play on these issues, and their mandates must be co-ordinated if policy coherence – and efficiency in central programming and service delivery - is to be optimised.

Vertical collaboration between central and local governments is equally essential as appropriate speed and place of urbanisation depends on local circumstances which can vary extensively across a given territory. At the central government level, sustainable urban policy which is economically, socially and environmentally balanced should be further promoted, but the appropriate and concrete balance of those three considerations (economy, society and environment) would be better discussed at regional and local level to reflect its unique opportunities and challenges.
Citizen relations: foster metropolitan governance whilst ensuring citizen participation.

A key issue is the extent to which large cities and regions have a capacity to formulate their own policies within a national framework. Across the OECD the trend has been to de-centralise and to devolve responsibility to regions. Large cities, especially those having the characteristics of metro-regions require a strategic capacity at the level of the whole urban area if they are both to realise the potential of their region’s attributes and to cope with such problems as transport congestion. But the erection of large authorities with populations of more than a million persons creates problems of remoteness from citizens and risks a decline in civil society among them. These problems become particularly intense if social segregation of the kind is taking place.

The strategic national and metropolitan level and the local, even ‘street’ level, offer different perspectives, which must be grasped in a successful approach to urban policy. Focus on the metro-region changes the perspective that might be taken on areas of decline. From a metro-regional view these might be seen as parts of the complex spatial readjustments that take place within a context of dynamism, rather than as the isolated problem cases that they may appear to be from a more local perspective. On the other hand, an approach of constant adjustment and alertness to new things implies a democratic responsiveness to large number of participants and citizens. Policy makers need to concern themselves with the trade-off that might exist between greater economies of scale and the importance of local identities.

Facilitate relations between government and business interests and between these and educational and training institutions

The phenomenon of ‘insider corporations’ has become an important feature of the current period of major structural change and globalisation; it presents governments with both opportunities and dangers, and the new urban policy is one of the arenas in which these are played out. There are advantages of directness of contact and a chance for public officials to become better informed, but there are two dangers. First, when some firms gain privileged access to ministers and senior civil servants, becoming ‘corporate insiders’ to government, they erect entry barriers to those firms who remain outsiders. Competition becomes distorted and displaced from the quality of products to the quality of political influence. Second, only large firms can usually participate in this kind of relationship with government, leading to public policy overlooking the role of small and medium sized enterprises.

In the OECD, it has become a truism to state that it is SMEs that by far create the most jobs and generate the greatest amount of innovation. Even if this were only half true, the fact remains that innovation and creativity – whether generated in SMEs or in large firms in a given urban area – is based first and foremost on people. The quality of a city’s human capital – its local labour force – is crucial to sustaining growth and building agglomeration economies. Therefore, governments have to play the role of catalyst and convenor: they can create the venues for firms – large and small – to exchange among each other and with academic and training institutions so that all actors know what skills are required to drive cluster development in their urban community and so that they can become aware of the innovative ideas that are being incubated locally along with which of these could lead to commercial successes in local, national and international markets.

Municipal finance: Design a fiscal toolkit specifically tailored for cities

Experience across the OECD points to cities’ need for a fiscal toolkit that reflects their specific functions, characteristics and challenges. The most important principles for the design of an optimal mix of fiscal policy are:
• **Provide cities with a mix of revenue sources that is appropriate for the functions they have to deliver:** Grants, local taxes and fees provide the most substantial part of funding for the majority of cities in OECD countries, but the proportion of these three revenue sources differs considerably depending on city functions. Fees and charges are ideal for funding local services where specific beneficiaries can be identified and non-payers excluded. Intergovernmental grants are often applied when fiscal discipline and spillovers are major concerns. General grants are generally suitable instruments for functions that benefit from large city autonomy. Specific grants could however be particularly suitable in case of spillovers across local boundaries. Cities should have possibilities to tax at the margin in order to be able to adapt to new circumstances. Local governments with property-related responsibilities such as sewerage and waste management are usually funded by a property tax, whereas local governments with more responsibilities within the field of social welfare tend to be financed more often by local income taxes. Since every revenue source has its drawbacks, it is important that the revenue sources of a metropolitan area are diversified.

• **Re-design local taxes and fees to improve environmental sustainability:** Several metropolitan regions use land-related income, such as land sales, land auctions and land development rights, but high dependence on this could generate an oversupply of land for construction, sprawled development and loss of cultivated land. Instead, appropriate funding sources for infrastructure could make use of the growing attractiveness of the city now and in the future; this forms the basis of instruments such as the value capture tax and tax increment financing. Proper pricing via fees and charges of environmentally sensitive services such as waste collection, water treatment, or transportation can help contain environmental degradation, especially if costs are fully recovered, which is common in waste, water and energy.

• **Avoid local tax policies that lead to wasteful tax competition and market distortions:** Good local tax bases are generally more immobile than national tax bases, in order to avoid tax evasion and wasteful tax competition between local jurisdictions. An example of a tax with such an immobile tax base is the property tax. The property tax should be designed in such a way that it does not distort the local property market. This could mean shifting the tax base more towards the value of assets instead of property transactions and splitting the property tax rate in a rate for the land and a lower rate for buildings, in order to stimulate urban redevelopment.
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CITIES AND THE ETHIC OF CARE AMONG STRANGERS

Prof. Ash Amin (Department of Geography and Institute of Advanced Study, Durham University, United Kingdom)

Introduction

Until recently, debate on the politics of integration in plural and diverse societies has made light of the imprint of lived and everyday material cultures on negotiations of difference. Attention has tended to focus on the rules and practices of human integration and recognition in the national or otherwise imagined community. For example, in the area of race and immigration, discussion has hovered around issues such as the rights and responsibilities of minorities, the obligations and duties of majorities, policies on immigration and asylum, opportunities for integration and participation, legacies of discrimination and prejudice, and public discourse on national belonging and its constituents. The insight of research on habits formed in everyday practices of living and interacting with others -directly or indirectly- has had marginal influence. This research shows the habits to be constitutively relational, plural and hybrid, which rarely remain open and fluid, but are hardened by rhythms of situated experience (e.g. local legacies of negotiating difference). It shows that the habits of living with diversity vary from place to place, weaving in emotions and precognitive reflexes formed in bodily, material and virtual encounter.

Curiously, policy discourse on diversity seems to have evolved in directions that are more sensitive to the dynamics of bodily encounter and local specificity. How far this stems from an awareness of research on situated practice is a matter of conjecture, but it certainly seems to acknowledge, for example, that neighbourhoods can vary sharply in their cultures of negotiating difference, that the tone and content of local policy interventions can make a real difference, that local balances of segregation and mixture affect cultural practices, that vigilance in a post-9/11 world requires intensified ground-level surveillance of difference (Graham, 2010). Woven into this awareness of the specificity of the local cultural environment, is a sense – and little more than this - of the potential significance of the urban infrastructure in regulating relations between strangers; a sense brought to the fore by certain celebrated examples of rupture or repair. These include the stark contrasts between London and New Orleans in their response to catastrophes with marked racial connotations (respectively the 7/7 bombings and hurricane Katrina), or those between cities such as Vancouver or Toronto with their elaborate infrastructures of social and cultural inclusion and towns such as Bradford and Oldham which faced the 2001 riots with a history of division built into the urban infrastructure.

This awareness of the powers of place in regulating local negotiations of diversity and difference is yielding, above all, an interest in tackling the problems of social cohesion in a multicultural society by changing the patterns of contact between people from different backgrounds in everyday spaces such as workplaces, neighbourhoods, and public spaces. On the one hand, states and publics convinced that the multicultural policies of the late 20th century that encouraged plurality and cosmopolitan engagement increased, rather than diminish, the distance between majorities and minorities, are now calling on urban managers - in the face of heightened suspicion and anxiety after 9/11 - to get tough on crime, minorities, youths, asylum seekers and dissenting voices, to step up measures of surveillance, control and compliance, to erect barriers to contain or keep out those judged to pose a risk, to sharply define the boundaries of tolerance. The belief here is that the only way of managing the plural city is through order and discipline, compulsion and conformity; in short, the abandonment of multicultural policies.
The measures being rolled out are both controversial and far from convincing. Every attempt to impose order and discipline has sparked opposition, generated counter-effects, or failed to penetrate the many hidden nooks and crannies of urban life. The war on terror and fundamentalism has only served to fan dissent and defiance among those under attack, along with escalating fear, insecurity and animosity among majorities. The rounding of vulnerable minorities and assimilated strangers has inflamed racism, intolerance and xenophobia and forced the injured into a feral and fearful existence. The indiscriminate use of sophisticated surveillance technologies has bred an urban culture of mistrust and punishment, pushed real criminality and harm into the shadows, and automated the means by which different sections of society are classified and evaluated. The many attempts to segregate communities in the name of urban order (in gated developments or ghettos and through restrictions on the mobility of those considered undesirable) regularly produce backlashes that breach the walls going up.

On the other hand, urban actors worried by such developments have begun to turn to more inclusive modes of social integration, looking to improve social interaction and cultural exchange. The interventions have included attempts to desegregate schools and neighbourhoods, open up public spaces to multiple use and diverse communities, encourage greater contact between people from different backgrounds or enrol them into common projects (e.g. communal gardens, sports ventures, neighbourhood regeneration schemes), build bridges between antagonists with the help of reconciliation schemes, and promote an open civic culture (e.g. by emphasising global connections and hybrid legacies). Across real differences in expectation between cities (e.g. UK cities tending to expect more from minorities than from majorities, compared to cities such as Vancouver which even after 9/11 remain committed to cultural diversity), is to be found the shared assumption that living with diversity demands a regularity of encounter between strangers and with the unfamiliar (Wood and Landry, 2007); a sense that in the inclusive city, demarcations should function as permeable boundaries rather than borders that separate (Sennett, 2008).

In many ways, the case for living with diversity through social engagement seems beyond criticism, welcome recognition of how everyday practice shapes human behaviour. But it begs two fundamental questions. The first is whether urban sociality is reducible to inter-human relations, and even when so, open to strong affinities between strangers. Modern urban living is about people placed far apart from each other, rushing past each other, carrying multiple cares with them, inhabiting familiar and known spaces, displaying varied affects – positive and negative – towards others, bringing a host of pre-formed orientations into the encounter (e.g. ingrained attitudes on race that are played out in the encounter – see Saldanha, 2006; Swanton, 2009). People are made as social beings through many modes of dwelling and association that exceed the encounter (e.g. living in the urban environment, intimacies with non-humans, resonances of work, educational or family experience). The affects of everyday urban encounter are a mixture of ‘turbulent passions’, including ‘malice aforethought’ among strangers (Thrift, 2005), diverse feelings brought into the encounter (Wilson, 2009), and complicated personal biographies (Sardar, 2009). This is precisely why a politics of encounter requires active intermediation by third parties, managed interaction, or common projects in order to undo settled behaviour, build interdependence or common purpose, catalyse positive feelings (Amin, 2002; Darling, 2009; Sandercock, 2003).

The second question begged is whether everyday urban experience – and its impact on relations between strangers – can be reduced to local transactions. There is a strong inclination in work in this area to interpret the daily as the rhythm of the spatially proximate, as noted by Valentine (2008). For example, the culture of transactions in schools, neighbourhoods, workplaces, streets and squares tends to be traced to the dynamics of human co-presence in these spaces. A concentric logic seems to be at work, with routine engagements in others spaces such as national public opinion, virtual networks, or international Diasporas seen as somehow ‘external’, one removed from the immediacies of the spatially proximate. But if the situated is grasped as the locus of many intersecting geographies, a meeting point of relations of varying spatial stretch and intensity (Massey, 2005), then everyday encounter has to be understood as the space in which near and remote intimacies intersect with each other in shaping social practice, including social
response to difference. Multiple geographies of association explain the everyday rhythms of encounter in the city.

This paper looks beyond the politics of interpersonal encounter by examining how the play between humans and non-humans in daily urban life and how the urban seen as a site of multiple connections, forces reconsideration of the influences on social response to urban diversity and difference. It examines the cultural resonances of the urban infrastructure that gives cities their means of collective service and security, circulation and connectivity, symbolic and affective commonality, and proposes that this infrastructure be regarded as a ‘collective unconscious’ shaping human reflex and affect in the city. The paper suggests that interventions in the urban unconscious (public spaces, physical infrastructure, public services, technological and built environment, visual and symbolic culture) have an important role to play in regulating social response to difference. In turn, the paper makes the case for an urban politics of living with difference that is both aware of, and works through, the many relational geographies that shape local cultural practice. It sees the challenge less as one of making cosmopolitans out of urban inhabitants, than one of developing institutional awareness of how the world at large shapes local habits of social encounter, leading to policy effort capable of mobilising relational connections beyond the city.

Where/What is the Urban Social?

The Topological City

The contemporary city poses an interesting spatial paradox. With half the world’s population living in urban settlements, some of which lie at the heart of shaping world economic, social and environmental change, it might seem fair to argue that the human and the urban condition have become one and the same. At the same time, the morphology of urban ‘settlement’ has become extraordinarily fluid and amorphous, with the whereabouts of the city no longer self-evident. The city no longer exists as a bounded space guided by its own internal dynamics. Instead, it is a relationally constituted entity, a space in which multiple geographies of composition intersect, bringing distant and dispersed worlds into the centre of urban being. The result is the transformation of the city from a territorial form with distinctive insides and outsides to a topological form with blurred and shifting spatial contours, as places on the cartographic map become drawn into diverse organisational topologies.

One geographical feature of this topology is spatial radiation, traced, for example, by the extensive physical and virtual communication networks that now traverse cities, situating life in a given place into daily worlds with many geographical forms. Sometimes, this ‘radiated’ existence involves a loosening of connections between co-located people and sites (Sassen, 2002; Graham, 2002), sometimes simply the addition of new spaces of linkage, sometimes dwelling in virtual environments that are rich ecologies of community and connectivity in their own right (Knorr Cetina and Bruegger, 2002; Dodge and Kitchen, 2004). Another is a geography of global organisation, typified by the transnational corporate networks that bind together producers and consumers in far parts of the world into the same economic space (Dicken, 2003), or the international circuits of migration, tourism, escape and organized crime that structure the lives of an increasing proportion of the world’s population, ceaselessly bringing new impulse to urban life, new remote connections, new connotations of power and control (Harris, 2002; Urry, 2007). A similar process of urban re-composition is occurring as a result of growing attachments formed in global diasporas – ethnic, religious consumerist, ideological (Pieterse, 2003; Thrift, 2005), and the rise of transnational social movements, intergovernmental bodies and international organisations pressing hard on urban and national institutions and in ways that challenge a politics of communal returns at the local level (Slaughter, 2004; Sparke, 2005).

The result is that locations on the map – cities, regions, nations – are becoming sites of intersection between territorial force (e.g. embedded cultural and social ties or institutional arrangements) and
relational force, involving complex patterns of spatial stretching and perforation, distant linkage and trans-territorial flow. The re-composition of place is no simple displacement of the local by the global, of place by space, of history by simultaneity and flow, of small scale by big scale, or of the proximate by the remote. Instead, it is a subtle folding together of the distant and the proximate, the virtual and the material, the present and absent, the passing and the settled, onto a single ontological plan. The implication is that the dynamics of location – the happenings in a place on the map – have to be seen as the jostle between cartographic framings and other geographies of formation, a continual struggle between multiple spatial orders of being and becoming (Olsson, 2007). All cities, from the most cosmopolitan ones to the most remote places, need to be grasped as a meeting point of rhythms formed in diverse temporal and spatial envelopes, shaped by the dialectics of relational and cartographic power, by being-in-relation in the same geographic space (Massey, 2005). This includes the interpretation of social relations, for in the city, diverse groups - from settled and segregated communities to mobile migrants and professionals – press to be understood in their multiple affiliations, relationships of co-presence, response to the many contingencies thrown up by urban complexity, and resilience in a field of unevenly poised powers.

Such an urban ontology dispels with the assumption that spatial contiguity implies relational proximity, and in so doing, poses the question of living with diversity less as a matter of building local community than of working with the constraints and possibilities related to the urban as a condition of ‘thrown-togetherness’ (Massey, 2005). This, on the one hand, means accepting that urban strangers are not of necessity tied to each other or inclined to recognise each other, dispersed as they are in the city, familiar with only particular spaces, locked into elective networks of belonging and intimacy, frequently compelled to stave off difference to cope with the multiple assaults of urban modernity (as originally suggested by Simmel, 1971). Clearly, the patterns of familiarity and indifference, local and external orientation, or stasis and mobility, are not uniform, but vary between individuals and social groups. However, even the most sedentary or least well-resourced people now participate in distributed communicative and affective spaces, linked to people and worlds elsewhere by telephone, internet, religion, ideology, consumption, media cultures, and more. For them too, the city is the city of parts, divisions, unfamiliarity, connections elsewhere.

On the other hand, there can be no denying that individual cities possess distinctive institutional and public cultures which, through the signals of inclusion and exclusion they send out to different social groups, influence how strangers respond to each other. Typically, the combined actions of urban elites and practitioners affect how different social groups fare and are perceived in a given city, through the specifics of land use allocations, social and cultural policy, economic strategy, housing distribution, uses of public space, access to collective services, and symbolic projections in the city. The perception and experience, for example, of a city as multicultural or assimilationist, exclusionary or inclusionary, is strongly shaped by the silent workings of such interventions. In turn, urban morphology itself – a city’s density, sprawl, arterial structure, connectivity, built and natural environment, visual horizon, monumental structure - can be considered as a form of collective material resonance, affecting social moods and dispositions, senses of proximity and distance among strangers, intensities of recognition between humans partly defined by their experience of urban space.

My argument is that habits of urban living – including social response to diversity and difference – are largely pre-cognitive, based on daily reflexes of urban negotiation that require little thought and deliberation. This is how the potentially bewildering experience of urban multiplicity and variety is tamed and domesticated, how humans adapt to being among strangers, in crowded or large spaces, with many non-humans, the surprises of urban complexity, the unknown elsewhere in the city. These reflexes, I have argued elsewhere (Amin, 2008), are the product of both habituated human practice and the orderings of urban material culture – how the assembly of humans, things, symbols, technologies, matter and nature in particular ways in different urban contexts guides individual and collective behaviour (see below). Urban habits of living with difference may not be reducible to the dynamics of inter-human encounter, if it is the
case that feelings among strangers might be shaped by the atmospheres of place – the crowded or empty street, the neighbourhood open or closed to variety, the condition of urban transit systems, the aesthetic of the built environment, the visibility of the unknown city, the sensory feel of a suburb, the regulation of risk in public spaces.

**The Trans-human Urban**

The non-human is deeply implicated in urban social practice because of intricate entanglements between humans, infrastructure and technology, and the built and natural environment in cities. If, as Latour (2005) has argued, the ‘social’ must be imagined as the field of all associations, then every constituent element, human and non-human, must be considered to be on the inside. This means seeing social relations traditionally considered as only involving humans, such as ties among friends and family, feelings towards community or nation, dispositions towards migrants and strangers, as indivisibly hybrid and involving also objects, biology, nature, software, symbols, and more. The entanglements of humans and non-humans are increasingly being recognised in social theory, to account for human being, behaviour, sentiment, and organisation (Latour and Weibel, 2005; Bennett, 2010; Gregson, 2009; Ingold, 2006; Rose, 2007; Miller, 2008).

Similarly, in urban studies, a new body of work has arisen showing how nature and the built or technological environment are threaded into urban social existence, as both life supports and components of human association (Graham and Marvin, 2001; Amin and Thrift, 2002; Pile, 2005, Latham and McCormack, 2004; Swyngedouw, 2004; Castree, 2005; Gandy, 2005; Marvin and Medd, 2006; Hinchliffe and Whatmore, 2006; Heynen, Käika and Swyngedouw, 2006; McFarlane, 2009). For example, new work on urban technologies is revealing how the everyday machinery of urban supply, mobility and regulation - assembled through timetables, software systems, communications infrastructures, data classification tools, architectural design, and a multiplicity of objects and machines – ensures urban survival and recovery, selects between social groups, and conditions human behaviour. Mathew Gandy (2005) has coined the phrase ‘cyborg urbanism’ to capture this melding of humans in the urban technological infrastructure, and while the phrase may miss the prosaic nature of such human being, it invites reflection on how material culture might be implicated in making and regulating relations between humans.

In our book *Cities*, Nigel Thrift and I have argued that the urban infrastructure made up of a city’s diverse systems of communication, maintenance and repair, order and security, welfare and basic provision, physical organisation, and more, can be thought of as a machinic assemblage that not only manages urban complexity but also regulates human practice (Amin and Thrift, 2002). This is an assemblage of objects-in-relation replete with ‘interactional intelligence’ (Thrift, 2005) built into code, thinking machines, software-led systems, and object-mediated human thought, pulsating as an ‘urban unconscious’ (ibid.) at work on, above and below the ground to maintain life in the city. It acts as the ‘hidden hand’ of supply, organization and control; allocating economic opportunity and reward, channelling circulation and orientation, designating the spaces, activities and people that count (e.g. by selecting zones for investment and groups deemed undeserving), and establishing the rules and tempos of urban participation. Usually working silently in the background, its centrality becomes all too clear during times of severe malfunction (e.g. when a city is brought to a halt by an energy blackout or environmental catastrophe).

The urban unconscious also regulates affects of living with difference. Daily experience of public services and utilities, neighbourhoods, streets and public spaces, transit systems, technologies of surveillance, is an experience of judgement of the quality of the urban commons and actors gathered around it (Latham and McCormack, 2004). The routines of negotiating the urban infrastructure and the resulting accommodation and frustrations shape collective expectation and individual assessment. Achille Mbembe (2008: 38) has suggested that the urban unconscious, composed of a city’s material infrastructure
as well as a city’s ‘aesthetics of surfaces and quantities’ (e.g. the symbolic projections of architecture or advertising or the routines of data gathering and classification) can be thought of as a field of affective excess that is able to ‘hypnotize, overexcite or paralyze the senses’. Working in the background, the urban unconscious nurtures public feelings, such as fantasies of desire projected through advertising or the built aesthetic, senses of security or insecurity aroused by the city’s systems of surveillance technologies, frustrations and irritations kindled by the quality of public service, angers stoked by the hidden discriminations of data-led classification. These accumulations give every city a distinctive affective register, one that however plays out differently among its inhabitants, as the rhythms of selection built into urban unconscious sort out the deserving from the undeserving, the necessary from the superfluous, the promising from the threatening.

It is such sorting that converts general feelings into particular responses towards and between minorities and majorities, citizens and non-citizens, social classes and communities. In the gap between affects of togetherness and those of division regulated by the political economy of the urban unconscious, lie all important differences in patterns of living with diversity among cities. It is in this space that a local sense of the commons and who has claim upon it is formed, where possibilities for change through the urban unconscious arise. For example, in cities with a functioning and inclusive urban commons (providing, for example, universal access to welfare, strong minority rights, accessible public spaces, and decent public services) sentiments towards immigrants, asylum seekers, drop outs, or the unemployed will often hover around public attitudes on the right of claim of these subjects to a commons seen by those doing the judging as ‘theirs’. Accordingly measures of the deservingness of these subjects (testing political status, economic and social worth, or cultural affinities) become the zone of attention of critics and hopefuls, marking out, in the meantime, the border between inclusion and exclusion in the ‘providing’ city. The implication is that redress under such a framing of urban belonging requires actions – possibly through the urban unconscious – that challenge the assumption that the right to the commons can be apportioned in this way.

In cities which make no pretence of a shared or functioning urban commons (e.g. segregated cities or those with a rudimentary public infrastructure), the affects stirred by the urban unconscious are quite different. In the segregated city, a prime role of the urban unconscious is to erect impermeable barriers - high walls, tight surveillance systems, myths of cultural incompatibility, and rigid hierarchies of social classification – and to naturalise separation as the culture of living with difference. Social and spatial demarcation becomes the rule of urban maintenance, the flashpoint of opposition, the spark to imagining another urban culture. In the ‘threadbare’ city, where the management of difference through the urban unconscious is weak as a result of regulatory or material failure, public feelings towards difference often gather around the improvisations of access to the basics of life. Here, with formal citizenship rights frequently bringing few privileges, and with low levels of care for the local commons among nationals and immigrants continuously on the move and loyal to people and places elsewhere (Landau, 2010), the negotiations of difference tend to crystallize around infrastructures regulating access to credit, medical care, energy, shelter, water, safety, sanitation, food, transport and work. Improvisations in the interstices of market and state failure – how, for example, ethnic groups, criminal gangs, moneylenders, vigilantes, moneyed individuals, charities, and other gatekeepers of organized scarcity regulate access – play a crucial role in the tug of war between different communities (Simone, 2008; Tulchin, 2010; Roy, 2009).

A rematerialized urban sociology, in summary, opens up new possibilities in understanding how urban patterns of living with diversity are shaped, by bringing into play relational proximities and separations structured around the urban unconscious. It suggests a post-human politics of living with difference, focusing on the urban unconscious and the shared commons, to replace a politics of recognition that lacks solid foundation in the city of affiliations formed in multiple spaces and with many non-humans (Amin, 2009).
Politics of Togetherness

If urban composition today – with its multiple and material orderings – does not favour a politics of human recognition, does it lend itself in other ways to foster positive modes of living with difference? Is there a way of working this through the urban unconscious, so that solidarities arise out of the pragmatics of negotiating a particular kind of material and aesthetic environment, out of affects and solidarities forged through the urban commons? The rest of this paper explores possibilities that make virtue out of the urban condition of ‘throwntogetherness’. Cities no longer come together as self-formed territorial entities, so a politics of togetherness based on appeals to community cohesion, local cultural legacy, or shared sense of place, seems implausible. However, they do come together as juxtapositions of diversity, sites of relational connectivity, and nexuses of overlapping worlds. Things and people with multiple and faraway connections become entangled in cities. Based on the proposition that the resonances and regulation of entanglement in a given location shape social experience of the city as shared or contested, communal or selective, inclusive or exclusionary, it might be argued that interventions able to fashion a sense of togetherness out of throwntogetherness have an important role to play in fostering positive ways of living with difference.

What form should a politics of togetherness take, and through what kinds of urban intervention? It is doubtful that a strategy to privilege particular sites of the urban commons is the best way forward. If anything, acting in this way, for example, by scaling back on urban surveillance, extending citizenship and welfare rights, or widening access to public services, could backfire by attracting negative attention to the individual site or shifting practices of aversion elsewhere. There is a history of evidence showing just this (e.g. decisions to scale back surveillance fanning public demand for more discipline, or those extending welfare protections to asylum seekers leading to vigilante attacks). A better strategy would be set in motion a machinery of inclusion across the urban commons so that a rhythm of inattention to difference, a habit of seeing the strange as familiar and the city as a space for the many, gradually works its way into the social unconscious. Pragmatically, this means acting on the diverse sites of the urban infrastructure around which affects of living with difference gather. The examples grouped below attending to the regulation of multiplicity and a sense of the urban commons are therefore by no means exhaustive, but serve as an indication of possibility; more or less appropriate in a given city, depending on its history of affects formed around the urban unconscious.

Multiplicity

Henri Lefebvre (1996) famously defended the right to the city as the right of all inhabitants to shape urban life and to benefit from it. He saw this very much as a participatory right extending beyond the conferral of entitlements of citizenship or residence. In many parts of the world, however, the denial of basic entitlements – for example the right of migrants, minorities, and the urban poor in general to have access to the minima of survival such as food, education, shelter and hygiene – remains a major obstacle to the right to participate. Those without basic entitlements can make no claim on the city, absorbed as they are by the task of surviving against the odds, often classified as unwanted subjects. Until their right of access to the means of life is recognised as a legal or civic right, there can be no possibility of their active participation in urban life. Such extremes of denial give majorities, elites, decision makers, and the righteous reason to assume that the suppression of the wretched and the foreign is entirely legitimate, even necessary in pursuit of civic harmony (Appadurai, 2006). The denial justifies intolerance as the basis of urban cohesion.

A rights-based approach to urban inclusion, however, is far from straightforward, as it raises important questions concerning the terms of recognition, whether entitlements can be delivered, and the balance between the needs of new arrivals and the expectations of settled majorities. Neglecting these questions can intensify social stress and division, along with blunting confidence in a city’s systems of
public provision as a source of collective well-being. Yet, the denial of rights to those without means and of means to those with rights makes little sense in a world of intense global connectivity and flow daily changing urban composition. In these circumstances, the assumption that some burghers possess a natural right to the city is increasingly untenable, in need of replacement by other principles of belonging and merit, perhaps the principle that all those who find themselves - from long-term citizens and established elites to newly-arrived migrants and the low income residents - start out from the same position in their right to belong. This would open the possibility of linking rights to urban contribution, which, depending on the means and capabilities of individuals, this could take a variety of forms, from fiscal and philanthropic donations to contributions in kind or community service, so that access to rights becomes a way of building social solidarity in the plural city.

But the conferral of rights – however the rights are defined - can only be a first step in forging a sense of equal access to the urban commons. Also crucial is the monitoring of the selections and resonances of the technological unconscious. For example, in the city of clockwork regulation, sophisticated software systems used by firms, public authorities, or insurance and security agencies, routinely track and influence the standing of different social subjects. Out of such automaticity – embedded in hidden cameras, customer evaluations, police records, post-code discriminations, insurance decisions, undisclosed circulation of personal data – stem evaluations of people as insiders or outsiders, dangerous or safe, worthy or unworthy. In the city of rudimentary technological systems, a different architecture of classification does the same kind of work, perhaps in a less hidden, less automatic fashion, relying on spatial segregation, direct forms of policing, and elaborate practices of racial, class and gender tagging.

While one type of technological unconscious discriminates silently and the other more visibly, common to both is a subtle fusing of the ‘interactive intelligence’ that keeps cities maintained and repaired (Graham and Thrift, 2007) and that which organises the city as a social hierarchy. Without the intelligence nested, for example, in software systems that integrate the multiple spatial and temporal rhythms of the city, urban life would simply shut down. Yet the same systems that enable urban circulation, coordination, communication and well-being are implicated in the maintenance of urban social order and discipline through their patterns of human selection. It is precisely this blurring of function in the technological unconscious that naturalises the reproduction of embedded social discriminations and injuries, making their regulation appear as integral to the management of urban complexity, explaining why those sitting in judgement feel unperturbed in calling for more discipline when the subaltern make their presence felt.

No attempt to weave a commons out of the multiple urban can afford to ignore the ambiguous roles of the urban technological unconscious. This requires making every effort to ensure that the regime of maintenance and repair sees to the cares and needs of those without voice, power or means, and that the regime of order and discipline protects the gains made along with providing urban security without recourse to gratuitous targeting of strangers and subalterns. Given the entanglements of the two regimes, there can be no easy decoupling of aims. However, a good start would be to place both regimes under close public scrutiny, by exposing, for example, the selection and separation done by ‘values, opinions and rhetoric … frozen into code’ (Bowker and Star, 1999: 35). This is a matter of exposing, ridiculing and neutralizing the uses of technology as a weapon of discrimination and discipline, enforcing public audit of the machinery of human categorization and selection in the city, experimenting with preventative and precautionary forms of order, bringing the machinery of urban order under democratic control. It is also a matter of building public momentum behind a machinery of urban maintenance and repair that minimises insecurity and disruption, that is non-discriminatory, that allows urban life in all its forms to flourish; an infrastructure of public utilities, services, institutions, technologies, spaces, and transit systems widely recognised as a commons that keeps the city on the move, acts as a life support and opportunity field, ensures that basic needs are met.
Common Ground

It is evident, however, from the many backlashes against the social state in the rights-based society that resentment and condescension hover close to the surface, with majorities often seeing themselves as the purveyors of rights allocated to minorities and subalterns seen to be different, inferiors, supplicants (Hage, 1998; Brown, 2006). For a rights-based culture to veer towards an ethic of human equivalence, it must embed itself in an understanding of the commons (nation, society, community, the public sphere, urban infrastructure) as a gathering of equals, a meeting ground, a space of mutual or overlapping interests valued in its own right. Such a sense is undoubtedly nourished by practices of daily encounter between strangers, but is also sustained by experience of the commons as a plural and non-discriminatory space. My claim here has been that the many local separations, dispersed geographies of attachment, and qualified proximities between strangers that characterise modern urban living, make it difficult to build solidarity based on care for the other. But the prospect of a solidarity based on sensing the urban as a public good still remains open, if able to build public recognition of common resources and spaces, work on shared concerns and intimacies in the public sphere, and cultivate stewardship of the urban commons.

A politics of common ground must feed off affects of togetherness, which in the city of multiple formations, require active cultivation, starting with public affirmation of the value of the plural city, backed by effective action against xenophobia, intolerance, inequality, injustice, and erosion of the public sphere. The city that commits to mixed or public housing under pressure to gentrify or segregate, to collective services under pressure to be more selective, to the vulnerable, disadvantaged and threatened under pressure to invest for the economically privileged and the rich, to open and inclusive public spaces under pressure to privatise or control entry, to multiculturalism and hospitality under pressure to eject and discipline the stranger, to a green and diverse urban landscape under pressure to exploit commercial opportunity, shows that it is willing to stand by a particular idea of urban living. It asks inhabitants, visitors and institutions to think of, and act in, the urban environment in a certain way; presenting throwntogetherness as opportunity for collective wellbeing and new formative experiences. It warns those who expect the city to serve partial or privileged interests to reconsider or move on.

But declarations alone do not make behaviour, unless they build on habituated experience of the city as a plural and shared space. Sustaining an ethos of urban togetherness requires the continual play between explication and practice, between prosaic and unconscious uses of the urban commons and public articulation of what this adds to personal and collective life. Selecting the individual spaces in which this play may be open to policy intervention is an imprecise art, and perhaps also ill-conceived, since what is required is a habit of living through multiple forms of connection into the urban communal; the presence of plural spaces of urban togetherness, their steady accumulation over time, their cross-fertilisation, their availability to bridge the gap when interpersonal negotiations fail short. The challenge here is to build a habit of collective identification formed through the urban unconscious and largely unnoticed, but also resilient because of its distribution across many operative spaces.

Some of these spaces can be named. They include the associations, clubs, meeting places, friendship networks, workplaces and spaces of learning that fill cities, where habits of being with others and in a common space and stances towards the city and the world at large take shape. They include the physical spaces – streets, retail spaces, libraries, parks, buildings - in which being with other humans and non-humans shapes sensibilities towards the urban commons, unknown strangers, and multiplicity and change. They include the city’s public services, infrastructure and collective institutions; experience of which forms attitudes and expectations related to the city as a collective resource, provisioning system, and source of welfare. They include the city’s public sphere – symbolic, cultural, discursive, and political – in which inclusive and open accounts of the city’s legacies and aspirations, and of subjectivity and belonging, ventilate popular understanding.
Across these spaces, the task for a politics of togetherness is to make the connections and dependencies visible, to reveal the value of a shared and functioning commons, to show how life chances depend upon an urban infrastructure capable of accommodating new demands and new claimants, to argue the necessity of an open, agonistic and active urban public sphere, to show that to damage the commons is to damage the self and future possibility, to build public stewardship of the urban commons. The kinds of intervention necessary to sustain such a politics hold few surprises and include measures to secure a decent public infrastructure, welfare equity, conviviality and ‘participative parity’ (Fraser, 2005: 87), vibrant public spaces, a democratic public culture, popular stewardship of the city’s natural and built environment, safeguards against abuses of power and influence, extensive linkage into the world at large. The real challenge lies in finding ways of maintaining public momentum behind these measures, so that an ethic of care for the urban commons spreads across the social fabric, open to multiplicity and difference.

This is a matter of building public interest in the plural communal with the help of diverse urban technologies, from the compulsions of cinematic representation, public art and the aesthetics of the built environment, to the percolations in popular culture of local stories, institutional practices and political discourse; slowly embedding care for the commons in the social unconscious (with the risk of it numbing social awareness and reflexivity) and making explicit the plural communal and the role that it plays in bridging difference, an object of desire. The everyday reproduction of urban affect, which can allow all manner of injury to pass unnoticed, has to be harnessed to a politics of publicity and rupture capable of mustering public concern over divisive or neglectful uses of the commons (Stewart, 2007).

**Conclusion: Beyond the City**

In this paper, I have chosen to link the challenge of living with difference to an ethic of care for the urban commons sustained through the city’s material culture, contra current policy emphasis on the tenor of relations between strangers. In arguing that urban contact networks are far too materially mediated and far too spatially dispersed to support a politics of recognition, my intention has not been to cast doubt on local attempts to build bridges between divided communities. It only makes sense to learn from conflict resolution techniques honed in fractured cities such as Sarajevo, Beirut or Belfast in order to tackle practices of ingrained fear and prejudice between communities (Bollens, 2007), to gather people from different backgrounds around common ventures to breakdown social distances (Amin, 2002), to build on mutual acts of kindness between neighbours who realise that they share a common space or common values (Wise, 2005). Instead, my ambivalence stems from the observation that such attempts tap into only some of the everyday influences shaping social habits towards diversity and difference.

These influences, it should have become clear from the urban ontology outlined in this paper, stem from a mixture of local and trans-local engagements, suggesting that even a politics centred on the urban commons cannot suffice in tackling the frictions of difference in an open and plural society. Situated behaviour is the product of dwelling in many relational worlds, with intensities of kinship towards others affected profoundly, for example, by representations of diversity and difference in the public sphere. In the spaces of communication sustained by state discourse, media commentary, educational practice, popular culture, are traced the contours of nation and community, the meanings of belonging, the duties and rights of the stranger, the stances towards the world, the purities and impurities of community. These spaces not only shape opinion, but are a sphere of intimacy in their own right in which feelings towards the nation and its outside, the self and the other, are made and unmade (Berlant, 2008). It is here that sentiments of imagined community are formed, along with affects of friendship or aversion towards the other, with the arousals of political broadcasts, news reports, school texts, films, internet chat, and cultural forums thoroughly worked into the habits of everyday encounter as a kind of precognitive coding instinct.

The powers of judgement based on intimacies of imagined community have become all too clear since 9/11, as a new public culture of aversion in the West towards the Muslim body works its way deep into
everyday habits of negotiating difference (Amin, 2010). Through incessant and emotionally charged commentary in the public sphere linking national identity, security and belonging to particular kinds of bodies, new instincts of daily response to Muslims and strangers in general are being formed. The proximities of multiculturalism that briefly surfaced in the late 20th century, sustained by a public culture sympathetic to diversity, cultural dialogue and openness towards the world, are being swept aside by new sentiments of suspicion, intolerance and retrenchment in the face of unassimilated difference. The strongly felt public compulsion now is to repel, domesticate or discipline the stranger, return blood, soil and cultural legacy into meanings of imagined community, look upon the outside as inferior, destabilising, threatening.

New public feelings reading culture and compatibility from evaluations of the physique of the stranger in the emotional spaces of imagined community are emerging, watchful of anyone failing to pass tradition-laden tests of conformity. As a result, along with Muslims and Muslim lookalikes, are being drawn into the firing line other minorities, asylum seekers, immigrants, welfare dependents, and dissidents, sensed as dangerous subalterns on the basis of charged sensory evaluations. Legitimacy in the public sphere for inflammatory labelling based on surface bodily judgements is allowing majorities to feel secure in venting all manner of aversion, passing vicariously from one kind of subject to another when it pleases. Affects of aversion are acquiring central regulatory force (Brown, 2006). While the beliefs of multiculturalism cautioned against vilifying difference (but often fell short of seeing the stranger as equal) and those of universalism made light of it (often at the expense of strongly held values among different communities), the affects of xenophobic labelling have normalised everyday vigilantism. The asylum seeker, drop out, Muslim, immigrant, protester, cosmopolitan are now required to prove their innocence, their ordinariness, their right to belong, their good intentions. The burden of proof now lies in demonstrating the acceptability of difference, requiring the courage and effort to think and act against the grain, the extra work to show that the new aversions are unnecessary and damaging, both to the other and the self.

Without a shift in the primary sentiments formed in intimate publics, the urban proposals outlined in this paper can only find themselves swimming against the tide. To be effective, the have to nest within a public culture that desires the imagined community for its heterogeneity, its multiple affiliations and legacies, its commitment to deep democracy. This is a public culture at ease with both convivial and disjunctive outcomes of everyday multicultural encounter (Gilroy, 2004; Chambers, 2001), community defined as the constellation of the many global connections that make up a society (Sardar, 2009), and the principle that all members of a society, temporary or permanent and settled or recent, have the right to participate in the democratic process (Connolly, 2005). To press for this in a present dominated by a culture of fear and anxiety towards difference may seem counterintuitive given the strength of the public machinery bent on tracing future risk to particular strangers and alien cultures and promising security through a return to the purer and more closed society. Yet, this is exactly the kind of counter-culture that must be mobilised, building hope in the idea of a future faced together through collective effort and mutual understanding, demonstrating that there is no pure or idyllic community to return to.

A machinery that makes public the dynamism, creativity and resilience of the open, equal and plural society needs to be put into place piece by piece, gradually unsettling the culture of fear of strangers and minorities that has come to prevail (Connolly, 2009). This involves fomenting new ideas of community (e.g. emphasising sympathy, hospitality, or mutuality), publicising the cruelties and absurdities of the vindictive present, closing down on practices of discrimination and prejudice, defending the social state and transnational membership, building intimate publics where the heterogeneous and the foreign merge, pressing for legislative change, linking up the many social movements and political forces that see sense in bridging difference. When the feelings of imagined community start resonating around such a machinery of public being, the city of the commons will be ready to play its full part.
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Abstract

This essay addresses the effects of recent trends—especially economic downturns—on cities and immigration flows, with attention to the changing conditions shaping local responses to immigration. It identifies recent immigration trends in the USA and Europe, 2000-2010, considers the impact of the recent economic recession on immigration trends, delineates some of the changing conditions shaping policy responses and highlights innovative strategies being pursued in cities dealing with increased immigrant populations.

Why Cities?

A focus on cities brings attention to the spatial context of immigration in a global city system and highlights the implications of immigration for local politics. That is, immigration is not a linear or universal process; increasingly it is an urban or metropolitan trend with immigrants clustering in cities and nearby suburbs. Recent immigration growth in Europe and USA is metro-centric: immigrants are settling primarily in metropolitan areas but often in urban peripheries. While one in every eight Americans now is foreign-born, one in every six metropolitan residents is foreign born which is a much greater incidence than in earlier immigration eras (Frey, 2009). Notably 94% of unauthorized immigrants in the US are estimated to live in metropolitan areas. While immigration increasingly is on national policy agendas in the U.S. and Europe, the impacts are local—local officials are on the front line but often without support or understanding of the pressures they face.

Even though the focus here is on local communities, the assumption is that the societal tensions experienced at the local level are shaped by state authority and action. In many ways, local officials are responding to problems they cannot control, including the actions and inactions of national and provincial authorities. Most of the time, national policies lag local realities. Local officials must respond to immediate demands created by immigration, often in the absence of national guidelines or policies. By focusing on institutions and policies, this essay takes a polity-centered perspective: it assumes that policies—or their absence-- shape future politics at both the national and local levels.

I. Recent Immigration Trends, USA and Europe, 2000-2010

When we compare immigration trends in Europe and the USA, we see similarities but distinct temporal sequences and differences in volume, and composition of the immigrant population. Both the USA and Europe experienced rapid immigration growth in the mid-1990s, peaking in 2000 for the USA and 2003 for the EU-27. What is less familiar is that both experienced a sharp decline shortly thereafter: after 2001 in the USA and after 2005 for the EU-27. Indeed by 2004, the annual inflow of foreign-born persons in the US was down 24% from the all-time high in 2000.

Certainly there was a difference in volume. In 2004, non-nationals (persons not citizens in their country of residence) in the EU were around 25 million, just below 5.5 percent of the total population
(Eurostat, 2006). By 2009, there were 31.9 million non-nationals, about 6.4% of the EU population—about 1/3 of these were members of other EU states (Eurostat 2010). In the USA, by 2008, there were 39.9M foreign-born immigrants, comprising 13% of US residents and 16% of US workers.

And there also is a difference in the composition of the immigrant stream. By 2006 in the EU-27, there were 3 million non national immigrants and more than 1.8 million were not citizens of EU-27 countries. Looking only at foreign citizens, 60% of EU immigrants were citizens of countries outside the European Union (these non-EU immigrants were primarily Turkish and Moroccans) while 40% were citizens of other EU Member States (Eurostat, 2008). The distribution of immigrant types also varies widely across countries, with the U.K., Spain, Sweden, Slovenia, Czech Republic, Cyprus, and Hungary having more than 50% of their immigrant population from countries outside the EU-27. As in the U.S., EU countries bordering less developed areas—such as Italy, Greece, and Spain—also faced the dilemma of illegal entries (Papademetriou et al., 2010).

The composition of recent US immigration streams is less diverse: by 2008, Mexicans were 1/3 of all foreign-born residents and 2/3 of all Hispanic immigrants (Passel and Cohn, 2009). Most significantly, illegal or undocumented immigrant numbers exceeded legal immigration by the end of 2004 (Passel and Suro, 2005). By 2007, undocumented immigrants were estimated to be 11.9 M or 30% of the foreign born population of 39M (Passel and Cohn, 2009) Within the U.S., both documented and undocumented immigrants have dispersed from gateway cities more widely than in the past, bringing immigration issues to communities that historically have been outside immigration corridors. While still important gateways, cities such as Los Angeles and New York City are now joined by cities such as Omaha, Nebraska and Durham, North Carolina as immigrant destinations (Frey, 2005). This geographic dispersion of immigrants, and their impacts on local communities, contributes to the increased political salience of immigrant concerns in the U.S.

II. Recession, Immigration, and Cities

But the recent recession disrupted these trends and highlighted the pressures on local communities. Legal or documented immigration to the USA remained steady but there has been a sharp decline in unauthorized immigration—down to 10.8 M in 2009 (Passel and Cohn, 2009). This dramatically reversed the trends of the 1990s, with the greatest impacts in cities and states with strong immigration gains earlier in the decade. The rate of unauthorized migration to the U.S. is now lower than that of legal immigration so we see an overall decrease in the unauthorized population but little return migration (Chishti and Bergeron, 2010). Border apprehensions were down 50% between 2000-2008 (Wilson and Singer, 2009). This decline began in 2006 when the housing market in the U.S. began to collapse, even before the “official” start of the recession in 2007. The recession hit hard on immigrant labour working in vulnerable sectors such as construction, tourism, and hospitality sectors. But the low rate of return migration meant that immigrants continued to “save” some American cities: international migration “cushioned” losses from domestic out-migration in many cities, even during the late-decade slowdown (Frey, 2009).
In Europe, the recession impacts vary by country, depending on the type of crisis driving the recession and the institutional configurations shaping labour markets as well as the characteristics of the most vulnerable sectors (Papademetriou et al., 2010). They also vary by immigrant group. As Figure 2 shows (Eurostat, 2008), migration by EU-27 members continued apace and actually increased during the recession period. All other groups decline beginning in 2005, with all showing upward trends thereafter except for nationals. The recession impacts are clearly gender and place-specific (Skeldon, 2010; Martin 2009; Papademetriou et al., 2010). OECD’s LEED program argues that in a cyclical downturn, “all sectors are affected by a changing financial environment and declining demand, even if certain industries are more sensitive to cyclical change than others.” So as a cyclical recession, the current recession “threatens the livelihoods of more people across many more sectors of the economy.” This means that all cities are affected, not just aging cities as might be the case in structural crisis. All localities are facing rising unemployment and budget cuts so that “managing immigration as part of a coherent local skills strategy will be very important, so that local people do not see immigration as a threat but part of a balanced local approach (OECD 2009).”

Sub-national governments increasingly are on the front line as they deal with the need to integrate immigrants into local communities, provide new and expanded services, and occasionally regulate cultural conflicts. These demands are increasing, just as recessionary trends weaken their ability to respond. As the recession brought job losses and unemployment, U.S. communities suffered declines in consumption-based tax revenue. Immigrants and ethnic minorities in the U.S. were especially hit by the burst of the housing bubble and the foreclosures on mortgages of new home-owners—often first generation immigrants or their families. As a result, property values declined and property tax revenues decreased as large swathes of many previously booming neighbourhoods lost residents (Capps, 2009). This made it hard for cities to continue levels of support for health, education, and community development services and even more difficult to sustain immigrant-targeted services such as language training and emergency health care.

These local issues in the U.S. often are framed as budgetary issues whereas — due to different public finance structures – the European response centres on improving public sector access to borrowing, strengthening local labour markets, and creating more jobs. European local governments also suffered a loss in revenue, either from declines in their self-generated resources or from cuts in national transfers and external investments (CEMR, 2009). As a result, analysts fear the fiscal impacts will result in cutting of local integration strategies as a vulnerable element of budgets (Papademetriou et al., 2010). Increasing sub-national governments’ access to loans and investment capital is a key concern although some European local governments are now burdened with “toxic loans” issued with variable rates during earlier growth periods (CEMR, 2009) Responding with labour market policies offers an opportunity to expand the traditional focus on redundant workers to newly unemployed workers, immigrant and otherwise. But to the extent that service sectors are also suffering from recession, relying on lower-skilled service sector jobs for
new job creation will be less viable and demands on the public sector for jobs and services will increase (OECD 2009).

III. Policy Responses in an Institutional Void

This highlights the importance of local responses but such actions are taking place—in most cases—in an institutional void. Given the lack of effective national policies and the ambivalent, contradictory findings reported in public opinion polls, sub-national officials find little guidance for developing responses to the immediate effects of immigration. The absence of a coherent national policy framework encourages growing sub-national immigration policy agendas. In the USA, there is unprecedented state legislative activity: by 2009 state governments enacted 222 immigration laws (NCSL, 2009). By June 2010, 191 laws and 128 resolutions had been adopted by 44 states with more pending; this is a 21% increase over the previous year (NCSL, 2010). These are both pro/anti immigration resolutions but heavily influenced now by Arizona’s SB 1070 which allows police to ask the legal status of individuals involved in a lawful stop, detention, or arrest if the officer reasonably suspects the individual is an undocumented immigrant. Other states are now considering similar legislation despite the court injunction against carrying out the Arizona law.

Despite the rhetoric and media attention to Arizona’s legislation, a majority of U.S. citizens think the federal government, not states, should make and enforce immigration laws. In a June 2010 poll, 52% of respondents supported the Federal role and 46% supported a state role (Washington Post-ABC, 2010). But Americans are decidedly ambivalent about what to do about immigration: about equal shares (39%) think immigration should be kept at the present level (in 2007) as think it should be decreased. Since 2000, a majority of Americans report seeing immigration as “a good thing,” rising to over 60% by 2005 and remaining at these levels through the beginning of the recession. With the restructuring of the welfare state and decentralization initiatives in Western Europe, immigration integration issues were pushed down to sub-national levels despite the lack of resources, experience, or administrative capacity (Ireland, 2004). With this localization of immigration issues, similar attitudinal patterns are evident in the U.K. and Europe, with more volatility in the U.K.

With the exception of the U.K., a majority of all Europeans think immigration policy should be set at the EU level rather than the national or local level (GMF, 2009). In both Europe and the U.S., political orientations influenced changing attitudes towards immigration more than the economic impact of the recession on households (GMF, 2009). The reasons behind negative views of immigration are varied: Britain and the U.S. focus more on the perceived job losses for native-born citizens attributed to immigration whereas Netherlands and Germany are more likely to voice concerns about immigrants and increases in crime. Yet there is widespread dissatisfaction with government “mismanagement” of immigration: only in Canada and Germany do fewer than 40% of respondents claim that “governments are mismanaging immigration.” It is possible that the new European Platform against Poverty, part of the EUROPE 2020 strategy, and focus on more economic, social and territorial cohesion would begin to redress this institutional void but it remains to be seen.

Most significantly, the variation in perceptions within countries may be even greater than the variation between countries. In the U.S. the distribution of negative sentiments on immigration is generally, but not invariably, associated with city size and whether a city is experiencing a high and or rapid rate of immigration. Larger U.S. cities—also more likely to have more immigrants—are less negative about immigration whereas smaller and medium sized cities are more likely to be negative. This may reflect the newness of the immigration experience for smaller cities, the introduction of more diversity, the scarcity of resources or other contextual features characterizing smaller communities. But the key point is that perceptions of immigration are context specific.
This is very true in Europe as well. The positive and negative perceptions of immigration are uneven within the same country: asked whether “the presence of foreigners is good for the city,” 26% of Marseille respondents disagree but only 12% of Parisians, 30% of Rotterdam respondents disagree compared to 15% of Amsterdam respondents.

Nor is there much consensus on how to respond to immigration. Overall there is a tendency to want both more integration and more enforcement. Europeans are more supportive of legalization of unauthorized immigrants where Americans are increasingly negative about such legalization (GMR, 2009). In the absence of coherent policies, political constituencies promote a wide range of often contradictory policies. Local officials, therefore, operate in an complex and volatile public context with increasing demands for both integration and enforcement, increasing fiscal pressures to cut back on expenditures overall, and the absence of effective institutional capacity to grapple with these issues.

In part this volatility and dissatisfaction with government efforts stems from conflicting views on the values of immigration and a lack of consensus on policy solutions. As a result, there are growing political tensions and increased polarization as politicians respond to electoral pressures with promises that defy the complexities of immigration issues. New political cleavages and coalitions rise in response to these demographic changes and lagging institutional responses. Both the absence of effective national policies and the growth of sub-national actions stir counter-mobilizations of immigrants and their supporters in Europe and the USA.

One of the most dramatic examples in the U.S. centered on protests against U.S. H.R. 4437, legislation (passed in the House but not the Senate) that would make “illegal presence” in the U.S a criminal act rather than a civil offense. It charged state and local law enforcement with the authority to make these charges against undocumented immigrants as well as those assisting them in any way. In the spring of 2006, immigrants mobilized across the U.S. to challenge this potential criminalization threat. As Benjamin –Alvarado et al (2009) document these protests were especially prominent in cities of new immigration since 1990. Although these immigrants might be considered the least likely to overcome resource and organizational barriers to mobilization, they used cell phones, social media, and other Spanish-language media to connect and mobilize.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Location and Numbers of Immigration Rights Protests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February-April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of high post-1965 immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April (excluding 4/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Benjamin-Alvarado et al, 2009

IV. Policy Agendas, Strategies, and Innovative Cases

In this difficult context, a number of innovative policy cases merit further attention. Five subnational immigrant integration strategies are highlighted here: relying on political leadership, creating local immigration partnerships, using community-based organizations, supporting immigrant entrepreneurs, and opening institutional channels for representation of immigrant voices. These suggest that crafting local integration strategies is contingent on effectively defining immigrant needs in the context of local
resources, capacities, and traditions. We should expect and learn from variations in local policy choices rather than seek a singular strategy or standardized blueprint.

Philadelphia, PA and Rotterdam, NE

Strategy: Using Political Leadership to Frame Issues

One of the most direct sub-national roles is relying on political leadership to frame issues in ways that generate responsive policies. In Philadelphia PA, Mayor Michael Nutter publically embraces immigration as an economic asset for the city. In 2008, Mayor Nutter created an Office of Multicultural Affairs; he also issued several Executive Orders aimed at integrating immigrants (Brookings, 2010). Directive 62 requires language access plans and programs for every department and agency in city government. As a result, every department in city government is required to produce materials in 12 different languages. Another Executive Order (9-08) requires every public employee to deliver services regardless of immigration status. No one can ask anyone’s immigration status, for example, unless it’s the Philadelphia Police Department and directly related and pertinent to a criminal investigation.

Similarly, Rotterdam’s Multicoloured City initiative from 1998-2002 sought to highlight cultural diversity in Rotterdam by making it a criterion used by employers and policymakers alike (Semprebon, 2004). This municipal initiative set a benchmark for Municipal Authority employment of minorities to increase from 16.1% in 1998 to 22%. By the end of December 2001, municipal employment of minorities reached 21.3%. Using public authority, the city’s goal was to make diversity “palpable, visible, and accessible.” This initiative was followed by the DiverCity program, moving beyond cultural and racial understandings of diversity to a more comprehensive view. In both instances, public leadership is used to reframe issues of local immigration by increasing their “visibility” in a positive way, as participants in the public sector.

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Strategy: Coordinating Service Delivery Through Partnerships

The Municipal Immigration Committee (MIC) was created under the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement (Ontario, 2008). Members include a wide range of municipalities throughout the province. The MIC “provides a forum for municipalities to voice local concerns regarding immigration.” In Canada, these concerns include effective ways to attract and retain immigrants in smaller municipalities as well as the “effective and timely settlement and integration of immigrants.”

In Toronto, the MCI, the CIC, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) and the City of Toronto joined together to develop the Local Immigration Partnership (LIP) concept. LIPs are organized to facilitate local efforts to help integrate newcomers to their communities. The emphasis is on creating local immigration initiatives through strategic plans that provide community-specific solutions for achieving immigration goals. This includes integrating service delivery for immigrant communities.

Washington DC and Bergamo IT

Strategy: Working Through Community-Based Organizations

Community-based organizations (CBO) draw on civil society resources to respond to immigration dilemmas. Contrary to many assumptions, they do not operate isolated from public authority or to replace public authority. Community-based organizations operate within a legal and regulatory institutional structure that can encourage or discourage organizational development. In the U.S. this is a rather porous structure that gives non-profit (non-taxed) status to organizations with service or educational functions.
The number of CBOs has grown rapidly in the past decade. They have been especially important for immigrant integration and services in the U.S. The Urban Institute (deLeon et al., 2009) analyzed the activities of immigrant-serving and immigrant-run nonprofits in the D.C. area, finding over 533 immigrant-serving nonprofits throughout the DC region. Most are concentrated in Washington, D.C. itself and the inner suburbs of Maryland and Virginia. With the continued growth of immigrant populations in the outer suburbs there is a growing spatial mismatch between organizational capacity and immigrant need in DC. Some of this gap is being met in immigrant communities themselves who provide leaders who create nonprofits as well as provide staff, volunteers, and board members to other organizations. In contrast, the immigrant-serving CBOs tend to rely more heavily on private contributions and government grants and less on program service revenue. Both types of organizations, however, are central to immigrant integration: not only do they provide immigrant-oriented services, they also encourage the civic skills that allow participation and empowerment in the larger society.

There are many examples of civil society organization in OECD countries as well. One example that blends immigrant serving and immigrant run features is the Community Foundation in Bergamo (EFC, 2006). It supported the establishment of a meals service for the elderly which is managed by immigrant or unemployed women and also a housing scheme for immigrant women; and shelter and support for women victims of trafficking.

**Barcelona, Spain and Antwerp, Belgium**

**Strategy: Supporting Immigrant Entrepreneurship**

Spain once was a major source of immigration but is now the host to many immigrants, not only from other OECD countries but also from North Africa and Turkey. This new immigration is especially prominent in larger cities such as Madrid and Barcelona as well as the traditionally working class inner suburbs ringing these cities.

In Barcelona, the immigrant population grew from 3.5% to 17.3% of the city’s total population from 2002-2008 (Barcelona Activa). As of 2009 18% of the city’s population was foreign registered residents; this is a very young population: only 2.1% of the immigrant population is over 65. The rate of growth, along with the increase in numbers of immigrants, accelerates the impacts on local communities. The city responded by focusing on new immigrants as a source of entrepreneurial energy and investment that could boost local economic growth. By adapting existing programs at Barcelona Activa, the city’s local development agency since 1986, the city was able to provide training and employment to meet the needs of newcomers to the city.

In particular, the Glories Entrepreneurship Centre became a key element in this effort to encourage innovation and entrepreneurial initiatives. Since 2004, the Glories Entrepreneurship Centre is available to all city residents free of charge. It provides essential information and advice on every phase of business startup for over 1,000 new projects a year. Notably, Barcelona does not provide migrant-specific support services but adapts mainstream programs to migrant needs where necessary. It appears that nearly a third of all participants in these entrepreneurship programs are immigrants, even though they are only 18% of Barcelona’s population. Many of these immigrant startups cater to immigrant-specific food, clothing, and household needs. The Entrepreneurship Centre claims a business creation rate of 60%, and a business survival rate of 91% in the first year. The Barcelona model is recognized as best practice by the Habitat Programme of the UN, and the best local project of support for entrepreneurship by Eurocities. In 2009, Barcelona Activa’s contribution to the city and wider community was recognized by the OECD as the “gold” standard in local economic development. Activa’s ODAME program, School of Entrepreneurship for Women, originally developed through the European Social Fund’s EQUAL Community Initiative, and targets entrepreneurial assistance to women. Again, the focus is not on
immigrants but on business development skills that will be of value to immigrants and non-immigrants alike.

Antwerp (BRC) also emphasizes immigrant entrepreneurship in their immigrant integration programs. In the late 1990s, the city sought to redevelop city districts by encouraging the activities of ethnic minority entrepreneurs through the LIA-Antwerpen Project. In contrast to Barcelona’s strategy, LIA initially targeted Turkish, Moroccan, and African shopkeepers and entrepreneurs by offering free, customized business management training. This was replaced by a more general “enterprise training course” but adapted and taught in Arabic and Turkish. The Belgian Bakers Syndicate gave special support to ethnic minority bakers, encouraging them to establish the Ethnic Minority Bakers Federation. This was followed by formation of the African Business Association (ABA) and the multicultural Business Club for Shopkeepers of HZEM. LIA was part of the ELAINE network, which is part of the EU funded programme LIA (Local Integration / Partnership Action Initiative). The project was co-financed by the Flemish Social Impulse Fund and continued beyond the end of LIA funding in 1998, through funding from the Antwerp Council and the Social Impulse Fund.

These local immigrant integration strategies emphasizing entrepreneurial skills reflect the view that addressing the supply and demand for labour skills is an increasingly important local responsibility, one that focuses on skills upgrading but also on the governance of local labour markets.

**Utrecht NE and Dublin, Ireland**

*Strategy: Opening Channels for Immigrant Voices*

Many local integration strategies actively seek the input and participation of immigrants themselves. This is essential for effective program design and implementation; it also offers opportunities for immigrants to learn local practices and become more involved in community activities. Local authorities often create advisory boards to consult immigrants more broadly on integration policy. Eurocities (2009) argues for better links between the European Commission and the European Economic and Social Committee with the European Integration Forum and these various local advisory boards. Utrecht’s “Saluti” exemplifies local advisory boards of migrants who represent their own group but also provide the city with perspectives on the daily concerns and issues important to migrants in the city. The city provides staff support but Saluti develops its own initiatives and has evolved into “a widely recognised authority on integration and diversity issues. (Eurocities, 2009). ”

But a more direct, more explicit focus on articulating immigrant voices is evident in several local initiatives encouraging local immigrant empowerment and political representation. Eurocities notes that only 15 of 29 EU member states allow non-national EU citizens to vote in local elections. Six of these also give voting rights to third-country citizens. Eurocities advocates the right of nonnationals to vote and urges them to be made eligible for election at local level. But eligibility may not be enough. In Dublin, the immigrant population is now 15% of the city’s population, with some districts in the city reporting over 50% immigrant populations (Dublin, 2008). These immigrants come from over 100 countries so the city is extensively involved in multi-lingual communications, including forums and advisory councils to provide immigrant input and consultation. In 2008, the City Council’s Office for Integration established a Migrant Voter Project that will educate migrants on their legal rights to vote—regardless of status— and on how and where to register and vote. Although the immigrant population is large, their voting turnout is extremely low. The Migrant Voter Project aimed at increasing immigrant voter registration by late 2008 by relying on immigrant community “ambassadors” to relay their citizenship training information to their communities. Immigrant registration increased substantially and by 2009, political parties were vying for the immigrant vote and sometimes slating immigrants as candidates—38 immigrants were on slates in the 2009 local elections.
V. Shaping Immigration Politics and Policies in the Coming Decade

It is clear that even in a context of potentially smaller and slower immigration flows, the immigration policy agenda will continue to be a critical national and subnational concern. While the immediate pressures may be familiar, anticipating the future of cities and immigration in a post-recession era is less predictable. Beyond the current recession, the aging of populations in both the U.S. and Europe, and the continued imbalances in a global market economy ensure that immigration will continue in the post-recession period.

The tenor and nature of these policy responses is contingent on finding a persuasive narrative to frame immigration issues. The discursive symbols of children and competitiveness currently appear to be alternatives to more xenophobic frames. Yet they may not be sufficient to overcome the policy discourse of securitization that increasingly defines immigration issues in Europe and the USA.

The increased ‘securitization’ of migration in Europe prompted the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Mary Robinson in 2001 to criticize a "Fortress Europe" mentality, in which Europe closes itself off from immigration because of xenophobic tendencies. Yet the 2003 European Security Strategy and the 2008 Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy frame illegal immigration as a state failure that affects EU security (Archer, 2009). Recessions are often times in which migration issues are reframed as security threats (Martin, 2009), usually independent of the actual rate of immigration. As in the U.S., apprehensions of illegal entries on the southern border of the E.U. declined dramatically with the onset of the recession; illegal entries through EU maritime ports declined by 40% from 2008-2009 and continue to do so (Papademetriou et al., 2010).

In the US, the tangled ecology of border security increasingly is framed in terms of enforcement rather than economic dynamics. Wilson and Singer (2009) report that the number of arrests for illegal crossings at the U.S. Mexico border dropped by more than 23 percent during 2009. The 556,000 apprehensions in 2009 represented a 50 percent drop from the 1.1 million apprehensions FY 2006 and marked a 34-year low point (Papademetriou and Terrazas, 2009). But at the same time the border patrol budget has risen to nearly $11 billion, up from $6 billion in 2004. Demands for more personnel on the border are increasingly at odds with the actual decline in attempts at illegal crossings.

The stark reality is that the intergenerational impacts of immigration are now independent of flows. In the U.S. a growing share of the children of unauthorized immigrant parents—73%—were born in the U.S and therefore are U.S. citizens (Passel and Cohn, 2009). According to the Urban Institute (Fortuny et al., 2009), “children of immigrants are the fastest growing segment of the nation's children population” - accounting for 77 percent of the growth of the U.S. children population between 1990 and 2007. Given immigrants’ metropolitan-centric settlement patterns, there are now 31 U.S. metropolitan areas that have majority minority child populations (Brookings, 2010). These children, both those who are unauthorized immigrants themselves and those who are U.S. citizens, make up 6.8% of the students enrolled in the nation’s elementary and secondary schools. (Passel and Cohn, 2009). Most significantly, “the number of U.S.-born children in mixed-status families (unauthorized immigrant parents and citizen children) has expanded rapidly in recent years, to 4 million in 2008 from 2.7 million in 2003 (Passel and Cohn, 2009).” This creates a troubling policy issue for national and subnational governments. There is substantial variation by state but nearly every state is home to a significant number of mixed-status.

While the core issue is the threat of deportation for undocumented parents of citizen children, the future policy agenda is likely to center on the education, labour skills, and health needs of these children. In the U.S., these services are primarily funded and delivered by subnational governments. The recession renders these governments less able, and in many cases, less willing to pay for these services.
While citizenship rules vary across OECD countries, it is clear that children of immigrants now present a policy issue in Europe as well. Indeed, leaders from the Migration Policy Institute and the Bertelsmann Stiftung refer to them as “the children that Europe forgot” (Papademetriou and Weidenfeld, 2007). Since citizenship criteria differ substantially across European countries, the focus increasingly is on the poverty status of children in immigrant households. With the apparent exception of Italy, the DPI (Disposable Income Poverty) poverty rates for children of immigrants are higher than those of majority population children in 14 European countries (Italy, Germany, UK, France, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Ireland, Belgium, Netherlands, Austria, Finland) in 2008 (Smeeding, 2009). Taking into account social programs benefitting children shows that policy efforts in these European countries are similar in their effects on reducing child poverty overall; that is, child poverty reduction impacts vary more by country than by immigrant status. Nevertheless, more immigrant children remain poor even after program benefits in all European countries although France, Ireland, UK, Belgium, and Sweden show comparable rates of poverty reduction for immigrant and majority children (Smeeding, 2009).

Papademetriou and Weidenfeld (2007) note that one of every two students in Amsterdam and Rotterdam schools is the child of immigrants and forecast this will become “the norm in much of Europe in coming decades.” This is already the reality in European schools, although with substantial variation across countries. Their findings detail sharp gaps between academic performance of immigrant and non-immigrant students, with immigrant students in Norway, and Sweden between a half-year and a full year behind non-immigrants and at least one-and-a-half years in Belgium and Germany. As in the U.S., these educational deficits in the future labour force bode ill for economic competitiveness.

VI. Concluding Points

Globalization creates a paradox: the more important the globalization trends, the more important actors local communities become in immigration policy. While the recessionary trends of the last few years appear to have dampened migration trends, the other side of the recession will feature increased migration rates and continuing local roles. Skeldon (2010) contends that “deep inequalities in the global system ensure continued migration.” Frey (2009) notes that the stagnation of migration at the 2007-2009 levels in the U.S. would mark a deviation from historical trends in the U.S. Instead, he anticipates a return to the 1990 rates, rather than the expansive trends of post-WWII or more recent years.

While the decline in the flow of migrants, particularly unauthorized immigrants, seemed to create a moment for rethinking and reform of immigration policy in the U.S. and Europe, that moment has passed. Little substantive reform has occurred and national immigration policy is increasingly subject to electoral pressures. In this politicized context, local municipalities remain burdened with immigration integration responsibilities and little guidance or resources. In particular, even if immigration slows, they are faced with the integration of current immigrants and their children. Since these children are integral parts of the future workforce in the U.S. and the E.U., their integration, education, and training is key to future economic competitiveness. In the absence of coherent and effective national immigration policy, localities must develop policies that are multi-scalar and multi-jurisdictional. This presents challenges that are at least as complex as the immigrant dilemmas that generated them.
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SUCCESSFUL STRATEGIES TO BUILD CONSENSUS IN PUBLIC POLICY: CREATING COALITIONS FOR IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION IN LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Representative Kyrsten Sinema, Democratic member of the Arizona State Senate

This paper will briefly discuss strategies to build consensus for public policies in local, state, and national government, based on experiences in Arizona and in other communities throughout the United States. Coalitions initiated by government leaders and elected officials are critical to the success of new government endeavours, particularly those endeavours that usher in major changes to existing policies or those that concern topics of social concern. As communities prepare to integrate immigrants into urban communities, effective coalition building techniques can prevent divisive reactions and negative outcomes from these transitions. This essay describes strategies that local governments can use to build effective, long-lasting coalitions that add positive value to immigration integration efforts. Governments face a host of challenges to successful immigrant integration, including lack of preparation for a rapidly changing community, resistance from established communities who may be unwilling to adapt to or accept a changing cultural community, reactions from social isolationists who resist the diversification of historically homogenous communities, and political opportunism by fringe political elements seeking to capitalize off constituents’ fears and apprehensions. In addition, governments face concerns such as lack of cohesion between previously settled immigrant communities and newly arrived immigrant communities, social isolation of recently arrived immigrant populations, ghetto-ization of neighbourhoods that are stratified by ethnic or national divides, the relative invisibility of immigrant communities within the larger community structure, and inaccessibility to immigrant communities by government actors and service providers. Skills needed to build successful coalitions to deal with these concerns include connecting with unlikely allies, talking and listening to community members, identifying common ground, locating a shared set of values, abandoning pre-conceived outcomes, naming interests, identifying creative alternative solutions, and seeking value added solutions that meet all parties’ interests. Finally, building in accountability within coalition work ensures that group decision-making is supported by all parties and is sustainable.

Creating Political Consensus

In today’s highly charged political climate, the concept of developing consensus may seem impossible and antiquated. Global news coverage has highlighted increased political cleavages not just in the United States, but in the United Kingdom, Germany, and a host of other European countries in recent years. As fringe political parties have emerged, focusing on one or two “wedge” issues, and economic and social changes have provided fodder for divisive political platforms, consensus in governing coalitions has become less and less likely. While this trend certainly presents additional challenges to local and national governments’ efforts to build broad-based support for policy endeavours, it does not rule them immediately impossible. It does, however, require new and innovative ways of thinking about coalition building and the implementation of strategic planning and action to build successful, broad, and lasting coalitions. Immigration has presented a special challenge to governments over the last decade. As an issue with both

1. The strategies and policy suggestions in this paper are adapted from my 2009 book, Unite and Conquer: How to Build Coalitions that Win and Last by Kyrsten Sinema, foreword by United States Department of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano. Published by Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
economic and social ramifications, immigration, particularly immigration within urban communities, has acted as a political lightening rod, spurring the genesis of new political parties and social movements across continents. In the United States, immigration has become one of the most emotionally charged and politically loaded topics of debate, leading to major policy struggles, rifts between traditional allies, and even violence amongst our citizenry. Over the last decade, as the political right in the United States began utilizing immigration as a political organizing tool, the political left largely ignored the issue. As such, the topic was politicized effectively and ceased to be viewed by the American public as a social quandary to be dealt with collaboratively and instead began to view it from a partisan political perspective. By ignoring the real impact of immigration into urban and exurban communities, policymakers left open a large political space for divisive political tactics. In order to prevent this from happening elsewhere, or to repair damage already done in communities similar to Arizona’s, this paper describes a number of strategies to be employed in creating early coalitions to build consensus, rather than fight over an already divided issue.

A. Consider unlikely allies

Too often in American government, employees are quite isolated in their practice. Government may not work regularly with actors in the private and non-governmental organization (NGO) sector, fail to reach out to citizens frequently, or even miss the opportunity to work collaboratively with other branches of government. Much of this in the United States is due to comparatively low levels of financial support for local government entities – employees are stretched thin with an ever-increasing portfolio of duties. While this is understandable, this lack of financial resources and time leads to implementation of policies that are not informed or supported by the community’s residents, businesses, or interest groups. As a result, the local government may spend more time after a policy is implemented dealing with the political fallout from the policy than was either anticipated or needed. By investing early in ally-building, governments can save time and money, and reduce friction in the community as policies are implemented. Local governments should build a first step into policy implementation that involves reaching out to unlikely allies. This would include community groups that are not typically involved in immigration-related policy, but whom care about public services or public accommodations, like groups that service children, the elderly, and disabled populations. It could also include parent groups in the school community, as they are concerned about public education. Other unlikely allies would include neighbourhood safety organizations, as they focus on aesthetics, security, and community cohesion. Brainstorming within traditional allied organizations could generate a much longer list of unlikely allies whose opinions and participation are needed for long-term success of any consensus-based policies. Local governments can play an unique role in gathering unlikely allies together. While a traditional pro-immigrant advocacy group may be viewed sceptically by an unlikely ally organization, governments can often act as “honest brokers” to bring multiple perspectives to the table for organizing purposes. In particular, elected officials are often able to bring together stakeholders from a wide range of viewpoints, if only through their inherent convening power. As a local government seeking to build consensus, the first step to building a successful coalition must be to include all relevant impacted communities, including those who may be considered as antagonistic to the government’s stated goals.

B. Reject identity politics

Historically, marginalized communities have embraced what is sometimes termed identity politics, a tendency to purposefully form small interest groups defined by one characteristic the actors share in common. In the United States, this results in movements for disability rights peopled by only those living with disabilities, gay rights activities composed of only lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgendered (LGBT) people, and rights for immigrants composed only of Latino immigrant communities. While the genesis of such identity groups is formed with the best of intentions and often in reaction to unjustified targeting or marginalization by unaffected communities, interest groups by definition are small and fragmented. While Latinos are certainly the prime group oppressed by Arizona’s current immigration policies, for instance, a
number of other groups may also share the concerns that Latinos voice in this debate. Civil libertarians, additional ethnic minorities, business leaders, and communities of faith also share a desire to establish humane immigration policies, regardless of whether or not their group members are the target of the misguided policies in place. Identity politics has historically made it difficult for these potential allied organizations to create common cause with the targeted interest group. However, successful coalitions the country over have proven that, in order to create social change in a community that results in humane policies, a targeted minority must join forces with non-affected groups. No one identity group in the United States, or any locality, is large or powerful enough to change policy on its own. Acting in isolation and forgoing important coalition building with other groups and other people guarantees continued isolation and marginalization. On the other hand, historically oppressed populations that have eschewed identity politics in favor of building broad coalitions that comprise a variety of people who identify in a myriad of ways have seen unusual successes. In the United States, these tactics were used successfully during the historic civil rights movements of the 1950s and 1960s to advance equal rights for African-American citizens. Only by soliciting the support and assistance of thousands of Anglo-Americans, faith leaders, and ultimately business and civic leaders around the country, did the movement to end de jure discrimination against African-Americans succeed. Today, Latino organizations are joining forces with other communities of color representing the interests of immigrants, such as Asian American, Arab American, European American, and African communities. Most recently, Latino and immigrant rights organizations have begun forging coalition with LGBT organizations, recognizing that their mutual struggles for justice and equality have many shared characteristics. These broad coalitions allow Latinos to create both depth and breadth in the effort to enact comprehensive immigration reform policies at the national level, and supportive policies to integrate immigrant populations into the local community.

C. Talk to others

Over the past several decades, political participation has waned in the United States, with many citizens expressing a sense of disaffection with government. Average Americans feel disconnected from the political process and feel that government does not work for them. Additionally, many feel that elected officials are consumed with gaining personal advantage and engage in negative partisan behaviors. As a result, these citizens have checked out of the political process. In local communities, governments have found that citizens feel disconnected from their government’s decisions and actions. One aspect of this disconnection is due to a lack of communication. When governments operate in an “alternate universe”, largely insulated or separate from the daily lives and activities of its citizens, people justifiably report feeling disconnected or ignored. Government can overcome this disconnect by engaging in meaningful, frequent communication with the community. Communication can manifest in a variety of ways, including paid mass media, focus group sessions, or town halls to share information, for example. When seeking to build consensus on immigration-related policies, it is especially important to reach out to those communities who will be impacted either directly or indirectly and share information with them early in the process. Sharing information, regardless of the nature of the information, helps build initial relationships with impacted communities. It sends a message to those individuals that their participation is important and that the government is committed to openness and transparency.

D. Listen to others

Just as important as sharing information with citizens is listening to their concerns and ideas. In the United States, citizens generally do not participate in local, state, or national political decision-making. Only a very small fraction of the community is involved in regular communication with policy makers or staff of government agencies. Town halls, listening sessions, and outlets for citizens to provide feedback to their elected representatives have continued to decline in recent years as political engagement has slowly and steadily declined (with a slight reversal in participation rates in 2008). As such, government actors often make decisions affecting the community without having the benefit of understanding what the
community’s interests and desires actually are. This is problematic and often leads to policies that are ineffective or resented within the community, leading to blowback and resistance. Local government leaders should create meaningful and relevant opportunities for residents to share their concerns, ideas, and feedback about policies during the development phase of such policies. Establishing citizen advisory committees or conducting a series of town meetings or listening sessions in potentially affected communities create outlets for residents to be engaged in upcoming policy decisions. Conducting telephonic or in person interviews with community members to identify community assets, needs, and concerns can help government actors prepare for implementation of immigration integration policies that will be supported by the existing community. When potentially fractious policies are planned, spending additional time with affected communities prior to implementation to identify alternative solutions to concerns is well worth the additional time and effort expended.

**E. Find common ground**

Immigration and immigrant communities have long been a part of Arizona’s makeup. As a border state, the flow of immigrant labour and family reunification is not new, but indeed has coloured Arizona’s southern region for many decades. In recent years, however, the increased flow of traffic through Arizona as a result of the United States’ policy of “Operation Gatekeeper” radically transformed the face of immigration. In 1994, the United States government enacted Operation Gatekeeper with the intent of virtually sealing the border regions of California, Texas, and much of New Mexico, effectively routing all immigration traffic through the Arizona desert. The strategy was designed to deter illegal immigration – many in the federal government assumed that the deadly terrain in Arizona’s desert would deter would-be border crossers. The policy did not deter illegal border crossings, but it did change the face of illegal immigration in the southwest. Whereas in years past, individuals traversed a short terrain to enter the United States with moderate levels of risk, with the Arizona corridor as the only passable terrain, many potential border crossers turned to professional coyotes, or human smugglers, for assistance across the often-deadly Arizona desert. This enterprise quickly became both expensive and dangerous, with coyote cartels controlling the traffic of people, guns, and drugs across the Arizona-Mexico border. Today, the average immigrant pays a professional coyote around $3,000 US and may end up in a drop house in central Arizona, held ransom by his/her traffickers for additional payment by a family member back in Mexico or Latin America.

This change in immigration traffic has impacted local communities. While border communities remain largely free of violence, violence has escalated on the Mexican side of the border region. Additionally, the prevalence of drop houses in the interior of the state, coupled with startling statistics showing that Phoenix is now the kidnapping and auto theft capitol of the country, have led many in the state to perceive immigrants and immigration as a safety threat and a law enforcement challenge. These changes have drastically altered Arizonans’ perception of immigration. Once a quiet yet ever-present part of daily life, immigration is now dramatized as a dangerous, threatening menace in established, safe communities. As these changes occurred, government largely failed to address either the growing problems associated with criminal syndicates operating on the border, or the changing perception of immigration in the community. Today, immigration is a highly charged and very polarized debate, with little area of identified common ground. Restrictionists point to violence and criminal activity as a reason to pass legislation such as Arizona’s recent SB 1070, while immigration advocates continue to agitate and seek comprehensive reform from the federal government. Media often portray the issue as a polarized war between two factions, with no common or middle ground to be found. Despite these developments, the majority of Arizonans really do share much common ground. For instance, all parties concerned really do want to reduce violence associated with illegal immigration, to provide protection to victims, and to enable law enforcement and prosecutors to crack down on criminal cartels. At the same time, most Arizonans also want a tough, comprehensive reform package enacted by Congress that addresses the underlying issues concerning illegal immigration. While parties often articulate a myriad of potential solutions that
sometimes conflict with each other, most agree on the problems presented and share a desire for a comprehensive solution. When government actors can identify and emphasize this common ground, they create a space in which interested parties can explore policy options that have broad support in the community.

F. Letting go of outcomes

One of the most common mistakes made when forming coalitions is people’s tendency to come to the table with preconceived notions of what a solution to the named problem is and what that solution should look like. In the United States, members of Congress repeatedly put forward various proposals to address immigration in various ways – including enforcement and border security, integration of existing communities into the American public, and creating a workable strategy to invite and integrate future immigrant communities. These are often crafted by one or two members of Congress, without the input or consultation of other members both within one’s political party and with the other political party. As such, the proposals lack support from more than a small portion of the elected body and are ultimately doomed. Successful legislation is made most often when parties bring a variety of ideas to the table, without any attachment to specific outcomes. Abandoning one’s own notions of what an outcome must or should look like allows for creative thought and dialogue amongst all interested parties about what shared outcomes can be envisioned.

In 1993, then First Lady Hillary Clinton envisioned a health reform package for the United States. In a largely insular fashion, she gathered experts and trusted advisors for months and drafted a complete plan to overhaul American health policy. After much fanfare, she sent the reform package to Congress, where it promptly died. The bill failed to even pass first committees in the lower chamber, the United States House of Representatives. Contrast that package to President Obama’s vision for health reform in 2009. President Obama largely shared Hillary Clinton’s ideas regarding health policy reform, but unlike the former First Lady, he did not offer a pre-determined health reform package to Congress. Instead, he outlined a broad set of goals and tasked members of Congress with drafting, refining, and ultimately passing legislation that met his broad vision. While health reform was a long and arduous process in Congress, the largest and most significant health reform package passed both chambers of Congress this spring and was signed into law by President Obama in March 2010. Many experts credit his willingness to let go of predetermined outcomes (for example, the public option) with successful passage of this historic reform. Immigration policy is even more contentious in American politics than health policy today. As such, in order to ultimately find significant consensus on a policy reform package in Congress, a process similar to the one utilized in the health reform debate must be utilized. Actors and interested parties must be willing to be flexible and let go of long-held pre-determined outcomes and be willing to discuss and explore new alternatives to solve the significant challenge we face.

G. Identify shared values

After a coalition has successfully abandoned members’ pre-conceived notions of preferred outcomes, the group should then identify its core, shared values. Members of a community largely share a common set of values that drive their beliefs and behaviours. In highly charged and divisive settings, one may believe that shared values are nonexistent. However, in these settings one often finds that, while actors may articulate a very diverse set of ideas about policy solutions, they still share a common set of values. For instance, in the United States the debate about immigration reform rages daily. Those on the right tend to support enforcement-only policies, while those on the left tend to emphasize integration and regularization policies. Yet if one were to ask each group to identify their core values, those characteristics and core beliefs that drive their opinions, both groups would likely respond that they believe in opportunity,
security, and freedom. These are enduring and deeply held American values, regardless of one’s political orientation. And upon closer inspection, one can see that these shared values drive both groups’ proposed solutions to the immigration quandary we face.

Supporters of enforcement policies are principally concerned with security for existing American populations, while those agitating for regularization emphasize opportunity for new American communities. Both groups would claim the protection and promotion of freedom as a driving force behind all of their work. Neither group would discount the need to protect the core values articulated by the other (opportunity and security, respectively). However, because we tend to not discuss policy options in terms of values, it is easy to discount each others’ ideas as outside the possible or desired range of outcomes. When government actors or elected officials convening coalitions begin by discarding pre-conceived outcomes and instead spend significant time within the coalition asking participants to identify and name their values, they create an opportunity for coalition members to recognize the overlapping values held within the group. Naming values without policy outcomes attached depoliticizes the process of creating a shared base from which to develop future, mutually supported policy outcomes.

H. Naming interests

After coalition members identify shared values, they can begin to discuss their interests, or general reasons why they are involved in the coalition in question. Naming interests prevents actors from falling back on their previously developed outcomes, and instead allows participants to move forward towards developing shared solutions that meet their interests. This step in coalition building can be difficult, as most people struggle to understand the difference between an outcome and an interest. The difference is important, as one inhibits consensus and the other facilitates the creation of consensus based policies. An outcome is a “product” that one is attached to, and that usually is articulated as a specific “thing” one wants to have happen. Example of an outcome: local governments should provide fully funded health care to immigrant families. Outcomes are polarizing because others at the coalition table may not, and probably will not, agree with a specific outcome.

Division surfaces, and the coalition breaks up. An interest, on the other hand, is a general commitment to a principle that guides one’s work and reason for being involved in the coalition. There are a myriad of ways to meet an interest, but only one way to meet an outcome. An example of an immigration-related interest could be: everyone should have access to high quality health care. The two statements above are quite different. The first demands that the local government allocate more of its limited budget to pay for the health care coverage of immigrants. The second statement leaves open numerous avenues to address the issue of health care for all members of the community, including newcomers. The first limits discussion and collaboration because it articulates an end. The second spurs debate and creative, collaborative ideas because it articulates a beginning. Effective coalition leaders guide participants through a process of eliminating attachment to outcomes, identifying shared values, and naming interests prior to discussing potential policy solutions or alternative outcomes.

I. Identify creative alternative solutions

When coalitions have successfully navigated the process of eliminating individualized notions of outcomes, identifying shared values, and naming interests, the actors’ cards are all on the table, so to speak. A number of barriers to successful policy development have been overcome, and coalition members now sit at the table with open minds, full understanding of their own core interests and a recognition of others’ interests, and a desire to create policy that meets all parties’ interests while reflecting the group’s shared values. In this setting, coalition members are free to consider innovative, creative, and non-traditional solutions to the challenges their community faces. Returning to the example used in the previous section, assume that a number of members in a local coalition are concerned about health care
provision to newly arrived immigrant communities. Previously, some approached the coalition with a demand that the local government provide for the health care of all immigrants in the community. Others concerned with budgetary restrictions and the allocation of taxpayer dollars may have come to the table adamantly opposed to the use of government funds for immigrant health care. By eschewing outcomes and instead identifying a shared interest in community and public health, the coalition can discuss a variety of avenues to ensure that all community members have access to adequate health care. Public-private partnerships can be explored, pay-as-you-go plans could be established, job training and job placement programs could be created to create wealth in the immigrant community (leading to an ability to pay for needed services), and many more options could be considered.

K. Utilizing and instead of but in consensus building

During the decision-making phase of coalition work, participants often get “stuck” over minor differences of opinion about policy, strategy, or implementation. Without care and attention, these minor differences can lead to the disintegration and failure of the coalition’s overall work. As such, special care must be taken to address minor differences prior to seeking final agreement or approval from the group. In working on major policy issues, first find agreement on the “easy” aspects of the policy. This might seem counterintuitive to business (where you might be encouraged to do the nastiest tasks first), but in coalition work starting with the easy is key. By finding agreement on the smaller items, you build trust and create a sense of unity. By the time you get to the harder parts, the group is invested in the outcome and want to make it work. The momentum leans towards success and completion, rather than friction and failure. Second, look for answers that are not obvious. Rather than forcing group members into an either/or situation over language that brings resistance from one party in the room, look for an answer that allows all groups to meet their key interests. Being creative with language helps enormously – finding neutral language to which no group is already attached (or opposed) allows group members to approach the issue from a different perspective. Finally, provide time for the group to brainstorm a variety of solutions that bring the group to and away from but – where one group is asked or expected to sacrifice or give up a deeply held interest in order for another group to have his/her interest met.

J. Accountability

Accountability is a key factor in building consensus that leads to lasting, effective policies. With accountability, coalition members have made and are required to fulfill commitments to the shared process and collectively determined outcome. Without accountability, group actors can engage in destructive, divisive and harmful activities outside the group process that undermine any proposed policies or solutions. There are a variety of ways to create accountability, and coalitions should establish their own accountability mechanism as a group early in the process. Some coalitions ask members to make a public commitment to upholding the group’s final decisions; others choose to have members sign memorandums of understanding that create a formalized system of accountability. Still others utilize consensus based decision making processes that require approval and active participation from all group members before decisions are made or acted upon. Whatever form of accountability a coalition chooses, it should be determined early via consensus of all group members and adhered to at all times by all group members.

Conclusion

Building successful coalitions to develop consensus in public policy is not easy. Over the past decade, the use of these strategies has waned as partisanship and divisiveness has overtaken electoral politics and dis-incentivized coalition work. In local communities, government actors are often constrained by challenges such as inadequate resource allocation, time, and authority to form and govern within community-based coalitions.
While these challenges continue, the benefit that accrues when coalitions are utilized to develop and implement strategies to integrate immigrant communities into a larger, established community structure clearly outweigh the alternative. In order to create and implement successful policies, community members must “buy-in” to these proposed policies. There is no better way to create buy-in than to include the affected community members to participate in the very creation of those policies.
IMMIGRATION AND THE MEDIA: FROM EXCLUSIONARY POLITICS TO INTEGRATION

Gabriela Jacomella, Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, University of Oxford

Media interest for migration phenomenon has become massive, with an ever increasing concern especially in the so-called “countries of new immigration”, like Italy or Spain – currently the nations with the largest migrant inflow in the continent. Coverage has growing accordingly; by contrast, narrative on the phenomenon consistently displays an amount of biases and partiality. Migrant communities are, much more often than not, excluded from the making of the news - even when they “are” the news; their voices, as spokespersons, experts, or simple citizens, are nowhere to be heard. This exclusionary approach hugely affects and determines processes of integration, especially in metropolitan areas. This paper will move from an analysis of press narrative on migration in three different European countries - Italy, Germany and United Kingdom -, stressing how a biased coverage can affect integration processes in multicultural communities.

Why should it be an issue

There is no debate that migration is one of the defining issues of the globalized world. In terms of facts and figures, no historical period has ever faced such a huge displacement and replacement of human beings across borders and boundaries.

In the last edition of their leading text, The Age of Migration, Castles and Miller wrote: “No one knows exactly how many international migrants there are. The United Nations Population Division (UNDP) estimate for mid-year 2005 stood at nearly 191 million (UNDESA, 2005). By 2007, the figure approached 200 million or approximately 3 per cent of the world’s population of 6.5 billion people”. The World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization released a report in 2004, stating that international migration phenomenon involves flows of more than 100 million people per year, from and to an ever increasing number of countries.

The latest figures provided by International Labour Organization are even more striking, and confirm the presence of a expanding trend in international migration and displacement:

“A growing number of nations are involved with migration as a countries of origin, destination or transit, or all three… it is estimated that there will be 214 million international migrants in the world in 2010 (UNDP, 2009)”.

4. Ibid., pp. 1-2
Europe is currently one of the main gates as well as a final destination of these massive flows of people. As for any event that involves such a huge number of human beings, migration is a driving and compelling force that contributes to a large extent to shape societies, thus creating its own narrative.

This reality triggered a natural reaction on the side of the media: the coverage of migration issues has become, especially in recent years, massive. The interest, in the so-called “countries of new immigration”, has also often been increasing. Italy, with its recent story of coping with overseas migration, provides an excellent example. As stated by the economist Tito Boeri on February 2010:

“Media in Italy cover migration more and more insistently, referring to news stories that involve immigrants, but they never (or almost never) report statistics on immigrants and locals as a whole. The percentage of news and articles including the word ‘immigration’ has been growing in the last five years in Italy by 15%, more than in all other EU countries, where media carry on giving more or less the same relevance to the issue”.

The last report from Transatlantic Trends, Immigration 2010, summarizes the situation as follows:

“In 2010, immigration dominated headlines in Europe and North America like never before. Though flows of new migrants slowed in 2008 and 2009 as a result of the economic crisis, Americans grappled with questions of governance stemming from legislation in Arizona, and asylum policy in Canada made headlines after a number of high-profile incidents. In September, France’s lower house overwhelmingly passed a ban on face-covering veils everywhere that can be considered public space. Dutch politician Geert Wilders won 15% of the vote for his Party for Freedom by running on an anti-immigrant and anti-Islamic platform. In Germany, a controversial book was released in August, drawing national attention to the integration of Germany’s Muslim minority.”

At the same time, there is a consistent awareness among scholars and media professionals of the fact that more coverage doesn’t necessarily imply and support a fair portrayal – thus enhancing integration processes – of migrant presences in the countries of destination. On the contrary, there seems to be a common pattern of biasedness, partiality, discrimination and even criminalization when it comes to describe the role migrants play in a community, and there is an ever recurring lack of space provided to them as an equal opportunity in being represented by media as a key part of the community itself.

As Bo Petersson summarizes in his study on Swedish local newspapers, media “reproduce and maintain hegemonic social relations, reinforce prevalent distinctions between in-groups and out-groups and, by the same token, strengthen notions of what is to be considered normative as far as membership of different collectives is concerned”. It is therefore clear how big a role media can play in strengthening or weakening national and local policies of integration, simply by including or excluding a group of subjects in or from their coverage, at the same time emphasizing an existing narrative or building a new one altogether.

5. T. Boeri, Immigrati e criminalità. Cosa dicono i numeri (“Immigrants and criminality. What numbers say”), La Repubblica, 04.02.2010. The translation is mine.
8. Ibid., p.98
It is indeed fair to say that in several occasions, the role the media currently play when it comes to portray the migration phenomenon is essentially related to conveying an image of emergency: crude language and stereotypes are commonly and almost daily found in the coverage when dealing with these issues.

The correlation between media attitude and social interactions is seen as a proven fact by most academics, to the extent that some economists are now focusing their studies on providing scientifically conclusive evidence of the existing inter-connection between the birth and making of a narrative of migration on one side, and the news coverage provided, on the other. “The way immigration is covered as well as the way it is framed in the national media – writes Marta De Philippis – are important determinants of natives’ perceptions towards immigration”9. Furthermore, self-perception of immigrants – and consequently, their chances of integration in a new social environment – relies heavily on these very same variables.

It is relevant, when searching for evidence of media bias in covering migration, not to be exclusively focused on contents, but also on their absence; where racism, xenophobia and similarly deep-rooted prejudices aren’t immediately visible and perceivable, the fact that migrant voices aren’t given the floor is nevertheless to be considered a good indicator of their presence.

Ian Law, in his Racism and Ethnicity, puts in a nutshell the most relevant characteristics of news coverage on migration and ethnic minorities in Europe:

“The identification of strong negative messages and mechanisms in news coverage across Europe has also been established… Country reports on media coverage confirmed that once a negative discourse on migrants or ethnic minorities was established it tended to remain prevalent. This became a ‘fixed repertoire’, where event coverage involved a repetitive chain of statements, actions and conclusions… It was found that journalists provided a reading of the events which shaped hostility and was markedly different to the perceptions of inhabitants of neighbourhoods that had become the focus of reporting (because of conflicts, protests, or decay) and that they did not recognize themselves or their positions in the way their problems or lives were shown in the media”10.

Sensationalization, building of negative myths, distortion, exploitation of people’s anxieties or fears, lack of information and representativeness: these are the most common features scholars point out when dealing with media narrative of migration, in Europe as well as in the United States or elsewhere11. Needless to say, this attitude doesn’t help in building social cohesion. On the contrary, it only contributes, if anything, to the separation and incommunicability between ethnic groups, or between migrants (“newcomers”) and residents.

One of the aims of this paper is to show how European mainstream media have, so far, mostly opted for an exclusionary approach to migration. There is, though, a way to counteract this situation; local administrations and voluntary sector can play a key role for the development of a new, unbiased and fair media approach, as well as co-operate in the realization of proactive strategies for a development of

participatory media. The final chapters of this paper will focus on examples of practical and successful strategies which it would be possible to take inspiration from and to apply in specific contexts.

**From an exclusionary approach to a new concept of citizenship**

There are several reasons which make worthwhile exploring the issue of the complex (and mostly unsolved) relationship between media and migrations.

As a media professional, the first aspect that might pop into one’s mind is the huge potential offered by immigration in terms of future readership. Migrants undoubtedly represent today – and even more so over the next few years, as ILO’s forecasts show – a great share of our societies; in this time of press crisis, for instance, they are a potential market ready to be explored. Oddly enough, very few media corporations seem ready and willing to invest on it.

More relevantly, from the point of view of society building, migrants will be – no matter what long-term residents think about it – the citizens of the future. Supporting or tolerating a narrative that denies, hides or ignores their presence in our cities will only protract and delay the necessary building of a new concept of citizenship. The example of how the United States dealt with the first waves of immigration, and the everlasting problems that arose from the denial approach to it, is a good reminder of the risks we are running if keeping up with this attitude.

Last but not least – and in a more inclusive way, that goes beyond the sheer concept of migration and multi-culturalism – if a free press is universally acknowledged as one of the pillars of a healthy democracy, fair and unbiased media coverage is essential in order to achieve real equality.

The research carried out as a fellow at Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism aimed at defining a methodological approach for the analysis of how immigration is portrayed by the media. An evaluation grid has been defined and tested on a sample of articles, selected with reference to specific events or time frames, and published in opinion-leading newspapers in three European countries: Italy, Germany and United Kingdom, as examples of nations with a diverse and long-standing history of migration, as well as a substantially different media approach.

These countries follow, however, three different patterns when it comes to their migration history: Italy experienced an evolution from a country of emigration to one of immigration; Germany shifted its approach from considering migrants simply as “temporary workers” to – somehow unwillingly – embracing them as permanent citizens; and finally, the United Kingdom can be portrayed as a nation whose society is the outcome and heritage of postcolonial ties, but which in recent years has been facing new crucial and controversial debates: asylum, often combined – in the aftermath of 9/11 and 7/7 – with the issue of Islamic immigration.

To understand and define how media debate contributes in shaping a narrative of migration in these 3 countries, four national newspapers were chosen for each one of them. The goal was to cover the widest range of socio-political positioning, from left-wing to right-wing dailies, from tabloids (where they exist) to broadsheet. All of them are so-called “opinion-leading media”: that is, media with a strong influence on other journalists and sources of information, as well as the greatest impact on the general public. Why daily

---

newspapers, and not television, or Internet? Because, in most of the countries, they really are still the “gatekeepers” of information.

Finally, a time frame has also been applied: two defined weeks, that mirror two different aspects of migration coverage. The riots in Rosarno (Italy), on January 7th, 2010 (the issues examined ranged therefore from the 8th to the 14th of the same month), on one side: the clashes between local population and immigrant workers in this Southern Italian town represent a good example of a context in which migration issues overlapped with an emergency and security approach, both at a national and international level of the debate. On the other hand, the research focused on a “week in the life” of migrants, where no migration-related incidents occurred. The choice fell upon the week between May 8th and 14th, 2010. The goal was to obtain a sample which could mirror different moments of media coverage as well as a diverse categorization of public opinion attitudes towards migrants and their presence in the country.

The portrayal of fear

When analyzing media impact on public opinion, one of the key aspects to be taken into account are images. Above you find an example of how the narrative of migration in Italy was shaped in the aftermath of Rosarno’s clashes: on the left, one of the first reportages published by Corriere della Sera – the main Italian daily, a centre-right broadsheet – on January 9th; on the right, the front page of il manifesto, a self-defined “Communist newspaper”, in the very same day.
The picture chosen is exactly the same, and captures one of the hottest moments of the riot, when migrants took onto the streets and set tyres, cars and bins on fire. The shot is definitely symbolic, compelling and vivid – even beautiful, one might say – but inevitably conveys an interpretation of the facts which labels migrants as culprits and initiators, whereas the titles – in both cases – try to portray them as victims: “Schiavi da morire” on *il manifesto* (a play on words that strictly means “Slaves to the extreme”, but also includes the verb “to die”), “Rage erupts in Rosarno, assaults and shootings against migrants” on *Corriere della Sera*.

We all know that images have a power which is stronger than any words. One can’t but wonder whether the choice of that specific shot derived simply from the beauty of the composition itself, or if some subterranean and subconscious prejudice might have played a role in that.
Then, of course, there are the words. Here above are four “word clouds” – from the top: Corriere della Sera, il Giornale, il manifesto, la Repubblica – which represent graphically the recurrence of certain words (related to specific semantic areas) in the coverage. The bigger the word, the more it is used. “Clandestine”, a term which – according to the Carta di Roma, a code of conduct drafted in 2008 by Italian Order of Jorurnalist – shouldn’t be used without proper reasons by the media, is definitely the dominating one, together with a bundle of words that are related to concepts of danger, emergency, criminality. As a matter of fact, in Rosarno the vast majority of migrants had a temporary working permit. They weren’t “clandestini” at all.
The voice of power

What mainstream media represent is, usually, the voice of power. The image above is a graphic representation of the number of quotes – i.e., sentences reported into brackets, as told to the media by various “actors” – that appear in the articles on Rosarno; the vast majority is related to politicians, officers and members of the Catholic Church, the Vatican.

The great absentee here are academics and researchers; and it goes along well with the fact that, when migration is the issue, very few sources or official data – demographic data, legal frames, information on countries of origin - are quoted. Migrants are voiceless, and their presence in the country is almost surrounded by mystery.
Another good example of how this narrative mechanisms is enhanced can be drawn by another similar analysis. The following image is the graphic rendering of what you get when counting how many physical lines, inside each one of the articles, are dedicated to report migrants’ voice. We should also add, at this point, that the outcome doesn’t change that much when the same parameter is applied to the coverage of a “week in the life” of migrants in Italy, or elsewhere.

This similarity stands out when we examine the “word cloud” generated from the analysis of a week of coverage in UK media (see below); it is somehow surprising to see that, in the immediate aftermath of 2010 elections, the national press chose to focus mostly on problems of “law and order” – the so-called issue of “bogus” asylum seekers, the policy of detention centres -, which on the other hand had almost vanished from the new government agenda. Once again, debate is poor and driven by slogan without evidence in order to back them.
The same lack of information also characterizes German coverage of the issue: especially over the last few years, the attention has been mostly devoted to the “lack of integration” of certain ethnic and religious communities, namely Turks and Muslims. As summarized by Transatlantic Trends report,

“when asked whether Germany is now a country of immigration, the overwhelming majority of Germans (78%) agreed in TTI 2010 that it is. Over the past few months, Germany has witnessed a re-emergence of immigration and integration issues in national political debates. Set in motion by Social Democrat and former Bundesbank Board Member Thilo Sarrazin, the German public has been wrapped up in an active discussion about who should be admitted to the country and whether the integration of immigrants, and second-generation Muslim immigrants in particular, has been successful.”

Notwithstanding the relevance of their opinions when debating these issues, however, the voice of these communities themselves – spokespersons, pundits, normal citizens – is nowhere to be heard.

---

The same exclusionary approach towards migrants surfaces in Italy, too, when examining - as in the “word cloud” above - how a “week in the life” of migrants is portrayed in a centre-left wing, authoritative broadsheet: this is the result of the analysis carried out on La Repubblica’s issues from May 8th to 14th, including all the articles, editorials, op-eds, comments and letters related to migration issues (as a whole, 22 items, 15 of them with a presence of migrant voices between 0 and 25%; migrants are quoted as “actors”, with sentences into brackets, only 7 times, versus 49 quotes by non-migrants). Emergency and criminality are clearly the central issue, and virtually no articles are published where migrants appear as a positive – albeit challenging – presence for Italian society.

What do these findings tell us, in terms of general considerations? First of all, that what we are witnessing here is a cultural issue: the narrative of migration is, today, biased and self-referential; migrants are not allowed to take the floor. In Antonio Gramsci’s theory, power reinforces itself and the status quo by creating a dominant hegemonic view. Once it is established – in this case, with the help of the media – to challenge it becomes very difficult.

Today the narrative of migration is blatantly hegemonic. In order to re-shape it, making it more inclusive, we need to be aware of its existence. From the social point of view, the building of a consensus around what we might call an “exclusionary narrative of migration” provides a pillar to what Saskia Sassen, during a recent lecture in Oxford\(^\text{15}\), defined as a “logic of expulsion”, which is currently applied everywhere to minorities – be they ethnic, religious, economic – all around the world. Media cut off migrants, not allowing them to get a fair and balanced representation; their expulsion from society becomes therefore much easier.

Last but not least, from the professional point of view, these findings clearly show the total failure of self-regulatory mechanisms such as the Charter of Rome, as well as more general recommendations

coming from European Community or other institutions: journalists, in Italy more than elsewhere, simply ignore them.

Where the “good news” are

The picture is, luckily, not all dark and gloomy. There are niches in which migrant voices are reported and heard: the first one is – and it is important to take it into account when talking about local policies and migration - the local press. Which can also, of course, be even nastier when reporting criminal events involving migrants; but at the same time, it is keener to cover success stories, and to give communities the floor. It might be related to the fact that migrants are indeed seen as a relevant presence in terms of potential readership; or maybe, this is simply the outcome of the closer look local press has on the daily life of a community, where migrants play an ever growing and relevant role. Either way, local media play a huge proactive role in building ties and connection between migrant communities and local population, and it is therefore key for local authorities to develop with them a coherent communication strategy.

Then, of course, we have the voluntary sector. This is an area of contemporary societies that has proven so far to be key in connecting migrant groups with official media. In Italy, a good example of a reality successfully operating in this sector is Redattore Sociale. Created by a non-profit group in 2001, this is a news agency specifically focused on social issues. Its reportages on migration in Italy are a primary source of information for journalists working for mainstream media, and its reporters – albeit mostly Italian - have direct connections with migrant citizens as well.

Last but not least, the ethnic press fills in the gap when the “official voices” are deemed to be inadequate. Because when mainstream media are silent, migrants find a way to make themselves heard. Numbers are amazing: in New York City, for instance, there are currently 198 magazines and dailies, printed in 36 different languages. The main problem here is that, as one might guess, the only gap which gets filled is the lack of information inside an ethnic community. The veil of ignorance surrounding them, for those who look from the “outside” and do not share the same language or cultural frame, might become even foggier and thicker.

What are, then, the best practices to focus on if a local community like Leganés - or similar suburban areas where immigration plays a key role, from the economic and social point of view - wants to facilitate integration by using media tools, by wide spreading information on both sides, by avoiding exclusionary strategies that affect such a huge part of its population?

Good examples come from what we might define as “hybrid press”: The New Londoners in London, Mixa in Milan. The first one is a free quarterly published by the Migrants’ Resource Centre; its aim is “to strengthen the presence of migrant voices in public debate about immigration”. The latter is a magazine edited by a cooperative of Italian and migrant journalists, its distribution reached a peak of 30,000 copies, to which it adds a very active website. They are both free magazines, they both are distributed in subway stations and local bars, pubs, etcetera. And more important than that, they are written by a mixed group of journalists, with a huge presence of migrant writers and relevant space given to their voice.

Empowering people, integrating people

There are, of course, various strategies that can be implemented, both at a local and national level, in order to involve migrant communities in building a new social narrative, in which they are seen as active participants and not as onlookers or – even worse – as outsiders.

Local authorities can get together with NGOs and develop successful campaigns, such as the one implemented by the Scottish government and Oxfam in 2010, called Forward Together: it is the result of a project started in Scotland in 2003, “Asylum Positive Images”, and involves a network of 20 organizations,
from statutory services to local media and migrant communities. One of its goals is to keep a constant media monitoring, which is seen as key in the fight against “negativity and misreporting”; the next step is to provide media and presentation training for refugees and asylum seekers, “to support them to engage with the media”.

The aim is not only to help immigrants in building a counter-narrative as such, spreading information and news which are usually ignored or even misrepresented by mainstream media. There is a huge potential for integration in using the media as a tool, and in involving migrant communities – which are often young, active and vibrant – in the making of new, more sensible media.

In this area even more than in any other field, the Web is the future. It is cheaper (and therefore it is easier, for local authorities, to find the money to sustain new projects), more effective, more familiar as a communication tool for the young generations. Internet, together with the recent boom of blogs and social networks, has already enabled individuals and organizations to post and spread news and opinions, potentially reaching thousands of readers.

This phenomenon has shown a political dimension of empowerment and democratization that, if enhanced and supported by local authorities and actors, might have a huge positive impact in the process of integration and inclusion of migrants in our cities and communities. Participatory media work and collaborative methodologies are a key to success.
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SECOND SECTION
PREFACE – THE FOUNDATION “INSTITUTO DE CULTURA DEL SUR”

The Fundación Instituto de Cultura del Sur (FICS) is made up of the Asociación Club Enlace, as the entity that first established it, and six municipalities in the southern part of the Madrid metropolitan area: Alcorcón, Fuenlabrada, Getafe, Leganés, Móstoles and Parla, whose combined population counts more than one million inhabitants. The main mission of the FICS is to identify—through comprehensive analysis and exchange of various experiences—migration flows due to economic development, and the emergence of new world players.

Since migration is a phenomenon that occurs both from south-to-north and south-to-south, it is very important to define the identity of “the south”, especially in the context of cities and the new 21st century social contract. Along these lines, high on the list of priorities for FICS is the struggle against new forms of suppression of human beings’ holistic development. We try to project this concern publicly by lobbying for a new Human Right: the struggle against invisibility.

The six cities integrated in the FICS are bound by a number of shared features, including similar socio-economic development in the last 40 years. All six grew substantially during this period, basically on account of internal migration within Spain, as millions of workers moved from rural areas to industrial cities in search of better opportunities. Since the end of the 20th century, these cities have witnessed a massive influx of immigrants from countries outside Europe.

In due time, public policies were put in place in the area. They involved substantial investment and the building of educational, cultural and sports facilities in all six cities. As a result, they became industrial cities endowed with good transportation, educational, cultural and sport infrastructures. To some extent they are still satellites of the big metropolis nearby, but they are no longer entirely dependent on it, as they used to be not so long ago. Anyone born in any of these cities today can grow up satisfactorily and even go to college without having to commute for training, leisure or work purposes. Based on this development of best practices and resources used in cultural and educational fields, and as a means of raising awareness against racism, xenophobia and discrimination, the FICS launched its No-Ghetto Cities International Campaign, in 2005.

This campaign underscores the need to promote rights and basic liberties as an essential requirement for the full development of individuals, but at the same emphasises the need to provide the necessary material resources to make such development real. It posits that cities are both the natural and the ideal locus for human development—since it has to take place primarily where people live and work. The No-Ghetto Cities Campaign was submitted to UNESCO in 2006 and presented to the Spanish permanent delegation to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 2007.

At that time, the OECD was interested in studying the impacts of immigration on cities. Because of this, the FICS added its interest in exploring social cohesion policies as a catalyst for the integration of immigrants. The present study stems from the synergies developed between the two institutions, the OECD and the FICS, since 2009.

The following section presents a study focussing on social cohesion and immigrant integration policies in four of the six cities located in the south of Madrid. The study, which draws on an OECD methodology, was done during 2010 with the active involvement of the four municipalities which were
invited to present their policies and measures and which choose to participate in the research project. The research was coordinated by Prof. Joaquin Arango and Prof. Elisa Brey.¹

The FICS is firmly convinced that policies such as those described below, both public and private, may significantly contribute to improve the quality of life and the opportunities of human beings. It also believes that the good use of public policies is an invaluable instrument at the service of society.

The FICS strongly hopes that this study, however modest, may contribute to improve the life of people, and especially the life of immigrants.

\[ Ubi \ bene, \ ibi \ patria^{2} \]

Institute of Southern Culture Foundation
Madrid (Spain), March 2011

For more information: www.fundacionics.org; cultura@fundacionics.org

---

1. Prof. Arango, Professor is a sociologist at the Complutense University of Madrid. He is an expert in immigrant integration. He has published widely and is a member of the editorial boards of a number of international scientific journals. He cooperates with a large number of international institutions, including the European Commission, the Council of Europe, the UN, the European Science Foundation, Eurostat, ILO, and the OECD. Prof. Arango is presently the Chairman of the Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants, a Spanish consultative body, which encompasses representatives from the different levels of government, representatives from immigrant associations, NGOs, and trade unions. Prof Arango was assisted in this research project by Ms. Elisa Brey who is a PhD candidate at the University Complutense of Madrid and the University of Liège.

Introduction

In recent times, the combined issues of immigration and the social integration of immigrants have come to the fore of attention in most countries of the OECD, if not in all of them. No doubt, immigration has become an important driver of social and economic change. The implications of both are vast and deep. Immigration takes place primarily in cities, and especially in large metropolitan areas. This is certainly the case of the Madrid Metropolitan Area (MMA), and in particular of the string of municipalities situated in the southern part of such area. Six of them – Alcorcón, Fuenlabrada, Getafe, Leganés, Móstoles and Parla – are integrated in an institution known as Fundación Instituto de Cultura del Sur (FICS). They are relatively large cities, with a sizeable proportion of immigrants. The six share not only geographical location and a common history but also a number of structural traits that have resulted in something akin to a common identity. In cooperation with the OECD, FICS has undertaken a study on the processes and policies of integration and social cohesion that are taking place in four of the aforementioned municipalities.

Only fifty years ago, these six cities were small towns in the periphery of Madrid. The rapid and sustained industrialization of the entire Madrid region in the 1960’s and 1970’s deeply transformed them. To give just an example, Getafe went from around 20,000 inhabitants in 1960 to over 120,000 in 1975. Rapid urban growth resulted from mass immigration from other parts of Spain. It was not always accompanied by sound urban planning and by the commensurate development of infrastructures. Political awareness and activism became prominent in the area amidst the social conflicts that marked the final years of the Franco dictatorship. In the 1980’s, in the context of a process of economic restructuring and de-industrialization, the area underwent a sustained recession, with the de-localization of plants and firms and high rates of unemployment. Pressures over the regional government to improve infrastructures were paramount in the southern crown of the MMA. Mounting socio-economic challenges triggered a vigorous answer both from local public powers and private initiatives to foster local firms, and a number of proactive measures saw the light in these years.

1. The study has been realised by the Foundation “Instituto de Cultura del Sur” based on the OECD methodology to assess urban competitiveness.
Today they are medium-sized cities, with a considerable degree of diversity. The largest of the four under scrutiny is Fuenlabrada, with over 205,000 inhabitants in 2009, followed by Leganés (190,000), Alcorcón (180,000) and Parla (110,000). Population density ranges between 4,400 and 5,300 inhabitants per square kilometer. The percentage of the population under 15 years of age goes from 13.5 to 16.5 per cent, while the percentage 65 and over ranges between 6 and 13.5 per cent. One out of 8 inhabitants in Alcorcón, Fuenlabrada and Leganés, and one out of four in Parla have a nationality different than Spanish. Around 22,200 local firms, whose medium size ranges between 5 and 8 workers, give employment to 160,000 workers in the four cities. Income per capita ranged from 11,500 to 14,400 Euro in 2006 (Table 1).

| Table 1 Socioeconomic indicators, four cities in the South of Madrid (2009) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | Alcorcón        | Fuenlabrada     | Leganés         | Parla           |
| Inhabitants     | 178,872         | 205,311         | 189,424         | 119,421         |
| % under 15      | 14.1%           | 16.2%           | 13.4%           | 16.5%           |
| % 65 and over   | 13.7%           | 5.6%            | 13.3%           | 6.4%            |
| % foreign population | 12.2%         | 12.3%           | 11.8%           | 24.8%           |
| Density per km² | 5,307           | 5,237           | 4,395           | 4,874           |
| Unemployment    | 11,880          | 18,222          | 14,506          | 11,619          |
| Local firms (LF)| 6,105           | 7,588           | 5,489           | 2,916           |
| Workers in LF   | 46,686          | 53,260          | 44,633          | 14,620          |
| Medium size of LF| 7.63           | 6.9             | 8.13            | 5.01            |
| Income per capita (2006) | 14,362       | 12,126          | 13,113          | 11,578          |

Source: Municipal Statistical Offices and Instituto Nacional de Estadística

A second wave of mass immigration, this time international, has taken place since the mid-1980’s, and especially since the end of the 1990’s, in Spain, the Madrid region and the municipalities surveyed in this study. Indeed it can be said that in these years Spain has known something akin to an immigration boom. The size of the immigrant population increased from about 1 million in the year 2000 to over 5.5 million in 2009, without counting the hundreds of thousands who naturalized in the same period. In these years Spain was the second largest recipient of immigrants in the OECD, only surpassed by the much larger United States. Immigrants have come from a host of countries in four continents, especially from Latin America, Northern Africa and Eastern Europe. A sizeable part of them settled in the Madrid region, including the southern municipalities.

Sustained economic growth between the mid-1990’s and 2007, at rates generally above those of the EU average, were the main driver behind the phenomenal increase in the number of immigrants. Economic growth, which was labour-intensive in nature, resulted in vigorous employment creation. The increasingly shrinking cohorts that in a rapidly aging population entered every year the labour market took only half of the new jobs. As a result, the demand for foreign labour was very large. A sort of virtuous circle between economic growth and immigration took place: the former induced the arrival of a large number of immigrants and the latter decidedly contributed to economic growth. In turn, the settlement of millions of immigrant workers, increasingly accompanied by members of their families, made imperative the adoption of measures and policies geared to foster integration and social cohesion.

The financial and economic crisis which started in the summer of 2007 would finally put an end to the immigration boom, albeit with a time lag, as substantial flows persisted until the last part of 2008, thus aggravating unemployment. In 2009 the deceleration of incoming immigrant flows was already clearly
under way, pointing towards the stabilization of the size of the population of immigrant background that has taken place in 2010.

While the crisis has increased the number of immigrants who return home, there is no doubt that the majority have decided to stay, despite very high rates of unemployment. The explosion of the construction bubble that had been growing in Spain in the preceding years has largely contributed to such rates. Indeed, a sizeable proportion of the workforce of immigrant background was employed in the construction sector and related areas, the first and hardest hit by the crisis. As a result, male immigrants have been much more affected by job destruction than their female counterpart, reversing previous trends.

The economic and social impacts of the recession on the immigrant population enhance the need for social policies. Although the Madrid region, and Spain as a whole, seems to have escaped the high degree of immigrant concentration in disfavoured neighbourhoods that is found in other cities of the OECD, pro-active labour market measures to favour the rehiring of unemployed immigrant workers are urgently required, as well as housing and other social policies to minimize the effects of severe unemployment and the risks of social exclusion. In a similar vein, a host of policies is needed to restore economic growth and competitiveness, and to set the economy on sounder bases than the ones which existed prior to the crisis.

Efforts to promote the social integration of immigrants by public powers and by institutions of the civil society have been prominent in Spain, and in the Madrid region, since the 1990’s, if not before. A national Integration Plan was adopted by the central government in 1994, and despite the fact that it was little more than a catalogue of principles and good intentions, valuable instruments such as the Permanent Observatory of Immigration and the Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants resulted from it. In 2007 a more articulated and effective national triennial Plan for Citizenship and Integration saw the light, a Plan that will be renewed in the initial months of 2011. These national efforts notwithstanding, the lion’s share in integration policies correspond to the regions and the municipalities, as these are the levels of government in which most capacities for social integration reside. Several regions (Comunidades Autónomas) and a large number of cities have put forth integration plans over the years. Many of them have been very active and committed in this regard, including Alcorcón, Fuenlabrada, Leganés and Parla.

Very often sub-national governments have fostered the participation of organizations of the civil society, and relied on them for many endeavours. Indeed the strength of the ‘third sector’, working in close partnership with local powers, has been a defining feature of the integration landscape in Spain and in the Madrid region, as well as a valuable asset.

The experience of the municipalities located in the south of the Madrid region attests to the crucial role that local governments play in integration matters, through the design and implementation of specific social and economic policies. Three points deserve consideration in this respect:

- thanks to their proximity to citizens, local authorities can stimulate civic engagement and activism, thus improving the local endowment of social capital;
- local governments usually have precise information about the needs of local actors (both citizens and entrepreneurs); and
- on account of their knowledge about precise local needs, local government can and should also be key partners in the design of regional and national policies, thus enhancing the importance of multilevel governance. Moreover, based on the detailed information they have, interventions by local authorities can be tailored to satisfy specific needs and objectives.
Local powers can foster integration and social cohesion both through general-purpose policies (education, health, employment, housing, social services, etc) and through specific ones (plans for social integration and citizenship, promotion of participation, etc.). Specific policies are developed by different areas of government in different municipalities. Integration can be seen as the outcome of an equation which involves many factors, both of an objective, structural nature and of a more subjective character, which has to do with identities and feelings of belonging. Structural determinants are as relevant as subjective, emotional ones for integration. The attitudes and the discourse of local officers are at times as influential as the policies themselves.

Main socio-economic trends in the South of Madrid

This section presents quantitative data relative to trends in immigration over a decade for the area, as well as to the main characteristics of the labour market. It will underlie a number of similarities and differences among the region of Madrid, the south of Madrid and each one of the cities involved: Alcorcón, Fuenlabrada, Leganés and Parla. Some information on Getafe and Móstoles is also included, as both cities belong in the southern part of MMA.

Immigration

The experience of the Madrid region, as far as immigration is concerned, mirrors that of Spain as a whole. Before the mid-eighties, immigrants were few, and they came mainly from North Western Europe (attracted by the weather and low prices) and from Latin America (escaping from dictatorships). In the course of the second half of the 1980’s and during the 1990’s immigration tended to increase gradually, due to manpower shortages in a number of sectors, mostly of the low-skilled type. Yet, immigration would not gain its contemporary prominence until the years of the change of the century, when the number of immigrants started to increase dramatically.

Between 1998 and 2010, the population of the Madrid region increased from 5 to 6.5 million inhabitants. In the same period, the number of foreigners went from 115,000 to more than 1 million. In the south of Madrid, the total population went up from 895,000 to more than a million in the same period, but the immigrant population increased from 13,000 to 161,000. While in 1988 immigrants represented less than 2.5 per cent of the total population, both in the South of Madrid and in the region as a whole, a decade later it represented 17% in the region of Madrid and 15% in its southern part. In 2010, the proportion represented by the foreign population ranged from 12.5 % in Alcorcon to 15.5% in Getafe, the exceptional case being the city of Parla, where such proportion reached 26.5%. The explanation for the high proportion of the latter is to be found in the lower cost of housing and the special strength of migrant networks.

Table 2. Total population (1998-2010) (in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region of Madrid</td>
<td>5,074</td>
<td>5,127</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>5,372</td>
<td>5,527</td>
<td>5,719</td>
<td>5,805</td>
<td>5,964</td>
<td>6,008</td>
<td>6,082</td>
<td>6,272</td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>6,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Madrid</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorcón</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuenlabrada</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getafe</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leganés</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Móstoles</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parla</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipal Population Registers, National Statistical Office (INE) (http://www.ine.es/)
Table 3. Foreign population (1998-2010) (in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South of Madrid</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorcón</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuenlabrada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getafe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leganés</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Móstoles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parla</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: INE

In the region of Madrid, immigration accounted for 70% of population growth, whereas its contribution reached 96% in the south of Madrid (Table 3). These trends are reflected in the changing distribution of the regional population among the city of Madrid, the south of Madrid and the rest of the region (Figure 2). Most immigrants settle in the central parts of the metropolitan area, which include the city of Madrid and the southern municipalities, while the proportion of Spaniards is higher in other parts of the MMA and the periphery of the region. As far as the Southern municipalities are concerned, immigration was responsible for 63% of the demographic increase in Parla, 79% in Fuenlabrada, 85% in Alcorcón and 96% in Getafe. Both in Leganés (155%) and Móstoles (238%), the arrival of immigrants not only accounted for the whole population increase but it was also responsible for preventing the population decline which would have happened in their absence in the period 1998-2010.

Immigration also induced a number of changes in the composition of the population (Figure 3). The bulk of the population of foreign origin is concentrated in the age groups between 20 and 45, as most immigrants were young adults who came to Spain to work. In this respect, differences between the region as a whole and the south of Madrid are not significant. As for the relative proportions of men and women, the latter are underrepresented in the immigrant population in the south of Madrid (90 women per 100 men), while they account for more than half of the Spanish population, both in the region as a whole and in
the south of Madrid. This is mainly explained by the timing of migratory flows, and to the imbalances in the sex ratio to be found in a number of national groups. In the south of Madrid, the proportion made by African migrants is much higher than in the region of Madrid, where the presence of Latin American migrants is higher, especially from the southern part of the continent. Migrants from Europe, especially from the Eastern part of the continent, are another of the most important groups.

Table 4 Total and foreign population increase (1998-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Madrid</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION (TP)</th>
<th>FOREIGN POPULATION (FP)</th>
<th>TOTAL INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of inhabitants</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number of inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Madrid</td>
<td>1,384,760</td>
<td>+27.3%</td>
<td>965,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Madrid</td>
<td>154,899</td>
<td>+17.3%</td>
<td>148,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorcón</td>
<td>24,329</td>
<td>+16.9%</td>
<td>20,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuenlabrada</td>
<td>31,515</td>
<td>+18.8%</td>
<td>24,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getafe</td>
<td>25,501</td>
<td>+17.8%</td>
<td>24,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leganés</td>
<td>14,064</td>
<td>+8.1%</td>
<td>21,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Móstoles</td>
<td>10,704</td>
<td>+5.5%</td>
<td>25,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parla</td>
<td>48,786</td>
<td>+68.3%</td>
<td>30,725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: INE

Figure 2 Changes in population distribution, Region of Madrid (1998-2010)

Source: INE
Local labour markets

This section begins by offering some general data about the local labour markets (employment, unemployment and total workforce), between 2004 and 2010, in order to gauge the effect of the recession, whose impacts started to be felt in the Spanish economy in the autumn of 2007. At the start of 2008, just before the crisis had any significant effect on the regional and local labour markets, over 74% of the total workforce between 16 and 65 in the Region of Madrid were actively employed or looking for a job, while 7% were unemployed. In the South of Madrid, activity rates ranged from 68% in Getafe and Parla to 71.5% in Fuenlabrada, whereas unemployment varied from 8.5% in Alcorcón and Getafe to 10.5% in Parla (Table 4 and Figure 4). This situation dramatically changed during the following years, as the examples of Alcorcón and Fuenlabrada will illustrate (Table 5 and Figures 5 and 6).
Table 5 Situation in relation to the labour market (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region of Madrid</td>
<td>3,037,138</td>
<td>229,150</td>
<td>3,266,288</td>
<td>1,131,031</td>
<td>4,397,319</td>
<td>6,271,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Madrid</td>
<td>484,032</td>
<td>48,009</td>
<td>532,041</td>
<td>231,454</td>
<td>763,495</td>
<td>1,025,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorcón</td>
<td>77,635</td>
<td>7,179</td>
<td>84,814</td>
<td>35,429</td>
<td>120,243</td>
<td>167,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuenlabrada</td>
<td>97,675</td>
<td>9,758</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>42,735</td>
<td>150,168</td>
<td>194,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getafe</td>
<td>74,601</td>
<td>6,748</td>
<td>81,349</td>
<td>37,926</td>
<td>119,275</td>
<td>164,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leganés</td>
<td>84,818</td>
<td>8,230</td>
<td>93,048</td>
<td>40,337</td>
<td>133,385</td>
<td>184,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Móstoles</td>
<td>99,040</td>
<td>10,233</td>
<td>109,273</td>
<td>48,999</td>
<td>158,272</td>
<td>206,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parla</td>
<td>50,263</td>
<td>5,861</td>
<td>56,124</td>
<td>26,028</td>
<td>82,152</td>
<td>108,051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: For the employed population, data correspond with affiliations to social security (1/1/2008). For the workforce and the total population, data were extracted from the INE (1/1/2008). For the unemployed population, data were obtained from the municipalities (31/12/2007).

Figure 4 Rates of economic activity and of unemployment (2008)

Table 6 Evolution of unemployment and activity (16-64), (2004-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcorcón</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>6,926</td>
<td>6,168</td>
<td>7,288</td>
<td>7,090</td>
<td>7,954</td>
<td>11,880</td>
<td>13,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>83,664</td>
<td>85,998</td>
<td>85,283</td>
<td>85,131</td>
<td>84,814</td>
<td>83,312</td>
<td>81,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuenlabrada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>8,546</td>
<td>7,077</td>
<td>8,985</td>
<td>8,883</td>
<td>10,684</td>
<td>18,222</td>
<td>19,699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipalities and INE
Between 2004 and 2007, the rate of unemployment hovered around 8% in both cities but in 2010 it rose to 16.5% in Alcorcón and 18% in Fuenlabrada. Such a marked increase stems from the end of the long period of economic growth that had taken place between the mid-90’s and 2008, and from the ensuing double fact that new jobs ceased to be created while many of the existing ones were destroyed. The recession first affected the building sector, which had been the engine of economic growth during the aforementioned period, and connected activities. The fact that a number of previously inactive family members decided to register in the Public Employment Services in order to actively look for job that would compensate job losses also contributed to the increase in the unemployment rate.

As stated above, the majority of immigrants in Spain are between 20 and 45 years old, as most of them came for employment reasons. In general terms, prior to the recession their activity rate was well above that of the Spanish population, both among men and among women, albeit their rate of unemployment was slightly higher, especially in the case of women. In 2010, they represented 15% of the population between 16 and 64 years old in Alcorcón and Fuenlabrada, and 16% and 19% of the unemployed. Such small differential greatly increased in the course of the recession, as many of them were employed in construction and related industries, as well as in other some sectors and activities highly vulnerable to the vagaries of the business cycle.

In Alcorcón, the number of local firms per 1,000 persons actively employed or looking for a job increased between 2004 and 2008. This could imply that self-employment might have been seen both by immigrant and Spaniards alike as an alternative during the crisis. Indeed this option was sometimes promoted by local governments in the area, as it will be seen in the next section.
### Table 7 Unemployment and workforce (16 to 64 years old), by nationality (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alcorcón</th>
<th>Fuenlabrada</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish population</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign population</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipalities and INE

### Table 8 Local firms and active population (Number of local firms per 1,000 people) (2004-2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcorcón</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local firms</td>
<td>12,022</td>
<td>13,746</td>
<td>15,369</td>
<td>17,374</td>
<td>17,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active population</td>
<td>83,664</td>
<td>85,998</td>
<td>85,283</td>
<td>85,131</td>
<td>84,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Local firms/Active pop</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fuenlabrada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local firms</td>
<td>7,466</td>
<td>7,629</td>
<td>7,462</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active population</td>
<td>105,727</td>
<td>106,924</td>
<td>105,949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Local firms/Active pop</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Region of Madrid
Indicators of good practices in the South of Madrid

In times of economic recession, local governments have to face new challenges regarding integration and social cohesion, as the risk for social exclusion and social tensions increases. In this section some indicators of good practices implemented by local administrations in the South of Madrid are presented. Information is provided relative to social cohesion policies, economic development and innovation strategies, the environment and sustainability. It does not intend to be exhaustive, but rather to offer a variegated sample of the specific measures put forth by the municipalities.

Social cohesion policies

This section presents best local practices in terms of equal opportunities for access to rights, recognition and respect of diversity, social participation, protection and promotion of health and local welfare. Before referring to the specific actions directed to the population of immigrant background living in the south of Madrid, a reference is made to the political response towards other groups which benefit from specific initiatives.

Women are among the main target groups of local policies. In Alcorcón, the City Council is developing the III Municipal Plan for (Gender) Equality. Measures in this Plan include care for women and their children in case of domestic violence, and social, legal and labour orientation. Other programs involve education to prevent inequality and discrimination towards women, as the main causes for violence. In Parla, the City Council is developing the IV Municipal Plan for Equality, with the following aims: education to promote equality values; recognition of gender as a transversal principle of public policies; shared responsibility between men and women; active participation of citizens within the municipality; and elimination of domestic violence. The government of both cities participate in the Regional Observatory of Gender Violence, together with the City Council of Leganés. Specific target groups of local policies are also defined in terms of age groups. In Alcorcón, the City Council has created an ad hoc department for the attention of children, and it is promoting the I Plan for Childhood. It develops special programmes for the attention of young people, including sexual education to prevent teenage pregnancies. People over 65 years old also benefit from specific initiatives in terms of housing, culture, sports and leisure, in order to combat loneliness, isolation and dependency. Disabled persons are another specific target group of local policies.

Welfare and well-being also depend on more general programmes, such as the ones implemented by the Departments of Education and Health. In the area of education, cities have developed programmes to promote friendly relationships in the classroom and to prevent social exclusion outside. In Alcorcón, the Department for Education has a specific programme to promote the conciliation of work and family life, and to promote adequate leisure for children and young people. In Fuenlabrada, the City Council develops a number of initiatives, such as the Turkana Programme (to prevent conflicts in schools); FUENCAP (early detection of learning difficulties); SIMCE (information network between officers working on education, innovation, social services and the local police); the Plan for the prevention of school absenteeism; the ULISES Programme (detection of conflicts and violence between students); the ITACA Project (workshops for students with low levels of achievement). In Parla, some programmes are oriented towards the promotion of arts and culture, in collaboration with the Municipal School for Music (Cantania Project) or the Municipal School for Theatre. Others are oriented towards leisure and sports, geared to students and their families. In Alcorcón, the Municipal School for Health and Consumption promotes healthy habits and responsible consumption among children and young people. In the course of 2009, the City Council carried out a Diagnosis of the Health in Alcorcón, as well as a quantitative study on the perception of the health system among the local population. In several cities, the City Council adopted a Municipal Plan on Drugs,
to prevent and treat drug addiction, especially among young people. The City of Leganés also promoted a Municipal Plan on Sexuality, and the II Municipal Plan on Health is in the making, with the participation of hospitals, health centres, associations and other entities which are part of the Council for Health and Consumption.

Citizens also have the opportunity to participate in relation to other questions dealing with local policies. In Leganés, citizens submitted more than 700 suggestions to the City Council for the design of the Local Budget in 2010. Through the programme The Mayor in your Neighbourhood, they have the opportunity to meet the Mayor and directly talk to him or her about the situation of their neighbourhood. Citizens can also choose representatives to participate in Local Government Councils (Juntas Municipales de Distrito), whose decisions refer to specific neighbourhoods or territorial areas. In Parla, several mechanisms allow citizens to participate in the elaboration of local policies. The main ones are the Neighbourhood Assemblies (meetings with the Mayor), the Sectoral Councils (on general matters such as education, health, etc.), the Neighbourhood Councils (with the participation of civil servants), etc.

New technologies are sometimes used to bring the local administration closer to the local population, not necessarily to participate in local policies but rather to have access to rights. In Alcorcón, the Innova Plan includes a network of electronic offices, located in seven neighbourhoods, to which the local population has access to solve formalities online; a digital administration; a new Internet Website; and a citizen card, to secure that every one living in the city can log on in these new services. There are also less technological ways to bring the municipal services closer to citizens. In Alcorcón, the City Council created the Service for the Attention of Citizens, with delegations in four neighbourhoods, to avoid the need to make it to the city centre for bureaucratic procedures. In the eight months after their opening, the first two delegations served 19,000 people. Three other delegations are expected to open soon. On the other hand, new technologies can facilitate the cooperation between administrations and other public institutions, for example through the network SARA, of which the City Council of Parla is part.

As part of local society, immigrants have access to all those programmes and services, sometimes conditioned to their age and gender. But they also benefit from specific initiatives developed by the City Councils towards them. In the south of Madrid, with the exception of Getafe, the Departments of Social Services are responsible for the coordination and the implementation of specific policies. In Alcorcón, they include legal orientation dealing with immigration law and work permits; Spanish courses; translation and interpretation from and to several languages; and so on. The City Council has also created a Local Observatory on Immigration and Living Together. In Fuenlabrada, specific policies towards immigration include the Municipal Service for Immigration (SEMI); the Forum for Immigrants, with the participation of 82 entities; and the Programme for the social integration of migrants under 18 and in risk of exclusion. The latter includes several services, such as legal orientation; translation and interpretation; Spanish courses; services for intercultural mediation; or the availability of books in other languages in municipal libraries. Since 2007, the Municipal Observatory for Immigration publishes the newsletter Calei2scopia, available online. In recent years, the City Council organized Workshops against racism and xenophobia; as well as a Congress for the Associations of Migrants. During the last years, the City Council of Leganés has organised an Intercultural Festival, in which citizens with different cultural backgrounds are invited to participate. This initiative was recognised as a good practice by the European Union, within the Socrates Project, and by the Spanish Ministry of Education, in 2009. The projects Mediation in Neighbourhood and Leganés for living together were also selected as good practices by the Ministry of Labour and Immigration (see *A good practice in the City of Leganés).*
Box 1. A good practice in the city of Leganés

Name of the program: “LEGANÉS POR LA CONVIVENCIA” (Leganés for living together)

Coordination: the Mayor’s Office, in the City Council of Leganés

Partnerships: Department for Education and Childhood, Department for Services to Citizenship, Department for Citizens Participation, Department for Youth, Department for Culture, Department for Infrastructure and Services to the City, Local Government Council in the neighbourhood La Fortuna, in City Council of Leganés

Period of time: 2009-2011

Main objectives: Promoting the participation of citizens, and creating common spaces where public servants, local associations and citizens can interact in order to facilitate intercultural coexistence

Civil servants involved: 1 Coordinator from the Area for Immigration, in the City Council of Leganés. 2 intercultural mediators specifically hired since the beginning of the project. In 2010 and 2011 124 civil servants were involved in seminars and other training activities related with managing diversity

Users: The entire population of the neighbourhood La Fortuna

Total budget: In 2009, 19,000 Euro were spent for activities and 60,000 Euro for the hiring of the mediators. In 2010, 28,000 Euro were used for activities and 76,000 for the hiring of the mediators

Funding: the City of Leganés, with the Spanish Ministry of Labour and Immigration (60,000 Euro in 2009, and 30,000 Euro in 2010)

Positive results: This project was selected as a good practice by the Ministry of Labour and Immigration. The City Council of Leganés intends to develop the same project in three other neighbourhoods.

More information on the policies implemented by the City Council of Leganés: http://www.leganes.org/portal/

The specific measures implemented by local administrations towards immigrants are usually articulated through specific municipal plans. In Alcorcón, the II Plan for Citizenship and Living Together will cover the 2007-2011 period; in Fuenlabrada, the City Council already adopted the II Integral Plan for Intercultural Citizenship and Solidarity (2006-2009); in Leganés, the local administration is drafting the II Municipal Plan for Citizenship and Immigration; and in Parla the City Council recently adopted the I Plan for the Integration of Citizenship (2009-2012). These plans are based in common principles, usually inspired by the European Union Basic Common Principles on Integration, and by the Strategic Plan for Integration and Citizenship, adopted by the Spanish Ministry of Labour and Immigration.

Box 2. A good practice in the city of Parla

Name of the program: “PROGRAMA PARA LA GENERACIÓN DE CONOCIMIENTO SOBRE GESTIÓN DE LA DIVERSIDAD EN EL ÁMBITO MUNICIPAL” (Program for the generation of knowledge on managing diversity in the municipal area)

Coordination: Department for Social Services, City Council of Parla

Partnerships: the Mayor’s Office, Department for Employment, Department for Education, Department for Childhood, Department for Youth, Department for Women, Department for Health, Department for Security of Citizens, City Council of Parla

Period of time: 2006-2009

Main objective: Promote knowledge relevant for managing diversity among civil servants working in different departments of the City Council

Civil servants involved: 200 civil servants were involved in seminars and other training activities related with the management of diversity. The majority was linked to the Department for Social Services (70), Education (63), Employment (18) and Urban Security (13).
Total budget: 162,500 Euro in 2006

**Funding:** City of Parla, with the Spanish Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (now Ministry of Labour and Immigration)

**Positive results:** After completion of the program, the Local Plan for the Integration of Citizenship was implemented (2009-2012). A Commission was created by the City Council, in order to promote the participation of local associations dealing with diversity in the city.

More information on the policies implemented by the City Council of Parla: [http://www.ayuntamientoparla.es](http://www.ayuntamientoparla.es/)

In Parla, the adoption of the Plan was justified on the basis of following needs: adaptation of public services to the new social reality of the city, following the arrival of a sizeable immigrant population; recognition that all persons living in the city will be part of local society; attention to the specific needs of the recently arrived population, without creating “parallel services”; and reinforcement of social participation to promote a collective and egalitarian identity among the local population. According to these four needs, the City Council of Parla defined the following goals: adaptation of local services to the management of diversity; education for the promotion of living together and the recognition of diversity among the population; development of specific services to facilitate the integration of the foreign population, especially as they arrive in their new receiving context; participation and communitarian coexistence. Before the implementation of the Plan, the City Council of Parla had developed a program for the training of civil servants in relation with the management of diversity (See “A Good Practice in the City of Parla). Last, but not least, Fuenlabrada, Getafe, Leganés, Móstoles and Parla signed the European Declaration of Cities Against Ghettos. The text was proposed by the Fundación Instituto de Cultura del Sur, in December 2005.

**Economic development and innovation strategy**

This section presents best local practices related to economic development, employment policies, vocational training, and industrial promotion, as well as specific measures to counteract the economic crisis.

In order to facilitate the management of employment policies, cities created independent organisms, such as the Municipal Institute for Employment and Economic Promotion (IMEPE – Alcorcón) or the Centre of Initiatives for Training and Employment (CIFE – Fuenlabrada). As seen in the preceding sector, the recession did not stop the creation of new firms in Alcorcón. Indeed, in 2010 43 local firms were launched. In this city, new economic developments could benefit from the availability of 8 million square meters for new business uses in industrial, commercial and technological areas. The specific areas of Lucero and the Northern District could be able to create 44,300 jobs during the next years. The Northern District was chosen for the installation of the new sports city of the Atlético de Madrid Football Club, which may promote the creation of new jobs and firms in the local labour market. In Fuenlabrada, the industrial area “La Cantueña”, with 1 million square meters, promoted the creation of 3,000 new jobs since it was opened. New industrial developments are planned for the future, such as the industrial and tertiary area “El Bañuelo” or the technological area “Miraflores”. Together they would occupy 2 million square metres, where 350 new firms could settle and create 5,800 jobs.

Since the beginning of the economic downturn, cities have put forth measures to widen social benefits or to reduce municipal taxes for the local population. The City Council of Alcorcón invested 700,000 Euro in order to provide access to schoolbooks for all the students of public schools, enrolled in compulsory education, and 9,000 families profited from this specific measure. Moreover, 40,000 Euro were invested to help students enrolled in semi-public schools, which had not applied to the programme. The City Council also decided that unemployed workers would not have to pay taxes in order to have access to municipal services in the areas of culture, sports and professional training. In cases where all the family members are
unemployed, children and young people would also benefit from this measure, enjoying free access to culture, sports and other activities. Some similar initiatives were developed in Leganés, where publicly sponsored social benefits have been reinforced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 3. A good practice in the city of Parla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of the program</strong>: “PLAN MUNICIPAL DE BECAS PARA EL FOMENTO DE LA OCUPACIÓN” (Local Plan of Grants for the Promotion of Employment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination</strong>: Municipal Institute for Employment and Economic Promotion (IMEPE), in City Council of Alcorcón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnerships</strong>: Department for Social Services and Department for Health, City Council of Alcorcón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of time</strong>: 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main objectives</strong>: Promote access to the labour market and facilitate professional training for unemployed workers who do not receive any social benefits. Social recognition in the media and experience in training and selection of workers for the local employers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Users</strong>: 1,300 persons asked for information and 411 people have received a grant to work in a local firm during year 2010. Among them, 226 were women (55%) and 52 immigrants (13%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total budget</strong>: 500,000 Euro in 2010 and 500,000 Euro in 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong>: City of Alcorcón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive results</strong>: Both workers and local firms considered this program to be very positive. More than 90% of the employers would recommend or repeat the experience. They especially appreciated the role played by the IMEPE in order to facilitate contacts between workers and local firms. After they received a grant, 62 workers were finally hired (15%). In 2011, self-employed workers will also have the possibility to benefit from this program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More information on the policies implemented by the City Council of Alcorcón: [http://www.ayto-alcorcon.es/](http://www.ayto-alcorcon.es/)

Cities also develop programmes to promote access to employment for unemployed workers. Through the Municipal Plan for the Promotion of Employment, unemployed people who do not have access to any social benefit can apply for a scholarship to work in a local firm, and they will receive a grant from the City Council of Alcorcón (300 Euro). During the last years, 120 local firms and more than 400 unemployed workers participated in the programme, thanks to which 60 persons were finally hired (see “A good practice in the City of Alcorcón”). Specific actions are also implemented towards young people facing social difficulties, and professional training programmes, in which 40% of the students are of immigrant background, are reinforced. In Fuenlabrada, the City Council is developing a specific training programme for unemployed women with low educational levels and who are over 35 years old, who are facing social exclusion (see “A good practice in the City of Fuenlabrada”). In the year 2009-2010, 34 vocational training courses took place in Parla, in which 556 students were involved, and 57% of them finally found a job. The City Council of Parla directly hires 75 unemployed people who are facing social exclusion. And the municipal services for employment offer resources (Internet, telephone, newspaper) and personal orientation to unemployed persons. During the year 2009, 1,064 people found a job through the Labour Mediation Service, and between 300 and 400 persons find a job each year through the Employment Club.
Box 4. A good practice in the city of Parla

**Name of the program:** “PACTO LOCAL: FUENLABRADA ACTIVA” (Local Agreement: Active Fuenlabrada)

**Coordination:** Centre of Initiatives for Training and Employment (CIFE), Department for Employment and Women, in City council of Fuenlabrada

**Partnerships:** Department for Social Welfare and House for Women, in City Council of Fuenlabrada; Health Centres for primary and mental attention, in Region of Madrid; local associations and entities working with women and other groups facing social exclusion

**Period of time:** From June 2008 to June 2011

**Main objectives:** Improve the work situation of women; promote the access of women to the labour market; facilitate professional training, especially for women with low qualifications, taking into account the present needs of the labour market

**Civil servants involved:** 1 coordinator, 5 employees

**Users:** 498 women, 182 of them immigrants (37%)

**Total budget:** 1,195,658 Euro

**Funding:** City of Fuenlabrada, with the European Social Fund, Competitiveness and Employment Operational Program (Programa operativo de adaptabilidad y empleo)

**Positive results:** The program “Fuenlabrada Activa” had positive results, so the CIFE decided to implement a new program for social inclusion. This new program includes personal orientation in order to facilitate the access to professional training and the labour market, both for men and women.

More information on the policies implemented by the City Council of Fuenlabrada: [http://www.ayto-fuenlabrada.es/](http://www.ayto-fuenlabrada.es/)

Some solutions to the recession can be found through the participation of cities in national and European programmes. Since the moment the crisis started to affect the Spanish economy, in 2007, more than 3,200 jobs were created in Alcorcón through projects sponsored by the State Fund for Local Investment. In year 2010, 300 jobs were created in Parla through the same programme, and 168 temporary jobs were created through several programmes sponsored by the European Social Fund (ESF). During the year 2009-2010, the City Council of Leganés received more than 650,000 Euros from the ESF to develop training courses for people with special difficulties to gain access to the labour market. Meanwhile, the City Council of Fuenlabrada participates in the PASE programme, sponsored by the European Union. This project, in which municipalities from eight European countries are involved, was recognised as a good practice by the European Commission.

**Environment and sustainability**

This final section presents best local initiatives in the areas of urban sustainability, housing, environment, mobility, transport and communication. Local governments have a key role in promoting green growth², especially looking at reducing energy consumption and shortening distances.

In Alcorcón, 25% of the new developments are devoted to urban parks. In the Northern District, this proportion reaches 30%, out of 4.6 million square metres. In Fuenlabrada, the City Council adopted a Municipal Plan for the Improvement of Air Quality and the Protection of the Atmosphere. In Leganés, the City Council created an Agency for Energy. It is also responsible for the elaboration of a Strategic Map of Noise in the city. Other initiatives include the remodeling of green spaces, the control of waste production, recycling, and the like. On account of these policies, the City of Leganés has received the Green Flag Prize

---

² [http://www.oecd.org/document/27/0,3343,en_2649_34361_39760027_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/27/0,3343,en_2649_34361_39760027_1_1_1_1,00.html)
During the last five years, in Parla, the City Council adopted a **Local Plan for Climate Change** and developed a **Plan for Local Action on Agenda 21**. This second plan aims at the efficient management and use of water; the control and reduction of air pollution; the control and reduction of noise pollution; urban sustainability; waste reduction and recycling; the planning of green zones and of sustainable mobility; and education of citizens for the respect of the environment. In order to reduce energy consumption, cities also promote sustainable housing. The City Council of Alcorcón received several prizes from the Ministry of Industry and the Architects Guild for the construction of bioclimatic housing in new neighbourhoods (*Ensanche Sur/Cuatro Caminos*).

In order to reduce distance and facilitate mobility, Alcorcón and Parla planned the renovation of their city centres. Other initiatives deal with transport to improve communication, within the city and with the rest of the metropolitan area, and with the development of special pathways for bicycles. In order to manage those matters, the City Council of Fuenlabrada, Leganés and Parla have adopted a **Plan for Sustainable Urban Mobility**.

**Recommendations for policy-makers**

**Specific recommendations for policy-makers**

**How to improve civic participation**

Civic participation can be improved through different mechanisms, including social forums, local plans, territorial councils or councils for specific sectors (for instance, education, health, social services, employment, etc.), festivals and other specific events.

All these mechanisms could be generally directed to the whole population, or specifically directed to the immigrant population. A combination of both approaches should be considered. Indeed, this will guarantee that the specific needs of migrants are taken care of, for example through learning the language of the host society. At the same time, migrants will not be isolated from the rest of society, as they share most of their needs with the general population.

One of the key elements for a successful participation is to make possible that all actors are involved. Within the City Councils, all departments should be included. Within the civil society, the range of actors includes migrant and non migrant associations; associations based in specific neighbourhoods; churches, mosques and other places of worship; associations for women, young people and the elderly; trade unions and employers’ associations; individual members of society. Common spaces should be created in order to share good practices and to develop common answers in relation with the interests of the population as a whole. The participation of all actors and the creation of common spaces should be promoted by the Mayor’s office, as participation is a central issue for municipalities.

**How to promote employment in times of economic recession**

As good practices in the South of Madrid have clearly shown, the promotion of employment involves the action of City Councils in two different ways. On the one hand, City Councils should try to diversify the initiatives they develop, and the solutions they offer to local social groups (young people, women, the unemployed, entrepreneurs, etc.) with different needs. On the other hand, City Councils should explore creative ways to manage employment policies and obtain funding, in order to implement specific programmes and support the population.

First of all, City Councils should consider the key role of education and professional training, as it provides children and adults with new competences to enter the labour market, social abilities and the capacity to develop autonomous initiatives in their everyday life. Therefore cities should develop specific
training programmes, taking into account the needs of the local, regional, national and international labour markets. The professional training programmes should involve firms, especially local ones. Their collaboration could facilitate access to an internship or a labour contract for the local workforce. City Councils should also provide personal orientation for people who are looking for a job and people who wish to become self-employed.

In order to manage employment policies, City Councils could develop a local plan for employment, or at least they should create a specific organism responsible on this area. Cities could develop partnership in three different ways. First, they could develop new industrial, commercial and technological areas, in relation with local, national and international firms. Second, they could participate in national and international programmes, promoted by the national government, the European Union, the European Social Fund, the OECD, and other. Last but not least, cities should try to collaborate with other cities, within national and international programmes or within more informal networks. These two options could be interesting ways to learn good practices and find alternative funding, especially in times of economic recession when the financial capacity of the local population and the cities suffer.

How to promote sustainability in urban spaces

Reducing energy consumption (through recycling) and reducing distances (through public transports and the use of bicycles) are two different ways to promote sustainability, especially if the physical dimension of cities is considered. In regard to the social dimension of cities, sustainability can be promoted through housing policies and the management of public spaces. City Councils should avoid segregation when promoting social housings or planning new neighbourhoods. The diversification of urban spaces is paramount, in terms of socioeconomic groups, ethnic groups, gender and age, but also in terms of uses. Thus a specific urban area should include residences, shops, commercial areas, green areas, children playgrounds, schools and respond to other urban needs. This should also facilitate the use of the city for pedestrians. In a sustainable city, public spaces should be easily accessible to all (adults with children, teenagers, elderly, etc.), while urban development and planning should avoid empty spaces that can generate insecurity.

General recommendations for policy-makers

- Maintain and reinforce vertical cooperation between cities and the regional, national and supranational (EU, OECD, UNESCO, UN) institutions, in order to benefit from the informational and financial resources they offer.

- Maintain and develop horizontal cooperation with other cities, especially those ones in the same urban area, but also between local services within the same municipality, to share experiences and develop common responses.

- Preserve the balance between general and specific policies to respond to immigration. Migrants and their children are part of the local society, and therefore they share a number of needs with the general population (education, employment, health, social services, housing, etc.). But specific policies would certainly help them to participate in society, especially during the initial stages of their arrival (translation, mediation, etc.).

- Respond to both the objective or structural needs of migrants and their subjective or symbolic ones. Whereas education, employment, health, social services or housing policies would tend to their material needs, the discourses and practices of the local officers could promote the development of common identities and feelings of belonging. These needs are also felt by the non-migrant segments of society.
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II MEETING ON SOCIAL COHESION AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT:
GOOD PRACTICES OF INTEGRATION IN THE SOUTH OF MADRID

AGENDA

Dates: 17 - 19 November, 2010

Venue: Centro Cultural Los Pinos (Alcorcón) Madrid, Spain

Organized by: Fundación ICS and OCDE

Collaboration: Club de Madrid, International Institut of Political Sciences

and Alcorcón City Council

With the support of: Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional y Desarrollo (Spanish International Cooperation and Development Agency)
This Meeting is designed to analyze the role that social cohesion has played in the past and the role it can play in the future. Since the late 1980s, much of the political debate in democratic societies has revolved around the need to keep social cohesion as one of the priority action items in governments' agendas. However, the idea that social cohesion is about equal opportunities under the law for citizens is now challenged on the basis of abstract values which distinguish national societies at risk of being undermined by such phenomena as immigration.

Wednesday, November 17
5:30 pm OPENING ADDRESS
    Marcelino García Domínguez, Deputy Mayor, Mayor of Alcorcón City
    José Manuel Gómez Bravo, Vice Chair of the Foundation Instituto de Cultura del Sur

5:45 pm ROUNDTABLE: COHESION AND SOLIDARITY
    (Approximate duration: 2 hours)
    Just as in recent years market liberalization and deregulation have been considered equivalent, so the concepts of cohesion and solidarity have also been considered interchangeable. Are they really? Or they actually trigger separate discussions? What is the relationship between these two concepts?

CHAIR:
    José María Ridao, writer, journalist, diplomatic and director of the Meeting

SPEAKERS:
    Tomás de la Quadra-Salcedo, former Territorial Administration Minister (1982-1985), former Justice Minister (1991-1993) and former President of Council of State
    José Luis Pardo, Professor of Contemporary Philosophy, Complutense University of Madrid, Spanish Essay Prize (2005)
    Guy Bajoit, Professor Emeritus at the Anthropology and Sociology Unit of FOPES (Open Faculty on Economic and Social Politics), and the Development Studies Institute of Catholic University of Lovaine. Expert on social change
    Juan Ramón de Laiglesia, Economist, Poverty reduction and social development Group, OECD

Thursday, November 18
5:30 pm ROUNDTABLE: THE INSTRUMENTS OF COHESION
    (Approximate duration: 2 hours)
    The Welfare State was set up since 1945 as the main instrument for social cohesion, an idea which was shared by all political forces. This consensus has broken down in the last two decades, as the management of the Welfare State has hit rough waters. What are the problems facing the welfare state now? Is it still the main instrument for social cohesion or are there new instruments available?

CHAIR:
    José María Ridao, writer, journalist, diplomatic and director of the Meeting

SPEAKERS:
    Claudio Aranzadi, former Industry Minister (1988-1993), former Ambassador of Spain to the OECD
    Carlos Westendorp, Secretary General of Club de Madrid and Former Minister of Foreign Affairs (1995-1996)
    Juan Hunt, ILO’s Director’s Spanish Office
    Gaspar Zarrías, Secretary of State of Law Enforcement (central government's relations with the regional governments) of the Spanish Government
Friday, November 19

5:00 pm PRESENTATION: OECD on Crisis, Migration and Integration.

Jean-Pierre Garson, Head of the Non-Member Economies and International Migration Division

OECD

5:30 pm ROUNDTABLE: THE FUTURE OF COHESION
(Approximate duration: 2 hours)

One of the most immediate effects of the economic and financial crisis that erupted in August 2007 has been the cutbacks in social spending carried out to address the huge deficits in the major economies. These cutbacks are likely to affect the Welfare State just when the surge of unemployment would make it appear most necessary. However, having a weaker welfare (i.e. increased insecurity and social risk) in a distressed economy is triggering a surge of xenophobia and spurring the idea that the social cohesion should apply only within social groups which are homogenous in terms of religion, customs or even race. Will the longstanding concept of social cohesion prevail to recent challenges, or will suffer from the fragmentation of society?
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TRANSCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTIONS

Lecturer: José Manuel Gómez Bravo, Vice President, Foundation Instituto de Cultura del Sur (ICS)

The Workshop celebrated on SOCIAL COHESION AND INTEGRATION belongs to the Foundation Instituto de Cultura del Sur’s Project Cities No Ghetto which was endorsed by José Maria Ridao, held as Spanish Ambassador before UNESCO in 2006.

Foundation ICS has been working to convince the national and international context of this small reality called the South of Madrid, like an element of good policies of integration within the Globalization, an adventure of a very small area. A million inhabitants, it is an example of improvement of the people who came over, in the 1960s, from an internal immigration due to the flood, an immigration which built cities that are an example in the context of globalization, not only for the topic of the integration but for its social cohesion, I believe that one has been a real example and the reward of the work of the Foundation.

Foundation ICS wants to share with you this work as though it has been worth it. This foundation, encompassing six municipalities, and his patronage has worked hard in the project Cities No Ghetto, in the coalitions against racism with UNESCO, as in this project of the OCDE it is the context where we had to find a diagnosis for the publication where show not only the good policies concerning the municipal decisions, worked out in the South of Madrid about social cohesion, but also all the works of good policies in the Latin American panorama.

Simultaneously, Foundation ICS has worked in the South Forum to create in the South of Madrid something similar to a true heart of cities of the economic and social thought; a nuclear idea that represented the adventure of social cohesion and solidarity.

This last word, solidarity, seems very easy, but this word sometimes has been pondered and discussed by some institutions to which the example of solidarity still seems rare and that the word solidarity is in the agenda of the social cohesion. But, for this Foundation ICS the important thing is to know and to share that we go under the signs of identity, of respecting diversity, under the signs of identity where the immigrants are never received as competitors, as we believe not in the “effect call”, but in the global effect and that it seems to us that the advantage of the economic flows in the local economies has to be enhanced, we want to give a go to what it can be represented by these reflections directed by José Maria Ridao, which give a huge value for the present publication.

For Foundation ICS it is very important to speak about social cohesion and solidarity, especially in this years of fear, where it is necessary to be careful and not to neglect the signs of identity of society. And, especially now when areas such as the South of Madrid or the zones that have led the social progress, think about a new social contract, to create this agenda of social cohesion and of solidarity, and that the only thing they are looking for is this integration in a globalised context with an economical and harmonic growth of the social progress.

I believe that Meetings as the celebrated between OECD and Foundation ICS can help to investigate and to work at this idea that is a good equation between economic cohesion, social cohesion and solidarity.
This Meeting was designed to analyze the role that social cohesion has played in the past and the role it can play in the future. Since the late 1980s, much of the political debate in democratic societies has revolved around the need to keep social cohesion as one of the priority action items in governments’ agendas. However, the idea that social cohesion is about equal opportunities under the law for citizens is now challenged on the basis of abstract values which distinguish national societies at risk of being undermined by such phenomena as immigration.

The next interventions on social cohesion do not say the last word on this question but hope that the final publication, that’s why it has been celebrated a meeting on social cohesion, could be a stimulus for the debate from certain points of view like the social democrats’ positions. These have given up principles, approaches to reality, without those positions can hardly give an answer.

Just as in recent years market liberalization and deregulation have been considered equivalent, so the concepts of cohesion and solidarity have also been considered interchangeable. Are they really so? Or they actually trigger separate discussions? What is the relationship between these two concepts?

Cohesion y solidarity is presented as objective to approach the concept of cohesion to the concept of solidarity: how relations are established between cohesion and solidarity, if there were any, and its differences.

The temporary conclusions are that while solidarity was a principle, a general value, cohesion would tend to see it as it more like a result of the application of this principle. Social cohesion has been defined too as a social production of certain devices that must perform properly; and there is as well an alert to the secret face, the reverse of cohesion which could grow out of negative values. In that sense there are totalitarians and nationalist societies which also defend the principle of cohesion, obviously it is not the same cohesion we are defining.

The Welfare State was set up since 1945 as the main instrument for social cohesion, an idea which was shared by all political forces. This consensus has broken down in the last two decades, as the management of the Welfare State has hit rough waters. What are the problems facing the welfare state now? Is it still the main instrument for social cohesion or are there new instruments available?

The Instruments of the Cohesion, once it has been established the concept of cohesion, it looks necessary to analyze its most important instrument until nowadays: the welfare state that at the moment is submitted to a conceptual and quantitative review.

Cohesion and welfare state as an instrument of social cohesion, could lead to a misunderstanding. That is why it looks convenient to avoid, again, the reverse of cohesion, which was referred before. It is proposed the idea of what to look for is a fairer society: it is not a society in which justice rules but that one which through public power could be possible finally to eradicate poverty.

It arose with the possibility that in front of the crisis that has flogged the international economy and has been translated into a decrease, in a clipping of the Welfare state expenses and the resources. The question is that if those resources could make out a future in which productiveness would end and finish withdraw resources for the welfare state the aging population and another series of factors have already been taking. The temporary conclusion is that the Welfare state will go on being an instrument, but a different instrument.

One of the most immediate effects of the economic and financial crisis that erupted in August 2007 has been the cutbacks in social spending carried out to address the huge deficits in the major economies.
These cutbacks are likely to affect the Welfare State just when the surge of unemployment would make it appear most necessary. However, having a weaker welfare (i.e. increased insecurity and social risk) in a distressed economy is triggering a surge of xenophobia and spurring the idea that the social cohesion should apply only within social groups which are homogenous in terms of religion, customs or even race. Will the longstanding concept of social cohesion prevail to recent challenges, or will suffer from the fragmentation of society?

Future of cohesion is the consideration on the It seems that after the crisis, what it avenges later will be different: it is unknown if better or more efficient than today, but in any case, there will be differences with what we have lived till now.

As definitively but temporary conclusions: there will be a welfare state in which the principle of social cohesion is well understood, that dominates our society, public action and that inspire public strategies but we should know how it would turn out to be, which features it will present, how we will mean it.
Between these two terms there is an ambiguous link: it is not clear that they are synonymous, and may even in some sense to be incompatible. It could be argued, that the term "solidarity", no doubt, is often used to refer to the "social bond" that holds the members of a community, especially in continental Europe, while the English researchers have tended each again to use for these purposes the term "social cohesion".

- Solidarity is primarily a legal term that describes a right or an obligation which, being common to two or more persons may be taken or should be fully implemented by each of them.

- Its fundamental features are 1) the feeling that caring people have of belonging to the same community of interests, beliefs, origins or doom, class and even blood, and 2) the fact that often is linked to a conflict and is therefore almost always solidarity against an enemy or external threat to the group, which requires maintaining close ranks to reach the solid state, until individuals are dissolved in the community and welded as a whole.

- In 1980's, public speeches by the Catholic Pope John Paul II promoted the systematic replacement of terms very discredited (by the institutions that managed their practice) as "piety", "compassion" or "charity" for "solidarity" giving the word a strange sense asymmetrical in moral-religious contexts. This sense was secularized by the popularity of the Polish trade union Solidarity and the growth of "NGOs" that constantly use it, taking responsibility for social programs that had previously been responsibility of the State, and all this while the neoliberal “doctrine” began to spread, announcing fiscal, social and ideological exhaustion of the project of the welfare state.

- However, this asymmetrical use of "solidarity" shows two clear limits. On the one hand, the context of economic crisis causes it to be affected by the same two suspicions of "charity": not to distribute more than “silly soup” (Spanish expression that means someone who survives avoiding work) "and infringing the orthodoxy of the law of supply and demand. On the other hand, Rafael Sanchez Ferlosio noted that, using the term this way, we would have to consider that compassion for the enemy is a form of high treason, which certainly says much of the merciless aspects of our Solidarity era.

- Cohesion does not seem to refer to the unit generated by an external enemy. The only enemy that threatens the cohesion is an internal: the concept is designed for a community of those who do not share the same beliefs, those who do not have a common origin, and this generates the risk of social breakdown, exclusion, and not due to economic factors: being part of a society is been recognized in a collective and in a shared civil plot. But when that society has the political form of democracy, the legal equality of citizens before the law, - that is, the abstraction of their communities and communions of belonging that converts human beings into individuals and makes possible the civil coexistence of diverse communities - is the principle of integration.
There is a sense in which all human beings are capable of pity, compassion or charity: we are inevitably exposed to pain, the disease, misfortune and death. Society - no matter what its level of cohesion is - cannot avoid this fact (on the contrary, it seems that society is replaced by a sworn community each time it promises to its members, in exchange for his "solidarity", a permanent shield against misfortune, a guarantee of eternal life, unwavering health or salvation of the condition of mortals), but social cohesion can manage and minimize the social effects of misfortune and the many great and small evils which grow as social inequalities.

To feel the risks specific to the appeal to the cohesion it should be noticed that in recent times - and especially speaking of the repeated victories of conservative parties in legislative elections - much has been said, not only about cohesion but consistency - which of course helps cohesion - of public and private values, which is characteristic of conservative discourse, regardless of the fact that something similar happens in the case of lynching or "rispetto" (in the sense Don Vito Corleone gave the word). And when we say that the "progressives" should imitate this to the conservative (to increase their electoral chances), this question arises: would not be liberals turning conservative, preferring injustice rather than the mess of inconsistency, rather than the complexity of reality itself and before the truth? Cohesion (to close ranks) is what major generals claim not only to its troops but also to politicians and civil society while they do their ways. Cohesion ("the nail that sticks out gets banged down") is what the rascals claim when they are caught red-handed.

Guy Bajoit, Emeritus Professor of Anthropology Unit Sociology FOPES

Social cohesion to me means simply the result of good functioning of a social contract, that is to say, in an agreement between the set of social groups belonging to a human community, a social contract that allows the pacific coexistence.

I believe that a social contract, in order to work well, it has to switch on some social devices, which necessary to assure let's say the stability of social peace. There are five types of devices which seem to me necessary to allow a social contract to work well. The first social device is a device of law and order maintenance, without violence. Assuring the good functioning of justice, of the police and the set of institutions which are meant to be responsible and support a pacific order in a community. The second is a device for negotiating compromises guaranteed by the state without needing to resort to violence. A third device is the existence of utilities that allow everyone to equally access to a range of collective goods such as health, education, transportation, housing and other social things.

The fourth device is so to speak represented by the devices of solidarity between people who are poor and people who are not a device that works through taxes for the redistribution of wealth, and the fifth device is a device of social integration, of integration of the new citizens, of young people, of immigrants allowing a reciprocal respect of different cultures.

Between the challenges that Europeans societies the challenges raised by the social contract for fault of the changes that have taken place in the economic contexts, the technology and the socialization of the cultural model. So the first modern societies were working on a social contract that leaned on the idea of equality in the social utility. Remember article n.1, the first declaration of the human rights stated August 24th, 1789 in National French Assembly. This article 1 said: "All the human beings are born free and equal before the law ", but there was the second very important phrase that added that the social differences are justified by utility, it is to say, between the most useful, the least useful and the useless ones, their differences could be justified.
Therefore the social contract of the first modernity was based on the idea of utility, who had the same utility had to treated in the same way collectively but about thirty or forty years we have left this first conception of modernity and adopted another conception on which the social contract is based more and more, and less and less on the idea of equality and increasingly on the idea of equity.

A much more individualistic society, a much more based on the right of the individual to take part to the social life and to the collective life, reaching the goal for his merit his personal fulfilment. And this changes the nature of social policies would like to name five points, each one for each of my five devices to show to which extent the challenges of a social contract, based on individual equality, are important and complex.

First, the device of law and order maintenance, now based on the idea of prevention and on security, a kind of obsession for public security. The second point concerns collective negotiations between groups of different interests. What it has radically changed everything is the fact that we have adopted a model, based on the individualization of labour contracts, and considerably increased exclusion, instability and unemployment. The third point concerns public services, everything that could has been undergone privatization in the public services. The fourth point concerns the question of solidarity itself. In my country there is one concept that is called the social active State, I do not know if that exists in Spain, if they call it his way. The social State the individual sees opposite his responsibilities and forces it to resolve or to help to solve his problem or to test that is not an exploiting the system and that is capable of solving his problem by himself or with help of specialized services. And finally the fifth example that concerns the integration devices of the immigrants and young people with the European construction we have left a part of sovereignty of the national State and we are in a current situation of globalization and we have a parallel with the movement of globalization a comeback of the dimension of ethnicity in society of old pre-national identities that joins to the integration of immigrants.

And finally, I would like to speak about the young people of our own society who live in a different world, live a different culture that has completely changed where society promised them the right to fulfill as people, to choose their life, not to suffer too much and obtain social advantages.

This raises a big challenge to social cohesion is one of the important problems so evident in cities, concerning pacific coexistence, that is to say, the social contract in our societies.

Tomás de la Quadra-Salcedo, Former Minister for Administration Territorial (1982-1985), Former Minister of Justice (1991-1993) and Former President of the Council of State, Chair Professor of Administrative Law at University Carlos III de Madrid

The topic that is propose is a reflection on cohesion and solidarity, to distinguish between them and highlight their differences, if any, and the nuances that may exist between a concept and another. You may think that solidarity refers more to a value, an ethical, moral, while cohesion seems to be more a result which is the proximity of people, the unity of people in a social or territorial cohesion, which speak of social and territorial cohesion.

If we allude to the perspective of the Spanish Language’s Royal Academy the word solidarity is a word rich of values, it is a word that points to this sensation of adherence to others or to the cause or to the company of others. If we look up the terminological aspect of the dictionary of the “Academy” and then we switch to the texts, it is curious that the word cohesion does not appear in the Spanish Constitution. And nevertheless it presents a wide range of values of cohesion. If the word solidarity appears, nevertheless, enough times to speak about solidarity in a territorial scale, of communities, a few communities with
others. Collective solidarity to speak about the environment and its preservation or to speak about the
topics of financing, financial autonomy of autonomous regions but it is a common principle of solidarity
among all the Spanish.

It seems that we value more in our Spanish Constitution the term solidarity, (which the opposite that)
while it happens the opposite in treaties as the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, where the
most common word is precisely the word cohesion; social and territorial cohesion. I am not sure to get any
conclusion in this point.

In my personal opinion, the European Community has obviously a more economic and market related
slant. And for this reason, the European Community has to be considered “guilty”, “happily guilty” I
would say, when started to build itself up within a market vision of market exchange, as it were in a free
market area. That is why I say it is a “happily guilty” because if it were not the way it is, it would have
never happened. As it was a proved fact to try to build a political European Community at the beginning
that failed.

However, fortunately since 1986 the Single European Act exceed that merchants’ Europe and went
into a Europe concerned on values, although nowadays there is an absolutely disconcert about the new
challenges opened by the economical crisis as it affects directly the welfare state.

So, since 1986 Europe has introduced elements and values beyond mere exchange of goods, and
Europe “speaks” about elements a social and territorial cohesion, even has policy tools which make this
cohesion possible. The structural funds for example, of which Spain has benefited and, over which when
those funds were very necessaries in Spain the Popular Party reproached Felipe Gonzalez to ask for them
too much; those funds were a consequence of social cohesion as Europe understood it then.

The preference of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU for the word “cohesion” does not mean
that the concept is not close to that of “solidarity”. The culmination of that process probably incorporate
values very close to the cohesion or solidarity inspired by it is in Article 14 introduced by the Treaty of
Amsterdam - after a long debate on the causes of the crisis in Europe after the Treaty of Maastricht, and
which is attributed to the loss of identity of the welfare state - to remember the importance of services of
general economic interest, for his role in promoting social and territorial cohesion. There is, so, an
important debate and discussion in Europe about solidarity, cohesion, debate that has been reflected in the
Treaty, recognizing the importance of services of general economic interest in the role of the construction
of the welfare state.

There is another dimension of cohesion and solidarity that today has to do with a new phenomenon
that is the immigration. This is an absolutely inevitable and necessary phenomenon, because without
immigration we could not have had the development that we have had in the last decade, but it raises also
some questions and this situation calls for cohesion, and solidarity, not among Spanish citizens but among
all the citizens who live in Spain, as we can see this issue as a world category issue, because it is a problem
shared in many other countries, in a way that it presents two different sides.

The first side shows the problem of cohesion and solidarity in the internal dimension among citizens,
and luckily it does not have the features which characterised past historical times. I remember an eminent
jurist who showed an important weakness in the National-socialism times. I am talking about Carl Smith,
who defended as a condition for development and progress in Germany a social and racial homogeneity.
And that man played an intellectual and juridical role in the Nazi dictatorship, and created the foundations,
of segregation and racialism, etc., which led afterwards to those horrible results.
That vision of racial homogeneity is not the problem fortunately we have, but some resonances still exist between us even are a minority.

I think that today we do not have the problem raised at that level, but we have raised the prospect that, with an economic crisis as the one we are experiencing, there are answers giving that affect the welfare state. And it brings up some xenophobic reflexes against the foreign or immigrant. So, we must be on guard without forget that foreign immigrants are human beings like us and are entitled to social benefits that the system has been established and the protection of their rights as individuals.

So, today, the question is solidarity and cohesion in relation to migrants, about the population who has come to Spain to work these last years, who now live in precarity and raised some issues of racism, xenophobia, etc. which make necessary to take care of some racism problems we need to support the institutions to prevent this issue to develop.

As interesting facts I shall say that luckily in Spain there is a regulation concerning immigrants that has gone beyond the European laws approved in the article 2004/38 on free transit, and that acknowledge to every member of the European community the right of free transit in the Union, but it is usually ignored that is just during three months only. If three months elapse and the person represents a social charge for the Community it is possible to intervene.

There are some new elements on which is concreted cohesion and solidarity nowadays and that should be on the table: it consists of solidarity and social cohesion about immigration and the underdeveloped world or developing countries. This confronts us with the obligation, as a country, to continue contributing with the appropriate adjustments arising from the economical crisis, but without abandoning the commitment to the rest of the World.
THE INSTRUMENTS OF COHESION

Carlos Westendorps, Secretary General of the Club of Madrid and Former Minister of Foreign Affairs (1995-1996)

When asked about “The instruments of cohesion”, the title of the OCDE and Fundación Cultura del Sur Seminar, it is the Club de Madrid’s Shared Societies Project that comes to mind as a relevant instrument for leadership action for inclusion.

We live in divided societies, globally, but also within nations, regions, cities and neighbourhoods; 90% of all countries have at least 10% of minorities. How we live together and how we face our differences is therefore one of the most important conversations of our times.

The Shared Societies Project approach considers diversity the grounds for coexistence and for the construction of “a world safe for difference”. The main idea behind the project is that a more just society, with fewer inequalities, where everybody is valued and respected, comes precisely for being different, and not because people are all alike. And the role of leadership is key for these purposes. Lebanese writer and Príncipe de Asturias Prize laureate, Amin Maalouf, recently emphasized the same idea in a letter he sent me:

The world needs to have a serene and responsible dialogue, respecting values but recognizing reality. The world also needs the reunion of who assumed the responsibility of ruling the countries and have already given a step backwards. In this dialogue of ex-leaders hides a promise of lucidity, vision and effectiveness.

The most direct threats to coexistence and social cohesion are not interpersonal, but institutional. The discrepancies among neighbours of different cultures is not what threatens inclusion, but the exclusion of those who are different from economic life, the proscription of certain cultural expressions, the inequalities and/or unequal treatments or the absence of representation and political participation concerning minorities do represent a real threat.

If we agree that social cohesion is an institutional and political challenge, and not a question of interpersonal relations, then it is easy to conclude that is a fundamental responsibility of governments and political leaders to ensure that their own political speech and public policies have a positive effect on social cohesion. It cannot be left to natural processes or claim that civil society alone will deal with the matter with its own inertia. Inclusion is the responsibility of governments and leaders, now more than ever, in an era when the financial, food and energy crises worsen, and the tendency to look for scapegoats among those that are different from us raises.

Some leaders despair that nothing can be done or ignore divisions and inequalities hoping they will disappear; others may even try to suppress them. It is important to show leaders that there are practical instruments to promote policies and practices that respond to the challenges of diversity and encourage inclusive societies.

The Shared Societies Project has identified ten areas where political leaders can act to advance towards social cohesion:
1. Locating responsibility of social cohesion within government structures
2. Creating opportunities for consultation
3. Monitor structures and policies to ensure they are supportive of social cohesion
4. Ensure the legal framework protects the rights of the individual
5. Deal with inequality and economic disadvantages by those discriminated against
6. Ensure that physical environments create opportunities for social interaction
7. A education system that demonstrates a commitment to a shared society
8. Initiate a process to encourage the creation of a shared vision of society
9. Promote respect, understanding and appreciation of diversity
10. Take steps to reduce tensions and hostility between communities

These “commitments” have been identified from the leadership experience of Club de Madrid’s membership (79 former heads of state and government); all of them have been much further expanded in the framework of the Shared Societies Project, and that is available for anyone who wishes to learn more.

But leaders know that the moral argument does not suffice. It is also important to showcase the economic rationale for social inclusion. The economic argument seems obvious. The sectors of the sidelined population contribute less to the economy. They have a more deficient education therefore their chances to contribute are more limited. They have less capital to invest. Evidence shows that social inclusion helps economic growth. A socially united society is more stable and productive. Its members feel secure of their role in society and their talents and contributions are recognized, nourished and applied for the further development of society. The economic contribution that immigrants make to their hosting land overcomes the cost of the policies which make easier their integration.

Political leadership is important to defy those who call on and exploit fears of difference; it is necessary to take initiatives, and to act favouring inclusive approaches; diversity may be a difficult challenge, but our societies would be a better place for all of us if we accept diversity, furthermore, there is no plan b, there is no alternative, we are all here to stay.

But leaders can’t replace the contribution of each individual in their own communities and the work of the local organizations. Political leadership can only favour and facilitate the social leadership that encourages changes in attitudes within communities and amongst people.

Shared societies are about agreeing on the common ground where we all feel safe to be ourselves, respect others. A common space where we can all meet and from where we can all contribute. It is about “us”, not “the others”.
Claudio Aranzadi, Former Minister of Industry (1988-1993), Former Ambassador of Spain to the OECD.

I will begin to answer the question of the panel: does the Welfare state keep on being a good instrument of social cohesion? “Social cohesion” is an equivocal expression. In fact, although it is used profusely in the institutions like the U.E., the OECD does not use it. An indicator of this ambiguity is the variety of factors that can induce a deep social cohesion. Religion or nationalism, for example, can be powerful instruments of cohesion in a community. In fact, any cultural leader who reinforces the community bonds can be a good instrument of cohesion. Let's think in the American “Firelighter Party”, and its slogan, more Nation (American) and Less government. “Firelighter Party” promotes a strengthening of the community bonds concerning the idea of American "nation" that, according to the followers, includes variable doses of religious values, constitution and sacralisation of the founding avatars as patriotic icons; it is a question, undoubtedly, of an efficient instrument of cohesion in a community. At the same time, with a variable dose of libertarianism according to his followers, it detests the obtrusion of the State (especially a federal one) and its intervention to guarantee typical services of the Welfare state as the health system.

A similar duality appears in some forms of ultra liberalism (or “classic liberalism”). The ultraliberal one of Hayekian inspiration may be able to value the existence of ties of solidarity between citizens, but whenever it must be an initiative of the civil society and not of the State. For the ultraliberal one the alternative to the Welfare state is philanthropy. The Beveridge Report of 1942 was already giving a response to this exposition, on having considered the welfare state to be a more consistent instrument with the dignity of the person since his services were not an act of charity but a civic right.

Returning to the initial question, I believe that it would be a preferable to articulate it again as: is the Welfare state an instrument to manage a more just society? I want to emphasize that the target is a more just society, not a society Just, with capital letters. Amartya Sen rightly criticizes the “transcendentalism” of most of the Theories of Justice. The political target must be to achieve a further level of justice but while distrusting the Utopias as an inspiring goal of the political immediate action. The urgent pursuit of the Utopia, although egalitarian and well-intentioned, has ended up by driving historically to disaster.

Of course, although reformists support as their target a program whose goal is to achieve a more just society, the controversy will keep on existing on its meaning. From an ultraliberal perspective, for example, the redistributive policies realized by the State imply coercion, an offence to the individual freedom and, therefore, they are illegitimate although they have been decided democratically. From a social-democratic point of view, nevertheless, the State must intervene to obtain a more just society. A social democrat will consider the institutional system of Sweden to be preferable to that of USA The ultraliberal one will have the inverse preference. It will be up to citizens to decide about a few democratic elections, after an open debate, which model to apply.

Although from a social-democratic perspective, the Welfare state is a part of its signs of identity, it finally determines how this must be and how many resources it must absorb. The Welfare state is not auto-financed; citizens finance it by paying taxes. On the other hand, although the target of the Welfare state is to eliminate the poverty and to obtain a more egalitarian distribution of the revenue, the final goal is wider. This goal, as A. Sen points out, is to facilitate the citizens a maximum of open options of individual development and active participation in collective decisions. As A. Sen underlines, there are cases where a major equality in the distribution of revenues does not mean better results in terms, for example, of health and education (essential factors of enlargement of vital options). A Sen quotes the example of China and India; in India there is a more egalitarian distribution of revenues than in China, but nevertheless this above mentioned country has better rates concerning literacy and infant mortality.
But, also, the aim of the Welfare state to restore or to support must bear in mind social preferences. It must be the result of a democratic decision anchored in its legitimacy for a sufficient majority of citizens. It is not possible, for example, to restore in these moments in the United States a Welfare state European style based on a sufficient majority. It is enough to observe President Obama’s difficulties to make to approve a health insurance reform that does not reach the levels of coverage of European health insurance systems. But, even in Europe, there are latent factors of mistrust of the Welfare state. This fiscal effort (in the shape of taxes or social security) increases notably in the long run in Spain, singularly for the aging process of the population. The relation between the over 65 people and the 15 to 65 population will increase from 25% in 2010 to 35% in 2030.

This will put a real stress on retired people revenues, health services and other social services and an international redistribution of retired people against active people.

To face on time the effects of this aging process, it is not only a demand of financial sustainability. It is also a way to stop the attack to the Welfare state. It will be necessary to discuss some form of payment of the sanitary expenses compatible with the universal access to the sanitary services and equally to tackle a reform of the public system of pensions that clearly discriminates between contributory pensions and not contributory pensions. The contributory pensions are not an instrument of redistribution of the revenues between citizens, but a mechanism of compulsory saving up to the retirement imposed legally on every worker. Consequently, every worker should perceive in the retirement the quantity contributed in the shape of quotations along his labour life (of course, updated), and to decide freely the retirement age. The system of share-out would be supported but the calculation of the quantity of the pension would be realized like in a pension found, a sort of virtual capitalization. The system would be equivalent to the subscription of the national debt for the worker in the quantity of his stamps along his labour life that would be reimbursed in the shape of pensions once retired. The mechanism of redistribution of the revenue should correspond to the system of not contributory pensions, financed by the taxes, as at present. The intensity of the redistribution and the form of application (for example, across a minimal pension) will depend on the volume of fiscal resources that it is desirable to use and of the redistributive structure that is considered to be more just (to promote a more egalitarian distribution of the revenue or, with a Rawlsian inspiration, to prioritize the most disadvantaged).

On the other hand, the design of the Welfare state will have to bear also in mind the quandaries equity - efficiency that can appear in the market economy. The Welfare state is only sustainable with an economic growth and, therefore, with the preservation of a competitive economy. The concrete joint of the mechanisms of the Welfare state will have to minimize the potential disincentives to a major competitiveness. Now then, the existence of these quandaries must be confirmed empirically and his quantitative importance must be estimated, to be able to reach the breakeven wished between equity and efficiency. There are empirical evidences opposite to the economic intuition. The Swedish case is a good example. Sweden, even after the reform of his Welfare state in the 90s, keeps on being supported as a country with high grade of equality in its wage compensations before taxes and with a high tax system.

Nevertheless, there is no disincentive in the investment of human capital of high qualification (as it would be necessary to wait, considering the minor yield of this investment); the number of doctors related to the number of inhabitants is still higher than in the United States. On the other hand, Sweden keeps on supporting in the head positions all the "rankings" of competitiveness. The health in the United States offers the second example. The sanitary expense per capita in the United States is far superior to that of the European countries, whereas its sanitary indicators (e.g. the life expectancy) are clearly worse than in Europe. That is to say, against “conventional wisdom” economic, a sanitary system predominantly deprived as that of the USA offers worse results than the predominantly public one as in Europe.
Gaspar Zarrías, Secretary of State for Regional Policy of the Spanish Government

Social cohesion is precisely a target that this Government has always kept in sight and has therefore, job creation as top priority, since it is an indespensable requisite for achieving social cohesion.

I am very grateful to the OECD, the South Culture Institute Foundation and the Municipality of Alcorcón for this opportunity to take part in this forum which, organised precisely during the European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion, highlights the need for social balance in response to the challenges raised by globalisation.

Activities like this one gives the possibility to analyze with a clear mind questions as complex as social cohesion, allowing the analysis results to have a positive translation in the citizen’s daily life, starting in my case with the conviction that the solution to the economic crisis cannot consist in unleashing a social crisis.

The hardness and depth of the global economic crisis is testing the ability of European societies to manage difficulties in accordance with social cohesion criteria, after these last two years performance of fiscal stimulus economic policy which has revealed the insufficiency of public resources to address these situations within a framework of budgetary stability. But it has also pointed out that the idea of unlimited growth as a generator of social welfare is false.

I therefore consider that the model underlying the Welfare state should not be rejected in times of difficulty, since there is more need of public intervention now than in times of economic prosperity. However, I think it is essential to conceive the crisis as an opportunity to rationalize growth in line with the idea of achieving a balanced and sustainable development by strengthening economic, social and territorial cohesion.

It is the moment to redirect the Welfare state around the concept of multilevel governance, ensuring social rights of both present and future generations. On this base, all the Administrations acting in the same area at different levels, local, provincial, regional and national, should act considering austerity criteria and clarification of responsibilities, with the common target of obtaining the maximum possible benefit from scarce resources, with the purpose of reinforcing social cohesion in the whole territory.

This is precisely the line followed in the development of the Europe 2020 Strategy, whose priorities for the next decade are to reach an intelligent, sustainable and inclusive growth, with the aim of achieving a more innovative and competitive economy, environmentally sustainable and in line with the European values of social and territorial cohesion.

At this point, the role played in Europe by the European Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund is remarkable, since they have been, and remain being, a major cohesion instrument for reducing social and economic disparities between Member States and, consequently, among people. As a reflection of the positive impact of these funds in Spain, which have allowed shortening the gap between regions and citizens, in the next Financial Perspectives (2014-2020), Extremadura is the only Spanish region that will continue to be Objective 1, since the rest of regions will then exceed 75% of the average GDP of the European Union.

At present, daily events highlight the lack of general public revenues, especially in local councils, to address the demands of citizens. Therefore the budget for 2011 focuses on administrative austerity, reducing the national Government global expense in 8 %, with investment budget cuts in more than 25 % and reducing the ministries expense by 16 %. Solving the crisis without eroding social cohesion is in sight, since now is the moment when public action is more necessary than ever to correct imbalances and to help
the most vulnerable ones and the unemployed, who need an indirect salary to compensate their job loss, which means that more than half of the Budget goes to social spending.

In parallel, with the aim of ensuring the creation of a new, social and sustainable, economic model, the Government has focused on investments concerning Education and R & D + i, which are synonymous with quality employment. It is a especially important commitment for our country, overly dependent on construction for the last 15 years, hence resulting in the creation of many jobs that did not require any specific preparation, reflected today in a huge pool of unemployed without training, mainly young people. A good example is the fact that in 1994, Spain had 1.1 million employees in the construction sector and in 2007, they were already 2.7 millions. The sector had almost 250% more employees in 13 years.

Nowadays, the Government is working to relocate the unemployed people by means of increasing the effectiveness of Active Employment Policies, so that the unemployed become the central issue of public management based on the cooperation of all levels of government.

Juan Hunt, Director of the Office of the International Labour Organization in Spain

The International Labour Organization, ILO, can be considered to be one of the pioneering institutions which actively work on social cohesion and Welfare state. In the Preamble of its Constitution, in 1919, it points out that a universal and permanent peace can uniquely be based on social justice. Since then, the ILO has approved 188 Conventions and 200 Recommendations concerning the practical totality of the world labour issues, including certain fundamental human rights as related to the freedom of affiliation, to the eradication of the necessary labour, equality in labour remuneration, to the promotion of employment and professional training or social security.

This system of international labour norms redeems an important role in the constitution of laws, of the strategies and of judicial decisions of governments and they turn, consequently, to the root of welfare state and of social cohesion.

In 1944 in the middle of another international crisis, at the end of the Second World War, the ILO contributed another grain of sand to the Welfare state and to the social cohesion approving the Declaration of Philadelphia, as an annex of the Constitution, focusing on the aims and targets of this Organization.

The Declaration includes the solemn obligation of ILO to encourage programs to enhance and employment and improves life conditions, in all the countries in the world.

In 1999, ILO added another grain of sand to the beach of the social cohesion when the current General Manager, Juan Somavia from Chile, presented the concept of decent work.

The decent work concept can be defined as a productive work that is provided with a fair remuneration, with safety conditions at the place of work and social protection for the families, with better perspectives for personal development and social integration, so that everybody can show his worries freely and the workers can organize themselves and have a decisional power on what affect their lives, as well as the equal opportunities for women and men.

In the decent work there are 4 strategic targets of the ILO that are strongly intertwined and that are consolidated among themselves and here they are:
To create more job opportunities for women and men, guaranteeing they will work with a fair access and dignity, to enhance the universal respect of the principles and fundamental labour rights, to expand social protection and to ease social dialogue and tripartism.

The decent work and the ILO strategic targets are the basis of the Welfare state and of social cohesion since they offer personal dignity, stability to the families and hearths and peace to the community, and they inspire trust in the governments and the firms, at the time, encourage the general credibility of the institutions which rule our societies. Employment is the principal way to get out of poverty and achieving a social integration. Without rights, people will not be provided with sufficient means to escape poverty and to integrate socially. Social protection guarantees revenue and protects health.

From the ILO point of view, the devices of social protection, for example, as the unemployment and sanitary services, day care services and revenue protection mechanisms of the elders and disabled, fulfill a role of extraordinary importance, since they protect the populations of the economic stir and reinforce social cohesion.

The participation of the organizations of employers and workers in the formulation of the governmental policies, through the social dialogue, reinforces the Welfare state and social cohesion.

Nevertheless, in the situation we face especially after the crisis, the essential points of the Welfare state and of social cohesion are not only in the countries but also in the world frame, where the balance between the economic and social sides of the globalization has turned into other pivotal principles of social cohesion and of Welfare state. The Declaration on Social Justice and Equitable Globalization approved by the ILO in 2008, recognizes the benefits of globalization but also underlines that new efforts have to be made for the implementation of policies which share the same perspective of the decent work, as a means to reach social cohesion.

The crisis we are going through has made clear that is not only necessary to restore the growth but also to establish the foundations of a just and sustainable economy. This crisis has also made clear the need to place employment and the decent work at the core of the economic and social strategies and has highlighted the importance of the ILO role to achieve it.

The Global Jobs Pact is an instrument created to give an answer to the world crisis, to promote the social dimension of globalization and so that the developed countries and the developing are employed together to guarantee a growth towards the employment generation and towards the promotion of social cohesion. In the ILO General Manager’s words, “the current crisis has allowed seeing an important point: they all are provided with a minimal base of social safety benefits”. For this reason, the ILO, conscious that it is now more urgent than ever, is working to reinforce social cohesion, through the promotion of a social protection plan on a global scale.

The social protection plan consists, on one hand, of a geographical and financial access to public fundamental services as water, health and education and, on the other one, of a basic set of fundamental social transferences to assure a minimum income and access to the fundamental services as children in charge services and sanitary attention.

The social protection redeems an important role in times of crisis, including the present one, on having acted as “irreplaceable stabilizer at economic, social and political level” offering a replacement of income and helps to stabilize the demand without affecting negatively the economic growth.

Along with these two instruments, the ILO contributed in favour of social cohesion when it takes part in the G-20 Summits. In the G-20 Summits (Pittsburgh, Washington, Toronto or Seoul) a big international support has been given to the Global Jobs Pact as an axis of the economic recovery and as a foundation
step for social cohesion. In the Final Declaration of the Seoul Summit, G-20 leaders expressed their
determination to put the full and productive employment and the decent work at the heart of recovery, to
provide social protection and decent work and to assure an accelerated growth in low income countries.
CRISIS, MIGRATION AND INTEGRATION

Jean-Pierre Garson, OECD

Immigration contributes to increase the population in the OECD countries

Immigration has strongly increased in the OECD countries and more particularly in the OECD European countries during the last two decades. The immigrated workers contributed mostly to the growth of the whole population and the employment. For instance, within the European Union limited to 15 members, the total amount of jobs increased up to 14.5 million for seven years before 2008, 58 % of which are due to the increase of immigrated employment (8.4 millions) against respectively 32 % in the United States (5 million of immigrated workers) and 19 % in Australia (590 000). The new interest for working migrations since the mid-nineties however did not concern all the OECD countries with the same importance. In some of them family migrations (accompanying families and family grouping) have marked the immigration waves on the whole.

These family migrations, as well as the humanitarian ones, represent the main element of the non discretionary waves, to which we shall add the working migrations due to free circulation and settlement in the free circulation areas, as in the case of the Community area(safe for certain countries members until May 2011, or January 2014). Therefore, an important part of current migratory waves, and of those to come are included into this context of migrations non discretionary migrations, for jobs which concern new immigrated workers coming from countries which do not belong to the free circulation areas.

The consequences of the crisis are clearer and clearer

If the decrease of the employers’ demands didn’t cause at once a fall of the immigrating fluxes at the end of 2008, the impact of the crisis was felt in 2009, especially in those countries where the working migration is directly dependent on the employers’ demand. The amount of the employment demands abroad shows well this phenomenon. In the United States, the demands of workers temporary validated as part of program H - 1B have dramatically diminished, from 729 000 in 2007 to 694 000 in 2008, then to 479 000 in 2009. Validations in the program H - 2B also diminished strikingly, from 254 000 in the financial year 2008 to 154 000 in 2009. In Australia, the level of demands of temporary skilled workers by the employers in 2009 was not more than of 60 % of that of 2008.

In Finland, the demand fell down to 43 %. The first countries touched by the crisis (notably Spain and Ireland) recorded some further strong decrease of the migration led by the employers’ demand. In Spain, the usual working migration collapsed: therefore from 200 000 demands in 2007 it reduced to 137 000 in 2008 and less than16 000 in 2009. In this country, the employment program of seasonal workers recorded an even more spectacular decrease: the demands, which were up to 41 300 in 2008, diminished to barely 3 600 in 2009. In Ireland, the number of new work permits issued to people coming from a non EEE country diminished from 10 200 to 2007 to 3 900 in 2009.
The different categories of immigrants don’t perceive the effects of crisis in the same way and the workers of certain sectors are touched in a disproportionate way

The crisis occurred when the rebound of interest for working migrations has been more important in certain OCDE countries. It concerned the newly arrived immigrants mostly. Actually, and for the time being, the crisis concerned a bigger number of immigrants in the countries which accepted more important fluxes of immigrated workers during the last five years (United Kingdom, Spain and Ireland). Among these three countries, Spain is the one who received the biggest number of new immigrants from Morocco, Latin America and Romania.

The different categories of immigrants cannot feel the effects of crisis of the same way. Several reasons can explain this phenomenon, among which a medium length of stay in the country, the job concentration in certain areas of activity, the differences concerning how important and selected the migrations back to their country can be, as well as the immigration socio-demographic features. Several elements can explain the deepest vulnerability of the immigrants compared with the natives in a context of economic crisis: i) they are often linked to areas which are more vulnerable to economic variations; ii) their employment contracts are, in general, more precarious and they often occupy more temporary jobs which will be the first to be abolished in case of deterioration of the financial context; iii) on average, an immigrant has the same position for a shorter period than a native; and finally, iv) they can be the object of selected redundancies.

In Spain, the total amount of working migrants fell down to 8.5% between 2008 and 2009. Between the first three quarters of 2008 and 2009, the unemployment rate of immigrants increases remarkably in all the OECD countries. It increased of 11% in Spain and about 8% in Ireland and in Iceland. During the last 25 years of 2009, the unemployment rate of the immigrated populations was 28.3% in Spain (versus 16.7% for the natives), and in more than 15% in Belgium, in Ireland, Finland, there France and Sweden. As for Austria, Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, Norway and Sweden, the percentage was at least the double of the natives’. During the last 25 years of 2009, the rate of the employed immigrants was 7 points less compared to the natives in the following countries: Austria, Belgium, Germany, Denmark, France, Hungary, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden.

It did not exceed 58% in Belgium and 53% in France and in Spain. The slowing down of economic activity touches the workers in a disproportional way in certain fields. For instance, construction jobs are particularly vulnerable in countries as Ireland and Spain which knew an explosion of residential buildings. In the United Kingdom, the area of financial services and firm services knew the strongest wave of job abolitions in 2008 (loss of 220 000 jobs), whilst in France, the most affected areas at the moment are the food processing industry and the manufacturing industries, particularly the car industry. The immigrants are concentrated in several fields vulnerable to the economic situation. In Greece and there again in Spain, for instance, the three areas which know the most important employment variations the immigrants concern constructions, wholesale trade, hotel business and restaurants. In areas as security, the industrial cleaning or private service, on the contrary, employment is doing better during the recession.

The economic crisis has already caused important changes in migratory policies concerning the employment. Certain countries took measures to reduce fluxes of entries on their territory but others reacted less fast to the economic shock caused by crisis owing to their management system of migrations and their legislative frame which doesn’t allow short term adaptations. Countries as Italy or Spain lowered the ceilings of temporary workers’ contingents; others who had established the lists of jobs in tension reduced the flux and reinforced the job market tests (France). It is very much likely that some temporary licenses will not be renewed. They already determine a tendency to be restricted to certain categories of flux which do not depend directly on the financial setting, as family grouping or applications for asylum.
The economic crisis led several countries to pan volunteer come back to their own countries for unemployed immigrants

The economic crisis led several countries to pan volunteer come back to their own countries for unemployed immigrants. In 2008, Spain created a program, mainly due to the increase of the unemployment rate of the immigrants conditioned by the crisis; candidates must be unemployed and meet the criteria to receive the allowance and coming from a country which did not sign the bilateral convention on national health and pensions with Spain (most of the Latin American countries where the fluxes come from towards Spain have subscribed these conventions). They are paid 40% of a forfeit sum in Spain when the demand is accepted and 60% in their own country of origin. The second payment is paid off when the candidates come personally to the Spanish diplomatic or consular representatives of their country of origin in 30 days since the first payment. The beneficiaries are subjected to a ban to enter the Spanish territory for 3 years, after which they are on the top of the list further to come back.

The Rumanian government organized job fairs in Italy and in Spain to encourage the Romanian emigrants to come back in their country. In 2009, an agreement was signed with Spain to allow job agencies of the public service to show jobs ads in Romania.

The crisis has slowed down a positive tendency towards working migrations, but when the economy will start back again, labor will be demanded again

The crisis has slowed down a positive tendency towards working migrations, but when the economy will start back again, labor will be demanded again and somehow in a stronger way as the working population due to the demographic aging will decrease.

The migratory fluxes will have to be adapted to the job market demands; the OCDE countries are confronted to the challenge of demographic ageing and especially concerning its impact on the population which has a suitable age to age to work, with situations more or less conditioned according to the countries. Moreover, the labor force available is too unequal according to the countries. The economic crisis caused an adjustment in the migratory working flux decrease, which was very quick and strong, especially in countries which had received several workers immigrated during the last decade. However, in several countries the amount of immigrants in the fields of healthcare and household services, as well as in the hotel business and restaurants increases. There are therefore short-term needs and structural needs in jobs, on which some of it still depends on the contribution of the new immigrated workers and also on the mobilization of the immigrated labor force already there on the territory of the OCDE countries, and which is unemployed.

For the OCDE countries, from 2005 to 2015 there will be a period of transition concerning the baby boom demographic impact of the on the population in age to work and the working population. People born after 1945 are now about sixty, and will retire soon if they have not already done it before their sixtieth birthday. These cohorts of baby-boomers are emotionally more important than those who preceded them. Therefore, in 2005, young people about to enter the threshold of working life (20-24 years old) of the OCDE countries, on average, were about 32% more than the retired men to be (60-64 years), a situation that will distinctly differ in 2015 when this proportion will not be more than 2%. Before 2020, they will rely even about 9% at least. From 2015, in almost all the OCDE countries, they will be more than the young people waiting for their first job. Concerning this issue, the country where the phenomenon of aging people who are still working is more evident in Germany and Japan, the South European countries but Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic as well.
A few measures have been adopted mainly to improve the economic and social integration of the immigrants.

The immigrants are more often discriminated and are the first ones to be made redundant; they are longer unemployed, even if the economy is catching up.

Selective recruitments are likely to be more common during a recession as the protection policy of non immigrant workers is more and more important and market tests are reinforced. Several studies on many OCDE countries show that recruitment discrimination, based on racial and ethical criteria does exist (see The immigrants and employment.Vol.2,Integration on the job market in Belgium, France, Holland and Portugal,OCDE,2008), yet the other hand concerning selective redundancies there are just a few.

A few measures have been adopted mainly to improve the social integration.

However, if we refer to the past periods of recession, we’ll notice that the immigrants who arrive at that time find it difficult to promote their human resources and taking advantage of their work experience. The past crisis and the actual crisis show that measures on a large scale must be set up to reinforce the policies of conflict against discriminations and those aiming at a better integration of the immigrants in job market and in society. A few measures have been adopted mainly to improve the economic and social integration of the immigrants.

The Spanish Parliament examined a new plan for a related law in June 2009. The plan gives foreigners, notably those who are not allowed to be resident, the same rights of gathering, demonstration, association, to create unions and promote strikes as the regular inhabitants. Besides, the right to a free justice must be extended to all the foreigners according to the Spanish example. The right to work was given to the parents who come to Spain due to family grouping: the spouse and the 16 years old children will have the right to work from the same deliverance date of their residence license. The government also negotiated the right to vote in the municipal elections for the foreign citizens who have been living in Spain for five years and come from countries with which principle of reciprocity been subscribed.

The integration of unemployed immigrants as well as of their children is urgent, as this integration must lead the migratory policies, with the stress on the accomplishment and the extension of the integration policies of the immigrants and their children on the job market. This policies will have to aim at a better promotion of these human resources, to the recognition of their experience and certificates, measures of strengthening their skills for some of them and their children, and also language classes adapted to their needs organized as many as possible at work, so that the immigrants can acquire a good command of the language of the new country.

Finally, aid policies for a volunteer come back to his own country should put more emphasis on deleting obstacles to go back to his own country rather than to financial aid strictly speaking, in collaboration with the countries of origin.

A specific attention should deserve the issue of immigrants living an irregular situation.

A particular attention should be granted to the issue of the immigrants living an irregular situation, and particularly the conflict against the illegal work of immigrants, because the immigrants who have temporary lost their job risk to be against the law. The immigrants in an irregular situation arrive in the countries of destination illegally at the green or coastal borders, by means of false papers, or they arrive legally but extend then their stay without approval. Available data point out that an unduly extended stay is the most usual practice and how, in certain countries, many underground workers are declared by their employers even if they are in an irregular situation. The development of irregular immigration seems to be
linked to the fact the entrance to the country to not very qualified jobs is limited to a small number of immigrants, as well as a high demand of labor force to get these jobs.

It also seems that the direct employment on informal job market is linked to the lack of official ways of recruitment. But all the irregular immigrants’ jobs can be included into this context. Some people relied on networks of dealers, where middlemen exploit the immigrants and the employers are without scruples. These last ones however have not at all a preference for irregular immigrants. The expenses linked to the employment play a big role in their decisions and, with appropriate measures of instigation and sanction, some of them, or even a big amount of them, can be anticipated and re-aimed to the official circuit.

The OCDE countries have to conceive and put into practice immigration policies which have to take into account the labor needs in the long run, concerning every skill level and targeted on the demand.

In medium and more long-term, the OCDE countries have to set up immigration policies taking into account the needs of labor force in the long run, concerning every skill level and targeted on the demand. It is important to envisage at the same time adequate dispositions to encourage employers and immigrated workers to respect rules, and measures in order to protect the immigrants as the national workers. It is necessary to start employing official recruitment devices to get low qualified jobs if we want legal practices to have a chance to take the place of informal recruitment methods on mutual agreement nowadays used by the employers who employ irregular immigrated workers. The future of working immigrations has to go through cooperation with the main actors, notably employers and social partners, the political decision-makers of the countries of reception and the countries of origin.

We have to define the needs better, to promote better the human resources of the already installed immigrants, to prepare better the candidates to the immigration according to the law, and, in case of necessity, to support their professional training in the countries of origin, before their arrival in the countries of reception and to adapt better the labor force to the demand (by the bias of skills and trainings). It is a question here to find the combination to increase the productiveness of the immigrated workers, taking into account their acquired training or still to be acquired as part of an international collaboration on working immigrations, to help the immigrants as countries of reception and as the countries of origin.

The future is also represented by the immigrants’ children, and therefore the policies of family immigrations are to give them the biggest chances of an accomplished integration on the job market and in society.
THE FUTURE OF COHESION

H. E. Mrs Cristina Narbona Ruiz, Spanish Ambassador before OECD

The future of cohesion, and for this, where social cohesion should be tackled, is based on values, a cohesion based on the fact that all citizens of the world. It does not matter where they are born. They have the same rights to a worthy life, whether they are born today or tomorrow, and this is a vision which privileges the citizens’ rights.

The OECD is committed in very different fields from political to public ones, has more than 250 committees and groups of work, a part of the organization deals, with immigration producing an economic and also social analysis.

By intervention of the OECD expert, it has been seen clearly how the OECD considers that the Spanish experience of an integration strategy of immigration proved to be the best of all in the countries of the OECD, and how the analysis points out, that fact of favouring the integration of the immigrants brings advantages for the citizens of the country that receives the immigration, in demographic terms, since it opens up a compensation scheme to the aging developed countries, a dynamics Spain is living too, but at the same time it is necessary to see from positive side and we should think about the economic recovery.

The OECD arose in a world that was very different from the current one, where rich countries might be related between themselves without worrying what was happening out of their borders. That today there are emergent countries that are growing at fast pace and made in a way that the wealth generated in countries which have been rich until now supposes a more and more reduced percentage of wealth on a global scale, and that explains to have gone from a G7 or G8 to a G20 where are the emergent countries, the countries which developing right now, as they have to be a part of the dialogue in the economic current situation. The current crisis makes clear the extraordinary increasing process of inequalities on an international scale, within the countries and in the international context.

The GDP can increase in a country as China where the human rights are not respected, the GDP can increase in one country that is destroying its forests and with it reducing the capacity of response to the climate change, see Brazil, the GDP can increase in a country that it is arming itself up to the teeth to take part in warlike conflicts.

We have to reconsider the economic paradigm and within the context there are international organizations which trust too much radicalism. When not long ago the International Monetary Fund, is working on the establishment of a global tax on financial transactions. This is an idea that it arose a few years ago and the most radicals were defending it, ATTAC, the ones against the system. The system has burst and we are enduring the effects of the explosion of capitalism in the whole world.

Therefore the situation of the world economy in these moments needs deep changes if we do not want to go to the following crisis, because we have wasted the equivalent of the GDP of the whole planet in one year. The OECD says that we need to work towards a global economy that has to be stronger, fairer and cleaner, a stronger economy that could face global challenges, a fairer economy where the citizens rights are guaranteed better, where the citizens could get better access to health services, to better educational
services, to better social protection services, based on a cohesion that has to do with the defense of how every citizen gain access to a worthier life, and a cleaner economy.

When we speak about social cohesion there is a problem of redistribution that only can be sorted out in a correct way, if the leading rules are going to be established at a national level, but also at an international level, because we face global challenges and we need global rules, we need financial rules which suit better the activity of the financial system of what we have done till now. We are being given right now is an opportunity of building a world based more on justice, and on more sensible and responsible values.

That this expression has lost value by means of being used without a real will to give content to this expression of the sustainable development, of what we have to speak about is responsible development, fair development, lasting development in which we have believed and has to be replaced with an economic model where beyond the GDP we build up elements of welfare based on redistribution. A different view from how from a local level we construct efficient architectures of administration at a municipal level in the regional, national and international context.

If we do not make the most of this opportunity certainly those tendencies will be able to triumph and reduce social cohesion, and that only leads to the most serious conflicts that can be warlike, which actually are taking place somewhere in the planet to face which we have enough intelligence, enough scientific and technological knowledge and, therefore, we should have enough responsibility to avoid that this crisis we are going through become previous phase of the following one which is much worse and stress even more on inequalities, deterioration of the planet and the absence of horizon. Let us remember that the markets have name and surname and that we know who they are, but the fact is that we have allowed them to get where they have.

Miguel Ángel Aguilar, journalist, President of European Journalist’s Association

In times of change, as journalist I should raise a preliminary question about the future of the press, a quite distressing subject for the majority of journalists. It is already practically impossible to announce a piece of news to anybody as he has already got it in the mobile. The journalists, the press, the traditional mass media behaved as plants to purify water, they face a fragmentary, invasive, completely disconcerted press since there is no system of integration, no system to make this current absolute avalanche more understandable.

I believe that is why journalism will always be or if it fits it is now more necessary. And, consequently, calmness and doing things well. And what it does not make great sense is that journalists behave thinking for themselves. What I want to say is that progress, changes, turn out to be damaged ones, any progress unveils who is harmed. Welfare State did not grow in an empty laboratory but as a compensation always: first at Bismark’s Prussian system, and later to compensate the combatants at II World War.

Later, this “social protection”, called Welfare State, was also encouraged by its rival Marxism. As Marxists were receiving support from people, which could get rid of the constituted society, and of course this was a threat, it was necessary to do something looking forwards compete with these Marxists. And, that is what we know as democratic societies: which were founded in Europe between social democracy and the social doctrine of the Church, and that together are making several steps forward.

Capitalism is the starting point and as Max Weber already taught us, it sparked off from Calvinism. According to this type of Protestantism, prosperity in the earthly life should be understood as a
predestination sign, it foretold salvation in the afterlife. One’s material wealth indicates closeness to God’s favor. But there are other countries such as Spain, where Trento’s Catholicism is deeply rooted, since the Council of Trento was passed in 1563. Material success and wealth are still regarded with deep suspicion. Following the parable of Lazarus and the rich man, it turns out that one’s destiny in the afterlife is the reversal of one’s earthly life. According to Trento, only inherited wealth, that Providence hands upon birth, is compatible with salvation. From there onwards, the consequences that this has in the field of cohesion for Calvinists and Catholics are significantly different.

Jordi Sevilla, Former Ministry of Public Administration Policies at Spanish Government

The principal question today is to know what is going to belong to politics and to politicians in a world where we all are conscious of the global dimension of issues and nevertheless we do not know anything better than going to see the mayor of an autonomous region or the national Government. One of the essential questions is a contradiction between the frame of issues we have to solve the poor institutional structure that politics allows us nowadays to sort things out. For example, between G20 and the FMI. Or the EU, which undergoes a process of re-nationalization.

That’s to say, which are the rules of the game we are going to fund our coexistence? The big advantage of democracy is that it allows living and working along with different people who don’t share necessarily the same view, the big advantage of a cohesion strategy is that it won’t erase differences but will work against inequalities. There is room for diversity, and that doesn’t mean to be unequal. The idea of cohesion has several meanings; in its roots, the idea of cohesion presents two fundamental principles: the first one, the rule of the game is the same for everybody. The second one, let’s involve ourselves into helping who needs it. This has been the basis of the Welfare state, due to belief, justice or because it’s good to do it. Its hypothesis suggests that the is that the arguments in favour of a cohesion strategy are diminishing due to self-defence or self interest, to egoistical criteria.

I stand for a compatible cohesion with freedom in the sense of developing an individual project of life that everyone has to invest on. Nevertheless there are ideological and practical resistances (battle for taxes against fiscal fraud of the richest layers of the society) to the concept of cohesion. It is deteriorating even if it has been accepted by the left wing one of the essential elements of social cohesion strategy as its financing. The fact of not fighting the fraud in social strategy delegitimizes the whole process. The right wing might use this as alibi to stop paying taxes and dismantling the Welfare state.

The last issue is the financing of pensions. Why do not we break this mental prison that forces us to think that if there are fewer pensioners and fewer working people we touch less? Here a proposition according to which part of the income which finance these pensions has to be related to the level of wealth of the country through a shared social contribution. It says: "As a society, we will grow older but also richer". This view sees the speech of the redistribution as lost. In a richer society young people are scared because they are going to live worse according to the schemes which have failed and mechanisms of social redistribution, the instruments of the social cohesion strategy, even speech and defense of ideas.

Enrique Cascallana Gallastegui, Mayor of Alcorcón, President of Fundación Instituto de Cultura del Sur

The debate on social cohesion is what we at the Fundación Instituto de Cultura del Sur call "good anti crisis measures adopted in the cities in the south of Madrid".
The cities in the south of Madrid that are part of Fundación Instituto de Cultura del Sur are used to dealing with crises of all kinds. They have dealt with migration from the interior of Spain that led to the emergence of so-called "dormitory towns". Although initially they lacked infrastructures and services of any kind, today we can claim, thanks to everyone’s efforts, that they are now cities where people can live together and enjoy a high quality of life.

It seems that the welfare state emerged in competition with Marxism, and it is now competing to some extent with deregulation, not just of the financial system but also of key elements such as collective bargaining. When the crisis broke out, the City of Alcorcón decided to focus investment on resolving municipal issues that were considered top priority, such as housing policy for young people.

In spite of the undeniable housing boom, there was no access to public housing. There were 20,000 young people in our city who could not afford — and many still can’t — something as basic as a home where they could live on their own.

We invest from the standpoint of public spending and put in place social protection policies. We have established immigrant housing that affords equal access rights and costs the same for all immigrants whether they come from Morocco and Ecuador or from Extremadura and Castilla La Mancha. We have invested public money for extending adult education programmes and are creating more advanced projects. We perceive cultural diversity as a positive asset for enhancing understanding and ensuring that levels of security and cohesion in the city are within acceptable levels in every respect.

Cities form a vital network for the future, so they deserve more political attention, more European oversight and more international policies. Cities play a key role in imparting education for getting us out of the crisis, but also for getting involved in ending the crisis. The cities south of Madrid that are part of Fundación Instituto de Cultura del Sur have been able in recent years to achieve a certain level of welfare. And without town governments this economic crisis would have had much more serious consequences than those it is suffering now, because town halls offer a major social safety net. Cities suffered more during the 1993-1994 crisis not because of the unemployment figures but because there were fewer social benefits than there are today. Local governments and cities have a very positive role to play: advocating policy, public intervention, as the only tool available.

The welfare state, politics, trade union organizations and an entire model of government seems to be under attack. This raises the need to develop new models of democratic organisation or seek the way forward towards a new model of economic development which is sustainable from every perspective. So, it is obvious that it will become increasingly important to bolster the role of cities.