
article

Superdiversity, multiculturalism and local policies: a study on European cities

Maurizio Ambrosini, University of Milan, maurizio.ambrosini@unimi.it

Building on a comparative study of the urban 'adaptations' of multiculturalism in eight European cities, this paper addresses four questions: 1) the changing relations between national and local immigrant policies; 2) the ways in which such policies are locally reshaped; 3) the involvement of civil society in the urban governance of immigration; 4) the advent, in some cases, of local policies of immigrant exclusion. Overall, local policies seem to have been less affected by the multiculturalist backlash than a commonsense understanding would entail; but they are in search of a new language. Diversity could be an answer to this issue.

keywords: multiculturalism • diversity • local policies • immigration policies

Introduction

This article, building on a comparative study of immigration policies at the urban level in Europe, discusses the present state of multiculturalist approaches and their adaptations at the local level after the 'multiculturalism backlash' (Vertovec and Wessendorf, 2009) in most political discourse. The relations between national frameworks and urban policies, the changing labels and the forms of continuity of local immigration policies, the involvement of civil society actors, the appearance of local policies of exclusion, will be the issues analysed in the paper. As I will suggest in the conclusion, diversity could be the new framework within which multiculturalist stances can be reshaped.

Beyond multiculturalism?¹

In recent years, immigration policies in most European countries have been intended to reaffirm both the control of external borders and the values of identity and national belonging, and particularly so since 2001 (Balibar, 2012). Especially in the case of non-skilled third country nationals, this approach can be defined as neo-assimilationist. Learning the local language, displaying political loyalty, and adapting to national values of some kind are generally required (Antonsich, 2016). In an increasing number of cases, this includes language tests and the formal signing of special 'integration agreements' according to a demand for 'civic integration' (Joppke, 2007; Goodman, 2010).

This change in immigration policies goes hand in hand with growing disaffection with multiculturalism, at least as a discourse, in the European political debate (Prins

and Slijper, 2002; Grillo, 2005). Several national leaders, including Blair, Cameron, Merkel and Sarkozy, have openly criticised the political idea of multiculturalism (Collett, 2011). This term can nevertheless be understood in different ways. It can be defined, following Modood, as ‘the recognition of group difference within the public sphere of laws, democratic discourses and the terms of a shared citizenship and national identity’ (2007, 2). But it can also be assumed, in practice, as an umbrella term covering many types of policies concerning ethnic and cultural diversities, migrants’ associations, promotion of ethnic minorities. In this framework, as Faist (2009) in particular has noted, diversity now appears more accepted in the political discourse than multiculturalism: it shifts the attention from the collective (ethnic group) to individuals; it creates links with other types of diversities; and it seems more acceptable from a neoliberal point of view, also because it may be seen as a resource for organisations, marketing and service delivery (‘diversity management’).

At a practical level, aspects such as support to immigrants’ and minorities’ associations, public recognition of religious pluralism connected with immigrant populations, organisation of festivals that celebrate cultural diversity in urban life, can be assumed as practical expressions of multiculturalist policies.

Another introductory remark regards the relationship between multiculturalism and local policies. Contrary to political discourses that link migrants’ integration with a ‘national culture’ always difficult to define, much research has shown that in all European countries immigrant integration primarily occurs at the local level (Penninx and Martiniello, 2007), as does the recognition and management of cultural diversity. Urban policies have thus assumed growing importance for the social inclusion of immigrants and their families. It is at the local level, and most notably in metropolitan areas, that what Vertovec (2007) has termed ‘superdiversity’ becomes a crucial challenge. In big cities, cultural and religious diversity must be negotiated and managed vis-a-vis the assimilative pressures and expectations of receiving societies (Foner, 2007). While in the last decades of the twentieth century, multiculturalism was the prevailing framework within which these issues were treated, today they are inserted in a predominant scenario of ‘multiculturalism backlash’ (Grillo, 2005; Vertovec and Wessendorf, 2009). For this reason, local policies of immigration are forced to define new frames and languages.

Against this background, comparing immigrant policies at city level acquires growing salience. Accordingly, this article revisits the findings of a comparative case study on immigrant and ethnic diversity policies in eight European cities (Brussels, Frankfurt, Marseille, Madrid, Manchester, Florence, Genoa and Verona) (Ambrosini, 2012). For the purposes of this article, among the Italian cities only Verona will be considered. Other elements useful for the present analysis will be taken from other studies on local immigration policies in Italy (Ambrosini, 2013a; Ambrosini, 2015). Building on these materials, I shall address some questions of broader theoretical interest: 1) What is the relationship between local policies and national policies and discourses on ethnic, cultural and religious diversity? In other words, what is the political space of local policies, and their capacity to mediate between national guidelines and the actual needs of people living in certain places? 2) How do local policies manage the superdiversity of urban populations in practice, beyond the present disaffection with the multiculturalist approach? 3) What are the meanings and the effects of the increasing involvement of civil society organisations in the urban governance of superdiversity? 4) Are local policies more open to diversity than national

policies, or in some cases do they seek to make the restrictions on immigrants and ethnic minorities more stringent?

The contention of this paper is that while declared policies and lexicons have undergone major changes, the assimilationist convergence trend has involved local policies to varying extents, but overall it has been more rhetorical than effective: I concur on this point with Vertovec and Wessendorf (2009). Even if it is no longer framed as ‘multiculturalist’, the public recognition of cultural differences remains in many respects a crucial element of the local governance of the superdiversity of urban communities. Nevertheless, in some cases local policies have introduced new forms of exclusion, reinforcing the boundaries between native communities and people with diverse cultural backgrounds.

The relationship between national and local diversity policies: aims and methods of the study.

On both sides of the Atlantic, immigration issues are now a priority on the political agendas of governments and political parties. In several European countries, new political actors have gained ground by demanding more restrictions on new arrivals, less tolerance for cultural and religious diversity, tougher measures against irregular immigration, and fewer social benefits for newcomers. Often, their success, and the consequent fear of losing political consensus, have produced a hardening of the positions of more moderate and institutionalised political forces (Albertazzi and McDonnell, 2008; Cento Bull, 2010; Ruzza and Fella, 2009). Overall, in recent years the mainstream response to greater human mobility has moved towards the reaffirmation of borders and national sovereignty (Wihtol de Wenden, 2009). Moreover, what can be termed ‘internal borders’ are in some cases affected by a tendency towards the ‘re-ethnicization of citizenship’ (Bauböck et al, 2006). Furthermore, a feature of European policies on immigration has been identified in a growing shift towards the demand for ‘civic requirements’ to be placed on immigrants (Goodman, 2010). Even if national differences are still visible (Mouritsen, 2012), the concept of ‘civic integration’ (Joppke, 2007) tends to blur the distinctions between the conventional ‘national models’ of immigrants’ inclusion. Civic integration, with the obligation to sign ‘integration agreements’ has been seen by this author as a key element of a ‘coercive turn’ in which liberal values are pursued with illiberal means. Furthermore, Joppke observes also a social divide in the demand for civic integration into national cultures: ‘while the state elites devising such policies are increasingly part of cross-border spanning professional networks and affiliations..., the opposite thrust of “civic integration” policies is to lock the low-skilled immigrant more firmly into established state borders’ (2007, 18).

For many reasons – ranging among the demands of labour markets, humanitarian concerns, the interests of tourism, international trade, students’ recruitment in a global education market, and the action of ethnic networks – the policy of closure is, however, often contradicted by the facts (Castles, 2004; Ambrosini, 2013b). Nor is it easy to define precisely who the outsiders and the insiders are. Since the populations of metropolitan areas are becoming increasingly diverse and mixed, a civic stratification can be identified among foreign residents in terms of legal status and recognised rights (Morris, 2002; Kraler and Bonizzoni, 2010).

At the institutional level, the increasing complexity of immigration's governance is characterised by two concurrent developments. On the one hand, the European Community has made the unprecedented move of abolishing internal borders, allowing the free movement of citizens and workers, and recognising various rights of citizenship, including political rights, for expatriate Europeans. This has given rise to what has been called 'nested citizenship' (Kivisto and Faist, 2007). On the other hand, local policies have acquired growing salience, as the arena in which public institutions meet 'diverse' people with their needs and aspirations. Large urban areas provide a laboratory for studying the key problems and possibilities stemming from so-called 'superdiversity' (Vertovec, 2007): contradictions and openings, unprecedented mixes and identity-related claims, and conflicts. Nowadays, possibly even more than in the past, metropolitan areas are perceived as emblematic of the tensions and conflicts surrounding the long-term settlement of immigrant minorities. They are settings where, in practical terms, adaptation, resistance and innovation take place on a daily basis. The multi-level governance of intractable policy issues (Schön and Rein, 1994), such as migrant integration, has become a widespread feature of the European political landscape (Scholten, 2012; Geddes, 2014).

This trend implies a divergence between the so-called 'national models' of integration (for example, assimilation in France versus multiculturalism in UK), and the actual policies (Bertossi, 2011), especially at local level. This was already noted some years ago in the case of France. Martiniello (1997), among others, highlighted the existence of a wide gap between the official positions taken at the national level, moulded by French Jacobinism and the rhetoric of secularism and local practices, where public authorities implement segments of multiculturalist policies and do not hesitate to negotiate with representatives of ethnic and religious communities on, for example, places of worship. Comparatively speaking, Alexander (2003), in a study of 25 European urban contexts, has built on the idea of 'national models' of reference, while highlighting that local policies often deviate from it – among other things, because they must cope at the peripheral level with the failures of national policies.

Against this background, one may wonder if similar divergences still occur today, amid increasing resistance to ethnic mixing and open mistrust of multiculturalist stances.

The research on which this article draws was conducted between 2010 and 2011. It adopted the case study method to analyse immigrant policy provision in eight European cities, three of which were Italian: respectively, Brussels, Frankfurt, Madrid, Manchester and Marseille; Genoa, Florence and Verona (Ambrosini, 2012). The selection included two capitals and other medium-large cities. While the case of Madrid resembles the Italian ones in many ways, the other cities have more mature and stratified immigration settlements. The rationale behind the selection of these cities was that each of them was a promising observatory on broader national models of ethnocultural diversity management – at least as ideal-typical (if still influential) frames: Manchester for the British multicultural model; Frankfurt for the German post-guestworker model created by the immigration reform of 2000; Brussels for the mixed Belgian model, which mirrors both the country's bilingualism and the influence of political models of the neighbouring states; Marseille for the persisting French 'assimilative' model; Madrid for a new country of immigration where the concept of 'convivencia' ('living together') is salient in public discourse. Within the Italian context, here I will consider only the case of Verona, a dynamic medium-sized

city where the Northern League has ascended to power but the local economy has shown, at least until the 2008 recession and even afterwards, a substantial need for immigrant labour.

A first result of the study is that in practice the correspondence between each city and the respective national model is increasingly contested and less relevant. This is due, first, to the irremediable internal differentiation of each national model (and of course, to the gap between discursive representations and actual policies in each of them: Vertovec and Wessendorf, 2009; for Italy, Çetin, 2012); second, to the significant spaces of autonomy emerging at a local level in the field of integration and diversity policies. The latter issue, along with other cross-cutting commonalities, lies at the core of our comparative analysis.

For each city, an in-depth literature review was conducted on the main aspects of local integration policies regarding immigrants and ethnic minorities, tracing their evolution over time and examining the most significant initiatives in detail. The study followed a common pattern adapted to the context in question, and then expanded on the most relevant areas at every local level. In practical terms, the analysis was built on site visits, meetings and in-depth interviews with civil servants, managers of local services, academics and representatives of associations. This source was supported by the documentary analysis of internet sources, scientific literature and relevant statistics. Overall, about 60 in-depth interviews were conducted.

Convergences and divergences among national and local scale of diversity governance

In accordance with a large international literature, our empirical research confirms the existence of a wide range of approaches to the governance of diversity in multi-ethnic societies (see Alexander, 2003; Collett, 2011; Penninx et al, 2004). The current prevalence of a trend towards civic integration (Joppke, 2007) has not substantially challenged this variety – even more so if the governance of immigration is considered on a local scale (but see Gebhardt, 2016, on the influence of state-led civic integration programmes on city policies). How the national formulation of these approaches interacts with their local expression at urban level is a matter for empirical analysis. I now present the main results of our study on this issue.

Among the cities that we studied, the most conscious and explicit divergence between the two scales of governance was exhibited by Frankfurt. For several years, the local government has been at the forefront of finding new approaches to dealing with immigrant populations (De Luca and Trotto, 2012). At the national level, it was only with the reform of 2000 that Germany officially acknowledged that it had become a country of immigration, but the German approach remains quite restrictive, even ‘prohibitive’ in terms of citizenship strategy, according to Goodman (2010): high barriers prevent access to full membership by aliens. On the contrary, since the 1980s the city of Frankfurt has adopted a more open approach, taking charge of the issues of discrimination, recognition and appreciation of cultural diversity. Salient in this forerunner policy has been the creation of a special office, AMKA (Office for Multicultural Affairs), which has emerged as a reference model for other German towns, and also beyond Germany’s borders (Heckmann, 2010). The main weakness of this approach, however, regards the incongruity between voluntary innovations conceived at an urban level and institutional frameworks determined at higher levels,

which restrict the scope of local activities. Emblematic of this is the high rate of education failures among minority students – an issue on which local policies exert only a minor influence.

In other cities that we studied, political divergence between the national and the local level of immigration and diversity policies is less explicit and visible, but still significant. Marseille is a case in point. Here local policies do not openly distance themselves from the national rhetoric of secularism and avoidance of ethnic issues in the public arena. Even so, in ways that are little visible and typically unreported, local authorities deviate from the nationally-proclaimed directives. They tend to pragmatically recognise the distinctive social issues concerning relations with ethnic minorities; they seek to involve mediating figures from minority groups; and they engage in extensive negotiations with representatives of different versions of Islam on controversial matters such as the construction of a large mosque (De Luca, 2012; see also Borkert et al, 2007). The French national model of integration is then renegotiated at the peripheral level by emphasising local identity and practicing a kind of *de facto* multiculturalism.

A significantly *pragmatic*, though not *discursive*, divergence between the national and the local can also be documented in the case of Manchester. In this large and ‘superdiverse’ urban area, local authorities have apparently followed the national government in formally abandoning the multiculturalist language (Boccagni, 2012a). They prefer now to emphasise social and community cohesion (Kalra and Kapoor, 2009), and tend to reduce the visibility given to social policies aimed at immigrant populations. But in reality what actually occurs is largely a restatement of the multiculturalist policies of the past using other labels and a different conceptual framework. Following Levey (2009, 92), it is possible to define Manchester’s policies as a case of ‘multiculturalism without culturalism’. In Manchester as elsewhere in the UK, the policies for the integration of immigrants, refugees and ethnic minorities seem threatened more by budgetary cuts than by an actual decline of the multiculturalist approach.

In the case of Brussels (De Bernardis, 2012), the interaction between the national and local pressures underlying immigrant policies is made more complex by the unusual status of the Belgian capital: an officially bilingual metropolis, and an inherently internationalised one thanks to its role as the EU capital. Establishing a ‘national’ culture to be transmitted to new residents is therefore a particularly difficult task. Neo-assimilationist trends, however, are expressed through the emphasis on social cohesion and the obligation on new arrivals to learn one of the country’s official languages. Nevertheless, the boundaries between ‘immigrants’ and ‘expats’ are not always easy to draw, especially when immigrants are EU citizens themselves. This is further complicated by the different emphases proposed by the two native linguistic communities. In any case, the celebration of cultural diversity through events involving the city is a prominent feature of the local political supply. It furnishes a low-cost, non-confrontational and widely appreciated form of multiethnic coexistence.

The dialectic between national and local stances on immigrant integration is declined still differently – and in relatively less politicised terms – in the case of Madrid (Boccagni, 2012b). Here, interestingly, changes in the nation’s political majority have not significantly affected the mainstream approaches to immigrant integration. Initiatives have been undertaken by local political leaders in voluntary ways, within a framework where the distribution of tasks between the city and

regional governments is unclear. This entails a volatility of local policies. This problem is connected with Spain's recent entry into the category of receiving countries. Here diversity is recognised mainly under the label of 'intercultural' policies, and the active participation of immigrants is pursued through consultative bodies and through the professionalisation of immigrant leaders in service delivery. Moreover, in Madrid, more than in any other city that we analysed, the economic recession has weighed simultaneously on integration processes and policies, giving easy justifications for reductions of funds and political commitment.

Verona, as I will highlight in the sixth section, is a case where a national discourse hostile to immigrants and ethnic diversity has been echoed and reinforced by local policies overtly aimed at introducing more controls on immigrants and at excluding them from local welfare provisions. In Verona, not only multiculturalism, but also the recognition of the legitimacy of cultural differences has been questioned. In practice however, as I will show, the system of local services to immigrants has been only partially affected by the political change.

Overall, our comparative analysis of the national–local policy relationship gainsays the supposed 'death of multiculturalism', especially when policy implementation is considered. While the multicultural approach has been declared unsuccessful, and to some extent discredited, in the stances of national political leaders, it is still adopted in various ways in the local urban contexts that we studied (see Vertovec and Wessendorf, 2009). However, it tends to be resumed in a more modest guise. This typically entails recognition and appreciation of cultural diversity, support for immigrant associations, and promotion of interfaith dialogue, together with the rejection of any explicitly (and clumsily) multiculturalist ideological frame. Policies aimed at encouraging immigrant integration are re-proposed under less visible labels, including those of 'social cohesion' and 'diversity'.

Rhetoric and practices of local welfare provision to immigrants and ethnic minorities

The distance between political proposals and actual interventions is not a surprise. External constraints, conflicts and pressures from various interests and actors oblige decision makers to mediate and to reach compromises at various levels.

In the field of migration policies, however, the gap between declarations and accomplishments (Schön and Rein, 1994) seems especially pronounced (Campomori, 2007). In the past, this divergence exhibited more usual patterns: despite promises to combat discrimination and a commitment to the equal dignity of people and cultural identities, the actual accomplishments typically remained limited. The promises of egalitarian commitment were not nourished by adequate resources and coherent political choices.

Nowadays, the structuration of these policy divergences is made more complex by additional issues. As the mainstream political discourse has resumed its emphasis on assimilation, at least some symbolic aspects of local policies reflect these predominant feelings. Hence my contention of a prevailing continuity of contents of local policies for immigrants passes through an adaption of political framing of such policies. Notions such as *community cohesion* (Manchester), *convivencia* ('living together' – Madrid) or *quartiers sensibles* ('high need areas' – Marseille, Brussels) have much greater salience and discursive legitimation than the recognition of culture-based identities, affiliations

and stances. Following a 'de-ethnicised' approach, social policies tend to target the residents of the most deprived areas or client categories with remarkable need profiles (single mothers, those who are long-term unemployed, pupils with learning difficulties, and so on), with no distinctive attention to immigrants or ethnic minorities as a significant part of those categories. Judging from our comparative study, the Madrid experience is a good case in point (Boccagni, 2012b).

In regard to other aspects, the real policy provision in each of the cities that we studied has undergone various institutional adaptations, but it has maintained a basically multiculturalist subtext, broadly understood: features such as celebration of cultural diversity in urban life, public recognition of cultural and religious pluralism, and cooperation with immigrant associations and representatives, have kept their place in local policies. In all these respects, however, urban multiculturalism results in a more or less extensive spectrum of culturally-sensitive service provisions, rather than in any radical strategy in regard to group-differentiated social rights. In terms of ideal-typical differentiation, one may then distinguish among different emphases and methods of presentation of the solutions adopted: a more daring and voluntaristic approach in Frankfurt; an inclusive but variable approach in Madrid; more cautious and careful action to prevent ethnic conflicts in Marseille; a pragmatic withdrawal which opts for a low profile in Manchester; a re-coding in neo-assimilationist language of the investments in the integration of immigrants in Brussels; a low-profile visibility and adaptive continuity in Verona.

A selective use of public communication is also part of the gap between rhetoric and practice. All these local authorities are keen to emphasise the issues most likely to raise interest and gain consensus in the overall population, including natives. This typically results in the over-visibility of what can be termed 'aesthetics of diversity': 'ethnic' arts, music or food, which are presented as enriching the cultural endowment of the city. In the same sense, in some cases interreligious dialogue initiatives have been widely emphasised (for example, in Marseille), and religions tend to receive more public recognition than in the recent past. By contrast, more expensive interventions which may trigger perceptions of competition, allegations of welfare shopping, or conflicts between old and new residents tend to be toned down (see Zucchetti, 1999). If necessary, pro-immigrant interventions are justified on grounds of general interest which may meet a broader consensus. Measures against early school leaving, for instance, are more emphasised than support for students of immigrant origin; housing improvements in certain neighbourhoods are discursively more salient, and legitimate, than specific initiatives aimed at overcoming immigrant segregation. This communication option is not a new one; but it has been strengthened in the past decade (Zincone, 2009): at a time of a worsening political climate on immigration, in order to grant investments for the benefit of immigrants it has become even more necessary to present them as investments that meet general needs, and if possible as alternatives to the much-disliked multiculturalism. The concept of 'social cohesion' has become popular in political discourse at European level and in national and local policies (Grillo, 2005). However, our result suggests that it is often a broader umbrella under which to present measures that in fact benefit mainly ethnic minorities as provisions of general interest: from this point of view, many changes are more rhetorical than substantial; they regard more the political framing of policies than their actual contents.

A broader urban governance of immigrant diversity: the emerging role of civil society organisations

The relationship between national and local policies, and the capacity of local policies to address and govern ethnic diversity is increasingly connected also to the multifaceted contribution of civil society organisations to local welfare provisions that address the needs of immigrants and ethnic minorities. The civil society category includes a broad range of bodies, ranging among formal NGOs, religious institutions, trade unions, immigrant and ethnic organisations, anti-racist and radical social movements. Their role may be important at several levels: from political voice to service delivery, as well as in the protection and advocacy of migrant and minority rights (Ambrosini and van der Leun, 2015). Even if their activities often do not have to do with multiculturalist stances, their prevalent cultural and political claims in favour of immigrants' and asylum seekers' rights, their protests against discrimination and exclusion, their practical support to undocumented people or ones with an uncertain legal status, pave the way to recognition of migrants' diversities in urban life.

Hence, it is true that neoliberal policies foster the outsourcing of social services to NGOs and other private providers. It is also true that restrictive policies often need to be softened by practical arrangements so as to prevent major human rights violations; and NGOs can fill this space (Castañeda, 2007). But civil society actors, especially when they form advocacy coalitions on behalf of migrants, are also political actors which participate in the public policy arenas. With their mix of discourses, demonstrations and services, they interact with local authorities, helping to shape local responses to immigrants and ethnic minorities issues. More directly when they are migrant associations, more indirectly when they are trade-unions, native NGOs, or religious institutions, their contribution to local governance supports a dynamic vision of cities' populations, cultures and aspirations.

Furthermore, on sensitive issues such as irregular immigration and asylum-seeking, various groups fighting for openness and respect for human rights oppose mobilisation in favour of border closures (see, for the US: Eastman, 2012; Hagan, 2008). Interestingly, local authorities can rely on these groups, or support their activities in various ways, in order to soften and to some extent circumvent the limitations created by national policies (Van der Leun and Bouter, 2015). Hence civil society organisations in several cases can be influential actors in allowing local authorities to evade restrictions fixed by national policies. In other cases, they pressurise local authorities to broaden or to change their approach to immigrant minorities and cultural diversities.

While public opinions and the political discourse are influenced by a drive to tighten border controls, organised groups active in the social and communicative fields can in their turn intervene in the public arena, raise specific cases and affect the production of (local) policies. As the Italian case has shown, their lobbying may offset the weak political citizenship of immigrants and combat restrictive policies (Zincone, 1999; 2011).

In almost all the cities that we studied, the local authorities have adopted a broader approach to governance based on interaction and negotiation between decision makers and organised civil society – for the purposes of service delivery and sometimes, less obviously, in an urban planning perspective. In Germany, for instance, the large religious and union organisations are firmly embedded in the welfare system as providers of social services, and they are especially involved in the supply of many

kinds of support to immigrants and refugees. Frankfurt is a clear example. We may cite the FIM (*Frauenrecht Ist Menschenrecht* (Social Consultancy for Foreign Women)) centre of the Diakonie network, which provides services to immigrant women in difficulties, among them ones without a residence permit, asylum seekers and victims of sexual exploitation. Another interesting case, as a mechanism of participatory urban governance, is Manchester's Agenda 2010. This is a ten-year programme covering four areas (crime and public order; education; health and social care; employment and vocational training). The most remarkable aspect of the programme is the participation of civil society organisations – including associations representing immigrants and ethnic minorities – in the work groups set up for each area and guided by the relevant public authority. Also in Madrid CSOs play an important role in the local governance of immigration and ethnic diversity, and immigrant associations have been involved in consultative practices and services, even if in recent years the economic crisis has driven a retreat of public commitment in this field.

Equally systematic forms of collaboration among public authorities, local CSOs and ethnic minorities' associations have been documented in Brussels; or, at a different level, in the *Marseille Esperance* initiative promoted by the local government and involving different religious communities.

For some aspects of local policies, the contribution of immigrant associations and NGOs has proved particularly important. The unpopular issue of the acceptance and protection of asylum seekers and irregular immigrants, for instance, is typically handed over to them, as has been reported in several countries.² Moreover, what is important is that civil society organisations do not confine themselves to easing tensions between state sovereignty and the affirmation of universal human rights: the controversial issue of protecting irregular immigrants has in some cases given rise to forms of protest, advocacy movements, or mobilisations by undocumented residents themselves (Nicholls, 2013), and especially in large cities, where numbers and concentration make it a more visible phenomenon. In our research, the case of Brussels is the most conspicuous one; but other studies have reported similar protests in other European cities, such as Paris and London (Chimienti, 2011). Here CSOs have acted in support of immigrants' claims, which in turn constitute a salient feature of multicultural cities. Even when immigrants are at the forefront as spokespersons of campaigns for migrants' rights, the support of national civil society is often highly influential because native actors can provide crucial resources such as financial means, legal advice and insider knowledge of national political cultures and institutions (Nicholls, 2013, 613). To a certain extent, they can even shape and overshadow claims of immigrants themselves (Nicholls, 2013, 615).

To recap, the main local activities developed by civil society organisations can be grouped under five headings. The first covers the *representation* of immigrants' interests in local bodies, consultations or other arenas where urban governments treat issues related to the settlement of ethnic minorities (Kosic and Triandafyllidou, 2005). Here mainly immigrant associations are involved, but also pro-immigrant NGOs and trade unions. This is possibly the most politically contentious of their functions, because the potential for CSOs (including the ethnic ones) to embody political representation, and their institutional legitimacy in doing so, are highly debated and context-dependent. Second, civil society organisations have been involved in several forms of *political pressure* in defence of immigrants' rights, social demands, cultural and religious claims. This is of particular salience in countries, such as Italy, where

immigrants do not enjoy voting rights, so that their weight in the political game is negligible. Third, local civil society – as a scattered set of native and ethnic-based organisations – has been remarkably active in *advocacy*, most notably against forms of discrimination enacted by local authorities, or against the use of demeaning language in the public sphere. Likewise, CSOs have generally played an important role in the fields of *communication*, *education* and *public awareness-raising*. Finally, CSOs should be factored into local policies on immigrants as key providers of *services* on behalf of public authorities or as independent providers, particularly in the case of irregular immigrants. What is important is that the relative significance of each of these functions is variable across the cities that we studied, as a reflection of their different historical and political trajectories of immigrant incorporation. In all these respects, however, both the local governance of ethnic diversity and the development of new ideas, projects and initiatives in the field, including multiculturalist stances, need to be appreciated in light of the growing involvement of civil society organisations.

The dark side: local policies for immigrants' exclusion

Local policies are not, however, only inclusive policies. Xenophobic tensions occur throughout Europe, as I have already mentioned, and they have taken root in many countries, even within democratic institutions and in local policies. Among the European cities studied, Marseille, Brussels and especially Verona are the ones most affected.

A phenomenon that has acquired particular importance in Italy is the advent in recent years of local governments introducing measures openly hostile to immigrants and which oppose the interests and issues of the native population against those of foreign residents (Çetin, 2012). In our research, the city of Verona is a case in point. Here I analyse this case more in depth, as an example of opposition against what can be termed a multiethnic transformation of the urban landscape: an opposition against cultural diversity.

In the wake of the new powers given to mayors by the so-called 'security package' passed by the national centre-right government in 2008, the city council of Verona has issued a significant number of ordinances aimed at regulating social behaviour: ordinances against begging, prostitution and the consumption of food in public spaces (Mauri, 2012). All the measures have been targeted, sometimes explicitly, on certain components of the immigrant population most immediately perceived as a nuisance. Another important piece of the mosaic of local policies is the attempt to introduce differential treatment in, and obstacles to, the access to services and local benefits, such as social housing.

As regards religious pluralism, while in several European cities, despite resistance and difficulties (Maussen, 2009), dialogue is actively promoted, in Verona there was strong concern about control and enforcement regarding the local expressions of Islam and the opening of places of worship. Indeed, the local government had strongly opposed the establishment of a prayer hall for the Muslim minority. In the case of Verona, three main reasons for opposing the establishment of immigrant populations can be identified: fears regarding safety, competition for access to welfare benefits, and the defence of a real or perceived local cultural identity.

On considering similar cases reported in other Northern Italian regions (Ambrosini, 2013a), it does not really matter that both the rules inspired by the security package,

and the impediments to freedom of worship, have been repudiated by the courts, since these measures are primarily addressed to voters. Their purpose is to send out the message that the local government protects the insiders from the intrusion of outsiders, from their behaviour which is perceived as disruptive, from their cultural expressions which are deemed contradictory to local traditions, from competition for the use of public resources and services. In this way, however, local policies promote and institutionalise the boundaries between 'us' and 'them', between residents of different origins sharing the same territory. In fact, these policies encourage separation and tension between majority and minority groups.

At the same time, this basis of the issue of ethnic relations has provoked the reaction of the pro-immigrant coalition, supported by lawyers who have repeatedly taken the Verona administration to court – as they have done with several other towns in northern Italy – and they have obtained favourable judgements. The policies of exclusion are also a magnet for the mobilisation of social forces and for the formation of unusual alliances between actors that are very different but united by their struggle against ethnic discrimination. Vigilant civil societies and socially well-established actors that have taken up the immigrants' cause alongside them, such as the Catholic Church and trade-unions, have provided vital defence against xenophobic tendencies.

Furthermore, as I have already recalled, service delivery to immigrant populations has not been deeply affected by political change: some services now have new and less evident labels in which immigrants are not mentioned; other services work with less visibility and public support; yet others have been outsourced to local NGOs. But overall, the case of Verona confirms that it is easier to fight against multiculturalism in declarations than in actual policies, in public discourse than in service provision. Street-level bureaucracies often resist the implementation of restrictive or discriminatory policies (see, for the Netherlands, van der Leun, 2006). Civil society actors protest and involve public opinion in specific cases (see, for asylum seekers in Germany, Ellerman, 2006). Consequently, the case of Verona paradoxically confirms my general argument: even if in that city political rhetoric is particularly adversarial, actual policies for immigrants by and large have substantial continuity with the past. Structural factors, such as labour-market demand, social needs that cannot be easily ignored, resistance by civil servants, protest by civil society, and anti-discriminatory limitations by judicial power combine to explain the weak efficacy of exclusion policies in Verona and other northern Italian towns.

I should stress, however, that in Europe, even in countries with long traditions of liberalism and openness, such as the Netherlands or Sweden, new populist and xenophobic political subjects are gaining political consensus. Such tensions may arise also at local level (Mahnig, 2004), and city governments can be active in implementing restrictive policies (Leerkes et al, 2012), even if local exclusion policies in Europe are an understudied issue (Ambrosini, 2013a). For instance, in Catalonia, in the past few years several local governments have taken positions similar to those of the Italian cities governed by coalitions of the centre-right and where the Northern League has a strong influence (Burchianti and Zapata Barrero, 2012). Furthermore, Grillo (2005) sees in Europe and North America a desire to return to older 'assimilative' models of the city that explains contemporary criticism against multiculturalism. In twenty-first century Europe, the issue of the reception and treatment of the cultural diversity brought by immigrant populations is an increasingly controversial item on the political agenda.

Concluding remarks: From multiculturalism to diversity?

I can now again address the four questions that I initially introduced to discuss the present state of urban multiculturalism. The results of our research allow me to draw the following conclusions. First, the local level of policy-making remains relatively autonomous from the national level, despite the growing emphasis on border closure, the struggle against irregular immigration, and the demand for ‘civic integration’ by regular migrants and ethnic minorities. Second, multiculturalist practices persist in various ways in service provision to immigrants at local level, despite the rejection of the concept in mainstream (national) political discourse: other concepts, such as diversity or social cohesion, often take the place of multiculturalist stances, but in practice elements of continuity prevail. Third, civil society organisations have acquired a growing (if variable) salience in the governance of superdiverse cities: in various ways, in alliance with or in opposition to local governments, they generally support broader visions of cities, giving more legitimacy to ethnic and cultural diversities. Fourth, in some cases, especially where parties openly hostile to immigrants rule cities, policies of exclusion are targeted on immigrants and ethnic minorities; but also in these cases actual policies do not follow the declared ones.

Clearly apparent across the different urban settings is the relative autonomy of the local policy-making level, as opposed to the national one. Whatever the national framework of immigrant incorporation policies, the urban level needs to be appreciated as a policy-making field in itself. Moreover, it appears to be independent from several aspects of the declared national philosophies of integration. At a local level, public policy is necessarily more sensitive to the actual problems and social dynamics which result from the settlement of foreign-born populations than it is to principled statements. Of course, urban-level immigrant policies also pay tribute to the neo-assimilationist emphasis which pervades the current public discourse in Europe: while much of the last century’s multiculturalist language has been abandoned, the emphasis is now on objectives of social cohesion and civic integration in receiving societies. At the same time, the real changes made to welfare services provision are generally more limited. At this level, the economic and financial crisis weighs more than any effective ‘backlash’ against multiculturalism: or to be more precise, it gives a stronger argument to the political intent to cut welfare services for immigrants, ethnic minorities or other weak groups (Collett, 2011).

A more remarkable development instead consists in the discursive emphasis on *mainstreaming* as part of an apparently de-ethnicised welfare provision: at least at a communicative level, local authorities across the cities tend to emphasise the need to improve the welfare of the local society as a whole, while watering down any special measure for immigrants and ethnic minorities. However, emphasis on social cohesion or other general aims allows a provision of local welfare to immigrants and ethnic minorities for which it could be more difficult to achieve political consensus under more explicit and ‘multicultural’ labels.

As regards the second question (multiculturalism), despite the declining political fortunes of multiculturalism as a political idiom and agenda, some local variants of it can still be documented under changing frameworks: in short, an inclusive and explicit multiculturalism in Frankfurt; a de-emphasised and pragmatic one in Manchester; a composite, integrationist and celebratory one in Brussels; a de facto and tacit one in Marseille; a voluntary and fluctuating one in Madrid. Interestingly, ‘diversity’ has often

taken the place of ‘multiculturalism’ as a label for projects and initiatives concerning ethnic and cultural minorities (Faist, 2009; Vertovec and Wessendorf, 2009; Boccagni, 2014). At the same time, the ‘aesthetics of diversity’ celebrating the musical, artistic and gastronomic contributions of minorities is often emphasised in local policies. This point requires further discussion.

Local policies are generally unable to deal with major structural issues such as labour market discrimination, residential segregation, or the educational failure of ethnic minorities (Mahnig, 2004). The answers to these challenges require large-scale reforms at national level, and now the shortage of economic means and the lack of political consensus make these reforms hard to conceive. Locally, however, many projects and innovative measures tend to pursue specific improvements in the conditions of disadvantaged minorities and of ethnically segregated neighbourhoods, or to highlight their contribution to the enrichment and diversification of the city’s cultural life. In fact, initiatives to celebrate the multicultural face of cities are far more popular, even at the cost of encroaching on the realm of folklore. Making diversity an element of attraction – or at least a ‘commonplace’ one (Wessendorf, 2011) – has even become an objective of urban marketing campaigns. While immigrant neighbourhoods are often seen as icons of degradation and segregation, in certain circumstances – and once properly gentrified – ethnic neighbourhoods can become tourist attractions, leisure-time destinations, and cultural experiences which are close to home while reproducing the charm of distant worlds (Rath, 2007).³

Third, urban immigration policymakers are increasingly oriented to alliance-building as a way to mediate among restrictive national policies, budget cutbacks and local phenomena seen only as intractable issues of security and public order. The connection with social forces and organised civil society actors is a recurrent feature of both policy-building and service provision. Particularly thorny issues, such as the needs of asylum seekers or unauthorised immigrants, require the formation of relational networks and strategic alliances among different actors. On the other hand, the political role of movements and associations, including immigrant networks, that demand respect for human rights and the widening of reception policies should not be forgotten: civil society organisations not only cooperate with local governments but also criticise them and support new issues and claims on immigrants’ and minorities’ rights. Clearly, civil society organisations are deeply diverse, ranging from religious institutions to radical social movements, from established trade-unions to immigrant networks: but in different ways most of them spread through urban life values and prospects linked to liberal visions of ethnic diversity.

Overall, a focus on the urban level of immigrant policies clearly points to a variable, if generally significant, persistence of multiculturalism in Europe – at various levels: as a pragmatic recognition of cultural differences, as an involvement of immigrant representatives and associations in public arenas, as a celebration of the ‘aesthetic of diversity’ in urban life, and as an adaptation of welfare service provision.

Much more contentious, however, are the prospects of multiculturalism as a public idiom and a political project. At a discursive level, multiculturally-oriented claims are arguably in need of an innovative language and of new ways to achieve re-legitimation, in a political and social context which appears more hostile than in the past, but where ongoing social processes enhance local diversities and the need to govern them. The emerging contribution of civil society, in this respect, is of key

importance for improving cultural acceptance of diversity and building a broader governance of superdiverse cities.

On the other hand, local policies can also become devices of exclusion which worsen the general framework of political restrictions against immigration and cultural minorities. Not only at the national level does immigration now rank high on the political agenda: also at local level it can be the object of symbolic and political conflicts. And at the local level, anti-immigrant political actors can more easily win democratic elections and achieve power. Local policies of exclusion, political conflicts and judicial controversies such as those identified in Northern Italy (Çetin, 2012), or in the United States (Chand and Schreckhise, 2014; Varsanyi, 2010) could spread across Europe.

Also for this reason, multiculturalist policies should be expressed in a new language and within a new conceptual framework. From this point of view, the concept of diversity is clearly of paramount importance; recalling Faist (2009), it is now more accepted than multiculturalism. Furthermore, it can foster alliances with other 'diverse' groups, such as religious or linguistic minorities. In the present European political landscape, diversity policies could recover and even enhance several multiculturalist stances, shaping them into a new cultural framework.

Notes

¹ The author thanks Paolo Boccagni and Francesca Campomori for their cooperation and suggestions.

² See, on the Dutch case, Engbersen and Broeders, 2009; on Germany, Lutz, 2011; on the US, Hagan, 2008; Fernández-Kelly, 2012.

³ This may entail, as pointed out by Zukin in particular (1998), a 'commodification of diversity' which, while fictitious and instrumental, has the merit of treating minority cultures and ethnicised neighbourhoods as economic resources for the city.

References

- Albertazzi, D, McDonnell, D, 2008, *Twenty-first century populism*, Basingstoke: Palgrave
- Alexander, M, 2003, Local policies toward migrants as an expression of Host–Stranger relations, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29, 3, 411–30
- Ambrosini, M (ed), 2012, *Governare città plurali*, Milan: FrancoAngeli
- Ambrosini, M, 2013a, 'We are against a multi-ethnic society': Policies of exclusion at the urban level in Italy, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36, 1, 136–55
- Ambrosini, M, 2013b, *Irregular migration and invisible welfare*, Basingstoke: Palgrave-MacMillan
- Ambrosini, M, 2015, NGOs and health services for irregular immigrants in Italy: When the protection of human rights challenges the laws, *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies* 13, 2, 116–34
- Ambrosini, M, van der Leun, J, 2015, Implementing human rights: Civil society and migration policies, *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies* 13, 2, 103–15
- Antonsich, M, 2016, International migration and the rise of the 'civil' nation, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2016.1155980
- Balibar, E, 2012, Strangers as enemies, *Mondi Migranti* 6, 1, 7–25
- Bauböck, R, Ersbøll, E, Groenendijk, K, Waldrauch H (eds), 2006, *Acquisition and loss of nationality: Policies and trends in 15 European states*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press

- Bertossi, C, 2011, National models of integration in Europe, *American Behavioral Scientist* 55, 12, 1561–80
- Boccagni, P, 2012a, Dal multiculturalismo alla coesione di comunità? Il caso di Manchester, in M Ambrosini (ed) *Governare città plurali*, pp 69–97, Milan: FrancoAngeli
- Boccagni, P, 2012b, Negoziando i confini della nuova convivenza multietnica. Il caso di Madrid, in M Ambrosini (ed) *Governare città plurali*, pp 149–69, Milan: FrancoAngeli
- Boccagni, P, 2014, *The difference diversity makes: A principle, a lens, an empirical attribute for majority–minority relations*, in T Matejskova, M Antonsich (eds) *Governing through diversity*, pp 21–38, Basingstoke, Palgrave
- Borkert, M, Bosswick, W, Heckmann, F, Lüken-Klaßen, D, 2007, *Local integration policies for migrants in Europe*, Cities for Local Integration Policy and the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2006/31/en/1/ef0631en.pdf
- Burchianti, F, Zapata Barrero, R, 2012, *Intolerant discourses about migrants in Catalan politics*, European project ‘Accept pluralism’, Florence: European University Institute, www.academia.edu/1797857/Intolerant_Discourses_about_Migrants_in_Catalan_Politics_report
- Campomori, F, 2007, Il ruolo di policy making svolto dagli operatori dei servizi per gli immigrati, *Mondi migranti* 3, 83–106
- Caponio, T, Borkert, M (eds), 2010, *The local dimension of migration policy-making*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press
- Castañeda, H, 2007, *Paradoxes of providing aid: NGOs, medicine, and undocumented migration in Berlin, Germany*, PhD Dissertation, Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Graduate College
- Castles, S, 2004, Why migration policies fail?, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27, 2, 205–27
- Cento Bull, A, 2010, Addressing contradictory needs: The Lega Nord and Italian immigration policy, *Patterns of Prejudice* 44, 5, 411–31
- Çetin, E, 2012, Exclusionary rhetoric expansionist policies?, *Compas, Working Paper* 95, Oxford: University of Oxford
- Chand, DE, Schreckhise WD, 2014, Secure communities and community values: Local context and discretionary immigration law enforcement, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41, 10, 1621–43
- Chimienti, M, 2011, Mobilization of irregular migrants in Europe, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34, 8, 1338–56
- Collett, E, 2011, *Immigrant integration in Europe in a time of austerity*, Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute
- De Bernardis, A, 2012, Una capitale cosmopolita alla sfida dell’integrazione: Il caso di Bruxelles, in M Ambrosini (ed) *Governare città plurali*, pp 101–24, Milan: FrancoAngeli
- De Luca, V, 2012, Multiculturalismo implicito come pratica locale. Il caso di Marsiglia, in M Ambrosini (ed) *Governare città plurali*, pp 190–212, Milan: FrancoAngeli
- De Luca, V, Trotto, C, 2012, Politiche locali avanzate in un contesto restrittivo: Il caso di Francoforte, in M Ambrosini (ed) *Governare città plurali*, pp 125–48, Milan: FrancoAngeli
- Eastman, CLS, 2012, *Shaping the immigration debate: Contending civil societies on the US–Mexico border*, Boulder, CO: FirstForum Press

- Ellermann, A, 2006, Street-level democracy: How immigration bureaucrats manage public opposition, *West European Politics* 29, 2, 293–309
- Engbersen, G, Broeders, D, 2009, The State versus the Alien: Immigration control and strategies of irregular immigrants, *West European Politics* 32, 5, 867–85
- Faist, T, 2009, Diversity – a new mode of incorporation?, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32, 1, 171–90
- Fernández-Kelly, P, 2012, Rethinking the deserving body: Altruism, markets, and political action in health care provision, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35, 1, 56–71
- Foner, N, 2007, How exceptional is New York? Migration and multiculturalism in the empire city, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30, 6, 999–1023
- Geddes, A, 2014, Migration in European governance, in A Payne, N Phillips (eds) *Handbook of the International Political Economy of Governance*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- Gebhardt, D, 2016, When the state takes over: Civic integration programmes and the role of cities in immigrant integration, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42, 5, 742–58
- Goodman, SW, 2010, Integration requirements for integration's sake?, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36, 5, 753–72
- Grillo, R, 2005, Backlash against diversity?, *Compas, Working Paper* 14, Oxford: University of Oxford
- Hagan, JM, 2008, *Migration miracle: Faith, hope and meaning on the undocumented journey*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Heckmann, F, 2010, Recent developments of integration policy in Germany and Europe, *EFMS Papers*, 4, www.efms.unibamberg.de/pdf/efms%20paper%202010-4.pdf
- Joppke, C, 2007, Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe, *West European Politics* 30, 1, 1–22
- Kalra, V, Kapoor, N, 2009, Interrogating integration, segregation and community cohesion, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35, 9, 1397–415
- Kivisto, P, Faist, T, 2007, *Citizenship: Discourse, theory and transnational prospects*, Malden (MA): Blackwell
- Kosic, A, Triandafyllidou, A, 2005, *Active civic participation of immigrants in Italy*, Country Report for the European project POLITIS, www.unioldenburg.de/politis-europe
- Kraler, A, Bonizzoni, P, 2010, Gender, civic stratification and the right to family life, *International Review of Sociology* 20, 1, 181–7
- Leerkes, A, Varsanyi, M, Engbersen, G, 2012, Local limits to migration control: Practices of selective migration policing in a restrictive national policy context, *Police Quarterly* 15, 4, 446–75
- Levey, GB, 2009, What is living and what is dead in multiculturalism, *Ethnicities* 9, 1, 75–93
- Lutz, H, 2011, *The new maids*, London: ZED Books
- Mahnig, H, 2004, The politics of minority–majority relations: How immigrant policies developed in Paris, Berlin and Zurich, in R Penninx, K Kraal, M Martiniello, S Vertovec (eds) *Citizenship in European cities*, pp 17–38, Aldershot: Ashgate
- Martiniello, M, 1997, *Sortir des ghettos culturels*, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po
- Mauri, E, 2012, Tra retoriche securitarie e integrazione di fatto: Il caso di Verona, in M Ambrosini (ed) *Governare città plurali*, pp 262–91, Milan: FrancoAngeli

- Maussen, M, 2009, *Constructing Mosques: The governance of Islam in France and the Netherlands*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam School for Social Science Research
- Modood, T, 2007, *Multiculturalism: A civic idea*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Morris, L, 2002, *Managing migration: Civic stratification and migrants rights*, London: Routledge
- Mouritsen, P, 2012, The resilience of citizenship traditions: Civic integration in Germany, Great Britain and Denmark, *Ethnicities* 13, 1, 86–109
- Nicholls, WJ, 2013, Fragmenting citizenship: Dynamics of cooperation and conflict in France's immigrant rights movement, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36, 4, 611–31
- Penninx, R, Martiniello, M, 2007, Processi di integrazione e politiche (locali), *Mondi Migranti* 1, 3, 31–59
- Penninx, R, Kraal, K, Martiniello, M, Vertovec, S (eds), 2004, *Citizenship in European cities*, Aldershot: Ashgate
- Prins, B, Slijper, B, 2002, Multicultural society under attack: Introduction, *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 3, 3–4, 313–28
- Rath, J, 2007, The transformation of ethnic neighborhoods into places of leisure and consumption, *IMES working paper* 144, Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam
- Ruzza, C, Fella, S, 2009, *Re-inventing the Italian Right*, London: Routledge
- Scholten, PWA, 2012, Agenda dynamics and the multi-level governance of intractable policy controversies, *Policy Sciences* 46, 3, 217–36
- Schön, AD, Rein, M, 1994, *Frame reflection: Toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies*, New York: Basic Books
- Van der Leun, J, 2006, Excluding illegal migrants in The Netherlands: Between national policies and local implementation, *West European Politics* 29, 2, 310–26
- Van der Leun, J, Bouter, H, 2015, Gimme shelter: Inclusion and exclusion of irregular immigrants in Dutch civil society, *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies* 13, 2, 135–55
- Varsanyi, MV (ed), 2010, *Taking local control: Immigration policy activism in US cities and states*, Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press
- Vertovec, S, 2007, Super-diversity and its implications, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30, 6, 1024–54
- Vertovec, S, Wessendorf, S (eds), 2009, *The multiculturalism backlash*, London: Routledge
- Wessendorf, S, 2011, Commonplace diversity and the 'ethos of mixing', *Compas, Working Paper* 91, Oxford: University of Oxford
- Wihtol de Wenden, C, 2009, *La globalisation humaine*, Paris: Press Universitaires de France
- Zincone, G (ed), 1999, Illegality, enlightenment and ambiguity: A hot Italian recipe, in M Baldwin-Edwards, J Arango (eds), *Immigrants and the informal economy in Southern Europe*, pp 43–82, London: Frank Cass
- Zincone, G (ed) 2009, *Immigrazione: segnali di integrazione*, Bologna: Mulino
- Zincone, G, 2011, *The case of Italy*, in G Zincone, R Penninx, M Borkert (eds) *Migration policymaking in Europe*, pp 247–90, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press
- Zucchetti, E (ed), 1999, *Enti locali e politiche per l'immigrazione*, Milan, Quaderni Ismu, n 3
- Zukin, S, 1998, Urban lifestyles, *Urban Studies* 35, 5–6, 825–39