

Vancouver Centre of Excellence



Research on Immigration and
Integration in the Metropolis

Working Paper Series

No. 03-20

**Integrating Immigrants: The Challenge for Cities, City Governments, and
the City-Building Professions**

Leonie Sandercock

November 2003

RIIM

Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis

The Vancouver Centre is funded by grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Citizenship & Immigration Canada, Simon Fraser University, the University of British Columbia and the University of Victoria. We also wish to acknowledge the financial support of the Metropolis partner agencies:

- Health Canada
- Human Resources Development Canada
- Department of Canadian Heritage
- Department of the Solicitor General of Canada
- Status of Women Canada
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation
- Correctional Service of Canada
- Immigration & Refugee Board

Views expressed in this manuscript are those of the author(s) alone. For more information, contact the Co-directors of the Centre, Dr. Don DeVoretz, Department of Economics, SFU (e-mail: devoretz@sfu.ca) or Dr. Daniel Hiebert, Department of Geography, UBC (e-mail: dhiebert@geog.ubc.ca).

**Integrating Immigrants: The Challenge for Cities, City Governments, and the
City-Building Professions ¹**

by

Leonie Sandercock
School of Community and Regional Planning
University of British Columbia
leonies@interchange.ubc.ca

November 2003

¹ This paper draws on Chapter 6 of my forthcoming *Cosmopolis 2: Mongrel Cities of the 21st Century* (New York: Continuum, Feb.2004)

Abstract: This paper is the second in a series of four, which covers (1) a rethinking of the philosophy of multiculturalism for the 21st century, (2) an exploration of the policy challenges that a multicultural society poses to urban planning and policy, urban governance, and citizenship, with examples of successful responses to these challenges (3) an analysis of the barriers to integration for one specific group, Sri Lankan Tamils, in Toronto and Vancouver, with specific attention to the built environment and the claiming of space, (4) an examination of the role of one community-based organization, the Canadian Tamil Congress, in working for the integration of Tamils in Canada.

In the first part of this paper I look at four ways in which difference is a challenge to planning practices. In the second part, I note five possible types of response: through legislation and the courts; through the market; through dialogue; through social mobilization; and through a transformed planning education. I then turn specifically to the challenge of integrating immigrants, discussing recent efforts in Frankfurt and Rotterdam to actively construct new ways of living together, and I contrast these European experiences with efforts in Australia and Canada (Sydney and Vancouver) to 'manage difference' at the municipal level. In the fourth section, I discuss models of citizenship that can address the everyday realities of life in immigrant cities. Finally, I offer seven policy directions.

Keywords: Immigration, urban planning, urban policy, urban governance, citizenship, difference, exclusion, fear, everyday life, neighborhoods, intercultural co-existence, racism.

Introduction

‘We’ve pretty much come to the end of a time when you can have a space that is ‘yours only’ – just for people you want to be there ... we’ve finished with that kind of isolating. There is no hiding place. There is nowhere you can go and only be with people who are like you. It’s over. Give it up.’ (Reagon 1981:357)

This paper sets out, in a very practical way, to address the question: how can we stropic strangers live together without doing each other too much violence? This question is a challenge to urban governance and to city dwellers, as well as to planning theory and practice. I first ask what kind of a challenge it is, and then what policies and processes and institutions exist or might need to be invented for dealing with the problem as I understand it: the problem of co-existing in the shared spaces of cities of difference. What might it mean to ‘manage difference’ in ways that could be transformative rather than repressive? How can migrants be integrated into cities that are unused to thinking of themselves as multicultural? How might intersecting material and psychological fears and needs be mediated? How might marginalized or excluded communities become organized to make effective claims on the urban political economy?

The great possibility of the multicultural cities of the 21st century is the dream of *cosmopolis*: cities in which there is acceptance of, connection with, and respect and space for ‘the stranger’, the possibility of working together on matters of common destiny and forging new hybrid cultures and urban projects and ways of living (Sandercock 2004). The great danger is that difference will further fracture, fragment, splinter the fragile urban social fabric as new demands for rights to the city emerge: rights to a voice, to participation, and to co-existence in the physical spaces of the built environment, which are then opposed by those who feel too threatened by the disruption to their accustomed way of life. Multicultural cities present challenges to city governments, to citizens, and to city planners, as well as to traditional notions of citizenship. This paper explores those challenges and looks at how some cities have become involved, in positive ways, in addressing these challenges. What kinds of planning, supported by what forms of urban governance and modes of citizenship, are best able to accommodate difference and have a beneficial impact on exclusion and marginality?

In the first part of the paper, I look at four ways that difference challenges planning practices. In the second part, I note five possible types of response: through legislation and the courts; through the market; through dialogue; through social mobilization; and through a transformed planning education. In the third section, I turn to one specific form of the challenge of difference, that of integrating immigrants. I discuss recent efforts in Frankfurt and Rotterdam to actively construct new

ways of living together by dealing with the emotional/symbolic as well as the material issues involved. And I contrast these European experiences with efforts in Australia and Canada, (actually Sydney and Vancouver), to ‘manage difference’ at the local government level. In the fourth section, I discuss models of citizenship that can address the everyday realities of life in immigrant cities.

The challenge of difference

Historically, exclusion and marginality have been the constant companions of difference. Think of generations of slaves, indigenous peoples, immigrants and other groups who have not belonged to or have chosen different paths from the dominant culture to which they were subordinate. I am under no illusions about the scope of this task. For in spite of all the talk, in planning, about working for the ‘common good’, the reality has all too often been otherwise. As a function of the state, planning is one of many social technologies of power available to ruling elites, and has primarily been used to support the power and privileges of dominant classes and cultures.² We have seen this in extreme form in colonial planning (see King 1976, 1990; Rabinow 1989); in planning under apartheid in South Africa (see Mabin and Smit 1997); and in ethnocratic states today, such as Israel, where a dominant ethnicity imposes its power through the management of space (see Fenster 1999a, 1999b; Yiftachel 1992, 1996, 2000). In only slightly less subtle forms, this use of planning as a technology of power has produced residential segregation by race in the United States (Thomas and Ritzdorf 1997; Martin and Warner 2000), and the attempted exclusion of indigenous people from metropolitan areas and country towns in Australia (Jackson 1998; Jacobs 1996). Is it realistic to imagine planning practices that can reverse or address these historic and systemic inequalities? Where, institutionally, would such practices be located? In state planning agencies, or are they necessarily insurgent practices, located in civil society and social movements?

In addressing these questions we have to be mindful that planning, in western cities, takes place in a context of racialized liberal democracies and an as yet unresolved ‘postcolonial’ condition. Planners have not yet sufficiently analyzed their own role in an ever-present yet invisible cultural politics of difference, a historic role that has reinforced the power of the dominant culture as well as the dominant class. Across Europe, North America, Australia, and New Zealand, that dominant culture has been ethnically white/Caucasian and planning, as a technology of power, has been an implicitly racialized practice. Nor has planning in this postcolonial era been decolonized by

² This is not meant to deny the counter-hegemonic, or radical, potential of planning, which I discuss elsewhere (see Sandercock forthcoming 2004, Part Three).

accepting difference as a category of analysis in the city. If difference matters, as I have argued in the first paper in this series, and if we accept the claims of hitherto excluded groups to their rights to the city, then difference is on a collision course with planning, or vice versa. How to avoid the crash?

In what ways is difference a challenge to planning?

In 1992, the Royal Town Planning Institute commissioned two British researchers to explore the sensitivity of the British planning system to the needs of black and ethnic minorities. After surveying over a hundred local planning authorities, their report concluded that there was a great deal of ignorance about the existence and nature of racial/ethnic disadvantage in planning, and they recommended creating an institutional framework which would give greater priority to the issue (Krishnarayan and Thomas 1993). This work perhaps inspired, certainly prefigured, a handful of similar studies in Australia (Watson and McGillivray 1995; Sandercock and Klinger 1998a, 1998b) and Canada (Qadeer 1994, 1997; Wallace and Milroy 1999; Dale 1999; Ameyaw 2000; Edgington and Hutton 2002) that have drawn attention to a number of issues: from the overall failure of the planning system to respond to the increasing cultural diversity of the city, to the ways in which the values and norms of the dominant culture are reflected in plans, planning codes and bylaws, legislation, and heritage and urban design practices, to planners' inability to analyze issues from a multicultural perspective or to design participatory processes that bring (cultural, religious, and other) minorities into the planning process (Sandercock 2000a).

Thomas and Krishnarayan (1994) have continued to do path-breaking work in this field of cultural diversity and planning, particularly in relation to the ways in which planning is influenced by and implicated in the racialization of social processes (Thomas 1995a, 1995b, 1997). And work is now emerging from the USA (Burayidi 2000) and Europe (Khakee, Somma and Thomas 1999; Ratcliffe 1999) of both a theoretical and empirical kind, documenting the circumstances and needs of indigenous and ethnic minorities, and critiquing urban policies and planning practices which either ignore these needs or actively contribute to the ongoing social exclusion of minorities. The work of some Israeli scholars should also be noted as pioneering both for drawing attention to the plight of minorities such as the Bedouin and Ethiopian Jews under the geo-politics of Israeli planning, and for delineating the conflicts between the discourses (and practices) of cultural difference and of human rights (Yiftachel 1992, 1996, 2000; Fenster 1999a, 1999b).

From the body of literature referred to above, it is possible to distill four different ways in which diversity challenges existing planning systems, policies and practices. *First*, these studies have shown that the values and norms of the dominant culture are usually embedded in legislative frameworks of planning, by-laws, and regulations. This should not be surprising, since this legal framework for planning evolved at a time when most societies were not yet multicultural, or at least imagined themselves as more homogeneous than they are now. The planning system thus unreflectively expressed the norms of the culturally dominant majority. It is disturbing, however, to recognize that these values are still driving decisions that, in turn, are legitimated and reinforced by the courts.

To take a recent case in the United States: a dispute between the Navajo tribe and the US Forest Service over proposed road construction and logging led to claims by the Navajo that this development would violate their rights of religious freedom, which had been established in the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978. The case ended up in the Supreme Court, where the majority ruling handed down by Justice O'Connor was in favor of the Forest Service. The fundamental issue in dispute was the definition of what constitutes 'religious use' of the land. O'Connor's argument was that the land in question was not actively used for ritual purposes and did not contain a specific religious site. This finding, however, 'begs the central question in planning for a multicultural society: it imposed a form of Judeo-Christian standard of "exercising one's religion" on Native American cultures' (Meyer and Reaves 2000:94). What the Supreme Court's ruling did not allow for is that not all religious practices are bound in time and space as are the church-based belief systems of the dominant US culture. The ruling raises the broader question of how a secular society is able to recognize and accommodate a culturally different sense of the sacred.

There is an additional issue relating to legal frameworks and the right to difference. Planning's legal frameworks in the West have been embedded in a particular conception of democracy as a form of majority rule in a multiparty system, and a corresponding belief that the right to difference disappears once the majority has spoken. As one planner whom we interviewed in Melbourne expressed it: 'Local laws and regulations are framed for the majority of the community. If the minority can't fit in, then bad luck' (Sandercock and Kliger 1998a). For the most part, planners have not questioned the modernist paradigm of 'one law for all', in spite of precedents in feminist planning literature, which have challenged the universalism of the legal framework of planning, a framework which has generally been regarded as neutral, or unbiased, with respect to age, gender, religion, and culture. Applying a critical lens to this framework reveals, however, that it is underpinned by all sorts of implicit assumptions -- about what constitutes a 'normal household' (the

nuclear family);³ about an ‘appropriate urban form’ for such households (single family housing); about gender relations and their spatial expression (women occupying domestic space, men public space); about religious practices (ritual sites versus sacred landscapes); about preferred forms of recreation (cricket and football), and so on. These norms not only conceal gender and sexual preference biases. They also congeal cultural biases.

A *second* way in which the recognition of the right to difference presents a challenge to planning practice is that the norms and values of the dominant culture are not only embedded in the legislative framework of planning, but are also embodied in the attitudes, behavior, and practices of actual flesh-and-blood planners. Burayidi (2000a) has suggested six ways in which ‘cultural misunderstanding’ might occur between planners (who belong for the most part to the dominant culture in the societies of Europe, North America and Australia) and cultural minorities:

- (i) communication style (cultural differences affect the outcomes of the transactive and social learning processes in planning);
- (ii) attitude toward disclosure (cultural differences influence the types of information people are willing to share with planners);
- (iii) attitude toward conflict (this has implications for the role that the planner plays as mediator in community conflicts);
- (iv) approaches to accomplishing task (this may affect the way in which planners and other professionals undertake teamwork in planning projects);
- (v) styles of decision making (different cultural groups have different decision-making procedures);
- and (vi) approaches to knowing (this affects the procedural approach to planning) (Burayidi 2000a:5).

Problems can arise not just from cultural misunderstandings such as these, however, but from more deep-seated beliefs in the superiority of one’s own culture, or the belief that all immigrants should adapt to the mores of the ‘host’ culture – which is the dominant attitude in Europe today.

A *third* challenge revealed by research concerns situations in which the xenophobia and/or racism within communities and neighborhoods finds its expression or outlet through the planning system, in the form of a planning dispute over, say, the location of a mosque or Hindu temple, the use of a suburban house as a Buddhist community center, the conversion of an abandoned factory into a training facility for indigenous youth, or the retailing practices of Vietnamese traders (see Sandercock and Klinger 1998a, 1998b). In such conflicts, it is not the planning system as such which is the problem, but rather the fact that the system becomes an outlet for the deep-seated fears, aversions, or anxieties of some residents. How might the planning system respond in constructive ways?

³ For an excellent study of the ways in which urban planning has developed, historically, as a heterosexist project antagonistic towards alternative sexualities, see Frisch (2002).

A *fourth* challenge arises when (western) planners come up against cultural practices that are incommensurable with their own perceptions, values, and practices. One way of interpreting the Supreme Court ruling described above, would be to see it as an incommensurable issue of different perceptions of and attitudes towards the meaning of land between secular mainstream American society and Native American communities.⁴ Another illustration of this dilemma is Tovi Fenster's sensitive account of planning new towns for Bedouins and housing for Ethiopian Jews in Israel. Fenster's post-occupancy research uncovered a deep distress amongst both the Muslim Bedouin women and the Ethiopian Jewish women as a result of the failure of the site plans and the housing design to deal with their culturally specific needs for spatial separation -- the separation of women from certain men in the case of the Bedouin, and the separation of menstruating women in special huts away from their own family compound in the case of the Ethiopian Jews. The problem, as Fenster describes it, is far more complicated than that of a top-down planning process that failed to consult with those for whom the towns and housing were being planned. There is a double dilemma of control and power at work here: of the state over minorities, and of certain community members (men) over other community members (women) within the minority community itself.

Fenster's nuanced discussion of planning across the divide of incommensurable cultural values and practices raises a profound difficulty for planners working in cross-cultural situations. She herself is conflicted, as a feminist on the one hand, and as a planner committed to the acknowledgement of and respect for cultural difference, on the other. Her way through this dilemma is two-fold; one step is to open up a dialogue within Bedouin and Ethiopian Jewish communities concerning the cultural construction of space and the associated lack of freedom of movement for women, and another is imagining more flexible design solutions which may be amenable to change over time, as inter-generational family values are likely to change. This is what she terms 'mapping the boundaries of social change' (Fenster 1999a:165).

Responses to difference

How can planners and the planning system respond to these multiple challenges? How is, and how might, the right to difference be accommodated in our cities and neighborhoods? As Wallace and Milroy have noted, neither the planning literature nor experiences in planning practice make it obvious how one *ought* to deal with difference in planning (Wallace and Milroy 1999:55). I suggest

⁴ An inability on the part of western societies to understand, acknowledge, or accept what is sacred to indigenous societies produces an ongoing source of conflict between the two, which manifests itself frequently in planning disputes (see Jackson 1998).

that there are five broad kinds of response. *First*, we might consider overhauling the planning system, either by revising legislation, or challenging it in the courts or appeal tribunals, testing whether it is consistent with, say, anti-discrimination legislation, or espoused multicultural policies. Wallace and Milroy drew this conclusion in their study of planning issues in Toronto and Southern Ontario, arguing that rather than the ‘neutral’ framework currently in place, difference needs to be taken as the point of departure. However, the (institutional and procedural) template for this kind of planning, as they note, has not yet been developed (Wallace and Milroy 1999:70). Furthermore, overhauling any legislation is a daunting task, and usually only occurs as a result of powerful lobbying which often takes at least a generation. (Think of feminist or civil rights reforms and how long and hard they were fought for.) This suggests that unless social movements are actively working on behalf of the rights of cultural minorities in and to the built environment, this kind of change is unlikely to come about in the short term. Nevertheless, the task of decolonizing planning will ultimately have to be addressed at this level.

A *second* type of broad response to the needs of different cultural groups is through market mechanisms, and here we can see a certain amount of progress in most cities. Most notably, stores open up to provide specialist goods and services (Halal and Kosher butchers, Asian and African markets for fruit and vegetables, Turkish video stores, Mexican bridal wear, Greek pastries, Chinese acupuncturists and herbalists). Shopping malls and whole precincts within a city spring to life providing, say, Vietnamese hairdressers, lawyers, tax accountants, shoe repairers, for predominantly Vietnamese (or Bengali or Korean...) enclaves of the city, whose members are unwilling as yet to venture beyond their own community for these common services.

Other kinds of small businesses emerge, for example in housing construction and renovation, to cater for culturally specific kinds of domestic spaces (Jewish builders who know how to do a kosher kitchen; Muslim builders who know about the orientation of bedroom and bathing spaces to Mecca, or about the gender-based spatial separations, or the spatial requirements for praying).

The activities of ‘immigrant place entrepreneurs’ (Light 2002) have been even more significant for the changing urban landscape of global cities. Ivan Light’s research in Los Angeles and Kris Olds’ in Vancouver demonstrate the significant roles of Korean and Chinese entrepreneurs in regional property development in Los Angeles, and of Chinese developers in Vancouver (Light 2002; Olds 2001). The immigrant land developers buy land cheaply, promote it in Chinese or Korean emigration basin areas, then sell it to co-ethnic immigrants at a profit. In the process these developers reduce the difficulties of immigration for their community, and are the primary forces in creating ethnic residential clustering (Light 2002).

But what has this market response got to do with planning? In the case of small businesses, there will be requests for signage, or for a change in regulations concerning retail practices, to allow street vendors, or to allow street displays of wares. Planners and city governments can ease these neighborhood transitions by facilitating such changes, or they can be obstructive (see Sandercock and Kliger 1998a, for such a case). In the case of immigrant property developers, local planners and politicians may be involved in delicate negotiations about the use of and design guidelines for large sites, as well as mediating adjacent users' fears of the prospect of a large-scale immigrant presence. Planners' own values and attitudes matter in handling these potential and real conflicts. Mediation processes may be necessary when local conflicts arise. Sophistication about other cultures is increasingly necessary in handling such negotiations and mediations.

This market response, and planning accommodations to it, is all well and good for those who can afford to pay for such goods and services. But we only have to think of the appalling housing situations of certain cultural minorities (indigenous peoples almost everywhere), or of the poorest members of any immigrant group (Bengalis in London, Vietnamese in Melbourne, Sri Lankan Tamils in Toronto...), to recognize that the market does not, and never will, address all the needs arising from and problems relating to cultural diversity.

This was indeed the conclusion drawn from a recent cross-national comparative research project that investigated the socio-spatial exclusion of ethnic minorities in six European countries (Khakee, Somma and Thomas 1999). The specifics of the research inquired into the impact of urban renewal or regeneration policies on immigrant communities, and concluded that whereas 'property-led renewal' has tended to displace ethnic minorities (by demolishing or upgrading inner city housing), state-led programs have resulted in the ghettoizing of immigrants in the worst housing in the worst neighborhoods, and have failed to address associated issues of economic and political integration. The general pattern that emerges from these six national studies shows a strong concentration of immigrant minorities in the worst housing, in specific districts of large urban areas, either in inner city high density housing or in peripheral districts. In all six countries (Sweden, Portugal, Italy, the Netherlands, France and Britain), discussions of immigration are framed by the conception of the 'immigrant as problem'. And, most disturbingly, each national case study notes the intensification of national and cultural forms of racism, an observation which has been reinforced by the political successes of anti-immigrant parties in Austria and Switzerland in 1999, the Netherlands and Denmark in 2002 (and in France much earlier), and the accompanying discourses, which both racialize and spatialize the immigration issue, portraying it as an invasion of national space by

‘foreigners’, those with different everyday practices, which manifest themselves most dramatically in the concrete spaces of streets, shops, schools, housing and neighborhoods.

Thus far I have discussed two responses to the right to difference: through legislation and the courts, and through the market. There are three other (interdependent) possibilities, which will occupy the remainder of this paper. One is the process-based response of establishing an intercultural dialogue that addresses fears and anxieties, as well as social needs and material conflicts. A second is the possibility of excluded groups mobilizing to fight for their rights to the city. A third, (see Sandercock 2004), is a profound reconsideration of the different qualities and skills that might be required if planners are to work in cross-cultural contexts. In the next section of this chapter I discuss several positive efforts by city governments and planners (in Frankfurt and Rotterdam, Sydney and Vancouver) to ‘manage’ difference with respect to integrating immigrants -- efforts to think through the implications of multiculturalism not only symbolically, but street by street, neighborhood by neighborhood, neither ignoring the fears aroused by the presence of strangers, nor the fears experienced by the strangers themselves as they struggle to accommodate to a new environment and develop new attachments to a strange place.

When strangers become neighbors: Integrating immigrants

When immigrants with different histories, cultures, and needs arrive in global cities, their presence disrupts taken-for-granted categories of social life and urban space as they struggle to redefine the conditions for belonging in their new society. The need to construct communities seems to be a deep and universal feature of the human condition (Tully 1995). In a world of globalizing cities, there are many ways of belonging to many kinds of community, which are not territorially defined or bounded. Nevertheless, place-identification and a sense of belonging to a place do not seem to have diminished in importance for most people. And that sense of belonging to a place is usually inseparable from the ties to the particular human community that inhabits the place.

Immigrants have a particularly strong need for community, for practical as well as emotional support, and past experience shows that they will almost always form their own communities over time, sometimes spatially concentrated (enclaves), sometimes spatially more dispersed. (This is particularly important for those refugees who come as single men or women, without possessions, with little knowledge of language, and no money.) A truly multicultural society not only encourages and supports community organizations *within* immigrant groups, but also works to incorporate immigrants into wider, cross-cultural activities and organizations. How is this second step achieved?

How do societies establish civility, then conviviality, across difference? How do we (migrants and host society) generate an everyday capacity to live and work with, and alongside, those who are (perceived as) different?

The presence of migrants in the national imaginaries of some host countries, especially those countries that have not traditionally seen themselves as countries of immigration, is confined to a distant awareness of the migrant body as a source of cheap, and preferably temporary labor. In these places there is, from the migrants' point of view, no social space that beckons them as a positive and permanent feature. They must endure a painful process of acquiring a new spatial and social sense of belonging, a new sense of home. From the hosts' point of view, there is an equally painful disruption of their own homely space, from the imaginary space of the nation to the very real spaces of neighborhoods, the kinds of shops and churches, the smells coming from restaurants, the way people dress. All this can seem an affront to an established and comfortable way of life. Nostalgia for a disappearing community mixes with fear of and aversion towards the stranger, the outsider (see Sandercock forthcoming 2004, Chapter 5).

The stranger, on the other hand, the migrant, has left his/her home and taken up residence in someone else's 'home', where s/he encounters suspicion, disdain, indifference, even outright hostility. Migrants need to construct a new place that they, too, can call home, and there are several stages of home-building and place-making that migrants typically go through. Pascoe (1992) describes Italian migrants' place-making processes in Australia as involving three sets of strategies: naming, rituals, and institutions. *Naming* refers to giving homeland names to places in the new country. It also applies to business signs in homeland languages. *Rituals* refer to public events that affirm the belonging and cohesion of the group, such as the 'blessing of the fleet' that regularly takes place wherever Italians own fishing boats. *Institutions* include welfare associations, sporting and other clubs, churches, revolving credit associations, and so on, that both demonstrate the presence of a community and provide the services its needs.

A richer understanding of these strategies can provide some guidance in thinking about integration in Europe. To become a multicultural society requires more than a top-down policy declaration of multiculturalism from the Hague, Stockholm, or Berlin. I have emphasized thus far the importance of *feelings* (fears, anxieties, hopes, and so on) in the lived experience of migration, the feelings of the host society as well as the newcomers, because I want to stress that becoming a multicultural society/city is more than a matter of bureaucratic management⁵, or of citizenship legislation. *It also requires the active construction of new ways of living together, new forms of*

spatial and social belonging. It is a long-term process of building new communities, during which such fears and anxieties cannot be dismissed but need to be worked through.

This is easy to say, but difficult to do: difficult politically, while xenophobic feelings are on the rise in European and Australian cities; and difficult to implement, precisely because it means dealing with those feelings among the host society as well as with the more obvious material needs of immigrants, such as housing and jobs and schooling. I now turn to the experience of two European cities, each of which has tried to tackle fears as well as material needs, followed by the experiences within an Australian and a Canadian city in actually institutionalizing responses to these issues.

Frankfurt

From 1989-1995 Frankfurt, under the Red-Green coalition city government, embarked on an ambitious social experiment to create a multicultural city in an anti-immigrant society, establishing AMKA (the Municipal Department of Multicultural Affairs), in the Lord Mayor's office. AMKA's tasks were to work in collaboration with all the agencies of the state to promote the social integration of the city's 30% foreign (non-German) population, and to work directly in the public sphere, to involve itself in a process of 'zusammenwachsen' or 'growing together' of all ethnic groups into a peaceful multicultural society, respectful of difference (Friedmann and Lehrer 1997). In AMKA's own estimation, the successful completion of this process could take as long as two or three generations, the result of a long period of mutual learning, mutual adjustment, and continuing (non-violent) conflict. Their political objectives included:

- reducing the German population's fear of 'the Other' and the number of violent acts against foreigners
- encouraging public discussion of migration and the limits of social tolerance
- working towards the active participation of newcomers in the public affairs of the city
- encouraging the cultural activities of each group of foreign residents
- offering in-service training for members of the municipal bureaucracy in intercultural communication
- forming a culture of everyday life in the context of immigration (Wolf-Almanasreh 1993, quoted in Friedmann and Lehrer 1997: 68-69).

⁵ See Westin (1996) for Sweden's failure in this respect.

AMKA worked towards these objectives on three main fronts: public hearings; the creation of a Municipal Advisory Council of Foreign residents; and strengthening the many voices of civil society among foreign residents. Over three years there were two hearings and a public forum. The first, *A Hearing on the Situation of Foreigners in Frankfurt*, took place in the Plenary Hall of the City Council, with all its symbolic resonance. 190 groups, organizations, and individuals were invited and almost all came, to hear and be heard. The message was that the new city government regarded them as an important part of the city and would work towards improving their circumstances. The second event, *A Hearing on the Situation of Migrant Women*, attracted 30 organizations and women from diverse cultures shared the fact of living in patriarchal regimes inside the relatively emancipated West German cultural environment to which they were exposed on a more or less daily basis. They raised numerous issues, including legal status, labor market participation, education, safe houses for young women wanting to leave the parental home, and sexual exploitation. The third hearing was conducted as a 2-day forum on 'Living Together'.

Lengthy preparations for this event included interviews with 50 Frankfurters on the subject of what Frankfurt thought and felt about its foreigners. The forum itself focused on *Suggestions and Demands for an Urban Policy Concerning Frankfurt's Population*, and 45 policy recommendations were produced, all of which reiterated AMKA's commitment to a philosophy of transformational dialogue (Friedmann and Lehrer 1997: 70-71).

The second sphere of AMKA's work involved the creation of a Foreign Residents' Advisory Board, whose members were chosen by election, and had the right to attend city council meetings, and the opportunity to review and comment on the municipal budget proposal. The third sphere, strengthening civil society, involved a number of activities, including preparing a register of all organizations run by migrants, supporting multicultural events with financial and technical assistance, working with sports clubs, and providing allotment gardens for migrants.

The extraordinary ambition of AMKA and the Red-Green coalition of moving toward the practical utopia of a multicultural society came to an end in 1995 with the election of the Christian Democrats to City Council. It had been a very bold, innovative experiment on European soil, in a country in which the majority had shown little inclination to turn foreigners into Germans and to share citizens' rights with them. But experiments like these have a life beyond their own short span, as inspirational examples, which sometimes pave the way for broader changes. What was particularly significant about AMKA is worth summarizing:

- it dealt with multicultural citizenship at the *level of the city* and everyday life
- it was committed to a *long-term* perspective

- it promoted *mutual* learning
- it recognized and tried to address *fear of foreigners*, and the violence that often accompanies this fear
- it addressed the culture of the municipal bureaucracy (police, teachers, judges, planners)
- it saw its main role as educational, oriented to learning and communication

One political conclusion that might be drawn is that for a project of migrant integration at the level of the city, there needs to be multi-party support. Another might be that support from the national state is essential if conditions of becoming a citizen are to change. A third insight has to do with the micro-politics of integration. The public forums were incredibly important symbolic events, and may also have contributed to the empowerment or confidence-building of those migrant organizations and individuals who took part, but there is also micro-sociological work that needs to be done street by street, neighborhood by neighborhood, and across a range of institutions. This was the argument in my previous paper in this series, which stressed the importance of the daily negotiations of difference in the ‘micro-publics’ of the city.

Rotterdam

The importance of a micro-sociological approach to integration has been understood in Rotterdam and directed specifically at cultural institutions and practices. When Rotterdam was designated as Europe’s City of Culture for 2001, the city decided on a number of programs that would address the challenge of its increasing ethnic diversity (164 different nationalities form 45% of the total population of 600,000). Under the umbrella of ‘Erasmus 2001’, and invoking the qualities of ‘dialogue, tolerance, and forbearance that goes beyond indifference’ for which Erasmus (1466-1536) himself was famous, the mission the city set for itself was ‘to stimulate cohesion in a changing society’, inspired from an arts and cultural perspective. The arts were posited as ‘an improved way of dealing with the tensions that go with a society of differences’. The cultural program included the establishment of a World Music faculty at the Rotterdam Conservatory; a reorganization of the public library to develop a culturally diverse program offering; the multicultural Theater Zuidplein (located in an ethnically diverse neighborhood on the outskirts of the city), which attempts to connect with its culturally diverse environment; discovering and developing a municipal safety net for new multicultural artistic talent; expanding the range of cultural voices in the local broadcast media; and staging an exhibition with the theme of ‘unpacking Europe’, by inviting 20 non-European artists to present their interpretations of ‘Europe’.

Social themes included building multicultural housing; asking the primary health care sector to examine its cultural sensitivity; exploring the possibility of a multicultural football club; investigating funeral customs across cultures; and researching the realities, as opposed to the myths, of safety and danger in ethnically mixed neighborhoods.⁶ Of course it is too soon to evaluate the effectiveness of these initiatives in Rotterdam, but they deserve attention because they were conceived in a new spirit of cultural exploration and sharing, in a spirit of welcoming the changes that are happening in the city as a result of immigration and building on them so as to nurture a comfortably hybrid city. For this reason, Rotterdam builds on Frankfurt as a lesson in the importance of openness, creativity, and risk – in the continuing experiment of *cosmopolis*.

Sydney

While European cities struggle to shift personal and institutional mindsets not used to thinking of themselves as countries of immigration, we might expect that new world cities such as those in Australia and Canada, nations necessarily founded on immigration, have come to grips with living with difference. In fact, this is far from true, for reasons related to their founding as racialized liberal democracies. Nevertheless, as officially multicultural societies, Australian and Canadian governments have been preoccupied with the challenge of accommodating (rather than assimilating) diversity for at least three decades. How far have they come? There is some very good research now available in Australia based on the first national survey of the responsiveness of local governments to cultural diversity⁷. I draw on this in the following brief summary of the efforts of one local municipality (Canterbury) in Sydney. But first some context.

Until the latter third of the 20th century Australia had a restrictive immigration policy that was known colloquially as the White Australia Policy, meaning that if you weren't of European/Caucasian lineage you weren't likely to be allowed to settle. That policy unraveled in the late 1960s, and was replaced by an official endorsement of multiculturalism in 1973, with the publication of *A Multicultural Society for the Future* (Grassby 1973). Over the next decade, national government documents advocated a model of cultural pluralism based on principles of social cohesion, cultural identity, equality of opportunity, and full participation in Australian society. Various federal government programs and agencies over the past three decades have been devoted to overseeing the development and implementation of a national multicultural philosophy. For the most part, state and local governments have lagged behind the federal level in their enthusiasm for implementing this new

⁶ Information about Erasmus 2001 was drawn from the website: www.erasmus2001.nl

⁷ Some of the publications from this research include Dunn et al. (2001a, 2001b); Thompson et al. (1998); Thompson (2003). What follows in this section draws primarily from Thompson (2003).

society. Nevertheless, in the most populous state, New South Wales (NSW), legislation is in place to encourage local government to act responsively to its diverse citizenry. The *Charter of Principles for a Culturally Diverse Society* (Ethnic Affairs Commission NSW, 1993) has been incorporated into local government legislation and requires local councils to respond (across all departments and services) to cultural diversity. This was done in 1998 with an amendment to the Local Government Act requiring councils to develop a detailed social plan addressing issues related to indigenous communities and migrants from non-English-speaking backgrounds. Such institutional pressures have, in principle, compelled councils to confront the need for reform. In practice, as the research shows, a systematic response to the needs of diverse groups is a long way off. ‘Some councils were surprisingly ignorant of the nature of their local diversity, and had failed to identify and abandon discriminatory and iniquitous practices in the provision of services and facilities’ (Thompson 2003).

Still, there are some remarkable cases where change has been institutionalized, one of which is in the municipality of Canterbury, 17 kms south west of downtown Sydney, with a population of 132,360 and a growth in the non-English speaking born population from 28% in 1981 to 45% in 1996. Canterbury has seen waves of migration since the 1950s, beginning with Greeks and Lebanese, and more recently, people from China and the Pacific Islands. The Council’s *Multicultural Social Plan* reflects its commitment to cultural diversity, embracing equity and access to quality services for all residents, and the promotion of harmonious and tolerant community relations (Thompson 2003). The Plan defines the settlement needs of all of its diverse residents, after consultation with them, and then identifies actions that link multicultural considerations to all departments within the Council: engineering, corporate and community services, and environmental services. There are ‘priority languages’ of information and signage, cultural awareness training for staff, and a community worker for multicultural services. There is also a Multicultural Advisory Committee, whose membership is external to the Council, but whose activities are interwoven through all Council departments via their action statements. In these ways, the Council has begun to institutionalize its rhetorical commitments to serve its diverse community.

Under ‘Environmental Services’ the Council has embarked on several significant initiatives. The Town Centres Development Program focuses on urban design guidelines and reviews the Council’s public domain policies for open space, outdoor dining, festivals, temporary outdoor stalls, signage, and street furniture. The intention is that public spaces should be well used by all sections of the community, and the understanding is that this can only happen if they are well designed, with the community’s input. There is also a recreation study that draws attention to the need for culturally sensitive recreation policies (from art works to cultural events to sports facilities to community

gardens and landscaping), and a proposed Multicultural Oral History Project that would document the social history of migration into the area, acknowledging the contributions of migrant families to the economic and social life of the municipality.

Thompson (2003) concludes that this and other case studies from the national survey show that it is possible to develop innovative and well funded projects ‘that address cultural diversity as part of mainstream planning activity’. Of course, the fact that Canterbury is one of the most diverse districts in Australia has helped to prioritize this work. And the Council is mandated by state legislation to produce a multicultural social plan. Still, the Council has institutionalized staff positions and sought partnerships with state government to secure funding for projects, and they have used culturally appropriate consultative techniques. What this demonstrates, then, is the desirability of a multi-tiered governmental framework supporting cultural diversity, and of an internal, whole of Council, interdisciplinary approach. At this point, the multicultural project no longer relies on local leadership only, or on the vagaries of election cycles, which brought down the Frankfurt experiment.

Vancouver

Multiculturalism in Canada has served as a guideline for government policy since 1971, and also as a framework for national discourse on the construction of Canadian society (Mahtani 2002:68). Initially conceived as a way of accommodating the separatist impulse of Quebec’s French-speaking population and Francophone culture, the policy has had to evolve to take on board, literally, the arrival of increasing numbers of immigrants from ‘ethnically diverse’ (non-Anglo, non-Caucasian) backgrounds. Canadian multiculturalism has encouraged individuals voluntarily to affiliate with the culture and tradition of their choice, and there has been significant spending, through multicultural grants, to support the maintenance of various cultures and languages and to encourage diverse cultural festivals in public places as well as the symbolic gesture of public artworks that recognize and celebrate the multiple peoples who make up the nation. The intention has been to forge a workable national framework of ‘unity within diversity’, surely a remarkable change from conventional strategies of nation-building (Mahtani 2002:70).⁸

⁸ As remarkably harmonious as Canadian society undoubtedly is, and in no small part thanks to multicultural policy, there are nevertheless three significant criticisms of that policy that have emerged over the past three decades. One comes from indigenous communities who argue that their claims (which go beyond calls for ‘cultural recognition’, to demands for land and sovereignty) cannot be accommodated within a multicultural political framework. A second comes primarily from within ‘ethnic communities’ and is critical of multicultural policy in so far as it focuses on ethnicity as a primary identification, and encourages ethnic separatism and competition (Bisoondath 2002). Some of these critics also object that it is only non-whites who are presumed to have an ethnicity, and further, that ethnicity is only one of many ways of defining a sense of self and of belonging. A third criticism has been that the apparent tolerance expressed in multiculturalism has actually

Still, there is a significant leap from multicultural rhetoric at the level of national politics and legal frameworks, to what happens in the streets and neighborhoods of Canada's cities. As has been the case in Australia, provincial and local levels of government have been slower to respond to cultural diversity in terms of examining and changing their policies. Recent research in Vancouver (Edgington and Hutton 2002) and Toronto (Wallace and Milroy 1999; Milroy and Wallace 2001) has shown that local policies in relation to the built environment have lagged behind the rapidly changing demographic realities. There are, however, exceptions, beacons of innovation, and it is to one of these that I now turn. The City of Vancouver (politically, a municipal government within the Greater Vancouver metropolitan region), with a population near 700,000, has developed a series of policy responses to its culturally diverse population, including staff hired within the City Planning Department as multicultural planners, and a multicultural outreach program. One remarkable initiative supported by the City of Vancouver is the Collingwood Neighborhood House.⁹

Collingwood is a predominantly residential neighborhood of significant ethno-cultural diversity within the City of Vancouver, just east of downtown. It is home to 42,000 people, only 32% of whom have English as their first language (compared to 51% citywide). Over the past twenty years there has been rapid demographic change. In 1986, people of Chinese background comprised 21% of the population and people of English background 51%. By 1996 the area was 44% Chinese, 10% English, with Filipino and South Asian groups growing to 5% and 8% respectively. There are also Italians, Portugese, Vietnamese, First Nations, Scottish, Irish, and German residents, and the South Asian and Chinese communities can be broken down into distinct linguistic and other subcultural groups.

In the early 1980s, the provincial and municipal governments held consultations with local residents over the potential impacts of an elevated rapid transit line (and five stations) that was planned to cut through the neighborhood. The process generated a new activism in the area and also highlighted intercultural tensions, as well as lack of local services. In 1985 a group of local volunteers established the Collingwood Neighborhood House (CNH) as a non-profit, non-government organization, initially to provide much needed family and childcare services. The funding agencies, the City of Vancouver and United Way, mandated a culturally diverse organization, and the founding

masked an ongoing and institutionalized racism in Canadian society directed at non-whites (Bannerji 1995, 2000; Hill 2001; Henry et al. 2000).

⁹ In the following discussion of the CNH I draw gratefully on the Masters thesis of Steven Dang, *Creating Cosmopolis: the end of mainstream* (Dang 2002), and on conversations with Nathan Edeleson, senior planner with the City of Vancouver Planning Department, and Norma-Jean McLaren, cross-cultural relations consultant.

members accordingly set out to diversify in terms of language and ethnicity.¹⁰ As the organization developed, issues of access for other groups – in terms of age, ability, and socio-economic situation - were also addressed. The CNH was one of the first institutions in Vancouver to develop a multicultural policy, which is part of what makes its story significant. More important, though, are the details of how this was done, and the (local and national) circumstances that made it possible.

The CNH is now widely recognized for its innovative practice in diversification,¹¹ its ability to create and maintain ‘a place for everyone’ (Dang 2002:73). In 2002, the agency’s programs and services reached an estimated 25,000–35,000 residents (60-86% of the neighborhood’s population). Among its successes, several different religious groups (Christian, Muslim, and various Chinese traditions) share the facility as a place of study and worship. Another is the establishment of its own community-leadership training institute that targets recruitment in under-represented and at-risk communities. A third is the success of outreach through the arts in its ‘Building Community through Cultural Expression’ program. Intercultural exchanges through children, food, and the arts seem to provide a less intimidating initiation into deeper, more long- term involvement in the community and in the organization (Dang 2002:84). An even more profound achievement, through the variety of outreach initiatives, has been an attitudinal shift. ‘People are seeing each other as *assets*, not just clients or people in need’ (Dang 2002:85). They are becoming contributors as well as recipients of services.¹²

On the surface, what CNH does is to develop and provide services according to perceived local needs. But there is more to it than that. First, the organization’s real purpose (as reflected in its mission statement) is to *build community*, and its belief is that that cannot be achieved by providing culturally specific services. The very idea of a ‘neighborhood house’ implies a place with no subcultural affiliation, no shared interest other than *creating a community based on common residency*.¹³ Thus the approach to programming is *intercultural*. Second, the services are not seen as

¹⁰ The organization has now diversified its funding sources and developed partnerships with other service providers. There are now over a hundred collaborative partners and 30 separate funding agencies provide over 60 different grants.

¹¹ In 1999 it received the City of Vancouver Cultural Harmony Award for having ‘consistently demonstrated through its programs and actions a strong commitment to cultural diversity and community harmony’ and for developing ‘broad programming that brings people of different cultures and backgrounds together’ (Dang 2002:73).

¹² The aboriginal community, for example, has always been seen as needy. People did not see the resources in that culture until residents suggested an arts initiative that invited indigenous artists to do some carving for the façade of the new premises. Through the carving, and participation in other activities, people began to see what aboriginal people could contribute to the community (Dang 2002: 85).

¹³ In the early 1990s, over a thousand residents took part in the planning and construction of the CNH’s main facility on Joyce Street. Representatives of various communities, based on age, ability, ethnicity, gender, and

merely services meeting a need. They are also seen as providing meeting places where people come together, and *connect through engaging in activities together*. Third, residents are engaged as researchers in the investigation of their own community, which further helps in establishing contacts and building relationships, as well as empowering locals to become involved in the decision-making and programming at the Neighborhood House.¹⁴ The CNH also conducts regular anti-racism education programs, and teaches through its consistent policies and actions that community is built through inclusion rather than through drawing boundaries. This is the daily negotiation of difference in the micro-publics of the city, in everyday activities, that was discussed in the first of these four papers as the most appropriate way to foster intercultural contact and exchange.

Dang (2002) conceptualizes the CNH achievement as a four-part organizational framework: achieving differentiated benefits; achieving inclusive participation; achieving varied discourse; and achieving inclusive definitions. Achieving differentiated benefits means building community through ensuring personalized flexibility within broad-based programs; constantly monitoring the diverse needs of communities; and regularly evaluating programs against these assessments. Achieving inclusive participation means conducting concerted outreach and building personal relationships in all communities to ensure diverse participation not only in programs but also in decision-making processes. Achieving varied discourse means initiating and facilitating opportunities for dialogue that bring people together, enable them to talk through conflicts, and build community leadership capacity. Achieving inclusive definitions means creating a sense of ownership and belonging in the organization among all the neighborhood's constituent communities, by making the organization accessible to and reflective of local diversity. Above all, these achievements have required patience, deliberate outreach (which involves personal cross-cultural communication skills), and a stable organization that residents get to know and come to trust over time (Dang 2002:95). Small decisions made each day by the Board, staff, volunteers, and user groups can matter a great deal to who is made to feel at home, who has access to community and identity. The art work on the walls, the language of a pamphlet,¹⁵ the faces behind a desk, the height of a water fountain, can all signify inclusion – or exclusion. In all of these ways, and at all of these levels of detail, the CNH has succeeded in becoming an exemplary *intercultural organization*.

socio-economic circumstances, all left their mark on the design of the facility and the policies that govern its operation (Dang 2002:89).

¹⁴ This approach has been particularly successful in assessing needs among youth and seniors. 'Seniors asking seniors' was one such project, another is an ongoing community youth mapping exercise (Dang 2002: 77).

¹⁵ All communication and information is provided in six languages: English, Chinese, Hindi, Punjabi, Spanish, and Vietnamese. These languages were decided on the basis of actual numbers of speakers in the community, and the likelihood of speakers not to understand one of the other languages.

What circumstances brought this organization into being? The CNH was born in the mid-1980s amidst the emerging philosophies of diversity and multiculturalism at the national level. The City of Vancouver, under new left-of-center leadership (the New Democratic Party) was engaged in redefining itself as both a global and a multicultural city in the lead-up to staging Expo in 1986. This City Council was eager to implement culturally sensitive policies. For example, the City of Vancouver created the Hastings Institute to provide leadership in diversity and improve race relations through anti-racist and diversity training programs. As a new organization, the CNH was not burdened with inherited ways of thinking and doing. It defined itself, from the beginning, as a *learning* organization that would have to constantly reflect on its own programs and ways of operating. It had strong internal advocates for diversity in its early development as an organization and strong leadership of its governing Board. The founding President and the Executive Director had each received training in the practice of diversity through the Hastings Institute, and required that that be an ongoing practice of the organization. Care has always been taken in recruiting new staff, Board members, and volunteers, who are expected to have cross-cultural experience and a demonstrated appreciation of the principles of diversification. Care has also been taken to ensure *ongoing* commitment by requiring that attention to diversity is integrated throughout the entire institution, from its strategic directives to its daily operations. Finally, the funding model is unusual. After initial dependence on the City Council and the United Way, the CNH successfully pursued a wide range of funding sources, so that if any one source is withdrawn, the operation does not collapse.

This intricate web of reasons for the success of the CNH cautions us against generalizing from it as a model to be imitated in other cities in other countries. Often, small local initiatives, especially ones that are sparked by strong and inspiring individual leadership, appear replicable if only comparable energetic and committed individuals can be found in different places, and some funding thrown at them. Clearly the situation here is far more complicated, involving philosophical, political, and/or financial support from two tiers of government, the engagement of a mobilized civil society, and the development of a complex funding model. Nevertheless, the story is instructive in what it takes to work towards living with diversity, beyond the model of ‘indifference to difference’, towards actually building an intercultural community. It is a living example of the principles discussed in the first paper, above all, emphasizing the daily and ongoing negotiation of difference through coming together on common projects and in everyday activities of survival and the reproduction of life.

I did not set out in this paper to provide an exhaustive review of different approaches to integrating migrants and building intercultural communities. (That would take a book-length study at the least). Rather, I have tried to concentrate on what is new and promising, what seems to be getting at the real issues. In this context it is worth mentioning, very briefly, the German federal government's efforts, under the Red-Green coalition elected in 1998, to tackle (rather than deny) migrant issues. This has operated on many fronts, including citizenship policy, and produced one impressive federal social policy initiative, which goes by the name of the 'Social City'. Money is available to cities to apply for neighborhood regeneration projects. Many of the successful applications for the money are for projects in migrant neighborhoods, where housing and other services are in need of additional support. When I visited one such project in the Kreuzberg district of Berlin in the Spring of 2002, what impressed me was the coordinated attempt to address migrant integration issues, from schooling to housing rehabilitation to the need for assistance in setting up small businesses. But what was disturbing, what the project has not been able to address, is the 'white flight' reaction of ethnic Germans, who are either leaving the neighborhood, or removing their children from its schools. In this very tangible way, Berlin's problems are Germany's problems, and these are also Europe's present problems of integration. I now want to discuss these issues from the perspective of citizenship debates.

Citizenship: Multicultural and urban

In a European Union of 350 million people, foreign (that is, non-EU) minorities are becoming an increasingly significant part of the urban landscape. The question of their acceptance, and citizenship rights, has suddenly become central to European politics and is crucial to the ongoing social stability of the region. What policy research has made clear in recent years (Sassen 2000; Papademetriou 2002) is the economic and demographic necessity of migrants, in part to do the dirty, dangerous and undesirable work that locals no longer want to do, or where there are not enough workers to fill such jobs; in part to provide high-end technological skills; and in part to ensure longer term growth in the labor force, in order for taxes to support a rapidly aging population. As Papademetriou explains:

'The demographic facts are clear. Because the baby-boom generation has failed to reproduce itself adequately throughout the advanced industrial world, its passage from the economic scene will create working age population voids. At the same time, a retirement age bulge will be created unlike anything we have witnessed in modern times – with the added 'wrinkle' of the aged now living much longer than ever before. This means that much higher old-age dependency ratios will follow, whereby the taxes of fewer and fewer workers will have to support ever-larger numbers of retirees. These facts suggest that over the next

two decades, immigrants will likely be relied upon more and more heavily for many important social and economic purposes. Among them are tending to the needs of relatively affluent first-worlders through their labor, helping to keep retirement and public health systems afloat through their taxes, and, in many cases, keeping production and consumption systems humming' (Papademetriou 2002: 29-30).

Thus has postcolonial history come full circle, as the world's poor (many of them former 'colonial subjects') travel to the erstwhile metropolitan nations of empire to settle 'a new frontier' (Sassen 2000: 156) in the midst of the West's prosperous societies, in the middle of 'White Nations' (Hage 1998) that have yet to come to terms with their own colonial and neo-colonial pasts. For European nations to reconstitute themselves as multicultural societies is a profound reorientation which surely will take more than one generation. My optimism about the possibility of *cosmopolis* rests on the creative working through of new identities and the forming of new hybrid cultures by second generation immigrants. What I have emphasized thus far is the significance of *cities* in this process, and therefore of city governments, city planners, and city dwellers. I have also argued that it is as important to address the psychological challenges of integration (fear of, aversion towards foreigners), as it is to address the material and communicative challenges. What remains is to discuss the importance and changing meanings of citizenship in multicultural societies.

The story of AMKA brings to the foreground the importance of debates about the meaning of citizenship as part of an *urban policy response* to the increasing presence of foreign migrants in global cities. In many parts of the world now, and not just in Germany, those loosely defined as 'guest workers' have become a permanent presence, yet survive as blatantly ambiguous groups, excluded by definition from the places where they live, and yet no longer at home in their 'homelands'. The problem of outsiders dwelling in a territory from which they are conceptually excluded as citizens, and often actively oppressed and subject to violent attacks from local citizens, has led to the 'return of the citizen' (Kymlicka and Norman 1994) to the center of political debate, both in the daily columns of newspapers and in the research papers of immigration scholars and political philosophers (Turner 1993; Holston 1998; Karst 1986; Friedmann 2002).

Prominent immigration scholars Stephen Castles and Mark Miller (1998:252) have argued that 'multicultural citizenship appears to be the most viable solution to the problem of defining membership of a nation-state in an increasingly mobile world'. Their multicultural model is a combination of a set of social policies to respond to the needs of new settlers – language policies and culturally sensitive social services provision - and a statement about the openness of the nation to cultural diversity. They contrast this multicultural model, which exists in Australia, Canada, Sweden and, to a lesser extent, the United States, with two other models predominant in Europe today, the

‘differential exclusionary model’ and the ‘assimilationist model’. The former exists in countries in which the dominant definition of the nation is that of a community of birth and descent, and members of the dominant group are reluctant to accept immigrants and their children as members of the nation (examples are Germany, Austria, Switzerland). This unwillingness is expressed in the ideology of not being countries of immigration. Differential exclusion means that immigrants are accepted into certain areas of society, most notably the labor market, but not others, such as welfare systems, and political participation. The assimilationist model describes those countries that ‘incorporate migrants through a one-sided process of adaptation: immigrants are expected to give up their distinctive linguistic, cultural, or social characteristics and become indistinguishable from the majority population’ (Castles and Miller 1998: 245). The price of citizenship is cultural assimilation. France is the best example of this model. Britain and the Netherlands have aspects of it, along with aspects of the multicultural model. While most liberal Europeans today would embrace this assimilationist model, seeing it as both a realistic acceptance of the necessity of immigration along with a reasonable (to them) tolerance of strangers (as permanent guests in ‘their’ nation), there is a long-term instability in such a position, since it is based on the absurdity of believing that immigrants who become, say, French citizens, lose their distinctive ethnic or cultural characteristics (including skin color) by virtue of this fact. Since that clearly does not happen, the reality for immigrants in this situation is the lived experience of second class citizenship.

Although I agree with Castles and Miller that the ‘multicultural model’ is the only model that is sustainable over the longer-term, both from the perspective of social stability and from the perspective of the right to difference, I think there is more that needs to be said on the subject of citizenship. Their work, like most of the debates on citizenship, takes for granted that this is a right conferred by and related to the nation-state. What I am arguing, however, is that the lived complexities of migrant integration occur in the city, and usually in the largest or most economically dynamic cities of any nation (sometimes referred to as ‘global cities’). Given this reality, some scholars as well as political activists have begun to talk of a new notion of urban or local citizenship (Siemiatycki and Isin 1997; Isin 1999), understood as the practices through which individuals and groups formulate and claim new rights or struggle to expand or maintain existing rights to the city, on the basis of their difference. This involves a more substantive notion of citizenship that goes beyond the formal, legal notion of *becoming a citizen* and extends to the lived, everyday, sociological experience of *being a citizen*. This in turn involves attempts by immigrant groups to establish collective cultural expressions of their identity in the form of places of worship, commercial environments, recreational facilities, community centers, as well as claims on and the use of public

space in everyday life, the ability to transform the built environment in ways that reflect cultural diversity, and a subjective sense of belonging.

What is being spelled out here is a *normative ideal of urban citizenship*, but one that has political implications and urban policy consequences. The political implications include the encouragement of the political participation of migrants and the openness of the society to being redefined in the process, to new notions of an emerging common identity. This involves nothing less than expanding the spaces of democracy through participation at the local level, and a model of agonistic democracy (see previous paper), in which there is no closure to the multicultural urban and political project; that is, no permanent state of integration and harmony towards which we are moving, *but an always contested engagement with and continually redefined notion of the common good and shared destiny of the citizens of the city*. Another crucial aspect of this normative ideal is the ethnographic reality of intercultural co-existence, the willingness of host society and immigrant groups and individuals to work together across cultural divides without the fear of losing their own identity. One of the roles of urban policy and of urban planners is to create the physical and discursive spaces for such debates and renegotiations of collective identity.

Conclusions

In this paper I have not attempted to be exhaustive about the range of existing or possible policy responses addressing the integration of migrants. I've asked how migrants might be integrated into cities that are not used to thinking of themselves as multicultural, and in answering that, I've looked to some recent experiments in Europe, as well as to several success stories from Australia and Canada which, as more traditional countries of immigration, have a longer experience with these issues.

My discussion has provided at least seven policy directions. The *first* requirement is for commitment by political parties at the local level (city and neighborhood) in developing integration initiatives as a central part of their mission. This can only be done cooperatively, involving a breadth of organizations in civil society. A *second* requirement is for multi-tiered political and policy support systems, from national through to provincial, city and local levels. The *third* requirement for addressing integration at the level of everyday life is to tackle the culture and practices of municipal workers such as the police, teachers, judges, planners, and service providers. Most bureaucracies need to undergo sensitivity training on gender issues in order to transform historic patterns of discrimination and domination. Now it is urgent that they address cultural difference and cultivate the qualities necessary to overcome discrimination and marginalization. A *fourth* requirement is reform

and innovation in the realm of social policy, from the most obvious - language assistance - to the creation of new institutions such as Neighborhood Houses, support for immigrant organizations, official recognition of immigrant rituals and naming rights, and provision of culturally sensitive social services, including culturally appropriate food and recognition rituals at official functions.

A *fifth* requirement is a better understanding of how urban policies can and should address cultural difference. This includes issues of design, location, and process. For example, if different cultures use public and recreational space differently, then new kinds of public spaces may have to be designed, or old ones re-designed, to accommodate this difference. Space also needs to be made available for the different worshipping practices of immigrant cultures: the building of mosques and temples, for example, has become a source of conflict in many cities. And when cultural conflicts arise over different uses of land and buildings, of private as well as public spaces, planners need to find more communicative, less adversarial ways of resolving these conflicts, through participatory mechanisms which give a voice to all those with a stake in the outcome. This in turn requires new skills for planners and architects in cross-cultural communication (see Sandercock, forthcoming 2004, chapter 9).

A *sixth* requirement is the elaboration of new notions of citizenship – multicultural and urban – that are more responsive to newcomers' claims of rights to the city and more encouraging of their political participation at the local level. This involves nothing less than openness on the part of host societies to being redefined in the process of migrant integration, and to new notions of a common identity emerging through an always contested notion of the common good and shared destiny of all residents. The *seventh* is an understanding of and preparedness to work with the emotions that drive these conflicts over integration: emotions of fear, and attachment to history and memory, as well as the status quo, on the part of host societies; and the (possibly ambivalent) desire for belonging, and fear of exclusion on the part of migrants. Not to acknowledge and deal with these emotions is a recipe for failure in the longer-term project of intercultural co-existence.

If multicultural cities are to be socially sustainable, their citizens, city governments, and city-building professions need to work collaboratively on all of these fronts.

References

- Ameyaw, S. 2000. Appreciative planning: An approach to planning with diverse ethnic and cultural groups. In *Urban Planning in a Multicultural Society*, ed. M. Burayidi. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Bannerji, H. 1995. *Thinking Through*. Toronto: Women's Press.
- . 2000. *The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.
- Bisoondath, N. 2002. *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto: Penguin Books.
- Burayidi, M., ed. 2000. *Urban Planning in a Multicultural Society*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- . 2000a. Urban planning as a multicultural cannon. In *Urban Planning in a Multicultural Society*, ed. M. Burayidi. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Castles, S. and M. J. Miller. 1998. *The Age of Migration*. 2d ed. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Dale, N. 1999. Cross-cultural community-based planning: Negotiating the future of Haida Gwaii. In *The Consensus Building Handbook*, ed. L. Susskind, S. McKearnan & J. Thomas-Larner. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dang, S. 2002. Creating cosmopolis: The end of mainstream. Masters Thesis, School of Community and Regional Planning, University of British Columbia.
- Dunn, K., B. Hanna, and S. Thompson. 2001a. The local politics of difference: An examination of inter-communal relations policy in Australian local government. *Environment and Planning A* (33): 1577-95.
- Dunn, K., S. Thompson, B. Hanna, and I. Burnley. 2001b. The institution of multiculturalism within local government in Australia. *Urban Studies* 38 (13): 2477-94.
- Edgington, D. and T. Hutton. 2002. Multiculturalism and local government in Greater Vancouver. RIIM Working Paper Series, No. 02-06, University of British Columbia.
- Ethnic Affairs Commission of New South Wales. 1993. *New South Wales Charter of Principles for a Culturally Diverse Society*. Sydney: Ethnic Affairs Commission of New South Wales.
- Fenster, T. 1999a. On particularism and universalism in modernist planning: Mapping the boundaries of social change. *Plurimondi* 2:147-68.
- Fenster, T., ed. 1999b. *Gender, Planning, and Human Rights*. London: Routledge.
- Friedmann, J. 2002. *The Prospect of Cities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Friedmann, J. and U. A. Lehrer. 1997. Urban policy responses to foreign in-migration. The case of Frankfurt-am-Main. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 63: 1 (Winter): 61-78.
- Grassby, A. 1973. *A Multicultural Society for the Future*. Canberra: Department of Immigration/Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Hage, G. 1998. *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*. Sydney: Pluto Press.
- Henry, F. et al. 2000. *The Color of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society*. Toronto: Harcourt Canada.

- Hill, L. 2001. *Black Berry, Sweet Juice: On Being Black and White in Canada*. Toronto: Harper Collins.
- Holston, J. 1998. Spaces of insurgent citizenship. In *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History*, ed. Leonie Sandercock. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Isin, E., ed. 1999. Special issues on cities and citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 3, 2.
- Jackson, S. 1998. Geographies of co-existence: Native title, cultural difference and the decolonization of planning in north Australia. Ph.D. diss., School of Earth Sciences, Macquarie University, Sydney.
- Jacobs, J. M. 1996. *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*. London: Routledge.
- Karst, K. 1986. Paths to belonging: The constitution and cultural identity. *North Carolina Law Review* 64 (January): 303-77.
- Khakee, A., P. Somma, and H. Thomas, eds. 1999. *Urban Renewal, Ethnicity and Social Exclusion in Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- King, A.D. 1976. *Colonial Urban Development: Culture, Social Power, and Environment*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- . 1990. *Urbanism, Colonialism, and the World Economy*. London: Routledge.
- Krishnarayan, V. and H. Thomas. 1993. *Ethnic Minorities and then Planning System*. London: Royal Town Planning Institute.
- Kymlicka, W. and W. Norman. 1994. Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics* 104 (2): 352-81.
- Light, I. 2002. Immigrant place entrepreneurs in Los Angeles, 1970-1999. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 26 (2): 215-28.
- Mabin, A. and D. Smit. 1997. Reconstructing South Africa's cities? The making of urban planning 1900-2000. *Planning Perspectives* 12: 193-223.
- Mahtani, M. 2002. Interrogating the hyphen-nation: Canadian multicultural policy and 'Mixed Race' identities. *Social Identities* 8 (1): 67-90.
- Martin, J. and S. B. Warner, Jr. 2000. Local initiative and metropolitan repetition: Chicago 1972-1990. In *The American Planning Tradition*, ed. R. Fishman. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Meyer, P. and C. R. Reaves. 2000. Objectives and values: Planning for multicultural groups rather than multiple constituencies. in M. Burayidi. Ed. *Urban Planning in a Multicultural Society*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Milroy, B. and M. Wallace. 2001. Ethno-racial diversity and planning practices in the Greater Toronto Area. *Plan Canada* 41 (3): 31-33.
- Olds, K. 2001. *Globalization and Urban Change. Capital, Culture, and Pacific Rim Megaprojects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Papademetriou, D. 2002. *Reflections on international migration and its future*. The J. Douglas Gibson Lecture. Kingston, Ontario: Queens University, School of Policy Studies.
- Pascoe, R. 1992. Place and community: The construction of an Italo-Australian Space. In *Australia's Italians: Culture and Community in a Changing Society*, ed. S. Castles, C. Alcorso, G. Rando, and E. Vasta. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

- Qadeer, M. 1994. Urban planning and multiculturalism in Ontario, Canada. In *Race, Equality and Planning: Policies and Procedures*, ed. H. Thomas and V. Krishnarayan. Avebury: Aldershot.
- . 1997. Pluralistic planning for multicultural cities. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 63 (4): 481-94.
- Rabinow, P. 1989. *French Modern. Norms and Forms of the Social Environment*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ratcliffe, P. 1999. Ethnicity, socio-cultural change, and housing needs. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 19 (2): 135-43.
- Reagon, B. 1981. Coalition politics: Turning the century. In *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology*, ed. B. Smith. New York: Kitchen Table, Women of Color Press.
- Sandercock, L. 2004. *Cosmopolis 2: Mongrel Cities of the 21st Century*. New York: Continuum, in press.
- . 2000a. When strangers become neighbors: Managing cities of difference. *Planning Theory and Practice* 1 (1):13-30.
- Sandercock, L. and B. Klinger (1998a) Multiculturalism and the planning system, part one. *The Australian Planner* 15 (3): 127-32.
- . (1998b) Multiculturalism and the planning system, part two. *The Australian Planner* 15 (4): 223-27.
- Sassen, S. 2000. *Guests and Aliens*. New York: The New Press.
- Siemiatycki, M. and E. Isin. 1997. Immigration, diversity and urban citizenship in Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Regional Science* (Spring-Summer): 73-102
- Thomas, H. 1995a. Ethnic minorities and planning. *The Built and Natural Environment* 6: 4-8.
- . 1995b. 'Race', public policy, and planning. *Planning Perspectives* 10 (2): 123-48.
- . 1997. Ethnic minorities and the planning system. A study revisited. *Town Planning Review* 68 (2): 195-211.
- Thomas, H. and V. Krishnarayan, eds. 1994. *Race Equality and Planning: Policies and Procedures*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Thomas, J.M. and M. Ritzdorf, eds. 1997. *Urban Planning and the African American Community. In the Shadows*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Thompson, S. 2003. Planning and multiculturalism: A reflection on Australian local practice. *Planning Theory and Practice* 4, (3) (forthcoming).
- Thompson, S., K. Dunn, I. Burnley, P. Murphy, and B. Hanna. 1998. *Multiculturalism and Local Governance: A national perspective*. Sydney: New South Wales Department of Local Government/Ethnic Affairs Commission of New South Wales/University of New South Wales.
- Tully, J. 1995. *Strange Multiplicity. Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, B., ed. 1993. *Citizenship and Social Theory*. London: Sage.
- Wallace, M. and B. Milroy. 1999. Intersecting claims: Planning in Canada's cities. In *Gender, Planning, and Human Rights*, ed. T. Fenster. London: Routledge.

- Watson, S. and A. McGillivray. 1995. Planning in a multicultural environment: A challenge for the nineties. In *Australian Cities: Issues, Strategies and Policies for Urban Australia in the 1990s*, ed. P. Troy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Westin, C. 1996. Equality, freedom of choice, and partnership: Multicultural policy in Sweden. In *The Challenge of Diversity*, ed. R. Baubock, A. Heller, A. Zollberg. Aldershot: Avesbury.
- Yiftachel, O. 1992. *Planning a Mixed Region in Israel: The Political Geography of Arab-Jewish Relations in the Galilee*. Aldershot: Avesbury.
- . 1996. The internal frontier: Territorial control and ethnic relations. *Regional Studies* 30 (5): 493-508.
- . 2000. Social control, urban planning and ethno-class relations: Mizrahim in Israel's development towns. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24 (2): 417-34.

No.	Author(s)	Title	Date
02-01	Galina Didukh	Immigrants and the Demand for Shelter	01/02
02-02	Abdala Mansour, Nicolas Marceau and Steeve Mongrain	Gangs and Crime Deterrence	02/02
02-03	Harald Bauder and Emilie Cameron	Cultural Barriers to Labour Market Integration: Immigrants from South Asia and the former Yugoslavia	02/02
02-04	Brian Geiger	Clothing Demand for Canadian-born and Foreign-born Households	01/02
02-05	Dan Hiebert	Canadian Immigration and the Selection-settlement Services Trade-off: Exploring Immigrant Economic Participation in British Columbia	02/02
02-06	David W. Edgington and Thomas A. Hutton	Multicultural and Local Government in Greater Vancouver	03/02
02-07	Steven Vertovec	Religion in Migration, Diasporas and Transnationalism	03/02
02-08	Isabel Dyck	Becoming Canadian? Girls, Home and School and Renegotiating Feminine Identity	05/02
02-09	Parin Dossa	Modernization and Global Restructuring of Women's Work: Border-Crossing Stories of Iranian Women	03/02
02-10	Barry Edmonston	Interprovincial Migration of Canadian Immigrants	03/02
02-11	Handy Gozalie	Immigrants' Earnings and Assimilation into Canada's Labour Market: The Case of Overachievers.	04/02
02-12	Isabel Dyck and Arlene Tigar McLaren	"I don't feel quite competent here": Immigrant Mothers' Involvement with Schooling	05/02
02-13	Geraldine Pratt	Between Homes: Displacement and Belonging for Second Generation Filipino-Canadian Youths	06/02
02-14	Kangqing Zhang and Don DeVoretz	Human Capital Investment and Flows: A Multiperiod Model for China	07/02
02-15	Minelle Mahtani and Alison Mountz	Immigration to British Columbia: Media Representation and Public Opinion	08/02
02-16	Kathrine Richardson	Sieve or Shield? NAFTA and its Influence within Cascadia	06/02
02-17	Don J. DeVoretz, Zhongdong Ma and Kangqing Zhang	Triangular Human Capital Flows: Some Empirical Evidence from Hong Kong and Canada	10/02
02-18	Deirdre McKay	Filipina Identities: Geographies of Social Integration/Exclusion in the Canadian Metropolis	10/02
02-19	Aranzazu Recalde	Recent Latin Americans in Vancouver: Unyielding Diverse Needs Versus Insufficient Services	08/02

No.	Author(s)	Title	Date
02-20	Gillian Creese and Edith Ngene Kambere	“What Colour is Your English”?”	11/02
02-21	Kate Geddie	Licence to Labour: Obstacles Facing Vancouver’s Foreign-Trained Engineers	11/02
02-22	Bernard Henin and Michelle R. Bennett	Immigration to Canada’s Mid-Sized Cities: A Study of Latin Americans and Africans in Victoria, BC	12/02
02-23	A. Charlton, S. Duff, D. Grant, A. Mountz, R.Pike, J. Sohn and C. Taylor	The Challenges to Responding to Human Smuggling in Canada: Practitioners Reflect on the 1999 Boat Arrivals in British Columbia	12/02
03-01	David Ley	Offsetting Immigration and Domestic Migration I Gateway Cities: Canadian and Australian Reflections on an ‘American Dilemma’	01/03
03-02	Don DeVoretz and Kangqing Zhang	Citizenship, Passports and the Brain Exchange Triangle	01/03
03-03	Johanna L. Waters and Sin Yih Teo	Social and Cultural Impacts of Immigration: An Examination of the Concept of ‘Social Cohesion’ with Implications for British Columbia	01/03
03-04	June Beynon, Roumiana Ilieva, and Marela Dichupa	“Do you know your language?” How Teachers of Punjabi and Chinese Ancestries Construct their Family Languages in their Personal and Professional Lives	01/03
03-05	Daniel Hiebert, Jock Collins, and Paul Spoonley	Uneven Globalization: Neoliberal Regimes, Immigration, and Multiculturalism in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand	02/03
03-06	Daniel Hiebert	Are Immigrants Welcome? Introducing the Vancouver Community Studies Survey	03/03
03-07	Yan Shi	The Impact of Canada’s Immigration Act on Chinese Independent Immigrants	04/03
03-08	Roger Andersson	Settlement Dispersal of Immigrants and Refugees in Europe: Policy and Outcomes	03/03
03-09	Daniel Hiebert and Ravi Pendakur	Who’s Cooking? The Changing Ethnic Division of Labour in Canada, 1971-1996	03/03
03-10	Serviy Pivnenko and Don DeVoretz	Economic Performance of Ukrainian Immigrants in Canada and the United States	03/03
03-11	Don J. DeVoretz, Sergiy Pivnenko, Diane Coulombe	The Immigrant Triangle: Québec, Canada and the Rest of the World	05/03
03-12	David W. Edgington, Michael A. Goldberg, and Thomas A. Hutton	The Hong Kong Chinese in Vancouver	04/03
03-13	Margaret Walton-Roberts and Geraldine Pratt	Mobile Modernities: One South Asian Family Negotiates Immigration, Gender and Class	09/03
03-14	Leonie Sandercock	Rethinking Multiculturalism for the 21 st Century	10/03

No.	Author(s)	Title	Date
03-15	Daniel Hiebert and David Ley	Characteristics of Immigrant Transnationalism in Vancouver	10/03
03-16	Sin Yih Teo	Imagining Canada: The Cultural Logics of Migration Amongst PRC Immigrants	10/03
03-17	Daniel Hiebert, Lisa Oliver and Brian Klinkenberg	Immigration and Greater Vancouver: A 2001 Census Atlas (Online format only)	10/03
03-18	Geraldine Pratt (in collaboration with The Philippine Women Centre)	From Migrant to Immigrant: Domestic Workers Settle in Vancouver, Canada	11/03
03-19	Paul Spoonley	The Labour Market Incorporation of Immigrants in Post-Welfare New Zealand	11/03

For information on papers previous to 2002, please see our Website

<http://www.riim.metropolis.net/research/policy>

Back issues of working papers are available for \$5 from

Vancouver Centre of Excellence: Immigration, WMX4653, Simon Fraser University, 8888 University Drive, Burnaby, B.C, Canada V5A 1S6. Tel: (604) 291-4575 Fax: (604) 291-5336

E-mail: riim@sfu.ca

<http://www.riim.metropolis.net/>