As a consequence of an increasingly urbanizing world migrants head primarily to cities, especially the globalized metropolises. Cities provide better prospects for income generation; they concentrate most support networks which are so crucial to incoming migrants; they are the main entry points to destination countries; and are information hubs on existing opportunities.

Through the scientific contribution of individual authors, SSIIM Paper Series intends to disseminate research results on the urban dimension(s) of international migration, both in cities of the global North and of the South.
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Marcello Balbo
The main features of international migration

International migrants represent approximately three percent of the world population, or about 190 million, with roughly as many men and women. Of these, approximately 13 million are refugees. The direction of migration flows is mainly South to North or, more specifically, from low- and middle-income to high-income economies: in 2008, migrants in OECD countries amounted to approximately 90 million, with another 20 million in non-OECD high-income countries, especially the Gulf and Singapore. However, international migration also follows a South-South direction: almost one out of two migrants move from one developing country to another. Migrants in the South amount to 80 million, and even after excluding migrant flows in the ex-Soviet Union, some 40 percent of all movements take place between countries in the South. When adding irregular migrants, whose numbers are unknown but certainly higher in developing countries than in Northern countries, migration flows in the South contribute a large share of worldwide migration (Ratha, Shaw, 2007). International migration has become central to the workings of globalization and foreign labour is inherent to our global economy. In addition, as a result of increasing economic and social inequalities emigration is an integral component of family and community strategies to improve the living conditions of those who go abroad as well as of those who stay behind. Migration is a significant source of economic growth in both destination countries and countries of origin. In the former, migrants typically contribute to GDP for more than their demographic share, taking up jobs that cannot be delocalized but which local labour is neither willing nor ready to accept. These jobs may even represent an opportunity for local economies to innovate, and increasingly contribute to the creation of new firms, typically in the construction and service sectors. As for the countries of origin, the World Bank reckons that between 1995 and 2007 official remittances to developing countries have roughly quadrupled, from 57 to 240 billion US dollars, reaching an estimated 305 billion in 2008. India received 27 billion US dollars in 2007; Mexico 25 billion and the Philippines 17 billion. In Tajikistan, remittances in 2007 represented as much as 45 percent of the GDP, compared with nearly 40 percent in Moldova, and over a quarter in Kirgizstan, Honduras and Lesotho. Of
course, remittances are important not only for the national economies of developing countries: being more stable than international aid and directly reaching the people that migrants left behind. It is well documented that remittances are the main source of income for a large number of families. Governments in various countries have set up financial instruments to safeguard the value of remittances and ensure that migrants keep sending money from abroad. One objective set by the Global Remittances Working Group of the Group of eight major industrialised countries (‘G-8’) is to reduce remittance fees by five percent in five years, which would make an additional US$15 billion available every year to developing countries.

Since the beginning of the financial crisis in 2008, the flow of remittances has decreased, particularly from those migrants in those countries where most severely hit by the slump such as the United States, the Emirates, the United Kingdom and Spain. According to recent forecasts by the World Bank a sharp decline of five to eight percent will be recorded in 2009 (World Bank, 2009) which will seriously affect many developing countries, particularly the poorer ones. Since remittances are directly available to households for consumption and investment needs (World Bank, 2008), this will cause social hardship in many areas. Nevertheless, remittances will no doubt continue to be a crucial, if not the major source, of family income in many Southern countries.

International migrants represent one of the most tangible examples of what is referred to as ‘glocalization’, namely, the consequences of globalization in local contexts. Since migrants are driven by revenue-making opportunities, most end up in cities where glocalization is more conspicuous. Though specific figures on migrant destinations are not easily available, the scattered information on hand corroborates the perception of the ‘urbanization of migration’ (Benton-Short et al., 2005; Balbo, 2005; Habitat Debate, 2006) as an almost inevitable outcome, as well as a factor behind rampant urbanization across the world and the growing role of cities as drivers of economic growth, social transformation and cultural change, particularly in the South. There are several reasons for this.

Cities concentrate most ‘modern’ activities, thus providing the best prospects for income generation, primarily, though not only, in low-paid, often informal (‘undeclared’) jobs (the so-called three ‘D’s: dirty, dangerous, demeaning) which local populations tend to eschew. In addition, the growing importance of the informal sector in the cities of the South makes these an obvious destination for foreign as well as internal migrants. It is essentially in cities that social and community networks can be found, as well as the ethnic enclaves newcomers can rely upon in their search for housing and work. Such networks are all the more important in view of the increasing ‘ feminization of migration’ that characterizes recent migration flows, as they can reduce some of the specific risks female migrants typically face when first arriving at a foreign destination.

Networks densities are much higher in urban than in rural areas. Larger cities in particular are at the core of the information network migrants need if they are to access the opportunities that made them take the decision to leave their countries of origin. Finally, cities are often the primary entry points to other countries for transit migrants with formal permits on the way to the country of their final destination (Marconi, 2008), or for those who decide to stay in the host country even when their visa expires, thus adding to the number of undocumented migrants. In turn, in their bid to be competitive and foster productivity, cities increasingly rely on foreign labour. There is much evidence that the presence of migrants does not affect economic conditions for the local population - quite the contrary: immigration contributes to local development and employment (IOM, 2008). Moreover, immigrants create the multi-cultural environment that has become one of the defining features of the global city’, in the process adding to the quality of life which skilled professionals look for when considering their own moves to far-away destinations.

**Migrants and urban society**

Globalization takes place in the virtual space of financial flows and the likewise elusive production space of the industrial assembly system. Instead, the presence of international migrants turns globalization into a very tangible and visible phenomenon which is circumscribed in clearly identifiable areas. Through migration, globalization becomes something that has to be dealt with entirely in a local perspective.

Though people have always moved from one place to another in search of a better environment, be it from an economic, religious, social or political point of view, never before have such movements featured the quantitative or geographical extent they display at present. A medium-sized European city is typically made up of 10 to 15 percent of foreigners from as many as 100 countries or more, this being even more true of those in traditional immigration countries such as Canada, Australia and the United States. A growing number of cities in Southern countries such as Thailand, South Africa and Brazil are experiencing a similar trend with Bangkok, Johannesburg and São Paulo hosting ever larger numbers of fresh migrants, mostly from neighbouring countries. As a result, local communities are becoming more diverse.

This diversity of communities and cultures brings to the fore the issue of the real meaning of concepts like collective identity, multiculturalism and social urban inclusion in the contemporary world.

On the one hand, identity is essentially the representation of the self and of others as shaped by any individual through their own representation of the self and others, as well as through the collective representation of others. As a consequence, collective identity derives from the cultural system individuals belong to, its evolution over time and the way values
are handed down from one generation to the other. On the other hand, each individual features multiple identities that are prone to change with time and space and that bear on the perception of others, of the self and of the relationship of the self with others. The implication is that the notion of collective identity is socially constructed and subject to continuous reinterpretations by those who believe they are a part of it, those who decide to become part of it, as well as those who refuse to belong to it (Ollivier, 2009).

However, the fact that identity is not a condition that exists in nature, but rather a complex, mutable notion that relates to specific circumstances in time and space, is rarely recognized (Boltanski, Chiappello, 1999). The concept is almost always referred to in an overtly schematic way, mainly to ‘demonstrate’ how diverse we are, and thereby the right to differentiate from and stand up against the others. Providing as it does a representation of the other as a collective individual, identity becomes a useful stereotype that offers an unquestionable truth and paves the way for clear-cut communication among community members. This notion of identity also sets straightforward boundaries between what belongs to the inside, us, and what lies outside, the others, thus strengthening social cohesion and the sense of what we are, in respect to the others. In fact, for those members of the community who adopt them, collective stereotypes are not just a representation of society, they become the social reality. In urban areas, this gives rise to the emergence of ‘spatial identities’ with specific areas allocated for use of local populations and various migrant communities. Such indexing of space triggers a process of tacitly agreed on domination over specific areas, which in turn may end up in the actual partitioning of the urban space.

For this same reason, stereotypes nurture the social, cultural and religious exclusion of the others, whose presence is felt as a threat to host community lifestyles. Stereotypes similarly foster spatial exclusion through the fragmentation of urban space brought about by neo-liberal urban policies over the past decades. Market-driven provision of housing and urban services, if any at all, as is the case with most developing-country cities generates great disparities as far as access to the benefits of urban life is concerned. Fully-serviced neighbourhoods are found lying right next to areas allocated for use of local populations and various migrant communities. Such indexing of space triggers a process of tacitly agreed on domination over specific areas, which in turn may end up in the actual partitioning of the urban space.

New communication technologies bring about the de-spatialization of identity, the ambiguous cultural dimension of which is only further reinforced in the process. This has a major impact on local society, where identity represents a crucial reference, prompting barriers that keep the others away from that society’s specific social, cultural and physical space (territory). The ongoing crisis only compounds the risk of a partitioned urban space, undermining the very idea of the city as a space of encounters, contention and exchange. With the global economy mired in recession and unemployment on the rise, politicians look to mostly demagogic, protectionist measures against immigrants as a response to the economic difficulties affecting their constituencies.

De-spatialization also produces also a process of de-centering that tends to iron out the differences that characterise urban space. Squares, public spaces, streets or parts of these appear to be losing their role as meeting places and, therefore, as essential components in the construction of a hierarchy of spaces. Paradoxically, with its focus on transportation and communication infrastructures as the main elements of spatial organization, modern urban planning seems to endorse the notion of a city of connections rather than of encounters (Ascher, 2001).

International migration also fosters multicultural urban society, in the process reshaping a city’s culture and use of space. Just like identity, multiculturalism is a much-debated notion and an even more controversial goal (Doytcheva, 2005). When perceived as a social phenomenon based on the recognition and acceptance of cultural differences, multiculturalism is quite different from the alternative approach that combines secularism and individual enjoyment of universal rights. Since society and, for that matter, its urban variant, has always been diverse, multiculturalism is not a specific feature of those contemporary cities in the throes of immigration. In urban areas, accommodating cultural differences and everyday social intermingling will have to co-exist with partial segregation (Hudson et al., 2007). What singles out today’s multiculturalism is its political nature: unlike inter-culturalism, which essentially records the presence of diverse cultures on the urban scene, multiculturalism is an objective to be achieved. Preserving and transmitting the cultural values of a community to the next generations requires public policies that explicitly endorse multiculturalism as a major factor of social justice.

Multiculturalism also represents a quest for a new balance between cultural diversity and social integration, be it at the national or local level. Multiculturalism theories acknowledge that to secure their social and political cohesion, modern societies must rest on recognition of a set of
individual rights, such as those set out in a number of international covenants and declarations, as well as upon loyalty and obligations around shared values, rather than specific community values. In this perspective, the notion of a multicultural city is faced with the need to acknowledge various uses of the urban space while at the same time coming to share a set of values. Put another way, the challenge for a multicultural city is to determine the various features citizenship can take within a mutually accepted system of “belonging” “where what becomes important is to make needs visible and heard” (Harvey, 2008). In the city, balancing diversity and collective values is no simple task, since the two traits are contradictory in essence; this is most visible in space uses, an issue which typically leaves only a small margin to strike a balance acceptable to all space-users. For these reasons, cosmopolitanism and the cosmopolitan city are more appropriate concepts when dealing with international migration. Like the multicultural city, the cosmopolitan city is a political project. Yet, while the former is intrinsically based on preservation of inherent differences and implies real (or assumed) separate communities, the cosmopolitan city is based on overcoming diversity and national distinctions. It is a sign of a strong urban society, where a dominant group is able to tolerate the presence of immigrants with the assurance that the shared values are respected, as it may be the case for Canada and Australia, or based on the recognition that growth and prosperity are the results of the contribution of all individuals, irrespective of their origins, as in Tijuana (Mexico). In a cosmopolitan city, ethnic distinctions dissolve into the wider polity, erasing the lines of divide that remain an inherent feature of the multicultural city. Urban social inclusion is another issue that needs clarification. Like identity and multiculturalism, inclusion is not easy to define since its meaning differs depending on the social and historic conditions of any given city. In London, Great Britain, urban inclusion means equal rights, citizenship, political representation, access to urban services and to urban public amenities. In East London, South Africa, or for that matter in most cities in the South, and to any long-distance immigrant, urban inclusion means primarily effective basic human rights, rule of law, social protection and equal treatment (Commission on Human Rights, 2003; UN-Habitat, 2007). The importance of urban inclusion also depends on individual choices of migration strategies – temporary, permanent, circular, individual, family reunification – and the extent to which inclusion can support these strategies. Though inclusion is perceived essentially as a one-way relationship (we include them), it must be acknowledged by now that it works both ways (we include them who include us). In the global cosmopolitan city, social inclusion must be worded differently so that the issue of who are us and who are the others appears more clearly. In today’s fragmented world, no attempt to build a general consensus around a given culture can hold any longer. Instead, “it is the leftovers and fractures that shape the scenario of collective identity” (Geertz, 1996).

Against this background, urban inclusion is to be understood primarily as getting connected with the systems that together shape urban society: (i) public authorities, as the main entry point to urban services; (ii) the labour market, for income generation; (iii) the system of representation, in order to gain citizenship; (iv) the family, as the primary component of any community (Sassen, 2006). For immigrants, the main cause of exclusion is a lack of connections with these systems, even more so than not having a place to stay or a job.

Migration policies

Policies regarding migration are of two types: immigration policies and policies towards migrants. Though inevitably related, they often take quite different paths. Over the past several years, national immigration policies have increasingly focused on security and controls. The objective is almost everywhere the same: reducing the number of immigrants through stricter rules for the delivery of permits and more severe border controls. With unemployment on the rise, many governments are introducing new restrictions on foreign labour in a bid to preserve jobs for their own nationals. Many countries have resorted to compulsory repatriation of undocumented migrants, irrespective of the conditions these face once repatriated. Such restrictive policies rarely prove successful, though, as demonstrated by the amnesties granted to illicit immigrants by high- and middle-income countries such as Chile and Thailand. In addition, restrictive policies fuel the migration ‘industry’ controlled by criminal organizations, force previously legal immigrants to disappear into the underworld of undocumented migrants, which in turn adds to the number of people working in informal as well as illegal activities.

As widespread globalization and liberalization reined in central government role in the 1980s, municipalities grew more and more involved in local development, including migration and management of increasingly diverse populations. Indeed, local authorities find themselves at the frontline, since the local level is where tensions between national and local government policies become palpable, and the need for coordination between migration policies and those addressing inclusion and integration becomes urgent. Local authorities play a crucial role in pursuing settlement policies which, in most cases, are only indirectly related to immigrants and their social and spatial inclusion. However, any positive outcomes for low-income groups at large can only include immigrants as well. As cities more than ever find themselves at the core of economic growth and, as such, act as magnets for immigrants, municipal and other public agencies, organized civil society and community-based associations have come to play major roles in the shaping of social and spatial inclusion.

Local policies towards immigrants are fundamentally different from
national immigration policies, since the ‘demand for the city’ (i.e., for a proper urban environment) emanating from individuals, families and communities (i.e., their needs for housing, schools, healthcare and public areas) cannot go unaccounted for. On the one hand, migrants perform tasks that are essential to the urban environment but which the natives shun; they offer services which families and individuals cannot do without but which governments are no longer able to provide; the lower salaries paid to migrants keep firms competitive on the world market. On the other hand, the migrants’ demand for the city often features types of behaviour that are rather at odds with those of the local population, eliciting social and cultural differences that can be difficult to reconcile and may become sources of local conflict. Diversity is not accepted easily and can be sensed as a threat, in particular by the most vulnerable groups. Furthermore, when marginalized, migrant communities tend to shun the dialogue with the host community, in the process opening up an ever-wider gap.

Policies towards migrants are inevitably diverse. Though influenced by the immigration policies set out at national level, they are primarily by-products of specific local economic and social conditions as well as of the local set of urban stakeholders that shapes these. For instance, until 2007 Mexico’s federal legislation punished undocumented migrants with two years’ imprisonment; but in Tijuana, next to the US border, being a Mexican or a foreign migrant did not make any difference, since in the past two decades the local economy has grown uninterrupted, absorbing all the available labour. In northern Italy, migrants are essential to the myriad of small- and medium-sized firms that make up the economic fabric, but policies vary widely from one place to the other. In the north-west city of Turin, mammoth local auto-maker Fiat and well-organized labour struggling to defend workers’ rights together have managed to sort out conflicts between major stakeholders in the name of the public interest. By contrast in Treviso, a vibrant town in north-east Italy, immigrant labour is crucial to the myriad small manufacturers that represent the backbone of the regional economy. Still, the dominance of family-owned firms and the role of the Church as main provider of ad hoc, individual welfare, have paved the way for a political discourse bordering on xenophobia, enabling a right-wing coalition to remain in power for the past 15 years. In Pakistan, under current laws, local, migrants, Bengali and Burmese migrants are still considered ‘illegal’ in Karachi where they first settled more than 30 years ago; but the benefits local firms gain from using cheap migrant labour is so significant that nobody would dare think of enforcing the law.

Cuts in public expenditure have reduced the urban services offered by the public sector. More importantly, they have affected citizen perceptions of the role and legitimacy of the state. Privatization, one of the most widely strategies for reducing public expenses, has led to weaker government involvement in response to the demands for a proper urban environment, voiced mainly by low-income populations, including immigrants. Such an issue is of particular concern in those many, if not all, cities where privatization has worsened an already poor degree of access to basic urban services. In order to access such primary services as water, sanitation or transport, the poorer segments of the population have relied on the distributive nature of public policies. However, these policies have been curtailed in most developing countries, where structural adjustment programmes have combined with economic deregulation, with severe consequences for immigrants that rely all the more on distributive policies as they lack solidarity networks in the host country. This is why it is so important to help immigrants engage with urban stakeholder systems through information campaigns, cultural mediation and the creation of information desks. Where such channels are not available, defective or overlapping, self-governed networks appear which are likely to generate social and spatial fragmentation, exclusion, and social conflict.

The current recession has a severe impact on migrants. Among the thousands of jobs lost in the past months, a large share includes the low-paid unskilled positions mostly held by foreign labour. In cities as varied as Dubai, London, Macau and Singapore, the number of non-resident workers employed in construction, cleaning or catering has seen a sharp decline. The world financial crisis is putting hard-up migrants at risk of default on interest payments on home loans: in Spain, an estimated 180,000 Latin Americans are finding themselves in such a (Rolnik, 2009). Still, many immigrants prefer to stay, or have no alternative, even if illegally, and continue to compete for jobs the local population do not want.

In a bid to fill the gaps created by inadequate, if any, policies towards immigrants, new practice is emerging in response to demands for a proper urban environment. A practice refers to an action implemented by formal as well as informal organized public and private entities, in response to specific functional and spatial needs. When a practice reaches out to other functions and/or spaces, it turns into policy. In most cases, however, practice is the only response to immigrant needs, for two reasons: (1), governments are seldom prepared, and even more rarely willing, to take up this issue in addition to all the others they face, and particularly in developing countries where migrants add to the already vast numbers of poor urban dwellers; and (2) in an increasingly diversified world, including in terms of cultures and values, public policies are often too wide in scope, and therefore unable to respond effectively to the needs of diversified urban populations. The cosmopolitan, multi-value globalised city calls for multiple policies and practices to encourage inclusion under its many guises, reflecting the diverse circumstances and the fluidity that characterize today’s multiethnic societies. Accordingly, policies towards immigrants must be flexible to the point of using practices in order to adjust to the varied nature of migrants’ needs and requirements. The changing relationship between government and the citizenry is very
apparent in the globalised cities where space is becoming more and more detached from the rest of the country and ties with central authorities are weakening. As a result, there is a growing gap between the notions of citizenship, i.e. being part of a local community and its specific space, and nationality, and this gap is all the wider in those countries that recognize dual nationality. This momentous shift from nationality to citizenship reflects a move away from a legal issue handled by central government as a security matter, to a local issue where the focus is on demand for a proper urban environment, access to urban space and the opportunities any city provides. In practice, the focus turns to (better) access to housing, employment and services as well as on gaining a voice in local policies and new forms of representation. Finally, the shift also means a radical change in long-term perspectives, as migrants bonds with the host locality become much weaker. In this process and rather paradoxically, the notion of citizenship is undergoing a partial transformation at the hands of immigrants, i.e. those who are not formally entitled to it.

The ‘right to the city’, inclusion, and urban space

Space plays a major role in urban inclusion. Many cities in the North are becoming more and more ‘fragmented’, a common feature in most of those in the South, resulting from an inability or reluctance fully to take into account the poorest segments of the population, which usually includes immigrants (Balbo, 1993).

By contrast, spatial and social inclusion of immigrants comes under the notion of a ‘right to the city’ advocated by multilateral organizations and referred to by various scholars (Brown, Kristiansen, 2009; Harvey, 2008; Purcell, 2008; Goldblum, 2006) who share in the assumption that every citizen, “by exercising rights and fulfilling duties like every other citizen, helps build a civilization” (Mayor, 1999).

The notion of the right to the city was first proposed by French sociologist Henri Lefebvre (1968) who emphasized that urban policy is the by-product of on-going, conflict and negotiation among urban stakeholders for the allocation of public resources. Accordingly, ‘the right to the city’ has many meanings, depending on the respective stance or status of individual stakeholders; moreover, this is a dynamic notion that cannot be set out once and for all, but rather must be continuously adapted to a changing political and social environment. The evolutionary character of the concept is reflected in the more recent meanings that have been attached to it, among them “the capacity of marginalized groups and individuals to influence the agendas of urban public institutions by claiming their ‘rights’” (Jouve, 2009) or, with direct reference to migrants, the recognition that they “articulate a double demand for greater equality and social justice and the recognition and respect of difference and cultural diversity” (Stevenson, 2002). With specific reference to immigrants, the right to the city is perceived as “a series of legitimate claims to the necessary conditions of a satisfying, dignified and secure existence in cities by both individual citizens and social groups” (UNESCO, UN-HABITAT, 2005) or “the right of all citizens to access the benefits the city has to offer, based on the principles of solidarity, freedom, equity, dignity and social justice” (Balbo, 2009).

The right to the city (and the derivative right to an inclusive city) is in turn clearly embedded in the notion of the cosmopolitan city, where people have developed an ability to live with each other’s differences and with respect for the ‘other’ (Bauman, 1998). The crucial issues the cosmopolitan city faces in terms of spatial inclusion include housing, services and public (collective) spaces such as squares, streets and parks. Host community perceptions of immigrants depend largely on housing patterns and the uses of public space. As highlighted elsewhere (Balbo, 2005), immigrant settlement patterns vary widely from country to country and city to city. They depend on many factors, and primarily the housing market which (with only a few exceptions) stands as the first and possibly major challenge migrants have to face when looking to settle down. In some areas, owners will not so much as contemplate renting to migrants for fear of overcrowding, damage to property or insolvency, if not out of sheer xenophobia. Migrants are often required to pay rents significantly higher than those paid by the locals, often in advance and in several monthly instalments, or have someone guaranteeing for them.

The cases of Tijuana, Mexico, and Vancouver, Canada – two prominent ‘migrants’ cities – illustrate the different settlement patterns that can be found. In Tijuana, public authorities are not in any position to prevent the growth of informal settlements where both domestic and foreign migrants reside, and there is no ethnic or country-specific enclave. At the other end of the spectrum, Vancouver is a clear example of a multiethnic, multicultural city where a mainly ethnic-based partition of the urban space combines with a widely shared notion of the city as a space belonging to all communities.

Paradoxically, the rapidly growing cities of the South are where access to housing is often easier. Migrants can tap in on the huge market of informal housing that makes up large portion of a city, as well as in the cortiços located in the centre of Brazilian cities, the khans of Mumbai and Kolkata, India, and the squatter settlements of Nairobi, Kenya. Cities in developing countries tend to be more inclusive, or less segregated than most in high-income economies where a regulated market, higher prices and greater social impediments drive migrants to concentrate in a few specific neighbourhoods (Ostanel, 2009) when, if eligible for public housing, they are not housed in blocks specifically designated for them. Nevertheless in most cities, communities of migrants from the same region tend to concentrate in certain areas. In Bangkok, the high-skilled managers of the multinational corporations live on one side, and the low-income, low-skilled workers from Myanmar and Cambodia on the other side in clearly defined ‘ethnic’ compounds. In Johannesburg, South Africa,
and as mentioned earlier, lack of affordable housing has resulted in Francophone and, more generally, West African migrants concentrating in a few inner-city areas, with the better-off skilled migrants living in the gated settlements located in the northern part of the city. For many years, in Berlin, Germany, Turkish ‘guest-workers’ have been relegated to the almost exclusively ethnic neighbourhoods of Kreuzberg, Neukölln and Wedding, a pattern that has been replicated more recently with the arrival of Eastern-European migrants.

Migrants themselves are often driven to create such enclaves as a strategy to cope with the lack of services. These, including healthcare and education, as well as to public offices dealing with visas and permits, the next major step to urban inclusion; and where relevant policies, if any, are inadequate, mutual help networks are the only alternative. For female immigrants in particular, the networks found in ethnic neighbourhoods are crucial as they often provide the only way to connect to the urban stakeholder networks that can deliver some services. In addition, such ethnic enclaves are perceived as safer since they are dominated by the values and behaviour patterns of the home country, cushioning the shock of a new, unfamiliar broader urban community.

Such enclaves and the specific networks that come with them can also become factors of exclusion. Whether physical or social, their boundaries, which can hamper the process of integration process with the rest of the city, fostering spatial fragmentation and the multiplication of identities (Castles, 2002; United Nations, 2006). For all the safety they can afford, they often stand in the way of individual advancement as they replicate the duties, responsibilities and social hierarchies prevailing in the countries of origin, including with regard to gender. Such gendered consequences of spatial fragmentation further reduce the likelihood of immigrant integration into local host communities (Avenarius, 2009).

The way urban services are provided is critical, not only to the relationship between a local community and migrants, but also to the way both local and migrant populations perceive the city. Ensuring ease of access to education and health services is crucial if migrants are to join the mainstream and feel they are accepted and fully recognized as components of a local community. Local policies should promote access to such services, particularly for women and children, taking into account the intricate cultural and gender aspects that can be involved. Adequate information, counselling and cultural mediation for both migrant and host communities are essential to foster inclusion and can help mobilize local resources. In this respect, community networks facilitate access to urban services, where they do not organize themselves to provide these services. On the other hand, such networks should also build bridges to social and spatial environments to help connect migrants to the local stakeholder system, while avoiding fragmentation of the urban space. The inclusive city is a cosmopolitan city, where differences are not simply tolerated but also considered as valuable to society.

In a world of unprecedented cultural mobility in terms of people and symbols, settlement patterns and the use of public space are the main determinants of the way diversity is perceived and its degree of acceptance or rejection. Urban public space and the ways it is used are inevitably reshaped both physically and culturally by the presence of immigrants. Whole areas of the city can be remodelled through the intricate encounter between the institutionally structured space of migration, the public space, and the cultural and social realities prevailing in those places. The question is whether the commonly accepted notion of urban space still holds. Collective space, as defined by the Western notion of the city and as institutionalized by Western urban planning, no longer fulfils modern requirements of sustained diversity and the resulting multiplicity of ‘public spaces’ that are expected of any truly cosmopolitan city. Unfortunately, in the face of these realities, the tendency today, without any doubt, is to tighten control and physical barriers, as well as to what amounts to attempts to make immigrants ‘invisible’. In this perspective, any use of public space that is considered at odds with the ‘norm’ is perceived as a threat to security, simply because it is unfamiliar: to wit, Pakistanis playing cricket in public parks in Istanbul, Turkey; Peruvians cooking tamales (buns) in the public spaces in Torino, Italy; or Bolivians setting up a weekly market in São Paulo, Brazil. As for Chinese communities in Bangkok, Madrid, Vancouver or Vladivostok, they tend to stay apart from both local and other immigrant communities, highlighting the need for a diversity of perspectives when considering urban space as an instrument for social integration. Way beyond the occasional ethnic food and music festivals where locals and immigrants commingle for a few hours, public space is the locus where arbitration between them happens every single day. Public space is where physical, as well as cultural contact takes place, including fractious and ‘indivisible’ confessional issues where compromise is a tall challenge (Häussermann et al., 2005).

If the cosmopolitan city really aims to build a common culture out of difference (Parekh, 2000), a policy of public space as the primary infrastructure of social relations and interactions across diverse communities is fundamental. The way public space is used challenges the stereotypes that feed social and spatial exclusion against the enduring appeal of ‘sameness’ as a way of addressing the anxieties of the global age. Since public space is where the presence of the other becomes more visible (that is, where the communicative feature of today’s societies is most clearly institutionalized), the way this space is used has a crucial role to play on the way to a truly cosmopolitan city based on liberal pluralism as well as on multiple cultural experiences – one where immigrants are no longer looked at as conspicuous strangers but as a constituent part of the urban scene and where they do not need to negotiate access to specific spaces over time (Noussia, Lyons, 2009): “The public sphere is undergoing
changes. We therefore cannot speak of the public sphere as a pre-established, immutable arena. The inclusion of new social groups necessitates a redefinition of its frontiers, and its normative values. Newcomers reveal the limits of the public sphere as constituted and imagined by the society and its legislators at a given time” (Göle, 2006).

In contemporary societies, cosmopolitanism is a matter of plain fact, since in daily life everyone continuously meets the ‘other’ and in the process cannot but recognize commonalities and differences. At the same time, in the new modernity of the globalized world, differences are more difficult to deal with because they originate outside one’s known world (Beck, 1992). Instead, the inclusive cosmopolitan city is based on a recognition, both of the voice of the ‘other’ and ethnic diversity on the one hand, and of the equivalence of differences on the other. Together with recognition of formal rights, reckoning with diversity and differences is a fundamental step to spatial and social inclusion, since urban inclusion rests as much on formal rights as on symbolic values.
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