BROAD-ER

Conceptual Paper on City Diplomacy

April 2023

KOÇ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
upf. Universitat Pompeu Fabra Barcelona
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

This project has received funding from the European Unions Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101079254

BROAD-ER

GRANT AGREEMENT NO.	101079254
DELIVERABLE NO.	D5.1
DELIVERABLE TITLE	Conceptual Papers Prepared by Each Partner on Different Themes (KU)
DISSEMINATION LEVEL	Public
LEAD BENEFICIARY	All
CONTRACTUAL DATE OF DELIVERY	30/04/2023
ACTUAL DATE OF DELIVERY	29/04/2023

KOÇ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
upf. Universitat Pompeu Fabra Barcelona
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

This project has received funding from the European Unions Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101079254

Table of Contents

This project has received funding from the European Unions Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101079254

List of Abbreviations

ERA: European Research Area
GCR: Global Compact for Refugees
GCM: Global Compact on Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration
ICLEI: International Council for Local Environment Initiatives
IOM: International Organization for Migration
KU: Koç University
UCLG: United Cities and Local Governments
UPF: Universitat Pompeu Fabra
UvA: University of Amsterdam

This project has received funding from the European Unions Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101079254

Executive Summary

BROAD-ER (Bridging the Migration and Urban Studies) seeks to create a Research Excellence Network that promotes interdisciplinary research and training at the intersection of migration and urban studies. The project is a joint effort between Koç University (KU) in Turkey, Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF) in Spain, and the University of Amsterdam (UvA) in the Netherlands. Its primary objective is to address the research deficit in the European Research Area (ERA) by introducing innovative and interdisciplinary methods while enhancing research and innovation capabilities in Turkey in emerging areas of migration and urban studies.

This document is a **conceptual paper** on the theme of "**City Diplomacy**" prepared by postdoctoral researchers from KU as part of the BROAD-ER project. It is one of three conceptual papers to be submitted by the researcher teams of the project partners for Deliverable 5.1 (Conceptual Papers Prepared by Each Partner on Different Themes). This deliverable involves each partner being assigned a specific theme and preparing a conceptual paper based on a literature review analysing one of the three primary processes involved in cities' efforts to develop autonomy and decouple from national governments. The KU team is assigned to the theme of City Diplomacy (Internationalization of Cities), while the UPF team is responsible for the theme of Establishing New Relations between the National and the Local and Increasing Autonomy from National Government, and the UvA team is assigned to the theme of Detachment from Formal Governance by Independent Actors.

Deliverable 5.1 falls under Work Package 5, which aims to develop an exploratory research design among BROAD-ER partners towards collaborative research excellence.

1. Introduction: City Diplomacy and Migration

Scholarship in migration studies, international relations, and urban studies has long viewed cities as places or venues of interaction, rather than actors (Acuto, 2019, p. 132; Stürner-Siovitz, 2023, p. 15). Academic discourse has been recently shifting towards acknowledging cities as actors with agency in international affairs, or as "global political actors" in urban governance (Oosterlynck et al., 2019). With more than half of the world's population living in urban areas and this number projected to reach 70% by 2050, cities are increasingly recognized for their role in addressing complex cross-border issues such as migration, global security, climate change, financial instability, and pandemics (UNHCR, 2023). In the last decade, there has been a growing trend of cities taking an active interest in conducting international engagements that were traditionally considered the domain of national governments, with many cities directly engaging with international actors such as non-governmental organizations, regional bodies, corporations, and UN agencies (Kosovac et al., 2021), in addition to forming city networks, with almost three hundred of them currently active (Curtis & Acuto, 2018, p. 11).

As cities have become major destinations for immigration, there is growing recognition of the important role that subnational actors can play in migration governance. The intersection of urbanization and migration has brought attention not only to the challenges of dealing with increasingly diverse populations in urban areas, but also to the questions of "how ongoing mobility shapes the nature of political community, participation, and the bases of inclusion and marginalization" (Local Inclusion for Migrants and Refugees, 2020, p. 1). On the policy front, there is a great emphasis on the need to move beyond nation-state-centered approaches that view local authorities merely as policy followers or implementing actors (Bendel et al., 2019; Stürner et al., 2020).

Notwithstanding this emerging discourse in favor of the importance of cities in migration governance, research on city diplomacy in migration governance is scarce. While cities can conduct diplomatic activities in various fields, including migration, existing research on city diplomacy has mainly focused on climate change (Bulkeley & Betsill, 2003; Fünfgeld, 2015; Kern & Bulkeley, 2009). International relations scholarship undermines the role of cities as political actors (Acuto, 2010), while urban studies pay less attention to the governance dimension of cities in the field of migration. Similarly, migration studies, despite its recent "local turn," put excessive emphasis on integration governance at the expense of migration governance, pay little attention to the international level in governance analyses, and even less attention to international city diplomacy (Stürner-Siovitz, 2023, p. 20). Hence, incorporating city diplomacy into migration governance provides a significant pathway to bridge the fields of migration and urban studies.

Spanning the fields of international relations, urban studies and migration studies, this conceptual paper aims to fill the gap in research on city diplomacy in migration governance. The paper is divided into two parts. The first part focuses on city diplomacy, addressing its conceptualisation and evolution; defining features; role in governance at various levels; and, as well as, obstacles and risks. The second part focuses on city diplomacy in migration, emphasising the dynamics of migration and cities and the role of cities in migration governance.

2. City Diplomacy

The role of cities on the international stage has reignited the debate around "city diplomacy", with concerns that this topic has been insufficiently addressed and under-theorized, with limited connections across the disciplines of international relations, urban studies, and migration studies (Stürner-Siovitz, 2023). Recently, a small field of research has emerged in urban studies, and to some extent in international relations and less so in migration studies, directly addressing the topic of city diplomacy. This small field of research has focused on the defining features and dynamics of city diplomacy in relation to the complexities of globalization, urbanization, and governance (Acuto, 2010, 2013a, 2013b, 2016; Acuto et al., 2017, 2021; Acuto & Rayner, 2016; Amiri & Sevin, 2020; Barber, 2013; Chan, 2016; Curtis, 2011; Curtis & Acuto, 2018; Gutierrez-Camps, 2013; Hocking et al., 2012; Kihlgren Grandi, 2020; Kosovac & Pejic, 2021; Leffel, 2018; Marchetti, 2021; Terruso, 2016; van der Pluijm & Melissen, 2007) and migration governance (Kihlgren Grandi, 2020, pp. 137–150; Stürner-Siovitz, 2023).

Drawing on this literature, this part first focuses on the definitions and historical patterns of city diplomacy. Although it is difficult to arrive at a single definition of city diplomacy due to its various forms and range of activities, it is crucial to differentiate city diplomacy from other types of international engagement that cities are involved in.

In the next section, we explore city diplomacy in its various aspects, including its goals, dimensions, actors, and tools. City diplomacy encompasses a diverse array of activities that span across various fields and come in different forms, such as city networks, twinning, multilateral projects, and international events. While the increasing significance of city networks in global affairs is noteworthy, it is important to recognize that not all cities may be equally equipped to pursue their aspirations regarding diplomatic activities in the current political economic context.

The following section delves into the discussions of the role and impact of cities in urban governance across the local, national, and global levels. There are different perspectives in research that focus on the city as a political actor with agency in global urban governance, problematize the debate between nation-state and city-level

governance, and highlight the multilevel and multiscalar dimensions of cities that complicate the traditional understanding of territorial and hierarchical relationships between different government levels.

Finally, the last section elaborates on the constraints on city diplomacy, which include obstacles and risks involved in city-level actors seeking diplomatic action. It emphasizes that city diplomacy activities vary across different cities and are not uniform within the same country. Moreover, they are not free from barriers and tensions that arise from power disparities in various dimensions, including structural, institutional, and financial.

2.1. Definitions and trends

Although no such definite division of labour exists in practice, in formal hierarchical terms, city diplomacy occupies the middle ground between state diplomacy, which refers to government-to-government interaction, and citizen diplomacy, which refers to transnational interaction of individuals and private groups (Marchetti, 2021, p. 47). Additionally, the engagement of substate and nonstate actors in diplomatic affairs has been given different labels. For example, some scholars who view it as parallel to traditional national actors have used the term "paradiplomacy" (Tavares, 2016), while others call it "municipal foreign policy" (Leffel, 2018) or "sub-state diplomacy" (Criekemans, 2010). The choice of label may depend on the specific characteristics of the local entity being studied and the political circumstances of the locality being analysed. It is also shaped by differences in theoretical perspectives. For instance, the labels used may reflect a tendency to view cities as mere parallel actors to states, which raises criticism for neglecting the agency of cities as participants in international affairs (Acuto, 2013a).

Some scholars who label the international engagement of cities as "city diplomacy" have made efforts to conceptualize the term. Pluijm and Melissen (2007, p. 6) conceptualize city diplomacy as "the institutions and processes by which cities, or local governments in general, engage in relations with actors on an international political stage with the aim of representing themselves and their interests to one another." In a later work, Kosovac et al. (2021, p. 130) also provide a similar definition as "the conduct of external relations undertaken by official representatives of cities with other actors, particularly other cities, nation-states, NGOs, and corporations." A third and relatively broader definition comes from Marchetti (2021, p. 47) as "the combination of institutions and practices that allow urban centres to engage in relations with a third party—a state or nonstate actors—beyond their borders, with the objective of pursuing their interests."

The "diplomacy" provided in these definitions extends "beyond mere ambassadorial and advocacy activities" and encompasses "mediated economic and cultural practices in

the context of goods provision and facilitation" as well as the "development and daily relations within the global networks of flows that run among cities" (Acuto, 2013, p. 48). In this sense, cities' diplomatic engagement is not a new phenomenon, as they have been "humanity's oldest diplomatic actors" (Acuto, 2016, p. 511). Examples include ancient Greek city-states and the German cities of the Hanseatic League. Modern city diplomacy has deep roots extending well before the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, which marked the rise of sovereign nation-states (Kihlgren Grandi, 2020, pp. 38–41). The Westphalian order marginalized cities, subsuming them under nation-states in the 17th century (Marchetti, 2021, p. 3). After being sidelined for centuries, cities gradually reappeared as international actors in the early 20th century. The beginning of modern city diplomacy is marked by the Universal Exposition in Ghent in 1913 when mayors from several countries gathered for the International Congress of the Art of Building Cities and Organizing Community Life, which established the first global city network, the International Union of Local Authorities (IULA) (Kihlgren Grandi, 2020, p. 39). Cities' greater engagement on the international stage occurred after the Second World War when there was an urgent need for urban reconstruction and development through international solidarity (van der Pluijm & Melissen, 2007).

Although this historical background may lead to think that "cities are back" and "they are resuming functions they once performed" (Marchetti, 2021, pp. 3–4), their current "return" cannot easily be treated the same as their precedents. Today's city diplomacy has distinguishing features. On the one hand, it is taking place "in a particular historical configuration in which states still possess huge legal, economic, social, and political power over localities" (Blank, 2006, p. 882). On the other hand, the tension between global capital and the territorial state system has generated economic and political possibilities for local actors and spaces to take part in processes that were once exclusive to the formal authority of nation-states (Sassen, 2004). As Curtis and Acuto (2018, p. 9) point out, it is "the contingent interplay of political, economic, technological and demographic trends" that has created "new roles and capabilities for major cities," and it is in this context that cities have started to "translate their new status and changing governance capabilities into political objectives". Equally important, this context has been widely shaped by the neoliberal turn in the 1970s, which led to urban transformation in the form of "global cities," as well as the inefficiency of state-centred efforts in dealing with global challenges and the outsourcing of state responsibilities to the local level (Curtis, 2016; Curtis & Acuto, 2018, p. 10). Finally, another trend that figures in present city diplomacy has been the increasing influence of cities at the national and global levels, along with the overall recognition of this trend by international and diplomatic bodies (Acuto et al., 2021, p. 5).

Among scholars who have examined the historical trends in the scope and form of city diplomacy, Acuto et al. (2021, pp. 2–5) have identified a series of "generational shifts"

that describe the modes of city interaction at the international level since its re-emergence in the early 20th century. The *first* generation is characterized by the bilateral twinning activities of cities in the early 20th century, in which local leaders pursued individual aspirations related to cultural exchange, diaspora communities, and commercial activities. The *second* generation emerged in the post-war era and is marked by the formation of multilateral relations, more organized and collective cooperation, and the expansion of policy concerns with a greater impact on the global agenda. The *third* generational shift occurred in the late Cold War years and the early 1990s, which witnessed the proliferation and expansion of city networks in more institutionalized forms, in touch with UN agencies. *Finally*, the current generational shift, taking place since the early 2000s, has been marked by the expansion and diversification of city diplomacy, the direct engagement with global policy agendas, the greater visibility of city representatives on the international stage, and the recognition of the global role of local actors.

Today, as the following section demonstrates, city diplomacy encompasses various activities across multiple areas at different levels. This diversity makes it challenging to rely on a single definition of city diplomacy and leads to conceptual confusion sometimes stretching the term for any city interaction on the international stage. Similar to Amiri & Sevin (2020, p. 3), we suggest using the term city diplomacy as an "umbrella term," recognising that the terminology used to describe the international activities of cities can be diverse, as cities have different ways of internationalizing themselves. Cities can internationalize themselves through various means, such as global governance, networking, twinning, international summits, sporting events, and museums. However, we also acknowledge that city diplomacy does not encompass all international activities of cities and that the degree of city internationalisation resulting from different city diplomacy activities may vary. Based on the current landscape of city diplomacy, Lara (2020) offers a typology that assesses the effect of various city diplomacy activities on a city's level of internationalisation or "insertion" into the international setting. In this context, insertion is defined as "the ability of the cities to act in, intervene and influence world politics without needing another international actor to support it" (Lara, 2020, p. 193). This typology categorises city internationalisation into four types, ranging from the lowest to the highest level of insertion: (1) external projection (through city associations and paradiplomatic activities), (2) international presence (through city-to-city cooperation and city networks and alliances), (3) territorial attractiveness (through competitive cooperation and city marketing), and (4) global recognition (through model cities and global networks) (Lara, 2020, p. 198). Although these types and ways of insertion are not necessarily mutually exclusive or fixed, it is worth noting that city diplomacy differs in kind and degree, and these differences are shaped by additional complexities that arise from specific circumstances that vary between cities, making it challenging to create a single definition of city diplomacy.

2.2. Goals, dimensions, actors, and tools

The literature identifies several goals behind cities engaging in diplomatic activity. Grandi (2020, pp. 9–10) describes *two* sets of goals that are often interconnected and interdependent: universal values and local interests. City diplomacy can be *value-based*, focusing on issues such as conflict resolution, cooperation for global challenges, and regional solidarity. Alternatively, it can be *interest-based*, involving the transfer of knowledge and technology and the achievement of economic and cultural attractiveness. Pursuing these goals, city diplomacy action often takes three central forms: (1) influencing narratives, (2) participation in global agenda-setting, and (3) claiming a position at intergovernmental decision-making processes (Stürner-Siovitz, 2023, p. 113),

City diplomacy encompasses a wide range of activities, which are typically classified in the literature as business and brand management, cooperation and representation, culture and environment, peace and security, and human rights, migration, and development (Balbim, 2016, p. 138; Marchetti, 2021, p. 69; van der Pluijm & Melissen, 2007, p. 19). Various actors participate in these areas of operation. However, when referring to city diplomacy, the literature often distinguishes formal municipal structures from other local actors. City diplomacy can be understood in broader terms, as Marchetti (2021, p. 60) has suggested, and can include four main types of actors: (i) formal representatives (e.g., mayors, municipal officials), (ii) citizens and civil society organizations (e.g., NGOs, associations, ethnic groups), (iii) economic and business organizations (e.g., companies, corporations), and (iv) educational and cultural actors (e.g., universities, museums, religious or sport organisations).

Cities use a variety of tools to engage in international activities, including bilateral agreements, networks, bilateral and multilateral projects, international events, and international advocacy campaigns (Kihlgren Grandi, 2020, pp. 10–21). While bilateral agreements in the form of twinning were more widespread during the Cold War years, the current landscape of city diplomacy is marked by a clear expansion in international city networking (Acuto & Leffel, 2021). City networks refer to "formalized organizations with cities as their main members and characterized by reciprocal and established patterns of communication, policymaking and exchange" (Acuto & Rayner, 2016, pp. 1149–1150). Currently, there are about 300 city networks operating at various levels (Curtis & Acuto, 2018, p. 11). Although national networks constitute a majority, regional and international networks are growing in size and power (Marchetti, 2021, p. 79). Examples of these networks include Eurocities, United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), C40-Cities Climate Leadership Group, and International Council for Local Environment Initiatives (ICLEI). City networks are particularly relevant to the study of city diplomacy and are often depicted as the most important tools through which cities engage in "global urban governance" (Acuto et al., 2021).

Recognizing the growing influence of city networks in world politics does not necessarily mean that cities are replacing or confronting the state in international affairs. For instance, major city networks such as the UCLG and C40's Urban20 employ a collaborative tone regarding partnerships between cities and states (Curtis & Acuto, 2018, p. 15). Furthermore, as the next section shows, a simplistic recognition of the city as opposed to the nation-state may not be a productive assertion due to the intricacies involved in the local, national, and global levels.

In addition, as will be explained later, cities often face obstacles in pursuing their aspirations. Main obstacles include structural tensions between cities and states, ongoing state-centrism in the organization of international institutions, and limited resources and growing competition between cities (Curtis & Acuto, 2018, pp. 15–16). Therefore, the goals of city diplomacy described here may not be easily achievable or equally feasible for all cities seeking diplomatic activities in the current political economic context. City diplomacy activities can be funded through national and local budgets or external actors such as international organizations, development banks, government agencies, embassies, NGOs, and the business sector (Kihlgren Grandi, 2020, p. 28). The trend towards funding through external actors is more likely due to the neoliberalisation processes. Under neoliberal policy regimes, cities are under pressure to compete to attract capital and promote urban prosperity to achieve a higher ranking in various city rankings and comparative indicators (Çağlar & Glick Schiller, 2018, p. 6). Cities are at the same time often constrained by their inability to collect their own taxes, independently set budgets, or deviate from state-level legal frameworks, and as a result, they must balance collaborative, networked efforts with pressing local needs to maintain economic vitality and attractiveness on a global scale (Curtis & Acuto, 2018, p. 14). This links back to the neoliberalisation of governance in which state responsibilities are increasingly delegated to local and private actors. As Kaya (2023, p. 12) argues in the case of migration governance in Turkey, "there is a 'local turn' in terms of increasing responsibilities of local municipalities to integrate refugees … while the central state actors have gradually opted for withdrawing themselves from being engaged in integration of refugees at the local level" (Kaya, 2023, p. 12).

2.3. Thinking city diplomacy through local, national, and global levels

The recent emphasis on recognizing cities as actors with agency has, on one hand, enhanced the emerging tendency to address cities as key architects of global urban governance. On the other hand, it has raised questions about the complexities of the local, national, and global scales and levels. Challenging the prevailing state-centrism of international relations scholarship, a current line of work on city diplomacy has focused on the role of cities as global actors with multiscalar agency (Acuto, 2013b; Curtis, 2016; Davidson et al., 2019; Kosovac & Pejic, 2021). Scholars have emphasized the importance of

cities as active agents, rather than merely passive places in international affairs or subnational entities with limited reach (Acuto, 2010). Beyond challenges of globalization and urbanization, Acuto and Rayner (2016, p. 1148, 1150) argue that city diplomacy is a "clear sign that cities are indeed participants in the architecture of world politics" with the potential to develop effective responses to "international gridlocks." This active involvement of cities in global governance is both reflected in and enhanced by multilateral processes such as the Sustainable Development Goals that target cities (Acuto et al., 2017, p. 15). Similarly, the recognition of cities within the United Nations system means that cities are viewed "not just as places for action but as actors and partners in their own right" (Curtis & Acuto, 2018, p. 16). Yet, as Acuto (2013a, p. 310) points out, "the international political role of cities is far more complex and multi-layered than much traditional IR scholarship would admit."

City diplomacy can operate simultaneously across multiple scales. As Sassen (2004, p. 660) argues, "an important feature of this type of multiscalar politics of the local is that it is not confined to moving through a set of nested scales from the local to the national to the international, but can directly access other such local actors whether in the same country or across borders." Recent work has explored how cities act simultaneously at the local, national and global levels, with empirical evidence on city networks such as Metropolis and the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group (Bouteligier, 2012), United Cities and Local Governments (Gutierrez-Camps, 2013), global and regional sustainability-oriented networks (Keiner & Kim, 2007), institutional capacities of city networks engaging in international activities (Kosovac et al., 2021), and networking strategies of mayors as global actors (Beal & Pinson, 2014; Miyazaki, 2021; Stren & Friendly, 2019). This demonstrates that city diplomacy is not merely another arena for international politics but is integral to global urban governance across various scales.

Recognizing the agency of cities, however, it is important to avoid simplistic dichotomies of nation-state versus local levels and not replace methodological nationalism with methodological localism, as warned by Stürner-Siovitz (2023, p. 18). As will be elaborated in the second part, scholars engaging in governance analysis in migration and urban studies point out the existence of various modes of governance between different government levels in multilevel settings (Scholten, 2013; Scholten & Penninx, 2016; Zapata-Barrero et al., 2017). These modes may include cases where the local level is primarily implementing policies at the national level, as well as situations in which the national and local levels, or even the local levels among themselves, are disconnected in policy making (Ambrosini & Boccagni, 2015; Jørgensen, 2012; Scholten, 2013). Furthermore, scholars such as Çağlar and Glick Schiller advocate for a shift from multilevel to multiscalar perspective that views cities "not as units of analysis or as bounded territorial units but as institutional political, economic, and cultural actors

positioned within multiple institutionally structured scales of differentiated but connected domains of power" (2018, p. 9). Thus, both the multilevel perspective that considers the complex interrelationships between different levels of government, and the multiscalar perspective that goes beyond fixed notions of levels and analyses their mutual constitution in a context of power inequalities across multiple dimensions highlight the limitations of simplistic dichotomies between the nation-state and local government in understanding governance.

As the next section shows, city diplomacy activities are not uniform across cities in the world or within the same country and are not free from barriers and tensions that result from power disparities in multiple dimensions, including structural, institutional, and financial.

2.4. Constraints on city diplomacy: obstacles and risks

As Davidson et al. (2019, p. 3546) note, the multi-layered "development of new urban governance landscape by default means decision-making becomes less transparent," and the strategies developed by city networks are often constrained by "limited funding, the need for participation in multilateral fora and nationalist backlashes by central governments." Yet, more extensive empirical research is needed to elucidate how power resources factor into cities' strategic mapping and how this varies depending on the issues they address as they negotiate, challenge, or align in the multi-layered context of urban governance. Few empirical studies have explored the challenges and potential pitfalls of city diplomacy for city representatives (Kosovac et al., 2020; Stürner-Siovitz, 2023).

City officials who participated in Kosovac et al.'s (2020, p. 21) research through surveys and interviews identified obstacles to their involvement in international city diplomacy, which include inadequate resources, professionalization, and authority to engage in international activities. Even when cities had international offices, there was often insufficient funding for staff to attend international events or travel abroad. In addition, many city officials working in city diplomacy offices and international projects lacked formal education and training in diplomacy, negotiation, and external engagement practices. These city officials also cited a lack of explicit authority on international issues as a reason for their limited engagement in city diplomacy, which reflects the ambiguous positioning of cities in relation to the international system, international activities beyond their immediate reach, and cross-border challenges affecting urban life worldwide.

A recent empirical work by Stürner-Siovitz (2023) that focuses on city diplomacy and migration governance also shows that city diplomacy in global migration governance provides chances for linking local and global levels of governance, but it encounters

significant obstacles and involves risks (p. 185). Stürner-Siovitz's (2023, p. 185) interviews with city representatives reveal that the obstacles include "national opposition to transnational municipal engagement, limited institutionalized access at the global level, scarce municipal resources, and a lack of municipal knowledge about global migration governance structures and stakeholders." National opposition arises especially when central governments do not recognize cities as migration actors or stakeholders in international processes (Stürner-Siovitz, 2023, p. 186). Limited institutionalized access at the global level is again an issue given that the access of local authorities to international processes is currently ad hoc and highly dependent on states, for example in the case of including municipal representatives into national delegations and international organisations (Stürner-Siovitz, 2023, p. 188). Scarcity of funding is an obstacle especially for cities that lacks human and financial resources that transnational municipal engagement requires such as staff, travel costs, and membership fees of city networks (Stürner-Siovitz, 2023, p. 188). Limited expertise in international relations is another barrier for local authorities to develop city diplomacy (Stürner-Siovitz, 2023, p. 190).

Institutional limitations on city autonomy can be exacerbated by different government systems across countries. For instance, research conducted in Turkey—which has a highly centralized unitary government system—has shown that district municipalities have limited administrative and financial capacities to respond to immigrant needs and influence migration policies due to heavy regulation by the central government (Karakaya Polat & Lowndes, 2022; Lowndes & Karakaya Polat, 2022). Yet, the same research also shows that, despite their weaker position compared to the central state, municipalities were able to develop strategies to address the needs of immigrants by engaging in formal and informal networks at various governance levels.

In addition to obstacles, Stürner-Siovitz's research shows that city diplomacy also involves risks including "a progressive city bias, limited municipal representativeness and accountability as well as the multiplication of city networks and the resulting fragmentation of the city diplomacy landscape" (2023, p. 191). Cities vary in their political will and capacity to engage globally; some support only certain forms of migration while rejecting others, and others hold negative views towards mobile populations, creating a "progressive city bias", as well as questions of representativeness and accountability of city diplomacy (Stürner-Siovitz, 2023, pp. 191-192). Furthermore, city networks compete for members and partners by focusing on narrow themes or crosscutting themes such as sustainability and resilience, leading to the multiplication and fragmentation of the city diplomacy landscape (Stürner-Siovitz, 2023, p. 193). The multiplication and fragmentation of city networks, in turn, can lead to competition and improved quality and merging of similar networks, as well as the success of one network causing others to lose resources agency, resources, and membership (Kihlgren Grandi, 2020, pp. 14-15).

3. City Diplomacy in Migration

The interdisciplinary nature of the phenomenon of migration gives rise to the potential, if not the imperative, of establishing a connection between migration and urban. Although migration is commonly understood as a process that involves the physical movement of individuals or groups from one location to another in response to social, economic, or political factors; social scientists proved and debated that relocating is only the beginning of migration process. (Basch et al., 1994; Faist, 2006; Schiller et al., 2004; Wakeman, 1988). IOM Report 2015 mentioned that "migration is a growing –and often a determining – factor in local planning, since most migration (whether internal or international) is to cities" (IOM Report, 2015, p. 13). It is important to note that the process of migration extends beyond the initial act of relocation. Fontanari (2018) argued that migration does not end "once the people arrive in Europe or when they have obtained a residence permit" (Fontanari, 2018, p. 2). This is true not only for migrant populations, but also for the governments and authorities that oversee migration. Indeed, the ongoing effects of migration are shaped by a variety of factors, including the social and economic conditions in the destination country, the legal and institutional frameworks that regulate migration, and the broader political and cultural context in which migration occurs. Thus, urban governance of migration gains importance as much as the significance of migration policies of state authorities. In the recent years, there has been more research on the relationship between migration and the city, and the role of local governments in migration has become more visible than before. Nevertheless, migration is still analysed at the level of states, and while looking at migration at the urban scale has become somewhat relevant, research on the autonomy and active role of the city is remained limited. However, cities have a crucial role to play in the governance of migration because they are often the most immediate context in which migrants experience the challenges and opportunities of the host country.

Surmacz (2018) argues that nation states are "too small to cope with global challenges, but on the other hand it is too big to deal with the needs of increasingly individualized and diversified communities … whereas cities … do not operate in the categories of national interests and are able to create such cooperation networks which the competing states cannot afford." (Surmacz, 2018, p. 11). In the light of these and by recalling former New York mayor Bloomberg's famous quote "while nations talk, cities act", it is worth studying the role of cities in migration governance.

In the following sections, we explore the relationship between migration and urban governance, emphasizing the critical role that cities play in the dynamics of migration and the significance of local governments and actors in the governance of migration. Thus, we highlight the necessity of situating "city diplomacy" at the intersection of urban and migration studies.

3.1. The role of cities

Cities are both affected by migration policies and play a crucial role in shaping them, as they are often at the forefront of migration-related challenges and opportunities. Hence, migration policies can have a fundamental impact on cities, influencing demographics, socio-economic conditions, and cultural dynamics. Therefore, cities are by no means detached from migration phenomenon. In the IOM Report 2015, city is defined as "a conglomeration of people that results in more intensive cooperation, a heightened level of economic activity, an interchange of ideas producing greater efficiency, innovation, and cultural richness, and the building of infrastructures to support these activities" (2015, p. 15). Cities, as global actors, can be analysed through the access to education, health, employment opportunities (urbanization and inequalities) or unique cultural offerings (urban culture), but also through their ability to withstand from crises and disasters (urban resilience). Cities are considered a combination of both conflict and solidarity. With reference to Bhabha (2004), Soja (1989) and Appadurai and Holston (1996), Lacroix and Spencer argued that "Cities are places of conflicts and competition, but also of artistic creativity, social adaptation and cultural innovation" (2022, p. 351). The basis of this is to consider cities not only as globally linked venues but also as actors (Curtis & Acuto 2018; Garcia-Chueca & Vidal 2019; Glick Schiller & Çağlar 2009); even as political actors with a stake in the international arena (Acuto, 2019; Curtis, 2016; Ljungkvist, 2014).

Acuto (2010) argues that cities cannot be seen independently of transnational processes, as all cities work as mechanisms to create new geographies and sustain existing ones. Acuto, known for his expression "cities are invisible gorillas," also states: "Urban products are, nonetheless, not limited to basic goods: cities also export knowledge, information, culture, through national, regional, and global communication networks" (2010, p. 431). Historically, cities were also described as sites for political, economic, and cultural activities. Barber (2013) argued that cities are the roots of civilization, while Surmacz (2018) mentioned that "states emerged much later, cities last when states fall... The collapse of the Roman Empire did not cause the downfall of Rome. Berlin is an example of a cosmopolitan city which survived the fall of the Kingdom of Prussia and the Third Reich" (Surmacz, 2018, p. 8). Initially, world cities were identified by Friedmann (1986) and followed by global cities which were described by Sassen (1991). With the 2000s, the place of cities in the literature has been increasing gradually (Acuto, 2013; Acuto & Rayner, 2016; Taylor, 2005; van der Plujim & Melissen, 2007). A tendency in migration studies to focus on global cities such as London, New York, and London (Cross & Moore, 2022) paved the way for studies on "'midrange cities', (Sassen, 2002a; Ward & McCann, 2011), 'gateway cities' (Benton-Short & Price, 2008), and 'ordinary cities' (Robinson, 2006)" (Çağlar & Schiller, 2018, pp. 2-3). In short, cities have long been a preferred destination for rural-urban migration as well as a main arrival destination for international migrants. In the last

decades, cities across the globe host various types of migrants including refugees, transits, tourists, migrants with temporary protection and so on.

Cities have become "the locations of new arrangements of governance … upon which access to rights, benefits and services for their inhabitants, including migrants are based" (Çağlar, 2016). Çağlar and Glick Schiller have sought to move beyond a focus on nation-states in examining the relationships between migration, cities, and neoliberalism (Çağlar, 2016; Çağlar & Glick Schiller, 2015, 2018, 2021; Glick Schiller & Çağlar, 2009, 2011). They argue that cities should be studied as entry points for exploring the connections between the incorporation of migrants and the materialization of broader neoliberal processes. Through this lens, the relationship between migrants and cities is mutually constitutive, with migrants actively involved in shaping urban life.

3.2. Local turn and city networks

Recent migration research has focused on the multilevel governance of migration and integration. Traditionally, migration governance has been the responsibility of the nation-state, and in the same vein, the issue of migrant integration has been heavily influenced by concepts of national identity (Scholten & Penninx, 2016, p. 92). Today, migration and integration are increasingly recognized as multilevel policy issues as various actors and different levels of government have become more involved. Academic and policy attention has grown around how policies develop at various levels, how interactions and coordination occur between these levels, the implications for emerging modes of governance, and the contradictions and challenges involved (Zincone & Caponio, 2006). For instance, according to Scholten (2013), policy development in multilevel settings take several forms including centralist, multilevel, localist, and decoupling: The centralist mode involves a hierarchical division of labor between national and local governments, with policies decided at the national level and implemented by the local level, and migrant integration framed as a national issue. The multilevel mode assumes mutual and strategic interaction between various levels of government in pursuit of a specific policy goal, without clear primacy of one level over another. The localist mode involves a bottom-up approach to governance, with local governments engaging in policy formulation and agenda setting, especially when addressing local issues. Finally, governance decoupling occurs when there is little coordination and interaction between government levels, even resulting in contradictions and conflicts within a single policy domain.

In line with the European Committee of the Regions, city diplomacy can be a "tool with which local authorities and their associations can promote social cohesion, environmental sustainability, conflict prevention, conflict resolution and post-conflict reconstruction and rehabilitation."[1] Migration governance has a multilevel structure

involving various actors and organisations at local, national, and international levels. So, this requires a co-operative approach in which city diplomacy can play an important role. If cities can influence migration policies through inter-city relations and work together for common goals and solutions, resources can be used efficiently. The importance of city diplomacy in migration policy and multilevel governance lies in its ability to encourage cooperation and collaboration among different actors and to foster inclusive and effective migration governance practices.

Integrating the local turn in migration research into a framework of city diplomacy could lead to an interdisciplinary and comprehensive understanding of the international engagements of cities in the migration field, serving as a pathway to bridge migration and urban studies. In doing so, "reconceptualization of cities from places to local integration actors" is crucial to focus on cities as important actors along with "sub-national, national, and regional levels in order to shape integration governance in multi-level settings" (Stürner-Siovitz, 2022, p. 16). In the European context, two trends have emerged: migration governance has become more Europeanized, and migrant integration governance has become more local (Zapata-Barrero et al., 2017). In the last two decades, a "local turn" emerged in migration studies which enounces that cities are "collective actors shaping the local governance of integration and diversity" (Zapata-Barrero et al., p. 17), and they are not *places* (Caponio & Borkert, 2010; Scholten & Penninx, 2016; Schiller, 2018; Schammann et al., 2021). This "local turn" is characterized by horizontal or vertical forms in multilevel governance settings. The horizontal dimension involves the involvement of local authorities, civil society organizations, and immigrant networks in the governance of immigrant policies, while the vertical dimension involves policymaking processes between levels of government (Zapata-Barrero et al., 2017, p. 3). Scholten and Penninx (2016, p. 97) argue that, despite the diversity of patterns in the relationship between national and EU institutions or the increasing role of subnational actors, the pattern is more consistent with multilevel governance than either centralist or localist modes.

European institutions have supported the development of local integration policies by encouraging direct interaction between EU-level bodies and city-level authorities and promoting cooperation between cities. One example of such efforts is the European Commission's promotion of city networks, such as Cities for Local Integration Policies, Integrating Cities, and Intercultural Cities, which facilitate horizontal forms of cooperation between cities through their exchange of knowledge and best practices on local integration policies (Scholten & Penninx, 2016, p. 104; Zapata-Barrero et al., 2017, p. 3). Recent action plans, including the Urban Agenda for the EU Partnership on Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees, and international efforts such as the Global Compact for Refugees (GCR, 2018) and the Global Compact on Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM, 2018), have also emphasized the need for multilevel governance of migration and integration

that is more inclusive of the local level. Furthermore, a guidance report has been published to share best practices and outline steps for implementing the GCM and GCR across different contexts (Local Inclusion for Migrants and Refugees, 2020). Municipalities have also utilized transnational networks like Eurocities or Solidarity Cities to demand greater competences and resources, not only in integration but also in migration policies (Heimann et al., 2019). This emphasis on the role of cities in various policy areas of global governance is reflected in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, which include targets for "cities."

Policy networks at the local level can even operate autonomously, serving as policy entrepreneurs that push their ideas into the national agenda (Scholten, 2013, p. 235). However, this pattern has not been uniformly developed across countries, nor even within them, as it has been influenced by different circumstances, such as variations in the evolution of migration flows, the decision-making structure, and governance structure (Zincone & Caponio, 2006, pp. 272-274). While some local governments engage in pragmatism and coping to handle emerging integration issues, others can surpass the everyday problem-solving to create opportunities for policy innovation by redefining the concepts of integration, inclusion, and citizenship (Jørgensen, 2012). This may also result in governance decoupling, where the logic of policymaking differs considerably between the national and local levels, as well as among cities within the same country (Ambrosini & Boccagni, 2015; Jørgensen, 2012; Scholten, 2013). Additionally, while there is widespread recognition of the importance of the local level in migration and integration issues, cities and municipalities frequently face challenges due to their lack of legal competences and financial and structural deficits. There is a growing demand for the development of more systematic forms of cooperation, rather than ad hoc mechanisms, between local, national, and regional levels in the field of migration governance, as well as integration (Bendel et al., 2019; Stürner et al., 2020).

Local governments have the potential to develop and execute policies that are tailored to the needs of newcomer population. Grandi stated that "as the closest institution to residents and the main provider of essential services, city governments are the best-suited entity to assess these inequalities and act to address them" (Grandi, 2020, p. 138). By adopting this approach, local governments could foster social cohesion and enhance the wellbeing of both migrants and the wider community. On the other hand, regrettably, migrants have limited prospects to access the complete potential of urbanization; frequently, the process of relocating coincides with a range of additional challenges, thereby exacerbating disparities within urban areas (Grandi, 2020, p. 138).

Although some earlier studies such as Miller (1981) and some recent studies on the involvement of cities in immigrant integration and local economic development (Rath & Eurofound, 2011; Rath & Swagerman, 2016), the scholarship on city diplomacy in the field

of migration is relatively rare. The current literature on city diplomacy has primarily centred around the broader international engagement of cities, emphasizing the dynamics of urban governance, and case studies of city networks that specialize only on specific issues. Although the existing scholarship is highly concentrated on Europe and North America (Caponio, 2018; Oomen, 2019; Lacroix, 2021), there are examples of city networks in other parts of the globe as well (Lacroix & Spencer, 2022, p. 350):

> In Latin America, several organizations ... were created to tackle the new migration realities the subcontinent is facing. In Africa (e.g., Africities, the coalition of African cities against racism) and in the Middle East (e.g., the Host Local Municipalities Network), local authorities organize to have their say in the management of refugee populations.

In addition to city networks, many cities in developing countries that host large numbers of refugees are establishing relationships with various actors and organizations at the international level. For example, there are currently several municipalities in Istanbul, the city with the highest number of refugees in Turkey, collaborating with UN institutions (UNHCR, IOM, UNDP, UNICEF, WFP), and various organisations at the international level such as Welthungerhilfe, American Bar Association, German International Cooperation Agency (GIZ), Taiwan Foundation, Tzu-Chi International Medical Association, Amnesty International, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) (Erdoğan, 2017, p. 89).

Lacroix and Spencer (2022) argue that through city networks, urban areas across the globe are progressively cultivating the practice of city diplomacy, which encompasses diverse fields: economy, culture, climate change, and migration. Given that cities now accounting for a significant proportion of global GDP and trade, they have become key actors in international trade and investment, forging their own economic links with other cities and regions around the world. Similarly, cities are becoming the primary sites of innovation, creativity, and cultural exchange. In both contexts, city networks have come to the forefront in migration governance as well.

4. Conclusion

Addressing the scarcity of research in the field, this conceptual paper has suggested that incorporating city diplomacy into migration governance can offer a significant pathway to bridge the fields of migration and urban studies. Existing research on city diplomacy has neglected the potential of cities to conduct diplomatic activities in the area of migration. Additionally, international relations scholarship often undermines the role of cities as political actors, while urban studies and migration studies have paid little attention to the role of cities in migration governance.

In this paper, we have first elaborated on the topic of city diplomacy by focusing on its defining features and patterns, as well as the institutional, financial, and structural challenges and complexities that exist at the local, national, and global levels. In the second part, we have emphasized the significance of the interaction between city and migration dynamics and highlighted the need to integrate the "local turn" in migration research into a framework of city diplomacy.

While migration is often analysed at the level of states, the growing visibility of local governments in migration has emphasized the need to investigate the autonomy and active role of cities. The interdisciplinary nature of migration necessitates a connection between migration and urban. Furthermore, cities can create cooperation networks that competing states cannot afford, and therefore have an important role to play in the governance of migration. While recognising the constraints on city diplomacy and the diversity in the ways in which cities conduct diplomatic activity and create impact in policymaking, this paper has underlined that understanding the role of cities in migration governance is crucial as they are often the most immediate context in which migrants experience the challenges and opportunities of the host country. We plan to further investigate the practices of cities seeking international engagement in the field of migration through empirical data in our fieldwork and country reports within the BROAD-ER project.

5. References

Acuto, M. (2010). Global cities: gorillas in our midst. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, *35*(4), 425–448. https://doi.org/10.1177/030437541003500405

Acuto, M. (2013a). World Politics by other means? London, city diplomacy and the Olympics. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, *8*(3–4), 287–311. https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-12341255

Acuto, M. (2013b). *Global cities, governance and diplomacy: The urban link*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203073810

Acuto, M. (2016). City diplomacy. In C. M. Constantinou (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of diplomacy*. SAGE.

Acuto, M. (2019). Whose urban agency is it anyway? In S. Oosterlynck, L. Beeckmans, D. Bassens, B. Derudder, B. Segaert & L. Braeckmans (Eds.), *The city as a global political actor*. Routledge.

Acuto, M., Kosovac, A., & Hartley, K. (2021). City diplomacy: Another generational shift? *Diplomatica*, *3*(1), 137–146. https://doi.org/10.1163/25891774-03010007

Acuto, M., & Leffel, B. (2021). Understanding the global ecosystem of city networks. *Urban Studies*, *58*(9), 1758–1774. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098020929261

Acuto, M., Morissette, M., & Tsouros, A. (2017). City diplomacy: Towards more strategic networking? Learning with who healthy cities. *Global Policy*, *8*(1), 14–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12382

Acuto, M., & Rayner, S. (2016). City networks: Breaking gridlocks or forging (new) lock-ins? *International Affairs*, *92*(5), 1147–1166. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12700

Ambrosini, M., & Boccagni, P. (2015). Urban multiculturalism beyond the 'backlash': New discourses and different practices in immigrant policies across European cities. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 36*(1), 35-53, DOI: 10.1080/07256868.2014.990362

Amiri, S., & Sevin, E. (Eds.). (2020). *City diplomacy: Current trends and future prospects*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45615-3

Barber, B. R. (2013). *If mayors ruled the world: Dysfunctional nations, rising cities*. Yale University Press.

Basch, L.G. Schiller, N., & Szanton, B. C. (1994). *Nations unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments and deterritorialized nation-states*. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach.

Beal, V., & Pinson, G. (2014). When mayors go global: International strategies, urban governance and leadership. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *38*(1), 302–317. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12018

Bendel, P., Schammann, H., Heimann, C., & Stürner, J. (2019). A local turn for European refugee politics: Recommendations for strengthening municipalities and local communities in refugee and asylum policy of the EU. Heinrich-Böll Foundation Policy Paper.

Benton-Short, L, & Price, M. (2008). Migrants to the Metropolis: The rise of gateway cities, an introduction. In M. Price & L. Benton-Short (Eds.), *Migrants to the metropolis: The rise of immigrant gateway cities*, 1–22. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University.

Bhabha, H. K. (2004). *The location of culture*. Routledge.

Blank, Y. (2006). The city and the world. *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law, 44*(3), 868-931.

Borkert, M., & Caponio, T. (2010). Introduction: The local dimension of migration policymaking. In T. Caponio & M. Borkert (Eds.), *The local dimension of migration policymaking*. Amsterdam University Press. https://doi.org/10.5117/9789089642325

Bouteligier, S. (2012). *Cities, networks, and global environmental governance: Spaces of innovation, places of leadership*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203106488

Bulkeley, H., & Betsill, M. M. (2003). *Cities and climate change: Urban sustainability and global environmental governance*. London: Routledge.

Caponio, T. (2018). Immigrant integration beyond national policies? Italian cities' participation in European city networks. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(12), 2053–2069.

Caponio, T., & Borkert, M. (2010). *The local dimension of migration policymaking*. Amsterdam University Press.

Chan, D. K. (2016). City diplomacy and "glocal" governance: Revitalizing cosmopolitan democracy. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, *29*(2), 134–160. https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2016.1157684

Criekemans, D. (Ed.). (2010). *Regional sub-state diplomacy today*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Cross, M. & Moore, R. (2002). *Globalization and the new city: Migrants, minorities, and urban transformations in comparative perspective*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Curtis, S. (2011). Global cities and the transformation of the International System. *Review of International Studies*, *37*(4), 1923–1947. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210510001099

Curtis, S. (2016). Cities and global governance: State failure or a new global order? *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, *44*(3), 455–477. https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829816637233

Curtis, S., & Acuto, M. (2018). The foreign policy of cities. *The RUSI Journal*, *163*(6), 8–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/03071847.2018.1562014

Çağlar, A. (2016). Still 'migrants' after all those years: Foundational mobilities, temporal frames and emplacement of migrants. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *42*(6), 952–969. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1126085

Çağlar, A., & Glick Schiller, N. (2015). A multiscalar perspective on cities and migration. A comment on the symposium. *Sociologica*, *2*. https://doi.org/10.2383/81432

Çağlar, A., & Glick Schiller, N. (2018). *Migrants and city-making: Dispossession, displacement, and urban regeneration*. Duke University Press.

Çağlar, A., & Glick Schiller, N. (2021). Relational multiscalar analysis: A comparative approach to migrants within city-making processes. *Geographical Review*, *111*(2), 206–232. https://doi.org/10.1080/00167428.2020.1865817

Davidson, K., Coenen, L., Acuto, M., & Gleeson, B. (2019). Reconfiguring urban governance in an age of rising city networks: A research agenda. *Urban Studies*, *56*(16), 3540–3555. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098018816010

Erdoğan, M. (2017). Urban refugees from "detachment" to "harmonization," Syrian refugees and process management of municipalities: The case of Istanbul. Marmara Municipalities Union.

Faist, T. (2006). The transnational social spaces of migration. Center on Migration, Citizenship and Development. *Working Papers* 8.

Fontanari, E. (2018). Lives in transit: An ethnographic study of refugees' subjectivity across European borders. Routledge.

Friedmann, J. (1986). The world city hypothesis. *Development and Change*, 17(1): 69–83. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7660.1986.tb00231.x

Fünfgeld, H. (2015). Facilitating local climate change adaptation through transnational municipal networks. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, *12*, 67–73, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2014.10.011

Garcia-Chueca, E., & Vidal, L. (2019). Introduction: (Counter) trends in global cities since the 21st century's first major crisis. *Monografías*, CIDOB, 76.

GCM (2018) Global compact on safe, orderly and regular migration. https://refugeesmigrants.un.org/sites/default/files/180711_final_draft_0.pdf

GCR (2018) Global compact for refugees. https://www.unhcr.org/5c658aed4.pdf

Glick Schiller, N., & Çağlar, A. (2009). Towards a comparative theory of locality in migration studies: Migrant incorporation and city scale. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *35*(2), 177–202. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830802586179

Glick Schiller, N., & Çağlar, A. (Eds.). (2011). *Locating migration: Rescaling cities and migrants*. Cornell University Press.

Gutierrez-Camps, A. (2013). Local efforts and global impacts: A city-diplomacy initiative on decentralisation. *Perspectives*, *21*(2), 49–61.

Heimann, C., Müller, S., Schammann, & H., Stürner, J. (2019). Challenging the nation-state from within: The emergence of transmunicipal solidarity in the course of the EU refugee controversy. *Social Inclusion*, *7*(2), 208–218.

Hocking, B., Melissen, J., Riordan, S., & Sharp, P. (2012). *Futures for diplomacy: Integrative diplomacy in the 21st century*. Clingendael Netherlands Institute of International Relations. https://www.clingendael.org/publication/futures-diplomacy-integrative-diplomacy-21st-century

Holston, J., & Appadurai, A. (1996). Cities and citizenship. *Public Culture*, 8, 187–204.

International Organization for Migration. (2015). *International dialogue on migration: conference on migrants and cities*, Palais de Nations, Geneva, https://www.iom.int/conference-migrants-and-cities-2015.

Jørgensen, M. B. (2012). The diverging logics of integration policy making at national and city level. *International Migration Review*, *46*(1), 244–278. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2012.00886.x

Karakaya Polat, R., & Lowndes, V. (2022). How does multi-level governance create capacity to address refugee needs, and with what limitations? An analysis of municipal responses to Syrian refugees in Istanbul. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *35*(1), 51–73. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/feab101

Kaya, A. (2023). The neoliberal face of the 'local turn' in governance of refugees in Turkey: participatory action research in Karacabey, Bursa. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-023-01033-9

Keiner, M., & Kim, A. (2007). Transnational city networks for sustainability. *European Planning Studies*, *15*(10), 1369–1395. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654310701550843

Kern, K., & Bulkeley, H. (2009) Cities, Europeanization and multi-level governance: Governing climate change through transnational municipal networks. J*ournal of Common Market Studies*, *47*(2), 309–332. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2009.00806.x

Kihlgren Grandi, L. (2020). *City diplomacy*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60717-3

Kosovac, A., Hartley, K., Acuto, M., & Gunning, D. (2021). City leaders go abroad: A survey of city diplomacy in 47 cities. *Urban Policy and Research*, *39*(2), 127–142. https://doi.org/10.1080/08111146.2021.1886071

Kosovac, A., & Pejic, D. (2021). What's next? New forms of city diplomacy and emerging global urban governance. In Agustí F. de Losada & M. Galceran (Eds.), *Cities in global governance: From multilateralism to multistakeholderism?*. Barcelona: CIDOB.

Lacroix, T. (2021). Migration-related city networks: A global overview. *Local Government Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2021.1938553.

Lacroix, T., & Spencer, S. (2022). City networks and the multi-level governance of migration. *Global Networks*, *22*, 349–362. DOI: 10.1111/glob.12381

Lara, R. (2020). How are cities inserting themselves in the international system? In S. Amiri & E. Sevin (Eds.), *City Diplomacy: Current Trends and Future Prospects*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Leffel, B. (2018). Animus of the underling: Theorizing city diplomacy in a world society. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, *13*(4), 502–522. https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-13040025.

Ljungkvist, K. (2014). The global city: From strategic site to global actors. In S. Curtis (Ed.), *The Power of Cities in International Relations*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 32–56.

Local Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees. (2020). https://data.unhcr.org/fr/documents/details/91145

Lowndes, V., & Karakaya Polat, R. (2022). How do local actors interpret, enact and contest policy? An analysis of local government responses to meeting the needs of Syrian refugees in Turkey. *Local Government Studies*, *48*(3), 546-569. DOI: 10.1080/03003930.2020.1825386

Marchetti, R. (2021). *City diplomacy: From city-states to global cities*. University of Michigan Press.

Miyazaki, H. (2021). Hiroshima and Nagasaki as models of city diplomacy. *Sustainability Science*, *16*(4), 1215–1228. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-021-00968-1.

Oomen, B. (2019). Decoupling and teaming up: The rise and proliferation of transnational municipal networks in the field of migration. *International Migration Review*, *54*(3), 913–939. https://doi.org/10.1177/0197918319881118

Rath, J., & Swagerman, A. (2016). Promoting ethnic entrepreneurship in European cities: Sometimes ambitious, mostly absent, rarely addressing structural features. *International Migration*, *54*(1), 152-166. DOI: 10.1111/imig.12215.

Rath, J., Eurofound. (2011). Promoting ethnic entrepreneurship in European cities. Luxembourg: Publication Office of the European Union.

Robinson, J. (2006). *Ordinary cities: Between modernity and development*. London: Routledge.

Sassen, S. (2004). Local actors in global politics. *Current Sociology*, *52*(4), 649–670. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392104043495

Schammann, H., Gluns, D., Heimann, C., Müller, S., Wittchen, T., Younso, C., & Ziegler, F. (2021). Defining and transforming local migration policies: A conceptual approach backed by evidence from Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 47*(13), 2897-2915. DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2021.1902792

Schiller N. G., Basch, L., & Blanc-Szanton, C. (2004). Transnationalism: A new analytic framework for understanding migration. In M. Mobasher & M. Sadri (Eds.), *Migration, globalization, and ethnic relations*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, pp. 213–27.

Scholten, P. (2013). Agenda dynamics and the multi-level governance of intractable policy controversies: The case of migrant integration policies in the Netherlands. *Policy Sciences*, *46*(3), 217–236. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-012-9170-x

Scholten, P., & Penninx, R. (2016). The multilevel governance of migration and integration. In B. Garcés-Mascareñas & R. Penninx (Eds.), *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21674-4

Soja, E. W. (1989). *Postmodern geographies: The reassertion of space in critical social theory*. Verso.

Stren, R., & Friendly, A. (2019). Toronto and São Paulo: Cities and international diplomacy. *Urban Affairs Review*, *55*(2), 375–404. https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087417722862

Stürner-Siovitz, J. (2023). *Curtain up: City diplomacy in global migration governance*. Springer VS.

Stürner, J., Heinemann, C., Bendel, P., & Schammann, H. (2020). When mayors make migration policy: What role for cities in EU migration and integration policymaking? European Policy Center. European Migration and Diversity Programme.

Surmacz, B. (2018). City diplomacy. *Barometr Regionalny*, *16*(1), 7–18.

Taylor, P. J. (2005). New political geographies: Global civil society and global governance through world city networks. *Political Geography*, *24*(6), 703–730. doi: 10.1016/j.polgeo.2005.01.009

Tavares, R. (2016). *Paradiplomacy: Cities and states as global players*. Oxford University Press.

Terruso, F. (2016). Complementing traditional diplomacy: Regional and local authorities going international. *European View*, *15*(2), 325–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12290-016-0405-7

UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). (2023). Global trends. https://www.unhcr.org/globaltrends.html

van der Pluijm, R., & Melissen, J. (2007). *City diplomacy: The expanding role of cities in international politics*. Netherlands Institute of International Relations.

Wakeman, F. (1988). Transnational and comparative research. *Items*, *42*(4), 85–88.

Zapata-Barrero, R., Caponio, T., & Scholten, P. (2017). Theorizing the 'local turn' in a multi-level governance framework of analysis: A case study in immigrant policies. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *83*(2), 241–246.

Zincone F., & Caponio, T. (2006). The multilevel governance of migration. In R. Penninx, M. Berger & K. Kraal (Eds.), *The dynamics of international migration and settlement in Europe: A state of the art.* IMISCOE Joint Studies Series. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 269–304.

[1] Opinion of the Committee of the Regions on city diplomacy, Official Journal of the European Union, 2009/C 120/01.

BROAD-ER

Conceptual Paper on Cities' Autonomy and Urban Migration Governance

April 2023

KOÇ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
upf. Universitat Pompeu Fabra Barcelona
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

This project has received funding from the European Unions Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101079254

BROAD-ER

GRANT AGREEMENT NO.	101079254
DELIVERABLE NO.	D5.1
DELIVERABLE TITLE	Conceptual Papers Prepared by Each Partner on Different Themes (UPF)
DISSEMINATION LEVEL	Public
LEAD BENEFICIARY	All
CONTRACTUAL DATE OF DELIVERY	30/04/2023
ACTUAL DATE OF DELIVERY	29/04/2023

KOÇ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
upf. Universitat Pompeu Fabra Barcelona
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

This project has received funding from the European Unions Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101079254

Table of Contents

This project has received funding from the European Unions Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101079254

Executive Summary

BROAD-ER (Bridging the Migration and Urban Studies) seeks to create a Research Excellence Network that promotes interdisciplinary research and training at the intersection of migration and urban studies. The project is a joint effort between Koç University (KU) in Turkey, Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF) in Spain, and the University of Amsterdam (UvA) in the Netherlands. Its primary objective is to address the research deficit in the European Research Area (ERA) by introducing innovative and interdisciplinary methods while enhancing research and innovation capabilities in Turkey in emerging areas of migration and urban studies.

This document is a **conceptual paper** on the theme of "**Cities' autonomy and urban migration governance**" prepared by postdoctoral researcher from UPF as part of the BROAD-ER project. It is one of three conceptual papers to be submitted by the researcher teams of the project partners for Deliverable 5.1 (Conceptual Papers Prepared by Each Partner on Different Themes). This deliverable involves each partner being assigned a specific theme and preparing a conceptual paper based on a literature review analysing one of the three primary processes involved in cities' efforts to develop autonomy and decouple from national governments. The UPF team is assigned to the theme of Establishing New Relations between the National and the Local and Increasing Autonomy from National Government, while the KU team is responsible for the theme of City Diplomacy (Internationalization of Cities), and the UvA team is assigned to the theme of Detachment from Formal Governance by Independent Actors.

Deliverable 5.1 falls under Work Package 5, which aims to develop an exploratory research design among BROAD-ER partners towards collaborative research excellence.

1. Introduction: Cities' Autonomy and Migration

The governance of international migration, particularly which related to the reception of exiled people[1] and undocumented migrants, is a central theme of public debate in Europe. This governance is not exclusive to nation-states; municipalities are both a scale and increasingly relevant actors of reception (Zapata-Barrero, 2017). The IOM report "World Migration Report 2015 - Migrants and Cities: New Partnerships to Manage Mobility" lays the outlines of the central importance that cities occupy and will continue to occupy, in the global North as well as the global South, in terms of international migration governance.

The focus on cities within the analysis of immigration dynamics is not new at all. The works of Georg Simmel and the Chicago School have laid the groundwork of an urban sociology combining studies on cities' transformation and the arrival of immigrants. When the position of global cities in the geography of capital has made them "a magnet for two opposite forms of migration: highly skilled labour working in the high tiers of the job market, and low-skilled" (Lacroix, 2020), small and medium-sized cities are also playing a role in the geography of the reception of international immigrants (Flamant et al., 2020). Why municipalities are increasingly involved in local governance of International migration, when nation-states still cling to this so-called sovereign competence? Two main contexts can give us an insight.

On the one hand, these local dynamics are taking place in a context of restrictive national migration policies. On the other, it takes place in the context of a willingness of local actors and municipalities to fill the gap left by central governments. The emergence of this gap has been caused by a lack of housing and accommodation, emergency-based migration governance and a lack of political will at national level (Vallois, 2019). Nation-states are perceived as failing in their reception obligations (in terms of accommodation, for example). In this double context, a relatively recent and rich body of research emerged to analyse the attempts to build autonomy of cities in terms of urban migration governance (Ridgley, 2008; Paquet, 2017; Furri, 2021; Agustín, Jørgensen, 2019; Collingwood, O'Brien, 2019; Flamant & Lacroix, 2021; Desille, 2022; Kaufmann et al., 2022).

[1] The term 'Exiled people" refers to persons who can be in one of these three specific administrative status: Asylym seekers, refugees, rejected asylum seekers. In our research, this term is usefull for many reasons. The main one is that municipalities addresses their local policies to immigrants who experienced the process of Asylum regardless to their specific administrative status. Otherwise, this term is intimately related to the Autonomy-building process which aims to make a rupture with the national governments.

What Autonomous cities mean in terms of urban migration governance? Before answering to this question, it could be useful to ask what autonomy means in social sciences, particularly in Urban Studies and Migration Studies.

Autonomy comes from the Greek word "*autonomos*" which means "who will be governed by its own laws". Regarding to the etymology, autonomy is related to detachment from a level which is considered as a leader. It reflects to an asymmetrical relation and a process of conflict between two or several levels, actors, institutions. Far than a vague etymological sentence, it's very important to keep in mind that the understanding of political, social and urban dynamics related to seeking, claiming and/or achieving autonomy needs to talk about complex conflicts between different scales, actors, laws, politics, policies and practices with a divergent interests and strategies. **We precisely consider that these conflicts are the key of (analysing and understanding) the emerging of autonomy-building processes of cities.**

Pospisil (1971) argues that there are in society a multiplicity of legal levels and a multiplicity of legal systems. Following this scope, the sociology of law shows the gap between laws, rules and regulations on the one hand, and the incapability of such systems to cover each and every aspect of life. That then leaves room for others to interfere and to develop different policies or different implementations. Sally Falk Moore (1973) writes about semi-autonomous Social fields, to go beyond "complete autonomy" or "complete domination". Semi-autonomous governance in the social life is plural, emerging in different (political and social) contexts. "Some semi-autonomous social fields are quite enduring, some exist only briefly. Some are consciously constructed, such as committees, administrative departments, or other groups formed to perform a particular task; while some evolve in the market place or the neighbourhood or elsewhere out of a history of transaction" (Moore, 1973, p. 745).

Writing about the institutionalizing of Islam in Western Europe, notably related to the arrival of North African immigrants, Rath et al. (2001) argued that there are various clear and principles national rules and policies – for instance to abstain from funding the establishment of mosques – and at the same time very practical solutions at the local level, where municipalities do sponsor mosques as a practice to accomplish particular goals (irrespective of the national rules of the game). This example shows that under laws, (local) practices emerge in interstitial (legal, social, political and spatial) life.

The review is structured as follows: after this introduction, section two and three will investigate how cities' autonomy process is discussed in urban studies and migration studies. Following that, section four reviews selected literature explaining how cities' autonomy in the field of urban migration governance is effectively and concretely emerging through the action of municipalities. Section five, then, discusses how cities are

seen as “city of hope” to build a “migration justice” by urban and migration studies, falling in an idealisation of the city, without taking into account its internal contradiction and conflicts. Based on this literature, dealing with the construction and the reinforcement of cities' agency, the conclusion proposes some suggestions for our research.

2. Cities' Autonomy in Urban Studies

Analysing the autonomy of cities in urban studies is not new at all. For instance, the book wrote by Pirenne H. in 1889, on the history of the city of Dinant in the Middle-Age, highlighted how this city was confronted to the State and the Bishop, when it seeks its urban and municipal autonomy. According to Engin F. Isin (1992), Autonomous cities were existed since many centuries. They have taken different names, reflecting different contexts in Europe.

> “The legal and political autonomy of the medieval city was epitomized in an institution that was named with a panoply of terms reflecting variations in autonomy in different regions of Europe. These included *commune* (French), *populi* (Italian), *Communitas* (English) [...], which can all be translated into modern English as the corporation. The corporation was a legal and political institution that expressed the association principle of the medieval city and its autonomy.” (Isin, 1992, p. 18)

What autonomy-building process of cities means in urban studies? The geographer Gordon L. Clarck (1984) proposed a “theory of autonomy” based to “the power of initiative and the power of immunity. The former refers to the power of local governments to regulate and legislate in their own interests. The second principle refers to the immunity of local governments from the authority of higher tiers of the state” (Gordon, 1984). This approach of cities’ autonomy, close to the concept of "semi-autonomous social fields" introduced by Moore (1973), is interesting in the sense that **we should consider the autonomy of cities not as black or white, but as a relatively and plural (spatial, social, economic and political) dynamic.** According to Clarck (1984), we can see, in a same country, cities with different situations from an “absolute” autonomy to “absolutely no autonomy”. Far to pretend to propose an exhaustively overview of scientific (and political) debate related to autonomous cities, this paper proposes to highlight three dimensions emerging from urban studies.

First, the autonomy-building process of cities is related to **the decentralisation process** engaged by States. Gérard François Dumont (2010) shows how the cities in France have accessed to autonomy after the law on decentralisation that the left-government had taken in 1981. The aim was to counter-balance to weight of Paris and to create a kind of balance between the capital and the other major cities. This

decentralisation provided to municipalities new responsibilities in several matters (e.g. Urbanism, economy, and public transport). These last four decades in France, decentralisation sometimes raised, other times fall, but have certainly changed the place of cities in the political and economic geography of the country. It also aimed at reforming public administrations to enable cities to participate in the international market (Lacroix, 2020).

Based on the example of Canada with a tradition of federalism, Smith and Spicer (2018) consider the "local autonomy as the ability to develop and implement policies at the local level, free from provincial institutional constraints." In japan, new trends toward local autonomy and political and economic decentralization have emerged following the growth and subsequent collapse of the bubble economy in the early 1990s, and in response to globalization (Hein & Pelletier, 2006). Obviously, our aim is not to provide an exhaustive overview of the decentralisation's policies that emerged in several countries around the world. But, these three cases in three different continents shows that the Autonomy-building processes of the city, through the process of decentralisation, are emerging to provide new competences to the cities to manage their own development, notably the economic model of local development.

In the 1990s, within the framework of decentralisation policies, the majority of the world's states adopted laws that broadened the powers of local authorities in order to promote partnerships with local associations and economic spheres (Ivanyna & Shah, 2012; Manor, 2004). These neo-liberal decentralisation policies aim to insert local authorities into a competitive environment in which various public and private actors cooperate and/or compete for limited economic resources (Lacroix, 2020)

Second, Autonomy building-process of cities is emerged within **local autonomy practices**. This second point of autonomy invited us to dive into the limbo of the cities, to go beyond the institutional actors and the formal bodies. The autonomy in this case is coming from the informal actors, from the inhabitants, contesting a global system. In the Urban scholarship, this autonomy-building process is related to how people invest, occupy and transform, even if temporary, the public space.

Based on the example of the Paris Commune in 1871, Vasudevan (2015) highlighted that occupation could represent "an attempt to produce an autonomous social space." Working on occupation-based practices, he shows how, taken together, these practices offer a model for the composition of an 'autonomous city' (Vasudevan, 2015). The autonomy here reflects to "those spaces where people desire to constitute non-capitalist, egalitarian, and solidarity forms of political, social, and economic organization through a combination of resistance and creation" (Pickerill & Chatterton, 2006, p. 730). We can also see these forms of occupation in the contemporary history,

like Occupation Wall Street or during the 'Arab spring'. Squatting as "paradigmatic autonomous urban movement" (Lopez, 2013, p. 867) is part of this occupation. Contributing to the Urban autonomy, squatting shapes a different "right to the city", to build a "counter-space" (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 383).

All of these notions related to occupation and squatting practices refer to complex and several urban dynamics, by trying to gain a new temporality and fighting against the "State who swatted Time"[2] (Lefebvre, 1974, p. 31).

Third, the processes of autonomy in urban studies are related to **urban utopias and dystopias**. The garden city developed by Howard and whose principals were laid down in his book "Garden Cities of Tomorrow", which can be considered as a treatise on urban planning, is part of the urban utopias which refer to the autonomous city. In the context of the urbanisation that accompanied the industrialisation during the 19th century, Howard advocated a social and urban ideal with the garden city model. Economic self-sufficiency, urban planning, collective ownership of land and autonomous local government are fundamental principles which ensure the autonomy of the city.

Other forms of urban autonomy, far from the social ideal of garden cities, are dystopias. For instance, the development of gated communities in the USA and among Europe, using walls to separate them from the city, accentuates social and ethnic segregation (Le Goix, 2003). Symbols of a form of 'secessionism', loss of confidence in public authorities and the substitution of public action by private action (Blakely & Snyder, 1997), gated communities are models of private urban governance in a neo-liberal context (Le Goix, 2003).

This third point related to the treatment of Autonomy-building processes of cities in Urban Studies leads us to move away from any idealisation or negative conception of autonomy. From our point of view, the most important thing is to understand the complex aims of and conflicts emerged from this process.

3. Cities' Autonomy in Migration Studies

Since these two last decades, research in the global North on cities' autonomy in migration studies is increasingly relevant (Ridgley, 2008; Sanders, 2015; Paquet, 2017; Furri, 2017; Lacroix & Desille, 2018; Spencer, 2020; Flamant & Lacroix, 2021; Kaufmann et al., 2022). In United States, advocates of more federalism in the field of immigration

[2] Original quote in French : "l'État écrase le temps"

have called to give local governments more (political) spaces to create policies concerning the distribution of migrants within the country (Sanders, 2015). Sanctuary cities in US emerged from local mobilisations against federal immigration and deportation policies in the 1980s (Ridgley, 2008) to make "direct" and "indirect" resistance to the national government (Paquet, 2017). In Europe, many municipalities in large sized-cities (Agustín & Jørgensen, 2019; Kaufmann et al., 2022) and small and medium-sized cities (Flaman et al. 2020) increasingly seeks autonomy from national governments. Nevertheless, following Thomas Lacroix (2020), the local processes to build this autonomy are plural and depend on nationals political systems (f.i. France is more centralised than Spain).

In Europe, this last decade, especially after the so-called "2015 refugee crisis", the autonomy of cities in terms of urban migration governance took an increasingly place in the field of migration studies. The European political context, highly publicised and dramatized in a contradiction with the factual situation (Héran, 2017), was shown by researchers as an opportunity to inform and understand a (political) phenomenon seen as a new momentum from cities (Spencer, 2020; Kaufmann et al., 2022). Obviously, the "new" city turn is perceived in that way, due to the fact that such research is confined to the field of migration studies. For instance, the role of cities autonomy and their detachment from national governments as well as their international cooperation were detailed earlier in research on Climate change (Bulkeley et al., 2003). In this section our aim is to highlight what (new) research on autonomy-building process of cities in migration studies shows.

First, these researches are contextual. As we said before, reflexions on autonomy of cities in the field of migration studies are motivated by national political contexts seen as a "*borne chronologique*"[3] (Gourdeau, 2018, p. 6). In Europe, many studies underline the role played by the insufficient number of places in national reception facilities - often leading to the visibility of camps for migrants in public space - in the involvement of municipalities in the reception system. In addition to this context, the relatively rapid increase of arrivals of exiled people in Europe and the rejection of States vis-à-vis the migrations coming from Middle East and the Horn of Africa. In the United States, academic interest in the role of sanctuary cities has been seen after President Trump signed the Executive Order on January 25, 2017, in order to discredit them with

[3] We can propose the term « chronological border » to translate this French concept that highlights how far research in Europe on autonomy of cities in the field of (forced) migration studies, is rooted in national political contexts after the so-called "2015 refugee crisis"

accusations of undermining national security and violating federal laws. These processes are unique to forced/undocumented migration.

We, therefore, observe the emergence of contextual studies aimed at understanding an ongoing phenomenon, the solidarity of cities with migrants regardless to their administrative status.

Second, in addition to these political contexts, the studies are based on a relatively old theoretical framework, mobilising concepts that often refer to the detachment of cities from the national scale (Alexander, 2003; Bazurli, 2019; Desille, 2022; Bazurli & Kaufmann, 2022; Zapata-Barrero, 2022), the shared and negotiated construction of a public policy in a bottom-up approach (Flamant & Lacroix, 2021), and the dynamics of urban resistance (Ridgley, 2008). Thus, we can see concepts such as "co-construction" and "co-production" (Hombert, 2021) used to explain how cities rely on and/or sometimes even outsource such responsibilities to associations and residents' groups to set up and/or reshape their reception policies, according with the increasingly implication of public actors in the field of neoliberal migration governance (Darling, 2016), "neoliberal bureaucracy" (Alberti, 2019) and "migration industry" (Gammeltoft-Hansen, Sorensen, 2013). Other concepts are "rebel cities" and "spaces of hope" following the work of David Harvey (2000) to highlight the "urban resistance" in the field of urban migration governance vis-à-vis the central governments (Furri, 2017; Mayer, 2018). Finally, the concepts of "municipalism" (Agustin & Jorgensen, 2019; Flamant, 2022) and "policy entrepreneurship" (Garcés-Mascareñas & Gebhardt, 2020) are used to highlight the emergence and, in some cases, the reinforcement of the municipalities as both an increasingly relevant scale and actor for urban migration governance.

All of these "new" research issues, at least presented as such, mainly aim to understand the types of and factors influencing public actions implemented by the municipalities to govern locally and in a different way the reception of exiled persons, whereas this is a competence of the States. This attempt to understand public action is made through the analysis of the local governance, which is based on the growth/reconfiguration of urban solidarities, as well as the emergence of exclusion policies/programs at the local level (Glorius, 2017; Liebe et al., 2018; Friedrichs et al., 2019; von Hermanni & Robert, 2019; Kurtenbach, 2019; Glorius et al., 2021; Nettelbladt, 2021), negotiations with national authorities within the framework of multi-level governance, as well as the internationalization of cities, which is part of the Autonomy-building process of the cities. These issues, which are not necessarily gathered in the same work, show the interdependence of scales in the understanding of the Autonomy-building process of the Cities, from informal actors (inhabitants, solidarity groups) to national and international city networks dealing with the theme of international

migrations. The following section will dive into these processes to explain how researches on migration studies are presenting the autonomy-building process of cities.

Third, most of these issues are related to the governance of migration ***in* cities**. Nevertheless, as a space, city is produced (Lefebvre, 1974) by neoliberal economic systems, by "technocrats" and also by how inhabitants are seeing and practicing public and private spaces. In our point of view, it is a great scientific (and political) gap to reduce the autonomy-building process of cities to the action of municipalities. In the city, related to the issue of international migration, there are other actors (inhabitants, associations, housing landlords, schools, religious actors such churches or mosques, actors of public/private transport, municipal or national/federal police…) with different, even divergent, strategies, (social, cultural, symbolic) capitals, tools, hopes and aims. Moreover, few works actually examine how the autonomy-building process ***of* cities** in the governance of migration contributes to the reconfiguration of urban spaces. Although some works have made a direct connection between urban studies and migration studies, for instance by working on the theme of housing (Gardesse & Lelévrier, 2020), these two disciplinary approaches are rarely used together to study the Autonomy-building process of the cities. However, both empirical and theoretical studies highlight the central importance of space, whether urban or rural, metropolis or small and medium-sized towns, in the way that cities seek and achieve autonomy in urban migration governance. Our research aims to respond to this gap by asking a dialectical question: **how the contemporary processes of urban reconfiguration of cities are participating and/or limiting their autonomy to set up local governance in solidarity with (or in a rejection of) immigrants? At the same time, how the local solidarities (or local rejection) are re-shaping cities and reinforcing their autonomies?**

4. Previous Research on Cities' Autonomy in the Field of Migration: A Tentative Overview

Cities' Autonomy-building processes are plural depending on political, social, and geographical contexts (Furri, 2017). Nevertheless, we observe a global dynamic with three steps taken by almost all the cities mentioned in the articles of this conceptual paper: the autonomy from below through the involvement of associations and collectives of inhabitants, which is actually not new when we know that the first institutions have deal with migration were non-governmental institutions, even in centralised states like France (Masse, 2001); the reshaping of the city to respond locally to the challenges posed by the autonomous governance of migration; the internationalization of cities seeking political alliances and exchanges of practices.

4.1. Associations and collectives: autonomy from below

In migration studies, the relation between associations, including "ethnic associations" and "migrant associations" is presented as one of the important keys that shape the relations between local authorities and migrants (Alexander, 2003). Related to the contemporary context, research in the global North shows that, associations and residents' collectives constitute the generating matrix of cities' autonomy. (Agustín & Jørgensen, 2019; Caponio et al., 2019; Flamant, 2021)

In the Catalan region, with a specific political context of autonomy related to the history and the relation with Madrid, the "*Barcelona Ciutat Refugi*" plan was preceded by a "citizen demand for action and political voluntarism" and the solicitation of the Catalan network "Asil.Cat" that brings together organizations specializing to defend asylum seekers and refugees (Hansen, 2019). We might be tempted to say that the Catalan region and Barcelona's political context, with greater autonomy than in other territories and regions of Europe, would explain this dynamic of structuring political action from below. This hypothesis is immediately invalidated when we see similar dynamics in Nantes and Paris where the political context is more centralized than in Spain.

In Nantes, for example, the NGO movement has made a dual demand for the resettlement of all squatters and the provision of vacant municipal buildings (Flamant, 2021). The pressure of the associative movement in this city went as far as taking the State and the municipality to the administrative tribunal, which resulted in the opening of more than 660 emergency accommodation places by the municipality, most of them transformed into permanent accommodation. In addition to the associations, there are the residents' collectives, which have the particularity of a local commitment, often on a neighbourhood scale, as well as being rooted in the field (Martinot-Lagarde, 2008).

In Paris, their work is similar to the role of a "whistle-blower" (Chateuraynaud & Torny, 1999), i.e. identifying and reporting encampments to local authorities; arriving "first on the site and organizing survival well before the city, which, faced with their pressure, then takes over" (Hombert, 2021, p. 12). The work of the collectives also involves advocacy in order to relay the opinions of the residents' collectives via petitions, in neighbourhood councils, or through official letters sent to local officials.

4.2. Rethinking the city to organise the autonomy

Relying on associations and collectives is not enough. Municipalities have had to rethink their own organisation to respond to the challenges raised by the urban migration governance. We can put this re-organisation in the line of the model of the process through which social problems rise and fall (Hilgartner & Bosk, 1988).Taking "social problems as products of a process of collective definitions", Hilgartner and Bosk

(1988) proposed model which "describes how problems and operatives compete for public attention and resource." Thus, to rethink their own (administrative, social and political) organization, municipalities in a complementarity/conflict with other local and national actors defined and recognized some social problems and then developed a social policy, by reshaping some public resources.

The first aspect of municipalities' reorganisation concerns their financial and human resources. In Barcelona, a technical team made up of specialists in the issue has been set up, in addition to a budget of more than 10 million euros to subsidise the association movement involved in the reception of exiled people (Hombert, 2021). In Nantes, a similar budget has been devoted to housing, through the creation of emergency accommodation facilities (Flamant, 2021). The mobilisation-capacity of accommodation is a central issue in the geography of reception (Berthomière et al., 2020).

Faced with the difficulty to mobilise sufficient accommodation, there is a trend towards "burden sharing" between several municipalities. In the metropolises, emergency accommodation has sometimes been created by drawing on the Metropolitan Fund and distributing the accommodation between the different municipalities of the metropolitan area to ensure political acceptability (*Ibid.*). Accommodation determines the geography of reception, and this puts not only larger but also smaller and shrinking places on the agenda of autonomy-building processes (Szalanska et al., 2022). Rethinking the city in the context of its Autonomy-building process in terms of urban migration governance involves adapting and/or inventing mechanisms to support exiled people. To respond to the increasing number of arrivals in Barcelona, the City council has adapted former administrative mechanisms (*Servei d'Atencio a Immigrants*, *Emigrants i Refugiats*) and increased the number of emergency accommodation facilities based on the availability of real estate: municipal hostels; boarding houses such as the *Servicio de acogida residencial temporal*; and hotel rooms (Agustin & Jorgensen, 2019; Garcés-Mascarenas & Gebhardt, 2020).

Rethinking the city also requires reinventing local citizenship and also the practices of local citizenship regimes (Bousetta, 2001). The example of the *documento de vecindad* in Barcelona is eloquent in this regard, as it allows the "undocumented migrants" to have local recognition, proof of anchoring in and belonging to the city (Hansen, 2019). This example of local recognition, which is both a result of and a factor in the Autonomy-building process of the cities, can also be provided by informal actors. This is what can be observed for instance in French villages and small-size cities regarding the setting up of unconditional citizen accommodation in mountain areas (Del Biaggio & Gatelier, 2021). Nevertheless, this local recognition remains constrained and limited to the space of solidarity, often the city of reception. As put by Henri Lefebvre in

"*La production de l'espace*" (1974), there is a triplicate of space (lived, practiced, perceived). These three dimensions are intertwined and contribute to the production and reconfiguration of the space of humans. In order to reshape the city, municipalities and local actors perforate public space by mobilising art to raise awareness of the importance of the reception of exiled people. This means reshaping the space experienced by the inhabitants. This is the case, for example, with the exhibition set up in the metro station of *Passeig de Gracia* in Barcelona, which lists the 35,597 documented deaths in the Mediterranean (Hansen, 2019), or the music concerts in support of exiled people even in spaces with a low-density of demography, which makes it possible to rethink urbanity and sociability outside metropolises (Arfaoui, 2020).

4.3. The search for allies to build power vis-à-vis higher entities

The Autonomy-building process of the cities involved in receiving migrants leads them to build alliances with other cities in the same country or abroad. According to Bue Rübner Hansen (2019), the model of the city of refuge developed in Barcelona "must crucially be read as a Europe-wide campaign against the climate of fear and closure (...) this campaign was influence in the European context - helping to install a counter-discourse and new networks of solidarity and cooperation across places as well as movements and institutions" (Hansen, 2019). This consideration ignores the still huge discourse of the rejection at the local level (von Hermanni & Neumann, 2018) and comes from and contributes to the idealisation of (big) Cities (Germain, 1997; Landy & Moreau, 2015). However, our aim here is not so much to engage in a critique of the idealisation of cities, but rather to focus on how current research shows that the autonomy of cities in the field of urban migration governance is based on cities' networks. How this networking is a fundamental condition for the Autonomy-building process of the Cities?

According to Thomas Lacroix (2020), two converging dynamics have structured the landscape of current city networks: a bottom-up dynamic of relative spontaneous groupings of cities and a top-down dynamic of networks carried by international organisations and their representative institutions. He divides them into two main groups (spontaneous networks and co-opted networks) at two scales (national and transnational). City networks have three functions: practical, symbolic, and jurisprudential (Oomen, 2019). These three dimensions are crucial for the Autonomy-building process of the Cities as they allow the adjustment and circulation of urban governance models (Lacroix & Spencer, 2022). Thus, the alliance serves not only to carry a collective voice, that of the cities but also to improve the way in which cities govern migration according to the plural economic, social, and political contexts they face.

Nevertheless, two paradoxes accompany the recent expansion of city networks for migration (Lacroix, 2020). On the one hand, the decentralisation policies in the

countries of the global North, inspired by neoliberalism, entrust more responsibilities to local authorities but with fewer financial means to do so. On the other, the 'local turn' (Zapata-Barrero el al., 2017) in integration policies is weakened by more restrictive migration policies.

5. The City as a 'Space of Hope' and 'Resistance' to Build a 'Migration Justice'

Completing or contradicting national immigrant policies, cities are increasingly autonomous to respond to the "policy challenge of ethnic diversity" (Ireland, 1994) and often perceived as a relevant scale of action, and a bastion to reorganise a struggle against systems considered unjust (Alexander, 2003; Darling & Bauder, 2019). This idealisation of the city, which somehow ignores the complexity of the economic, social and political systems of city production in the neoliberal era, is not specific to recent migration studies.

Benjamin Barber (2013) answers Eric Corjin's (1999) question "Can the Cities save the World? in the very beginning of his book "If Mayors ruled the World" by saying 'yes'. Following this approach, cities have been seen as increasingly major both scale and actor (Ireland, 1994; Brenner, 1999; Alexander, 2003) to lead migration policies in a context of "dysfunctional nation-states" and a "crisis of democracy" (Castelli Gattinara, 2017; Bazurli, 2019). More generally, this approach considers the city as a 'space of hope' (Harvey, 2000), a hope for renewal in the context of states facing crises. This same reference to the Marxist geographer can be seen in works on urban migration governance. Thus, Oscar Garcia Agustin and Martin Bak Jorgensen (2019), perceiving the city as a space of imagination, invite us to think of new imaginaries, i.e. the city as an open place for all residents in opposition to national policies of exclusion. According to Filippo Furri (2017), the solidarity movement of Mediterranean municipalities with migrants is akin to urban resistance and forges 'rebel cities'. "These are more or less openly opposed to the security evolution (control, anti-solidarity, etc.) and of the reason of State and they embody the tension between different levels of power" (Furri, 2017, p. 6).

These forms of urban resistance are major characteristics of the Sanctuary City movement in the US. Sanctuary cities come from local mobilisations against federal immigration and deportation policies in the 1980s (Ridgley, 2008) and the emergence of the New Sanctuary Movement from 2007 onwards (mobilisations rooted in churches and religious organisations). But their main characteristic is their refusal to cooperate with national immigration policies (Paquet, 2022). According to Mireille Paquet (2017), there are direct resistances (declarations of non-cooperation with federal programs) and

indirect resistances (not collecting information so as not to have to communicate anything to higher authorities).

To govern a global dynamic and its implications at the local level, it is necessary to have both locally anchored approaches and a universal ideal. The plural mobilisations of municipalities around the world, whatever they are called, claimed, or assigned, are essentially based on the dynamics of 'policy entrepreneurship' (Garcés-Mascarenas & Gebhardt, 2020) and 'neo-municipalism' (Furri, 2017). Municipalism can be seen as "a space for radical imagination since the possibilities of producing policies driven by politicians in cooperation with citizens (as a 'democratic rebellion') are already provoking new ways of solidarity that can inspire other spaces (cities) and even change the way we understand politics" (Agustin & Jorgensen, 2019, p. 202). This locally-rooted solidarity, which at the same time finds allies within city-networks, leads to the construction of cosmopolitanism from below. According to Oscar Garcia Agustin and Martin Bak Jorgensen (2019, p. 200), cosmopolitanism from below in the context of urban migration governance "is grounded in the constitutive role of trans-local relations and their capacity to shape a cosmopolitan 'we', which is universal but rooted in practices and solidarity relations."

Furthermore, contemporary research on cities' autonomy in the field of urban migration governance shows that urban solidarity movements with migrants have been coupled with a paradigm shift from a "capitalist logic of development" and the depoliticised humanitarian discourse of international cooperation to an approach based on the concept of justice. Taking inspiration from the environmental justice movement, the municipality of Barcelona did not ask itself how to do international aid in the so-called South, but how to fight for change and justice within the city itself, Spain, and the EU (Hansen, 2019). Urban solidarity expressed by municipalities is therefore seen as 'a migrant justice movement' (Nail, 2015).

Putting the issue of urban migration governance on the chessboard of justice shows a desire not to fall into the trap of the idealisation of the City. According to Oscar Garcia Agustin and Martin Bak Jorgensen (2019), Cities are not necessarily inclusive or progressive. Moreover, some policies aimed at improving the reception of migrants at the local level may produce injustices and/or feelings of injustice. For example, the dynamics of racialisation in the access to housing and inequalities in the access to public facilities and services resulting from municipal decisions to distribute migrants among different localities (Gardesse & Lelévrier, 2020) are both the result of policies that seek a form of justice, namely to provide accommodation to migrants who are excluded from it. According to Lorenzo Pezzani and Maurice Stierl (2019), the notion of (and struggles for) 'migration justice' must be opened up to other political and social levels, to other scales

including local ones, and to no longer think of these struggles separately from those that exist within society and that do not necessarily concern only migrants.

6. Conclusion

This conceptual paper gives us two principal insights to choose our specific topic by bridging urban studies and migration studies.

First, a major insight that emerges from this conceptual paper concerns the fragility of the autonomy-building process of cities. This fragility is linked to the pressure on housing, particularly in large-sized cities (Flamant, 2021), the excessive personalization of some local actors (Furri, 2021), ministerial reshuffles, partisan opposition at the local level, the dependence on available budgetary resources (Flamant, Lacroix, 2021) and, more generally, the variations in political orientations (Paquet, 2017). At the same time, political actions, as well as research orientations, are focusing on the detachment of the cities from the national governments. So, what about internal conflicts, emerging from divergent politics and policies, strategies and (no) hopes? For Instance, even if Barcelona has this image of "city of refuge", fighting the national government, the municipality faces several difficulties to provide accommodations to migrants, due to the tension on housing market, gentrification and segregation dynamics. Thus, dissemination (and dispersal) migration policies are emerging to propose to migrants (most of them are refugees and asylum seekers) to be accommodated in small municipalities in the countryside of the Catalan region (see the project Opportunitat 500[4]). **Our aim in this project is to go beyond the classic opposition between national and local level, and to dive into internal struggles of cities to ask how the autonomy-building process can emerge and/or can be restricted by local urban dynamics.**

Second, most contemporary research addresses in their conclusions the issue of urban resilience vis-à-vis the challenge that the autonomy-governance of migration by the cities represents (Zapata-Barrero, 2023). This provides a fruitful scope of opportunity for our research by **asking how Cities deal with the different urban challenges they face in their Autonomy-building process**. This will require bridging Urban Studies, specifically the processes of adaptation and transformation of cities as well as the urban struggles that they face, with Migration Studies, specifically the Autonomy-governance process of International Migration at the local level.

[4] <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/dec/11/catalan-villages-refugees-repopulation-plan>

As we said at the beginning of this conceptual paper, bridging Urban Studies and Migration Studies is not new at all. Therefore, our research is not about looking at a disciplinary nexus that dates back more than a century. Rather, the aim is to rehabilitate a fruitful dialogue in a contemporary context characterised by an increasingly autonomy-building process of Cities regarding the urban migration governance, a process that faces urban challenges resulting from a neoliberal production of space.

7. References

Agustín, Ó. G., & Jørgensen, M. B. (2019a). Institutional Solidarity : Barcelona as Refuge City. In Ó. G. Agustín & M. B. Jørgensen (Éds.), *Solidarity and the « Refugee Crisis » in Europe* (p. 97-117). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91848-8_5

Agustín, Ó. G., & Jørgensen, M. B. (2019b). Solidarity Cities and Cosmopolitanism from Below : Barcelona as a Refugee City. *Social Inclusion*, *7*(2), 198-207. https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v7i2.2063

Alberti, C. (2019). Sous-traitance et bureaucratisation néolibérale : Une analyse de l'interface de la distance dans l'accueil des demandeurs d'asile. *Lien social et Politiques*, *83*, 123-143. https://doi.org/10.7202/1066087ar

Alexander, M. (2003). Local policies toward migrants as an expression of Host-Stranger relations : A proposed typology. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 411-430.

Arfaoui, R. (2020). The Effects of Territory on Reception and of Reception on Territory. Geography of Asylum in the Territory of Ambert (K. Booth & A. Poméon O'Neill, Trad.). *Revue Européenne Des Migrations Internationales*, *36*(2-3), Article 2-3. https://doi.org/10.4000/remi.17880

Barber, B. R. (2013). *If Mayors Ruled the World : Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities*. Yale University Press.

Bazurli, R. (2019). Local Governments and Social Movements in the 'Refugee Crisis' : Milan and Barcelona as 'Cities of Welcome'. *South European Society and Politics*, *24*(3), 343-370. https://doi.org/10.1080/13608746.2019.1637598

Bazurli, R., & Kaufmann, D. (2022). Insurgent Asylum Policies in European Cities : A Multi-Level Governance Perspective. *Urban Affairs Review*, 10780874221091594. https://doi.org/10.1177/10780874221091594

Berthomière, W., Fromentin, J., Lessault, D., Michalon, B., & Przybyl, S. (2020). L'accueil des exilés dans les espaces ruraux en France : Orientations nationales et

déclinaisons locales d'une politique de dispersion. *Revue européenne des migrations internationales*, *36*(2-3), 53-82. https://doi.org/10.4000/remi.15550

Bousetta, H. (2001). *Post-immigration politics and the Political Mobilisation of Ethnic Minorities. A comparative Case-Study of Moroccans in Four European Cities*.

Brenner, N. (1999). Globalisation as Reterritorialisation : The Re-scaling of Urban Governance in the European Union. *Urban Studies*, *36*(3), 431-451. https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098993466

Bulkeley, H., Davies, A., Evans, B., Gibbs, D., Kern, K., & Theobald, K. (2003). Environmental Governance and Transnational Municipal Networks in Europe. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, *5*(3), 235-254. https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908032000154179

Caponio, T., Scholten, P., & Zapata-Barrero, R. (2018). Introduction : The governance of migration and diversity in cities. In *The Routledge Handbook of the Governance of Migration and Diversity in Cities* (p. 1-8). Routledge.

Caponio, T., Scholten, P., & Zapata-Barrero, R. (2019). *The Routledge handbook of the governance of migration and diversity in cities*. Routledge Londres/Nueva York.

Castelli Gattinara, P. (2017). The « refugee crisis » in Italy as a crisis of legitimacy. *Contemporary Italian Politics*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.1080/23248823.2017.1388639

Chateauraynaud, F., & Torny, D. (1999). *Les sombres précurseurs : Une sociologie pragmatique de l'alerte et du risque*. Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales.

Collingwood, L., & O'Brien, B. G. (2019). *Sanctuary Cities : The Politics of Refuge*. Oxford University Press.

Corijn, E. (1999). Can the city save the world. In *The future of the past. Reflections on history, urbanity and museums* (p. 263-280). Antwerpen: Musea Antwerp.

Darling, J. (2016). Privatising asylum : Neoliberalisation, depoliticisation and the governance of forced migration. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *41*, n/a-n/a. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12118

Darling, J., & Bauder, H. (2019). Introduction – Sanctuary cities and urban struggles : Rescaling migration, citizenship, and rights. In *Sanctuary cities and urban struggles* (p. 1-22). Manchester University Press. https://www.manchesterhive.com/display/9781526134929/9781526134929.00006.xml

Desille, A. (2022). Local immigrant policies in Israel : The paradox of autonomy. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, *0*(0), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2022.2114535

Domingo, A., Pinyol-Jiménez, G., & Zapata-Barrero, R. (2020). : Multiple-governance and integration policies in diverse socio-demographic contexts. In *Relations between Immigration and Integration Policies in Europe*. Routledge.

Etat de la migration dans le monde 2015 - Les migrants et les villes : De nouveaux partenariats pour gérer la mobilité (Vol. 8). (s. d.). Consulté 7 mars 2023, à l'adresse https://publications.iom.int/books/etat-de-la-migration-dans-le-monde-2015-les-migrants-et-les-villes-de-nouveaux-partenariats

Flamant, A. (2021). Nantes, « ville accueillante » pour les populations exilées. De l'urgence humanitaire à la mise à l'abri inconditionnelle. *Migrations Société*, *185*(3), 49-63. https://doi.org/10.3917/migra.185.0049

Flamant, A. (2022). *Inside Municipalities : Considering Politicians as Significant Actors of Local Practices on Migration*. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=fr&user=0Gq7P1YAAAAJ&citation_for_view=0Gq7P1YAAAAJ:HDshCWvjkbEC

Flamant, A., Fourot, A.-C., & Healy, A. (2020). Editorial : Out of the Big Cities! The Reception of Exiles in Small Immigration Localities (A. Moyer, Trad.). *Revue Européenne Des Migrations Internationales*, *36*(2-3), Article 2-3. https://doi.org/10.4000/remi.16908

Flamant, A., & Lacroix, T. (2021). « Villes et territoires accueillants » en France et ailleurs [coord. n°185 de : Migrations Société]. *Migrations Société*, *2021/3*(185), 228.

Friedrichs, J., Leßke, F., & Schwarzenberg, V. (2019). The acceptance of refugees. A comparative study of six German neighbourhoods. *Raumforschung Und Raumordnung | Spatial Research and Planning*, *77*(4), Article 4. https://doi.org/10.2478/rara-2019-0015

Furri, F. (2017). Villes-refuge, villes rebelles et néo-municipalisme. *Plein droit*, *115*(4), 3-6. https://doi.org/10.3917/pld.115.0003

Gammeltoft-Hansen, T., & Sorensen, N. N. (Éds.). (2012). *The Migration Industry and the Commercialization of International Migration*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203082737

Garcés-Mascareñas, B., & Gebhardt, D. (2020). Barcelona : Municipalist policy entrepreneurship in a centralist refugee reception system. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *8*(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-020-0173-z

Gardesse, C. (2020). La dispersion de personnes exilées : Ce que la spatialisation des CAO révèle des politiques migratoires et urbaines. *Revue européenne des migrations internationales*, *36*(2-3), 83-105. https://doi.org/10.4000/remi.15602

Gardesse, C., & Lelevrier, C. (2020). Refugees and Asylum Seekers Dispersed in Non-Metropolitan French Cities : Do Housing Opportunities Mean Housing Access? *Urban Planning*, *5*(3), 138-149. https://doi.org/10.17645/up.v5i3.2926

Germain, A. (1997). Etranger et la ville. *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, *20*(1-2), 237-254.

Glorius, B. (2017). The challenge of diversity in rural regions : Refugee reception in the German federal state of Saxony. *Hungarian Geographical Bulletin*, *66*(2), 113.

Glorius, B., Bürer, M., & Schneider, H. (2021). Integration of Refugees in Rural Areas and the Role of the Receiving Society : Conceptual Review and Analytical Framework. *Erdkunde*, *75*(1), 51-60.

Gourdeau, C. (2018). *Des communes d'accueil pour les personnes migrantes : Expériences de collaboration entre mairie et collectif citoyen en Normandie et en Bretagne.* Fondation de France/La Cimade, 76 p.

Hansen, B. R. (2019). Barcelona—City of Refuge and Migration. *Rosa Luxemburg Foundation*.

Harvey, D. (2000). *Spaces of Hope*. University of California Press, 293 p.

Hein, C., & Pelletier, P. (Éds.). (2006). *Cities, Autonomy, and Decentralization in Japan*. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203358498

Hilgartner, S., & Bosk, C. L. (1988). The Rise and Fall of Social Problems : A Public Arenas Model. *American Journal of Sociology*, *94*(1), 53-78.

Hombert, L. (2021). Barcelona Ciutat Refugi. Cinq ans d'action publique locale à Barcelone (2015-2020). *Migrations Société*, *185*(3), 139-154. https://doi.org/10.3917/migra.185.0139

Ireland, P. (1994). *The Policy Challenge of Ethnic Diversity : Immigrant Politics in France and Switzerland*. Harvard University Press.

Kaufmann, D., Räss, N., Strebel, D., & Sager, F. (2022). Sanctuary Cities in Europe? A Policy Survey of Urban Policies in Support of Irregular Migrants. *British Journal of Political Science*, *52*(4), 1954-1963. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123421000326

Kurtenbach, S. (2019). No place for refugees? An empirical study of the exclusion of refugees citing the city of Bautzen (Germany) as an example. *Raumforschung Und*

Raumordnung / Spatial Research and Planning, *77*(4), Article 4. https://doi.org/10.2478/rara-2019-0029

Lacroix, T. (2020). Réseaux des villes hospitalières : Un panorama global. *e-Migrinter*, *20*, Article 20. https://doi.org/10.4000/e-migrinter.2281

Lacroix, T., & Desille, A. (2018). *International Migrations and Local Governance : A Global Perspective*. Springer.

Lacroix, T., & Spencer, S. (2022). City networks and the multi-level governance of migration. *Global Networks*, *22*(3), 349-362. https://doi.org/10.1111/glob.12381

Landy, F., & Moreau, S. (2015). The Right to the Village. *Justice Spatiale - Spatial Justice*, *7*, http://www.jssj.org/article/le.

Lefebvre, H. (1974). La production de l'espace. *L'Homme et la société*, *31*(1), 15-32. https://doi.org/10.3406/homso.1974.1855

Liebe, U., Meyerhoff, J., Kroesen, M., Chorus, C., & Glenk, K. (2018). From welcome culture to welcome limits? Uncovering preference changes over time for sheltering refugees in Germany. *PloS One*, *13*(8), e0199923. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0199923

Martinot-Lagarde, P. (2008). De nouvelles formes d'engagement. *Revue Projet*, *n ° 305*(4), 48-54. https://doi.org/10.3917/pro.305.0048

Masse, J.-P. (2001). Genèse et institutionnalisation du dispositif d'accueil des réfugiés politiques en France / Jean-Pierre Masse. N° 45, 3ème trimestre 2001. *Genèse et institutionnalisation du dispositif d'accueil des réfugiés politiques en France / Jean-Pierre Masse. n° 45, 3ème trimestre 2001*. https://documentation.insp.gouv.fr/insp/doc/SYRACUSE/197125/genese-et-institutionnalisation-du-dispositif-d-accueil-des-refugies-politiques-en-france-jean-pierr

Mayer, M. (2018). Cities as sites of refuge and resistance. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, *25*(3), 232-249. https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776417729963

Mazza, J. (2022). *Urban asylum policy in openly conflicting, decoupled migration governance : The case of Barcelona*. http://repositori.upf.edu/handle/10230/54758

Moore, S. F. (1973). Law and Social Change : The Semi-Autonomous Social Field as an Appropriate Subject of Study. *Law & Society Review*, *7*(4), 719-746. https://doi.org/10.2307/3052967

Nettelbladt, G. (2021). Disrupting Dialogue? The Participatory Urban Governance of Far-Right Contestations in Cottbus. *Urban Planning*, *6*(2), 91-102. https://doi.org/10.17645/up.v6i2.3793

Paquet, M. (2017). Aux États-Unis, des villes sanctuaires. *Plein droit*, *115*(4), 11-14. https://doi.org/10.3917/pld.115.0011

Paquet, M. (2022). Sanctuary cities. In *Routledge Handbook of Immigration and Refugee Studies* (p. 434-443). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003194316-51

Ridgley, J. (2008). Cities of Refuge : Immigration Enforcement, Police, and the Insurgent Genealogies of Citizenship in U.S. Sanctuary Cities. *Urban Geography*, *29*(1), 53-77. https://doi.org/10.2747/0272-3638.29.1.53

Smith, A., & Spicer, Z. (2018). The Local Autonomy of Canada's Largest Cities. *Urban Affairs Review*, *54*(5), 931-961. https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087416684380

Spencer, S. (2020). Cities Breaking the Mould? Municipal Inclusion of Irregular Migrants in Europe. In S. Spencer & A. Triandafyllidou (Éds.), *Migrants with Irregular Status in Europe : Evolving Conceptual and Policy Challenges* (p. 187-205). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-34324-8_10

Szalanska, J., Gac, J., Jastrzebska, E., Poplawska, J. Z., & Moralli, M. (2023). Public policy towards immigrants in poland's shrinking cities – The case study of the city of Lomza. *International Migration*, *61*(1), 256-272. https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.13013

Vallois, É. (2019). Saint-Just : Forcer la porte et se faire hospitalité à soi-même. *Vacarme*, *89*(4), 29-34. https://doi.org/10.3917/vaca.089.0029

Vasudevan, A. (2015). The autonomous city : Towards a critical geography of occupation. *Progress in Human Geography*, *39*(3), 316-337. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132514531470

von Hermanni, H., & Neumann, R. (2019). 'Refugees welcome?' The interplay between perceived threats and general concerns on the acceptance of refugees – a factorial survey approach in Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *45*(3), 349-374. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1459183

Zapata-Barrero, R. (2017). Intercultural policy and multi-level governance in Barcelona : Mainstreaming comprehensive approach. *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives*, *83*(2), 251-270.

Zapata-Barrero, R. (2022). New scales of migration governance in the Mediterranean : Regional cities in the spotlight. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 09697764221125343. https://doi.org/10.1177/09697764221125343

Zapata-Barrero, R. (2023). Urban migration governance under the resilience lens : Conceptual and empirical insights. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *0*(0), 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2023.2166793

Zapata-Barrero, R., Caponio, T., & Scholten, P. (2017). Theorizing the 'local turn'in a multi-level governance framework of analysis : A case study in immigrant policies. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *83*(2), 241-246.

BROAD-ER

Conceptual Paper on Detachment from Formal Governance by Independent Actors

April 2023

KOÇ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Universitat Pompeu Fabra Barcelona
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

This project has received funding from the European Unions Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101079254

BROAD-ER

GRANT AGREEMENT NO.	101079254
DELIVERABLE NO.	D5.1
DELIVERABLE TITLE	Conceptual Papers Prepared by Each Partner on Different Themes (UvA)
DISSEMINATION LEVEL	Public
LEAD BENEFICIARY	All
CONTRACTUAL DATE OF DELIVERY	30/04/2023
ACTUAL DATE OF DELIVERY	29/04/2023

KOÇ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
upf. Universitat Pompeu Fabra Barcelona
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

This project has received funding from the European Unions Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101079254

Table of Contents

This project has received funding from the European Unions Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101079254

Executive Summary

BROAD-ER (Bridging the Migration and Urban Studies) seeks to create a Research Excellence Network that promotes interdisciplinary research and training at the intersection of migration and urban studies. The project is a joint effort between Koç University (KU) in Turkey, Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF) in Spain, and the University of Amsterdam (UvA) in the Netherlands. Its primary objective is to address the research deficit in the European Research Area (ERA) by introducing innovative and interdisciplinary methods while enhancing research and innovation capabilities in Turkey in emerging areas of migration and urban studies.

This document is a **conceptual paper** on the theme of "**Detachment from Formal Governance by Independent Actors**" prepared by the post-doctoral researcher from UvA as part of the BROAD-ER project. It is one of three conceptual papers to be submitted by the researcher teams of the project partners for Deliverable 5.1 (Conceptual Papers Prepared by Each Partner on Different Themes). This deliverable involves each partner being assigned a specific theme and preparing a conceptual paper based on a literature review analysing one of the three primary processes involved in cities' efforts to develop autonomy and decouple from national governments. The UPF team is assigned to the theme of Establishing New Relations between the National and the Local and Increasing Autonomy from National Government, while the KU team is responsible for the theme of City Diplomacy (Internationalization of Cities), and the UvA team is assigned to the theme of Detachment from Formal Governance by Independent Actors.

Deliverable 5.1 falls under Work Package 5, which aims to develop an exploratory research design among BROAD-ER partners towards collaborative research excellence.

1. Do-It-Yourself (DIY) Urban Migration Governance: Towards a Conceptualization of Detached Forms of Governance by Independent Actors in Cities

The past years have seen an increasing interest in local migration governance, including modes of organizing and managing migration that take place detached from municipal and especially (supra-)national regulations. Governance is shaped by local and national politics and regulations on the one hand, and so-called 'street-level bureaucrats' (Lipsky, 1980) on the other. The first develop rules and regulations in the formal sense, which the latter are expected to implement locally. Urban migration governance today is strongly shaped by so-called 'street-level bureaucrats': actors in the domain of public services, such as educators, social workers, but also planners, who find themselves stuck between nation-state regulations and the expectations of residents; but it is also increasingly shaped by actors completely independent of local or national governments, and hence outside the state bureaucratic apparatus: residents, social groups and migrants themselves.

Cities are increasingly 'superdiverse' (Vertovec, 2007): their residents are marked by increasing diversity in terms of race, class, sexual orientation, abilities, and lifestyles. Migration forms an important aspect of this superdiversity (Scholten, 2018). Individuals who migrate have various legal statuses, tying them to diverse sets of regulations in the areas of housing, healthcare, education, and labour, rendering migration governance in cities increasingly complex, too. As a result, we find what Phillimore et al. (2015) describe as blurred boundaries between formal and informal governance and the emergence of new actors in service provision (see Phillimore et al., 2015).

As various policy fields have seen the increasing devolution of responsibilities from national to local governments or non-governmental actors, and as markets are increasingly deregulated as a result of neoliberal restructuring (Peck & Tickell 2007, p. 27), various forms of **Do-It-Yourself (DIY) practices** in urban settings emerge as "institutions are incapable or unwilling to address" a host of issues (del Pozo 2017, p. 432). In such settings – described as "dysfunctional" (ibid.: 426) by some –, residents with and without migration backgrounds develop strategies to cope, identify problems, and organize to find solutions (Kinder, 2016; del Pozo, 2017; Cremaschi et al., 2020).

The concept of DIY has thus far been discussed mainly in the **urban governance** literature where we find an ambivalent picture. Some authors suggest that it is the withdrawal from municipal actors and governments that invites residents to 'take matters into their own hands' (Kinder, 2016; Douglas, 2018; Eizaguirre & Parés, 2019). Kinder (2016) emphasizes in her work on DIY strategies in decline-ridden Rust Belt-City Detroit (MI) how disinvestment in certain neighbourhoods pushes residents to manage the urban infrastructures on their own. Moving away from the built environment and to the sphere

of social services in the Spanish context, the 2007 and 2008 financial crisis with its following austerity measures has had severe negative social implications, leading to the emergence of citizen-led initiatives in the years to follow (see Eizaguirre & Parés, 2019).

The withdrawal of authorities from certain areas, so it is argued in much of the urban planning literature cited above, can lead to DIY practices. While this may be true in urban governance – especially under conditions of tight municipal budgets impacting social service provision and urban infrastructures –, the governance of migration continues to be centrally regulated, and local actors are both enabled and constrained by regulations at different scales. While de-regulation and liberalization are extensively applied to the domains of housing and labour, for example, migration remains firmly embedded in multi-scalar governance in which integration and migration effects are governed locally, while immigration is governed at (supra-)national scales (Zapata-Barrero et al., 2017).[1] This continuously important role of national governments and the often national perspective on migration with regards to questions of social cohesion and national identity is criticized by the literature as what Glick Schiller and Wimmer (2002) referred to as methodological nationalism.

In this context of **local migration governance** so strongly conditioned by higher scales of governance, we find how residents push their municipal actors towards action, which can come in the form of exclusionary as well as inclusionary practices. The latter is discussed in the literature as 'cosmopolitanism from below' (García Augustín & Jorgensen 2019, p. 199) "foster[ing] an inclusionary universalism, which is both critical and conflictual." García Augustín and Jorgensen do not argue that cities are always pursuing inclusive policies, but that the urban "becomes the place to locally articulate inclusive communities" (ibid.). As such, it is in cities that we find residents challenging municipal action, cooperating with municipal actors, or forming independent support and migration governance structures that can be considered detached from national migration governance. Such local actor constellations and their practices increasingly form part of urban migration governance.

Recent scholarship in urban and migration studies increasingly contests two things: (1) That the urban is merely a site in which national regulations play out; and (2) that local forms of organizing can be understood only as informality and hence in opposition to formalized governance forms. The importance of bottom-up forms of governance linked

[1] For further discussions of the multi-level governance of migration in cities, see also the BROAD-ER working papers by Arfaoui (forthcoming) on local autonomy-building processes, and by Kılınçarslan & Kulkul (forthcoming) on city diplomacy.

to migration and the urban are increasingly put forward (Darling, 2017; McFarlane & Waibel, 2012) with an emphasis on the role cities play as sites for political contestation from the below (see Nicholls & Uitermark, 2016; Leitner et al., 2007). That interest in local forms of organizing migration-related issues beyond informality is growing underlines a need to further develop what exactly constitutes DIY urban migration *governance*.

Following Scholten (2018, p. 11), **urban governance** can be defined as "interactive process of problem definition, policy formulation, and problem solving between government and society at the urban level." **Migration governance**, according to the IMISCOE Migration Research Hub, includes "laws, regulations, decisions or other government directive related to migration, [...] as well as the factors related to decision-making processes and implementation." (IMISCOE Migration Hub, 2023: n.p.) **Urban migration governance**, then, encompasses such processes within the realm of the urban environment, including the issues connected to it. **DIY urban migration governance** will be defined here as local forms of managing (defining issues/problem areas, and efforts to address them) migrant related issues which include a degree of organization of actors who are detached from especially national governance. That said, it is important to stress that (im)migration is soundly embedded in multi-level governance (local, national, and supra-national) and spans various domains with their respective regulations.

This paper discusses selected literature that engages with the emergence of DIY-forms of governing migration-related issues in cities, i.e. processes and practices which happen independent from, and at times in opposition to, municipal or national government bodies, and as practices which are driven by migrant groups and residents themselves.[2] These forms of local action and organizing are noteworthy for migration governance is highly regulated with the nation state playing a decisive role. DIY migration governance as conceptualized here is highly at odds with this logic.

The paper is structured as follows: after this introduction, section two will lay out how DIY developed as concept within urban scholarship and elaborate in what ways DIY governance of migration-related issues differs from, and potentially goes beyond, what has been discussed as informality within migration research. Following that, section three reviews selected literature organized around the following themes: the informal economy and migrant entrepreneurship; housing; and the city as site for political contestation. We

[2] We will not consider the role of multinational companies and their international recruitment schemes, as these are considered deeply embedded in and linked to national regulations. What is more, international staff still must comply with visa and other immigration regulations and do so in at times close cooperation with government agencies, for example through skilled-labour schemes (see Kuvik, 2012).

focus on these three themes as they provide valuable insights into the complexities tied to and the differentiated contexts paving way to DIY urban migration governance. Section four, then, briefly discusses the actors involved in DIY migration governance scholarship, upon which section five ties first conceptual considerations on DIY urban migration governance together.

2. 'DIY' in Migration Scholarship: Going beyond Informality

While the term **DIY** is increasingly common in urban planning literature, where it describes local forms of organization to shape the built environment, migration scholarship has not yet engaged with such practices under this term, and instead often refers to practices that take place detached from state or municipal actors as **informality**.

In urban studies scholarship, DIY *urbanism* is broadly tied to processes of neoliberalization, as it "emerges from and relies on a lean state, financial disinvestment, free and flexible modes of production, flexible capital accumulation, and deregulation of urban rules and regulations, meanwhile promoting individual responsibility and self-help." (Heim LaFromboise 2017, p. 430) DIY urban governance, here, is also understood as form of contesting neoliberal restructuring processes (Leitner et al., 2007).

In urban planning literature, DIY-forms of place-making are often celebrated as "creative, participatory, spontaneous, guerrilla, grassroots" (Douglas 2018, p. 3) practices, which are distinct from formal urban planning and place-making through their disconnection from institutionalized processes and their citizen-led character. Douglas (2018, p. 8f.) writes:

> At its simplest, DIY urban design shows us how everyday problems are experienced by everyday people, and how these people sometimes respond. At its grandest, it has much to tell us about the complex and evolving conditions of inequality, privilege, local cultural identity, and the promise of civic participation, all in relation to urban space.

According to Douglas, this practice has rapidly emerged in the past decades, spanning various projects and activities in urban settings today, especially but clearly not exclusively under conditions of urban decline. Such practices are not exclusive to marginalized members of local communities. Urban scholars work on informality in the contexts of art and how it is at times instrumentalized by cities (see Campos, 2021), housing (Neuwirth 2007; Usman et al., 221), efforts to increase social cohesion, e.g. through community gardens (Eizenberg, 2012; Hou, 2014; Jean, 2015) or the economic activities that shape urban spaces (Jónsson et al., 2023). Finally, DIY governance has also been studied through the lens of neighbourhood security, for example through neighbourhood watch groups aiming community social control (Kang, 2015).

As such, the urban literature discusses DIY as ways of "non-professionally planning the city" (Devlin 2018, p. 569), but also as means to govern social encounter and interaction, the latter forming an intrinsic part of the governance of migration-related diversity. Its appearance depends on the local but also broader political and institutional contexts. For example, while DIY forms of beautification and basic infrastructure improvements are commonly found in downscaled urban areas, DIY practices linked to housing provision or labour can also be found in prosperous urban settings marked by tight housing markets and large informal employment settings. Several metropoles have seen informal housing popping up in the 1960s and 1970s, be it in form of the *gecekondular* in Istanbul (Neuwirth, 2005; Sadikoglu Asan & Ozsoy, 2018), or Paris' so-called *bidonvilles* (Paskins, 2009; de Barros,2012)[3].

However, urban *migration* governance, and DIY forms of it, are highly at odds with it, as the extensive deregulation occurring in the processes of deregulation do not apply to international migration as highly regulated policy field. However, neoliberal restructuring also affects migration-related policy fields such as the management of asylum at the local level (see Darling 2016). It hence appears almost paradoxical that international migration remains highly regulated while the governance of its local effects are increasingly managed by non-state actors such as NGOs and other not-for-profit organizations.

The concept of DIY has only recently been transferred to migration scholarship (see Cremaschi et al., 2020). Much of previous literature on self-organizing (migrant) groups has not been using this term, but instead discussed and analysed as various forms of informality.

Building on Roy (2004, 2009a, 2009b, 2011), McFarlane reminds that informality is "a state of deregulation maintained by the negotiability of value" in the context of which "[t]he political, economic, and legal elite can use or suspend the law to enable violation of, for example, planning or building controls in order to allow new developments." (McFarlane 2012, p. 93) Much of the literature describes informal practices as a response to exclusion in formalized spheres of day-to-day urban life, be it employment, access to capital, education, political participation, or consumption (see for example Bayat, 1997;

[3] Following de Barros (2012), the emergence of *bidonvilles*, while targeted by housing policies and named as category by the French statistics office INSEE starting in the 1960s only, must be understood as tightly linked to the French imperial project. To de Barros "the imperial dimension of the history of bidonvilles in mainland France is clear – first, through the practices of personnel in the prefectural administrations that took charge of dealing with the bidonvilles, who were recruited in Algeria; and secondly, because of the role played by bidonvilles in the manifestations of the Algerian War in mainland France." (de Barros 2012, p. 2)

Kloosterman et al., 1999; Kinder, 2016; del Pozo, 2017). Other authors put forward how informality can emerge as space of opportunity for newcomers, be it for housing (Usman et al. 2021) or for becoming political agents (Harris & Roose, 2013). Finally, some researchers hint towards inclusionary and exclusionary forces *within* informal spaces, problematizing the formal-informal dichotomy[4] and emphasizing the need to further investigate the experiences of navigating such spaces (see Vaiou & Stratigaki, 2008).

DIY practices "stem from everyday problems and realities that communities face" (del Pozo 2017, p. 428). Describing a multitude of practices and processes, the existing literature remains marked by a variety of concepts and terms which are often used interchangeably. This leads authors to point towards the conceptual pitfalls within existing research. Devlin (2018), for example, points out that while the philosophical critique of "modernist top-down spatial production" (p. 569) is far from new, ranging from the works of Lefebvre (1992) to Jacobs (1962) and Harvey (2007), empirical work is only just emerging, and criticizes that existing work remains marked by conceptual imprecision.

For Bayat (1997), DIY activities can form "logical ways in which the disenfranchised survive hardships and improve their lives." (Bayat, 1997: p. 55) The author describes these practices as "mundane, ordinary and [of] daily nature" (ibid.). In the context of migration and superdiverse urban societies, DIY practices have been examined in various forms: from economic activities (Desai et al., 2021; Kloosterman et al., 1998, 1999; Kloosterman & Rath, 2003; Rath, 2002; Solano et al., 2022; Zack & Landau, 2022), housing (Raimondi 2019), educational or health care services, to broader local contestations of migration governance on higher scales (Artero & Ambrosini, 2022; Nicholls & Uitermark, 2016).

DIY governance, however, goes beyond individual informal practices, as it encompasses local forms of collective organization; while tackling issues connected to mundane spheres of daily life such as housing and work, such forms of local governance may not be so mundane after all.

Hence, in this paper we will investigate different spheres of everyday urban life and the variety of ways in which migration is governed by non-state actors in cities. We will see that, while migrantisized groups are often marginalized, DIY governance is not exclusive to marginalized groups, and while it encompasses practices which may be seen as informal, for example in the field of housing provision, it also includes the intentional

[4] Said dichotomy is a common critique of much of the literature on informal and DIY practices (see for example McFarlane & Waibel, 2012).

non-enforcement of regulations by local actors, including NGOs and municipal bureaucracies.

Similar to much work on DIY practices in urban scholarship, a critique of neoliberal restructuring can also be found in DIY migration governance literature, especially but not exclusively since 2015, where authors critically reflect the privatization impacting progressively various aspects of the asylum process. Building on Peck's (2012) work on austerity urbanism, Darling (2017) provides a first account of "how asylum accommodation processes are reshaped in the context of both national austerity politics and, more specifically, a turn to austerity argued to have been specifically 'urban' in character" (Darling 2016, p. 485).

What DIY governance and informality share in common is the detachment from regulated processes and regulating state-actors. DIY governance, however, forms its own case of locally identifying and responding to problems – in an organized and collective manner. Examples can be migrant organizations supporting migrant groups in housing or employment matters, political groups enabling civic participation, or collectives organizing housing.

Many such forms of identifying and solving problems related to migration can be considered DIY governance. The remainder of this conceptual paper will discuss such form of DIY urban migration governance via the examples of how local groups work around challenges connected to housing for migrants, migrant workers forming collectives against bad working conditions, or how local groups pave the way for citizenship from below.

3. Forms of DIY Urban Migration Governance: A Tentative Overview

Migration increasingly shapes cities and cities are discussed as increasingly relevant actors in the governance of migration (see Zapata-Barrero et al., 2017). Migration management at the local level is increasingly affected by economic restructuring and market forces. DIY urban migration governance encompasses the management of issues linked to migration apart from formal frameworks and actors. Such governance takes place at the local level, within communities, rather than at municipal or national levels.

This section will focus on three areas in which DIY urban migration governance can be observed: (1) the governance of migrant labour with a focus on attempts at collectivizing and organizing migrant labour detached from state bureaucratic bodies, (2) the governance of housing and housing as realm of DIY governance, and (3) and migrants rights struggle in and through cities.

These three areas were deemed particularly interesting for investigating and conceptualizing DIY urban migration governance, as they exemplify the complexities tied to such practices and help critically reflect under what conditions DIY governance processes emerge in the context of migration, what actors are involved, and just how it differs from urban informality related to migration.

3.1. DIY governance of migrant labour

Connected to the previous discussion of the contextuality of regulations governing migrants at the local level, labour and employment are subject to varying regulations, and provide spaces for DIY activity, on the one hand, but also bottom-up collectivization on the other. National labour frameworks differ greatly depending on national contexts, e.g., a country's population development and how it is considered in formulating migrant labour regulations, and whether newcomers can access employment depends on their status on the one hand, and on said national regulations on the other. For example, while asylum seekers in Germany and France are unable to legally access employment, asylum seekers in Spain have the permission to work, here, working for at least three years is understood as basic local integration, and thus a facilitator for an asylum seeker's recognition processes. In the context of skilled-labour shortages, some countries such as Canada have long-standing frameworks governing migrant labour, while in others such frameworks are only emerging (Burmann et al., 2018).

DIY governance of migrant labour emerges where the political and legal contexts allow for or even provoke detached practices. There is overall agreement in the literature that informal economic activity in contemporary cities must be understood as intrinsic part of advanced capitalist development (see initially Sassen 1997, 2009), in which "deregulation and flexibility in the formal economy have restructured the retail sector broadly defined." (Clark & Colling 2019, p. 757) The resulting DIY governance of migrant labour has ambivalent effects: while informal arrangements allow to access to labour, we will see further below that the informal labour market is anything but free of problems for individuals engaging in it, paving way for bottom-up forms within migrant labour governance, e.g. in the form of collectives.

Taking a step back and diving into the literature on the informal economy, we find that migrants are prone to entering the informal economy due to a lack of recognition status, citizen rights, a limited understanding of the bureaucratic procedures in their countries of arrival, or language barriers (see Kloosterman et al., 1999; Clark & Colling, 2019). Investigations into immigrant entrepreneurship in informal economies, hence, often have as a starting point the marginalization of immigrants in formal employment. As put by Kloosterman et al. (1999, p. 253): "Excluded to a considerable extent from the mainstream labour market, an increasing number of immigrants have opted to set up

shops themselves."[5] In line with McFarlane (2012), the authors emphasize the that defining what constitutes informal activity is essentially a political choice: While in some places or time, and for some groups, activities can be informal or even illegal, in other places, for other groups and at other times, they may be perfectly formal. Migrant entrepreneur's activity, then, depends on the social, economic, political, and institutional contexts they are embedded in. To the authors,

The mixed embeddedness approach argues that migrants are "embedded" in both their home and host societies, and that this dual embedding shapes their entrepreneurial strategies and outcomes. It emphasizes the importance of social networks, institutions, and economic structures in shaping the experiences of migrant entrepreneurs. The need to consider local, institutional, social and political conditions applies to investigations into DIY urban migration governance, too.

Within the research on migrant entrepreneurship, refugee entrepreneurial activities have received less attention, even though the forced nature of their mobility may be influencing their entrepreneurial activities and how it impacts cities (Desai et al., 2021) Due to legal frameworks determining whether forced migrants are allowed to work, depending on their recognition status, their activities may differ from those of voluntary migrants (see OECD, 2019, 2016; Cortes, 2004). Indeed, the legal frameworks governing refugees in the labour market can impact what kinds of activities they chose, when, and how (see Schuster et al., 2013). As such, the fact that (forced) migrants face structural barriers to labour markets, and that the latter are increasingly deregulated, can prompt DIY-forms of governing migrant labour. Like entrepreneurship among voluntary migrants, research from countries with high refugee populations such as Jordan (Desai et al. 2021) or Lebanon (Chaaban et al., 2016; Uzelac & Meester, 2018) showed that refugees, too, can opt for self-employment or entrepreneurship if confronted with exclusion on labour markets, when lacking documentation or the right to work (see Rashid 2018), or simply when identifying gaps in service provision for refugee communities and beyond.

The sphere of self-employment can be a space of liberation and autonomy, but also a source of dependence, marginality, exploitation, and exclusion. Equally viewed from a gender perspective, Vaiou and Stratigaki (2008) found in their work on Albanian female migrants in Athens that engagement in informal work may also come as a result of

[5] The authors developed the mixed embeddedness approach to study migrant entrepreneurship in the informal economy.[5] In their view, "[c]omplex configurations of mixed embeddedness enable immigrant businesses to survive partly by facilitating informal economic activities — in segments where indigenous firms, as a rule, cannot." (Kloosterman et al., 1999, p. 253)

employers – especially in feminized care work – who refuse to agree to formalizing the work relationship.

Connecting to exclusionary practices, Jónsson et al. (2023, p. 2) discuss European marketplaces and their "oversimplistic and romanticized" image as inclusive spaces for economic practice to marginalized people. What they find is that there are indeed exclusionary practices within the informal regulations of who gets to participate in market place trade. They investigate the "informal mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion that entail that some traders are supported while others face significant barriers, including discrimination in the marketplace." (ibid) These play out primarily in form of tightly knit networks and "norms governing traders' behavior" (ibid., p. 4), but also through clearly defined roles, e.g., market managers with the power to decide over which traders to issue licenses to. As such, their article also exposes the myth of easy accessibility to market spaces in Europe (ibid., p. 5). While exclusionary forces were identified, the authors concluded also that the norms and barriers also constituted the construction of an in-group, within which a support system was in place which helped traders navigate the informal governance of marketplaces. As such their case is a good example for small-scale governance.

Introducing a gender lens to research on refugee entrepreneurship, research from the Canadian context has shown that many refugee women enter self-employment out of necessity to make ends meet, but also that some entrepreneurship can be described as feminized labour, including care work for elderly or children (see Senthanar et al., 2021). Relevant for our DIY perspective is that the authors found that while entrepreneurship was a means to omit structural barriers on the labour market, it also posed challenges and barriers due to regulations. In such cases, the authors state, ethnic networks contributed to the success of businesses (ibid., p. 840), inviting a closer analysis of such forms of self-organizing collectives.

In her work on migrant and ethnic workers in the UK, Holgate (2005) investigates the challenges connected to unionizing migrant labour, including wide-spread racism or challenges connected to language barriers. Peck and Theodore (2012) investigate local forms of organizing migrant labour through the example day labour organizations and their cooperation with municipalities in the US, who "have been at the forefront of the struggle to improve conditions in day labor markets through worker organizing and leadership development, assisting government officials in crafting effective policy responses to substandard conditions in day labor markets, and seeking remedies to the problems faced by day laborers (…)" (Peck & Theodore 2012, p. 750). Day laborers in the US face significant challenges through the federal criminalization of day labour on the one hand, and the instability of day labour, and the often dangerous working conditions on the other. In an attempt to answer the question what the potentials of 'regulation from below'

through day labour workers' rights organization may be, and whether they can serve as "alternative forms of municipal-level legislation" (ibid.), the authors investigate the case of The National Day Laborer Organizing Network (NDLON) in the US and its activities in pushing for improved working conditions of day labourers and regulation from below. According to Peck and Theodore, the network created a worker centre which not only served to regularize the criminalized hiring procedure, but also to "monitor the quality of the work performed" (ibid., p. 754). For workers, the centre facilitated organization, and rendered the hiring process more transparent and monitored. For Peck and Theodore,

> (…) day labor worker centers have themselves become significant sites of rule making and rule enforcement in contingent labor markets, even as they work against formidable tides of regulatory regression. They point to the potential of progressive forms of labor market intermediation prosecuted in a harsh regulatory and political climate. At the same time, their relatively modest scale—when balanced against, say, the size of the network of for-profit intermediaries, like private temp agencies—also speaks to the way in which the odds are stacked when it comes to "positive" regulatory reform. (ibid., p. 755)

These examples show the informal ways in which labour is organised locally. Such informal economies prevail also because keeping labour relations informal can be lucrative for those providing work, due to the dumping of wages and since labour organization becomes difficult under informal conditions. Migrant worker collectives and networks, as the previous example showed, can form an important counterforce and means to govern work in informal spaces from below.

DIY migration governance is not exclusively a phenomenon in the labour market, however, but can also be found in housing. The next section reviews selected work dedicated to it.

3.2. DIY governance of housing

Housing is a major challenge for newcomers in cities. Informal housing refers to a range of housing arrangements that are outside the formal regulatory framework of housing markets, such as squatting, unregistered tenancies, substandard housing, and informal settlements, or unregistered room sharing (see Usman et al., 2021). Informal housing is often associated with poverty and disadvantage, but it is in fact commonly found among all economic strata, especially in metropolitan areas with rising costs of living.

As put by Neuwirth (2007), much urban growth is linked to immigration as newcomers arrive in cities in search for work, which they find there. "What they can't find," he writes, "is a home." (2007, p. 71) – that is housing. In his research, Neuwirth investigated

squatter communities in Brazilian, Turkish, Indian, and Kenyan cities, providing an in-depth account of informal housing practices there. According to the United Nations, approximately one billion people lived in slums and other informal housing constellations in 2018, with an estimated three billion by 2030 (UN 2023). As neither governments nor markets cater to these newcomers, "[t]hese squatters mix more concrete than any developer and lay more brick than any government. No one else is building for them, so they have to build for themselves." (Neuwirth 2007, p. 72)

Like Neuwirth (2007), Raimondi (2019) investigates **squatting** practices. Analysing migrant squats in Athens in a multi-scalar perspective from the individual experience to the urban, she conceptualizes them as "socio-political formations" (Raimondi 2019, p. 560). In Athens, 2,000 migrants are considered to live in housing that is managed independently from authorities (Raimondi 2019, p. 567). Building on Nyers and Rygiel (2012), she understands these squats as forms of 'citizenship from below' on the hand, and spaces that allow newcomers "to 'opt out' of citizenship as legal status" (Raimondi 2019, p. 560) on the other. Like other authors, Raimondi urges to understand the autonomous housing projects as embedded in their socio-political and spatial context. For example, housed migrants may enact citizenship through their residence in autonomous projects, but as many migrants are in transit, their goal may in fact not be to obtain Greek citizenship status (ibid., p; 561). What is more, one of the investigated squats is located in the neighbourhood Exarcheia, which the author describes as "a peculiar neighborhood in the centre of Athens, internationally known as an anarchists and leftists area, whose resistance identity is characterized by numerous political squats and *aftonoma stekia* (autonomous centres)" (ibid., p. 565).

This spatialization of political resistance in the centre of Athens in combination with the fact that the investigated squats are part of a wider movement, hints towards a distinct DIY governance character, where housing migrants is governed disconnected from and in opposition to formal structures.

In their research on the Ghanaian social network and its role in providing newcomers with housing opportunities in New York, Usman et al. (2021) find that access to informal housing is easier for undocumented Ghanaians than for those entering the country on a diversity visa. They argue that this is the case because individuals arriving on said visa-type tend to have only six months to prepare their move, leaving no time to establish networks in their arrival city. Besides this lack of network connections, the authors also documented a reluctance from documented Ghanaians to seek social support from official bodies. Undocumented Ghanaians interviewed in their study, in contrast, had often planned their arrival over long periods of time and in close cooperation with networks of friends, family and acquaintances on both sides of the Atlantic, allowing them to immediately immerse themselves in and build upon these networks upon arrival.

Support can range from free-rent accommodation during the first months to the borrowing of IDs and credit records for proofs of documentation on formal housing markets. Their research emphasizes the importance of networks and highlights the unequal access to sometimes elaborate support systems, but also sheds light on the variety of drivers and motivations to move or stay, depending on local support structures, especially for undocumented migrants. It also hints towards how arrival is governed locally and detached from authorities.

While much of the presented work deals with contemporary cities, Bayat (1997) has discussed means of acquiring housing (and work) in the context of pre- and post-revolution Iran. Drawing the development of small- and medium-sized cities at the peripheries of metropoles back to migration of poorer populations from rural regions to urban centres, Bayat describes the street politics in Iran, and how institutional disadvantage leads to self-organization, which is then faced by pushbacks from formal actors. Such street politics, the author continues, exist across the global South (Bayat, 1997, p. 54f.). In Chile, for example, the term 'Basismo' has emerged to describe an emergence of bottom-up activities in the areas of housing and economic activities, marked by an "emphasis on community and local democracy, and distrust of formal and large-scale bureaucracy." (ibid., p. 55) – a crucial aspect of DIY governance.

What much of the work on housing shares is the capacity of DIY practices to provide accommodation to challenge the 'host'/'guest' narrative commonly encountered (see Raimondi, 2019; Squire & Darling, 2013), and how such practices are a response to unregulated housing markets and bureaucratic barriers tied to citizenship status.

3.3. The city as site of political contestation for migrants

Urban and migration scholars pay increasing attention to the city as site of political contestation. As national exclusionary practices such as bordering play out at city-level (see Darling, 2017), it is also at that level that such practices are contested, and mechanisms developed which support migrants in coping with and challenging them (see Varsanyi, 2010).

Cities post distinct challenges and opportunities for such DIY-practices (Nicholls/ Uitermark 2016). Nicholls and Uitermark applied Nancy Fraser's concept of "counterpublic" to the urban environment and showed how migrants form such counterpublic and contribute to the urban as political space for migrant rights. Fraser conceptualized counterpublics as "parallel discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counter discourses to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs" (Fraser, 1990, p. 68).

In other works, Nicholls thought Lefebvre's right *to* the city further by conceptualizing the city as means towards rights for migrants: rights *through* the city. Much critical work engages with the urban as political space, leading to a focus in the literature on the co-production of local reception policies that include residents and non-municipal actors such as NGOs. As previously mentioned, the urban becomes a site of contestation in these works, inspired by ideas of "rebel cities" (Harvey 2000) contesting national policies. However, DIY governance, we argue, emerges when cities do not have the possibility to, or are unwilling to 'rebel' against national governments.

One arena of migrant struggle is the quests for belonging, mainly via citizenship, which "play[s] out at multiple, interrelated spatial scales." (Grundy & Smith, 2005, p. 390) Among the literature dealing with this we can find work on processes described as "citizenship from below" (see for example Artero/Ambrosini, 2022), which has already been mentioned in the section on housing, where migrant squats in Athens became spaces through which citizenship was claimed. Such forms of citizenship beyond the legal concept include political practices ranging from demonstrations to hunger strikes (Ataç et al., 2016; Chimienti, 2011; Monforte & Dufour, 2013) in support of migrant rights on the one hand, and practices described as "lived citizenship" (Lister, 2007), describing day to day practices, on the other.

Isin (2008) differentiates between formal citizenship granted solely by national bodies, and *substantive* citizenship as "condition of possibility of the former" (ibid., p. 17). The latter are by now described as various forms of citizenship from below, that is "a broad range of everyday activities that affect the meanings and representations of citizenship constructed by social actors" (Artero/Ambrosini, 2022, p. 204). Isin and Saward (2014) as well as Darling (2017) emphasize the role of activism, local organizing and collectivizing in claiming citizenship, especially by actors without normative belonging to the nation sate through formal citizenship.

The work of these authors centres on urban space. However, it is important to note that DIY migration governance is not an inclusively urban phenomenon: rural spaces and small and mid-sized towns play an increasing role as localities in which migration governance takes place, not least since the emergence of national dispersal schemes. As such, these places become potentially more urban, if we consider urbanity as characterized by density and diversity.

The concept of 'lived citizenship' put forward by Lister (2007), in contrast, emphasizes the idea of practiced citizenship on the domestic level. Harris and Roose (2013) have investigated forms non-formal citizenship practices early on in their work on young Muslims with migration biographies in Australia. The authors describe these practices as DIY-citizenship. To them, they are the result of "broader social forces of globalisation and

individualisation that have transformed the nature of community life and civic identities" (Harris & Roose 2013, p. 795) which can lead to DIY forms of governing civic participation locally.

In their cases of two Australian cities, such DIY-citizenship took form of informal talks with peers, cultural projects, or blogs. Similarly, volunteering constitutes an increasingly important element in this discussion on enacting citizenship, which has not yet gained much attention (Artero/Ambrosini, 2022). Artero and Ambrosini's (2022) research on volunteering second generation migrants interrogated whether volunteering is to be considered a political act and can be considered a form of citizenship from below.

Reflected in the literature presented in this section are the various actors involved in such forms of contestation. The next section briefly will briefly dive into the question of what actors can be found in DIY migration governance.

4. Who Does DIY? Actor Constellations in Bottom-Up Urban Migration Governance

From a look at actor constellations in any given city and how they relate to actors at other scales, one is quickly confronted with complexity. To address this complexity, Phillimore et al (2015) explored the ways in which residents in superdiverse urban areas experience and access social services and propose the concept of **welfare bricolage** (Phillimore et al., 2015: 2), meaning the "messy, complex, unexpected forms of everyday strategies that combine, mix and link different resources." (ibid.) These, the authors find, exist in various welfare regimes prompting their new concept of welfare bricolage. Indeed, our review, too, exposes complex actor constellations in DIY migration governance, ranging from networks with varying degrees of organization, residents engaging in civic action, to faith-based or migrant organizations.

Starting with migrant networks and organizations, it is of course migrant groups who practice DIY migration governance in cities. Research on housing in the Bronx presented above has shown the immense importance of ethnic networks the possibility inherent to them to avoid formal housing markets or succeed within them (Usman et al., 2021). Equally engaged with housing questions, research from Athens has provided insights into the active political role newcomers themselves play in keeping autonomous spaces in the city's centre intact (Raimondi, 2019). In the fields of art and culture, migrants actively reshape narratives on (forced) migration, becoming agents of change (see Mekdijan, 2018), governing public opinion.

Faith-based institutions play a crucial role in the spheres of welfare services and health care. Clarke and Jennings (2008, p. 6) define faith-based organizations as "any organization that derives inspiration from and guidance for its activities from the teachings and principles of a faith or from a particular interpretation or school of thought

within a faith." Fiddian-Qasmiyeh (2011, p. 430f.) emphasizes the variety among faith-based organizations and their operation on multiple scales. In the context of (forced) migration, these organizations follow specific goals, depending on the context they act within (ibid.). As such, they act similar to other NGOs participating in the governance of migration locally (Ferris, 2011). Dey (2008) describes in his research how churches can become service provides for migrant groups in Greater Vancouver, where a church struggles to adapt to the increasing diversity in its congregation.

Depending on the context, residents can become crucial actors in DIY migration governance, for example by providing housing or transport. Much work on this stems from the French context where individual action in support of newcomers – apart from and often in opposition to the national government – forms an important part of local migration governance. As put by Roche (2021, para. 1, own translation):

> The city of solidarity – understood as 'hospitable' or 'welcoming' – would be that of the hosts. It is composed of apartments rearranged to provide a new room, of community halls to support newcomers in navigating the dense forest of urban risks and opportunities, of car journeys to medical appointments.

Work from the German context, too, underlines the importance of residents in managing migration locally (see for example Ataç & de Jong, 2020).

That said, while volunteering becomes a growing part of migration management locally and can possibly described as integral part of DIY migration governance, Humphris (2019) criticizes that its independent character is unquestioned. In her work on a downscaled urban area in the UK, she emphasized that their emergence is also the result of economic restructuring and austerity measures. In downscaled places, local governments are often struggling or simply unwilling to provide newcomers with the needed support, leading volunteers to chime in. Humphris argues that such forms of DIY migration governance can reproduce hostile national politics if they are embedded in downscaled urban contexts where the volunteers, too, need support (Humphris, 2019, p. 106).

DIY migration governance, the reviewed literature shows, is formed of various subjectivities, including local, national, and international activists, faith-based groups, migrant organizations, or unorganized residents with and without migration biographies. DIY migration governance spans from the micro to the macro-levels of society, leading to consider such forms of migration governance to form a spectrum ranging from practices by individuals to municipalities supporting or engaging in migration governance from below.

The following section closes this paper by summarizing a set of implications derived from the reviewed literature.

5. Concluding Remarks and Conceptual Implications

Several conceptual implications can be drawn from our discussion of the literature. A non-exhaustive few of them shall be briefly presented in the following.

Firstly, despite a growing debate about the increasing importance of the local in migration governance, central governments continue to be the institutions that determine who is allowed to enter the territory, become a member through citizenship, and under what conditions. Societies further have sets of norms and values newcomers generally are expected to comply with, leading to what Hackl (2022) calls the conditionality of inclusion. In advanced welfare states, it is also central governments that are expected to guarantee that every member of the nation state is provided for regarding their basic needs: for citizens and non-citizens alike (the latter being regulated through international regulations), this is regulated through elaborate systems based on taxation that allow for spendings in favour of those in need, including social benefits, pensions, education, or care. National and local governments, hence, are key institutions in migration governance. Our literature review has pointed out how DIY governance is at odds with this logic and these expectations. DIY migration governance, as the literature review exposed, can be understood in part as a response to failures of the state, as a result of the continuous outsourcing of responsibilities, and the deregulation of markets which set barriers to some, but open spaces for other practices. Research into DIY migration governance must be mindful of the different underlying processes between 'failure', as in the inability or unwillingness to provide social services due to the weakening of welfare systems, and restructuring, that is reconfigurations in who provides services in the contexts under investigation.

Secondly, much of the literature on informality emphasize the need to overcome the dichotomy of formal – that is regulated and often associated to be within legal frameworks and social norms – and informal – often understood as unregulated and outside said legal and social norms. Such an understanding too often associates informality with urban governance in the Global South, considering similar processes in Global North contexts with bottom-up initiatives in urban governance including practices broadly described as everyday urbanism (Devlin, 2018). Such literature also proposes to extend the focus on the differentiated practice of DIY across socio-economic strata (see Devlin, 2018; Roy, 2009; Yiftachel, 2009). A focus on DIY-practices as what Delvin refers to as informality by choice, can help expand the literature by looking at the practices beyond marginalization and poverty, including thus far less investigated processes.

Thirdly, and most crucially, DIY migration governance is at times romanticized, which neglects the inherent challenges to it and that involvement in DIY practices can have ambivalent consequences for participating individuals. This could be seen in Raimondi's (2019) work on migrant squats as political spaces in Athens, where participants still in the process of gaining refugee status expressed concern over their political activism being perceived by authorities as forms of 'trouble making' (ibid., p. 571). It also undermines the powerful political potentials that are inherent to them. More work needs to be done on what Peck and Theodore (2012) refer to as 'regulation from below' by collectives pushing for more inclusive and just regulations affecting migrants in cities and elsewhere.

This paper has demonstrated that the literature continues to be marked by conceptual unclarity, but that emerging literature increasingly problematizes the romanticization of DIY as urban practice. More empirical research is needed to further theorize DIY migration governance, the conditions under which it emerges, and its effects on their urban environments.

6. References

Artero, M., & Ambrosini, M. (2022). Citizenship beyond the normative script: Young immigrants' volunteering as a practice of 'citizenship from below.' *Citizenship Studies*, *26*(2), 203–220.

Atac, I., & de Jong, S. (2020). Begegnungsräume als Orte der Politik: Unterstützungs-initiativen für Geflüchtete in Wien. In K. Binner & K. Scherschel (Eds.), *Fluchtmigration und Gesellschaft. Von Nutzenkalkülen, Solidarität und Exklusion.* (pp. 15–31). Beltz Juventa.

Augustín, Ó. G. & M. B. Jørgensen (2019). Solidarity Cities and Cosmopolitanism from Below: Barcelona as Refugee City. *Social Inclusion* 7(2), pp. 198-207.

Bayat, A. (1997). Un-civil society: The politics of the "informal people." *Third World Quarterly*, *18*(1), 53–72.

Burmann, M., Pérez, M. H., Hoffmann, V., Rhode, C., & Schworm, S. (2018). *Highly Skilled Labour Migration in Europe* (Ifo DICE Report Volume 16; pp. 42–52). ifo.

Campos, R. (2021). Urban art in Lisbon: Opportunities, tensions and paradoxes. *Cultural Trends*, *30*(2), 139–155.

Clarke, G. & M. Jennings (2008). Development, Civil Society and Faith-Based Organizations: Bridging the Sacred and the Secular. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cremaschi, M., Albanese, F., & Artero, M. (2020). Migrants and Refugees: Bottom-Up and DIY Spaces in Italy. *Urban Planning*, *5*(3), 189–199. https://doi.org/10.17645/up.v5i3.2921

Darling, J. (2016). Asylum in Austere Times: Instability, Privatization and Experimentation within the UK Asylum Dispersal System. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *29*(4), 483–505.

Darling, J. (2017). Forced migration and the city: Irregularity, informality, and the politics of presence. *Progress in Human Geography*, *41*(2), 178–198.

de Barros,F. (2012). Bidonvilles: from colonial policy to the Algerian War, Metropolitics, 21 March 2012. translated by Oliver Waine, online: http://www.metropolitiques.eu/Bidonvilles-fromcolonial-policy.html, last accessed 06/04/2023.

del Pozo, J. G. (2017), 'Global social activism, DIY culture and lack of institutional help', Journal of Urban Cultural Studies, 4:3, pp. 427–36, doi: 10.1386/ jucs.4.3.427_1

Devlin, R. T. (2018). Asking 'Third World questions' of First World informality: Using Southern theory to parse needs from desires in an analysis of informal urbanism of the global North. *Planning Theory*, *17*(4), 568–587.

Desai, S., Naudé, W., & Stel, N. (2021). Refugee entrepreneurship: Context and directions for future research. *Small Business Economics*, *56*(3), 933–945.

Douglas, G. C. C. (2018). *The Help-Yourself City: Legitimacy and Inequality in DIY Urbanism*. Oxford University Press. https://academic.oup.com/book/6983?login=true

Eizaguirre, S., & Parés, M. (2019). Communities making social change from below. Social innovation and democratic leadership in two disenfranchised neighbourhoods in Barcelona. *Urban Research & Practice*, *12*(2), 173–191.

Eizenberg, E. (2012). Actually Existing Commons: Three Moments of Space of Community Gardens in New York City. *Antipode*, *44*(3), 764–782.

Roche, É. (2021). L'hébergement citoyen des exilé·es, une zone grise, informalité et territoires solidaires, le cas de la vallée de la Drôme et de la métropole lyonnaise. *Espace populations sociétés. Space populations societies*, *2021/2-3*, Article 2021/2-3.

Ferris, E. (2011). Faith and Humanitarianism: It's Complicated. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *24*(3), 606–625.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E. (2011). Introduction: Faith-Based Humanitarianism in Contexts of Forced Displacement. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *24*(3), 429–439.

Fraser, N. (1990). "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *Social Text,* 25 (26), pp. 56–80.

Grundy, J. & Smith, M. (2005). The politics of multiscalar citizenship: the case of lesbian and gay organizing in Canada, Citizenship Studies, 9(4), pp. 389-404.

Harris, A., & Roose, J. (2013). DIY citizenship amongst young Muslims: Experiences of the 'ordinary.' *Journal of Youth Studies*.

Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *610*(1), 21–44.

Hou, J. (2014). Making and Supporting Community Gardens as Informal Urban Landscapes. In V. Mukhija & A. Loukaitou-Sideris (Eds.), *The Informal American City*. The MIT Press.

Humbphris, R. (2019). Mutating faces of the state? Austerity, migration and faith-based volunteers in a UK downscaled urban context. *The Sociological Review*, 67(1), pp. 95-110.

Isin, E. F. (2008). Theorizing acts of citizenship. In: Isin, E. F. & Nielsen, Greg M. eds. *Acts of Citizenship.* London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 15–43.

Isin, E. F. & M. Saward (Eds) (2013). Enacting European Citizenship. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobs, J. (1961).The Death and Life of Great American Cities. New York: Random House.

Janovicek, N. (2003). "Assisting Our Own": Urban Migration, Self-Governance, and Native Women's Organizing in Thunder Bay, Ontario, 1972-1989. American Indian Quarterly, Vol. 27, No. 3/4.

Jean, M. (2015). The Role of Farming in Place-Making Processes of Resettled Refugees. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, *34*(3), 46–69.

Jónsson, G., Lindmäe, M., Menet, J., & Van Eck, E. (2023). 'ALL EYES ON ME': The (In)Formal Barriers to Market Trade in Europe. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 1468-2427.13158.

Kang, J. H. (2015). Participation in the Community Social Control, the Neighborhood Watch Groups: Individual- and Neighborhood-Related Factors. *Crime & Delinquency*, *61*(2), 188–212.

Kinder, K. (2016), DIY Detroit: Making Do in a City without Services, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kloosterman, R., & Rath, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Immigrant entrepreneurs: Venturing abroad in the age of globalization*. Berg.

Kloosterman, R., van der Leun, J., & Rath, J. (1998). Across the border: Immigrants' economic opportunities, social capital and informal business activities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *24*(2), 249–268.

Kloosterman, R., Van Der Leun, J., & Rath, J. (1999). Mixed Embeddedness: (In)formal Economic Activities and Immigrant Businesses in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *23*(2), 252–266.

Kuvik, A. (2012). Skilled Migration in Europe and Beyond: Recent Developments and Theoretical Considerations in: Martinello, M. & J. Rath (eds.): An Introduction to International Migration Studies (pp. 209-235). IMISCOE Textbooks. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Lefebvre, H. (1992). The Production of Space. New York: Blackwell.

McFarlane, C., & Waibel, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Urban informalities: Reflections on the formal and informal*. Ashgate.

Mekdjian, S. (2018). Urban artivism and migrations. Disrupting spatial and political segregation of migrants in European cities. *Cities*, *77*, 39–48.

Migration Research Hub (2023). Migration Governance. IMISCOE. Online: https://migrationresearch.com/taxonomies/topics-migration-governance, last accessed 26/04/2023.

Neuwirth, R. (2005). Shadow Cities. A Billion Squatters, A New Urban World. New York: Routledge.

Neuwirth, R. (2007). Squatters and the cities of tomorrow. *City*, *11*(1), 71–80.

Nyers, P. & K. Rygiel (2012). Citizenship, Migrant Activism and the Politics of Movement. London: Routledge.

Paskins, J. (2009). Vague Terrain: Bidonvilles, Run-Down Housing, and the Stigmatisation of (Sub)urban Space in and Around Paris in the 1960s. MoveableType, Vol. 5, doi: 10.14324/111.1755-4527.044.

Rashid, L. (2018). *"Call Me a Business Owner, Not a Refugee!" Challenges of and Perspectives on Newcomer Entrepreneurship*. *7*.

Rath, J., & Swagerman, A. (2016). Promoting Ethnic Entrepreneurship in European Cities: Sometimes Ambitious, Mostly Absent, Rarely Addressing Structural Features. *International Migration*, *54*(1), 152–166.

Rath, J. (Ed.). (2002). *Unravelling the rag trade: Immigrant entrepreneurship in seven world cities*. Berg.

Roy, A. (2009). The 21st-century metropolis: New geographies of theory. *Regional Studies* 43(6): 819–830.

Sadikoglu Asan, H., & Ozsoy, A. (2018). The Enduring Influence of Informality in Istanbul: Legalization of Informal Settlements and Urban Transformation. *Berkeley Planning Journal*, *30*(1). https://doi.org/10.5070/BP330137619

Sassen, S. (1997): Informalization in Advanced Market Economies. Geneva: International Labour Office.

Sassen, S. (2009): Cities today: A new frontier for major developments. The Annals of the American Academy 626(November): 53–71.

Scholten, P. (2018). Beyond Migrant Integration Policies. Rethinking the Urban Governance of Migration-Related Diversity. HKJU-CCPA. 18(1), pp. 7-30.

Senthanar, S., MacEachen, E., Premji, S., & Bigelow, P. (2021). Entrepreneurial experiences of Syrian refugee women in Canada: A feminist grounded qualitative study. *Small Business Economics*, *57*(2), 835–847.

Solano, G., Schutjens, V., & Rath, J. (2022). Multifocality and opportunity structure: Towards a mixed embeddedness model for transnational migrant entrepreneurship. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *10*(1), 3. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-021-00270-0

UN (2023). Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable. Online: https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2019/goal-11/, last accessed 10/03/2023.

Usman, M., Maslova, S., & Burgess, G. (2021). Urban informality in the Global North: (Il)legal status and housing strategies of Ghanaian migrants in New York City. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, *21*(2), 247–267.

Vaiou, D., & Stratigaki, M. (2008). From `Settlement' to `Integration': Informal Practices and Social Services for Women Migrants in Athens. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, *15*(2), 119–131.

Varsanyi, M. (Ed.). (2010). *Taking Local Control: Immigration Policy Activism in U.S. Cities and States*. Stanford University Press.

Vertovec S. (2007): Super-diversity and its implications. Ethnic Racial Studies, 30(6), pp. 1024–1054.

Wauters, B., & Lambrecht, J. (2008). Barriers to Refugee Entrepreneurship in Belgium: Towards an Explanatory Model. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *34*(6), 895–915.

Yiftachel, O. (2009). Theoretical notes on "gray cities": The coming of urban apartheid? *Planning Theory* 8(1): 88–100.

Zack, T., & Landau, L. B. (2022). An enclave entrepôt: The informal migration industry and Johannesburg's socio-spatial transformation. *Urban Studies*, *59*(11), 2333–2351.

Zapata-Barrero, R., Caponio, T., & Scholten, P. (2017). Theorizing the 'local turn' in a multi-level governance framework of analysis: A case study in immigrant policies. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *83*(2), 241–246.