



Hackett, S. (2017) 'The 'local turn' in historical perspective: two city case studies in Britain & Germany.' *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 83 (2), pp. 340-357.

Link to official URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0020852315592466>

ResearchSPAce

<http://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/>

This version is made available in accordance with publisher policies.
Please cite only the published version using the reference above.

Your access and use of this document is based on your acceptance of the ResearchSPAce Metadata and Data Policies, as well as applicable law:-

<https://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/policies.html>

Unless you accept the terms of these Policies in full, you do not have permission to download this document.

This cover sheet may not be removed from the document.

Please scroll down to view the document.

The “local turn” in historical perspective: Two city case studies in Britain & Germany

Preferred abbreviated running head: The “local turn” in historical perspective

Abstract

This paper addresses the “local turn” of migration and integration policies in historical perspective in Newcastle upon Tyne and Bremen. It draws upon a wide range of government documentation and offers a comparative assessment of both cities’ policies from the 1960s onwards. It discusses the vertical dimension of policymaking through an exploration of the local governance of migrant integration in relation to the national level. Although Britain and Germany’s post-war immigration histories and political structures have often been perceived as contrasting, this paper reveals a convergence in these cities’ governments’ approaches to their own local diverse societies. These case studies question the long-term impact of overarching national constitutional structures on city-level migration policies. Findings are framed within the local governance and the MLG debates.

Points for practitioners

European cities are increasingly being recognised for the role they play in devising and implementing their own migration and integration policies. Yet very little is known about the relationship between this “local turn” and Multi-level Governance (MLG). Practitioners can learn more about cities’ policymaking processes and the extent to which these have been influenced by national agendas, as well as about how research of a historical and cross-country and cross-city nature can inform the on-going policy debate.

Keywords

Bremen, city-level migration and integration policies, history, Multi-level Governance, Newcastle upon Tyne, political convergence

Introduction

Multi-level governance (MLG) has become a widely used term of late with reference to democracies across the globe. Taken to mean the negotiation of authority between governments at various territorial levels, it is often perceived as an effective way of questioning the role played by central governments, and exposing types of political contributions and influences that a national approach might fail to notice (Bache and Flinders, 2004: 203; Gamble, 2004: v). However, despite its recent popularity within a European context, it is a concept that is deeply embedded within a concrete historical framework comprised of an ever-greater decentralisation that emerged in the years following the Second World War, and culminated in the creation and development of the European Union (Hooghe and Marks, 2001: xi; Piattoni, 2010: 5). Yet a corresponding body of academic research did not emerge in earnest until the 1990s, with Gary Marks' 1992 paper on structural policy within the European Community often identified as a useful starting point. An abundant literature has since developed addressing an array of policy areas including social cohesion, higher education and the environment (Kearns and Forrest, 2000; Piattoni, 2010). Nevertheless, there has long existed a marked absence of inquiry on the topic of migrant policies and especially on the local level thereof (for a few recent studies, see Joppke and Seidle, 2012; Hepburn and Zapata-Barrero, 2014).

This paper has two key aims. Firstly, it will provide an insight into local-level migration and integration policies by exposing the "local turn" in two European cities,¹ Newcastle upon Tyne in the North East of England and Bremen in the North West of Germany. The traditional academic literature has tended to assess and analyse immigration and integration policies in Europe from a national perspective (Joppke, 1999; Geddes, 2003). Whilst studies addressing migration at a local level are certainly

nothing new (Ireland, 1994), it has not been until more recent years that the importance of locality has been recognised. Indeed the content and conclusions of this paper hope to go some way towards furthering the notion that cities and local governments play a critical role in the migration process, as well as building upon the wider renewed interest in comparative urbanism (Østergaard-Nielsen, 2011; Ward, 2008). More specifically, they constitute a response to Nina Glick Schiller and Ayşe Çağlar's calls for scholarship to move beyond 'the ethnic lens' and 'methodological nationalism', and do more to address the relationship that exists between migrants and the cities in which they live, thus constructing 'a comparative theory of locality in migration studies' (2009; 2011).

In doing so, the case studies of Newcastle and Bremen both support and develop some of the key theses proposed in the academic literature, such as Michael Alexander's (2003) aim to expose the often obscured significance of local-level policymaking, Rinus Penninx's (2009) revelation concerning the importance of locality in putting integration policies into effect, and Nina Glick Schiller's (2012) argument that a city's relationship with its migrants is influenced by its policies, economy and history. Furthermore, they uncover the "local turn's" previously unexplored historical context, demonstrating not only that the local dimension to migration policies is nothing new, but also the extent to which past policy has shaped recent and contemporary government agendas.

This paper's second objective is to further the small, yet growing, number of MLG studies that focus on migration. Although progress has certainly been made in recent years (Zincone and Caponio, 2006; Scholten, 2013), little attention has been awarded to the consequences the "local turn" has on the multi-level governance of migration and integration policies. Whilst the important role the local level can play

has been recognised by the European Union through a series of municipal networks and research programmes, including EUROCITIES and the Council of Europe's Intercultural Cities, the academic sphere is still catching up. It is this paper's hypothesis that an analysis of the "local turn" can offer an in-depth understanding of both how and why cities react to the challenges of migration and integration, as well as provide an insight into the relationship between the local and national levels of government.

Newcastle and Bremen are pertinent case studies for a number of reasons. Firstly, although overwhelmingly neglected in the academic literature despite being home to well-established ethnic minority communities (for a few exceptions, see Taylor, 1976; Çil, 2002), both have long been active agents with regards to immigrant policies. Both cities' local governments have adopted a proactive and conscientious approach to immigrant integration. In Newcastle, measures and strategies have largely been directed at South Asian migrants whilst, in Bremen, they have mainly been implemented with the initial Turkish guest-workers and subsequent settled Turkish community in mind. Secondly, these case studies expose the fact that, whilst recent and contemporary examples are often more familiar, the role played by cities in migrants' experiences and levels of integration is certainly nothing new to the twenty-first century. Thirdly, a historical insight into Newcastle and Bremen's policies enables an exploration of the local-level impact of these cities' different overarching systems of intergovernmental relations as a result of Britain's position as a unitary state and Germany's as a federal one. Lastly, a study of Newcastle and Bremen also complements the small body of literature that addresses migrant integration at a local level in Britain and Germany, whilst constituting a unique comparative and historical

perspective (for works that use British and German cities as case studies, see Garbaye 2004; Ireland, 2004).

The following section will provide an insight into the content and aims of Newcastle and Bremen's policies within the socio-economic dimension of integration. This assessment will comprise employment, housing and education sector policies from the 1960s onwards, and offer a glimpse into both cities' overarching approaches to diversity and integration. Following this, the paper will discuss the vertical dimension of policymaking through an assessment of the local governance of migrant integration in relation to the national level. After briefly making suggestions regarding the city-level characteristics that have played a role in triggering a "local turn" in both cities, it will lastly frame findings within the local governance and MLG research frameworks.

Newcastle & Bremen: histories, localities, government systems & migration policies

During the post-1945 period, Newcastle and Bremen pertained to distinct immigration frameworks, and were the recipients of migrant groups of different ethnic backgrounds and dimensions. Whilst never being renowned in Britain for the size of its ethnic minority communities, Newcastle experienced an influx of South Asian migrants, the majority of whom arrived with the intention of settling for the long-term. Over the decades, the city has witnessed the formation of substantial Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities which, according to the 2001 Census, measured by ethnicity, stood at 3,093, 4,847 and 2,612 respectively.ⁱⁱ In Bremen, companies recruited guest-workers during the 1960s and early 1970s from countries including Italy, Spain and Turkey. Whilst it was originally believed that they would not remain in the city longer than the duration of their initial short-term employment

contracts, Bremen was soon home to sizeable migrant communities that had their origins in the guest-worker years. By 2009, 150,626 out of 547,685 residents in Bremen had a migration background of which 36,406 were of Turkish origin and constituted by far the largest ethnic group.ⁱⁱⁱ

Despite the inherent differences in their political migration structures and ethnic minority communities, Newcastle and Bremen are cities that allow for an effective and pertinent historical comparative multi-level governance study for numerous reasons. Firstly, and most importantly for providing an assessment of the policy-making process, these case studies constitute a combined cross-country and cross-city comparison, something that has been overwhelmingly absent from both general research on MLG and local governance, as well as that addressing immigrant policies specifically. As a result of the archival material that exists for both cities, the study of Newcastle and Bremen enables an assessment of the extent to which the implementation of local government policy on migration has been influenced by Britain and Germany's inherently different multi-level government structures. Operating within what is the highly centralized British unitary state, Newcastle City Council's approach to migration has traditionally had to take national policy directives and legislation into account. To the contrary, due to Germany's federal structure as well as its position as a city-state, Bremen's local government has had the freedom to devise its own particular migration policies.

Secondly, these cities share a similar economic history in that they were major European ports, had economies dedicated to basic manufacturing and both have struggled to adjust to the post-industrial era. Indeed from the seventeenth century onwards, Newcastle's identity was shaped by industries such as coalmining and shipping, whilst Bremen's revolved around steel and wool textile production and ship

construction (Colls and Lancaster, 2005; Power, Plöger and Winkler, 2010). Thus, these similar economic histories and structures enable a comparison between two comparable cities.

Thirdly, there are similarities between Newcastle and Bremen's migration histories. Despite both cities' histories of immigration often being overshadowed in the academic literature, Newcastle's by that of South Shields, a neighbouring coastal town renowned for its Yemeni community that began forming in the late 1800s (Lawless, 1995), and Bremen's by its own historic role as an emigration port, both have considerable traditions of receiving migrant groups (Armstrong, 1991). Newcastle and the wider North East region, for example, have a history of Black settlement that dates back to at least the early 1700s, and experienced an influx of Irish and Welsh migrants during the mid-1800s (Allen and Allen 2007; Creighton 2008). Bremen's migration history includes the settlement of French Huguenots during the late 1600s, and Poles and Croats during the late 1800s (Barfuss, 1995: 201; Hoerder, 2002: 296). Fourthly, it has been argued that both Newcastle and Bremen are home to strong regional identities, with the academic literature asserting that Newcastle is at the centre of a region that has historically been a welcoming host to minority groups (Renton, 2007), whilst Bremen's particular identity has derived from its political, economic and social distinctiveness (Buse, 1993; Ulrich, 2003). As well as constituting a further reason why these two cities are indeed comparable, these identities help further test the notion that a city's relationship with its migrants is influenced by its history.

Employment, housing and education are at the centre of this study because they are areas to which both Newcastle and Bremen's governments have awarded a significant level of attention throughout the post-1960s period (see also *****, 2013).

With regards to the employment of South Asians, Newcastle's local authority has traditionally concentrated largely on entrepreneurship, stressing the need to encourage business formation, and suggesting measures such as enhanced security and support procedures. Other proposals and initiatives have included the establishment of an "Asia Town", a zone that it was hoped would act as an equivalent to the city's Chinatown, a business forum intended to constitute a support mechanism for migrant businessmen, and a project aimed at advancing socio-economic independence amongst ethnic minorities through self-employment. Newcastle's local government has gone some way to addressing other types of employment, expressing concern over the small number of ethnic minorities employed in the city's public sector, for example. Yet entrepreneurship remained at the centre of the city's political deliberations concerning South Asians in the local labour market ((T)yne & (W)ear (A)rchives (S)ervice, January 1986; TWAS, 16 March 1988; TWAS, 17 April 1998).

Regarding housing, Newcastle's local authority's policies and aims have included improving the monitoring of the council housing allocation system and preventing racial harassment. One key area of focus was the city's Bengali community, which was portrayed as the least integrated, and as suffering poor housing conditions and racial harassment in certain neighbourhoods. Proposed solutions included the prioritising of complaints from Bengali families, the replacement of windows broken as a result of racist attacks and the removal of racist graffiti, as well as having a higher police presence on the estates in question and improving the support available to victims. Racial harassment remained an area of focus with regards to all ethnic minority communities in the city, with the local government investigating and exposing the extent to which attacks took place on individual properties, on local streets and in neighbourhoods. Another area of

importance for Newcastle's local authority from the mid-1980s onwards was ethnic minorities' access to council housing. Measures have included an improved monitoring system, staff training, an allocation scheme aimed at addressing overcrowding, and an attempt to work closer with local community groups with regards to housing management and investment (TWAS, 31 May 1984; TWAS, November 1984; TWAS, February 1997).

Regarding education, there existed an awareness already during the 1960s concerning the concentration of migrant pupils in certain schools in Newcastle and the lack of proficiency in the English language amongst a proportion of them. The council's approach was to avoid special reception centres, opting instead to mainstream ethnic minority schoolchildren, and offer special training courses to teachers. The mid-1980s witnessed the council supporting a multicultural education that was to both meet the requirements of ethnic minority pupils and prepare all children in the city for a multi-racial future. Schools were expected to review their policies and learning materials for racist content; an understanding of different cultures was to be promoted amongst schoolchildren; ethnic minority parents were encouraged to become involved in their children's schools; an effective monitoring system for the recording of racist incidents in schools was to be introduced; mother-tongue teaching was to take place in both primary and secondary schools alongside additional tuition in English; and there was an intention to hire more teachers from an ethnic minority background. The 1990s also saw the council continue to implement schemes in schools with large numbers of ethnic minority pupils and language problems, and focus on combatting racial harassment (TWAS, 5 December 1967; TWAS, January 1986; TWAS, 5 November 1996).

Bremen's local government's policies initially followed a very different trajectory to Newcastle's. Regarding employment, like across Germany, there were a number of companies in Bremen that partook in the guest-worker recruitment scheme and, as has come to be expected, cases of work-related health problems, low wages and discrimination were not uncommon. Yet, on the whole, a proactive and progressive approach was adopted in the city. Whilst guest-workers were appreciated for their economic value, Bremen's government also encouraged their integration. The aims and policies that emerged from this approach shaped the June 1979 *Konzeption zur Integration der ausländischen Arbeitnehmer und ihrer Familienangehörigen im Lande Bremen*, Bremen's pioneering collection of concepts and proposals regarding the integration of its migrant communities in the post-war period, which acted as the foundation for government measures during subsequent decades. In more recent years, Bremen's local authority has begun to implement measures addressing ethnic minority businesses, including advisory services, and the availability of information in mother tongues regarding economic support and business foundation ((S)taatsarchiv (B)remen, 7,2121/1-712; Bremische Bürgerschaft Landtag 16. Wahlperiode, Drucksache 16/262).

The housing sector in Bremen initially mirrored that of employment in that, whilst the guest-workers' experiences were sometimes marred by incidents of overcrowding and poor living conditions, there was a clear commitment in the city to meet their housing needs. The residential integration of guest-workers was awarded a firm place on Bremen's political agenda. As was the case with employment, the government also adopted a two-pronged approach regarding housing: whilst integration was to be pursued, guest-workers were not expected to abandon their identities nor the chance that they might eventually return "home". Once again, the

1979 *Konzeption* acted as the foundation for successive policies, and outlined measures aimed to offer migrants reasonably priced housing, safeguard them against racism and prejudice, and provide them with the same residential opportunities as their German counterparts. The 1980s witnessed Bremen's government attempting to both improve migrants' quality of housing, and combat residential concentration through property modernization and renovation projects. In recent years, housing has continued to be at the centre of migrant policy in the city, with a large emphasis being placed on improving both the quality of ethnic minority housing and neighbourhoods by increasing their participation in residential developments, through individual projects and programmes, and by promoting integration at a neighbourhood level by encouraging more involvement between migrants and individual city districts (SB, 4,130/4–250; SB, 4,63/2N-284; Die Senatorin für Soziales, Kinder, Jugend und Frauen, February 2008).

Bremen's local government's approach to education was different to those regarding employment and housing in that, as a result of the guest-worker scheme's framework, it was initially believed that any type of provision for children was unnecessary. Yet by the mid-1960s, despite the fact that Bremen was home to far fewer migrant schoolchildren than many German cities, the government began focusing heavily on their education and learning needs, stressing that they were entitled to the same educational opportunities as their German counterparts. During the 1960s and 1970s, the aim was to integrate migrant pupils as quickly as possible by mainstreaming them, dispersing them across the city, and promoting a rapid acquisition of the German language. Measures, many of which were outlined in the 1979 *Konzeption*, also revolved around encouraging kindergarten and school attendance, using translators to help teachers and pupils, training for both German and

ethnic minority teachers, after-school homework support and social activities, and ways in which schoolchildren could learn both the German language and maintain their mother tongues simultaneously. These objectives were reinforced by the government's concerns and policies of the 1980s and 1990s, which continued to centre upon intensive German language tuition, kindergarten attendance and ethnic minority pupil concentration, as well as extend to vocational training, and youth and social work. Education has remained a key aspect of migration policies in Bremen during the 2000s, and continues to be perceived as essential for the integration of ethnic minority children as well as their families and communities (SB, 4,111/5–2276; SB, 4,124/3–4; SB, 4,124/3–5; Bremische Bürgerschaft Landtag 15. Wahlperiode, Drucksache 15/447).

The vertical dimension: the local governance of migrant integration in relation to the national level

The vertical dimension is central to MLG research both within and beyond the area of immigrant policies (see Bache, 2008; Hepburn and Zapata-Barrero, 2014). Taken as referring to the relationship and linkage between higher and lower levels of government, an overview of Newcastle and Bremen's governments' approaches to migration during the post-1960s period examines the vertical dimension through an assessment of the extent to which their policies have been influenced and shaped by national frameworks. This investigation complements numerous other studies that have assessed the relationship between the local and national levels both in unitary states like Denmark (Bak Jørgensen, 2012) and the Netherlands (Scholten, 2013), as well as in a number of federal countries, including Belgium (Martiniello, 2013). It demonstrates that, not only have Newcastle and Bremen long been home to an abundance of distinctly local migration policies, but also questions the notion that

city-level policies are constructed according to their overarching national settings of centre-periphery relations.

There is no doubt that certain national influences have been witnessed in both cities. For example, Newcastle City Council's focus on its own position as an employer of ethnic minority communities was largely driven by the 1976 Race Relations Act and the 1982 guidelines for local authorities issued by the Commission for Racial Equality (TWAS, November 1984: 3, 5; TWAS, March 1988). The 1976 Race Relations Act and the Commission for Racial Equality also played a role in promoting the increased level of attention awarded to the housing of ethnic minorities in Newcastle from the early to mid-1980s onwards as did the anti-racist movement of the 1970s, and the 1981 urban disturbances and subsequent Scarman Report (TWAS, 10 October 1984: 1; TWAS, 20 January 1988: 1-2).^{iv}

Similarly, the political approach to the education of migrant schoolchildren in the city reflected the national government's legislative trajectory, with the assimilationist position of the 1960s and early 1970s being replaced by the multicultural outlook of the 1980s following the publication of both the 1981 Rampton Report and the 1985 Swann Report (for an overview of national policies, see Tomlinson, 2008). Furthermore, it is essential to also appreciate that all of Newcastle's policies concerning the South Asian ethnic minority communities were implemented against the backdrop of Britain's post-war colonial immigration history in which long-term settlement was overwhelmingly expected.

As might be anticipated, as a result of the German federal system, Bremen's policies have arguably been impacted less by national factors and mandate than Newcastle's. Nevertheless, national influences have certainly existed. Company barrack accommodation, for example, had to adhere to the same guidelines as those

throughout Germany with regards to the space and conditions that guest-workers were entitled to, and education policies were at least partially shaped by the *Ständige Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik* or KMK, a political body that advised on policies (SB, 4,92/2–382; SB, 4,111/5–2268; for a brief outline of the KMK's recommendations, see Klopp, 2002: 104-105). Moreover, the measures introduced in Bremen were also heavily influenced by West Germany's post-war guest-worker political paradigm and reflected the inherent uncertainty that existed regarding the future of guest-workers in the city.

However, by no means should Newcastle and Bremen be perceived as a British and German microcosm respectively. To the contrary, whilst national influences have unquestionably filtered down to impact policies in both cities, local particularism has prevailed. Whilst it should not be surprising that Bremen, a German city-state, devised its own particular political approach to migration following the abandonment of the guest-worker model, this is certainly to be less expected from Newcastle, a city whose government has operated within Britain's highly centralised state. Yet there have been numerous instances of a local governance turn in relation to immigrant policies in both cities.

For example, during the mid-1980s, Newcastle's Housing Management Committee perceived itself as having a better structured and more effective council housing allocation system with regards to ethnic minority communities than that in the London borough of Hackney as described in a report issued by the Commission for Racial Equality. Furthermore, Newcastle's local authority's progressive approach is seen in that it had already implemented all of the report's recommendations to some extent (TWAS, 8 February 1984). What is perhaps a more pertinent example of Newcastle's government formulating its own immigrant policies was witnessed in the

education sector. Not only did it reject the policy advocating the dispersal of ethnic minority schoolchildren during the 1960s, but it also challenged certain aspects of the 1985 Swann Report and disregarded its condemnation of language centres for pupils for whom English was a second language, for example (TWAS, 5 December 1967; TWAS, undated).

In Bremen, local autonomy has been even more apparent. The 1979 *Konzeption* has been recognized as having been very innovative and forward-thinking compared to other federal states' equivalents (Ireland, 2004: 90), and the local government's early and persistent attempts to promote the integration of the city's Turkish community constituted a resistance to the national government policy that Ulrich Herbert notoriously termed '*zukunftsblind*' or 'blind to the future' (1986: 232, 234). Furthermore, it was once again the education sector that best exposed Bremen's local determination, with the local authority adopting a different approach to that witnessed in other states, such as Bavaria and Berlin (Rist, 1978), through its aim to mainstream ethnic minority pupils, promote a quick learning of the German language and permit the maintaining of mother tongues. On the whole, Bremen was certainly a city in which what Maren Borkert and Wolfgang Bosswick have described as Germany's 'uneven relationship between national reluctance to consider itself a country of immigration and the pragmatic response to migrants' needs on the local level' was played out (2007: 22).

As is to be expected, differences have existed between Newcastle and Bremen's governments' policies. For example, Bremen's political debate began already during the 1960s and remained both dynamic and persistent, whilst Newcastle's did not fully materialise until the 1980s and resulted in fewer and more sporadic measures. Additionally, Newcastle's local authority concentrated on ethnic

minority entrepreneurship far sooner than Bremen's, the council housing debate that played such a role in Newcastle never featured in Bremen and, unlike was the case in Newcastle, all of Bremen's policies during the 1960s and 1970s were marred by a sense of uncertainty over whether Turks would remain in the city or return to the "homeland".

Yet despite these differences, similarities have progressively developed between the migration policies implemented in both cities across the post-1960s period. Not only have both Newcastle and Bremen traditionally promoted the integration of ethnic minority schoolchildren through a variety of measures, including training for teachers and language instruction, but Bremen's approach regarding the employment and housing sectors has also increasingly mirrored that of Newcastle once the initial restraints of the guest-worker years had evaporated. In other words, once former Turkish guest-workers and their families became independent agents on the city's labour and housing markets, Bremen's government gradually began to implement policies and measures that had been employed in Newcastle for some time, such as those regarding entrepreneurship and the amelioration of migrants' housing conditions.

This convergence is undoubtedly the most unforeseen result to emerge from this research. Despite the fact that Britain and Germany are countries that are characterized by inherently different institutional systems of relations between centre and periphery as a result of their statuses as a unitary and federal state respectively, Newcastle and Bremen's city governments have, in the long term, adopted a similar approach to migration. This cross-national perspective demonstrates that two different institutional settings of centre-periphery relations have not had the distinct impacts on city-level policies that might be expected, thus eroding the notion that local

authorities operate firmly within the mandate of their overarching national governments (Agranoff, 2013: 2).

Whilst there exists a body of literature that recognises that a convergence in some aspects of local migration policy and policymaking has taken place (Penninx and Martiniello, 2004: 152-157; and Borkert et al., 2007), this paper's findings shift existing research in new directions. Rather than argue that the merging of local migration policies is a recent phenomenon caused primarily by the process of Europeanisation or that it is merely a consequence of wider policy convergence at a national level (Penninx, 2009; Adam and Jacobs, 2014), it reveals how, in Newcastle and Bremen, a convergence of policies has increasingly evolved across the post-1960s period in spite of often diverging national-level models and agendas. This convergence has transpired as a result of the fact that, in both Newcastle and Bremen, the vertical dimension of migrant integration policy governance has progressively followed a "bottom-up" rather than "top-down" trajectory. In other words, both cities have been experiencing a local governance turn in the area of immigrant policies for quite some time. Furthermore, this "local turn" has been so consistent and compelling in both cities that it has often rendered their differing overarching national constitutional structures practically irrelevant.

Whilst it is evident that the local level has long played a prominent role in the devising and implementing of migration policies in both Newcastle and Bremen, it proves harder to assert why this local governance turn emerged as early and as persuasively as it did in both cities. It is certainly a possibility that cities with comparable economic histories and structures respond to migrant integration in a similar way, and this is a potential correlation that is in need of further investigation. Yet it is Newcastle and Bremen's strong regional identities that have been awarded

academic attention. I have previously cast doubts over the aforementioned “welcoming host” hypothesis regarding Newcastle (*****, 2009), yet this theory has been repeatedly endorsed, the support for which includes the successful manner Irish migrants became integrated and Blacks were treated during the 1800s, and the notion that Martin Luther King Jr. encountered a city proud of its reputation for positive race relations during his 1967 visit (Cooter, 2005; Todd, 1987: 23; Ward, 1995). Indeed Newcastle’s government’s political deliberations, policies and measures have been proactive and reflected a desire to integrate the city’s South Asian communities, in no way warranting the criticism endowed upon other local authorities in Britain (for example, see Rex and Moore, 1967).

Bremen is a city that has distinguished itself through its position as an international shipping and trading centre, was perceived as being different from the other German cities captured by the Allies, and grasped onto its distinct Hanseatic history in order to preserve its identity during its post-Second World War recovery (Buse, 1993, 2002). It appears as though Bremen has drawn upon this history and identity in order to construct a progressive political agenda with regards to migration during the post-1945 period. Indeed, in addition to the aforementioned acclaim received for the 1979 *Konzeption*, Bremen has also been widely recognised for its ethnic minorities’ integration and positive experiences both in school and in one of the city’s shipbuilding companies (SB, 7,2121/1-712, 8 August 1973; unknown author, 1973; unknown author 1979). The city has long taken a great pride in the position of its migrants, with the mayor during the 1970s, for example, stressing that the ample provisions available for guest-workers and their families distinguished Bremen from other German states (SB, 4,63/2N-284, undated interview). Overall, Bremen’s government’s approach has been one that has eagerly encouraged the

integration of the city's Turkish community, escaping the widespread criticism that has been lavished upon policy in Germany at both a national and local level (for some of the debates, see Klusmeyer and Papademetriou, 2009).

Conclusion: the local governance and MLG research perspectives

This is a time at which it is being recognised that local governments play an active role in the migration policymaking process, and are capable of implementing local policies in response to local issues, problems, needs and settings (Alexander, 2007; Caponio and Borkert, 2010). Furthermore, the EU is currently endorsing a number of networks and research programs in an attempt to establish a stronger relationship between the EU- and the local-level of government. As such, the historical relevance of the local turn presented here should be of interest to migration specialists, scholars of local governance and MLG, and practitioners for a number of reasons.

It is evident that the local dimension has played a role in shaping Newcastle and Bremen's migration policies. As has been argued to be the case in recent years in Birmingham, Lille, Amsterdam and Berlin, amongst other cities, both have witnessed a clear local-level approach to their ethnic minority communities (Garbaye, 2000; Vermeulen and Stotijn, 2010). Yet whilst the local governance turn is overwhelmingly portrayed as still being an emerging phenomenon largely triggered by the recent appreciation of the part the local level can play in addressing current social issues (Bache, 2008; Piattoni, 2009), there is no doubt that it has established historical roots in the area of immigrant policies in Newcastle and Bremen. Indeed, the local dimension in the past has acted as the foundation for more recent and contemporary integration policies regarding employment, housing, education, as well as diversity and integration more widely in both cities. Even during periods of

austerity and anti-immigrant popular sentiment in more recent years, Newcastle and Bremen's policies have been characterised by a sense of continuity and commitment (Die Senatorin für Soziales, Kinder, Jugend und Frauen, February 2008; Newcastle City Council, June 2008). Thus, the historical perspective enables a more comprehensive understanding of individual policies and the wider policymaking process, something that has yet to be recognised either in the debate on the "local turn" in the area of migration policies or in the local governance literature more widely.

Furthermore, the exposure of the local governance turn in both cities in historical perspective offers an insight into its consequences on MLG governance through an assessment of the way in which these local governments have reacted to the challenges of migration, as well as of the relationship between the national and local levels. In neither city do the traditional British and German "national models of integration" adequately capture the way in which immigrant policies have developed across the post-1960s period (Joppke, 1999; Hansen, 2000; Panayi, 2000). Whilst Newcastle and Bremen's initial policies were often deeply entrenched in national-level legislation and integration philosophies, this paper reveals that national and local immigrant policies have gradually become 'two worlds apart' (Poppelaars and Scholten, 2008), with a wealth of distinctly local strategies and approaches increasingly emerging in both cities.

This vertical fragmentation between national- and local-level migration policies found in both unitary Britain and federal Germany is in itself justification for the developing body of research on MLG in this area. In Newcastle and Bremen, city authorities have long done much more than merely enforce national directive. To the contrary, there does indeed appear to exist a local dimension to migration

policymaking that is more accommodating and practical in nature. The configuration of the local dimension in both cities has been driven by city-level determinants, including particular histories and identities, a sense of pride and achievement regarding the implementation of proactive and considered immigrant policies, and a set of local dilemmas and concerns.

The increasing convergence that has evolved between both cities' policies across the post-1960s period is testament to just how resilient this local dimension has been. In sum, regarding the vertical dimension, Newcastle and Bremen's migration policymaking has been characterized by an ever-diminishing negotiation between the local and national levels than by actual effective MLG interactions. Although some progress has been made, additional studies of a historical and cross-country and cross-city nature are needed. Research that adopts an alternative methodology, such as by considering a city that lacks a history of migrant inclusion, for example, would further extend our understanding of the local governance turn in the area of immigrant policies and the consequences this has for future MLG relations.

-
1. The "local turn" refers to the notion that local governments are increasingly playing a role in the devising and implementation of migrant integration and diversity policies (Alexander, 2007; Caponio and Borkert, 2010).
 2. These statistics have been provided by the Office for National Statistics (ONS).
 3. These figures have been provided by the Statistisches Landesamt Bremen (Bremen's Statistical Land Office).

-
4. The Scarman Report was the result of the investigation into the 1981 riots in numerous British cities. It concluded that they had been generated by long-term issues, including a general mistrust in the police and poor social conditions amongst ethnic minority communities.

References

- Adam I and Jacobs D (2014) Divided on immigration, two models for integration. The multilevel governance of immigration and integration in Belgium. In: Hepburn E and Zapata-Barrero R (eds) *The Politics of Immigration in Multi-Level States: Governance and Political Parties*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 65-85.
- Agranoff R (2013) Local governments in multilevel systems: Emergent public administration challenges. *The American Review of Public Administration* 44(4): 47-62.
- Alexander M (2003) Local policies toward migrants as an expression of host-stranger relations: a proposed typology. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29(3): 411-430.
- Alexander M (2007) *Cities and Labour Immigration: Comparing Policy Responses in Amsterdam, Paris, Rome and Tel Aviv*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Allen J and Allen R (2007) Competing identities: Irish and Welsh migration and the North East of England, 1851-1980. In: Green A and Pollard A (eds) *Regional Identities in North-East England, 1300-2000*. Woodbridge: Boydell, pp. 133-160.
- Armgor A (1991) *Bremen, Bremerhaven, New York: Geschichte der europäischen Auswanderung über die bremischen Häfen*. Bremen: Verlag Steintor.

-
- Bache I (2008) *Europeanization and Multilevel Governance: Cohesion Policy in the European Union and Britain*. Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bache I and Flinders M (2004) Conclusions and implications. In: Bache I and Flinders M (eds) *Multi-level Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 195-206.
- Bak Jørgensen M (2012) The diverging logics of integration policy making at national and city level. *International Migration Review* 46(1): 244-278.
- Barfuss K (1995) Foreign workers in and around Bremen, 1884-1918. In: Hoerder D and Nagler J (eds) *People in Transit: German Migrations in Comparative Perspective, 1820-1930*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 201-224.
- Borkert M and Bosswick W (2007) Migration policy-making in Germany – between national reluctance and local pragmatism? *IMISCOE Working Paper* 20.
- Borkert M, Bosswick W, Heckmann F and Lüken-Klaßen D (2007) *Local Integration Policies for Migrants in Europe*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Bremische Bürgerschaft Landtag 15. Wahlperiode, Drucksache 15/447, ‘Antrag der Fraktion Bündnis 90/Die Grünen. Zehn-Punkte-Programm zur Integration von Zuwanderern im Lande Bremen: Konkret handeln – gemeinsame Zukunft gestalten’, 8 September 2000.
- Bremische Bürgerschaft Landtag 16. Wahlperiode, Drucksache 16/262, ‘Mitteilung des Senats vom 25. Mai 2004. Das wirtschaftliche Potenzial von Unternehmern und Existenzgründern mit Migrationshintergrund’.
- Buse D (1993) Urban and national identity: Bremen, 1860-1920. *Journal of Social History* 26(3): 521-537.

-
- Buse D (2002) Federalism and identity: Bremen, 1945–1960s. *Debatte: Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe* 10(1): 33-50.
- Çağlar A and Glick Schiller N (2011) Introduction: migrants and cities. In: Glick Schiller N and Çağlar A (eds) *Locating Migration: Rescaling Cities and Migrants*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 1-22.
- Caponio T and Borkert M (eds) (2010) *The Local Dimension of Migration Policymaking*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Çil H (2002) *Anfänge einer Epoche: Ehemalige türkische Gastarbeiter erzählen*. Berlin: Verlag Hans Schiler.
- Colls R and Lancaster B (2005) *Geordies: Roots of Regionalism*. Newcastle upon Tyne: University of Northumbria Press.
- Cooter R (2005) *When Paddy Met Geordie: The Irish in County Durham and Newcastle, 1840–1880*. Sunderland: Sunderland University Press.
- Creighton S (2008) Black people and the North East. *North East History* 39: 11-24.
- Der Senat der Freien Hansestadt Bremen (June 1979) *Konzeption zur Integration der ausländischen Arbeitnehmer und ihrer Familienangehörigen im Lande Bremen*.
- Die Senatorin für Soziales, Kinder, Jugend und Frauen (February 2008) *Konzeption zur Integration von Zuwanderern und Zuwanderinnen im Lande Bremen 2007– 2011, Grundsätze, Leitbilder und Handlungsziele für die bremische Integrationspolitik*.
- Freie Hansestadt Bremen Statistische Monatsberichte (June 1977) *Die Beschäftigung ausländischer Arbeitnehmer im Lande Bremen, 29. Jahrgang*.
- Gamble A (2004) Foreword. In: Bache I and Flinders M (eds) *Multi-level Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. v-vii.
- Garbaye R (2000) Ethnic minorities, cities, and institutions: a comparison of the modes of management of ethnic diversity of a French and a British city. In:

Koopmans R and Statham P (eds) *Challenging Immigration and Ethnic Relations Politics: Comparative European Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 283-311.

Garbaye R (2004) Ethnic minority local councillors in French and British cities: social determinants and political opportunity structures. In: Penninx R, Kraal K, Martiniello M and Vertovec S (eds) *Citizenship in European Cities: Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 39-56.

Geddes A (2003) *The Politics of Migration and Immigration in Europe*. London: SAGE.

Glick Schiller N (2012) A comparative relative perspective on the relationships between migrants and cities. *Urban Geography* 33(6): 879-903.

Glick Schiller N and 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.

***** S (2009) The Asian of the north: immigrant experiences and the importance of regional identity in Newcastle upon Tyne during the 1980s. *Northern History* 46(2): 293-311.

***** S (2013) *Foreigners, Minorities and Integration: The Muslim Immigrant Experience in Britain & Germany*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Hansen R (2000) *Citizenship and Immigration in Post-war Britain: The Institutional Origins of a Multicultural Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hepburn E and Zapata-Barrero R (2014) (eds) *The Politics of Immigration in Multi-level States: Governance and Political Parties*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Herbert U (1986) *Geschichte der Ausländerbeschäftigung in Deutschland 1880 bis 1980. Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter, Gastarbeiter*. Bonn: Dietz.

-
- Hoerder D (2002) *Cultures in Contact: World Migrations in the Second Millennium*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Hooghe L and Marks G (2001) *Multi-level Governance and European Integration*. Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Ireland P (1994) *The Policy Challenge of Ethnic Diversity: Immigrant Politics in France and Switzerland*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ireland P (2004) *Becoming Europe: Immigration, Integration, and the Welfare State*. Pittsburgh PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Joppke C (1999) *Immigration and the Nation-State: The United States, Germany, and Great Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Joppke C and Seidle F (2012) (eds) *Immigrant Integration in Federal Countries*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Kearns A and Forrest R (2000) Social cohesion and multilevel urban governance. *Urban Studies* 37(5-6): 995-1017.
- Klopp B (2002) *German Multiculturalism: Immigrant Integration and the Transformation of Citizenship*. Westport CT: Praeger.
- Klusmeyer D and Papademetriou D (2009) *Immigration Policy in the Federal Republic of Germany: Negotiating Membership and Remaking the Nation*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Lawless R (1995) *From Ta'izz to Tyneside: An Arab Community in the North-East of England during the Early Twentieth Century*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Marks G (1992) Structural policy in the European Community. In: Sbragia A (ed) *Euro-Politics: Institutions and Policymaking in the "New" European Community*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution, pp. 191-224.

-
- Martiniello M (2013) Immigrant integration and multiculturalism in Belgium. In: Taras R (ed) *Challenging Multiculturalism: European Models of Diversity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 120-37.
- Newcastle City Council (June 2008) *Community Cohesion Strategy*.
- Østergaard-Nielsen E (2011) Codevelopment and citizenship: the nexus between policies on local migrant incorporation and migrant transnational practices in Spain. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(1): 20-39.
- Panayi P (2000) *Ethnic Minorities in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Germany: Jews, Gypsies, Poles, Turks and Others*. Harlow: Longman.
- Penninx R (2009) Vergleichende Studien zu Integrationspolitiken europäischer Städte. In: Gesemann F and Roth R (eds) *Lokale Integrationspolitik in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft – Migration und Integration als Herausforderung von Kommunen*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 611-633.
- Penninx R and Martiniello M (2004) Integration processes and policies: state of the art and lessons. In: Penninx R, Kraal K, Martiniello M and Vertovec S (eds) *Citizenship in European Cities: Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 139-163.
- Piattoni S (2009) Multi-level governance: a historical and conceptual analysis. *Journal of European Integration* 31(2): 163-180.
- Piattoni S (2010) *The Theory of Multi-level Governance: Conceptual, Empirical, and Normative Challenges*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Poppelaars C and Scholten P (2008) Two worlds apart. The divergence of national and local immigrant policies in the Netherlands. *Administration & Society* 40(4): 335-357.

Power A, Plöger, J and Winkler A (2010) *Phoenix Cities: The Fall and Rise of Great Industrial Cities*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Renton D (2007) *Colour Blind?: Race and Migration in North East England since 1945*. Sunderland: University of Sunderland Press.

Rex J and Moore R (1967) *Race, Community and Conflict: A Study of Sparkbrook*. London: Published for the Institute of Race Relations by Oxford University Press.

Rist R (1978) *Guestworkers in Germany: The Prospects for Pluralism*. New York: Praeger.

Scholten P (2013) Agenda dynamics and the multi-level governance of intractable controversies: the case of migrant integration policies in the Netherlands. *Policy Sciences* 46(3): 217-236.

(S)taatsarchiv (B)remen 4,130/4–250, Orts- und Wohnungshygiene – Wohnunterkünfte für ausländischer Arbeiter 1962–1975.

SB 4,111/5–2268, Beschulung der Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer –KMK – Rundschreiben (Mitteilungen, Beschlüsse) Bd. 1 1964–1971.

SB 4,111/5–2276, Beschulung der Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer – Regelung in Bremen: Allgemeines 1965–1976.

SB 7,2121/1–712, Sammlung von Schriftgut zur Beschäftigung, Unterbringung und Lage der ausländischen Arbeiter auf dem Vulkan 1969–1981.

SB 7,2121/1–712, letter from Zweites Deutsches Fernsehen to Bremer Vulkan, 8 August 1973.

SB 4,92/2–382, Bauvorhaben ‘Wätjens Park’ (Wohnungen für die Beschäftigten des Bremer Vulkan) 1970–1990, ‘Richtlinien für die Unterkünfte ausländischer Arbeitnehmer in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland’.

SB 4,63/2N-284, Gastarbeiter 1971–1973.

SB 4,63/2N-284, Gastarbeiter 1971–1973, undated interview with Mayor Hans Koschnick.

SB 4,124/3–4, Planung in Bremen – Konzeption Bd. 1 1985.

SB 4,124/3–5, Planung in Bremen – Konzeption Bd. 2 1986.

Taylor J (1976) *The Half-way Generation: A Study of Asian Youths in Newcastle upon Tyne*. Windsor: NFER.

Todd N (1987) Black-on-Tyne: the Black presence on Tyneside in the 1860s. *North East Labour History Society Bulletin* 21: 17-27.

Tomlinson S (2008) *Race and Education: Policy and Politics in Britain*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

(T)yne & (W)ear (A)rchives (S)ervice (5 December 1967) MD.NC/149, Immigrant pupils in schools.

TWAS (8 February 1984) MD.NC/162/1, Race and council housing in Hackney – report of a formal investigation by the Commission for Racial Equality.

TWAS (31 May 1984) MD.NC/162/1, The Bengali community in the inner West End of Newcastle (Bentinck Estate).

TWAS (10 October 1984) MD.NC/162/1, Racial harassment in Newcastle.

TWAS (November 1984) MD.NC/162/1, The council and racial equality: policy statement and action plan

TWAS (January 1986) MD.NC/162/2, The council and racial equality: policy statement and action plan.

TWAS (undated) MD.NC/162/2, The Swann Report.

TWAS (20 January 1988) MD.NC/162/3, Commission for Racial Equality report on racial violence and harassment in housing: ‘Living in Terror’.

TWAS (March 1988) MD.NC/162/3, Employment and black people.

TWAS (16 March 1988) MD.NC/162/3, Recruitment of employees to the city council.

TWAS (5 November 1996) MD.NC/614/2, Anti-racist policy and procedures for dealing with racial harassment.

TWAS (February 1997) MD.NC/614/3, Monitoring equality of opportunity in access to council housing: allocating council housing to different ethnic groups.

TWAS (17 April 1998) MD.NC/358, City of Newcastle upon Tyne Asian Traders Working Group.

Ulrich B (2003) The senator's tale: the development of Bremen's bourgeoisie in the post-1945 era. *Social History* 28(3): 303-320.

Unknown author (1973) Großwerft ohne Gastarbeiterprobleme. Bremer Vulkan will die Ausländer nicht nur für ein Gastspiel gewinnen – Integration wird schon längst praktiziert. *Ostbremer Rundschau*, 20 September.

Unknown author (1979) Die soziale Zeitbombe tickt nicht überall. Bremens Schule an der Schmidtstraße als Modell für die Integration. *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 21 September.

Vermeulen F and Stotijn R (2010) Local policies concerning unemployment among immigrant youth in Amsterdam and in Berlin: towards strategic replacement and pragmatic accommodation. In: Caponio T and Borkert M (eds) *The Local Dimension of Migration Policymaking*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 109-34.

Ward B (1995) A king in Newcastle: Martin Luther King, Jr. and British race relations, 1967–1968. *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 79(3): 599–632.

Ward K (2008) Editorial – toward a comparative (re)turn in urban studies? Some reflections. *Urban Geography* 29(5): 405-410.

Zincone G and Caponio T (2006) The multilevel governance of migration. In:
Penninx R, Berger M and Kraal K (eds) *The Dynamics of International Migration and
Settlement in Europe*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 269-304.

Author Biography

Sarah E Hackett is Senior Lecturer in Modern European History at Bath Spa
University, UK. Her research addresses European city-level migration and integration
policies, migration and religion, and Islam in Europe in historical perspective. She is
author of *Foreigners, Minorities and Integration: The Muslim Immigrant Experience
in Britain & Germany* (Manchester University Press, 2013).

Corresponding author:

Sarah E Hackett, School of Humanities & Cultural Industries, Newton St Loe, Bath
Spa University, BA2 9BN, UK.

Email: s.hackett@bathspa.ac.uk

Tel: 01225 875826