

LOCAL STRATEGIES FOR IMMIGRANTS' INTEGRATION IN SPAIN: CASE STUDIES OF THE CITIES OF MADRID, BARCELONA AND BILBAO

José Manuel Rodríguez Álvarez (Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain)

ABSTRACT

Spain is the European country that has received the largest number of immigrants during the last decade, and the second in the Western World after the U.S.A. The country has changed dramatically since the 1990s, and today more than 5.6 million of foreigners live in a country with 46 million of inhabitants, which means 12 per cent of the Spanish population.

Even in a framework of economic recession, and after several amnesties in the past years, most of immigrants prefer to keep in Spain. In this context, the priority is now the complete integration of immigrants in the Spanish society, in a most complicated framework due to the economic crisis. The three levels of government existing in Spain (central government, autonomous communities and, at the local level, a set of large cities) have drafted strategies for the integration.

Within this context, this paper presents from an institutionalist comparative perspective the main trends and goals of the integration strategies of three Spanish cities (Madrid, Barcelona and Bilbao). All they are large cities and they are governed by mayors belonging to different parties.

I. INTRODUCTION

Spain is the European country that has received the largest number of immigrants during the last decade, and the second in the Western World after the U.S.A. After being an emigration country since the late decades of the 19th century until the 1970s, sending millions of citizens to Latin America, first, and to Europe, later, Spain has changed dramatically since the 1990s, and today more than 5.6 million of foreigners live in a country with 46 million of inhabitants, which means 12 per cent of the Spanish population, when in 1991 there were in Spain just 0.36 million foreigners.

This dramatic change has to do with the Spain's extraordinary economic growth within the last two decades, but even after the economic crisis started in 2008, Spain is still receiving a large number of immigrants (almost 400,000 in 2008), although at a slower pace.

Spanish central government has passed during this time six programs of regularization (the last one in 2005), concerning more than 1.3 million migrants. Later, when the economic crisis started in 2008 and the unemployment rate dramatically increased, the Central Government implemented a program of "voluntary return" to encourage migrants to get back to their countries. If the regularization programs had been a clear success, the last one has been a complete failure, because only 1,000 immigrants have participated on it.

Even in a framework of economic recession, most of immigrants prefer to keep in Spain and their number is increasing. In this context, the priority is now the complete integration of immigrants in the Spanish society, in a most complicated framework due to the economic crisis. The three levels of government existing in Spain (central government, autonomous communities and, at the local level, a set of large cities) have drafted strategies for the integration.

Within this context, this paper presents from an institutionalist comparative perspective the main trends and goals of the integration strategies of three Spanish cities (Madrid - the capital city of Spain- Barcelona –the capital of Catalonia-, and Bilbao -in the Basque Country-). All they are large cities (3.2 million inhabitants in Madrid, 1.6 million in Barcelona and only 0.35 million in the city of Bilbao but one million in its metropolitan area) and they are governed by mayors belonging to different parties (People’s Party in Madrid, Socialist Party in Barcelona and Basque Nationalistic Party in Bilbao). The percentage of immigrants is very close in Madrid and Barcelona (about 17.5% and 18.1%), but just 7.9% in Bilbao. All three are also in some of the richest regions of Spain.

While Madrid is the capital city and a kind of paradigm of the Spanish culture, Barcelona and Bilbao belong to regions with a strong identity and its own language –the Catalan in Catalonia (a language very close to Spanish) and the Basque in Bilbao (a very old and pre-Roman language)- where the cultural and educative integration presents special characteristics due to the pressing for learning the regional language, which is the official one in the regional and local administration and also the language of the educational system in most of the public schools and colleges. This fact complicates the integration of immigrants, especially of those coming from Latin-American countries and for that reason Spanish speakers, who don’t expect to have to teach (they or their children) a very different and minority language just in Spain.

In which aspects the integration strategies of these three cities converge and differ? Belonging Barcelona and Bilbao to regions with strong nationalistic feelings, do their integration strategies show similar of different principles and goals than Madrid strategy? And how similar Bilbao and Barcelona strategies are?

This paper is based on comparative research conducted in 2009 on the integration strategies of these three cities, on government documents and on interviews with staff of these cities.

II. THE EVOLUTION OF THE IMMIGRATION IN SPAIN¹

Since its entrance to the European community, Spain has acquired a crucial geopolitical importance in Europe as the border dividing the economically developed North, represented mainly by the Western European nations of the European Union, and the less developed South, which begins in Northern Africa.

¹ This part of this paper is based on the paper presented with Miryam Hazan in the 104 APSA Annual Meeting (Boston, 28-31 August 2008), entitled *Immigration Policies and Amnesties in the U.S. and Spain: A Comparative Approach*.

Along with Italy, Spain has the lowest fertility rate of Western Europe: 1.26 children per woman- (Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales, 2007). A rate of 2.1 children per woman is considered necessary to guarantee a stable reproduction of the population. For that reason, immigration had become a solution for this country's expected population drop. Furthermore, at least until very recently, immigrants have also been perceived as contributing to the welfare state rather than as its beneficiaries; and while the Spanish economy was growing, they became an important engine of its economy, rather dependent on the construction and service sectors where immigrants generally work, in addition to the agricultural sector. Despite these evident facts, its elites could have chosen to oppose immigration as have those of other developed countries where the rapid aging of population is a major problem. Instead, they have decided to pursue a policy of openness toward immigration, although important differences can be found in the policies of the two main parties – the PSOE and the PP.

From the 1850s to the 1970s Spain was a country of emigration. In the nineteenth century Spaniards left as temporary labourers to the Americas (Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil and Cuba) and later to North Africa (Morocco and Algeria). In the twentieth century around six million Spaniards left their country, first to the Americas due to its civil war, and after the 1950s to Northern Europe due to its economic backwardness compared to other countries of similar size within Western Europe (Arango and Jachimowicz, 2005). By the 1980s, however, this pattern started to shift and Spain, like Portugal and Italy, became a country of immigration as other European nations that had received guest workers after the Second World War and until the 1970s confronted economic crises and became very restrictive to the arrival of newcomers. Through the 1990s, when Spain experienced a large economic expansion, it attracted immigrants predominantly from North Africa and Eastern Europe. In the new century, this country has also attracted large numbers of immigrants from Latin America, especially from countries confronting major economic crises such as Ecuador, Colombia and, a few years later, Peru and Bolivia. These last immigrant groups, and especially the Ecuadoreans, have almost surpassed those from Morocco as the largest immigrant contingent. It is expected that the Latin American contingents will surpass those from any other region of the world in the next few years. This is related to the fact that Spanish law grants Latin American immigrants citizenship in two years, compared with ten years for the rest of the world, due to historical and cultural connections. This obviously has acted as a magnet for these groups who perceive Spain as more welcoming than other developed countries.

Table 1. Evolution of the total immigrants residing in Spain according to the census (legal and illegal immigrant registered in the census) (1981-2008)

Year	Number of immigrants	Total population of Spain	Year	Number of immigrants	Total population of Spain
1981	197,942	37,683,362	1996	542,314	39,852,651
1987	334,936	38,725,115	2000	923,879	40,499,791
1990	407,647	39,887,268	2003	2,664,168	42,717,064
1993	430,422	39,790,955	2005	3,730,610	44,108,530

1995	499,773	40,460,055	2009 (1 st January)	5,598,691	46,661,950
------	---------	------------	--------------------------------	-----------	------------

Source: National Institute of Statistics

A large number of immigrants who have arrived in Spain in the last few decades have done so illegally, generally reaching Spanish territory by air and land (with a few arriving by sea) then never leaving the country. This has forced Spain to require visas, especially from countries that have provided large numbers of immigrants such as Morocco and more recently Ecuador and Colombia. This however, has not been the only response adopted to the large presence of unauthorized immigrants. Over a period of more than twenty years Spain has implemented six amnesties, with various approaches and results (Aguilera Izquierdo, 2006). Over this long span it is possible to identify two periods distinguished by the guiding elements compelling the government to regularize the unauthorized populations within Spanish territory.

a) First period, following the imperatives of the European Community and the needs of the business sector

In a first period under the Socialist government of Felipe González, the main national goal was to modernize the country under democratic rule and to become part of the European Community (EC). González also wanted to project the idea that his was a moderate but progressive government not very tilted to the left in a country that had a long history of being controlled by the right. This last attitude, however, sometimes made tense his relationship with the main unions, and especially the socialist *Union General de Trabajadores* or UGT (General Workers Union), since they expected him to follow a more socialist agenda.

In a context in which the left wing sectors within its government had a smaller input than at other times, and in which the goal was to satisfy the requirements imposed by the EC, the González administration produced in 1985 the first law on the Rights and Liberties of Foreigners in Spain. Popularly known as the *Ley de Extranjería* (Law on Foreigners) this law focused more on restrictions than on defending the rights of immigrants, even though it was implemented by the Labour Ministry rather than the Interior Ministry, reflecting the fact that “immigrants were broadly conceptualized, first and foremost, as workers (Ortega Pérez, 2003: 4).” This last aspect is interesting because over the years these two ministries have competed intensely over the agenda setting process on immigration. As mentioned earlier, the Labour Ministry has tended to focus more on the labor side of immigration, whereas the Interior Ministry has focused more on the national security side.

The main goal of the law was to control the access of immigrants to the labor market, and made stable residency very difficult. Newcomers could attain residency permits only once they got a job offer, and after getting the permit they were forced to renew it and to meet numerous requirements to do so. This contrasted, for example, with the contemporary American approach to immigration, where the immigrant who acquires residency can keep it permanently and regardless of her situation in the labor market.

Because of these limitations many immigrants ended up in an irregular status. Furthermore, in contrast to the United States, where family reunification had been the guiding principle of immigration law since 1965, the Spanish law made family reunification very difficult. This situation was corrected only in 1996 when an

amendment to the law was introduced recognizing immigration as a structural phenomenon and acknowledging that newcomers had a set of rights, including that of being able to reunify their families.

As a compensation to its many limitations the law also previewed the possibility of regularization although, as noted above, only under temporary conditions. Immigrants could attain regular status by applying on an individual basis or through their employers. They had three months to present the necessary documents. Because the foreign population in Spain was still relatively small, this regularization was not very significant in terms of numbers --only 38,131 benefited from it- and also did not require the involvement of major social actors such as the unions and the business organizations, who in the 2005 amnesty, as we shall see, played a key role.

Because of the harsh immigration policies introduced in 1985 many immigrants were left without the possibility of securing the proper documentation to attain a legal status. This situation left the doors open for further regularizations in 1991 and in 1996, still under the government of Felipe González, although the 1996 regularization was designed but not implemented by the socialists since the PP took control of the national government that same year.

In the years 2000 and 2001, the PP was forced to implement yet two more amnesties because the flaws of the 1985 law, despite the 1996 reforms, were still making it very difficult for foreigners to attain a legal status. Because there were larger migratory flows to the country, however, the regularizations were becoming bigger and thus creating more tensions. Labor unions started to perceive these amnesties as going against their interests, as expanding the pool of legal workers and thus pushing wages down. In contrast, the business sector not only did not experience real sanctions for hiring unauthorized immigrants, but also was not forced to register workers in the social security system. Because the amnesties only required for immigrants to get a job offer (and in many cases even this was not necessary) rather than an employment *contract*, in many cases they got offers but went back to their irregular status within the labor market.

The tensions the amnesties created were reflected in a conflict between the PP government of José María Aznar and the opposition in the parliament when a new law on foreigners was being negotiated.

In January 1998 the opposition -- including IU, the Catalan Nationalist Party *Convergència I Unió*, and *Grupo Mixto* but not the PP -- introduced an initiative to create a new Law on Foreigners. This law was finally approved in January 12, 2000 with a broad political consensus; all political parties voted in favor, including the PSOE and the PP. The PP, however, was forced to do so against its interests since it did not have an absolute majority in the parliament.

The legislation called the Law on the Rights and Freedoms of Foreigners in Spain and their Integration --technically Organic Law 4/2000--, marked a drastic shift in Spanish immigration policy which would have repercussions in the future, especially in 2005. Until then the main function of Spanish immigration law had been controlling immigration rather than integration. The law would grant more rights to immigrants regardless of their legal status, including the right to associate, to rally, and to unionize. This last right was a triumph for the two main Spanish unions including UGT and *Comisiones Obreras* or CC OO (Workers Commissions). The law also recognized the

immigration phenomenon as a global and permanent one, and accordingly emphasized the importance of incorporating newcomers into the needs of the labor market. This would become a key issue of the 2005 amnesty. In addition it introduced for the first time in Spanish legislation the notion of co-development, which implied that to control the migratory flows coming in to Spanish territory, Spain also had a responsibility to help in the economic and social development of sending areas.

After the March 2000 elections the PP recovered its absolute majority in parliament and passed Organic Law 8/2000 to amend the previous legislation just a few months later. This law was less generous than the one approved previously. Among other things, the new Organic Law granted the rights of association, rallying and unionizing only to legal immigrants². Nonetheless, it kept the integration principle as a key to Spanish immigration policy. This law was the base of what was known as the Plan Greco. This program presented immigration as a desirable phenomenon for Spain and argued that foreigners should become active contributors to Spanish economic development. However, the PP argued that Spain should follow the principles of the European Union on immigration, including the emphasis on security. On those grounds, the regulatory functions on immigration were passed from the Labor Ministry, where they had been until then, to the Interior Ministry, emphasizing the national security aspect of the subject.

An important contribution of the Plan Greco was that it recognized the vital role that regional governments play in the integration of newcomers; this recognition would become very important in the integration policies implemented by the Spanish state thereafter. In addition, as part of a broad policy on immigration designed by the PP, Spain has concluded guest worker program agreements with sending countries since 1997. After the first such program was adopted with Morocco in 1997, in 2001 Spain concluded a similar agreement with Romania and Bulgaria, which at that time were only negotiating their entry into the European Union and thus sent a lot of undocumented immigrants to Spain. An interesting aspect of these programs is that they provided workers access to Spanish citizenship after a certain period of time if they returned to their countries of origin when their contract agreements ended. A worker having thus duly returned to her country of origin was able to come back to Spain the following year, subject to agreement with her Spanish employer.

These guest worker programs were important because they showed the business sector that there was a pool of workers that they could hire legally, without running afoul of the law. This facilitated the support of the business sector for the 2005 amnesty.

A few years later, Spain also signed similar agreements with Senegal and with Latin American countries such Ecuador, Colombia and Peru.

b) The second period: the neo- corporatist model, fortifying the welfare state

In 2005 Spain implemented a new but very different amnesty. This amnesty benefited 577,923 people. The most striking characteristic of this amnesty, however, is

² In 2007 the Constitutional Court declared that the limits introduced by the Organic Law 8/2000 to the rights of association, rallying and unionizing were unconstitutional.

not the number of people it allowed to regularize their status, though that number is strikingly large but the fact that it was implemented in line with the needs of the labor market.

As we mentioned at the beginning, the amnesty was done through employers rather than on an individual basis, except in the case of domestic workers. This was an important break with past practice: whereas it had always been the immigrant herself who was responsible for regularizing her status, the employer, forced to register her employees in the social security system, now thus bore the responsibility for regularizing them. Toward the end of smooth regularization of workers demanded by the market, the government granted employers four months –from February 7 to May 7, 2005—in which they could petition without sanction for the legalization of their workers.

How was it possible to implement such an amnesty, which implied a radical change in Spanish immigration policy?

The 2005 Spanish amnesty was designed without much public debate and in closed-door meetings between the government, the two main labor unions – UGT and CC OO—and the business sector, represented by the *Confederación Española de Organizaciones Empresariales* or CEOE (Spanish Confederation of Business Organizations).

By 2004 Spain had an estimated 1.2 million unauthorized immigrants, the large number reflecting the limitations of the previous amnesties, the inefficiency of Spanish authorities in controlling immigration and the large and unexpected arrival of new immigrants from Latin America.

Union and business leaders interviewed for this research explained that they had been negotiating an amnesty with the government of Aznar through the Spanish Economic and Social Council (CES), which includes all the relevant actors of the Spanish Economy. After long negotiations between the unions and the CEO, the CES produced a report of 170 pages, published in April 2004, which called for a better-regulated immigration policy. This report, which implied that agreement already existed between the unions and the business sector, created a positive environment for the negotiation of a new amnesty in 2005.

Both the unions and the business sector realized that in order to have an effective reform that command consensus by benefiting the diverse interested parties, it was necessary first to regularize in a definitive and effective way those who were already illegally in the country.

Parallel to the amnesty two extraordinary mechanisms were created to facilitate the regularization of those who did not qualify for a legal status and those who arrived after this program was implemented. The first mechanism is known as “social attachment” or *arraigo social*, whereby an immigrant can qualify for legal residency if she has been in the country for a period of at least three years – a fact that can be confirmed simply by registration upon arrival in the city hall of the locality in which she has settled -- does not have a criminal record in Spain or in their country of origin, has a

work contract of at least one year, and can prove some social links to the place where she resides in Spain.

The second mechanism is the one known as “labor attachment” or *arraigo laboral*, whereby immigrants can attain legal permanent residency if they can prove to have been in a country for a period of at least three years and they have a labor relation with an employer (which they have to prove by taking the employer to the tribunals and denouncing her for a specific reason) and do not have a criminal record in Spain or in their country of origin.

Although these mechanisms are insufficient to guarantee that illegal immigration will not be a problem in the future, and do not fully neutralize the call effect which the amnesty is having, they are an important step in facilitating the gradual integration of those persons residing without a legal status in the country.

The new amnesty was implemented in a context uncommonly favorable to experimentation in this policy field: the Socialists had just arrived to power after eight years in opposition with high levels of legitimacy and public support, and the conditions of strong economic growth underpinned arguments for the amnesty based on the demand for immigrant labour. Furthermore, the socialists were less interested than in the past in following the dictates of the European Union, since Spain was by then sufficiently powerful, stably institutionalized, and accepted as a member of the Union to have confidence in its independent political judgment.

The new socialist President, Jose Luis Rodriguez Zapatero, had won the 2004 legislative elections against Mariano Rajoy who was elected by the outgoing president Jose Maria Aznar to replace him as the PP leader. This happened after Aznar blamed the nationalist band ETA (Euskadi Ta Askatusuna) for the terrorist attacks that took place three days before the election in Madrid, even though ETA itself had denied its participation. These attacks killed 191 people – almost a third of them recent immigrants to Spain on their way to work - when a series of bombs exploded in trains approaching the Atocha Central Train Station in the country’s capital. The public was angered by this accusation without proof, and punished the PP by giving an unexpected victory to the PSOE. Investigations already becoming public suggested that Muslim extremists from Morocco were the authors of the attacks. Although originally the PP was expected to win the elections, there was already a public animosity against the PP because of the support which the Aznar administration had given to the United States in its war against Iraq despite the limited popularity in Spain of the American military enterprise³. This anger along with the baseless charges made by Aznar just after the explosions, contributed to the triumph of Zapatero, who immediately began to govern from the left in stark contrast to the right wing Aznar administration. For example, Zapatero immediately withdrew the Spanish troops Aznar had sent to Iraq to support the Americans.

The Zapatero administration was quick to avoid xenophobic positions condemning Muslims and immigrants. Zapatero’s government transferred most

³ According to the polls, more than 95% of the Spanish population was against the Spanish involvement in the War. Even most of right-wing people were against the official policy of the Spanish Government on Iraq.

immigration functions from the Ministry of Interior to the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs – again, thus reframing the immigration phenomenon as an economic and labour problem. As part of this process, his government created a new Secretariat within the Labour Ministry focused on Immigration and Emigration. Four years later, right after the legislative elections of March 2008, Zapatero, who had just won the legislative elections again, changed the name of the Ministry of Labour to Ministry of Labour and Immigration, thus consolidating the perception of the immigration problem as a matter of labour and welfare.

In line with these administrative changes, immigrant integration became a major goal of the Spanish state. Starting in 1994 during the government of Gonzalez, the Council of Ministers approved the Plan for the Social Integration of Immigrants with the goal of helping in the settlement process of newcomers. Although many of the goals set by this program were never fully realized, two major instruments that emerged from it not only survived but actually set the parameters of future integration policies. These instruments were the Forum for the Integration of New Immigrants and the Permanent Observatory of Immigration to Spain. The first instrument had the goal of fomenting immigrants' civic participation and representation by allowing them to elect representatives to the forum, which plays an advisory role. The second instrument produced research on immigration and integration with the goal of using it in the process of policy design on those subjects. These instruments have been emulated at the sub-national level in most Spanish autonomias and cities where large numbers of immigrants have settled in the last few years, including in those localities controlled by the PP which, as noted earlier, in the Plan Greco also emphasized the important role that local governments play in immigrant integration. In 2007, a year before the transformation of the Labour Ministry, the Zapatero administration presented the Strategic Plan on Citizenship and Integration with the main goal of promoting social cohesion in the country through the implementation of policies that grant equal rights to newcomers. Working within this same logic, in July 2008 -- in a context of economic downturn, remarkable -- the socialist government proposed to grant the right to vote in local elections to non-European Union citizens conditioned on the principle of reciprocity established by the Spanish Constitution.

III. THE CASE OF MADRID

The increasing of the foreign population in Madrid has been bigger than the Spanish media. The City has reached in 2009 575.000 foreigners, being the whole population 3.3 million (17.5% of the total).

But this data shall be desagregated by districts. Madrid is divided in 21 districts and 120 boroughs. In some districts and boroughs is really impressive. For instance, The district Centro (the central part of the City or downtown) immigrants are 27.6%, 24.4% in Usera, 24.2% in Villaverde and 22.2% in Tetuán. In the opposite extreme are districts as Retiro 10.0%, Mortatalaz (11.2) and Fuencarral-El Pardo (11.9%). In some boroughs, the percentage of immigrants is really impressive: 43.1% in San Cristobal, 33.6% in Embajadores, 33.5% in San Diego. Even if, in general terms, immigrants trend to bring together in more modest districts, there are also a high percentage of foreigners in rich districts.

Other important question, with key effects on the integration, is the geographical and cultural origin of immigrants living in Madrid. Figures show that a large number – about 55%- are Latin American and 24.8% from countries of the European Union. Only 7.1% are from Africa and 7% from Asia and Oceania. The rest are immigrant from other European and OECD countries.

Table 2. Distribution of immigrants in the City of Madrid (01-01-2009)

Area	Number of immigrants	%
European Union (15)	56,219	9.78
Enlargement of the European Union (27-15)	86,453	15.04
Other OECD countries	12,825	2.23
Other European countries	13,479	2.34
Other Latin America countries	316,218	55.01
Africa	43,664	7.60
Other Asia and Oceania countries	40,590	8.00
Apatriads	92	0.01
TOTAL	574,869	100%

Source: Madrid City Hall

Latin American immigrants share language, religion, traditions and behaviors with Spanish Population. And common values and civilization is shared with European and even OECD countries immigrants. It means that, from the approach of integration, more than 80% of the immigrants offer a profile of easy integration. Probably the most complicate group to integrate for cultural reasons are Muslims. Morocco represent 61.4% of the African immigrants (26,821 people), the sixth foreign community in Madrid, after Ecuador, Romania, Bolivia, Peru and Colombia.

On the other hand, Madrid is a city that for many reasons, mainly historical ones, has been known for its openness and capacity for integration. The origins of the city as we currently understand it come mainly from the events of the last fifty years. During this time, Madrid has doubled its population, but it has also acquired the personality that defines it: an open mentality, integrating and against exclusion. A large number of the Spanish inhabitants of the City have born in other regions of Spain. Madrid is the Spain' crossroad, and the modern song and poems about the city exalt the eclectic nature of this city, very different in this sense that the other big Spanish cities, Barcelona included.

Openness, integration and a feeling of fusion have been the real signs of identity of this city for nowhere men. Madrid's recent history has led to a character that is hospitable to external influences and receptive for newcomers. Therefore, coexistence and openness are presented as inseparable traits.

However, based on the intuitive and immediate perception of a palpable social reality that is accessible to all its inhabitants, and in order to face up to the increasing immigration from an proactive approach, the Madrid City Council has drafted and developed a specific model for public action regarding immigration, which began with the First Madrid Plan on Social and Intercultural Coexistence (2005-2009) and continues with this Second Plan, which has come to be known as "a model for coexistence".

The model for coexistence is characterized by the implementation of services and measures, the aim of which is to bring about an approximation between the immigrants and the city residents. This binding should also be established by both parties and with equal intensity by both of them. In short, the policies of a model of coexistence must comprise instruments that address both immigrants and locals at the same time.

The intercultural coexistence model that inspires the Second Plan (2009-2012) acknowledges the influence of the trend of thought led by the German philosophers who developed the theory of communicative action. Coexistence is achieved through dialogue and discourse between the people who represent the different cultures present in the city. Nevertheless, this dialogue, in order to be authentic, requires the acknowledgement of certain basic principles: respect for the life and dignity of all of the people participating in the process. It is funded in their radical freedom to express themselves, because otherwise communication would be tainted, and in equality, not only formal but also material, which can only be achieved through equal opportunities for life development (Madrid 2009).

I. Governing Principles

The governing principles of this Second Plan are based on the features of the described model and its philosophical grounds. These principles attempt to respond to the ideal sequence of migrational reality as it takes place in the city and to offer a theoretical and hermeneutic framework that guides and channels the actions of the City Council and of the entities that carry out their work within the scope of immigrant integration (Madrid 2009):

First: Principle of universal attention.

This principle relates to the most unique feature of the City of Madrid: its openness and rejection of exclusion. The principle of universal attention also remits to one of the human rights: the dignity of every human being, inherent to all, independently of their condition, condition that will always be of an adjective nature. The proclamation of this principle entails the commitment to properly serve all of the people who live in the city, regardless of their nationality or administrative situation. In addition to an ethical commitment, this principle implies a legal obligation imposed by article 14 of the Organic Law 4/2000, of the 11th January, on rights and freedoms of foreigners in Spain and on their social integration.

Second: Principle of active integration.

The initial attention to new arrivals referred to in the preceding principle, which is mainly based on accommodation services, is not enough for immigrants to achieve a position equal to local residents. In order to place them in a situation of equal opportunities, a series of services and actions must be implemented to provide them with basic instruments for integration.

Therefore, active integration entails the full and free-willed incorporation of immigrants to Madrid society, their inclusion in equality of rights, their assumption of obligations and responsibilities and the development of opportunities.

From this viewpoint, integration is one of the key elements of the Second Plan for Social and Intercultural Coexistence. The integration process thus becomes a key element when defining the policies of intervention aimed at guaranteeing knowledge of the language, information, employment, legal assistance and access to general public services, amongst others.

Third: Principle of intercultural coexistence.

After these preceding stages, the Plan underlines the necessity of establishing the aforementioned community of communication. This communication entails committing the different social agents, entities and institutions to participate as qualified parties in the drafting, implementation and follow-up of the actions programmed by the Plan. To this end, the Plan recognizes that there must be institutions and participation mechanisms where the inhabitants of Madrid can meet, dialogue and discuss the affairs that affect them as a whole.

II. Core strategies

The Second Madrid Plan for Social and Intercultural Coexistence was drafted based on the experience of the Madrid City Council after more than ten years developing programs within the scope of immigration and taking into consideration the current socio-economic context. As a result, the core strategies of the Second Madrid Plan are (Madrid 2009):

A) Material core strategies:

1) **Counseling for integration in the labor market.** This Plan specific measures aimed for immigrants who do not have a job, in order to guide them towards other labor sectors and to offer them suitable training for their integration into the labor market.

2) **Campaign against racism, xenophobia and intolerance.** Until now the city of Madrid has been a city open to other cultures; however, and although the racist or xenophobe incidents that have taken place in Madrid have just been sporadic events, it is necessary to act forcefully, and this Second Plan undertakes to design indicators and actions geared towards detecting and preventing racism in the city.

3) **Promotion of social integration and coexistence.** This second edition of the Madrid Plan pays special attention on promoting **public spaces** as a way of reinforcing intercultural coexistence.

B) **Technical core strategies:**

- 1) **Flexibility and adaptation** of resources and services to the needs that are detected.
- 2) **Coordination** that favours **optimization of resources and services**.

III. Methodology

A participative and reflexive methodology was used in drafting the Second Madrid Plan for Social and Intercultural Coexistence that is based on (Madrid 2009):

- a) **Assessment** of the actions carried out in the First Madrid Plan for Social and Intercultural Coexistence and on analysis of the documentation regarding the different experiences of plans and models for management of immigration at a national and European level.
- b) The process of **social consultation**, the aim of which was to involve social agents so that they could cooperate with the Government in designing the model for management of immigration in the City of Madrid. This was carried out between the 22nd of April 2008, when the working document for the Second Madrid Plan was approved in the plenary meeting of the Madrid Forum for Social and Intercultural Coexistence, and the 31st of July, date when the period for presentation of proposals ended.
- c) **Interviews with professionals** dealing with immigration from the Council for Immigration of the Community of Madrid and from different Government Departments and General Directorates of the Madrid City Council. Group working sessions were also held regarding the services comprised in the First Madrid Plan.

IV. Operational framework

1. - Introduction

The Madrid City Council, within its general activities, provides services to all citizens by virtue of the principle of access by all residents, in equal conditions, to municipal services. These services are increasingly important both in quantity and in quality. Although the immigrant population does use these services, this Plan contains only the actions and measures aimed at specific attention to immigrants, as well as initiatives intended to favour intercultural coexistence developed by the General Directorate of Immigration and Cooperation for Development of the Secretariat of Family and Social Services.

Regarding the actions contained in the operational framework, we must highlight that some particular actions, mainly the transversal ones and those developed in coordination with other Secretariats, were not specifically included in the list of measures. Thus, for example, the subsidies aimed to finance projects of social entities in the areas of shelter or integration in the labour market must be considered as incorporated in said areas of intervention.

2. - Specific objectives

The objectives of the Second Madrid Plan for Social and Intercultural Coexistence are aimed to (Madrid 2009):

1. Guarantee the access of immigrants to social services in equal conditions with the local population.
2. Establish a system for sheltering new immigrants and those who are in an especially vulnerable situation, until they are in a condition to access the general public services.
3. Adapt social intervention to the new needs that arise from the presence of foreign population in the city of Madrid, incorporating the necessary intercultural competences to local administrations.
4. Campaign against the different manifestations of discrimination, racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance in all scopes of social life, both in the public and private sectors.
5. Promote citizens' participation through associations and consolidation of the Madrid Forum for Dialogue and Coexistence and of the Intercultural Dialogue and Coexistence Boards of each district.
6. Promote policies and experiences of co-development with the immigrants' countries of origin.
7. Establish mechanisms to learn about the reality of immigration and its management, as well as training of professionals related to this area.

V. Budget

The Second Madrid Plan for Social and Intercultural Coexistence will be developed within the period 2009-2012. The budget is based on the amounts established for 2009: these are predetermined figures that appear included in the budget for the Immigration Program of the City Council for 2009. The remainder of amounts registered in the years 2010 to 2012 are approximate, and were calculated taking into account hypothetical budget increases respectively of 3, 4 and 5%.

One of the core strategies of the Second Plan is flexibility. Following this line, the budget for the Plan must be equally flexible and open to possible changes required by the situation, in any case establishing as a limit the budget restrictions set by the competent entities of the Madrid City Council. Therefore, the amounts stated in the budget may be modified and readjusted between the different lines depending on the changes that are made to the Plan.

Table 3. Approximate budget for the second Madrid plan for social and intercultural integration

Year	Budget (€)
2009	13,032,624.19
2010	13,423,602.92
2011	13,960,547.03
2012	14,658,574.38
Total	55,075,348.52

Source: Madrid City Hall

VI. Monitoring and assessment

In order to guarantee the suitable performance of the services contained in the Coexistence Plan, they will be closely monitored. To this end a monitoring and management system has been designed which includes detailed monitoring, of both quantity and quality, of the services comprised in the Plan (Madrid 2009).

The work methodology includes monitoring of quality and quantity, as well as the definition of a system to assess the services. A study will be carried out which will combine the information collected on the performance of the services and their consistency with the Plan's objectives.

With these tools, the aim is to increase efficiency in the management and implementation of the services comprised in the Madrid Plan, providing:

- A homogeneous level of information that conforms to the reality of each line.
- A detailed view of the reality and of the work carried out by each service.
- An early and precise detection of the incidents and technical deviations that may arise, allowing an immediate and suitable response.
- An increase in the capacity to respond to the future needs that may arise.
- A global and updated vision of the Plan.

VII. Creation of an intercultural coexistence index for the City of Madrid

The Plan includes the creation of a new system of indicators of racism, intolerance and coexistence. These methodological tools will provide further knowledge on coexistence relations and will enable a study of their evolution in time, in order to adapt the municipal policies to reality (Madrid 2009).

The result of this work will be the drafting of the *Index of Intercultural Coexistence in the City of Madrid (ICI)* which will be performed in three stages (drafting, designing and implementation) during the life of the Second Plan.

The fieldwork in this area will be carried out in accordance with the Plan of action against racism and intolerance approved by the Plenary Session of the Madrid Forum for Dialogue and Coexistence on the 22nd April 2008. The drafting work of the ICI will have a close relation with the European projects with which cooperation is established and which in turn contemplate the development of their own indicators, such as for example *Opencities* and *Eurocities*.

VIII. The Centre for Migration and Intercultural Coexistence for the city of Madrid

The Centre, a public service formed by and for the city of Madrid, aims to increase understanding of migration phenomena and multicultural coexistence through research, policy evaluation and publication.

The Centre has two principle objectives:

- Monitor and analyze the changing population demographic and social climate in Madrid, in order to foster and promote open-minded coexistence and diversity through citizen participation and community effort.

- Increase dialogue and interaction between all neighbours in Madrid via organized forums and district discussions on coexistence, as outlined in the Madrid Plan.

To achieve these broad objectives, the Centre is divided into two complementary branches:

Area of Social Research:

- Initiate and actualize independent research
- Analyze and interpret demographic and socioeconomic data
- Maintain a specialized documentation resource centre
- Develop, publish and circulate reports on findings and studies
- Collaborate and coordinate with other departments founded by the Plan Madrid
- Promote multilevel exchange of experiences and information not only between citizens, but also municipal, national and international organizations

Area of Coordination:

- Create and periodically update an informational “Resource Guide” available to the public
- Develop a “Guide for Intercultural and Social Coexistence” for the city of Madrid
- Set up and monitor Madrid’s Forums and Boards of Dialogue and Intercultural Coexistence
- Collect proposals suggested in the forum and board discussions, ultimately presenting results to corresponding municipal organizations

IV. THE CASE OF BARCELONA

With 1,629,381 inhabitants in 2009 (just a half than the first city, Madrid), Barcelona is the second city in Spain. Barcelona has shifted very quickly from an industrial city to a postindustrial society, where services and tourism are the main sources of wealth, even if Barcelona is an economically speaking diverse city.

The city and its economy has proved important attractiveness for foreigners during the last decade, and the percentage of immigrants has gone from 4.9% in 2001 until 18.1% in 2009 (Table 4).

Table 4. Evolution of immigration in Barcelona

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Total	74,019	113,809	163,046	202,489	230,942	260,058	250,789	280,817	294,918

immigrants									
% of total population	4.9	7.6	10.7	12.8	14.2	15.9	15.6	17.3	18.1

Source: Barcelona City Hall

In 2009, 129,563 foreigners are from America (43.9%), 90,388 from Europe (30.6%), 52,938 from Asia (17.95%) and 21,665 from Africa (7.34%). By nationalities, the most important are Italians (22,684), Ecuadorians (22,210), Pakistanis (17,735), Bolivians (17,672), Peruvians (15,613), Moroccans (14,402) and Chinese (14,067).

The distribution of immigrants within the 10 districts of Barcelona is, in general terms quite balanced, except in the Old City District (Ciutat Vella), where they reach 39.70%, with some risks of ghettification. In the other districts, the percentage goes from 11.10% (Les Corts District) to 19.00% (Sants-Montjuïc District).

The City Hall of Barcelona approved in 2002 the *Municipal Plan of Immigration*, monitored by the Political Committee of Immigration, established in 2001 and integrated by the Mayor, the leaders of the political parties at the City Hall and the responsible of the immigration policy of the city. The main goal of this Plan was “to reach an effective integration of immigrants in all the domains of the public life of Barcelona and the Catalanian society”. This Plan is based on the principles of equality, cultural diversity, coexistence, social cohesion, normalization, cross section approach and participation.

Within the context of this Plan, the City Council passed in 2008 the “*Working Plan Immigration 2008-2011*”, as a pragmatic, consensual plan, addressed to specify the main working lines.

The Working Plan is based on three pillars:

- The guarantee of equal rights and duties. In this sense, Barcelona City Hall always has promoted the electoral rights at the local level for all the non-EU foreigners.
- Qualitative and quantitative adaptation of municipal services, in order to give the appropriate answer to the new socio-demographic reality.
- Recognition of cultural diversity, but stressing the common aspects joining people, stimulating the links and the positive interaction among citizens on the basis of the cultural heritage of the host society and starting from the principle of inter-culturality.

The Working Plan is organized in five intervention areas:

1. To study in depth and disseminate the knowledge on the migratory fact.

This area includes the following measures:

- a) Identify and collect an indicators set about the immigration in Barcelona.
- b) Draft a panel of indicators top follow up along the time the integration process and the efficacy of the integration policies.

- c) Draft dissemination materials about the reality of immigration in the city.
- d) Organize an annual conference about a significant issue
- e) Draft studies and reports
- f) Create a web of new citizenship

2. Strengthen and adapt the embracement strategy of the city

- a) Establish in all the city a system of group informative sessions for the newcomers
- b) Draft welcome materials for newcomers, including information basic about the city and its society, services, regulations, etc.
- c) Implement the support program for regrouping families in all the districts of the city.
- d) Strengthen and adapt the Service for Attending Immigrants and Refugees (SAIER) to the new demands and realities
- e) Formalize and consolidate the Network of Welcoming to the City, formed by 80 NGOs
- f) Keep and support a line of grants for the welcome entities.
- g) Stimulate the highest degree of learning of the Catalan language in cooperation with the Consortium for the Linguistic Normalization of Catalonia. A large effort has been done in this arena, and in 2008 27.600 immigrants participated in the Catalan language. On the other hand, the support for learning Spanish is very weak, as the same Working Plan recognizes.

3. Management of municipal responsibilities in the field of immigration

- a) Reports on housing availability for immigrants
- b) Reports on social integration for the regularization of illegal immigrants
- c) Guarantee the enforcement of the regulation of the census

4. Work for interculturalism and promote participation for guaranteeing the whole integration

- a) Support the European Year of Intercultural Dialog in 2008.
- b) Draft a municipal program for interculturalism
- c) Enlargement of the intercultural mediation services in all the districts.
- d) Establish a new line of grants for NGOs with intercultural projects.

- e) Stimulate and support specific initiatives for promoting the incorporation of newcomers to the existing participative networks and channels.
- f) Promote the incorporation of the immigrant associations to the Barcelona social tissue.
- g) Disseminate the knowledge and promote the participation of newcomers in local festivities and celebrations.
- h) Support and stimulate the work of the Municipal Council of immigration as a core participative and consulting board of the immigrant NGOs, as well as a forum for debating the sectoral policies on immigration.
- i) Consolidate the Festival of the Migrant Day on 18 December as an open festival for all citizens.

5. Guarantee the crossing coherence and a complete approach on immigration

- a) Establish a Crossing Bureau on Immigration, formed by representatives of municipal diverse sectors.
- b) The concerned sectoral fields are: education, social services, civil rights, Culture, housing, health, security and prevention, gender policy, sports, youth and professional training.
- c) Strengthen the role of the districts within the welcome and integration policy, drafting their own planning, and promote specific projects in some boroughs with higher rates of immigrants, within the framework of integrated strategies, to avoid and prevent ghettification processes.

The Budget to implement the Working Plan is almost 15 million Euros in 2010, and 15.3 millions in 2011.

V. THE CASE OF BILBAO

Bilbao is the largest city in the Atlantic Spain, with 355.731 inhabitants in 2009. This Basque city has been on the core cities of the industrial revolution in Spain, a key place of the iron and steel manufacturing industry and also an important finance center (Banco de Bilbao, Banco de Vizcaya, later merged in the Banco Bilbao-Vizcaya-Argentario –BBVA-). The city experienced a very strong crisis and decline in the 1980, when the unemployment rate reached 30% of active population.

A deep process of restructuring and modernization, led by an strategic planning reached by all the Government levels (Central State, Autonomous Community of Basque County, provincial Government of Biscay and Bilbao City Hal, as well as the economic actors) has raised Bilbao again among the most Spanish and European cities, now basically as a city of services and new technologies.

Even if with slower intensity, also the city of Bilbao has experienced the increasing of the immigrant population (Table 5). In 2009, 7.98% of its population was immigrants, a modest percentage when comparing with Madrid (17.5%) of Barcelona (18.1%) at the same time.

Table 5. Evolution of immigration in the city of Bilbao (2005-2009)

	2005		2006		2007		2008		2009	
Total population	354,168		354,918		353,938		354,180		355,731	
Spanish population	337,534	95.30%	335,093	94.41%	331,815	93.75%	328,917	92.87%	327,359	99.02%
Immigrants	16,634	4.70%	19,825	5.59%	22,123	6.25%	25,263	7.13%	28,372	7.98%
Non EU	15,074	4.26%	18,133	5.11%	18,719	5.29%	21,265	6.00%	23,876	6.71%
EU	1,560	0.44%	1,692	0.48%	3,404	0.96%	3,998	1.13%	4,496	1.26%

Source: Bilbao City Hall

56.27% of immigration in Bilbao is from Latin American countries, 20.11% from African ones, and 17.43% from European ones. Main nationalities are Bolivians (4,879), Colombians (3,730), Rumanians (2,248), Moroccans (2058), Ecuadorians (1.832) and Chinese (1.390).

This figures shows that the decrease of the Spanish population in the city during this period (almost 10,000) has been balanced by the ion crease of immigrants (almost 12,000). A third of immigrants in Bilbao are Latin American women, which is the profile better adapted to the demand of workers for care of elderly and other needed people.

There is not a ghettification process in Bilbao. The city is divided in 9 districts or boroughs, and the percentage of migrants goes from 2.7% in Otxakoaga-Txurdinaga District (the lowest) to 11.7% in Ibaliondo District (11.7%). Out of these moderate “extremes” the percentage of migrants in the other seven districts is very narrow, going from 5.3% in Begoña District to 8.6% in Errekalde District.

The City of Bilbao has approved a **Plan for the Integration on Immigrants**, formed by the following activities:

- a) Legal and social services for foreigner immigrants, delivered by the “Municipal Service for Immigration (SEMI).
- b) Promotion of the intercultural coexistence, in charge of three units:
 - The Mediation Unit
 - The Communication and Awareness-Raising Program
 - The Municipal Observatory of Migrations
- c) Participation, organized by the Local Council for Coexistence
 - a) Legal and social services for foreigner immigrants, delivered by the “Municipal Service for Immigration” (SEMI)

The aim of the legal service is to deliver socio-legal council to immigrants, through a free, direct, personal service including personalized information about the right of

asylum and the legislation on immigration in Spain, as well as administrative arrangements and their follow-up in this field.

Concerning the social service, its goals are the drawing up of reports about the social insertion of immigrant in order to obtain their legalization, as well as reports about the availability of houses for family regrouping and for the voluntary return of migrants.

b) The intercultural coexistence is promoted by the **Intercultural Social Mediation Unit**, a free of charge service that, in coordination with other entities and actors, looks for to facilitate the coexistence in a context of diversity, helping dialogue and communication among cultures existing in the city, and preventing conflicts or facing those that already have been provoked.

This unit manage an *on-line multilingual guide or resources for immigrants* (in Spanish, Basque, English, French, Arabic, Rumanian and Chinese), with specific information about census, social services, culture, sports, youth activities, health services, grants, housing, employment, education, driving license, security, migrants' legalization, help to the violence victims, consulates and migrants associations.

They also lead a specific program about "*women, diversity and health*", addressed to reach the self-management of the sexual and reproductive health of immigrant women, by training a group of women (most of them foreigners) to tell the others on how to access to family planning methods and health services and how to react in cases of gender violence.

This unit also organizes every year the "World Peoples Festival", a week addressed to the cultural and artistic interchange between the different cultures and communities existing in the municipality, integrated by exhibitions, movies, conferences, music and folklore events, workshops and gastronomic exhibitions.

c) **The Municipal Observatory on Migrations** is an office which, among other activities, analyzes the local census as well as the perceptions, values and attitudes of the citizens towards the foreign immigration.

d) **The Local Council on Immigration** is a participative path for the migrants' associations existing in Bilbao. This Council allows a stable work between the City Hall and these associations, in order to improve information about needs, difficulties, resources and services, strengthening the role of the association in the local tissue.

Finally, the City of Bilbao, like Madrid and other European cities (Belfast, Dublin, Vienna, Sofia, Bucharest, Düsseldorf, Poznan, Gdansk, Nitra, Cardiff and the British Council), take part in the Project and Network "Opencities", an Urbact Project financed by the European Union, which main goal is to elaborate an index of the participant cities' opening towards the foreigners.

Within the context of "Opencities" local Support group has been established, called "**Galu Bilbao**", formed by public administrations, Universities, the Basque Observatory

on Immigrations, NGOs and other organizations, in order to draft the Integration index of the city and to propose measures contributing to the openness of Bilbao.

VI. LANGUAGE AND INTEGRATION OF IMMIGRANTS

Spain is culturally speaking a plural country. The Constitution recognizes that the Spanish nation is formed by different “nationalities and regions”, and as well as the Spanish, the other languages are recognized as co-official languages in their territories. This linguistic diversity is considered as a cultural heritage that shall be “an object of special respect and protection”.

The three cities presented in this paper have a different situation with respect to the official languages and its learning. Madrid, the capital city of Spain, belongs to a monolingual region, where only the Spanish is spoken, the second language in the West world in terms of speakers. In theory, it simplifies the integration of immigrants, and particularly of those coming from Latin American countries. In the cases of Bilbao and Barcelona, these cities belong to Autonomous Communities where there are also an own language –Basque Country and Catalonia, respectively-. But the learning system and the implication of local authorities in the language policy is different in both cases.

In the case of Bilbao, the legal power on regional language in up to the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country, and the city doesn't imply itself in the learning of the Basque language for foreigners. In the Basque County the education policy organizes the education system in three models: A, B and D (letter “C” doesn't exist in Basque). In the system A, all the education is just in Spanish, and the Basque language –a pre-Roman language very different from Spanish- is a subject like the others. In the system B, the learning of the different subject is distributed half and half between the Spanish and the Basque. Finally, the system C is just the opposite than A: teaching is only in Basque, and the Spanish language is just a subject like the others.

In practice, under nationalistic Government until 2009, in the Basque Country the public offer of System A has practically disappeared, the offer of system B has been reduced in fact, and System D has been imposed slow but continuously. In the infant education, only 37 on 500 centers offer education in Spanish. 71 % of children study only in Basque (38% in the year 1996), 23,9% according to the bilingual system, and just 1000 children in the whole Basque Country study in Spanish within the model A. During decades, nationalistic local governments and director of public schools have launched campaigns to banish the system A. Also in the secondary education model A is disappearing. Only in no subsidized private school the most common model is a “trilingual” learning in Basque, Spanish and English. It is almost sure that this situation will change in the next years towards a more balanced one because, for the first time, there is in the Basque Country since 2009 a no nationalistic regional government, supported at the Basque parliament by a coalition between the Socialist Party and the People's Party, breaking the “siege to the Spanish language”.

The immigrant use to choose the system A at the first, but in the last years, as a sign of integration, most of them choose for their children the system B. The problem has been the limited offer of places in this system, something that will be corrected by the new government. Concerning the adult immigrant, the learning of the Basque language is

offered by private institutions subsidized by the public powers. However, the city of Bilbao doesn't include in its immigration policy the teaching of the Basque language, because they understand that this is a role of the regional level.

The situation is different in Catalonia, where a much more monolithic (and, at the end of the day radical) policy has been imposed in the public education. The so called "normalització lingüística" (linguistic normalization) of Catalonia the imposition of a single language in the education, in the public administration and even in the streets (where to put a sign in a shop only in Spanish can imply a fine from the regional government): the Catalan, a Romanic language very close to Spanish.

This monolingual system is very evident in the education, where all the subjects are given in Catalan, and Spanish is only a two hours a week subject (less than the English or other foreigners languages). Except (like in the Basque Country) in several no subsidized private schools, which prefer a trilingual education in Catalan, Spanish and English. Immigrants, so, shall accept this model, and there are "reinforcement" Catalan classes to the newcomers in order to do so quickly. In general terms, the linguistics "normalization" of immigrants is a kind of obsession of the Catalonian regional authorities that look at the immigration as a challenge to the process of "Catalanization" of Catalonia.

Jus for this reason, other important difference from the situation in Basque Country is the active implication of local governments in the linguistic "normalization" of adult immigrants and, since 2005, some municipalities have participated in "pilot planning" to stimulate the knowledge and use of the Catalan language.

In the case of the city of Barcelona, the Working Plan on Immigration 2008-2011 includes as an important aim the promotion of the learning of the Catalan in cooperation with the Consortium for Linguistic Normalization of Catalonia. Actually, the evolution of the Catalan course for immigrants in Barcelona has been very impressive: 13.664 students in 2005, 17.078 in 2006, 20.038 in 2007 and 27.600 in 2008.

The Barcelona City Hall also supports the NGOs offering Catalan and Spanish learning, including support for the edition of materials in Spanish (for Catalan they use the very complete materials of the Consortium for Linguistic Normalization of Catalonia). But, by miles, the most of the efforts are concentrated in the learning of Catalan language.

The question is: is there an important effect on immigration because of the existence of a different regional language? As I have said before, the rate of immigrants is very different in Barcelona and Bilbao: 18.1% and 7.9%. Barcelona even has a little bit bigger percentage of immigrants than Madrid. Concerning the complete regional territory, in Madrid the percentage of immigrants is 16.4% in the Autonomous Community of Madrid, 15.9% in Catalonia, and 6.1% in Basque Country. All three are rich regions, so, what explain the difference? Basque Country, for instance, has less percentage of immigrants than 13 of the 17 Spanish regions, while Catalonia is in the fifth position and Madrid in the third.

The language doesn't seem to have any relation with these differences. First of all, instead of the normalization policies in Catalonia and Basque Country, Spanish is the everyday language for most of people in Basque Country, and the most used daily at least for 50% people in Catalonia. It means that immigrants (and especially Latin

American ones) don't find a special integration difficulty because of the regional languages in Spain.

The differences in the percentage of immigrants, are mostly explained by differences in the economic system, and by the economies of scales and opportunities provided by the largest metropolitan areas like Madrid and Barcelona. In Spain most of the immigrants work in the services, in tourism and in building sectors. If building has similar important in Madrid, Catalonia and Basque Country, Services, included tourism is by large much more important in Madrid and Catalonia than in Basque Country, a typical industrial region (Ministerio de Política Territorial 2008) (Table 6).

Table 6. Distribution of GDP in Madrid, Catalonia and Basque Country in 2008 (%)

Autonomous Community	Services	Construction	Industry	Agriculture
Madrid	75.5	10.9	13.2	0.2
Catalonia	65.3	0.5	22.8	1.4
Basque Country	58.3	10.3	30.2	1.2

Source: Ministry of Territorial Policy of Spain

Immigrants also trend to concentrate more in the main metropolitan areas, such as Madrid and Barcelona, where they can find more job opportunities due to the economies of scale.

Also the “bizarre” political situation of the Basque Country, with limited political violence, could have discouraged some immigrants to establish there, but economic structure seems to be the key factor.

VII. CONCLUSIONS: MORE SIMILARITIES THAN DIFFERENCES

In a country that has received almost a half of the immigrants in the European Union during the first years of the 21st Century, it is not a surprise the necessity of a State policy to integrate them. Six amnesties processes have been implemented in Spain, for both the People's Party (centre-right) and the Socialist Party, the last one of them linking the regularization and the market.

All the tiers of Government (State, Regions and Cities) have implemented strategies for the immigrants' integration, independently of the political party governing in these institutions. If traditionally the left has been more sensitive towards immigration, this is not the case in the today's Spain, where we can find local governments of different “colors” implementing similar o very close policies in this arena. Madrid, Barcelona and Bilbao, Governed by different parties and coalition (table 7), offer evidence about it.

Table 7. Governing parties and coalitions in Madrid, Barcelona and Bilbao (mandate 2007-2011)

City	Mayor's Party	Governing coalition
Madrid	People's Party	People's Party (center-right) (absolute majority)
Barcelona	Socialist Party	Socialist Party (center-left), Initiative per Catalonia (nationalist, left), Republican Left of Catalonia (Independentist, center-left)
Bilbao	Basque Nationalist Party	Basque Nationalist Party (nationalist, center-right), United Left (left)

Source: Own elaboration with data of Ministry of Interior

Madrid, governed by the center-right People's Party, is a clear example of the engagement of a City in this arena. The main reason is the international vocation of the city and its tradition as an integration place, first with the inner immigration in the two first thirds of the 20th Century, that made Madrid a very eclectic city in terms of identity, al lately with the massive immigration of foreigners in the late years of the same century and the first ones of the 21th Century.

For the local political elites, it is clear that a good integration of foreigners is a key element for the social cohesion, the progress and the attractiveness of Madrid in the international arena. The II Madrid Plan on Social and Intercultural Coexistence (2009-2012) is an excellent example of this approach and its holistic approach shows the engagement of the Government of the City within this arena.

Barcelona and Bilbao, governed by very different coalitions (a left-nationalist coalition in Barcelona, and a strange coalition between a center-right nationalistic party and a left party in Bilbao) have strategies very close to Madrid in terms of principles and practices.

There is an important different between Barcelona and Bilbao: the first city has clearly engaged in the pro-regional language policy, while Bilbao understands that it is an Autonomous Community policy. But the existence of a regional language is nor a key factor in the immigration phenomenon: Catalonia has a strong policy on this issue, but despite in the region has a percentage of foreigners quite close to the Autonomous Community of Madrid, and Barcelona even a little bit more than the city of Madrid. It is also obvious that Spanish is used in large cities in the everyday life much more than the regional languages. The main differences in the percentage of immigrants have much more to do with the size and opportunities offered by the largest agglomerations (Madrid and Barcelona) and also to the length of the different economic sectors.

Finally, it is important to underline that in this three cities the immigration, at the moment, has not given rise to clear ghattification processes, even if there is some risks due to the concentration and percentage of poor and modest immigrants in the central district of Barcelona (Ciudad Vella) and some boroughs in the Center, South and East of the city of Madrid.

REFERENCES

Aguilera Izquierdo, Raquel (2006) “El acceso de los inmigrantes irregulares al mercado de trabajo: los procesos de regularización extraordinaria y el arraigo social y laboral”, Madrid: *Revista del Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales*, 63 (October 2006), pp. 175-195.

Ajuntament de Barcelona (2002) *Plan Municipal de Inmigración*.

Ajuntament de Barcelona (2008) *Pla de Treball Immigració 2008-2001*.

Arango, Joaquín, and Jachimowicz, Maia (2005) *Regularizing Immigrants in Spain: A New Approach*. Published by Migration Policy Institute, www.migrationinformation.org

Ayuntamiento de Madrid (2008) *Anuario de la Convivencia Intercultural de la ciudad de Madrid*

Ayuntamiento de Madrid (2009) *Segundo Plan Madrid de Convivencia Social y Cultural*

Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (CIS) (2007) *Estudio 2667, La identidad nacional de los españoles*. (Date 1st January 2007).

González Baker, Susan (1997) “The “Amnesty” Aftermath: Current Policy Issues Stemming from the Legalization Programs of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act”, *International Migration Review*, Volume 31, No 1 (Spring 1997), pp. 5-27.

Ministerio de Política Territorial (2008) *Perfil económico-financiero de las Comunidades Autónomas*. Madrid, published at www.mpt.es

Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales (2007) *Plan Estratégico de Ciudadanía e Integración 2007-2010*. Madrid, published at www.mtas.es

Ortega Pérez, Nieves (2003) *Forging an immigration Policy*. Published for Cato Institute, Trade Policy Analysis, www.cato.org

www.bilbao.net/immigration/