

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	vii
<i>List of Tables</i>	viii
<i>Preface and Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	xi
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xiii

Part I Conceptual Framework

1 Introduction: Immigration Policies in Multilevel States <i>Eve Hepburn and Ricard Zapata-Barrero</i>	3
2 Multilevel Governance of Immigration in Multinational States: 'Who Governs?' Reconsidered <i>Ricard Zapata-Barrero and Fiona Barker</i>	19
3 Multilevel Party Politics of Immigration: Territorial Rescaling and Party Competition <i>Eve Hepburn</i>	41

Part II Governance

4 Divided on Immigration, Two Models for Integration. The Multilevel Governance of Immigration and Integration in Belgium <i>Ilke Adam and Dirk Jacobs</i>	65
5 Canadian Federalism and the Governance of Immigration <i>Raffaele Iacovino</i>	86
6 Managing Immigration in a Multinational Context. Border Struggles and Nation-Building in Contemporary Scotland and Catalonia <i>Jean-Thomas Arrighi de Casanova</i>	108
7 Migrant Reception Policies in a Multilevel System: Framing and Implementation Structures in the Italian Regions <i>Francesca Campomori and Tiziana Caponio</i>	130

8	The Multilevel Dynamics of Migrant Integration Policies in Unitary States: The Netherlands and the United Kingdom <i>Peter Scholten</i>	150
Part III Political Parties		
9	Politicizing Migration in Competitive Party Politics: Exploring the Regional and Federal Arenas in Germany and Italy <i>Oliver Schmidtke and Andrej Zaslove</i>	177
10	Regionalist Parties and Immigration in Belgium <i>Régis Dandoy</i>	200
11	FPTP Ain't All That Bad: Nationalist Parties, Immigrants, and Electoral Systems in Québec and Flanders <i>Jan Erk</i>	223
12	Immigration, Nationalism, and Politics in Scotland <i>Eve Hepburn and Michael Rosie</i>	241
13	' <i>Catalunya, terra d'acollida</i> ': Stateless Nationalist Party Discourses on Immigration in Catalonia <i>Núria Franco-Guillén and Ricard Zapata-Barrero</i>	261
14	Conclusion: Exploring the Contours of a Theory of Immigration in <i>Multilevel States</i> <i>Ricard Zapata-Barrero and Eve Hepburn</i>	285
	<i>Index</i>	299

Part I

Conceptual Framework

1

Introduction: Immigration Policies in Multilevel States

Eve Hepburn and Ricard Zapata-Barrero

The context and academic debate

Immigration has become one of the most contested issues in advanced democracies. Blamed for threatening national cultures and disrupting social cohesion, immigration has also been identified as the only way to mitigate the pending demographic crises of Western states. Yet despite these demographic arguments, there are few issues that have aroused the concern of electorates more than the prospect of rapid social change resulting from migration. This issue has become increasingly apparent in light of the Arab Spring, which has prompted new population movements. A survey on public attitudes towards migration in six European states revealed that a significant share of citizens is apprehensive about immigration, often perceiving it as a threat to employment, public order, and safety (Diamanti and Bordignon, 2005). We also believe that there are difficulties in tracing a clear dividing line between the social and political rhetoric of these perceptions (Zapata-Barrero and Díez-Nicolas, 2012). This edited book corroborates a number of studies highlighting the potentially destabilizing effects of immigration on the politics and societies of host states (Messina, 2002).

Immigration-related issues have risen to the top of the public policy agenda of the European Union (EU) and its member states (Messina and Thouez, 2002), resulting in a widespread tightening of illegal immigration controls (Coleman, 2002: 47). In response to such concerns, many countries have seen a public and media backlash against increasing immigration, the emergence of grassroots anti-immigrant protests (Della Porta, 1996; Gómez-Reino, 2002: 132; Tyler and Marciniak, 2013), the rise of radical-right anti-immigrant parties in statewide elections (Zaslove, 2004; Mudde, 2007), and the need to build a new

European discourse on tolerance (Zapata-Barrero and Triandafyllidou, 2012).

However, in federal and devolved multilevel systems, immigration is not only an important issue at the *state* level; it has also become a key concern for *sub-state* political units (Zapata-Barrero, 2009; Joppke and Seidle, 2012). With the decentralization of powers to sub-state levels of government, regional assemblies have been empowered with control over large sections of social and economic policy, including health, education, housing, culture, the environment, planning, and economic development (Keating, 2001; Marks et al, 2008). And although immigration policy generally falls under the rubric of central-state control, being governed by the state's citizenship rules and requirements, certain aspects of migration policy have devolved to the sub-state level¹ – most notably, migrant integration policies but also in some cases control over admissions/selection, such as in Quebec. The primary reason why regions have been steadily gaining powers over migration is because many sub-state policy areas 'overlap' with issues of migration, which affects regional demographic growth, the labour market, economic development, and the delivery of public services (such as schooling, health and social care, and housing). As such, some sub-state territories are seeking, and being granted, more control over migration issues (Joppke and Seidle, 2012). The decentralization of such a key policy area is also indicative of a general trend towards the 'decentralization' of states in Europe, which acknowledges that sub-state territories are important political, social, and economic communities for citizens – including migrants (Keating, 2001; Hepburn, 2010a).

Furthermore, the impact of immigration on sub-state societies, public services, and economies has necessitated a response from sub-state political actors. And, as in other policy areas, sub-state governments and parties may adopt quite distinctive policies on migration, which may diverge from, or even contradict, those of the state. While some sub-state territories may seek to distinguish themselves from a 'restrictive' state by proposing a more progressive approach to migration, others may criticize the state for advocating an open-door policy of migration by proposing more restrictive measures at the sub-state regional level (Hepburn, 2011). This may become an especially contentious issue in cases where sub-state territories are seeking to pursue greater autonomy and must identify what is 'distinct' about their culture, and demarcate who belongs to the sub-state community (and equally, who does not) (Banting and Soroka, 2012; Barker, 2012). Often, these sub-state political approaches to immigration conflict directly with central-state (national)

models, resulting in tensions over policy coordination and the framing of immigration in different parts of a country.

As immigration has become ‘rescaled’ across several levels of multi-level states, there is an urgent need to develop a deeper understanding of how immigration is governed and framed by political actors across different territorial levels, and to explore the degree of cooperation and contestation between these levels. Immigration has rarely been examined from a multilevel perspective, including the sub-state/devolved view. The vast majority of works on immigration focus on the state level, and more recently on the European level. Yet, it is precisely at this sub-state territorial level that migrants seek full participation in the social, economic, and cultural life of a host community. Sub-state territories now hold substantial power over the rights of citizenship – social, cultural, economic, and political – and control over institutions that provide access to participation and belonging. This has important implications for migrant integration. As a representative of the EU Committee of the Regions (CoR) recently argued, ‘regional authorities play a decisive role in creating the right conditions for third-country nationals to access a whole range of public services, including above all education, healthcare, employment and housing. Cities and regions are the linchpins that enables immigrants to develop a strong and constructive connection with the host society, developing a climate of trust and maintaining social cohesion’ (CoR Press Release, 15 February 2012). The importance of sub-state territorial policy on migration is therefore becoming increasingly recognized.

Yet scholarship on the territorial rescaling of immigration politics and policy across federal and devolved states is hampered by the fact that multilevel politics tend to be understood as an exclusively EU-state relationship. Certainly, the multilevel governance approach evolved from the study of governmental interaction in the European Union. Gary Marks (1993) was one of the first scholars to describe the interactions of governments in the EU context as resulting in multilevel governance. Marks and Hooghe (2001) furthermore presented different types of multilevel governance at the EU level and focused their analysis on the EU-state relationship. But since this elaboration of multilevel governance, there have been far fewer examinations of this multilevel perspective at the state/sub-state political level (for some exceptions, see Hepburn, 2010a; Detterbeck, 2012) nor has it ever been examined with regard to the specific area of immigration, which is clearly a cross-cutting policy issue that affects both levels (see the seminal comparative work by Joppke and Seidle, 2012).

The purposes of the book

The aim of this edited book is therefore to tackle the topical issue of immigration from a widely neglected multilevel perspective that incorporates the analysis of state/sub-state approaches to, and coordination of, immigration policy and politics. The book addresses the complex politics of immigration in states of a federal or devolved nature where immigration, and especially migrant integration, have become ‘overlapping’ policies between central-state and sub-state levels. It also considers the effects and consequences of the ‘territorial rescaling’ of immigration in multilevel political frameworks, seeking to identify the challenges and opportunities for the emergence of different immigration approaches following decentralization. These challenges and opportunities include issues of how migrant integration policy diverges across different regions of a state; intergovernmental relations and coordination between states and sub-state territories on immigration policy; the regionally differentiated economic dimensions of the multilevel integration of immigrants; and the possible tensions arising from migration to a region that considers itself a stateless nation or linguistic minority group.

In order to understand the differences between state and sub-state approaches to immigration, an important part of this analysis is to examine immigration through the prism of ‘territorial interests’ that dominate the regional level. These territorial interests may be cultural, economic, or political in nature; and immigration affects them all.

With regard to cultural territorial interests, there is a rich body of literature detailing the distinctiveness of regional identities, cultures, and languages within states. For instance, within the EU’s 27 member states, there are 74 sub-state territories with legislative powers and over 100 more regions with administrative powers (AER, 2009). These sub-state territories provide important spaces for social and political attitudes, behaviour, cultures, and identities (Keating, 1996; Henderson, 2010; Hepburn, 2010b). Many of these sub-state territories make claim to a distinctive local culture and traditions that have evolved separately from state-building processes. These include, for instance, the ‘Celtic’ traditions of Galicia in Spain and the ‘Alpine’ traditions of Bavaria in Germany. Sub-state territories also often boast a particular religious concentration, such as the predominance of Catholicism in North-Rhein Westphalia or Presbyterianism in Scotland. Finally, some sub-state territories also speak their own language instead of the central-state language. In addition to the 23 official languages of the EU, there are over 65 more that are spoken at the sub-state level; some of which have been included

in the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages (CoE, 1992) and many others that have no official recognition at all (Hornsby and Agarín, 2012). These languages provide an important lens through which citizens understand and make sense of the world, and many efforts have been made to prevent their extinction. These culturally distinctive characteristics of regions mean that migrants are often presented with a challenge when moving to a particular sub-state territory: integrating into the culture and learning the language is often more important for their participation in social, political, and economic life than adopting the culture/language of the state. In particular, some sub-state languages may be perceived as more 'difficult' to learn than state languages (i.e., Basque and Welsh) while other sub-state territories place an emphasis on learning an accent or dialect as a sign of belonging.

Yet one of the greatest fears of sub-state territories with a strong linguistic identity is the possibility that immigration erodes that linguistic identity (Erk, 2003). As Zapata-Barrero (2007: 12) argues, 'if the minority community does not have sufficient competencies in the matter, the tendency of the immigrants who settle in the national territory is to integrate into the dominant culture ... if immigrants become integrated into the dominant culture, then the minority nation may become a minority within its own territory'. So immigration raises concerns for the protection of minority languages in sub-state regions and nations, as immigrants often adopt the language of the majority as the best route for social mobility, which subsequently reduces the sub-state population speaking a minority language. As a result, sub-state political actors may view immigration as a threat to their identity, language, customs, traditions, or ways of life. In some cases this has directly led to the rise of anti-immigrant nationalist parties in sub-state territories that have won a large share of the vote (on the Belgian case, see Adam and Jacobs, Erk, and Dandoy in this volume; and for the Spanish case, see the contribution by Franco-Guillén and Zapata-Barrero).

Second, with regard to economic territorial interests, a wealth of scholarly studies has emerged on the issues of regional economic development and regional economic policy (see Storper, 1995; Piore and Sabel, 1984). Sub-state territories are not only viewed as distinctive economic systems and labour markets; they are also seen as autonomous economic actors with devolved economic powers. Economic regionalization means that immigrants must be attuned to the needs of the sub-state economy and labour market when they arrive in their host community (on the German and Italian cases in particular, see Schmidtke and Zaslove's contribution in this volume). For instance, some sub-state economies

are dominated by the tourism industry, others by the services industry, and others by high-tech manufacturing, which may be different from other parts of the country (Storper, 1995). And while some sub-state territories may be performing better in economic terms than the state average, others may be doing poorly (for an examination of regional economic inequality and immigration in the Italian case, see Campomori and Caponio's chapter). In response, sub-state governments and parties may seek to protect traditional modes of economic development within the sub-state territory (such as an emphasis on small and medium-sized businesses), demanding that the territory requires certain labour-market skills from immigrants in order to maintain the specific territorial mode of economic development (on how this has been encouraged at the local municipal/city level, see Scholten's analysis of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands).

Third, with regard to political territorial interests, there may exist demands for autonomy and/or independence within the regional and/or statewide party system, which are affected by immigration. Recent studies show that party systems and party competition at the regional level are becoming increasingly distinctive from the state level, whereby statewide parties must operate in a peculiarly regional context and compete on regional issues (Hough and Jeffery, 2006). In response to decentralization, political parties in federal and devolved states have strengthened their sub-state organizational structures and programmes (Detterbeck and Hepburn, 2010). The decentralization of political parties has enabled party branches operating at the sub-state level to diverge in their policy agendas from their statewide 'parent' parties. This 'sub-state dimension' acquires particular salience in cases where stateless nationalist and regionalist parties (SNRPs) exist whose constitutional goals have won formidable electoral support (Hepburn, 2009b). If immigration becomes a key concern of SNRPs in their development of a nation-building project, then it must also become a concern of sub-state branches of statewide parties in order to represent regional interests. This dynamic means that party competition over issues such as immigration at the sub-state level may be entirely distinctive from party competition at the statewide level. For instance, party competition may be highly polarized on immigration if it is seen to threaten the culture or language of the region (see Erk's chapter on the situation in Flanders). Yet party competition may also be consensually in favour of immigration if this is seen as a way to bolster the region's demography and economic growth (see the chapters by Hepburn and Rosie on Scotland; and Franco-Guillén and Zapata-Barrero on Catalonia).

Immigration therefore affects the autonomy/independence of sub-state territories in several ways. Demographically, the sub-state territory in question may be experiencing low demographic growth, and increasing the population through immigration may make the territory more 'viable' as a self-determined political unit (see Arrighi de Casanova's contribution on Scotland). Conversely, demands for self-determination may be based on the existence of a distinct history, culture or language, and immigration may be perceived as threatening this claim (unless immigrants are fully integrated into the culture/language of the region – see Iacovino's chapter on the Quebec case). As Bauböck (2001: 333) maintains, 'if a national linguistic minority were to become a minority in its own province through intermarriage, the immigration of other groups, or the emigration of its own members, this demographic shift would undermine its power to claim regional autonomy and special representation at the federal level.' Clearly, there are several ways in which immigration may intersect with the 'territorial' dimension of party competition in multilevel states.

Themed issues: *Governance and Political Parties*

In order to tackle the ways in which territorial interests intersect with immigration in multilevel states, this book addresses two principle themes. The first theme focuses on the *governance of immigration* in multilevel states, especially in countries with a federal, devolved, or multinational character. Following the framework of R. Dahl's *Who Governs?* (1961), we assume that there are unresolved tensions between 'who does' (implementation) and 'who decides' (decision-making process) in immigration governance. This tension invites us to follow a conflict-oriented perspective (for example, between administrations or how each administration resolves conflicts related to immigration). This perspective connects the dimensions of social dynamics, policy responses, and legal frameworks. This discussion revolves around external and internal dimensions of governance institutions – an analytical distinction that is made from the perspective of the sub-state unit (be it a region, stateless nation, or other form of sub-state administrative unit). To elaborate, the 'external dimension' addresses the main issues arising from the relationship between the sub-state units and the central-state. The 'internal dimension', on the other hand, addresses issues that arise from the relationship between the national units and societal culture. These dimensions are explored from three perspectives: (1) (policy) competencies, (2) power relationships and intergovernmental relationships, and

(3) effects of the management of diversity. The ‘Governance’ section of the book therefore focuses on the impact of multilevel governance on immigration policies, and vice versa, the impact of immigration policies on multilevel governance more broadly.

A second, equally important, theme of the book is to understand the response of political parties to the question of immigration, especially at the overlooked sub-state level. This level has so far been almost absent in the field of immigration studies, which has tended to focus on the nation-state or supranational level. However, this level is crucial in understanding immigration, because sub-state territories have become increasingly responsible for designing policies of migrant integration. At this sub-state territorial level, quite distinct party systems can often be detected, which do not follow the logic of statewide politics (Hough and Jeffery, 2006). In particular, in sub-state territories with claims to a distinct identity (be it cultural, historical, economic, or linguistic) party competition is often influenced by a territorial or linguistic cleavage that is often absent from competition at the state level (Keating, 1996; Hepburn, 2009b). This territorial/linguistic cleavage interacts with the issue of immigration in peculiar ways. While some parties may perceive immigration as threatening the identity or language of their own territory, others may view immigration as a way to boost the membership vis-à-vis the state in their claims for self-determination (Erk, 2003; Bauböck, 2001; Kymlicka and Patten, 2003; Hepburn, 2009a). In any case, immigration has become an important focus of political parties at the sub-state level – including stateless nationalist and regionalist parties (SNRPs) and regional branches of statewide parties – whose responses have been informed by strong ‘territorial interests’, as described above.

The distinctive approach to immigration evident in sub-state territories is further exacerbated if the unit in question also considers itself to form a ‘nation’ with a claim to special treatment. In this case, sub-state elites may be preoccupied with promoting a distinctive nation-building project and conception of citizenship that diverges from the state. Sub-state political actors may prefer to set their own terms for territorial membership and migrant integration within the contours of the nation-building project, whose terms may be more open *or* more restrictive than those decreed at the state level, and which may cause tensions with central statewide party offices. For SNRPs in particular, this may lead to demands to wrest control over immigration policy from the central government in order to develop a distinct approach that reflects the specific needs and interests of the sub-state territorial community.

This twofold approach to studying both the governance and the party politics of immigration allows us to examine not only how, and by whom, immigration policy is decided and implemented at multiple territorial levels, but also how it has become an important dimension of party competition in multilevel states. The analysis of state/sub-state coordination and conflict over immigration has become increasingly important due to the growing responsibilities that sub-state territories have been given in the field of immigration (especially integration policies). But until now, scholarship on state/sub-state immigration has been very much lacking in this area. As Zaslove (2006) argues, immigration is a cross-cleavage issue in left-right terms, posing challenges for traditional parties. Yet in multilevel states, regional-level parties often pursue quite divergent approaches to immigration compared to national parties.

Overview of different contributions

The book is organized thematically. It begins with two ‘conceptual’ chapters, which together provide a theoretical framework for understanding the governance and party competition dimensions of immigration in multilevel states. The first of these, by Ricard Zapata-Barrero and Fiona Barker, proposes an interpretative framework that can help to map the nexus between multilevel governance and immigration policy. This model has two main dimensions – Structure and Policy. The dimension of ‘structure’ addresses how powers are organized in terms of the relationship between central and sub-state levels. Zapata-Barrero and Barker introduce three main analytical distinctions: two driving forces (efficiency and national identity), two principles (coordination and coherence), and three scenarios (centralist, cooperative, asymmetric) which are later employed by contributors in the Governance section of the book. Along the policy dimension, they map out tensions that can arise between levels of government with reference to concrete elements of immigration policies, such as admissions, reception, and citizenship. In doing so, they acknowledge the impact that language, as a common marker of national identity, can have in multinational states.

The second conceptual paper, written by Eve Hepburn, develops an analytical framework for the Political Parties section of the book. She explores the dynamics of party competition on the issue of immigration, especially at the sub-state regional level. Immigration has become an important focus of regional political parties which have responded in diverse ways to the challenges and opportunities associated with immigration. The impact of territorial interests – political, economic,

and cultural – on the immigration strategies of regional parties encourages them to take distinctive positions from national-level parties. To account for this, Hepburn develops an explanatory framework for understanding the positioning of both sub-state regional *and* statewide political parties on immigration. She presents several hypotheses to account for the immigration stances of regional and statewide parties, and the divergence between the two, by drawing on variables relating to demographics, economics, language, ideology, the electoral system, policy control, and party polarization. These hypotheses are then employed by contributors seeking to empirically examine party positioning on immigration in the Political Parties section of the book.

The book then proceeds in the following manner. The section on Governance comprises five chapters focusing on the institutional aspects of governing immigration in federal, devolved, and multinational states. It focuses on the question ‘Who does what’, and how the related questions of ‘Who decides’ and ‘Who does’ are managed from a theoretical and conflict-based approach. This section includes a mix of case studies (Belgium, Canada, Italy, Spain, the UK and the Netherlands) and different methodological perspectives on multilevel governance. It also considers broader governance themes including the impact of European integration on migration policy; obstacles in the management of diversity and societal integration; the link between citizenship and integration; and the relationship between security and migration.

The first chapter in the Governance section, written by Ilke Adam and Dirk Jacobs, explores immigration and migrant integration policy-making in the centrifugal multilevel context of Belgium. The authors show that while immigration and citizenship policy is still a prerogative of the central-state, legislative *and* executive power over migrant integration have been devolved to the sub-state regions since 1980. Moreover, immigration politics and policy-making at the central-state level must be situated in the context of a regionalized party system and the absence of statewide parties. In their findings, the authors show that regional policy responses on migrant integration, as well as Flemish and Francophone political party positioning on the central-state’s immigration and citizenship policy, largely diverge. The authors explain these differences by pointing at divergent party dynamics and sub-state nation-building processes in Flanders and Francophone Belgium.

The next chapter by Raffaele Iacovino focuses on Canada. It examines how immigration policy has shaped two nation-building projects – the Québécois and the Canadian – which compete in their affirmation as primary host societies and national identities. This competition, which is

also marked by interdependence, has led Quebec and the federal government to carve out a shared governance framework that has remained in place for around 20 years. Yet, in recent years Canada has introduced a considerable degree of decentralization in both admissions and reception policy to other parts of the country, incrementally extending and signing a patchwork of bilateral agreements with all of the other provinces/territories. As such, Canada's immigration regime can be characterized as one of variable decentralization grounded on two primary justificatory schemes (efficiencies/functional vs. national identity/autonomy). While these separate and sometimes conflicting logics operate simultaneously, the nature and scope of asymmetry emerges in the variance associated with the federal government's capacity as a steering agent vis-à-vis the provinces, which is much more circumscribed in Quebec.

Examining two other cases of multinational states, Jean-Thomas Arrighi de Casanova explores the relationship between minority nationalism and migration in Spain and the UK. Addressing the question of 'who governs', he compares how the Catalan and Scottish governments have sought to gain greater control over the regulation of aliens' entry into their own jurisdictions between 1999 and 2011. His findings show that their demands have remained largely unfulfilled as the UK and Spanish central administrations have proved equally reluctant to share their prerogatives in a matter that they view as closely associated with their sovereignty. However, while the sub-state governments may have failed to gain administrative or legislative control over admissions policy, their success in criticizing the central-state's immigration regime could also be interpreted as a political victory.

Francesca Campomori and Tiziana Caponio then focus our attention on migrant integration in the highly regionally diverse system of multi-level governance in Italy. They compare migrant integration policies in sub-state regions that represent the so-called three (political and social) 'Italies' – Veneto in the North, Emilia-Romagna in the Centre-North, and Calabria in the South – which are differentiated by two cleavages: the North/South cleavage and the Red/White political culture cleavage. In order to understand what policy control the regions actually exert, Campomori and Caponio consider two dimensions: the framing of immigrants and immigration and the implementation structures. From their analysis, the authors reveal a fascinating and complex patchwork of centre-periphery/state-society relations, characterized by high levels of fragmentation and divergence in regional policies, which clearly contradicts the principle of coherence that is supposed to inspire the multilevel governance of immigration in multilevel settings.

Peter Scholten brings up the rear of the Governance section by examining multilevel governance as a relevant phenomenon also in unitary states. As he argues, local governments, especially large cities, often do much more than implement national policies in a top-down manner in unitary states. Instead, they often play a key role in the formulation of their own policies while also influencing national policies. Scholten tests this hypothesis in two (decentralized) unitary states – the Netherlands and the UK – examining cases of migrant integration policies in four cities within these states: Amsterdam and Rotterdam in the Netherlands and London and Glasgow in the UK. The diverse approaches to integration found at the local level provide significant challenges in terms of the effective multilevel governance of migrant integration and for adopting effective policy strategies.

In the next section on Political Parties, the focus turns from structure to the ‘agents’ of immigration policy. In other words, the role of political actors in framing and mobilizing immigration issues in multilevel states, and the distinct dynamics of party competition on issues of immigration at different territorial levels. The five chapters in this section offer several case studies on the party politics of immigration in multilevel states (Belgium, Canada, Germany, Italy, Spain, and the UK respectively). The authors explore several themes relating to the politics of immigration, including the impact of the electoral system on sub-state party competition over immigration, ideological convergence and the ‘ownership’ of immigration policies, and the influence of regional political cultures on party positioning.

Opening the Political Parties section, Oliver Schmidtke and Andrej Zaslove argue that migration and integration are at the centre of competitive party politics in Europe. But while this development is predominantly described in terms of national contexts, it is not yet clear whether regional party politics are vulnerable to similar dynamics that exist at the national (state) level, in particular with respect to the exploitation of anti-immigrant sentiments. In response to this, Schmidtke and Zaslove examine whether there is a different logic at play in politicizing migration-related issues at the national-state and sub-state regional levels. They focus on four regions in Germany and Italy that are characterized by opposing traditional political identities: North Rhine Westphalia and Emilia-Romagna, which both share a legacy of social-democratic or communist rule, and Bavaria and Lombardy with a tradition of conservative dominance. Here they explore how the socioeconomic position and political culture of the region shapes political party responses to immigration.

Régis Dandoy then shifts our focus to regionalism and party competition on immigration in the federal state of Belgium. He argues that scholars of the Belgian case often perceive extreme-right (anti-immigrant) parties as the only 'owners' of the immigration issue. However, with the help of a quantitative and qualitative analysis of party manifestos since 1977, Dandoy demonstrates how the ownership of extreme-right parties on immigration is not as clear-cut as expected. His findings show that regionalist and liberal parties also significantly emphasize immigration. In particular, the position of the regionalist parties on immigration is more a question of ideology than the consequence of party competition (that is, the effects of extreme-right parties on their own positions) and that the issue of immigration is often combined with the parties' main policy interests, that is, decentralization and the linguistic conflict between Flemish and French-speaking parties.

Jan Erk also focuses on Belgium as a multination democracy with a strong sub-state nationalist movement, in a detailed comparison with Canada. He argues that Québec and Flanders are both facing growing immigration, but while the goal of self-rule/independence unites the agendas of the main nationalist parties, there is a clear difference in terms of their positions on immigration. *Parti Québécois* actively courts the immigrant vote and has placed immigrant inclusion at the centre of its party programme, while opposition to immigration is a core part of the programme of *Vlaams Blok/Vlaams Belang*. Erk examines whether the electoral system can explain these different positions, whereby the first-past-the-post system may pressure the Parti Québécois to cast a wide political net to bring in as many immigrant votes as possible, while the proportional electoral system presents no similar political incentives to appeal to the immigrant vote in Flanders.

Eve Hepburn and Michael Rosie then examine the intersection of immigration and nationalism in Scotland. They present a puzzle: while UK parties link immigration to insecurity, crime, and a threat to British national culture, Scottish parties focus on its economic, demographic and social benefits and embrace the discourse of multiculturalism and inclusion. The authors employ four hypotheses to explain this divergence: the demographic needs of low-population Scotland, the perceived low barriers to becoming a member of the Scottish nation, the lack of Scottish control over immigration policy, and the lack of party polarization in a system characterized by a broad liberal consensus on immigration. However, as the authors warn, if Scotland gains control over immigration policy following the independence referendum of 2014, then we may see a rather different, and more polarized, dynamic.

In the final Political Parties chapter, Núria Franco-Guillén and Ricard Zapata-Barrero explore the interaction between minority nationalism and immigration through the examination of SNRP discourses in Catalonia. They develop an analytical framework to explain how elements of nationalism appear in the construction of a discourse on immigration. The framework, which includes a system of categories related to identity (belonging, values and function of language) that is partly based on the distinction between civic and ethnic nationalisms, has the novelty of proposing the transversal inclusion of language across the civic/ethnic distinction. In an analysis of the immigration discourses of the two most relevant SNRPs in Catalonia (Convergència i Unió – CiU and Esquerra Republicana per Catalunya – ERC), the authors argue that a party's stance (positive/negative) towards immigration determines the shape of the nationalist discourse.

In the concluding chapter, Ricard Zapata-Barrero and Eve Hepburn summarize the key issues pertaining to the governance and party politics of immigration in multilevel states. They reflect on the diverse findings of the chapters, and compare and contrast trends in the governance mechanisms and party competition dynamics in the multilevel states analysed. Finally, they develop the first contours of an exploratory theory of the politics of immigration in multilevel states based on the general patterns detected in the book and suggest some pathways for future research.

Note

1. As concepts are not cut in stone, there are different ways to refer to sub-state level in the multilevel governance and comparative territorial politics literature. We have given contributors the freedom to express this conceptual reference without trying to recommend just one 'undisputable' concept, thereby acknowledging that there are different concepts that refer to the same empirical fact, i.e. region, province, autonomous community, sub-state nation, stateless nation. However, in this Introduction we have decided to use the term 'sub-state territory' or 'sub-state level' as the most descriptive (and possibly most neutral) concept.

References

- AER (2009) 'Tabula Regionum Europae' (Strasbourg: Assembly of European Regions).
- K. Banting and S. Soroka (2012) 'Minority Nationalism and Immigrant Integration in Canada', *Nations and Nationalism*, 18: 156–176.
- F. Barker (2012) *Immigration and Contested Nation Building: Explaining the Political Salience of Immigration in Multi-National Societies*. GRITIM Working Paper. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

- R. Bauböck (2001) 'Cultural Citizenship, Minority Rights and Self-Government' in A. Aleinikoff and Doug Klusmeyer (eds) *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*. (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment).
- CoE (1992) *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. (Strasbourg: Council of Europe).
- D. Coleman (2002) 'Mass Migration to Europe: Demographic Salvation or Unwanted Foreigners?' in A. Messina (ed.) *West European Immigration and Immigrant Policy in the New Century*. (Westport CT: Praeger).
- R. Dahl (1961) *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- D. Della Porta (1996) 'Immigration and Protest: New Challenges for Italian Democracy', *South European Society & Politics*, 5(3): 108–132.
- K. Detterbeck (2012) *Multi-level Party Politics in Western Europe*. (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- K. Detterbeck and E. Hepburn (2010) 'Party Politics in Multi-level Systems: Party Responses to New Challenges in European Democracies' in W. Swenden and J. Erk (eds) *Exploring New Avenues of Comparative Federalism Research*. (London: Routledge).
- A. Diamanti and F. Bordignon (2005) *Immigrazione e cittadinanza in Europa. Orientamenti e atteggiamenti dei cittadini europei*. (Urbino: Fondazione Nord-Est).
- J. Erk (2003) "'Wat We Zelf Doen, Doen We Beter": Belgian Substate Nationalisms, Congruence and Public Policy', *Journal of Public Policy*, 23(2): 201–224.
- M. Gómez-Reino Cachafero (2002), *Ethnicity and Nationalism in Italian Politics*. (Aldershot: Ashgate).
- A. Henderson (2010) 'Why Regions Matter: Sub-State Politics in Comparative Perspective', *Regional and Federal Studies*, 20(4/5): 441–447.
- E. Hepburn (2009a) 'Regionalist Party Mobilisation on Immigration', *West European Politics*, 32(3): 514–535.
- E. Hepburn (ed.) (2009b) *New Challenges for Stateless Nationalist and Regionalist Parties*, Special Issue of *Regional & Federal Studies*, 19(4/5): 477–650.
- E. Hepburn (2010a) *Using Europe. Territorial Party Strategies in a Multi-level System*. (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- E. Hepburn (2010b) 'Small Worlds in Canada and Europe', *Regional & Federal Studies*, 20(4/5): 527–544.
- E. Hepburn (2011) "'Citizens of the Region": Party Conceptions of Regional Citizenship and Immigrant Integration', *European Journal of Political Research*, 50(4):504–529.
- M. Hornsby and T. Agarín (2012) 'The End of Minority Languages? Europe's Regional Languages in Perspective', *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe*, 11(1): 88–116.
- D. Hough and C. Jeffery (2006) *Devolution and Electoral Politics: A Comparative Evaluation*. (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- C. Joppke and F.L. Seidle (eds) (2012) *Immigration Integration in Federal Countries*. (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press).
- M. Keating (1996) *Nations Against the State: The New Politics of Nationalism in Quebec, Catalonia and Scotland*. (London: Macmillan).
- M. Keating (2001) *Plurinational Democracy. Stateless Nations in a Post-Sovereignty Era*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

- W. Kymlicka and A. Patten (2003) *Language Rights and Political Theory*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- G. Marks (1993) 'Structural Policy and Multilevel Governance' in A. Cafruny and G. Rosenthal (eds) *The State of the European Community*. (Harlow: Longman).
- G. Marks and L. Hooghe (2001) *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*. (Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield).
- G. Marks, L. Hooghe and A. Schakel (eds) (2008) 'Regional Authority in 42 Countries, 1950–2006: A Measure and Five Hypotheses', *Regional & Federal Studies*, 18(2/3): 111–302.
- A. Messina (2002) 'Introduction' in A. Messina (ed.) *West European Immigration and Immigrant Policy in the New Century*. (Westport CT: Praeger).
- A. Messina and C. Thouez (2002) 'The Logics and Politics of a European Immigration Regime' in A. Messina (ed.) *West European Immigration and Immigrant Policy in the New Century*. (Westport CT: Praeger).
- C. Mudde (2007) *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- M. Piore and C. Sabel (1984) *The Second Industrial Divide: Possibilities for Prosperity*. (New York: Basic Books Inc).
- M. Storper (1995) 'The Resurgence of Regional Economies, 10 Years Later', *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 2(3): 191–221.
- I. Tyler and K. Marciniak (eds) (2013) 'Immigrant Protests', special issue in *Citizenship Studies*, 17(2): 143–292.
- R. Zapata-Barrero (2007) 'Setting a Research Agenda on the Interaction between Cultural Demands of Immigrants and Minority Nations', *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 5(4): 1–25.
- R. Zapata-Barrero (ed.) (2009) *Immigration and Self-government of Minority Nations*. (Brussels: Peter Lang).
- R. Zapata-Barrero and J. Díez-Nicolas (2012) 'Islamophobia in Spain?: Political Rhetoric Rather than a Social Fact' in M. Helbling (ed.) *Islamophobia in Western Europe and North America*. (London: Routledge).
- R. Zapata-Barrero and A. Triandafyllidou (eds) (2012) *Addressing Tolerance and Diversity Discourses in Europe. A Comparative Overview of 16 European Countries Barcelona: Fundació CIDOB* [Download: http://www.upf.edu/gritim/actualitat/accept_libro.html#UZDsTbXZZ2A]
- A. Zaslove (2004) 'Closing the Door? The Ideology and Impact of Radical Right Populism on Immigration Policy in Austria and Italy', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 9(1): 99–118.
- A. Zaslove (2006) 'The Politics of Immigration: A New Electoral Dilemma for the Right and the Left?', *Review of European and Russian Affairs*, 2(3): 10–36.

Index

- acollida, 269, 281, 283
 Action démocratique du Québec (ADQ), 235
 admissions, 28–30, 86–7, 89, 91–2, 97–8, 161
 conditions for, 102–3
 immigrant, 29, 110
 admissions policies, 13, 30–3, 37, 103, 109
 central-state, 36
 control over, 109, 114–16, 118–19, 121–3, 286–7, 293
 ADQ (Action démocratique du Québec), 235
 anti-immigrant, 15, 55, 61, 194, 230, 253, 288
 mobilization, 188
 parties, 47, 55–8, 147, 202–4, 235, 250–7, 291, *see also* LN
 politicization, 79
 positions, 47, 55–6, 205, 291, 294
 rhetoric, 177, 288, 293
 sentiments, 14, 177, 188, 204, 223
 anti-immigration parties, *see* anti-immigrant, parties
 associations, immigrant, 74, 76–7, 133, 139
 asymmetric scenario, 21, 26–8, 32–3, 145
 asymmetry, 86

 Bavaria, 14, 178, 186–91, 194–5, 197, 289, 296
 Belgian State, *see* Belgium
 Belgium, 14–15, 65–7, 81–3, 200–20, 225–6, 231, 235, 285–6, 290
 BNP (British National Party), 109, 241, 253, 258
 Bologna, 132, 148–9, 198
 Britain, 112, 114, 122, 156, 245, 248, 253, *see also* UK
 British National Party, *see* BNP
 Britishness, 156, 158, 246–7

 Brussels, 75–7, 201, 231, 234
 Flemings, 231–2
 French-speaking, 206
 Region, 67, 73, 75–6, 79

 Calabria, 131, 135–6, 142–5, 285
 Canada, 12–16, 54, 92–4, 96–8, 115, 225–7, 234, 287
 Constitutional framework, 86–9
 Parliament, 102
 ROC (rest of Canada), 54, 96, 101
 Catalan language, *see* language
 Catalonia, 16, 109–24, 242, 261–82, 287, 291–2, 295
 Catalunya, *see* Catalonia
 CDU, 184, 186, 188, 191, 194, 197
 centralization, 22, 29, 37, 39, 78, 282, 293
 centre-left parties, 47, 251, 289, 295
 centre-periphery/state-society relations, 13, 147, 287
 centre-right parties, 131, 181–2, 251, 273, 295
 Christian Democratic Union, *see* CDU
 Christian Social Union, *see* CSU
 citizenship, 101–2, 253–5, 293–4
 acquisition, 22, 34, 49, 286
 conception, 10, 34, 44, 48, 71, 93–4, 228
 policy, 12, 28, 30, 33–7, 254
 rights, 5, 84
 CiU (Convergència i Unió), 109, 119–20, 262, 268–71, 273–82
 civic, *see* discourse; values
 collaboration, intergovernmental, 88–9, 97, 99, 114, 143, 191
 competences, regional, 57, 70
 competencies, 7, 9, 20–1, 67–9, 71, 120, 155
 see also competences, regional
 compare decentralisation and devolution
 conflict, political, 44, 46, 101

- control, 47–8, 112–13, 210–11
 border, 108
 immigration, 40, 127, 83, 210–15,
 245, 251
 over admissions, 36, 97, 109, 118
 over immigration policy, 15, 56–7,
 89, 91, 93, 215, 254–6, 270, 289
- Convergència i Unió, *see* CiU
- cooperation, intergovernmental, 70–1
 horizontal, 81
- coordination, 28, 88, 90, 99, 101, 103,
 120, 286
 government, 6, 23, 27, 88, 99, 103
 policy, 6, 90, 120, 154, 156, 158, 163
 principle, 11, 20–5, 37, 147, 288, 293
- CSU (Christian Social Union), 184–90,
 194, 197–8, 290
- culture, 32, 46, 51, 273, 276, 294–5
 multilevel governance of, 152–4
 national, 3, 242
 origin, 219, 256
 receiving, 4, 54, 67, 163
 regional, 6–9, 30, 42–3, 49, 58, 228,
 276
- decentralization, 6, 8, 15, 21–3, 32–3,
 47–8, 50, 57, 87, 205–6, 264,
 293
 immigration powers, 4, 50, 57,
 96–8, 132, 202–3
 reception, 33, 37
- devolution, 76, 87, 100, 105, 109,
 112, 114–16, 121, 126
 admissions policy, 121
 immigration powers, 65, 69–70, 76,
 105, 114, 255
 local governments, to, 139, 157
- discourse, 16, 83, 137, 159–60, 193, 282
 admissions, 109, 124
 analysis, content, 261–4, 272, 278–9
 civic, 266, 279
 ethnic, 264, 273, 278–9
 extreme-right, 200
see also anti-immigrant, rhetoric
 migrant integration, 137, 193
 nationalist, 16, 264–6, 271, 273,
 280, 282
- discrimination, 88, 93, 96, 103, 138–9,
 166, 252
- education, 24, 32–3, 163, 167, 188,
 216, 220, 231–2
- elections, 168, 179, 213, 220–1
 Bavaria, 186, 189
 Belgium, federal, 65, 70, 201,
 207–20, 235
 Belgium, Flanders, 78
 regional, 180, 184, 197, 201
 United Kingdom, Scotland, 115,
 177, 248
- electoral politics, 193, 224, 236
- electoral systems, 12, 14–15, 52–6,
 230, 235, 289
 majoritarian, 223–5, 229–30, 249
 proportional, 225, 233, 291, 294
- England, 112–15, 123, 160, 247–8,
 250, 253–4, 256
- English, *see* language
- equality, gender, 276–7
- ERC (Esquerra Republicana de
 Catalunya), 16, 119, 262,
 268–81
- España, *see* Spain
- Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya,
see ERC
- EU (European Union), 5–6, 38, 43,
 108, 137, 153–4, 219
- European integration, 12
- extreme-right, 208–10, 219
 parties, 15, 43, 73, 77–9, 200–20,
 290, 294
 success of, 204–6
see also anti-immigrant, parties
- far right, *see* extreme-right
- Flanders, 15, 66–81, 205–19, 223–37,
 290–1
- Flemish, 68–72, 74–8, 80–3, 201–20,
 234, 286, 291
 parties, 66, 71–2, 201, 207, 210–11,
 213, 216, 219
 party system, 77
 regionalist party, 202–3, 220
see also nationalism, Flemish
- Francophone
 Belgium, 67, 73, 78–81
 Brussels, 76, 231
- Francophone parties
 Belgium, 72, 234

- French, *see* language
- French Community (Belgium), 67–8, 73, 237
- French-speaking, (Belgium), 201–6, 208–9, 217–20
- French-speaking parties (Belgium), 202, 206–8, 210–19
- Generalitat, 118–21, 123–8, 261, 267, 274, 282
- German Politics, 187–8, 198
- Germany, 6, 14, 177–6, 285, 289, 297
- governance
- immigrant, 22
 - regional immigrant reception, 145
 - structure of, 21, 24, 86–7, 137, 152, 154
 - see also* culture, multilevel
 - governance of
- governance framework, 24, 86–7, 288
- multilevel, *see* multilevel
- governance
- government
- sub-state, 4, 8, 13, 31, 33–4, 109, 122, 286
- green, party, 45, 201, 209, 215–16
- identity, 7, 10, 16, 29, 34, 49, 93, 179, 196, 229, 273–80, 294
- national(-state), 11–12, 20–5, 31–6, 67, 110, 152–6, 164, 185, 197, 264
 - regional, 6, 58, 108, 188, 195, 206
- illegal immigrations, 139, 209, 251, 253, 272
- controlling, 181
- immigrant communities, 227–9, 297
- immigrant federalism, 26
- immigrants
- categories of, 91–2, 97, 157
 - legal, 139
 - skilled, 52, 98, 114, 177
- immigration powers, 31, 57, 121
- formal distribution of, 122, 287
- incorporation, immigrant, 73, 173, 234
- see also* integration
- independence, 8, 42–3, 67, 122, 128, 224, 226, 248, 255, 267
- integration
- approach, 5, 158, 170
 - courses, compulsory, 75, 79, 83
 - framework, 95, 104, 158
 - governance, 30, 82
 - models of, 21–6, 65–83, 95, 134–5, 150–2, 162, 169–70, 275
 - see also* immigrant federalism;
 - models
- integration policies, 20, 31, 36–8, 84–8, 104, 121, 133, 161–4, 190–2, 286
- cultural, 80–1
 - local, 151, 167–9
 - regional migrant, 66, 71–6, 78, 153, 181
- Italy, *see* Italy
- Italian language, *see* language
- Italy, 12–14, 75, 144–9, 177–80, 196, 287, 289
- regions, 61, 130, 137
- language, 6–12, 30, 42, 48–9, 54, 75–6, 103–4, 210–14, 264–6, 294–5
- Catalan, 142, 273–8, 280, 292
 - English, 54, 103, 227, 229, 250, 253, 281
 - Flemish, 231
 - French
 - Flanders, 219, 231 291
 - Quebec, 54, 90, 94, 104, 109, 228–9
- function of, 16, 265–6, 273, 277
- Italian, 134, 138, 140–1
 - role of, 228, 264, 277, 279, 292
- language courses, 73, 75, 106, 142–3, 277–8
- language legislation, 94, 227–8
- law, immigration, 131–3, 137, 178, 185, 191
- national, 137
 - regional, 137
 - see also* reception
- left-wing, party, 45, 47, 55, 180, 210, 290
- Lega Nord, *see* LN
- liberal parties, 15
- Flemish, 78–9, 208, 217
 - see also* French-speaking parties (Belgium)

- LN (Lega Nord), 131, 179–83, 194, 289
- local
- governments, 14, 138–47, 150–7, 160–3, 169–71, 287
 - policies, 133, 153, 157–67, 170, 288
- Lombardy, 14, 178–9, 181, 183, 194–5, 289
- mainstream party, 46–7, 216, 243
- managing immigration, 251, 270, 281
- manifestos, 79, 114, 204–18, 245, 252, 268–71, 276–9
- see also* party manifestos
- membership, national, 10, 20, 28, 33–4, 93–4, 242, 286
- barriers, 242
- migrant
- organizations, *see* organizations
 - reception policies, *see* reception, policies
 - see also* anti-immigrant; immigrant
- minorities policy, 165, 168–9
- minority languages, 7, 17, 54, 294
- regional, 42, 54
 - see also under individual names*
- models, analytical, 11, 22, 212, 215–18
- models, integration, *see* integration
- Montréal, 106–7, 118, 229, 237, 239–40
- multiculturalism, 73–4, 93–5, 138, 209, 229, 253
- failure, 74, 156, 185, 187, 194
- multilevel governance, 5–28, 37, 101, 154, 169–71, 296–7
- of reception policies, 135, 144
- Muslim immigrants, 187
- nation, 10, 44, 58, 90, 150, 155, 232, 257–8, 262–82, 291–6
- see also* membership
- national
- party, 11, 52
 - see* culture; identity
- national projects, competing, 93, 287
- nationalism
- civic, 265, 273, 277, 279–80
 - ethnic, 16, 263, 265, 273–7, 280
 - Flemish, 231–4
 - minority, 13, 16, 122
 - nationalist, 224, 226, 228, 291
 - see also* discourses
- nation-building, 28, 36–7, 79, 123, 265, 277
- projects, 10, 12, 48–50, 69, 86, 261, 297
- Netherlands, 112, 146, 150–2, 158–72, 285
- North Rhine Westphalia, *see* NRW
- NRW (North Rhine Westphalia), 178, 190–7, 289, 295–6
- organizations, migrant, 163, 165, 168, 193, 195
- role of, 166–7
- Parti Québécois (PQ), 15, 95, 224, 226, 228–30, 235, 237, 239
- participation
- political, 82, 180–1, 195
 - socioeconomic, 162–3, 168
- Partido Nacionalista Vasco (PNV), *see* PNV
- parties
- see* anti-immigrant; centre-left parties, centre-right parties, green, party; left-wing, party; mainstream party; national; populist parties; statewide parties; stateless
 - see under individual names*
- party competition, 8–11–15, 41–60, 183–94, 200–14, 250–1, 294
- party families, 46, 57, 70, 200–3, 206, 208–18, 290
- party manifestos, 202, 207–18, 244, 295
- analysis, 15, 202, 211, 218–19, 268–76
- party positioning, *see* positions
- party systems, *see* systems
- PNV (Partido Nacionalista Vasco), 281
- points-based immigration systems, 32, 113
- polarization, 55–7, 223
- party, 15, 55–7, 78, 187, 243, 256, 272, 279, 291, 294

- policy
 coordination, 5, 155–6, 197
see also coordination
 framing, 151–2, 161
 minority, *see* minority
 positions, 47, 55, 66, 72, 205–6,
 209, 221–4, 235
see also settlement
- political culture, regional, 14, 51, 178
- politicization of immigration, 79, 204,
 283
- populist anti-immigrant rhetoric, 194
see anti-immigrant
- populist parties, 18, 60, 199, 201–2
 centre-right, 168
- positions, immigration, 78, 200, 205,
 217–19, 224, 243, 288–9, 290–4
 negative, 265–6, 269, 273, 280, 292
 party's, 12, 15, 14, 44–59, 66, 95,
 180–1, 215–19, 243, 258, 291,
 295
 positive, 53, 55, 56, 58, 207, 272,
 291
 similar, 52–3
- PPC (Partit Popular de Catalunya),
 272, 281
- PQ, *see* Parti Québécois
- proportional representation (PR), 45,
 55, 223–5, 232–4, 239, 290
- Québec, 13–15, 80, 86–107, 223–40,
 263–4, 290–2
 government, 89, 92, 94
 nation, 230
 nationalism, 226, 235, 237, 282
 parties, 193
- race relations, 152, 155, 159–60
- racism, 82, 197, 270
- reception
 law, 274, 278–9
 policies, 13, 32–3, 35–7, 68, 130–3,
 135–7, 141–9, 198, 288
see also *acollida*; multilevel
 governance
- regional party systems, *see* system
- regionalist parties, *see* Stateless
 Nationalist and Regionalist
 Parties (SNRP)
- relations
 centre-periphery, *see* centre-
 periphery relations
 intergovernmental, 6, 40, 66, 84–7,
 103, 110, 119, 124
- rights
 immigrant, 72, 221
 social, 68, 132–3
- right-wing parties, 45, 47, 55, 189,
 210, 290
- Rotterdam, 14, 152, 164, 167–72, 174,
 288
- Scotland, 15, 109–26, 155, 160–2,
 241–57, 272, 287, 291
- Scottish
 Conservatives, 245, 252–3, 259
 identification, 246–7
 identity, 242, 245–7, 256, 259
 Labour, 244, 251–2, 256, 259
 Liberal Democrats, 244, 251–2,
 255–6, 259
 nation, 15, 253, 256
 National Party, *see* SNP
- Scottishness, 246–8
- self-determination, 9–10, 31–2, 36,
 43–6, 51, 57–8
- self-government, 23–6, 28, 43, 120,
 261, 267
- settlement, 92, 98, 100–2, 142, 164,
 272, 287
 policies, 89–90, 94, 100
- SNP (Scottish National Party's),
 114–16, 161, 241, 244–57, 291
- SNRP (Stateless Nationalist and
 Regionalist Parties), 8–15, 42–6,
 186, 200–19, 262, 289–90, 294
- Social Democratic (SPD), 183, 185–6,
 188
- socialists
 Belgium, 201–16
 Scotland, 245
 Spain, 109–23, 267–8
 Spanish Immigration Policy, 117, 127
 SPD (Social Democratic), 183, 185–6,
 188
- stances, immigration, *see* positions
- Stateless Nationalist and Regionalist
 Parties (SNRP), *see* SNRP

- stateless nations, 43, 49, 58, 291
- statewide parties, 12, 41–4, 50–9, 77, 201, 296
- national, 57
 - regional branches of, 8, 10, 44, 49–52, 56, 58, 256, 296
- sub-state
- government, *see* government
 - nationalism, 31, 67, 77, 79, 224
- system
- party, regional, 42, 47, 50–1, 58, 179–80, 201, 258
 - proportional, 55, 225, 233, 235–6
- territorial cleavage, 42–4, 46, 51, 57, 194–6, 262, 270
- UK (United Kingdom), 116, 155, 157, 159, 161–71, 216, 246, 250–4, 291, *see also* Britain
- unitary states, 14, 56, 146, 150, 154, 288
- United Kingdom (UK), *see* UK (United Kingdom)
- values, 16, 34, 73–4, 95, 124, 167, 188, 265, 275–6, 279, 297
- civic, 264, 273, 276–7
- Veneto, 13, 131, 135–6, 139–45, 147–8, 179, 285
- Vlaams Belang, 46, 80, 202–3, 224, 233, *see also* Vlaams Blok
- Vlaams Blok, 77–80, 202, 232
- votes, immigrant, 15, 224–5, 230, 234–5
- Wallonia, 75–7, 83, 206, 231, 285, 290
- Walloon Region, 67–9, 75
- Westminster, 116, 121, 241, 244–5, 254–5, 257
- work, permanent immigrant, 294