From Sovereignty to Solidarity

Rethinking Human Migration

Harald Bauder

First published 2022

ISBN: 978-1-032-07423-8 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-032-07428-3 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-20685-9 (ebk)

Chapter 5

Urban Migrant and Refugee Solidarity

(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003206859-9

The funder for this chapter is Ryerson University

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

5 Urban Migrant and Refugee Solidarity

On February 20, 2013, the City Council of Canada's largest city, Toronto, passed a resolution on "Undocumented Migrant Workers" that reaffirmed the municipality's "commitment to ensuring access to services without fear to immigrants without full status or without full status documents" (City of Toronto, 2013). In the lead up to the council meeting, the *Solidarity City Network*, a grassroots coalition of community organization, service providers, and activists, played a key role in lobbying and working with councillors to ensure a successful vote. The day after the vote, the media reported that Toronto had just become a "sanctuary city," a term that was not included in the Council's resolution (Keung, 2013). This event illustrates that the language of urban solidarity with migrants and refugees varies. Even the same event within the same city can be associated with the labels of sanctuary city and solidarity city, and connected to phrases such as "access to services without fear."

Around the world, different labels are used to describe urban solidarity policies and practices: the term "sanctuary" is popular in Canada, the USA, and the UK. In other countries, a range of labels are used such as "refuge" city and "solidarity" city. It may be tempting to associate labels such as "solidarity city" with bottom-up activism and "sanctuary city" with managed top-down policies initiated by mayors and city councils. However, a common feature of the urban policies and practices to protect illegalized and other vulnerable migrants and refugees is that they blend bottom-up and top-down approaches. Adding to the complexity is that such urban policies and practices may not only focus exclusively on illegalized inhabitants but also on other issues, such as resettling refugees, and on helping vulnerable non-migrant populations, such as the homeless or persons without access to health care.

In this chapter, I ask the following questions: What policies and practices exactly does urban solidarity towards migrants and refugees involve? How do these policies and practices differ between countries and on different continents? Is there a coherent approach of urban migrant and refugee solidarity? Answering these questions is important because labels to describe urban solidarity policies and practices vary across the world and between urban actors. This lack of a

DOI: 10.4324/9781003206859-9

shared language has obscured the existence of a common urban approach to address the exclusion that migrants and refugees experience at the hands of sovereign territorial states.

Below, I first introduce various dimensions that define an urban solidarity approach. Thereafter, I apply these dimensions to cities located in different parts of the world.[1] By examining international examples of urban solidarity, I show that underlying structures of urban solidarity are a global phenomenon. However, this investigation also reveals that urban solidarity is highly contextualized and involves a wide range of local practices and policies (de Graauw and Vermeulen, 2016; de Graauw and Gleeson, 2020).

Defining of Urban Solidarity

A wide range of different urban solidarity policies and practices exists across national contexts (de Graauw, Gleeson and Bada, 2020; Kron and Lebuhn, 2020; Schmidtke, 2021). Comparing urban solidarity policies and practices internationally provides a comprehensive picture of what exactly an urban solidarity approach entails. Altogether, there are four distinct dimensions of such an urban solidarity approach, revolving around legal, discursive, identity-formative, and scalar themes.

Legality

The first dimension of urban sanctuary is of legal nature. In many solidarity cities the municipal legislative body (i.e., city council) supports solidarity initiates. In the USA, this legal dimension often involves the formal refusal by the municipal police and administration to cooperate with the enforcement of national immigration law. In other parts of the world, municipal law makers often formally commit to welcoming refugees, share local resources, and nurture an environment of hospitality. Thus, an important characteristic of solidarity cities across national contexts is the official affirmation of solidarity policies by the municipality's legislative body.

Discourse

This dimension of urban solidarity involves challenging exclusionary migrant and refugee discourses that often circulate through national media and national political debate. Urban solidarity efforts present alternative narratives, often depicting the local community as compassionate and affirming this community's morality vis-à-vis illegalized and vulnerable migrants and refugees (Squire and Bagelman, 2012; Darling and Squire, 2013). On the one hand, such depictions may present some refugees as deserving and worthy of being included in the community while excluding other migrants and refugees who are perceived as undeserving; they may also follow a "pastoral logic" that generally affirms existing structures of political authority (Squire and Bagelman, 2012; Darling and Squire, 2013, p. 194). On the other hand, alternative narratives may radically

dispute the categories migrant, refugee, and citizen, and fundamentally critique neo-colonial structures and the Westphalian system that have given rise to these categories in the first place (Walia, 2014).

Identity

The third dimension concerns reimagining the city as a space of belonging. Grassroots practices of solidarity aim to create a unified urban community that encompasses all inhabitants, including illegalized migrants and refugees, and that enables all inhabitants to participate as equal members. When illegalized migrants are able to move about the city and participate in the everyday rhythms of the city, they share the urban space as a political stage. In this way, refugees and illegalized migrants enact themselves as urban citizens and political subjects (Isin and Nielsen, 2008; Nyers, 2010) and exercise what Henry Lefebvre (1996) would call their right to the city (Purcell, 2002, 2014; Bauder, 2017). These urban solidarity practices alter the imagination of the city as a community in which everyone can equally participate (Darling, 2010). This dimension of urban solidarity resonates with Jacque Derrida's (2001) idea of the "city of refuge" that entails new forms of urban politics beyond the status categories imposed by the Westphalian model that continue to shape urban politics (Bauder, 2017).

Scale

A final dimension of urban solidarity involves the rejection of national policies towards migration and refugee admission. In fact, urban solidarity initiatives can be interpreted as the attempt to rescale migration and refugee policies from the national to the urban scale. Solidarity cities do not see themselves as bound by federal migration and refugee laws that exclude some of their inhabitants. Rather, these cities evoke the *domicile* rule of belonging, according to which de-facto residents in a community should also be recognized as members of this community and possess corresponding legal entitlements and receive municipal services and police protection (Varsanyi, 2007; Bauder, 2014). Solidarity cities mobilize their municipal resources and a local infrastructure of civil society organizations to include and provide services to all their inhabitants, independent of their national citizenship or national legal status.

By asserting a "form of power and politics at the sub-national level" (Sassen, 2008, p. 314), solidarity cities constitute a threat to Westphalian sovereignty. The reaction to this threat to Westphalian statehood can be observed when US federal lawmakers try to deny funding to municipal governments for enacting local sanctuary policies. In 2007, the US House of Representatives passed legislation that – had the Senate also passed it – would have denied federal emergency funds to sanctuary cities. More recently, the Trump administration tried again to find ways to cut federal funding to sanctuary cities. This attempt, however, did not intimidate the mayors of Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, and many other US cities, who instead reaffirmed their commitment to including their cities' inhabitants who do not possess full immigration status (Robbins, 2017).

Urban Solidarity around the World

As we have seen, there is no single set of policies or practices that define what a solidarity city is. Rather, urban solidarity involves various legal, discursive, identity-formative, and scalar dimensions; it is the *combination* of these dimensions that defines a coherent, yet flexible, urban sanctuary approach. Below, I investigate how these various dimensions of urban migrant and refugee solidarity assemble in different ways in various parts of the world.

The Anglo-American Realm

Cities in the USA and Canada are often called "sanctuary city" when they seek to accommodate illegalized migrants and refugees. The term sanctuary city has a complex history. Although today, sanctuary cities involve largely secular urban policies and practices, the term sanctuary has originally had religious connotations and meanings (Caminero-Santangelo, 2012). It can be associated, for example, with various faiths, including Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Judaism, Hinduism, and Sikhism (Bagelman, 2016, p. 20). The Bible (Numbers 35) mentions six "cities of refuge" that offer protection to people who have accidentally killed another person. Ancient Roman law dating back to 392 CE granted sanctuary privileges to churches rather than cities (Lippert, 2005). This practice of church sanctuary continued in mediaeval Europe, giving protection to murderers, thieves, and other criminals from worldly authorities (Shoemaker, 2012).

Since then, the population receiving church sanctuary has shifted from criminals to illegalized migrants and refugees (Lippert and Rehaag, 2012). In the second half of the 20th century, churches in Denmark, France, Finland, Germany, Norway, Sweden, the United States, and other countries began offering sanctuary to rejected refugee claimants, asylum seekers, and illegalized migrants (e.g., Caminero-Santangelo, 2012; Loga, Pyykkönen and Stenvaag, 2012; Millner, 2012). Church-based sanctuary …

> can be interpreted as a challenge to the state's monopolization of decisions on the right of residence and citizenship … and thus the right to determine who has the right to have rights. … The refugee, by refusing to be deported and enacting herself as belonging to the territory and political community in contradiction to the determination of the state, challenges not only state sovereignty, but also the state monopoly on the political.
>
> (Czajka, 2012, p. 51)

In the late 20th and early 21st centuries, sanctuary policies and practices shifted to the urban scale. This shift arguably marks an even more serious threat to national sovereignty than church sanctuary because urban municipalities provide a territorial political entity – not unlike the nation state – which articulates this threat.

The City of Berkley in the USA is often cited as the birthplace of the idea of the contemporary sanctuary city: in 1971 it offered protection to soldiers on-board the aircraft carrier USS Coral Sea who resisted the Vietnam War. This

event symbolically linked the sanctuary city with the biblical city of refuge that protects people who kill, in this case not murderers but soldiers (Ridgley, 2012). Today's sanctuary cities offer protection to illegalized migrants and typically follow secular motivations and arguments (Lippert and Rehaag, 2012). Despite their common label, however, sanctuary cities involve a wide range of different policies and practices.

An important milestone in the evolution of sanctuary cities brought the legal dimension into the foreground. In 1985, San Francisco (Mancina, 2013) passed the largely symbolic "City of Refuge" resolution, which was followed in 1989 by the "City of Refuge" ordinance. The latter specifically prohibited the use of city funds and resources to assist in federal immigration enforcement, and forbid requesting, recording, and disseminating information about an individual's immigration status unless it is required by federal or state law (City and Country of San Francisco, 1989). In response to an incident in which a police officer engaged in surveillance activities for the consulate of El Salvador, the ordinance also prohibited cooperation with investigations by or surveillance request from foreign governments (Bau, 1994). This sanctuary ordinance was intended to end discrimination by the municipal administration and its employees against primarily El Salvadorian and Guatemalan refugees who lack federal immigration status or residency permits (CBS SF Bay Area, 2015).

Another milestone was the launch of the faith-based New Sanctuary Movement (NSM) in 2007. This movement shifted focus from newly-arrived refugees to illegalized migrants who have lived in the USA for longer periods and now call US cities their home. In the New York Metro Area, an estimated 1.1 million illegalized people resided in 2016; in the Los Angeles Metro Area it was 925,000 (Passel and Cohn, 2019).[2] Urban solidarity policies and practices in such cities increasingly focussed on migrants who seek to maintain the "quotidian, ordinary life they have built" (Caminero-Santangelo, 2012, p. 96) rather than newly arriving refugees fleeing from war, violence, or disaster. In other words, urban solidarity in the USA today tends to emphasize the safety of individuals and families who already are de-facto members of these urban communities.

Today, dozens of cities and over 100 counties in the USA have passed sanctuary legislation that aims to protect illegalized inhabitants of these cities (Griffith, 2020). Concrete policies include Don't Ask, Don't Tell (DADT) policies, which typically prohibit municipal police forces and city service agencies from requesting, recording, or disseminating status information, and deny cooperation with federal immigration authorities unless required by federal or state law. Some municipalities, such as Chicago, New Haven, New York, and San Francisco, have issued municipal identification cards to enable all residents to identify themselves to local authorities, independent of whether they possess federal status documents or a state-issued driver's license (de Graauw, 2014; City of Chicago, 2021). Issuing local identification cards challenges national sovereignty and reframes who belongs to the community and who does not (Czajka, 2012). Other municipalities are accepting the *matrículas consulares* issued by the Mexican government to nationals living abroad as means of identification (Varsanyi, 2007).

Some commentators critique the term sanctuary city for being a "catch-all phrase" (Chishti and Hipsman, 2015, n.p.) that refers to diverse policies and practices. The American Immigration Council (2015) observes that sanctuary cities do not actually offer "sanctuary"; the term is incorrectly suggesting that local police can protect illegalized migrants from federal immigration authorities:

> The term 'sanctuary city' is a misnomer when used to describe community policing policies which attempt to eliminate fear from those who worry that reporting a crime or interacting with local law enforcement could result in deportation.
>
> (American Immigration Council, 2015)

While urban sanctuary policies in the USA may lower the bar for illegalized residents to access municipal police and thus help solve and prevent crime, these policies cannot guarantee protection from federal immigration authorities. Even in sanctuary cities, illegalized migrants remain vulnerable to detection, detention, and deportation by US federal immigration authorities. Sanctuary cities are not above national law (Tramonte, 2011, p. 5). In other words, urban sanctuary policies and practices do not eliminate illegalization; they merely enable illegalized migrants to better cope with their circumstances of living in illegality. Thus, sanctuary cities fail to tackle the root problem caused by Westphalian statehood.

Sanctuary cities also exist in Canada. In Toronto, urban solidarity initiatives began as early as the 1980s, when Chilean refugees advocated for sanctuary-city by-laws (Solidarity City Network, 2013a). An important milestone occurred in 2004, when Toronto-based activists launched a DADT campaign, after which Toronto's city administration and the Toronto District School Board quietly adopted a range of DADT policies (Bernstein et al., 2006; McDonald, 2012). Then, in 2013, Toronto City Council passed the by-law resembling sanctuary policies that I mentioned in the opening passage of this chapter (Solidarity City Network, 2013b; Humphris, 2020). A year later, the City of Hamilton also voted to become a sanctuary city. Many other Canadian cities followed suit and developed municipal policies that follow the same spirit, although they have not always embraced the label sanctuary or solidarity city.

Under urban solidarity policies in Canada, illegalized migrants receive access to municipal services, such as emergency medical care, public health programmes, emergency shelters, fire protection, recreational programmes, and libraries. In the spring of 2016, Vancouver passed an "Access to City Services Without Fear" policy. Because this policy excludes many civic services such as police, library, and parks services, and to encourage the future expansion of access-without-fear principles to these services, many advocates refrain from calling Vancouver a sanctuary city (Robinson, 2016). Similar to their US counterparts, urban solidarity initiatives in Canada can be seen as acts of defiance by municipal policy makers against federal immigration laws and policies.

City administrations and police forces in Canada, however, are not always following sanctuary practices, even if municipal council passed corresponding policies and directives (Hudson et al., 2017). Toronto's municipal police, for

example, continue to frequently call the federal border enforcement agency to conduct status checks (Keung, 2015; Hershkowitz, Hudson and Bauder, 2020). In addition, many locally-administered services that are funded by the province are excluded from sanctuary policies (Hannan and Bauder, 2015).

In addition to the legal dimension, urban solidarity in Canada also involves practices that construct a unifying urban identity: by presenting “people living with precarious status as everyday residents of the city” (McDonald, 2012, p. 137), and by including illegalized migrants in the imagined local community, urban sanctuary initiatives disrupt the distinctions created by federal status categories and seek to forge a shared sense of community among all inhabitants of the city. In Toronto, for example, an important aspect of the urban solidarity campaign was “its ability to change the ways in which people interact with one another locally and to develop a shift in ideas around community and belonging” (McDonald, 2012, p. 143).

In addition, urban solidarity policies and practices in Canada re-scale belonging. These policies and practices distinguish between the local community and the sovereign nation state. Anti-racist feminist writer and organizer Fariah Kamal writes:

> Sanctuary/Solidarity City is about bypassing the ideas behind nation-states and centralized governments. In a Sanctuary/Solidarity City, ideas don’t have to get passed at the “top” in order for them to manifest themselves in our day-to-day lives. Sanctuary City is about building ways of living that allow us to horizontally make decisions with collective communities, on the ground, every day, with or without the approval of a colonial state that we believe is an illegitimate occupying force.
>
> (Nail, Kamal and Hussan, 2010)

Toronto’s sanctuary city idea includes illegalized migrants in a non-hierarchical urban community, while rejecting the Westphalian system that renders these migrants “illegal” (McDonald, 2012).

In the United Kingdom, the “City of Sanctuary” movement was established in Sheffield in 2005. Two years later, Sheffield was the first city in the United Kingdom to receive the official “City of Sanctuary” designation when City Council supported the movement’s initiatives. Other cities followed suit. By 2011, a network of 17 towns and cities, including Bristol and Swansea, also achieved official City of Sanctuary status. To qualify as a City of Sanctuary required support from local groups and organizations, the involvement of the local refugee community, a strategy towards greater inclusion of people seeking refuge, as well as an expression of support from city council. In addition, over 60 cities and towns across the UK and Ireland have developed sanctuary initiatives (Bagelman, 2013; Darling and Squire, 2013; City of Sanctuary, 2016). According to the City of Sanctuary website, the movement included 114 cities, towns, and villages in the UK plus 10 cities in Ireland in early 2021.

Unlike in the USA, urban sanctuary initiatives in the UK do not focus on municipal policing practices or refusing to cooperate with national immigration

authorities, and they do not seek ways to protect illegalized migrants and refugees from national immigration authorities. Rather, these initiatives emphasize "awareness raising, telling the true stories of refugees to those who never hear them" (City of Sanctuary, 2016, n.p.).

> *City of Sanctuary* Sheffield does not actively engage in the material or physical provision of accommodation or protection … It might thus be tempting to suggest that *City of Sanctuary* represents little more than a collective of organizations and individuals who promote values of hospitality but who do not effectively practice sanctuary. However, this overlooks how the activities of *City of Sanctuary* both emerge from, and create possibilities for, everyday enactments of sanctuary in a more diffuse sense.
>
> (Darling and Squire, 2013, p. 196, original italics)

The key achievement of cities of sanctuary in the UK is not protecting illegalized people from national immigration authorities, but rather intervening in refugee discourse and reimagining the city as a place of welcome where everyone can feel they belong.

Critics interject that cities of sanctuary in the UK reproduce the distinction between guests and hosts, "notions of gratitude and indebtedness" (Darling and Squire, 2013, p. 194), and the images of "'good' and 'worthy' citizens, as figures 'deserving' of sanctuary" (Darling and Squire, 2013, p. 194). However, urban solidarity initiatives in the UK also disrupt this distinction by promoting activities and events where refugees and citizens can engage and get to know each other as active and caring participants in the urban community. These urban solidarity activities challenge the nation state's monopoly of defining who deserves to belong and who does not, and rescale belonging from the national to the local.

Jonathan Darling has suggested that Cities of Sanctuary seek to fundamentally reimagine belonging. Sanctuary initiatives in Sheffield "sought to alter a vision of the city, its identity as a 'welcoming place'" (Darling, 2010, p. 129). In this way, City of Sanctuary aims "to alter geographical imaginations – to force a reconsideration of how those in Sheffield view the world and their responsibilities within it" (Darling, 2010, p. 129). Urban sanctuary initiatives in the UK thus seek to fundamentally transform the way people think about the city as a place where migrants and refugees belong. When refugees and illegalized migrants in sanctuary cities constitute themselves as political subjects, they deny the territorial nation state the sovereign authority to decide who is a legitimate member of the polity.

Continental Europe

Cities in continental Europe have also implemented urban policies and practices to accommodate migrants and refugees in precarious situations. Especially since the arrival of large numbers of migrants and refugees from the Middle East and Africa during the "long summer of migration" in 2015 (Hess et al., 2016), urban solidarity efforts have received increased attention from activists,

non-governmental organizations (NGOs), city administrations, and local politicians. European cities are motivated to protect migrants with "irregular status" for a variety of reasons. Many urban initiatives and municipal policies respond to a legal obligation of care towards all inhabitants; other urban solidarity efforts are motivated by humanitarianism and respect for human rights law; or they aim to maintain public order, health, and safety (Delvino, 2017). Urban solidarity initiatives often involve municipal partnerships with NGOs and roundtables of stakeholders. Their methods include strategic litigations (for example, denying a right to an irregular migrant, knowing that this migrant will sue and establish precedence for inclusion), attaching entitlements to place of residence rather than immigration status, unofficially offering housing, shelter, health care, education, legal counselling, and access to other municipal services without alerting authorities (Christoph and Kron, 2019; Schweitzer, 2019). This variety of initiatives and methods indicates that there is no single model of what defines a solidarity city in continental Europe.

An interesting case for examining urban solidarity initiatives is Spain, where municipalities are responsible for collecting demographic information irrespectively of migration status. By comparing the number of residence permits issued by the Spanish Home Office (*Secretaría General de Inmigración y Emigración*) with the number of third-country nationals who registered with the Municipal Population Register (*Padrón Municipal*), it could be estimated that approximately 600,000 undocumented people resided in Spain in 2012 (PICUM, 2013). A later estimate suggests that this number declined to between 390,000 and 470,000 by the end of 2019 (Villarino, 2020). The multi-level governance of Spain provides municipalities with decentralized self-rule (Keating, 2000). The Spanish constitution recognizes the municipal autonomy in matters of policing and requires the municipal and local police (*policía municipal/local* or *guardia urbana*) to report to local town halls in municipalities with a population over 5,000 inhabitants (Granda, 2014). Since municipal police forces operate largely independently from the national police (*policía nacional*) and the civil guard (*guardia civil*), they can be included in urban solidarity policies.

Illegalized residents acquire access to municipal services through the Municipal Population Register, which requires all residents by law to register regardless of their immigration status. This register provides proof of residency in the municipality but is not an identification document confirming legal status in Spain (Instituto Nacional de Estadísitica, 2016). Given the autonomy of local governments granted by the Spanish constitution, the municipal registration process (*enpadronamiento*) varies considerably between municipalities. The registry has been instrumental in granting illegalized migrants access to social services, compulsory education for minors, and health identity cards (*tarjeta sanitaria*) required for medical appointments[3] (Escandell and Tapias, 2010; Cimas et al., 2016).

The Catalonian city of Barcelona exemplifies how the solidarity city concept applies in Spain. Barcelona has undertaken concrete steps to promote the rights of all inhabitants, including illegalized migrants and refugees (Gebhardt, 2016; Smith and Levoy, 2017), and extended access to all municipal services through

the municipal register. Barcelona's Refuge City initiative addresses all four dimensions of a solidarity city: in 2015, the municipal government launched the Barcelona, Refuge City plan and City Council committed to sanctuary policies by officially declaring Barcelona a "Refuge City" (Ayuntamiento de Barcelona, Secretaría General, 2015; Ayuntamiento de Barcelona, Redacció, 2017). In addition, in 2010, City Council launched the Anti-Rumour Strategy (*Estratègia BCN Antirumores*) to dispel stereotypes and myths about the migrants and refugees such as "they don't pay taxes," "they take our jobs," or "they are uncivil" (Ayuntamiento de Barcelona – BCN Acción Intercultural, 2017). Furthermore, the municipality and its residents have been proactive in imagining the city as a space of co-belonging. In February 2017, tens of thousands of demonstrators filled the streets of Barcelona, following a call from mayor Ada Colau who challenged the Spanish government's failure to meet its pledge to accept more refugees (Agence France-Presse, 2017). The protest was organized by the group *Casa Nostra, Casa Vostra* (Our Home Is Your Home), which has long advocated for the protection and the right to a dignified life for refugees and illegalized migrants (Casa Nostra, Cada Vostra, 2017). Finally, Barcelona has created institutions at the local scale, such as the city's Care Service Centre for Immigrants, Emigrants and Refugees (*Servicio de Atención a Inmigrantes, Emigrantes y Refugiados*; SAIER). SAIER mitigates exclusionary national migration and refugee policies by providing local information about obtaining asylum and a range of services including interpretation and shelter – among many others to 55 refugees displaced after the devastating fire in the Moira camp in Greece. Since its establishment in 2015, SAIER has increased the number of migrants and refugees it assisted from 11,370 people to 19,264 in 2018 (Ajuntament de Barcelona, 2018). Despite the international mobility and physical contact restriction during the COVID-19 pandemic, SAIER continued to support 20,620 people in 2019 and 19,001 in 2020 (Ajuntament de Barcelona, 2021). City Council has also established the Nausica programme in 2016 to offer employability, housing, and mental health services (Garcés-Mascareñas and Gebhardt, 2020).

In Germany, national law requires that all residents – citizens and foreigners alike – must register with the municipalities in which they live. The municipalities then assess the identities of residents and report foreigners to the municipal foreigner office (*Ausländeramt*), which in turn reports visa and status violations to federal authorities. Municipal registration offices can also request from landlords to provide information about their tenants. Despite these control measures, estimates from before the summer 2015 suggest that between 180,000 and 1 million illegalized migrants lived in Germany (Lebuhn, 2016; Vogel, 2021). In addition, there are large numbers of "tolerated" (*geduldete*) refugees with permission to stay but without long-term perspective to remain in Germany.

With the exception of the city-states of Berlin, Bremen, and Hamburg, German municipalities do not possess independent local police forces that could be included in urban solidarity efforts. Instead, policing authority rests largely with the federal police (*Bundespolizei*), which are responsible for border security, and the regional police (*Landespolizei*), which assume many other policing functions that require identity and status checks of individuals. National laws,

administrative regulations, and the lack of municipal police create unfavourable conditions for the implementation of solidarity policies to protect and include illegalized migrants like in the United States or Spain (Schönwälder, Vogel and Sciortino, 2004; Buckel, 2008; Scherr and Hofmann, 2016).

Despite the restrictive legal and administrative context, solidarity initiatives involving many different actors exist in German cities. Many German city councils are supporting solidarity initiatives. For example, in 2016, the City Council of Osnabrück, where 368 years earlier one of the Westphalian Treaties was signed (Chapter 1), officially declared its support for the initiative "50 from Indomeni," which sought to bring 50 refugees from the Greek border village of Indomeni directly to the city, thus asking to bypass the European Union's refugee system (Heuser, 2017). In addition, local campaigns and public media outlets, such as Radio Dreyeckland in Freiburg im Breisgau, challenge exclusionary national discourses that depict migrants and refugees as criminal, undeserving, and predatory. Expressions of solidarity with illegalized migrants are often complemented by calls for a united urban community and demands for "cohabitation in the city without discriminating state regulations" (Rasthaus, 2017). Civil society in most German cities has also been generally supportive of accommodating vulnerable migrants and refugees. Many civil and faith-based institutions offer "safe spaces" (*Schutzräume*) to illegalized immigrants, where they are treated with respect and dignity, rather than as anonymous statistics (Zabel, 2001, p. 93; Just, 2012). In many cities, hospitals and organizations provide medical services for free or reduced fees to people requiring anonymity (Misbach, 2008; Maltester Migranten Medizin, 2016). Local schools are exempt from the requirement to report the status of students to authorities (Köβler et al., 2013). All four dimensions of urban solidarity can thus be observed to some degree in German cities.

Latin America

Latin America has a regional approach for supporting the local integration of migrants and refugees. The Mexico Plan of Action, signed in 2004 by 20 Latin-American countries, promotes integration throughout the region at the municipal level. Since Latin America has experienced a significant amount of political conflict and corresponding displacement since World War II, "many leading officials in countries such as Chile, Argentina and Uruguay have personally experienced asylum and the benefits of international solidarity" (Varoli, 2010, p. 45). Such experiences have helped facilitate the establishment of the *Ciudades Solidarias* (Cities of Solidarity) network, involving dozens of Latin-American cities. Each city cooperates with UNHRC to offer housing, food, education, and other services to refugees and asylum seekers. Although these solidarity cities do not necessarily focus on accommodating illegalized migrants, they resemble a coordinated effort at the city level to include migrants and refugees in precarious situations.

Chile provides examples of the application of urban solidarity policies and practices. After dictator Augusto Pinochet's fall in 1990, the country welcomed refugees from other South-American, Caribbean, and European countries (Leo,

Morand and Murillo, 2015). In recent years, however, there have been growing anti-migrant and refugee sentiments (Teletrece, 2017). An estimated 150,000 illegalized people resided in Chile in 2017 (Kozak, 2017). Most migrants enter Chile as tourists and subsequently apply for residency or other forms of regularization within the country (Pedemonte and Dittborn, 2016). Recently, the government initiated a campaign to register undocumented migrants and require visas upon arrival in Chile, causing migration levels to fall. This decline has continued in light of the COVID-19 lockdown and job loss which drove many migrants to return home (Laing, 2020).

In 1992, the Organic Law of Municipalities (*Ley* No. 18.695, *Orgánica* Constitucional de *Municipalidades*) progressively transformed Chilean municipalities into self-governing entities. In 2014, the appointment of the Presidential Advisory Commission for Decentralisation and Regional Development sought to modernize and strengthen municipal functions and transfer new competencies to the new self-governing regions in the areas of economic, social, infrastructure, and housing development (Organization of American States, 2008; UCLG, 2016). However, municipal autonomy does not involve the police. The Chilean national police (the *Carabineros*) maintain jurisdiction over the entire national territory.[4] Nevertheless, the increased decentralization and growing autonomy of regions and municipalities has resulted in innovative local solidarity initiatives granting many city inhabitants access to education, health care, and other social services independent of their national status (Thayer Correa, Correa and Novoa, 2014).

These initiatives can be observed in the Santiago Metropolitan Region. Graduate student Margaret Godoy conducted a detailed study of several municipalities in this region (Godoy, 2020). She found that none of the municipalities used the label of "solidarity city." While the municipality of Quilicura had adopted the label of "Commune of Reception" (*Comuna de Acogida*), the municipalities of Recoleta used the slogan of "We are all Recoleta" *(Recoleta somos todos)* (Municipalidad de Recoleta, 2020). One of her research participants, a senior municipal employee with intimate knowledge of Recoleta's Migrants and Refugees Programme, explains:

> …the mayor has always argued that he does not believe in these concepts of [national] citizenship, because they are very complex, complicated and also imply that people have to wait years to obtain [national] citizenship. But he does believe in the concept of settlement, that a person — by living, residing, working or studying in a place — must have inherent rights. We started working in Recoleta based upon this concept.
>
> (Godoy, 2020, p. 33)

The municipality of Independencia, too, refrains from using the term "solidarity city" but calls itself "intercultural *comuna*" and "inclusive *comuna*" (Municipalidad de Independencia, 2020). A senior municipal employee explains that this term "addresses not only the inclusion of migrants but of the entire population." Godoy's research showed that "municipalities' actions [are] carrying more weight

than the label applied to them" (Godoy, 2020, p. 35). To be a solidarity city does not require using that label.

The municipality of Quilicura exemplifies the urban solidarity approach. This municipality has received substantial numbers of Haitian and Palestinian migrants and refugees since 2000. Given the language and cultural barriers between the new and established residents, the municipality approached UNHCR to help develop innovative local programmes within the framework of the Mexico Plan of Action (Thayer Correa, Correa and Novoa, 2014; Leo, Morand and Murillo, 2015). These programmes address the four dimensions of a solidarity city. In 2014, the municipal government officially launched the Action Plan for the Reception and Recognition of Migrants and Refugees (*Plan de Acogida y Reconocimiento de Migrantes y Refugiados*) that aims to include all inhabitants regardless of their administrative status. Quilicura's reception efforts are founded on the promotion of equal rights and duties, and full civil, cultural, and social participation of all inhabitants, and the municipal government is vocal about its dislike of the term "illegal" when referring to non-status residents (Lizama, 2013). Furthermore, Quilicura has organized an annual Migrant Fest, which is centred on the idea that culture and diversity are a source of pride and strength in the community (Municipalidad de Quilicura, 2016). Moreover, the municipality created the Office for Migrants and Refugees (*Oficina Municipal para Migrantes y Refugiados)* in 2010 to provide orientation, support, and information about education and health services, and employment and training opportunities for migrants and refugees (Leo, Morand and Murillo, 2015). Quilicura also cooperates with other municipalities to replicate and expand local programmes that include all inhabitants (Thayer Correa, Correa and Novoa, 2014).

Interestingly, in Mexico, Mexico City declared itself a "sanctuary city" in 2017, adopting the terminology used in the USA.[5] However, unlike corresponding municipal policies in the USA, Mexico City's sanctuary policy did not aim to help illegalized foreigners, but assists predominantly Mexican citizens who are returning or were deported from the USA. The need to protect these returnees and provide them with special access to shelter, food, health care, legal aid, credit, and other important services, illustrates the different circumstances that exist in the cities of the Global South compared to the richer cities in the Global North. In Mexico City, "citizenship is not enough" (Délano Alonso, 2021, p. 88) to have access to equal opportunities and rights in light of deeply entrenched social hierarchies and various forms of systemic discrimination. The case of Mexico City shows that cities continue to play a crucial role in migrant inclusion, not only in the context of fundamentally different economic, social, and geopolitical circumstances that exist in different countries but also in response to different stages of the migration process, in this case the return of migrant citizens.

Africa

Debate on cross-border human mobility in African cities often revolves around "urban refugees" (e.g., Buscher and Heller, 2010; Pavanello and Pantuliano, 2010; Buscher, 2011). This group encompasses persons who have migrated for a

variety of reasons, including fleeing violence, disaster, and political persecution as well as seeking economic opportunities. Several factors frame the situation of urban refugees in Africa. First, in many regions the root problem producing urban refugees (and internally displaced persons) is that territorial nation states are unstable, and the presence of urban refugees is often a symptom of state failures (Haysom, 2013). Africa has suffered from centuries of European colonialism and exploitation, and many parts of the continent have not developed secure, liberal, and democratic Westphalian states which in Europe achieved a bondage between citizens, national territory, and imagined national identities (Torpey, 1999). In Africa, national citizenship and carrying a passport often has not the same significance as in the Global North. In fact, in many parts of Africa, even formal citizens lack birth certificates, state-issued identification cards, or passports, because these documents are of little relevance to daily life and to gaining access to services, entitlements, and rights (Bakewell, 2020). Correspondingly, having refugee status may not make a big difference in receiving access to welfare and security (Landau and Duponchel, 2011). In addition, the nation state in Africa does not always serve as the primary focus of belonging and identity; people may experience stronger bonds to their ethnic group or tribe than to their nation (Bakewell, 2007). In this case, the situation of urban migrants and refugees differs fundamentally from the Global North where strong Westphalian states legally deny rights to some migrants and refugees and exclude them from national membership. If national legal status is not a defining criterion of who gains access to services and belonging in the same way as in the Global North, then the characteristics of urban solidarity will also differ.

Second, unlike in Europe and North America where the city was a place of refuge and immigrant arrival, in Africa refugees are often placed in rural camps. This practice was established during the Cold War supposedly to isolate refugees fleeing from conflicts in countries such as Angola, Congo, and Mozambique "from sources of political contamination represented by Communists and other radical currents" (Marfleet, 2007, p. 38) (also, Fábos and Kibreab, 2007; Hoffstaedter, 2015). Today, many urban migrants and refugees belong to "mobile classes," creating a "liminal space" (Kihato, 2010) where migrants imagine a future elsewhere. These transitory migrants and refugees may embrace a pan-African identity, a universal urban youth culture (Kihato, 2010), or a selective "tactical cosmopolitanism" (Landau and Freemantle, 2010), rather than urban or national belonging. "Illegality" may in fact be an advantage when it permits these migrants and refugees to avoid obligations, such as military service, while still gaining access to state and local resources (Landau, 2010, p. 179). In addition, moving to a city is not necessarily associated with claiming "rights to the city" in a way permanent settlement would (Kassa, 2019). Rather, loyalties often exist to family members, and ethnic and tribal communities located elsewhere (Landau and Freemantle, 2018; Landau, 2019).

Third, poverty and the experiences of violence and exploitation are often widespread in African cities, instigating competition for scarce resources between migrants and refugees, and established residents and citizens. In addition, we cannot assume that there is "a dominant host community or political order" like

in cities of the Global North (Landau and Freemantle, 2018, p. 171). Migration and Development scholar Loren Landau elaborates:

> Much of the writing on inclusive cities explores how a preexisting and self-conscious host community makes space – or does not – for the poor, minority religions, migrants, immigrants, and disempowered genders, ethnicities, and racial groups. … Without denying the existence of self-identified host communities within African cities (or parts thereof), one must be wary of ascribing undue social coherence to Africa's primary urban centers where ethnic heterogeneity, enormous economic disparities, and cultural pastiche are the empirical norms, not exceptions.
>
> (Landau, 2010, p. 173)

Rather, one can speak of "archipelagos of belonging" (Landau and Freemantle, 2018, p. 279; Landau, 2019), characterized by diversity, fluidity, and fragmentation.

Fourth, formal local governance structures can be weak and unable to cope with problems related to poverty, population growth, corruption, and other local challenges. In this situation, "power is often shared in ad hoc ways" (Landau, 2010, p. 176) between state officials, local private actors, and individuals and groups with authority. In light of limited municipal capacities, NGOs, faith-based communities, migrant self-help organizations, and private enterprises often offer support and provide essential services. Some of the enterprises delivering these supports and services can also be predatory and abusive, especially towards vulnerable migrants and refugees.

Despite these significantly different circumstances compared to the Global North, urban solidarity policies and practices exist in Africa. In a recent book Sociologist Derese G. Kassa calls Nairobi, Kenya, "Africa's preeminent sanctuary city" (Kassa, 2019, p. 2). In 2014, Kenya was home to about 2.4 million citizens of Somali origin and – after deploying troops in Somalia – hosted hundreds of thousands of Somali refugees. Following a series of terrorism attacks that occurred in Nairobi in 2013 and 2014, Kenyan security forces rounded up thousands of Somalis, triggering accusations of physical abuse and extortion. The crackdown also instigated religious tension between Muslims, who saw themselves as victims, and Christians, some of whom were depicted as "cheering the crackdown" (Muhumed, 2014). In this situation, Kenya has been in a double bind. On the one hand, the country generally supports a human rights framework, signed the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, endorsed the Organisation of African Unity (OUA) Convention on African Refugees of 1969, enacted the Refugee Act of Kenya in 2006, and has liberally issued residency certificates to urban refugees permitting them to obtain business permits, attend schools, function in urban society (e.g., open bank accounts), and acquire exit visas for onward migration. On the other hand, urban refugees are depicted as national security threats and often denied political rights. In addition, it is widely acknowledged that elements of the Kenyan police frequently humiliate and harass urban refugees and exploit their vulnerabilities (Kassa, 2019).

In Nairobi, many urban refugees are transient, using the city as a "launching pad" (Kassa, 2019, p. 77) to migrate onward to Europe, the USA, Canada, or South Africa; other migrants and urban refugees, however – especially Somalis and Ethiopians – have lived in Nairobi for decades (Campbell, 2015, p. 109). Nairobi's refugees often seek economic opportunities and enhanced security relative to the rural refugee camps and engage in a wide range of economic activities, working as bus drivers and ushers, maids, cooks, waiters and waitresses, guards, janitors; many own shops and small businesses, which they sometimes operate without a license (Kassa, 2019). Nairobi's refugees often experience violent crime and robberies, harassment, and extortion from the Kenyan police and corrupt city bureaucrats (Kassa, 2019). Many feel isolated and unwelcome in Nairobi (Pavanello and Pantuliano, 2010), and they frequently live in the city without documents or UNHCR protection, effectively as illegalized inhabitants.

Kassa's research on Ethiopian refugees in Nairobi addresses some of the dimensions characteristic of solidarity cities in the Global North. Support services exist at the local level, for example in the form of the local Ethiopian church community providing assistance and community connections. Although many refugees lack full national status, they participate in the everyday life and rhythm of the city. Kassa explains: "Because of their full-blown participation in Kenya, it is hard to define them only as 'refugees' even though most of them fled their country of origin for several reasons" (Kassa, 2019, p. 45). Ethiopian refugees concentrate in the Eastleigh neighbourhood, which Kenyan officials call "'*their*' neighbourhood" and which the refugees claim as "*their* space" (Kassa, 2019, p. 79, original italics). In this way, the refugees demonstrate that they belong. Nevertheless, the legal dimension of urban solidarity is absent. Nairobi's municipal government appears to be inactive in offering solidarity to refugees, and has no "formal line of communication with urban refugees" (Kassa, 2019, p. 60). In addition, the police continue to discriminate against, harass, and exploit vulnerable refugees.

Johannesburg, South Africa, is another African city that exhibits some dimensions of urban solidarity towards migrants and refugees. After the fall of apartheid, migration to South Africa increased as many African countries lifted their travel restrictions. Simultaneously, local governments have received greater autonomy (Kihato, 2007). However, I could not find evidence that municipalities are using this autonomy to enact urban solidarity policies mirroring those in the Global North. In many ways, Johannesburg can be described as an anti-solidarity city. The City of Johannesburg has a history of hostility towards migrants. In 2003, police raids sought to cleanse the inner city of illegalized migrants, "who are perceived as responsible for crime and grime in the city" (Kihato, 2007, p. 267). In 2008, xenophobic violence against foreigners erupted in Johannesburg, with horrific images of Ernesto Alfabeto Nhamuave, a migrant from Mozambique, being set on fire while the police failed to intervene. In 2018, Johannesburg's mayor, Herman Mashaba, clamped down on undocumented migrants and "announced that he is working with home affairs" to conduct raids and deport migrants without proper documents (Jadoo, 2018, n.p.). In addition, many migrants consider Johannesburg a temporary destination and have little interest in claiming local political inclusion, although "they do want rights to economic opportunities"

(Kihato, 2010, p. 223). In this context, sharing of residential space between migrants, refugees, and established residents and citizens does not "produce a 'we'" (Landau and Freemantle, 2018, p. 290) or common urban identity.

Although the legal and identity dimensions of urban solidarity seem to be absent in Johannesburg, civil-society actors rather than municipal institutions are implementing urban solidarity measures. An example is the Central Methodist Church in downtown Johannesburg. Under the leadership of Bishop Paul Verryn, the church sheltered almost 35,000 migrants and refugees, mostly from Zimbabwe, between 2001 and 2014 (Joseph, 2015, p. 60); at its peak in May 2008, more than 3,000 people lived there (Kuljian, 2013, p. 17). The City of Johannesburg provided only minimal assistance when it set up portable toilets outside of the Church. After Verryn was removed from his position in 2014, Central Methodist Church ceased to be a major migrant and refugee shelter (Joseph, 2015). In addition, migrant communities in inner-city Johannesburg are establishing their own networks to cope with their "illegality," revealing …

> remarkable resourcefulness in providing access to the most basic needs: shelter, security, job opportunities and 'papers', so much so that if a member of an association is a victim of crime, his/her first port of call is the leadership in the network who investigates the case or mediates between the victim and the police.
>
> (Kihato, 2007, p. 263)

Research on Pretoria, not far from Johannesburg, corroborates how citizens and non-citizens who live in squatter communities self-organize in the absence of state services and rely "on solidarity and consent issuing from a sense of shared destiny" (Monson, 2015, p. 45). Generally speaking, however, African cities do not seem to offer the full range of solidarity dimensions that cities in the Global North often exhibit.

Asia

The Asian continent presents a setting that is at least equally if not more diverse than Africa and Latin America. With greater diversity, the chances of encountering urban solidarity policies and practices arguably also increase. In a recent study, Antje Missbach and her colleagues ask if the Indonesian city of Makassar resembles a "sanctuary city" (Missbach, Adiputera and Prabandari, 2018). Indonesia has not signed the Refugee Convention, has received relatively few refugees and asylum seekers, and considers itself mostly a transit country for refugees, rather than a country of permanent settlement. In addition, the Indonesian national government downloaded responsibilities of refugee protection and management for housing, security, supervision, and other services to the local level (Missbach, Adiputera and Prabandari, 2018). In this national context, Makassar's mayor, Mohammad Ramdhan "Danny" Pomanto, has been the driving force behind local initiatives towards the protection and inclusion of refugees and asylum seekers. However, neither the municipal government nor local

civil society but rather the International Organization for Migration funds these initiatives. Diverting municipal funds towards refugee inclusion is politically unpopular, and local NGOs are only marginally involved in offering assistance to local migrants and refugees. Local actors in Makassar focus on management goals, but they do not seek to rescript negative rumours and anti-refugee smear campaigns. Local civic society also lacks interest in refugee inclusion and protection, or refrains from offering much hospitality to refugees (Missbach, Adiputera and Prabandari, 2018).

Like Indonesia, Malaysia has also not signed the UN Convention on Refugees. According to Malaysian immigration law, refugees are in the country unlawfully and are subject to fines, detention, and deportation. In addition, the Malaysian national government has been surveilling NGOs and constraining civil society activities (Hoffstaedter, 2015). In this national context, NGOs in Kuala Lumpur are struggling to provide services to illegalized migrants. Nevertheless, local civic-society actors and community-based organizations are finding ways, for example by collaborating with UNHCR, to provide access to shelter, health care, and education to illegalized migrants, many of whom are refugees (Hoffstaedter, 2015). A local support infrastructure seeks to mitigate the adverse effects of hostile national policies and actions against international migrants and refugees.

A major Asian refugee destination is Turkey. According to the UNHCR (2021), the country hosts the largest number of refugees in the world, including approximately 3.6 million Syrians. Rather than refugee status, however, the Syrians receive only temporary protection, which "places restrictions on their ability to access citizenship rights, regular employment, and permanent residency status" (Rygiel, Baban and Ilcan, 2016, p. 317). In addition, due to their temporary status, Syrian refugees receive social assistance only on an arbitrary basis rather than on the basis of legal entitlements granted to refugees. This situation puts many refugees in precarious circumstances. Correspondingly, the Turkish national government focuses on reception and hospitality rather than integration (Yıldız and Uzgören, 2016; Danış and Nazlı, 2019).

Some Turkish municipalities and local civil society – especially those opposing the Erdogan government in power – have successfully assisted people with temporary protection who are not granted full status by the Turkish government. Other local authorities, however, are aligned with the exclusionary national politics towards refugees. A study in Sultanbeyli, a peripheral district of Istanbul, shows how a shared understanding of faith and loyalty frames the work of local NGOs. In this way, the Turkish state "has developed new tactics and strategies for regulating and controlling the lives of migrants and refugees who have entered its soil" (Danış and Nazlı, 2019, p. 153). Although this approach serves to offer hospitality to refugees, it also disciplines local NGOs and municipalities, and stifles their ability to resist national politics of exclusion.

Australia and New Zealand

Australia's "Pacific Solution" entails transporting refugees and asylum seekers to detention centres on remote islands, preventing their presence on the Australian

mainland. In this way, the country has sought to circumvent the non-refoulement principle, despite signing the 1951 Geneva Convention. Australia's Pacific Solution has spanned multiple governments and enjoys bipartisan support. Asylum seekers who enter Australian territory by boat irregularly and receive offshore visas are permitted onto the Australian mainland territory but remain ineligible for permanent residency and receive only temporary protection for 3–5 years subject to reassessment and without the possibility of family reunification (Warbrooke, 2014; Alunaza, Maulana and Sudagung, 2018; Caluya, 2019; Briskman, 2020). Due to its geographical remoteness, New Zealand receives few irregular migrants. The county also has strict laws that permit the detention of asylum seekers, including children (Global Detention Project, 2021).

Although the region is known for its harsh policies towards migrants and refugees, urban solidarity initiatives do not seem to have gained the same traction in Australia and New Zealand as in other countries of the Global North. This situation is puzzling because I would have expected that exclusionary measures at the national level triggers local resistance and efforts towards inclusion. One explanation may be that many of the non-status migrants living in Australia are actually non-racialized visa over-stayers from the United States and the United Kingdom. They may not experience the same degree of exclusion as racialized "boat people" (Robertson, 2018). Another explanation is that urban initiatives in response to harsh national measures exist, but they simply do not register as urban solidarity initiatives in public and academic debates. For example, in Australia, grassroots movements such as Mums4Refugees, Grandmothers Against Detention of Refugee Children (GADRC), and TassieNannas advocate for "alternative border practices by mobilizing feminine moral authority in networks of care to generate transformative material solidarity with refugees" (Caluya, 2019, p. 978). These organizations extend a family and friend network to illegalized migrants and organize protest activities. In New Zealand, the Refugee Council of New Zealand (RCNZ) aims to "facilitate the participation of refugees and asylum-seekers at all levels in the community" (The Refugee Council of New Zealand, 2021). A recent call for a city of refuge in *The Conversation* (2019) seems to have been a rare attempt to introduce this type of terminology in the region.

Conclusion

Legal, political, and administrative systems, geopolitical circumstances, mobility patterns, and demographic trends vary widely between continents and countries. Correspondingly, urban solidarity initiatives also assume different characteristics. For example, municipal police forces in the USA have been able to implement DADT policies relatively independently from federal law enforcement policies and practices. Conversely, in countries such as Chile or Germany, where independent municipal police do not exist, similar local DADT policies cannot be enacted (Scherr and Hofmann, 2016; Bauder and Gonzalez, 2018). In addition, the absence or presence of municipal registries or reporting obligations to national authorities have profound effects on the types of local solidarity policies

that are possible. In Africa, status categories imposed by the national government and international institutions do not always reflect the way in which migrants and refugees experience community and belonging. The cases of Nairobi and Johannesburg show that civil-society actors rather than municipalities have created an urban support infrastructure that provides important services to international migrants and refugees, and migrants and refugees in both cities have carved out spaces where they feel they can belong. Although Asia is a vast and diverse continent, there is little literature that focuses on urban migrant and refugee solidarity policies and practices. In Australia and New Zealand, the urban sanctuary approach appears to be less developed.

Despite the apparent differences between cities in the Global North and Global South, urban actors in both contexts act in solidarity with migrants and refugees. Urban solidarity and the associated challenge to Westphalian sovereignty is a global phenomenon. Granted, the literature has disproportionately focussed on studying urban solidarity in North America and Europe. However, once we look beyond the Eurocentrism of academic knowledge production, we can observe various dimensions of urban solidarity in the Global South.

Although various labels and terminologies are used internationally to describe urban sanctuary initiatives, there are commonalities among urban policies and practices to protect and include vulnerable and often illegalized migrants and refugees. We must look beyond particular labels and existing national idiosyncrasies to recognize how urban actors in very different situations are using the scope of their possibilities to enact solidarity policies and practices.

Nevertheless, a comparison of urban solidarity in different parts of the world also reveals that the experiences of solidarity cities in the Global North differ substantially from those in the Global South. The underlying theoretical foundations of urban solidarity are Eurocentric. For example, the Lefebvrian notion of the "right to the city" is rooted in Marxian understandings of labour–capital relations and localized belonging that do not apply in the same way, for example, in many contemporary African cities where populations are often transient and surplus value is produced elsewhere (Landau, 2019). Empirical investigations of cities in the Global South could therefore offer important insights into theorizing urban migrant and refugee solidarity in non-Eurocentric ways.

From a practical perspective, the differences between urban sanctuary initiatives in various parts of the world pose major challenges for transferring urban policies from one national context to another and for applying urban solidarity experiences to cities located in different countries let alone on different continents. In different countries, local policy makers, civil society actors, and activists operate in very dissimilar environments. The good news is that urban solidarity as an approach is flexible and can be adapted to local, national, and regional conditions and can respond to specific strategic objectives. For example, when municipalities are legally constrained to offer a particular service to illegalized migrants and refugees, civil society institutions may be able to step in to provide such services and vice versa.

Despite national and regional differences, there is already a considerable cross-border transfer of policy ideas related to urban solidarity with migrants and

refugees. Correspondingly, activists in cities across North America, Europe, and elsewhere are travelling and networking internationally to exchange information about their experiences. In 2015, for example, Ayesha Basit and Nathan Prier, two prominent solidarity-city activists from Toronto, went on a speaking tour to Berlin, Frankfurt, and Freiburg in Germany and Zurich in Switzerland – where the concept of sanctuary cities was largely unknown at the time – to inspire local activists and share their experiences about the struggles and successes in Toronto. In all four cities they visited, solidarity and sanctuary initiatives emerged in the coming months and years. The following chapter reports on the findings of an empirical study in three of these cities.

Notes

1 The research I present in this chapter follows a stepwise method. Initially, I reviewed the international English-language scholarly and grey literature on urban sanctuary in the USA, UK, and Canada. Then, I distilled this information into several dimensions of urban sanctuary. Subsequent research that I conducted with graduate student research assistant Dayana Gonzales examined non-English speaking national contexts. Our choice of Spain, Chile, and Germany was guided by the combination of our scholarly expertise in Europe and Latin America, and our proficiency in German and Spanish, as well as the fact that the three countries have recently received large numbers of migrants and refugees, many in precarious legal, political, and economic situations. We again surveyed the academic and grey literature related to these three countries as well as internet-based sources, such as municipal websites, to examine local policies and practices towards illegalized migrants and refugees. We read and analysed these sources in their original languages. Once we obtained an overview of national, regional, and municipal legal and policy contexts, we explored to which degree cities in Spain, Chile, and Germany exhibit the same dimensions of urban solidarity as cities in the USA, UK, and Canada. In follow-up research, I reviewed the English language literature to examine whether urban solidarity policies and practices, as they occur in the Global North and Latin America, also exist in other parts of the Global South. While the literature related to cities in the Global North is expansive, it is sparse in relation to cities in the Global South. Very few works on migration and refugees in the Global South explicitly refer to concepts such as sanctuary city or urban solidarity. As a result of this limitation, the review cannot provide conclusive evidence on the extent or the degree to which there is a “Southern” experience related to urban solidarity. Overall, in presenting the findings on both the Global South and the Global North, I focus on selected cities in selected countries as examples that illustrate urban solidarity policies and practices. These cities are likely not the only ones in their countries or regions that have adopted urban solidarity policies and practices.

2 Although the number of the undocumented population in the USA has generally been in decline and was estimated to be 10.4 million in 2019 (Warren, 2021).

3 Access to health services illustrates the interplay between various levels of government. Prior to 2012, Spanish law provided inhabitants registered with municipalities similar access to health care, irrespective of citizenship or legal status (Cimas *et al.*, 2016). A 2012 reform linked access to health care to citizenship or registry with the Social Security department (*Seguro Social*). Spain’s autonomous regions responded by introducing various pieces of legislation that enable municipalities to provide at least some degree of health care to illegalized migrants (Smith and Levoy, 2017).

4 During the Pinochet regime, the *Carabineros* became highly militarized and gained considerable autonomy. Since then, police reform has been largely delegated to the

Carabineros themselves, which continue to retain substantial autonomy from civilian governance (Bonner, 2013). Preventive identity checks are an autonomous faculty of the *Carabineros*, regulated in Article 85 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (*Código Procesal Penal*) (Irarrázabal González, 2015). In 1998, this power was restricted (through Law No. 19.567). However, in 2015 the Citizens Security Commission of the Chamber of Deputies (*Comisión de Seguridad Ciudadana de la Cámara de Diputados*) approved legislation that reinstated the *Carabineros*' power to carry out preventive identity checks based on suspicion of committing or attempting to commit a crime or concealing one's identity (Irarrázabal González, 2015; Rivas, 2015).

5 Under the leadership of a new mayor, Mexico City discontinued using the term "sanctuary city" and replaced it with language evoking hospitality (Délano Alonso, 2021).

References

Agence France-Presse (2017) 'Protesters in Barcelona Urge Spain to Take in More Refugees', *The Guardian*. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/feb/18/protesters-in-barcelona-urge-spain-to-take-in-more-refugees (Accessed: 14 June 2021).

Ajuntament de Barcelona (2018) *Barcelona, Refuge City: From 'We Want to Welcome' to 'We are Welcoming', Umbral*. Available at: https://www.barcelona.cat/umbral/en/NODE/131 (Accessed: 4 May 2021).

Ajuntament de Barcelona (2021) *The SAIER Helps the Same Volume of People, Despite the Pandemic*. Available at: https://ciutatrefugi.barcelona/en/noticia/the-saier-helps-the-same-volume-of-people-despite-the-pandemic_1047119 (Accessed: 4 May 2021).

Alunaza, H., Maulana, I. and Sudagung, A. D. (2018) 'The Pacific Solution as Australia Policy towards Asylum Seeker and Irregular Maritime Arrivals (IMAs) in John Howard Era', *Jurnal Ilmiah Hubungan Internasional*, 14(1), pp. 61–75. doi: 10.26593/jihi.v14i1.2789.61-75.

American Immigration Council (2015) *"Sanctuary Cities," Trust Acts, and Community Policing Explained*. Available at: https://www.ilw.com/articles/2015,1020-AIC.pdf.

Ayuntamiento de Barcelona – BCN Acción Intercultural (2017) 'Estratègia BCN Antirumores'. barcelona.cat. Available at: http://ajuntament.barcelona.cat/bcnacciointercultural/es/antirumores-que-hacemos.

Ayuntamiento de Barcelona, Redacció (2017) 'A Municipal Front by Refuge Cities'. barcelona.cat. Available at: http://ciutatrefugi.barcelona/en/noticia/a-municipal-front-by-refuge-cities_487542.

Ayuntamiento de Barcelona, Secretaría General (2015) 'Acuerdos adoptados por el Plenario del Consejo Municipal en la sesión ordinaria de 2 de octubre de 2015'. Available at: http://ajuntament.barcelona.cat/sites/default/files/acords_021015_es_0.pdf.

Bagelman, J. (2013) 'Sanctuary: A Politics of Ease?', *Alternatives*, 38(1), pp. 49–62.

Bagelman, J. J. (2016) *Sanctuary City: A Suspended State*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bakewell, O. (2007) 'The Meaning and Use of Identity Papers: Handheld and Heartfelt Nationality in the Borderlands of North West Zambia', *IMI Working Paper Series*, 05. Available at: https://www.migrationinstitute.org/publications/wp-05-07 (Accessed: 14 June 2021).

Bakewell, O. (2020) 'Undocumented Migration and Development', in Bastia, T. and Skeldon, R. (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Migration and Development*. Abindon: Routledge, pp. 74–83. Available at: https://www.routledge.com/Routledge-Handbook-of-Migration-and-Development/Bastia-Skeldon/p/book/9781138244450 (Accessed: 2 February 2021).

Bau, I. (1994) 'Cities of Refuge: No Federal Pre-emption of Ordinances Restricting Local Government Cooperation with the INS', *Berkeley La Raza Law Journal*, 7(1), pp. 50–71.

Bauder, H. (2014) 'Domicile Citizenship, Human Mobility and Territoriality', *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(1), pp. 91–106.

Bauder, H. (2017) *Migration Borders Freedom*. London: Routledge. Available at: https://www.routledge.com/Migration-Borders-Freedom-1st-Edition/Bauder/p/book/9781138195608 (Accessed: 7 December 2019).

Bauder, H. and Gonzalez, D. A. (2018) 'Municipal Responses to 'Illegality': Urban Sanctuary across National Contexts', *Social Inclusion*, 6(1), pp. 124–134. doi: 10.17645/si.v6i1.1273.

Bernstein, C. et al. (2006) '"Access not Fear": Non-Status Immigrants & City Services'. Available at: https://we.riseup.net/assets/17034/Access%20Not%20Fear%20Report%20(Feb%202006).pdf (Accessed: 30 April 2013).

Bonner, M. D. (2013) 'The Politics of Police Image in Chile', *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 45(4), pp. 669–694.

Briskman, L. (2020) 'The People's Inquiry into Detention: Social Work Activism for Asylum Seeker Rights', *Journal of Sociology*, 56(1), pp. 100–114. doi: 10.1177/1440783319882540.

Buckel, S. (2008) 'Repression und Integration: Wie gehen Kommunen mit dem Problem der Illegalität um?', in Drossou, O. and Schwenken, H. (eds.). *Leben in der Illegalität: Ein Dossier*. Berlin, Germany: Heinrich-Böll Stiftung, pp. 35–39.

Buscher, D. (2011) 'New Approaches to Urban Refugee Livelihoods', *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, pp. 17–30. doi: 10.25071/1920-7336.36473.

Buscher, D. and Heller, L. (2010) 'Desperate Lives: Urban Refugee Women in Malaysia and Egypt', *Forced Migration*, 34, pp. 20–21.

Caluya, G. (2019) 'Intimate Borders: Refugee Im/Mobility in Australia's Border Security Regime', *Cultural Studies*, 33(6), pp. 964–988. doi: 10.1080/09502386.2019.1660693.

Caminero-Santangelo, M. (2012) 'The Voice of the Voiceless: Religious Rhetoric, Undocumented Immigrants and the New Sanctuary Movement in the United States', in Lippert, R. K. and Rehaag, S. (eds.). *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migration, Citizenship and Social*, Abingdon, UK: Routledge, pp. 92–104.

Campbell, E. H. (2015) 'Increasing Urban Refugee Protection in Nairobi: Political Will or Additional Resources?', in Koizumi, K. and Hoffstaedter, G. (eds.). *Urban Refugees: Challenges in Protection, Sercies and Policy*. London: Routledge, pp. 98–115.

Casa Nostra, Cada Vostra (2017) *Quiénes somos*. Available at: www.casanostracasavostra.cat/es/quienes-somos/organizacion.

CBS SF Bay Area (2015) 'Timeline: How San Francisco Became A Sanctuary City For Undocumented Immigrants'. Available at: https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2015/07/08/timeline-how-san-francisco-became-a-sanctuary-city-for-undocumented-immigrants/ (Accessed: 2 June 2016).

Chishti, M. and Hipsman, F. (2015) *Sanctuary Cities Come Under Scrutiny, As Does Federal-Local Immigration Relationship*, migrationpolicy.org. Available at: https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/sanctuary-cities-come-under-scrutiny-does-federal-local-immigration-relationship (Accessed: 14 June 2021).

Christoph, W. and Kron, S. (eds) (2019) *Solidarity Cities in Europe: Charity or Pathsways to Citizenship – A new Urban Policy Approach*. Berlin: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung. Available at: https://www.rosalux.de/en/publication/id/40039/ (Accessed: 8 March 2020).

Cimas, M. et al. (2016) 'Healthcare Coverage for Undocumented Migrants in Spain: Regional differences after Royal Decree Law 16/2012', *Health Policy*, 120(4), pp. 384–395.

City and Country of San Francisco (1989) *San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 12H: Immigration Status*. Available at: http://sfgov.org/ccsfgsa/san-francisco-administrative-code-chapter-12h-immigration-status (Accessed: 2 June 2016).

City of Chicago (2021) *Chicago's CityKey Program*. Available at: https://www.chicago.gov/city/en/depts/mayor/supp_info/office-of-new-americans/Municipal-ID.html (Accessed: 9 February 2021).

City of Sanctuary (2016) *About City of Sanctuary UK*. Available at: https://cityofsanctuary.org/about/ (Accessed: 1 June 2013).

City of Toronto (2013) *City Council consideration on February 20, 2013 – Undocumented Workers in Toronto*. CD18.5. Available at: http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2013.CD18.5 (Accessed: 4 May 2021).

Czajka, A. (2012) 'The Potential of Sanctuary', in Lippert, R. K. and Rehaag, S. (eds.). *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migration, Citizenship and Social Movements*, Abingdon, UK: Routledge, pp. 43–56.

Danıs¸, D. and Nazlı, D. (2019) 'A Faithful Alliance Between the Civil Society and the State: Actors and Mechanisms of Accommodating Syrian Refugees in Istanbul', *International Migration*, 57(2), pp. 143–157. doi: 10.1111/imig.12495.

Darling, J. (2010) 'A City of Sanctuary: The Relational Re-imagining of Sheffield's Asylum Politics', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35(1), pp. 125–140.

Darling, J. and Squire, V. (2013) 'Everyday Enactments of Sanctuary: The UK City of Sanctuary Movement', in Lippert, R. K. and Rehaag, S. (eds) *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migration, Citizenship and Social Movements*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 191–204.

Délano Alonso, A. (2021) 'Sanctuary in Countries of Origin: A Transnational Perspective', *Migration and Society: Advances in Research*, 4, pp. 84–98.

Delvino, N. (2017) 'European Cities and Migrants with Irregular Status: Municipal Initiatives for the Inclusion of Irregular Migrants in the Provision of Services', *Report for the City Initiative on Migrants with Irregular Status in Europe*. Available online: https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/2017/european-cities-and-migrants-with-irregular-status (accessed on 15 July 2020).

Derrida, J. (2001) *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. London: Routledge.

Escandell, X. and Tapias, M. (2010) 'Transnational Lives, Travelling Emotions and Idioms of Distress among Bolivian Migrants in Spain', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(3), pp. 407–423.

Fábos, A. and Kibreab, G. (2007) 'Urban Refugees: Introduction', *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 24(1), pp. 3–10. doi: 10.25071/1920-7336.21363.

Garcés-Mascareñas, B. and Gebhardt, D. (2020) 'Barcelona: Municipalist Policy Entrepreneurship in a Centralist Refugee Reception System', *Comparative Migration Studies*, 8(1), p. 15. doi: 10.1186/s40878-020-0173-z.

Gebhardt, D. (2016) 'Re-thinking Urban Citizenship for Immigrants from a Policy Perspective: The Case of Barcelona', *Citizenship Studies*, 20(6–7), pp. 846–866.

Global Detention Project (2021) *New Zealand Immigration Detention Profile, Global Detention Project*. Available at: https://www.globaldetentionproject.org/countries/asia-pacific/new-zealand (Accessed: 11 February 2021).

Godoy, M. (2020) *Solidarity Cities in Santiago de Chile and Civil Society Participation during COVID-19*. Toronto: Ryerson University.

de Graauw, E. (2014) 'Municipal ID Cards for Undocumented Immigrants: Local Bureaucratic Membership in a Federal System*', *Politics & Society*. doi: 10.1177/0032329214543256.

de Graauw, E. and Gleeson, S. (2020) 'Labor Unions and Undocumented Immigrants: Local Perspectives on Transversal Solidarity During DACA and DAPA', *Critical Sociology (early view)*, pp. 1–12. doi: 10.1177/0896920520980123.

de Graauw, E., Gleeson, S. and Bada, X. (2020) 'Local Context and Labour-community Immigrant Rights Coalitions: A Comparison of San Francisco, Chicago, and Houston', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(4), pp. 728–746. doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2018.1556454.

de Graauw, E. and Vermeulen, F. (2016) 'Cities and the Politics of Immigrant Integration: A Comparison of Berlin, Amsterdam, New York City, and San Francisco', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(6), pp. 989–1012. doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2015.1126089.

Granda, A. (2014) *Un análisis de la seguridad pública en España: hacia un nuevo modelo más eficaz*. Proyecto/Trabajo fin de carrera/grado. Universitat Politècnica de València. Available at: https://riunet.upv.es/handle/10251/45690 (Accessed: 14 June 2021).

Griffith, B. (2020) 'Map: Sanctuary Cities, Counties, and States', *CIS.org*. Available at: https://cis.org/Map-Sanctuary-Cities-Counties-and-States (Accessed: 9 February 2021).

Hannan, C.-A. and Bauder, H. (2015) *Towards a Sanctuary Province*. RCIS Working Paper Series.

Haysom, S. (2013) *Sanctuary in the City? Urban Displacement and Vulnerability – Final Report*. London: Human Policy Group. Available at: https://odi.org/en/publications/sanctuary-in-the-city-urban-displacement-and-vulnerability-final-report/ (Accessed: 14 June 2021).

Hershkowitz, M., Hudson, G. and Bauder, H. (2020) 'Rescaling the Sanctuary City: Police and Non-Status Migrants in Ontario, Canada', *International Migration*, doi: 10.1111/imig.12714.

Hess, S. et al. (eds) (2016) *Der lange Sommer der Migration*. Berlin/Hamburg: Assoziation A. Available at: https://www.assoziation-a.de/buch/Der_lange_Sommer_der_Migration (Accessed: 30 January 2021).

Heuser, H. (2017) 'Städte der Zuflucht – FluchtforschungsBlog'. Available at: https://blog.fluchtforschung.net/stadte-der-zuflucht/ (Accessed: 2 April 2020).

Hoffstaedter, G. (2015) 'Urban Refugees and UNHCR in Kuala Lumpur: Dependency, Assistance and Survival', in Koizumi, K. and Hoffstaedter, G. (eds) *Urban Refugees: Challenges in Protection, Services and Policy*. London: Routledge, pp. 187–205.

Hudson, G. et al. (2017) *(No) Access T.O.: A Pilot Study on Sanctuary City Policy in Toronto, Canada. 1*. Toronto: Ryerson University.

Humphris, R. (2020) 'A History of the Memories of the "Sanctuar City" in Toronto, Canada', 2020(5).

Instituto Nacional de Estadísitica (2016) *Cifras oficiales de población de los municipios españoles: Revisión del Padrón Municipal*. Available at: www.ine.es/dyngs/INEbase/en/operacion.htm?c=Estadistica_C&cid=1254736177011&menu=resultados&idp=1254734710990.

Irarrázabal González, P. (2015) 'Igualdad en las calles en Chile: el caso del control de identidad', *Política Criminal*, 10(19), pp. 234–265.

Isin, E. F. and Nielsen, G. M. (2008) *Acts of Citizenship*. London: Zed Books Ltd.

Jadoo, Y. (2018) 'Mashaba Using "Maverick Trump" Tactics to "Gain Votes"', *The Citizen*. Available at: https://citizen.co.za/news/south-africa/1866833/mashaba-goes-rogue-with-maverick-trump-tactics-2/ (Accessed: 14 June 2021).

Joseph, N. (2015) 'Sheltering Against Resentment: End of the Line for the Johannesburg Church that Provides Sanctuary for those Fleeing Xenophobia', *Index on Censorship*, 44(1), pp. 60–63. doi: 10.1177/0306422015571517.

Just, W. (2012) 'The Rise and Features of Church Asylum in Germany', in Lippert, R. K. and Rehaag, S. (eds) *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migration, Citizenship and Social Movements*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Kassa, D. G. (2019) *Refugee Spaces and Urban Citizenship in Nairobi: Africa's Sanctuary City*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books. Available at: https://rowman.com/ISBN/9781498570992/Refugee-Spaces-and-Urban-Citizenship-in-Nairobi-Africa's-Sanctuary-City (Accessed: 15 April 2020).

Keating, M. (2000) 'The Minority Nations of Spain and European Integration: A New Framework for Autonomy?', *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*, 1(1), pp. 29–42.

Keung, N. (2013) 'Toronto Declared "Sanctuary City" to Non-status Migrants', *The Star*. Available at: https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2013/02/21/cisanctuarycity21.html (Accessed: 4 May 2021).

Keung, N. (2015) 'Toronto Police Urged to Stop Immigration "Status Checks"', *The Toronto Star*. Available at: https://www.thestar.com/news/investigations/2015/11/24/toronto-police-urged-to-stop-immigration-status-checks.html (Accessed: 1 July 2016).

Kihato, C. (2007) 'Governing the City? South Africa's Struggle to Deal with Urban Immigrants after Apartheid', *African Identities*, 5(2), pp. 261–278. doi: 10.1080/14725840701403556.

Kihato, C. W. (2010) 'Reconfiguring Citizenship in African Cities: Inclusion and Exclusion in Inner-city Johannesburg', in Kihato, C. W. et al. (eds) *Urban Diversity: Space, Culture, and Inclusive Pluralism in Cities Worldwide*. Washington, DC: Woodrop Wilson Center Press, pp. 213–224.

Kozak, P. (2017) 'Caribbean Migrants Risk Danger and Discrimination for a New Life in Chile', *The Guardian*. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/jun/29/caribbean-migrants-chile-desert-minefield (Accessed: 14 June 2021).

Köβler, M. et al. (2013) *Aufenthaltsrechtliche Illegalität – Beratungshandbuch 2013*. Freiburg: Deutscher Caritasverband & Deutsches Rotes Kreuz.

Kron, S. and Lebuhn, H. (2020) 'Building Solidarity Cities: From Protest to Policy', in Baban, F. and Rygiel, K. (eds) *Fostering Pluralism through Solidarity Activism in Europe: Everyday Encounters with Newcomers*. Cham: Springer International Publishing (Palgrave Studies in Altruism, Morality, and Social Solidarity), pp. 81–105. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-56894-8_4.

Kuljian, C. (2013) *Sanctuary: How an Inner-city Church Spilled Onto a Sidewalk*. Auckland Park, South Africa: Jacana Media.

Laing, A. (2020) 'Chile Eyes New Migration Law after Report Predicts It Will Rise Once Pandemic Eases', *Reuters*, 9 June. Available at: https://www.reuters.com/article/us-chile-politics-migration-idUSKBN23G351 (Accessed: 10 February 2021).

Landau, L. (2010) 'Inclusion in Shifting Sands: Rethinking Mobility and Belonging in African Cities', in Kihato, C. W., Massoumi, M., and Ruble, B. A. (eds) *Urban Diversity: Space, Culture, and Inclusive Pluralism in Cities Worldwide*. Washington, DC; Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Univ Press, pp. 169–186.

Landau, L. B. (2019) 'Temporality, Informality, and Translocality if Governing Africa's Urban Archipelago', *Migration Conference: Migration, Mobility and Forced Displacement*, Merian Institute for Advanced Studies in Africa (MIASA), University of Ghana, Legon, Ghana.

Landau, L. B. and Duponchel, M. (2011) 'Laws, Policies, or Social Position? Capabilities and the Determinants of Effective Protection in Four African Cities', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 24(1), pp. 1–22. doi: 10.1093/jrs/feq049.

Landau, L. B. and Freemantle, I. (2010) 'Tactical Cosmopolitanism and Idioms of Belonging: Insertion and Self-Exclusion in Johannesburg', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(3), pp. 375–390. doi: 10.1080/13691830903494901.

Landau, L. B. and Freemantle, I. (2018) 'Shallow Solidarities: Space and Socialities of Accommodation and Exclusion in Nairobi and Johannesburg', in Bakewell, O. and Landau, L. B. (eds) *Forging African Communities*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 277–302. doi: 10.1057/978-1-137-58194-5_12.

Lebuhn, H. (2016) 'Illegalisierung', in Belina, B., Naumann, M., and Strüver, A. (eds) *Handbuch kritische Stadtgeographie*. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, pp. 228–233.

Lefebvre, H. (1996) *Writings on Cities*. Kofman, E. and Lebas, E. (transl. and eds.) Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Leo, C. C., Morand, M. and Murillo, J. C. (2015) 'Building Communities of Practice for Urban Refugees', *Europe Regional Workshop Report*. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Available at: https://www.refworld.org/docid/570617304.html (Accessed: 14 June 2021).

Lippert, R. K. (2005) *Sanctuary, Sovereignty, Sacrifice: Canadian Sanctuary Incidents, Power and Law*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Lippert, R. K. and Rehaag, S. (2012) 'Introduction: Sanctuary across Countries, Institutions, and Disciplines', in Lippert, R. K. and Rehaag, S. (eds.), *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, pp. 19–30.

Lizama, J. (2013) 'Beneficios para niños y mujeres migrantes en Quilicura', *Revista Sur*, 21 February. Available at: https://www.revistasur.cl/revistasur.cl/2013/02/beneficios-para-ninos-y-mujeres-migrantes-en-quilicura/ (Accessed: 14 June 2021).

Loga, J., Pyykkönen, M. and Stenvaag, H. (2012) 'Holy Territories and Hospitality: Nordic Exceptionality and National Differences of Sanctuary Incidents', in *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives*. London: Routledge, pp. 139–152.

Maltester Migranten Medizin (2016) *Maltester Migranten Medizin*. Available at: www.malteser-migranten-medizin.de/startseite.html.

Mancina, P. (2013) 'The Birth of a Sanctuary-city: A History of Governmental Sanctuary in San Francisco', in Lippert, R. K. and Rehaag, S. (eds) *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migration, Citizenship and Social Movements*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 205–218.

Marfleet, P. (2007) '"Forgotten," "Hidden": Predicaments of the Urban Refugee', *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, pp. 36–45. doi: 10.25071/1920-7336.21366.

McDonald, J. (2012) 'Building a Sanctuary City', in Nyers, P. and Rygiel, K. (eds.). *Citizenship, Migrant Activism and the Politics of Movement*. London: Routledge, pp. 129–145.

Millner, N. (2012) 'Sanctuary sans Frontières: Social Movements and Solidarity in Post-war Northern France', in Lippert, R. K. and Rehaag, S. (eds) *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives*. London: Routledge, pp. 75–88.

Misbach, E. (2008) *Leben in der Illegalität: Ein Dossier, Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung*. Available at: https://www.boell.de/de/publikationen/publikationen-3085.html (Accessed: 5 February 2020).

Missbach, A., Adiputera, Y. and Prabandari, A. (2018) 'Is Makassar a "Sanctuary City"? Migration Governance in Indonesia After the "Local Turn"', *Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies*, 11(2), pp. 199–216. doi: 10.14764/10.ASEAS-0003.

Monson, T. J. (2015) 'Collective Mobilization and the Struggle for Squatter Citizenship: Rereading "Xenophobic" Violence in a South African Settlement', *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 9(1), pp. 39–55.

Muhumed, M. (2014) 'Cracking Down on Nairobi's Somalis,' *Al Jazeera*. Available at: https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2014/4/22/cracking-down-on-nairobis-somalis (Accessed: 14 June 2021).

Municipalidad de Independencia (2020) *Municipalidad de Independencia*. Available at: https://www.independencia.cl/.

Municipalidad de Quilicura (2016) *Municipalidad de Quilicura*. Available at: https://muniquilicura.cl/index2.html.

Municipalidad de Recoleta (2020) *Municipalidad de Recoleta*. Available at: https://www.recoleta.cl/.

Nail, T., Kamal, F. and Hussan, S. (2010) 'Building Sanctuary City: NOII-Toronto on Non-status Migrant Justice Organizing', *Upping the Anti*, 11. Available at: http://uppingtheanti.org/journal/article/11-noii-sanctuary-city/ (Accessed: 12 April 2016).

Nyers, P. (2010) 'No One is Illegal between City and Nation', *Studies in Social Justice*, 4(2), pp. 127–143.

Organization of American States (2008) *General Political Structure of Chile: Form of Government*. Available at: www.oas.org/juridico/mla/en/chl/en_chl-int-des-ord.pdf.

Passel, J. and Cohn, D. (2019) 'Most U.S. Unauthorized Immigrants Live in Just 20 Metro Areas', *Pew Research Center*, 29 March. Available at: https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/03/11/us-metro-areas-unauthorized-immigrants/ (Accessed: 9 February 2021).

Pavanello, S. and Pantuliano, S. (2010) 'Hidden and Exposed: Urban Refugees in Nairobi, Kenya', *Overseas Development Institute*. Available at: https://odi.org/en/publications/hidden-and-exposedurban-refugees-in-nairobi-kenya/ (Accessed: 14 June 2021).

Pedemonte, N. R. and Dittborn, C. S. (2016) 'La migración en Chile: breve reporte y caracterización', *Observatorio Iberoamericano sobre Movilidad Humana, Migraciones y Desarrollo*. Available at: www.extranjeria.gob.cl/media/2016/08/informe_julio_agosto_2016.pdf.

PICUM (2013) 'PICUM Submission to the UN Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.' Geneva. Available at: http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/CMW/Discussions/2013/DGDMigrationData_PICUM_2013.pdf.

Purcell, M. (2002) 'Excavating Lefebvre: The Right to the City and its Urban Politics of the Inhabitant', *GeoJournal*, 58(2), pp. 99–108. doi: 10.1023/B:GEJO.0000010829.62237.8f.

Purcell, M. (2014) 'Possible Worlds: Henri Lefebvre and the Right to the City', *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 36(1), pp. 141–154.

Rasthaus (2017) 'Rasthaus - Idee'. Available at: http://rasthaus-freiburg.org/userfiles/downloads/tafel_rasthaus_2_idee.pdf.

Ridgley, J. (2012) 'The City as a Sanctuary in the United States', in Lippert, R. K. and Rehaag, S. (eds) *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, pp. 237–249.

Rivas, F. (2015) 'Control de identidad preventivo: ¿el regreso de la detención por sospecha?', *BioBioChile*. Available at: http://www.biobiochile.cl/noticias/2015/06/09/control-de-identidad-preventivo-el-regreso-de-la-detencion-por-sospecha.shtml.

Robbins, L. (2017) '"Sanctuary City" Mayors Vow to Defy Trump's Immigration Order', *The New York Times*, 25 January. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/25/nyregion/outraged-mayors-vow-to-defy-trumps-immigration-order.html (Accessed: 27 May 2020).

Robertson, S. (2018) 'Status-Making: Rethinking Migrant Categorization', *Journal of Sociology*. doi: 10.1177/1440783318791761.

Robinson, M. (2016) 'City of Vancouver Grants Access without Fear', *Vancouver Sun*. Available at: https://vancouversun.com/news/local-news/vancouver-considers-access-without-fear (Accessed: 17 September 2016).

Rygiel, K., Baban, F. and Ilcan, S. (2016) 'The Syrian Refugee Crisis: The EU-Turkey "Deal" and Temporary Protection', *Global Social Policy*, 16(3), pp. 315–320. doi: 10.1177/1468018116666153.

Sassen, S. (2008) *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. 2nd edn. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Scherr, A. and Hofmann, R. (2016) 'Sanctuary Cities: Eine Perspektive für deutsche Kommunalpolitik?', *Kritische Justiz*, 49(1), pp. 86–97. doi: 10.5771/0023-4834-2016-1-86.

Schmidtke, O. (2021) 'Rescaling Citizenship: Inclusion and Exclusion of Refugees in Europe's Multi-level Governance Structure', in *The Condition of Democracy*. London: Routledge, pp. 19–35.

Schönwälder, K., Vogel, D. and Sciortino, G. (2004) *Migration und illegalität in Deutschland*. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung.

Schweitzer, R. (2019) 'Health Care versus Border Care: Justification and Hypocrisy in the Multilevel Negotiation of Irregular Migrants' Access to Fundamental Rights and Services', *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 17(1), pp. 61–76.

Shoemaker, K. (2012) 'Sanctuary for Crime in the Early Common Law', in *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives*. London: Routledge, pp. 33–45.

Smith, A. and Levoy, M. (2017) 'Cities of Rights, Ensuring Health Care for Undocumented Residents', *Brussels: The Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants (PICUM)*. Available at: http://picum.org/picum.org/uploads/publication/CityOfRights_FINAL_WEB_EN.pdf.

Solidarity City Network (2013a) 'A Short History of How We Got There. Leaflet'. Available at: Leaflet.

Solidarity City Network (2013b) 'Towards a Sanctuary City: Assessment and Recommendations on Municipal Service Provision to Undocumented Residents in Toronto'. Available at: http://solidaritycity.net/learn/report-towards-a-sanctuary-city/ (Accessed: 20 December 2013).

Squire, V. and Bagelman, J. (2012) 'Taking Not Waiting: Space, Temporality and Politics in the City of Sanctuary Movement', in Nyers, P. and Rygiel, K. (eds.) *Migration and Ctizenship: Migrant Activism and the Politics of Movement*, London: Routledge, pp. 146–164.

Teletrece (2017) 'El crudo análisis del diario inglés The Guardian sobre la situación de los inmigrantes en Chile'. Available at: https://www.t13.cl/noticia/nacional/el-crudo-analisis-del-diario-ingles-the-guardian-situacion-inmigrantes-chile2 (Accessed: 14 June 2021).

Thayer Correa, L. E., Correa, S. and Novoa, T. (2014) *Plan de Acogida y Reconocimiento de Migrantes y Refugiados de la Comuna de Quilicura*. Quilicura, Chile: Municipalidad de Quilicura. Available at: http://web.minsal.cl/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/BP04Plan-acogida-y-reconocimiento-Quilicura-2014.pdf (Accessed: 13 July 2017).

The Conversation and Parish, K. (2019) *Refuge City, a New Kind of City for Our Times, The Conversation*. Available at: http://theconversation.com/refuge-city-a-new-kind-of-city-for-our-times-106992 (Accessed: 23 February 2021).

The Refugee Council of New Zealand (2021) *Our Mission, The Refugee Council of New Zealand (RCNZ)*. Available at: http://rc.org.nz/ (Accessed: 11 February 2021).

Torpey, J. (1999) *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Cambridge Studies in Law and Society). doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511520990.

Tramonte, L. (2011) *Debunking the Myth of 'Sanctuary Cities': Community Policing Policies Protect American Communities*. Washington, DC: American Immigration Council. Available at: https://www.immigrationresearch.org/report/immigration-policy-center/debunking-myth-sanctuary-cities-community-policing-policies-protect (Accessed: 28 April 2020).

UCLG (2016) *Chile: Unitary Country*. Available at: www.oecd.org/regional/regional-policy/profile-Chile.pdf.

UNHCR (2021) *Refugees and Asylum Seekers in Turkey, UNHCR Turkey*. Available at: https://www.unhcr.org/tr/en/refugees-and-asylum-seekers-in-turkey (Accessed: 10 February 2021).

Varoli, F. (2010) 'Cities of Solidarity: Local Integration in Latin America | Forced Migration Review', *Forced Migration Review*, 34. Available at: https://www.fmreview.org/urban-displacement/varoli (Accessed: 19 June 2021).

Varsanyi, M. W. (2007) 'Documenting Undocumented Migrants: The Matriculas Consulares as Neoliberal Local Membership', *Geopolitics*, 12(2), pp. 299–319.

Villarino, Á. (2020) *La inmigración ilegal en España – Datos estadísticos, El Confidencial*. Available at: https://www.elconfidencial.com/espana/2020-06-25/inmigracion-irregular-espana-datos_2653811/ (Accessed: 10 February 2021).

Vogel, D. (2021) *Update Report Germany: Estimated Number of Irregular Foreign Residents in Germany (2014)*. Clandestino: Database on Irregular Migration. Available at: https://irregular-migration.net/ (Accessed: 14 June 2021).

Walia, H. (2014) 'Sanctuary City from Below: Dismantling the City of Vancouver', *The Mainlander*. Available at: https://themainlander.com/2014/06/02/sanctuary-city-from-below-dismantling-the-city-of-vancouver/.

Warbrooke, A. (2014) 'Australia's "Pacific Solution": Issues for the Pacific Islands', *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies*, 1. doi: 10.1002/app5.32.

Warren, R. (2021) 'In 2019, the US Undocumented Population Continued a Decade-Long Decline and the Foreign-Born Population Neared Zero Growth', *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, p. 231150242199374. doi: 10.1177/2311502421993746.

Yıldız, A. and Uzgören, E. (2016) 'Limits to Temporary Protection: Non-camp Syrian Refugees in İzmir, Turkey', *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 16(2), pp. 195–211. doi: 10.1080/14683857.2016.1165492.

Zabel, U. (2001) 'Aus der Beratungsarbeit mit Zuwanderern ohne Aufenthaltsrecht und Duldung im Caritas-Migrationsdienst Berlin', in Bade, K. J. (ed.) *Integration und Illegalität in Deutschland*. Osnabrück: IMIS & Rat für Migration, pp. 91–99.