

Introduction

New York and Amsterdam: Immigration and the New Urban Landscape

JAN RATH, NANCY FONER, JAN WILLEM DUYVENDAK,
AND ROGIER VAN REEKUM

Immigration is dramatically changing major cities throughout the world. Nowhere is this more true than in Amsterdam and New York City, which, after decades of large-scale immigration, now have populations that are about a third foreign born. Amsterdam and New York City have had to deal with incorporating hundreds of thousands of immigrants whose ethnic, racial, and national backgrounds differ from those of many long-established residents, and who display a variety of different languages, religions, cultures, and lifestyles. How have the specific urban contexts of Amsterdam and New York shaped the fates of these newcomers? And—conversely—how has the massive recent immigration transformed New York City and Amsterdam? These are the central questions that will be addressed in this book.

A Transatlantic Comparison of Immigrant Cities

Amsterdam and New York City share more than a high proportion of foreign born. That the immigrants arriving there in the last half century have mostly come from outside of Europe is a new development in both cities. Newcomers have had to face a wide array of challenges of adjustment and accommodation, and these processes show remarkable *similarities* in the two cities. Immigrants have sometimes gotten a cold or

even hostile shoulder, but at other times received a warm welcome. By the standards of their respective countries, Amsterdam and New York are relatively liberal cities with progressive elites.

The *differences* between the cities, however, overshadow the parallels. Among other things, Amsterdam lacks a large native minority presence, which is so significant in New York, as well as a continuous history as an immigrant city and the institutional legacy that this involves. New York, for its part, lacks (in American eyes) the generous welfare protections and services that are provided in Amsterdam.¹ The cities have different political and economic institutions. The immigrant flows also diverge dramatically. Owing to recent immigration, Amsterdam is now home to a large number of Muslims² while New York's nonwhite populations—Latino, West Indian, and Asian—have mushroomed. About 13 percent of the foreign-born population in the Netherlands lives in Amsterdam;³ New York City has slightly less than 8 percent of the U.S. foreign-born population.⁴ The naturalness of the way in which these migratory flows are commonly characterized and in which labels are attached to them—“Muslims” in Amsterdam, “nonwhites” in New York—also point to remarkable social, political, and discursive differences. And, finally, there are profound differences in scale. The population of Amsterdam's municipality proper as of 2012 was 790,044 and that of the agglomeration about one million,⁵ whereas New York City's population was 8.2 million according to the 2010 census and the 31-county metropolitan region's about 22.1 million.⁶ The surface area of New York City is six times that of Amsterdam and the population density three times as high. Notwithstanding the fact that Amsterdam is considered a “big city” in the Dutch context, Amsterdam compared to New York City sometimes seems barely more than a small picturesque European place.

Starting from the observation that Amsterdam and New York City simultaneously display similarities and local differences, this book explores the immigrant experience so as to be better able to describe, understand, and explain the nexus of immigrant incorporation and urban form and structure. Although the book focuses on two specific cases, old and “new” Amsterdam, we think it has implications that go beyond these cities.

Comparative studies on the immigration experience in cities, let alone transatlantic comparisons, are still quite rare. There is nonetheless

a growing interest in comparisons of immigration in European and American cities. Within Europe, there have been some attempts to look at the effects of immigration in cities in the same or different countries (e.g., Alexander 2007; Body-Gendrot and Martiniello 2000, Garbaye 2006; Penninx et al. 2004); within the United States, comparisons of different gateway cities have risen on the research agenda, especially in light of large-scale immigration to new or emerging urban destinations (e.g., Singer, Hardwick, and Brettell 2008).⁷ A central question has been understanding how cities differ as contexts of reception depending on the way geographic and historical particularities have shaped immigrant flows—including their skill levels, national origin composition, and timing of arrival—and the effects of particular social, economic, and political institutions and structures on the options available to newcomers from abroad (Brettell 2003; Foner 2005; Price and Benton-Short 2008; Waldinger 2001). New York has loomed large in cross-city comparative efforts in the United States, which have often tried to explain why Los Angeles—the other major U.S. immigrant city—has provided a different, and until recently a much less welcoming, reception for millions of immigrants who have moved there in the last half century (e.g., Sabagh and Bozorgmehr 2003; Foner 2005, 2007; Foner and Waldinger 2013; Mollenkopf 1999; Waldinger 1996). As Roger Waldinger (1996) has pointed out, the case of New York has been too often considered as a proxy for “the” immigrant experience in American cities. Certainly, many of the same kind of social relations and processes are found in different cities, but “the unique characteristics of each of the places and the differences in their respective immigrant flows highlight the way in which the urban context matters” (Waldinger 2001: 5).

Comparisons of European and American immigrant cities are also scarce. John Mollenkopf (2000) in a thought-provoking paper explored the fate of the second generation in Amsterdam and New York. Bowen Paille (2005) has provided a comparative ethnographic account of schools in the Bronx (New York) and Bijlmer (Amsterdam) that focuses heavily on immigrant-origin youth, and Maurice Crul and Jennifer Holdaway (2009) have examined how the different educational systems in New York and Amsterdam shape the trajectories of the children of immigrants in schools. A number of edited collections—*Unraveling the Rag Trade: Immigrant Entrepreneurship in Seven World Cities*

(Rath 2002), *Immigrant Entrepreneurs: Venturing Abroad in the Age of Globalization* (Kloosterman and Rath 2003), *Bringing Outsiders In: Transatlantic Perspectives on Immigrant Political Incorporation* (Hochschild and Mollenkopf 2009), *The Next Generation: Immigrant Youth in a Comparative Perspective* (Alba and Waters 2011), and *The Changing Face of World Cities: Young Adult Children of Immigrants in Europe and the United States* (Crul and Mollenkopf 2012)—compare immigration's effects in Europe and the United States, but they put the spotlight on one topic (ethnic entrepreneurship, political incorporation, the second-generation experience) and include wide-ranging chapters on different countries and groups. Immigrant political incorporation and immigration policy in European countries and the United States have been the subject of several single-authored books—for example, *Immigration and the Nation-State: The United States, Germany, and Great Britain* (Joppke 1999) and *The Politics of Immigration in France, Britain, and the United States: A Comparative Study* (Schain 2008)—but there is, at yet, no systematic book-length analysis with an immigration focus on other topics through a transatlantic lens. In general, in U.S.-Europe comparisons, the nation-state is the unit of study, yet cities within them vary in significant ways—so that the urban context needs to be examined and its special features taken into account. When we speak of migration to countries what we often mean is migration to cities. It is usually in these urban contexts that migrant incorporation into host societies ultimately takes place and shape. Therefore, comparing cities of migration allows us to be more precise in our analysis.

By focusing on two urban contexts, this book represents an in-depth view of the impact of immigration as it affects particular places, with specific histories, institutions, and immigrant inflows, thereby contributing to our broader understanding of the transformations wrought by immigration and the dynamics of urban change. It provides material on issues that are at the heart of debates about immigration in the United States and Europe—from economic incorporation and immigrant access to political influence to racial and religious inequalities and barriers. And it offers new insights into how—and why—immigration's effects differ on the two sides of the Atlantic. We strongly believe that our comparative approach will bring us further for a number of reasons.

First, as has already been said, such comparative studies are thin on the ground and this is actually quite striking in a field as global as international migration to world cities. It is precisely because Amsterdam and New York are both so similar and so different that a book bringing together essays on them as immigrant cities is valuable. Juxtaposing essays on, and contrasting, immigration in the two cities helps to illuminate the contextual factors shaping immigration's effects. The transatlantic, trans-city comparison also calls attention to dynamics that might be missed or taken for granted if we focused on only one city. Scholars of immigration in New York, for example, often downplay the role of the state, while for Dutch academics it is central; in New York, race is at the top of the agenda, in Amsterdam it is not, but "Islamophobia" is a dominant theme in academic and public discourse. Those local particularities—both in everyday urban practice and in academic research—emerge more sharply and can be better identified in a comparative setting. Many social and cultural patterns that are seemingly "natural" in one setting—so natural that researchers don't even bother to pay attention to them—might seem unusual or out of place in another setting. Comparing one's own city with another one is therefore like looking into a mirror (cf. Bovenkerk, Miles, and Verbunt 1991). It is the strategy *par excellence* to learn about the self—and, in this case, about one's own city—and a more profound understanding is the result.

Second, comparing cities also serves to correct ideas about the immigrant experience in particular settings that are based on generalizations about national features or qualities. For as far as students of international migration are interested in the situation in countries other than their own—something that, unfortunately, cannot be taken for granted—there is a tendency to take commonsense assumptions about national characteristics or even "national models of integration" for granted (cf. Bertossi and Duyvendak 2012). Think for example of such notions as "In the U.S., the state and other regulatory institutions do not interfere with immigrants' integration into the mainstream" or "The Netherlands abandoned soft multiculturalism and embarked on a tough assimilationist approach." Such sweeping statements are problematic in general, but are definitely misleading when one focuses on local settings (Rath 2011). As the various chapters in this book show,

both Amsterdam and New York are positioned in specific ways in terms of a broad range of real or alleged national developments.

While acknowledging that the immigrant experience is the product of a multitude of factors at various levels, Adrian Favell (2001) has been critical of national comparisons as these often reproduce national stereotypes and assumptions about the nation-state. What is needed, according to Favell, is an international comparative approach that appreciates local particularities. He has argued that the city is an excellent unit of analysis, as it represents a level of research that “enables both contextual specificity and structural comparisons that allow for the fact that immigrant integration might be influenced simultaneously by local, national and transnational factors” (2001: 349 ff.). All in all, the city constitutes a level of analysis that provides a way to appreciate and understand the complexities of everyday experiences and patterns of incorporation.

Third, and related to the previous points, a volume on Amsterdam and New York offers an opportunity to see whether theoretical perspectives and frameworks developed to explain the immigrant experience and immigration’s impact in one urban context make sense to apply to the other. Or to put it another way, it reveals whether theoretical insights into immigration’s effects in Amsterdam help to illuminate what happens in New York—and the other way around, as well. Ultimately, the analysis of immigration’s role in the two cities can stimulate new research questions and lead to future comparisons and transatlantic interchanges.

Although our focus is on the two cities, it is clear—indeed obvious—that they do not exist in isolation from the countries in which they are located. The immigrant experience in both cities is affected by social, economic, and political developments in the nation-state as a whole, including laws passed and policies made at the national level and that apply nationwide. At the same time, as the chapters in this book bring out, Amsterdam and New York are distinctive immigrant gateway cities in the Netherlands and United States in many ways. In the United States, New York stands out for, among other things, the remarkable diversity of its contemporary immigrant flows and presence of historically based institutions that have shaped immigrant incorporation. In Amsterdam, the widely held international and perhaps cosmopolitan

outlook as well as “live-and-let-live” mentality have fostered the development of an environment in which immigration and diversity are seen as a normal part of life, or at least as more normal than elsewhere in the Netherlands.

Introducing Amsterdam and New York

Before introducing the main themes and the structure of the book, let us first go a bit deeper into the characteristics of the two cities.

Amsterdam is the older of the two. It started as a small fishing village in the twelfth century, then rose to great power in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—the so-called Golden Age—due to its aggressive and innovative maritime trading strategies. Private investors and entrepreneurial traders, unbothered by traditional power structures, established a successful mercantile capitalist system and—for a relatively short period of time—a globally dominant empire (Chua 2007). The famous *grachtengordel* (the scenic ring of canals located in the heart of the city) dates from that period. Amsterdam lost its leading position to other cities, notably to London, in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, but it remained the Dutch capital. The Amsterdam economy has continued to depend on trade and commerce, although it did attract manufacturing industries in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including ship building and repair, tobacco, diamonds, car assembly, and garments. However, most of these industries were relocated at the closing years of the twentieth century, and a new economy emerged. Amsterdam is now the country’s most important center for financial and cultural industries. In 2011, Amsterdam attained twelfth place on the Mercer list of the world’s most livable cities—a ranking based on the availability of goods and services, safety, and infrastructure.⁸ People from around the world are evidently attracted to Amsterdam, including approximately 30 million tourists and visitors each year. The city of Amsterdam nonetheless has felt the need to further boost its international image with the slogan (in English!) *I Amsterdam*, inspired by *I love New York* and *Je suis Paris*.⁹

As Leo Lucassen describes in his chapter in this book, these economic developments have coincided with international migration, although the migratory flows in various historical periods show sharp

differences. Benton-Short, Price, and Friedman (2005), who explored the rise of global cities, point to the fact that globalization entails more than just economic developments, and they argue that immigration is a powerful example of “globalization from below.” They claim that seen from such a perspective, Amsterdam is among the leading global cities in the world. This “globalization from below” is vernacularized within everyday urban practices. According to Nell and Rath:

One senses the international mobility of capital and labour in the sky-boxes of the Amsterdam Arena—the grounds of the local soccer team Ajax—where international businessmen manage their affairs. One senses globalization in basements of the high-rises in the Bijlmer suburb where everything from food processing to hairdressing and weed dealing takes place, oftentimes informally, or at the Albert Cuyp Market in the southern part of the city where one can purchase imported ingredients for Surinamese and Ghanaian dishes. The globalization of popular culture can literally be smelled and tasted in the Chinese, Thai, Vietnamese, Japanese and Portuguese restaurants on the Zeedijk in downtown Amsterdam. This much is clear: international business people, travellers and migrants personify the global character of the city and bring new impulses to the urban social fabric. (2009: 12)

The international character of the city is obviously manifested in the composition of the population. In 2012, almost 29 percent of Amsterdam’s inhabitants were first-generation immigrants. First- and second-generation immigrants together made up half the population (precisely 50.5 percent).¹⁰ These proportions of immigrants bring Amsterdam on a par with global cities such as New York City.

After World War II, Amsterdam like many other places in the Netherlands, received many guest workers from Mediterranean countries such as Spain, Italy, Portugal, Yugoslavia, Greece, Tunisia, Morocco, and Turkey. They were attracted by manufacturing industries to fill the vacancies that upwardly mobile Dutch left behind. The guest workers were recruited between the late 1950s and the early 1970s, initially on a short-term basis, but gradually also on a more permanent basis, to do dirty, dangerous, and dull jobs such as meatpacking, cleaning, assembly line production, and so forth. Being selected on the basis of their

physical strength rather than educational qualifications, and being hired mainly for low-level jobs, they got stuck in the bottom tiers of the labor market. Things took a serious turn for the worse when the manufacturing industries downgraded and one factory after the other had to close its doors. As Kloosterman describes in his chapter, unemployment skyrocketed in the 1980s, and especially the poorly educated guest workers and their children found it hard to get reconnected to the new urban economy.

Amsterdam was also a magnet for immigrants from former colonial areas, notably immigrants from Suriname. This “small” country—squeezed between French and British Guiana and (measured in square kilometers) still four times the size of the Netherlands—was part of the Dutch kingdom until November 25, 1975, when Suriname became an independent republic. Until the early 1970s, only small numbers of Surinamese moved to the Netherlands, mainly people from the elites who came to study. In the early 1960s, there were some attempts to recruit Surinamese as guest workers, but those programs failed (Schuster 1999). Things changed in the early 1970s when negotiations about impending independence were being held. People in Suriname feared political (and ethnic) strife and one after the other decided to move to the Netherlands before it was too late. This migration took the form of a true exodus as eventually one-third of the total Surinamese population had left for greener pastures. Amsterdam received large numbers, especially those of African origin—the so-called Creole Surinamese.¹¹ Many flocked to the southeastern part of the city, the Bijlmer, a satellite city built on the basis of Corbusian principles, with a strict separation of functions and many anonymous high-rise buildings. In the 1990s, immigrants from other parts of the world, notably from Ghana, Nigeria, and other African countries, settled in Amsterdam, and many joined the Surinamese community in the Bijlmer.

Amsterdam also has a relatively sizable population of “expatriates,” an utterly amorphous and heterogenous category comprising well-educated professionals, students, and businessmen from both advanced and less-advanced economies. This is related to the fact that Amsterdam hosts a number of international or European headquarters (including Starbucks, Cisco, and various financial companies) and higher educational institutions, that it is adjacent to the international Amsterdam

Schiphol Airport, and that it continues to be an appealing place for lifestyle migrants from all walks of life.

While it is important to note that numerous immigrants and members of the second generation are following the example of the native Dutch middle class and moving to the suburbs, the Amsterdam population is still becoming more and more diverse. In 2012, foreign-born Moroccans comprised 4.3 percent of the Amsterdam population, Turks almost 3 percent, and Surinamese almost 6 percent, while another nearly 16 percent came from the rest of the world (more than half of them originating in Western countries).¹² However, if we count the second generation as well, we get a different picture: first- and second-generation Moroccans comprise 9 percent of the Amsterdam population, Turks more than 5 percent, Surinamese nearly 9 percent, and more than 25 percent have other origins.

The immigrant population is not equally distributed over all neighborhoods. The canal area in downtown Amsterdam and the area around the Vondelpark are predominantly native white. Surinamese and Africans are strongly represented in the Bijlmer, while Moroccans are to be found in great numbers in the Western part of the city, notably the garden-park neighborhoods built in the early 1960s.

The Dutch government categorizes immigrant groups primarily on the basis of a combination of ethnocultural characteristics and socioeconomic disadvantage, even though in policy making other labels play an important role as well, such as “autochthones” and “allochthones”; the latter group, defined as people born abroad or with at least one parent born abroad, is subdivided into “Western allochthones” and “non-Western allochthones.” Recently, non-Western allochthones often have been equated with Muslims, who are the subject of government interventions, as the chapter by Uitermark, Duyvendak, and Rath shows.

Across the Atlantic, *New York City*—originally called New Amsterdam—was settled by the Dutch as a trading post in the early seventeenth century, and evolved into the nation’s major center of maritime trade and later of manufacturing. As manufacturing declined after World War II, the city’s economy became dominated by financial and other producer services (for an overview of the history of the city’s economy, see Drennan 2010). Although New York City was the first capital of the newly formed United States in 1788, it lost this role only

two years later, never to regain it. New York is, however, the financial capital of the country and one of the world's two premier financial centers. A global corporate hub, it is home to Wall Street and the New York Stock Exchange as well as major corporate services in commercial and investment banking, securities, insurance, accounting, advertising, management consulting, and law. Among other things, it is the most important center for book and magazine publishing and the arts in the United States.

New York is also the classic city of immigrants, the major historical gateway for the country's new arrivals and a major receiving center today. It is fitting, as Nancy Foner notes in her chapter, that America's two most powerful symbols of immigration—Ellis Island and the Statue of Liberty—stand in New York's harbor. Many of the millions of southern and eastern European immigrants who passed through Ellis Island's halls a hundred years ago remained in New York. In 1910, one out of seven of the nation's immigrants lived in New York City—and 41 percent of the city's residents were foreign born. A smaller fraction (7.6 percent) of the nation's immigrants live in New York City today—and a smaller percentage of the city's population is foreign born (37 percent)—but the actual number of immigrants has never been larger, just over three million in 2010. Adding on the children of immigrants, the figure rises to about 4.5 million, or an estimated 55 percent of the city's population (Lobo and Salvo 2013).

Since the late 1960s, New York City has received millions of people from abroad, and the influx shows no signs of abating. Changes in U.S. immigration law at the federal level in 1965 opened the doors to mass immigration by ending the national origins quotas that had restricted inflows since the 1920s as well as severe limits on Asian immigration in place since the late nineteenth century. As long as the doors to the United States remain relatively open—and the federal government continues to allow hundreds of thousands of immigrants into the country every year—New York is likely to continue to receive large numbers if only because of the networks that link newcomers to settlers.

New York City's immigrant population today is extraordinarily diverse. Before the 1960s, the overwhelming majority of immigrant New Yorkers were from Europe, and earlier massive waves were dominated by two groups—the Irish and Germans in the mid-nineteenth century

and Russian Jews and Italians at the turn of the twentieth century. Even the enormous internal migration in the twentieth century was a two-group phenomenon: African Americans who arrived from southern states between World War I and the 1960s and Puerto Ricans from the island (U.S. citizens by birth and not classified as immigrants) in the first few decades after World War II (see Foner, this volume; Foner 2000). Today, no two—or three or four—groups dominate, and most immigrants come, not from Europe, but from Latin America, Asia, and the Caribbean. In 2010, the top three immigrant groups—Dominicans, Chinese, and Mexicans—were 30 percent of all the foreign born, and no other group accounted for more than 6 percent (Foner, this volume). Immigrants are also diverse in their socioeconomic origins; while many have low levels of education and skills, a substantial proportion—26 percent in 2010—have a college degree or more.

The huge immigration of the past half century is a major factor behind the dramatic transformation of the city's ethnic and racial composition. Between 1980 and 2010, non-Hispanic whites went from 52 to 33 percent of New York City's population, Hispanics from 20 to 29 percent, Asians from 3 to 13 percent, and non-Hispanic blacks, reinforced by immigration from the Caribbean and, to a lesser extent, from Africa, held fairly steady, 24 percent in 1980, 23 percent in 2010 (Lobo and Salvo 2013). Not surprisingly, views of race and ethnicity have changed as well—"Asian," for example, no longer means Chinese in New York City but also Indian, Korean, Filipino, and Bangladeshi, to name a few, and Puerto Ricans, who several decades ago equaled "Hispanic," are now outnumbered by a combination of Dominicans, Mexicans, Colombians, and Ecuadorians, among others (Foner 2000, 2005, 2013; see Waters, this volume).

Because successive waves of immigrants over the past 200 years have left an indelible imprint on the city, it is not surprising that their impact on New York's institutions, politics, and culture looms large in the chapters in this book on New York City. What comes out from these chapters is the legitimacy of ethnicity—and appeals to ethnicity—and that New Yorkers, both old and new, are used to ethnic succession. Writing about second-generation New Yorkers, Philip Kasinitz and his colleagues observe, "While these young people feel the sting of disadvantage and discrimination, they move in a world where being from somewhere else

has long been the norm. For them, being a New Yorker means being both ethnic and American. . . . In this feeling they are reaping the benefits of New York's long history of absorbing new immigrants" (Kasinitz et al. 2008: 360).

Comparative Complications

It is clear that both Amsterdam and New York City have been undergoing dramatic changes owing to the large-scale immigration of recent decades. As the chapters show, both cities try to be welcoming, failing and succeeding in different ways. But this book is not about winners and losers, about which city is better. Rather, it brings together a distinguished—and interdisciplinary—group of American and Dutch scholars to examine and compare the impact of immigration on these two major world cities.

In so doing, the authors and editors encountered several complications. Migration and assimilation/integration studies are internationalizing: international scholars publish more often in the English language, go to the same international conferences and workshops, invite each other back and forth, embark on joint research projects, and exchange empirical data and theoretical ideas. They communicate intensively with each other and use the same terms and concepts and speak to the same theories. For those involved in such exchanges it is very tempting to believe that they are really on the same page. But is it really true that terms, concepts, and theories have exactly the same meaning at both sides of the Atlantic?

Take the term "race," which is commonplace in American parlance. The Dutch equivalent would probably be *ras*, although even that seems debatable (see Bovenkerk 1984), and in the Netherlands the term *ras* is rarely if ever used. Yet social scientists and others from outside the Netherlands frequently refer to the concept of "racism" in discussing the Amsterdam context, a concept associated with a set of assumptions about the superiority or inferiority of "races" marked by visible physical differences. This, to be sure, is not to suggest that assumptions about inferiority and superiority do not exist in the Netherlands (see the chapter by Uitermark, Duyvendak, and Rath in this volume and Rath 1999). But it does illustrate that these kinds of concepts do not

travel easily. There is also the term “black,” which in the United States refers to people of sub-Saharan African ancestry, but in the Netherlands can include Moroccans and Turks, among others. The latter is the case, for instance, when people in Amsterdam refer to “black schools” and “black neighborhoods” in areas with high numbers of immigrants, irrespective of the immigrants’ skin color or phenotypic features (see Paulle 2007; Rath 1991; Vink 2010).

In the same vein, the process of incorporation of immigrants in the receiving society is described and analyzed in the Netherlands in terms of “integration,” a term that in the United States is more often used in reference to the plight of African Americans. Integration in this context refers to the ending of systematic racial segregation. American social scientists tend to prefer to use the term “assimilation,” a practice that Dutch scholars would rarely if ever adopt. In Dutch academic parlance, assimilation is almost a term of abuse implying the imposition of monolithic mainstream views and practices, not a term to describe and analyze the kind of social processes that happen continuously as immigrants become part of as well as remake mainstream society—what American sociologists Richard Alba and Victor Nee (2003) discuss in their influential book laying out a “new assimilation theory.”

Theory suggests abstractions from everyday empirical realities, but this epistemological idea notwithstanding, theories are always built on particular empirical cases and emerge out of particular social, cultural, and political contexts. This holds true for social science in general and for public social sciences in particular. The same holds—*mutatis mutandis*—for notions about cities, about urban structures, about urban dynamics, and about the changing position of newcomers. While taking account of these intellectual challenges, this volume endeavors to describe and understand how immigrants have fared in the specific urban contexts of Amsterdam and New York, and how these cities have been transformed by massive recent immigration.

Central Questions

The book is organized around five main themes that are framed as questions about the impact of immigration. The questions probe the history of immigration, the integration of immigrants in the urban economy,

the dynamics of political incorporation, the construction and effects of racial and religious differences, and the role of the children of immigrants in shaping the arts and public culture. Each chapter focuses on one city, drawing on the expertise of the author(s); each of the five sections is preceded by a short introduction (by the editors) that draws out the comparisons between the two cities.

We begin, in the first section, with history. The question posed is: *How has the immigrant past shaped the immigrant present in New York City and Amsterdam?* As one would expect, the chapter on New York by Nancy Foner demonstrates the power of the *longue durée*: immigrant inflows in one period shape the experiences of subsequent inflows. The creation of a welcoming city is strongly related to the institutions and the public culture and ethos that earlier waves of immigrants developed. Such a favorable social, cultural, political, and economic environment, that is, one that has been formed by subsequent inflows of immigrants, does not exist in Amsterdam. Amsterdam did experience mass immigration in earlier historical periods but, as the chapter by Leo Lucassen shows, these distant inflows are not appealed to or remembered in a way that has had any positive influence on the situation today. History matters in a different way, however. The institutionalization of religious and socioeconomic difference—as developed throughout the twentieth century, and unrelated to immigration—has had a far greater impact, particularly in the way the native Dutch deal with religious differences between groups in an increasingly secular society. Dutch politicians and opinion leaders do reflect on the Dutch past, but immigrants do not really have a presence in their take on history, something that interferes in the acceptance of immigrants as members of the Dutch nation.

The second section is about the economy, with a guiding question: *What difference does the urban economy make to immigrant incorporation?* In his chapter, David Dyssegaard Kallick demonstrates how racial and ethnic disparities and immigrant status influence labor market careers in New York City. In recent years, immigrants have displayed even lower unemployment rates than the native born. As Robert Kloosterman notes in his chapter, the reverse is true in Amsterdam: non-Western immigrants in particular have displayed higher unemployment rates than the native Dutch. Kloosterman explicitly addresses the regulatory environment in Amsterdam, including the restructuring of the welfare

state, and argues that it has helped foster the booming of Amsterdam's economy and, indirectly, affected immigrants' labor market performance.

The third section is about the ideological representation of immigrants and the real and alleged boundaries between immigrants and the receiving society. Inspired by Aristide Zolberg and Long Litt Woon's paper "Why Islam Is Like Spanish" (1999), the third section poses yet another question: *Is Islam in Amsterdam like race in New York City?* In her chapter on New York, Mary Waters explores the social boundaries and barriers that people of African, Asian, and Latin American ancestry encounter. Racialization continues to structure everyday social relations and social opportunities, although in different ways than it did in the past. The white-black binary, which dominated racial relations in New York for much of the twentieth century, has not disappeared, but other terms are now needed to adequately describe New York's racial/ethnic hierarchy, as the arrival of large numbers of immigrants from Asia and Latin America has changed the racial landscape. In Amsterdam, in contrast, social cleavages are not so strongly structured by "color," but by other features. As Uitermark, Duyvendak, and Rath note in their chapter on Amsterdam, religion—notably a specific version of Islam—in combination with lifestyle and class, are important today as social divides. Whereas Islam is often disparaged by many Dutch policymakers and opinion leaders as "backward" and "hindering integration," in Amsterdam in the past decade the local government and civic society institutions have actively influenced the formation of a particular—more liberal and "Western-oriented"—type of Islam that has the potential to facilitate the integration of Muslims into Dutch society.

Politics is the focus of the fourth section of this book, which revolves around the question: *How are immigrants entering the precincts of power in New York City and Amsterdam?* In both New York City and Amsterdam, immigrants and their children are making strides in electoral politics, although in neither city have they achieved elected office proportionate to their representation in the city population. In his chapter on New York City, John Mollenkopf demonstrates how politically active immigrants have benefitted from the gains won by earlier waves of immigrants as well as the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s. On top of that, ethnic politics are viewed as legitimate in New York City. In Amsterdam, in contrast, there was no civil rights movement comparable

to the one in the United States, there is not a huge native minority group, and ethnic politics are not seen as at all legitimate. As Floris Vermeulen, Laure Michon, and Jean Tillie show, immigrant ethnic groups that have been most successful in mobilizing ethnic loyalties—Turks for instance—have turned out to be the least successful in gaining access to appointed executive political positions. While they display “civic virtues” and constitute a politically interested group, ethnic politics are seen as problematic and undesirable. Immigrants are not expected to represent ethnic political constituencies in Amsterdam; in New York City, in contrast, these constituencies constitute a rich resource.

The final section looks at the second generation, and another domain. The guiding question is: *How are the children of immigrants shaped by, but also changing, New York City’s and Amsterdam’s cultural life?* The second generation seems to be a source of cultural creativity and innovation in all cities of immigration, but how and why they manage to do so varies considerably. In his chapter on New York City, Philip Kasinitz points to a “second-generation advantage,” that is, the ability to combine elements of their parents’ and receiving society’s cultures in new ways, on the one hand, and being slightly outside the dominant culture, on the other hand. In New York City, the U.S.-born children of immigrants today, as in the mid-twentieth century, have established a strong presence in the American arts, including the visual arts, music, film, and theater. In Amsterdam, immigrants find it harder to gain access to and become accepted into the dominant cultural scene, as Christine Delhay, Sawitri Saharso, and Victor van de Ven demonstrate. This situation reflects local particularities including the place of New York City and Amsterdam in the global art scene, the presence or absence of welcoming structures shaped by earlier inflows of immigrants, the celebration or marginalization of diversity, and—again—the specific role played by the government.

The five themes shed light on New York City and Amsterdam as global hubs of immigration. It is clear that more research remains to be done to produce a fuller picture of each of these themes. We believe that this collection of essays reveals telling patterns and represents a step forward in bringing a comparative—transatlantic—perspective to our understanding of two major world cities that have been reshaped in striking ways by the massive immigration of recent years.

NOTES

1. Many provisions, for example schools and other educational facilities, tax exemptions for house owners, subsidies for poor renters, and so forth are strictly speaking not provided by the city, but by other governmental or non-governmental entities, and are therefore not dependent on Amsterdam's tax base.
2. It should be noted that until the closing years of the twentieth century, only a few people in Amsterdam referred to particular categories of immigrants as "Muslim." In fact, it is since the late 1990s that the Dutch have become aware that many newcomers are followers of the Muslim faith. In governmental statistics, there are still few if any references to Muslims per se. See the chapter by Uitermark, Duyvendak, and Rath in this volume.
3. See [http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=37296ned&D1=a&D2=0,10,20,30,40,50,\(1-1\)-1&HD=120426-2109&HDR=G1&STB=T](http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=37296ned&D1=a&D2=0,10,20,30,40,50,(1-1)-1&HD=120426-2109&HDR=G1&STB=T), accessed April 26, 2012, for national statistics in the Netherlands, and <http://www.os.amsterdam.nl/tabel/7221/>, accessed May 15, 2012, for Amsterdam statistics.
4. Foner (2013).
5. See <http://www.os.amsterdam.nl/tabel/8746/>, accessed May 15, 2012.
6. Lobo and Salvo (2013).
7. For comparisons of immigrants in U.S. and Canadian cities, see Bloemraad (2006) and Reitz (2003).
8. Mercer Human Resource Consulting Worldwide Quality of Living Survey 2011, <http://www.mercer.com/press-releases/quality-of-living-report-2011#City-Rankings>, accessed April 23, 2012. In the same list, New York City ranked 47.
9. Go to <http://www.iamsterdam.nl/>.
10. See <http://www.os.amsterdam.nl/tabel/7221/>, accessed May 15, 2012.
11. Surinamese of Indian origin—the so-called Hindustani Surinamese—flocked to The Hague. See Van Niekerk (2000).
12. See <http://www.os.amsterdam.nl/tabel/7221/>, accessed May 15, 2012.

REFERENCES

- Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Alba, Richard, and Mary Waters (eds.). 2011. *The Next Generation: Immigrant Youth in a Comparative Perspective*. New York: NYU Press.
- Alexander, Michael. 2007. *Cities and Labour Immigration: Comparing Policy Responses in Amsterdam, Paris, Rome and Tel Aviv*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Benton-Short, Lisa, Marie Price, and Samantha Friedman. 2005. "Globalization from Below: The Ranking of Global Immigrant Cities." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29 (4): 945–59.

- Bertossi, Christophe, and Jan Willem Duyvendak. 2012. "National Models of Immigrant Integration: The Costs for Comparative Research." *Comparative European Politics* 10 (3): 237–47.
- Bloemraad, Irene. 2006. *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporation of Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Body-Gendrot, Sophie, and Marco Martiniello (eds.). 2000. *Minorities in European Cities: The Dynamics of Social Integration and Social Exclusion at the Neighborhood Level*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bovenkerk, Frank. 1984. "Rassen of klassen? De politieke economie van de gastarbeid." *Intermediair* 20 (47): 35–41.
- Bovenkerk, Frank, Robert Miles, and Giles Verbunt. 1991. "Comparative Studies of Migration and Racism in Western Europe: A Critical Appraisal." *International Migration Review* 26 (3): 927–39.
- Brettell, Caroline. 2003. "Bringing the City Back In: Cities as Contexts for Incorporation," in Nancy Foner (ed.), *American Arrivals: Anthropology Engages the New Immigration*. Santa Fe, NM: School for American Research Press.
- Chua, Amy. 2007. *Day of Empire: How Hyperpowers Rise to Global Dominance—and Why They Fall*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Crul, Maurice, and Jennifer Holdaway. 2009. "Children of Immigrants in Schools in New York and Amsterdam: The Factors Shaping Attainment." *Teachers College Record* 11: 1476–507.
- Crul, Maurice, and John Mollenkopf (eds.). 2012. *The Changing Face of World Cities: Young Adult Children of Immigrants in Europe and the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Drennan, Matthew. 2010. "Economy," in Kenneth Jackson (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of New York City*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Favell, Adrian. 2001. "Integration Policy and Integration Research in Europe: A Review and Critique," in Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas Klusmeyer (eds.), *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.
- Foner, Nancy. 2000. *From Ellis Island to JFK: New York's Two Great Waves of Immigration*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- . 2005. *In a New Land: A Comparative View of Immigration*. New York: NYU Press.
- . 2007. "How Exceptional is New York? Migration and Multiculturalism in the Empire City." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30: 999–1023.
- (ed.). 2013. *One Out of Three: Immigrant New York in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Foner, Nancy, and Roger Waldinger. 2013. "New York and Los Angeles as Immigrant Destinations: Contrasts and Convergence," in David Halle and Andrew Beveridge (eds.), *New York and Los Angeles: The Uncertain Future*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Garbaye, Romain. 2006. *Getting into Local Power: The Politics of Ethnic Minorities in British and French Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Hochschild, Jennifer, and John Mollenkopf (eds.). 2009. *Bringing Outsiders In: Transatlantic Perspectives on Immigrant Political Incorporation*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Joppke, Christian. 2008. *Immigration and the Nation-State: The United States, Germany, and Great Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kasinitz, Philip, John Mollenkopf, Mary C. Waters, and Jennifer Holdaway. 2008. *Inheriting the City: The Children of Immigrants Come of Age*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kloosterman, Robert C., and Jan Rath (eds.). 2003. *Immigrant Entrepreneurs: Venturing Abroad in the Age of Globalization*. Oxford/New York: Berg/NYU Press.
- Lobo, Arun Peter, and Joseph Salvo. 2013. "A Portrait of New York's Immigrant Melange," in Nancy Foner (ed.), *One Out of Three: Immigrant New York in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mollenkopf, John. 1999. "Urban Political Conflicts and Alliances: New York and Los Angeles Compared," in Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind (eds.), *The Handbook of International Migration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- . 2000. "Assimilating Immigrants in Amsterdam; A Perspective from New York." *Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences* 36: 15–34.
- Nell, Liza, and Jan Rath (eds.). 2009. *Ethnic Amsterdam: Immigrants and Urban Change in the Twentieth Century*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- O+S (Onderzoek en Statistiek Amsterdam). 2010. *Amsterdam in Cijfers 2010*. Amsterdam: Dienst Onderzoek en Statistiek.
- Paulle, Bowen. 2005. *Anxiety and Intimidation in the Bronx and the Bijlmer: An Ethnographic Comparison of Two Schools*. Amsterdam: Dutch University Press.
- . 2007. "Van kleur naar klasse: desegregatie in het onderwijs," in Lex Veldboer, Jan Willem Duyvendak, and Carolien Bouw (eds.), *De mixfactor: integratie en segregatie in Nederland*. Meppel: Boom Lemma.
- Penninx, Rinus, Karen Kraal, Marco Martiniello, and Steven Vertovec (eds.) 2004. *Citizenship in European Cities: Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Price, Maria, and Lisa Benton-Short (eds.). 2008. *Migrants to the Metropolis: The Rise of Immigrant Gateway Cities*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Rath, Jan. 1991. *Minorisering: De Sociale Constructie van "Etnische Minderheden"*. Amsterdam: SUA.
- . 1999. "The Netherlands: A Dutch Treat for Anti-Social Families and Immigrant Ethnic Minorities," in Mike Cole and Gareth Dale (eds.), *The European Union and Migrant Labour*. Oxford: Berg.
- . 2011. "Debating Multiculturalism: Europe's Reaction in Context." *Harvard International Review*, January 6. <http://hir.harvard.edu/debating-multiculturalism>, accessed November 1, 2011.
- (ed.). 2002. *Unraveling the Rag Trade: Immigrant Entrepreneurship in Seven World Cities*. New York: NYU Press.

- Reitz, Jeffrey (ed.). 2003. *Host Societies and the Reception of Immigrants*. San Diego: Center for Comparative Immigration Studies.
- Sabagh, Georges, and Mehdi Bozorgmehr. 2003. "From 'Give Me Your Poor' to 'Save Our State': New York and Los Angeles as Immigrant Cities and Regions," in David Halle (ed.), *New York and Los Angeles*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schain, Martin. 2008. *The Politics of Immigration in France, Britain, and the United States: A Comparative Study*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schuster, John. 1999. *Poortwachters over Immigranten. Het Debat over Immigratie in het Naoorlogse Groot-Brittannië en Nederland*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Singer, Audrey, Susan Hardwick, and Caroline Brettell (eds.). 2008. *Twentieth-First Century Gateways: Immigrant Incorporation in Suburban America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Van Niekerk, Mies. 2000. *De krekel en de mier. Fabels en feiten over maatschappelijke stijging van Creoolse en Hindoestaanse Surinamers in Nederland*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Vink, Anja. 2010. *De Mythe Van De Zwarte School*. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.
- Waldinger, Roger. 1996. "From Ellis Island to LAX: Immigrant Prospects in the American City." *International Migration Review* 30: 1078–86.
- . 2001. "Strangers at the Gates," in Roger Waldinger (ed.), *Strangers at the Gates: New Immigrants in Urban America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zolberg, Aristide, and Long Litt Woon. 1999. "Why Islam Is Like Spanish: Cultural Incorporation in Europe and the United States." *Politics & Society* 27: 5–38.