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Summary
The economic development of recent years has altered the social panorama of the Rioja Alavesa. This is a common perception among the inhabitants of this rural region situated in the south of the province of Alava in the Basque Country. The impetus of the world of wine has brought economic welfare to the region and, along with this, successive waves of people proceeding from other places. These people have brought about a certain questioning of the ‘communitarian and autochthonous We’ and, as a simultaneous consequence, new representations of the ‘other(s)’. It is possible to reconstruct this process in a sequence in which at least two moments can be recognised: in the first place, the phenomenon of so-called ‘temporerismo’ [seasonal work], which refers to the workers who, year after year, for a couple of weeks, arrive in the region in order to harvest the grapes and carry out other agricultural tasks. In the second place, in recent years the region has witnessed the arrival of foreign immigration that seeks to settle in some of its towns.

The confluence of these two phenomena activates the representations on alterity in local society in a special way, and has given rise to the emergence of a series of institutional initiatives that attempt to diagnose, guide, correct or, in any case, influence social relations, trying to bring about a better coexistence and tolerance. These two situations give a special significance to work as a social value and as an agency of socialisation, showing both the channel it provides to relations with alterity and the obstacles to integration that arise in its absence. In one case, work regulates, positioning subjects from both sides in a relatively specific field of relations; in the other, its absence intensifies the vulnerability of subjects, constituting them as such.
Both situations therefore give rise to different representations and treatments of the ‘other’, involving a differentiated panorama of mediators. These social mediation agents are the ones approached in our research (governmental, intermediate and belonging to civil society).

Therefore, this paper addresses to four fundamental subjects that permeates the entire research project in which is held: firstly, the construction of ‘otherness’, that is, how the other is defined, in what terms he or she is referred to, how he or she is seen, treated and profiled; secondly, the situation of generalised vulnerability in which we find the groups that are discriminated against due to their situation as ‘other’, ‘strange’ or ‘different’; thirdly, the controversies and problems experienced by the discriminated groups due to their place of origin or their ethnic origin; finally, the mechanisms that are set underway to change those positions of vulnerability and seek the integration of the excluded, proposing a plural and multicultural coexistence.

Introduction
The economic development of recent years has altered the traditional and peaceful social panorama of the Rioja Alavesa. This is a common perception among the inhabitants of this rural region situated in the south of the province of Alava in the Basque Country. This is where a part of the famous Rioja wines is produced and its population, adding together the fifteen villages that it includes, does not reach twelve thousand people. The impetus of the world of wine has brought economic welfare to the region and, along with this, successive waves of people proceeding from other places. These people, whether or not they intend to settle in the region, have brought about a certain questioning of the ‘communitarian and autochthonous We’, and, as a simultaneous consequence, new representations of the ‘other(s)’ of that ‘we’. It is possible to reconstruct this process in a sequence in which at least two moments can be recognised: in the first place, the phenomenon of so-called ‘temporerismo’ [seasonal work], which refers to the workers who, year after year, for a couple of weeks, arrive in the region in order to harvest the grapes and carry out other tasks associated with this agricultural activity. This is a traditional practice in the region, which summons workers of Gypsy origin who arrive with their families. This practice increased in parallel with the sector’s economic prosperity and, with time, new people became involved, proceeding from abroad, especially the Maghreb (Ararteko, 2002: 35). In the second place, in recent years the region has witnessed the arrival of foreign immigration that seeks to settle in some of its towns. This population is relatively unconnected to the agricultural activity of wine production; it is occupied in service jobs,
but includes a high proportion of unemployed people and therefore – according to statements by agents from the place – with the advance of the economic crisis, it is receiving habitual and increasing attention from the public services of social assistance. In percentage terms they account for less than 10% but, in the province of Álava and in the Basque Country in general, the Rioja Alavesa is one of the areas with the highest relative concentration of immigration (Diputación Foral de Álava, 2009: 40). In any case, this is a question that, perhaps due to its novel character, is of special concern to the local society and the provincial Deputation [Provincial Council], which pays special attention to the region in the I Immigration Plan of the year 2009.

The confluence of these two phenomena – immigration related to seasonal work [tempoerismo] and settled immigration – activates the representations on alterity in local society in a special way, and has given rise to the emergence of a series of institutional initiatives that attempt to diagnose, guide, correct or, in any case, influence social relations, trying to bring about a better coexistence and tolerance. And the coming together of these two situations gives a special significance to work as a social value and as an agency of socialisation, showing both the channel it provides to relations with alterity and the obstacles to integration that arise in its absence. In one case, work regulates, positioning subjects from both sides in a relatively specific field of relations; in the other, its absence intensifies the vulnerability of subjects, constituting them as such, and their relations with the community thus take place through institutions that specialise in dealing with disaffiliation. Both situations therefore give rise to different representations and treatments of the ‘other’, involving a differentiated panorama of mediators who, at different and complex levels of institutionalisation, intervene and endeavour to bring about solutions for a situation that they evaluate as problematic.

This report brings together the main results of research developed with a series of social agents who, in one way or another, dedicate their activity to the questions outlined above. Following certain methodological specifications, an analysis is made of the institutional deployment in the area, the conceptions on the different problems that motivate their activity, the representations of the ‘other’ in the Rioja Alavesa, their weaknesses and practices, the discourses and proposals on tolerance and coexistence in the region.

Methodological notes
Eighteen in-depth interviews, some with a group character, analyses of documents, plans and proposals, and successive visits to the Rioja Alavesa in which informal
interviews were held with members of associations, political representatives and different social agents from the region, make up the field work of the research project. In principle, as indicated by the general framework of the project, the observation and realisation of the interviews set out from the differentiation of three fields within which we placed the different informants, and on the basis of which their practice and discourse on the treatment of the ‘other’ and tolerance were deduced: governmental, intermediate and civil society.

What defines the agents we consider to be **governmental** (ETg) is a type of political action founded on democratic reasons, with which they elaborate and legitimise their actions (and they elaborate them in relation to a reading of the legitimacy of certain claims). The organisations that implement this type of policies – the governmental ones but also some of the intermediate ones – might be inspired by a model of integration of a universalist type, directed towards problems defined by ‘social territories or categories, rather than groups defined by an identity’ (Wieviorka, 1995: 212) and tending to correct social inequalities that, it is believed, are behind discriminatory behaviours. This is an inclination that is diametrically opposed to policies of a ‘differentialist’ type, which intervene in defined minorities in order to mitigate the discrimination that they suffer from. This type of policies is what inspired the interventions based on positive discrimination that were abundant from the 1970s onwards in the United States and the United Kingdom and, in our setting, from the 1990s onwards, with the policies of gender equality.

Those mediators who we identify as **intermediate** (ETi) are made up of organisations or groups of experts who advise governmental agencies in their decision making or else implement the putting into practice of the policies. Their fields of activity include both that of ideas and that of the work of legitimising the interventions, what the actors themselves refer to as ‘social consciousness raising’. Several types of actors are placed in the organisations of **civil society** (ETsc): some of them are inspired by humanitarian reasons, religious in some cases, and militant in others – involving an attitude of ‘support’ for subjects considered vulnerable or victims of racial or xenophobic discriminations; and others are motivated by concrete interests, such as those that could form part of the vulnerable or ‘racialized’ group itself. It is important to stress the close relation existing amongst the actors of these three different fields in links that are encouraged to a significant degree by the governmental institutions, both in the role of advising or legitimisation carried out by the agents of the intermediate sector, and in the incentive they give to certain organisations of civil society for the development of different programs of intervention that, as we shall see, are stipulated.
by the autonomous and foral (provincial) immigration plans. The detail and classification of the agents interviewed is shown in the following description:

1. ETg-1: Immigration officer of the Department of Social Promotion of the Foral (Provincial) Deputation of Álava.
4. ETi-1: Advisor on the elaboration of the Foral Immigration Plan of Álava.
5. ETi-2: Basque Observatory of Immigration (Ikuspegi).
6. ETi-3: Official of the UAGA (Union of Agricultural and Livestock Farmers of Álava) in the Rioja Alavesa.
7. ETi-4: Headmistress of the Oyón school.
8. ETi-5: Social Worker of Cáritas in the Rioja Alavesa.
9. ETi-6: Member of the Leadership Commission of the UAGA.
10. ETsc-1: Prestaturik. Association of Foreign Professionals in Álava.
12. ETsc-3: President of Cáritas of Laguardia.
13. ETsc-4: Official of SOS Racism of Álava.
14. ETsc-5: Volunteers and priest of Cáritas in Oyón. (Group).
15. ETsc-6: Association of Businesswomen of Álava.
16. ETsc-7: Oyón Moslem Association (group).
17. ETsc-8: ‘Meanwhile enjoy yourself / Bitartean Jolasean’ Association.
18. ETsc-9: SOS Racism Euskadi.

The choice of these agents was not based in all cases on the fact of their action being inscribed in the specific field of work. While it is well known that work is a basic instance of socialisation in modern societies, its degree of institutionalisation is relative, or its influence in social organisation is such that it traverses different institutions that are not necessarily specialised in the question. In any case, our research’s inscription in the field of work did not so much determine the selection of informants as serve as a guide for the realisation of each interview and, above all, for the construction of the interview’s object. This was given by a fundamental difference in the classification of alterity, determined precisely by a distinction between ‘work/no work’ which, as we shall see in detail later, corresponds to the categories of the ‘seasonal worker/settled immigrant other’.
1. Immigration as an Official Concern: the Basque Plan of Seasonal Immigration and the I Foral Plan of Immigration of Álava

Immigration is an issue of governmental concern at the different institutional levels within the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country (ACBC), both with respect to its conditions of social welfare and to the processes of integration into local society. The most significant form of expressing this concern is through plans. Plans are the tangible form of public policies for the local administration. In their presentation, they delimit a problem through a detailed diagnosis of the situation and they subsequently present it as an object of government through different lines of intervention that involve the different administrative departments. With respect to our subject two types of plans can be emphasised: the Plans of Attention to Seasonal Work (the I, from 2004-2007 and the II, from 2008-2112), and the Immigration Plans, both at the level of the autonomous community (the I, from 2003-2005 and the II, from 2006-2009) and at the provincial level (I Foral Immigration Plan of Álava, 2009-2112).

The seasonal immigration plans also involve several governmental institutions (Basque Government, Foral Deputations, Delegation of the Government of Spain, Association of Basque Municipalities and the European Social Fund). They were created following the presentation of a Report by the Ombudsman (Ararteko, 2002) to the Basque Parliament in which, prior to a diagnosis of the situation of seasonal workers in Álava, the institutions were urged to intervene in this question. Following the denunciations formulated in this report, a Committee on Seasonal Work was formed that established four aims for improving conditions in the sector: 1) Conditions of contracting; 2) Accommodation; 3) Care for minors linked to the seasonal worker population; and 4) social consciousness-raising and integration in the community. Both plans, which contained no substantial differences, were posed as a continuation in the development of the abovementioned aims, and clearly differentiated between two fields of activity: ‘the strictly labour field and the social and integration field’, with the latter aspect including a series of actions involving the schooling of minors, consciousness-raising and cultural mediation between foreigners and locals, and work on ‘values of interculturality’.

The Basque Government’s successive Immigration Plans have been dealt with in the WP1 Report. From the latter, and in relation to our aim in the present report, we should emphasise the delimitation of their field of action according to the restriction of administrative jurisdiction on questions of the migratory status of foreign persons in the

---

ACBC and, from there, the inscription of the problem of immigration in the field of social policies. These plans also set up the goal of building a structure of attention to the immigrants' problems: the ‘Forum for the Integration and Social Participation of Immigrant Citizens in the Basque Country’; a juridical service for immigrants; a Basque Observatory of Immigration (Ikuspegi) and a network of local bodies committed to these goals of attending to the problems of this population. Special mention is merited by the chapter on ‘Participation’ since, within the framework of provincial actions of the Plan, grants are established for civil and volunteer associations that present projects of ‘activities in the field of immigration’ (Diputación Foral de Álava, 2009: 23).

The elaboration of the I Foral Immigration Plan of Álava is inscribed within this final aim of the Basque plans, with emphasis placed on the peculiar character of this question in the province, as is done by the Plan’s technical official in the following terms:

So, clearly, the Basque Government does not stress the specificity of Álava, so as a commitment of the Deputation we had to get involved in that, because we were also detecting that there was already an immigrant population, that there were no great conflicts of coexistence, but there was a need for prevention, for starting to work on the question of families, girls, boys, second generations (ETg-1).

And the Plan has a special bearing on the rural zones of the province, where, in many cases, there is a peculiar combination of two types of immigration, seasonal and settled:

The first region we started to work with was in the Rioja Alavesa (...) The Rioja Alavesa region was the one that had proportionally more immigrant people and, besides, it has some very particular circumstances as a region, that is, its coexistence with the autochthonous population, as one way of putting it, the settled immigrant population and the phenomenon of seasonal work. (...) It was our pilot project, and it’s where this work with groups is most established today (ETg-1).

The diagnosis is that there is a problem with immigration that is specific to the rural zones, which requires concrete actions by the agents that work with immigrants in such zones. Hence the insistence on creating government and planning structures in the rural zone itself, far from the normal nucleus – Vitoria, the provincial capital – from where different programs and actions have been carried out traditionally:

So what we wanted, and what we are working on, is the attempt to create stable structures, as strong as possible, in the rural zone, so that programs, plans, strategies are created there; one is working there with the people who live there, who know the real situation of their village, their group, at the street level; so that structures are maintained there that are specific to the place, not always exported from Vitoria (ETg-1).

In short, what is made evident by this whole institutional deployment of intentions through government plans is the dense network of agencies and the enormous bureaucratic work that are dedicated to immigration, both of which are favoured by the government’s resolve to make the issue of immigration and social integration its explicit
concern. Immigration thus becomes an issue of the autonomous government, in spite of the declared lack of jurisdiction on the regulation of the status of immigration affairs of the ACBC. And it is precisely this vacuum that leads to the inscription of the migratory question in the administrative field of social policies. For the institutions of the government, the immigrant population forms an important goal of their policies and it does as an ‘other’, differentiated from the citizen with full legal rights, from the autochthonous inhabitant. As an ‘other’ deserving public attention, immigration is a motive for assistance, a vulnerable subject, one inspiring pity, an artisan of cultural enrichment, a future citizen, etc., but, in any case, the alter ego of the communitarian We.

2. The take-off: the development of the world of wine and the institutionalisation of the agrarian sector in the Rioja Alavesa

The take-off of the vine-growing economy in the Rioja Alavesa was marked by a return to the planting of vineyards in the zone in the 1980s, following their uprooting and replacement by cereals, which until then had had a higher value. The recent development of the region, with the take-off of tourism, medieval architecture, large wineries and the mystique that characterises the world of wine, occurred in the Rioja Alavesa when, in the 1990s, an autonomous policy became established that favoured investments in the region. This accentuated its differential character with respect to the ‘Rioja’ guarantee of origin, which had existed since the start of the twentieth century but which, in its turn, had taken on a new impulse in the 1990s as well². A certain sense of their own identity encourages the local wine producers, responding to the frontier of the autonomous community and to the boundaries of the regionalisation of the guarantee of origin, which divides the Rioja zone into Rioja Alta (Upper Rioja), Rioja Baja (Lower Rioja) and the Rioja Alavesa.

² This label and the protection of the vine-growing zone arose in 1925, but it was not until 1991 when the region was awarded the Guarantee of Origin of Spain, establishing a regulation that demarcates the zone of production, the varieties of grape, the production limits of the farms and the production techniques, regulations that are overseen by a Regulatory Council. (Consejo Regulador DOCa Rioja, http://es.riojawine.com/es/).
But development and the economic bonanza also began to find expression in social situations that were novel and undesirable for the inhabitants of the zone. The demand for labour power for the seasonal activities of the wine sector (pruning [espergura, desniete], harvesting) resulted in the arrival of seasonal immigrants who occupied the village centres of the region, awaking in the population the spectre of forms of life associated with nomadism, vagabondage and poverty. This is how it was recounted by a worker from the organisation that unites some of the region’s farmers:

> When we started, in 1998, what happened? (...) In the Rioja Alavesa, where there were good salaries in grape harvesting, wine had significant economic results, so it was a centre of attraction for all the immigrants, and they came to do the harvesting, without any organisation, but a lot of people. You came here, it was all camps everywhere, the social question was overloaded, the schools, then there wasn’t enough work for everyone. So what happened? Well, there were all types of problems, weren’t there? People have to eat, they have to take a shower, they have to... there were problems (ETi-3).

This was the social context that, at the time, resulted in initiatives being taken to regulate, institutionalise and professionalise the sector. The main attempt, within the framework of the Plans of Attention to Seasonal Work, was that undertaken by the UAGA (Union of Agricultural and Livestock Farmers of Álava), amongst other agents from the region. Facing the lack of an ‘agrarian agreement’ in the province\(^3\), it concentrates efforts to intervene in the situation in three basic aspects: administering the contracting of the seasonal workers; obtaining a commitment from the farmers to establish suitable working conditions; and guaranteeing lodging for these workers in
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\(^3\) The collective agreements, in this case in agriculture, are set by provinces or historical territories and consist in the establishment of working conditions by sector of activity between employees and employers. The interviews held with personnel and representatives of UAGA (ETi-3; ETi-6) and of other institutions of agricultural development of the autonomous government (ETg-3), as well the report of the Ombudsman cited above, record the need for such an agreement in the region and justify the initiative to intervene in this lack.
properly-equipped installations so as to avoid them wandering about and spending the night outdoors – this last aspect was repeatedly stressed by the representatives. From the outset, the actions of the UAGA received broad institutional support, both in terms of funding for the initiative, which even receives grants from the European Social Fund, and in supervision by the local government institutions, such as the Work Department of the Basque Government, and even the Autonomous Police, who ensure that the immigrants do not spend the night in the streets.

But one important dimension of the work of the UAGA consists in what is usually described as ‘consciousness-raising’ amongst the farmers, who are often reluctant to take responsibility for the situation of the seasonal workers:

Well, first a bit of consciousness-raising. We have held talks in all the villages. Since in the end,... anything new troubles them (...) Although there were people who provided their own lodgings in the past. But there are other people who seeing as they have had it so easy in the streets, well, and with the Portuguese why bother, isn’t that right? So the work of consciousness-raising has been hard from village to village. The Work Inspectorate has played an important role, that is, when they come with us they are making sure everything is legal (ETi-3).

The UAGA also carried out mediation between farmers and seasonal workers, endeavouring to solve the conflicts of a relationship that exceeds strictly labour terms and is situated on the more tricky terrain of cultural differences between autochthonous farmers and foreign seasonal workers:

And then there are talks, a lot have been given, to see what they are like. And then, when people have worked once with us, they have seen that they are people who are all right, they’re Moors but they’re nice people (...) And at times too, something we always do, we act as mediators (ETi-3).

The emphasis on this work of mediation should be situated in the specific characteristics of the process of institutionalisation of the sector in which the UAGA participates. From the start of its work with seasonal immigration in the Rioja Alavesa, the organisation proposed a type of ‘ethnic change’ in the performance of the agricultural work of the vine. Although at first those who were successively contracted each season as temporary workers came from a variety of origins, its strategy of contracting was consolidated with workers proceeding from Morocco. And this ‘ethnic specialisation’ of the UAGA is situated in opposition to another practice, which it fights on the understanding that contracts are being made outside the regulations (‘subcontracting’)

4. According to the observations of the members of UAGA

---

4 There is a certain tradition of the practice of subcontracting in the zone. It consists in ‘a person who assumes the functions of the ‘leader of the group’ making a verbal agreement on, for example, harvesting the grapes of a vineyard in certain conditions or for a certain quantity of money, which he receives directly from the farmer and that he shares out amongst the group, using criteria that are on occasion abusive or that are not in any case controlled by anyone’. The group is usually formed on the basis of family or ethnic
interviewed, this involves a ‘mafia’ that is commanded by ‘Portuguese Gypsies’. It is against this background of ‘ethnic specialisation and competition’ that some incidents of xenophobic and racist reactions are inscribed; these occurred in the early period of the UAGA’s intervention:

When we were making the accommodation there was graffiti saying ’Moors no!’ and so on, and now they are totally integrated in the village. When they come they go to the bar, they are served their tea, they say hello and so on, and everyone is delighted with them. That has served as an example. And so we are now a point of reference and a lot of people come here (ETi-2-28)

In short, vine-growing production is sustained to a significant degree by immigrant seasonal labour power that is bringing about the intervention of the institutions given the lack of specific regulation for this sector of activity. This is an undertaking that brings together institutions from various levels of government administrations, which cover 25% of the sector and that base their intervention on a work of ‘cultural mediation’ between autochthonous employers and foreign employees. The short production cycles of the vine and the relatively abundant seasonal labour power that is required, mean that the presence of seasonal workers in the region transcends in collective representations of cultural differentiation that go beyond mere labour relations, generating imaginaries of alterity in the population of the zone.

A world in crisis

‘The crisis’, occurring contemporaneously with the development of this research, is returning vine-growing production to its old forms: there is a return to family work that results in a reduction in the demand for seasonal labour power (ETI-5) and makes visible a type of settled immigration, differentiated from the field of work of the vine-growing sector. This is a sensation that, in the autochthonous collective imaginary, situates this immigration as being the cause of the crisis and as a competitor for the mitigating measures that attempt to keep the social effects in check. And that sensation is explained by agents of civil society in the zone through the personification of the figure of the scapegoat in the immigrant population, at a time when the crisis appears to be producing competition between the autochthonous and foreign populations.

It is a time of economic crisis, so there must be expulsion, the guilty party must be sought, and the guilty party is the immigrant who has come and taken away our work, and on top of that they make themselves comfortable here (ETsc-8).

Thus, they are times when the differences, between the autochthonous and the immigrants and amongst the latter, become more visible, causing an outbreak of
cultural distinctions that are based on the willingness to work and the assistances that is awarded in the absence of work. It is recounted as follows by another member of the same association to which the previously cited informant belongs:

A lot of comments have been made to me like ‘now that they are here, they don’t give anything to us; in the past they gave to me, above all in the reality of the dining room, in the past they gave to me and now, as all of these people are here, they don’t give us anything’.

Yes, so I’ve had a lot of arguments in this respect, that, for example, you see them, they’re there with no work, they don’t do anything, and they’re there all day... Above all the terrible division between the Moroccan and the Latin American, I mean, with the Latin Americans I practically notice no problems. They are, like, much more integrated and people accept them more. The big problem as I see it is with the Moroccans. I mean, they are very intolerant about clothes and about habits and they have a heap of children, I mean, they are so different from the local people that they can’t cope with it’ (ETsc-8).

The crisis has even come to threaten the institutionalisation of the sector in terms of workers being contracted, creating more favourable conditions for subcontracting by farmers from outside the UAGA, who are related to the structure referred to as a ‘mafia’. Subcontracting thus implies ignoring the producers’ fiscal obligations and the inspections of working conditions (wages, accommodation and hygiene). In these circumstances, maintaining the affiliation of the farmers who are associated involves a moral commitment, a ‘social conscience’ removed from the logic and conditions of the market:

The people who have consciousness about the question continue with us unconditionally, because they see things clearly, but there are always people who want cheap labour power. (ETi-3).

That is, the crisis is showing up the fractures of the local society, revealing the break-up of the process of institutionalisation of the vine-growing sector due to the reappearance of mechanisms of sub-contracting seasonal labour and a heightening of the discrimination against the settled immigrant population; the latter has been increasing since the times of the region’s economic take-off and is significantly separated from the seasonal immigration.

A new class of agricultural producer

The crisis, in so far as it reflexively shows the consequences of the economic peak of the take-off, is contributing to the formation of a sociological outlook amongst the region’s social actors and is sketching a profile of the agricultural producer, showing certain forms of social reproduction that do not receive approval from the local agents and mediators. The account of the situation given by an official from Cáritas from one of the region’s villages is representative of the opinion of other informants:

-So people are returning to the land. -They are returning to the land. Look, I was a teacher for many years and I had a pupil... the children here don’t study because everyone knows they are going to go into agriculture, and one said to me ‘I am an only child’, and that is the mentality they had, he said it but the others had it, ‘I am an only child, my father doesn’t lift a finger...’. -What do you mean by ‘doesn’t lift a finger’? -He doesn’t lift a finger, he doesn’t
work. ‘He doesn’t work, he gives the workers orders and so on, he doesn’t work at all, and he lives like that, he has his big car, he’s got this and that’, he says ‘All of this is going to be for me, so why should I work?’ -Why should I study, eh? -Why should I study.-That was some years ago when you... -Yes, fifteen years ago, something like that, but that wasn’t it either. And he said to me: ‘You are stupid, because, I don’t know, because you don’t buy vines and live well, and you wouldn’t have to spend the day working here like you do’. That is, that wasn’t his mentality, it was the mentality of nearly all these youths. Studying here, the girls got much better marks than the boys (ETsc-3).

The social changes of recent times have been sufficiently important as to be evaluated in generational terms, showing a past characterised by hard working and self-sacrificing agricultural producers, aware of the value of work, and a present where the protagonists are producers described as ‘entrepreneurs’, a term connoting mentalities that are opposed to the old values of work and more concerned with immediate returns:

For example, we like to work with the parents a lot, because they have always been workers and decent people... Furthermore, in their mentality many are not entrepreneurs but workers, workers who need help in the harvest. On the contrary, many of their sons are entrepreneurs, they are entrepreneurs who bring Moroccans, Moors and Gypsies (ETi-3-113).

All kinds of criticism are levelled at these new agricultural mentalities from the institutions that regulate the sector of the agricultural economy – producers’ corporation (ETi-3; ETi-5) and the government’s institute for agricultural training (ETg-3); other attitudes are favoured which are more sensitive to the setting and have what is termed ‘social consciousness’:

Yes, social consciousness, that’s all. (...) Someone with social consciousness here can do a lot of work (ETi-3).

Between the economic take-off and the emergence of the crisis, the appearance of a significant distinction between two types of immigration became evident: seasonal workers and settled immigration. The former fits into the order of a sector of activity, vine-producing; it has a function assigned to it and is framed within a relative institutionalisation in terms of labour relations. The latter, on the other hand, lacks the guarantee of functionality and the position provided by work as an agency of socialisation and value judgment in the local society; it is relegated in the collective imaginary and in the influence that the latter produces in the institutions, to that world of compensatory social aid that tries to avoid or reduce social disaffiliation (Castel, 2004).

3. The Representations of ‘the others’ and Their Vulnerabilities in the Rioja Alavesa

The definition of the ‘other’ in the Rioja Alavesa involves two main conditioning aspects: in the first place, the peculiarity of the region as a labour niche characterised
by the ‘need’ for seasonal labour power and, in the second, in contrast to the figure of the seasonal worker, there is the immigrant who has settled in the zone in relatively recent times\(^5\). Both aspects deploy a series of imaginary representations of ‘here’ and ‘there’, and ‘We’ and the ‘others’, which include the autochthonous population and the ‘the eternal others’: the Gypsies.

In a conjuncture of increase in immigration and economic crisis, the perceptions of the ‘other’ and the narrative on the historicity of ‘otherness’ in the context of the Rioja Alavesa take on a particular character. On one side, in the construction of different positions and degrees of stigma: the excluded, the seasonal immigrant, the settled immigrant, the neighbour (who is understood as being autochthonous) and the Gypsy (who, although autochthonous, as an ‘other’ is compared to the foreigner); on the other, but in close relation with foregoing, a scale of degrees of vulnerability, which corresponds to the distribution of stigma in local society.

**The representation of the ‘other’: seasonal workers and settled immigrants**

At present – with the intensification of the migratory phenomenon – readings are made in more global terms that do not exclusively concern seasonal work. The ‘other’ is understood on the basis of cultural difference, which leads to perceptions involving incomprehension and feelings of threat, basically through the reproduction of the stereotype ‘they come to take away what is ours’, which concerns work in the first place, and now, in a crisis situation, social assistance.

There is a clear concern by the institutions about the perception of immigration by the autochthonous population. The *Foral* Plan of Immigration in Álava itself, based on studies of other public institutions of the Basque Autonomous Community\(^6\), dedicates one of its chapters to this question. Although, at least until 2009, the cut off date for such reports, immigration does not appear amongst the chief concerns of the local society, what is evident is its constitution as a ‘problem’ in so far as its perception occupies a central place in official reports. And something similar occurs with many of the people interviewed for this research, who, when referring to the question, always

\(^5\) According to figures from the Basque Observatory of Immigration, the evolution of the foreign population in the region of Rioja Alavesa shows a marked and sudden growth: while in 1999 the percentage of foreigners was 0.5%, in 2005 this figure rose to 4.8% and in 2009 it reached 8.8% (Ikuspegi, 2009). On the other hand, the figures for the intermittent presence of seasonal immigration oscillates between 3,000 and 4,000 people. Bearing in mind that the population registered as resident in the region is, according to figures for 2009, 11,429 people, the percentage of foreigners can reach 35%. Although, as mentioned, this is an intermittent proportion, this occasional figure tends to generate oversized representations of immigration in the zone (*Proceso de reflexión sobre la convivencia en la Rioja Alavesa*, 2009).

express their concern about stigmatising representations of immigration when referring to third parties. For example:

And then there are the customs of immigrants, like Moroccans, they go to the square, sit on a bench and so on. ‘Fuck, they are receiving assistance and there they are sitting down, with their cell phone, smoking, when I have to clean houses’... I mean, you'll hear that because it's something that's there (ETg-2).

A lot of comments have been made to me like ‘now that they are here, they don’t give anything to us (...) in the past they gave to me and now as all of these people are here, they don’t give us anything’. (ETsc-8).

This is a question of exteriorising the problem, of situating it outside the agent who is enunciating and it reveals a government position (ETg-2) or one of denunciation or civil concern (ETsc-8) about these representations of the ‘other’, around which there is a growing differentiation and stigmatising specialisation:

Yes, so I’ve had a lot of arguments in this respect, that for example you see them, they’re there with no work, they don’t do anything, and they’re there all day... (...) I mean, they are very intolerant about clothes and about habits and they have a heap of children, I mean, they are so different from the local people that they can’t cope with it (ETsc-8).

There are two clearly differentiable categories within ‘that immigrant ‘other’ in the Rioja Alavesa; these result in a predisposition towards a first, already mentioned, classification of alterity: on one side, seasonal immigration and, on the other, settled immigration. In both cases, the perceptions of ‘otherness’ and how they are managed are different, and the central concern is basically with settlement, which results in a narrative of change, of transformation of the local society, emerging.

For its part, seasonal immigration refers to a pragmatic view concerning work: the farmers need labour power and immigration provides that resource:

In the end the farmer needs seasonal workers. That is, he might like them or dislike them, or later in the bar perhaps he’s the most xenophobic person in the world, I don’t know, but he needs the seasonal workers, so he has no choice but to contract them or to bring them here to work. So it’s a need on the farmer’s part. And, well, the seasonal workers too, logically, come looking for work so there is a confluence of interests. In that aspect I think it’s positive for everyone (...) if a group of Romanians comes and it works out well, perhaps the following year, if people are needed, more Romanians are brought; but not because the Maghrebis are worse than the Romanians, but well, because... For example, for the potato harvest, I believe it’s Romanians who come above all; but because they started to come and keep on coming, not for any special reason (ETg-3).

Seasonal workers are a type of “other” that, precisely due to their seasonal character and their functional disposition towards a specific type of work that is considered ‘necessary’ although looked down upon by the autochthonous population, find themselves, unlike the settled immigrants, set relatively apart from a local ‘code of honour’ (Goffman, 2006: 17) that sanctions and classifies people in so far as they are
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7 A perspective that corresponds to the methodological approach of the research, in so far as we work as mediators, that is, as subjects constituted on the basis of some resolve or ethical mandate of intervening in reality.
proximate or neighbours. Seasonal workers activate stereotypes and suffer from stigmas in an intermittent way, associated with the productive cycles of the vine. They are not exempt from suffering discrimination, exploitation and from being, in general, figures who especially personify vulnerability, but their seasonal presence situates them in a place of assured alterity. They are excluded without a promise of inclusion. Their essence neither threatens nor announces residency, nor does it prognosticate or herald a future position of equality. Their habitat is the lodging house, their work is inscribed within the field of a ‘guarantee of origin’ that is not theirs, and their labour power has a shorter life than the vine. Their work is not guaranteed beyond their momentary presence, and their status as workers seems to be based on older forms, distant from the modern constitution of the labour law and that guarantee of neutralising origins, and hence of equality, on whose basis belonging to a community is understood normatively in modern societies. Seasonal workers will never be citizens. Their order of recognition is that of the human, of the personal order (Fassim, 2005):

We check how manylodgings we have, what network of lodgings are available to us. That is, we can bring the people that we are able to provide lodgings for (...) But we want, we think, that if these people spend two years with us then we have to be loyal to them, then they have priority, these people. So we can give 98% to Maghrebis. So when we know how many people, that is, what our needs are, we begin calling, I don’t know, ‘Ibrahim, can your group come? OK, we will expect five of you’. Besides, the moment always comes when they are no longer groups, instead we know them, that is, they are now people... ‘How are you? Your wife has had a child, hasn’t she?’ I mean, a much more human atmosphere has been achieved, isn’t that so?’ (ETi-3).

Unlike seasonal immigration in the representations of alterity, immigration with a settled character is one that competes and that is placed in opposition to autochthony. A competition that, above all in times of crisis, is posed in terms of jobs and, principally, mitigating assistance in the absence of jobs. And as this results from migratory processes that are relatively recent in the region, there is a local narrative on the origins of this ‘other’ and an interpretation in terms of ‘the call effect’ based on the fact that it is the existence of prior contacts and networks of the same origin that leads families to decide to settle in the same place. This effect is understood to be a form of settlement that has taken place recently, in a progressive form, and has resulted in abundance and even saturation:

I think it began (...) Moroccans, perhaps five or six years ago, I believe. Perhaps a family or two arrived and remained for perhaps two or three years; but I think that it is in the last three years that the great arrival of a great number of families took place; and I imagine they too, since they call each other, don’t they? (ETi-4).

8 ‘And the vines are a very special type of crop, one has a special affection for them (...) I mean, I have three vines that are one hundred years old, eighty years old, so...’ (ETi-6).
And the interpretation of this call effect produces a series of discourses that, on one side, are differentiated from the forms of acceptance of earlier migrations from within the state\(^9\) and, on the other, underline the difference with people who have had a migratory experience in their own family:

Yes, national immigration was much better accepted. And apart from that, myself, in my group of friends there are many, well, there are several who were in Germany, their parents. And even so, when you talk of immigration they are the first ones who say ‘they only come to receive, they don’t come to work, I don’t know why they come’ (ETsc-2).

So there is a heightening of the sensations of threat and injustice between those ‘who have always lived here’ and the recently arrived, who might appropriate the resources of the milieu.

With the question of the crisis, since the majority of the families have someone who is unemployed, there is dissatisfaction with that business of saying: ‘and he is working, while my son, who has always lived here, isn’t’; so that discourse that existed many years ago has resurfaced again (ETi-5).

After the seasonal worker, the classification of ‘otherness’ refers mainly to the settled immigrant, followed by other positions that are related with proximity to an experience of alterity or migration in different contexts: from the local resident who sees how his milieu is being transformed, to the Gypsy or the autochthonous person who has experience of some migratory trajectory in the course of their life. In the following narrative we find an enumeration of the ‘other’s on the basis of a diagnosis of vulnerability, and also on a scale of an ethnic type of difference in which two aspects intersect: social class/level of education/training and the assistance received from the local social welfare institutions:

The local population is very heterogeneous. Referring to the Rioja Alavesa, one of the historical groups, one that is the most demanding and that has a significant population in Oyón, is the Gypsy collective, the Gypsy ethnic group. I mean, they are also highly vulnerable but they have a good knowledge of resources; you find a situation, if you analyse it, of a call effect involving the neighbouring provinces. And then there is the population mixture of Gypsies with foreigners, I mean, it is a situation that is often not differentiated. Some collectives even coincide in certain fields, for example in education. They meet up in the same school, in the same classroom; the local population with economic means flee from that school, separated worlds are produced (…). Then there are different vulnerabilities in everything relating to foreigners, but I mean, differentiated vulnerability, that is, those people that are unemployed but receive significant social assistance are less vulnerable. What happens is that we also find an autochthonous population who are people on their own, without social support, with significant elements of marginality, and the conflict arises again with this sector. I mean, we would have a whole profile of vulnerable groups, local ones as well, who have the same vulnerability in many cases; what happens is that part of those sectors claim that they have more rights, more preference when it comes to rights, because they enter into conflict with these sectors; and there are rows that take place in the queue for social services and all of the conflicts within poverty, which is one of the most worrying elements that we can find in that respect, isn’t it? (…) Then there are different
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\(^9\) Although these serve as a historical basis, in very close relation to the symbolic network of the local nationalism – which, although there are important historical variations with respect to the criteria of belonging to the Basque nation (See: WP1 Report), has that strong ethnic rootedness that characterizes citizenship based on *ius sanguinis* (Brubaker, 1992) – for the development of a current social imaginary concerning the Other.
vulnerabilities of the immigrant groups proceeding from abroad. In the rural zone we find Saharan women, for example. The Saharan group is very different from a Latin American group; and within the Latin Americans, there is nothing in common, due to cultural levels, due to social levels, I mean, because of support, because of acceptance by the population, for many reasons, a Uruguayan has nothing in common with... let's say, the situation of a Colombian or someone from Peru, for example, without qualifications, with no recognition of their qualifications, with different situations. Then we also have Arab groups with different... but for the population the discriminatory element is basically the Moor, who is the most feared and who... is seen as generating threats, who is held responsible for threats, robberies, or in the question of coexistence (ETi-1).

Two fundamental questions arise from this register: on one side, a broad range of stigmas that show a heterogeneous panorama of ethnic differentiation, which is complex and follows a scale; on the other, a classification by degrees of vulnerability of each of the stigmatised collectives. In that broad and differentiated range of alterity, Gypsies and Moors are the extremes of a segment of vulnerability that corresponds to the most severe stigmatisations in the local society. The position of the Gypsies because a central concern in so far as they are the ‘eternal ‘other’” and in their difference with respect to immigrants. Stereotypes are recurrent in this way, and their absolute ‘exclusion’ in cultural terms is stressed.

No, the fact is we also have Gypsies; in my opinion the Gypsies are the most racist of the lot. I don’t know if it’s because they are Gypsies and they feel marginalised, in inverted commas, or something like that (...) for example, I recall that there was a row between a Moroccan boy and a Gypsy boy who’s really cocky, and that they’ve got several of them a bit terrified there (ETi-4).

The Gypsy collective is a bit special, it’s a bit special because they’ve always been here, but they’re always, like, it’s partly their fault, in part for sure, and in part prejudices too, don’t you think? But we would say that that’s a separate world (ETi-5).

When it comes to talking about people who perhaps work less, or who create problems, it’s the Maghrebis. I believe that the Maghrebis are the group that receives the most discrimination. I think so (ETsc-2).

Gypsies and Moors, as extremes on a scale of stigmatisation, reinforce the certainties about an ‘autochthonous We’, with respect to which other belongings draw closer or further away. Since a taboo is in operation with respect to behaviours, activities or social norms, these extreme stigmas ‘protect the [local] consensus’ on the autochthonous character of the community, ‘reducing intellectual and social disorder’ in the representation of belonging (Douglas, 2007). Translated into its collective effects, stigma is taboo for the local society, hence a reduction in the former implies its simultaneous withdrawal from the latter and, as a consequence, heralds a broadening of the We and hence a better coexistence.

Vulnerability and stigma are directionally proportional. For the mediating agents, especially those with a reparative social vocation, vulnerability is the form of identifying
and apprehending the subjects of their interventions. This correspondence might encourage strategies by the stigmatised subjects in order to gain access to the social services (assistance), bringing about competition with the autochthonous population over priorities of rights, but the fact is it strengthens negative stereotypes on alterity of the ‘they’ve come to take what is ours’ type. Besides, although the subjects are mentioned in collective terms in the narrative on the stratification of stigma, vulnerability, inasmuch as it is a position in relation to social rights, converts subjects into individuals, ignoring the possibility of their collective constitution. In the narrative of a member of a Moslem association of one of the villages in the region (ETsc-8), the complaint about the difficulties in constituting a collective was evident. Counterposed to this intention was the insistence of the institutions on the right of its members to receive assistance and thus their negation as a collective subject.

But vulnerability with stigma does not extend to all stigmatised, vulnerable people. There is another ‘other’ who, due to invisibility, does not fit into that stratification of alterity. This is the person who has no access to recognition because he/she is situated in a position of ‘illegality’ or marginality. This is a radical ‘other’, a fundamental cleavage in the sociology of immigration, a status that becomes a dividing line:

The greatest problem for an immigrant person,? Well, the greatest problem in my opinion, I think it’s the lack papers, the administrative problem that they have. And added to that, well, we have a lot of other problems; but I think that problem is not a problem specific to here; to the moment one starts... (ETsc-1).

A lack of papers creates difficulties for – when it does not cancel out – the work of the mediating bodies, and hardens the viewpoints of the general population with regard to immigration:

Bear in mind that to be eligible for social services one needs certain requirements that they possibly don’t have; so, what happens to these people in the meantime? There is one question, and that is what happens to immigrant people who don’t have the necessary documentation in order to work? Those people are here, they are not invisible, they are visible; but I think that the institutions don’t consider that work must be done with them. It turns out they design training plans for people who are regulated and they aren’t eligible; but they do have access to the social services and we’re providing for them, because they have the right; I mean, this isn’t to say ‘No, no, how is that?’ They have the right, they meet the requirements, we are giving them social assistance, but we aren’t doing anything so that these people can progress and get out of that situation. And that’s something we have raised: ‘Fine, OK, so what about these people?’

‘With documents/without documents’ is a fundamental distinction within immigration, but what stand out especially in the register of alterities of the local society – perhaps because of the thick veil that, in the eyes of the institutions, covers that ‘other’ without – is another distinction, that of ‘seasonal workers/settled immigrants’. And then, from
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10 This is, in part, why the form of reporting racist and xenophobic discriminations is enunciated in the third person, as could be seen in earlier sections.
another angle of analysis, there is another type of order in the register of alterities: work/no work. Especially in the world of the seasonal workers, but not only there, work arranges a social classification: it imposes itself and dominates as an instance of recognition of the ‘other’, on whom it confers attributes, identity marks; when the ‘other’ is in the world of lacks, of no work, of unemployment, the method of arrangement, of classification, of identification and of subjection is that of vulnerability and its corresponding palliative, social assistance. We will now consider each one of these orders in more detail.

**Racial division of work and forms of being**

Skills, abilities, aptitudes or willingness of character are qualities that appear explicitly racialised in the narrative of experiences of contracting seasonal workers. In agricultural work it is common to associate different activities with places of origin, ethnic origins or different cultures:

Well, when we started, at first we didn’t want Maghrebis, everyone said they didn’t want Maghrebis. (…) Because they are from a very different culture and people didn’t want them to come, but seeing how they worked… a lot of people wanted Portuguese people, I think it’s the custom, they wanted Portuguese people. We had an experience with Europeans, with Romanians, people from Romania have come, this year we’ve seen Romanians harvesting grapes, and people from Andalusia, and then one year we had a lot hippies come from Barcelona, typical hippies. (…) Yes, a completely hippy culture. It was very pleasant to have dealings with them, but at weekends they went off to the village festivals, they left us in the lurch… it was a horrific experience. I mean, they didn’t realise that the grapes have to be picked… (…) So, no hippies come now (ETi-3.61).

Work appears as a fertile terrain for the reproduction of stereotypes, once again associating place of origin with all types of qualities, characters, forms of being:

Yes, and Moroccans come, who are very hard working, they’re in their… they’re all, in the work we’ve just done with the University of San Sebastián, they’re all from a specific zone in Morocco, within a radius of 30 or 40 kilometres. So they come here, they know each other, they have a good time. Romanians are more… how should I put it, they even seem a bit tough, more like the people from Andalusia, calmer when it comes to working, it’s another system of working. For example, the wineries, this happens a lot nowadays as well, that farmer who delivers his grapes to the winery, wineries that want to collect in boxes so that the grapes don’t get trampled on. That’s where we have problems with the Maghrebis, because they want to fill the boxes really fast, kilos and kilos. That means more work; we work more with the people from Andalusia or with the Romanians. It’s calmer work, less hurried.

Going beyond the tasks deriving from the vine, the placement of populations by sector of activity constructs areas of classification that arranges the representations of the ‘other’, sketching a clearly racial division of work:

Well, look, there’s… well, the truth is that Romanians, of course they’re Romanians, are working in domestic service as well. And Colombians, there are a lot of Colombians who… There are others that don’t, who are in the building industry, who came to work in the construction industry, and obviously, at this time they’re strongly affected by unemployment… Above all those two… (ETsc-5).
This is a question of practices and conceptions that, although highly questionable, do not lack historical and cultural reasons. These range from a historically significant and enormous experience of migration that, from the nineteenth century onwards, was called for and received in America on the basis of its racial features, to a prolific interpretation of the migratory phenomenon in terms of labour markets, and doubtless include that species of ‘differentialist racism’ and ‘cultural fundamentalism’ (Taguieff, 1990). Since the 1960s and coinciding with the crisis of the notion of society, these have brought about a displacement from the concept of race to that of culture or ethnic group, providing grounds for a discourse that ranges from inequality to difference, ‘from a heterophobic attitude to a heterophile one’, and that, in its turn, favours the definition of migrant populations on the basis of cultural, if not directly racial, particularities (Santamaría, 2002: 66).

That whole range of differentiations becomes clearer when it is framed in the field of work. Within its limits, unemployment and the risks of disaffiliation, authorise other criteria of distinction where the intensity in designating the ‘other’ takes on a different tone:

> Although there are also some Romanians who work in some winery or other, that too, but now they are unemployed (ETsc-5. 98).

**Social work with, and concern for... vulnerability and immigrants**

The association between immigration and vulnerability opens up the field to another dimension of work: not so much that of the work done by immigrants as that brought about by its lack\(^\text{11}\). The loss of jobs, which, with the crisis, is especially affecting immigrants, places them on that terrain of vulnerability that authorises the work of a complex and widespread network of assistance and reparatory actions: that of social work. Social work is a basic institution of welfare societies but, unlike the other big socialising agencies such as education or health, it deploys a less structured and centralised apparatus, one that is more atomised and diversified than those of the former, focused on problems and specialising in the publics to which it is directed. Its practice oscillates between profession and vocation, inspired by values of
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\(^{11}\) The relation between immigration and unemployment is something about which – leaving out Durkheim – it could be said that it is inscribed in the field of representations, rather than in that of social facts. Studies done in the region have shown that, in comparison with the autochthonous population, the immigrants have a greater percentage of people in employment (66% against 56% amongst the autochthonous population), due perhaps to the greater percentage of young people and males amongst the immigrants. However, the percentage increase in unemployment between 2008 and 2009 is significantly higher amongst the immigrants (143% against 61%) (Procesos de reflexión sobre la convivencia en la Rioja Alavesa..., 2009: 21), which indicates that the economic crisis is especially affecting those who have recently arrived.
normalisation but also by others of a more universal type and guided by sentiments of pity; it is directed towards both controlling and freeing individuals (Dubet, 2006: 263-4).

And that is how it is in our field of research: there is a complex structure of government agencies, of associations that carry out assistance programs; some of a professional type, others with a charitable character; some focusing on problems and others directed to specific populations. In the government field we find several levels of activity: that of the Foral Deputation, whose Department of Social Welfare brings together social workers, who administer assistance in the face of concrete situations of individual need, and technical posts of Community prevention (ETg-2); that of the municipal councils, who also have Social Services departments; and there are even other lines of mainstream activity, such as those set up by the Foral Immigration Plan of Álava. Similarly, there is an associative level of activity that includes different types of undertakings: one corporative, which brings together professionals from the sector with a voluntary disposition towards ‘social assistance’ (ETsc-2); others with specific programs aimed at the immigrant population (ETsc-1; ETsc-8) and others of a religious type, which, guided by charity, dedicate a significant part of their associative structure to helping the needy (ETi-5; ETsc-5; ETsc-3).

As we have observed, a large part of their activity is directed towards the immigrant population, which is especially prone to vulnerability. One could say that the activity of this diversity of agencies and undertakings functions in a progressive way, covering a graduated segment of situations of vulnerability or exclusion. Nearly all – certainly inspired by the deontology of a profession that is very widespread and institutionalised in Basque society – work on the basis of principles of ‘normality’, endeavouring to define their actions in terms of situations that they consider problematic, rather than in terms of those who suffer from them. This principle is especially explicit in the government agencies, which work following the guidelines of ‘inclusive citizenship’ (WP1) and therefore without differentiating between immigrants and the autochthonous population. But in a situation that is considered to be critical, the daily practice of social work means that on occasion those principles are modified:

So, for us personally, this involves a lot of wear, because there isn’t already... I mean, it’s everybody’s daily struggle. And of course, it’s that too, a very high dedication of time is required in social services, and also in immigration, since in the past it was more the elderly, more this and that (ETg-2).

In the associative field, in the case of a voluntary association of social workers in the province, work with immigrants is also more frequent. There, the immigrant is viewed as a subject characterised by her many lacks and shortages, since he/she is the one who ‘remains outside’, ‘the one who doesn’t meet [the requirements]’, ‘the one who
lacks rights’. It is this vulnerability that makes him/her into an object of social work, a preconception on which all the work of the social worker is constructed:

There were people who always remain outside, for whatever reason there are always people who remain outside, because they don’t meet... because they can’t cover I don’t know what; it’s really stupid but those people don’t have the right to. So, we decided that those people who really don’t have the right to were the people who we wanted to work with. That is what we do (ETsc-2).

In spite of the recognition of the immigrants’ special situation of vulnerability and of their constitution as subjects in so far as they are vulnerable, even by the organisations of charitable assistance, who are aware of the erroneous implications of singularising certain social problems within immigration, there is an insistence on inscribing their treatment within ‘normality’:

And in fact, I think that experience itself tells you not; in the end, you have to treat her as just another person who is going to have the same rights and duties that we all have, I mean, if you have a problem, well, let’s work on it, if you have some need, some situation, well. So there’s no specific program that says, no, this is only for immigrants, no (ETi-5).

However, this normalising treatment, merely reparatory facing an unfavourable contingency and restorative of the capacities of individuals, is not evaluated in the same way by some immigrant organisations, who feel that they are being especially questioned by the institutions of social assistance and who evaluate such intervention in terms of control. This is the case of an association of Moslem immigrants from a locality in the region:

The basic subsidy is a way into a personal, social prison, here in Oyón for example. You must not move, you must not travel, you must not do anything; and people don’t want to spend their whole life receiving the basic subsidy. They tell you ‘you have to spend what we give you’. So what is the benefit then, what is the benefit. What you give to me I have to spend. I want to get on in life. With this assistance I want to put together some capital so as to carry out some activity (ETsc-7).

They are indeed precarious individuals like any other, but they also have singular problems, which only seem to affect them: obstacles are placed in the way of their gaining access to housing due to their condition as immigrants (immigrants in need, with problems of access to and right to); they are offered highly precarious employment and with requirements that cannot be asked of the local population; they have difficulties in getting their status and the training they received in their countries of origin recognised (ETsc-1). They are treated as just another person, but their problems, needs and precariousness are not those of just anyone, as appears to be recognised by the social workers themselves, who previously developed the discourse of the ‘other’ as just another in need. But there are even differences within the collective of immigrants, such as those that are clearly evident – once again – between those who come to work as seasonal workers and those who are to be found in a settled situation.
In the case of the seasonal workers, the work is basically developed by the Technical Agency of Communitarian Prevention and is treated in a specific way, differentiating it from the work with settled immigants. Following the specific plans of the sector, the institutionalising intervention of the UAGA and the work of the officer from the Agency, the work is now considered to be moving in an appropriate direction, both regarding the welfare of the subjects themselves and their families, and the problems that the phenomenon was causing in the community:

So then, that has disappeared, the accommodation is getting better; the farmers have, to a certain extent, become aware that they must put them up in better conditions; we have isolated cases and we continue to insist, but it is nothing like what happened fifteen years and there has been an improvement (ETg-2).

The situation of the settled immigration is different and, it seems, urgent; this has already been sufficiently noted in the report. As explained above, the circumstances of economic crisis are generating a perception of unfair competition with respect to assistance from the social services, which frequently makes social work difficult, putting into question the model of inclusive citizenship that was analysed in WP1. This is a question of representations of fraud on the part of the immigrants that circulate amongst the local population, frequently with little basis in reality; but, despite that, prejudice is a reality that the social workers consider they must deal with:

So then, we can say that everything is going fine and so on; but people don’t have that sensation. And then, too, it coincides with the arrival of a lot of people when the prices of grapes are falling, when companies are closing, when people don’t have work... So, they aren’t taking our work, but... (ETg-2).

It also appears that the social mediators have detected the presence of individuals who, although registered as residents in villages close to the border with the Autonomous Community of La Rioja, are really working in that autonomous community, but prefer to establish their fixed residence in the ACBC because they consider that this brings them better economic conditions.

In any case, apart from the necessary work of consciousness-raising, or mediation between the local and immigrant populations, it should not be forgotten that one of the main characteristics of social work with immigration rests on the fact that the social workers serve as guides for the immigrants to be able to attain their goals, in this case, to settle. Thus, one of the main instruments for attaining this is integration through work, which is why there is an effort to sort out shortcomings in this field:

And then we focused on [the problem] and we started a project called IPI, which was a project involving a Personalised Itinerary for the Integration of people. So, what we did with this project, what we tried to do, was to train people in the trades in which immigrant people are able to work. So, which ones? Women in geriatrics, caring for children; for the men at that time there was growth in the construction industry, so... plumbers, well, we organised a lot of courses (ETsc-1).
Two dimensions of work should be stressed in relation to immigration, both seasonal and settled, and to the local population’s perception of this, above all its effects: on one side, as has already been made evident, work arranges, channels and stabilises the representations of the ‘other’, placing the immigrants in a place that, due to its being habitual or common, is acceptable to the ‘local We’. This is an instance of relationship – although this is traversed by another order of inequalities and differentiations (such as the racial division it fosters, especially amongst seasonal workers) – that places the We into communication with the ‘other’s, and significantly reduces the generation of stigmas. Because, in the final instance, as the Officer of Social Welfare Department emphatically put it ‘what the person with no relationship has is fear’ (ETg-2).

The other dimension of work is, paradoxically, where its absence leads: the work that is produced by non-work, that is, the social work of the social workers. This is practical work that, since it quotidian and involves resolving problems, is elusive and sceptical of theorising and transcendental arguments\(^\text{12}\), even when principles of another, higher order guide their vocation, resolve or even profession, producing a kind of ‘social faith’ as a result (Dubet, 2006: 264). These principles are sometimes profane, professional and secular (ETg-2; ETsc-2) and sometimes religious (ETsc-3; ETsc-5), but there is always a strong and marked intention to have a quotidian effect. And it is work that is almost completely done by women: social workers; volunteers in charitable organisations; members of civil associations... social work and therefore work with the ‘other’ who lacks work is a female job.

4. Everyday Discourses and Modulation of Language

The terminology on immigration, racism, tolerance, etc., opens up a semantic field of great extension and complexity, and it articulates deep debates in a double sense: on one side, it raises the question of whether or not it is convenient to name the migrant subjects, since ‘naming’ implies differentiating and it is understood that this might lead to stigmatising; and, on the other, there is discussion over the multiple meanings of a terminology that overwhelms those who have to use it: interculturality, multiculturality, integration, adaptation, coexistence, etc. There is no clear idea on the subject, even amongst government authorities that are actively involved in it:

If you ask for a definition of intercultural coexistence, I won’t give you one. I wouldn’t know how to. I wouldn’t know how to because everyone understands it in a different way (ETg-1).

\(^{12}\) - What concept do you work with? That is, citizen, inclusion, I suppose; those are the things you most frequently invoke, aren’t they?
- Yes, we, in principle, people who might need a boost and that’s all. (…) That’s the philosophy, but, well, since in the end the work takes up all our energy we don’t philosophize, we simply work (ETg-2).
Likewise, as is made clear by one of the experts responsible for drawing up the Immigration Plan of Álava, there is an attempt to avoid explicit references to the question of racism and xenophobia and, on the contrary, ‘positive’ reference are preferred for dealing with the needs of collectives that might be considered victims of this type of discrimination:

When we were drawing up the document [the Immigration Plan of Álava], the declaration, there was a very interesting discussion in this respect. There was a lot of talk in the Interculturality Commission about positive aspects, and even the word exclusion, racism or xenophobia was only mentioned once. In that line on the commitment of associations to continue promoting the issue of interculturality and the positive elements of this society, and so on. When this was taken to the plenary session, the criticism made was that something very idyllic was being posed, and that it wasn’t real. And so a meeting was organised, a discussion in that respect, which is why several more paragraphs were put back in again, talking about exclusion, poverty (ETi-1).

An effort is thus made to avoid terms that might carry a risk of touching on stigma discursively and/or producing stigmatising policies. Going more deeply into that debate, which strongly overlaps as we shall see, it should be stressed that, at least for the subjects most closely linked to the institutions – Immigration Officer (ETg-1); expert consultants (ETi-1), there is a commitment to not naming as a sign of normalisation.

This fits in with the modulation of the language of the institutional texts where there is an effort not to make ‘negative’ references and, on the contrary, to opt for more inclusive, normalising and common terms, like ‘coexistence’:

The opening term was not the word immigration, or immigrant, or racism, or xenophobia; the opening term was... ‘we are going to do this from normality’, from normality, from not making a distinction between immigrants and non-immigrants; from where we are going to try to mainstream this, and we are going to go into what needs are detected, what coexistence problems can be seen. We don’t speak of immigrants or of non-immigrants, but of problems of coexistence, that is, amongst people, amongst institutions, amongst men, women, whites, blacks, youths, the elderly... (ETg-1).

And that seems to be the decision: coexistence and neighbourliness based on principles of social equality. At least that is what can be deduced from the Process of Reflection on Coexistence in the Rioja Alavesa in Relation to the New Migratory Processes, the document resulting from the exchange of opinions amongst different social agents of the region and that has received broad institutional sponsorship (Deputation, Basque Government, European Union). It is understood there that the difficulties in the processes of integration derive from social inequality produced by the ‘vulnerability that especially affects broad sectors of the immigrant population’ and by the ‘social barriers’ that create ‘circles of relations’ that keep those same sectors separated (Proceso de reflexion..., 2009: 6-7).

In any case, a constant tension between theory and practice can be detected in the discourse of all the actors, sometimes implicitly and sometimes explicitly. ‘Theory
and practice’ indicates two different orders of recognition, but the second term always imposes itself:

Normally, always, these things are started with the theoretical proposal of interculturality, multiculturality; you spend four meetings discussing that, and you haven’t got anywhere. And then, obviously, some immigrant people, with their problems, their ways of... who say: ‘Fuck, what has this go to do with me?’ I mean, these philosophical elements... I mean, there are people, immigrant people, who have these ideas in their heads and they’re delighted with them, it’s an interesting discussion; but, obviously enough, of course this frightens away the rest of the associations (ETi-1).

But what is theory and what is practice in the context of this work with actors who inscribe their activity in the order of doing? ‘Theory’ might be the debates with a certain philosophical content that arrive through the mediation of expert consultants in that ‘proposal where normally, always, these things are started’ and lead into the foundations for the intervention (ETg-1; ETi-1); but it might also be the government plans themselves, such as the Immigration Plans for the social workers who ‘simply get on with the work’ (ETg-2). With respect to ‘Practice’, it is the programs, actions, social assistance, ‘work at street level’ and the basis and practice of the civil organisations that gravitate around the ‘good causes’ that adjoin and sustain (and are sustained by) government plans, which derive part of their support from its grants13 and that ‘have practical subsistence problems’ (ETi-1).

In short, beyond this tension, or perhaps as one form of resolving it, the semantics of tolerance reveals the difficulty of giving meanings to terms that circulate profusely like interculturality or multiculturality and, in the face of that, normalising categories are opted for like ‘coexistence’ and ‘neighbourliness’. On the other hand, the normalising discourse channels the vulnerabilities associated with the “other” along the institutional paths envisaged for treating exclusion or poverty.

5. ‘Good Practices’

The complex articulation of ‘good practices’ becomes especially evident in the world of work, largely due to the absence of a central institution from which they could emanate. The institution of work is diluted amongst numerous public and private bodies, and

---

13 Decree 155/2002 of the Department of Housing and Social Affairs of the Basque Government regulates the assistance and grants given to private, non-profit making bodies for carrying out programs in relation to immigration, interculturality, etc. (1º Plan Foral de Inmigración de Álava, p. 21) The following statement is by the representative of an association of immigrants of Vitoria, the capital city, with respect to grants: ‘There are a lot of drawbacks, that is, there is an arrogant attitude by the administrations towards the associations, a threat, a constant threat of depriving us of economic support if we do not follow the paths that they have marked out for us, the directives that they set. They really do not take any of our suggestions into account. And, look, this is something I want to get off my chest... it’s something I really resent... I think the administrations use the associations in a really despicable way so as not to pay the real costs of developing work of this type, which is what we are doing in society’ (ETsc-1).
within the public administration there is a great deal of lobbying amongst the different municipal, group, provincial, autonomous and state jurisdictions. On the one hand, this is positive as it constitutes a dense network of mediators of every type involved in the question, and, on the other, it makes it difficult to determine the role of each body in relation to immigration and work.

In this respect, there is an almost complete absence of ‘good practices’ linked specifically to the world of work and employment, but those government agents who were questioned had recourse to enunciating two typologies of actions that only have a collateral relation to work:

On one side, a series of generalist actions: this is a question of the development of Immigration Plans at different administrative levels (autonomous and provincial) that take form in the proposal of ‘lines of action’ that try to involve the different administrative departments in providing attention to the immigrant population. In administrative jargon this is referred to as ‘mainstreaming’. Deriving from this general strategy there is an indeterminate number of protocols, sectorial plans and programs, public announcements and grants that, as we saw above, in many cases sustain some civil organisations and whose final aim is no more than to manage a population that is largely intangible, due to the very effect of trying not to name it.

On the other hand, there are more concrete undertakings, limited to the region within which our treatment of the issue is inscribed, that reveal a specific concern for the situation of the immigrant in the Rioja Alavesa. Two cases are worth outlining. In the first place, the above mentioned document: Proceso de reflexión sobre la convivencia en la Rioja Alavesa en relación a los nuevos procesos migratorios. As mentioned previously, it employs the idea of coexistence and neighbourliness, and an interpretation is made of the factors that might undermine those intentions in terms of social inequality. According to the report, inequality is shown in the following fields of coexistence, for which a series of reparatory actions are later proposed: housing, employment, education, health, social services, security, leisure and sports, and cultural activities. In general, the actions that are suggested are limited by the complex structure of government jurisdictions and in most of the cases there are orientations towards ‘raising consciousness’ amongst the autochthonous population about the conditions of vulnerability of those who have recently arrived. In the concrete case of the field of employment, it proposes developing training plans for the immigrants, having verified the precariousness of their conditions of work and the notable increase in unemployment with the consolidation of the situation of economic crisis.

On the other hand, the Guía para el Nuevo vecindario [Guide for the New Neighbourhood] is a project that, co-funded by the European Social Fund and inscribed
in the attributions and aims of the I Foral Immigration Plan, arises from the effort to regulate the phenomenon of seasonal work. In spite of its being directed at the region’s population in general, it is evident that its aim is to communicate the norms of the local society to those who are joining the community, either temporarily or in a settled way. The Guide contains different types of information (services related to housing, information on the public administrations, garbage and waste, social resources, attention to women who are victims of gender violence, etc.). It is published in several languages and, from the opinions that we have received from the informants, it is a project that is appreciated by both the associative and the institutional worlds.

In general, the administrative spheres from which this type of initiatives emanate are related to those that produce gender policies. They are inscribed in that type of policies that derive from the social movements, based on principles of equality, and prolific in the production of plans to correct gender inequalities. The development of such initiatives has been important in the panorama of the autonomous community and they therefore form a threshold of comparison for predicting the future of the policies of integration and interculturality:

Obviously, from not hearing any mention made of coexistence, interculturality, immigration, integration, prevention, to starting to work with this, that for me personally is an achievement. I always take myself as an example for making comparisons, I say: How many years have we been working on the issue of equality between men and women? How far have we advanced in all these years? And what remains to be done. Obviously, I am not now going to say: no, we are not only going to dedicate the mainstream part to equality, but now we’re also going to incorporate interculturality. But, whether it’s a little or a lot, I believe progress has been made (ETg-1).

In any case, the representatives of the governmental sector interviewed recognize the limits of the Administration’s capacity for intervention due to a lack of resources, which means that the basic needs that are taken care of by the social services are established as priorities, and the ‘explosion of bombs of coexistence’ (ETg-1) is

---

14 This is how the social movements’ drift towards the institutions was described by the technical officer of the Deputation when she referred to the political officer in her area: ‘She is responsible for Social Promotion, she does Immigration, she does Equality and Cooperation. She is a woman who proceeds from the associative and socially committed world, above all the area of equality...’ (ETg-1).

15 There is a long history of producing equality policies based on the tool called the ‘Equality Plan’ in the Basque Autonomous Community, where the I Equality Plan was passed in 1991, up until the current ‘V Plan for the Equality of Women and Men in the ACBC. Directives IX Legislative Period’. We find that equality plans have been passed by the three provincial Deputations and a large number of Basque municipal councils; 87.8% of the Basque population lives in a locality with an equality plan according to figures from Emakunde 2009. The sub-title of the Basque equality plan is not something trivial, but implies that in that Plan Emakunde (The Basque Women’s Institute) not only sets the actions of the Basque Government for promoting equality between women and men, but also establishes the strategic lines – empowerment, co-responsibility and conciliation, violence, besides governance for equality – within which the ensemble of public institutions must inscribe their actions on this question. This means that Foral Deputations, Mancomunidades [Associations of Municipalities], Cuadrillas [Regions] and Municipal Councils must develop their equality plans on the basis of the directives from Emakunde. On equality policies in the Spanish state, the following bibliography can be consulted: Bustelo, 2001; Astelarra, 2005; Bustelo and Lombardo, 2007.
avoided. This shortcoming is criticized and denounced by the civil organizations with a militant character, who consider that the government is not doing what it should (ETsc-9).

Another series of good practices are inscribed in the intermediate field and that of civil society, sketching a panorama that is as dispersed and fragmented as the associative network from which they emanate.

In this sector that we have termed intermediate, which includes corporative associations like UAGA, experts contracted by the administration to draw up plans, and semi-public bodies involved in sociological research and databases, the panorama is also a varied one. It is basically directed towards the production of data that serves as a basis to legitimise plans and/or to ‘raise consciousness’ amongst the autochthonous population by measuring the perception of the ‘other’ (barometers), amongst both immigrants and the autochthonous population, which are broadcast through the mass media. This is the case of agencies like the Basque Observatory of Immigration, Ikuspegi.16

The actions undertaken from civil society are even more varied. Those originating from organisations with a militant orientation, like SOS Racismo, which works at the levels of the province and the autonomous community, are also directed towards the work of consciousness-raising employing mechanisms similar to those used by the agencies that produce data. Their actions also include campaigns involving public demonstrations or criticisms aimed at some governmental undertakings that they consider discriminatory or openly racist (ETsc-4; ETsc-9). However, their action is generally urban and is barely concerned with rural regions like the Rioja Alavesa.

The case of local organisations is different. Their radius of their activity is the village or the region. Those of a charitable type, supported by voluntary work, fundamentally provided by women parishioners, direct their activity towards mitigating concrete situations of need, but, on occasions, they believe that this effort has a consciousness-raising effect on the autochthonous population. This is how it is understood by the Caritas coordinator for the region:

16 ‘Ikuspegi, or the Basque Observatory of Immigration, was I think created back in 2003 or 4, at the end of 2003, 2004, resulting from an agreement between the University of the Basque Country (UPV) and the Basque Government’s Immigration Management, with the aim of analyzing and gaining a deeper understanding of the migratory phenomenon from an academic point of view. So, we are involved in that work and, related to what you were saying, our work does not so much consist in designing policies as in proposing measures to fight against discrimination, etc., etc. It’s something political, to put that way, prior to investigating, to determining what we have, what we don’t have; it consists in going deeper into certain fields of the migratory phenomenon in order to offer information both to the public political institutions and also, in this case, to make available academic, scientific information on the migratory phenomenon to the mass media, to people who might be interested…’ (ET1-2).
The volunteers play a really good role as well as being of direct help. Bear in mind that they see you in the village: 'Well, look, she is talking to this girl who is from elsewhere, if she talks to these people then they open their doors to them', yes, that’s something I’ve seen happen (ETi-5).

Amongst the secular civil associations, although there are few in the zone, a difference must be drawn between autochthonous and immigrant ones. The main actions of the former (ETsc-8) consist in teaching the Spanish language, and very occasionally Euskera, to the foreigners, and they are orientated towards helping immigrants to find work and also to become integrated. It is also common to organise intercultural festivals that endeavour to promote coexistence and mutual understanding between foreigners and the autochthonous population. Both activities are seen together in the following extract:

One of the things that we said is that we do think it’s important that the information should get to them... because they often don’t know the language or can’t read it; that information reaches them and the reaches information them that ‘you can come too’, eh, ‘you should know that you’re invited to this’. A person from Romania said to me with pride: ‘When is the activity? When are we going to have that activity that is going to take place?’ It was like it was his own. So that can happen in a continuous way, but we don’t always get together on the issue of interculturality, but instead it’s to take a coffee or go somewhere, I don’t know. I do think it’s necessary to encourage this, that more work could be done, don’t you think? (ETsc-8)

The latter type of organisations, even though they are weak and in the process of formation, are fighting to achieve institutional recognition guided by the conviction that their group status can contribute to mitigating or reducing stigma amongst the autochthonous population.

Because it’s when they see some immigrant foreigners, who are doing this because they are in associations, people are not going to speak about Tom, Dick or Harry; no, they going to speak to the whole community, because the whole community is taking part in this work (ETsc-8).

This observation by the informant introduces an emphasis that might be material for reflection and for proposing future good practices. If it is compared to the following register of the interview with one officer of the Social Welfare Department in the region, it is revealing about the conflict between individualism and universalism characteristic of multicultural epistemologies (Laclau, 1996) and contrary to the republican normalising imperative (Wieviorka, 1995):

I mean... when it’s the association of immigrants that says to me ‘No, the fact is that we want to do this’. No, no, if there is a group, come to the group; we do educational courses for children, teaching them Spanish; let the people from the Gypsy community, who might need support, come; let the Moslem child come; but they should all come a bit, because, in a certain way, if not... if the population sees specific groups which are receiving, which are getting stronger and are going to this, they feel badly about it (ETg-2).

As can be seen thus far, these are actions that are not explicitly conceived as ‘good practices’; they are as dispersed and varied as the actors that formulate or undertake
them, and they only refer occasionally, and almost always collaterally, to the field of work. In this sense, the work with seasonal labour has been clear, explicit and concrete. The programs and actions set up on the basis of the Ombudsman’s Report (Ararteko, 2002) have contributed to an institutionalisation of the sector that is evaluated satisfactorily by the different actors involved. But this is a phenomenon where relations between ‘locals and foreigners’ are marked and regulated by the labour relations themselves. The situation of so-called ‘settled immigration’ is different. As we have seen, this is a population that is characterised either by a lack of work, or by its realisation outside the legal framework that regulates it. It is, in this respect, a supernumerary population and, as such, its relationship with the society where it is settled is with the social services that are directed towards mitigating this shortcoming, this lack of connection. Its filed is therefore that of the community, and its relation with the latter is neighbourliness. Its work is non-work and, perhaps, the work of the social workers.

Conclusions

As argued in the first report of this project (CEIC/UPV, 2010), immigration has been historically constituted as that ‘other’ that makes it possible to construct the communitarian We in the Basque Country and, thus, although there have been variations over the course of the history of nationalism, it has frequently been the object of discriminatory treatment. In spite of presenting its own local identity features, the Rioja Alavesa does not differ much from this tradition. Both due to the concern shown by the administrative authorities and the local agents, the problem of coexistence in the region is centred on immigration. This is a concern that became apparent with the economic boom generated by the vine-growing economy and the world of the vine in the region, and it has increased with the consolidation of the economic crisis that has been placing that ‘immigrant ‘other’ in a situation of competition with the ‘autochthonous’ population over labour and social resources.

With this phase of TOLERACE focused on the field of work, we have confined this research to the Rioja Alavesa given that a peculiar division in the representation of the immigrant ‘other’, based precisely on work, can be found there. Both in the policies of the government agents, and in the concerns of the intermediate bodies and civil society, a clear distinction emerges between ‘seasonal and settled immigration’ that is operative for the different interventions. In the case of the seasonal workers, the function of regulation and clarification of the place of the ‘other’ who carries out work is evident. The seasonal worker is a type of alterity that is momentary and
institutionalised in the terms and for the periods established by a work contract. And, although not exempt of stereotypes that associate certain skills and dispositions to work with racial characteristics, the work of institutionalising the sector has been evident, with the attainment of welfare in their conditions of life during the time that the seasonal workers remain in the zone. The improvement in the conditions of accommodation and the work of consciousness-raising carried amongst the autochthonous population has contributed significantly to reducing negative stereotypes in local society and, in general, all these actions are positively evaluated by the different agents who have collaborated in this.

The situation is different with so-called ‘settled immigration’, which the economic crisis has placed in a situation of competition with the autochthonous population and that has generated in the latter representations associating it with a lack of work. Thus, for the different agents consulted, but especially for those from the government sector, its field of recognition is that of vulnerability and its relations are with those institutions specialising in the treatment of disaffiliation and lacks: social work. The inscription of this ‘settled ‘other’ in the place of ‘non-work’ is what generates the principal situations of tension in local society, which gives urgency to the interventions by the mediating agents in questions of integration and coexistence, and in limiting more precise practices, such as those concerning the specific field of work.

Thus, an identification is generated in the local imaginary and in the discourse of the mediating agents between ‘work and seasonal workers’ and ‘non-work and settled immigrants’ that makes evident the role of work in its function of integrating and regulating social relations.

Since relatively recently in the Basque Country, immigration has been the object of numerous political associations that, with more than enough reason, have attempted to counteract discriminatory and stigmatising treatment while procuring its integration into local society. An important institutional effort is being made, which is shown through different interventions, diagnoses, plans, programs, working commissions, etc.; however, there is an evident lack of consensus on – and even ignorance of – the values that inspire the actions: priority is given to those of equality and to the aim of cohesion, inclusion and social integration, but these are thwarted facing the new cleavages of difference. Thus, the growing and novel multicultural reality finds itself almost lacking an intercultural epistemology that would contribute foundations for the interventions, and the constant complaint about the lack of correspondence between theory and practice expressed by the majority of the agents consulted is partly due to this.
Why is there this insufficiency of theory? Why the priority and urgency of practice(s)? Why are definitions impossible? Why those mitigated forms of speaking, which are reticent when it comes to naming? What seems to be demonstrated by this disassociation between theory and practice is a lack of socialisation in the values of multicultural citizenship, a question that, while they are not exempt from it, does indeed exceed the local administrations. The model of inclusive citizenship, developed on the integrating principles of equality, does not manage to cover the differences of a cultural order that have become evident – even old discriminations of this type, such as those that affect the Gypsy minority, have come to light – with the new migratory processes that have been occurring in the local society since the 1990s. The local government agents have a considerable experience with policies of equality that, as one of the informants suggests, could well constitute a paradigm of equality for another genre of differences.
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