

This study is an attempt to summarize the history of Swiss immigration policy from the perspective of public finance. This study is also part of an ongoing research project on immigration policy and public finance. The authors have critically examined the "fiscal contribution of immigrants" theory, which focuses only on the question of "how immigrants have a positive or negative impact on the economy, public finance, and labor market" in economics and public finance discussions. I have argued that the focus should be on how immigrants are positioned within social security, education, and democracy.

However, it is undeniable that discourses such as "immigrants' financial contribution" have been functioning in the actual political arena and have strengthened the anti-immigrant movement. This is no exception in Switzerland, where approximately 25% of the population is foreign, the second highest in the OECD. This, combined with Switzerland's unique political culture of direct democracy, has led, for example, to restrictions on foreign workers following the passage of the "Mass Immigration Initiative" in 2014. In fact, until the bursting of the bubble at the beginning of the 1990s, Switzerland's unemployment rate remained at an extremely low level of around 1%, partly because immigrants were used as a "balancing valve. Until the 1960s, in particular, the Swiss federal government maintained a policy of using foreign labor as

a buffer in the economy. The famous words of Swiss writer Max Frisch, often quoted even today, "We asked for workers. We got people instead", were uttered against this background in the late 1960s.

The research question of this paper is: How is it possible to avoid positioning immigrants as labor force only? The research question is: How is it possible to avoid positioning immigrants solely as a labor force? In fact, some of the previous studies have suggested that since the 1970s, there has been a shift in Switzerland from the traditional policy of positioning immigrants only as labor force. Indeed, the late 1960s and 1970s were a period of political movements (e.g., the Mittenand Initiative) seeking to expand the rights of immigrants (while at the same time, the anti-immigrant movement represented by the Schwarzenbach Initiative was also gaining strength). If so, how was such a change in policy toward immigrants possible? Or is such an assessment still valid in the first place?

The first concrete point of contention is whether such a change in policy toward immigrants was possible. Furthermore, the rise of right-wing populism in the 1990s after the bursting of the bubble economy and since the 2000s, and the anti-immigrant movement based on this populism, have a different context. By considering these periods as targets, how can right-wing populism and anti-immigrant movements

be controlled within a direct democratic system? This is the second specific point of contention.

In other words, this paper focuses on how Switzerland has responded to two crises: the parallel expansion of rights and exclusion in the 1970s, which was accompanied by an increase in immigration in the 1960s; and the second increase since the late 1990s and the subsequent rise of right-wing populism and nationalist parties. Specifically, the history of reorganization based on trends and consolidation of administrative bodies and expert committees responsible for immigration policy will be traced to show, among other things, how the focus and budget size of immigration policy have shifted from time to time. Furthermore, this paper will show that the form of direct democracy, which at first glance appears to be easily joined with populism, has not been straight-forwardly anti-immigration. Rather, we point out that, in fact, radical institutional reforms in referendums, such as the Schwarzenbach Initiative and the Mittenand Initiative, have undeniably failed on both the right and the left.

Through these studies, we will explore the possibilities of a different way of thinking about immigration and public finance, while reconsidering the nature of fiscal democracy, and how immigrants and public finance have been regarded as a form of labor force, even though they have actually been integrated into fiscal regimes through

infrastructure construction and care work. This project explores the possibilities for a different way of thinking about immigration and public finance, while rethinking the nature of fiscal democracy.