

International Organization for Migration

Migration in Italy. Current situation and perspectives

Research commissioned to Idos Study and Research Centre

Idos Ed., Rome, December 2011

Promoting organization
IOM Rome, Director José Angel Oropeza

Editorial staff (Idos Study and Research Centre, Rome)

Editorial coordinators: Luigi Gaffuri and Franco Pittau.

Editors: Alberto Colaiacomo, Ginevra Demaio, Luca Di Sciullo, Renato Marinaro, Maria Paola Nanni, Delfina Licata, Antonio Ricci.

Editorial secretary: Maria Pia Borsci, Claudia Mancosu and Giuseppe Mazza.

PART I

1951-2011: 60 Years of Migration

by José Angel Oropeza, Director of the IOM Rome

A Reflection on Migration on the Occasion of the 60th Anniversary of the IOM

Birth and Evolution of the International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Organization in Italy from 1951 to the Present
IOM from the '90s to Today
Balance after 60 Years of Activity and Future Perspectives
A Commitment to Reflection on the Migration Phenomenon in Italy

PART II

Italy from Emigration Country to Immigration Country

by Idos Study and Research Centre

Brief History of Italian Emigration Abroad

1861-1915: from the Unification of Italy to World War I
1922-1942: the Period between the Two World Wars
From 1946 to Mid-'70s: the Great Post-War Migration
From 1975 to Today: Persistence of Emigration in a Country of Immigration
The Italian Diaspora in the World Seen as a Resource

Brief History of Foreign Immigration in Italy

Evolution of Immigration from the '70s to Today
The "Foschi Law" (943/1986) and Regulation of Labour
The "Martelli Law" (39/90) and Regulation of Stay
The Troubled Passing of the "Turco-Napolitano Law" (Consolidation Act 40/1998)
Limitations introduced by the "Bossi-Fini law" (189/2002)
Rigidity of the "Security Package" in the "Maroni Law" (94/2009)

Border Crossing: between Visas and Regularizations

Visa Regulations and their Circumvention
A Long Series of "Amnesties"
1982, 1986, 1990, 1995, 1998, 2002, 2009

Current Immigration Scenario in Italy

Main Statistical Data Collected in Early 2011
Process of Structural Integration in the Society
The World of Work
Leading Role of Entrepreneurship
Crime between Myth and Reality
Remittances and their Relationship with Development

Future Scenarios

Short-term Business Trips
New Flows of Permanent Settlement

The Great Goal of Integration
From Social Exclusion to Equal Opportunities

Statistical Tables

PART I
1951-2011: 60 Years of Migration
by José Angel Oropeza, Director of the IOM Rome

Birth and Evolution of the International Organization for Migration (IOM)

In 1951, in confirmation of the necessary attention to be paid to the great post-war migration, the delegates from the 16 founding Member States, who gathered in Brussels for the International Conference on Migration, approved the establishment (formalized on December 5 of the same year) of the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe (PICMME). The provision of this new body was due to the need of providing adequate tools for the regularity of migration flows at the international level. The establishment of this Committee was followed by the Geneva Convention on Refugee Status and the creation of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

With its growing importance, the PICMME first became the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), then the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration (ICM), and finally, in 1989, with a further expansion of its tasks (implemented in Italy by Law No. 449 of 1989), it took the current name of International Organization for Migration (IOM).

1989 was also the year of the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the world's division into two blocs. After the end of the Cold War, due to the socio-political reorganization of the former Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries, the Organization inevitably reviewed and extended its role by working directly with those countries too, for the benefit of a humane and dignified migration. Since then, the geographical limitation for asylum seekers' protection has been abolished, and the necessity to provide assistance to refugees around the world has been recognized. Furthermore, the link between migration and development has been emphasized, and the cooperation with all countries of the world and various international organizations has been enhanced.

The IOM has been dealing with events that have marked the recent European and world history: the revolutions in Hungary (1956), Czechoslovakia (1968), Chile (1973), the Boat People of Vietnam (1975), the war in Kuwait (1990), Kosovo and East Timor (1999), natural disasters and migrations of the last decade, always aiming to promote orderly migrations, in which human dignity would be respected and both migrants and recipient societies would benefit from each other. Thus, the evolution of the Organization has been characterized by the events of the last decades (Paolo Serpi, "From the ICEM to the IOM: New Perspectives of the International Organization for Migration in Geneva", in *Affari Sociali Internazionali*, n. 3, 1990, pp. 65-74).

The '50s. Immediately following the European devastation caused by World War II, there was an absolute necessity to find new destinations for the ever growing population. Migration flows, which at the time mainly consisted of unskilled workers, were channeled to American countries: migrants were assured assistance (starting from the travel itself, which was almost entirely subsidized), with particular attention to social aspects. The ICEM also dealt with hundreds of thousands of refugees from Eastern Europe, by helping them to integrate in their new society. In the immediate post-war period, 11 million people uprooted from their homeland due to the conflict, moved from Eastern Europe to Western countries: the organization dealt with travel, assistance and resettlement of a million of them, as well as with the cooperation on immigration between governments.

The '60s. During this decade, due to the reduced need for unskilled workforce overseas, qualified migrants began to be paid attention to, going beyond the simple concern of travel expenses; moreover, migrants leaving from developing countries started to be taken into consideration as well.

The '70s. The organization dealt with refugee flows from Eastern Europe, Africa and Asia. These were years of great conflicts and problems, which led to large migration flows on a global scale; consequently, the ICEM became even more open to all categories of migrants. Suffice it to think of the 29,000 Latin Americans reorganized in some forty countries and the over 200,000

Indochinese settled in 35 countries.

The '80s. The Organization, in the meantime renamed ICM, went beyond the European context alone. In 1989, after a long period of study of the necessary changes, a new certificate of incorporation replaced the one originally approved in 1953: it emphasized the openness to all categories of migrants and insisted on the activity of a global study of the migration phenomenon, which is more and more complex in its causes and its effects and extended to developing countries as well, in collaboration with other international organizations.

Organization in Italy from 1951 to the Present

In Italy, the Organization was immediately and prominently active, as can be seen from a book published at the time (Goffredo Pesci, *Le attività del C.I.M.E. in Italia - ICEM'S Activity in Italy*), *Italiani nel Mondo*, Rome 1958); it collaborated at a central level with the Italian government, and at a local level with municipal employment agencies, union chambers, social welfare agencies, social service centers and other charitable organizations, both religious and secular. By 1958, 35,000 workers had been placed in the host countries, 150,000 migrants had received assistance for family reunifications in Latin America, 25,000 Italian (and partly foreigner) refugees had been helped by the Refugee Camp in Latina.

In Italy the Organization, which is operational since 1951, dealt not only with refugees from Europe but also with Italians included in assisted emigration programs to overseas countries; thus, between 1952 and 1962, the then ICEM assisted over 1,230,000 migrants. During the second half of the '80s, it was deeply committed to helping Russian Jews leave Russia for the United States, via Vienna, by housing them for a few months in Ladispoli (near Rome), in order to teach them English and speed up their visa processing formalities. In particular, in 1990 the Organization dealt with the transfer of more than 60,000 people, mostly Jews but also Pentecostals and members of other minorities.

IOM Rome is currently in charge of the wide variety of activities mentioned in the previous paragraph.

IOM from the '90s to Today

The IOM, which has become the largest international organization dealing with migration, performs its activities on a worldwide basis. Its headquarters are in Geneva, and it currently comprises 132 Member States, with 17 other ones, both States and international organizations, which joined it as Observers.

At present, the IOM cooperates with governments, international organizations and voluntary agencies to plan migration flows and facilitate their reception, but also to promote economic, social and cultural growth in developing countries and carry out programs for the resettlement of those migrants and refugees who are willing to return home.

Since 1990, the IOM's work is based on the wide variety of activities contemplated by the new 1989 Statute. The utmost attention is paid to the UN Convention on the Rights of Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, which was approved by the UN General Assembly on December 18, 1990; so far it has not been ratified by any more developed country, although its opportunity and urgency are generally recognized. It is rightly underlined that migrations are an essential factor of development and that, therefore, it is necessary to analyze the causes of their origin by establishing a closer collaboration between sending and receiving countries, in the respect for human rights and in the belief that nation-based perspectives, by themselves, are not enough to provide fully satisfactory solutions. This implies not only relevant issues in terms of demography, economy, employment, transfer and increase in value of migrants' savings, but also relevant implications in terms of cultural exchanges and protection of human rights.

As already seen, the IOM's activities in Italy have diversified and enhanced over time through specific (and even transnational) projects regarding vocational training abroad for the professional integration in Italy; the link between migration and development in Africa and use of remittances; return of qualified people interested in resettlement or, regardless of their return, the

use of their professional skills and economic potential; family reunification; fight against trafficking of human beings and exploitation of migrants; psycho-social assistance to vulnerable migrants; assisted return of the various categories involved; operations on the field during crucial emergencies. The Organization's work has also regarded awareness raising, integration and cultural mediation, with a constant in-depth evaluation of the most significant issues.

Balance after 60 Years of Activity and Future Perspectives

In a context of globalization, we are all moving towards forms of societies that will be marked by significant changes; among them, the growing presence of people moving for work reasons or because forced to move. The number of migrants worldwide is over 200 million; annually, more than 6 millions move from one country to another, and these flows are foreseen to continue also in future scenarios.

On the basis of the experience gained in these decades, the guidelines to be followed in the future will be based on directives which have already been proven valid, such as:

- institutional cooperation, at the governmental level, with public structures (including decentralized ones) and other international bodies;
- attention to the migrant as an individual with rights and as the core of the entire migration policy;
- opening to the social environment, in its various aspects, as well as to the Church, emphasizing their great basic resources;
- in-depth examination of problems, which is an indispensable condition to find more advanced solutions regarding mobility.

60 years of commitment are not few, and results have been obtained, but the road ahead is still long for migration to be recognized as the most significant aspect of modern society and for policies to be improved. This gave rise to a publication dedicated to the IOM's experience in Italy, which has become one of the main destination countries in Europe for current migration flows, after being a country of emigration for decades (30 million departures over 150 years, and more than 4 million Italians currently residing abroad); everything suggests that a reflection on the Italian experience may generate wide interest. It is, in fact, a compelling national case in several respects, both for outgoing and return flows, and for incoming flows from countries with a strong migration pressure. In the past, for instance, emigrants were extremely beneficial for Italy, because they reduced the unemployment level, sent remittances, had their pensions paid in Italy and pushed the Italian exports. Today, every year tens of millions of people enter Italy for short tourist or business stays – the latter reason, as already mentioned, is also generating a substantially permanent settlement.

The IOM believes it can contribute to deal with these issues (which are intrinsic to its 60 years of activity as well as to the recent history of Italy) with much more confidence, by presenting data and analyses that can improve the debate and create a favorable context for decision-making by politicians and public administrators, as well as citizens' awareness.

A Commitment to Reflection on the Migration Phenomenon in Italy

In consideration of this challenging anniversary of the Organization, which coincides also with the 150th anniversary of the Unification of Italy (and, therefore, with 150 years of history largely characterized by emigration and then by immigration), we decided to carry out a comprehensive study summarizing the different aspects of the Italian case (to be presented abroad in its English version), in order to achieve awareness-raising both in Italy and in foreign countries, where IOM operates.

IOM believes that the relationship between the public structures and the social environment should not be competitive but collaborative (albeit not subordinate): it must tend to make the urgings of the community fall in the public domain, in order to achieve greater social justice and human dignity. Therefore, in presenting the Italian case, we asked for the support of the editorial staff of IDOS Study and Research Centre, which edits the *Statistical Dossier on Immigration* and the *Italians in the World Report* on behalf of Caritas and Migrantes Foundation. Whoever deals with migration, for different reasons and in different institutional environments, has learned to appreciate the promoting organizations as well as these motivated researchers, whose knowledge of statistical data and historical memory – two fundamental elements in the celebration of our 60th anniversary of activity in Italy – have been extremely helpful to us. In the past, the IOM had already established a fruitful cooperation with this group of researchers, realizing several research projects and in particular, at the beginning of the 2000s, the so-called *Equal Project* dedicated to the perception of immigrants in the workplace and in our society, which led to the publication of a book that had widespread diffusion throughout Italy (Organizzazione Internazionale per le Migrazioni – Caritas Roma Dossier Statistico Immigrazione – Archivio dell’Immigrazione, *L’immagine degli immigrati in Italia tra media, società civile e mondo del lavoro* - Image of migrants in Italy through Media, civil society and the labour market, Ed. Anterem, Rome, 2005).

In other words, it is possible to benefit from a reflection on the historical experience of Italy as a major emigration country in the past, and as a country in which integration is becoming more and more urgent today. This is due to its transformation from a transit (or second choice) country, to a country for permanent settlement, whose migration flows increase at a rate unmatched by any other industrialized country. The causes of this change were both external (strong migration flows from the countries of origin and closing of the borders of traditional receiving countries) and internal (the demographic decrease and the need for additional workforce), but also related to the geographic location of Italy at the meeting point of migration flows originating from Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa.

Our goal is not only to promote a reflection on the Italian case of migration abroad, but also a fruitful debate on these issues in Italy which is well within the possibilities of an international organization like the IOM that has always been committed to migration, and thanks to the support provided by an esteemed research center. It is well-known that, not only in Italy but also throughout Europe and other parts of the world, migration is perceived as problematic by a large proportion of the population, and this affects the attitude of politicians as well as their decisions on the matter.

You can often hear that immigrants have higher crime rates, give rise to a social and religious invasion, consume more public resources than what they pay in taxes and contribution, can not be integrated in the receiving country because of their lack of homogeneity. Would not it be better limiting the newcomers to a temporary settlement – sometimes this seems to be the hope – rather than committing to their full integration into society? Experts point out, however, that the future of Italy, from the population and employment points of view, depends on the contribution of migrants. It is, therefore, worthy of being considered a decisive factor.

The Italian case is emblematic of what is happening in the world and shows that migrants' inclusion must be managed by making them an active part of the host society and a propulsive force for their countries of origin. Migration has always raised concerns, but has also helped to resolve problems with its contribution of hope, creativity and investment in the future. We need to improve the laws, as well as our mentality, in order to properly understand this new multicultural reality.

This volume sponsored by the IOM goes along these lines, with the hope that the migratory phenomenon, despite the above-mentioned issues, will be considered a great opportunity.

World Migration Report 2011: IOM Publication on the Occasion of the 60th Anniversary

The recent global economic crisis has highlighted the resilience of migration and further confirmed that human mobility forms an integral part of our globalized world. Migration is one of

the ways in which the exchange of talent, services, skills and a diversity of experience is achieved. Yet migration remains politically sensitive and governments face the difficult task of dispelling the misunderstandings surrounding it. Indeed, misinformation and misperception can trigger a vicious cycle which influences government policy, and in turn, perpetuates negative attitudes in mass media and the community at large. Policies and political discourse can therefore play a major role in shaping the image of migrants in home and host societies. Communicating effectively about migrants and migration policy to the wider public remains one of the biggest challenges governments in countries of origin and destination face.

The *World Migration Report 2011* presents available evidence on public perceptions and attitudes regarding migration globally. It analyzes the way in which they are shaped and how they can influence and be influenced by policy as well as by the media. Furthermore, the media's role in communicating opinions, reporting trends and framing migration discourse is analyzed. Examples of good practice in communicating a positive and balanced image of migrants among government, civil society and the media are also included. Finally, the report suggests several ways to improve communication about migration in order to promote a better understanding and recognition of the benefits of migration, more evidence based policymaking and effective engagement with migrants themselves. This includes: building an open, balanced and de-politicized migration discourse.

That is also the scope of this volume, that has been elaborated to celebrate 60 years of fruitful activity carried out by IOM in Italy and to inform the wider public on the Italian experience.

PART II
Italy from Emigration Country to Immigration Country
by Idos Study and Research Centre

1861-1915: from the Unification of Italy to World War I

From the unification of Italy (1861) to today, migration to foreign countries has clearly represented a key element in the socio-economic evolution of the country. Only since the '70s of the 20th century, a steady trend reversal has begun to be recorded, initially revealed by an attenuation of the pushing factors and then by the fact (unexpected to most people) that Italy changed from a country of emigration to a country of immigration. The main stages of this migration history are hereby shortly presented.

At the 1861 Census, there were just 230,000 Italians living abroad, of whom 100,000 in America and, within Europe, 77,000 in France alone. They usually came from Northern Italy. Favoured by better road systems and a tradition of trade, they emigrated as artisans, street vendors selling statuettes, knife grinders, tilers, street performers (wanderers, acrobats and organ grinders), small traders (especially food sellers, like peanut vendors in the winter and ice cream vendors in the summer), as well as anarchists and revolutionaries - far from being favorably considered by local authorities!

The unification accentuated the economic backwardness of Southern Italy and aggravated the agricultural situation, bringing about an urgent need to migrate from that area as well – as summed up by the “Southernist” Francesco Saverio Nitti, with his famous words “Either migrants, or bandits”. The beginning of the migration of peasants from the South is traced back to 1887; while, in 1881, they accounted for 17% of total emigrants, in the following decades they became the majority, preferring intercontinental destinations. While in 1876 migration towards the Americas accounted for 18.2% of total flows, in 1900 it rose to 47.2% due to the attraction of Argentina and Brazil, whose governments provided a grant to candidates to emigration. At the turn of the 19th and 20th century the United States, which were experiencing a strong process of industrialization, also exerted a powerful attraction.

In a parliamentary report of 1880, Stefano Jacini maintained that men and beasts lived together in hutches in the valleys of the Alps, in the Apennines and especially in the southern countryside. Italians who migrated were not only poor, but also hardly educated, often despised and sometimes even physically assaulted; they raised concerns among the landowners due to the increase of labor costs, but also the significance of emigration agents and sub agents who emphasized the possibility of building a new life abroad.

Migration was a personal choice, without any form of protection. The first law introducing regulations on migrant protection was passed in 1888, and another one which perfected its shortcomings in 1901. From 1861 to 1880 the migration average was just over 100,000 people a year, in the '80s, it reached 190,000 units, in the '90s 290,000 units and in the first decade of 1900 600,000 units a year, who mostly migrated overseas. The peak in the entire history of Italian emigration was reached in 1913, with nearly 900,000 migrants out of a registered population of approximately 35 million inhabitants. After that year, emigration decreased due to the war. However, the average for the period 1911-1920 remained high, with about 382,000 migrants per year.

1922-1942: the Period between the Two World Wars

In the period between the two World Wars, international migration slowed down, mainly due

¹ Data reported in the following chapters have been taken from the main Italian statistical archives on the migration phenomenon: Istat National Institute of Statistics, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Interior, Labour, Treasury and Education, University and Research; Bank of Italy, Union of Chambers, Inps National Social Security Institute, Inail National Institute for Insurance against Accidents at Work. These data have been analyzed in the annual reports edited by Idos Study and Research Centre and in the other published monographs, as shown by the bibliography. When necessary, the text indicates data from other sources or quotations from other elaborations.

to regulatory restrictions introduced by the host countries (such as the United States, that resorted to such measures against southerners), and to the fascist regime which was biased against Italians who settled permanently abroad. As a matter of fact, fascism had an opposite interest in using them both within the mother country and in the colonies. However, it is curious to note that the first International Conference of Emigration and Immigration was held in Rome at that time (1924), with the participation of 58 countries, which were committed to fostering a better legal regulation of migration.

This was a phase of controlled emigration and facilitation of returns. Therefore, migration flows within Europe and to the Americas decreased, while the migration rate per year decreased to an average of 255,000 people in the '20s and 70,000 people in the '30s. The prevalence of southerners in migration flows became even stronger, especially towards overseas destinations, such as the United States, Argentina and Brazil, but also Venezuela, Canada and Australia after the end of World War II.

Within the European countries, France continued to be the preferred destination until the first post-war years. In 1930, however, the economic need of the country led to sign an agreement with Germany, on the basis of which 500,000 Italians moved to that country. Since 1939, net migration has become positive, also as a consequence of a certain increase in returns between 1939 and 1942. More generally, the migration balance for the period 1922-1942 was estimated at approximately 1,200,000 people.

From 1946 to Mid-'70s: the Great Post-War Migration

After World War II, migration abroad intensified again; at the time, it was believed to be functional to the development of Italy, due to the weakness of the industrial structure and the backwardness of the agricultural sector. At the same time, while Northern Italy was quickly recovering, millions of people moved to those regions from the South which, therefore, was deeply affected by two large and different displacements at the same time. Between 1946 and 1950, migration abroad involved an average of 225,000 people, in the '50s 293,000 and in the '60s 264,000. In 1961, there was a peak in migrations (387,000 units), whereas in 1962, in returns (229,000). Initially, overseas destinations prevailed, but subsequently, with the decline of Latin America, Europe became the preferred destination (about 70% of the entire migration phenomenon), partially for temporary migration projects. During these years, Italy signed several bilateral agreements on protection of workers, starting with Belgium in the immediate post-war period (summed up by the phrase “immigrants in exchange for coal”), up to those with Switzerland, a country characterized by a significant amount of seasonal and cross-border workers, and Germany, which was characterized instead by a strong rotation policy, which made 1 out of 8 migrants settle permanently in the country. Migration flows from the Centre-North of Italy strongly decreased, except for some regions like Friuli Venezia Giulia and Veneto, whereas the flows from southern regions increased.

On average, between 1970 and 1975, 132,000 migrations and 129,000 returns were annually recorded. In 1975, the turnaround reached its maximum: returns exceeded the total migrations by 30,000 units (123,000 returns vs. 93,000 migrations). A further decrease continued in the following years, therefore the great migration epic of the unified Italy could be considered finished: Italy had passed from being a proletarian country to becoming one of the biggest industrial powers in the world, following the “economic miracle” built on the ruins of war.

From 1975 to Today: Persistence of Emigration in a Country of Immigration

In the mid-'70s, Italy started to become a country of immigration. 1975 was not only the year in which returns from abroad prevailed, but also the year in which the Italian Parliament ratified the Convention of the International Labour Organization (ILO) on the protection of migrant workers, whose presence in Italy had started to become relevant. During this period, emigration began to be characterized by a higher qualification of the people involved, an increase in family reunifications (representing a way to bypass the restrictive rules of various countries) and an

absolute predominance of European destinations, albeit the amount of cases was lower than in the past.

From a qualitative point of view, organizations dealing with the migration phenomenon started to develop the contents of their requests to the government and the regions (which, in the meantime, had become the main protagonists in the protection of emigrants) and, therefore, to the Italian society as a whole. In 1975, the first National Conference on Emigration took place in Rome, in order to take stock of the measures on immigration until then implemented, and to identify future lines and objectives of migration policies. Some of those objectives were achieved, although later, such as the creation of the General Council of Italians Abroad (1989) and the Committees of Italians Abroad (1985), the right to vote in political elections and referenda (2001) and the citizenship reform law (1992). On the other hand, both the Italian society and its political powers seemed to be unable to properly accept this *diaspora*: the Italians were faced with a difficult economic and institutional situation, and, in dealing with the growing phenomenon of immigration, they were unable to make the best of the experience gained abroad.

Already since the second half of the '70s, and then during the first half of the '80s, the decrease of international flows was progressive and significant. In the '80s, the average number of emigrants amounted to 80,000 units (the same amount of returns); most of them were directed to European countries (Germany and Switzerland were the preferred destinations), and departed from the southern regions, particularly Sicily.

Between 1990 and 1999, however, cancellations to abroad of Italian citizens transferring their residence were 468,223, whereas registrations from abroad for return reasons were 426,473. In the '90s, Italian migration flows were very moderate (47,000 departures and 43,000 returns a year), that is the same numbers which roughly marked the first years of the new century. It must be underlined that three-quarters of the flows regarded European countries, whereas Latin America was characterized by the prevalence of returns.

The 2000s, in line with what happened in the '90s, were not characterized by consistency of flows to and from abroad, which remained stable at 40,000 people involved (usually slightly more departures and slightly fewer returns). "New immigrants" were more and more young people with a high degree of education, who, in the hope of catching more opportunities abroad, chose to make their educational and professional background available to either European countries or the United States or Asia. In addition to migration flows related to relocation of production by companies, individual departures were conducted as an experiment or at the invitation of foreign organizations or companies (and therefore were more difficult to quantify). It is also necessary to highlight the temporary nature of the transfers, which are characterized by both commuting and the high amount of returns, and which often cannot be detected by statistics. Therefore, we are talking about young people with decidedly different expectations, needs and perspectives than those of the protagonists of traditional migration, who were mostly driven by the primary necessity to satisfy basic needs.

The Italian Diaspora in the World Seen as a Resource

Do the over 4 million Italian citizens in the world and the much larger community of people having Italian origins (60-80 millions) represent a resource for the development of the Italian socio-cultural and economic system, at a time when globalization urges to be included in a system? Do not the continuous and substantial decline in the volume of remittances and the stability achieved by Italian communities residing abroad, go in the opposite direction? Does it make sense allocating funds for the internationalization of countries with a higher presence of fellow countrymen, often based on the promotion of a specific commodity production?

The reality of Italians residing in foreign countries is extremely heterogeneous and complex: there are migrants of a distinct age being educated in Italy; young migrants being educated in the host country; young people born in the host country, with or without dual citizenship; people of different ages having re-acquired their citizenship; natives having acquired citizenship by marriage. Finally, there are many who are not migrants in the proper sense of the term, but being second-, third- or fourth-generation descendants of migrants they are also considered part of the Italian

community.

Such richness is primarily due to the contexts of settlement, the period and length of migration and, of course, the peculiarity of each experience. Even within the same country, stories of success and failure coexist in a context that refers to the specificity of each migrant's experience. Besides, many of them are not out-and-out migrants, as they never moved, but were born and grown in the host country. This is the case of children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren of migrants who often keep their Italian citizenship and a sense of belonging to the Italian reality, although born and grown in a foreign country. Their condition, especially with regard to relations with Italy and with the country of settlement, is obviously remarkably different from that of their peers who are protagonists of the most recent Italian migration. Furthermore, both of these categories significantly differ from the broad group of “pioneers”, who left Italy when it was still characterized by massive emigration. On the other hand, the large volume of returns highlights both the importance of return migration, and the reduction of the period that new migrants spend abroad.

Today, the recovery and maintenance of the “*Italianity*” should be pursued in new ways, if the objective consists in making young Italians born abroad involved in the society of origin of their parents or their grandparents. The most significant elements of the made in Italy are language, culture and art of our country, as well as products “sold” through tourism, without forgetting the various industrial manufacturing, handicraft, and food farming products for which Italy is famous in the world.

Evolution of Immigration from the '70s to Today

Among the EU Member States, Italy represents the most significant case of transition from an emigration to an immigration country. As in other Member States which are part of the so-called “Mediterranean model”, migration to Italy began to emerge in a context characterized by a negative demographic trend, a significant unemployment rate in large areas of the country, and the need for additional workforce but only in specific sectors (agriculture, family collaboration, building and certain industrial sectors), and usually in the form of irregular jobs.

Until the '80s, there was a phase of neutrality: part of the Italian population perceived immigration with a certain degree of curiosity towards foreigners, whereas others were completely indifferent to them. The 1931 rules on public security (Royal Decree on public security No. 773 of June 18, 1931, art. 142-152), implemented at a time when Italy was a strictly mono-cultural reality, were still in force. A positive attitude of the social organizations, like trade unions and voluntary associations, and the Church, however, tempered the ambivalent attitude of the society.

Then, for the first time, the government started to take care of the problem, while the first signs of estrangement began to appear. From the mid-'80s to the mid-'90s Italy experienced a phase of emergency. Migration to Italy was becoming more and more attractive, whereas the approved legislation was showing its limits. It was found necessary to intervene but, unfortunately, this was done without a medium and long term planning, due to a lack of awareness of the dimension of the phenomenon; furthermore, many statutory provisions were established at a formal level, but had little effectiveness at a practical level.

In the '90s, there was a phase of in-depth examination which, after a long debate, led to the approval of the Consolidation Act on Immigration (1998). This positive legislative development was not accompanied by a broad parliamentary agreement nor by an organic maturation of public opinion which - then as now - was divided in half: one side was open to the new presence of immigrants and the opportunities it offers, whereas the other side, which was equally large, was closed to what was perceived as a danger.

In the first decade of the 2000s, legislative interventions (2002 and 2009) were characterized by their restrictive nature: they reduced the openings of the 1998 Act without, however, abrogating it. This is, after all, a good reason to hope for a better balance in the future, which is necessary for a country like Italy, which should not only have a large number of immigrants (as it actually does and will continue to do), but also a stronger and more participatory migration policy.

The “Foschi Law” (943/1986) and Regulation of Labour

The Italian Constitution (article 10, paragraph 2) states that “legal regulation of the status of foreigners [in Italy] conforms to international rules and treaties”; refugees are given particular attention: “Foreigners who are, in their own country, denied the actual exercise of those democratic freedoms guaranteed by the Italian Constitution, are entitled to the right to asylum under those conditions provided by law” (article 10, paragraph 3). Until the approval of the 1986 law, however, the 1931 legislation on public security remained in force, and many issues regarding residence and employment were subject to administrative discretion and regulated by ministerial circulars. For this reason the Constitutional Court, with the famous ruling No. 46 of January 20, 1977, considered it necessary to “... say that the matter under consideration, because of the sensitivity of the interests involved, needs a reorganization by the legislator that takes into account the need to develop comprehensive and consistent regulations, able to guarantee the fundamental human freedoms associated with the entry and residence of foreigners in Italy”.

In the '70s, foreign citizens were less than 300,000, one-third of whom coming from EU countries. Their presence increased in the following years (450,000 regular migrants in 1986), while the EU nationals dropped to one-quarter of the total. In this period, the migration regulations of those countries which, until then, had been preferred destinations for migration flows, became much

more restrictive and, therefore, Italy began to be considered an attractive destination.

Meanwhile, albeit after 5 years, the Italian government at last ratified the Convention No. 143/1975 of the ILO on the protection of migrant workers, with the Law No. 158 of April 10, 1981. Article 3 of the ratification law enabled the government to enact decrees having the force of ordinary law within one year, in order to ensure fulfillment of obligations deriving from the Convention; the government, instead, decided to present a standard bill, in order to ensure a comprehensive parliamentary debate and even the consultation of social organizations, even though in the meantime irregular flows had become more visible.

The fear of a foreign invasion, exacerbated by the assassination attempt on Pope John Paul II in St. Peter's Square, by the young Turk Ali Agca (May 13, 1981), led to close the borders in order to control the new migration flows, and did not favour the overcoming of the “geographical reserve” for refugees; therefore, the government continued to accept only asylum seekers from Eastern Europe and set limited admission quotas for students. Such restrictive measures caused an increase of irregular presence, rather than a decrease. Despite a wave of indignation caused by the terrorist attacks which occurred almost simultaneously in Rome and Vienna airports on December 27, 1985, the Parliament continued its work, and at the very end of the legislature approved the “Regulations on placement and treatment of non-EU immigrant workers and against irregular migration” (Law No. 943 of December 30, 1986). It is the so-called “Foschi law”, with reference to the member of parliament (native of the Marches region) who worked for its approval, which was made possible also with the support of the Christian Democrat Party, as well as the Italian Communist Party and the Italian Socialist Party.

The new rules were mainly concerned with occupational aspects:

- employment planning, through the involvement of Regional Committees for employment, with the aim of supporting the matching between job supply and demand;
- work placement abroad, but only after verifying the unavailability of Italian nationals for the job;
- lists of workers living abroad and interested in being hired by an Italian company (this innovative procedure would be then developed by the 1998 law);
- equal treatment in employment and access to services, and progressive removal of barriers to the effective exercise of rights;
- right to family reunification;
- first regulations on protection, housing, vocational education, language of origin, cultural programs - unfortunately without any national funding: it would have avoided the passage through the Budget Committee, which ultimately prevented the approval of the law before the end of the legislature;
- repression measures against traffickers encouraging the clandestine movement of migrants and the employment of irregular foreign workers;
- possibility of reintegration in countries of origin, by using the special “Return Fund” created to ensure the return of the newcomers.

Law 943/1986 also contained the first “regularization” for irregularly employed migrants: a measure that allowed the emergence of approximately 120,000 workers in two years' time. Previously, by means of a circular letter of September 9, 1982, the Minister of Labour had introduced another regularization, which benefited thousands of domestic workers. The new law concerned only employment aspects, whereas on January 3, 1986 a specific government bill about entry and residence was presented, but it was approved only by the Chamber of Deputies and lapsed at the end of the legislature.

In those years, the migration phenomenon gained visibility, although it was not considered an epochal phenomenon, at the time; as constantly happens within the Italian context, open-minded attitudes began to coexist with narrow-minded ones, the latter being expressed by both the term “*vu cumprà*” (for hawkers) and the term “extracomunitarian” (which was used by the law 943/1986 in

a simply legal sense, but eventually took on a derogatory meaning). This phase was characterized by some inconsistencies: for instance, the Return Fund was created because it was considered normal that migrants would return to their country of origin; furthermore, no funding for reception policies was established (only in order, however, to avoid the delays which would have prevented the approval of the law before the end of the legislature).

The “Martelli Law” (39/90) and Regulation of Stay

While the labour market assigned to migrants all those activities which were considered humble and unpleasant by the Italians, the implementation of this new law did not meet all the needs, because administrations were slow, interventions were too discretionary, interpretations were restrictive. The government delayed appointing the relevant bodies (within the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Regions) due to inadequate information, the limited effects of the regularization measures and insufficient rules for entry, compared to the increasing migration pressure. The biggest problem was the lack of new regulations on entry and stay of foreign citizens, which the law 943/1986 had not introduced, since it had dealt with employment aspects alone.

During 1989, year of European elections, the two Italian governments that succeeded each other (De Mita and Andreotti governments) promptly faced the situation, on the recommendation of the Minister of Social Affairs (Mrs. Rosa Russo Jervolino) for a complete implementation of the law 943/1986 and then of Vice-President of the Council of Ministers (Mr. Claudio Martelli) for the approval of a new law, which was urgently needed by the current social situation.

On the night of August 24, 1989, in the countryside of Villa Literno (Campania) where there was a significant concentration of non-EU agricultural workers, who were illegally exploited, some young Italian thugs attacked a group of foreigners, killing Jerry Essan Masslo, a young black South African, for refusing to hand over his hard-earned money. The attack became a symbol of the potential racism in the country and caused considerable emotion. A few weeks later, on October 7, 1989, a national demonstration against racism was held in Rome, during which more than 100,000 people marched in a procession, including many immigrants. At that time, immigrants holding a valid residence permit were a little less than half a million.

Italian Vice Prime Minister, Mr. Claudio Martelli, wanted to introduce a new, tolerant legislation in line with the rest of Europe, by taking into consideration many aspects: entry and stay, employment, housing and assistance, foreign students, abolition of the so-called “geographical reserve” in recognition of asylum seekers from countries other than those of Eastern Europe. Nevertheless, the urgency of the matter prompted the government to pass a law decree. Within the majority, the Republican Party remained firmly opposed to the new orientation, considering it too lax; the controversy did not die down even after the entry into force of the new law, as it emerged at the first National Conference on immigration, which was held in Rome on June 4-6, 1990.

The Law Decree No. 416 of December 30, 1989, which became the Law No. 39 of February 28, 1990, in an attempt to mediate the dispute, incorporated a few improvements suggested by the social forces, as well as some restrictive measures proposed by the Republicans (entry visa, residence permit needed even in the case of tourism, date of entry indicated on the passport, strengthening of the border police). The 90% of political forces (virtually all the forces of government and opposition, with the exception of the Republican Party and the Italian Social Movement) voted in favor of the new text. Social organizations, including trade unions and entrepreneurial organizations, as well as the Catholic Church, applauded the decision.

The most relevant aspects of the Law 39/1990 can be summarized as follows:

- as regards asylum seekers: abolition of the so-called “geographical reserve” which forced to deal with Eastern European countries alone, introduction of recognition procedures and provision of state aid for a period of 45 days (being optimistically considered a sufficient time to take a decision on applications for asylum);
- as regards entry and stay (which are the aspects most taken into consideration): provisions on the issuance of permits and their typologies, conditions for their renewal (i.e. income verification

in the occasion of the first renewal), registration at the Registry Office;

- as regards the planning of migration flows: a planned Ministerial Decree to fix the number of entries and their beneficiaries (forecasts, however, proved to be incongruous also in this new formulation, so much so that the decree was passed at the end of every year, in the belief that it was not at all effective);
- as regards employment: employment opportunities for immigrants extended to employment in cooperatives and self-employment;
- as regards protection: improved regulation of the appeals submitted to the Regional Administrative Tribunals (TAR);
- as regards control of migration flows: provisions on border control, on rejections and expulsions;
- as regards social matters: creation of a fund to finance reception centers, measures for the allocation of funds to the Regions, provisions for the recognition of educational qualifications, recruitment of social workers employed by the offices of the Ministry of Labour;
- as regards regularizations: a general amnesty for those able to demonstrate their entry into Italy by 1990, regardless of their employment status (about 220,000 people were regularized, whereas approximate estimates indicated the presence of more than two million irregular migrants);

An extremely interesting provision consisted in the sponsorship of migrants' stay by institutions and associations (Article 3), which remained unimplemented, but would have been re-enforced by the Law 40/1998.

It was a wide-ranging law, especially regarding reception of asylum seekers from all over the world, regulation of stay, guarantees of protection, introduction of a first - albeit modest - budget allocation for first reception (30 billion Liras per year), issuance of an annual decree on flows, overcoming of legislative limitations on self-employment and regularization granted to more than 200,000 irregular immigrants. The weaknesses of this law were: the exiguity of funds (which were even cut after three years), keeping the procedure of the direct call from abroad as the only way of access, conceiving the annual decrees on flows as an “amnesty” for pre-existing situations, restrictive interpretation of the rule of reciprocity, lack of involvement of migrants' countries of origin.

The Troubled Passing of the “Turco-Napolitano Law” (Consolidation Act 40/1998)

The Law 39/1990 was inadequate with regard to integration procedures; therefore, with the Bill No. 5353/1992 (which was not approved within the end of the legislature), the Government proposed several measures of reception: from health care to education, from vocational training to recognition of educational qualifications. In line with this orientation, under the Ciampi government a decree by the Minister for Social Affairs (September 8, 1993) instituted a Study Commission led by Fernanda Contri for the proposal of a consolidated law on foreigners' juridical status. In 1994, before the end of the legislature, the Commission concluded its work and presented to the Prime Minister a draft law, inspired by principles of openness of the European context (quite different from the Italian one): it suffices to recall the Resolution adopted by the Ministers of Interior and Justice of the EU Member States (Luxembourg, June 24, 1994), which defined entries as “exceptional events”. The document of the Commission led by Mr. Contri was subsequently refined with the contribution of religious organizations and groups summoned by the National Council of Economy and Labour (CNEL).

On June 13, 1994, during the center-right government of Berlusconi, Alleanza Nazionale MP Vincenzo Nespoli proposed a synthesis of the various bills presented to the Chamber of Deputies, focusing on the most restrictive provisions. The reaction within the Church was negative, on the grounds that such synthesis presented immigration as a potential danger, resulting in closure of the borders and precariousness in the protection of fundamental human rights. The proposal, however, did not pass due to the fall of Berlusconi's government, but highlighted the strong contrasts on immigration between the two political factions.

During the successive Dini's "technical government", the Law Decree No. 489 of November 18, 1995 introduced measures which combined duty of reception, employment protection and regularizations with the temptation to close the borders and enforce expulsions (immediately subjected to issues of legitimacy), acknowledging suggestions by the center-left parties and the Lega Nord as well. This law decree, however, was not converted into law within 60 days, and the new center-left Government, headed by Mr. Prodi, approved the provisions relating to regularization alone, while presenting a new organic and comprehensive law on migration. In the meantime, the number of immigrants reached over one million units.

The Law No. 40 of March 6, 1998, entitled "Provisions concerning immigration and the condition of third country nationals", acknowledged with some amendments the Government Bill No. 3240 presented on February 19, 1997 to the Chamber of Deputies; the first signatories were the President of the Council of Ministers Mr. Romano Prodi, the Minister of Social Solidarity, Mrs. Turco, the Ministry of the Interior, Mr. Napolitano and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Dini, and was commonly known as "Turco-Napolitano Law". This law expressed awareness about migration as a structural phenomenon, implying a broader planning (triennial planning of flows, albeit applied by annual decrees) to be issued by the most powerful political institution (the Presidency of the Council of Ministers), with the involvement of countries of origin (provision of bilateral agreements and planning of flows based on their employment needs). In consideration of the regulatory flexibility, the Government was delegated to make, within two years, the necessary adjustments to adhere to the principles of the law and guarantee their proper implementation.

This organic law, which focused both on duties to be respected and rights to be granted, is articulated in the following seven chapters (which have continued to characterize the structure of the Consolidated Law even after the subsequent changes):

1. General Principles;
2. Entry, Stay, Removal;
3. Labor Discipline;
4. Right to Family Reunification;
5. Health, Education, Housing and Social Integration;
6. Rules Concerning EU Citizens;
7. Final rules.

The subsequent Regulations on Implementation contained further details on practical aspects. This law, however, lacked new rules for asylum seekers and persons in need of humanitarian protection, because it was considered preferable to remove them from the text and address the issue in a more complete way; on the other hand, provisions for the regularization of migrants without a residence permit for work or family reasons were added, albeit later.

This law also contained significant innovations (partially cancelled by subsequent changes):

- regarding the working environment (such as the diversification of mechanisms of access to employment, the possibility of entering Italy to search for a job and the elimination of preliminary verification of Italians' unavailability for job positions to be filled);
- regarding the social context (granting of residence after five years, support for integration by the National Fund for Migration Policies, right to health care and education granted to irregular migrants as well).

Social organizations expressed some perplexity, however, in relation to rejections, expulsions, granting of protection, detention of irregular migrants (at the time up to 30 days) at the Centres for Temporary Stay (CPT), renewal of residence permit subject to income verification – mild perplexities, to say the least, when compared to the critics raised by the subsequent exacerbation.

After the approval of the Regulations on Implementation, the Law 40/1998 was incorporated in the Consolidation Act on Immigration, which also includes the previous unrepealed laws which remained in force even after subsequent changes.

Limitations introduced by the "Bossi-Fini law" (189/2002)

Once returned to power, after the elections of May 2001, the center-right government of the MP Silvio Berlusconi, on the proposal of the Lega Nord and Alleanza Nazionale parties, approved a restrictive bill (compared to the previous laws) which contained the following innovations:

- entry and stay of immigrants strictly subordinated to the practice of a job through the so-called “Contract of Stay” and issuance of two-year residence permits in cases of indefinite contracts and one-year ones in other cases;
- priority to migrants who come from countries who signed readmission agreements with Italy, or have attended vocational training courses organized by Italy abroad;
- restrictions on the duration of residence permits for unemployed migrants (12 to 6 months);
- increase (from 5 to 6) of the necessary years to be granted a permanent residence permit in order to stay in Italy for an indefinite period (a subsequent European Directive re-established the 5-year period);
- restrictions on family reunification for parents and relatives;
- reintroduction of priority for local workers through verification, and abolition of the “sponsor system”;
- restrictions on protection in the event of rejection, and increase of the detention period at detention centers, from 30 to 60 days, for foreign citizens without a residence permit;
- obligation (introduced for the first time) to fingerprint capture and detection, at the time of issuance or renewal of residence permits;
- provision of regulations for regularization of people already staying in the country (not only for domestic workers but, with a subsequent amendment to the initial proposal, for all categories of workers).

Once more, such law lacked organic regulations on asylum, except for some transitional provisions. Despite its restrictive elements, the basic principles of the Law 40/1998 remained unchanged, indicating a difficult but possible agreement on a few points by the two political factions. This gave rise, however, to the philosophy of precariousness. The reactions reported by the press could not be univocal, as shown by some:

- Positive headlines: “We have overcome the feeling of living in a house without doors” (Minister Rocco Buttiglione); “The Government and the majority have shown great balance in addressing the sensitive issue of immigration” (Minister Carlo Giovanardi); “An excellent starting point, now let us move forward” (Under-secretary of the Interior Alfredo Mantovano); “A serious law on a serious problem. There are those who defend the peoples and those who defend nothing, or rather illegal immigration, which is nothing” (MP Umberto Bossi); “Now we will deport bunches of illegal immigrants” (MP Mario Borghezio).
- Negative headlines: “They have made a very harmful and despicable law. By doing so, the number of irregular migrants will increase” (MP Livia Turco); “With the Bossi-Fini Law, Italy adopts a measure that significantly affects the matter of asylum, modifying some procedures but without granting an adequate protection to all applicants” (UNHCR Italian Delegation); “Recording fingerprints of foreigners may ratify the image of foreigners as dangerous subjects” (Fr. Luigi Ciotti).

Rigidity of the “Security Package” in the “Maroni Law” (94/2009)

The Law No. 94 of July 15, 2009, better known as the “security package”, introduced new restrictive regulations on public security, and the below-mentioned significant innovations regarding migrants.

1) Introduction of the crime of illegal entry and/or stay, punishable by imprisonment and a sanction of €5,000 to €10,000 (which does not extinguish the crime), which, however, was followed by a negative ruling of the European Court of Justice. In addition, the dispositions of Arts. 361 and 362 of the Penal Code (respectively punishing public officials and officials responsible for public service who do not comply with “the obligation to report a crime of which they gained

knowledge in or on account of the performance of official duties”) force all public officials with whom the foreigner comes in contact to report the irregular situation, with the exception of health workers and teachers (at municipal, provincial, regional and national level).

2) Obligation to provide proof of the regular stay as a condition to access services (not including health and education) and to update vital records (marriage, registration of birth, recognition of natural child, registration of death). As a side effect, this resulted in the impossibility to denounce the illegal exploitation by employers offering irregular jobs.

3) For the purposes of family reunification, obligation to provide a certificate of suitability of the accommodation (obtained by the Municipality), which many apartments of the expensive private market are unprovided with;

4) Introduction of “residence permit by point system” (the “Integration Agreement”), in which points can only be subtracted, with the risk of losing all of them and the authorization to stay in a short time.

5) Issuance of EC permits for long-term residents (enabling access to specific social services), conditional on passing a test of the Italian language.

6) Introduction of a contribution (to be determined between €80 and €200) for each issuance and renewal of a residence permit (much more expensive than ID cards).

7) Abolition of the tacit consent rule after 180 days when waiting for the Prefecture to give the authorization, even if there are still delays in public administration.

8) Legalization of private citizens' patrols to ensure security (which, instead, should remain a primary duty of the State).

Other aspects, summarized below, have a restrictive nature in common with each other: extension of the maximum period of detention in the Identification and Expulsion Centers (CIE, replacing former CPT Permanent Stay Centres); extension of the waiting time necessary to apply for citizenship through marriage (from 6 months to 2 years); extension of the detention period (from six months to one year) for the foreign citizens who do not show their ID to the police; reduction from fourth to second degree of kinship as a requirement to prevent the expulsion of irregular foreigners; imprisonment from six months to three years for anyone renting a property to a foreign citizen without a residence permit, and possible confiscation of the property; obligation for operators of money transfer services to photocopy (and keep for ten years) the residence permit of their customers and report to the police (within twelve hours) any customer without such permit; obligation to produce a residence permit for foreigners willing to celebrate their wedding in Italy (this rule was then declared illegitimate by the Constitutional Court).

The “security package” has aroused controversial reactions not only in the social context, but also in the jurisdictional one. In April 2011, the European Union Court of Justice rejected the crime of illegal immigration because such a provision, implying imprisonment for irregular migrants, is contrary to the European Directive (2008/115/EC of December 16, 2008) on returns of irregular migrants, which contains common rules and procedures to be implemented in Member States in the cases of irregular stay of third country nationals. In fact, while the Italian law provides for the forced accompaniment to the border as the normal way to implement expulsion orders, the European directive provides for the voluntary return within a period of 7 to 30 days.

In Italy, the Constitutional Court, by judgment No. 245/2011 of July 20, 2011 (recorded on July 25), declared the unconstitutionality of Article 116, first paragraph, of the Civil Code, as amended by art. 1, paragraph 15 of the Law No. 94 of July 15, 2009 (Provisions on public security), with reference to the words “and a document certifying the regularity of stay in the Italian territory”, which refers to citizens who travel to Italy to get married without holding a residence permit.

Moreover, the Law Decree No. 89/2011, which transposed two EU directives into Italian law (No. 2004/38/EC on the free movement of EU citizens and No. 2008/115/EC on the return of irregular third-country nationals), ordered the immediate expulsion of irregular migrants considered dangerous either for public order, national security or risk of escape. It also established a further extension of the stay period in the CIE, from 6 to 18 months, and an extension, from 5 to 7 days, of

the time-limit for foreigners to leave the country by order of the police commissioner – if not possible at the CIE. The new law introduced the forced expulsion also for the EU citizens who do not comply with the obligations of the directive itself.

Therefore, legislative changes have been highly significant and, furthermore, have been introduced during a phase when the global crisis had increased in Italy the precariousness of migrants.

Visa Regulations and their Circumvention

In order to obtain a visa, the strict Schengen rules require adequate budgetary allocations, indication of the purpose of the visit and availability of housing: conditions that not everyone is able to satisfy. Although forging a visa (or the necessary documents) is a crime punishable by imprisonment which also causes the automatic inadmissibility of the application itself, there are still many transgressors, both in Italy and other European countries. Even if passports and visas have become much harder to counterfeit, this practice is still common and sometimes even advertised online, where you are supposed to pay in advance in the hope that the documents will be sent to you later. The acquisition of a permit is highly coveted because it allows the migrant to enter the chosen country. Some of those who are not able to meet the legal requirements will unjustly try to get a letter of invitation from a university or a cultural institution, a request to attend a seminar, or will try to obtain false certificates. Sometimes, visa traffickers receive illegal support at the institutional level, and their business is profitable and far less dangerous than that of drug dealers, whose arrests and sentences are more frequent.

In Germany, in the mid-90s, there was the famous case of travel agencies which favored the granting of visas to Ukrainian citizens who professed themselves to be tourists, based only on self-declarations about their personal economic resources and their willingness to travel abroad only for a temporary stay. Many of those “tourists” then settled permanently also in other EU Member States, forcing the German Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. Joschka Fischer to quickly issue a restrictive circular on the matter. In the early 2000’s, Switzerland too complained about corruption in some of its diplomatic missions and consular posts, and in order to fight them, decided to restrict the use of local collaborators in those offices.

In Italy, the first inquiry on visas – which regarded Cuba – was conducted in 1998, but many others followed in the course of the years, regarding respectively: Algeria, Albania, Argentina, Belarus, Croatia, Ethiopia, Iran, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rumania, Russia, Somalia, Turkey and Ukraine. The collaboration between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of the Interior allowed to ascertain that many of the granted visas were actually false.

During the early 2000’s, some Russian travel agencies took care of organizing fake shop-tours in Europe, providing for flight tickets, hotel accommodation and a credible itinerary; this facade allowed people to easily enter into an EU country and disguise themselves in the new context.

In the past (as well as today), another way to circumvent the law was by fake marriages, which were usually organized by unscrupulous agencies specialized in getting around the law by scamming elderly people and making money out of them.

In Bulgaria, before it joined the EU, the most valuable subject to obtain a fake visa was often a tour operator, who usually had a deep knowledge of the various aspects of migration laws as well as close contacts with key government officials. In more recent years, it has been noted that many Macedonians (of Bulgarian origin) requested and acquired the citizenship in order to be able to move freely within the EU.

In Rome, in 2008, an inquiry was conducted on visa trafficking in Senegal: such practice was to the Senegaleses' and other African citizens' benefit, and involved drug dealers as well as money launderers. During the same year, it was suspected that an illegal visa trafficking in favor of 800 Albanians from Kosovo was conducted within the Italian Embassy in Montenegro. The following year, it was the turn of Morocco, where traffickers, in order to obtain fake visas, managed to get in touch with the provincial labor offices and even obtain or forge company documents - as proven by the dramatic fraud of San Nicola Varco, a town in the Province of Salerno, in 2009.

Unique is the case of Moldova. In the past, due to the presence in that country of an honorary Italian consulate only, the Moldavians who intended to travel to Italy were forced to pass through two distinct bureaucratic barriers: firstly obtaining a visa to travel to Romania (introduced

in 2007) and secondly, after a journey of several hundred kilometers, obtaining a visa at the Italian Embassy in Bucarest. These inconveniences, which fueled the use of subterfuges in order to bypass such complex procedures, were solved only by the establishment of an Italian embassy in Chisinau, in 2009.

For the benefit of citizens from Serbia, Montenegro and Macedonia, the European Union established (starting from December 19, 2010) the abolition of the visa requirement for stays of less than 90 days in the Schengen area. However, in cases of significant migration flows and in order to avoid irregularities and abuses, on May 24, 2011 the European Commission suggested the introduction of a safeguard clause allowing the temporary suspension of the visa-free regime in emergency situations.

Finally, in 2011 – a very complex year for the whole North Africa – as a result of checks carried out at the airport on transit passengers to Europe, the police of Tunis uncovered a trafficking of fake Schengen visas and residence permits.

A Long Series of “Amnesties”

In Italy, over the last thirty years (1982 to 2011), there has been an extensive use of regularization measures, each with its own characteristics. Overall, about 1.660.000 irregular immigrants have been regularized, that is more than what done by any other EU Member State.

The first measure, which dates back to 1980, was of an administrative nature (i.e. provided for by a ministerial circular letter), and affected 5,000 foreigners, whereas in 1986, the applications were more than 100,000; the last two regularizations, however, reached the highest peaks (more than 700,000 applications in 2002 and almost 300,000 in 2009).

Over the years, following the initial prevalence of African immigrants, workers from Eastern Europe started to be more involved in the regularization process, while the amount of Asians and Africans continued to be relevant: in the last regularization (2009), Ukrainians were more involved than Moroccans, and Moldovans more than Chinese. We are now going to examine the evolution of these measures over the years, and their main features (Massimo Carfagna, Franco Pittau, “Italy: 20 years of regularization” in Statistical Dossier on Immigration 2002, Anterem Editions, Rome, 2002, pp. 129-138).

1982. The first regularization was implemented in the early '80s and was executed at the administrative level by means of the Ministry of Labor circular letters of March 2 and September 9, 1982. While awaiting for the approval of the first law on immigration (which seemed imminent, but would be approved only at the end of 1986), the Ministry of Labor blocked any further employment of foreigners (with the exception of specific types of citizens of a few, selected countries), and provided for measures to regularize the de facto situation of people who had found employment without a residence permit, or who had an expired permit. These immigrants needed to have: entered Italy within 1981, an employer willing to hire them, demonstrated that they had been employed continuously from the moment of entry, declared they had not spent more than two months at a time outside of Italy, and a deposit from their employer for their return flight home. These measures remained valid until Law 943/1986 came into force, and yet, their effects were limited (only a few thousand positions were regularized), due to the improper tool used (administrative circular letters, which did not provide for an appeal in case of denial, instead of a law), its poor promotion, the lack of involvement of protection institutions, the contrasting behavior of the administrations and the fact that those circular letters did not regularize the tax position of the employers, thus excluding penalties.

1986. The Law No. 943 of December 30, 1986 (the first law on immigration to be approved in Italy) implemented the ILO Convention 143/1975 on migrant workers. At the time, there was a widespread perception of a vast area of irregularity, so much so that the approval of the law, which began to be discussed in 1981 (the year when the Convention was ratified), required a very long procedure before being approved, thus leading to many illegal entries and subsequent job research

on the labor market. This is the reason why the legislator willingly regularized the previous irregular positions of employers and employees, offering the possibility of obtaining work authorizations or registrations on the employment lists, depending on the situation. The deadline for submitting the applications, initially set for April 27, 1987, was extended three times that year, by Law Decrees No. 154 of April 27th, No. 242 of June 27th and No. 353 of August 28th. Afterwards, the deadline of December 31, 1987 was extended to September 30, 1988, by Law No. 81 of March 28, 1988.

1990. Approximately half a million foreigners were living in Italy when the so-called “Martelli Law” (39/1990) came into force; this law substantially modified the immigration regulations, and introduced a general amnesty for those who could prove their entry into Italy by 12/31/1989, leaving all other conditions out of consideration. The law sought to reduce irregularities and to introduce provisions in order to prevent the formation of these irregularity pockets in the future. In fact, only a limited percentage of the migrants concerned were able to demonstrate an ongoing employment relationship; however, migrants who did not have a job could find one, not only in the employment sector, but in the autonomous and cooperative sectors as well (a significant innovation introduced by the law), although within two years' time. After that time, the residence permit would not be renewed if the migrant did not have a job by then. It has been assumed that a certain number of women who entered into Italy for family reunification was regularized for employment, since the regularization for family reasons had not yet been established at the time. In this case, Africa was the continent that most benefited from this measure, making up more than half of the total number of regularized migrants, while the presence of immigrants from Eastern Europe began to be significant.

1995. The regularization measure was planned by the Law Decree No. 489 of November 18, 1995, which was reiterated several times but was never converted into law by the Parliament. However, the law No. 617 of December 9, 1996 gave final effect to instances of regularization received by the Ministry of the Interior. The new regulation provided for three possible types of regularization: for employment, for registration at the employment office and family reunification. Almost every application was accepted, and only a few thousand were rejected. Successful applications were usually linked to an existing employment relationship (82.4% of all applications), with a small number of cases of unemployed workers (12.9%) or family members for family reunification (4.7%). During these years, in addition to immigrants from Eastern Europe, Asian immigrants began to play a greater role.

1998. The Law Decree No. 113 of April 13, 1999 introduced the possibility of regularizing all foreign citizens who had signed up for regularization by December 15, 1998. The requests submitted were 250,966, a few thousand of which were difficult to define even after several years. 14.5% of applications for regularization were presented for the exercise of self-employment, and this clearly indicated the importance of the so-called “ethnic entrepreneurship” (especially in Tuscany, Latium and Sardinia). 3% of applications were presented for family reunification (spouses in 55.1% of cases, and children in 36.1% of cases). As shown by the job offers, which appeared quite solid, the majority of these people seemed to have a steady job, whereas the length which characterized the applications' approval seem to have influenced those who have struggled to find work.

2002. The regularization for domestic workers and “caregivers” was defined by Law No. 189 of July 30, 2002, introducing “Changes to the legislation on immigration and labor” (also known as the “Bossi-Fini law”, published in the *Gazzetta Ufficiale* No. 199 of 26 August, 2002, which came into force on September 10, 2002); the regularization for employees, however, was introduced by the Law Decree No. 195 of September 9, 2002, converted with amendments into the law No. 222 of October 9, 2002, regarding “Urgent regulations on the regularization of the irregular

employment of non-EU nationals". The Minister of Labor, by decree of October 28, 2002 (*Gazzetta Ufficiale* No. 17 of January 22, 2003) has subjected the admissibility of the work regularization to the previous payment of €700 to INPS, on the part of the migrant; of this amount, €669 corresponded to 32.7% of the minimum contributory rate for the relative pension contribution for the three months prior to the amnesty (with reference, therefore, to September 10, 2002) and €31 covered the necessary expenses to organize and conduct the regularization procedures. Employers were also allowed to pay contributions for previous periods, in a lump sum or in monthly installments (up to 24 months increased by legal interest and up to 36 months further increased by interest for delay with effect from the 25th month). The 702,156 applications for regularization (of which 9 out of 10 were accepted) represent a far higher amount compared to that of the previous amnesties. With regard to length of stay of immigrants to be regularized, a study conducted by the Andolfi Foundation (CNEL, 2003), involving a sample of 400 female domestic workers, indicated that the different percentages of irregularity depended on their shorter or longer length of stay in Italy. People who have been living in Italy for 2 years: 68.3% of irregularity; for 3 to 5 years: 38.8% of irregularity; for 6 to 10 years: 12.6% of irregularity. This data suggest that foreign workers recently settled in Italy have been the main beneficiaries of this measure.

2009. The latest regularization was described as an "amnesty for domestic workers and caregivers", because it was limited to the category of male and female domestic workers. This measure was introduced by Law No. 102 of August 3, 2009 and recorded 295,126 job applications submitted by employers. As at March 14, 2011, the majority of applications (222,182, equal to 75.3%) were accepted, 34,559 applications were rejected (11.7%), 2,713 were withdrawn, and 35,672 were suspended for further investigation. This operation generated about €154 millions as outstanding contributions and an anticipation of additional pension contributions equal to about €1.3 billions for the period 2010-2012. As a result of the new laws introduced in 2009, the Italian legislation on migration became much stricter, defining the irregular presence in the country as a crime, and considering it an aggravating circumstance for sentencing purposes (the aggravating circumstance was then declared illegitimate and the new crime was considered non-compliant with EU legislation). For this reason, it was hoped by many that these regularizations could be extended to other categories of workers.

These pockets of irregular migrants, which have been regularized repeatedly and at short intervals, highlight that the quotas established by the various flow decrees were not always adequate, but also that, in Italy, there is a need for additional labor force, which, according to a prudent assessment of the Ministry of Labour (February 2011), should be equal to about 100,000 units in the coming years. It is time to refine the match between demand and supply of labor (which currently has to be done from abroad, with no possibility of any research in the field), as well as to adopt more flexibility with regard to skilled workers (who should be considered apart of the entry quotas and provided incentives to enter the country). Since the demographic projections show that both Italy and the EU will continue to need for entry flows, we should overcome the reluctance to take cognizance of it, trying to find common rules - partially different from today's ones - which would allow to operate with greater effectiveness. Simplistically, we can say that allowing more workers to regularly enter the country, means not being forced to regularize many of them afterwards. Planning of flows ensures dignity and promotes integration, whereas regularization is an emergency action: the first one is a real immigration policy, while the second one is only useful to repair the damage.

The major statistical information collected in early 2011

In the last decade migrants worldwide have increased by 64 million, leading to an overall number of 214 million migrants and to an annual number of emigrants of 5.8 million. It is undisputed that the flow will resume when the slowdown due to the global financial crisis has stopped. In these 10 years the economies of developing countries grew significantly (+13.4% only in 2010) and half a billion people were freed from extreme poverty, even though another billion and a half are still involved. On the one hand, the out of proportion difference of income per person between the North (\$ 33,400) and South (6.200) of the world continues to be stressed; on the other hand, in several Countries, particularly the European ones, the working age population is decreasing, therefore many areas that are currently subject to emigration, will undergo the opposite process. Even the Asian continent that has been the main provider of workforce so far, will be subject to an overall decrease of the working age population within the end of the century, while the Philippines will remain a country of emigration (as well as the African continent), China will become the main outlet for international migration flows, together with Japan, South Korea and other countries.

The Old Continent will continue to be subject to immigration, but in line with innovative scenarios where Countries presently subject to emigration will turn into immigration destinations: a significant example is Poland, where in 2011 a bill on resident permits for about 300 thousand non-EU citizens was approved. Europe, from important area of emigration in modern history, has become the main actor requiring workforce. Within the 27-EU states there are 32.5 million immigrants, accounting for 6.5% of the overall population, while there are 14.8 million individuals born abroad that have acquired the citizenship of the place of settlement: in 2009 the acquisition of citizenships across the EU area have been 776,000. The fertility rate in Europe has almost halved compared to 1952 (2.6 children per woman). In all countries the population has increased thanks to the contribution of immigrants who have also helped to increase productivity. In these years of crisis, even if its negative effects have been borne by the immigrants more than others, the attitude towards them has become more restrictive and there are frequent attempts to limit the right of the free movement of workers in the EU. However, according to the OECD, immigration, which has presently slowed down, will acquire new dynamism along with the economic recovery.

Italy has been ranked, along with Spain, as one of the major destination countries in the EU, just after Germany with about 7 million immigrants. The attention has been focused by the trend of increase of the immigrated population that is constantly growing. On one hand, the dynamism of the foreign population is to be attributed mainly to its demographic evolution and, on the other, to the labour request in our Country, while the influence of tens of thousands of landings is minimal, considering that its protagonists are mostly asylum seekers or persons deserving humanitarian protection.

The foreign residents in Italy, just over 100,000 in 1951, have become 4,570,317 at the beginning of 2011, of which 51.8% women: in terms of incidence on the total resident population in Italy (60.626.442) the rate is 7.5%. The annual increase, despite the crisis, was 335,258 units in 2010, mainly due to new registration of foreigners to the Municipal Register Office (+424,499) and, secondly, to foreign children born in Italy (78,082 in 2010). However, among those deleted from the lists of residents, 32,817 have moved abroad and about 5 thousand have died, while nearly 74 thousand are recorded as cancelled from the lists due to unavailability and with expired residence permit. The number of migrants who acquire Italian citizenship every year is also increased (66 thousand in 2010). According to the Caritas/Migrantes *Immigration Statistics Dossier* estimations, another 400 thousand people regularly present but not yet registered at the Register Office must be added. In the course of a decade, immigrants have increased by almost 4 million, helping to

rejuvenate the country against continued population aging, as confirmed by the low fertility rate (1.29 for Italian women, 2.13 for foreign women) and by the global budget for the period 2000-2010: +1,800,000 residents sixty-five-and-over years old, +1,465,000 residents in the range of 15-64 years of age and +348,000 residents from 0 to 14 years of age.

Italy, while formerly considered an area of transit to the countries of the North or overseas, has become over the years a stable destination, as is undoubtedly confirmed by the increasing length of permanence or by the number of immigrants who have bought their own house (more than one tenth of the total). This can be seen both in the North, where there is nearly 60% of the foreign presence and in the Centre (about 25%) and, albeit to a lesser extent, there is also 13.5% in the South. Furthermore, the outflow to Municipalities other than provincial capitals has further increased, thus immigration should be considered a national phenomenon even from the territorial point of view.

The Romanian community is the largest, with about 1 million residents (968,576); Albanians and Moroccans follow with nearly half a million residents each (482,627 and 452,424 respectively), while Chinese and Ukrainians add up to almost 200,000 residents (209,234 and 200,730). Together, these five communities cover more than half of the immigrant presence (50.6%), just as it occurs with the Europeans as a whole (53.4%); the shares of the other continents are: 21.6% for Africa, 16.8% for Asia, 8.1% for America and 0.1% for Oceania.

Several national groups like Filipinos, Peruvians and Ecuadorians live mostly in the regional capitals. Others, like Indians, Moroccans and Albanians, have mainly settled in Municipalities other than capitals. Generally the settlement occurs in North and Central Italy (a total of 86, 5% of the foreigners are registered at the Register Office of 8,094 Italian Municipalities). The South is however also involved in the phenomenon, since it is considered a privileged area for the integration of some communities: this is the case of the Albanians in Apulia, the Ukrainian in Campania, the Tunisian in Sicily and the Ecuadorians in Liguria. Rome and Milan have the highest concentration of migrants with almost 345,000 and more than 217,000 foreign residents respectively, nevertheless, immigrants also settle in small towns, often with high incidences with respect to total residents.

The mobility concerns also the Italian universities, where 47,506 foreign students are enrolled, twice as much compared to just 10 years ago. Newly registered foreign students are 10,000 (60% women). Very often however, they encounter difficulties in continuing their studies (language, means of subsistence, personal and group contacts).

The process of structural integration into society

This presence has become ever more characterized by stability and by family, as confirmed by several indicators: the equality between men and women, the prevalence of married persons on single persons, the cohabitation with members of their own communities, the increase of immigrant children born in Italy (about 80,000 per year). Annually more than 100 thousand children are born to foreign mothers (104 thousand in 2010) and about 40,000 came from abroad for family reunifications. In an Italy struggling to defeat the increasing rate of aging, where the sixty-five-and-over year olds exceed those under 15 years, immigrants are a partial factor of stability to the population, also positively influencing the workforce.

The number of acquisitions of citizenship is increasing (65,938 in 2010), often subsequent to marriage (21,630). Marriages celebrated in Italy, as a whole, have decreased from 418,4944 in 1972 to just over 217,000 in 2010, with a decrease especially of first marriages, an increase in second marriages (one sixth of the total) and in the average age of married (30 years for women and 33 years for men). In the period 1996-2009 257,762 mixed marriages were celebrated. In 1995, out of 100 marriages only two were mixed, now there are almost ten out of 100 mixed.

In average, one person out of 13 is a foreign citizen, but the incidence is higher among minors (1 million) and among young adults (18-44 years), with consequent higher visibility at school and on the labour market. Foreigners, in fact, have a younger average age than Italians (32 years against 44 of the total population), with an incidence of 22.0% of minors (5.1 percentage

points higher than the average) and people of working age of 75.7% (10 percentage points higher), while among the migrants the sixty-five-and-over year olds are only 2.4% (minus 17.9 percentage points).

The immigrants' children currently enrolled for the 2010/2011-school year are 709,826 and they account for 7.9% on school population. The data reveals a higher school delay rate than that of the Italian students, stressing the need to deploy more resources for their integration in case they come for family reunification. More than half of these children are second-generation children born in Italy, and addressing them as "foreigners" is totally inappropriate, because they have the place of birth, residence, language, education and social system in common with Italians. From various surveys it comes out that the Italians would be willing to grant citizenship to foreign children born in Italy on more favourable terms, but this perspective has not yet found an endorsement at the legislative level.

What could be the future appearance of Italy is already visible in the regions (almost half of them) where the incidence of immigrants is around 10% or more of that percentage.

The number of women has increased and their role has broadened, driven by necessity but also by interest in bettering their skills and freely developing their social, cultural and religious level. The itineraries they have followed are mainly two: the first is related to family reunification, a form protected by international regulations, and the second is connected to direct work integration, an opportunity regulated by laws and by the national labour market. This evolution has been a considerable remedy for separated families, since this greatly affects the proper growth of children.

Immigration is, therefore, an intrinsic reality to Italy. These new citizens have suffered more severely the crisis and there are several hundreds of thousands of unrenewed resident permits, meaning a return (often forced) to home country or camouflaging in undeclared employment. Half of the Italian population mistakenly believes that foreigners, typically, cost more than they produce and they do not have a positive attitude towards them. *The Immigration Statistics Dossier 2011* by Caritas and Migrantes Foundation helps to become aware of the reality. In fact, in the surveys conducted on the benefits and costs of immigration, it was highlighted that immigrants pay more taxes and are less prone to go on welfare. The ratio of public expenditure incurred for the immigrants (10.5 billion euros) and taxes and contribution paid by immigrants (12 million) is therefore to the benefit of the Italian system.

The positive impact of migration can be seen by comparing the retirement trends of Italians respect to those of immigrants, since the latter contribute such a large sum to the Italian social security fund (more than 7 billion Euros per year) that doesn't find comparison in terms of pension benefits paid; moreover, this has allowed to boost the social security's budget. Based on the retirement age, it can be estimated that in the five-year-period 2011-2015 about 110 thousand foreigners will demand their pension, equal to 3.1% of all new requests for retirement. From the 15,000 retirements in 2010, equal to 2.2% of all the requests, 61,000 will be reached in 2025, approximately 7% of the entries. Currently, 1 every 30 resident immigrants is retired, while among Italians, 1 every 4 residents is retired. In 2025, foreign retirees will total about 625 thousand (8% of foreign residents). At that time, there will be about 1 retiree for every 12 people among foreign residents, while among the Italians the relationship will be about 1 to 3.

The working world

Even before the crisis, compared to other EU countries, Italy was not favoured in attracting direct foreign investments, and from the 22 billion dollars recorded in 2007, it is facing a continuous decrease. Meanwhile, the Gross Domestic Product growth is diminishing: 3.8% in the 70's, 2.4% in the 80's, 1.4% in the 90's, and from 2000 to date 0.3% (a very small ratio also due to the effect of the 6% fall of Italy's GDP during the two-year period 2008-2009). In addition, the relationship between GDP and public debt, amounting to 95.2% in 1990, rose to 109.2% in 2000 and 119.0% in 2010, as declared by the Ministry of Economy and Finance on their website – being the debt of 1.843 billion Euros and the GDP of 1.549 billion Euros, the highest debt-to-GDP ratio

among all EU Member States. On the other hand, the mere transfer of low-cost production abroad, without maintaining synergies with Italy, involves the risk of selling out the Italian *know-how* and paying the negative consequences in the medium and long term, within a singular panorama of producing countries with low number of consumers and consuming nations but no longer engaged in production.

In this scenario, anything but positive, immigrants have been supportive. The internationalization of the Italian labour market is underway since some time and the foreign-born workers are 15.5% of the total. Among these there are also Italian emigrants returning (testifying the presence of more than 4 million emigrants residing abroad), nevertheless, especially in the last decade, foreign workers are the vast majority. Foreign immigrants are almost a tenth of the total employed (over 2 million) and they contribute to creation of wealth in the country for a similar quota (Unioncamere survey on GDP). These are people who, having overcome difficult initial conditions, present today these characteristics:

- a participation rate of 12 points higher than the average;
- high motivation to succeed, since migration was for them a strong existential choice;
- willing to do any kind of work and, for this reason concentrated in the areas that are less attractive to the Italians, without objecting that the work does not comply with their preparation;
- higher exposition to risk conditions in relation to the actual hours of work, as confirmed by 120,135 injuries, of which 138 fatal;
- lack of appropriate rewards (failure to recognize qualifications and placement in subordinate positions);
- interest in supporting their families left in the country of origin (they send 6 billion Euros every year with remittances);
- patience in putting up to a suspicious attitude, and alas even hostile, with recurrent acts of pure racism.

Many are those who work in construction, agriculture, in the various sectors of services and in industries. Just over 1 million immigrants are members of a union to better protect their rights in the different sectors. Immigrant labour is, in fact, subject to low rate of legality since the Italians recruit for undeclared work, use illegal gang-master systems, evade social security contributions, do not comply with terms of contract of employment and fail to recognize qualifications. Generally, the black wages are about one-sixth of the entire national economy.

Considering the effects of the crisis one should wonder whether the immigrants, who contribute to the creation of gross domestic product of about 11%, are the problem or rather a contribution to its solution. Several studies, including that of the Bank of Italy in July 2009, have highlighted the complementary role of immigrant workers, able to promote better job opportunities also for the Italians. If there were no immigrants, or if they cease to grow in the productive sectors considered undesirable by the Italians (agriculture, construction, industry, in the home help sector and in many other services), the country would be facing several difficulties.

It is not possible to conduct herein a full review of working conditions that immigrants encounter in Italy, but a *focus* on immigrant women in the labour market could be useful. It is estimated that there are over 1 million among them who take care of our families. There are 40 national groups where the incidence of women exceeds 70%, and Ukraine is the most representative. On the other hand, there are 18 national groups, with predominantly Muslim traditions, in which the percentage of women is less than 30%: amongst the most representative to be mentioned are Algeria, Bangladesh, Egypt, Libya, Pakistan and Tunisia. Only one of ten immigrants is a woman in the case of Senegal, 1 of 6 for Algeria and Egypt, 1 every 4 in the case of Tunisia and 1 every 3 for Morocco. The incidence is 20% among the Pakistani and Bengali women. Many of these women have more than one University degree and speak several languages, but they adapt to work as domestic employees.

Not always, however, they are appreciated and, within the walls of private homes, they may suffer all kinds of harassment. Their emotional life is also greatly affected when they are away from

their families. In 2010 ISTAT certified that immigrants, and particularly immigrant women, have lower wage levels than Italians (respectively 973 Euros versus 1,286 Euros for males and 683 Euros versus 1,048 Euros for women) and, just because they are foreign immigrants, they have not always been admitted to the enjoyment of the benefits provided in support of motherhood.

However, the meeting point between the needs of families and the availability of the immigrants is an appreciable model of family care that, nevertheless, needs to be modified. In the future the elderly and persons in need of care will be much more numerous but with less available income. It is a must therefore, with appropriate regulatory and tax measures, that there be an increase in the presence of male and female collaborators, or similar organized forms, capable of assisting more people, as well as better qualification of these workers, without entrusting this issue to local experiments in absence of a unifying framework at national level.

Entrepreneurial leadership

Before the entry into force of Law 39/1990, in order to become an entrepreneur in Italy the immigrant, even if only artisan or merchant, had to belong to a country tied to ours by a reciprocal agreement on self-employment. This agreement was never the case with countries having strong migratory pressure. A substantial change occurred with the abovementioned Law of 1990 that, however, due to a restrictive interpretation just recently judicially overcome, allowed only regularised persons to be self-employed regardless of the existence of bilateral agreements. The liberalization of immigrant self-employment has been established in the Law 40/1998 and since then the entrepreneurial initiatives have grown massively.

Foreign citizens, who held an entrepreneurial position (owners, administrators, associates) until 31st December 2010, were 415,394; while in 2005 they were only 300,000, with an increase of 40.4 percentage points (while the Italians had a decrease of 9.1%). Among these, the business owners are 228,540 (19,712 more than last year), with four communities holding more than 10% of the share: Morocco 16.4%, Romania 15.3%, China 14.7% and Albania 10.4%. The 72.1% of businesses run by foreigners are working in the fields of construction (37.4%) and retail trade and repair (34.8%).

The phenomenon of immigrant entrepreneurs has emerged in the late 90s and grew further in the subsequent decade; in the future it appears likely that it will reach the rate of Italian entrepreneurship. Companies of immigrants are of small dimensions, and often are run by the sole owner, nevertheless, especially in this difficult economic climate, it would be wrong not to consider the importance of the benefits it brings in terms of labour and wealth creation, personal satisfaction for those who promote it and even for the dragging effect that it creates with the countries of origin. It is estimated that around half a million individuals are actively involved, considering the owners and other figures such as partners and employees.

The commitment of business immigrants has, so to say, a “chameleonic”(ever-changing) character and reflects that of the Italians in the individual territories: in the places where Italians are more dedicated to creating enterprises, the immigrants are also there, even if always in lower numbers - and this shows that there is still a long way to go. Nonetheless, it is not easy to follow the choice of entrepreneurship in Italy especially if one comes from abroad with this very purpose. Less than a thousand foreign nationals a year are willing to relocate with the intention of creating a company in Italy, a country no longer able, in terms of profitability, to attract foreign direct investment. Just as many Italian entrepreneurs have relocated part of their labour intensive activities abroad, benefiting of more incentivizing regulations. Instead, there are tens of thousands of immigrants living in Italy who attempt every year the adventure of entrepreneurship.

Entering the world of business needs to be supported by an initial capital, to be integrated with funding from local authorities and specific bank mortgages (see Ethnoland Foundation, *Immigrant entrepreneurs*, Ed Idos, Rome, 2009). The search for the initial capital is not facilitated by the unstable situation linked to the permit of stay, reason for which the most available support comes from the same immigrant community with its forms of mutual aid. There are different factors

driving towards entrepreneurship and one of these is the desire of higher earnings. This economic interest choice is also characterized by a strong desire of redemption: one who is self-employed does not depend on others, has no superior and is not subject to harassment.

In some occasions, it is the direct contact with the Italian productive system that allows earning experience in a specialized activity, permitting subsequently the start an own business. In other occasions, the stimulating factor is the perspective of a fruitful social or commercial involvement with their own community or the possibility of establishing relations with their country of origin. Sure enough, it is necessary to keep the immigrants' motivation alive, through vocational training structures, credit institutions, local authorities, national procedures and incentives, since many companies are in danger of ceasing due to lack of support.

Another key aspect is the tendency of the individual communities, some of which are more involved as employees and others, such as Moroccan or Chinese that excel in entrepreneurial activities. Immigrant entrepreneurs are under-represented in agriculture (they hold about 2,500 companies), due to the consistent amount required for the purchase of the farm. So far this has been possible only for a certain number of people coming from highly developed countries. Studies conducted by Caritas/Migrantes *Immigration Statistics Dossier*, together with professional associations (Farmers, Italian Farmers Confederation, Federation of Food Cisl), have highlighted, on the one hand, the lack of conditions for the protection of employees in this sector and, on the other, if one considers the average advanced age of Italian farmers, that their tendency to become entrepreneurs in this sector is not excluded: much will depend on support provisions that will be achieved.

The Italian experience leads to the understanding that entrepreneurship, unless it serves to hide a position of employment, is certainly a valid path of integration, and in part allows various crafts necessary for the wellbeing of the population to remain alive. On the other hand, entrepreneurship cannot be functional only to the needs of fellow countrymen settled in Italy but also to the needs of countries of origin, giving rise to on-site projects (production, marketing, credit) and activation of exchanges, also through a more functional use of remittances. Two cases of entrepreneurial presence will now be considered: the Chinese and the Egyptian case.

The Chinese have come to Europe in the twentieth century, during the years of World War I, to work in artillery factories and to dig the trenches, initially in Britain and The Netherlands and then in France: some of them rather than return home, preferred to stay in the place and also move to Italy. Their migration project is characterized by the return to their country when they are 50 years old, following the Chinese saying that "it is not good that leaves fall far away from the roots of their tree". The entrepreneurial predisposition of the Chinese favours the small size family-based structures, distinguished by contained profit margins, cheap but laborious workforce and enormous capability of adapting to different regional contexts ("the Chinese are like water, they fit to the container that carries them," says another Chinese proverb). They are working in the textile industry in Prato, in the stone processing industry in Piedmont, in the cultivation of rice in some parts of Lombardy and Piedmont, in trade business in Rome (where in the early 2000 they were the central driving force for all of Europe), in addition they promote a variety of services for the benefit of their community (grocery stores, video stores, *call centers*, hair salons, travel agencies, translation services, advisory services and other).

Furthermore, Italy is the country in Europe where the Egyptians have established the largest community. This was due to the past migratory heritage and to the position of Egypt in the Mediterranean, the sea of trade. The first flows towards the Peninsula date back to the 70's. These flows, even if occasionally and not in mass proportion, were mainly made up of young people, mostly unmarried, belonging to the middle-class and eager to improve their knowledge, although, the appeal of an immediate wage earning led them to neglecting their studies and dropping their intentions of return, especially in the cases of recurring mixed marriages. The economic crisis, experienced in Egypt in the mid-80s increased the flows to Italy and, as the temporary migration projects turned into permanent migration, the reunification with Egyptian women began. These immigrants are usually big savers, however when this saving is not sufficient to allow them to put

together the initial capital, they are helped by their ethnic and family relations. In this manner, over 10,000 Egyptian companies have been established and, every 10 adults, 1 is self-employed. The preferred sectors are restaurant industry, *import-export* activity, construction, cleaning and truck transportation companies, telephone communications and commercial trades functional to the needs of the community (bakeries, butcher shops, travel agencies, kebab shops and *takeaways*, *phone centers* and similar). It is surprising that in Milan there are more Egyptian pizza makers than Neapolitan and the same happens in Rome. The Moroccans, first community for number of entrepreneurs, are instead known throughout Italy for their versatility in commercial trade. On the other hand, the Romanians and Albanians, as well as several other Eastern European communities, have mainly addressed their business skills to the construction industry.

Organized Crime between myth and reality

From the investigation *Transatlantic Trends – Immigration 2010* it is noted that 65% of the Italians believe that in Italy there are more illegal immigrants rather than legal, 56% believes that the legal immigrants contribute to the increase of crime and 57% believes this for what concerns the illegal immigrants. This spread “liquid” fear, as to say with Zygmunt Bauman, that establishes a connection between immigration and criminality, is very distant from reality. To the various approaches to the migration phenomenon, considered to be an essential aspect of the migratory reality and related policies, the IOM has paid the utmost attention in the *World Migration Report 2011*, where a specific chapter (*Communicating Effectively about Migration*) includes data and considerations from a general perspective. Here below we will only refer to the Italian context. With reference to the link between immigration and crime data from Italian statistical archives and elaborations carried out by Idos Study and Research Centre have been reported. In Italy, the claims against known generators of crime have been 866.395 in 2010 (of which 592.447 Italian citizens and 273.948 foreign citizens). At first instance one may disregard that the claims against Italians concern only the population resident in Italy, while the claims against the foreigners concern only partially the immigrants resident in Italy and, as will be seen, other categories of foreign citizens are contemplated therein. The increase from 2004 through 2010 has been altogether of 22,1%, so determined: +23,4% for the Italians and + 19,4% for the foreigners against a consistent increase of the foreign population from 2.402.157 to 4.570.317 (+ 90,3%), while the Italian population remained stable. The theory of a direct correspondence between the numerical consistence of the immigrants and the crimes committed by them, was not rejected in many studies that highlight how foreigners have often become the scapegoat of Italian insecurity, typical in periods of strong cultural changes and economical crisis.

However one could object that the frequency of the claims remains 6 times higher among immigrants respect to what occurs among Italians. This however, as mentioned, would be a superficial interpretation. As a matter of fact, it is not correct to attribute all the claims against foreigners only to the immigrants (that is, to individuals who have come to settle in Italy) and, on the contrary, one must take into consideration also the numerous foreigners who are only passing through: 72 million have entered in 2010 of which 40 million have stayed overnight. Then, amongst the same immigrants, one must distinguish from residents or those however authorized to stay (5 million) and the other individuals present on the territory without any authorization (approximately 500.000, thus 1 every 10 legally present).

The claims mentioned above may concern the non-resident foreigners or those passing through: for example, a foreigner officially coming to Italy for business may be a drug mule, a tourist may commit a robbery in a supermarket or, when drunk, may start a riot. It is difficult to conduct precise investigations on categories so different and it is not acceptable, on a methodological plane, to attribute to the illegal immigrants (those who have stopped in Italy without authorization) the criminal behaviours that may concern a much larger population.

Unfortunately, the interest in knowing the different criminal behaviours of the Italians and of the resident immigrants, does not find support in the available statistics. On the contrary, much less is known now in that respect ever since (2007) when the EU citizens were no longer subject to a

resident permit; furthermore, for the non EU citizens, the information on the possession or not of a resident permit (or at least the application to obtain one) is lacking, also because it is no longer made available. Moreover, it is not correct to believe that an illegal immigrant is destined to become part of the criminal organizations, even if this could happen.

As far as the legal immigrants are concerned, it is necessary that the claims attributable to them be taken into consideration (a disaggregation which was previously available) to verify the type of population who commits them (through comparison of the age class between Italians and foreigners, considering that amongst the younger individuals – age class in which migrants are mostly concentrated - there is a higher tendency towards crime). As a matter of fact, one should consider that the age class amongst immigrants with the highest tendency to deviation is that of 18-44 years of age (92,5% of the foreigners accused of crime is within this range) and with lower frequency that of 45-64 years of age (5,3%). Following this methodology, the *Immigration Statistics Dossier 2009* has come to the conclusion that the cumulative rate of criminality (without considering the single types of crimes), is substantially the same for the two populations, on the contrary, it is lower for the immigrants if one excludes those claims directly or in some way related to the regulations on foreigners.

Another stereotype to be considered is that the crimes committed by the foreigners are more serious, while instead the criminal claims registered in 2010 show this distribution between the two populations:

- similar for a certain number of crimes: forgery, robberies, drugs, bodily harm, sexual assaults and criminal conspiracy;
- with a prevalence of Italians for certain crimes: threats, insults and hacking;
- with a prevalence of foreigners for another series of crimes: handling of stolen goods, theft and violations to intellectual property.

Furthermore, easy to guess, it should be considered that the foreign citizens are natural protagonists of the crimes related to the violation of the procedures on immigration and to the effort in entering or maintaining legality (escaping, false identity, false documents, resistance to arrest, verbal assaults to public officials, etc.) They have more opportunities, respect to Italians, of being charged, arrested and jailed, being more exposed to the procedural provisions and lacking support to fulfil their needs. In the VII CNEL Report *Index of immigrant integration (Indici di integrazione degli immigrati)* (June 2010), it is also however demonstrated that the new immigrants (data referred to the period 2005-2008) have less criminal charges than the resident population (Italians and foreigners), thus the idea, that the main cause of lack of security in Italy is due to foreigners (legal and illegal immigration), is further weakened.

Finally, one should not forget that the immigrants are not only the source of risk but also subject to risk, and in the case of violent crimes against people, they are the recurring victims (at least 1 case every 6). It is also extremely important to take into consideration that for many communities the accent on the criminal statistics is minimal and that determined factors allow the reduction of the impact of the deviation: in the *Immigration Statistics Dossier 2011* the accent is posed on the availability of a stable housing and on family reunion.

The crimes reported in Italy are presently attributable to the first generations of immigrants, while the behaviour of the second generations is still to be understood, considering that in other countries the second and third generations have been charged with worse judicial claims respect to their predecessors. The phenomenon of “gangs” of young immigrants has been encountered also in Italy (for example the Latin-Americans in Milan and in Genoa), but not spread out in all areas.

On the basis of this data and of these assumptions it is absolutely groundless to set immigration and criminality on the same basis, without denying the implications and without dramatizing them. The same comparison within the European context does not penalize Italy. If one adds up all the criminal charges recorded in 2006 in the 27 EU member states, according to their respective legislations (*Statistics in focus*, Eurostat, no. 19/2008) and they are divided among the resident population, it results that in average 6 every 100 residents of the EU are implicated in crime

(both citizens and residents). Italy finds its place almost in the middle with 4,6 claims every 100 residents, better positioned with respect to Belgium and United Kingdom (10 claims every 100 residents) and Sweden (13 every 100).

Remittances and their relation with development

At international level, especially in these last two decades, the increase in value of the economic role of the immigrants is tied to the high and continuous increase of the remittances. In many cases these exceed the amounts for aid to public development and come close to the level of direct foreign investments, so being determined as the primary source of foreign currency, especially for the economies of small dimensions. They represent a very reliable form of economic support for the families who have stayed at home, in some cases very long-lasting, which is not subject to economic fluctuations of the countries of origin of the migrants. The remittances, that in 2007 have exceeded 6 billion Euros per year, are sent by all categories of immigrants and, among these, in particular those who have higher economical resources such as the immigrants who have become employers. Agreement has been found on some of the positive outcomes of this considerable financial flow: the remittances contribute to the economy of the Country of origin since they increase the consumer spending, increase the education of the human resources, reduce the deficit in the balance of payments, provide stability against the cyclical periods of crisis.

There is disagreement, however, on the macro economical impact of the remittances (if they really produce economic growth) as well as on their use by the families (consumer spending or investments). There is instead agreement on the idea that the sole remittances are not sufficient to fulfil the development requirements of the poorer countries nor substitute the foreign aid. Therefore, an immigrant who has become an employer in the Country of immigration must be invited to invest in his Country, promoting development projects with the support of public and private institutions. This because only in this manner can his bridging function be optimized, channelling the remittances towards structured forms of saving, of credit, of insurance, for health, education, housing, but also for the starting of small businesses and forms of self-employment in the Countries of origin. In other words, favouring his consciousness of a possible role as development agent, being the bearer of a considerable human, financial and social potential due to his immigration experience. Therefore, without insisting on the fact that they physically return to their countries, decision to be taken as a free choice and subject to consideration of different factors, one must invest on their capability of influencing the development of their original communities as immigrated employers. In this manner the migratory flows become functional to promotion of international integration and favour the economical, social and cultural relations.

The destination of the remittances sent from Italy does not reflect exactly the consistency of the immigrant communities, this because some of these communities are capable of higher savings or, at least, higher availability to send home some part of their savings. The differences between the amount of remittances respect to the settlements, based on 2009 calculations, is positive for Asia (+34,1 percentage points) and America (+4,9 percentage points). These are the continental areas that are the highest beneficiaries of the remittances of their immigrants also at world level: Asia 132 billion dollars, equal to 31,9% of the world volume of remittances in 2009 and Latin America 57 billion dollars, equal to 13,8%.

Proposals and projects to channel and enhance the impact of remittances in countries of origin are emerging from many international and national actors, including migrant communities themselves. Remittances are not automatically transformed into local development: policy intervention or appropriate actions and initiatives are needed in order to push in this direction.

Most development initiatives come from the local level through a decentralized development cooperation approach (municipalities, provinces, regions, and other civil society and business sector actors), while other initiatives are supported by Italian development cooperation. The *SME: Support Migrants' Entrepreneurship* project (2009-2011) is among the first type of initiatives, promoted by Veneto Lavoro, and co-financed by IFAD-International Fund for Agricultural Development in collaboration with Banca Veneto, the Veneto government, Banca Etica, Etimos Consortium, and

Fundatia Dezvoltarea Popoarelor Prin Sustinere Reciproca (a Romanian agency which also operates in Italy and Moldova). The project offers banking knowledge and tools to facilitate remittances and savings transfers, and establishes a fund to guarantee reliable and technical assistance to those who want to open a business in rural areas of the countries of origin (Romania and Moldova). The project therefore not only focuses on money transfers, but also movement of knowledge and above all *braingain*, that is to enhance the potential of knowledge gained by the Diaspora in projects aimed at stimulating development at home.

Another example of initiative aimed at encouraging this process is the MIDA – Migration for Development in Africa Programme, promoted by IOM with the support of Italian Cooperation (Ministry of Foreign Affairs). The scope of MIDA is to contribute to the socio-economic development of certain countries of origins of migrants residing in Italy, by identifying and transferring migrants' skills and financial, social and professional resources as well as promoting partnerships between origin and host communities. More specifically, the MIDA Programme supports migrants interested in contributing to the economic and social development of their country of origin through investments in small and medium enterprise projects, self-sustained entrepreneurial initiatives with social value in favour of the context of implementation, and characterized by the participation of a network of partners (local bodies, associations, enterprises, in Italy and in the country of origin) in a decentralized cooperation perspective. Thanks to MIDA, it was possible to provide migrant entrepreneurs with economic as well as technical support, through training courses and business start-up counseling. This support, which was not conditioned by the permanent return of migrants in the country of origin, led to the creation of small and medium ethnic enterprises capable to generate employment in the migrants' African countries of origin, in particular in agriculture and food processing sector. The valorization of migrants' remittances is a central element of MIDA strategy, which also promotes the collaboration between banks in Italy and in the migrants' countries of origin, and foster the elaboration of innovative financial products and effective mechanisms to gather, transfer and invest remittances in the countries of origin.

Short stay travel for business purposes

According to the United Nations World Trade Organization (UNWTO), in 2009 both national and international tourism has involved 880 million individuals and Europe has been the destination of approximately half of the world tourists. Italy is reported to be a highly attractive Country due to its extraordinary artistic heritage, the landscape and the food, but it is also encountering difficulties due to increasingly fierce competition that can be fought only by offering more competitive prices and reinforcing the *low cost* accommodation facilities.

This sector, as mentioned, is of fundamental importance for Italy. The touristic potential, as established by the ISTAT census conducted in 2009, is of 4.598.682 sleeping accommodations, of which almost one fourth in the hotels, in addition to camping grounds and touristic villages, rented rooms, farm holiday (agro-tourism) facilities, youth hostels, vacation homes, alpine shelters, *bed and breakfast* facilities. Based on some estimations (Bank of Italy 2009), the tourist industry, including its linked activities, has a global turnover of about 150 billion Euros (a little above 10% of the national Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and provides employment to 2,2 million workers. The touristic flows from abroad have alone ensured 30 billion Euros against the 26 billion spent by the Italian tourists traveling abroad.

A survey on the matter has been conducted by both ISTAT and the Bank of Italy on a vast sample, monitoring those travellers that included at least one overnight accommodation both in Italy as well as abroad. In this context, however, reference is made only to the survey results coming from the Bank of Italy, according to which the arrivals from abroad are not only for vacation purposes but also for study and training, religious purposes, medical care and thermal baths, honeymoons, shopping (but also for visits to relatives and friends, aspect related to permanent immigration) and also for short periods of work (less than 1 year), or for occupational purposes (seasonal or border work, representation activities, business meetings, business travel, fairs, shows and exhibitions, participation to congresses, conferences, etc.), as well as for training and refresher courses. The progressive internationalization of the labour market involves also travel in the opposite direction, taking Italian workers to foreign countries for short periods of activity.

The 72.540.000 travellers that have come from abroad in 2009, distributed over 365 days per year, demonstrate that, in average, every day approximately 200.000 foreign citizens enter Italy thus reinforcing the conviction that the concept of "border" is to be considered as fluid and ever more relative. Their entry into Italy comes mainly from the road borders (66,8%), secondly follow the airport borders (27,7%), the port borders (3,3%) and the train borders (2,2%). A good 58.247.000 individuals have come for personal reasons or for tourism and about one fifth (14.293.000) for occupational or work reasons: 28.931.000 have entered for one day only, without overnight stay. In the last five years the travellers for work reasons have increased with respect to those that travel for personal or vacation reasons.

Mention has been made above to those travellers coming from foreign countries that have contacts with their Country of origin or with the permanent migrants. In this case the most part are Italians that have permanently migrated abroad or their descendants that have the opportunity of returning to their places of origin or to learn about the places of their parents or ancestors. This type of traveller, whose accommodation is care of the relatives or friends, is around 8 million: 5.119.000 visiting relatives and 3.027.000 visiting friends, for a total of 71.997.000 overnight stays. This phenomenon doesn't concern only the citizens living abroad or their descendants, but also a growing number of foreign citizens that are interested in maintaining relations with the immigrants residing in Italy. Furthermore, in 2009 the foreign travellers that stayed in houses of their own property were 1.394.000, with an average of 14,2 overnight stays and an average expense of 528 Euros per trip.

These are travels linked to migratory remembrance (both those who depart as well as those

who come back) that, although having had little eco at public level so far, are not to be considered unworthy of consideration, given the high number of individuals involved, the consequent financial implications (to which higher attention is paid especially in this moment of crisis) and also the social and cultural links that express an ever more global context. The migratory phenomenon also deserves being presented in this aspect of intensive exchange, exercising a positive influx at economical and cultural level and facilitating the international cohabitation (see: Migrantes Foundation, *Italians in the World Report 2011*, Ed Idos, Rome, 2011, pp. 28-38).

The new flows of permanent settlement

It is some time now that the Italian population is more and more characterized by the prevalence of death over birth and by considerable ageing. The number of young workers between 18 and 44 years of age, according to the ISTAT projections, will decrease of 4 million and a half units between 2005 and 2020. The mirage of “zero immigration” is an absolutely unreal hypothesis and, according to EUROSTAT, in half a century would make Italy lose one sixth of its population.

The yearly increase of 250.000 units, high trends as certified by the latest ISTAT demographic projections, are to be considered as the most credible; these are certified by the trends registered in the last years. In reality, one can assume that in 2020 Italy will pass Germany as the first Country of immigration, while in 2050 it is foreseen that the number of foreign citizens will be of 12,4 million, equal to 18% of the entire population. This trend can be compared to that in the post-war period, where 3 million Italian emigrations were recorded in the ‘50s as well as the ‘60s, at first overseas and subsequently towards Europe, in particular towards Germany and Switzerland. At that time this was called “the Exodus” and it involved all families of southern Italy through relatives, friends and relations: just as important are the incoming flows to which we are now assisting.

As a consequence of these demographic and occupational necessities, the flows naturally require adequate regulations and it would be wrong to consider these as not required, not insisting on the integration of a presence that is bound to increase in any case, considering determinant only the opposition regulations, which although necessary have limited effects, are expensive and subject to unexpected events, as was observed during the events of North Africa in the first semester of 2011.

ITALY. ISTAT Demographic forecasts: high scenario (2006-2050)

	2006	2050		
Global Population (it. + for.)	59,1	67,3 mil. HT	61,6 mil. MT	55,6 mil. LT
of which Italians	56,2	54,9 mil. HT	50,9 mil. MT	46,7 mil. LT
of which foreigners	2,939 mil.	12,4 mil. HT	10,7 mil. MT	9,0 mil. LT
Births	560.010	435.000 HT	300.000 MT	169.000 LT
Deaths	557.892	800.000		
Average age	42,8	48,9 HT		
0-14 years (v.a.)	8,3 mil.	9,3 mil. HT		
0-14 years (%)	14,1	13,8		
15-64 years(v.a.)	39 mil.	35,8 mil.		
15-64 years (%)	66,0	53,2		
Over 65 years (v.a.)	11,8 mil.	22,2 mil. HT		
Over 65 years (%)	19,9	33		

HT = High Trend; MT = Medium Trend; LT = Low Trend.

SOURCE: Caritas/Migrantes - *Immigration Statistics Dossier*. Based on data from ISTAT, *Demographic forecast 1st January 2007-1st January 2051*, www.istat.it

As far as the demographic forecasts shown in the table are concerned, summarized here below is a comment of the famous demographer Antonio Golini (Caritas/Migrantes - *2008 Immigration Statistics Dossier*, pp. 116-124). Foreign immigration, with such intense and overwhelming flows that could not have been imagined, are devastating, and will continue to

devastate the quantity, the structure and the tendencies of the Italian resident population, considering that the citizens of Italian origin are experiencing, ever since three decades, an extraordinary and persisting low fertility, of which the intensity and duration has no precedents in the history of mankind.

Foreign immigration, that will settle mainly in the richer regions of the Centre-North (the population of which, in this manner, would become comparatively younger) has to be considered as a structural and central element of the Italian population and no longer as a marginal and marginalized element as it has been considered and collocated up to now. We are facing a real revolution that requires more active policies than the actual ones in terms of integration, with particular reference to labour, housing, health, school and social mobility, essential components for a correct and appropriate growth of the second generations and therefore a longer lasting and more advantageous social peace.

The ageing of the Italian population will continue intensively, just slightly touched by the positive contribution of immigration, both with the increase up to 33% of the over sixty five year olds (against the actual 20%), as well as with the decrease to 12,8% of the under fifteen year olds. The population in working age will diminish, despite the foreign immigration, of approximately 1,1 million individuals in the Centre-North, but of a good 4,5 million in central Italy and this demographic change will certainly influence the richness produced there.

The economically developed countries, due to the diminishing working age population, will require immigrants; while in the countries under way of development the working age population will increase of almost 1,7 billion individuals. The migratory pressure South-North will therefore be very strong and uncontrollable. In particular, in mid century Africa will reach 2 billion inhabitants and the Africans in Italy, presently slightly less than 1 million, subsequent to the demographic explosion of their continent, may reach 3 million individuals. The possibility and capability of creating sufficient work, and decent work, in order to cope with the offer that in the coming years will largely exceed 1 billion and a half of individuals, constitutes one of the forthcoming main challenges for mankind; challenge that, evidently, in general may largely interfere with the more stringent Italian and European projects.

These are the future scenarios, as summarized by a recent comment of Antonio Golini, with an Italian population where one third are over-sixty-five year olds – a fact that will create many problems to the compatibility of the social security system. Within this complex state of issues there will also be the future pension scheme of the immigrants: what will happen to the immigrants when, after 15-20-25 years, they will arrive to the retirement age? Their intermittent career, often lacking of social security contributions even when they are working, will not allow them to accrue a retirement pension (which may, at that time, have been suppressed or consistently scaled down), but at the time of their normal retirement age they will receive a very reduced pension amount, and often not including the integration provision which is however not very widespread.

This is another reason to deal with the integration projects, also as an expression of gratitude for the positive activities presently being carried out by the immigrants. It is even more important to deal with them if one considers the vast and persisting undeclared employment, a national plague that, besides creating damages to the public finances, constitutes a severe penalization of rights: the immigrants, when not in a conditions to demonstrate a labour income, are prejudiced under many aspects (renewal of the residence permit, access to mortgages, family reunions, obtainment of citizenship, social security benefits).

In the following scenarios the illegal flows are also treated. All good-minded individuals recognize the necessity of controlling the coasts, avoiding that they become the docking facilities for the illegal migration organizers and the base of operation for their lucrative commerce (2,5 million dollars in the world, according to UN). This severity, however, is to be contemplated along with the respect of the asylum rights and humanitarian protection, continuing to be required by those individuals escaping from desperate situations and risk of life. As opposed to the arrivals on shore one should not forget that in the majority of cases at the origin of the irregularity there are

legal entries into Italy, with or without Visa, of tens of millions of foreigners that come for tourism, business, visits and other reasons. Against these impressive flows, which cannot be eliminated, even the highest rate of landings reached in 2008 (almost 37 thousand individuals), subsequently exceeded in 2011 (over 60 thousand landings), assume a relative magnitude.

In 2010 the individuals intercepted in an irregular position were 50.717 and of these 40% were sent back at the borders or deported or repatriated. In the course of the years 2000 the number of intercepted individuals touched 150 thousand units in 2002 and exceeded 100 thousand units also in the other years between 2001 and 2006, while after this period the number went constantly decreasing.

To this extent it is important to reassert that the control of the maritime coasts as well as that of the land borders will be inefficient unless the normal routes for immigration are incentivized. In this case, the necessity of rules is not in discussion, rather their correct application.

According to the social world and also to many experts, this should bring to an innovative reconsideration of the flexibility of the quotas, the procedures for the coming together of employers and employees, the time required for seeking a new job, considering also the periods covered by social security (salary integration or unemployment benefits) which should be extended. Furthermore, it should be recalled that Italy is also a junction and a forced destination for women, men and minors, victims of trafficking for sexual exploitation and, ever more frequently, for labour exploitation (especially in agriculture), a phenomenon that is being fought also by granting residence permits for social protection with the involvement of the European Return Fund.

The great objective of integration

A part of the Italians believe that a multi-ethnic presence in the Italian society is acceptable but not multicultural, let alone intercultural, since this would involve exchanges, links and mixing, while instead the “purity” of traditions should be safeguarded. We are facing the revisited philosophy of immigrants as “guest workers” that Germany since several years has definitively overcome by betting on integration. Only integration, even if presently shadowed by the excessive insistence on security, can help to understand what is happening and what will happen in the future. The immigrants have become aware, with regret, of this restrictive and short breath setting and, according to some surveys, they have summarized this Italian attitude in two concepts: “residence permit” (temporary basis) and “racism” (hostility).

Sometimes, as a justification, it is stated that Italy is a recent Country of immigration, while others prefer to highlight that the first law on immigration in Italy dates back to 1986 and that the migratory flows had begun ten years before, and therefore it is time for a more mature policy. To prepare for the turning of mid century and, even before, to what will happen in 15 years, more forceful social and family policies are required together with the necessary resources, a requirement that within the NGO has been called “integration package”. In this context, the various objectives that have been expressed, may be presented point by point:

- Italians should learn to distinguish the real problems from the wrong or partial information, to overcome the prejudices and the mental reservations not aiming towards the criteria of equal opportunities, to privilege an opening towards integrating respect to the banishing of the “strangers” that are ostracized instead of being integrated;
- the immigrants, on their part, are asked not to isolate themselves by participating to the social life of the community that has welcomed them, contributing to the building of rules and objectives which they share, naturally, expecting in return to be respected and appreciated. In this specific sense, expressing the right to vote in the local elections or in revising the rules of citizenship, too harsh not only for the children born in Italy but also for their parents who are permanently established, does not weaken the national cohesion, rather strengthens it.

A significant example on the process of integration is that of the Albanians, at first

considered a prototype of a “scoundrel community” (Gian Antonio Stella, *L’orda. Quando gli albanesi eravamo noi*, Milano, Rizzoli, 2003), even if a prior historic event in the XV century saw 200.000 Catholics escape from Albania in order not to be subjected to the Turkish domain, finding positive integration in various regions of southern Italy. In 1990, at the fall of the Marxist regime, 1 million Albanians (one fourth of the total population) escaped towards Greece and Italy either with desperate coastal landings or as organized by illegal traffickers in the course of all the ‘90s. These escapes were determined by the dramatic conditions of the Country (civil war, financial meltdown, lack of occupation, misery). As the situation of their Country improved and having regulated the flows, today the Albanians are considered a well integrated community, in their occupations and within the Italian society. Several factors have influenced this integration, firstly, the ability of the community to make themselves accepted and the ability of its “elite” in their representation; it has also been understood that the most part of the criminal charges are not attributable to the single individuals rather to organized crime. If the Albanian still appears as a “foreigner”, certainly he is no longer a “stranger”, rather an individual of different origin that has demonstrated to be available, trustworthy, respectful of the institutions and, for what concerns the labour market, capable of performing all kinds of work (Rando Devole, Franco Pittau, Antonio Ricci, Giuliana Urso, a cura di, *Gli Albanesi in Italia. Conseguenze economiche e sociali dell’immigrazione*, Edizioni Idos, Roma, 2008 - *The Albanians in Italy. Economic and Social consequences of Immigration*, Ed. Idos, Rome, 2008).

Under the institutional profile, in the month of June 2010, the inter-ministerial project for integration called “Identity and Meeting” was presented and favourably judged. The project presents a plan for integration in security, qualifying as an Italian model far from assimilationism and multiculturalism. The document presents itineraries based on rights and duties, responsibilities and opportunities, with a view towards a reciprocal relation that stimulates the individual and the social initiatives rather than the State, identifying five areas of action: education and learning, from language to values; work and vocational training; housing and management of the territory; access to essential services; handling of minors and second generations.

In this governmental document, as is done at European level, emphasis is given to the circular migrations, the returns and to the aids for development, progressively diminished to a very low level. In the meantime, however, the conviction, supported by data, that immigration is acquiring a more stable character has taken root. In the document there are appreciable openings towards civil service, critical analysis respect to what has been done in the past, identification of lines of action to be taken and in particular criteria for verification, that is, the monitoring of the solid implementation of what is proposed in the document itself.

In fact, the basis for a dignified integration can only be set after having granted to the foreign citizen equal opportunities in respect of housing, work, education, health and political expression, superseding the model of subordinate integration of the functional-utilitarian type, channelling the migrants towards determinate sectors and assigning them only less appreciable activities.

From marginalization to equal opportunities

It is necessary to avoid that the immigrant presence, although structural to the development of the Country, becomes a virtual suburb, meaning with this term a marginal reality that has no value, “prey” of exclusion. In fact, “not being Italian citizens” is a basic discrimination that can be radically overcome by obtaining citizenship and it can in large part be realigned, but not completely, by the acquisition of equal rights in different areas, among which the more important is that of acquiring the right to vote in local elections. On the other hand, the same concession of citizenship if not accompanied by an appropriate itinerary of confrontation, interaction and exchange, rather with a sense of participation, by itself is not sufficient to guarantee the efficiency of the migration policies, as was experienced by the French *banlieues* affair. Foreign citizens are intrinsically characterized by a combination of negative conditionings, being subject to the same duties as the Italians (plus others which are foreseen only for them) but without having the same rights.

It is true that the judicial evolution has brought to assimilation of foreigners to citizens of the Country in which they live for what concerns fundamental rights and many social rights, as for example, instruction and health. Even for citizens that do not come from another member state, provided they have an EU residence permit for long term residents, the right of stay and a considerable assimilation to Italian citizens is guaranteed, without however contemplating the right to vote in the local elections and access to public service jobs. The situation for the non-EU immigrants not having a residence permit for long terms residents, is instead more “peripheral” and marginal for what concerns the fruition of rights and services (see “La popolazione immigrata: una periferia virtuale?” – Migrant population: a virtual periphery?, in Idos, *Le condizioni di vita e di lavoro degli immigrati nell’area romana* – Life and work conditions of migrants in the Roman area, Idos, Roma, 2008, pp. 232-244).

At bureaucratic level, closely tied to the juridical one, there are a long series of obstacles: the complexity of the procedures to be followed for the release of a residence permit and for those related to concession of citizenship, language and in some cases cultural barriers, scarce availability (and often inadequate information) on behalf of the civil servants and counter operators, poor use of mediators, lack of immigrants as employees in the public offices, lack of availability of support services (not only in the schools and health facilities), a not often organic connection to the social organizations. For example, amongst the immigrant population, only 68% is registered to the National Health Service, as can be seen from the second report of the Ministry of Interior on the territorial councils – this explains why the most part of the hospitalizations, in the case of immigrants, occurs in emergency or through the emergency runs of the hospitals.

Another emblematic example, at social level, is that of the housing conditions. Despite refusal to provide housing to regular immigrants is legally punishable with fines or with imprisonment of up to 3 years, in the newspaper the advertisements of this kind are very frequent. Almost daily, local newspapers state the seriousness and the diffusion of the speculative (and discriminative) actions that are performed against the immigrant population.

A further example to be mentioned concerns the school world. It is estimated that the problems of scholastic delay of various nature involve more than three fourths of the foreign students and this is particularly worrisome in a Country with a high rate of school withdrawal (one fifth of the enrolments) before diplomas. In particular, there is a significant difference among those that are not admitted to the final secondary school exams: for the Italians it is of 1 student every 50, for the foreigners it is 1 student every 10 (school year 2005 – 2006). CNEL elaborates annually these and other differences, using social-statistical indicators, preparing reports on *Index of immigrant integrations in Italy* (available on www.cnel.it)

The discriminatory treatment of the foreigners can be avoided only with the establishment of equal opportunities, which are to be considered as an integral part of the integration strategies. The National Office of Racial Antidiscrimination UNAR created in 2004 is the first national instrument for the constant prevention, monitoring and contrast of the ethnic and racial discrimination. Its birth was foreseen by the legislative decree no. 215/2003, implementing the provisions of the EU directive no. 43/2000 for the promotion of equal treatment and abolishment of discrimination against race and ethnic origin.

Even in Italy, the xenophobic feelings and symbolic representations are recurrent, in particular against some forms of ethnic – racial and national differences. According to the UNAR reports, the acts of discrimination, not only in the work environment, affect mainly the Africans, the Rumanians, the Chinese, the Moroccans, the Bangladeshi, the Roma and the Sintians (gypsies). The Rumanian community, in particular has been the subject of negative reactions by the Italians that have gone well over the single facts attributable to members of that community. The charges against the Rumanians, from 31.465 in 2005, have gone to 41.703 in 2008 (+32,5%), but in the same period the Rumanian residents have more than doubled, going from 297.570 to 796.477 (+267,7%) without counting that the charges (not always transformed to convictions) are referred to the entire foreign population, including the illegal immigration one. This data therefore, brings toward another direction: the continuous identification of the Rumanians as a “scoundrel

community”, repeating the error made years before with the Albanians.

One must get used to identifying the Rumanian presence under another perspective. The Rumanian community, even if it started to register its immigration after the fall of the Berlin wall, has become in 2003 the first community in Italy and it solidly maintains its position with 1 million registered in the municipal registers, one fifth of the entire foreign presence. Italy, together with Spain, has been the most preferred EU Country by these new migrants, especially after the abolition of the short stay visa (in 2003) and the accession of Rumania to the EU (in 2007), procedural dispositions that have further facilitated the flows. The Rumanians are integrated in all the work areas, in particular building construction and assistance to families: in Rome just as much as Milan, one half of the enrolments to the Building Fund are foreigners, among these the Rumanians prevail. At the beginning of the ‘90s, most Rumanians emigrated to collect the necessary funds, which would allow them to start an activity in their Country upon return, after this period the return became more difficult. However, the physical return has been replaced by the virtual return, through the remittances sent home (Franco Pittau, Antonio Ricci, Laura Ildiko Timsa, a cura di, *I romeni in Italia tra rifiuto e accoglienza* -“The Romanians in Italy between refusal and acceptance”, Ed Idos/Sinnos, Roma, 2010, in particular pg. 22-26).

Another significant case is that of the Moroccan community, highly exposed to prejudice in the past and in part also presently. The Moroccans who were at first integrated in Italy were mainly farm workers and street vendors of rugs and hand crafted products. Very soon, those who came from the farms were joined by those coming from the cities with a higher level of education. They were mainly men, either single or with families who had stayed in their home Country. Students also arrived, attracted by the Italian universities, also because in the meantime it had become much harder to obtain a visa for other European countries with more ancient migratory tradition. On completion of the stabilization process of these first settlements, in which both the employees and the self-employed workers had taken part, starting from the ‘90s the reunifications increased, with the consequent development of family settlements and, therefore presence of minors in the schools and women, often with higher education, that lived the migratory experience without being stressed by the dynamics of illegality, which their predecessors often had to cope with.

This community is today demonstrating a great affection to Italy, as reported by the data on naturalizations, family reunions, obtainment of citizenship, second generations, although it does not receive satisfactory responses from the Italian population. According to the Court of Cassation, calling an individual “Moroccan” is offensive and racist because such term “has prejudicial significance” and doesn’t simply designate the ethnic origin, especially when it is addressed to a colleague of whom the name is well known. To this extent, what expressed in verdict no.19378/2005 of the Court of Cassation reads: “a noun adjective which identifies the ethnic origin of an individual and the addressing of the same individual with such term with evident scorn and mockery, constitutes an insult with the clear intent of racist discrimination, making the offence even more reproachable”. In another verdict of the same Supreme Court, no. 41011/2008, it is emphasized that “in the injurious term dirty Moroccan (porca marocchina) there is a manifest intent of racist hostility” and being this an aggravation of the crime of insult it is possible to proceed without first filing a complaint. “just these sentiments of racist scorn, hostility, with a will to offend a person of a different race – states the Court of Cassation – nourish the conflict between individuals that confirms the presence of racial hatred”.

To avoid that the immigrants become a suburb of society it is necessary to individuate adequate action strategies that reduce the situations of disadvantage (and consequently push away the possible conflicts that may arise), favouring also the progressive emerging of a social and juridical area that is fully and solidly shared. Very forward-looking strategies and brave choices on behalf of the policy makers would be necessary, in addition to a more coherent behaviour on behalf of the citizens and their aggregate communities. Only a realistic and responsible taking charge of the present situation and the risks of marginalization can bring to the efficient exercise of an anti-peripheral function. Common effort is needed for the creation of shared time and spaces that gather together indifferently Italians and immigrants around the common progress objective of the

Country: this will be the best antidote against exclusion and poverty.

In this itinerary, the indications coming from the European Court of rights that have been elaborated in matter of equal opportunities can be of great help (cf. Roberta Medda-Windischer, *Nuove minoranze. Immigrazione tra diversità culturale e coesione sociale* Cedom, Padova, 2010 “New minorities - Immigration between cultural diversity and social cohesion”) as well as the verdicts of the Court of Justice of Luxembourg pronounced in occasion of prejudicial remands on behalf of the single member States of EU. These jurisprudential orientations, showing the impact of rights on concrete aspects of migrants’ lives, help to better respond to the difficult tasks that we are approaching in a society evermore marked by the presence and by the role of the migrants that, for this same reason, together with us can contribute to build - with effort, intelligence, creativity, severity and patience – the scenarios for an intercultural future.

Idos Study and Research Centre bibliography

For the purpose of this research, a wide use has been made of the scientific documentation produced by Idos, a research centre specialized on migration studies in Italy and supported by a team of senior researchers working in this field for almost 20 years as well as several external experts.

On this topic Idos does not only elaborate studies, researches and surveys (in which transfuses data collected and processed statistics from different sources), but also organizes or participates in conferences, seminars and training courses both in Italy and abroad, in collaboration with international organizations, national and regional bodies and the ecclesiastic networks of Caritas and Migrantes Foundation.

Since 1991, each year, commissioned by Caritas Italiana and Migrantes, Idos produces a socio-statistical report on immigration in Italy called *Dossier Statistico Immigrazione* (Edizioni Idos, Rome, October 2011). This book, about 500 pages, is published in 20,000 copies and distributed throughout all Italy. In September 2003, in cooperation with the International Organization for Migration (Iom) and the National Council for Economics and Labour (Cnel) an English edition was also published (*Contemporary Migration in Italy. Current trends and future prospects*, Edizioni Nuova Anterem, Rome, September 2003), in occasion of the Italian Presidency semester of the EU.

Since the end of 2002 Idos was chosen by the Ministry of Interior as technical support of the National Contact Point at the European Migration Network of the European Commission, due to the capacity to gather and analyze information and data on a national level. Several comparative studies have been uploaded on the national website www.emnitaly.it and three bilingual reports have been published: *Migration Policies, High qualified workers, Health sector. First Emn Italy Report*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, December 2009; *Unaccompanied minor, Assisted return, International protection, Second Emn Italy Report*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, March 2010; *Labour Market and Migration. Third Emn Italy Report*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, November 2010. An Italian edition of the Emn Glossary on Asylum and Migration has also been recently finalized: *Glossario Emn Migrazione e Asilo*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, July 2011. Three bilingual pilot studies have also been edited: *The impact of Immigration on Italy's Society*, Emn/Ministry of Interior, Rome, December 2004; *Irregular Migration in Italy*, Emn/Ministry of Interior, Rome, December 2005; *Return Migration: the Italian case*, Emn/Ministry of Interior, Rome, December 2006.

For the National Council for Economics and Labour (Cnel), Idos implements an immigration database and produces a yearly report on *Indices of territorial integration of immigrants in Italy*, in which, through a system of original indicators and indices, the researchers apply a methodology in order to measure the different levels of social, cultural and employment of foreigners in various regions of Italy. Among the reports uploaded on the website www.cnel.it, the last printed output is: Cnel, *Indici di integrazione degli immigrati in Italia. VI Rapporto*, Cnel, Rome, March 2011. Within the same field of research, we shall also quote the report referring to the

EU project INTI (bilingual version): Idos Centro Studi e Ricerche, *Measuring Integration. The Italian Case*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, March 2008.

For its own initiative or on behalf of other institutions, Idos also carries out research activity on specific issues related to immigration as well as on emigration from Italy. Among these examples it's important to remember the annual publications: *Rapporto sui Lavoratori di origine immigrata negli archivi previdenziali* edited for INPS - National Institute for Social Pensions, Edizioni Idos, Rome, May 2011 (since 2005); *Rapporto Italiani nel Mondo* edited for the Migrants Foundation, Edizioni Idos, Rome, June 2011 (since 2006) and the *Osservatorio Romano sulle Migrazioni* for Caritas Rome, Edizioni Idos, Roma, December 2011 (since 2007), the latter being anticipated by a monographic volume: Camera di Commercio e Caritas di Roma, *Gli immigrati nell'economia romana: lavoro, imprenditoria, risparmio, rimesse*, Camera di Commercio, Rome, August 2003.

There are several monographies: Oim, Caritas di Roma/Dossier Statistico Immigrazione, Archivio dell'immigrazione, *L'immagine degli immigrati in Italia. Media, società civile e mondo del lavoro*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, April 2005; Caritas Italiana, *Dalle consulte e dai consiglieri aggiunti al diritto di voto*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, July 2005; Deutch Botschaft Rom – Caritas Italiana, *Vom Einwanderer zum Mitbürger: Erfahrungen in Deutschland und Italien*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, February 2008; Idos Centro Studi e Ricerche, *Le condizioni di vita e di lavoro degli immigrati nell'area romana*, Edizioni Idos, Roma, July 2008; Ethnoland Foundation, *Immigrati Imprenditori*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, January 2009; Ministero dell'Interno/Fondo Europeo Integrazione, *Immigrazione, regioni e consigli territoriali per l'immigrazione. I dati fondamentali 2009*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, June 2010; Regione Lazio, *Il Lazio nel Mondo. Immigrazione ed Emigrazione 2011*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, July 2011.

Finally, the utmost attention has been paid to the elaboration of monographies aimed at analyzing specific foreign groups: Caritas Italiana – CNEL, *Europa. Allargamento a Est e immigrazione*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, June 2004 (published on the occasion of the Eastern enlargement of the EU); Caritas Italiana, *Polonia. Nuovo Paese di Frontiera. Da migranti a comunitari*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, June 2006; Caritas Italiana, *Romania. Immigrazione e lavoro in Italia. Problemi e prospettive*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, June 2008; Idos Centro studi e ricerche, *Gli albanesi in Italia. Conseguenze economiche e sociali dell'immigrazione*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, September 2008; Caritas/Migrants, *America Latina-Italia. Vecchi e nuovi migranti*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, September 2009; Caritas/Migrants, *Africa-Italia. Scenari Migratori*, Edizioni Idos, Rome, June 2010; Caritas Italiana/Confederatia Caritas Romania, *I romeni in Italia tra rifiuto e accoglienza / Romanii di Italia intre respingere si acceptare*, Edizioni Sinnos/Idos, Rome, March 2010 (bilingual edition in Italian and Romanian).

Region	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	%	Var. 09-10	Var. 0 10
EU 15	201.285	201.677	238.256	224.534	228.613	312.934	4,9	36,9	55
UE New 12	776.108	935.958	931.964	995.902	966.454	945.280	14,8	-2,2	21
Central & East. Europe	347.925	353.541	387.191	393.025	397.545	400.333	6,3	0,7	15
Other European	19.973	32.630	48.314	42.689	35.320	48.260	0,8	36,6	141
EUROPE	1.345.291	1.523.806	1.605.725	1.656.150	1.627.932	1.706.807	26,7	4,8	26
North Africa	311.556	382.884	465.304	464.535	402.315	352.446	5,5	-12,4	13
Central East Africa	37.133	40.664	47.282	47.679	47.758	73.916	1,2	54,8	99
Central West Africa	262.279	323.602	397.086	413.289	385.005	369.916	5,8	-3,9	41
Southern Africa	1.334	1.108	1.297	1.536	1.202	2.559	0,0	112,9	91
AFRICA	612.302	748.258	910.969	927.039	836.280	798.837	12,5	-4,5	30
Far East Asia	1.212.971	1.240.439	2.438.825	2.487.709	2.796.766	2.517.341	39,4	-10,0	107
Sub-continental Asia	85.075	245.690	326.378	456.698	535.918	488.211	7,6	-8,9	473
South Asia	10.837	11.304	11.985	12.029	11.526	20.167	0,3	75,0	86
CIS Asia	9.766	13.311	17.180	36.422	52.592	44.623	0,7	-15,2	356
ASIA	1.318.649	1.510.744	2.794.368	2.992.858	3.396.802	3.070.342	48,1	-9,6	132
North America	36.151	25.223	24.520	26.269	25.374	34.116	0,5	34,5	-6
Central-South America	585.298	710.065	698.202	769.182	855.403	705.662	11,1	-17,5	20
AMERICA	621.449	735.288	722.722	795.451	880.777	739.778	11,6	-16,0	19
OCEANIA	3.102	3.557	3.558	3.539	3.666	16.524	0,3	350,7	432
Not divisible	-	6.013	1.913	1.912	2.361	53.586	0,8	2169,6	
Total	3.900.793	4.527.666	6.039.255	6.376.949	6.747.818	6.385.874	100,0	-5,4	63

* Data from April 1, 2011

SOURCE: Statistical Dossier on Immigration Caritas/Migrantes. Based on data from Bank of Italy

ITALY. Non-nationals by continent of origin (1970-2010)

YEARS	Europe	Africa	Asia	America	Oceania	Stateless and other	TOTAL
1970	61,3	3,3	7,8	25,7	1,9	-	143.838
1971	62,6	3,3	7,8	24,5	1,8	-	156.179
1972	60,8	3,7	8,3	24,7	1,8	0,7	167.961
1973	59,9	4,2	8,6	24,8	1,8	0,7	175.746
1974	59,5	4,4	8,6	25,1	1,8	0,6	186.423
1975	60,5	4,7	8,1	24,3	1,8	0,6	186.415
1976	59,8	4,7	8,8	24,3	1,8	0,6	186.713
1977	59,2	5,1	9,6	23,9	1,7	0,5	194.062
1978	59,3	5,0	9,6	23,9	1,7	6,5	194.024
1979	56,6	6,5	8,6	21,8	2,0	4,5	205.449
1980	53,2	10,0	14,0	21,0	1,4	0,4	298.749
1981	52,7	10,5	14,6	20,5	1,4	0,3	331.665
1982	52,1	10,9	14,8	20,5	1,4	0,3	355.431
1983	52,0	10,7	15,3	20,2	1,4	0,4	383.765
1984	51,9	10,7	15,6	20,1	1,4	0,3	403.293
1985	52,1	10,5	15,4	19,5	1,4	1,1	423.004
1986	52,3	10,6	15,2	20,3	1,4	0,2	450.227
1987	46,9	16,0	16,7	19,0	1,2	0,2	572.103
1988	45,3	18,3	16,1	18,9	1,2	0,2	645.423
1989	43,0	20,3	16,4	19,2	0,9	0,2	490.388
1990	33,5	30,5	18,7	16,4	0,8	0,1	781.138
1991	34,5	30,8	17,8	16,2	0,6	0,1	*648.935
1992	34,7	30,8	17,7	16,1	0,6	0,1	*589.457
1993	36,9	29,1	17,5	15,9	0,5	0,1	*649.102

1994	41,0	28,0	16,0	14,5	0,3	0,1	*677.791
1995	40,7	28,2	16,4	14,3	0,3	0,1	*729.159
1996	37,5	30,6	18,5	13,1	0,2	0,1	*986.020
1997	37,4	30,4	18,9	13,0	0,2	0,1	*1.022.896
1998	39,0	29,0	19,0	12,7	0,2	0,1	*1.090.820
1999	39,6	29,1	19,1	12,0	0,2	0,0	*1.340.655
2000	40,7	28,0	19,2	11,8	0,2	0,0	*1.379.749
2001	41,4	26,9	19,1	11,6	0,2	0,9	*1.448.392
2002	42,6	30,0	18,0	9,3	18,0	-	1.549.373
2003	45,9	27,6	16,8	9,5	0,1	-	1.990.159
2004	46,7	26,7	16,9	9,6	0,1	-	2.402.157
2005	48,8	23,1	17,4	10,6	0,1	-	2.670.514
2006	47,3	26,0	17,0	9,6	0,1	-	2.938.922
2007	52,0	23,2	16,1	8,6	0,1	-	3.432.651
2008	53,6	22,4	15,8	8,1	0,1	-	3.897.295
2009	53,6	22,0	16,2	8,1	0,1	-	4.235.059
2010	53,4	21,6	16,8	8,1	0,1	-	4.570.317
YEARS	Europe	Africa	Asia	America	Oceania	Stateless and other	TOTAL

*Residence permits elaborated by Istat - Since 2002 data on non-national residents

SOURCE: Idos Study and Research Centre. Based on data from Ministry of Interior and Istat

Summarizing table on immigration in Italy, absolute and percentage values (2005-2010)

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Total resident population	58.751.711	59.131.287	59.619.290	60.045.068	60.340.328
Of which non-nationals	2.670.514	2.938.922	3.432.651	3.897.295	4.235.059
% Incidence of non-nationals within the total population	4,5	5,0	5,8	6,5	7,0
% Women within the total non-national resident population	49,9	50,6	50,4	50,8	51,3
Non-nationals born abroad during the year	52.000	57.000	63.000	72.472	77.148
% Minors within the total non-national resident population	586.000	666.000	767.000	862.453	932.675
Enrolled at school	424.683	500.512	574.133	628.937	673.592
Acquisitions of citizenship by marriage and long-stay	19.266	35.766	38.466	39.484	40.084
Second-generation resident population	-	398.205	457.345	518.700	572.720
Estimate of overall regular presence (Dossier Caritas/Migrantes)	3.035.144	3.690.052	3.987.112	4.329.000	4.919.000
<i>Territorial distribution of resident population</i>					
North West	36,5	36,3	35,6	35,1	35,0
North East	27,4	27,3	26,9	27,0	26,6
Centre	24,0	24,6	25,0	25,1	25,3
South	8,6	8,5	8,9	9,1	9,3
Islands	3,5	3,3	3,6	3,7	2,8
Italy	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
<i>Disaggregation of resident population by country of origin</i>					
Europe	48,8	49,6	52,0	53,6	53,6
Africa	23,1	22,3	23,2	22,4	22,0
Asia	17,4	18,0	16,1	15,8	16,2
America	10,6	9,7	8,6	8,1	8,1
Oceania	0,1	0,4	0,1	0,1	0,1
Italy	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

** Provisional data

SOURCE: Statistical Dossier on Immigration Caritas/Migrantes. Based on data from various sources

