

INTEGRATION POLICIES IN MODERN AGE OF MIGRATIONS

Alessio Caracciolo
University of Bari "Aldo Moro", Italy
alessio.caracciolo.3@gmail.com

Abstract:

During last century, especially since the late '70s, there was a drastic increase in the level of legal and clandestine immigration into the European Union, to which Community institutions have provided with an inadequate answer. Analyzing integration models and their application can one work a comparison between theoretical formulations and practical confirmations, especially about long term effects of the lack of a structural program aimed at regulating in a forward-looking manner the migration phenomena, which is intrinsic in human nature. The aim of this paper is to offer an overview about integration models application to the current situation, characterized by the conjunction of an increase in migratory fluxes and the global economic and financial crisis, in a Europe more and more concerned about the potential implications for internal security, but still far from the adoption of an agreed roadmap of concrete measures. Through a comparison of the systems implemented in some States, there will be a special focus to the model "of the emergency" that characterizes Italy, revealing how inadequate it is in a long term reception perspective, that is inevitable due to methods and motives correlated to what could be called a new age of migrations. Thereby, in conclusion, will be offered some interesting train of thought on regulation perspectives for achieving the harmonization of the social framework, in the spirit of a more acceptable reception, according to contemporary demands.

Keywords: European integration, Social inclusion, Human rights, Democracy, Sustainable development.

1. INTRODUCTION

Last century have been characterized by a considerable increase of migratory fluxes. Whether during the first half of the 20th century, also because of atrocities of global conflicts, the main vectors for emigrants was US directed ships, like in a prosecution of the search of *luck in the New World* which started fundamentally since the discovery of the Americas, in the second half the same European countries from which typically the vessels departed becomes also an ongoing destination for immigration. For populations not only from Mediterranean countries, but also from the African and Asian outback, which runs from political turbulences and atavistic armed conflicts dues to a bad planning and a worst implementation in decolonization politics, it forge a whole new myth, the *European dream*. After more than half century it is possible to contextualize even for the Old Continent the sentence whose figure on a plaque at Ellis Island: "*On the day of arrival, most immigrants felt both hope and apprehension. On Ellis Island, the weary travelers would be observed, examined and either permitted to land or sent back to their homelands. Many immigrants had invested all they owned in the journey, and exclusion at this point would almost certainly cause great financial and emotional hardships*". Today the same situation occurs in Europe, where old American's ethnics stereotypes are replaced by people's prejudices which label one ethnic group or another as addicted to thieving or bound up in work, more inclined to delinquency than to education, intrinsically greedy or charitable, whipping up such mistrust and, ultimately, a thinly disguised racism which makes unenforceable every integration model. The framework that is perceived is a failed integration, which seems more a mere tolerance of the alien on the condition of demonstrating worthy of that dignity which should be ensured to all person. Europe in the new millennium opens itself with suspicion to refugees, because it has to, and to professionals, to face a drastic falling in birth rate, labelling all others as illegals, failing upon taking up the duty of guide for emerging democracies.

The first part of this paper analyses the latest developments of migratory phenomena and the most widespread integration politics. Describing the carried out search and its perspectives, special attention will be paid to Italian emergency model. The conclusion will be that we cannot forget of having been a people of migrants if we wants to effectively regulate migrations, as this means to have learnt nothing from the past and at the same time have no foresight to face a consubstantial practice of human being: since prehistoric times mankind born nomadic, and settles for safety and economic reasons. If one of these cease, migration is inevitable. An interesting train of thought for research perspectives has been given by the UN report dated June 2000, which have been confirmed by ISTAT data in 2015: if its predictions were to be confirmed also in the future, the so-called *replacement migration* would be the only way to keep workable the welfare system applied in this day and age.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. The scale of migratory phenomenon today

According to data provided by Italian Ministry for Equal Opportunities in Statistical Dossier Immigration 2015, in 2014 worldwide immigrants raised to about 240 millions, which means approximately 3% of global population. Among these, around 630 thousands applied for asylum, compared with about 423 thousands of first semester 2015. If that data will be confirmed even for second semester, the total number of asylum-seekers would have increased among 2014 and 2015 by at least 30%. An uncritical reading of that data would result in the statement that fluxes towards Europe are alarmingly growing, because the number of asylum requests hides a vastly number of unnoticed immigrants. Furthermore, is also not without significance the influence of global population increasing, from 7,22 billions of January 2014 to 7,38 billions of November 2015 (ONU, World Population prospects: the 2015 Revision), and of new crisis scenarios not only connected to sadly notorious news related to international terrorism, but also to escalation of local conflicts. Often described as *economic migrants*, people coming from Africa's poorest states are mostly rejected because they didn't match international criteria for recognition of *refugee status*. In Italy from January to June 2015 there were 22 thousands of new applications, of which just 6% have been recognized as *refugees*, 18% the *subsidiary protection* and 25% an *humanitarian permit*: this means that more than half of applicants have been rejected because of their unsuitability for the obtainment of international protection.

Many studies on migration have shown how the issue cannot be reduced to an emergency dimension, but have to be related to the individual Member States' integration mechanisms. The western model, which is considered universally applicable and exportable (Ambrosini 2004), clashes with legal and socioeconomic particularisms which make difficult, where not impossible, a complete cohesion with local inhabitants, giving rise to marginalization and ghettoisation phenomena.

2.2. Intercultural integration models

Integration can be defined as “*the process in which migrants became holders of same rights and opportunities, subject on the availability from the members of the community to coordinate regularly and effectively their actions with those of other individuals at different levels of the social structure, reporting a relatively low degree of conflict*” (Gallino 2006). It's a tortuous and complex path, which discipline is regulated by a double level of politics: *of the fluxes*, with regard to arrivals control, and *of the integration*, in its proper meaning, with regard of relational aspects. These latter, undoubtedly more incisive for citizens' everyday lives, vary with opening on social cohesion towards immigrants, and give rise to a range of models which range spans from mere tolerance of diversity to its valorisation and promotion (Facchi 2001).

Fusion

Developed in United States starting from the late nineteenth century, it have a strong theoretical background but lacks in application's problem solving. The idea behind this model, also known as *melting pot*, is to homogenize the population removing differences, by promoting pacific co-existence and minimizing social conflicts (Berti 2000), through the mixing of different cultures' customs and traditions. The hopes placed in this method have been betrayed by a reality made of discriminations and ghettoisations due to impermeability of individual communities (Rossi 2011): choosing not to see differences (Taylor 1968) and to dissolve original identities (Carbone 2012) it ends up to not deal with the inherent difficulties of the co-existence of peoples which experience linguistic and social barriers, carrying with them previous conflicts due to their heritage.

In the last few years the *melting pot* model has been the subject of a revision that led to the *salad bowl* model, which provides the mixing of all original substrates, but not without specialities and differences valorisation. Once again, however, integration is left to spontaneous cooperation of communities, without an institutional intervention aimed to harmonisation and control, so that without a true “integration will” among involved subjects it would not be possible to obtain any result.

Assimilation

Behind the assimilationist model, typical of post-colonial France, there is the theoretical assumption that native culture is *dominant* compared to that of foreigners that settles in a new nation. This means that assimilation is considered as the normal product of a gradual and linear process (Carbone 2012), as immigrants, which deals with a new *strong* culture, adapts themselves regardless of their own wishes to local usages, aiming at integration and to feeling included. The greatest field of application of this model is the world of education, where the children of migrants are raised according to the typical ways of the country on which they are situated, often with little or no attention to the valorisation of cultural heritage: for them assimilation is unavoidable (Alba & Nee 1997).

To that approach it was claimed a possible authoritarian reading based on the assumption of a *cultural superiority*, interpretation that led to the neo-assimilationist theory. According to the new wording, the socioeconomic perspective and his influence are a fundamental component of integration, both of individual choices in adhesion to local models and of host communities' participation in inclusion process. In other words, migrants would be tempted to integrate because doing so they'd have greater opportunities to participate in society and in economic life of chosen country, improving their chances of being successful in working life and of climbing the social ladder, without prejudice to receiving society's balances.

Functional

Extensively applied in several States, which include Germany, this structure is based on the inclusion of immigrants in certain social areas according to the *differential exclusion* principle: they can settle in the country as long as their contribution is worthy for the society (Carbone 2012). That approach has been defined as instrumental and utilitarian (Bramanti 2011), because the perspective is that of a temporary permanence strictly connected to the exercise of a determined work, deemed useful to guest nation's economic development, without any cultural involvement.

Multicultural

From criticism with regard to assimilationist model, especially referring to incorporation of the differences and to the denial of minorities' values and dignity (Colombo 2002), multicultural model has born. For that theory, universalistic approach of assimilationist model would led to removal of social and cultural bonds with communities which immigrants originally belong, a sort of repudiation of their ethnic background in favour of an imposed culture: integration would thus be perceived as "*ethically unjustifiable and politically incorrect, result of stronger groups and nations' imposition on minority cultures*" (Ambrosini 2008).

The result of the accession to this reconstruction is a resistance against the same ideal of integration, with potential phenomena of self-ghettoisation, pigeonholing subjects inside ethnic or cultural default containers (Colombo & Semi 2007). In this way "*Are no longer immigrants to having to standardise, but the host society at having to prepare the ground for peaceful coexistence of the various cultural souls, allowing space for expression to each of them*" (Carbone 2012).

Transnational

More than a model, the transnational one is an approach, since it's not proposed to resolve integration question from the deterministic point of view, but to describe relationships between encountering cultures. In this perspective, migrations constitutes a Globalisation experience *from below* (Ambrosini 2008), and immigrants would be definable as social actors (Carbone 2012) involved in a series of interpersonal and interregional relationships which extend beyond boundaries and divisions between migrants and autochthonous. Integration becomes therefore an exceeded concept, replaced by the encounter and collaboration moment between people, independently from its origins and cultural belonging substrate.

Even this approach is not devoid of critical considerations, especially with reference to the impossibility to concretely determine the public role within this spontaneous virtuous path. Like in application of the *melting pot*, collaboration with other cultural components of the place of acceptance would seem left to the whim of the single, that, where doesn't consider cooperate for the common good appropriate or necessary to, could render ineffective theory's fundamental ideal.

Intercultural

By overturning the assumption of multicultural conception, that seems considering culture as if it was "*property of individuals and groups*" (Mantovani 2004), the intercultural approach invites us to consider cultures as "*shared, challenged and negotiated narratives*" (Benhabib 2002). Each provenance substrate becomes therefore the merging result of original experiences, uses, traditions and language, in a new scenario in which different realities comes into contact, deserving equal dignity without exception, interacting in a joint report from which all of them can benefit by increasing their cultural stock-in. Dialog, sharing, respect for fundamental human rights becomes the basis for the creation of a new common culture that involves a real integration of individual cores of a territory.

The adoption of a model based on this approach is much more difficult as higher is the belief in the public opinion of a determined people of having reached the scientific-cultural apex and not having thus nothing to learn from other realities, considering them less civilized or, at worst, radically different on social or religious so as not to be able to have no point of contact. Such a conviction leads to worsening conflicts and, where there are no active policies aimed at the repression of antisocial xenophobic conducts, the impossibility to reach the most basic foundations of coexistence.

3. RESEARCH

3.1. Italian framework: emergency model

Between the Nineteenth and the Twentieth Century over 16 million people expatriated from Italy (Simeoni 2014). This massive and unceasing movement had socio-economic considerable aspects, starting from integration problems in the United States until contribution to the revival of the country of origin through the "remittances", which was often used to buy a house, a field or another property thanks to which the families in conditions of hardship could even become wealthy. In 1973 there was a turning point in migration mechanisms: for the first time the inputs overcame the outputs (Simeoni 2014), both for the increase of the returnees who had been successful or that they were unable to make fortune, both for the improvement of living conditions in the peninsula. Italy became the destination of foreigners who aimed at improving their living conditions and those of their loved ones in a similar way to the flows from Italy to America and with the same economic instrument of remittances. These economic migrants were compounded by refugees, which run from political persecutions and from post-colonial conflicts. Immigration became a socially and economically important phenomenon and overcame the spotty condition already since 1975, year in which Italy ratified the convention of the ILO (International Labor Organization) for the protection of migrant workers.

From the legislative point of view the first Italian immigration rules date back to 1931, in full fascist period, when the phenomenon was reduced to a public safety dimension. The subsequent regulatory interventions were meant on the same wavelength. The first parliamentary work followed the ruling of the Constitutional Court n.46/1977, which affirmed what was already enshrined in the Constitution with regard to the refugees ("The foreigner to which is denied in his country the effective exercise of the democratic freedom guaranteed by the Italian Constitution has the right of asylum in the territory of the Republic, in accordance with the conditions laid down by law") believing that it was necessary a legislative reorganization of the subject. The path of reform met several difficulties because of the fears spread in the population as a result of the attack on the Pope in 1981 and the terrorist attacks in Rome and Vienna in 1985. The rules adopted in 1986 with law n.934, which became later known as "Foschi Law", aimed mainly at labor law aspects, with precise references to combating the brokering of the so-called *caporali* and to regulating input and output mechanisms for foreign workers (worklists, repatriation funds), as well as the first regularization of immigrants who were smuggled in Italy and had swollen the ranks of *undeclared workers*. Law Foschi didn't face entry and stay aspects, so as to be necessary from the outset the reopening of the works for the provision of a specific framework, while the term *extracomunitario* (non-EU citizen), used for the first time, became common use also in a disparagingly sense.

It was the birth of a discipline ambiguous that, in fact, begat a mechanism clandestine-propaedeutic: if the foreign worker had to be selected within special lists and to conclude a contract before his entry, this meant that either the employer had to go abroad, or had to rely on a foreign agency, which could obtain advantages of any kind in exchange for the insertion in said lists (and this happened, as demonstrated by the chronicle). The alternative was the submission of the contract to a foreigner present irregularly on the territory. This gave rise to an increase in the possibility of profit for the new human-traffickers, on the one hand, and to an endless series of legitimating acts on the other. The subordination to the work authorization, moreover, foresaw a preventive control about the unavailability on territory of Italian or Communitarian workers which have the same professional profile, with inevitable problems of timing.

In 1990 the Government passed a decree that gave following origin to the law n.39/1990 (so called "Martelli Law"), widely shared by political forces, which regulated, among other aspects, the programming of the flows, by introducing the first reception and disciplining fund and establishing the issuing and renewal of residence permits. The norm however didn't introduce concrete and effective mechanisms for integration, and the 1994 foreigners inputs were still being defined as *an exceptional event* (IOM report 2011). The following years were studded with lacking proposals and debates on the subject, until the adoption of the law n.40/1998 (so called "Turco-Napolitano Law"). For the first time immigration was considered to be a structural phenomenon, with the consequent overshoot of the call

from abroad as the sole criterion for recruitment and the prediction of the possibility to go to Italy in search of work. The tightening up of the rules in the theme of refoulements and expulsions, as well as forecasting the forced retention of irregular at *centers of temporary residence* aroused several doubts. In the following decade first law n.189/2002 (so-called “Bossi-Fini Law”) and then law n.94/2009 (so-called “Maroni Law”) operated a series of additional restrictions, limiting the entry and residence of immigrants depending on the pursuit of an occupation and reducing the duration of residence permits. The increase of detention time in *centers of temporary residence* and the introduction of the obligation of fingerprints recording, combined with the introduction of the offense of “illegal entry or residence”, gave overall an overview of immigrant’s criminalization, which is moved from the *centers of temporary residence* to the *centers for identification and expulsion*. In public opinion is spreading dangerously the idea that migrants move to commit crimes or to destabilize the States of destination, involving an additional cost for the already undone local finances, so that reception policies are opposed by the same indigenous peoples: exemplarily shameful was disputes of November 2014 in Rome against the opening of a reception center for unaccompanied minors. The European Court of Justice has recently expressed a strongly critical opinion on the illegal immigration crime considering it in contrast with the European Directive 2008/115/EC, specifically with regard to the voluntary repatriation, so that, for the umpteenth time, a tortuous process of reform was undertaken. On the other hand, it is a widely held opinion by the main international humanitarian organizations that the current configuration of reception mechanisms is pushed dangerously on the verge infringement of the rights provided by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, placing the pressing question about the suitability of a system which proclaims itself welcoming but seems more voted to borders defense than to the safeguard of human lives (Amnesty International 2013).

The “hosting Italy” is not only made of refoulements and prejudices. Among others, an example of virtuous model is represented by Lampedusa island, transit point for tens of thousands of immigrants, where was signed a Charter (Carta di Lampedusa 2014) inspired by principles established by the League of Nations and reiterated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: freedom of movement and of settlement (Atak & Dimitru 2015). The presence of a strong social conscience manifests itself in the form of association and voluntary, where the public interventions are prey to criminal speculation, making the existing mechanism, for if tending toward an improvement and greater public awareness of their role in respect of immigrants, structurally fallacious and, in concrete, inadequate.

3.2. European crisis

On the basis of Articles 79 and 80 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), the European Commission has been very active in relation to migration, especially since 2003, with the adoption of several directives (among other stand out e.g. 2003/109/EC, 2009/50/EC, 2011/98/EC, 2014/36/EU) to provide the guidelines within which it would be necessary to incardinate Member States’ policies. Over the years, however, several practical inconsistencies were found in directives’ transposition, but above all there was a lack of uniformity between the internal regulations. The current setting of the European model, particularly attentive to borders defense and to illegal immigration contrast, hasn’t prevented from the intensification of that which has been branded for years as *a crisis*.

Dwelling on the etymology of the word, it originally was used with reference to the Greek word *κρίσις*, *separate*, but also *choose*, changing in *dangerous or decisive time* during the Twentieth Century, until the current meaning of *acute disturbance in an individual or a community’s life, serious difficulties*. If there is no doubt that the phenomenon of migration is connected to the immigrants *choice to separate* from their own homeland, and that there occurs a *disturbance in an individual or a community’s life* causing *serious difficulties* both for States that for foreigners, it is doubtful about the definition of the situation as *acute*. This would in fact means to not take account of the episodic configuration overrun, now universally shared. Not so much an acute, but a chronic situation that requires a structural programming, further than what inserted into the European agenda in the migration area. If it’s essential to make intensive efforts for saving human lives and for fighting against human beings traffic, it’s necessary that Commission proposals on guidelines in this context actually lead to the development of a strong common policy in the field of reception and integration.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The framework reconstructed leads to the conclusion that in Italy, as in Europe, there isn't a real model of integration, but the coexistence of several models applied on different levels, not only because of national policies, but also depending on the choices of involved people, which are not *directed* toward a scheme rather than another. This leads to a *non-model*, which circumscribes integration to the action of local communities and to the good will of those involved, without an institutional firm stance. In this way the problems connected to the coexistence of different cultures not only remain unresolved, but it leads to social conflicts related to the division between a not well defined *us* and an even less clear *they*.

Open frontiers theory

In the difficult contemporary framework a daring theory arise, which presents itself with a strong theoretical fundament and promises epochal consequences. Starting from the assumption that today very few States, among those none of the Member States of the European Union, have ratified the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and their Families, adopted by the United Nations in 1999, and that according to the United Nations report *Replacement Migration* (UN2000) in the near future the decline in rate of births in Europe will lead to a gradual population reduction, to the progressive increase in the average age and to the reduction of the ratio between working-age people and pensioners, several scholars argued that the opening of borders would lead to a considerable increase in the gross domestic product of the host countries (Clemens 2011) and, thanks to *remittances*, to the doubling of the gross domestic product of the countries of origin (Kennan 2013). In a world where globalization and technological development demolished the distances between peoples is no longer so unthinkable to think in terms of cosmopolitanism and sharing, to support the need for a repatterning of the of sustainable development concept in the social field: a program shared by all the Member States for the eradication of poverty and social inequality would certainly lead more benefits of yet another border control program.

Educate to remember

The role of education in integration programs is fundamental. The rediscovery of migrations origins with an increase in responsibility by economically more advanced States, with insertion of shared paths into study programs that allow a meeting between different cultures, and the exploitation of past experiences of the host countries, are obligatory steps toward a full intercultural integration. Only keeping in mind to have been a people of emigrants you can have the necessary social consciousness to arrange for a far-sighted inclusion project that takes account of all the critical factors and promotes the migration as a resource, spreading virtuous examples of the foreigners who have contributed to the development of the Country where they settled.

Research perspectives

The coming years will be fundamental to understand what will be the position of Europe in relation to migration and social inclusion, especially in a turbulent framework in which there are serious concerns regarding the possibility of frontiers closure and of a step backwards on Schengen agreements. Research carried out here will be the basis for a series of comparisons between the internal regulations of the Member States as resulting of the implications of the changing global context and of latter Directives transposition. Is currently setting up a European studies and disseminations program on this theme, which will lead to the creation of an international research group whose purpose will be to analyze the perspectives of various systems applications and to identify best alternatives. The greatest challenge will be to assess whether and how feasible is the open borders theory and what would be long term consequences and associated risks.

REFERENCE LIST

1. United Nations, *World Population Prospects – Key findings and advance tables – 2015 revision*, retrieved online at <http://esa.un.org> on 14 February 2016.

2. Ambrosini, M. & Abbatecola, E. (2004), *Immigrazione e metropoli: un confronto europeo*, Milan, Italy: FrancoAngeli.
3. Gallino, L.(2006), *Dizionario di sociologia*, Turin, Italy: UTET.
4. Facchi, A. (2001), *I diritti nell'Europa multiculturale. Pluralismo normativo e immigrazione*, Rome-Bari, Italy: Laterza.
5. Berti, F. (2000), *Esclusione e integrazione: uno studio su due comunità di immigrati*, Milan, Italy: FrancoAngeli.
6. Rossi, G. (2011), *Quali modelli di integrazione possibile per una società interculturale*, Milan, Italy: FrancoAngeli.
7. Taylor, R. S. (1968), *Question-Negotiation and Information Seeking in Libraries*, In *College and Research Libraries*, v.29 no.3, May 1968, pp. 178-194.
8. Carbone, T. (2012), *L'integrazione come "pratica sociale": un'etnografia delle seconde generazioni a Modena*, retrieved online at <http://www.univr.it> on 14 February 2016.
9. Alba, R. & Nee, V.(1997), *Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration*, in *International Migration Review*, Vol.31, No.4, Special Issue: Immigrant Adaptation and Native-Born Responses in the Making of Americans, Winter 1997, pp. 826-874.
10. Bramanti, D. (2011), *Generare luoghi di integrazione. Modelli di buone pratiche in Italia e all'estero*, Milan, Italy: FrancoAngeli.
11. Colombo, E.(2002), *Le società multiculturali*, Rome, Italy: Carocci.
12. Ambrosini, M. (2008), *Un'altra globalizzazione. La sfida delle migrazioni transnazionali*, Bologna, Italy: Il Mulino.
13. Colombo, E. & Semi, G. (2007), *Multiculturalismo quotidiano. Le pratiche della differenza*, Milan, Italy: FrancoAngeli.
14. Mantovani, G. (2004), *Intercultura. E' possibile evitare le guerre culturali?*, Bologna, Italy: Il Mulino.
15. Benhabib, S. (2002), *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
16. Simeoni, V. (2014), *Storia delle migrazioni: chi si muove, come e perché*, retrieved online at <http://www.lenius.it> on 14 February 2016.
17. Simeoni, V. (2014), *Governo delle migrazioni: cosa succede attorno ai confini*, retrieved online at <http://www.lenius.it> on 14 February 2016.
18. International Organization for Migration, *World migration report 2011 – Communicating Effectively about Migration*, retrieved online at <http://publications.iom.int> on 14 February 2016.
19. Amnesty International, CS126-08/10/2013 & oth., retrieved online at www.amnesty.it on 14 February 2016.
20. The Charter of Lampedusa, retrieved online at www.lacartadilampedusa.org on 14 February 2016.
21. Atak, I. & Dumitru, S. (2015), *Pourquoi penser l'ouverture des frontières*, in *Éthique publique* retrieved online at <http://ethiquepublique.revues.org> on 14 February 2016.
22. United Nations – Department of Economics and Social Affairs – Population Division, *Replacement Migration: Is It a Solution to Declining and Ageing Populations?*, retrieved online at www.un.org on 14 February 2016.
23. Clemens, M. (2011), *Economics and emigration : Trillion-dollar bills on the sidewalk?*, in *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 25, no. 3, Summer 2011, pp. 83-106.
24. Kennan, J. (2013), *Open borders*, in *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 16 (2013), L1–L13.