Making and unmaking migrant irregularity: a border city during Italy's 'migration crisis'.

Simon McMahon
Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations, Coventry University
simon.mcmahon@coventry.ac.uk

Irregular migration is a significant political concern in countries around the world, with vast budgets being spent on attempting to control it. In policy circles and popular discourse, it has usually been described as the process of crossing a national border without permission or illegally. This has been particularly the case with descriptions of migration across the Mediterranean Sea to the EU. Collier, for example, has considered that the problem of irregularity is essentially one of the porosity of the Mediterranean border, which should be addressed by greater controls on entry and automatic returns to origin or third countries to deter potential migrants (2014). Elsewhere, irregular migrants have repeatedly been described as people who have crossed the sea without documents or permission or by criminal methods, particularly by the EU's border agency Frontex (Frontex 2015). The European Commission has also expressed the view that 'criminal networks of smugglers' have been to blame for enabling so many migrants to make an illegal journey towards Europe (European Commission 2015).

By reducing irregularity to a form of mobility, such views are, however, overly simplified. Numerous studies have shown how migrant irregularity is actually produced and maintained by the legal, economic and social structures found *within* states (Calavita 2005; De Genova 2004; Portes 1978; Bommes and Sciortino 2011). Portes' seminal text on the topic argued, for example, that illegal immigration was a reflection or a 'function' of actions and structures within a host society, specifically (a) legal frameworks of migration control, and (b) the labour market (1978: 472). A similar view has been presented by De Genova, who argues that illegality is produced primarily by the state's legal frameworks, which enforce the vulnerability of the illegal immigrant by rendering them 'deportable' (De Genova 2004). In Italy, Calavita has also highlighted the role of short-term residence permits and widespread informal employment in making it all but impossible for migrants in southern European countries to retain legal status over time (2005: 48-70) and Sagnet and Palmisano have underlined how a lack of legal residence and employment rights facilitates the exploitation of African agricultural workers in the South of Italy (2015). Irregularity is, in other words, not simply a form of mobility but a particular mode of incorporation of migrants into a subordinate and precarious legal, economic and social status.

Against this backdrop, this chapter offers an exploration of the structures and processes that contribute to the existence and (re)production of migrant irregularity in specific locations *after* the border has been crossed. In does so by focusing on the Italian port city of Siracusa, in Eastern Sicily, during the so-called Mediterranean migration crisis of 2015 to show how border cities such as this are contested spaces in which the status of migrants is repeatedly negotiated, made and unmade (Mainwaring 2016; Schuster 2005).

It is useful to focus our attention on cities for at least two main reasons: on one hand, specific approaches to the governance of migration can develop within cities. Local authorities may have specific competencies and responsibilities in policy implementation which mean that they can develop their own approaches (Borkert and Caponio 2010). Regarding the governance of irregular migration in particular, arbitrary or discretionary decisions and outright corruption among border enforcement and local administrations can also affect the way that migrants are treated, giving rise to localised 'grey areas' of migration control which preclude some individuals from the right to a legal resident status or form of international protection (Amit 2015, Barsky 2015, McMahon 2015, 2016). On the

other hand, in cities there is also a concentration of varied social, political and economic dynamics (Amin and Thrift 2002; McMahon 2015; Sassen 2005). This can produce localised assemblages of actors and resources, understood as loosely organised structures of diverse and distinct elements which come together and function in particular ways according to the shifting connections and affiliations among them (Deleuze and Guattari 1987). Social movements, solidarity networks and civil society organisations may be able to draw on local resources and opportunities in cities to mobilise in response to the specific challenges that are posed there (Sassen 2005; Uitermark et al 2005). Migrants can also draw on these assemblages to adapt to or contest their assigned status. Consequently, although national legal frameworks formally define the boundaries between migrant categories, focusing on the level of cities can foreground the processes through which the status of migrants is negotiated through their encounters with state representatives, border enforcement, street-level bureaucrats, activists, lawyers or civil society solidarity networks (De Genova 2016; Mainwaring 2014).

The chapter draws on data collected in Siracusa and surrounding locations in Eastern Sicily through October to December 2015. Since the first declarations of a migration crisis in Italy, in 2011, hundreds of thousands of people have crossed the Mediterranean Sea from North Africa to get there, with many of them disembarking in Sicily. In response, and amidst rising demands across many European countries for increased control of irregular migration, the Italian government established an elaborate, multi-tiered and spatially differentiated system of migrant and refugee reception (Caponio and Cappiali 2017), with the aim of distinguishing people who were considered to have a right to remain in the country from those who were not. Alongside this system, however, many new arrivals resided in an irregular status and in informal spaces such as mosques, churches, cultural centres, squats, warehouses and train stations. Interviews were carried out with 75 people who had crossed the Mediterranean Sea by boat to Eastern Sicily during 2015 and 10 local stakeholders working with migrants in the local area, as well as benefitting from observation in formal reception centres, ports and locations of informal accommodation of migrants. This dataset is a small part of the MEDMIG database, which carried out 500 interviews with migrants and refugees and over 100 with key stakeholders in Greece, Italy, Malta and Turkey. Where relevant the paper also draws on observations that were made during a return field trip in May 2016.

The chapter begins by situating the city of Siracusa in the context of Mediterranean migration and Italy's migrant and refugee reception system. It then examines the production of irregular statuses in the city during 2015 before taking a closer look at the ways that the city's assemblage of support networks enabled migrants in an irregular status to reside there, continue their journeys or contest the legal status that they had been assigned. It finishes drawing out some conclusions on the importance of cities for the making and unmaking of irregular migration.

Situating Siracusa

Migration across the Mediterranean Sea towards Italy is not a particularly new phenomenon. Up to 2009, the scale of irregular migrant arrivals by boat detected on Italy's shores remained fairly constant before increasing in scale from 2011 (see Figure 1). More recently, arrivals across the Mediterranean Sea repeated a similar pattern year after year, with increasing arrivals in the summer, less during the winter months and fairly small variations in scale over the course of each year. These patterns have been the product of a combination of established migration routes from the African continent and further afield to the countries of North Africa and Southern Europe, as well as the dramatic social and political changes in the countries of North Africa since the so-called Arab Spring of 2011 (McMahon and Sigona 2016). It should be noted, however, that in the latter half of 2017, the scale of migration declined significantly against the backdrop of agreements of the Italian government with the Libyan authorities and militia groups in Libya to intensify restrictions on departures of migrant boats.

< FIGURE 1 HERE>

The fact that migration routes across the Mediterranean were already known and patterns of arrivals repeated year on year challenges the notion of it representing an immediate, unpredictable and unresolvable 'crisis' in 2015. Moreover, although in Italy an emergency had already been declared back in 2011, through 2015 there was an increasing sense of urgency amidst rising public concern about deaths at sea and against the backdrop of the EU's Agenda on Migration. This renewed urgency inspired a widespread reorganisation of the governance of border control and refugee reception in the Mediterranean (Crawley et al 2017; McMahon and Sigona 2016). The result in Italy was a complex, spatially differentiated system of containment, identification, relocation and removal of migrants and asylum seekers at sea and after arrival. Whereas in 2011 boats carrying migrants could arrive directly on Italian shores such as on the island of Lampedusa or the southern coasts of Sicily, since 2014 this became much rarer. Boats would instead be intercepted at sea as part of the European Union's Joint Operation Triton, as well as by a range of other humanitarian missions. These interceptions ostensibly sought to prevent deaths at sea but also had the function of channelling migrants into Italy's (and the EU's) border control apparatus (Tazzioli 2016). Almost everybody who entered Italy having made an irregular journey across the Mediterranean Sea in 2015 was intercepted at sea and then disembarked in segregated, secured spaces at Italian ports before being transferred into reception facilities where they could apply for asylum or would be given deportation orders. The result was, at least at first glance, a more consistent and controlled arrival of migrants on Italian shores than before.

Moreover, after arrival there was also a large-scale production of irregularity as people left, or were removed from, the formal reception system for refugees and migrants (Bertotto 2016; LasciateCIEntrare 2016). Figure 2 shows data from the months leading up to the period of this study which points towards the scale of the issue in two important ways (see also McMahon and Sigona 2016 for a discussion of these figures). The first is the step between the number of people whose application for asylum was rejected and those given deportation orders, signalling that a large proportion of people who were not given a legal status to remain in Italy were not physically removed from the country either. The second is the step between sea arrivals and the number of asylum applications lodged, highlighting the fact that although everyone who was intercepted at sea in 2015 was taken into the refugee reception system a large proportion did not apply for a legal status through an asylum request. Many of these people sought to move through Italy and onwards to other European countries to apply to reside there, helped by an inconsistent approach to identifying and fingerprinting migrants upon their arrival (Denaro 2016). This was particularly the case prior to the introduction of more rigid processes for finger-printing and identifying migrants at Italian ports in the autumn of 2015. These processes included forced identification at 'Hotspots' in particular ports, which was described by Amnesty International as a violation of refugee and migrant rights (Amnesty International 2016). As a result of this stricter approach a greater proportion of people arriving had an asylum application lodged, reducing the gap between arrivals and asylum applications. Nevertheless, at the end of 2016 the Italian reception system was still being described as a 'factory of irregularity' (*clandestinità*): as the number of asylum rejections increased, many people were continuing to reside in the country without a legal status (ANCI et al 2016; Camilli 2016). On a return field trip in 2016 I could also observe how transit migration was ongoing, albeit on a smaller scale than before, as people continued to leave official reception centres to attempt to reach other countries. This was despite the fact that nearly all would have had a set of fingerprints recorded at their arrival which could enable other EU countries to return them to Italy under the EU's Dublin regulation.

<FIGURE 2 HERE>

The case study of Siracusa offers a useful opportunity to document this production of irregularity in practice. At the time of this research, Siracusa was an important city within the context of the governance of Mediterranean migration. It lies on the Eastern coast of Sicily, the southern Italian region that has been the first point of entry into Europe for tens of thousands of migrants over the

years. Around 120,000 people live there and thousands of tourists arrive each year too. In the province of Siracusa the large industrial port of Augusta can be found, where more migrants disembarked in 2015 than in any other Italian port (22,391 people, according to data from Ministero dell'Interno)[i]. Upon disembarkation at Augusta, new arrivals would go through an initial identification process which would record their basic biographical information (name, age, nationality and so on) and fingerprints. They would then be taken to reception facilities with available space to host them in the local area or further away. At the time of the fieldwork for this research, in the autumn of 2015, official sources showed a mixture of different reception facilities across the province. Seven 'first reception' centres for short-term accommodation were recorded in towns around the province, housing approximately 400 people, as well as ten 'second reception' longer-term accommodation centres (although severe limitations in the reporting of official figures mean that a significant gap persists between reality and the numbers recorded in official data sources). The experiences of migrants in these reception facilities will be examined in more detail in the following section.

Producing irregularity

One particular reception centre that I regularly visited in Siracusa was located in the suburbs of the city, down a quiet side road, in the square concrete building of the old Umberto I school. The school closed over a decade ago and became a reception centre from 2013 until May 2016. The classrooms became dormitories; the school gates were guarded by police. At the entrance, two temporary sheds provided an office space and doctor's surgery provided by an NGO, which gave free medical care to the centre's residents. A small square in the centre of the school building, a terrace to hang washing and a concrete football pitch with faded paint and torn nets provided the only outdoor space. The residents could leave the grounds during the day and walk into the city if they wished, but I was told that local supermarkets sometimes refused to serve them.

At the Umberto I reception centre two main dynamics producing irregularity could be found. Firstly, migrants could be pushed out of the formal system as a result of decisions made on their status by police officers, border guards and asylum commissions. These decisions could be rejections of asylum applications following an application and commission hearing. Rejection of asylum applications was a common occurrence: over the course of 2015, 2932 asylum cases were processed across the whole of the province of Siracusa, of which 62 were given refugee status, 1142 were given a temporary form of protection and 1569 were 'unrecognised' (rejected, application was inadmissible or the applicant was absent for the hearing). Moreover, migrants could also be 'pushed out' by discretionary decisions made by border officers granting a 'differed expulsion order' (*respingimento differito*) requiring that the holder leave Italian territory within a stipulated number of days and without being accompanied by law enforcement officers (Paleologo 2009). These were often granted at short notice, to entire groups of people with little justification. Local lawyers and activists reported over 100 cases in the town of Syracuse and a similar sized group in the nearby port town of Pozzallo in October 2015, for example (*La Repubblica* 2015). The people receiving them were primarily from countries of West and Central Africa which did not have readmission agreements for repatriations from Italy. In these cases, they could not be physically sent back by the Italian authorities and often lacked the resources, knowledge or will to return to their place of origin. As a result, they would remain on Italian territory despite not having a legal resident status.

Secondly, newly-arrived migrants could also decide themselves to move out of the formal reception facilities and status recognition processes. Often, new arrivals who did not wish to remain within the Umberto I reception centre stayed very little time there; they would perhaps have a shower, sleep and then, within a day of arriving move out to connect with kin, friends or smugglers elsewhere in Siracusa and further afield, who would help them to reach a different intended destination. Whereas disembarkation would take place in closely policed spaces, the reception centres were open and migrants could easily leave. Furthermore, as noted above, before the introduction of new measures of identification at ports of arrival and so-called 'Hotspots' which were rolled out in the autumn of 2015

fingerprinting was not carried out on a systematic basis (Pastore and Roman 2015). Transit migration through Italy and onwards to other parts of Europe is not a particularly new phenomenon, as noted by Denaro (2016) who states that only the vast majority of Syrian nationals who arrived in Italy in 2013 and 2014 sought to leave the country quickly and without being identified, highlighted by the fact that on 6% of arrivals applied for asylum there in 2013, falling to 3% in 2014.

The production of migrant irregularity through being pushed out or moving on from the reception centre in Siracusa should be interpreted against the backdrop of a series of contradictions and deficiencies in the city and the rest of the country's reception system. According to official data, the Umberto I centre had space for 150 people and during October and November of 2015 it was claimed that 62 people were there.[ii] But both this figure and the total capacity of the centre were regularly surpassed. On the date of my first visit, for example, in early October 2015, there were 230 people present. Two weeks later, following a series of relocations to other centres and deportations, this had declined but there were still over 140. This lack of spaces was found elsewhere too, such as in the reception facility at Mineo in the neighbouring province which had a capacity of 2,000 places but in August 2014 there were 3,792 recorded living there and in April 2015 there were 3,219. The task of identifying new arrivals and applying for asylum was also complicated and arduous. Very few had identity documents to confirm their name, age or nationality. At disembarkation, this information was also often mistakenly recorded with names misspelt and dates of birth which were unknown or not believed. Birth certificates would confirm their age, but they would have to be faxed from their country of origin and this could potentially take days or longer to organise. The lack of reliable data from migrants and Italian authorities further added to administrative delays and bottlenecks.

The result of these deficiencies was extended waiting times to process applications for asylum; it was quite normal for stays to last weeks, months or longer. One resident had been awarded refugee status but then stayed, informally in a reception centre unable to find a home or job elsewhere. By the time I met him, he said he had arrived in the city four years earlier. The daily routine and rhythm of life was similar to that found elsewhere in refugee camps where waiting, almost in a sense of limbo, is commonplace (Horst 2006; Wood and Young 2012). A structured timetable was provided for eating breakfast, lunch and dinner, and for the weekly distribution of pocket money, telephone cards and cigarettes but there were no language lessons or opportunities to learn skills or find employment. The doctors would open their surgery at 9 or 10 every morning and close in the evening at 5 or 6. Around these given daily and weekly events, save for the occasional game of table tennis or football and sporadic arrival or removal of residents, a lot of time was spent sitting, talking, smoking and discussing when documents would be given, how long it would take and what would happen next. Positive feelings of gratitude for being safe that were often initially expressed by the people I met could easily mutate into a negative sense of frustration, feeling imprisoned and held back from getting into a home and a job.

In this context, the production of irregularity had a particular function for border enforcers as well as for migrants. On one hand, differed expulsion orders could be employed as a means to free space in the over-crowded reception system, due to their discretionary character. Research in other fields has shown that discretionary decisions are not arbitrary or idiosyncratic but rather arise in situations in which existing processes and regulations are considered by street-level bureaucrats to be inadequate or inappropriate (Otenyo 2016). Even if migrants with an expulsion order did not leave Italy, they would be required to leave the reception system, thus temporarily addressing the problem of a lack of space. On the other hand, moving out of the reception system was also useful for those who had an intention and available resources and knowledge to continue their journeys onwards within or out of Italy. At least prior to the intensification of identification measures towards the end of 2015, avoiding having fingerprints recorded and moving out of formal reception facilities could enable them to avoid being stuck in the slow and unpredictable administrative procedure necessary to claim a legal status. People who had friends and family who had previously made the journey often held negative expectations of the Italian reception system based on rumours and stories they had previously heard. Entering into an irregular status and leaving the formal reception system was thus motivated by their

intention to reach other destinations and informed by their expectation of the social and policy context awaiting them in Italy.

Against the backdrop of the large-scale production of irregularity seen at the time of this study, the reception centre thus had a particular function within the city of Siracusa not only as a site of accommodation for migrants but also as a transit hub.

Informal assemblages

The previous section pointed towards a series of complexities in the official reception system in Siracusa which ensured it was unable to effectively and efficiently fulfil its role of containing, identifying and relocating migrants. However, outside of the official reception system there was also a varied range of organisations and spaces which could provide support and opportunities to those who had entered into an irregular status. As was the case elsewhere in Italy, this informal reception regime arose to cater primarily for people who (a) were previously in the formal system but no longer had an entitlement to support, (b) did not want or were not offered a place in the formal reception system despite having applied for asylum, or (c) did not want to apply for asylum in Italy and wanted to rapidly move to other destinations without being identified (McMahon and Sigona 2016). One study of the informal regime in Italy which examined settlements housing only, or predominantly, for asylum seekers or refugees estimated that there were around 10,000 people living in such conditions across the country in 2015 (Bertotto 2016). Due to the hidden nature of some of these settlements and the mobile populations that reside in them, it can however be expected that the true scale of the phenomenon was somewhat greater.

In Siracusa, a varied assemblage of actors provided informal reception and support services for irregular migrants. They included the doctor's NGO which worked at the Umberto I reception centre, the local immigration drop-in centre (*sportello immigrazione*), a local immigration lawyer and the Bosco Miniti parish church. Each of these offered a particular service and resources to migrants, such as healthcare and medical check-ups (doctors), legal advice and employment skills training (drop-in centre), legal representation (lawyer) and accommodation and food (the church). Often, irregular migrants were known to some or all of them at the same time. But despite this, they did not have formal agreements among them or defined ways of working together. Rather, members from each had personal connections and histories of helping out with favours and support that ensured that they could promptly call on each other when necessary.

A brief examination of the Bosco Miniti parish church can highlight the workings of this assemblage in practice. The church is located in the centre of a working-class quarter of Siracusa, between large blocks of flats and haphazardly parked cars. It is modern and square, flanked by a rusty playground on one side and a concrete football pitch on the other. A low building lay to the side with metal railings over the windows. When I visited in the autumn of 2015, around 60 African men resided here, sleeping on camp-beds pressed against each other. In the afternoons they would play football matches against local children or sit outside smoking, playing cards and talking. In the evening, the pews in the atrium of the church itself would be cleared to the side and a long table put in their place; once everyone was seated enormous saucepans of pasta would be passed around. The priest would watch, chatting with anyone, patting them on the back, making jokes and sharing cigarettes. The parish had a long history of welcoming migrants. In the 1990s homeless drug addicts knew that they could find a place to stay there, for example. From around 2005 onwards the residents were increasingly migrants who arrived on the Eastern coast of Sicily and were directed to the parish by people who had stayed there before, as well as local police officers, activists, charities, doctors in the hospitals and workers in reception centres. During the first increase in the scale of migration flows around 2011, there could be 100 people sleeping there as a result of what were described to me as 'informal transfers' as police and civil protection officers would call the priest and request a space for people to stay in when state-run emergency reception facilities became full.

But I was also told about how this pattern changed from 2014. The people who arrived had increasingly passed through the formal reception system, but had been expelled or decided to move out. I was told of how, in the Spring of 2015, the church housed Syrian and Eritrean families who stayed for two weeks before continuing their way to Northern Europe, for example. 'Here anyone can enter' said an interviewee to me one day, 'I don't care if they are immigrants, *clandestini* or whatever'. It is estimated that 20 to 25,000 people have passed through the church doors over the past decade. This role has not, however, come without controversy. Some members of the local community have avoided the church, whilst others have voiced their concern more directly. As one interviewee said, 'many criticise the fact that the church welcomes them [the migrants], they distance themselves from it, criticise, view them as a plague' (interview with a local NGO worker). Padre Carlo was also accused of facilitating clandestine migration and placed under house arrest by the Siracusa police between 2010 and 2014, although the case was defeated and he was eventually cleared of wrong-doing. On a return visit in May 2016 the number of people passing through the church did appear, however, to have reduced, which was likely as a result of the tightening of identification measures for arrivals at ports and in particular the conversion of the nearby port of Pozzallo into a closed Hotspot.

The church informally provided a range of services aside from just a place to eat and sleep. Two cultural mediators from an NGO which ran the city's immigration drop-in centre passed by regularly to ask how people were and to give information on rights and, where necessary, how to apply for documents. Anyone under 18 would be signposted to the local refugee lawyer who also directed an organisation responsible for a guardianship programme for unaccompanied minors and could take on their legal representation. In the case of someone having a health condition, the priest would take them to the doctors at the Umberto I reception centre who could do a short, informal check-up. A particular episode during October 2015 highlights the workings of the inter-relationships between the church, local organisations and the formal reception system. At a reception centre located 35 kilometres from Siracusa, in the countryside, a group of between 30 and 40 young men from West African countries were presented with expulsion orders soon after their arrival. They had been told to sign a piece of paper and then that they could not stay any longer. One of the staff at the reception centre told them the direction to walk in;

> *these people when they received the paper to be expelled, the doctors [in the reception centre], they sent us them all … the first person who was called was me and they told me "they are coming" the other ones, some expulsed people, there were 98 of them, they arrived because they met a Gambian guy who knows me and sent them to me* (Interview with a local NGO worker)

Seven hours later they arrived in Siracusa and were advised by the local lawyer to go to the church. Through the legal representation of the lawyer and whilst residing in the church, they contested the expulsion order and applied for asylum. Two weeks later, they were transferred to reception centres around Italy. Following their arrival, these men had been declared irregular migrants; they found an informal residence in the church before subsequently returning to a regular status within the formal reception system. Their journey through institutional spaces and legal statuses highlights the way that migrant irregularity can be produced within the reception system, and removed through the operation of a loosely organised but quick to mobilise support assemblage within the city.

In this way, the assemblage of organisations within the city enabled those staying at the church to look after their health, receive identification documents by email or fax, contest negative asylum applications or move onwards to subsequent destinations. As referenced by one newspaper, Padre Carlo has said that 'in the parish … people from non-European countries find a reference point where they can be listened to and accompanied from a civic, moral, health and legal point of view' (di Nella 2010). In a way, the church informally acted as a *de facto* reception centre for migrants and refugees.

Conclusion

This paper has taken the case study of the city of Siracusa, in Sicily, to highlight how migrant irregularity can be made and unmade in border cities. In doing so, it has highlighted the need to look beyond border crossings and the journey across the sea in order to understand how migrant irregularity arises and persists. Indeed, in the case of Italy during the time of this research almost all migrants who made the Mediterranean Sea crossing were brought in to the country's reception system for asylum seekers. Although the Italian government has responded to calls from many European countries for tighter control of migration in the region with a multi-tiered and spatially differentiated system of migrant and refugee reception, in practice this system has been the site of a large scale production of irregularity as people were pushed out by border officials or, especially before September 2015, left of their own accord. This illustrates how migrant irregularity is not simply a result of someone having crossed an international border without permission, but can be produced after they enter a country.

The chapter has also illustrated how assemblages of actors and resources within cities can offer specific services to irregular migrants and sporadically collaborate with one another when needed. The elements making up this assemblage can be specific to the local context in which they are found, and their arrangement can often be inconsistent and shift over time. In Siracusa, for example, irregular migrants could find healthcare, accommodation, legal advice and legal representation that would enable them to reside in the city and, in many cases, to seek ways of regularising their status. This assemblage enabled migrants to adapt to, or to contest their irregular status. In this way, the particular social, political and economic contexts found in border cities such as Siracusa can shape the ways that migrant irregularity is made and unmade through ongoing negotiations and contestations.

References

Amin, Ash and Thrift, Nigel (2002) *Reimagining the Urban* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Amit, Roni (2015) *Understanding Immigration Detention and Deportation in South Africa* (Johannesburg: African Centre for Migration and Society)

Amnesty International (2016) *Hotspot Italy* (London: Amnesty International)

ANCI, Caritas Italiana, Cittalia, Fondazione Migrantes, Servizio Centrale dello SPRAR (2016) *Rapporto sulla protezione internazionale in Italia 2016* (Roma: ANCI)

Barsky, Robert F (2015) *Undocumented immigrants in an era of arbitrary law: The plight of people deemed illegal* (Abingdon: Routledge)

Bertotto, Marco (2016) *Fuori Campo* (Rome: Medici Senza Frontiere)

Bommes, Michael and Sciortino, Giuseppe (2011) Foggy Social Structures (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press)

Borkert, Maren and Caponio, Tiziana (eds.) (2010) *The Local Dimension of Migration Policies*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press

Calavita, Kitty (2005) *Immigrants at the margins: Law, Race and Exclusion in Southern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Camilli, Annalisa (2016) La fabbrica della clandestinità di stato per i migranti deve essere superata, *Internazionale* (available online at https://www.internazionale.it/opinione/annalisa-camilli/2016/11/24/clandestinita-migranti-accoglienza-italia, accessed 20th November 2017)

Collier, Paul (2014) Illegal migration to Europe: what should be done? (Social Europe, available online at https://www.socialeurope.eu/2014/09/illegal-migration/, accessed 19th April 2017)

De Genova, Nicholas (2004) "The legal production of Mexican/migrant ''illegality'' *Latino Studies*, 2, 160-185

De Genova, Nicholas (2016) *Detention, Deportation, and Waiting: Toward a Theory of Migrant Detainability* (Geneva: Global Detention Project Working Papers)

Deleauze, Gilles and Guattari, Felix (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus* (Minnesota: the University of Minnesota)

Denaro, Chiara (2016) "Agency, Resistance And (Forced) Mobilities. The Case Of Syrian Refugees In Transit Through Italy" *Revista Interdisciplinar da Mobilidade Humana*, XXIV: 47, 95-114

Di Nella, Sarah (2010) *Padre Carlo il clandestino* (available online at http://dimensionesperanza.it/geopolitico/item/5808-padre-carlo-il-clandestino.html, accessed 10th February 2017)

European Commission (2015) Speaking Points of President Juncker – Press Conference on Western Balkans Route Leaders' Meeting (available online http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-15-5905_en.htm, accessed 1st March 2017)

Frontex (2015) *Frontex Risk Analysis Network Quarterly* (Brussels: Frontex)

Horst, Cindy (2006) Buufis amongst Somalis in Dadaab: The Transnational and Historical Logics Behind Resettlement Dreams , *Journal of Refugee Studies* 19(2): 143–157

La Repubblica (2015) *Respingimenti, si ricomincia a cacciare via i migranti "economici"* (available online at http://www.repubblica.it/solidarieta/immigrazione/2015/10/19/news/respingimenti-125425049, accessed 1st March 2017)

LasciateCIEntrare (2016) *Accoglienza: La Vera Emergenza* (LasciateCIEntrare) http://www.lasciatecientrare.it/j25/italia/news-italia/193-scaricabile-il-rapporto-di-lasciatecientrare-accogliere-la-vera-emergenza

Mainwaring, Cetta (2014) "Migrant agency: Negotiating borders and migration controls" *Migration Studies*, 4:3, 289-308

McMahon, Simon (2015) *After the Boats: Refugee Reception and the Production of Irregularity in Italy's Migration Crisis* (Washington DC: Middle East Institute)

McMahon, Simon (2016) *Border Control and the Precarious Lives of Migrants in Italy* (Oxford: Oxford Border Criminologies)

McMahon, Simon and Sigona, Nando (2016) *Boat migration across the Central Mediterranean: drivers, experiences, responses*, (MEDMIG, available at http://www.medmig.info/research-brief-03-Boat-migration-across-the-Central-Mediterranean, accessed 1st March 2017)

Otenyo, Eric E (2016) "Administrative Discretion" in *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance* (New York: Springer) 1-6

Paleologo, Fulvio Vassallo (2009) "Il respingimento differito disposto dal questore e le garanzie costituzionali" *Diritto, Immigrazione e Cittadinanza*, 2, 15-29

Portes, Alejandro (1978) "Toward a structural analysis of illegal (undocumented) immigration" *International Migration Review*, 12:4, 469-484

Sagnet, Yvan and Palmisano, Leonardo (2015) *Ghetto Italia* (Rome: Fandango Libri)

Sassen, Saskia (2005) "The Global City: Introducing a Concept", *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, XI:2, 27-43

Tazzioli, Martina (2016) "Border displacements. Challenging the politics of rescue between Mare Nostrum and Triton" *Migration Studies,* 4:1, 1-19

Uitermark, J., Nicholls, W. and Loopmans, M. (2012) "Cities and Social Movements. Theorizing beyond the right to the city" *Environment and Planning A*, 44:11, 2546-2554

Wood, P.B., McGrath, S. and Young, J. (2012) The Emotional City: Refugee Settlement and Neoliberal Urbanism in Calgary, *Int. Migration & Integration* 13: 21. doi:10.1007/s12134-011-0191-7

---

[i] This data was made available online by the Ministero dell'Interno at http://www.libertaciviliimmigrazione.dlci.interno.gov.it/it/documentazione/statistica/cruscotto-statistico-giornaliero, last accessed 9th January 2017. It has since been removed.

[ii] This data was gathered by the Ministero dell'Interno and collated for an inquiry in the reception system by the Camera dei Deputati. It was distributed to the research team by several of the key stakeholders interviewed for this study. Data on the reception system was also made available online at http://www.libertaciviliimmigrazione.dlci.interno.gov.it/it/documentazione/statistica/cruscotto-statistico-giornaliero during 2016 but has since been removed.