
HIM 1990-2015

2012

A comparative analysis of the immigration policy in italy, france, norway, and the role of the european union

Christina Belmonte
University of Central Florida



Part of the [International and Area Studies Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorstheses1990-2015>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in HIM 1990-2015 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Belmonte, Christina, "A comparative analysis of the immigration policy in italy, france, norway, and the role of the european union" (2012). *HIM 1990-2015*. 1345.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorstheses1990-2015/1345>



A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE IMMIGRATION POLICY IN ITALY,
FRANCE, NORWAY, AND THE ROLE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

by

CHRISTINA BELMONTE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Honors in the Major Program in International and Global Studies
in the College of Sciences
and in The Burnett Honors College
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term 2012

Thesis Chair: Dr. Houman Sadri

ABSTRACT

This thesis analyzes the differing immigration policies and issues within Italy, France and Norway by looking at the factors of historical background, politics, and economics. Each of these factors plays a different role in shaping immigration. Italy with a shift to the center right politically although currently with a technocratic government in power; a large unstable economy; and also a society not quite standardized culturally yet becoming increasingly multi-ethnic with immigration, is beginning to become stricter with immigration policy as it has been increasing in recent years. France with a newly left-wing socialist political party in power after a many years of a center right political dominance, a strong economy, and a very nationalist society also has a very strict immigration policy that many view inadequate for the integration of France. Lastly, Norway with a social-democratic labor led party in support of a strong welfare state; a strong economy; and a historical society of relative homogeneity that values equality and individuality, seeks immigration policy to maintain those values and encourage integration. Also, important to note is the role of the European Union which has an effect on all of these countries with many new initiatives to further the integration of immigration within the European Union as well as causing new migration flows with its expansion.

DEDICATIONS

For my professors, thank you for your encouragement and guidance.

For my family and friends, thank you for your love and support.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank everyone who helped this thesis especially my professors Dr. Houman Sadri, Dr. Robert Bledsoe, and Dr. Chiara Mazzucchelli. You all provided me with the knowledge, guidance, and support which led me to set out and achieve this project. A special thanks to Dr. Houman Sadri for first introducing the idea of this thesis to me and helping to push me along the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
ITALY	14
FRANCE	29
NORWAY	41
THE ROLE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION	51
CONCLUSION	61
REFERENCES.....	67

INTRODUCTION

Politics, economics, and historical experiences, are all major contributing factors in immigration policy as perceived in states such as France, Italy, and Norway. Depending on the ideology of the political parties in power, the state of the economy, and differing historical experiences and values, contrasting outcomes are witnessed in the above listed nation-states. Another important aspect to note is the European Union which has an impact on each of these countries immigration through its own immigration policies and expansion. Politically, Italy is positioned to the center right. However, currently they have a technocratic government in power, which has no political party affiliation. Moreover, Italy has a large unstable economy and a historically diverse society. Recently, it has been standardized culturally, yet is becoming increasingly multi-ethnic with immigration. All these factors have made Italian immigration policies stricter in recent years. France, with a newly left-wing socialist political party in power (after many years of a center right political dominance), a strong economy, and a very nationalist society, also has a very strict immigration policy that many view inadequate for the integration of France. Lastly, Norway has a social-democratic labor led party in support of a strong welfare state. Their strong economy and historical society of relative homogeneity that values equality and individuality, seeks immigration policy to maintain those values and encourage integration. Additionally, the European Union (EU) interacts with each of these countries' policies by imposing additional regulations that the domestic governments of Italy, France, and Norway can either choose to use to their advantage or provide additional protection and security.

There is a significant relationship between politics, the state of the economy, historical experiences and values of a state, EU policies and growth, and the states' consequent

immigration policy. Depending on these independent variables the immigration policy of the state will differ whether strict or open, effective or ineffective. Strict in terms of immigration, stricter immigration would mean the state is increasing regulations, tightening quotas, and restricting immigration more. Generally when the political party is socialist and left wing such as in Norway there is a more liberal immigration policy as opposed to a stricter immigration policy when the party is politically to the right as seen in France and Italy until recently. When the economy is stronger there is a positive effect on immigration policy because the state has the capability to absorb and integrate immigrants better. Lastly, when the historical experiences and values of a state create a more culturally similar society there tends to be a stronger relationship of decreasing acceptance to the changes immigration imposes on its receiving country. This is significant because immigration to Europe is increasing and these states need to learn how to better handle these new influxes of immigrants especially when more and more culturally diverse groups flee from instability and war in the Middle East, Africa, and Eastern Europe. Immigration policy is important in managing these immigrants and integrating them into the state as well as to the stability of the state and well-being of the people. Immigration policy and what influences it, politics, economics, historical experience, and the European Union, can help these states (France, Italy, and Norway) improve and create better policy as well as work on a problem that is only becoming more important.

There is a valuable relationship between the politics of a state, the economics of a state, and the historical experience and values of a state with immigration policy and how a more positive relationship might be achieved by comparing and analyzing France, Italy, and Norway. Immigration policy is policy growing in prominence in Europe where immigration is increasing

especially in France, Italy, and Norway. Immigration policy in a state is influenced by politics, economics, and historical experiences as well as the influence of the European Union which decide who enters these states and the level of integration. The following literature helps illustrate how these three countries immigration policies are influenced by the above mentioned factors.

To start in the first case of Italy, scholars have written numerous and varying articles and books related to Italian immigration since its importance has grown in recent years. In 1997, Allen and Russo put together an anthology of works in the book *Revisioning Italy: National Identity and Global Culture* which investigates the concept of national identity in Italy considering its culture, history, immigration, and unification with Europe. Part I which talks about the culture and history of Italy and Italy as a European Country helps describe the historical experiences of Italy in relation to its immigration. Part III talks about “Immigrations” and includes the contribution of Graziella Parati’s “Strangers in Paradise: Foreigners and Shadows in Italian Literature” which discusses the cultural status of Italy and how it has changed through immigration. She does this by evaluating immigrant literature. This work helps describe the transformation of the cultural identity of Italy from mono-cultural to multi-cultural.

Later in the spring of 2001, Padoa-Schioppa wrote about the relationship between Italy and Europe (the EU) in an article, “Italy and Europe: A Fruitful Interaction.” Just in the last decade, Italy has been faced with the challenges brought by new immigrants and multiculturalism. Italy became very nationalistic after becoming a nation-state and after Mussolini took control of Italy but after the damage of World War II, European integration was important to rebuilding Italy. Italy is an economically fragile, politically unstable state and

Europe has helped transform the economic and political structure of Italy. He talks about how Italian history helps us understand the support of European unification and this shows us how historical experience transformed Italy's immigration policy over time. Also, in 2001 the anthology, *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Italian Culture*, edited by Baranski and West, explores the development and problems of "modern Italian culture" through politics, history, literature, etc. One of the essays by Dickie, "The Notion of Italy," gives an historical background of Italy leading it up to today which helps in forming the historical experiences of Italy in terms of immigration. Another essay in this collection is Bull's "Social and Political Cultures in Italy from 1860 to the Present Day," which start at the 1860s and goes through each time period in Italy and the different political trends and social status of the country which has changed over time. She discusses the cultural differences and homogenization in Italy as well as its national identity.

In January of 2004, Dell'Olio published an article, "Immigration and Immigrant Policy in Italy and the UK: Is Housing Policy a Barrier to a Common Approach Towards Immigration in the EU?", about the "social integration" of migrants in the EU specifically looking at Italy and the U.K. She discusses the legislation and policies in place that determine the migrants that enter Italy. Italy's restrictions have limited certain migrants from entering or working legally. The primary focus is described to be on border control and restricting migrants from entering rather than the problems of integrating migrants within the state. In 2005, Calavita contributed a section, "Italy," in the book, *Immigration and Asylum: From 1900 to the Present*, which discusses the changes of immigration in Italy looking at many aspects from migrant flows to various immigration laws and policies imposed. The importance of the economy in immigration

policy is considered such as how immigrants often take up labor gaps which can help the economy. Another important matter is the various immigration laws starting from 1986 up to 2002 which are explained along with the intention and actual effect of each. Calavita gives a comprehensive overview of Italy's immigration policy and the different factors influencing it. Another important literary work was the book published in 2008 by McCormick, *The European Union: Politics and Policies*. McCormick discusses the EU thoroughly and talks about the postwar world and Italy's situation and integration policy with Europe as well as EU enlargement, open border policy, East Europeans, Middle Easterners, and North Africans as immigrants, and terrorism.

In May 2009, Finotelli and Sciortino discuss how the inadequacies of Italian immigration policies have been accredited to the common European trend of being a "weak" Southern European country. However, Italy has improved as an immigration country and can instead attribute its lacking outcomes of immigration regulation methods to factors such as opposing international pressures like those from the EU, unstable party coalitions causing unstable government, and other domestic structural issues. Finotelli and Sciortino discuss how illegal immigration is difficult to control in Italy especially considering Italy's shadow economy and regularization policies. In 2010, Antelmi and Santulli contributed a case study, "The Presentation of a New Government to Parliament from Ritual to Personalisation: A Case Study from Italy," in the book, *European Parliaments under Scrutiny: Discourse Strategies and Interaction Practices*, which gives a thorough outline of the Italian governmental system and how it has changed. For example, the Italian parliament relies on coalitions of political parties yet these coalitions often

collapse which is a factor when discussing the instability of Italy's government and Italian politics in relation to immigration policy.

In 2011, scholars Crepaz and Steiner published the seventh edition of *European Democracies* all about the governmental systems of European democracies. They talk about globalization and illegal immigration and human trafficking. There was a recent incident in Lampedusa, Italy where 2,000 African immigrants were returned to Libya. Other important themes include multiculturalism, nationalism and ethnicity. Also, in 2011 Ambrosini and Triandafyllidou again wrote an article, "Irregular Immigration Control in Italy and Greece: Strong Fencing and Weak Gate-keeping serving the Labour Market," about Italian and Greek immigration control. Italy and Greece are often attributed with having a "porous" border (more so because of their geographical location) and also their failure to prevent illegal immigration. The whole state of immigration in Italy is compared with Greece from immigration policy to labor markets.

Again in 2011, Zincone in the book, *Migration Policymaking in Europe: The Dynamics of Actors and Contexts in Past and Present*, contributed with her part, "The Case of Italy." She evaluates the main features of immigration in Italy especially migration flows and how immigration is controlled. For instance, the quotas determined for those entering Italy as well as the policies which have changed since immigration began to really increase are noted in detail. Zincone also talks about Berlusconi, former Prime Minister of Italy, and his policy for immigration in Italy. Most recently in 2012, an article from *Reuters*, "Insight: Italy in Political Chaos as Election Nears," written by Moody gives the most recent account of the political and economic situation in Italy. All of these articles and books talk about Italian immigration policy

or an influencing factor such as Italian politics, economics, or historical background, which helps support my work.

The work and literature on the next nation-state compared, which is France, starts with an article from Hollifield in 1986, "Immigration Policy in France and Germany: Outputs versus Outcomes." The positive and negative aspects of immigration policy in France and Germany are compared. The economic state of Italy and factors such as labor are aspects evaluated in regards to immigration in Italy. Also, immigration policies and a background of certain changes are explained like the effect the oil crisis had on immigration policy in France in 1973. This article helps in providing information to better show the relation of economics to immigration policy.

In 1991, Safran includes the factors of economics, politics, and historical background which help show the condition of immigration in France in his article, "State, Nation, National Identity, and Citizenship: France as a Test Case." Safran gives a thorough account of French identity and culture which display nationalistic tendencies as seen by the French attitudes towards migrants in France. Later in 1994, in his article, "Comparative Migration Policies," Martin compared immigration policies within Europe using France, Italy and the U.K. as his countries of focus. In France, assimilation of immigrants has been the primary approach considering the historical background of France. The cultural and historical background described helps give a picture of French sentiment toward immigration.

Later in August 2005, in the article, "Compassion and Repression: The Moral Economy of Immigration Policies in France," Fassin talked about the economy of France and its relation to immigration and policies. He shows how immigration policies have become stricter over time in France using statistics like those that detail increased rejection of asylum applicants. Also in

2005, Silverstein with his article, “Immigrant Racialization and the New Savage Slot: Race, Migration, and Immigration in the New Europe,” wrote about immigration in Europe focusing on racial issues. His review explores the new ways immigrants are classified into changing racial settings in the new Europe. The historical background of France plays a role in the reactions to increased immigration of different cultures and peoples.

In 2006, in the article, “The October Riots in France: A Failed Immigration Policy or the Empire Strikes Back,” Balz and Haddad focused their literature on the riots from October 2005 in France and issues with immigration policy. In October 2005, the riots of Arab immigrants became an example of the “failure” of France’s immigration policy. The historical background of France as a colonial power along with its politics and nationalistic traditions influence its immigration policy. France has a strong national identity which has made it difficult for immigrants to integrate into French culture and still maintain their own identity.

Later in 2008, Marthaler focused on French politics in discussing immigration policy in the article, “Nicolas Sarkozy and the Politics of French Immigration Policy.” Immigration policy is largely influenced by politics and political leaders and this is seen in the case of France and with Nicolas Sarkozy, former President of the Republic of France. Sarkozy is leader of a center-right political party and has had a major impact on French immigration policy since he became Minister of the Interior in 2002. Marthaler explains the policies Sarkozy pushed for and passed for immigration control. More recently, in 2011 Crepaz and Steiner published the seventh edition of *European Democracies* and talked about French immigration as well as multiculturalism and issues of xenophobia.

In 2011, Joppke in his article, “Trends in European Immigration Policies,” from the book *A Threat Against Europe?: Security, Migration and Integration*, describes how Europe is moving in terms of immigration policy. France which is noted in particular has incorporated some European immigration policies such as the EU Blue card. France preferred “selected” or “wanted” immigrants over unwanted immigrants and used the EU work permit to help its initiative.

The next chapter analyzes Norway’s immigration through politics, economics, and historical experiences starting with Robert’s article from 2003 on Nordic countries, “A Midsummer Night’s Dream.” He discusses the historical background of Norway describing the common identity it shares with the other Nordic countries through history and culture. The Nordic countries share similar yet unique flags. They have long national histories and a shared Nordic history as well as an old Nordic identity. There is a notion of a new European identity. In Norway, ethnic homogeneity is becoming more diverse and there is an aging population. Roberts analyzes the changing identity of these countries because of Europe, and immigration.

Later in 2005, Hartog and Zorlu in the article, “The Effect of Immigration of Wages in Three European Countries,” note the changes in immigration in the Netherlands, the U.K, and Norway and how immigration has affected labor. Norway did not see major immigration influxes until the 1970s and has seen changes in the types of immigrants as well as increased volumes of migrants. The economic factor in immigration policy of Norway is supported by the articles various insight into labor, the oil and gas sector, and migration flows. A few years later in 2008, an article from the *European Review*, “Immigration, the Welfare State and Working Life? The Case of Norway,” studied Norway’s case of immigration. This article also helps in showing how

economics is a factor in immigration policy in Norway by considering the welfare states draw as well as looking at migrant labor needed versus received.

In 2009, Gibbs used politics to discuss immigration in the article, “Norway Keeps Leftists in Power.” He reports how the Prime Minister of Norway and center-left labor party leader, Jens Stoltenberg, does not support stricter immigration policies as seen in other parts of Europe. Gibbs looks at the voting habits of Norwegians who are labor focused. Political orientation and leaders have an impact on immigration policy in Norway. In 2010, in the article, “Dealing with the Dilemmas: Integration at the Street-level in Norway,” Hagelund wrote that increased immigration is changing the historically homogeneous Norwegian society forcing work on integrating foreigners and promote social equality. This article gives a recent account of the changes experienced in Norway from immigration and how historical background effects immigration policy. Also in 2010, Moore wrote the article, “Immigration in Denmark and Norway,” which compared the nation-states Denmark and Norway by looking at their politics and anti-immigration attitudes. Norwegian political parties such as far-right anti-immigrant parties are discussed as well as a brief historical background showing past instances of xenophobia.

In a more recent article, from 2011, “Integration: Migrants and Refugees between Scandinavian Welfare Societies and Family Relations,” Olwig talks about the cultural background and society of Norway along with other countries from the region and how it has shaped the attitudes toward immigration. The aspect of the welfare state which makes Norway unique from other European countries is another factor mentioned in the article. Olwig gives a good overview of the cultural notions of Norway and their tie to immigration. Also, in 2011 the

article, “Shift Seen in European Immigration Debate as Inflammatory Comments Are Condemned,” by Anderson, Kulish, Povoledo and Homola which reports on the terrorist attacks in Oslo and the reactions of various political leaders. Members from far-right political parties in Sweden, Italy and Norway made xenophobic comments attributing multiculturalism for the attack. Lastly in 2011, Valenta and Strabac wrote in the article, “State-assisted Integration, but not for all: Norwegian Welfare Services and Labour Migration from the New EU Member States,” about the increases seen in labor migration from East European countries. The flows of immigrants received from the new EU countries are looked at especially in Norway which has received a good majority of the labor migrants. All of this literature together aids in my research to discuss the effect of politics, economics, and historical experiences on immigration in Norway. All together all of this literature on Italy, France and Norway help support my thesis and comparative analysis of the countries immigration policies from a political, economic and historical aspect.

Another factor that is discussed is the role of the European Union which affects each of these countries. To start, in 2005, Koff looked at the effect of Eastern enlargement and EU migration policies in an article, “*Security, Markets, and Power: The Relationship Between EU Enlargement and Integration.*” The EU is seeking to create a common European immigration policy and asylum. Later in 2007, Hix and Noury in the article, “Politics, Not Economic Interests: Determinants of Migration Policies in the European Union,” talks about the EU legislation and policies which affect not only Italy and France as member states but also Norway through the Schengen agreement. Then in October 2009, in the article, “European Asylum Policy – Inclusions and Exclusions under the Surface of Universal Human Rights Language,” Pirjola

discusses the inconsistency of the EU between particularism and universalism where universal human rights and the interests of EU members so not match up. Also, in 2009, Domnar talks about the effects of EU enlargement socially and economically in the article, “When the East Goes West: Romanian Migrants in Italy or How to Deal with Mobility Issues in the EU 27.” Recent Italian legislation such as the security package is also explained.

Even more recently, in April 2011 Donadio wrote the article, “France to Help Italy Block Tunisian Migrants,” describing the situation where thousands of Tunisian refugees fled to Italy overflowing them with immigrants. Many then tried entering France and in turn France blocked its borders causing a temporary tension between France and Italy that was eventually worked out by working together to block the Tunisian migrants. Also in 2011, the book, *The European Union: Economics and Policies*, written by El-Agraa gives a very good overview of the history of European integration leading up to the EU as well as the many policies along the way. One of the more important in particular in relation to the EU and immigration has been the Schengen agreement which has opened up most of Europe to trade and the free movement of peoples. Lastly, in 2012 Cappelen and Skjerpen in the paper, "Immigration to Norway 1969-2010: Effects of Policies and EEA Membership," show the relationship between Norway and the European Union from EEA membership and the Schengen agreement with a detailed statistical based study. This paper helps describe how Norway is affected by the EU almost just as much as Italy and France are. All of this literature helps to show the importance of the role of the European Union in immigration policy of Italy, France and Norway.

The literature about my topic talks about all my three countries (France, Italy, and Norway) but does not compare them with one another. There are also not any specific articles or

books that use politics, economics, and historical experiences all together to compare their influence on immigration policy. Most of the literature focuses on the problems within these states with immigrants, the attraction to these states, new problems with refugees seeking asylum, the interaction with the European Union, new issues of terrorism and immigration and how the immigrants affect the labor sector, just to name a few of the major topics. Using arguments and information from many of these different articles and books I will compare France, Italy and Norway politically, economically, and historically in relation to how they influence their immigration policy. The gap in the literature my work will cover will be to overlap these three countries and use my three independent variables to compare their immigration policy. In my study, there will be three sections of discussions of Italy, France, and Norway and within those a comparative analysis of how politics, economics, and historical experience affect their immigration policy. An additional fourth section of discussion is provided in order to further expand on the major impact and role of the European Union.

ITALY

Italy's immigration policy, characterized by emigration, has over the past thirty years transitioned towards immigration. It is a part of the European Union which has also had affects on its migration flows and immigration policies. Another factor affecting Italy's immigration policies are the historical experiences of the state which have transformed over time through Italy's interesting ancient past. Italy has traditionally been a fragmented nation with differing cultures which within the past 50 years has been united into a common cultural identity. With the increased flows of migrants coming from distant and diverse backgrounds creating a multicultural society, the historical background of Italy is an important aspect when looking at Italian immigration. Politics and the government is another important aspect of immigration policy which has not been stable in Italy, consisting of constant new prime ministers and coalition rearranging. Silvio Berlusconi took office as Prime Minister four times from 1994-1995, 2001-2005, 2005-2006, and 2008-2011 making him one of the longest-serving Prime Ministers of Italy. He represented the center-right parties including his Forza Italia political party which later merged into the People of Freedom political party. Berlusconi whom allied with the Northern League, an anti-immigrant federalist political party, pushed for stricter immigration policies while in office to crack down especially on illegal immigration. Mario Monti is the current Prime Minister who took office after Berlusconi's resignation in November 2011 and is an independent technocrat who formed a new technocratic government of experts as opposed to politicians in attempts to re-stabilize the government and economy. This instability of Italy's government and its politics is a major factor which affects immigration policy. The economy of Italy has a major impact on its immigration policy as well. The economy of Italy has had its ups

and downs over time but overall remains to have one of the largest economies in Europe and the world. It is a member of the G8 (group of eight) industrialized nations as well as the European Union and Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Italy suffered economically from 2007-2011 and had one of the highest national debt ratios along with Greece of the EU states but is working on improving debt with austerity measures initiated by new Prime Minister Monti (Van Puyvelde 2010). The strong economic well-being of Italy began drawing immigrants slightly after the economic boom of the 1950s/1960s. Immigrants can help fill labor gaps and just the same take jobs from Italians. The economy is an important aspect for any state and has an effect on immigration policy. On the whole, the factors that affect Italy's immigration policy include its historical experiences, politics, and economics.

To start, Italian immigration is affected by the historical experiences and the culture of Italy. Historically, Italy has differed from region to region in many varying aspects since much of what makes up current Italy was once a part of other states. For example, linguistically Italy has many distinct dialects all over that reveal each regions' different foreign influences yet has become less prominent with the nation-wide use of the Italian standard. The Italian standard language became more widespread with the increase of mass media, literacy, education, and immigration (Baranski 10). Many dialects were influenced by foreign languages that had a historic part of that region such as in far northern regions which dialects have French or German influences or more southern regions which dialects have Greek, Arabic and Spanish influences. This demonstrates how Italy has a tradition of assimilating foreign influences into a common culture. After the fall of Rome, the Italian peninsula broke up into small city-states which were taken over by many of the other European powers. For many centuries, the Roman-Christian

culture favored assimilation and integration. The appearance of a “shared cultural identity” surfaced early on. Then, in the 19th and for most of the 20th century after an increase in nationalism, Italy eventually reunited in 1861 under the king of Italy, Victor Emmanuel II of the House of Savoy (Padoa-Schioppa 2001:14). At this point, the Italian people were not geographically, socially or linguistically integrated which is how it remained until internal migration increased (Dickie 27). Although up until World War I Italy had been allied with Germany and Austria-Hungary in the Triple Alliance, the promise of Austria-Hungary territory lured Italy into joining the Triple Entente and declaring war on its previous allies. Italy gained the territory it wanted including Istria, Trentino-Alto Adige, Trieste (Venezia Giulia), Zara, and some Dalmatian islands integrating people from different cultures (Bankston 2). Italy desired possession of this region for strategic reasons for its location between the Alps and Dolomites. Post World War I, Fascism emerged and refortified Italy with an unfaltering nationalism doomed under the leadership of Benito Mussolini. Italy was not strong enough economically or militarily to withstand the aggressive nationalist agenda of Mussolini or the war he pulled Italy into in 1940. Fascism sought to create a common national Italian identity where the citizens shared the same language, history, culture, national symbols, cuisine, etc. To achieve this, any characteristics that did not represent the common Italian identity were stamped out. This meant “Italianizing” the newly acquired regions of Trentino-Alto Adige, Venezia Giulia, Istria, and Dalmatia where the people were predominantly Slovenian, Croatian, or spoke German. Mussolini banned all languages besides Italian and went so far to relocate many German speakers from Trentino-Alto Adige to Germany with the help of Hitler (Bankston 2). However, according to Bull, Fascism accomplished no more than a “superficial homogenization of Italian

society and culture,” (52). An anti-fascist sentiment spread towards the end of World War II and the social differences of Italy were brought back to light.

Before and after World War I and II, millions of Italians left Italy for places like the U.S, France, the U.K., Germany, Spain, Australia, Argentina, Brazil, etc where better economic conditions waited. These wars ravaged Italy’s economy causing many to emigrate in search for a better life. As maintained by Dickie, since the end of the fascist reign, “aggressive nationalism has been marginalized,” and as he describes, “a kind of inverted patriotism”(29). Italy went from many differing cultures, languages, and people from all over Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia which were brought together under the rule of the Roman Empire, to separate city states invaded by various nations like Spain, France and Austria, to a unified Italian nation under a constitutional monarchy, to a nationalistic Fascist state where the people were forced to accept a single national identity, to a state which became wounded by the aggressive nationalism of Fascism. Italy was accustomed to diverse ethnicities and differing identities naturally mandated by its geographical and political location. Due to its lack of a strong national identity throughout history, matters of cultural diversity were not engaged and foreign influences were easily assimilated (Baranski 10). Over time the regional differences that hindered the formation of a national identity faded forming a common Italian culture. This was propelled by the “economic miracle” of the late 1950s which increased manufacturing and the advanced mass media. This lead to the development of a “secularized, modernized, [and] standardized society and culture,” and created a more “monocultural” and “monoracial” country through the 1980s (Bull 55; Parati 169). However, in recent times immigration concerns and the new cultural diversity it brings has surfaced as a main issue in Italy. Previously Italy was mainly a sending country of migrants and

according to Padoa-Schioppa, “only in the last decade, when a new wave of immigrants arrived, did Italy start to meet the challenge of being a multicultural, multiethnic society” (15). These rapid influxes of foreigners have not been able to assimilate quite as easily as past foreign influences. One thing making it more difficult may be the new forms of xenophobia and racism which are surfacing in response to “the historic failure of Italy to come to terms with its fascist past” (Allen and Russo 12). Instead of assimilating these immigrants and creating a newer version of common Italian culture as in the past, they are preserving their own language, religion, culture, etc. and forming a multicultural Italian society. This modification has not been received lightly as noted by Parati, “the new multicultural Italy is far from being a peaceful cultural melting pot of the nineties: Italians have often responded with racism and violence to the changes taking place in their country” (169). These extreme responses are only a minority of the Italian population.

According to the results of recent surveys, the attitude of the Italian population toward immigration seems to be quite ambiguous. On the one hand, Italians are convinced that immigrants are necessary for the Italian economy, an attitude which is in line with the overall acceptance of economic migration and regularization processes. On the other, a sizeable part of the Italian population has developed the perception that illegality and criminality are deeply interrelated. As a matter of fact, the number of denounced and condemned immigrants, usually for small crimes, has increased significantly in the last two decades (Finotelli and Sciortino 134). The historical experiences of Italy from a divided, fragmented state to an imperialist state to an aggressive nationalistic state to a industrial mono-cultural state to a multicultural state have shaped Italian immigration policy and attitude toward Italian immigration policy. Italy has

advanced from a disjointed state of diverse cultures to a united state with a common culture made increasingly multicultural by immigration. The integration into this relatively newly formed common Italian culture and society is proving difficult for new immigrants with differing ethnicities, races, religions, etc. Also, the view of immigrants has become tainted due to ties with crime further impeding their integration. Through European integration and Italian legislation, Italy is working on incorporating immigrants, controlling the large flows, and regularizing illegal immigrants.

As previously stated, immigration is a relatively recent phenomenon for Italy. Up until the 1980s, Italy was considered a sending country for immigrants rather than a receiving country. The transition for Italy was first seen in the 1970s when two main occurrences initiated increased flows of migrants. The first incident was the oil crisis of 1973. Much of Western Europe relied on oil from oil-producing Arab nations so when the Organization of Arab Petroleum Countries (OAPEC) declared an oil embargo Western Europe was negatively affected. Oil prices rose, economies suffered and unemployment increased. This caused Western European countries like the U.K., Germany, and France to suspend immigration and in turn shifted flows of immigrants towards Southern European countries like Italy (Zincone 247). The other reason immigration increased was because during this same time period between the 1970s and early 1980s, Italy faced a labor shortage especially for low skill and low wage jobs since their economy grew so much after World War II. This drew immigrant workers to Italy and a lacking in Italian immigration policy allowed mass flows of migrant workers to enter, stay, and work in Italy sometimes legally and also illegally. According to Zincone, “since 1986, Italy had adopted a policy of planned inflows meant, in principle, to manage immigration,” which meant that illegal

immigrants could obtain permits to stay and work legally in Italy due to regularizations suggesting illegal entry is tolerated (248). The problem of illegal immigration and integration is still a major issue in Italy especially considering how it changes the makeup of society from mostly Italian homo-ethnic to multi-ethnic, it increases anti-immigrant sentiment with higher crime levels which shifts support for right-wing politics, and it floods the economy with low skill workers and cheap labor.

Italian legislation has passed two major laws regulating immigrants in Italy from outside the EU including one in 1986 and the Martelli Law in 1990. The 1986 immigration law included three main elements as described by Calavita, “foreign workers’ rights, rules on the employment of foreigners, and a legalization program” (338). The 1990 Martelli Law offered a plan for a quota worker system and incorporated a more lenient legalization program giving the immigrant worker more power and their employer less responsibility in the process of regularization (Calavita 339). Then the Turco-Napolitano Law in 1998 tried to normalize and help integrate non-EU immigrants and acknowledged their value to the economy. The law worked to help the immigrant maintain legal status, employment, workers’ rights, unify with family, and lastly integrate. Then in 2002, the Bossi and Fini Law was passed amending the 1998 Turco-Napolitano Law with stricter new clauses requiring immigrants to be fingerprinted, allowing use of naval ships for patrol the coast, linking legal residence to the work, and introducing restrictions on family unification (Dell’Olio 113). Also, third country nationals must possess a valid visa to enter Italy. The Bossi-Fini law created a more strict immigration policy overall in Italy that still worked to integrate immigrants. There are factors that manipulate Italy’s system such as, “preferential treatment to the nationals of several countries with which it has stipulated

special agreements,” as well as the fact that, “Italy has a quota system that reflects both the nature of demand in the labor market and the number of permits already issued for family reunification” (Dell’Olio 114). As for the policies of asylum seekers in Italy, the waiting period is at least a year wherein they receive temporary residence and are not allowed to work. Not many asylum seekers are successful as depicted by Dell’Olio, “In 2000 only 4,118 asylum seekers were granted asylum out of 24,500 applicants” (114). However considering that Italy faces the political ramifications of legal and illegal immigration and challenges integrating those given legal status it is understandable that the immigration policy of Italy is becoming more rigid. Especially when facing problems of human trafficking organized by the Mafia and corrupt border guards. Crepaz and Steiner point out, “immigration into relatively homogeneous European societies is fueling resentment by natives- because the immigrants are ‘different’ in race or religion, or they take jobs away from natives, or because natives believe they have come to exploit the cushy welfare state. The people are becoming fonder for leaders of the radical right” (320). These politically right politicians such as “Silvio Berlusconi’s government approve a tough ‘security package’ to stem illegal immigration and sling out unwanted foreigners” (*When Brussels Trumps Rome* 63). The increased immigration flows are not only seeing legislative changes but also political changes.

Political leaders like Silvio Berlusconi as well as political parties and Italian politics can have a significant impact on Italian immigration and immigration policy. For instance, each party holds varying views toward immigration policy and different political leaders have set out to change or amend immigration policy. After World War II, a referendum replaced the Italian monarchical system with a new constitution allowing the people to vote for Parliament using a

proportional representation system and created a new government. This marked the beginning of Italy's First Republic which lasted from 1948-1992. The Italian Parliament is a bicameral system made up of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. During this period, the main political parties were the Christian Democrats (DC), the Italian Socialist Party (PSI) and the Italian Communist Party (PCI) with the Christian Democrats centrist party as the winning majority party for most of the era. Christian Democrats saw "regulated" migration as a win-win for both the migrant and the nation leading it to set up "guest worker programs" with other countries (Calavita 333-334). Left opposition parties pushed for the 1986 immigration law in order to help mass influxes of illegal immigrants. In 1990, Socialist Deputy Prime Minister Claudio Martelli sponsored his Martelli Law offering additional immigration policies to regularize immigrant workers and thwart the exploitation of illegal immigrants. According to Antelmi and Santulli, "the proportional representation system produced highly fragmented legislatures and short-lived coalition governments," which combined with the major political corruption discovered by the Mani Pulite investigations starting in 1992 prompted electoral reform and began the Second Republic (113). Many of the political parties like the Christian Democrats who were caught up in the scandals fell apart or dissolved. A new electoral system was implemented shifting from a proportional representation to single-member district plurality voting of 3/4ths of the seats of Parliament. Unfortunately, this change did not stabilize government as hoped and although it did help create two main broad electoral unions of the left and the right, the party system continues to be highly-fragmented (Antelmi and Santulli 114). The shift from no party holding an absolute majority of seats to majority vote also diminished the responsibility of the President of the

Republic, who appoints the Prime Minister, from actually choosing among the party leaders within Parliament to consequently just appointing the leader of the winning coalition.

Silvio Berlusconi headed the Second Republic as the first prime minister in 1994 with his Forza Italia center-right party and was re-elected four times up until 2011 when he was forced to resign. In between Berlusconi's government, the Olive Tree center left coalition made Romano Prodi prime minister twice as well as Giuliano Amato and Massimo D'Alema. In 1998, Cabinet Minister Livia Turcu and Minister of the Interior Giorgio Napolitano of the center-left coalition party drafted the Turcu-Napolitano Law on immigration controls which further softened restriction and focused on immigration integration (Calavita 339). Berlusconi's party, Forza Italia, merged into the People of Freedom political party (PdL) one of the two major political parties in Italy currently with the Democratic Party (PD) being the other. Berlusconi whom allied with the Lega Nord, an anti-immigrant federalist party, and the National Alliance, a post-fascist party, pressed for stricter immigration policies while in office to crack down especially on illegal immigration. In 2001, under Prime Minister Berlusconi, Reform Minister Umberto Bossi of the Northern League and Deputy Prime Minister Gianfranco Fini from the National Alliance Party, created the Bossi-Fini Law which adjusted several of the "liberal provisions of Turco-Napolitano" and tied work with legal residence and included new harsh law enforcement measures (Calavita 340). According to Calavita, these two anti-immigrant right parties "have won regional elections over the past decade in part on their anti-immigrant platforms" which can be attributed to the anti-immigrant attitude in some areas to the growing Islamic population after the September 11 terrorist attacks in America (340). It appears that these right political parties take full advantage of anti-immigrant feelings and further encourage them in order to advance

their own political policies. Although Italians tend to view immigrants as “potential criminals,” research indicates that in general, “they express less anti-immigrant sentiment than other Europeans” (Calavita 341). Recently, in 2009 Berlusconi passed a tougher security law on immigration which made illegal immigration a criminal offense (*When Brussels Trumps Rome* 63). According to Zincone, one of the main reasons Berlusconi’s center-right coalition was brought back to power in 2008 was due to increased anti-immigrant sentiment (274). The center-right political parties have become increasingly stricter on immigration in Italy as opposed to center-left political parties in Italy which have remained more liberal in comparison. Political leader Berlusconi has grown to hold a sterner anti-immigrant attitude and in 2009 he confirmed, “he did not want Italy to become a multi-ethnic country” (Zincone 278). In 2011, Berlusconi’s Interior Minister Roberto Maroni restricted reporters and journalists admittance to any immigration detention center which was quickly repealed in 2012 by the new Interior Minister Anna Maria Cancellieri under the newly appointed technocratic government of Mario Monti.

Prime Minister Monti who replaced Berlusconi in 2011 is an independent technocrat and expert in economics appointed by Napolitano in hopes of re-stabilizing the government and the economy. The new technocratic government has not maintained the strict stance toward immigration like that the previous Berlusconi center-right government but has not made any significant changes to immigration policy either. This instability of Italy’s government and its politics has made it difficult for the government to pass many of the laws proposed since many often parties hold differing views on immigration and how to manage it. These parties may be a part of a coalition and the differing views on immigration can cause coalitions to fall apart and governments to collapse. Political leaders such as Prime Ministers and other Ministers, political

parties, and government are major factors which affect Italian immigration and policy. Farther right and even center-right parties and coalitions tend to support stricter immigration policies such as focusing more on security measures. On the other hand, center-left parties and coalitions tend to support more liberal immigration policies that focus more on integration, amnesty and immigrant rights. Politics is a major factor in terms of immigration.

Economic factors are another major factor in Italian immigration. Italy and its' economic state was left in ruins after World War II. At the time America was concerned with stopping the spread of Communism especially in Europe which was left vulnerable and wrecked by the war. So, the U.S. set up the Marshall Plan which funded aid to reconstruct Europe and help restore European economies. The Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC) was created in 1948 as an organization to direct a joint recovery program and allocate the funds received from the Marshall Plan. The OEEC eventually worked to free trade and integrate Europe economically and led to the European Common Market. Italy transitioned from a predominantly rural, agricultural country to an industrialized, manufacturing, export driven country. During this period know as the "economic miracle," Bull states that, "Italian industry expanded at an annual rate of 8 percent and exports almost doubled" (55). Europe integration changed Italy into a 'modern and affluent nation' by helping it overcome its impoverished state. For example, according to Padoa-Schioppa, from "1950-1990 the average per capita income of Italians was multiplied by five" (32). Italian consumerism grew and so did the standard of living. Often times there were inconsistencies between EU economic policy and Italian economic policy but the relationship and common market ultimately forced Italy to become more of a capitalist economy. Unfortunately, most of the economic growth and industrialization centered in Northern

Italy leaving Southern Italy underdeveloped in turn causing southerners to migrate to the prosperous north.

Later in the 1980s, Italy experienced a period of stagflation, both high unemployment and high inflation, which it quickly recovered from after tighter economic measures lowered inflation and revitalized economic growth. Economic growth slowed down in the 1990s and in 2007 marked the start of a recession Italy is still fighting to lift itself out of. Italy has a large shadow economy, a part of the Italian dual labor market, which attracts immigrants and is able to absorb sizeable numbers of undocumented workers, natives and foreigners. Italian immigration legislation is lacking especially in the battle against illegal work. For example, “Italy lacks the necessary administrative infrastructure to carry out adequate controls. Inspectors and controls are unevenly distributed across the Italian regions and only one third of them are active in the field” (Finotelli and Sciortino 131). It is difficult to impose too harsh of legislation in order to hinder informal work since the local culture encourages this kind of informal economy. According to Finotelli and Sciortino, the most appropriate and practical way to handle, “the incorporation of immigrants in the shadow economy identified by the Italian state has been the launch of regularization programs. Italy has carried out five regularization processes between 1986 and 2002” (131). The economy of Italy needs immigration to fill labor positions yet the association with immigrants to crime and the strict pressures from the European Union to restrict immigration has started to cause Italy to impose stricter immigration policies. According to Triandafyllidou and Ambrosini, “during the last 20 years the Italian economy has produced a high number of low skill jobs that natives were not willing to take and which were filled by immigrants to a large extent,” and examples of some of these jobs are in, “the caring and

cleaning sector, agriculture and low skill manual jobs” (271). Immigrant workers tend to fill these lower jobs and fill critical labor gaps created by Italy’s low birthrates and aging population.

The firmer policies are mostly just externally stringent and not internally as witnessed by the accommodating economy for immigrant laborers. Although immigrants are becoming more important to Italian economy with more legal and working legally, they are still mainly seen in the underground economy of illegal labor, often hold temporary work, and work for low wages (Calavita 338). Stricter immigration policies seen more recently by center-right governments’ simply push desperate immigrant workers to enter and work illegally lowering their standards and wages. Center left governments who have offered more liberal policies and short-term fixes of regularizing immigrants is also not a better solution. Illegal labor does not contribute to taxes and will work for low wages and no benefits lowering labor standards and the wages of other workers in this sector. With wages lowered, workers decrease their power purchasing parity and the economy suffers. Yet if lasting integration programs and immigrant worker rights are enforced, the problem of illegal immigrant workers will diminish. In recent news, the generally political party led and coalition driven Italian government was replaced with a technocratic government in order to improve the Italian economic situation. For example, Prime Minister Monti has been imposing austerity measures in order to decrease debt such as increased taxes, spending cuts, and pension reform. Yet his measures have not been met with much success in improving growth, unemployment has increased dramatically reaching 11 percent, and Italians are bearing “a deep recession worsened by Monti’s debt cutting measures”(Moody). With economic issues so dire, immigration is still a major challenge that has been met with increased

stringency on the borders reinforced by the European Union yet with a focus on integration and security.

In conclusion, Italian immigration policy has seen many changes influenced by politics, economics, and historical experiences. More recently, the European Union has been imposing stricter immigration regulations and expects Italy to follow suit which it has attempted to do as they themselves have found issues with immigration. Changing attitudes toward immigration in Italy has elected parties and leaders such as Berlusconi looking to impose firmer regulations and laws to prevent unwanted immigrants who could be linked to crime. Conversely, as externally Italy is becoming more guarded to immigrants, internally it is lacking especially economically where foreign labor is rapidly absorbed especially in the underground economy. The availability in the labor force for foreign immigrants is attractive and draws them from neighboring countries like Romania, Morocco, Libya, and Albania. Historical experiences have made Italy a more homo-ethnic society increasingly multi-ethnic with immigration increases however the more immigrants that are tied to crime the more Italians oppose foreign immigration and the more difficult integration. The issues of immigration can therefore be looked at from a historical background and cultural view, politically and economically.

FRANCE

France has a long history of being a very powerful country with a great deal of cultural, economic, and political influence in the world. France colonized all over the world and became one of the largest empires. France has been a major player in many wars throughout Europe's long history of conflict. To this day France remains one of the most developed and wealthiest countries with one of the largest economies in the world providing its inhabitants with a relatively high standard of living. This has made France quite attractive to immigrants. Ever since the end of World War II, immigration has increased in France and today is a major point of interest. Politics, economics and historical experiences are all major factors that have affected France's immigration policies. France just newly with a left-wing socialist political party in power after having a center right political party in power since 1995, a relatively strong economy, and a very nationalist society has a very strict immigration policy that many view inadequate for the integration of France.

After World War II, France began recruiting foreign workers and encouraging immigration in response to low population trends and forecasts possible future labor needs. Safran explains how luring the French economy became after WWII drawing in such a large number of immigrants that "the assimilation machinery threatened to become overloaded" (219). In general the foreign labor took over the lower paying, low skill job sector. France used immigration and foreign workers to help expand their economy as well as help with increasing population. They began to lose control of immigration patterns receiving new streams of immigrants from North Africa (Hollifield 116). In 1973, the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC) declared an oil embargo which caused an oil crisis and had

significant economic effects on many countries in Western Europe. There was a recession that soon followed the oil shock and immigration policy in Western Europe changed “radically” (Hollifield 114). The economic fall, inflation, and increasing unemployment during this period led France to completely change their immigration policies from actually recruiting foreign workers to suspending immigration and restricting movement of immigrant workers. With such high unemployment especially among nationals, foreign workers were now viewed as “a political and economic liability” (Hollifield 114). France now wanted to cut foreign labor and drive foreigners back to their country of origin in essence helping reduce competition for jobs once again to help their economy.

Although, France went to great lengths to try and enforce these new policies such as making bilateral agreements with major sending countries to help control migrant flows, immigration continued to increase. This was due to the settlement of families and immigrants who now provided new foreign labor, an influx of seasonal workers, the exemptions made to companies who relied on this cheap source of labor, the higher birth rates of immigrants, clandestine immigrants, and an increase in political refugees especially after the ratification of the Rome Treaties giving workers freedom of movement within the European Economic Community (Hollifield 121-127). In 1992, the Maastricht Treaty opened up the freedom of movement of all EU member state citizens and in 1995 the Schengen Agreement added to that freedom by relaxing border controls. Also, the recent European Union enlargement to include Eastern Europe caused France to set up special restrictions guarding its labor market from migrants from these new member states. Additional possible EU enlargement to include Turkey

has been delayed temporarily alleviating the concern many EU member-states such as France have about the country joining.

In 2006, Nicolas Sarkozy sought to “better adapt immigration to France’s capacity to receive immigrants and economic needs,” by changing migration from family to labor (Marthaler 390). He coined this new policy “selective immigration” and created a “skills and talents permit” for highly qualified non-EU professionals to help the economic development of France and keep France open to the global job market. He in a sense sought to replace family reunification and asylum-seeking immigrants who often times tend to fill low skill jobs mostly in the primary sector of the economy and who rely on the welfare of the state with these more desired and skilled workers working in the secondary, tertiary, and quaternary sectors of the economy who only have temporary permits (Joppke 19). These specially selected higher skilled workers would also be able to stimulate and contribute more to the economy and French state.

France was successful in opening the flood gates to immigration in the 1950s and 60s for economic and demographic reasons however once immigration was no longer politically & socially flattering with the high unemployment among national workers they were not able to simply export the foreigners and stop immigration. As Hollifield states very concisely, “importing labor has long-term political, economic, and social consequences that make the use of foreign workers as shock absorbers very problematic,” as well as difficult to control, reverse and stop (128). Essentially, you cannot use foreign workers as “shock absorbers” and get rid of them or stop them and their families from coming once you do not need or want them anymore. Immigration policy in France has continued to firm up since the 1970s and attempted to control migration flows in order to keep out the “Polish plumbers” and other immigrant workers

threatening to take French jobs and work as cheap labor. Many different laws and policies have been put into place seeking to restrict certain types of immigrants most notably asylum-seekers and family reunification who are regarded as burdens of the state and no longer favorable to the economy. Using these laws and policies, France has tried to use and control migration to its advantage to help drive its economy but without much success. The process is not black and white; France has to consider human rights, its responsibilities as a member of the EU, and the effects immigrants have on French society. The current economic situation in France has prompted even more restrictive immigration policies to let in fewer migrants that would take French jobs away from citizens when unemployment is high compared to the past.

France has a long history dating back to prehistoric times. Many believe the French share a common ancestry from the Gauls dating back to the first millennia BCE. Over time this region now known as France was invaded, integrated with empires, and annexed multiple times making its population a mix of Celtic Gaul, Latin, and Frankish from long rule by the Roman Empire and Carolingian Empire. Starting around the eighteenth century as Safran states, “the vast majority of French citizens developed a degree of certainty, if not smugness, about their Frenchness. They shared many historical memories” (219). France and its people have survived hundreds of years of wars and inturn, ”...benefited from a long history of political unification and from the existence of durable national frontiers”(Safran 221). Traditionally, the French have expected assimilation of foreigners and in a sense was very much a melting pot that had changed Italian, German, Polish and Jewish immigrants into Frenchman with a generation. President Mitterrand, President of France from 1981 to 1995, put it concisely, “We are French [and] our ancestors [were] Gauls—[and] Romans, and a little German, a little Jewish, a little Italian, a little Spanish,

increasingly Portuguese,... and I ask myself if we are already a little Arab as well” (Safran 226). They may be a melting pot but is this due to the fact that assimilation was expected up until recently considering the European Union prefers the practices of integration with immigrants.

France is historically very nationalistic which stemmed from the French Revolution and was then encouraged by Napoleon Bonaparte in order to validate expansion, colonization and the many wars France was involved in. During the Third Republic from 1870 to 1940, the French Empire expanded and colonized based on the idea of “the civilizing mission” which calculated that “the French culture was the most evolved” and should be spread to “less civilized peoples” (Haddad and Balz 25). They believed colonization enriched lesser cultures with their superior values of equality, liberty and education. World War I and II temporarily weakened nationalism only to be revived by the founding of the French Fifth Republic in 1958 lead by President de Gaulle who instilled patriotism and pushed for national independence. Since President de Gaulle, Safran states that many attempts have been made by French governments, “to protect national identity by means of policies aimed at safeguarding national sovereignty and increasing national power, influence and pride and preserving the integrity of the French language” (Safran 225). Many policies such as the assimilation concept have attempted to have foreigners “melt” in the pot of France and become French avoiding a multi-cultural society but this is proving to be more difficult since many foreigners do not wish to hide their differing culture or values. According to Martin, “the ‘republican model’ held that immigrants should behave like French in public, and confine celebrations of ethnic differences to their private lives”(165). However, some immigrants are not willing to assimilate which undermines the system. Haddad and Balz made a very good point that, “while the civilizing mission no longer explicitly figures in French political

discourse, the idea that French culture is inherently superior to the culture of immigrants remains a key element of French policy” (25).

France has a history of xenophobia and racism. For example, in 1930s France anti-immigration and fear for the future circulated due to the “unfettered presence of lesser-evolved races on French soil” (Silverstein 370). According to Silverstein, Jews and Gypsies were “racialized” in the past and the new racially suspect are Muslims (370). Immigrants from the Maghreb regions, often Muslim, have made up a large portion of foreigners who have found it difficult to assimilate into the French society. Another historical instance of racism was witnessed by Belgian and Italian immigrants in the 1800s that faced “violence, riots, and murders” (Haddad and Balz 26). In October 2005, riots broke out among second and third generation immigrant youth. Violence and riots among the foreigners in France is clearly not anything new and actually reoccurring. Haddad and Balz stated “the persistence of xenophobia was evident” when early the same year in May a referendum was rejected against the proposed constitution of the European Union influenced by news media and politics that warned “about the threat of Polish plumbers who would take away jobs from French workers” (26). In 2005, the majority of immigrants were arriving from former colonies such as North and West Africa particularly Algeria and Morocco as well as the Maghreb and Turkey which was forming a large Muslim population “around 7 per cent of the population, the largest percentage of Muslims in any European Union member state”(Marthaler 383). The rapid formation of this Muslim community within France and the differing values and cultures of these foreign people’s who did not wish to assimilate took the French by surprise whom were not ready for the changes. Many feared that the Muslim community would influence French society instead of assimilating and

would not respect nor embrace French values and culture. Islamophobia was become a new type of xenophobic discrimination adopted mostly by far-right extreme parties after large influxes of Muslim immigrants. In general, only a small few of the millions of French citizens actually hold these beliefs and racist views and overall the fear of immigrants especially to safety is declining.

Another important factor when discussing immigration policy in France is politics from political parties to political leaders which can lead to different ideas, methods, and goals. France has two major political parties the Union for a Popular Movement (UMP) which is a center-right party and the Socialist party (PS) which is a center-left party. Recently on May 15, 2012 the new President of France, Francois Hollande, was sworn in defeating the sitting former president, Nicolas Sarkozy. He is only the second Socialist President of the Fifth French Republic preceded by Francois Mitterrand who was the first when he was elected in 1981. The Union for a Popular Movement (UMP) was able to remain the political party in power in France starting in 1995 when Jacques Chirac was elected President until just recently. Of the 53 years of the Fifth French Republic, only 14 years (two terms of seven years) were served by a left-wing President, Francois Mitterrand and now Francois Hollande for at least one term of the next five years until elections again in 2017. Not only was this new President from the Socialist Party and left-wing being elected a big change but in addition the candidate Marine Le Pen of the anti-immigration National Front party came a close third in the elections for President and was able to win two seats for her party in Parliament's French National Assembly. This is a big accomplishment considering they were founded in 1972 and ever since have rarely even won one seat although they gained an increasing percentage of votes and not including the 1986 legislative elections where they won an astonishing 35 seats (Safran 228).

Looking back, immigration policy was not always such a hot topic of debate in French politics and as Marthaler states, “the politicization of immigration in France is associated primarily with the rise of the far-right National Front (FN),” which weren’t founded until 1972 and didn’t really start gaining a following until the 1980s (384). The 1981 elections was when the topic was seriously brought to light which Marthaler contributes in part to the Communist party (PC) focusing attention to the issue as well as the FN (384). These parties attributed immigrants to crime, a danger to national identity, and welfare mooching. The FN circulated views that were xenophobic and discriminatory and stands against multiculturalism. After the 2011 terrorist attacks in Norway committed by Anders Behring Breivik who was a far right extremist, Islamophobic, and sought to annihilate “Eurabia,” the *New York Times* reported that “a member of France's far-right National Front was suspended for praising the attacker,” because he (Anderson et.al.10). The FN member later expressed disapproval for the attacks and Breivik’s actions however his initial comments just show how strong this party feels about immigration.

According to Marthaler, “the immigration issue was virtually ignored by the moderate parties of both left and right during the 1993 parliamentary, 1994 European, and 1995 presidential elections,” but did not last long (385). After the public sentiment showed favor to anti-immigration, other parties started to step up to please voters. For example, both the center-right and far right political parties have “linked migrants with rising crime levels, fraud and abuse of the welfare state as well as cultural decline, generating a climate of suspicion towards immigrants,” helping to defend the formation of restrictive immigration policies. (Marthaler 385). Right party Ministers of Interior began hardening France’s immigration policies. In 1993, the Pasqua laws made immigration policy changes in order to reinforce French nationality and

toughen asylum laws, residency permits and citizenship and in 1995 the Debre law cracked down on illegal immigration. As suggested by Marthaler, the “center-right promoted an assimilationist model for immigrants,” which has more recently been criticized for its anti-multicultural take and been encouraged to replace with a more integrative model (386). The effects of the new stricter policies were evident considering in 1981, 16,000 of the 20,000 foreigners who sought asylum were granted it and in 1999, only 6,000 of the 30,000 foreigners applying for asylum under the Geneva Convention were granted it. The rejected rate increased from 20 percent to 80 percent while the amount of applicants increased (Fassin 374). For a period in the late 1990s, immigration lost precedence in part due to a split in the far-right party, the National Front as well as a drop in unemployment however after the September 11 attacks violence resurfaced and in attempts to keep the peace no new major immigration policies were projected by the two main political parties in the 2002 elections.

In 2002 after the French public expressed opinions that the immigration policy was not strict enough, center right President Jacques Chirac of the newly formed UMP sought to tighten them and keep high the public opinion. Chirac appointed Nicolas Sarkozy to Minister of the Interior who passed two major laws in 2003 and 2006 which further toughened and restricted immigration policy. Sarkozy’s new law of 2003 created stricter limits on immigration control, nationality, and residency of aliens in France and focused on reducing illegal immigration with deportation and reducing the amount of asylum seekers (Marthaler 388). Sarkozy justified these new restrictions by claiming they would help integration of settled immigrants and even created the French Muslim Council (CFCM) which encouraged multiculturalism, not a method the UMP or Chirac necessarily agreed with (Marthaler 389). Regardless, the public approved of Sarkozy’s

stricter policies. As previously discussed, the 2006 Sarkozy law focused on “selective immigration,” which sought to control immigration types preferring skilled temporary workers over family or asylum seekers. He also introduced the Reception and Integration contract insisting immigrants respect French values and learn French. Sarkozy later won the 2007 presidency elections for the UMP by targeting far right voters. During Sarkozy’s presidency, a new Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Co-Development was created continuing his work in migration policy-making he underwent while Minister of the Interior under Chirac’s presidency. This new ministry drew much debate from opposing parties, unions, associations, and even the Catholic Church about “its nationalist and xenophobic overtones” but the French public supported it by 72 percent (Marthaler 382). According to Marthaler, “between 1984 and 2007 the view of a majority of the French public was that there were too many foreigners in France with a peak of 73 per cent in 1995,” yet views towards immigration are improving with more foreigners “feeling at home” in France and less French fearing the loss of national identity as a result of immigration (393). Until the latest 2012 elections, the UMP formed in 2002 by combining several center right parties held the majority in French parliament.

The Socialist party (PS) which was founded in 1969 and is the main center left party in France first gained ground when their presidential candidate, Francois Mitterrand won the 1981 presidential elections. The party was able to hold the majority in the French parliament from 1981 to 1986, 1988 to 1993, and just recently winning the 2012 parliamentary elections with Socialist party leader Francois Hollande winning the presidency. This democratic left had a different approach to immigration and instead of having anti-multicultural views believed in the “right to be different” (Safran 230). Leading up to the 1997 parliamentary elections, the Socialist

party (PS) alleged it would repeal the harsh Pasqua-Debre laws but after winning ended up making quite reserved reforms (Marthaler 386). Amazingly, the PS had won the 1997 parliamentary elections and obtained the majority in the French National Assembly until 2002 while center right leader Chirac was still President. Recently, in the 2012 elections according to Irish and Ahmed, “[Hollande] promised to break with Sarkozy’s immigration and security policies, seen by many as stigmatizing France’s 5 million Muslims, who are mostly of Algerian origin”(A15). Apparently, concerns over immigration were not of great concern to the people since Sarkozy was not successful in winning by targeting far right voters again with his threats to remove France from the EU’s Schengen agreement. Hollande plans to fulfill his promise by granting more visas to Algerians, opening relations, and “easing naturalization” (Irish and Ahmed A15).

With the importance of historical experiences, economics and politics to immigration policy exemplified throughout France’s history, it is obvious many factors contribute to immigration policy. It can vary depending on the politician in power, the political party in power, the current economic state of the nation including unemployment levels, and the historical background the people share contributing to their attitude and public opinion which in turn can influence politics. France has a historical background as a strong country promoting nationalism and with a history of xenophobia and discrimination which can still be seen today and has contributed to the public sentiment of uneasiness towards immigration but is improving. The economic stability of France has always played a major factor in immigration policy from deciding to recruit foreign workers to fill jobs aiding the economy’s lacking labor force to freezing immigration in response to high unemployment and a slower economy. Lastly, the

obvious influence of politics chooses the president and political party that will make immigration policies and laws depending on their platforms, views and willingness to please the public. From strict immigration policy enforcers like Chirac and Sarkozy of the UMP center right party to leaders of the center left Socialist party like Mitterrand and current President Hollande aimed at easing immigration policy, both are influenced toward certain policies and influence immigration differently. Immigration policy in France is therefore determined by the combination of its historical background, current economic status, and politics.

NORWAY

It is said best by Hagelund in his article from *International Migration* where he captures the essence of the issue with his summation, “in Norway, as elsewhere in Europe, the debates about immigration, increasing cultural diversity and the need for integration, are heated and polarized” (79). Norway is a very different country in many ways when compared to Italy or France. Norway is not a part of the European Union and is led by the social-democratic labor party in support of a strong welfare state. Compared to Europe, Norway benefits from a more stable, composed political system. Norway is a very attractive country to many immigrants most notably its high standard of living compared internationally and its advantages it gives its citizens such as an “ample welfare, low crime, political stability, wealth, and a good life.” (Roberts 4). Norway upholds a Nordic welfare model with many favorable features including universal health care, subsidized higher education and an inclusive social security system. In official terms, Norway is depicted as a “leader in international peace negotiations and supporter of human rights,” and although it wishes to preserve this representation, it does not truly represent the attitudes of many Norwegians, “who basically view foreigners with skepticism” (Olwig 180). This view and immigration has been a major topic of debate during elections. In the past 30 years, Norway have received refugees, asylum seekers and labor migrants with refugees and asylum seekers dominating migrant flows since the 1970s up until the EU enlargement in 2004 when labor migrants began dominating migrant flows (Valenta & Strabac 664). Recently, since these changes Norway has put in place certain regulations to protect the welfare state from being affected by the high unemployment rates of the migrants.

Norway shares an identity with the Nordic countries including Denmark, Sweden, Finland, and Iceland all with a long history dating back to 1397 to the Kalmar union of the kingdoms of Norway, Denmark and Sweden (Roberts 3). Historically, Norway has had few issues with discrimination and xenophobia one of the few in 1814 when Jews were prohibited from holding office in the Norwegian Parliament and endured anti-Semitic violence and discrimination. Again in 1940 when Nazi propaganda and anti-Jewish signs appeared in Norway, the state did nothing but abide by the commands of the Nazi's by giving lists of Jews and allowing the Nazis to issue identity cards and round the Jews up for concentration camps (Moore 356). Norway has a history of being weaker and more submissive which today has translated into an extensive focus beyond its borders preserving an "all-inclusive and open society at home" (Moore 357). Just in 1905, Norway became an independent state from Sweden and continues to preserve a rather low-profile monarchy. Out of concern of losing sovereignty and power over their economy, Norway did not join the European Union.

As one of the Nordic countries, Norway has a common history and ethnic homogeneity which Roberts' describes as "fair-haired, blue-eyed descendants of Norse farmers, fishermen and traders," and is changing with an increased influx of foreigners including "immigrants from all over Asia, Europe, Latin America, and Africa" (3). With the history of Norway: essentially ethnically homogenous with no major history of racism or xenophobia, and shared Nordic values of "open-mindedness and egalitarianism"; these immigration changes which really began to rise roughly in the 1960s began to make the public unsettled (Moore 357). These changes have caused new strict laws and anti-immigrant political parties to arise to prohibit immigrants even though the generous welfare state does need migrant workers to fulfill jobs Norwegians will not

and cannot fill. The welfare state relies on working taxpayers to function. The pressures of Europe, new increased immigration, and increased stress on the welfare state are all obstacles facing Norway which the practical identity of the people can help them adapt to and meet as it has in the past, integrating foreigners and continuing as a prosperous stable state (Roberts 4). Norway knows how it feels to be dependent and not a significant player in the international arena which has led it to become world leader in human rights and an international mediator for peace. For hundreds of years, Norway was either in control by Denmark or Sweden and later by Germany during World War II (Moore 363). The historical experience of Norway leaves it with insight and knowledge helping it to steer clear of racism that may be spouted by certain far-right parties and remains a more open society to immigration and multiculturalism.

Norway experienced immigration mostly from other Nordic countries until around 1970 which was in part due to the history and proximity it shares with the other Nordic countries as well as due to an arrangement of mutually open labor markets (Hartog and Zorlu 119). Some other common immigrants until 1970 were Western immigrants such as immigrants from the U.K. and the United States. These typical immigrants eventually became replaced by immigrants from developing countries and asylum seekers coming from countries like Pakistan, India, Turkey and Morocco. According to Zorlu and Hartog, Norway decided to crack down on immigration and "...passed a restrictive immigration law in 1974, although admitting immigrants with specific skills." (119).

The more "restrictive law" didn't seem to have much of an effect considering since then immigration in Norway increased, especially due to family (re-)unification and asylum seekers. At first coming from countries like Chile and Vietnam and as of 1975 countries like Iran, Sri

Lanka, Bosnia-Hergovina, and Somalia (Hartog and Zorlu 119). Also later, after the breakup of Yugoslavia an influx of migrants came from this former state. An increasing amount of refugees immigrated to Norway. As determined by Zorlu and Hartog research published in the *Journal of Population Economics*, “In 2000, 282,500 immigrants (first and second generation) live in Norway which is 6.3% of the total population. The share in immigration from Nordic countries, Western Europe, and North-America/Oceania has decreased over time. In the same period, the share of immigrants from developing countries and from Eastern Europe increased from 6% to 50%, and from 10% to 16%.”(119). So, statistics are showing a changing trend in Norway’s typical immigrants from 1970 to 2000, once originating from industrialized countries and Nordic countries to more recently coming from developing countries.

Although, Norway has a high demand for labor it does not receive the actual labor it wants which poses a mismatch between the supply of, and demand for, immigrants. The welfare state is faced with the pressure among the sense of humanitarian responsibilities and the concerns of the national economy (*Immigration, the Welfare State and Working Life? The Case of Norway* 529). In general, compared to other Norwegians, immigrants from Nordic countries and EU countries have a higher education level and a higher income level of workers whereas immigrants from Eastern Europe and developing countries tend to have a lower education level and lower income level of workers (Hartog and Zorlu 128). The more restrictive law on immigration posed in 1974 aimed at regulating the inflow of unskilled labor from poor countries while also making certain to give access to specific roles of the labor market such as the quickly growing oil sector. Unfortunately, this law did nothing for the humanitarian entrance into Norway which was promptly opened and taken over by family reunifications and refugees.

According to an article from the *European Review*, Norway's "...immigration policy since 1975 has been based on the underlying assumption that newcomers will constitute a potential burden for the state, i.e. that they will be dependent on net contributions from the social security budgets," and this theory has been validated from the flows of immigration experienced and as the article states has likely, "tainted popular opinion towards immigration in general" (*Immigration, the Welfare State and Working Life? The Case of Norway* 529). These concerns would be reduced with another regulation set up in 2004 which would keep immigrants from becoming a "potential burden for the state."

Norway is a welfare state that is facing increasing cultural and religious heterogeneity which in turn is creating some social exclusion of immigrants and creating a challenge for the welfare state to integrate. In order to integrate immigrants it must, "provide space for cultural diversity and promote social equality through participation in the labor market, education and civil society." (Hagelund 79). Considering the structure of the welfare state is meant to provide assistance and provide equal rights, in theory integration should come naturally for the welfare state. However, a majority of the migrants in Norway are labor migrants primarily from new EU member states and they are not given the same rights to welfare services and integration aid as Norwegian workers and refugees benefit from (Valenta & Strabac 664).

In 2004, Norway imposed new transition rules that allowed labor migrants to fully qualify for benefits only after working at least 12 months without employment breaks which kept many EU migrants from Eastern Europe from receiving unemployment benefits (Valenta & Strabac 668). Since the global economic crisis in 2009, unemployment levels of labor migrants especially from Eastern European countries increased drastically compared to the 5 years prior, a

period in which Norway received the largest influx of labor migrants ever and when labor migrants unemployment rate was roughly equal to Norwegians unemployment rate (Valenta & Strabac 671). So, labor migrants were the ones losing jobs and not being able to receive unemployment benefits unless they had been employed for at least 12 months prior. However, this stipulation was put in place to safeguard the welfare state from allowing immigrants to use the generous welfare state to its advantage. Valenta and Strabac express concern that, “the Norwegian system is deviating from its original, social-democratic orientation, and moving towards a laissez-faire liberal position,” ...because of an, increased segmentation of the labor market and a lack of integration assistance to labor migrants.” (675). Although, the system has added a more inclusive requirement it does not by any means completely restrict immigrants or labor migrants from benefits or even unemployment benefits. The condition creates a sense of ease to Norwegian taxpayers and protects the welfare state from being drained by unemployed migrants.

The economy of Norway is very strong especially after oil and gas was discovered in the 1960s increasing their economic wealth as a state. Today, Norway is a major producer of oil and natural gas. In 2009, Norway got through the financial crisis fairly easily due to its collective oil fortune (Gibbs 1). According to Zorlu and Hartog, up to around the year, “1970 immigrants in Norway were mainly from other Nordic countries (through the arrangement of mutually open labor markets) and from industrialized countries like the UK and the US, and were overwhelmingly employed in the growing oil and gas sector” (119). This sector has helped Norway’s economy remain stable and kept unemployment levels low.

In general, politics is a major factor in the implementation of a state's immigration policy agenda. Different political parties and leaders have varying approaches to the immigration policy agenda of each state. In Norway, Jens Stoltenburg of the Norwegian Labor Party has held office as Prime Minister for over 7 years starting in 2005. In 2009, after elections in Norway continuing Stoltenburg's streak to maintain in office in pursuit of further developing public services and opposing demands to crack down harshly on immigration, the *New York Times* printed an article with details about the election. According to the article, "Mr. Stoltenberg's three-party left-wing coalition won 86 seats in the 169-seat Parliament. That would give it just enough of a margin to continue as the only left-of-center government in Scandinavia and one of the few remaining in Western Europe" (Gibbs 1). The major issues of this election and the past few elections were all issues that affected quality of life as opposed to issues such as foreign policy. In Norwegian politics, there has been a problem with xenophobia which has increased the popularity of the far right parties such as the Progress Party however the left and right-leaning parties refuse to cooperate or associate with these far right parties whether it be in forming coalitions or over policy issues (Moore 355).

Starting with the election in 1989, the Progress Party, a far-right political party, starting seeing an increase in the percentage of votes and by the election in 2001 it became the third largest party in Norway which was attributed to the fact that double the amount of immigrants arrived in Norway from 1986 to 1987 (Moore 360). According to research done by Elina Kestilä and Peter Södedund , provided in Moore's article, "Immigration in Denmark and Norway," from the journal *Scandinavian Studies*, it appears that, "ethnic prejudices in Norway do not seem to exhibit a positive correlation to immigrants already there, but rather to the significance and

consequences of continued immigration such as the effects of the employed exploiting the welfare system and threats to cultural and national identities” (360). During the 1999 elections, in debates the Progress Party publicly degraded immigrants and credited them to a rise in crime. This led to other parties both left and right distancing themselves from the Progress Party. So, although Norway seems to have moved closer to the right since immigration became more of a policy issue this can be attributed to other issues such as economics. In fact, Norway has been under center or center-left government since 1986 and remains under center-left government with Jens Stoltenburg as prime minister.

In July 2011, Norway experienced two terrorist attacks, a bombing in Oslo and a massacre on the island of Utoya. Anders Behring Breivik, a right-wing extremist, was found to be behind the terrorist attacks. In Oslo, several government buildings were bombed and on the island of Utoya where a summer camp was being held a gunman opened fire killing many and causing hundreds more injuries. The target was the Norway Labor Party which was directly targeted by the bombings of government buildings and the massacre of the campers of the Workers Youth League, the youth division of the Norway Labor Party. Mr. Breivik’s manifesto stressed the importance of nationalism, expressed his extreme xenophobia and as expected coursed with violence.

Several members of far-right parties in Italy, France and even Sweden were criticized for attributing multiculturalism for the attacks. Heated debate over immigration in Europe has encouraged far-right politicians in recent years. Some politicians such as Sigmar Gabriel, head of the Social Democratic Party in Germany, believed the attacks were “fostered by a trend toward xenophobia and nationalism in the region.” On the other hand, others such as Jimmie Akesson,

leader of the Sweden Democrats felt that there couldn't be any blame placed on social structures for the actions of individuals. The real question is how this tragedy has affected public opinion in Europe and in Norway since. The right holds power in Britain, France, Germany and Italy unlike in Norway where the left is very much still in power. Although the tragedy has had an impact on several countries maybe making elections more challenging for far-right politicians, it has not affected any major shifts from left to right (Anderson et. al.10).

Due to the upward trend of immigration and the persistent trend of globalization, the topic of integration has become an important aspect of Norway's future development as a welfare state and society. In Norway and internationally, Norway advocates human rights in all forms. The legislation against discrimination based on race, religion, and ethnicity is an example of how Norway seeks to provide legal security for immigrants (Moore 363). Overall, Norway's historical experience, economic stability and politics are all major factors of its immigration policy.

Historically, Norway has been governed by either Sweden or Denmark for a good deal of its existence and was even controlled by Germany during World War II. It never had any major issues with racism or xenophobia and was relatively ethnically homogenous for the majority of its history. These factors had made Norway what it is today and influenced how it deals with immigration and creates policy. Norway is very much a permissive and equality-valuing society seen by the strong welfare state formed as well as its position as a leader in international peacemaking and philanthropic support (Moore 355).

Another major factor to immigration discussed was economic stability. Norway's economy has always been fairly stable with wealth in oil. This stability and oil wealth has been a

determinant of the arriving migrant workers in Norway. Also, the welfare state's generosity to its citizens compels immigrants to come to Norway and stay considering the many benefits even though new restrictions have been put in place to prevent abuse. Unemployment rates tend to remain stable among Norwegians where migrant unemployment rates run high. Essentially speaking economically, Norway maintains a stable prosperous welfare state with relatively low unemployment which in effect draws in immigrants, makes them want to stay even without employment, and in turn causes Norway to create immigration policy to protect these economic features yet still help integrate immigrants.

Finally, the politics which includes political leaders, political parties and political system of Norway is the last major factor in regards to immigration. Over the years, the politics of Norway have fluctuated from different prime ministers to different reigning political parties to different coalitions. The values of the political party in power helped determine the stance toward immigration the state took. However, being a more open and accepting state, Norway has kept center and center-left parties in power since 1986. Immigration policy has not been a major issue in elections which means the parties in power have not made any major policy changes in regards to immigration. The current prime minister is Jens Stoltenburg of the Norwegian Labor Party, a center-left party which supports a strong welfare state and cooperation nationally and internationally. The trend of the politics in Norway has led immigration policy to be less restrictive as in neighboring European states which has encouraged more immigration to Norway. This has led to a growing diverse and multicultural Norway, where integration is key to the future development of the welfare state and the Norwegian society.

THE ROLE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

Immigration policy of the European Union and its member states is becoming an increasingly imperative issue so much so that, “it is estimated that about 500,000 illegal immigrants make their way into Europe per year” (Crepaz and Steiner 320). The European Union is not only important to Italy and France considering they are member states but Norway as well when looking at immigration policy. The European Union has its own immigration policies and initiatives it expects its member states to support and enforce. These policies and laws interact with the domestic immigration policies of member countries like Italy and France as well as affected countries like Norway. The EU’s policies and agreements can change the immigration in each of these countries. Another factor has been the expansion of the EU to include less developed Eastern European countries which has allowed new flows of migrants from these countries to relocate to more prosperous countries like France, Italy or Norway. In response, many of these countries have passed stricter immigration policies to limit new flows of “unwanted” immigration.

The European Union we know today took a while to establish through varying treaties which incorporated more and more integration of different aspects over time. Starting in 1947, the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) was organized by the United Nations (UN) which sought to help start and manage projects in order to rebuild Europe’s economy (El-Agraa 20). Then, the Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC) was created in 1948 as an organization to direct a joint recovery program and allocate the funds received from the Marshall Plan. The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) created by the Treaty of Paris in 1951 after World War II in order to further join together Western Europe after two

consecutive and devastating wars as well as the Treaty of Brussels signed in 1948 which was a treaty of economic, social and cultural harmony as well as collective security (El-Agraa 24). These agreements were meant to help rebuild Europe's economy and promote peace while beginning to integrate Europe. There were six founders of the ECSC and Italy and France were two of them. Later in 1957 the Treaty of Rome was signed which created the European Economic Community (EEC) to further help integrate Europe economically and create a common market. It also created the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM). Then in 1965, the ECSC, EURATOM, and EEC combined into the European Communities (EC) in the Merger Treaty creating a single institution (El-Agraa 27). The EC expanded by including Greece, Spain, and Portugal. The next treaty that made the EU what it is today is the Schengen treaty signed in 1985 which allowed free travel within the Schengen area with only external border controls (McCormick 275). This was a major advancement especially when analyzing the effect of the EU's immigration policies on its member states and other affected states. Anyone could travel from state to state within the Schengen area freely. The Schengen Agreement produced:

Passport-free travel for EU citizens and the requirement of only a single visa for noncitizens but also the end of checks at airports for flights among signatory states, the drawing up of rules for asylum seekers, cross-border rights of surveillance and hot pursuit for police forces, the strengthening of legal cooperation, and the creation of the Schengen Information System (SIS), providing police and customs officials with a database of undesirables. (McCormick 275)

Earlier, in 1952 the Nordic Passport Union was created allowing free travel amongst the Nordic countries of Norway, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, and Sweden basically the same concept of the Schengen treaty. Not too much later the Single European Act (SEA) was signed in 1986 to further harmonize Europe's laws and policies and aimed for a Single European Market (SEM) by 1992 which would allow the "free movement of goods, services, capital and labor" (El-Agraa 29). Lastly, there is the Maastricht treaty of 1992 which created the European Economic Area (EEA) and later the European Union (EU) and led to the creation of the Euro, a common currency for Europe. Norway joined the European Economic Area (EEA) in 1994 which made it part of the common European labor market (Cappelen and Skjerpen 4). This treaty was amended in 1997 by the Amsterdam treaty, in 2001 by the Nice treaty, and 2007 by the Lisbon treaty. The Amsterdam treaty turned the Schengen rules into European Union law. Today, there are 26 states that are a part of the Schengen area including four non EU-member states one of which is Norway. In 2001, Norway joined the Schengen area. So although, Norway is not a member of the European Union it is a part of the Schengen area allowing free travel to and from any other Schengen area state. This combined with Norway's participation in the EEA ties it closely to the European Union. There are some restrictions to the Schengen Agreement allowing Western European countries a period of seven years to limit immigration from Eastern European states to prevent new economic immigrants.

The European Union has several Resolutions, Agreements, and Conventions which help control European immigration policy and set common standards. There are three types of immigrants as Dell'Olio explains, "family members of immigrants already established in the EU, new economic immigrants, and asylum-seekers/refugees" (Dell'Olio 110). The Resolution on

Family Reunification, the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and the UN Convention on Migrant Workers have all attempted to help family members of immigrants already established in the EU. In regards to new economic immigrants Dell'Olio asserts that, "Association Agreements between the EU and Algeria, Hungary, Morocco, Poland, Tunisia, and Turkey regulate labor immigration into the EU from these countries" (110). Lastly, the Geneva Convention, Title IV of the Amsterdam Treaty, the Tampere European Council of October 1999, the 2002 Seville meeting of the European Council, and the Hague Programme together form the EU policies toward asylum-seekers and refugee immigrants (Dell'Olio 110; Koff 403). These plus others which will be discussed make up the immigration policy of the EU and as Hix and Noury stated, "EU rules now cover the full gamut of 'migration policies,' from entry, residence, and economic rights of immigrants to societal integration of immigrants and their descendents"(183). However, with the EU expanding and new migration issues caused by the inclusion of poorer Eastern European countries, member states lack a congruent position. Due to the challenges with immigration policy and the inability to effectively agree on a solution to enforce, "the previous fifteen EU member states have treated the new members as second-class citizens in migration-related discussions," and are concentrating on the security issues the enlargement to include these new members brings as opposed to seeing the potential they can have in easing migration pressures (Koff 414). This inconsistency can be seen by further examining the interactions of Italy, France, and Norway's domestic immigration policies with the EU's immigration policies.

Italy has many policies and laws dictating immigration policy which interact with the immigration policies of the European Union. As the European Union has grown, member states

have felt the effects of including membership to eastern European states and there has been an increase of movement and immigration to western European member states. Italy in particular has a large border especially accessible from the sea making it one of the most convenient member states of the EU for immigrants to access Europe. In effect, Italy has been passing stricter immigration policies to prevent illegal immigration and reduce unwanted immigration. Recently, the European Union has been working to “harmonize EU migration controls” and to create a “common asylum and immigration policy” (Koff 402). However, thus far as Dell’Olio points out, “national laws are still the only effective measures on both immigration control and immigration policy” (Dell’Olio 108). Italy and other member nations are left to deal with enforcing their own immigration policy.

As Pirjola describes there is an interesting inconsistency in the EU between “universalism” and “particularism” and is seen in how, “the EU tries to ensure the universal normativity of the refugee law standards, but at the same time it attempts to ensure the law’s concreteness by distancing it from the human rights law (357). Until the European Union arrives and settles on a Common Immigration Policy infrastructure, market stability, and the integration of social and welfare policies, immigration policy will be left to each member state. Italy like other EU member states is “unmistakably converging toward restriction and intolerance,” in immigration policy (Dell’Olio 112). The EU has reflected this shift with immigration policies and by pressuring the government to ensure borders are secured but still upholding human rights, EU laws as well as integrative approach to migrants.

There have been many clashes between Italian immigrant policy and EU immigrant policy in recent years due to the harsh policies and laws Italy is imposing. For instance, a plan

was devised to clear out Romanian Roma (gypsies) by kicking out EU citizens who cannot show that they have sufficient capital to survive. This new regulation was apparently criticized for conflicting with EU laws on the free movement of people. In effect, caution was given by the EU justice commissioner, Jacques Barrot that he would look to soon start infringement proceedings against Italy (*When Brussels Trumps Rome* 63). Another security package Berlusconi attempted to enforce, “required the courts to add a third to the sentences or fines imposed on non-Italians living in Italy illegally,” however, “the head of a delegation from the European Parliament said that he had secured from Mr. Maroni an undertaking it would not be invoked for EU citizens” (*When Brussels Trumps Rome* 64). The European Union has a strong influence on the political governing of its member states. The free movement of people enacted through the Schengen Agreement means, “the politics of ‘them’ and ‘us’ in the EU no longer applies. Except, of course, at election time” (*When Brussels Trumps Rome* 64). Since the European Union has failed to successfully secure the border and enforce immigration policies to prevent illegal immigration Italy has decided to create stringent immigration policies of its own in hopes of aiding the challenges illegal immigration poses to it. In 2011, thousands of Tunisian migrants fled to Europe after the Tunisian revolution which started in 2010. Italy gave six-month residence permits to thousands which under the Schengen agreement would allow them to travel freely but France blocked its borders from the Tunisian migrants (Donadio A8). Many Tunisians have family in France which attracted many of them to head there. Italy hoped the EU would relocate the refugees in order to disperse them over Europe but this was not imposed. France pointed out that under the Schengen rules they are justified in blocking immigrants if they do not have proper documentation or “the means to support themselves” (*Take My Migrants, Please* 58). In order to

overcome the conflict between Italy and France over the Schengen rules, they decided to work together to patrol the coasts preventing refugees from entering their borders and leaving Tunisia. According to Donadio, this crisis “comes at a time when the domestic politics of both Italy and France are being shaped by parties with strong anti-immigrant agendas: the National Front in France and Italy’s Northern League, of which Mr. Maroni is a member”(A8). In September 2011, The European Commission proposed from common rules for the Schengen Area to be able to temporarily reintroduce border control at internal borders to help deal with “exceptional circumstances” like that experienced with mass flows of Tunisian migrants. This is a perfect example of the ineffectiveness of the EU’s border security measures, the implications agreements and immigration policies of the EU impose on its member states, and the inconsistency in EU policies.

France is one of the member states with the largest migrant issues even with increased security and stricter immigration policies. The EU enlargement started in the 1970s increasing membership steadily and agreeably from its original six members, until a controversial increased enlargement in 2004 where a whopping ten members mostly of Eastern Europe were added, increasing the EU from 15 to 25 members. Due to fear that the citizens of these new member states would overrun the French labor market, France along with other original member states set up special restrictions on the free movement of the citizens of the new member states for five years of the seven year transitional period in hopes of easing the growth and transformation. Later in 2007, the EU enlarged again entering Romania and Bulgaria and increasing its members to 27. Again, France put restrictions for seven years until 2014 on the movement of these countries citizens requiring Bulgarian and Romanian workers to obtain a work permit. In

comparison, Italy did not impose the restrictions opening its labor market to the new member migrants (Domnar 35). The European Union currently has eight potential new members looking to join the EU all working to meet the criteria required. Croatia appears to be the closest to joining next while Turkey, a predominantly Muslim country, started accession talks in 2005 but is not anticipated to be joining any time soon which has temporarily calmed concerns of EU member-states like France about the country joining. France has also incorporated some of the EUs schemes such as the 2009 EU Blue Card Directive which is an EU work permit allowing high-skilled non-EU citizens to work and live within an EU country. The EU Blue Card was created to match the U.S green card however has not had the same attraction as the green card (Joppke 24). The EU Blue Card went along with President Sarkozy's plan to shift the immigration trend in France to encompass mostly "chosen" economic migrants of high-skill. However, this is difficult to achieve since family immigration is "protected by domestic, international, and –most importantly—European law" (Joppke 28). France has taken advantage of some of the EU policies in order to support their own immigration policies as well as has set up restrictions to guard itself from the residual effects of EU enlargement.

Norway has also been influenced by the European Union and its immigration policies even though it is technically not a member of the EU. According to Cappelen and Skjerpen, "Norway's membership in the European Economic Area (EEA) in 1994, and in the Schengen-area in 2001 resulted in higher immigration while the 2004 and 2007 EU enlargements also increased labor immigration to Norway substantially"(4). To start, the EEA creates a single European labor market with the free movement of goods, persons, services, and capital. Norway is able to enjoy free trade and participation in the European single market without EU

membership. However, Norway has no part in determining EU legislation regarding the market which it must ultimately adhere to. Therefore, under this agreement, "...citizens of the EU gained free access to work in Norway for three months or to stay for six months as job-seekers, as well as getting in principle the same social benefits as Norwegian citizens" (Cappelen and Skjerpen 37). Also, since Norway has been a member of the EEA it has contributed to a large portion of the financial grants it provides with Iceland and Liechtenstein, the other non-EU members, in order to help social and economic evenness in the single market the EEA members share. Norway does not receive any financial support from EU policies or funds. Because of this agreement Norway's immigration is significantly impacted by the EU. In fact, Cappelen and Skjerpen estimated that, "...the accumulated immigration over the time period 1994-2010 would have been 10 per cent lower without Norwegian involvement in the European Economic Area" (25). Norway's involvement in the EEA also led it to joining the Schengen agreement in 2001 allowing citizens of all the countries involved in the area to receive a temporary visa to travel anywhere within the area without a passport. When the EU expanded in 2004, new countries now had easier entry into Norway only slightly limited with gradual progressive regulations. In 2007, many of the 2004 new EU members were added to the Schengen area and more countries were added to the EU which included Bulgaria and Romania and the same regulations to Norway enforced on the 2004 new members were directed to them (Cappelen and Skjerpen 38). Then, in 2009 many of these regulations ended giving most of the new EU members from 2004 full access to Norway. Due to Norway's membership in the EEA and Schengen area it is, "...affected by migration flows in Europe just as any other EU-country and migration to Norway from EU-countries has increased significantly in recent years" (Cappelen and Skjerpen 4). Therefore

immigration in Norway has been affected by the European Union in many of the same ways it has been affected in Italy and France. All three have moved towards stricter immigration policies in attempts to thwart “unwanted” immigration.

Overall, the European Union has a major impact in regards to immigration not only on its members but also other countries it trades with, has agreements with, etc. This can be seen in the cases of Italy, France and Norway. According to Bellucci, more recently, “since the 1990s, after a decade of relative openness, the EU has, generally speaking, started to restrict immigration,” however not to the extent many countries hoped and the enlargement of the EU has only liberalized immigration (91). Italy has started to tighten immigration laws after being “one of the more permissive countries” in Europe following the immigration trend of the rest of Europe (Bellucci 86). The EU has not approved of some of these new restrictions although it has sought to close the “backdoor” of Europe since many migrants find Italy a more accessible way into Europe. France has some of the more restrictive firm immigration policies of Europe which have helped guard it from EU growth although it has also implemented some of the EU’s policies like the EU Blue Card Directive. Lastly, Norway which is not a member of the EU is affected just the same since its membership in the EEA and the Schengen Area open it to the same flows of migrants. The common response and trend of these countries is enforcing stricter domestic immigration laws and setting up restrictions.

CONCLUSION

In summation, Italy, France, and Norway's immigration policy is affected by their historical experiences, politics, economics, and the European Union. Each of these factors plays a different role in shaping immigration. Italy with a shift to the center right politically although currently with a technocratic government in power; a large unstable economy; and also becoming increasingly multi-ethnic with immigration, is beginning to become stricter with immigration policy as it has been increasing in recent years. France with a newly left-wing socialist political party in power after many years of a center right political dominance, a strong economy, and a very nationalist society also has a very strict immigration policy that many view inadequate for the integration of France. Lastly, Norway with a social-democratic labor led party in support of a strong welfare state; a strong economy; and a historical society of relative homogeneity, seeks immigration policy to maintain their values and encourage integration. Also, important to note is the role of the European Union which has an effect on all of these countries even Norway through agreements instead of membership. Depending on the ideology of the political parties in power, the state of the economy, and differing historical experiences and values as well as the differing interaction of the European Union, differing outcomes are witnessed in France, Italy and Norway.

The historical experience of Italy has formed the current Italian society and attitude toward immigration. For example, historically Italy was regionally diverse with different parts of Italy belonging to different empires and domains. Then, Italy unified and started to grow culturally and ethnically homogenous after the economic boom in the 1950s. Increased immigration has made Italy more multi-cultural changing society. Italy was not ready for this

rapid influx of immigrants since it had been a sending country for so long and never really a receiving country for migrants. Problems with immigrant crime along with the recent changes in society have left a bad impression on Italians and produced increasing anti-immigrant sentiment. This of course has been fueled by certain political parties and leaders. The politics of Italy are very complicated since its political system and government is very unstable and often changes. The current government which just changed in November 2011 is technocratic led by an economist Mario Monti however the center-right had a strong hold on the immigration in Italy until the change which upheld relatively firm immigration policies. This new government was formed in response to the current economic recession Italy is experiencing. Economics is another major factor in determining immigration considering Italy only became developed, industrialized, and economically sound starting in the 1950s after World War II, there new economic success saw an increase in immigration. Their economy was pretty much able to absorb the migrants until more recently with unemployment on the rise, Italy implemented stricter policies in order to prevent migrants from coming and taking jobs. Illegal migrant workers especially hurt low skill labor by offering cheap cost productive labor Italians cannot compete with.

The historical experience of France has formed the current French society and attitude toward immigration which has a historical past with nationalism. The strong French identity has produced growing xenophobia among France specifically of Muslim immigrants and has made it difficult for immigrants to assimilate into France. Political parties such as the National Front have fed off of this anti-immigrant sentiment and other parties and leaders have been prompted to provide strict immigration policy for its citizens. The economic state is another factor

important in looking at immigration policy. France has a relatively stable and strong economy that has been a major developed country for long enough that it was able to be a major colonial power. This prosperous economy has attracted many migrants seeking a better life. France was able to absorb much of this immigration when its economy needed labor gaps filled in the 1950s and 1960s. Yet, more recently immigration has been focused on accepting mainly high skilled labor immigrants who would contribute to the French economy. The current economic state has really prompted even more restrictions on immigration in hopes of preventing introducing the competition of cheap labor migrants into the French labor market when unemployment and debt is a major issue. The politics of France have been predominantly right leaning since 1995 up until recently with the elections in May 2012 which shifted the power to the Socialist left party leader Francois Hollande. Strict immigration policies and restrictions were enforced under the right wing government and Hollande is expected to maintain the same strictness as well as help turn around the current economic state in France.

The historical experience in Norway has shaped the current Norwegian society and attitude toward immigration. Norway has been historically culturally and ethnically homogenous with little migration seen from countries other than Nordic ones. Although, Norway has probably had the most welcoming response of the three to the increased immigration flows it's seen and increasing cultural diversity migrants have brought, it has still imposed restrictions and strict immigration policies. The effects of increased migrant populations in Norway have prompted Norwegians to push for these stricter policies and regulations. Another important factor to consider is the strong economic state and welfare system of Norway which has a very big draw for migrants who are coming from countries with little opportunity or government assistance.

Immigrants are filling the labor gaps in Norway but recently Norway has pushed to safeguard its generous welfare state from migrants looking to take advantage. It has been able to maintain its strong economic state and prosperous welfare state by restrictions and policies ensuring immigration does not affect the economy negatively. Lastly, the politics of Norway impacts its immigration policy with a left-wing Labor party in power led by Jens Stoltenberg. Although, he is left leaning he has responded to Norwegian concern about immigration and provided satisfactory strict immigration policies and restrictions. The Progress Party's increased support does however show the right leaning immigration views of Norwegians. Yet, the inability to change the political party in power reveals the approval with the current immigration policies under the left party.

In addition, the European Union is another factor when analyzing the factors of these countries immigration policies. They are each further influenced by the EU either directly as members are more indirectly through agreements and trade. For example, Italy has relied on the EU's immigration policies to help determine its immigration policy but has had to pass stricter domestic policy in order to better restrict and regulate immigration. France has some of the toughest immigration policies that it has set in place to guard it from the EU's growth as well as some policies to use EU policy to its advantage such as the EU Blue Card. Lastly, Norway the non-EU member is affected almost just as much first through the European Economic Area which is joined to become a part of the EU market and then later by the Schengen area agreement which opens Norway's borders to the flows of migration looking for refuge, family and work. Norway cannot directly influence the EU since it lacks membership yet it has still set up restrictions to keep the new EU members notably from Eastern Europe from full access to

Norway in order to protect its borders. So, it is easy to see how all of these countries are affected by the EU which has its own immigration policies and agenda.

Politics, economics, and historical experiences are all major contributing factors in immigration policy as perceived in states such as France, Italy, and Norway. The role of the European Union is almost important to note since it imposes policies on its members and allows large flows of migrants by expanding its territory. As determined through the research in this thesis, politics can either end up more right oriented with generally stricter immigration agendas or more left orientated which tend to have more liberal immigration agendas although the left can enforce strict immigration policy also if it is needed to keep the party in power. The state of the economy also helps determine immigration policy if it is strong and growing then immigration policy can absorb and use migrant labor however this also attracts a flood of migrants which eventually the state will have to regulate with restrictions and stricter policies. The historical experiences of the state also determines its history with immigration and the cultural sameness it shares which shows that when states have a longer history with immigration and a nationalistic identity they tend to prefer stricter immigration. When they have a more recent experience with immigration and homogeneity of cultures they allow more diversity at first, favor integration and eventually push for increasingly stricter policies. For further research, the evaluation of which variable has the biggest impact in each different state could help set Italy, France and Norway apart more clearly. Also, the European Union's immigration policies do not effectively provide enough protection and even causes Western Europe countries increased flows of migrants from inclusion of Eastern European countries. This has led countries to enforce their own domestic and stricter immigration policies as well set up additional

restrictions and policies to protect it from EU growth. Also, to expand more the notion of the Schengen agreement as an individual factor in immigration policy can be analyzed. Such as how the Schengen agreement impacts each of these states statistically. These opportunities for further research could provide a different take and more in depth analyses, further expanding on this thesis. In summation, each of the factors analyzed influence a state to enforce different immigration policies and a trend toward enforcing stricter immigration policies is seen among Italy, France and Norway.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Hamid Ould and John Irish. "Hollande Hints at an Apology; France's Socialist President, who has Affinity with Algeria, may be Ready to Express Regret for Colonial War." *The Gazette* (Montreal). 4 July, 2012: A15.
- Allen, Beverly and Mary Russo, eds. *Revisioning Italy: National Identity and Global Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997. 1-19. Print.
- Ambrosini, Maurizio and Anna Triandafyllidou. "Irregular Immigration Control in Italy and Greece: Strong Fencing and Weak Gate-keeping serving the Labour Market." *European Journal of Migration & Law*: Jul 2011, Vol. 13 Issue 3, p251-273, 23p Academic Search Premier.
- Anderson, Christina, Nicholas Kulish, Elisabetta Povoledo, & Victor Homola. "Shift Seen in European Immigration Debate as Inflammatory Comments Are Condemned." *New York Times*. July 28, 2011: p. 10. Academic Search Premier.
- Antelmi, Donella, and Francesca Santulli. "The Presentation of a New Government to Parliament from Ritual to Personalisation: A Case Study from Italy." *European Parliaments under Scrutiny: Discourse Strategies and Interaction Practices*. Ed. Cornelia Ilie. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010: 111-134. Print.
- Balz, Michael J and Yvonne Haddad. "The October Riots in France: A Failed Immigration Policy or the Empire Strikes Back?" *International Migration*. 2006: Vol. 44, Issue 2, p23-34. Academic Search Premier.
- Bankston, III, Carl L. "Mussolini's Italy." *Magill's Literary Annual 2007* (2007): 1-3. *MagillOnLiterature Plus*. Web. 30 Oct. 2012.

- Baranski, Zygmunt G., and Rebecca J. West, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Italian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 1-15, 337-346. Print.
- Bellucci, Stefano. "The Changing Face of Italy." *ItaliAfrica: Bridging Continents and Cultures*. Ed. Sante Matteo. Stony Brook: Forum Italicum, 2001. 85-103. Print.
- Bull, Anna Cento. "Social and Political Cultures in Italy from 1860 to the Present Day." Baranski and West. 35-61.
- Calavita, Kitty. "Italy." *Immigration and Asylum: From 1900 to the Present*. Vol. 1. Eds. Matthew J. Gibney and Randall Hansen. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2005. 335-342. Print.
- Cappelen, Ådne and Terje Skjerpen. "Immigration to Norway 1969-2010: Effects of Policies and EEA Membership." Discussion Papers, 687. Oslo: Statistics Norway, 2012: 1-41. Web. Google Scholar. <<http://www.ssb.no/publikasjoner/DP/pdf/dp687.pdf>>.
- Crepaz, Markus and Jurg Steiner. European Democracies. Seventh edition. Pearson Education, 2011.
- Dell'Olio, Fiorella. "Immigration and Immigrant Policy in Italy and the UK: Is Housing Policy a Barrier to a Common Approach Towards Immigration in the EU?" *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies*. Jan 2004: Vol. 30 Issue 1, p107-128. Academic Search Premier.
- Dickie, John. "The Notion of Italy." Baranski and West 17-33.
- Domnar, Anca Oprisor. "When the East Goes West: Romanian Migrants in Italy or How to Deal with Mobility Issues in the EU 27." *Romanian Journal of Political Science*. 2009: Vol.9, Issue1, p29-45. Academic Search Premier.

- Donadio, Rachel. "France to Help Italy Block Tunisian Migrants." NYTimes.com. *The New York Times*. 8 April 2011: A8. Web. 10 October 2012.
<<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/09/world/europe/09italy.html>>.
- El-Agraa, Ali M. *The European Union: Economics and Policies*. 9th ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011. Print.
- Fassin, Didier. "Compassion and Repression: The Moral Economy of Immigration Policies in France." *Cultural Anthropology*. Aug.2005: Vo.20. No.3, p362-387. JSTOR.
- Finotelli, Claudia and Giuseppe Sciortino. "The Importance of Being Southern: The Making of Policies of Immigration Control in Italy." *European Journal of Migration & Law*: May 2009, Vol.11 Issue 2, p119-138, 20p, 3 Charts. Academic Search Premier.
- Gibbs, Walter. "Norway Keeps Leftists in Power." *New York Times*. Sept.16, 2009: p1. Academic Search Premier.
- Hagelund, Anniken. "Dealing with the Dilemmas: Integration at the Street-level in Norway." *International Migration*. 2010: Vol. 48, Issue 2, p79-102. Academic Search Premier.
- Hartog, Joop and Aslan Zorlu. "The Effect of Immigration of Wages in Three European Countries." *Journal of Population Economics*. Mar. 2005: Vol 18, Issue 1, p.113-151. Academic Search Premier.
- Hix, Simon and Abdul Noury. "Politics, Not Economic Interests: Determinants of Migration Policies in the European Union." *International Migration Review*, 41: 2007: 182–205.
doi: 10.1111/j.1747-7379.2007.00061.x

Hollifield, James F. "Immigration Policy in France and Germany: Outputs versus Outcomes."

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. May 1986:Vol.485,
p113-128. JSTOR.

"Immigration, the Welfare State and Working Life? The Case of Norway." *European Review*.

2008: Vol.16, Issue 4, p529-536.

Joppke, Christian. "Trends in European Immigration Policies." *A Threat Against*

Europe?:Security, Migration and Integration. Eds. J. Peter Burgess and Serge Gutwirth.

Brussels: VUBPRESS Brussels University Press, 2011: 17-31. Print.

Koff, Harlan. "Security, Markets and Power: The Relationship Between EU Enlargement and

Immigration." *Journal of European Integration*. Dec 2005: Vol. 27 Issue 4, p397-415.

Academic Search Premier

Marthaler, Sally. "Nicolas Sarkozy and the Politics of French Immigration Policy." *Journal of*

European Public Policy. 2008: Vol. 15, Issue 3, p382-397. Academic Search Premier.

Martin, Phillip. L. "Comparative Migration Policies." *International Migration Review*. 1994:

Vol.28, Issue 1, p164-170. Academic Search Premier.

McCormick, John. The European Union: Politics and Policies. Fourth edition. Colorado:

Westview Press, 2008.

Moody, Barry. "Insight: Italy in Political Chaos as Election Nears." Reuters.com. Thomson

Reuters, 31 Oct. 2012. Web. 1 Sept. 2012.

<<http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/10/31/us-italy-chaosidUSBRE89U0XL20121031>>

Moore, Harald F. "Immigration in Denmark and Norway." *Scandinavian Studies*. Fall 2010: Vol

82. Issue 2, p.355-364. Academic Search Premier.

- Olwig, Karen Fog. "Integration: Migrants and Refugees between Scandinavian Welfare Societies and Family Relations." *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies*. Feb. 2011: Vol.37, Issue 2, p.179-196. Academic Search Premier.
- Padoa-Schioppa, Tommaso. "Italy and Europe: A Fruitful Interaction." *Daedalus*. Vol. 130, No. 2, Italy: Resilient and Vulnerable, Volume I: The European Challenge, Spring, 2001, pp. 13-44. JSTOR.
- Parati, Graziella. "Strangers in Paradise: Foreigners and Shadows in Italian Literature." Allen and Russo 169-190.
- Pirjola, Jari. "European Asylum Policy – Inclusions and Exclusions under the Surface of Universal Human Rights Language." *European Journal of Migration and Law*: Oct. 2009, Vol. 11 Issue 4, p347-366. Academic Search Premier.
- Roberts, Adam. "A Midsummer Night's Dream." *Economist*. June 14, 2003: Vol. 367, Issue 8328, special section p3-4. Academic Search Premier.
- Safran, William. "State, Nation, National Identity, and Citizenship: France as a Test Case." *International Political Science Review*. Jul.1991: Vol.12, No.3, p219-238. JSTOR.
- Silverstein, Paul A. "Immigrant Racialization and the New Savage Slot: Race, Migration, and Immigration in the New Europe." *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 2005: Vol.34, p363-384.
- "Take My Migrants, Please." *The Economist*. 16 April 2011: Vol. 398 Issue 8729, p58. Academic Search Premier.
- "When Brussels Trumps Rome" *The Economist*. 5 Sept. 2009 Vol. 392 Issue 8647, p54-55. Academic Search Premier.

Valenta, Marko, & Zan Strabac. "State-assisted Integration, but not for all: Norwegian Welfare Services and Labour Migration from the New EU Member States." *International Social Work*. 2011: Vol. 54, Issue 5, p663-680.

Van Puyvelde, Eric. Deficits Increase in Eurozone and EU. 15 Nov. 2010. *Europolitics*. Retrieved from <<http://www.europolitics.info/economy-monetary-affairs/deficits-increase-in-eurozone-and-eu-artb287086-50.html>>.

Zincone, Giovanna. "The Case of Italy." *Migration Policymaking in Europe: The Dynamics of Actors and Contexts in Past and Present*. Eds. Giovanna Zincone, Rinus Penninx, and Maren Borkert. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011. 247-290. Print.