

Migrants and refugees: bottom-up and DIY spaces in Italy

The term ‘Arrival City’ was notoriously introduced by Saunders (2010) indicating all places which provide first access to the city. For Saunders, migrants from rural third world villages confront the same challenges in any city in their home country or abroad. These cities provide opportunities even beyond the appearance of poverty. What is true for arrival cities in developing countries (the broad spectrum of informal neighbourhoods) is advocated for cities in western countries (and local government officials responsible for development policies). Through an ethnographic approach, the paper considers the emerging practices of welcoming refugees in the center of Milan and the spatial arrangements of migrants in a small town on the outskirts of Rome. Such empirical situations combine a varied set of reception models. In conclusion, the paper tries to conceptualize both the hospitality and the role of cities, contributing to a critique of the model of the sanctuary city while cognizant of their geographical and spatial aspects.

This paper explores the contradictory spatial organization of migrants and refugees in the Italian case, analysing two different cases of informal (bottom-up and DIY) spaces of coexistence. In a few decades, sometimes within a few years, migrants and their descendants have become a permanent feature of all European countries. Besides, governments have tried to disperse asylum seekers following more or less pondered demographic criteria. Between the opposing logics of concentration and dispersion, urban policies struggle to grasp the emerging spatiality of migrants. A notorious answer came from the concept of the ‘Arrival City’ (Saunders, 2010) that indicates the neighbourhoods and places providing first access to the city. For Saunders, the developing city is the model: migrants from rural villages confront the same challenges in any continent. Saunders advocates for cities in northern and western countries (and local government officials responsible for development policies) with what he infers from cities in the South: that informal neighbourhoods are the political answer for the arrival cities in the North. Arrival neighbourhoods can be either ethnic or mixed settlements, in the cities core or periphery: they can be understood as transition areas, combining a network of migrants, community monitoring, gradually upgraded jobs, homes and density.

The paper initially discusses the apparent contradiction between planning and informality and the embarrassing tension created by Saunders appraisal of informal ethnic neighbourhoods. Second, the paper contextualizes the specific features of the Italian case and in particular whether migrants and refugees share the same space and the same spatial logic. The following paragraphs present two studies: the first addresses the emerging practices of welcoming refugees in Milan; the second the local arrangements of migrants and foreign-born residents in the case of a small town on the outskirts of Rome. Both cases have in common a form of sustained informal production of arrival space; however, they represent two different facets of it. Both settings, indeed, perform arrival cities’ specific set of functions but one constitutes a temporary entry point for refugees within the core of Milan, which has recently witnessed a surge of forced migrants during the so-called ‘refugee crisis’; whereas the other instantiates the role that peripheral locations in urban areas can play as arrival context for stable settlement. In conclusion, the paper tries to conceptualize both the hospitality and the role of cities, contributing to a critique of the model of the sanctuary city underpinned by an awareness of the geographical and spatial aspects.

1. Planning, informality and immersion

Planning scholars have become increasingly concerned with informality, acknowledging the structural role it plays in the economic and urban development processes. Widely studied in the global south (Roy, 2005), it is still often considered as marginal in the north, apart from a few historical cases. In particular, it is useful to consider “a multidimensional ‘continuum’ between more formal and more informal neighbourhoods” (Altrock, 2012, p. 187). In this approach, it is suggested to focus upon the “discrepancy between the regulative system and its implementation” (*ibid.*). The model of the arrival city falls into this gap between practices and systems of regulation. From this point of view, it solicits two questions:

- a) which local actors are concerned: migrants or asylum seekers, NGOs and street-level bureaucrats; to function effectively, in fact, arrival districts need a consistent engagement of local actors.
- b) what mix of formal and informal activities is at stake. Actors combine in a dense social space, where goods and services are produced and exchanged in markets, public arenas and sometimes in informal networks. No one, however, is considered to be stand-alone, and actors can play multiple roles at the same time in different arenas.

Though arrival neighbourhoods are often considered as low-cost settlements, it is hard to consider them as the result of a spontaneous movement of citizens who re-appropriate urban spaces, or secluded political space, naïvely excluded from all political transactions. As argued by Hall (2013), continuous immigration has rapidly changed urban neighbourhoods, which are becoming increasingly diverse. Global processes of migration, indeed, are reshaping the social and spatial texture of contemporary neighbourhoods. This is a place-making process that turns neighbourhoods into examples of transnational spaces (Ley, 2004), and sometimes challenges social cohesion (Phillips, 2006).

Arrival spaces are indeed complex urban artefacts but they are not the informal output of a random assemblage; they require an increasing awareness of community and local actors as well as a (sometimes) not obvious involvement of professional and expert capacities, either driven by local actors themselves or called in at certain points. Within this political influences are not excluded, rather it is the opposite as these processes are often highly politicized. In fact, public and community actors are engaged in negotiations around public and common goods.

This paper analyses such process of change, the establishment of novel routines, in two case-studies of arrival space considering various political, technical and social dimensions: actors involved in creating such arrival spaces, defined, adapted and negotiated ‘projects’ based upon capacities as well as materiality and uses. Even more importantly, public and community actors – NGOs, associations, activists - have strongly interacted with migrants, inhabitants, policymakers, addressing all the usual resources and constraints of the social and material assemblage of different actors.

The analysis is aimed at understanding the emergence of novel practices and how the actors related to each other. We explore the different forms of planned and informal developments that are involved. In this sense, informal projects are not the opposite of a plan or a project; they rather disclose and explode the contingencies that characterise by definition

all planning processes. Informality and the emergence of a new order, though still a provisional one, lend themselves to being analysed in terms of ANT. The main contribution of ANT is the conviction that the world as we know it is constituted by the association of the actants (for an introduction to ANT, we refer to a well-tempered interpretation: Ryding 2020). ANT insists on the notion of fluidity or stability of relationships, and allows for focusing on ambivalences and resistances. In this sense ANT is an approach that by definition is suitable to study moments of controversy and social change (Callon, Lascoumes and Barthe 2009). The study of change is a crucial point undeniably and a complex one: change, shift, transition, all are generalized views of the shape of change and open the way to different conceptualisations and approaches. We also add that postulating that change is fluid by definition as it is an ontological and normative position to the same extent as pretending that change is only structural and determined. But one could argue that social change is always a disruption of established routines: what generates this disruption and the form it takes are empirical rather than ontological questions.

The two case studies are the result of an in-depth ethnographic immersion work parallel to the doctoral studies of XXX and XXX, respectively. The Milan case accentuated the interpretive aspect and the immersion; the Roman case investigated materials and sites involved and the relationship actors they established in assembling the situation. The methodology of the case study is based in both cases on in-depth interviews with volunteers and operators; migrants and residents, as well as site visits and discussion with key witnesses, local decision-makers, researchers and experts. The understanding of the relationships between the participants derives from the interpretation that the authors of the interviews made of the case study and the materials collected. To this aim, we adopt an 'immersive' point of view that acknowledges that such space is the outcome of the interactive and recursive practical engagement of field workers, activists, migrants themselves as well as a variety of street-level bureaucrats and policymakers. In other words, we adopt a 'political ethnography' approach that focuses intentionally on situations to uncover the situated construction of broader categories and practices. Ethnography allows in fact for an understanding of how categories, like legal norms and political directives, are translated into actions and, the other way round, of how practices can inform our knowledge about issues, standards and procedures (not only in the informal domain). The adjective political points to the collective dimension and the interaction between a plurality of actors, and the structured character of the arena that is neither independent from interests nor excluded from the competition for public resources.

2. Working definitions: migrants and refugees

Geographers have insisted on the difference between the spatial behaviour and patterns of diverse groups of migrants, forced migrants, refugees and asylum seekers. Though most live in large cities, an increasing number is now located in either small cities or the countryside (Balbo, 2015). Italy has a particular, hybrid organisation of the reception system, based upon a mix of central and local actors, both public and private. This is a crucial question from the point of view of the Arrival concept. For instance, migrants tend to disperse spontaneously, following a general trend in suburbanizing and the offer of housing; while the relocation of refugees and asylum seekers is a specific policy objective and follows

national criteria and directives. Thus, the spatial coincidence of refugees and migrants in the same neighbourhood, a basic tenet of the concept of the arrival neighbourhood, is all but guaranteed.

The label of ‘migrants and refugees’ is often blurred and the exercise in categorizing is awkwardly incomplete. Combining diverse criteria, a distinction is often made among foreign-born residents, asylum-seekers (or refugees) and undocumented migrants, which allows for a better understanding of their distinctive geographies. Scholars have criticised this distinction (Crawley and Skleparis, 2018), as people can belong to more than one category or move from one to another. Labels are in fact the result of states controlling national boundaries (Agier and Madeira, 2017). However, for the purpose of defining the different logic of territorialisation, a provisional distinction can be useful:

a) refugees, including asylum seekers. The first term indicates people who, owing to a well founded fear of persecution are outside their country of nationality (EMN, 2014). While the latter term refers precisely to those who undertake the process of formal determination of their refugee status (*ibid.*). Despite these notions having featured strongly during Europe’s ‘migration crisis’, refugees and asylum seekers represent just a partial share of both foreign-born residents and displaced people all over the world.

b) statistically, migrants, or foreign-born residents, are those having resided in a foreign country for more than one year for all combined reasons, often because of the search of a better job and access to welfare;

Italy occupies a specific place in this double transition: foreign-born residents are 5 million, about 8.5% of the total population, half of whom originated from European countries. Romania, notably, after joining the European Union (EU) in 2007, became the first country of origin (23% of foreign residents in Italy in 2019 come from Romania). Italy is however characterized by a great variety of nationalities of origin and therefore by a scarce presence of large cohesive ethnic communities. The ‘spatiality’ of migrants follows a specific logic. In major cities, the average proportion of migrants is 11.3%; however, more than 50% of foreign-born residents live in smaller municipalities (Balbo, 2015). This new geographic location of migrants partially follows a suburbanization process that pushes a slice of the population towards the smaller metropolitan municipalities (XXX, 2016), and partially a ruralization process that sees the insertion of many foreigners in the "fragile areas" (Osti, Ventura, 2012).

Contrariwise, compared to most other European countries, the migrants’ inflows coincide with the restructuring and the crisis of the Italian industrial model. Flows are not (anymore) commanded by firms and industrial jobs, as they were in the post-war period when migration was mainly an interregional process. Of late, economic pull-push factors and the rural industrial divide seem less influential on the global movement of international migrants (Pastore and Ponzio, 2012). The access to jobs in all sectors, from care to commerce and agriculture, rely mostly upon urban ethnic networks. The particularity of immigration in Italy, therefore, leads to the definition of different insertion models, due in part to specific geographical characteristics (Pugliese, 2002). In addition to be more attractive in economic-working terms, medium and small municipalities are more porous and welcoming. Regardless of national governance levels and policies, it is usually the responsibility of the municipalities to help the refugees with housing, education, jobs, integration etc. Overall,

the governance system and the public discourse are particularly weak and contradictory, with a strong divide apparent between the largely national (anti)immigration policies, and the often mainly local welcome initiatives (Balbo, 2015; Caponio, Jubany Baucells and Güell 2016).

At the same time, some notable initiatives at the local level have reached significant success, like those launched by the Protection Service for Asylum Seekers and Refugees (SPRAR) intending to aid refugee integration in the local community. The paper now introduces two different cases, one about refugees in the metropolitan core of Milan; and the second about migrants in a small municipality at the metropolitan fringe of Rome.

3. *Refugees in Milan: from the bottom up*

With a population of 1.4 million, Milan is Italy's second-largest city (Comune di Milano). Capital of the Lombardy region, since the 1980s it witnessed a rapid growth of the foreign population, now accounting for about 20% (*ibid.*). The recent arrival of refugees has further strengthened the relationship between Milan and international migration. Indeed, from 2011 to 2017 there was a particularly high influx of refugees, during the so-called "refugee crisis". Some arrived 'formally', by following their distribution in national asylum system reception centers (i.e. CAS and Sprar), as decided by national and local authorities; most, however, arrived more spontaneously to Milan's Central Railway Station, along the transit route from Southern Italy to Central Europe. In this period, the city of Milan assisted roughly 170,000 refugees coming firstly mainly from Syria and subsequently from Eritrea (see XXX, 2019).

Under the incitement of an 'emergency', Milan developed and structured its welfare sector to accommodate up to 2,000 people a day (XXX, 2019), during which Milan emerged as an 'avant-garde' for migrant integration (Bazurli, 2019). This 'Milan Model' spread internationally and depicted Milan's response as resulting from the local administration's determination to tackle effectively the 'refugee question', with a municipal delegation invited to the European Parliament (*ibid.*). However, the 'Milan Model' mostly represents the accomplishment of the efforts and expectations of a set of actors (Bazurli, 2019) in a constant discussion (also with disapproving tones) with the local administration. Some guiding principles and operational strategies were, indeed, shaped by and even introduced 'from below' (XXX, 2019), through a series of networks of actors constituted by pro-migrant supporters of various kinds (from NGOs to political activists) activated at different scales.

Importantly for us, supporters' groups operated and even emerged at the micro-scale. During the *en-masse* arrival of refugees, many of these grassroots associations, volunteer groups and civil society networks mobilised to assist incoming migrants in particular neighbourhoods of the city. Alone they were just 'minor' expressions of solidarity but taken together formed an *infrastructure of welcome*, less formalised than the one constituted by the Municipality but equally important, shedding light on the critical role that urban neighbourhoods have for migration dynamics. Refugees' visible presence in public spaces has provoked expressions of discontent by some residents and shopkeepers. At the same time, Milan's neighbourhoods have also proved to be able to represent welcoming contexts. In particular, the strong presence of bottom-up social capital in some of these areas have been capable of creating a certain degree of 'solidarity' toward the newcomers, that

expressed through the activation of groups of residents or local associations - groups that confronted the mounting discontent, in some cases successfully (Bazurli 2019).

In what follows, we illustrate the successful case of Porta Venezia, a historical neighbourhood near Milan's center . Porta Venezia is an 'antique' arrival neighbourhood, the point of reference for Eritrean exiles in the '70s, which thanks to a 'strange alliance' of descendants of those Eritreans and Ethiopians who first arrived in this neighbourhood in the '70s and the middle class that inhabits now this part of the city proved to be able to regain its function of welcome space. What is more, Porta Venezia is paradigmatic of how the welcome of refugees is not simply 'given' or bestowed, but is actively 'made' from the 'bottom-up' initiatives in neighbourhoods that embody the idea of cities as "strategic frontier zone for those who lack power" (Sassen, 2013:67). The arrival of refugees produced tensions as well as the activation of a set of refugee supporters that confronted the strong discontent by some residents and shopkeepers, envisioned a route to refugees' reception opposing the securitisation of the neighbourhood, and tried to act as an interlocutor with the local administration.

Porta Venezia: the neighbourhood and the contention over the public space

Located just north of Milan's historic center , Porta Venezia is an important shopping area, and the city's 'gay village'. Thanks to a large affordable housing stock, this neighborhood represented Milan's *arrival neighbourhood* for the first Eritrean migrants in the '70s. Even today, though gentrified, Porta Venezia retains a certain recognition as the heart of the Eritrean community in Milan (Arnone, 2010). This neighbourhood, indeed, has been the target of economic and symbolic investment for Eritreans and Ethiopians, with the opening of many ethnic shops and restaurants flanking their 'Italian' counterparts; a 'community hub' (Ostertag, 2016) where an ethnic economy serves a spatially dispersed population.

During the so-called 'refugee crisis', from 2013 to 2016, furthermore, Porta Venezia has assumed an important role in the geography of migration. In this time, Italy was affected by a surge of seaborne migration that brought many people to its coast and among them also a significant number of Eritreans and Ethiopians. Milan was an important stopover for thousands of refugees from Eritrea who were waiting to leave and continue to Central Europe; a waiting period that many Eritrean refugees used to spend in Porta Venezia (Grimaldi, 2016). Following on the steps of their predecessors, in effect, Eritrean refugees were attracted to Porta Venezia hoping the informal ethnic networks could help them to find accommodation and orientation. Actually, the ethnic community was unable to 'absorb' the unparalleled number of newcomers (even 300 a day) (*ibid.*). In a short period, the public spaces became crammed with *de facto* refugees, meaning refugees who have not yet undertaken the process of formal determination of their refugee status, who usually escaped from reception facilities and were without a place to sleep. In particular, 'taking advantage' of its public nature, refugees utilised the nearby park (*Indro Montanelli Public Gardens*) as shelter. Thus, full of people, the flowerbeds along *Viale Vittorio Veneto* became dotted by makeshift beds. Porta Venezia, and in particular the green area surrounding *Viale Vittorio Veneto* soon became the stage of a 'battle' between an association of local shopkeepers and

residents, who argued that the use of the public spaces should be forbidden to vagrant refugees, and pro-migrants groups.

As advanced by Brivio (2013), the social use of public spaces by immigrants (that is divergent from the one of Italians) often causes outcry and exacerbates the stigma on migrants. In this case, some the residents and Italian shopkeepers vocally expressed their anger toward the use that Eritrean refugees made of the park. They promoted an anti-immigrant initiative, led by members of the League party, and a neighbourhood watch initiative, ‘infiltrated’ by right-wing politicians; they also requested the securitisation of the neighbourhood, with the deployment of police agents to prevent refugees from sleeping out within the neighbourhood. While the municipality limited its response to acquiesce to security-driven demands, the work of assistance was delegated to civil society groups, in particular to a group constituted mainly by second-generation young Eritreans with links with far-left activism (a group that later on became formally established as *Cambio Passo*, henceforth CP) and to volunteers linked to local parishes and led by members of *Sant’Egidio* (then SE), a well-known catholic voluntary organisation. This situation of indolence from the municipality is well-painted by Zeghé, one of the leaders of CP, when remembering the context of their initial intervention:

“For us, the inability of the municipality to talk with local leaders of the Eritrean population was really depressing. [At that time], the municipality’s only interlocutors were some residents and shopkeepers with a strong demand for securitarian interventions. [...] So much so that the only action from the municipality was to send in policemen to move migrants off of certain streets. With no noticeable results, since migrants temporarily moved to return to their previous location”.

Both CP and SE were engaged in offering humanitarian assistance to the migrants in Porta Venezia: mainly food, clothes, and accommodation for the fortunate few. These activities were at first mainly carried out in the *space of contention*, the public gardens where refugees used to spend the night and from which anti-immigrant groups wanted them removed. Soon, however, they aimed to spread their activities throughout the area and involve as many residents as possible. One of them is Caterina, a long-standing resident of Porta Venezia that joined the volunteers of SE. She recalls the outcry that the presence of many black men generated in the area:

“There were many hostile people among the residents that organised the distribution of flyers here. They said that migrants were too many, that they carry some serious disease [...]. But I think that the main problem was the fact of being young men, young black men in particular”.

As observed by Amin (2013), due to ‘phenotypical racism’, the visible nature of migrants often fosters the perception of ‘socio geographical transgression’ at the local level. The visibility of migrants’ presence as well as the work of assistance carried out by civil-society groups, however, represented also a trigger for many residents to join CP and SE. To promote a virtuous circle, residents were involved not only in humanitarian relief but also in activities whose goal was self-promotion and recruitment of new volunteers. Caterina recalls, for example, the neighbourhood festival that she organised with other volunteers. This work of ‘solidarity-spawning’ - as it was called by Luca, the leader of SE - pursued also another goal: dampening the hostility and getting residents’ and policymakers’ consensus, by showing the welcoming spirit of the neighbourhood.

The strategic alliance in Porta Venezia: local actors and political negotiations

As illustrated above, the joint efforts of CP and SE made possible the arrangement of a set of services aiming at satisfying refugees' basic needs and easing the tension in the neighbourhood. These actions, however, saw the acquiescence of the city government that at first adopted a strategy of tolerance and then expressed active support. In effect, providing voluntary services and obtaining permission for neighbourhood festivals required extensive negotiations. In particular, strategic considerations drove mutual interactions between CP and SE, on the one side, and the local politicians, on the other; such negotiations brought together a sort of alliance that strengthened each other's positions in the face of an otherwise hostile environment. In Porta Venezia, these groups used different tactics to get the attention of the municipality and public opinion; tactics as the ones described by Luca:

“Our first goal is to interest residents and parishioners [...]. This is fundamental since the involvement of volunteers outside our organisation is a means to generate further solidarity. For this, we appeal to the city as a whole, through interviews with newspapers and interventions in media outlets.”

Against this backdrop, claims have moved from the 'level of the street' to the institutional level. The city government first legitimised some CB and SE demands, once the municipality started considering them as valid interlocutors. This introduced an important shift in the municipality's action, from a securitarian to a more humanitarian approach. As narrated by Zeghé, indeed, the municipality limited the deployment of police officers and started to meet (partially) the demands for the provision of services to migrants as expressed by the civil-society groups:

“Our demands to the municipality were for more services: more public toilets, more cleaning services, and presence of Eritrean mediators that inform and orient migrants. This when the dominant frame was securitarian [...]. Over time, however, the municipality has increased the services for refugees, starting with more toilets and the assistance of Eritrean mediators.”

What is more, while adopting a confrontational attitude toward the Municipality, CP and its leader, Zeghé, sustained continuous dialogue with the municipality, showing a partial success. CP, for example, actively campaigned for two initiatives endorsed subsequently by the city government: the opening of the city's reception centers to Eritrean *de facto* refugees and the establishment of a 'reception hub' from which to manage incoming people. In the accounts of interviewees, in this period the pro-migrant movements of the city felt encouraged to upscale their demands: CB, for example, endorsed the emerging local branch of *No One is Illegal* movement and its precise requests for a change in national and local policies on asylum.

At the same time, in such favourable contexts, the municipality has felt legitimised by a large sector of the civil society in articulating a line conflicting with national positions. Indeed, albeit the central government was also led by PD, the same center-left party, its Milanese branch has most often maintained a pro-migrant stance while the national government took an increasingly restrictive approach. As a result, its local leaders felt isolated; as revealed by a public official, “*since [...] the national government did not understand nor reply*” Milan's resolution was to maintain a pro-migrant stance.

Ultimately, the pressure on the city government enacted by committees, groups and supporters in different neighbourhoods of the city (in particular, other than Porta Venezia, in the district of Ghisolfi and Central Station, see XXX, 2019; Bazurli, 2019) pushed the municipal agenda closer to their demands and proved critical for shaping the response of Milan to the arrival of refugees. Though Saunders (2010) depicts arrival spaces as rather spontaneous, neighbourhoods like Porta Venezia indicate how arrival neighbourhoods are the outcome of the interactions of a variety of actors with projects; the arrangements of political negotiations, rather than the triumph of informality. In addition, the events following the en-masse arrival of Eritrean and Ethiopian refugees in Porta Venezia have shown how urban neighbourhoods can (re)turn into welcoming sites for migrants by establishing new connections and alliances.

This example, set in the metropolitan core of Milan, illustrated the important function that social network and civil society exerted on the forging of arrival contexts. In the next section, we will focus, instead, on an arrival context in the eastern metropolitan area of Rome. Public space in it is seen as an opportunity for informal gatherings and exchanges, creating, therefore, a chance for stronger inter-ethnic bonds.

4. Migrants in Rome and DIY urban spaces

Public and collective spaces are important assets in contemporary cities for promoting the daily encounter among diverse people and for encouraging the expression and recognition of different cultures. The social inclusion of migrants is a matter that involves many areas that must be considered and continually connected. Urban space is one of the main places of visible coexistence. However, it emerges from literature and field research the great importance of every public space in social inclusion processes due to the creation of positive relationships between natives and new arrivals (Fincher, Iveson, 2008). The public space which will be referred to later includes both open urban spaces, such as squares and parks, and welfare spaces, such as schools and libraries. Scholarly research emphasises the importance of ‘welfare spaces’ concerning the issue of migration (Fioretti, 2016); indeed, public facilities and open spaces open to dialogue and recognition of differences, playing a key role in building up a shared feeling of citizenship. Besides, migrants tend to revitalize some abandoned urban contexts, not only by taking over jobs which Italians no longer want, but also by proposing new uses of the public space (Briata, 2014).

Between suburbs and countryside

Rome, capital of Italy and of the Lazio region, contains the second-highest number of migrants (after Lombardy) with 683 thousand foreign-born residents (Istat 2019). The province of Rome (now a Metropolitan City) hosts 82% of the regional foreign-born population. During the last twenty years, the attractive role of the city has decreased favouring suburbanization towards the small municipalities, as much as towards the other Provinces. The centrifugal movement of migrants and the decentralization process is a widespread phenomenon throughout the country, as demonstrated by the growing amount of empirical research that focused on the settlement of those foreign-born in small and medium-sized Italian suburban centers (Balbo, 2015; Fioretti, 2016) and no longer only those in large urban centers.

In this section, we illustrate the case of Marcellina, a small town with a population of 7 thousand, in the eastern metropolitan area of Rome, 37 km from the capital that hosts a large number of migrants. Marcellina is indeed one of the municipalities in the Lazio Region with the highest incidence of foreigners (nearly 20%) of which approximately 80% are of Romanian origin, and mainly arrived prior to 2007. Their presence is largely due to the greater access to the local labour market and affordable housing options. But it is also due to its proximity to Rome and the convenient railway connection to the second most important station in the city. In recent years, the emerging and most prominent issue is certainly that of refugees and asylum seekers reception. Even Marcellina has obviously been involved in the issue by hosting in its territory a small reception center (which later emerged was run by an association linked to the well-known criminal organization named *Mafia Capitale*).

Beyond the thorny management of the recent refugee crisis, the local administration of Marcellina seemed unable to promote social inclusion even of those migrants, such as Romanians, who have been living in Italy for decades and are experiencing a more stable phase in their settlement process (compared to newly arrived refugees and asylum seekers). As often happens, Romanians living in Marcellina have kept the jobs abandoned by Italians. According to interviews and the available information, men usually have started as agricultural workers and they have then moved on to the more profitable building and construction sector (nowadays about 90% of the Romanian residents of Marcellina work in these sectors); women instead mostly work as caregivers, also due to the lack of recognition in Italy of degrees and qualifications obtained in Romania.

Even in the locational choice, they seem to fill in Italian's blanks: many Romanian families live in the small historical center, reusing empty housing units, as described by Pietro Nicotera, the center-right mayor in 2015:

“The apartments in the historical center of Marcellina were rented by Romanian citizens. They have restructured them. They concentrated right in the historical center for two reasons: first, some houses were actually uninhabited; and secondly, these are old buildings and therefore the prices are more accessible. In general, however, there is no concentration of immigrants in some areas, such as ghettos. Furthermore, we are currently renovating the facades of the historic center”

The concentration of foreigners in the run-down center, despite not being such a thing as a ghetto or ethnic neighbourhood, has still resulted in growing stigmatisation and division between migrants and indigenous population. Moreover, although the families who settled in the historical center have in fact renovated and maintained - often informally - the abandoned houses, however, for the work done by the public administration on the facades, there was no involvement of the residents and no collaboration has been promoted by the administration. In this case, the dialogue between formal and informal is made of silent indifference between actors: the mayor ignores the work of migrants and they rearrange the houses with DIY solutions. Evidently, the difficulties encountered in the process of inclusion of migrants are tangible (XXX, 2016). They strongly depend on the social and economic dynamics that affect in turn the intercultural relations, and on the peculiarity of the territorial and urban fabric of the small town. Marcellina is stuck in between metropolitan growth and rural decline, not yet a suburb and can no longer be considered a small town. It could be considered as a dormitory suburb where public urban spaces are not well frequented and there is a lack of spaces for aggregation.

Below three examples of significant public space (a church, a square and a sort of park) are presented. These are useful for debating about the role of the space's materiality and those of the local actors dealing (or not) with social inclusion. The first example clearly highlights that when public authorities are absent or unable to meet the specific needs of foreign-born residents, other actors come into play as supporters. Indeed, for their own specific needs, migrants often resort to do-it-yourself solutions. This is the case of the Romanian Orthodox Church of Marcellina for which the large local community sought to identify an appropriate place. Proving the administration, however, unable to respond adequately, the Orthodox congregation rented and redecorated a garage to celebrate their functions, as remembered by the Orthodox priest of Marcellina:

“Initially we celebrated mass in the municipal library. The space had been made available by the Municipality (also thanks to the intervention of the Romanian municipal councillor). However, the space was absolutely inadequate and we still had to pay the rent. We asked the municipality to sell us land where we could build a church. But he told us that there are none. So we, the Romanian Orthodox community, rented a garage with our money and set it up like a church.”

As mentioned by the priest, Marcellina for two years (2009-2011) had an elected municipal councillor of Romanian origin, Leontina Ionescu. She was elected in the center-left civic list “Mondi Nuovi” and she was the first Romanian-born councillor in Italy. Although her election may seem an opportunity, actually Ionescu dealt mainly with legal and social counseling for individuals. Even for the short time she was in charge, however, little was done for the community and its needs for public spaces. Despite the presence of a foreign-born member in the municipal administration, local public policies remain inadequate to understand the specific needs of foreign-born population, making DIY practices necessary.

The second public space considered is *Piazza 4 Novembre*, the central square of Marcellina. Public spaces are often abandoned or underused, even though the town is not suffering from depopulation. The central square of Marcellina, due to an unfortunate rearrangement of the 90s and the displacement of the market that was held there every week, is today stripped of its social and urban functions to represent instead a static and solemn image. The space is mainly used by Romanian mothers and their children when leaving the adjacent primary school, a rare possibility of exchange with other parents of different nationalities. Although they did not declare an interest in using such space, Italian mothers have displayed intolerance towards Romanian women, accusing them of spending too much time sitting on benches. Some Romanian women interviewed in the square, have reported the discomfort caused to them by these discriminations :

"The four of us (...) meet here in the square when the children come out of school and, when possible, we stay a little outdoors with them. It is something that Italian mothers almost never do. However, even this simple habit has created tensions with local women who complain that they never find free benches because they are occupied by Romanian women. For us, this square is basically the only place where we can be together, even if the possibility of entertainment for the children has been undermined by forbidding them to play ball. "

This woman's words highlight the fact that, as Valentine (2008) underlines, mere proximity does not suffice to generate social relations and change, while “meaningful contact” is needed. A common sense of belonging can be fostered, for instance, within children playgrounds where parents from different backgrounds can meet each other and

share common needs and concerns. In doing so, they can overcome the prejudices. Unfortunately, playgrounds in Marcellina are either degraded or in peripheral areas of town.

To overcome this lack of public spaces and nice parks, the foreign-born residents of Marcellina have the habit of spending Sundays and holidays in a few clearings in the nearby mountain woods, named *Prati Favale* - this is the third example - where the public space is used in a similar way to that of some large parks and gardens in Rome. As Peters *et al.* (2010) states, parks can play a positive role in building interactions between different groups and in building social cohesion and cooperation. However, strangely enough, *Prati Favale* is almost exclusively frequented by the foreign population (mainly Romanians, but also Moldovans). A Romanian woman described the situation as follows:

"Today is the day of Orthodox Easter (...) The Romanian community is very fond of traditions. Many Romanians went to celebrate it by picnicking on the mountain because we have a strong bond with the countryside and nature. (...) During the rest of the year, on Sunday, many Romanians go to barbecue. (...). There was an equipped area, with benches and more, but someone destroyed it. Some say it is the fault of some Romanians who got drunk; but also some Italian boys from Marcellina often spent the nights there drinking. "

Although uninterested in using mountain meadows, the locals restrain from barbecuing and listening to music in the open air, habits that also generate growing friction. Frictions occurred when the alternative use that Romanians propose deviated from the habits of the natives, and were perceived as inappropriate (Brivio, 2013). This demonstrates how cohabitation is a question related to the use and appropriation of spaces by different populations (Tosi, 1998).

Finally, it is believed that the flexibility of public spaces, their opening to different and multiple uses, is a requirement for them to be capable of offering opportunities for meeting and therefore the possibility of creating inter-ethnic bonds (Fioretti 2013). A flexibility that is expressed in the reception of different activities, and the ability to accommodate functions not foreseen at the start. Immigration, like all social phenomena, is in fact in constant evolution, and continually proposes new needs to which urban policies and public space must respond. Lacking dedicated local public policies, these are only DIY spaces: a few Romanians residents occupied and partially restored some buildings in the historic center ; reused public urban spaces (square and parks); converted a garage to a church. While these actions respond somehow to direct group or individual needs of the foreign-born population, they did not interact with the local natives.

5. *Governing the space of arrivals*

The evidence from the two case studies matches the aspiration of the arrival city model under several aspects, but a crucial distinction should be made. The model correctly pinpoints the informal aspects of the spatial arrangements that foster integration: informality, however, hardly applies at the level of policy-making. This paper suggests distinguishing between the aspect of the spatial dimension from the dimension of governance and partnerships of these neighbourhoods. Whether they qualify as informal is one aspect that requires a scrupulous exam; however, one may wonder whether space and regulation are informal in the same way. The two case studies, though they are both arrival places, show different facets of the arrival city model. Indeed, as already noted, Porta Venezia has been

and is, for refugees and asylum seekers, more a transitional arrival place, while Marcellina has been, for Romanians, more a final point of arrival and stable settlement place.

The two case studies show a profound engagement of community groups, individuals and sometimes (informal) NGOs. In the case of central Milan, the arrival of refugees has produced both the friction between different actors within the neighbourhood and the activation of supporters; that resulted in the creation of a sort of bottom-up ‘welcoming neighbourhoods’. To the same extent, civil-society groups calmed down the sparkling hostility, and pushed the municipality to adopt a less securitarian approach. In the case of metropolitan Rome, groups of foreign residents developed an incremental strategy of renewing collective spaces as a sum of individual actions, without neither igniting overt conflicts (only minor frictions) nor open communications with the local natives. A major character of this strategy is its flexibility that corresponds with the prerequisites of rapidly evolving processes such as those induced by migration.

Therefore, while in the first case groups of supporters have not only taken action to welcome newly arrived people but also forged an alliance with formal authorities, in the second case the migrants themselves are the ones setting up the spaces they need. However, a number of similarities are notable. In both cases there are in fact actors playing the role of supporter for reception and socio-spatial inclusion, such as CP and SE in Porta Venezia, or the orthodox priest and the Romanian councillor in Marcellina. In addition, both cases share forms of porosity: even though in different stages of the migration process (transit or settlement), both Eritrean refugees and Romanian migrants tend to slip into interstitial spaces, public ones or housing, taking possession of them and sometimes re-interpreting their meanings. Interestingly, the ‘trasgressive’ use of spaces by the migrants in both cases has led to conflicts with the local population, such as residents and Italian shopkeepers in the green area of Porta Venezia, or Italian mothers in the central square of Marcellina.

In conclusion, we suggest that the ‘arrival city’ is not the natural output of informal arrangements; it results instead from some form of political arrangement of different actors. The lack of planning does not entail that these activities are not regulated. This dilemma is due to a limited understanding of the informal character of these actions that must instead be conceptualised as a multifaceted social order. Thus, informal bottom-up and DIY initiatives arise when both social actors activate novel practices and governments do not implement their regulatory powers.

The two cases show a formal and stronger set of regulation, almost unexpectedly, in the more difficult case of Milan, and an informal one in the more ordinary suburban Roman case. In the context of migrant transition, this lack of regulation may foster complementary initiatives, whose combination result in fact in some form of compensation and stabilisation between formal and informal arrangements.

This process is not without risks and pitfalls, since people in receiving areas are potentially equally deprived (Eckardt 2018). Informal and formal regulation are both at work in the arrival spaces that respond to different logics of action: new regulatory patterns result from the cooperation between local and political actors that produce empowering, fit-to-size regulation. The ‘arrival city’ requires regulation, though a specific, empowering one.

- Agier, M., Madeira, A.V. (2017). *Définir les réfugiés*. Paris: PUF.
- XXX, F. (2016). Marcellina: l'inclusione degli immigrati romeni in un comune in bilico. In Fioretti (ed.).
- Altrock, U. (2012). Conceptualising informality: Some thoughts on the way towards generalisation. In: C. McFarlane and M. Waibel (Eds) *Urban Informalities: Reflections on the Formal and the Informal*. Farnham: Ashgate, 171–193.
- Amin, A. (2013). Land of strangers. *Identities*, 20(1), 1-8.
- Arnone, A. (2010). *Being Eritrean in Milan: the constitution of identity* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Sussex). Retrieved from <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/2489/>
- XXX, M. (2019). Motivations and Effects of Volunteering for Refugees. Spaces of Encounter and Political Influence of the 'New Civic Engagement' in Milan. *Partecipazione e Conflitto*, 12(1), 142-167.
- Balbo, M. (2015 Ed.), *Migrazioni e piccoli comuni*, Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Bazurli, R. (2019). Local Governments and Social Movements in the “Refugee Crisis”: Milan and Barcelona as “Cities of Welcome.” *South European Society and Politics*, 24(3), 343–370.
- Briata, P. (2014), *Spazio urbano e immigrazione in Italia. Esperienze di pianificazione in una prospettiva europea*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Brivio, A. (2013). La città che esclude. Immigrazione e appropriazione dello spazio pubblico a Milano. *Antropologia*, 13(15).
- Callon, M., Lascoumes, P., & Barthe, Y. (2009). Acting in an uncertain world. An essay on technological democracy.
- Caponio, T., Jubany Baucells, O., & Güell, B. (2016). Civic integration policies from below: accounting for processes of convergence and divergence in four European cities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(5), 878-895.
- Comune di Milano (n.d.). Popolazione Residente. *Sistema statistico Integrato*. Retrieved from <http://sisi.comune.milano.it/>
- Crawley, H., & Skleparis, D. (2018). Refugees, migrants, neither, both: Categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe’s ‘migration crisis’. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(1), 48-64.
- Eckardt, F. (2018). European Cities Planning for Asylum, *Urban Planning*, Vol 3, No 4.
- EMN (2014). *Asylum and Migration Glossary 3.0*. European Commission.
- Fincher, R., Iveson, K. (2008). *Planning and Diversity in the City. Redistribution, Recognition and Encounter*. London: Palgrave.
- Fioretti, C. (2013). Abaco degli spazi urbani dell'immigrazione. *Crios. Critica degli ordinamenti spaziali*, 2, 47-60.
- Fioretti, C. (2016, ed.). *Inclusione fragile. Migrazioni nei piccoli comuni del Lazio*. I Quaderni di UrbanisticaTre, 11.
- Grimaldi, G. (2016). Tra sbarco e approdo: liminalità e valore performativo del transito dei richiedenti asilo eritrei ed etiopi nel quartiere di Milano Porta Venezia. *Mondi Migranti*. 229-247
- Hall, S. M. (2013). Super-diverse street: a “trans-ethnography” across migrant localities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38(1), pp. 22–37.
- Ley, D. (2004). Transnational spaces and everyday lives. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 29(2), pp.151–164.
- Ostertag, E. (2016). Transitory community hubs. *City*, 20(1), 116–129.
- Osti, G., Ventura, F. (2012 Eds). *Vivere da stranieri in aree fragili. L'immigrazione internazionale nei comuni rurali italiani*. Napoli: Liguori.

- Pastore, F., Ponzo, I. (2012 Eds.). *Concordia discors. Integrazione e conflitto nei quartieri di immigrazione*. Roma: Carocci.
- Peters K., Elands B. Buijs A. (2010). Social interactions in urban parks: Stimulating social cohesion?. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 9(2), 93-100.
- Phillips, D. (2006). Moving Towards Integration: The Housing of Asylum Seekers and Refugees in Britain. *Housing Studies*, 21(4), 539–553.
- Pugliese, E. (2002). *L'Italia fra migrazioni internazionali e migrazioni interne*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- RFT (2016) *Making Heimat: Germany, Arrival Country*, Biennale Venezia.
- Rydin, Y. (2020). Silences, categories and black-boxes: Towards an analytics of the relations of power in planning regulation. *Planning Theory*, 19(2), 214-233.
- Roy, A. (2005). Urban informality: toward an epistemology of planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 71.2, 147–58.
- Sassen, S. (2013). When the center no longer holds: Cities as frontier zones. *Cities*, 34, 67–70.
- Saunders, D. (2010). *Arrival City: How the largest Migration in History is Reshaping Our World*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Tosi, A. (1998). Lo spazio urbano dell'immigrazione. *Urbanistica*, 111, 7-19.
- Valentine, G. (2008). Living with difference: reflections on geographies of encounter. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(3), 323-337.