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ABSTRACT

Migration is a central phenomenon of the global age, which Western societies often treat as a temporary and emergency case that needs to be managed and controlled. This thesis explores the tension between the EU internal borders and the crossing-border mobilities of migrant subjects that attempt to build autonomous lives in Europe. Drawn on 20 months (October 2013 – August 2015) of fieldwork in Milan and Berlin using multi-sited ethnography, this work investigates the everyday experiences of a group of “temporary refugees” who have obtained a temporary humanitarian protection in Italy after escaping the Libya war in 2011. Because of unemployment and homelessness, a part of them undertook secondary movements towards northern European countries to find better life conditions, although they were not allowed under the European laws. Some of these temporary refugees joined the Oranienplatz protests in Berlin and claimed their rights to freely work and move through Europe.

Here, I focus on the everyday life of my research protagonists in Milan and Berlin and the recurring cross-border movements back and forth between these places. The contradictory attempt of institutions and bureaucracies to control and host them in their ambivalent image as victim and internal enemy entails a lengthened temporariness and a hypermobility in the migrant subjects biographies. In my research Europe emerges as a space of negotiation practices where the internal border are constantly re-defined by the tensions and frictions of different actors. The permanent negotiation of the borders occurs in the battleground of the everyday lives and affects the biographies of the migrant subjects on the move. I find that the temporal rather than the spatial dimension is crucial in the understanding of migrant subjects experiences in the EU border regime. My research protagonists internalize the lengthened transit condition – which is juridical, spatio-temporal and existential – becoming thus subjectivities en transit. This suggests that migration should be understood as a process of becoming, where the interrelation of control mechanisms and autonomous social practices of migrant subjects challenges and re-defines the borders of Europe.

I argue that subjectivities en transit emerge that criss-cross the European territory, attempting to autonomously build their lives moving between the social and juridical constrains. They open up interstices of autonomy, although the precariousness of their everyday shapes their lives as fragmented.
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ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

**IOM:** International Organisation of Migration.

**UNHCR:** United Nation High Commissioner of Refugees.

**FRONTEX:** European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union.

**SIS:** Schengen Information System.

**EURODAC:** European fingerprint database for identifying asylum seekers and irregular border-crossers.

**NATO:** North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.

**ENA:** Emergenza Nord Africa (North Africa Emergency)

**SPRAR:** Sistema di Protezione per Richiedenti Asilo e Rifugiati (Protection System for Asylum Seekers and Refugees)

**CARA:** Centro di Accoglienza per Richiedenti Asilo (Asylum-Seeker Reception Centre)

**CIE:** Centri di Identificazione ed Espulsione (Identification and Expulsion Centers)

**CAI:** Centro di Assistenza e Identificazione (Center for Assistance and Identification)

**ANCi:** Associazione Nazionale dei Comuni Italiani (National Association of Italian Municipalities)

**UPI:** Unione delle Provincie Italiane (Union of Italian Provinces)

**CDU:** Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschland (Christian Democratic Union of Germany – right-wings party)

**SPD:** Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschland (the Social Democratic Party of Germany)

**NPD:** Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands (the National Democratic Party of Germany)

**BAMF:** Bundesamtes für Migration und Flüchtlinge (Federal Office for Migration and Refugee)

**O-platz:** is the contraction of Oranienplatz, usually used by the protagonists of the political protest, the supporters and the activists.
I am reading the book of Italo Calvino, “The invisible cities”, while a part catches my attention: when Marco Polo speaks with the emperor of China, Kublai Khan, about his experience in travelling around the world. The Venetian merchant traveller explains to Kublai Khan that the more he was lost in unfamiliar quarters of distant cities, the more he understood the other cities he had crossed to arrive there. It touched me when Marco Polo refers to his native city, Venice, where also I was born and raised. Marco Polo explains to Kublai Khan that through his journeys he came to know the port from which he had set sail, the familiar places of his youth near his house and a little square of Venice where he used to play as a child. I close the book, and I lose my gaze in the vacuum thinking of me as child jumping around on a silent small square of Venice while hearing the noisy engines of the cars in the big city of Berlin where I am living now. Amal looks at me and asks why I stopped reading the book and what I am thinking about. So I read him the text of that book and he exclaims: “Oh, I can understand you! I sometimes also lose myself in the memory of my home … I can understand many things about home after I moved away from there”. Me and Amal have lived in different cities in several countries, and we live now both in Berlin where we decided to stop – maybe only temporarily – also because we both have German partners. We are both connected with Italy, but we are somehow different. “I have to go back to Italy soon – tells me Amal – do you also have to go back? Maybe we could travel together … but you know, I cannot take the train or the flight. We have to take another transport, this would be better. Unfortunately, I am not as invisible as you!” and he smiles.

When I arrive at home in Venice, I try to explain my father why I took the shared car instead of a fast plane from Berlin to Venice. He cannot understand why I travelled ten hours in this modern world of mobility, above all in Europe thanks to Schengen. I explain that the problem was my friend Amal, who could get troubles crossing the borders from Germany to Italy. “Why? – exclaims my father – there are no controls any more at the internal borders in the Schengen space. I always fly from Venice to Bruxelles, through Paris, to London up to Barcelona without problem. No one controls me!” I tell him that Amal runs the risk to be controlled because of his skin colour, and that a control could bring him trouble. “Why? Is your friend without documents?” asks my father, and I reply that he is regular since he holds a humanitarian protection obtained in Italy. “But then, what is the problem?”), and I reply: “Well, I can explain you why Amal can get some problems crossing the borders, but do you have enough time to listen to me? It is a long story.”
The stories of Amal and the further protagonists of my research provide insights into the issues of global migration and the internal borders of the European Union. The phenomenon of migration and the heterogeneous forms through which it takes place is a central issue of our contemporary world, and the efforts to control and manage it, as employed by the host societies, is highly contested. Migration challenges the power structures on which the host societies are based.

Europe, as a contemporary battlefield of migration, emerges as a conflictual space where the borders are continuously produced, negotiated and redefined. Several actors are involved in this battleground, such as political and non-political actors, the civil societies, and the migrant subjects on the move. The redefinition of borders as selective mechanisms is recurrently negotiated, dividing the population into a multiplicity of categories along hierarchies that place people in a continuum between citizens and non-citizens.

This thesis will focus on the crossing-borders mobilities of temporary refugees in Europe and the attempt by several actors to control and manage them. The people in middle of the continuum, namely the multiplicity of “half-citizens” or “half-non-citizens”, are the subjects of this work. These people, notably the category of “refugee”, do not fulfil – and challenge – the logic of national state-citizenship-sovereignty. They are often confined to a marginal life and struggle for their rights to autonomously build their lives. Grasping the ways through which such migrant mobilities are controlled and managed can help to shed light on the power structures in the host societies.

I here follow a particular heterogeneous group of migrant subjects who have obtained a temporary residence permit in Italy for humanitarian reasons escaping from the Libya war. They can be thus considered as “temporary refugees”. Because of the difficult life conditions in the Mediterranean country, they decided to undertake “secondary movements” towards northern European countries, although they were not allowed under European laws. Some of them happened to arrive in Germany and engaged in a two-years protest in Berlin, claiming their rights to freely move in Europe and to autonomously decide where they want to live. Their crossing-border movements among Europe and the interaction and tensions with the EU internal borders will here be grasped in their everyday life.

I frame the empirical case-studies through the theories of border studies, transnational and mobilities studies, and critical citizenships studies. These theories help to understand the complex phenomenon of (forced) migration in the global age and the way through which Europe faces it. Specifically, I will apply the analytical concepts of border, mobility and subjectivity.
Referring to the concept of border, I consider it as filter, as a scattered and porous entity that acts in different ways following the power relations embedded in the considered place. Thus, I put the focus on the internal borders of the EU rather than on the external ones, grasping the dynamics of bordering processes. To overcome the understanding of “refugee” category in relation only to the structure of the national-state I will grasp my empirical case-studies through the concept of mobility. Moreover, “secondary movements” of temporary refugees across the internal borders of Europe challenge the categories that we use for labelling non-European people.

The concept of subjectivity allows me to grasp the everyday experiences of my research subjects within the structural constrains of power relations, and the way through which they develop social practices in order to autonomously build their lives. I will attempt to overcome the dichotomy between the structural and the agency dimension, looking at the relation and interaction between them within unequal fields of globe-spanning power. In the emerging battleground not only the migrant subjects and the actors that attempt to control and manage them play a role. The groups, networks and private citizens that are involved in voluntary activities in supporting the migrants and refugees are crucial in the struggles within Europe.

In this work I aim to understand which are the effects of the EU control and management policies upon the biographies of temporary refugees. I aim to grasp where and which are the EU internal borders, and how they interact with the temporary refugees on the move. Finally, I want to investigate how the temporary refugees enact social practices in order to autonomously live and move between and beyond these borders. A particular attention is given to the temporal dimension of migratory experience.

This thesis is organised in six chapters. The first chapter presents a literature review of the main theories and empirical studies. I discuss the contributions and limitations of these theories in relation to my work. The second chapter details the methodology and introduces the technique of multi-sited ethnography that I applied to grasp my empirical case-studies. The third chapter aims to contextualize the case-studies and is mainly based on secondary literature. A critical analysis of the contemporary European system of control and management of migration is given, notably of the European asylum system. The structural contexts of Italy and Germany are presented and set into relation to better understand the case-studies of my research. In the chapters four, five and six, I present and analyse my empirical material and research. Chapter four investigates the effects of the EU control and management policies on the biographies of temporary refugees through presenting the everyday life of my research subjects in the cities of Milan and Berlin. Chapter five focusses
on the crossing-border mobilities of my research subjects and refers to the interaction between the internal borders of the EU and the crossing-borders mobilities of temporary refugees. The tensions and frictions that emerge from this interaction are highlighted, with a focus on the legal status as one of the internal borders' manifestations and on border places that are created within the national and urban territories. Finally, in chapter six I focus on the agency dimension through the concept of subjectivity and I address how the temporary refugees work out everyday practices in order to overcome the EU internal borders and build autonomously their lives. A discussion about whether their everyday practices can be understood as “resistance” practices or “existence” tactics is given.
Chapter 1

AT THE INTERSECTION OF THEORIES AND DISCIPLINES
A literature review about migrant mobilities, borders, and (non)citizens

In this chapter I will present different literatures in the social science that have worked on the migration issue in the global age. In particular, I will focus on those studies and theories I am referring during my research work, shedding light on the theoretical and epistemological insights that I applied in order to understand the phenomenon I have studied. I refer to the main sociological traditions about migration studies and social theory, but I also broaden my theoretical horizons to other discipline such as anthropology, philosophy, human geography and jurisprudence. Therefore, in this chapter and also during this entirely work I will apply an interdisciplinary gaze that allows to in-depth analysed a complex phenomenon from different perspectives. The main literatures I relate to are the studies on transnationalism, and notably the mobility studies, the border studies and the critical citizenship studies, linked to the focus on (forced) migration. The union of these currents of social and political sciences supports the theoretical purpose of my work, i.e. to highlight the tensions between the structure and agency dimensions through a processual perspective, looking at the reality as constructed by social processes that involve power relations. The theoretical frameworks are here discussed in light of their contributions and limitations, with reference also to contemporary and empirical studies.
1.1 Beyond a static perspective in migration studies: transnational (im)mobilities

The phenomenon of migration has progressively entered the public discourse and academic debate in the last decades. Migration and globalization are fundamental challenges of our age. These challenges involve the nature and structure of the western national-state, the sense of belonging linked to it, i.e. the issue of identity and citizenship. It also sheds light on the dynamics of power relations that criss-cross the age of globalization at the local, national and supra-national level. Thus, migration is a complex phenomenon interconnected to other social phenomena, and its analysis requires more than one analytical lens.

The classic research on migration has been characterized above all by a static perspective. Until the 1990s migration was described as a linear and on-time movement from a point A – the origin country – to a point B – the reception country. It is possible to observe two big patterns in this classical literature on migration: First, research has looked at the phenomenon from a macro perspective, grasping the effects of migration movements on the national system from an economic and demographic point of view. Second, research has focused on the concept of “integration”, looking at the migrants as object that have to be incorporated into the western host societies. These research perspectives refer moreover to a wider social theory that consider society as a “container” in which social relations occur. According to these theories, migrants have to be integrated into the host society through (multi)cultural, social and identity-related measures. Since the beginning of the 1990s, the phenomenon of globalization has highlighted the limits of this theoretical frame. Increasing mobility, the endless motion of migration, the dynamics of displacement, the expanding circulation of cultural traits, commodities, goods and services in postcolonial and post-national structures pervade most aspects of contemporary societies. In order to understand these big changes in contemporary society, I refer here to three interconnected theoretical and empirical research fields that have been developed within social sciences. First, there is an increasing interest in transnational mobility. Second, the issue of borders became significant and third, questions of social membership, identity, political citizenship and (distributive) justice have enriched the theoretical debate (Freise and Mezzadra 2010).
During the 1990s a new paradigm has been developed in the theoretical debate that criticized the idea of migration as a singular and linear movement, termed the transnational paradigm. Several scholars have focused on social networks and social relations as central concepts in order to grasp and understand the complexity of the emerging global society. According to the scholars of transnational paradigm, migration is an important transnational process that reflects and contributes to the political configurations of the global economy (Schiller, Basch, Szanton Blanc 1995). The image of the migrant as an “uprooted subject”, that leaves his own country – and culture and identity – behind, turned into the image of the “trans-migrant”, whose daily life depends on multiple and constant interconnections across international borders and whose identity is configured in relationship to more than one nation-state. The transnational perspective undermines the classic idea of migration as a linear and singular movement from point A to point B, focusing on the ongoing and continuing ways in which migrants construct and reconstitute their simultaneous embeddedness in more than one society. Since transmigration entails different socio-economic, political and cultural linkages across boundaries, it raises questions also about identity, rights and entitlements, and renders problematic the bounded conceptualizations of race, class, ethnicity, and nationalism, which pervade the social science and also the mainstream thinking (Grillo 2001). This theoretical framework has been developed within the wider research area on globalization, although it has distanced itself from theories, which underline the diminished significance of national boundaries in the production and distribution of objects, ideas and people. During the 1990s, indeed, the idea that globalization phenomenon leads to the progressive demise of national borders established itself in the social sciences and cultural studies, highlighting also how this phenomenon was transforming the way in which space and time were experienced and represented (Appadurai 1990, 1991). The transnational paradigm took distances from this “positive” view on globalization as a “world without borders” where flows of people, capital, and ideas are free to move (Appadurai 1996, Castells 1996, Bauman 2000, 2007), and rather underlines the new asymmetries produced by power relations in the age of globalization (Freitag and von Oppen 2010; Glick Schiller 1999; Held et al. 1999). Some research has been focused on the fact that globalization has to be interpreted as a phenomenon of the global reconstitution of the structure of accumulation, i.e. the focus on the capitalistic economic system is necessary in order to understand this new single system of production (Sassen 1991).
This interaction between both global and local levels is grasped in research on transnational processes through the focus on social networks and transnational linkages. A big section of research focused on household and family economies rooted in both sending and receiving societies, highlighting the connection between these places. The concept of “transnationalism” has allowed researchers to take into account the fact that immigrants live their lives across national borders and respond to the constraints and demands of two or more states. Migrants are those people whose networks, activities and patterns of lives encompass both their host and home society; their lives cut across national boundaries and bring two societies into a single social field. “Transnationalism” is exactly this process by which migrants build a social field that links together the home and host countries, and it has to be analysed as a new field of social relations operating within and between continuing nation-state (Glick Schiller at all. 1992). This approach allowed to observe the migrants experiences in process, analysing its origins, monitor changing within it, and seeing how it affects both country of origin and country of residence.

“Transnationalism” has influenced also both methodological and epistemic fields in the social and cultural sciences: the so called methodological nationalism, i.e. the assumption that the nation/state/society is the natural social and political form of the modern world was criticized through the transnational paradigm. These scholars highlighted the limits of the mainstream conceptual apparatus that let us taking for granted a world divided into discrete and autonomous nation-states, thus we see nation-state building and global interconnections as contradictory (Beck 2000). According to this critical perspective, nation-state building processes have fundamentally shaped the ways immigration has been perceived and received, and these perceptions have in turn influenced – though not completely determined – social science theory and methodology, and its discourse on immigration and integration. National thinking and the “container model” of society dominated postwar social sciences. The peoplehood was divided in four categories – people as a sovereign entity, as citizens, as a group of obligatory solidarity and as an ethnic community – to which correspond the vertexes of the world order of nation-building, i.e. democracy, citizenship, social security and national self-determination. Once this order was established, it was projected on the surface of the earth and become territorially inscribed. The isomorphism between citizenry, sovereign, solidarity group and nation requires that all corresponding territorial borders become coincident. Consequently, the distinction between what is inside and what is outside these fixed territorial boundaries became central. Thus, migration phenomena have to be understood in relation to the emergence of nation-states, because the national territory at the same time
traces the frontiers of the sovereign population, delineates the homeland of the citizenry, defines the borderline between social order and disorder and distinguishes between the national home and the wilderness of the foreign (Wimmer and Schiller 2003). According to methodological nationalism and the “container model” society, migrants became a special object of policy-making as well as of a specializing body of research, and “integration” became the perspective through which this phenomenon was observed. First of all, migrants destroy the “natural” relation between people, sovereign and citizenry; they are perceived as foreigners to the community of shared loyalty towards the state and shared rights guaranteed by that state. Second, migrants undermine the relation between people and nation, representing a renewed challenge to the nation-building project and pointing to the fragility of its achievements. Thus, in postwar migration studies the issue was to measure the cultural differences between immigrants and nationals and to describe pathways of assimilation into the national group. Third, migrants undermine the relation between the people and the solidarity group. A vast amount of studies focussed therefore on the implications of immigration for national welfare systems, analysed immigrant unemployment, traced the dynamics of slum development and ghettoization, and tried to understand the culture of poverty in which immigrants were thought of being trapped. Fourth, every move across national borders becomes an exception to the rule of sedentariness within the boundaries of the nation-state. “Cross-border migration” appears as an anomaly to the rule of people staying where they belong, i.e. their nation-state, but this anomaly was just the migration of non-citizens, not to other forms of mobilities such as internal migration of citizens.

These four points clarify that migration studies are strongly embedded in the postwar history, when the nation-state successfully stood out, highlighting the influence of methodological nationalism on the way to think, study and manage migration phenomena. Describing immigrants as potential security risks, as culturally others, as socially marginal and as an exception to the rule of territorial confinement, postwar social sciences mirrored and at the same time legitimized the project of nation-state building, aimed at establishing a sovereign citizenry, a homogeneous nation, a community of solidarity and a territorially-bounded state (Wimmer and Schiller 2003). Scholars of transnationalism changed this theoretical lens through which migration phenomenon was observed: moving away from methodological nationalism they highlight the long-term trends of global processes and global connections from a historical perspective (Glick Schiller 1999; Wilson and Donnan 1998). Moreover, scholars of both Asia and Latin America have begun to examine the connections of regions to global processes, thus overcoming another limitation of methodological nationalism and
breaking up the national focus of the development and modernization paradigm. Anthropologists were playing an important role in examining local and regional variations in connecting the global and the local (Ong and Nonini 1997). The suggestion to move away from methodological nationalism implies to focus on studies that examine the connections between transnational migrants and actors within the various localities in which the migrants settle and into which they move. That could carry us beyond the static, reified and essentialized concept of community and into the study of migrants and non-migrants within social fields of differential power (Ong 1999; Wimmer and Schiller 2003). Although this critical perspective highlights the limits of methodological nationalism, it also underlines the continued potency of nationalism and how it is still a powerful signifier that continues to make sense for different actors with different purposes and political implications. Several scholars that criticized methodological nationalism, however focus on the centrality of the nation-state as actor in the global age, highlighting that the production of global markets and global phenomena are embedded in concrete geographical locations and take place within bounded, not necessarily territorially limited, social environments (Sassen 2001).

The so called «transnational turn» gave a crucial contribution to migration studies and to social theory in general. One central and helpful concept of this approach is the social space, i.e. the fact that space is considered as socially constructed and it involved asymmetries and power, as reflected in social fields. Moreover, the concept of network has become crucial in order to capture the flows across boundaries and to structurally capture the formations that criss-cross national-state borders. Thus, it allows to look at migration phenomenon through a dynamic lens and in term of social processes, overcoming the static perspective. Moreover, transnationalism shed light to a new way to look at space and places in the global age, which are interconnected through the movement of people.

«Mobility turn» and nomadic metaphysic

The «transnational turn» let the social and cultural studies diverge from the classical migration studies in favour of mobility research field. This new perspective led social and anthropological research to focus on the everyday-life transnational practices and their interrelations to the global phenomenon and the capitalistic system of production (Burawoy 2000; Riccio 2000; Tsing 2005). Thanks to this theoretical turn, mobility is no longer conceptualized in a mechanical way as being organized by push and pull factors, as a result of
rational choice and economical calculation or as the inevitable consequence of the ‘world-system’. Migration is understood as the result of multiple factors and even contradictory, individual decisions, creativity, personal dreams and expectations, entailing freedom as well as social pressure or sheer necessity of survival (Friese and Mezzadra 2010).

A further effort in deconstructing the mainstream static perspective through which migration phenomena were analysed, was started by studies focusing on the mobility as the normal social form of contemporary global society. The so called «mobility turn» (Sheller and Urry 2006) allowed to introduce a new theoretical paradigm that aims to criticize the dogma of sedentariness as the norm of social life (Papastergiadis 2000). The scholar John Urry through his work Sociology Beyond Societies (Urry 2000) has started this new current of studies. The author argues that the new phenomena of cross-national and cross-cultural flows and networks that characterize the global world of the twenty-first century are undermining the “old traditional sociology”. Thus, sociology urgently needs to be taken beyond the nation-state-society, and in order to do that we need a new sociological method that «focuses upon movement, mobility and contingent ordering, rather than upon stasis, structuring and social order» (Urry 2000, p. 18). This work has been criticized by some scholars of transnationalism, which underlined the need to still consider within sociology the centrality of structural constrains – such as institutions, borders, nation-state etc. – as important elements that still exist and organize these flows and mobilities that Urry idealized (Favell 2001). Although it is true that scholars of mobility in earlier works have focussed above all on the increase of different forms of mobilities in the global world and the role of new technologies and communication in facilitating it, they also underlined their awareness of the role of power relations in controlling these mobilities. According to the scholars who theorized the “turn” (Sheller and Urry 2006), the mobility paradigm does not insist on a new “grand narrative” of mobility, fluidity, or liquidity. It suggests a set of questions, theories, and methodologies rather than a totalising or reductive description of the contemporary world. Mobility is always located and materialised, and occurs through mobilisations of locality and rearrangements of the materiality of places. Therefore, this new paradigm emphasises also how all mobilities entail specific often highly embedded and immobile infrastructures (Graham and Marvin 2001; Sassen 2002).

The mobility paradigm also aims to rethink both space and time dimensions: it undermines existing linear assumptions about temporality and timing, and it points out the complex relationship between people and places connected through performances. In the new mobility paradigm, places themselves are seen as travelling, slow or fast, greater or shorter distances,
within networks of human and non-human agents. The central idea here is to consider travel—and mobilities—no more just as a question of getting to a destination, but rather as performances that have their own effect on social life. Mobility, indeed, is a socially produced motion, it is practiced, experienced, and embodied in power relations. Thus, time and space are both the context for movement—the environment of possibility for movement to occur—and a product of movement. Moving people and objects are agents in the production of time and space, and mobility itself is part of the process of the social production of time and space. It is not just a function of time and space, but an agent in their production (Cresswell 2006).

Thus, the point is not to neglect the presence of power relations and global hierarchies, but to put at the centre of social science the movements of people, objects, information and images, constituting the norm of social life. Also the ways in which physical movement pertains to upward and downward social mobility is a central point: research on mobility grasps the proliferation of places, technologies, and “gates” that enhance the mobilities of some while reinforcing the immobilities of others. Social life, thus, is seen as full of multiple and extended connections often across long distances, but these are organised through certain nodes. Mobilities entail distinct social spaces that orchestrate new forms of social life around such nodes, for example, stations, hotels, airports, leisure complexes, cosmopolitan cities, and roadside parks. But we are not dealing with a single network, but rather with the complex intersections of “endless regimes of flow”, which move at different speeds, scales, and viscosities. The interesting contribution of “new mobilities” scholars is their reference to a more relational approach to the classic problem of agency and structure, as demonstrated by their emphasis on the relation between human mobilities and immobilities—and unequal power relations which distribute mobility—(Hannam, Sheller, Urry 2006).

The attempt to mobility studies is to focus on mobility itself—and consequently on mobile subjects and objects—and thus they contribute to enrich the wider theoretical debate that counterposes the sedentatistic metaphysic to the nomadic one. Both metaphysics are ways of viewing the world, and each tries to understand mobility, place and spatial order. Mobility as a threat, a disorder in the system, a thing to control has always been a mainstream way of thinking in the modern Western world. The first critic to this sedentarist metaphysics originates from the anthropologist Liisa Malkki (1992) who, in her writing on refugees, has noted a tendency to think of mobile people in ways that assume the moral and logical primacy of fixity in space and place. She highlights how the incessant desire to divide the world up into clearly bounded territorial units has lead to the creation of a “sedentarist metaphysics”. She argues that fixed, bounded, and rooted conceptions of culture and identity are linked to
particular ways of thinking, which are themselves sedentarist. This way of thinking reaffirms
the commonsense segmentation of the world into things like “nations”, “states”, “countries”,
and “places”. Such thoughts actively territorialize identities in property, in region, in nation.
They simultaneously produce discourse and practice that treats mobility and displacement as
pathological. The view of mobility as threat and dysfunction in the social sciences is only a
reflection of the wider world, i.e. the idea with reference to the assumption that people belong
to particular places, particularly to national “homes” (Malkki 1992). State and political
reaction to those people “without a place” – such as refugees, “gypsies”, migrants and nomads
– are, of course, diverse but there are several similarities in different time and contexts – as
for example their confinement within camps. In general, the mobility of those people is seen
as a threat, and the devices and discourses referring this mobility emphasizes legibility and
order. The material sites and discourses provided for them are virtually interchangeable –
plans of order, hygiene, and sedentary values.
There is also a positive notion of mobility as progress, freedom, and change, which runs
alongside a sedentarist metaphysics. This ways of thinking emphasize mobility and flow over
stasis and attachment, focusing on the “corporeal, imagined and virtual mobilities of people”,
the interactions between people and objects, the constitution of social identities through travel
rather than embeddedness in societies, and the increasing importance of trans-national, global,
forms of governance (Cresswell 2006). Those theories that consider mobility and migration as
the markers of our time, highlight that the lived experience of exiles, migrants, and refugees is
tied to the need to think nomadically. Not only does the world appear to be more mobile, but
our ways of knowing the world have also become more fluid. Several authors emphasize the
positive – sometimes heroic – role of nomad figures in contemporary society. A central theme
in the nomadic metaphysic, indeed, is the equation that links mobility to forms of subaltern
power: mobility is treated as central to the practices of transgression and resistance (de
Certeau 1984; Deleuze and Guattari 1986; Braidotti 1994; Bauman 2000). From an
epistemological point of view, nomadic metaphysics links mobility to a world of practice, of
anti-essentialism, anti-foundationalism, and resistance to established forms of ordering and
discipline. By focusing on mobility, flux, flow, and dynamism it is possible to emphasize the
importance of becoming at the expense of the already achieved: the stable and static.
Considering mobility as the main characteristic of modernity – and thus a central issue of
social sciences – shifts the focus from migrants to all mobile subjects and objects. Thus,
migration phenomena are included within the wider phenomenon of global mobility and
flows. Moreover, the main figures of these mobility studies are those defined by their
mobility, such as migrants, refugees, tourists, commuters, and vagabonds, (Cresswell and Merriman 2011). One of the main risks in shifting the focus on all the mobile subjects within the wider theoretical frame of flows, fluidity and mobility in the global world, is to underrate the presence of power relations that produce new hierarchies within the new global system. Although scholars of “new mobilities” declare their awareness of the existence of power relations and asymmetries in the global age, they do not focus on it endorsing other research topics.

“Regime of Mobility”: moving beyond «mobility turn» focusing on power dimension

In the beginning of the 2000s several scholars criticize the theoretical and epistemological assumption of the «mobility turn», underlining the proliferation and strengthening of borders, power hierarchies and social inequality in the global society. This new theoretical current works against those theories that consider globalization in terms of cross-border flows connoting imageries of openness, arguing that globalization must not be considered only by its social openness, but also by its social closure. According to these scholars, mobility has to be considered as a scarce resource, and therefore we are witnessing an accelerating development of mechanisms that attempt to control and block mobilities of certain social categories and hence to sort population. Earlier works highlighted that the normative dimension of globalization should be theorized not only in terms of the global human right but also in terms of a “global mobility regime” that works in the opposite direction. The regulation of movement under these new cultural and normative conditions brought by globalization is predicated on a “paradigm of suspicion”, i.e. individuals and groups have suspect identities related to the risks of immigration, crime and terrorism, which becomes a social problem. The global age is characterized by a tension between forces that try to create an open global world – such as the human rights system, and global networks and flows – and forces that try to maintain and reinforce the existing structures such as national states and sovereignty. The consequences of this tension are the proliferation of borders and the creation of a “global mobility regime” that maintains a high social inequality among different categories of people. The global mobility regime is predicated on the classification of people and groups according to principles of perceived threats and risks – also as a consequence of new phenomena such as the war on terrorism after the 11th September 2001. Moreover, the emergent technology of intervention provides the technical/statistical means for creating elaborate forms of social distinctions. Biosocial profiling is one example of such technology
of intervention that enables the mobility regime. Any police-initiated action that relies on race, ethnicity, or national origin rather than on particular individual behaviour as criteria for selecting whom stop or arrest is an action of *biosocial* profiling. Profiling predicts behaviour and regulates mobility by situating subjects in categories of risk. It is hence different by the law – which punishes and locks away through a binary guilty/innocent distinction – and by the discipline – which corrects behaviour and occasionally quarantines. Profiling represents a distinct modality of power that immobilizes, creates social distances, and polices and regulates spatial behaviour. This classification of profiling serves the mobility regime in its attempts to block or contain individuals (Shamir 2005).

After the earlier theorization on “global mobility regime”, further works proposed some variations, while still supporting the main criticism on the positive view of globalization. One further step was the introduction of the difference between *mobility* and *immobility* by relating these developments with the securitization of modern societies. According to these studies, we have – rather than mobilities – the emergence of an “*immobility regime*” of gated communities – for the elderly –, ghettos – for “legal” and “illegal” migrants –, imprisonment and a range of related practices – for criminals and deviants –, and increasingly the need for quarantine to ensure biological containment. That leads to an “enclave society”, where governments and other agencies seek to regulate spaces and, where necessary, to immobilize flows of people, goods and services (Turner 2007). Also several anthropologists started to work on this issue, aiming to shift the focus away from mobility. They criticized the idea that mobility is the characteristic of the global era, arguing that also in the past there was a lot of cross-border mobility within societies; moreover, they disagree with the idea that mobility means to become more similar and equal. The processes that produce movement and global linkages also promote immobility, exclusion, and disconnection (Tsing 2005). Thus, borders and mobility are not antithetical: transnational borders are not singular and unitary, but are designed to encourage various kinds of mobility (business travellers, tourists, migrant workers, students) and discourage others (“illegal” migrants, refugees). According to these scholars, social science needs to focuses on the political-economic processes by which people are bounded, emplaced, and allowed or forced to move, in order to show how mobility is materially grounded. Physical movement is the natural, normal given of human social life; what is abnormal, changeable, and historically constructed is the idea that human societies need to construct political borders and institutions that define and constrain spatial mobility in particular, regularized ways, such that immobility becomes the norm. Therefore, scholars focusing of immobility argue that the question is not so much about the rise or decline of
mobility, but how such mobility has been formed, regulated, and distributed around different regions and areas and how the formation, regulation, and distribution of such mobility is shaped and patterned by existing social, political, and economic structures of the contemporary world (Salazar and Smart 2011). Furthermore, it is not so easy to distinguish between forced or voluntary mobility, since mobility is a trend that goes hand in hand with the flexibility required by the economic system. If mobility is the topic of research, the authors argue that there is a risk that different interpretations of the complexity of these phenomena could be neglected, highlighting only (hyper)mobility or (im)mobility. They suggest hence to learn about mobility while also studying other processes and issues, and that is to situate movements within the multiple structural context in which people move. They argue that attention should also be drawn to other dynamics that might not be considered if the focus is on mobility and immobility only.

The scholars of “Regime of Mobility” agree with the main argument put forward by “mobilities studies”, i.e. the focus on the several ways in which people and their cultural practices are not confined to a fixed territory but are parts of multiple spatial networks and temporal linkages. However, they underline how the concept of “flow” – which was used in order to overcome the fixed relationship between culture, territory and identity – is agentless and frictionless. If fixity and motion are constructed as binary categories, then social life cannot be seen as a process in which both fixity and motion are relative and interrelated. Therefore, the aim of social science should be to address the dynamics between mobility and stasis within unequal fields of globe-spanning power (Schiller and Salazar 2013). Thus, the dimension of power became the central analytic lens through which these phenomena are seen, underlining the attempt to move away from binary thinking in order to consider migration and stasis as interconnected aspects of the human condition.

These scholars developed hence the concept of “regimes of mobility” rather than mobilities studies to explore the relationship between the privileged movement of some and the co-dependent but stigmatised and forbidden movement, migration and interconnection of the poor, powerless and exploited. To analyse the changing of mobility and immobility, they theorise power within multiple intersecting geographic scales, arguing that if we speak about mobility and interconnection, we cannot avoid speaking about significance of territory and about governmental powers that are based on territory.

Several scholars, indeed, underline the necessity to not completely neglect the role of national-state in research analysis. Nowadays, the effective migration control is part of western welfare states, and the protection of this welfare state is one of the main
rationalizations for immigration control and restriction. The cross-border movements have become the crucial mode for addressing inequalities, leading researchers to speak about a “transnational social question” – comparing it to the so-called social question of the nineteenth century, i.e. the class dichotomy. Looking at the welfare state in close connection with national economic competitiveness, it is possible to highlight social mechanisms of hierarchization which juxtaposes two categories of cross-border people: the so called labour migrants – regular and irregular – and the so-called high skilled – those coming from abroad and citizens. The former are “wanted but not welcome”, the latter are “wanted and welcome”. This research underlines how mobility reflects the necessities of global economic competition, whereas migration is connoted with problematic outcomes such as the social integration of immigrants into national policies and national welfare states. That shows how international migration is still controlled by the national-states and how it has not been globalized to the same extent as markets (Faist 2013).

The concept of regime itself also refers to the role of both individual states and of international regulatory and surveillance administrations that affect individual mobility. It reflects the notion of governamentality and hegemony in which there are constant struggles to understand, query, embody, celebrate and transform categories of similarity, differences, belonging and strangeness. That doesn't mean that the national-state is the unit of analysis, it is rather a force that structures political economy and that participates in the formation of the global regime of mobility by imposing barriers on the emigration and immigration (Schiller and Salazar 2013; Barak 2013). The attempt to focus on the relationship of unequal power within which relative stasis and different forms of mobility are constructed and negotiated, is the main contribution of the “Regime of Mobility” approach.

This theory moves beyond the mobility studies focusing on the dimension of power that became central in order to understand the dynamic between mobility and immobility, endorsing a structuralistic perspective in understanding the social reality. Since I am interesting in this work to grasp the tension between the structure and the agency, I here refer to other literature that shed light on the subjective dimension of individual in relation to the structural constrains.
1.2 From a critical perspective: the Border Studies approach

Border Studies are a current of studies in social and political theory. Scholars of border studies shed light on the power dimension in the global society. They also criticize the classical mainstream migration approach, proposing to analyse the interconnection between migration and globalization phenomena through the analytical category of border. They adopt a critical perspective arguing that globalization has lead to a proliferation of borders, and thus social and political sciences need to focus on power relationship and new hierarchies that come to the fore in the global age. The changing nature of borders, the relationship between migration phenomena within the global society, and their influence in the transformation of citizenship are the main topics grasped by these scholars (Balibar 2003; Mezzadra 2004, 2006; Transit Migration Forschungsgruppe 2007). The turbulent nature of the contemporary migration phenomena is one of the analytical premises (Papastergiadis 2000), which allows us to move away from theories that speak about migration flows, stable geographical area of departure and arrival, and push/pull factors in order to find out objective factors for explaining people mobilities. Contrasting this classical approach, several scholars refer to the thesis of autonomy of migration, that highlights the interrelation between migrants’ movements – which have elements of autonomy – and the exploitation of labour force implemented by the capitalistic system. This thesis argues that contemporary migration phenomena have to be understood also through the wider analytical lens of post-colonialism, focusing also on political struggles of migrants (Mezzadra 2004).

A substantial contribution to border studies came from the United States, that have conducted several ethnographic, geographic and sociological research on the frontier between Mexico and USA. They worked on the concept of hybrid, which characterized the experience of frontier that migrants have – living within it and crossing it. The border is here seen as a “third space”, a space characterized by several contradictions and ambivalence; accordingly several earlier border studies research were conducted on the so called “borderland”. The “borderland” research field has highlighted the ambivalence of borders, i.e. as a means of exclusion and division and as zones of contact, encounter and commerce, providing a livelihood for many inhabitants of these regions (Anzaldúa 1987). Moreover, the focus on this ambivalence in the experience of borders highlights the dialectic dynamic in migrants' experiences of border crossing and border reinforcing (Vila 2003). This underlines the
ambivalent relation between migrants and borders: migrants criss-cross several borders through their movement, but at the same time these borders have negative effects on the migrants' bodies, trying to block and sort their movements. This ambivalence can be seen as the main characteristic of the interaction between migration and globalization phenomena, which highlights the tension between agency and structure through the focus on the power dimension. Therefore, I related to this interdisciplinary literature that look at the global migration phenomena through the analytical concept of border.

Earliest border theory in anthropology has seeked answers to how identity, territory and the state are interrelated in the formation of the self and of group identification. They were interested in theorizing the intersections of borders, place, power, identity and the state. Also geographers worked from the perspective of borders, looking at them as geographical and political peripheries. In contrast, the latest border studies have shifted the focus more on borders as a “process” as much as “product”, looking at the nation state as something incomplete, fragmented and embedded through everyday practices. Moreover, border(ing) is understood as within as well as at the edges, and hence “margins” become the “new centers” (Wilson and Donnan 2012; Mezzadra and Neilson 2013). This second wave of border studies is more visible in the empirical research in Europe, which has offered in the last 20 years a great “sociological laboratory” in understanding these border(ing) processes and the relation with migrants' mobilities.

The concept of “border”

Before to explain the development of border studies in Europe, it is important to briefly introduce the concept of border itself. Since the 1990s the studies around the concept of border came to the fore, aiming to deconstruct the old conception of border that was derived from the classical geography, considering border as a line in the space. The first step to deconstruct this static conception of border was to highlight that border can manifest itself both in the form of a line or in the form of space. The suggestion of these studies is to not focus on the form of borders, but rather on the nature of border, i.e. consider it as a product of power relations. Indeed, the border is the act of tracing a line that divides, that produces a difference, that characterizes a border as such. Moreover, the function of the border is not just to trace a division that creates a separate space, but also to give a specific meaning to this separate space. Thus, this act implicitly includes a legitimacy to a norm that creates a sovereign order. Indeed, for ancient Romans to trace a border meant to redraw the cosmic
order on the earth, and hence allow the one who had traced it to establish a law (Zanini 1997). This connection between space–borders–power has been grasped in the political philosophy and social theory, underlining how these three elements are interconnected and contribute to the production of power and socio-political structures, such as the national-states (Foucault 1984; Cavalletti 2005; Gentili 2009). Once a line of division is traced and a separate space is created, the people dwelling this space recognize themselves as member of the same group defined in opposition of what is “outside”. Thus, works focusing on border directly refer also to the concept of “otherness” and “stranger” in order to highlight how border has to be understood as a relational social category (Simmel 1950; Colombo 1999). Thus, border cannot be considered just through its material component, rather as a relation that involved the dimension of power. Furthermore, borders can be lived and experienced, since they can manifest themselves in the form of space, i.e. as frontier. In the literature a classical distinction was made between border and frontier, considering the former a line and the latter a space. The word frontier include the word “front” that immediately evokes the concept of conflict and crisis, therewith it highlights how the frontiers are socially constructed and changed according to the different social and historical experiences (Zanini 1997). Proceeding with a linguistic analysis of this concept, we discover that not in every language the words border and frontier appear as two distinct concepts. The German language, for example, uses just the term Grenze – i.e. border – for both meanings of “border” and “frontier”. In the past the word Merk was used, which indicated the concept of frontier, but the usage ended in the 13th century when the Teutonic army had to negotiate the border with the Polish army. According to the Teutonic army, it was more useful to use the term border as line rather frontier as a broad territorial space, that should be problematic to be controlled. This example highlights how the border and its meaning changed in the history, underlining hence how it is socially constructed. Linked to this concept of border, it is possible to find the concept of threshold, that of confinement, and that of liminal experience – referring to the Latin word limes. These concepts refer to the experience of border and bordering process, highlighting the social experience of living within “border places” or in liminal conditions. These concepts by referring to the space dimension rather than to a line that divides, invoke the idea of “zone of transition” in which there is a possibility of movement and change.

“The threshold must be carefully distinguished from the boundary. A schwellen (threshold) is a zone. Transformation, passage, wave action are in the word schwellen, swell, and etymology ought not to overlook these senses”.

(Walter Benjamin 1982, “The Arcades Project”, p. 494 [O2a, 1])
The work on these concepts that are linked to and sometimes overlapping with the concept of border, allows us to highlight its ambivalent and dynamic nature. The double meaning to divide and to connect at the same time become apparent through a brief etymological analysis of the word “confinement”. The origin of this concept is the Latin word confinem, which is a compound word from the preposition cum, which means “to bind” and “to connect with,” and the verb finis, which means “to limit” or “to outline.” Therefore, confinem denotes something that links and divides at the same time. Following its historical evolution, the word also began to include the concept of “in-between”: the Latin verb finis corresponds to the ancient Greek τέλος, which corresponds to the Sumerian verb tilla, which in turn is linked to the Akkad word panū, which means “space in between”.

This etymological explanation helps us to understand how the contemporary border studies use the concept of border as an analytical tool that highlights the dynamism of the processes of bordering and border-crossing, and its function as filter rather than a wall that completely blocks. Indeed, in the latest border studies the dichotomy between border and frontier is overcome by the fact that the focus is more on the bordering process, and hence it allows to speak about “border place” wherever this process came to the fore. Studies that focused on borders themselves, started to redefine borders as an ongoing project, an activity, and a process, rather than as an entity or object. The border-as-process approach argues that borders are a technique: bordering, or the process of classifying and ordering space and relations between here and elsewhere in the world (Green 2013).

**“European Border Regime”: the relevance of internal borders and the reduced legal-statuses**

Recent European border studies argue that globalization does not necessarily lead to a reduction of borders. Rather, globalization changes the relation between the state and its territory, on which is the the classical conception of border has been founded. Borders hence do not confine any more the space of the political community, they do not fence and distinguish the polis from its outside, but they decompose themselves, reproduce themselves within its center and, at the same time, project themselves in its outside. In this sense, “border zones” are not marginal to the constitution of the political and the public arena but rather are at its very center (Friese and Mezzadra 2010). Europe represent a great case-study in

---

1 This etymological analysis has been done by the author working on the Latin and ancient Greek dictionary of the Italian linguist Giovanni Semerano. In bibliography is possible to find the complete literature references.
understanding the construction of a regime of borders' control, showing how the Schengen Agreement, the Dublin Convention, and the process of the EU enlargement have been build around the rhetoric on the war against “illegal” migrants and asylum-seekers, despite the aim to abolish the internal borders for the European citizens.

Several scholars have analysed this topic through the analytical lens of Foucault theory, focusing on the disciplinary power that characterizes the government of migration phenomena. According to these scholars, border becomes an instrument of biopower that is used to systematically regulate population in its national and transnational aspects – movement, health and security. The border and its control action assume hence a filter function which modifies the border's nature itself: it becomes a machine characterized by an assortment of technologies, which includes passports, visa, transit zones, laws, regulations, medical authorities, immigration offices etc. (Walters 2004; De Genova 2013b). Thus, borders become zones of experimentation and innovation of control and government technologies (Andrijasevic and Walters 2010).

This governmental regime uses borders as instruments of selection and hierarchy reproduction, highlighting its flexible nature. Its aim is not to completely block migrants outside of Europe and reinforce the walls of a “fortress”, but rather to govern a process of differential inclusion of migrants (Mezzadra 2006). It is a structurally hybrid regime, since the exercise of sovereignty is implemented by different actors: nation-states, supranational entities such as the European Union, and those international actors with no character of sovereignty such as the International Organisation of Migration (IOM) and United Nation High Commissioner of Refugees (UNHCR) (Düvell 2004; Andrijasevic and Walters 2010).

The change of political, economic and military actors, who intervene globally on the borders, is accompanied by the process of proliferation of these borders, which multiply and differ qualitatively, showing how this adjustment occurs in a decentralized, multi-level manner. Some scholars argue that this regime of migration control aims at a process of migrants' labour inclusion through its illegalization (De Genova 2013b). Others just underline how the interplay between this border regime and the economy's need is strongly interconnected. Accordingly, we can observe how the whole population of “strangers” is oscillating between the condition of outsiders and insiders in the construction of a post-national and post-colonial order, for which Europe appears as a sort of violent and conflictual laboratory; migrants could be either “internal enemies” or “additional citizens” (Balibar 2010). A phenomenon that came to the fore is the de-territorialisation of borders, which has also generated several changes in how the categories of people are produced and organized by the national-states: today there is
not just the dichotomy citizen/non-citizen, we are instead witnessing different levels of citizenship. Therewith the action of national-states and other actors involved in the migration’s control is highlighted, which create through their borders different categories of persons such as “illegal migrants”, “asylum seekers”, “refugees” etc. (De Genova 2013a). Therewith these scholars stress another classical foucauldian issue, i.e. the power that works through the creation of subjectivities (Foucault 1982). According to this perspective, the bio-political dimension of borders is not only the result of a relation between sovereignty, space and law, but also of a relation between the sovereignty and the personal identity of migrants. This shows how borders are social sorting tools that allow to put migrants through different legal regimes and to different mobility entitlements in light of bureaucratic and administrative classification in which they are trapped (Zetter 1991; Campesi and Sbraccia 2014).

These theories highlight the new trend to consider border as a process rather than an entity of object; this process is a technique that sorts and ranks people according to their legal status and national belonging. And exactly these bordering practices that deny or reduce the rights associated with legal residence and entrance play a central role in determining which movements and activities are defined as unauthorized, irregular or “illegitimate” (Squire 2011).

The categories of people who do not belong – “asylum-seekers” or “illegal migrants” – can be confined thanks to their reduced or absent legal status in places such as camps, highlighting hence the presence of “border places” within national territories. These are places where it is possible to confine certain categories of people, being thus another sign of the phenomenon of de-territorialisation of borders. The proliferation of several camps with different functions – such as deportation prison, asylum-seekers and refugees camps – shows how the relation between borders and its spatial constraints has changed. They have become immaterial and supra-national. The supra-territorial borders can crystallize in space – becoming asylum seekers camps or deportation centers –, or in other cases they are bound to the body of individuals in the form of legal status or rights to which an individual can have access (Cuttitta 2007). Over the last decades, these two forms of control have increased: through the different types of camps and through the proliferation of different forms of temporary legal status. In both cases temporariness is the main characteristic of these new immigration management and control measures, which limits the possibility of a definitive stay of migrants from the “host” civil society’s imaginary.

The gradual shift from constitutional law to administrative law facilitated use of different kinds of camps and the reduction of legal status. The administrative law allows a reduction of
the "legal person", receding the borders of legal rights in order to put specific categories of people under a special regime of legal and extraterritorial status (Campesi 2011a). These extraterritorial borders have a juridical dimension that however tie them on the territory dimension, and thus delineate “new territories” cut out ad personam (Brighenti 2009).

It is possible to speak about “extroversion” and “introversion” of borders (Cuttitta 2007) since borders are, on the one hand, projected to the outside and stretch their shadow and influence outside of European territory, and on the other hand, they reflect themselves within national territories. Several devices of surveillance and security are being employed inside national-states and outside European borders. Examples of externalisation of borders are the visa system, which is linked to the passports system (Torpey 2000), and bilateral agreements between a European state and a neighbour state close to European borders – such as the agreement between Germany and Poland (Dietrich 2004), or that between Italy and Libya (Andrijasevic 2006a; Paleologo 2009). Examples of internal borders are the transit zone of international airports, the different kind of camps – reception, deportation, residential accommodation etc. – and all those laws and regulations that restrict the possibility to move free within national territories for migrants. The legal status, i.e. the reduced legal statuses that nowadays are given to each different category of migrant, can be considered one kind of internal border. Through the legal status it is possible to deny the access to several rights, to confine specific categories of persons in camps and to restrict their social and spatial mobility.

Since border control nowadays implies a growing confusion between internal and external security, we are witnessing a multiplication of border control agents and the creation of a complex cooperative inter-institutional network that involves various transnational and national agencies, private actors, and non-governmental organizations. Thus, the Schengen area is a clear example of the transformations that lead to its consideration as “borderland” (Lebuhn 2013), where the objective of sovereign powers – involved in borders control – is no longer the definition of different spaces of political and legal appropriation, but the management of flows across the territory (Mezzadra 2006; Rigo 2007).

The theories of European border regime address the concept of “border zone” – or “border place” – as zone of indistinction (cfr. Agamenon 1995) characterized by a confusion between inside and outside of sovereignty. These are spaces of legal and political uncertainty which expose individuals to the discretional powers of the authorities, where bureaucratic agents have the power to defining the situation. And the process of control is enforced exactly through these zones (Campesi and Sbraccia 2014). The theorization of “border zone” as places of confinement within national territories refers to the wider theory of borders having
nowadays acquired the characteristic of *ubiquity*: they are no longer at the margin, they are instead in the center (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013). Research that have grasped the issue of citizenship helped to make this shift towards the center visible, showing how legal status has become a differentiation machine, which give the border a central role— not much in a spatial and geographical way, but more in a political and juridical one. Citizenship is a “bordered identity”, since border creates the category of migrants through the construction of a specific mobility as an act of border-crossing. Without such bordered identity, we would only have *mobility* and no migration (De Genova 2013a). Some scholars underline the attempt of the European Union to divide the population between those who can freely move and have full access to European rights – the European citizen – and those who cannot – the “strangers” –, highlighting the creation of an «European apartheid» (Balibar 2003). Others focus on the «freedom of movement» as the central point around which the creation of borders is build, highlighting the interconnection between the mobility enacted by migrants, the borders of the European regime and the citizenship (Rigo 2007).

These theories try to overcome the dichotomy between citizen and non-citizen, looking at this issue through the lens of processuality: migrants and citizen are both protagonist actors in the process of negotiation of borders and citizenship. Therewith these scholars emphasize to look at this issue through the lens of power relations, i.e. to focus on the interaction – and tension – between the agency and structural dimensions. Indeed, several scholars of border studies aim to shed light on the political struggles of migrants and on the ways in which such struggles constitute “borderzones” in which control mechanisms are enacted and contested. This theoretical process in bringing the agency of migrants to the fore aims at distancing the theory from other fields of social and political sciences that shed light on migrants’ agency such as trans- and post-national studies. Rather, the scholars of border studies focus on those struggles around borderzones and irregularity, shifting away from scalar-thinking in order to think politics in a more dynamic way (Squire 2011). In the following subparagraph several empirical research are highlighted in order to shed light on the research fields through which the theory of European border regime has been grasped until now.

**Empirical research: “European border regime” as a space of negotiating practices**

There are several empirical research that have grasped the European border regime by focusing on the relation between migration control's mechanisms and the migrants as a social, conflictual process of negotiation (Kasparek and Hess 2010). The aim of these research was to
analyse the actors, practices, technologies and discourses involved in this process by applying the ethnographic method, in particular the multi-sited ethnography that allows to grasp the same phenomenon in different places without the need to apply a classical comparative analysis (Marcus 1995). The scholars mainly attempted to bring the agency of migrants in the conceptualization of borders to the fore and proposes to understand how borders are being shaped by taking as a starting point the struggles of mobility enacted by migrants. The research shed light on the tension between migrants and European border regime by focusing on the perspective of migrants' practices. The focus on the processuality is crucial to underline that the process of border displacement and externalization should not be understood as a sovereign act by states to extend their power or competence on the basis of an abstract claim for hegemony and control. Rather, it represents a multifaceted constitutive plane of struggle, where the regime of mobility control is itself challenged by the fluid, clandestine, multidirectional, and context-dependent forms of mobility (Karakayali and Tsianos 2010).

Some ethnographic research grasped the borders externalization being set in the “borderzones” within neighbour countries of Europe such as Morocco (Heck 2010), Ukraine (Speer 2010), or Turkey (Karakayali and Tsianos 2010), showing the impermeability of borders as well as how borders lead to the management of migrants' mobility. Indeed, most of these works have different reception camps or deportation prisons as research field and highlight through this migration management the current trend in the transformation of sovereignty and its relation with the space and borders. Other research investigate the actors who take part of these control regime such as UNHCR (Scheel and Ratfisch 2010), Frontex (Kasparek 2010) or IOM (Georgi 2010), emphasizing their ambivalent and contradictory role of managing and control migration's mobilities under the discourse of humanitarianism (Garelli and Tazzioli 2013). Particular attention is given in these works to the bordering practices of these actors and their bureaucratic procedures (Infantino 2014), highlighting its characteristic of government power in creating subjectivities. A set of research is conducted also within European countries which are geographically located at the margins of European Union, such as Greece (Karakayali and Tsianos 2010), the Lampedusa island in Italy (Gatta 2012a), Malta (Sciuoba 2007; Ricci 2014), Ceuta and Melilla in Spain or Cyprus (Lenz 2010). These works focus on the topic of external borders of Europe, highlighting how the European border regime creates border places such as refugee camps that contribute to the control and government of migrants' mobilities. These border places have effects on those people who transit through them – on their lives, projects and bodies – and hence produce new subjectivities. There are also works with the research field in continental Europe, such as in
Germany (Pieper 2004) or England (Griffiths 2014). The focus of these works with research fields in Europe shift from the external to the internal borders, since they analyzed the practices of confinement of migrants within national states. But also in these works the privileged research fields are the control structures such as camps, international airport, or harbours as places where the internal control is deployed. Within the border studies there is less focus on how the internal borders are deployed outside the confinement structures and arrival places, as for example in the urban spaces or scattered in the whole national territory. What happens after the first arrival and how the internal borders enact, once migrants have obtained some kind of residence permits, is so far less grasped. Therefore, I referred also to another group of empirical research and theoretical works, namely those that focus on citizenship issue setting the research fields within the urban space.
1.3 Citizenship, its hierarchies and the emphasis on the urban level

The citizenship studies provide an interesting contribution to the issue of internal borders system, in particular those focusing on the urban level. Indeed, in the last decades some currents within citizenship studies aimed to shed light on the tension between structural mechanisms – the socio-economical one and those of mobility and border control – and the agency of the subjects. On one side, the migration government is enforced through the mobility regime, which sorts and ranks people through the hierarchy of legal-status – i.e. the citizenship. On the other side, the increase and diffusion of migrants’ struggles that call for freedom of movement and access to the rights highlights how citizenship is a practice from below.

This issue has often been linked to migration studies in different traditions of social and political sciences, such as transnational and diaspora studies, and critical border studies (Rigo 2007; Anderson 2012).

The movement of people across the national-states' borders at the global level has challenged the institution of citizenship in the modern state. Since the post-war time the Marshall's categories of citizenship and its universalism was reviewed, showing how citizenship is not only a set of rights, but also a mechanism of closure that sharply demarcates national-states' borders. Several authors worked on the questions how immigration is changing citizenship, trying to figure out new forms of membership according to the economical, political and social changes of our contemporary society (Joppke 1999). According to these studies, citizenship is nowadays rather seen as a legal status and identity that excludes rather than includes people, and some theoretical works attempt to think new forms of post-national membership suitable for the transformations of the global age (Soysal 2000).

Looking at the struggles for citizenship it is possible to individuate two groups: struggle for redistribution and struggle for recognition. The first highlights how the profound transformation of the welfare-state implemented by the “neo-liberal revolution” has led to the erosion of social rights. The second shows how citizenship is eroded also as a consequence of changing government strategies. Indeed, critical citizenship scholars shed light on the contradictory approach of western societies, whose economies need migrant labour force, but their democratic governments are reluctant to give migrants some legal recognition. In the age of war against terrorism and the establishment of the “state security” – and its need to defend
political borders – the restriction of citizenship and its more stringent criteria are direct consequences. «The transformation of the state from an instrument of the law into an instrument of the nation» (Arendt 1951, p. 257) has led to the definition of citizens of the state as nationals whether defined racially, ethnically, culturally or even religiously. This transformation was the beginning of the struggles for recognition of the groups that were ostensibly of the state but remained out of the nation.

The issue of citizenship and the struggles for it are an aspect of a wider and more complex issue, which is the relationship between human rights and the rights of citizen, and the role of sovereignty – and thus the state – in the definition and application of those rights. Human rights are often linked to the issue of migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers as their categories undermine the order of state – nation – territory – citizenship. Since these people move and participate in the economies of reception societies, but they are not recognized as citizen, they can draw signs of an emergent post-national – and post-colonial – society, from which transnational rights can emerge. The problem lies in the nature of these rights: while human rights are regarded as innate and inalienable, and they refer to all human beings, the rights of citizen are created by the state and refer only to the members of a nation or a state. Thus, while the state enforces social rights, there is no sovereign power to enforce human rights at the global level. Moreover, human rights are experienced as important but often as a remote form of legal protection because people do in general not exercise their human rights until they are confronted by a crisis. By contrast, having an active, dynamic and vital citizenry is the precondition of democracy (Turner and Isin 2007). Thus, the legal-status plays an important role in the contemporary societies: it is the tool through which the border regime regulates the mobility of people, sorting and ranking the population in several categories to which it denies or grants the access to rights and society. The citizenship is also the battleground in which people that are not recognized as citizen fight in order to participate to western societies, in which they live and work though are not socially accepted and legally recognized.

**Citizenship as tool of migrant mobilities' control: building of hierarchies and stratification**

The citizenship issue cross-cuts that of migrants' mobility and the attempts to control and manage is actuated by the states. Moreover, it highlights the several tensions and conflicts that occur through the interconnection of different phenomena. Focusing on Europe, first of all we observe the tension between demand for labour – and the migrants' participation to western
economies – and the reluctance of western states in giving them a legal recognition, supported by the argument of scarcity of resources and welfare protectionism. Second, there is a contradiction in the European political procedures that creates a single market in Europe with free movement of goods and citizens while refusing the free movement for work of non-European people. The nature of the mobility regime in Europe and the governance of migration actuated by different state and non-state actors at different levels – local, national and supranational – leads, besides tensions, to a complex and sometime contradictory management system.

Several scholars of border studies stress the central role of citizenship and legal-status in regulating these contradictions as discussed in the previous paragraph. The difficulty to distinguish between the internal borders and the external one is a typical characteristic of the European Union, which has to deal with a double otherness: the “fellow Europeans” and the non-Europeans, i.e. “internal otherness” and “external otherness” (Balibar 2003). The creation of a “European apartheid”, according to Etienne Balibar, or an “enclave society” (Turner and Isin 2007) is a reaction to this double otherness. Such enclave society expresses the securitization of liberal societies, the building of physical barriers against foreign immigration and the creation of gated communities to defend citizen against “urban incivility”. Several authors underline the proliferation of different forms of legal-statuses and consequently citizen that have as common characteristics the temporariness, precariousness and an existence lived in the shadow. The “illegal citizen” of Enrica Rigo (2007), or the concept of “citizenship's shadow” of Nicholas De Genova (2013a) highlight exactly this creation of various bordered socio-political identities. The attempt of these theories is to overcome the binary distinction between citizen/non-citizen, focusing on the concept of a “hierarchy of legal-statuses” that lead to a differential inclusion.

The interesting work of Lydia Morris (2002) underscores the same issue and links it to the tensions of the contemporary society and their effects. Morris introduces the concept of civic stratification and stresses how the transnational dimension of rights and their limitation in the context of national resource constraints lead to the civic stratification. With the research field set in Europe, the author observes the interrelation between international convention and the treaty of European Union. Morris argues that this interrelation leads to a new level of differentiation: European citizen and an increasing diversity of “outsider” statuses for migrants. Since the political and social construction of rights and the underlining principle of control need to be analysed, the civic stratification is conceptualized as a formal device of inclusion and exclusion with respect to rights. The different legal statuses of belonging play a
crucial role in this system of inequality based on the relationship between different categories of individuals and the state, and the rights thereby granted or denied. Therewith a new dimension of analysis appears, i.e. *rights as governance*: the elaboration of rights for categories of non-citizen also provides the opportunity and the means for exercising surveillance and control. Moreover, this theory sheds light on the dissonance between the formal structures – laws and policies – and the social practices: usually rights are formally granted but restricted in practice, and that highlights a high level of discretion or law interpretation (Morris 2003). According to the author, a regime of rights reflects a “balancing of” or a “competition between” a variety of constraints: welfare resources, labour market management, and international obligations. The concept of *civic stratification* is interesting because it highlights the relation between stratified rights and state control of population. Moreover, it sheds light on the relevance of the legal-statuses as internal borders, and how these *reduced* statuses are a consequence of negotiating practices and struggles, which involves institutions, non-state actors, and migrants itself.

Several empirical research stress exactly this control mechanism of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers through the tool of legal-status. This theory has been developed within the *urban studies*, which stress the crucial role of the urban dimension for analysing wider social phenomena. Since the city assumes a new central role within the contemporary global society, becoming the place where the intersection between the global and the local occurs (Sassen 2004), it emerges as an important dimension of analysis. The authors grasp mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion through the legal-status at the urban level and highlight how the city became an important site through which citizenship act as tool of control and is acted through the social practices of non-citizens. The presence of new subjects such as the *denizen* – the one who is legally in the national territory but is not a citizen – show the ambivalent attitude of political authorities that build at the local level several mechanism of control aimed at a differential inclusion. The legal-status of *residency* in Italy exemplifies this ambivalence: it is a gateway to some rights that otherwise non-citizen wouldn't have recognized, while it is also a bureaucratic mean of local authorities to control the population. We therefore need to speak about a new process of rights' localization that develops in almost all Europe and from which a system of “local citizenship” emerges (Gargiulo 2011; 2014).

The focus of these empirical research in *urban studies* is to grasp how the internal borders act at the local level, looking at the city as a *battlespace* (Graham 2009). Accordingly, the extension of the border on the local scale should be conceptualized as a result of contingent and constantly changing political and institutional conflicts, contradictions and practices.
rather than the outcome of a coherent top-down strategy or technique. This is possible thanks to a gradual system of rights (Ong 2006) – or civic stratification – that requires the systematic monitoring of migrants’ legal statuses. Thus the urban realm can be seen as a site of negotiating, shaping and interconnecting local practices of border control and urban citizenship (Lebuhn 2013). That allows to consider citizenship in its two different dimensions: the normative one – as legal-status – and the cultural and social one – as a social practice from below.

**Citizenship as a social practice from below: a new battleground**

“There are no power relations without resistance”

(Foucault 1982)

Citizenship has been analysed both as a top-down manifestation of the state, and as a bottom-up practice from below. The latter analysis involves the investigation of the struggles of migrants, and the everyday life practices through which they act as citizen although they are not formally recognized as such. Several works focus on the political struggles of migrants, highlighting how they act as citizen through their performance (Isin and Nielsen 2008). A different branch of works investigate the everyday practices of migrants, who participate informally to the societies – to the labour market and social life – without being legally recognized (Vasta 2008; Ambrosini 2012a). Although the two currents of studies focus on different objects of analysis, both aim at shedding light on the agency dimension of migrants. Despite the several mechanisms of control, migrants find practices to resist and overcome these mechanisms and live in and participate to western societies although they are not legally recognized. These scholars aimed to highlight how the migration issue has become a crucial battleground in the contemporary society, involving and crossing other problematic issues such as national and cultural identity, citizenship, scarcity of resources in the western welfare-states, the redefinition of power and sovereignty in the global age, etc. Within the migration-as-battleground perspective some scholars underline the importance of the variety of actors – state and non-state actors –, which are involved in these struggles of redefinition of borders, identity and power (Ambrosini 2013; 2014). The perspective of street-level-bureaucracy (Lipsky 1980) shed light exactly on these negotiating practices, the ambivalent role of various actors, and the fact that the borders are continually redefined. This analytical perspective argue that the role of the various brokers, which mediate between the formal institutions of
society and the migrants that are not formally recognized, is crucial within the negotiation practices and in general in the “grey world” of informality in which most of the migrants moved in western societies (Engbersen and Broeders 2009). Therewith, they shed light on the discretionary space of bureaucratic practices, highlighting the ambivalent behaviour of bureaucratic officers dealing with problematic issues of migration and control mechanisms (Ellermann 2006).

While these scholars put the interplay between several actors in the negotiation practices of borders' redefinition at the center of analysis, other scholars prefer to focus on the struggles of migrants as claim-making subjects. The city assumes a crucial role in this context, since it is the site through which social relations are produced, reproduced and transformed. The works of these scholars also contribute to redefine the concept of territory – and hence city – and the relations that human beings have with it. City is not considered as the sum of its part, but as «the site of social», that means also the battleground of various social groups that come into existence through it (Isin 2008). According to Saskia Sassen, the city is becoming a strategic frontier zone for «those who lack the power, the outsiders»: they can grant presence in cities, presence vis-à-vis power. The city is a new frontier zone in which different actors meet, without clear rules of engagement (Sassen 2012). Ultimately, these scholars aimed to grasp power relations and show how «the strategy of struggles constitutes a frontier for the relationship of power» (Foucault 1982., p.794). The city has to be seen as the border space into which several actors negotiate the borders (Lebuhn 2012). The «act of citizenship» highlights exactly the practices of becoming claim-making subjects in and through various sites and scales: if acting produces subjects, then we can define «acts of citizenship» as those acts that produce the citizen and the other (Isin and Nielsen 2008).

Other scholars that highlight the centrality of the urban dimension refer to the concept of the «right to the city». This is a collective right, i.e. it is not preferentially a right for the access to city's resources, but rather a right to change and reinvent the city according to the desires of those who live and practice the city (Harvey 2008, 2012). According to these scholars, the city is not a city in the conventional sense, but a place in an urban society, in which the hierarchical distinction between city and the country has disappeared. Thus, the central point is not a city at all, but the whole society; the “urban” is only a synecdoche and a metaphor, according to Henri Lefebvre the right to the city is the right to urban life (Marcuse 2010). Therefore, urban level has become a crucial analysis dimension in order to grasp the topic of power relations and borders' negotiation between western societies and migrants who enter them.
Both “normal” everyday practices of resistance and more aware «acts of citizenship» are signs of the emergence of citizenship as a battleground, and signs of the new important role that city plays in the global age. The literature that underscores migrants' struggles and their resistance strategies focused almost only on undocumented migrants (Vasta 2008; Chimienti 2011; McNevin 2013; Nicholls 2013; Ambrosini 2014). Those migrants who have obtained a residence permit are usually considered a step further in the process of integration or participation to the host societies, and thus they are less present within the discourses about migrants' struggles or migrants' everyday practices of resistance. Concerning the literature on refugees and forced migrants, there is a missing focus on the everyday resistance practices and struggles of these particular category of subjects as the next paragraph details. Indeed, the contemporary imaginary of western societies produces political, academic and public discourses that distinguish between economic migrants – to which categories belong also that of “illegal” migrants –, who are seen as persons with a strong agency, and refugees or asylum-seekers, who are considered as people with a lack of agency (Squire 2014).

In the following paragraph, I will discuss these different categories on the light of the literature, and I will underline their limits and what is still missing in the empirical and theoretical research about this issue.
1.4 Refugees, asylum-seekers, forced migrants: between bureaucratic categories and social images

The issue of refugees has gradually and largely entered the public and academic debate during the last decade. We can observe how the “refugees” and “asylum-seekers” have become the new social icon, as it was the “mad” (mental illness) in the 1970s and the drug addicted in the 1980s. The “refugee” as a social icon – as a social representation of the reality – justifies and supports a huge machine of relief that involves financial transfers, juridical apparatus, political dialectics, and cultural practices that are implemented to manage this phenomenon.

In order to better understand the complexity of the “refugee” figure and the multiplicity of phenomena that are correlated with, it is necessary to go through a brief historical excursus. This allows us to show how the “refugee” has become an artificial category, created by several authorities and applied to some people on the strength of several criteria. The criteria (applied by authorities to mark refugees) are not always the same, they change during the history and according to the power relations in the international community.

Though the term “refugee” is a recent word, the concept of exile is as old as the western society: from the biblical exodus to the image of Enea, up to the experience of Saffo in the old Greek, the exile for political reasons had always played an important symbolic meaning. The concept of “refugee” appeared for the first time in the 19th century and it was used to classify the religiously persecuted. Some scholars consider the Huguenots – the protestants who were exiled from France in the 17th century – as the example of “classical refugees” because of their peculiar characteristics that differentiate them from other categories of people escaping during that time (Zolberg 1989, Adelman 1999, in Marchetti 2006). The main characteristic to define a “refugee” has always been the persecution, which undermines the lives of those people who are escaping. The recognition of the persecution as such by the authorities of the receiving country is a second and connected characteristic, leading to a form of juridical protection. The latter characteristic is crucial to define the category of “refugee” as we understand it in the contemporary age. In Germany, for example, until the end of 19th century a term for refugee did not exist, just the word Heimatlos – “without homeland” – referring to stateless people. Since this German term did not have the meaning of “refugee”, the consequent protection and relief was not considered. The role of the authorities of the
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2 Insights developed in the introduction of the Italian review Gli Asini, n. 25, 2015.
receiving countries is crucial in the definition of the refugees phenomenon, since they ultimately decide either to accept or to reject the refugees in their territories. In the beginning of the 19th century the refugees in Europe were “kindly” accepted by the governments because they where persons – escaping for political reasons – who were belonging to the European elite. In this time the governments were convinced that these refugees would go back to their original countries once the political problems there would be solved. At the end of 19th century the behaviour of European governments changed immediately, when a bigger heterogeneous population started to move because of the several social revolts, nationalism movements and wars. Also poor people became refugees, and since they were belonging to the working class – that at this time was the “social problem” – the reaction of governments was to reject these “poor” refugees through expulsion. The development of the capitalist economy also played an important role in building the control devices for managing migrants and refugees: the need for cheap labour force led to the progressive overlapping between the categories of “economical migrants” and “refugees” (Sassen 1996).

The creation of the national state and its correlated national identity based on the ethnic belonging is crucial for the category of refugee. As several scholars pointed out, the category of refugee is ontologically interconnected with the existence of national state and its principle of birth (citizenship) – nation – territory (Arendt 1951; Agamben 1995). According to the principle of sovereignty of the national state, a “stateless” is a person outside the space of state's jurisdiction, is an outlaw and, thus, outside the “normality” (Arendt 1951). Since the end of the 19th century to the first half of the 20th century, Europe was involved in several wars – notably the first and second world wars – that contributed to the continuous redefinition of the national states' borders. This process led to the creation of a huge number of displaced persons which suddenly remained without a state and had to be “re-placed” in the new nation-states. The status of refugee become a specific category: the state could decide who was insider and outsider through the definition of citizenship based on the link between territory/nation/sovereignty. Moreover, the state strengthened its system of controlling the population through the mean of citizenship in order to reinforce its sovereignty principle; consequently, stateless, asylum seekers and refugees became a central problem for the governments.

«The term “stateless” at least acknowledged the fact that these persons had lost the protection of their government and required international agreements for safeguarding their legal status. The postwar term “displaced persons” was invented during the war for the express purpose of liquidating statelessness once and for all by ignoring its existence. Non-recognition of statelessness always means repatriation, i.e., deportation to a country
of origin, which either refuses to recognize the prospective repatriate as a citizen, or, on the contrary, urgently wants him back for punishment» (Arendt 1967, p. 279).

During the same time the process of internationalization of the “problem of refugees” started and progressively became an issue for international organizations: from the creation of the High Commissioner for Refugees\(^3\) in 1921 to the Geneva Convention and the creation of UNHCR in 1950. After the second world war the issue of refugee was characterized by the idea of a protection system applied by the international community. From a juridical point of view, the issue started to be linked with that of human rights: to provide a refugee status, the responsible authorities no longer focussed on the ethnic group, but on the story of each individual. The distinction between the category of “economic migrants” and “refugees” was strengthened by international authorities, which established a mixed international regime of migration control and management. A private inter-governmental agency, i.e. the IOM – the International Organization for Migration – was entrusted with the issue of economical migration linked to the labour issue. The issue of refugees and asylum seekers was entrusted to a humanitarian international organization, i.e. the UNHCR – the United Nation High Commissioner for Refugees. Although the attempt to internationalize the issue of refugee linked it to the principle of human rights, the influence of the axis of power within the international community was still huge. The USA did not want the international organizations to interfere with their own internal migration policy linked to their labour market. Therefore they strongly pushed for the internationalization of the management of refugees, but not for that of “economical migration”. Moreover, the cold war scenario – influenced above all by the USA – led to the overlapping of the refugees topic with the anti-communists issue: the refugee was an anti-communist-white-man. Hence, “refugees” became a sort of social group that governments considered as a separate category, leading to the development of technical thinks and management devices in order to control and organize it. The issue of refugee becoming a global problem – and no longer an only European one – was an important change for post-war global societies; the United Nations through the UNHCR takes the decisions in defining who is a refugee and in the management of the phenomenon. According to the Geneva Convention, a refugee is:
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\(^3\) The High Commissioner for Refugees was committed to Fritjohf Nansen, a famous scientist, who had the responsibility to manage the problem of refugees linked to the war. In fact, at this time there was the certainty that the refugees’ issue was a temporary problem linked to the war, and thus resolvable once the war was finished. Moreover, at this time the issue of refugee was linked just to the particular category of Russian refugees because of the Russian communist revolution. The increasing wars and number of different ethnic groups which applied for the refugee status highlighted soon that it was not enough to consider the issue of refugees just in relation to the nationality of a group, but instead as a wider global phenomenon.
«a person who owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it».

The characteristics of the “contemporary refugee” highlight its double nature: from one side it is linked with the national-state, since it exists as someone who has lost the protection of his national states; from the other side while it is also linked to the idea of human rights, it shows its universalistic element.

The evolution of the refugee category hasn't stopped with the Geneva Convention of 1951, instead it is following the transformations in the global society and the changes of power relations within it. As discussed in the chapter three, since the 1980s the category of refugee involves new trends such as a depoliticisation of refugee category in favour of humanitarian and security aspects, and the new, no longer European origins of refugees from so-called “developing countries” of the global South. The chapter three highlights how the paradigm of refugee management is changed through the implementation of restrictive policies, which declare the temporariness of refugees’ stay in the host country.

Who is a “refugee”? From refugee studies to forced migration studies

In the sociological literature the issue whether “refugee” has to be considered as a specific social category or not has been strongly debated. The earliest theoretical current dealing with this topic referred to the push/pull theory, underlining the difference between the category of “economic migrants” and that of “refugees”. This theory was based on the dichotomy between “economic migrants” and “refugees” that was highlighted by the element of voluntariness, that is the choice to leave the origin country. According to the push/pull theory, “economic migrants” voluntarily decide to migrate because of economical reasons, being attracted by the pull factor of the arrival societies. By contrast, “refugees” are forced to migrate because of political persecution and thus the push factors of the origin countries dominate the reasons for migration. According to this classic theoretical perspective the migration movement of a refugee is understood as an escape from his or her country, which is not well programmed, and the country of arrival is not freely chosen. Hence the refugee is described as a victim, his or her migration as one-way movement from its country to the welcome society, and his or her situation in the host society is read just through the lens of

4 Reference to Geneva Conventions 1951.
integration. As highlighted in the first paragraph of this chapter, this theoretical perspective is limited because it considers the refugees as subjects without agency and deals with migration as a linear and singular movement from point A to point B.

In contrast, another earlier theoretical current argues that the “refugee” is a bureaucratically-constructed category, neglecting some empirical evidences. Accordingly, there are not only voluntary or forced movements, most of the migration movements have instead both a component of voluntariness and constraint (Richmond 1993). Some research of this theoretical current highlighted how the integration paths in the host societies of economic migrants and refugees are very similar; therewith they aimed to highlight the weakness of a theoretical model that distinguishes between economic migrants and refugee. Accordingly, “refugees” were first a juridical construction, that afterwards became also a social one. Nevertheless, considering their situation, in the labour market, racist discrimination in the host societies and the migration policies, the condition of refugees and economical migrants is very similar.

This short overview shows how the discussed earliest studies on refugees focussed on the definition of refugee as a social category with its particularities that should allow to distinct it from other categories of migrants. Later, thanks also to the creation of refugee studies in 1982 at the University of Oxford, and the further Journal of Refugee Studies in 1988, the theoretical debate about refugee has been amplified to other topics. The understanding of the crisis situation within the origin countries gained focus and allowed to highlight the complexity in the decision to leave the home country. These studies aimed to contextualize the conflicts in the origin countries in the wider worldwide processes, such as globalization, decolonization, formation of new national-states etc. (Zolberg et all 1989). Although refugee studies contributed to highlight the complexity in the phenomenon of refugees, the focus remained on the reasons of the migration, i.e. the level of constrain in the choice to leave the origin country. Only at the beginning of the new millennium, refugee studies experienced a turn thanks to the work of Stephen Castels (2003) that traced the theoretical and methodological lines for a Sociology of Forced Migration. The author aimed to eliminate the dichotomy between “economic migrants” and “refugees”, maintaining just the distinction between voluntary and forced migration. He argues that the term “refugee” is just a juridical – and bureaucratic – category, which doesn't have a sociological significance. Thus, he proposes to substitute the word “refugees” with that of “forced migrants”, highlighting hence just the forced nature of their migration movement. Castels shed light on the limits of the definition of “refugee” implemented by the Geneva Convention. He argues that we cannot consider just
those people as “refugee”, which are recognized as such by the international law – highlighting hence the discrentional power of governments in deciding who is a refugee and who is not. Instead, all people that are forced to move should be considered. The wider category of “forced migrants” includes asylum-seekers, internally displaced persons, those which have obtained international protection, and those who are forced to move because of development projects. The work of Castels allowed to overcome the issue about the distinction between the economical or political origin of migration and helped to move the focus on issues like the interconnection of different phenomena at the global level, which produces mixed migration movements.

The theory of labelling of Roger Zetter (1991) is an influent work about the definition of “refugee” and the complexity of phenomenon surrounding this topic. The work outlines the conceptual tools of bureaucratic labelling – stereotyping, identity disaggregation, political and power relationships – and underlines how the reality has to be understood as a combination of social processes and power relations that construct it. The labelling is a process that constructs the reality, creates identities and thus the category of “refugee” has to be understood as a social construction. The labels assume political and conflicting meanings that influence the act of both labelled and labellers. Thus, the analytical lens to understand the distinctive characteristics of the refugee category is not the political nature of their migration or the push factors that forced their migration, instead it is the processes of labelling, differentiation between refugees and not-refugees, and the imposition of the programmed identity. This work has deeply influenced the debate on refugee issues. Several further research have shed light on the process through which the refugees were constructed by the power relations implemented through the labelling processes (Cabot 2012; Sorgoni 2013). These labelling processes strongly influenced also the image of refugee in the contemporary western society, that changed from the classic icon of a “hero” to the image of a “victim” (Marchetti 2014a). The process of victimization influences also the whole “machine” of refugee management, i.e. the implementation of aid policies and aid institutional programs, the introduction of humanitarian criteria – instead of political ones – , and the building of structures – such as camps – designed to manage the phenomenon in terms of aid, compassion and humanitarianism (Marchetti 2006). Starting from this new current of studies, the topic of control mechanisms for forced migrants implemented by western authorities came to the fore.

---

5 This image refers to the post-war age and the Geneva Convention of 1951. The “refugee” was a person either escaping from totalitarian regimes or escaping from the communist bloc during the Cold War. Thus, the image constructed by western societies was that of “hero” escaping from political governments against western democracy and civility.
Above all, as we will see in the last paragraph, several works have been focused on the control devices and structures such as reception centers, detention prisons and refugee camps.

**Forced migrants and their relation with the nation, its territory and its borders**

The scholars of the transnational approach attempted to include the issue of refugee within a wider global context. According to their perspective, the focus shift from the reasons of migration – political or economic, forced or voluntary – to the social, political and economic connections and networks of refugees, which link departure countries with arrival countries and with third spaces through a transnational prospective. The fact that a person cannot go back to its origin country is the only feature that is inherent to refugee according to these scholars. Nevertheless refugees maintain linkages to their origin countries and develop transnational activities similar to other categories of migrants.

The current named diaspora studies has been developed at first within the transnationalism, and later it became an independent line of research that aimed to better define the specificity of refugees' phenomenon. Since the transnational approach was seen as too broad, several scholars aimed to interpret the experience of refugees and its specificity through the concept of “diaspora”, i.e. the creation of a transnational community whose characteristic is the experience of displacement. The people who experience the diaspora share common characteristics such as the escape from their origin countries, their belonging to an ethnic minority in the host society where they feel not completely integrated, and their maintained linkages to their origin country (Safran 1991; Wahlbeck 2002). The social networks of refugees as a resource for their migration and integration paths is the focus of these studies, highlighting some similarities with other categories of migrants. Moreover, the diaspora refers to an ideal community experienced by displaced persons who maintain their ethnic identity and linkages with their homeland.

The diaspora studies have been criticized for neglecting the power relations and structures within the host societies where the “diasporic people” actually lived. Although refugee experience is a global and transnational social reality, the refugees lives within a local context and are subjected to its power and social relations. Similar criticism has been raised by transnationalism and mobilities studies towards works that highlighted just the positive side of globalization through the concepts of flows, freedom of movement etc. Also in the diaspora case, the borders of national-states as well as the power relations that criss-cross the western societies where refugees and migrants live and move cannot be ignored. As detailed in the
first paragraph, a critical current within transnationalism aimed at underlining the centrality of the state in the global age, its borders and the power relations concerning it. The same applies within some works on refugees analysed through the lens of transnationalism, that shed light on how the movement of refugees and their transnational linkages have reinforced the state control, rather than empowered refugees (Koser 2007). The centrality of the relationship between refugees and the national-state has been highlighted by several authors dealing with this topic. The category of refugee is ontologically interconnected with that of national-state, and moreover the contemporary category of refugees could be a particularly informative one in the study of the socio-political construction of space and place (Malkki 1992, 1995). The relationship between the category of refugees and the nation, its territory and its culture was grasped by several scholars within social and anthropological studies. The contemporary spatial theories aim to understand this relationship, focusing on the concept of place as space that is socially and culturally constructed. Several studies criticised the classical spatial theory – and its static perspective – that argues the existence of a “natural place” for every person to which the identity is directly linked; accordingly refugees should be people “out of place”, precisely displaced. This perspective has allowed the development of policies in western societies that treat refugees just through psycho-pathological lens – people tear out from their country – reinforcing thus their image as victim and policies of externalization. Liisa Malkki underscores exactly the limit of this sedentaristic perspective, underlining that:

«To plot only “places of birth” and degree of nativeness is to blind oneself to the multiplicity of attachments that people form to places through living in, remembering, and imagining them». (Malkki 1995, p.72)

The latter approach focuses on the networks and global dimensions of migration experience, theorizing the phenomenon of deterritorialization of identity that is at the base of transnationalism. Also in this case, the risk of focusing on the transnational dimension and on the deterritorialization phenomenon is to neglect the power relations deployed at the local level where refugees live.

Which place for forced migrants? The camp’s paradigm

Several research tried to overcome the risk to hide the local dimension through grasping the experiences of refugees at the local level in their everyday lives. The wider current of research that has been developed following this perspective deals with empirical works set within refugees camps. A real paradigm has been developed in the social and political theory that
considers the camp as analytical lens to understand the relationship between space and power. The pioneer work of Giorgio Agamben has been a reference theory for years for several studies concerning the issue of refugee camps. In its book *Homo Sacer* (1995), Agamben argues that the camp has to be interpreted as the nomos of modernity, i.e. a normative and founding form that shapes today's society. He argues that camps are “exceptional spaces” excluded from the center, but still linked to the law, and that this is possible due to the process of “exclusion through inclusion” implemented by the sovereign power. Agamben sheds light on the process through which the sovereign power has been constituted in the contemporary society, and he refers to the foucauldian theory of biopower in order to explain the centrality of subjects’ lives – called by him naked life – for the modern national-state. In underlining the nexus between nation-birth-citizenship on which the sovereign power has been developed, Agamben reveals the figure of refugee as an example of a «disturbing element» of this system. According to the author, looking at the legal status of those who are confined into the camp is the crucial issue to understand the camp’s existence – and function. Thus, refugees and asylum-seeker as people who have lost their relationship with the national-state are the exemplar dwellers of the camp's structures. Also Hannah Arendt’s work shed light on the camp as the “only place” where stateless and refugees could be placed according to the national-states order:

«Every attempt by international conferences to establish some legal status for stateless people failed because no agreement could possibly replace the territory to which an alien, within the framework of existing law, must be deportable. All discussions about the refugee problems revolved around this one question: How can the refugee be made deportable again? The second World War and the DP camps were not necessary to show that the only practical substitute for a nonexistent homeland was an internment camp. Indeed, as early as the thirties this was the only “country” the world had to offer the stateless». (Arendt 1967, p. 284)

Several further works focus on refugees' camps, underlining the post-colonial power relationship that have produced these structures (Rahola 2003) as well as their several functions as technologies of power employed for control and manage displaced persons (Malkki 1995). Through analysis of the contemporary refugees camps these recent works shed light on a wider shift in the asylum management: the development of the humanitarian and security discourses and practices that progressively depoliticized the asylum issue. In the post-war society, the number of forced migrants strongly increased and their origin countries changed longer from Europe to the the global South, leading to the establishment of a t a humanitarian regime to manage the so called “refugee crisis”. The humanitarian agencies
such as UNHCR based their programs on camp structures settled in the crisis areas to tackle the refugee crisis. Several further currents of research have been developed on this topic, focusing on the camp but trying to include it in the wider issue of urban studies. The well-known work of Michel Agier (2002) aims to analyse the camp as an urban ethnographic case, highlighting how it is both a place of segregation implemented by the political authorities, and a place socially constructed by the relationships and interactions between the refugees and the humanitarian staff.

There is a huge number of empirical and theoretical works on refugees camps, but only few studies on the so called “urban refugees” who live inside the cities. The hidden and marginalized nature of urban refugees makes difficult to provide accurate estimates, indeed they are considered a subset of two larger populations: other foreign-born migrants and the national urban poor. The few works on urban refugees focus either on the issue of their integration in the host societies (Korac 2003), grasping the resettlement programs or opportunities, or the livelihood strategies in urban areas through the analytical lens of social capital (Jacobsen 2006). Furthermore, these works take as research subject those forced migrants who have obtained the whole refugee status. Less research are conducted on those forced migrants who own temporary protection. As we highlighted in the previous paragraph, there is a lack of literature on forced migrants as social actors, on their agency dimension and on their resistance practices.
Summary: placing my work at the intersection of these theories

In this first chapter I present the relevant literature in social and political sciences to which I refer in this work, highlighting the theoretical concepts that I use as analytical lens in order to understand and interpret the empirical research that I have conducted.

I relate the literature on border studies, transnational and mobility studies and the literature on critical citizenship studies in order to understand the (forced)migration phenomenon in the global age. The union of these currents of social and political theories support the theoretical purpose of this work, i.e. to highlight the tensions between the structure and agency dimensions through a processual perspective, looking at the reality as constructed by social processes that involve power relations. This theoretical issue is transposed in the theme of migration phenomena and the attempts to control and manage it employed by governments in Europe – through migration control. Specifically, I here grasp the relations – and tensions – between migration control and management mechanisms and the migrants' mobilities, i.e. their attempt to autonomously move and live in order to overcome the European internal and external borders. The aim is to overcome the dichotomy between structure and agency, focusing on the interaction between them rather than on just one of these dimensions.

Moreover, the focus on “forced migrants” as protagonists of the research, because of their relevance in the latter decade as new social icon, allows to better highlight the nexus between national-states formation – its borders and sovereign power – and how it is undermined and put in crisis by migrants' mobilities. Sovereign power and agency of subjects are here interpreted as mutually constitutive rather than dichotomous (Scheel and Squire 2014).

This work is based on the empirical case-study of a specific group of “forced migrants” that have crossed several territorial and juridical borders in Europe to follow their desire to move and live free. My case-study allows me to shed light on a research field that has little been grasped in the literature, i.e. on the so called “(irregular) secondary movements” of forced migrants who have obtained a temporary residence permit in a European country. As we have seen in this chapter, the research on forced migrants and refugees focused predominantly on the earlier reception condition in western societies, in particular on camps or reception centers, or on the integration path into one society – in just one country. Moreover, forced

6 In the methodological chapter I will be better explained the use of the term “protagonists” of the research in referring to the subjects with whom I have conducted the empirical research.
migrants as victims or objects of integration policies was the main perspective of analysis, underlining their passivity and lack of agency. By contrast, my work aims to consider forced migrants as social actors that move and act within several social constraints, learning resistance practices in order to overcome the constraints. Thus, to analyse the experiences of this group through the concept of mobility – referring to the literature of transnational mobilities – is a new way to work on forced migrants that were predominantly analysed through a static perspective. The transnational and mobilities perspective helps to also overcome the understanding of society as “container” and migration as a one-way movement. This perspective also allows to move beyond the methodological nationalism and the perspective of integration in just one national country that pervaded the literature on migration. For these reasons I set my research fields in two cities, Milan in Italy and Berlin in Germany. The choice of these two research fields is not addressed for comparative purposes, but for showing how the non-linear movements of these forced migrants connect different places.

Since social science should address the dynamics between mobility and stasis within unequal fields of globe-spanning power, I refer to the literature around the concept of “mobility regime”. Moreover, since the dimension of power is a central analytic lens in my work, I need to speak about significance of territory and of governmental powers that are based on territory. Accordingly, the critical perspective of border studies is here applied to address the centrality of power dimension through the analytical category of border. The studies of European border regime help to understand the complexity of the system of management and control implemented by the European governments in order to filter, rank and organise the migrants’ mobilities. According to my theoretical purpose to highlight the tensions and interaction between structure and agency, the “EU border regime” is seen as a space of negotiating practices, where the borders are continually redefined. The attempt here is to shed light on the agency of migrants that shape the new borders of Europe through their semi-legal mobilities among Europe and through their everyday life resistance practices. There is a lack of focus on the internal borders, since most empirical research has so far been conducted at the external borders of Europe. Research on internal borders focused so far mainly on the confinement structures such as camps and less on borders scattered in the urban territories. For this reason, I refer also to citizenship studies, in particular to those focusing on the urban level. From the citizenship perspective, the urban realm is a site of negotiating, shaping and interconnecting local practices of border control and urban citizenship. Citizenship is not the object of my research, but an analytical category trough which the power relationships
between political actors involved in migration control and the migrants themselves can be interpreted. Its ambivalence as a legal tool through which the control of migrants’ mobility is implemented, and as a social practice from below, allows to better understand the power dynamics deployed in my empirical case-study. Finally, the literature about agency focuses predominantly on political struggles of non-citizens. In this work I rather focus on the wider issue of social practices of everyday life that can also be seen as political, although the political struggles of non-citizen are part of my empirical case-study. The resistance and everyday practices of migrants in western societies are grasped focussing mostly on the category of undocumented migrants; thus, looking at “temporary refugees” shedding light on their agency dimension in their everyday life has been until now a less grasped issue.
Chapter 2

THE METHODOLOGICAL PATH

Following mobilities between the borders and across temporalities

The theoretical purpose of this work is to highlight the tensions between the structural constraints and the agency dimension of the subjects by applying a processual perspective. Notably, the focus is on the power relations involved in the social processes that constitute the phenomena to study. Within this thesis, I aim to overcome the dichotomy between agency and structure, focusing on the interaction between them. I will grasp this theoretical issue in the phenomena of global migration and the attempts to control and manage it that are employed by governments in Europe. I consider the concern of migration control in western societies and the management of migrant mobilities as one of the central phenomena that challenge the power structures on which the western societies are based. Europe emerges as a space of negotiating practices, where the mechanisms of control and management of migration deployed by several political actors interact with the everyday practices of migrant subjects and their supporters in the civil societies that attempt to open autonomous spaces to freely move and live. The redefinition of borders as selective mechanisms, which confine the categories of people who do not fulfil the logic of national state – citizenship – sovereignty to a marginal life, is at stake in this struggle for rights. According to the social science literature, the “refugees” or “forced migrants” well represent this marginalised category of people that challenge the national-state order underlining related power relations.

I here draw my research focus on a particular group of migrant subjects that were forced to migrate to Europe and obtained a humanitarian or subsidiary protection in Europe. The biographies of the migrant subjects, which are the empirical material on which this work is based, are characterized by a high mobility across several juridical and geographical borders. The mobilities of these persons and their interaction and tension with the internal borders of Europe are the lenses through which I grasp the migration phenomenon.

In order to grasp the tension between migration control mechanisms and the “resistance” everyday practices of migrant subjects through a processual perspective, I employ qualitative methodology. The use of this methodology is in line with a more general change within social research, in which qualitative methodology aims at providing an emergent and recursive
interpretation of processes through a dialogical exchange between the observer and the observed (Melucci 1998). Qualitative research allows also to grasp the processuality of the interaction between the individuals and the social structures, through which is possible to understand the power relations involved. Being interested in the understanding of social phenomena through the critical lens of power, I here refer to the scholars in the social science that have spoken about a reflexive sociology (Melucci 1998; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). The reflexive sociology is inherently interrelated with the qualitative research, because it has at its core a theorization that cannot be detached from its practical construction, i.e. from the empirical research. Reflexive sociology is aware of and discusses the issues of the critical position of the researcher within the field, his or her influence and effects on the reality to study, and the power relations with the subjects of the research. Thus, in this methodological chapter I will dedicate a paragraph on a reflection on the ethic issues involved in my empirical research, discussing my position as researcher within the research field, the relation with the research subjects, the language used in order to describe the empirical results, and the knowledge produced through them.

Before discussing the ethical issues, I will explain the methodology and methodological tools employed in my research, presenting also the case-studies and the research fields.
2.1 Multi-sited ethnography, research fields, and the subjects of my research

A number of empirical research conducted in the last years aimed at grasping the dynamics and power relations within the European border regime. They employed, beside others, the methodology of multi-sited ethnography (Kasparek, Hess and Tsianos 2009; Karakayali and Tsianos 2010). When understood as a space of negotiating practices, – as I will in this thesis – the European border regime can be grasped as a social, conflictual process of negotiation (Transit Migration Forschungsgruppe 2007; Papadopoulos et al. 2008) in which several actors are involved in the redefinition of borders. Past analyses on the European border regime have focussed on the actors, discourses and practices involved in the process of negotiation set in concrete social situations. Applying the multi-sited ethnography (Marcus 1995) means to combine different countries, but also different social and local settings in order to shed light on the power relations that emerge. According to these ethnographic studies, the concept of the “regime” related to the migration control and to the management system in Europe is distinct from the idea of a central power with its logic and rationality. It assumes instead a “space of negotiating practices” that can be grasped through the methodology presented here. A space of negotiation implies a space of conflicts, thus the power dimension is central. Grasping the European border regime through multiple sites is related also to the way through which we consider the concept of border: the border is not considered as a solid line – a wall –, but as a filter. Multi-sited ethnography helps to highlight the dynamics that entail the creation of differentiated “border zones”. The latter are a sing of how the hierarchies built by the power relations involved in the migration control in Europe take shape in places within national territories, where the practices of confinement of “unwanted” people are deployed. Grasping the interaction between the internal borders and the social practices of migrant subjects to autonomously move and live requires a methodology that allows to consider the geographical spaces and societies not statically but dynamically. The multi-sited ethnography, indeed, allows to overcome the analysis of different places through the conventional comparative approach, which risk to consider the issue in a monolithic and static way. The multi-sited ethnography was first theorized by the anthropologist Marcus (1995), who attempted to adapt the ethnographic practices to the increasingly more complex objects of study related to globalisation phenomenon. He aimed to overcome the conventional single-site location, replacing it with a multi-sites of observation and participation that cross-cut
dichotomies such as the “local” and the “global”, the “lifeworld” and the “system”. The object of study grasped by the multi-sited ethnography is mobile and multiply situated, so any ethnography of such an object will have an integral comparative dimension, which differs from the controlled conventional comparative one. Marcus introduced the idea of juxtaposition in which the global collapses into and produces parallel and related local situations rather than being something monolithic or external. This methodology is well suited for my empirical case studies, which are characterized by a high level of mobility and can be grasped only through a multiplicity of sites. The interconnections between the different sites of my research emerge through the mobilities of the subjects of my research, with this mobility itself being a part of the empirical focus. According to recent research that applied the multi-sited ethnography (Falzon 2009), the essence of this method is to follow people, connections, associations, and relationships across space. Multi-sited ethnography involves a spatially dispersed field through which the ethnographer moves – actually, via sojourns in two or more places, or conceptually, by means of techniques of juxtaposition of data. Thus, several modes or techniques to follow the people are suggested, such as the shadowing or to follow the life or biography through biographical narrative interviews – as a means of designing multi-sited research.

The subjects of my research: crossing categories

The decision to set the research fields in the cities of Milan in Italy and Berlin in Germany was influenced by the particularity of the group of migrant people that I individuate as the subjects of my research. According to qualitative methodology (Cardano 2003) the identification of the cases to study occurs on account of their theoretical or practical significance, rather than on account of their representativeness, which is a central criteria in quantitative research. This leads usually to the study of a small number of cases, privileging hence an in-depth case study (Flyvbjerg 2006) instead of an extensive one. The tension between migration control in Europe and the struggles to autonomously move and live enacted by the migrant subjects can be well highlighted by the experiences and biographies of the migrant people who landed on the Italian shores in 2011 escaping the Libya war. In chapter three, I will introduce the structural conditions that determinate the biographies of these people, that could solely escape the Libya war by undertaking the dangerous boat travel through the Mediterranean sea towards Italy. The subjects of my research are, hence, a reduced and selected number of the so-called
refugees, namely migrant subjects coming from different countries of the Sub-sahara region that had lived and worked in Libya for many years. The “Sub-Saharan migrants” are a category that is socially constructed by several policies and political relations that occurred in North Africa at the beginning of the 1990s, when Libya became an attractive country for inner-African migration. The national economy of Libya was revived through the employment of Sub-Saharan migrants, whose countries of origin were mainly Sudan, Chad, Niger, Mali, Nigeria, Ghana, Senegal, Eritrea, Ethiopia and Somalia. Once the Libya war started in 2011, around 30.000 Sub-Saharan people were forced to leave Libya and escape through the Mediterranean sea with destination Italy. They were channelled into the emergency program “Emergenza Nord Africa” in Italy, developed by the Italian government in order to control and manage the great number of landings that occurred during the year 2011. The biographies of my research subjects help to deconstruct the static categories that are often applied to group of migrants, such as “economic migrants”, “asylum seekers”, “refugees”, “illegal migrants” etc. Indeed, the subjects of my research are people that decide to leave their countries for several reasons – political or economical reasons, feelings of adventure, aspiration for a better future, or a mix of all these. They have lived in Libya as “guest workers” for many years without the aim to migrate to Europe. Once the Libya war started, they were forced to leave and they arrived in Italy, where they were treated as “asylum seekers” by the Italian institutions. After one year and eight months, the Italian government issued a humanitarian protection for them, namely a one year document. Few of them obtained a subsidiary protection, a three years document. Thus, they turned into “temporary refugees”. Because of difficult living condition and unemployment many of them decided to abandon Italy and head towards northern Europe, becoming thus again “illegal migrants” under the European laws. A group of people headed to Germany and landed in Berlin, where they joined a political protest of refugees and asylum seekers claiming the right to work and freely move in the whole Europe. For my research, I decided to follow some that remained in Italy, and some that joined the protest in Berlin.

The criteria through which I selected the persons who became my research subjects were related to the trust relationships I built during my stays in the research field. Since the category of Sub-Saharan migrants is characterized by a high heterogeneity of biographies, I attempted to work with people coming from different origin countries to grant a variety among the selected group. The subjects of my research are from Niger, Mali, Guinea Conakry,

---

7 “North Africa Emergency” plan was deployed by the Italian government in order to face the management of the big number of migrant people landing on Italian shores during the so-called Arabic Spring and the Libya war. See chapter three for details.
Nigeria, Chad, Burkina Faso, Sudan and Ghana. All of them were living in Libya for at least three years, many for more than ten years and some since when they were child. None of them has the Libyan citizenship. Nevertheless, the country of origin is not an important element according to my research purpose. The fact of being “Sub-Saharan migrants” living in Libya and having to escape the war landing in Italy are the important elements, together with the holding of a document obtained during the *Emergenza Nord Africa* program. Indeed, according to my research purpose I aimed to grasp the tension between the internal borders in Europe and the mobilities of “refugees” with a temporary document.

I started my research field in October 2013, thus the subjects of my research were holding the humanitarian or subsidiary protection obtained during the emergency program for almost one year, and were starting to renew their one-year document. I come into contact with 120 migrant subjects between Milan and Berlin, with whom I had daily conversation during my research fieldwork. I selected a small number of migrant subjects with whom conduct the deep research through the tools of shadowing and narrative and in-depth interviews. The type of my research allowed to only follow a small number of people. The research field lasted almost two years in which I was maintaining close contact with the selected small number of my research subjects: ten people in Milan, and twenty in Berlin. I also need to underline that my research subjects were solely men. The reason of this choice is not related to the obscuration of the gender dimension, which I consider very important in the analysis of power relations and migration studies. Rather, the population of Sub-Saharan migrants working in Libya as “guest workers” was mainly male, and the number of women among the 30,000 who escaped the Libya war and landed in Italy was particularly low. The women are also usually channelled in particular protection programs that are separated from that of the men. For example, women are usually allowed to remain inside the dormitories all the day, while the men have to leave the dormitory at 8 o’clock in the morning and can only come back at 20 o’clock in the evening. I have obtained the access to the research fields through the voluntary work in an association. The migrant subjects hanging out in this association were my first contacts and they were all male. Thus, being aware of the importance of the gender dimension, the particularity of my selected group does not allow me to introduce this analytical element. Moreover, also those migrant subjects that decided to move further and landed in Berlin were mostly male; only a small percentage of women have joined the protest of Oranienplatz in Berlin, in particular the number of women in the *Lampedusa in Berlin* group was small. To sum up, the subjects of my research are male person in the age between 18 and 40 years old, coming from a country in the Sub-Saharan region. They had lived in
Libya for several years and escaped the Libya war landing in Italy; there they obtained a temporary “refugee” protection and because of difficult living conditions some of them decided to move further to another country, arriving in Berlin, Germany.

As explained at the end of chapter one, the so-called “irregular secondary movements” are not yet extensively grasped in the migration studies. Above all there is in particular little literature on irregular secondary movements of refugees, a category often analysed in relation with the national-state through the lenses of integration. Thus, the particular biographies of my research subjects, that have criss-crossed several geographical and juridical borders, let me decide for them as case-studies for my empirical research.

**The multi-sited research fields: Milan, Berlin and the crossing-borders movements**

The choice of the research fields in Italy and Germany was a consequence of the biographies of my first contacts in the field and the associated migration phenomenon in Italy in 2012. I decided for Milan and Berlin as the cities of my research fields. I decided for Milan, because it is the only urban metropolis in Italy and strategically located as a gateway to northern Europe. Thus, Milan is both the arrival point for internal movements of migrant subjects and a transit place, a crossroad towards northern Europe. It thus fits well as a research field through which to grasp the im-mobility dynamics of migration control. The city of Berlin emerged as a natural choice for the research field in Germany, being the place where the political protest of refugees and migrant subjects occurred through the occupation of the square Oranienplatz. The subjects of my research holding an Italian humanitarian or subsidiary protection that joined the protest in Berlin constituted a specific group: the “Lampedusa in Berlin”.

I chose to set the research fields in urban context due to the attempt illustrated in the previous chapter, i.e. to grasp the phenomenon of “refugees” and internal borders in the time after their first arrival. Urban sites are the central places where refugees try to build their life after having left reception camps or centers. According to the critical citizenship studies and the urban studies, I consider the city as a site through which social relations are produced and reproduced: a battleground where people who do not belong elaborate social practices in order to open up spaces of autonomy. The research fields have not been set in Milan and Berlin because of a comparative perspective. Rather, the two sites allow to grasp and understand the power dynamics of migration control and the struggles enacted by the migrant subjects to autonomously move within the social constraints. A last element that made me choose these two research fields, notably Berlin, is linked to my personal biographical
experience, as usually occurring in the ethnographic practices (Semi 2010; Braidotti 1994). Indeed, the fact that I had already lived in the German capital where I had many contacts with NGOs and migrant subjects allowed me to have quick access to the field.

According to the premises of the multi-sited ethnography, I do not analyse these two cities for comparative purposes. I rather aim to grasp the wider mechanism of migration control at the European level, involving thus multi-level hierarchies of laws that cannot be reduced to a national-state comparison. Berlin and Milan are not seen as two containers to be compared, but rather as knots of informal networks traced by the mobilities of my research subjects that criss-cross geographical and juridical borders. Through these movements the mobilities of my research subjects link the several places. Indeed, also the crossing-borders movements of my research subjects have been grasped and treated as a crucial research field, which sheds light on the processuality of this complex phenomenon. The in-depth interviews and the narrations that the subjects of my research have done about their cross-borders mobility made the grasping of their movements possible. Moreover, being myself often travelling between these two cities with the same transports used by my research protagonists – trains, shared cars, planes and buses – I could observe the mechanisms of racial profiling applied by the police within these transports.

Furthermore, other ethnographic fields emerge within the urban places, namely such places in the cities where the subjects of my research usually pass the time, such as the central train station, public parks, and the abandoned houses of a former rail yard in Milan; the places of the refugees protest in Berlin such as the occupied Oranienplatz, the squatted school, and other places of sociability. These sites were criss-crossed by the migrant subjects and by the control mechanisms deployed in order to filter and rank them, changing thus the nature of these places – as I will highlight in chapter five. Finally, bureaucratic offices in Milan and Berlin were an ethnographic field where I could grasp the power relations and the negotiating practices.

The methodological tools: participant observation, shadowing, and in-depth interviews

I apply different methodological tools to grasp the interaction between the internal borders and the agency of the subjects as well as the interaction and tensions between the structural
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8 One example of these written testimony I took can be found in the website of Escapes, an Italian network of critical researcher about forced migrants, to which I belong. The title of the short article is: “L’indistinguibile biglietto da visita” (the indistinguishable calling card) published in October 2015. http://users2.unimi.it/escapes/indistinguibile-biglietto-visita/
constraints and the migrant subjects' attempt to autonomous move and live. I consider here as structural constraints the socio-economical structures, the cultural and political structures and the juridical structure. To conduct an analysis of these structural constraints I refer to secondary literature, namely to several studies and research that have focussed on the analysis of structural factors that influence the migration phenomenon in Europe. In chapter three, I illustrate in a historical excursus the European laws on migration and asylum management and control in order to shed light on the juridical constraints that affect the biographies of migrant subjects. Furthermore, I illustrate the socio-economical, cultural and political structures of the two local sites where the research is set, which are here analysed also based on secondary literature.

Aware of the structural constraints that interact in the battleground of the migration and asylum issue in Europe, I started the empirical research by use of the ethnographic methods. I conducted seven months of fieldworks in the city of Milan from October 2013 until April 2014. I moved to Berlin afterwards where I conducted field research from April 2014 until August 2015. I also attended some seminars and workshop at the Humboldt University of Berlin, notably as visiting PhD student at the Institute of European Ethnology where a laboratory on migration was held.

During this fieldwork time I conducted research within the urban context of the cities and on the movements of migrant subjects from one city to another, following the crossing-borders mobilities through their narrations. Moreover, I moved often between these two cities myself for personal reasons and as a researcher: indeed, I have already lived for three years in the city of Berlin, in 2007-2008 and in 2011-2012, thus I had many contacts there that allowed me to often move back and forth. In both cities I was active as volunteer in two associations that deal with legal and social consulting for migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees: the Naga Har Onlus in Milan, and the KuB in Berlin. The work in these associations allowed me to get the access to the research fields and to built trust relationships with the subjects of my research.

During the seven months of the research field in Milan, I was working as volunteer at Naga Har association for three days a week, doing legal consulting and orientation in the territory about the reception system for refugees and asylum-seekers. This work allowed me to have direct contact with the bureaucratic practices on asylum and the correspondent offices such as the Questura of Milan – i.e. the police station that houses the immigration office. By following several single cases and accompanying some migrant subjects to the offices I was able to grasp the level of discretionary power and the ambiguous nature of these places as
well as the negotiating practices that occurred between the bureaucratic officers and the migrant subjects. The days and hours spend in the Naga Har association allowed me generally to conduct a part of the research through the technique of *participant observation*. Both the association members and the migrant subjects, who daily attended Naga, were aware of my double role as a volunteer and also a researcher: this allowed me to consider the informal talks with migrant subjects and the single cases I was following as empirical material of my research. For the research technique of participant observation the researcher needs to spend many time within the research field and together with the research subjects, allowing thus to conduct an in-depth analysis of the phenomenon (Semi 2010). I employed this technique during the work in the associations, where I collected several ethnographic notes. The main empirical material I collected in Milan are however the ethnographic notes that I took through the research technique of *shadowing*. In *shadowing* the researcher closely follows a subject over a period of time to investigate and understand what people actually do in their everyday lives (Quinlan 2008). The behaviours, opinions, actions, and explanations for those actions are usually the data that the researcher observes and describes in his empirical notes. I aimed at understanding the interaction of migrant subjects with the internal borders of Europe, and to observe the social practices through which they open up spaces of autonomy. Following the subjects of my research in their everyday lives was thus the most appropriate methodological tool, with the shadowing often happening on the move, as people circulate within and between highly diverse networks of relationships (Quinlan 2008). I proposed the practice of shadowing only to the small number of migrant subjects I had a relationship of trust with. I followed four of them two or three days a week for two months and then for one or two days a week for further two months. That allowed me to spend time in the urban places where the migrant subjects in Milan were usually stay during the day, such as the central train station, the public parks or other sociability places. Being locations frequented by migrant subjects, I always met a lot of other migrant people that I knew from Naga, and we spend a lot of time together. The migrant subjects were all aware about my role as researcher, as I will explain in paragraph 2.2. Some of them proposed themselves to be followed as research subjects, as happened with Essien who told me during the shadowing with Radu: «ah, interesting what are you doing. If you want I can also help you. If you like, you can also follow me in order to understand which are our problems.»

During the shadowing in sociability places I also employed the so-called *ethnographic interviews* (Manocchi 2014), namely conversations that were not recorded, but from which I took notes once outside the research field. The informal conversations occurring
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9 From ethnographic notes in Milan: shadowing with Radu in February 2014.
during the everyday represented an important empirical material and were the source of substantial information.

The shadowing allowed me to understand immediately which were the internal borders the migrant subjects daily face and in particular the heterogeneity of their social practices enacted to move free between these social constraints. Above all, it allowed to build trust with my research subjects through which I could also grasp the more intimate dimension of human subjects, i.e. the emotions and feelings – presented in chapter six. Building a trust relationship and intimacy is possible only when there is a lot of time to dedicate to the relation with the research subjects. During the shadowing in Milan, I could observe how the temporal dimension emerged as a crucial element in my research: I grasped it both as a subjective dimension on which the European border regime has a strong influence, and more in general as an analytical dimension through which the migration phenomenon can be understood – as I will explain in chapter four. I highlighted temporalities of mobility and displacement through the shadowing, therefore I decided to leave in the text with long pieces of ethnographic notes in order to confront the reader with the (slow) rhythm of the everyday lives of my research subjects.

The shadowing entailed constantly shifting research roles, between direct observer, participant observer and sometimes “invisible” observer. Thus, it presents the same ethical concerns as the participant observation: the researcher’s position within the fields and the power relations with the subjects of research. A constant negotiation between the researcher and the subjects of research occurs, and also between distance and engagement within the research field. This negotiation implies continuous adjustments to the actual observation circumstances the researcher and his or her subjects encounter during the fieldwork. For example, in Milan I went three times with a subject of my research to abandoned houses in a former rail yard where migrant subjects live informally. The third time we went there with the photographer and colleague Lucia Gennari that took pictures of the abandoned spaces for a common project. When some migrant subjects living there saw us they reacted very angry against the subject of my research who brought us there. We immediately decided to stop photographing and went away, although the subject of my research insisted to remain to have a better look at this place. The aim of the research became secondary to the safety of the subject of my research who would come back to that place. We did not want to damage his relationships with the other migrant subjects living there.

The in-depth interviews, semi-structured and recorded, are the third methodological tool I applied during my fieldwork. In Milan, I conducted 10 in-depth interviews with the subjects
of my research I had a trust relationship with. The interviews were conducted at the end of the fieldwork in Milan and after the shadowing. I wanted to ensure a trustful relationship between us before turning on the audio recorder. Indeed, the shadowing practices allowed to develop relationship of trust that evolved sometimes even to friendship. Participation implies emotional involvement, during the shadowing practices it is thus important to remain aware of the double role as researcher and as a person having a relationship with another person. The in-depth interviews allowed me to grasp biographical fragments of my research protagonists such as their experiences in Libya, the many travels they did before landing in Italy, their experiences in the emergency reception system in Italy and the difficulties as homeless and unemployed, and their movements towards northern Europe and back. Moreover, it allowed to grasp the tension between their attempt to autonomously build their lives and the internal borders they encountered such as the bureaucratics procedures, the difficulties to find a job contract and the many racial profiling controls they experienced moving with buses and trains across Italy.

I moved to Berlin in the beginning of 2014 and I conducted my fieldwork in this city from April 2014 to August 2015. Oranienplatz, the occupied square, was my first research field. It was evicted exactly two weeks after my arrival in the German capital. During the year 2013 I went to Berlin every two months for some weeks: at this time the Oranienplatz protest was still alive, I took part as an activist and researcher also thanks to my personal contacts I already had in Berlin. Indeed, I have lived in Berlin one year between 2007-2008, and one year and half between 2011 and the end of 2012. I worked as volunteer during this time in the association KuB that is dealing with legal consulting for migrants and asylum-seekers; notably I conducted a project about the confinement of asylum-seekers in camps placed in the region around Berlin, Brandenburg. I wrote my master thesis about this issue, and I had hence many contacts with NGOs, associations and asylum-seekers in Berlin. These contacts allowed me to quickly access the research field for my PhD research, or better to “remain” on the research filed between the end of my master in July 2012 and the occupation of Oranienplatz in August 2012. Furthermore, when I stayed in Milan doing the PhD fieldwork, some colleagues from Berlin contacted me in order to build a network of associations between Germany and Italy for supporting the migrant subjects with Italian document that were living in Berlin but had to travel to Italy in order to renew their documents. This support activities during the document renewal and the travels back and forth between Germany and Italy criss-crossing the borders allowed me to grasp the action of the European border regime upon these semi-regular and semi-irregular movements of migrant subjects – see chapter five. I employed
the participant observation methodology during the practices for the renewal, and I conducted 10 in-depth interviews with migrants subjects moving from Berlin to Italy and the way back. In Berlin the fieldwork had different characteristics in comparison to Milan because of the different social context, influenced above all by the events of the Oranienplatz political protests. Indeed, when I arrived in Berlin the political protest was already in decline and the migrant subjects politically active in the group *Lampedusa in Berlin* were discouraged because of the failure of the negotiation with the German authorities. Thus, on the one side they were used to speak in front of a cameras or an audio recorder being already for one year in the spotlight of the media. On the other side they developed a mistrust against all the journalists or activists that were asking them an interview. Thus, starting a research with them at that time was not an easy process, and I had to adapt the methodological tools to the new situation I was facing in respect of the sensibility and requests of my research subjects. Furthermore, Giulia Borri, a colleague of mine, was during this time involved as researcher and activist within the Oranienplatz protest and with the group *Lampedusa in Berlin*. Giulia Borri is a PhD candidate at the BGSS (Berlin Graduate School for Social Science) at Humboldt University of Berlin, and she was conducting research very similar research to mine. We decided hence to conduct the ethnographic fieldwork in Berlin together, applying the methodology of *co-ethnography*, following the research of Navarini and Colombo (1999), and following the collaborative approach of the anthropologists Bourgois and Schonberg (2009). The shared research interest and the common theoretical perspective combined with the sharing of the supporter practices within the Oranienplatz protest allowed us to conduct our research successfully together. Co-conducting research can involve ethical concerns about the relation between the researcher and the subjects of research. We needed to avoid two separate fieldworks as we would have asked the same or similar questions to the same persons. Being aware that the migrant subjects of *Lampedusa* group were reluctant to give interviews, we decided to combine (and exchange) our empirical material so that every person just had to give one interview. An interesting methodological tool emerged during the ethnographic practices, thanks to the continuous exchange of opinion about the fieldwork and the data observed. We sometimes noted that we had observed very similar elements, which helped us to develop an in-depth understanding and interpretation of the phenomenon. Similarly, if we noticed that we had completely different interpretations, we could reflect on these particular observations and go back to the field with more awareness. We observed that often four eyes are better than two for the confirmation or questioning of the empirical data observed. This exchange occurred during the ethnographic practice, but being the participant
observation a very personal and subjective technique, the ethnographic notes were taken separately and put together just at the end. The evaluation of information and coding of empirical data were not shared, since we conducted two different and distinct researches. The writing process of the thesis was handled on an individual basis.

The fieldwork in Berlin was conducted above all through participant observation in several situations linked to the protest of Oranienplatz. Being ourselves involved in the support activities, we participated in the demonstrations, the political meetings and we were often spending time on Oranienplatz and in the squatted school during the protest. At this time ethnographic interviews and participant observation were employed, and together with the collection of newspaper material it allowed us to reconstruct the chronology of Oranienplatz protest and to shed light on the power relations that crossed it. Moreover, the access to the artistic exhibition and archive in progress WE WILL RISE – Refugees Movement Berlin, allowed me to study and analyse many documents and newspapers about the protest of Oranienplatz. This was a collection built up by the Oranienplatz supporters and shown in an exhibition at the FHXB Museum\textsuperscript{10}.

Once the Oranienplatz protest ended, we remained in contact with most of the migrant subjects active in the group \textit{Lampedusa in Berlin} and many others who had an Italian document but were not politically active in the protest. We could follow the everyday lives in Berlin thanks to the continuous political meetings and \textit{soliparty}\textsuperscript{11} that were held once the occupied square was evicted. Furthermore, being both Italians we were constantly contacted by German lawyers or activists for legal consulting around single cases of people with Italian documents. This allowed to follow the situation after the Oranienplatz protest grasping the manifestation of internal borders through the legal statuses, and the social practices enacted by the migrant subjects in order to overcome these borders. The eviction of Oranienplatz posed problems also for our empirical research, since it shifted the phenomenon we were observing from the public to the private space. Thus, also the ethnographic field changed as new private spaces and new places of sociability emerged. Giulia and me were not only colleagues but also flatmates, thus we organized what we called “ethnographic dinners” in order to spend time together with the migrant subjects and create a space of sociability that after the Oranienplatz eviction was missing. At the beginning we invited the migrant subjects we knew, and after some time they started to bring friends because these dinners became a shared space and time where it was possible to stay together and build a community. Also

\textsuperscript{10} The Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg Museum.

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Soliparty} means party of solidarity that is jointly organized by supporters groups in order to collect funding for any issue linked with a struggle.
some friends of me and Giulia sometimes joined these dinners, and being many friends also
Italians drove the discourses and conversations to the memory of Italy and the experiences
that our research protagonists have had there. Furthermore, other biographical experience
emerged: narrations about the living condition in Libya, the travels criss-crossing Africa and
also personal biographic narrations of me and Giulia were shared. Exactly like with the
subjects of my research in Milan, also in Berlin the persons were aware of our role as both
researchers and persons politically active that support them through voluntary work.

We also employed participation in collective projects as a methodological tool, trying thus to
break the roles of researcher and subject of research, with both being part of a project. An
eexample is figure 22 at page 388 that shows a drawing made by me, Giulia, Obasi and
Cosimo Miorelli, an illustrator and friend who lives in Berlin. Obasi participated in an artistic
project with the Gorki theatre of Berlin: the project involved some actors of the theatre and
some protagonists of the Oranienplatt refugee protest. The protesters drew maps representing
the everyday life during the protest camp. The drawings were planned to be exposed in an
exhibition within the Gorki theatre. Obasi asked us to help him and to draw together, and we
spend some hours drawing while he was explaining us what the everyday life was about in
Oranienplatt.

Drawing migratory route maps collectively is a further collective project that fed into this
thesis: me and Giulia Borri had the idea shared with Amal – a subject of our research. To
visually deconstruct the idea of migration as a linear paths we asked some of the protagonists
of Oranienplatt to draw their trajectories on a map of Europe. Amal made the point that it is
important to add the African continent and to start the trajectories from there. He correctly
claimed that if we wanted to deconstruct the idea of migration as a linear process we should
“start” from the many trajectories they had done in Africa before landing in Europe. We hence
met in our flat several afternoons with three persons at once. We spent many hours drinking
teas together and drawing the maps (see appendix 1). While they were drawing, they narrated
us many stories about their travel and journeys and about the several cities they lived in. This
was a very important ethnographic data collection, since we spent much time together and we
conversed a lot. Being aware of and agreeing with the critical cartography tradition (Tazzioli
and Irrera 2011) we did not want to precisely trace the migratory routes of migrant subjects
and we would like to avoid the European and colonial way of the map drawing practices. The
idea was rather to develop a collective process of narrations: indeed there were no rules about
how to draw the maps, every person could draw the map like he wanted and could write or not
write the name of the cities, or regions or even just country names. The lines are consciously
not precise and the routes are approximative; the suggestive impression that emerges is what mattered in that project. The drawn maps are exposed in the appendix 2 of this work.

We collected 8 maps, and we asked to the authors whether we could also interview and record them. They all accepted and we thus collected 8 in-depth interviews with migrant subjects living in Berlin and moving back and forth between Italy and Germany. I planned the interview structure together with Giulia Borri, but we decided to conduct the interviews separately because we did not want to create an asymmetry of two researchers to one interviewee. The interviews in Berlin took rather a form of narrative interviews, in contrast to those I conducted in Milan. There was more intimacy built with the research protagonists in Berlin. We conducted the interviews between winter 2014 and spring 2015, and during this time the subjects of my research had many experiences to narrate also regarding their previously condition in Italy. Furthermore, being the relationship with the research subjects in Berlin strong enough, they felt free to narrate us many experiences without us asking many questions. The freer conversations that we recorded as narrative interviews allowed to grasp interesting fragments of the subjects' biographies, and they let us “access” to their feelings and emotions – an issue stressed in the chapter six.

I continued the fieldwork in Berlin after the square eviction in the urban places of the German capital, above all in the neighbourhood of Kreuzberg that was also close to our apartment. The new places of sociability where the protagonists of Oranienplatz protests were spending time were thus similar to our places of sociability such as the public park Görlitzer park and the Cafè at Kottbusser Tor, a crossroad close to the occupied Oranienplatz. Moreover, I shared with one subject of my research, Amal, the passion of soccer and he invited me to the bingo at Kottbusser Tor to watch together the matches. Thus, I was spending time in that place at least two times a week every two weeks, following to the soccer timetable. There were many friends of Amal watching the matches with us, and that bingo became another ethnographic field where I could collect important ethnographic data. I collected there biographic fragments about the life in Libya, the life in Italy during the emergency program, the dangerous travels and movements crossing the borders for the renewal, and the living situation in Berlin as “irregular” persons. The bingo at Kottbusser Tor became an important ethnographic field, where I met many people and made further contacts for the empirical research.

The continuous contact and collaborative work with several supporters of Oranienplatz protest allowed us to grasp their crucial role in the negotiating practices that involve the struggles for the redefinition of borders within Europe. Since we did not interview people belonging to the
so-called *supporters network* and we focused our ethnographic practices only on the migrant subjects, I will not provide a deep analysis of the supporters. Nevertheless, I will underline their crucial role as social actors in the migration battleground.

Tough the cities of Berlin and Milan have been at the center, my research fields expanded beyond: the subjects of my research were *on the move*, the research fields were therefore scattered and spatially dispersed. That implicated for me a high level of mobility and flexibility as researcher, considering hence the “fieldwork as a travel practice” (cfr. Clifford 1992, in Falzon 2007). As I shared the condition of the subject of research being mobile and/or spatially dispersed, being likewise became a form of participant observation. Indeed, my personal situation, namely to live both in Milan and Berlin, has been a part of that process. After some months of my presence in the field, I started to be part of the informal networks of migrant subjects across Europe: I met some people in Berlin that I knew from Milan; I met migrant subjects that were friends of some subjects of my research during the travels back and forth between Italy and Germany. Doing ethnography with people on the move and being myself on the move, living in both cities, allowed to well observe the connections between the migrant subjects and the dynamics of their informal networks. The following ethnographic note clarifies this:

I am on the bicycle around Berlin, I have to do some bureaucratic things because I moved again to Berlin just one week ago. The weather is very beautiful, so I decide to bike further and to pass through Oranienplatz in order to see how the situation is there after the eviction. I arrive in Oranienplatz, and I see many police vans and many police men all around the square. There are also several groups of African people together with some supporters. I stop my bicycle close to a group of African people, and I start to observe the situation in the square. I realise that one of the African guys in the group close to me is looking at me for some minutes; I look away. After some time I look again at this guy, who is still looking at me. His face is familiar to me, but I cannot realise who he is. I look again away, and in that moment I think who he reminds me of: Asad from Naga, in Milan! So, I think that I am a bit confused, what I already have experienced when I changed the city to live: the first period in the new city I seem to see people living in the old city that I left. So, I think that I am confused and I am looking at another person. The small group of African guys moves to another place of the square, and that guy still looks and smiles at me. Then I decide to go closer to them, and I start talking with the other guys, asking them whether they are people of the *Lampedusa in Berlin* group. That guy is still smiling at me and fixing me, then I look at him and ask: “But, we know each other?”. He laughs, and says: “Do you not recognize me?!”, and immediately I scream: “Asad! I wasn't sure if it was you! I thought that I was crazy, because you are living in Milan!”. Asad smiles and says: “I was also looking at you, but I wasn't sure that you were you! But what are you doing in Berlin?! I am also surprise to meet you here! Why are you in Berlin?”. I explain to him that I moved to Berlin one week ago, and I will live here for the next year. “Really?! That is crazy! I also moved to Berlin … three days ago! I try to find a place to sleep now, maybe you can help me, like when we were in Naga” and he starts laughing. We exchange the German telephone numbers and we decide to go together to drink a coffee also with the other guys. (Participant observation in Berlin, April 2014)
This ethnographic note sheds light on the role of the researcher within the research fields, underlining how he or she, as well as the subjects of the research, is embedded in the social contexts. More generally the procedures of data construction in the qualitative research are directly shaped by the personal characteristics of the researcher, by his or her personal knowledge, and by the person itself, namely his or her relational competence, his or her way to be in the world (Cardano 2003). In the following paragraph I will discuss my twofold role as researcher and person active in the support of migrant subjects, referring to the problematics and ethnic issues that the reflexive sociology highlights.
2.2 Doing research together: ethical and methodological issues in research with “vulnerable” subjects

Reflexive sociology means to have a critical gaze on one's position as a researcher within the research fields, about the power relationships between the researcher and the subjects of research, and about the knowledge that one produce through the research.

The so-called action research or militant research shares the same reflections, aiming to bring together the intervention aiming at changing the social situation and the production of knowledge (Unger 2007). The action research was developed at the end of the 1940s in the United States, and during the 1960s in Italy. The central issue of this methodology is to consider the active practices of the researcher within the research field as the main criteria for the construction of the knowledge. Action research is based on a practice of theory building from below, with the awareness and aim to produce a knowledge that need not be considered absolute. Usually, researchers that are employing this methodology are at the same time politically and socially active and believe that through a particular way to do research it is possible to change the social reality. Above all a process of empowerment of marginalized subjects is one of the main aim of this research. The focus on power dimension and the dynamics of power relations in the social processes are hence the main interests of such research.

Although I do not fully follow the action research approach, I refer to its wider research tradition that believes in the transformative potential of the ethnographic practices and more generally of the social and anthropological research. Thus, in my empirical research and in the process of theory building I never considered the ethnographic practices and the knowledge production as detached from each other. This requires the redefinition of the relation between the researcher and the subjects of research, overcoming the relation researcher/object through a relational dimension of exchange. Indeed, I never speak about a research object, but always about subjects of my research. In the following subparagraph I will explain the continuous negotiation between me, the research subjects and the research fields.

The access to the research fields and the continuous negotiation practices

The access to the ethnographic field is always complicated, since the researcher has to
negotiate his or her role within the research field and has to negotiate the relation with the research subjects. I gained the access to my research fields through the voluntary work in two association active in Milan and Berlin, which are dealing with legal and social consulting for migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees. In Milan I was active in the association Naga Onlus, notably in a group called Naga Har that is specifically working with asylum-seekers and refugees. Naga Har is not just a place for legal consulting, but also and above all a sociality place that aims to give a feeling of home to “displaced” people that struggle everyday with the borders and culture of closure of the western societies. Thus, being active in Naga Har means also to spend a lot of time with migrant subjects, to do activities together and to build friendships and trust relationships. In Berlin I was connected with the association KuB (Kontakt- und Beratungsstelle für Flüchtlinge und MigrantInnen), where I had worked during the research field of my MA thesis; this association in Berlin makes a very similar job as Naga in Milan. I became furthermore active in the support of Oranienplatz protest in Berlin thanks to the network of supporters and lawyers that asked me for consulting as expert of the Italian jurisdiction and bureaucratic practices.

Both associations present themselves as non-institutional actors that intentionally work with volunteers in order to be as detached from the governments as possible. This allows to build a particular trust with the migrant subjects. They are mostly aware that the work of the association aims to support the rights of migrants, and not to earn money. Moreover, both the associations are also active in political protests and denounces against the anti-migrants laws and policies at the local, national and European level. This voluntary engagement is always well seen by the migrant subjects that often rely on the people working in the associations. The relationship between migrant subjects joining Naga and KuB and the associations' members is a crucial and debated issue, as the associations attempt to overcome as much as possible the social distances and power inequalities: issues of gender and race inequalities, their intersection and how they relate to the work are frequently debated.

The negotiation within the research field has been bidirectional: I as researcher have to built a trust relationship with both the members of the associations and the migrant subjects. The relationship with the associations was crucial in order to let the migrant subjects understand which kind of work I do and through which methodology. It was important for me to underline that my role as volunteer in the association was not secondary to my research purpose, I rather aimed to interconnect these two interests and roles: the social and political intervention and the research interests. Once the members of the associations trusted me as
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12 Translation: contact and consulting center for refugees and migrants.
both person active in migrants’ rights support and as researcher, I could easily move within the research fields.

The trust relationship with the subjects of my research is the most complicated and interesting one, since the migrant subjects start from a position of disadvantage, being juridically and socially – and sometimes also psychologically – more “unstable” than me. Thus, doing research with “vulnerable” subjects requires very careful negotiating practices that need a lot of time. Indeed, the time is the crucial variable in the negotiating practices between researcher, the research fields and research subjects. I decided to dedicate much time to this negotiation phase: the first three months in the associations my priority was to invest all the energy to the work within the association, temporarily not focusing on research. This allowed me to immerse within the field and to build trust relationship with the association members and migrant subjects without being “distracted” by the research interests. Once the trust relationships were built, I started my work as research within the fields.

In a first passage I selected one or two privilege witnesses, namely subjects of my research with whom I had built a particular strong relationship of trust and to which I hence could explain my research project. In Milan, the two privileged witnesses were Dakari and Radu with whom I started my fieldwork. We met one afternoon and I explained my work as researcher in the University, my research project, and how they could help me in the research. I showed them my previous works, that of my MA thesis about the asylum-seekers’ camps in Germany and a project about the deportation prison in Italy conducted with the NGO Borderline Europe. I wanted to let them know the way I used to work and the potential “product” that could come out of the new research in which I want to involve them. The discussion with Dakari and Radu was very productive, because they suggested me to follow them in their everyday life, as Radu said: «if you want to really understand how we live and which are our problems, you have to stay with us all the day long»13. The fact that before I chose the appropriate methodological tool I asked them which would be better for them was a crucial passage in the ethnographic practice. My practice aimed to consider the research subjects as co-authors of the discourses and of the research, according to the action and collaborative research tradition (Melucci 1998; Fontanari, Karpenstein, Schwarz and Sulimma 2014). After explaining the tools of in-depth interview and participant observation, Dakari and Radu suggested me to first stay some time together and see and experience their everyday life, and then to conduct the interview. This example of negotiation practice underline how the roles of the researcher and that of the research subjects should be seen
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13 From the ethnographic note in Milan, January 2014.
more flexible and less fix, although at the end I am the researcher writing the thesis. Nevertheless, discussing together the appropriate methodology allowed to reduce the power imbalance between me and the “vulnerable” research subjects. Moreover, they knew my ethical and political engagement in the issue of migrants’ rights, which convinced them to “help” me in my research project, as Dakari told me laughing: «of course we help you! You do this research and then you try to become the President of the Republic! We need people like you that change the laws!».

Also in the research filed in Berlin the role of privilege witnesses was fundamental for me and my colleague Giulia Borri; there Amal and Obasi were the two privilege witnesses. The four privileged witnesses introduced us to their friends and were mediators of our trust: when they introduced us to other people and explained our role as researcher, they always underlined how we are “good people that help refugees”. The ethnographic practice often works with privilege witnesses that facilitate the access to the fieldwork by introducing the researcher to the other research subjects. Both in Milan and Berlin, the role of my privileged witnesses was crucial to facilitate the relationships of trust with all the other subjects of my research.

My first experiences in the shadowing practices were not very successful, there was some embarrassment between me and the migrant subjects. Above all they felt often ashamed to show me the difficult life conditions in which they lived such as eating in the soup kitchen or sleeping in abandoned houses. Moreover, they were often protective towards me and in some “dangerous” situations such as in the abandoned rail yard, they were anxious to bring me there. These “problems” are typical in the ethnographic practice with people that are living in marginal conditions, it is therefore always important to dedicate much time to the relationship with the migrant subjects explaining that for me there is no problem to go in such places, or that their “interests” and “safety” are more important than my research results. Indeed, as an example I decided to not present myself again in the Questura of Milan after one negative experience occurred with Rashid, a subject of my research. There was a risk that the police men could recognize me and because of our conflict bring trouble to the research subjects with me at that moment. This experience highlights that it is crucial to be aware when the ethnographic practice and/or my presence as researcher in the research field could cause damage to the research subjects, and in that case to stop immediately and to adjust the research objective or methodology. In some critical situation, such as in the police office during a document renewal, the presence of the researcher – as a European person – can have a twofold effect: it could harm the migrant subjects if it starts a conflict with a police man for

14 From the ethnographic note in Milan, January 2014.
example. It could also help the research subject, for example a police man can be more reluctant to apply the discretionary power under the eyes of a European person. Since it is difficult to control how every actor reacts in situations of conflict, it is important to be attentive and to not consider the ethnographic field and practice as stable and definitive, but as a continuous and enduring changing situation in which the researcher is involved in a process of negotiation. Furthermore, the presence of the researcher in the research filed could also distort the research itself, since her or his presence influences the behaviour of all actors. Accordingly, some works of the action research (Unger, Block, and Wright 2007) argue that the presence of the researcher in the field can be useful for the research purpose that aims to grasp the power relations. Indeed, only being within the research field and participating in the relationships that criss-cross it allows to really grasp the dynamics of power relations involved in the phenomenon. My activity in the support during the document renewal allowed to well grasp the level of discretionary power in the bureaucratic offices. Similarly, the support activities for the Lampedusa in Berlin group during the refugees protest allowed to discover the local power relations and the process of abandonment deployed by the institutions.

The presence of the researcher can create problems for the associations too. If the migrant subjects were damaged by the ethnographic practice they could lose some trust in the association. The practice can thus conflict with the association's aim to solely work in the interests of the migrant subjects. Thus, it is also crucial to pay attention towards the associations in such mined and challenging research practice like ethnography with “vulnerable” subjects.

I put the adjective “vulnerable” to quotation marks to challenge the category of the “vulnerable” research subject. Being aware of the differences between me as European citizen and the subjects of my research as migrant persons with a precarious juridical and social situation, I experienced during the ethnographic practice a sort of role inversion in the power relations between us. Indeed, after some months of the shadowing practices in Milan, the subjects of my research were no longer embarrassed to experience their everyday life together, and they even assumed an active role in our relation. In the last months the subjects of my research drove the ethnographic practices, thanks also to an as “passive” as possible behaviour that I favoured. It allowed me to be surprised and wondering by the “new” social reality I was observing. Sentences like “today I bring you in this place” or “come with me, I will show you something”, or “I explain you how the thing are going here” were signs of their active role in our relation. Indeed, as the “marginal world” of my research subjects was a new
reality for me, the role inversion was quick and spontaneous. Walking with them in the streets of Milan, listening to their narrations about the travel between Berlin and Italy allowed me to see some places, streets, and everyday situations, which I considered well-known, from another perspective. Such role and perspective inversion inspired my research curiosity (cfr. Semi 2010).

To conclude, I consider the ethnographic practice and the research as a *process through which* the knowledge is co-produced with the *protagonists* of the phenomenon I want to analyse.

**The protagonists of my research**

I name the research subjects with whom I have conducted the ethnography “*protagonists of my research*” in order to shed light on their active role in the research process. Their active role in the ethnographic practice challenges the concept of “vulnerability” and the category of “victim”, despite the strong awareness and reflections about the power relations between me and my research protagonists and my privileged social position and their precarious one.

The protagonists of my research that joined the refugees protest in Berlin have undertaken a process of empowerment and building awareness through the political protest and the relationships with the supporters. Thus, when we started the ethnographic research it was easier to speak with them and explain them which kind of project we wanted to developed. Many of them were already active in artistic projects, some doing videos and theatre pieces about their biographies, thus they were used to give interviews and to be recorded or even filmed. We started hence immediately a more “equal” relationship attempting to build together a process of the research. For example, we proposed to two of them to write together with Giulia Borri and me an article for an Italian review journal, *gli Asini*. The editors asked us for a narration on the protest of Oranienplatz. We wrote an eight-handed article in which me and Giulia worked on the issue of our concern – namely the sociological analysis of the situation – and the two protagonists of our research worked on their issues, i.e. their biographies and experiences in Berlin. Me and Giulia put together the text because of the Italian language. We then gave it to the two research protagonists who read it and proposed changes.

During the ethnographic practice some problems emerged because of the structural characteristics of both me and the protagonists of my research. One problem was my privileged position as a white western woman, citizen, and academic, contrasting with their position as black men without higher education and with the precarious condition of being
temporary regular or sometimes “half-irregular”. Because of these structural disequalities a power relation sloping to my side was self-evident. The relation between the researcher and the research protagonists is active and fact-finding at the same time (Navarini 1998), it is hence crucial to maintain the interaction always active. That means to also open yourself up as a researcher and person, and not see yourself as the one who only asks questions and investigates. I always told my research protagonists that they could ask me everything, and we always spoke also about me and my biography to build a relationship as little unilateral as possible.

I often built trust relationships that allowed to collect interesting data, still some conflicts emerged, often caused by the high frustration and mistrust that some of my research protagonists had experienced in their marginal everyday lives. One protagonist of my research experienced a lengthened marginal living condition and at one point could not trust me anymore, turning his frustration in anger against all the European people. In this case, I preferred to stop the ethnographic practice and only provided the support he needed.

My position as woman among a group of men brings up the critical point of gender dimension. The gender issue emerged above all at the beginning of the ethnographic practice, when it was crucial to clarify my position as researcher and person of trust but nothing more. This is part of the negotiating practices I detailed earlier: as woman in relation with young men I always had to clarify my role and the nature of our relation. The different ways how the women are seen and treated in the different cultures has also been a critical point. I had to convince some of my research protagonists that I was a “good person”, despite I was a woman hanging out alone all the days with many young men, leaving my boyfriend at home alone. I therefore consider the variable of time crucial, since it allows to build a trust relationship. The build-up of trust takes particularly long in a setting with many structural differences that characterized us as subjects culturally and socially embedded.

The Italian language and me as Italian person played an interesting role during the ethnographic practices in Berlin. In Milan I was within “my country”, speaking my language, and thus I had a clear advantage in comparison to my research protagonists; the distance between us was then bigger. To the contrary, in Berlin I was also a “stranger” who was speaking a foreign language and who was sometimes object of discrimination as “south European” person. Of course, still in Berlin I maintained a privilege position as European in comparison to my research protagonists, but they felt more close to me as we were “both strangers” in Germany. Many times me and Giulia Borri heard our research protagonists use the sentence: «Oh, you are Italians too! We are also from Italy!». The fact that the people of
have lived at least one year and eight months in Italy allowed them to feel a bit Italians – as we will read in chapter six – and thus to experience a solidarity with us and a closeness opposing to the German societies. The relational character of the ethnographic practices and the never ending redefinition of the researcher’s role in the different fields is nicely highlighted in this example of language.

The production of knowledge from below

The knowledge that is produced through the interactive ethnographic practice is the last critical point that I like to reflexively discuss. Though the choice of the methodology and the ethnographic process can be discussed and conducted together with the research protagonists, the analysis and discussion of the results is usually undertaken solely by the researcher. The process of building knowledge from below has hence in its last phase of data analysis and writing its less collaborative part. Nevertheless, according to scholars that have theorized the qualitative research it is difficult to consider the ethnographic practices and the theory building as detached from each other. The ethnographic practice is the phase through and during which the theory is built. Indeed, the qualitative methodology and notably ethnography apply an inductive approach rather than a deductive one. Thus, the process of doing research and the theory production cannot be separately considered. This argument is also present in the American tradition of the Grounded Theory elaborated by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Fieldwork, analysis and writing are not three detached phases, but rather interconnected actions that occur together (Semi 2010); that allows to turn the epistemological perspective speaking about theorizing rather than theory (Swedberg 2012).

I decided to present the results of my research in the form of narrations. I focus on the narrations of my research protagonists with the aim to listen to them and their biographies. I do not consider my work as a practice that “gives voice to marginal subjects”, because I am convinced that marginal subjects already have a voice and they express them. The problem is that the majority of the societies do not listen to their voices. Thus the first step for me was to consider the lengthened time spent together during our ethnographic practice as a listening process. In the benches of Milan, during the going around in the public transports, as well as in the hours spent within the bingo in Berlin or in Oranienplatz, the narrations of migrant subjects could express, fluctuate and be listened as the expression of a neglected subjectivity. Giving space and time to subjective narrations usually not listened is crucial in this particular way to do ethnography, which recognizes the marginal subjects as full expression of
subjectivity (Pinelli 2013b; Gatta 2012b).

The narrations of my research protagonists allowed me to discover the internal borders in the European space, the way through they are activated and how they influenced the biographies of migrant subjects. Moreover, they revealed the protagonist's aspirations, desires and fears, namely a subjective dimension that allowed me to deeply understand the migration phenomenon as a process of becoming rather than a linear movement. The transit experience as expression of their subjectivity – see chapter six – could be grasped through the long time spent together in which their narrations could freely emerge. I consider thus the ethnographic practice also as a way through which it is possible to open space and time for subjective narrations that are usually not listened or neglected. Furthermore, the passive role of “victims” was thus deconstructed, and a stormily inner drive emerged that moves the migrant subjects across several borders. Through their narrations, the protagonists of my research have shed light on several overshadowed fragments of their biographies on the move.

«When we enter in that “parallel reality” consisting of a narration, we find ourself always in a situation similar to a travel» (Jedlowski 2000, p.93, in Gatta 2012b)

The presented form as narrations are also chosen in order to provide to the reader the possibility to deeply understand and immerse in the everyday life of the migrant subjects. The publication of the research results is a delicate and problematic process if the research involves “vulnerable” subjects and their practices to overcome the borders. Indeed, I always payed high attention in the writing process to avoid giving information that could damage the protagonists of my research and other migrant subjects living in their condition. Fist of all, according to a usual praxis in the ethnographic research with marginal subjects, I do not use the real name of my research protagonists. I discussed this issue with the protagonists and we decided together to use the anonymity. Thus, I use some African names that are not corresponding to the real identity of the subjects of my research. Also the origin country is not corresponding to the real one, it is not a central information for my research purpose. I present the protagonists with a random name from the list of Sub-Saharan countries they come from. I still give some information when I introduce the protagonists in order to present them as persons, subjects and social actors and to avoid abstract material the reader cannot relate to. Furthermore, sometimes I replace the name of an European city with a fake name of a invented city taken from the novel of Italo Calvino, The invisible cities (1972). Since some research protagonists still have pending juridical bureaucratic procedure, I didn't want to give any biographic information about them, therefore also the city's name where their
administrative procedures were set has been changed. Working on the strategies and social practices in the everyday life enacted to overcome or break the borders poses some ethical problems. Therefore I needed to carefully select the information I collected during the ethnographic research, attempting always to not damage the migrant subjects moving and living between and beyond the EU borders. Indeed, I did not write down all the information I collected, above all in Berlin where the process of negotiation with the local authorities is still going on. For the collaboratively drawn route maps that I report in a digital format\textsuperscript{15}, I ensured a level of inexactness to protect the authors they are not precisely tracing the migratory paths of my research protagonists, do not show the exact border crossing points or sometime the precise city. Instead, they are applied here to give the reader an approximate but suggestive visual impression of the \textit{fragmented circuits} stretching across Europe that characterized the migratory experiences of my research protagonists. The decision to use dotted lines was taken in order to deconstruct the image of a linear and one-direction route, illustrating instead the fragmentation and the temporal ruptures that characterized the migratory experiences of my research protagonists – see chapter four.

The use of other visual material, such as the photos done by my friend and colleague Lucia Gennari, were part of the collaborative process and have been discussed with some research protagonists. Indeed, when we walked in Milan taking picture we were together with Dakari that was aware of our intentions and agreed that “his places” were photographed. We decided together to take pictures just of places and spaces with no human presence, since we considered that the narrations I have collected through the ethnography could fill these places with life without the need to take pictures of subjects\textsuperscript{16}. The nine illustrations presented in this thesis are also in line with this way to collaborative working together with the protagonists of my research and with other friends and colleagues that are belonging to different disciplines. Together with Cosimo Miorelli, the illustrator, and some protagonists of my research we started to develop a visual project that could illustrate their biographies deconstructing the image of migrant subjects as passive bodies landing on the Lampedusa shores. This project -- still a work in progress -- took the first shape as a live multimedia storytelling\textsuperscript{17} titled “\textit{Storm•i}” (see appendix 22) referring to the subjective dimension of migrant subjects that undertake the migration experience as a \textit{stormy} mix of desires, aspirations and fears. The Italian language

\textsuperscript{15} The digital maps were drawn by the architect Simon Burko, see acknowledgements.

\textsuperscript{16} Also note that if we planned to take pictures of people we would have needed to undertake another negotiation process with the subjects protagonists according to the anthropological literature working with the images of marginal subjects (Bourgois and Schonberg 2007).

\textsuperscript{17} In the project of live multimedia storytelling the sound artist Massimo Croce has worked with us using some registrations he has recorded during his travels through the Sahara desert and his stay in Libya and Egypt.
allows a wordplay, because “stormi” means “flocks of birds” an image often used by the
illustrator referring to the experience of my research protagonists.
Once a work is published, the author gives away control on it and on the ways through which
its results can be used and manipulated. A careful presentation of the results is therefore
crucial in order to minimize problems for the protagonists or other people living in the same
conditions. A fragmented knowledge emerged, exactly as the lives of my research
protagonists are fragmented, highlighting thus how the knowledge production cannot be
detached from how the social reality is grasped and how the ethnographic praxis is conducted.
Thus, the knowledge produced cannot be seen as absolute, but is exactly what the reflexive
sociology underlines: qualitative research does not produce absolute knowledge, but instead
plausible interpretations (Melucci 1998). Being the language the medium through which the
knowledge – and its power – is produced, I dedicate the last paragraph on a reflection about
language and the writing process, being both crucial in the qualitative methodology.
2.3 The language, the writing process and the problem of the nomenclature

The writing process is a crucial and non-secondary phase in the qualitative research, because it is the ethnographic writing communicates the research results of the author. Accordingly, also the structure of the ethnographic text is fundamental (Cardano 2003), and therefore I carefully chose the structure and organization in chapters and sub-chapters. The function of writing is not just to communicate the research results, but also to contribute to the definition of the contents itself. The choice of the rhetoric style (Colombo 1998) the researcher uses in order to communicate with the scientific community is important and needs space of reflection. As researchers we produce knowledge and discourses that (should) circulate in the academic and public debate, and can potentially influence the social reality. Michel Foucault has written about the power of the scientific discourses as producing devices through which power circulates and creates particular subjects and social categories. Working as researcher and writing books and articles makes reflection on this point necessary, not at least to be able to produce counter-narrations that oppose the mainstream and dominant discourses. In this work I attempt to deconstruct the idea of migration as a linear one-way movement from A to B, from southern (poor) regions to the northern (rich) ones. In doing so, I apply the analytical category of mobility to the issue of refugees in Europe, which has been usually analysed through a static perspective within the national-state borders. The mobility involves also the temporal dimension, together with the spatial one, which became one of the focusses of this work. In order to give the feeling of a continuous movement and to emphasize the temporal dimension, I often employed the present continuous of the verbs for the chapters' and paragraphs' titles. “Building”, “moving”, “living”, “dwelling” are just some examples of that idea of mobility and temporalities that characterized the experience of my research protagonists. Furthermore, I aimed also through the structural organization of the text to deconstruct the linear geography of the national-states as criteria that organizes our world and the way through which we think and see – and intervene on – it. Applying the multi-sited ethnography was already a choice of not to consider Italy and Germany, Milan and Berlin as containers that have to be compared, but rather to shed light on the multiplicity of territories overlapping through the ways in which migrant subjects experience them. Thus, though the chapters three and four are structured in subparagraphs that divide Italy and Germany, I abandoned this dual structure in the chapter five where the crossing-border mobility of
migrant subjects is in focus. Blurring the national-states borders through my writing was an attempt to reproduce the everyday lives of my research protagonists that have experienced a multiplicity of overlapping territories, leading to a far and opaque image of “Europe”, national states, cities and neighbourhoods, train stations and urban places. A geographical fragmentation emerges through the pages of this work, where interstices are opened up by contested mobilities that trace fragmented and circular trajectories.

«They trace “indeterminate trajectories” that are apparently meaningless, since they do not cohere with the constructed, written, and prefabricated space through which they move. They are sentences that remain unpredictable within the space ordered by the organizing techniques of systems. Although they use as their material the vocabularies of established languages […], although they remain within the framework of prescribed syntaxes […], these “traverses” remain heterogeneous to the systems they infiltrate and in which they sketch out the guileful ruses of different interests and desires. They circulate, come and go, overflow and drift over an imposed terrain, like the snowy waves of the sea slipping in among the rocks and defiles of an established order. Statistics can tell us virtually nothing about the currents in this sea theoretically governed by the institutional frameworks that it in fact gradually erodes and displaces. Indeed, it is less a matter of a liquid circulating in the interstices of a solid than of different movements making use of the elements of the terrain.» (de Certeau 1984, p. 34)

The power dimension and relations were another theoretical focus of my work expressed by the analytical concept of border. The main problem of power that circulates through the discourses on migration phenomena is the production of categories and social images. I will detail this issue in chapter three, highlighting how the categories of “illegal migrants”, “refugees”, and “asylum seekers” are socially constructed and thus bearer of a moral power that entails laws and policies. Accordingly, when I will named these categories I will write them in quotation marks to make aware of their social construction. In particular, the undocumented migrants will be named as “illegal” migrants to point at the process of criminalization occurring upon this category of people. A deep reflection was conducted in order to decide how to name the protagonists of my research. I decided to use the word “subject” in order to underline their active role in the power relations and to deconstruct their image as victim. Indeed, being the literature of refugees and asylum-seekers impregnated of the image of “passive people” in need of humanitarian aids, I decided here to not name the protagonists of my research “refugees”, although they obtained a humanitarian and subsidiary protection. I use the word “refugees” only when I point to the people of the Lampedusa in Berlin group, because they named themselves “refugees” following the political process of building awareness about their condition. Furthermore, the fluid movement between different categories of migrants such as “asylum-seekers”, “temporary refugees” and “illegal” migrants
has been the experience of my research protagonists, thus challenging these categories and the fix and static way through which we use them. I hence name my research protagonists “migrant subjects” that in a phase of their migratory route have applied for asylum, since they were forced to leave the place where they were living. The adjective “migrant” is pointing to their migratory experiences that took different shapes in different places and times.

The writing process, the words and concepts we use and build are also a part of doing research (Semi 2010); it is when we transform our experiences and the understanding of them in texts that will take an autonomous nature. Therefore, I decided to present in the next chapters the empirical material by intertwining the descriptive data with the understanding and thus the analysis of them. My purpose is to make the reader immerse himself or herself in the social reality I am describing, to make him or her follow me and the protagonists of my research, moving together in their everyday lives. Thus, I dedicate just the last short paragraph of each chapter to a more theoretical summary in order to accompany the reader along the fil rouge of this complicated but interesting story.
Chapter 3

A EURO-MEDITERRANEAN MOSAIC
Cartographies of migrant mobilities and the European Border Regime

In this chapter I will introduce the structural contexts through which my research phenomenon has been developed. Basing on secondary literature, I will first analyse how the contemporary European system of control and management of migration has been constructed, shedding light on the power relations involved in it. A particular focus will be given to how the categories of the subjects on the move have been changed over the time according to the different ways in which the governments label and manage migration phenomenon, and how the migrant subjectivities react to these categories. The categories are socio-legally produced, and hence presented as ontological and moral qualities. The knowledge and the discourses produced around these categories create both cultural imaginaries and laws, which influence each other and affect the biographies of the migrant subjects (Pinelli 2013a).

In the first paragraph, I will narrate through a genealogy (cfr. Foucault) the construction of the hybrid system of migration control, which tightly binds securitarian and humanitarian devices and discourses. I will focus on the asylum issue and the “refugee” figure as the category through which this interconnection of humanitarian concern and securitarian devices took shape.

In the second and third paragraph the two case studies of my empirical research are contextualized. I present them in order to highlight how the mechanisms of this hybrid system concretely work. The two case studies are setted in two different geographical areas: the Mediterranean area, notably Italy, and a northern European state, Germany. I will underline how the Mediterranean area has become a strategic place of EU border control of migrant mobilities, above all after the events of Arab Spring and Libyan war in 2011. The example of the use of an emergency regime in Italy highlights how securitarian and humanitarian devices can be applied in order to manage migrant mobilities. Furthermore, I will present the story of the political protests in Germany in 2012 enacted by asylum-seekers, refugees and other migrant subjects, which attempted to break and react to the restrictions and confinements of the migration-control and management system. These political protests culminated in the occupation of Oranienplatz in Berlin. These two case-studies must not be considered as static
geographical entities and separate temporal events, but instead as interconnected and multi-sited situations that together allow to shed light on the European border regime as a space of negotiating practices.
3.1 The hybrid Regime of migration control: interconnection of humanitarian and securitarian devices

In this paragraph, I will highlight through a genealogical perspective how the socially constructed *figure* of migrant changed over the time according to the dialectical relationship between national and super-national policies and the subjective drive that is inherent to any form of human mobility (Karakayali and Rigo 2010). Thus, the policies on migration control and management have to be understood as the result of the power relationships between the political authorities, which aim to control migrant mobilities, and the migrants trajectories and practices, which contest and face these controls. I will particularly focus on the figure of “refugee” and the asylum procedure, since it has progressively become a central matter in the migration issue.

The time after the Second World War was dominated by the binary distinction between forced and voluntary migration, characterized respectively by “political” and “economic” reasons to move. The “refugee” was he who is defined by the Geneva Convention, i.e. embodied by the “anti-communist white-man”. At that period, all the other migrant subjects that were fleeing political persecution from the global South – because of non-communist dictatorships, the decolonization process, and new State formations – were treated as “voluntary economic migrants”. Although “illegal”, many of these migrants were able to regularize their status as “guest workers” once they had found an employment (Scheel and Squire 2014). The latter example shows the strong influence of the socially constructed image of the different migrants’ categories on the migration policies: despite technically qualifying as “illegal migrants”\(^\text{18}\), these groups of forced migrants were not perceived as a problem as such, because they could integrate themselves within the matrix of migration policy under the figure of “guest workers” (Karakayali and Rigo 2010). The image of “guest workers” dominated the post-war age in the European migration system with strong influences on migration policies until the 1970s. The basic idea of this system – introduced and implemented particularly by Germany – was the *temporary* stay of migrants in the Northern European countries before their return to “home”. Migrants had the right of residence just for a limited period, since the resident permit was linked to the duration of their labour contract. In that time, indeed, the

\(^{18}\) In the sense, in which the term “illegal migrants” has been used in the recent years, i.e. persons that cross without permit - “illegal” – the national-borders.
Northern European societies needed migrants' manpower because their growing economics ran short of labour. Nevertheless, the governments treated migrants as “guests” with the idea that once their economies would have no need for them any longer, they would be obliged to go back to their homelands. This system ended in the 1970s in conjunction with the economical crisis in 1973, which led to a significant shift in the European politics of mobility and migration.

This shift has to be understood in the light of several phenomena within Western countries, notably Europe, since the 1970s and 1980s. First, the process of European unification with the building of a “common market” and the “security space” has been started at that time. Second, the number of people on the fleeing increased considerably in the 1980s, accompanied by a geographical shift of the origin countries from Europe to the Global South. Further, the asylum system became the remaining legal channel of entry after the abolishment of guest-worker system (Castles 2003; Karakayali 2008). Migrants who might previously have migrated as “guest workers” or “Commonwealth migrants” were better off to claim asylum (Zetter 2007), and they had to invent stories of political persecution (Karakayali and Rigo 2010). Between the 1980s and the 1990s, the number of asylum applications in Europe increased significantly: between the 1975 and 1979 there were 233,700 asylum applications, between 1980 and 1984 540,200, and between 1985 and 1990 1,102,300. At the beginning of the 1990s the number increased again reaching 2,419,800 (Hatton 2005, in Marchetti 2006).

The process of European unification and the change of migration geographies entailed a shift towards the securitization of migration. This comprehensive shift involved the images of migrants, the public discourses, the policies, and the management and control system. Further, the securitization of migration led to a growing emphasis on the figure of the “asylum seekers” (Zetter 2007; Squire 2009) and “refugee”, which started to be considered as a social problem.

I will highlight how the hybrid regime of migration control and management developed through the progressive interconnection of humanitarian and securitarian devices during the last decades. Moreover, I will focus on how the progressively blurred social image of “refugee” that oscillates between “victim” and “enemy” has influenced this hybrid control system. First, I shed light on how the progressive securitization of the migration issue is embedded in the process of European Unification, namely in the reinforcement of the external EU frontiers. Second, I will focus on the asylum externalization policies in neighbouring non-EU countries and on the introduction of “reduced legal statuses”, highlighting how the humanitarian regime has been developed. Third, I refer to the management of the circularity...
of migrants within European space through their legal status as a crucial point of the migration control system, thereby highlighting how temporariness and (im)mobilities characterize migrants experiences in Europe.

**The building of “Schengenland”**: the basis for the European Border Regime

Several scholars highlight how the European Union was build on the principle of a progressive opening of the internal borders for the goods, first, and European citizen, after, and the consequent closure of external borders for the non-European citizen. Scholars of critical border studies argue that the fight against the so-called “illegal migration” was one of the pillars around which the European Union project was build. The path of a common European migration policy was not a linear process: at the beginning the influence of European institutions was weaker in comparison of that of national-states, which stipulated intergovernmental agreements to keep control on migration policies and hence on their national labour markets. However, it is still possible to identify some general guide-lines that national-states followed in the process of building a common migration policy. The first step towards common migration policy was done in 1985, when the responsibility of the Trevi group was extended and the migration issue included. The Trevi group was build from an intergovernmental agreement, and it was responsible for the issues of public order, i.e. terrorism, political extremism and criminality (Düvell 2004). The fact that the European Council decided to treat migration within the wider issue of public order and terrorism highlights how the progressive process of criminalizing migrants is rooted in the basis of the European Union. Indeed, this process definitively emerged during the 1990s with the shift from the forced/voluntary binary towards the illegal/legal binary as the dominant framework and terrain for the politics of mobility (Scheel and Squire 2014). The control of people's movement was at the center of the European project. Some categories of people should move free while others should be restricted. Accordingly, two important agreements were stipulated: the Dublin Convention and the Schengen Agreement.

The Schengen Agreement aimed to progressively abolish the internal border controls, and hence to reinforce those at the external frontiers of the European Union. A common area of freedom and security should be created, in order to overcome old national rancour and to

---


20 This principle is the basis of the Maastricht Agreement.

21 That allowed to overcome old national fights on border territories, such as the area of Ruhr competed.
start a process of economical integration. The set up of this new geopolitical formation was regional rather than national, nevertheless it has some characteristics of national states and other of supranational formation. From one side, the Schengen borders aims at the reduction of internal borders and they surrounded a political entity. From the other side, they do not delimit just one administrative space: the Schengen area has several borders and several policies that intersect and act at the supranational, national and local levels. Moreover, the sovereignty of this space is not just one – as by the national state – rather is localized in the intersection of supranational and national institution (Walters 2004). Thus, the migration control issue involved several sovereign and non-sovereign actors – such as IOM and UNHCR – highlighting hence the constitution of an hybrid regime of variable sovereignty, i.e. the European border regime (Mezzadra 2004).

The European system of migration policies was modernized in 1999 during the Tampere European Council, where the aim was to build a common EU asylum and migration policy. Three separate guide-lines were presented: the first on immigration for asylum reasons, the second on the fight against “illegal” immigration and the third on opening up new channels for “labour migration”\(^\text{22}\). Within these guide-lines the issue of migration and asylum emerges as a matter of “security” and a “problem of public order”.

The Tampere European Council laid the basis for the policies of borders externalisation that have characterized the EU migration policies during the last decades. The idea of a «partnership with countries of origin» and with the “third countries”– the transit countries – was another crucial point of EU migration policies, as written in the points 24 and 26 of this Council:

«The European Council calls for closer co-operation and mutual technical assistance between the Member States' border control services, such as exchange programmes and technology transfer, especially on maritime borders, and for the rapid inclusion of the applicant States in this co-operation […] and calls for assistance to countries of origin and transit to be developed in order to promote voluntary return as well as to help the authorities of those countries to strengthen their ability to combat effectively trafficking in human beings and to cope with their readmission obligations towards the Union and the Member States»\(^\text{23}\).

The process of border externalisation was implemented through two different devices: the

\(^{22}\) A consequence of this third line was selective migration policy, which entail to a polarization in the European labour market between “high skill” jobs done by citizen and “law skill” jobs done by the non-EU-citizen (Düvell 2004).

\(^{23}\) From the official web site of European Parliament: \url{http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/tam_en.htm}
implementation of bilateral agreements between a European country and a transit country\textsuperscript{24}, and through the militarization of the EU external borders. The latter entailed the creation of Frontex\textsuperscript{25} in 2005, an agency in charge of the control of the EU external borders through military operations. These operation of control were supported by the creation of electronic database systems, which allow to share information about several migrants’ categories between several national police services, intelligence agencies and the EU borders agency. Two example of that are the SIS – Schengen Information System – and the EURODAC – European fingerprint database for identifying asylum seekers and irregular border-crossers. In 2008 the Return Directive\textsuperscript{26} was implemented. It incorporated and consequently formalised the bilateral agreements, which until then had been under the responsibility of individual states. Furthermore, these repatriation agreements were accompanied by measures both to formalise the structure of detention centres and to implement the use of the police forces in the “transit zones” – such as international airports and frontier posts. The camp for migrants has been a crucial device implemented by the European border regime. As highlighted in the chapter on, the literature on border studies shed light on how the processes of securitization and criminalization of the migration issue entailed the legitimacy of putting specific categories of subjects under a system of confinement, that is based on camps and detention centers, but also on administrative practices as the restriction of mobility\textsuperscript{27}. These camps are set on European territory, but also in the transit countries. An example are the camps in Libya opened by Gaddafi in order to “help” the European countries in blocking the movements of migrants towards Europe – since Libya has been one of the most important transit country before the war in 2011.

Detention and reception centers set within European countries shed light on the issue of internal borders, as introduced in the first chapter. These places produce an exceptional space within a national territory, where none of the detainees have the same rights as legal citizens (Cuttitta 2007). One of the main actors that governs the different camp structures is the IOM – International Organisation of Migration; looking at the ambiguous nature and role of this agency allows us to better understand how the European border regime is working. The IOM was founded in 1951, the same year as the UNHCR – United Nations High Commissioner for

\textsuperscript{24} For example the bilateral agreement between Italy and Libya that will explained in the next paragraph.

\textsuperscript{25} The European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union.


\textsuperscript{27} The German case-study explained in the last paragraph of this chapter shed light on these practices of mobility restriction.
Refugees, but unlike to the latter, the IOM was based on economic rather than humanitarian principles. Indeed, UNHCR derives its mandate from international law and agreements', IOM instead is a membership organization, not a UN agency (Morris 2004). IOM is involved in the promotion of what it calls migration management and border management: it produces knowledge and practices about border control and management of migrants. The IOM works together with humanitarian organisations – such as UNHCR – and also with security agency – such as the International Center for Migration Policy Development – blurring hence the distinction between securitarian and humanitarian concerns. Indeed, this agency introduced for the first time the administrative practices of “voluntary return”, namely operations of repatriation of migrants with an expired resident permit or asylum-seekers that have obtained a deny (Düvell 2004). Through the introduction of new terminology and language the IOM fosters the creation of new imaginaries: for example, it implemented the classification of migrants categories, dividing the “good migrants” from the “bad ones”, namely the “illegal” that can hence be deported. Furthermore, it works together with national governments in order to implemented these new knowledge of migration management, «they [the national governments] must both “facilitate bona fide travellers, providing a welcoming and efficient gateway to the state” and also “provide a barrier and disincentive to entry for those seeking to circumvent migration laws”» (Andrijasevic and Walters 2010, p.985). On these discourses and practices lies the production of socially constructed figures of migrants – the “bad one”, i.e. the “illegal” migrants, and the “good one”, i.e. the “true” asylum-seekers – and the consequently management system of their mobilities that interconnect securitarian and humanitarian devices.

**Between victims and enemies: (“bogus”) forced migrants as illegal migrants**

The change of the perceived image of “refugee” in western countries is rooted in the global phenomena that started at the end of the 20th century. The change of the geographies of migration has a crucial influence, since those fleeing from the global South were perceived as poor and helpless persons. Asylum-seekers from the global South were constructed as different with regard to their motivation for movement, because they were imagined as deprived and, thus, a lack of political agency became the defining feature of the “refugee” in this period (Scheel and Squire 2014). The icon of “victim” emerged and it entailed a process

---

28 IOM operates in the four main areas of migration management: migration and development, facilitating migration, regulating migration, and addressing forced migration.
of medicalization, through which “asylum-seekers” and “refugees” were treated as weak and ill subjects. For example, the so called “Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder” (PTSD) became in the 1990s the more natural way to define and to cure those people who have experienced wars and traumatic escapes (Marchetti 2014). Vulnerability became, hence, the main feature of “refugees” and their pathologization became the way through which these people were treated. This process can be considered consistent with what Michael Foucault in Society Must be Defended (1975-76) individuates as the establishment of racism at the end of 19th century, when the theme of racial purity replaced that of race struggles, and when the «counterhistory of race struggles» began to be converted into a biological racism with its biological-medical perspective. «The historical war – with its battles, its invasions, its looting, its victories, and its defeats – will be replaced by the postevolutionist theme of the struggle of existence. It is no longer a battle in the sense that a warrior would understand them, but a struggle in the biological sense» (Foucault 1975-76, pp. 80-81). Accordingly, the tendency will be a society biologically monist, which is threatened by heterogeneous elements that are not essential to it, but accidental. Hence the idea of foreigners developed as those who have «infiltrated this society», and that of deviants as those who are this «society's by-products». In this context, the state is no longer an instrument that one race uses against another, instead it becomes the protector of the integrity, the superiority, and the purity of the race (cfr. Foucault 1975-76). This wide social change highlighted by Foucault, has been also underlined by Saskia Sassen (1996) as the base on which the modern system of citizenship was build: the state elevates the biology as parameter through which the stable belonging – of people – is distinguished from the time-limited coexistence. The treatment of forced migrants as “victim” has to be understand within a wider social change, namely the process that pathologizes the social issues as a problem of the personality of individuals, of the life styles and of the social relations (Pupavac 2006). The creation of a system that is appropriate to the idea of “victim”, namely a humanitarian system, is a main consequence.

The French anthropologist and sociologist Didier Fassin identifies, over a range of social contexts, a general logic in the contemporary society that he calls «humanitarian reason», which throws some light on the multiple facets of a moral history of the present. The humanitarian reason represents a powerful social imaginary of our time. The author follows Charles Taylor that developed the concept of “social imaginary” of an era as not a set of ideas, rather as what enables, through making sense of, the practices of a society. Thus, the humanitarian reason entails to the humanitarian government, i.e. the way that moral sentiments have become generalized as a frame of reference in political life. Hence, a
«politics of life» and a «politics of suffering» lead to the development of «moral economies», which have been constituted around a new relation to suffering that makes it a central element of our public life. Moreover, Fassin argues that the «humanitarian reason», by instituting the equivalence of lives and the equivalence of suffering, allows us to continue believing – contrary to the daily evidence of the realities that we encounter – in a concept of humanity which presupposes that all human beings are of equal value because they belong to one moral community. Thus, the humanitarian reason obscures the inequalities in which the violence, disasters, epidemics, and also poverty and insecurity are embedded. The consequence in Western societies is the opening of their democratic space as little as possible, while preserving the possibility, as a last resort, of granting consideration to those who succeed in entering “western world”, but on the basis of humanitarianism rather than as of a right (Fassin 2011a).

Indeed, the progressive shift to a humanitarian regime entailed a progressive de-politicization of the asylum issue, that ever since was framed just as a humanitarian problem. The image of a single famous “refugee”, who had fought his political regime and, therefore, he had to escape, has been replaced by the image of an anonymous mass of people fleeing some humanitarian disaster.

The humanitarian regime involves various management techniques, devices, and discourses. The refugee camp has been the most used device in order to manage the new “mass of forced migrants”, usually placed close to the crisis areas. Letting survive the refugees living inside is the main function of such refugee camps, absolving just the refugee's primary need – such as sleeping and eating. Several research have highlighted the ambiguous nature of these places, that should give a temporary place to people escaping from their origin countries, but at the end become «definitely temporary zones» (Rahola 2003). As we have seen in the first chapter, several scholars underlined how the camp appears usually as the only possible territory for persons that exceed any form of univocal belonging (Arendt 1967; Agamben 1995; Malkki 1995).

Since the 1990s the humanitarian actors started to be responsible for the management of these places: they provide food, organize the everyday life inside the camps, and be the intermediary between forced migrants and the national and international authorities that decide about their situation. Works on these places highlight exactly how the relationship between the humanitarian staff and those forced migrants living in the camp is reproducing that between the doctor with its patient, referring frequently on the work Asylums of Evring Goffman (1961), that highlighted how the institutionalisation process socializes the people in
several roles (for example, as the good or the bad patient). The treatment of the “refugee” as an ill persons entails to not consider him any more as a political subject, who exercises his self-determination rights, but becomes an object of professional intervention (Pupavac 2006). These interventions are mobilized as acts of charity and protection, which however develop also the normalization of border practices (Walters 2011b).

Indeed, the humanitarian regime build around the “refugee as victim” has become a complex technical and professional machine, which involve several spheres of policies, different actors – institutional and non-institutional –, and experts such as officials, social workers, humanitarian staff, journalists, academics, lawyers, NGOs. The practices derived from this new charitable and assistance approach implemented by institutions and humanitarian actors emptied the “refugee” of its political feature. This de-politicization is also highlighted by the emergence of the issue “migration management”, which is becoming the main activity of the international actors dealing with migrants and asylum-seekers government, as we have seen for the IOM. The implementation of technocratic norms and management dynamics has replaced the social and political work through which previously this issue was faced.

The UNCHR is the main humanitarian actor that deals with forced migrants and has endorsed the migration management paradigm is. Like the IOM, also this international governmental organisation has been studied through the foucauldian paradigm of governmentality (Scheel and Ratfisch 2014). These works state that UNHCR is actually part of a global «police of populations» (Walters 2002) and actively involved in the promotion and implementation of migration management procedure and “border management”. Although UNHCR distances itself from the IOM on the base of its humanitarian principle, it is possible to individuate similar characteristics. An example is the creation of artificial labels in order to create different categories of migrants. Indeed, UNHCR fosters the distinction of migrants through the problematisation of “mixed migration flows” and through the attempt to reduce the “secondary movements” in order to control and manage the migrants mobilities following the selective approach of European policies (Scalettaris 2007).

The governmentality action of UNHCR is clarified with a look at its operation within refugees camps, how these places are exemplar spaces of governmentality. The UNHCR contributes to the production of places where techniques of containment are mixed and obfuscated with humanitarian attempts. This increase the difficulty in understanding the aim and functions of these places and the actors that manage them. For example, rejected refugees are considered by UNHCR staff in Choucha refugees’ camp as «people not of our concern», and those

29 Choucha is a refugees’ camp that was opened in 2011 by UNHCR for people fleeing the Libyan civil war. It
forced migrants that are not included in the UNHCR’s space of protection, are classified as «nomads in the desert» (Tazzioli and Garelli 2016). These works underline the exclusionary sorting action of the humanitarian regime, that are in line with the wider securitization process of EU migration policy. This sheds light on the interconnection between the humanitarian regime and the securitarian one: both entangle into a wider hybrid regime of migration management and control.

The big change in understanding and managing migration and asylum issues that have entailed to the interconnection of securitarian and humanitarian regime, can be understood looking at the turned point of 1970s. At the beginning of this chapter I have highlighted the global phenomena that have entailed this change, such as the changed geographies of migration. The fact that the new forced migrants were fleeing from poor countries led the global North to consider them with suspicion, since they were not escaping persecution – according to western countries – but making an informed and beneficial migration choice. This idea led to the creation of the image of “bogus asylum-seekers” that has dominated from the 1970s until the 1990s, and consequently has influenced migration and asylum policies. The idea was that asylum-seekers falsely claimed to need an international protection in order to gain entry in the global North, but they were in fact “voluntary economic migrants” (Scheel and Squire 2014). This image of “fake asylum-seekers” was supported also by the fact that the “age of guest workers” had finished, and asylum was the only legal way to get inside European territory. As we have seen in the first paragraph of this chapter, the EU policies of migration and asylum aim at the reduction of entrances of forced migrants in the Schengen area, and thus restriction policies have been implemented. This change has to be understood within the wider “national-securitarian shift” that criss-crossed western countries in the 1980-90s. This shift was part of a wider political and economical change towards a new ideology that involved values and belief – of political parties and civil societies –, and that led to the development of the so called “neoliberal age”. It was exactly also in that period that migration became a sensible and high politicized issue that could break political coalitions (Valluy 2011).

The dominant discourse of “bogus asylum-seekers” was supported and strengthen by the media and policy discourses, and provided the basis for the problematization of “illegal” migrants that came to the fore during the 1990s. The term “illegal” is here used in order to

---

is placed in Tunisia close to the border with Libya, although its officially closure in June 2013, the camp still exist and rejected refugees live inside.

30 In the literature on migration is usually used the term “undocumented migrants”, in order to overcome the criminalization over these subjects enactment by western institutions and political discourses.
underline the criminalizing process implemented by western countries and their institutions, which labelled “illegal” migrants as the new “social enemy”. My paragraph about Schengen highlights the direct consequence of that in the implementation of security guide-lines and measures in EU migration and asylum policies.

In the 1990s occurred the shift from the forced/voluntary binary towards the legal-illegal binary as the dominant framework for politics of mobility. In contrast with the previous figure of “refugee”, whose feature was a lack of political agency, the “bogus asylum-seeker” is conceived as a person with a dangerous or excessive agency (Scheel and Squire 2014). This “excessive” agency is governed by the humanitarian regime through specific politics of truth and authenticity: the asylum-seeker has to prove its vulnerability that must be assessed and certified (Khosravi 2010). The broad humanitarian regime with its institutional and non-institutional actors, are involved in the registration procedures, the medical and psychological certification (Fassin 2011a) and the proof of the credibility of migrants' narrations. The aim is here to discover the “illegal” migrants among the “real” asylum seekers, through mechanisms of sorting and ranking human mobilities. The paradox is that as asylum is disqualified both quantitatively and qualitatively: states develop increasingly sophisticated instruments to scrutinize the “truth” of the applicants who, in the great majority of cases, will be rejected and hence will become “illegal” aliens (Fassin 2011b).

Thus, “illegality” emerged as a dominant frame of migration during the 1990s (Karakayali and Rigo 2010), and consequently the imprisonment and confinement of forced migrants within camps or detention centres was the central measure of migration management. “Schengenland” was constructed exactly around the fight against “illegal” migration and the restriction of asylum procedures: these two figures became hence the new “intern enemies”. The EU border regime has thus turned forced migrants into “illegal” migrants through its deterrence and confinement policies, that led forced migrants to live “illegal” (Schuster 2011). This juxtaposition between forced migrants and “illegal” migrants entails the shift from the icon of refugee as “victim” to that of “enemy”, i.e. a dangerous subject that has to be treated as a social threat (Marchetti 2014). This process has been strengthened after the 11th September 2001, with the “war against terrorism” and the intensified process of borders closure and securitization of western societies. The issue of “security” and “public order” have been included in that the issue of forced migrants, who started to be seen with suspicion as they could be potential terrorists. As explained in the first chapter, the contemporary global (im)mobility regime is based on the classification of people and groups according to principles of perceived threats and risks, that was strengthened after the Twin Towers terrorist attack. I
have highlighted how the nexus between migration and asylum policy with that of security concerns was already shaped during the creation of an Area of Freedom, Security and Justice in the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997). After the 11\textsuperscript{th} September the creation of a real «security framework» can be observed, that involves political and public discourse, policies, administrative and political practices, as well as cultural imaginaries. The «security framework» is based on a new emergent domain, i.e. the insecurity domain (Huysmans 2006). The social process that leads to the perception of the “other” – a person outside the community – as a social threat entails the construction of an *(im)mobility regime* where some group of privileged people are allowed to freely move, and others not (Shamir 2005).

The political devices and practices have been changed in order to face this transformed figure of forced migrants, who is not any longer a “humanitarian victim” but a “social enemy” and a potential terrorist. This involves the introduction of visa restriction for non-OECD countries, the introduction of the principles of «safe third countries» and of «safe countries of origin», the proliferation of temporary legal statues, the detention of asylum-seekers and their restriction of mobility, as well as the (illegal) refoulements in the Mediterranean sea\textsuperscript{31}.

The humanitarian regime can be seen as the peculiar of 2000s until the emergence of the securitarian regime after 11 September 2001. But the humanitarian regime has not been fully replaced by the securitarian one. As the title of this chapter evokes, I consider the two regimes as dynamically interconnected and still active in the management and control of migrants’ mobilities. The combination and juxtaposition of these two regimes allow a sort of schizophrenia in the migration polices that oscillate between humanitarian principle – protection and reception – and securitarian devices – detention and confinement – that produce an ambivalent image of forced migrants perceived either as “victims” or as “villains” (Anderson 2008; Scheel and Rathfisch 2013). I will detail in the next chapters through the empirical material the effects of this mixed regime in the everyday life of migrant subjects in Europe.

**The erosion of asylum: externalisation polices and temporary protection**

We have already seen how the figure of “refugee” is socially constructed, and the crucial role of the reception societies – and their governments – in defining and producing this category. The Geneva Convention of 1950s has defined the modern category of “refugee”, i.e. a person

\textsuperscript{31} Italian government was negatively famous for the “illegal” refoulements of migrants’ ships in the Mediterranean see enacted during 2008-2009. The European Court of Human Rights pronounced a sentence against Italy because of these facts, the so called Hirsi sentence.
that escapes from a political persecution and cannot go back to its own origin country. The historical and geographical embedding of this Convention is a main critique, since it is rooted in western society, notably in Europe and its history. This characteristic is almost universally accepted in the literature on this topic. Even the universalistic nature of the Geneva Convention, based on the human rights principle, has to be seen as historically determined, as a product of European culture. Indeed, during the “Cold War” the single interests of national states have prevailed over that of the single person – universalistic principle – highlighting how national interests were prioritized over human rights. From a perspective of political philosophy, the Geneva Convention is subject to the same criticism as the construction of the human rights principle, which also is rooted in the European society. The main ambiguity of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen of 1789 is that inalienable and inviolable human rights are valid for persons as citizens of a national state. Thus, there is a “natural” linkage between the rights and the citizenship. People outside the “natural” order of national-states are treated as “abnormal” or “exceptional”. I discussed in the first chapter in the paragraph on citizenship the controversial relationship between citizenship and human rights, and detailed that the latter didn’t have sovereign actors that defended them (Turner and Isin 2007). Exactly this tension between human rights and national sovereignty, which characterized the global age, takes an important place in the asylum issue. The system of civic stratification (Morris 2002) and that of selection and rank of human mobilities through the legal status (Rigo 2007; De Genova 2013a) are examples of this tension.

Human rights are an exclusionary category, whose access is granted just to some specific categories of people: at the beginning of the Declaration of Right of Man and Citizen, women were in fact excluded. In European culture, universalism is, thus, something that has to be achieved through political struggles enacted by those excluded categories. Similarly, the right to political asylum is also a subjective rights, and hence it belongs to the same historical process of human rights. This is particularly evident by the fact that asylum-seekers have to prove the truthfulness of their reason of escape, namely a political persecution that concerns their own personal experience, otherwise they are accused to be “bogus asylum-seekers”. This is one characteristic of the wider process of erosion of asylum that has been developed in Europe since the 1990s, entailing a progressive reduction of the whole asylum status – comparable to that of citizens – in favour of reduced – temporary and precarious – legal statuses. The progressive substitution of precarious legal statues is precisely conform to that humanitarian reason explained by Didier Fassin (2011a): the humanitarian government is constitutive of the tension between inequality and solidarity, between a relation of domination
and a relation of assistance. Humanitarian reason governs *precarious lives* within social fields of power. Indeed, when compassion is exercised in the public space, it is therefore always directed from above to below, from the more powerful to the weaker, the more fragile, the more vulnerable, that are those those who can generally be constituted as “victims”. This compassion as moral drive for the politics is accompanied by an increasing repression, that led to a politic of «compassionate repression» direct to asylum-seekers (Fassin 2005).

The 1990s represent the period of the “asylum turn” into a regime of restrictive measures and closure of borders. This process is part of the wider project of European unification, and its strengthening of external borders, that treat “illegal migrants” and asylum seekers as the “internal enemies” against whom the new European society has to defend itself. We have seen how the category of forced migrants assumed a negative meaning during the 1980-90s, and how the European governments and institutions organized themselves in order to block “fake asylum-seekers” that were claimed to just take advantages from the European welfare-states. Because the Geneva Convention played an important role within the management of asylum, the European governments could not just reject all the asylum requests. Specifically, the principle of *non-refoulement*, ratified by the Art. 33 of the Convention, did not allow the governments to easily deport asylum-seekers to their origin countries. Thus, European governments started to implemented several measures that aimed to delimit and restrict the presence of forced migrants within European territory, without deporting them. The several forms of temporary protection that have been developed, supported exactly this national-states' interest to reduce the subjective right of asylum, originally characterized by its limitlessness. The UNHCR statistic data support this explanation, underlining how the whole status of political asylum shifted from 48% in 1982 to 15% in 2001 (Marchetti 2006), despite the strong increase of asylum requests during that period.

The new EU asylum policies have been considered as “measures alternative to asylum”, underlining hence the progressive substitution of the asylum status by reduced legal statuses. The process of policy harmonization, i.e. visa system harmonization, asylum harmonization and the control of external borders were important pillars within the process of European unification. Since the accesses to Europe has been the same for forced migrants and the so-called “economic migrants”, the authorities of the reception countries have been justified to frequently be suspicious of the truthfulness of the potential asylum-seeker arrived through “illegal” access.

The focus of the European Union on external borders is highlighted by one of the main policies for protection of the European area form the “illegal” entrances of non-EU citizen,
i.e. the so called asylum *externalisation*\(^{32}\). This policy builds on the previous bilateral or inter-governmental agreements between single European countries and third-neighbour countries or origin countries. The aim of European Union has been to guarantee the political and economical stability of the third neighbour countries, which were transit places for forced migrants heading Europe. By considering these countries as “safe”, the burden on the EU asylum system should be reduced, facilitated by development of programs of regional protection in order to improve the asylum system in these external areas (Cuttitta 2007). The idea of «safe state» builds on this concept was ratified by the EU member states in 1992 at the London Resolution. Three parts of that resolution, ratified by the EU member states ministers, turned out to be crucial for the contemporary new asylum system. The first is the «Resolution of manifestly unfounded applications for asylum», which regularizes the cultural clime of suspicion that had been developed since the 1980s around the “bogus asylum-seeker”. Indeed, this resolution legitimises a quick procedure in the elaboration of an asylum request considered unfounded:

> «This Resolution determines in which cases an application for asylum can be considered as manifestly unfounded and dealt with in accelerated procedures. It also establishes that Member States can use admissibility procedures where applications may be quickly rejected on objective grounds.»\(^{33}\)

These «*objective* grounds» are the base on which application for asylum can be rejected, and should refer to the “safe” situation in the origin country. According to that, European countries could decide whether in an origin country it is possible or not to be persecuted in accordance with the Geneva Convention. This refers to the second pillar of the new asylum system, i.e. the «Resolution on safe countries of origin». The third resolution introduces the principle of «safe third country», in other words those countries through which forced migrants have transited. This allows EU member states to reject forced migrants to these transit countries, which have been classified as such by the European states. Several critics and contradictions can be applied to these two principles of safe origin and transit countries: first, the decision taken by EU member states about which should be a safe country is partly arbitrary. Second, since asylum should be given on the base of an *individual* persecution, the general situation of the third or origin country should not influence the
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\(^{32}\) Asylum externalisation polices are not only a European prerogative, instead Australia and US have also developed devices and policies in order to externalize their national borders in neighbouring countries, as highlighted by the examples of the detention center for asylum-seekers build in 2001 in Nauru island as the only access way to reach Australia, or the positioning of Haitian refugees in the 1990s outside US territory, i.e. within Panama and Guantanamo – US enclaves (Cuttitta 2007).

decision on the application. Moreover, the principle of «safe third country» contradicts the core of Geneva Convention: indeed, if the asylum application can be accepted in Europe only for those forced migrants, who arrive directly in a European country – without passing through a third country –, then the asylum is not given any more on the base of the political persecution, but on the base of the route that forced migrants undertake. Thus, forced migrants' trajectories and migration paths become central, to the detriment of the reason of escape.

The London Resolution exemplifies how asylum policies have been based more on the interest of EU member states than on the asylum right of individual subjects since the 1980s. The Dublin Convention is consistent with this development and is the official European measure on the asylum topic. The Dublin Convention was signed in 1990 and entered into force in 1997. It ratified the principle that just one EU member state is responsible for the examination of a specific asylum application. This Convention rooted on the “one chance idea”, according to which forced migrants can apply for asylum just one time and only in one place. As consequence each single asylum application is anchored to just one domestic jurisdiction of the EU member state, where the asylum is applied. The aim of this principle was to avoid the so called “asylum shopping”, i.e. the possibility that forced migrants should apply for asylum in different EU member states. Of course, this measure has strongly restricted the forced migrants' freedom in moving around Europe and decide where apply for asylum. A second aim of Dublin Convention was to prevent the so called “asylum-seekers in orbit”, namely the transfer of asylum seekers between EU member states, with none of them willing to accept its application. In 2003 the Dublin Convention was replaced by the Dublin II Regulation\(^{34}\), which transposed the Convention to the EU jurisdiction. The Dublin II Regulation establishes the criteria and mechanisms for determining which EU member state should be responsible for examining an asylum application. Exactly these criteria are the most criticized and problematic. Indeed, the first EU member state through which the forced migrant has transited is the responsible state for an asylum claim. In this state finger prints\(^{35}\) need to be taken and stored or an asylum claim is lodged. If a forced migrant tries to apply for asylum in another European country, he or she can be deported back to this first arrival country. This principle influences the whole European system on management and control of migrants' mobilities, highlighting how the migrants' route has become the element that influences the destiny and projects of forced migrants at most. The states situated on the
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\(^{35}\) The EURODAC system allow to a change of information and data about all those forced migrants which cross the European borders and are registered by the authorities – through fingerprints.
The borders of Schengen area are hence more implicate, since they function as the “external doors” of the European Union. By contrast, the states situated in the centre of Schengen area, are less affected by the “irregular” arrivals. In June 2013 the Dublin III Regulation was approved, replacing the Dublin II Regulation, but it does not entail substantial changes on the original principles.

The Dublin Convention sheds light also on the power relations among national-states within the European Union, where north European countries, such as Germany and France, have played a crucial role in the definition of these European guidelines of migration and asylum policies. The case-studies presented in this work highlights exactly the tensions and contradiction inherent in the Dublin regime.

The introduction of several kinds of temporary protection, which have replaced the “whole” asylum status, was another crucial change that led to the progressive erosion of asylum principles and rights. The Council Directive 2004/83/CE of 29th April 2004 has ratified the minimum standards for the qualification and status of third country nationals or stateless persons as “refugees” or as persons who otherwise need international protection, and the content of the protection granted. This Directive has been interpreted as the result of the fears of several EU members states, that pushed towards a more restrictive jurisdiction rather than towards a protection of forced migrants subjective rights (Pretto 2010). The classification of the so-called “alternative measures to political asylum” appear within this Directive for the first time. The Article 2 listed the new residence permits alternative to asylum status, i.e. the «international protection», which includes the «refugee status» and the «subsidiary protection». While the former is an indefinite legal-status that provides rights almost at citizen level, the latter is a temporary legal-status that gives less rights, and entails more restrictions.

«‘person eligible for subsidiary protection’ means a third country national or a stateless person does not qualify as a refugee but in respect of whom substantial grounds have been shown for believing that the person concerned, if returned to his or her country of origin, or in the case of a stateless person, to his or her country of former habitual residence, would face a real risk of suffering serious harm as defined in Article 15, and to whom Article 17(1) and (2) do not apply, and is unable, or, owing to such risk, unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country» (Official Journal European Union, 30.09.2004).

The subsidiary protection is part of the international protection, so it refers to Geneva Convention, but it is a reduced residence permit. It is valid just for three years, after which the person loses the right to stay in the EU member state if he or she does not demonstrate the conditions requested in order to renew it. This status is reduced not only because of the time
limitation, but also because of several restrictions to the access of rights, as for example the freedom of movement. People with subsidiary protections are allowed to freely move in the whole Schengen area – in possession of a document given by the EU member state that functions as a pass – just for three months and as tourists; they are not allowed to live and work in other European countries.

The subsidiary protection already existed as a temporary legal-status within the Amsterdam Treaty under the name «humanitarian protection», but through the Directive 2004/83/CE it became an ordinary law. Also positive effects of this Directive were underlined. The introduction of subsidiary protection allowed to cover a wider number of people on the run asking for asylum (Schiavone 2015); but even though the number of people with an international protection has increased, the typology of this protection qualitatively decreased, because it became temporary. Moreover, the problem is not the subsidiary protection as such, but the fact that it substitutes the refugee status instead of being complementary to it. Together with the subsidiary protection other even more temporary and precarious residence permits have been progressively introduced in the EU member states, as for example the «humanitarian protection» anchored to single national jurisdictions, which assume characteristics based on the domestic laws of a single national-state.

The temporary protection is an old principle, already introduced by the UNHCR in the 1980s in order to reaffirm the validity of the non-refoulement principle, and in order to grant a protection to those who were denied the political asylum status. The introduction of this temporal status led to an overturn of the burden of proof: the national-state that gives protection does not have to demonstrate any longer whether the political reasons on which the protection was given still exist. Rather, the beneficiary of protection has to convince the authorities that it is necessary to lengthen its legal status. This temporary protection was introduced during the Balkan war, because the European national-states were reluctant in accepting the forced migrants fleeing from that war. Thus, the solution was to give them a temporary protection – for two years – that did not allow them to apply for asylum and excluded them to the access of several welfare-state benefits. Some European countries adopted even more restrictive measures such as the restriction of mobilities, the prohibition of work, the exclusion from education rights, and the prohibition of family reunification.

This political compromise highlights the aim of national-states to avoid the risk that “temporary migrants” become “stable migrants”, denying thus the access to several social rights, and ratifying the impossibility to obtain the political asylum, which the closer status to

\[36 \text{ Since the year 2014 the subsidiary protection provides a residence permit of five years, rather than three.}\]
that of citizens. These temporary protection statuses made historical impact because they imposed at the European level the principle of an alternative protection to that of political asylum. The temporary protection strengthens the role of territorial borders of national-states because they become also the borders of legal status. Thus, the legal statuses can be understood as internal borders, since they define the access of rights within the national territory (Cuttitta 2007).

It is possible to underline the general failure of the declared goals of European Union to diminish the differences among the EU members states in terms of asylum policies, which were ratified in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union modified by the article 2 of the Lisbon Treaty in 13th December 2007. The differences among EU members states are still existing, above all for the quality of the «common procedures for the granting and withdrawing of uniform asylum or subsidiary protection status» (paragraph D), the concrete legal protection, the efficiency of the «standards concerning the conditions for the reception of applicants for asylum or subsidiary protection» (paragraph F), and the quality – or even the existence – of programs of social integration37. For these reasons, the Dublin regime that restricts the freedom of migrant subjects in choosing the EU members state to live in, entails a differentiation of migrant subjects between the “lucky one”, which arrives directly to a EU members country with a “generous” welfare-state, and those “unlucky”, which arrive in a EU members country that does not grant the minimal standards. The contradiction of the European asylum system does not lay only on the slowness of the policies' harmonization, but also in the inadequate of the European Union to develop a strategic and forward-looking view on asylum policies, that is able to face the changed global scenario – the Dublin Convention was conceived in the 1990s. The main problem is the obstacle of any kind of internal mobility of forced migrants who have obtained some international protection. The Dublin III Regulation does not overcome this ideological base and structure on which the Dublin regime was build, leaving the precedence to the interests of the more influential EU members states to the detriment of forced migrants' freedom rights (Schiavone 2015).

Circularity of migration: the government of migrant mobilities through temporal legal status

The development of recent EU migration and asylum policies can be divided into three different policies implementations that are overlapping. The first – ratified by Schengen Agreement – has been the reinforcement of the external frontiers and the creation of an area of free circulation directed to the member states' citizens. The second one was characterized by the externalisation of borders in neighbouring non-EU countries. The third one refers to the management of circularity of migrants' mobility: this model is directed to the citizens of third countries who come to Europe temporarily for work, study, training or a combination of these, on the condition that, at the end of the period for which they were granted entry, they must reestablish their main residence in their country of origin.

The latter is a crucial point, since it highlights the awareness of European institutions about the presence of migrants – with and without a residence permits – in the European territory, and sheds light on the centrality of the management of their mobilities within European space. The internal circulation of migrants – and its restriction – in Europe has recently become a central issue. Indeed, European Union assumes that the circulation of migrants – even “illegal” migrants – is a matter that needs to be governed at the European level, and the government of circulation is a priority. This applies not only to the expulsion and repatriation of aliens but also to migrants' rights of establishment and work in European space (Karakajali and Rigo 2010). In 2007 the European Commission and Council opened a discussion about the issue of «circular migration», which converged into the so called “mobility package” – COM 16 May 2007. According to some juridical studies, the «circular migration» cannot be seen as an innovative model; it is rather an expedient to channel pre-existing forms of mobility into policy frameworks (Rigo 2011). Circular migration is thus a way of managing migration, whose temporal character emerges as the central feature: temporariness is one of the main factors that produces clandestine migration because it diminishes the possibility of acquiring stable legal status. The increasing “illegalization” of people, both through the tackling of uncontrolled movement and the loss of legal residential status, ultimately produces an informal rotation of migration. The “illegalization” of migrant movements has been considered as a de facto way of managing circular migration (Karakajali and Rigo 2010).

Scholars dealing with the topic of EU migration policies and control management of mobility underlined exactly how one of the main problems today are the obstacles to any kind of
internal mobility of migrants in Europe (Schiavone 2013). Entirely in line with the wider EU migration policies, the peculiarity of circular migration in Europe is supported by the idea of “transitionality” and temporariness of migration. This way of thinking on migration is deployed in juridical apparatus and management devices that perpetuates this temporariness. It limits migrants' access to the European social, political and juridical space. This system continuously sorts and ranks the access of migrants to Europe, and once they get inside it build hierarchies of access of rights (Morris 2003). The borders of legal status take a crucial role for the management mechanisms.

According to some scholars of the borders studies, the illegalization of human mobility is a direct consequence of this European regime of mobility control. This allows some authors to speak about an «economy of clandestinity» (Karakajali and Rigo 2010), where the proliferation of camps and other internal borders, rather than stopping the circulation of mobility, reinserts a socially commensurable time in the migrants' movements. It is possible to speak about a decelerated circulation of mobility as a device that rather than stopping the circulation of migrants aims to regulate its speed and to decelerate its velocity. Accordingly, the centrality of temporal over spatial regulation for an understanding of migration in the contemporary societies is clear when we shed light on how the time regime of the camp is distinguished by the dissociation of the body from its direct economic utilization. In the past, mobility was rendered productive by territorialisng movements and inserting those movements into a spatial regulation of bodies – as, for example, the workhouse in the guest workers’ era, which territorialized mobility in order to create a productive workforce. The today camps do not attempt to make migration economically useful by making migrants productive in the spatial order. Rather they make migrants productive by inserting them into a global temporal regime of labour, which is not based on disciplining bodies and regulating whole populations. The temporal regime of global labour follows the movements of people and invests where it finds a productive workforce in a state of flux (Karakajali and Tsianos 2010). In contrast to the guest-workers era, the control of migrant mobility today is not mediated through the welfare state, but seems to take place in an unregulated manner that is exposed to border controls. Thus, these authors prefer to speak about regime of migration control, rather than on control acted by the state. The notion of migration regime helps to stress the interdependence of knowledge, discourses, and practices of migration, and to conceptualize migration politics as structured by gaps and ambiguities.

The focus on the temporal dimension is crucial to explain the contemporary regime of migration control. Some authors claim the necessity of focussing rather on time and
temporalities than on space dimension in order to better understand the contemporary phenomenon of migration (Griffiths, Rogers, and Anderson 2013). Temporality has been analysed as a tool and vehicle – even a weapon of sorts – in the “fight against illegal migration” (Anderson, R. 2014), and also as a crucial characteristic of the border-crossing experience. Indeed, waiting, insecurity and eventual refusal have come to characterize border experiences for those without the economic, social and cultural capital needed to deploy ‘flexible citizenship’ in a world on the move (Ong 1999). Other authors focus on a «European regime of temporal control», in which the moving and changing workforce is rapidly embedded into capital’s productive structure (Rigo 2011). Migrant subjects living within the European border regime have experiences of passing through and living in «borderscapes» where the compression, elongation, and partitioning of time exerts effects of control, filtering, and selectivity (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013). In this temporal regime, the spaces where global capital invests constantly emerge and vanish as people move, migrate, and change their lives. The temporal barriers that enable the «transitionality» of migration affect not only undocumented migrants, but also, and to varying degrees, other migrants. The reiteration of borders over time provokes a continuous shift in the legal status of migrants, who, also after living and working in the national territory for long time, can still easily find themselves “irregular”. Accordingly, the high degree of mobility and flexibility within European space has tended to merge with the embeddedness of the juridical status of migrants (Rigo 2011). The legal status is the means through which mechanism of management and control enact on migrants lives, by the restriction of rights and mobility access. Therefore, these different kinds of reduced legal status have been conceptualized as internal borders (Cuttitta 2007). By governing borders it is not the territory that becomes a finite and scarce resource, but precisely people’s mobility – the legitimate exercise, which is is expropriated from its original bearing subjects.

The work on passports system conducted by John Torpey (2000) shed light on how modern national-states and international state system of which they are part, have expropriated the legitimate «means of movement» from individuals and private entities. Thus people have been deprived of the freedom to move across certain spaces and they have become dependent on states and the state system for the authorization to do so. Moreover, people have become dependent on states for the possession of an “identity” from which they cannot escape and which may significantly shape their access to various spaces. Torpey argues how state’s monopolization of the right to authorize and regulate movement has been intrinsic to the very construction of national-states: in fact, the procedures and mechanisms for identifying persons
were essential to the process of national states' construction, and in order to be implemented in practice, the notion of “national communities” must be codified in documents. Thus, states have implemented several reinforcing aspects: the (gradual) definition of “states” everywhere as national; the codification of laws establishing which types of persons may move within or cross their borders, and determining how, when, and where they may do so; the development of identification techniques from birth to death; the constitution of bureaucracies designed to implemented this regime of identification and to scrutinize persons and documents in order to verify identities. This process was supported by building an extensive administrative infrastructure necessary to carry out such regulation, which allows to speak about a «Revolution identificatoir» (Norie 1991, in Torpey 2000), namely the development of cards and codes that identified people unambiguously for administrative purpose. According to Torpey, national-state must embrace societies in order to penetrate them effectively, thus the unusual strength of modern states is infrastructural and their capacity to embrace their own subjects and to exclude unwanted others is the essence of that infrastructural power. The need to sort “who is who”, and particularly “what is what” becomes especially serious when states wish to regulate movement across external borders. Since states must implement the distinctions between people, they require documents in order to do so in individual cases and, hence, they developed a passports system that include external or international passports, internal passports or passes, and identification cards. These documents allow the state to control the movements across and within national borders, the identities of each person, and to securing citizen access to privileges and benefits. Torpey's work is crucial because it highlights how state monopolization on legitimate movement has rendered individual travellers dependent on state regulation of their movements, and how people become «prisoners of their identities» (Torpey 1998, p.256) which may sharply limit their opportunities to cross jurisdictional spaces. Moreover, it sheds light on the centrality of the national-states normativity in defining and sorting out who belongs where, and consequently in regulating the cross-borders human mobilities, with passports and documents being the markers of this right to move or not.

Although the national-states normativity considers a sedentary world as the norm(al) one, the procedural order of the EU migration regime does not aim to stabilize migrants' movements into sedentary juridical communities, neither through their integration nor through the definitive removal of those who resist integration, rather it aim to govern human mobility. It is crucial to underline how the EU migration regime is not just the outcome of institutional engineering but also the result of a dialectical struggle between migrants' subjectivities urge to
freely move across borders and the control of human mobility. That allows Enrica Rigo (2007) to speak about «illegal citizen» as a specific condition experienced by a large part of human mobility: not only border trespassers, but also those whose status is affected by the multiplication and reiteration of spatial and temporal borders. It is exactly this mechanism, which shapes the experiences of the protagonists of my work, as I will show in the next chapter.

Before I present the empirical data, it is useful to understand the historical, social and political context in which the phenomenon I analysed has been developed. I will present in the next paragraph an example of how the interconnection of humanitarian and securitarian regime works to govern migration phenomena. Notably, I will explain how the Mediterranean area is becoming a “laboratory” of human mobilities control. It will be presented the case of Italy, that shed light how the interconnection of humanitarian and securitarian devices has allowed to the construction of an emergency regime in order to govern the migrant subjects landed on the Italian shores.
Figure 1: Méditerranée sans frontières (Borderless Mediterranean Sea)

by Sabine Réthoré (2013)
3.2 The Mediterranean crisis: producing an area of contested human mobilities

In the last decades the Mediterranean sea has become one of the access-ways for migrant subjects that try to reach Europe without any document or visa. Although several statistics highlight that most irregular arrivals in Europe occur through other gateways, the South European border has been constructed in the public and political debates as the main problematic gateway for the access to Europe. Thus, the whole Mediterranean area has become a place to observe the human mobilities and the various ways through which the European policies attempt to control, select and manage them. This area is a complex space formed by the Mediterranean sea, North Africa and the southern European states, on which the «humanitarian border» is deployed (Walters 2011b).

The Mediterranean basin has a long history of migration paths that have criss-crossed it. Shedding light on the genealogy of the historical and present migratory routes, allows to highlight how they are produced by the interconnection of EU migration policies – that attempt to block and sort it – and the autonomous movement of migrant subjects opening always new pathways.

Research have highlighted how the migratory routes in this area emerge from power relationships that involve at least three actors: the European governments, the trafficking networks and the migrant subjects (Monzini, Pastore, and Sciortino 2004). The interaction between these actors lead to the creation of several migratory routes that continually change and modify themselves. For example, at the beginning of 2000s a main migratory route connected Sri Lanka with the Italian coasts – notably Sicily and Calabria coasts – through the Suez canal. The Italian and European political actors applied diplomatic and political pressure on Turkey and Egypt, Syria and Lebanon to close the route. The “closure” of this migratory route led migrant subjects to look for new and open trans-mediterranean corridors oriented to the North African countries, increasing hence the crossings of Sahara desert. Countries like Libya then started to assume a central role in the geopolitic relations between European and North African countries.

The shift of migratory routes towards Spain during the 1990s with the introduction of a visa

38 Until 2011 the main gateways towards Europe have been both the territorial one – Easter borders – and the “regular” one, notably with a regular document or visa.

39 For Mediterranean area is here understood the geographical one, namely the Mediterranean European countries, those of North Africa and the Mediterranean Mid East countries.
regime for Moroccan people is a second example. At the beginning of the 1990s the main migratory route to Spain went through the strait of Gibraltar. The Spanish government responded with an advanced surveillance system, the SIVE, that had an immediate and strong impact in blocking the arrivals in that area. Thus, migrant subjects traced new routes through the Canary islands starting both from central and west Africa passing through Capo Verde island toward the Canary islands, and starting from the west Sahara region. Due to the changed configuration of the migratory route that now started from the Sahara desert, the population moving to Europe has changed involving more people coming from Sub-Sahara region since 2005. Accordingly, it is possible to observe how the repression of the Gibraltar routes, led to the creation of new corridors from the Sub-Sahara region to Europe, which did not exist before (Monzini 2009).

These empirical research show the complexity of migratory routes and aim to deconstruct the rhetoric of the “invasion” of Europe through the Mediterranean gateway. Statistical research on the topic shows that since the 1990s the migration flows in the Mediterranean sea direct to Europe have continuously decreased, and the migrants composition is characterized by “white”, “orthodox”, and “European” people (cfr. Sciortino & Cvajner 2009, in Monzini 2009). Furthermore, the UNHCR statistic on migration mobilities clarifies that geographical areas other than Europe are far more involved in the reception of big numbers of migrants and displaced persons.
The governing of migrant mobilities across the Mediterranean area has been implemented in different ways and through several devices as the bilateral agreements, the readmission agreements, and the militarization of Mediterranean sea through Frontex operations. Between 1998 and 2001, the South European countries have first adopted the readmission agreements with transit or origin countries as Tunisia, Albania, Egypt and Turkey. The readmission agreements were supported by coordinated police operations, as for example those between Italy and Albania where the Italian coastguard and navy assiduously controlled the Albanian coasts, reducing hence the irregular departure from this area. Alongside, they implemented also bilateral agreements as that between Spain and Morocco and that between Italy and Libya in order to block migration from these neighbouring third-countries. Thus, in 2003 and 2004 the number of arrivals in Italy and Spain decreased, but it increase again in the following years.

Since 2002 the so-called “second generation” of arrivals started, coinciding with the new migratory routes through the Atlantic ocean towards Spain and from Libya through the strait of Sicily. The European Agency for controlling and managing the migrant mobilities in the South external EU border was created in these years, i.e. Frontex. The military operation implemented by Frontex and some national navies began in 2005, aiming at intercepting the
migrants ships in the Mediterranean sea and rejecting them back to the North African coasts. Moreover, Frontex activities operate together with local governments of some African countries in order to shift the EU border as far away from Europe as possible. In this way the “illegal migration” is produced (Anderson, R. 2014b), and the migrant subjects gradually became “illegal” en route (Coutin 2005).

At this time, Libya became the main transit country towards Europe, while being also one of the major immigration countries in Africa. The new migratory route that emerged in these years went from the Libyan coasts through the strait of Sicily, specifically towards the small island of Lampedusa. The creation of this new migratory route in the early 2000s has to be interpreted as a combination of the historical relationship between Libya and the Sahelian countries, of changes in the Mediterranean routes utilised by human smugglers and in the European policies of controlling them, and of the deterioration of the crisis in Sudan and at the Horn of Africa (Ciabarri 2014). The new route became the main way to arrive in Europe in the Mediterranean area: according to the Schengen Committee there were 13,594 arrivals in 2004, 22,824 in 2005, 21,400 in 2006, 16,875 in 2007, and 34,540 in 2008. The Sicilian coasts and Lampedusa have already been places of first arrivals for migrant subjects. Before 2000 most migrants boats were however from Tunisia, which means just ten hours of travel compared to the two or three days from Libya. Furthermore, the migrant subjects travelling from Tunisia were mainly seasonal workers coming from the North African countries, which were used to travel to Sicily since 1993. By contrast since 2002 migrant subjects were predominantly from the Sub-Sahara region and from Asian – Pakistan, Bangladesh, Iraq and Palestine (Monzini et al. 2004). These two changes, i.e. the longer boat travels from Libya – therefore more dangerous, increasing the number of accidents – and the new composition of people coming from Sub-Sahara region, led to the construction of the rhetoric of “massive invasion from Africa”, which characterized the public and political debate in Europe and Italy in subsequent years.

The fact that Libya has been a destination country for the migration movements within Africa has also played a crucial role in the redefinition of the migrant population. Since the 1960s Libya has become a country of immigration, attracting people from neighbouring North African countries, mainly because of a growing oil industry. Migrants were employed with short-term contracts in the oil industry and related infrastructural and agricultural projects in the administration and education sector (Pastore 2007). At the beginning of the 1990s the number of migrant subjects from Sub-Sahara region increased strongly, because of the changed geopolitical power relations: Libya was internationally isolated through a United
Nation embargo, due to the alleged involvement of Libya in cases of international terrorism. The international sanctions were interrupted in 2003, but already since the 1990 Colonel Muammar Gaddafi⁴⁰ changed his political relations within African region. He opened the southern Libya's frontier inaugurating a new policy of political alliances and influence towards Sub-Saharan countries⁴¹. Gaddafi started a new project to revive the national economy through the employment of Sub-Saharan migrants – the main origin countries were Sudan, Chad, Niger, Mali, Nigeria, Ghana, Senegal, Eritrea, Ethiopia and Somalia. This shift in the African political and economic relations entailed a transformation of the whole region⁴². This changed geopolitical configuration within Africa together with the policies of migration control carried out by European countries and the change in human smugglers’ strategies in the Mediterranean basin (Monzini 2004), have produced the migratory route from Libya to Lampedusa, have created Libya as a transit territory toward Italy, and Lampedusa was build as the “dramatic” and spectacularized place of landings.

Several works shed light on the construction of specific discourses and categories around the migration issue, notably on the recent Libya-Lampedusa migratory corridor. This production of discourse on migration contributes to the construction of social icons and social imaginaries that lengthen and pervade the public and political debate and the European perception of this phenomenon, obscuring its complexity. For example, from the diplomatic interaction between European countries and Libya two specific discursive categories have emerged: the category of “transit” and the category of “sub-Saharan migrants” (Ciabarri 2014). The first refers to the fact that Libya was built as a corridor of transit of African migrants who try to reach Europe, obscuring its nature of immigration country and the fact that most of migrants living in Libya didn't plan to come to Europe. According to some scholars (Pastore 2007; Morone 2011) the idea of “transit” was a sort of invention of the African leaders that aimed at building up negotiation power with European countries. Increasing the number of potential migrants in transit was part of this dynamic. This category of “transit” has been taken over by the European governments in order to reinforce another constructed category, i.e. that of an uncontrollable “massive invasion” of “desperate” people coming from Africa (De Haas 2008). The construction of the “Sub-Sahara migrant” category conceals migrants’ diverse motivations, trajectories and areas of origin, obscures the issue of

---

⁴⁰ The Colonel Muammar Gaddafi was the Libyan revolutionary and politician who governed Libya from 1969 to 2011.

⁴¹ For a deep analysis of the history of Libya and its role in the African geopolitical relations, see Morone, 2011.

⁴² For a deep analysis if these interconnected phenomenon see Ciabarri, 2014.
refugees and reinforces the idea of “one travel” and “one route” (Ciabarri 2014).

The island of Lampedusa has been constructed as the site where the «border spectacle» takes place (De Genova 2013b). The spectacle of the migrants landings in Lampedusa, and that of the shipwrecks and rescues, have been intensified since Lampedusa received a lot of attention from the media becoming the icon of the “illegal” landings place in Europe. Though several research have highlighted that the main irregular migrants’ arrivals occur through ways not crossing the Mediterranean sea, the Lampedusa island became the EU border hotspot of “illegal” migration, useful for the «political spectacle» (Cuttitta 2012; 2014). The image of Lampedusa is directly connected to the deaths in the Mediterranean sea, and hence to the “dramatic side” of the migration. And exactly the images of this “dramatic side” of migration are amplified by the media, which give a hyper-visibility to the mass of migrants bodies that landed in the island, alive or dead. Thus, the necessity of a management – and control – of such multitude of migrants bodies came to the fore, supported by the discourses around the protection of EU-citizen “security”. The image of «dangerous bodies and bodies in danger» (Gatta 2012b, p.15) represents precisely the interconnection between securitarian and humanitarian devices that are implemented to govern them. Indeed, the Sicilian small island has became a sort of “bordering laboratory” where unlawful detention, forced deportation from the island and push-back operations from neighbouring waters occur until the years 2013-2014. The «border spectacle» that takes place in Lampedusa is a key moment in the construction of the social category of “clandestine” people, and through this process the juridical production of “illegality”, enacted by the European border-control policies (Gatta 2012a), is hidden. There were several political choices that entailed the construction of Lampedusa as the embodiment of EU border regime and the “illegal” African migration. These policies have to be understood as a part of the wider government system of migration that combines securitarian and humanitarian discourses and devices: Lampedusa has thus been considered a privileged stage for the securitarian and humanitarian “border spectacle”

---

43 In 2007 arrivals in Lampedusa represented 13% of irregular immigration towards Italy, instead the 64% of “irregular” arrivals were represented by the so called overstayers, i.e. those people entered in Italy with a regular visa, which remained once the visa was expired. Most of them were coming from east Europe (Pastore, Monzini and Sciortino 2004).

44 In 2014 the Italian government applied the rescue operation called Mare Nostrum that was supposed to avoid the high number of deaths in the Mediterranean sea. This operation was substituted at the end of the year 2014 with a Frontex operation of border-control called Triton.

45 At the beginning of 2000s, the concept clandestine person was progressively introduced within the Italian public and political debate above all by the xenophobe party Lega Nord. This word defines the undocumented migrants emphasising the “illegal” characteristic of undocumented migration, and thus its danger for the public security. That led to the development of the so called “security package” in 2008, which introduced the “crime of clandestinity”. The latter was afterwards declared unlawful because against the Italian Constitution, since it criminalize a status and not an action.
The production of Lampedusa as “border spectacle” is also related to the evolution and changes of the migratory routes, as previously explained. The 2008 was a crucial year in the genealogy of Euro-Mediterranean border control system, because in that year the number of refoulements and failed rescues significantly increased, and thus increased the number of migrants shipwrecks on Lampedusa coasts. Moreover, the bilateral agreement between Italy and Libya was achieved. On 30 August of 2008 the «Treaty of Friendship, Partnership, and Cooperation between Italy and Libya» was signed by Gaddafi and the Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi. Although this bilateral agreement was built around the rhetoric of public excuses and the ending of the colonial relations between the two countries, the issue of fight against terrorism and “illegal” immigration through security devices has prevailed. Indeed, the Friendship Treaty allowed to implemented the devices of expulsion, deportation and (forced) readmissions of migrants back to Libya. The Treaty of Friendship indicated a normalisation of the relations between Italy and Libya that were establishing several bilateral and readmission agreements on the fight against terrorism, organised crime and “illegal” immigration (Ronzitti 2009) since the 2000s.

Already between 2004 and 2005, Italy and Libya were protagonists of several collective repatriations and deportation of migrants and asylum-seekers from the Lampedusa island to Libya – around 1500 people were deported (Andrijasevic 2006b). The Treaty of 2008 led to the strengthening of these procedures. Moreover, the refoulements in the Mediterranean sea towards the Libya coasts increased and, together with the collective deportation and the increased number of deaths in the sea, provoked a combated international debate around the failed protection of human rights of migrants, notably around the possibility to apply for asylum. These (irregular) refoulements implemented by the Italian-Libya cooperation led to a temporary deterrence effect, and the departures from Libya temporarily decreased. According to the statistics of the Italian Ministry of the Interior, the “irregular” landings in Italy coming from Libya turned from 31,281 in 2008 to 3,185 in 2009; the Italian government and European Union managed, thus, to shut for a short period the main migratory route through the Mediterranean sea, albeit they just had diverted the “irregular” flow of migrants to the Greek-Turkish border (Campesi 2011b). The imprisonment of a large number of the Sub-Saharan migrants that were rejected back to Libya was another consequence, where they were arrested as “illegal migrants” (Mororne 2011).

The position of European Union was controversial. In 2010 the European Commission reaffirmed its support to the Italian-Libyan agreement and its aim to fight the “illegal” migration, pressing for a strengthening of cooperation between Libya and Frontex. This
cooperation shed light on the attempt of EU institutions to delocalise the southern European border from the Italian coasts to the North African coasts and to the southern Libyan border (Andrijasevic 2006b; Morone 2011). Nevertheless, on 28 April 2010 the European Council has pronounced a sentence against Italy for the refoulements policy, which was adopted in 2008 and 2009. This example highlights the contradictory position of European Union and the complexity of political relations among it: indeed, Italy disagreed with European Union around the shared responsibility of the “illegal” landings on Italian coasts, which are the southern border of the European Union. This internal diplomatic and political conflict in the EU has increased since 2011 and the changed geopolitical situation of migratory routes because of the events of “Arab Spring” and Libya war.

The construction of emergency regime in Italy. First phase: facing the “Arab Spring crisis” through the state of emergency

The year 2011 has marked a turning point in the history of international migration across Africa and Europe and, consequently, also in the European control and management system of migrant mobilities. It is possible to find the main origin of these changes in two interconnected events that occurred in this year: the so-called Arab Spring and the Libya war. The name “Arab Spring” was built by the media during the year 2011 as an umbrella term for the several political uprisings, revolts and riots occurred in several countries, in which the majority of population belong to the ethnic category of “Arab”.

There are some common denominators that allow to consider these heterogeneous events under a wider category: the generational component – the majority of the participants to the uprisings were young people –, the role that the new social networks such as facebook and twitter played in the protests, and the causes that triggered the uprisings as the economic crisis, the lack of individual freedom, and the violation of human rights.

The role that these diverse uprisings and revolutions have played in the reconfiguration of the geopolitical balance in Europe and in the Mediterranean area – referring to migration control system – is of relevance for this work. First of all, the Arab Spring has changed the fragile

---

46 Actually, even the category “Arab” results inadequate, because the countries involved in the uprisings named “Arab Spring” present a variegated population, which do not correspond just to the Arabic one, even if it is the majority. The countries that fall under the events named “Arab Spring” are Syria, Libya, Egypt, Tunisia, Yemen, Algeria, Iraq, Bahrain, Jordanian and Djibouti. Other countries that were less involved are Mauritania, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Sudan, Somalia, Morocco and Kuwait.

47 For a more in-depth analysis of the phenomena named “Arab Spring” see the book edited by P. Amar & V. Prashad (2013), “Dispatches from the Arab Spring: Understanding the New Middle East”.
political balance between the European and the North African countries, which was build over the years through bilateral agreements, the role of some neighbouring North African countries as “gendarmes of European borders”, and the construction of a regime of permanent emergency build around the image of “massive invasion”. This crisis of the European border regime post-2011 is thus mainly political, not migratory (Campesi 2011b). Moreover, the uprisings in North Africa have changed also the political relations within Africa, and thereby the migratory routes; therefore it is considered a breaking point in the history of international migration crossing the Mediterranean sea.

The protests and uprisings in some countries of the North African region started in January 2011, which led to the resignation of the Egyptian president, Hosni Mubarak, and the fall of the Tunisian regime of Ben Ali. In February 2011 the insurrection in Libya started, which quickly turned into a civil war between the Eastern region of this country, where the revolt started, and the Western region, which remained under Gaddafi’s regime control. In March 2011, Libya received some international sanctions by the United Nation, and on 19th March started the military intervention first enacted by France, and then by the NATO. The end of war in Libya was officially declared in October 2011, when Gaddafi was killed by the rebels. These events provoked an enhance of landings on the southern Italian coasts, namely on Lampedusa: around 63,000 fleeing people arrived in Italy in 2011. The Italian government responded with the declaration of a state of emergency in order to manage such “exceptional” situation.

According to the Copenhagen School of Critical Security, the concept “securitization” allows to identify a process of social construction that pushes an area of regular politics into the area of security by resorting to a discursive rhetoric of emergency, threat, and danger aimed at justifying the adoption of extraordinary measures. The latter are reached above and beyond the law and the ordinary political process. Italian government deployed extraordinary measures, although the number of landings was relevant – if we think that just from January to May 2011 the number of arrivals was already about 30,00048 – but not exceptional (Campesi 2011).

From May to October 2011 around 30,000 people from Libya landed in Italy fleeing the war, but almost no one was a Libyan citizen: the main nationalities were Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Eritrea, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Somalia and Sudan. All these people were living in Libya for several years before, both for working or waiting to reach Europe.

48 Many of them were Tunisians and a minor percentage were fleeing from Libya.
The statistics of people fleeing from Libya shows that the situation in Italy was “extraordinary” but not “exceptional”, since the majority of movements was directed towards North African countries next to Libya. According to the IOM statistics\textsuperscript{49} about 790,000 people have crossed Libyan borders fleeing the war: 263,554 persons towards Egypt, 345,489 persons crossed the Libyan-Tunisian border, 13,962 persons towards Algeria, to Niger 96,231 people, to Chad 84,283, to Ghana 11,386, to Mali 11,395, to Nigeria 3,391, to Burkina Faso 1,661, to Mauritania 783, to Guinea 680, to Togo 369, and to Senegal 406 persons. The majority of Libyan citizens that left the country fled towards the neighbouring states. By contrast the sub-Saharan migrants moved either back to their origin countries or towards Europe.

\textbf{Figure 3: Map of people fleeing from Libya's war to the neighbourhood countries, IOM 2012}

\textsuperscript{49} Migrants caught in crisis. The IOM experience in Libya, published in 2012,  
http://publications.iom.int/bookstore/free/MigrationCaughtinCrisis_forweb.pdf
These numbers presented in figure 2 show how Europe was not the main landing region, highlighting that the “emergency” situation after the Arab Spring and Libyan war was constructed by the European and Italian authorities. As some works highlight, the use of emergency to frame this migratory flow has influenced the public and political debate, the legislative measures concerning the status of migrants, and ultimately the biographies of migrants themselves (Campesi 2011b; Marchetti 2012; Dal Zotto 2014). Minimize the importance of this event, not opening, for example, the first aid and reception centres in Lampedusa, was one of the first reaction of the Italian government to the first landings – on 15th January 2011. After the continuous increase of landings on Lampedusa shores the Italian government changed its position. Rather suddenly, between the 12th and 13th February the national and local authorities started to speak about an “emergency” situation, using exaggerating terms such as the definition as «biblical exodus», as said by the Italian Minister of the Interior, Roberto Maroni. Suspending the transfers from Lampedusa was the first action implemented by the Italian government; consequently thousands people remain blocked on the island without any reception facilities and increasing, thus, the border spectacle of the “invasion of Lampedusa” (Sciurba 2012). On the 12th February 2011 a Decree of the President of the Council of Ministers declared the «state of humanitarian emergency» until the 31st December 2011. The decree called for the necessity «to enact extraordinary and urgent measures aimed at establishing structures suitable for providing the necessary humanitarian assistance, while ensuring the effective fight against illegal immigration and identification of individuals who might represent a danger to the order and the national public safety» 50. These words are a further example of the entangled interrelation between humanitarian and securitarian discourses that entailed the implementation of blurred devices for governing migration. The rhetoric of the “crisis” and the urgency to solve it led to the legitimation of the suspension of the ordinary rule invoking exceptional powers. The Italian politicians used dramatic words and sentences within the discourses about the situation of the migrants’ landings such as «is a new ‘89» 51, referring hence to other historical turning point that evokes the fall of a wall.

The Minister of Interior, Roberto Maroni, insisted for an intervention of the whole European Union from the start, claiming that «we are in front of a humanitarian emergency. I asked to Europe to implemented all the possible measures to tackle this catastrophic situation. Italy

50 Translation of the author of the Decree of the President of the Council of Ministers Of 12th February 2012.
51 Declaration of the Minister of Interior, Roberto Maroni on 14th February 2011.
cannot be left alone\textsuperscript{52}. Thus, a subtle but constant political dispute regarding the management of “extraordinary” migration flows towards Europe crossing Italy has been started between Italy and European Union, notably with the neighbouring northern European countries such as Germany and France. These internal political relations and conflicts have played a crucial role in the management of this situation, influencing the legislative framework and thus, the trajectories of migrant subjects – as we will see in the further chapters. The behaviour of the European Union actors has been ambiguous. Although a plan of financial and technical aids for Italy was approved\textsuperscript{53} – since it was recognised that the migrants flow from North Africa was “a truly European issue” –, the European Commission rejected the “humanitarian emergency”, framing the migrants flow as an ordinary, albeit particularly intense, case of “irregular” migration and invited the Italian government to strengthen border control and repatriate the “illegal” immigrants from North Africa. Also the UNHCR supported this view, speaking about an «ordinary case of mixed migration» and inviting the institutional actors involved to scale back their rhetoric and not voice alarmist views (Campesi 2011b).

The discourses of the Italian government were different on the national and local level, where they emphasised the securitarian issue. The Italian government focused on the guarantee of the public order during the first phase through the implementation of securitarian devices, overlooking the humanitarian protection issue. Indeed, in relation to the decree that declared the state of emergency, on 18\textsuperscript{th} February Prime Minister Berlusconi issued an ordinance establishing «urgent civil protection provisions to tackle the state of humanitarian emergency in the country due to an exceptional influx of citizens from African countries, as well as to counteract and manage the inflow of non-EU citizens'».\textsuperscript{54} This ordinance gave extraordinary powers to the Prefect of Palermo, Giuseppe Caruso, to implement all the measures necessary to deal with the emergency, also in derogation of the laws in force. Between 18\textsuperscript{th} February and 5\textsuperscript{th} April 2011, the commissioner Caruso and the Italian government presented a threefold plan in response to the “emergency situation”: to make full use of Lampedusa's reception facilities; to organize an airlift to the existing centers in the rest of Italy and to open temporary camps to absorb the increasing number of people landing on the Sicilian island. Concerning the temporary camps, the commissioner decided to create tent cities on abandoned military sites or other remote locations, such as Manduria, Trapani Kinisia, Caltanisetta, Potenza, San Gervasio, Santa Maria Capua Vetere, and Mineo. Some migrant subjects were transferred

\textsuperscript{52} Interview of Roberto Maroni at TM news on 24\textsuperscript{th} of February 2011 (translation of the author).
\textsuperscript{53} The “Hermes operation” of Frontex
\textsuperscript{54} Ordinance n.3924 -11A02503
from Lampedusa to these “irregular” camps, even though there were serious doubts on the legitimacy of such *de facto* detention. Other migrant subjects were relocated to the already existing CARA (Centro di Accoglienza per Richiedenti Asilo, Asylum-Seeker Reception Centre) or CIE (Centri di Identificazione ed Espulsione, Identification and Expulsion Centers), without any clear distinction based on their claims (Marchetti 2012).

«In that period of the famous *Emergenza Nord Africa*, it was decided that Italy was at the center of a global emergency. […] The Italian government gave extraordinary power to the Prefect of Palermo, who had to organize the reception notwithstanding the national, European and international laws. […] Due to the high number of landings, the Ministry of Interior decided to forbid the access to the CIE and all the new tent camps also for the members of Parliament, in order to guarantee the public order. Of course, the UN organisation were allowed to enter, otherwise the notwithstanding of the laws would have been too serious! […] We organized several massive visits for one week, with the police rejecting us on the camps’ doors. At the end this prohibition went on just 15 days, afterwards they let us get inside. But thereafter, the new tent camps functioning as reception centers have been transformed overnight into real CIE. These were the camps of Trapani Kinisia, Santa Maria Capua Vetere, and that of Potenza» (Interview with a Senator of the Democratic Party responsible of the Human Right Commission, interviewed by the author in September 2011)

The nature of these new centers was blurry, oscillating from reception centers to centers for identification and expulsion (CIE): the ordinance no. 3935 issued on 21\(^{th}\) April 2011 stated that the temporary reception structures already established in the municipalities of Santa Maria Capua Vetere (Caserta), Palazzo San Gervasio (Potenza) and Trapani Kinisia, would be transformed into CIE. According to the *emergency regime* and the state of exception none of these centers were mentioned on the Ministry of the Interior’s website. That triggered several protests among the Italian civil society and several riots enacted by migrants within these centers, leading to the closure of the centers after several months. The Italian government created a sort of *limbo* during this period, waiting a reaction from the European Union, with no clear procedure regarding the status of the mainly Tunisian migrants.

«Santa Maria Capua Vetere was born as CAI\(^{55}\) during the second wave of Tunisian immigrants. It was a big car park, where the Civil Protection build some tents […] During the first period, almost 1500 persons managed to escape from this camp, but the escapes stopped when they decided to transform it from CAI to CIE. At this time, just the bad luck decided that those 200 people which were inside in that moment, should remain detained there. The night of this Ministry Decree there was a riot, a very aggressive fight between the migrants and the police: 100 migrants managed to escape. Then, the remaining 100 persons experienced a juridical limbo: there was no information from the government about their legal status, and a lot of them have their family in Belgium, France, Germany, and even in Italy […] After the last fire trigged by the migrants inside

\(^{55}\text{CAI is the acrimonious of Centro di Assistenza e Identificazione (Center for Assistance and Identification), which was one example of the temporary camps established during the state of emergency without a clear legal status: it was neither a CARA nor a CIE, a blurred structure in-between.}
the camp, they were all transferred to the CARA of Crotone and Foggia. Transferring these people to structures that were no more CIE, was more or less an admission of guilt by the government. Of course, since a CARA is an open structure, the majority of migrants transferred there, have managed to escape. The last fire was on June 2011, after which the camp has been closed». (Interview with a Senator of the Democratic Party responsible of the Human Right Commission, interviewed by the author in September 2011)

The attention of the media increased, the images of crowded camps in south Italy full of “turbulent North African migrants” pervaded the everyday news, enhancing hence the feeling of an emergency situation.

**The construction of emergency regime in Italy. Second phase: Libyan war and the “Emergenza Nord Africa” program**

The second phase of the Italian political intervention spans the period from 5th April to 31st December 2011. The Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi issued a second decree that confirmed the state of emergency and stated that «citizens from North African countries who entered the national territory between 1st January and midnight on 5th April 2011 are eligible for the temporary protection measures provided for by Art. 20 of the Consolidated Text of the Law on Immigration 286/98». The Italian government gave a six-months temporary protection for humanitarian reasons to the Tunisians citizens that arrived until the 5th of April. This decree refers to a provision contained in the 1998 Consolidated Text of the Law on Immigration that allows the application of temporary protection for humanitarian reasons related to conflicts, natural disasters, or other particularly serious events occurring in non-EU countries. A similar decree was applied in 1999 during the emergency of Kosovo war (Marchetti 2012). As explained in the first paragraph, the temporary protection was introduced in Europe during the Balkans war, and can be interpret as a compromise between the pressure from humanitarian actors asking EU national states to receive people fleeing from war, and the reluctance of EU national states to accept these people, treating them as “temporary guests”.

The temporary protection issued in 2011 allowed the Tunisian citizens to move freely within the EU juridical space, and this was a matter of conflict between the Italian government and some North European countries, namely France. Indeed, the emission of 14,000 six-months temporary protections was presented as a great government action to the Italian citizens that solved the “Lampedusa's crisis” through the emptying of the island. Moreover, the Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi supported this action with political discourse that underlined the inactivity of European Union in the assistance of Italy during the management of this
“emergency situation”, and he encouraged the Tunisian citizens to move further to other European countries. The reaction of the French government was to issue a Circular that listed strict conditions for the free movement of Tunisian citizens in the country on 6th April. It allowed the police authorities to return the migrant subjects who entered France without the appropriate condition to Italy. The border of Ventimiglia 56 between Italy and France became the place of a new “border spectacle” during these days, allowing the French police to enact massive refoulements of Tunisian “illegal” citizen back to Italy, temporally suspending, thus, the Schengen cooperation protocol in favour of national interests 57.

As a second action, the Italian government issued a bilateral agreement between Tunisia and Italy that aimed to manage the “emergency” situation of “massive landings”. According to this agreement, all the new arrivals since the 6th April would be treated as “illegal migrants” and had to return to Tunisia. Indeed, the agreement entailed the strengthening of controls at Tunisians coasts, and Tunisia had to accept the repatriation measures applied by Italy to undocumented Tunisian migrants that landed on Italian shores after 5th April.

None of these government decisions was issued or approved by the Parliament, they rather came immediately into effect without any public debate. Moreover, the return procedures were highly questionable from a legal point of view: the Italian government abused the so-called “deferred refusal of entry”, which usually can be applied only in frontier zones, applying it also for those migrants already within the national territory. That sheds light on how the state of emergency led to a state of exception that spread to the whole Italian territory, but prevailed particularly in the temporary camps created in 2011. Lampedusa and the other temporary camps became a sort of an “extraterritorial frontier zone” where the migrant subjects, despite being well inside the Italian territory, could never reach the “legal border” (Campesi 2011b). In this way border places are created within the national territories, as a product of the European border regime.

Border places are spaces that differ from the norm, characterized by uncertainty and indeterminateness; they are in-between space, borderland (Walters 2011a). The juridical indeterminateness emerges also from the discourses of the political actors, which use generic figures in order to evoke a confused distinction between humanitarian and securitarian discourses, that legitimate their policies.

56 Ventimiglia is a small city in Italy situated on the border between Italy and France.

57 At this time the Chambery bilateral readmission agreements (1997) was applied, according to which Italy and France are each allowed to return illegal immigrants found in their own territory when it could be materially proved that they had transited through the other country. The same bilateral agreement has been applied again in June 2015, during another “Ventimiglia crisis”.
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«This emergency can be solved only and when the Tunisian government will block the migration flows controlling its own coasts, and when it will take back the clandestine people that arrived [in Italy]. These clandestine people have to be repatriated, this is the position of our government […] The destiny of a clandestine person is that to be detained in a center, to be identified and then repatriated. So these are different centers, they can detain an elevated number of people, because they are temporary centers for the repatriation. […] For the profugi it is a different story. Since they are profugi, they will have the right to a refugee status, and they can remain in Italy also for many years. I confirm that 2,000 profugi have just arrived from Libya, almost all are people from Eritrea and Somalia». (Roberto Maroni, Minister of Interior, Press conference after the Council of Ministers on 31 March 2011)

Looking at the discourse of the Italian Minister of Interior, we can observe the use of two categories in order to diversify the migrant subjects: clandestine people and profugi. Both categories do not correspond to a clear figure of a particular person or to a juridical-administrative condition, they are rather generic definitions used in the public and political debate, and hence they create a specific imaginary that influence the policies. The term clandestine is used to support the fight against the “illegal” migrants and the rhetoric of security and public order; the word profugo cannot be translated into English, it describes a person escaping from a war but it denotes neither “asylum seeker” nor “refugee” nor “international protection beneficiary” (Marchetti 2012). Despite the blurred nature of these figures, they have an influence on the implementation of the migration policies, since they represent categories of governance: the clandestine figure is useful for the «economy of clandestinity» (Karakayali and Rigo 2010), and the profugo figure for the humanitarian government. Furthermore, the profugo figure has exactly represented the intersection of the humanitarian and the securitarian issue during 2011, that was managed through the emergency regime in Italy.

The frequency of political discourses on the “emergency” situation and the “invasion” of migrants, both “illegal” and forced migrants – profugi – played a crucial role in the construction of the emergency regime. Accordingly, what securitizes a given issue is not the language per se, through its performative power, but the symbolic power of the words spoken by certain key social and political actors (Campesi 2011). These actors work in a complex structure of cultural, political, economic, institutional, and legal constraints that entails the creation of a hybrid reception system, where humanitarism and securitarism fuse and confuse each other. The overlapping of the humanitarian and securitarian reasons produced a blurred reception system characterized by this ambivalence. This becomes clearer from grasping the so-called exceptional reception program “Emergenza Nord Africa” (North Africa Emergency), applied in Italy since April 2011.
At the same time of the “solution” of the “Tunisian crisis”, the landings of people fleeing Libya war strongly increased, and the people arriving on Italian coasts quickly exceeded the number of 2,000 stated by the Minister Maroni. Thus, another “urgent situation” needed to be managed, and the Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi issued an ordinance, which supported the second decree of state of emergency. The ordinance no. 3933 of 13th April 2011 established a new extraordinary commissioner and the management of the new migrants flows was assigned to the Civil Protection Department. An agreement was signed by the Italian government, the Italian regions, the National Association of Italian Municipalities (ANCI) and the Union of Italian Provinces (UPI), which tasked the Civil Protection Department with planning all the activities necessary to displace the incoming migrants, based on the population numbers of the various regions. This new program was called “Emergenza Nord Africa”, well known in Italy with its acronym ENA. From a juridical point of view, the ordinance was not clear: the Commissioner «shall prepare the plan for distribution on the national territory, the initial reception, and accommodation of non-EU citizens from North Africa who have arrived in the country and have been granted the status of profughi or with respect to whom temporary protection measures have been taken». The status of profughi does not exist, it was immediately clear that this special program was designed for a subgroup of people fleeing the Libyan war: neither Tunisian nor Libyan citizens, but mostly “Sub-Sahara migrants” that were residents in Libya – my research protagonists.

"I want to start my story from Libya. I was living in Libya, in Tripoli, the capital. I was working there. I lived in Libya five years and I was happy, I didn't need to come to Europe. But at the beginning of 2011 the war came in Libya. In this time I had decided to visit my family in my country, but unfortunately begun the war. Since the war started, the situation turned very bad: they closed the airport, it was impossible to go out from the country. You had to stay at home all the day long, you couldn't go outside, otherwise you could be shot. You couldn't take the bus, you couldn't go out from Libya territory. There were just two possibilities: take the rifle and go to the war fighting against the rebels or take the boat to reach Italy. We had just these two possibilities! If you don't want to take the rifle and go to the war, you must take the boat. If you don't want to take the boat, you must take the rifle and go to the war. The Gadafi militants and also the rebels took a lot of friends of mine, they gave them the rifle and they must fight in the war. Me … I was in prison for three weeks, and then I found the solution to get out of the jail directly into the sea! Otherwise, I die! I didn't have any possibility. So, I got out of the jail, and I came to Italy, it was the only solution. I told to my self “if I have luck, I will be in Italy” … my best friends was sleeping with me … now he … yea, now he has … [long pause. He sighed several time] he lost his life. He did not want to come to Italy, he told me that he preferred to remain in jail! They could shot him, no problem, but he did not want to take

58 The Civil Protection is the authority responsible of issues on civil protection, i.e. natural and human disasters, emergencies, and catastrophes. It is headed by the Office of the President of the Council of Ministers. It operate through both securitarian and humanitarian devices.

59 Ordinance no. 3933 of 13th April 2011. Translation of the author
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the boat, for any reason! They killed him in Libya. When I arrived in Italy, Lampedusa, I tried
to call him, but no answer. After six months I managed to make a call, and they gave me
the news that he was killed. So … it … it hurts so much, yes … so much. If I remember
this story, it hurts too much, also his family … I knew them since so much time .. it hurt too much .. no [he shaking his head] I have to stop [we stop the interview for some minutes]. You know, I was afraid of the boat, because I never took a boat before.
I was so afraid! But it was too dangerous to remain in Libya, so I went onto the boat, but
didn't want it. From Libya to Lampedusa, I started to vomit .. I vomited until Lampedusa.
I couldn't drink the water, I didn't know how long I was on the sea … I didn't know if I
could have lived in the future, I thought “my life is at the end”. But we arrived in
Lampedusa, and we have been unloaded on the island. After two days, they transferred us
to Puglia, in Manduria». (Interview with Amal, in Berlin on October 2014)

The story of Amal, a young protagonists of my research from Ghana, is just one of the
thousands of heterogeneous biographies that left Libya and landed in Lampedusa during the
Libyan war. These people were in Libya for several reasons, some were seasonal workers
while others were waiting for the opportunity to reach Europe. The heterogeneity of the
biographies and the migratory routes of these people was blurred under the wider and unique
category of “Sub-Sahara migrants”. Moreover, the heterogeneity of migrants' biographies was
normalized through the emergency program ENA that influenced and targeted their life
trajectories.

The extraordinary ENA program, connected with and legitimised by the state of emergency
was established and operated in parallel with – but almost replaced – the official responsible
Protection System for Asylum Seekers and Refugees in Italy, i.e. the SPRAR. The SPRAR
system was established only in 2002, due to the fact that Italy just recently became an
immigration country at the beginning of the 1990s, and during the first years the asylum
system was very weak and little developed. The SPRAR is a decentralized reception system
for asylum-seekers and refugees: it is a public service and it was established by the Ministry
of Interior, which delegates the responsibility of the management to the National Association
of Italian Municipalities (ANCI). The responsible actors, working through a multilevel
governance, are the local authorities, the Ministry of Interior, and the managing companies,
which are subjects of the third-sector. This system offers the basic aids for the reception such
as accommodation, food provisions, health services, and language courses. Once asylum-
seekers have applied the asylum request, they have to wait for the answer within the reception
centers, usually the CARA, for six months that can be extended for other six months. The
main problem of SPRAR was the limited capacity, until 2013 there were only 3,000 available
places. Thus it was undersized for the number of landings in Italy. For the years 2014-2016

60 SPRAR: Sistema di Protezione per Richiedenti Asilo e Rifugiati (Protection System for Asylum Seekers and Refugees)
the system has been enlarged for a total of 18,765 places.

In 2011, although the SPRAR offered 1,500 additional places to face the “emergency”, only 816 have been activated, because the Italian government preferred to use the new extraordinary ENA program. The decision of Italian government to largely avoid the official SPRAR system in favour of the emergency one gave rise to several points of criticism. First, the actors involved in the management of the situation have been exchanged. The director of Civil Protection Department constituted the head of the exceptional system, whit extraordinary power and extraordinary funds. He was in charge of identifying a large number of “providers” and managing agency, which were hired through private and direct contracts. The accountability of these “providers” was difficult to determine and monitor because there was no public institution charged with controlling their behaviour (Marchetti 2012). The main problem was that both Civil Protection and the “new private providers” had almost no experiences in the management of forced migration issue, and thus little competence in the law and administrative practices of asylum. Furthermore, the choice of the Civil Protection – an actor usually dealing with natural catastrophes – sheds light on the imaginary built by the Italian government on the refugees issue in 2011: the refugee figure was no longer treated as a vulnerable category, instead the receiving country was turned vulnerable by the arrival of refugees (Garelli & Tazzioli 2013), as a society that must be defended (cfr. Foucault 1975-76) from a human catastrophe. Moreover, the facilities provided for the reception of migrant subjects were not the appropriate structures for the fulfilled function: most of the accommodation facilities were hotels or old schools temporarily transformed as reception centers. These centers were scattered on the whole national territory following the ENA plan, which decentralized, externalized (from state institutions to private actors), and unregulated (there were no guidelines for selecting the agencies) the implementation.

As explained above, during the first months of 2011 also several temporary camps were opened with unclear legal status, because no official document or legal provision that legitimized these centres existed. We have seen how Lampedusa was presented as camp-island under invasion; another example is the asylum-seekers camp of Mineo, build in the military aereo-naval station of Sigonella. The center of Mineo represents specifically well the blurred nature of these temporary camps build during the state of emergency: it was a site of multiple forms of confinement for its “inhabitants”, who were a heterogeneous group of asylum-seekers that partly just arrived in Lampedusa and partly have been already staying in Italy and transferred to the camp (Sossi 2013). The blurred nature of these new centers may have determined the status of the migrants placed inside: for example, since Mineo was
treated as a center for asylum-seekers, all the people that lived inside were considered asylum-seekers, and were forcefully inserted in the asylum procedure (Marchetti 2012). Thus, once the ENA program had been established, all the new arrivals from Libya were somehow automatically classified as “asylum-seekers” and entered the reception plan set up by the Civil Protection.

These examples shed light on how the way through which the security issue is implemented through the emergency frame. The several decrees, implemented by the Prime Minister Berlusconi, empowered the special commissioner for the emergency to set up “facilities” or “spaces” where the landed migrants could be held or detained. These decrees generically reference to the need to act outside the law in handling the emergency and thus legitimized an institutional practice that opened a breach in the legal framework, creating detention places whose legal void was filled by police acting with full sovereign powers. Those places represent the so called “spaces of legal indistinction” (Agamben 1995), i.e. institutional settings that function outside the legal framework regulating the ordinary detention of migrants and ruled under a state of permanent exception. This highlights how the emergency frame is conjured into being by political actors and security officials who channel fears and anxieties to legitimize an expansion of their political prerogatives (Campesi 2011b). The “spaces of legal indistinction” have been transformed through the ENA program into “technological zones” (Walters 2011a) that attempt to standardize the heterogeneity of the biographies living there.

The emergency regime built in Italy in 2011 also has to be understood as a consequence of the complex intersection of different governance and sovereignty levels that involved several political actors like the European Commission and its agency for the management of external frontiers (Frontex), the international actors such as IOM and UNHCR, and the Italian national government that has to deal with different local authorities. The latter usually play a crucial role in the local management of migration, due to the battle to gain political consensus – which is strongly influenced through the migration issue (Ambrosini 2013b). Thus, the political relations and interests at the supranational and sub-national level assumes a crucial role: due to the fact that migration is an ideological issue that influences political coalitions and government balances (Ambrosini 2014), the Italian government acted on the different levels differently and changed the discourse several times. When the Minister of Interior, Maroni, spoke with the European Union he emphasised the «humanitarian emergency». To the contrary, when he operated on the national level dealing with local actors, he used concepts like «humanitarian catastrophe» evoking the imagery of natural disasters familiar to
the Italian audience (Campesi 2011b). The principal effect of this ambivalence entailed the reception system which oscillates between control and humanitarian assistance. I will show in the next paragraph and chapters, how this ambivalence leaves holes in the assistance and reception system, into which migrant subjects are sometimes abandoned, hence creating shadow zones where assistance and rights for migrants are missing.

The temporalities of emergency: lengthening and fragmenting the time

In this subparagraph, the focus on temporalities of migration management and migrants experience is highlighted, basing on the narrative interviews I collected. Following the claim to focus on temporal dimension (Griffiths, Rogers, and Anderson 2013), the ENA program can be interpreted as a temporal disjuncture within the migratory journeys of the migrant subjects. In the first paragraph of this chapter I shed light on how the European border regime influence the temporality of migration mobilities, accelerating and decelerating it through several control devices. The Emergenza Nord Africa has influenced the temporalities of migrants biographies during and after the end of the program, suspending and decelerating the time experience of migrant subjects.

The Italian emergency regime in 2011 features some peculiarities as compared to the standard border-control regime that characterized the global migration management in the last decades. The “2011-crisis” has to be included in the way through which Italy has management migration movements in the last decades. Indeed, migrants landings were governed under a permanent state of emergency that clearly broke ranks with regular border-control management. There was an abuse of the extra-constitutional emergency powers used over years to manage different kinds of economic, environmental, humanitarian, and social crises, thus allowing a parallel governmental practice beyond the ordinary political procedure and legal framework. This has provided the legal and political basis for a crisis-management model built around an extensive use of arbitrary administrative detention and the systematic violation of migrants’ basic rights (Campesi 2011b). At least since 2002, immigration control has been defined as an internal security emergency, and already in 2004 and 2005 the Italian government had described the situation in Lampedusa in terms of emergency, speaking about “millions of illegal migrants” who are waiting on Libyan shores to cross over to Italy (Andrijasevic 2010). The difference of the state of emergency declared in 2011 was its mixture of “humanitarian justification” with the securitarian one. Moreover, the emergency of 2011 was not temporally limited to the short time of the migrants landings, it became instead
a “normal” permanent state of emergency for almost two years. Indeed, the ENA program and the state of emergency were planned to finish on 31\textsuperscript{th} December 2011, but they were extended through the decree of 6\textsuperscript{th} October 2011 until the 31\textsuperscript{th} December 2012. These two years have been characterized by a massive reliance on exceptional measures: between February 2011 and September 2012 the Council of Ministers issued 27 Decrees and Resolutions and 18 Ordinances in order to manage the state of emergency (Marchetti 2012). The way of operating through the continuous issuing of decrees and the permanent state of emergency has an ambivalent effect on the temporality of migration government: first, there is a lengthening of the time through the permanent state of emergency: second, the time of an emergency is essentially limited, since it does not consider a long-term project.

The time of a state of emergency is characterized by a high level of uncertainty, since the management authorities do not have a clear project and ways to proceed and face the “unknown” situation. This leads to a high level of wait until the “emergency” situation will be better defined. The uncertainty, wait, indeterminateness and precariousness characterize the emergency situation and its temporality, as well as other empirical research on “suspended time” of asylum-seekers and immigration detainees have highlighted (Griffiths 2014). The juridical indeterminateness is one example, which emerges from the legal status of the camps that where temporary build in 2011 (Campesi 2011b), but also from the legal status designated to the migrants (Marchetti 2012). During 2011, indeed, the migrant subjects have been treated very differently, not on the basis of their individual claims according to national and international laws, but according to the time of their arrival or their nationality – as shows the example of the Tunisian citizen who obtain or not obtain the temporary protection, only depending on the date of their arrival. One characteristic of emergency temporality is the sudden acceleration of government decisions without a long-term project. Indeed, since the emergency situation needs to be “urgently” solved, there is no time to plan a long-term and structured management project, instead there is the urgency to act immediately. The high number of decrees not approved by the Parliament are an example of such “urgency” govern acts, which shed light also on the frenzied time of migration management system (Griffiths et al. 2013). That is also highlighted by the decision to consider all the people landed during the Libyan war as “asylum-seekers” and, consequently, to pull all of them into the asylum procedure without differentiating the personal cases. The Emergenza North Africa program has framed the trajectories of those migrants entered in this Civil Protection plan, more than the individual and biographic characteristics. This shows the power of the normative procedure and administrative practices in channelling the “turbulence” of migration through
sorting mechanism and juridical protocols through which migrants’ lives and geographies are organized into and shaped as statuses (Garelli and Tazzionli 2013). Most of the migrant subjects were citizens from the several Sub-Sahara countries, but there were also many Bangladeshi, and some Chinese, Philippine and Pakistani citizens. They constituted a typical mixed flow, with people that had leave their own origin countries for diverse reasons. The process through which they were all channelled into the Civil Protection plan was compulsory too: after their landing on Lampedusa, they were sent to different destinations according to the quotas assigned by the ENA program (Marchetti 2012), and most of the time they did not receive any information about the asylum procedure they were going to do. The fact that in the interview for the asylum procedure the Territorial Commissions investigated the situation of the origin countries of migrants, not considering the fact that they were living since years in Libya and they escaped the Libyan war, sheds light on the incoherence within the procedures and discourses during the Emergenza Nord Africa. The following two pieces of interview with Masud – a young man from Chad who arrived in Italy in 2011 after the Libya war, and with Dakari – a young man of Niger, who has lived in Libya for several years – highlight the heterogeneity of the biographies and migratory paths of people treated under the ENA program:

«I was very happy in Libya! I was working, helping my family in Niger .. a big family! But then the war came, and the street to go back to my country was blocked. The Arabs … eh, they are very bad people! I have friends in Libya coming from Niger too. They tried to go back to Niger, but they were stopped at the border. They have been arrested, they have been beaten! The Arabs stole everything, all the money they earned in Libya! So .. I couldn't try this way .. I had to take the boat to Europe». (Interview with Dakari, in Milan on January 2014)

«I was born in Chad, but I grew up in Libya, I moved there with my family when I was 7 years old. I spent 18 years there, living in Tripoli, while my family was living in Ersilia. […] Things were going well, I was working, life was going well, until the uprisings began. One day, after the uprisings had started, the police of Gaddafi came to my place offering me money, and asking me to fight against the rebels. But this is not my country, I said, how could I fight for a country that is not mine? So I decided to leave the place, because otherwise I would get in trouble. In Tripolis I could not stay, it was too dangerous, and I couldn't go to my family either, because the rebels and Gaddafi's police where checking everybody that tried to go to other African countries. So Europe was the only way that was open for me. I decided that I had to go there, I thought I cannot go back, I have to move forwards. So I paid a trip with the boat to Italy, it costs 600 $. I left Tripolis with other people on 15. August 2011 but after 8 hours on the sea the boat broke down and we had to go back to Tripolis. So on the next day we left again for Lampedusa,

61 The Territorial Commission is the local office designated to analysed the asylum requests.
62 Ersilia is an invented city from the book “The invisible cities” of Italo Calvino (1972); here is pointing to a city in Libya where the family of my research protagonist was livign.
and we reached it on 17th August. When we arrived in Lampedusa the Italian police took our fingerprints and controlled each one of us, and then they put us in a big camp, where we stayed for one week. After that week I was put on a big ship with other 2000 people or maybe more. The ship brought me from Lampedusa to Genova, but it also stopped in Napoli to pick up other people. When we arrived in Genova I was put into a bus with other 20 people and we were driven to Alessandria. There I have been living for one year in a reception centre, a building that was owned by the church which was right next to it. Since in Lampedusa the police made us fill in the form for the asylum request, me and the other people that were living in the reception centre went to the Questura in Torino to do the interview».

(Interview with Masud, in Berlin on January 2015)

As Masud tells us, they have been channelled into the asylum procedure without well understanding what it was and what they had to say during the interview. The following narration of Dakari well shows the uncertainty that they experienced during the asylum request, not having enough information about the procedures.

«I arrived in Lampedusa in 2011 … 19th of May 2011. I arrived in … which is the name? La .. in Lampedusa. We stayed one week there. After, we move to Genoa. And then, we move further to Brescia. In Brescia we do the camp. At the beginning we were in the hotel, where we stayed three months and we learned the Italian language. After we have been moved to another place, always managed by the Caritas. Then, we went to Milano in order to do the Commission. They [Caritas staff] told us how to do the asylum, “you have to do like this, like this, and like this”. So we follow their suggestions, and we went to the Commission .. but we were afraid … fear, fear, we have a lot of fear. I spoke about my life … I have lied sometimes, I didn’t know what I should say! After, my chef [the Caritas chef] told me that he has a three years document for me. I was so happy! After one months we went in Questura, and the police told me that I get the subsidiary protection. I signed. Afterwards, I went to another hotel, where there were other new refugees [people yet landed in Italy] we went there to visit them, they were all Africans! I help them for the Commission, I told them “you have to do like this, you have to say this and that, if you do like this you will get the document. I have got it!”. So, all the 15 people went to the Commission … all 15 people get a negative! [a refusal] I couldn’t understand nothing … why? After, they went there again, and finally they get one-year document!! And I get it too! But I had signed for a three years document! I was so angry! They gave me a humanitarian document, but I signed for the subsidiary! The police man told me “If you want it, take it. If you don’t want it, go away!”. So, I went away! But they follow me and gave me the humanitarian document. I was so angry! They told me that they made a mistake, I have received just one-year document. At this time I couldn’t speak Italian, not at all! So it was difficult to understand what happened. There was my chef with me … but he told me “Dakari, it is not a problem, come on! They have made a mistake, amen”. And we went back at home»

(Interview with Dakari, in Milan on January 2014)

Although the most of the people living under the Emergenza Nord Africa experienced the uncertainty and contradictory nature of the blurred reception system, there were also

63 Questura is the police office where there is also the administrative office designated for the asylum procedure.
64 The expression “we do the camp” refers to the period during which the person lived in the structure designated as reception center and carried out the asylum procedure. All the protagonists of my research use this expression, therefore I decide to keep it aiming to less change the original words of the research subjects.
experiences of everyday resistance practices. These experiences highlight how the control and management system has to be understood as a battleground, where negotiating practices are continuously enacted between the attempt to control and rank migrant mobilities and the attempt of migrants subject to build their lives, well aware of the situation they are experiencing. This is the story of Amal, the Ghana young man presented before:

«At the beginning, no one of us could speak Italian. We could speak just English, or French, some of us also Arabic, and other African languages. But no one could understand Italian. Therefore, they [the staff of reception center] give us an interpreter. He was living in Italy since three years, but he couldn't speak very well Italian as well. So we didn't understand each other. When we were telling him our concerns, our questions, even our stories … he was not correctly translating. He couldn't understand us very well, and also he couldn't speak Italian very well. He was even translating wrong things. So I told to myself: “stay in this country without knowing the language, it’s like be in the dark”! So I decided to seriously learn the language .. I had the courage to learn quickly the language! I really wanted it! In order to help myself and the other African brothers. I started to speak the language, and I was speaking better than the interpreter, therefore I told him that I didn’t need him any more. After, I became the interpreter for a lot of friends. All my friends said “the interpreter cannot speak well Italian, we trust just Amal”! Afterwards, things changed! We could speak and tell our needs, our voices were heard! [he smiles]». (Interview with Amal, in Berlin on October 2014)

The narration of Amal highlight a everyday practices enacted in order to react to the emergency system, which leaves the migrant subjects in a condition of uncertainty and lack of information and services – as a good translator for the interview during the asylum procedure. Since ENA program involved new and very different actors, many of which with no experience in the asylum issue, there was a high level of discretionary power in managing the migrants reception – the structures and local entities vary from hotels to private housing, to social cooperatives (Dal Zotto 2014).

Also the asylum procedure itself involves a high level of indeterminateness. First, the time for the asylum procedure has been lengthened, due to the large number of requests in comparison to the previous years – in 2011 the asylum applications have been 37,350. The migrant subjects within the ENA program had to wait more than one year for their answers. During this long wait, the migrants under ENA program were living in a limbo, that was juridical, temporal and sometimes also spatial – some ENA reception accommodations were in a very isolated places in the mountains. The experiences of migrants differed a lot during their waiting time, due to the high arbitrariness that characterized the ENA reception system. Some people remained trapped in the “limbo” condition waiting for the document, as the following experience of Radu shows. Radu is a young man from Mali, who has lived in Libya until the war and obtained afterwards a subsidiary protection in Italy:
«Well, you know my story. From Lampedusa I was transferred to Brindisi, where I stayed one year just waiting for the document […] No, I haven't done anything, just wait and wait … and waste time, of course [he smiled]. Yes, ok, we have done the language class, I learned Italian, but anything else». (Interview with Radu, in Milan on April 2014)

Other people, instead, tried to break the “limbo” condition supported by the personal relations they build during their migration route, and also facilitated by the blurred nature of the reception centers, from which it was sometimes easy to leave and come back. This is the experience of Issa, a young man from Burkina Faso who arrived in Lampedusa in 2011:

«After Lampedusa, I was close to Siracusa … in a small village 40 kilometres far from Siracusa, we stayed there some months. After that, we were moved to Siracusa, where I did the camp. We stayed there more or less six months, but nothing happened. We were waiting for the document, which after one year finally arrived! But during the wait for the answer about my document, I went to Foggia. I didn't want to stay in the camp doing nothing! I thought, “if I go to Foggia, maybe I can work” […] Well, all people know it, in Foggia there is this country work. All people know that if you go there, you can find something [to work]. I have a friend that I met on the boat from Libya. We arrived together in Lampedusa, and then he was transferred to Foggia. I called him and he told me that there was job, so I went there. I worked there, but after some time, I went back to the camp in Siracusa, because I heard that the documents were ready. And I received the document». (Interview with Issa, in Berlin on March 2015)

Although the applications for asylum done by the migrants under the ENA program were strongly pushed by the political authorities, paradoxically the majority obtained a refusal: the territorial Commissions processed 25,626 asylum applications, and only 40,1% received a protection – humanitarian or international. Most of the people who obtained a refusal have appealed against the Commission's decision, more or less supported and influenced by the reception centers staff and other associations of the civil society.

During this waiting period, the behaviour of the Italian government has been contradictory and not clear: during the last months of 2012 before the official closure of the Emergenza Nord Africa program the most of the asylum procedures were not concluded. On 28th October 2012, the Italian government issued a Circular of the Minister of Interior in which they encouraged all those migrant subjects who obtained a refusal to apply for the revision of their asylum request. It was explicitly underlined that there is the «necessity to find a solution for the legal status of foreigner people under the ENA reception system, who although belonging to third states, they were living since years on the Libyan territory where they were maintaining work relations, and from which [country, i.e. Libya] they were forced to escape, due to the “Arab spring”». The uncertainty arose from the fact that the Italian government allude to the willingness for a solution for the legal status of “ENA-migrants”, but it did not
clearly explain which kind of solution. In this Circular the problem of the lengthened wait experienced by the migrants within ENA program is highlighted, which has to be solved since it «produces tensions in the local territories [...] and blocks each attempt of integration».

This uncertainty in the decision of the legal status led several migrants, who at the beginning had obtained the refusal, to leave the ENA reception centers looking for other solutions, and lose hence the possibility to obtain a document. Looking at the statistic of the Civil Protection at the end of the ENA program on 1st January 2013, only 16,844 migrant subjects have been assisted by the ENA program, despite the statistics at the beginning of the emergency program highlighted that more people were channelled into the ENA: the landings of people escaping Libyan war were around 28,431 and the asylum requests in 2011 were around 38,000. Thus, a number of migrant subjects with an uncertain or “unknown” legal status became invisible, falling through the reception system “mesh”. The same happened for the case of the Tunisian citizens. It is possible to estimate around 5,000 of Tunisian “missing people” displaced in the Italian and European territory, shedding light on the so called “physiologic dispersion” phenomenon (Campesi 2011b). These experiences of “escapes” from the ENA can be interpreted as another examples of everyday resistance practices. Contrary to Issa, who came back to take the document, other people never came back succeeding in find a place to live outside Italy, notably in North European countries.

During the last months of ENA program, the Italian government issued several Circulars without taking any clear decision, which contributed to the increase of uncertainty and blurry situation. On 31st December 2012, there were still 20,000 pending cases for asylum refusals. That led the Conference of Regions and State to issue the Circular n°400 on 31st December 2012 of the Minister of Interior, which aimed to close the state of emergency. Although it was never clearly declared in the Circular, giving a temporary residence permit for humanitarian reasons to each migrant still waiting within the ENA program was proclaimed as the “solution”. The permit is a renewable one-year document that does not belong to the international protection according to the Geneva Convention, instead it is anchored to the Italian national law. The duration of this humanitarian residence permit can oscillate between six months and two years, and this decision is taken by the responsible administrative office.

65 For a well deep explanation of the contradictory behaviour of the Italian government see the article of Nicola Grigion in the website Meltingpot on 6th November 2012. http://www.meltingpot.org/Emergenza-Nordafrika-Permessi-di-soggiorno-il-Governo.html#.VaeNwx9h1BQ

66 Translation from the author of the Circular of Ministry of Interior on 28th October 2012.

67 Date taken by the website of the Italian Ministry of Interior.

namely the Immigration Office in Questura (police office). Thus, the nature of this document itself presents an uncertain time component that is temporary and precarious, which can also change case by case according to the discretionary power of the administrative staff. This residence permit allows the holder to work and gives the access to the national health system, to the local structures and aid measures provided for those holding an international protection, and to the education courses. It however does not recognise the possibility for family reunification, and it does not allow to move outside Italy without a passport or a document that functions as a passport, i.e. the Titolo di Viaggio (Travel Title).

Also in this case, the issuing of humanitarian documents happened in a fragmented way: because in the first months of the year 2013, the number of migrants waiting for the answer about their legal status was still high, the deadline of emergency was again postponed until the 28th February 2013. Because of the territorial dispersion of the ENA reception centers and the high autonomy through which they could operate – i.e. high discretionality –, the issuing of humanitarian residence permits occurred in different times and ways. For example, there was the possibility to receive the Titolo di Viaggio together with the humanitarian permit for those people who couldn't go to their origin countries' embassies because of political persecution. There were however some Questura, who issued the Titolo di Viaggio easily, and some who didn't without any particular reason, underlining hence the high level of discretionary power. On 1th of March, there were around 8,000 people still “depending” on the ENA program. Although the “emergency” ended according to the official documents, the de facto emergency was still present, also because the most of the ENA reception centers closed and the migrants found themselves suddenly without a place to sleep and high difficulty to find a job. Thus, the new Minister of Interior, Annamaria Cancellieri, declared the extension of the assistance and reception for further six months, in order to allow to accompany the exit of the persons still living within the reception centers (Dal Zotto 2014). Moreover, the Italian government allocated 500 Euros as a sort of “severance package” to each migrant subject who still lived in a reception center. Also in this case, the discretionary power was applied, and not everybody received the 500 Euros, as the following narration of Badu, a young man from Guinea Conakry shows us:

«The people of the camp took me out. They said “the camp is finished”, “there is no home here”. So they said. […] No money!! When the camp closed, they didn't gave to me the 500 Euros. That 500 Euros that everybody has received, I did not received! They said just “the camp is finish, go outside! Go away!”. It was in Calabria …. Cosenza». (Interview with Badu, in Milan on April 2014)
This way to manage migration through quickly urgent decisions and through the “extraordinary” ENA program led to a high level of fragmentation: time and space fragmentation, and thus, subjective experiences fragmentation.

The use of the emergency frame in order to manage the migrant mobilities in Italy was the result of the interrelation and conflicts between several actors at different levels. At the supranational level it can be interpret as the outcome of the diplomatic and politic fight between Italian government and the European institution, as explained before. The European institutions helped Italy with technical and financial aids, but they strongly rejected any burden-sharing mechanism designed to distribute the 60,000 migrant subjects landed in 2011 mainly in southern European countries. This highlights the predominance of national-state interests above those of individual migrants, and how the Dublin Convention and Schengen agreement do not reflect a common project, but are instead rather a consequence of power relations between national states. At the national and local level, the use of the emergency regime can be understood as a mean to gain political consensus, legitimacy for “exceptional power” and to receive a great amount of financial aids (Marchetti 2012). Moreover, it can be read as a convenient system implemented for managing migration, in the absence of a long-term program that understands the migration movements as a phenomenon that is intrinsic to the global societies, rather than to consider it as “exceptional”. Another consequence of the lack of a common management strategy, of an unclear juridical status for migrant subjects, and of the high discretionary power implemented in the different ENA reception centers, was a process of invisibilization. The emergency was made invisible to the public opinion, and this invisibility allowed also to delegate the political responsibilities into the reception system (Dal Zotto 2014). Moreover, I will highlight in the next chapter, how this process of invisibility influences also the experiences of the migrant subjects, and thus their biographies. The device of emergency through which the migrant mobilities have been managed, has shaped the experiences of these migrant subjects as temporal: the emergency, first, excludes a long-term view, and second, it produces laws, legal statuses and management policies that strengthen its temporariness.

68 The overall amount of money spent on the ENA project has been enormous: 797 million euros in 2011 and 485 million Euros in 2012
3.3. From the Arab Spring to the Berliner Herbst\textsuperscript{69}. Displacing “Lampedusa”

2011 has been a tumultuous year for protest movements all around the world. The so-called ‘Arab Springs’ have risen against long-lasting authoritarian regimes. The 15M or ‘Indignados’ movement has brought into the Spanish streets millions of people reclaiming real democracy. The Occupy Wall Street campaign have spurred a worldwide network of occupations to protest against the influence of financial and economic powers on politics.

Despite the strong heterogeneity between the different contexts, two elements allow to collect these distinct mobilizations under a common thread: the importance of digital media for enabling a new logic of ‘connective action’ (Bennett and Segréber 2013) and the complementary role of the occupation of public space as a protest strategy (Gerbaudo 2012).

Social movements are always interconnected entities, developing through ‘spillovers’ (Meyer and Whittier 1994) and through the circulation of ‘modular repertoires’ (Tarrow 1994). In this particular case, nonetheless, the mutual influences between the various waves have been extremely explicit (see Gonzales-Bailon and Wang 2013; Kerton 2012).

For these reasons, it’s important to keep in mind the broader context in which the occupation of Oranienplatz took place. Furthermore, in order to understand why the protest of asylum-seekers started, it is necessary to provide before some information about the migration and asylum management system in Germany.

\textit{Forced to stay and forced to go. A genealogy of migration management in Germany}

Germany has historically managed immigration through strong state regulation, although the migrants groups had very different characteristics during the several migration periods. At the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century Germany was crossed by a big internal migration from its eastern regions to the western one, namely the Ruhr region, which experienced a quick industrial development. Thus, the “emptied” eastern regions of Germany were filled with seasonal workers from Poland (Sassen 1996). The reaction of the German authorities was ambivalent: although they needed this cheap labour force according to the economic structural condition,

\footnote{The translation of \textit{Berliner Herbst} is “Berliner Autumn”. The reference is to the phrase “German Autumn” developed in order to define the political atmosphere that Germany experienced in the Autumn of 1977 characterized by an escalation of political protests and demonstration (also linked to the left extremist group RAF).}
the political and public discourses aimed to deny the necessity of these people and to assert the temporariness of their stay in German territory. The government bound the foreigner seasonal workers' stay to their employment contract – through the so called *Legitimationskarte* – and, furthermore, their mobility was restricted (Terkessidis 2000). Exactly the same practices, binding the resident permit to the employment contract and to confine the mobility of migrants to their work place, was applied decades later to the *Gastarbeiter* (guest-workers) in the 1950s and 1960s (Sassen 1996).

The basic principle of migration policies in Germany has always been to consider migrants “guest-workers” who, according to labour market needs, were obliged to stay (*Zwangsarbeit*)\(^{70}\) or were repatriated (*Rückkehrzwang*) (Terkessidis 2000). Indeed, during the period of the World Wars, German authorities implemented several policies that forced the movement of foreigner workers, sometimes they were forced to come to Germany\(^ {71}\), sometimes they were deported back to their origin countries. The *temporary stay* was the central idea of this policy, enforced by devices of migrant control and management and by specific structures such as residence camps and deportation prisons. Interestingly the creation of these two structures happened in tandem in the 1920s\(^ {72}\) despite their proclaimed different purposes. In this way, the boundaries between the different camps' functions, i.e. to receive and to expel migrants, were blurred.

In Germany, the camps have been a constant instrument of management and control of the foreign population, despite possessing different characteristics and functions (Weinmann, Keiser, and Kraus-Schmitt 1990). Even if their logic has appeared primarily similar, they have been inhabited by different categories of people and assumed a variety of shapes. The camps were isolated structures, organized not only to accommodate migrants, but also to facilitate the control of their mobility, preventing them from moving and settling in Germany. Several history and sociology scholars (Weinmann *et al.* 1990; Herbert 2001; Pieper 2004) highlight that the peculiarity of German migration management lies in its *systemic* nature: different

---

70 For example, during the First World War there was a lack of male labour force, and a big number of foreigner workers were obliged to remain in the German territory through the practice of *Zwangsarbeit* – forced work (Terkessidis 2000)

71 For example, between October 1916 and February 1917 61,000 workers from Belgium have been transferred by force to Germany. Due to the degrading conditions through which this operation was implemented, 13,150 Belgian citizens were send back to Belgium, because they were too weak or sick. The Belgian workers were allocated in collective accommodation – called *Sammellager* – from where they couldn't move away. The aim was to control their mobility, in order to avoid the possibility to remain in Germany once the employment work would be ended (Herbert, 2001. pp. 103-109).

72 The first *Abschiebungshaft* (deportation prison) in Germany was built in 1920 in Ingolstadt (Bayern) within the old military fort, Prinz Karl. The first camps for foreigners were built in 1923 in Cottbus-Sielow and Stargard (Herbert 2001).
types of camps, with different functions, are joined with mobility restrictions and temporary legal statuses. This system of organizing an “undesirable” population through camps experienced its worst degeneration during the time of Nazism, although the aim and function of the Nazis’ Lagers cannot be compared with those created for foreigners (Terkessidis 2000). After the Nazism time, camps disappeared for a while in the European and German territories. With a resurgence in migration in the 1950s and 1960s – the time of Gastarbeit – the German government again employed isolated structures organized to accommodate migrants and control and restrict their mobility. The period of guest-workers spans 1955 to 1973, which was characterized by an increased number of migrants working in the German territory, and by the behaviour of German government, i.e. to “open the door” to foreigner labour force according to the needs of the German labour market. The bilateral recruitment agreements were the device used by the German authorities: in 1955 with Italy, in 1960 with Spain and Greece, in 1961 with the Turkey, in 1963 with Morocco, in 1964 with Portugal and Tunisia, and in 1968 with Yugoslavia. The cultural and political imaginary built in that period was to consider the migrants as “guest”, living in German as long as the German labour market would need them. This idea of “guest” is also developed in the political and public debate, as the famous sentence «Wir sind kein Einwanderungsland» highlights, said by the German Chancellor, Helmut Kohl74. This idea has shaped the integration policies in a restrictive direction for many decades (Heinz and Braun 2006). Also during the “guest-worker” time the foreigner workers were accommodated in special common houses, most of the time near the workplace. These houses had very bad living conditions – surrounded by barbed wire and sleeping room of ten cubic meter for six people – and a high level of isolation that entailed increasing the temporariness of the guest-workers condition (Terkessidis 2000).

In 1973 parallel to the economic crisis – and probably caused by it – the so-called Anwerbestopp (stop of recruitment) came into force: the German government decided to end the policy of foreigner labour force recruitment that had until then characterized the German immigration policy. The Anwerbestopp marked the end of the Gastarbeit time, and due to the closure of the majority of gateways to access Germany, it implied a crucial shift in the politics of migration, influencing the whole of Europe. After the Anwerbestopp, indeed, the asylum procedure remained as the only immigration path to Germany.

---

73 «We are not a immigration country», translation of the author.
74 Helmut Kohl has been the German Chancellor from 1982 to 1998. He has been the leader of the right-wings CDU (Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschland) party from 1973 to 1998.
Confined to the threshold: asylum seekers experience between camps system and Residenzpflicht

The German government hoped that after the Anwerbestopp the migrant population living in the German territory would decrease. To the contrary, the population with migration background increased during the 1970s, due to the politics of family reunification implemented for the “old” guest-workers. In this period, the “integration” discourse pervaded the public and political debate, aiming to solve the social problems provoked by the growing number of people with migration background living in the urban peripheries. The 1980s represent a turning point in the German migration policies, because a new figure was put on the center of the migration debate: the asylum-seeker. As explained in the previous paragraphs, the figure of the asylum seeker assumed a negative connotation in the 1980s: they were generally considered “liars” and “bogus” in public and political debate because of their suspected status as “economic migrants”. In Germany a xenophobic and racist climate emerged and in the 1990s became established, implying a real fear of the foreigners, which in that period corresponded to the asylum-seekers and refugees figures. The concerns of German political authorities derived from the increasing number of asylum seekers, to which they decided to respond through reestablishing the use of camps. In 1982, the German Parliament approved – without contrary votes – the use of the accommodation camps – called Lagerunterbringung – and the implementation of the prohibition of work for asylum seekers. The fires of asylum seekers' camps and the harassments against foreign people increased, supported by new extremist right-wings party as the NPD (Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands, the National Democratic Party of Germany). During this period the words used in the public and political debate evoked ideas of “overloaded” and “loading capability” (of German space) that led to the implementation of mobility restriction and the confinement of asylum-seekers to the camps (Zepf 1986, p.73).

In 1992 the number of asylum-seekers was 440,000 and they became a perceived social problem. Moreover, this issue assumed a strong political connotation, indeed, it was used as battleground between the governing party CDU and the opposition party, the SPD (Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands, the Social Democratic Party of Germany). The tension in the public and political debate rose quickly, and led to the so called Asylkompromiss (asylum compromise) in 1993. This agreement is considered as a turning point in the migration politics in Germany, influencing also other European countries. The “asylum compromise” in 1993 entailed the revision of the article 16(a) of the Constitution on
the asylum right: the three quarters of German Parliament voted for the limitation of the asylum right (Herbert 2001). From being an open article giving the right of asylum, the new 16(a) modified article introduced strong restrictions and derogations to the basic right of asylum. Exactly in the same time, the European level the principles of «safe third country» and «safe origin countries» were introduced, highlighting the crucial role that Germany played in orienting the cultural imaginary and the policies of migration influencing the European level (Post and Niemann 2007). The constitutional change introduced in Germany a new Asylum Procedure law – Asylverfahrensgesetz75 – within the National Foreigner law – Ausländerrecht76 –, whose principal articles are the 26(a) and the 29(a), respectively introducing the principle of «safe third country» and «safe origin countries». The article 32(a) is another sign of the new tendency of asylum, notably it introduces the temporary humanitarian protection for people fleeing humanitarian or natural disasters. This allowed to introduce a procedure parallel to that of political asylum, which was applied for the first time during the Yugoslavia war.

In addition to the temporary humanitarian protections, another “reduced” legal status was introduced, i.e. the so called Duldung, literally “toleration”. This legal status refers to the sections 53 and 55 of the Ausländerrecht, and it is a very particular document: it is not a residence permit, but just a suspension of deportation for those asylum-seekers who have been denied residency but who cannot be deported for various reasons77. Thus, they are “tolerated” and are able to stay in German territory. This condition is particularly interesting because its subjects are numerous78 and, moreover, because the Duldung reflects an important shift in asylum legislation from constitutional to administrative-based regulation. The Duldung has been introduced to give a legal “status” to those who cannot be deported for humanitarian reasons, since deportation can still be applied once these humanitarian reasons disappear. This legal status represents an example of a phenomenon that is spreading throughout European asylum policies: the progressive introduction of humanitarian criteria, which do not just complement, but properly replace political criteria. Indeed, the Duldung has become a rule nowadays; people with the Duldung exceed those with political asylum. There is no limit on renewing this status, therefore there are people who live under Duldung for more than 10

75 Law of asylum procedure. Translation of the author.
76 Law of foreigners. Translation of the author.
77 The main reasons are the lack of country pass that should allow the deportation, or humanitarian reasons – such as illness – that do not allow the deportation.
78 In 2002, there were about 200,000 individuals with the Duldung; in 2010, there were 87,000 after a sort of amnesty implemented by the German Parliament.
years\textsuperscript{79}, and it is almost impossible for these persons to change his or her Duldung status unless they marry or have children with a German citizen. In this way, these people experience a lengthened temporariness, since they cannot build their lives because they can be deported at any moment, trapped within a \textit{threshold} enforced by the “paper walls” of their documents. They live in a \textit{law interstice}, in the \textit{threshold} of citizenship (Fontanari 2015). Furthermore, the Duldung status represent exactly these interconnection of compassion and repression highlighted by Fassin (2005): the people with Duldung have, indeed, a strong mobility restriction – the \textit{Residenzpflicht} – that confine them to the camps where the asylum-seekers have to wait for their asylum procedure.

Since the 1980s, the management of asylum-seekers in Germany has been developed through a system of three types of camps: reception centers (\textit{Erstaufnahmeeinrichtungen}), residential accommodations (\textit{Wohnheime}), and deportation prisons (\textit{Abschiebungshaft}). Asylum-seekers are moved from one camp to another, trapped in a system that puts them in confinement through restriction of mobility (\textit{Residenzpflicht}) and prohibition of work. The administrative management of the camps' system is partitioned at the regional level: for each region there is one reception center and one deportation prison, and the number of \textit{Wohnheime} varies from region to region according to the number of administrative districts (\textit{Landkreis}). Those working in the office for foreigners – the \textit{Ausländerbehörde} – and the administrative manager of the \textit{Wohnheim} are the central actors in this decentralized system of camps managed by administrative law.

Empirical research shows that these system of camps entail a high level of segregation and exclusion of asylum-seekers from the German society (Pieper 2004). Indeed, these places exercise a subtle power, making the people living inside feel as if they are trapped without actually being trapped in a literal sense. Although asylum seekers can leave and come back to the camps, they prefer to stay inside, feeling encased. This is linked to the internalization of the \textit{threshold} condition, which assumes spatial, temporal, relational, and identity-related dimensions. Administrative law confines non-belonging subjects in places where they must wait for resident permits. During this waiting period, the uncertainty and insecurity of their condition constantly increases due to the actions of the spatial and temporal power of the camp, as well as the nature of the relationship between asylum-seekers and administrative staff. Furthermore, the overlap between the control- and assistance-oriented functions of these places, contributes to the perception of \textit{Wohnheime} as ambiguous places (Fontanari 2015).

\textsuperscript{79} In 2011, the total amount of people with the Duldung numbered 87,244; 29,285 of these had had this status for more than 10 years (German Parliament, 02/16/2011).
Once the threshold condition is internalized and the suspension and wait becomes definitive existence, asylum-seekers can happen to fall in psychological problems that trap them within the Wohnheim (Pieper 2004), which sometimes culminates in suicide\textsuperscript{80}.

It was the suicide of Mohammad Rahsepar, a 28 years old asylum-seeker from Iran, committed on 29 January 2012 in the Wohnheim of Würzburg in the region of Bavaria, being the spark that trigged the refugees protest march that ended with the occupation of Oranienplatz in Berlin – namely the second part of our story.

\textbf{«Breaking the isolation». A protest march against the restriction of asylum-seekers’ mobility and the group of «Lampedusa in Berlin»}

The suicide of Mohammad Rahsepar led to the organisation of a political protest by other asylum-seekers living in the same Wohnheim,

\texttt{«We are a group of non-citizens who left our countries because of concrete political reasons. […] Not having any secured life under dictatorship in the country of origin, brought us here to Germany. […] We are here, just to have a secured life and freedom of choice in our lives. But what we face in Germany is totally something else: Inhuman living conditions like being forced to live in asylum camps and the general isolation as the result of it, deportation, Residenzpflicht, food packages, not having permission to work and study, are just some examples about what we experience every day. The result of this situation is the countless numbers of suicides of non-citizens in the camps. We as room mates can not just sit and watch our room mates’ deaths any more. On 28 January 2012 a non-citizen hung himself because of the frustration, the fear of deportation and the way non-citizens have been treated in this part of the world, in Germany. On 19 March 2012 non-citizens went into the street with protest tents and on 2 July 2012 Tent Action started, as there was no positive response from the authorities. Again, on 8 September 2012 non-citizens organized a protest march to Berlin and after 28 days the march arrived in Berlin. On 13 October 2012 a big demonstration took place with the participation of 7000 people. 22 non-citizens organized a hunger strike at Brandenburger Tor in Berlin in October 2013, and again, without any result, it got stopped. […] That’s why we non-citizens decided to start a protest march on the streets of Bavaria for our freedom, for our basic rights as human beings. We want to start walking to spread our voice with our steps». (Non-citizen group of the “Refugee Struggle for Freedom”)\textsuperscript{81}.

In the city of Würzburg the politic protest of asylum-seekers grew quickly through several demonstrations within the city center fighting against the Residenzpflicht, the German asylum system, the food packages etc. The asylum-seekers protest revived an old political debate on the bad living condition for asylum-seekers in the Wohnheim, supported and carried out in the

\textsuperscript{80} According to the anti-racist archive of Berlin (Antirassistische Initiative e.V.), 179 asylum-seekers die between 1993 and 2014 under the pressure of deportation or trying to fleeing from the deportation prisons. Moreover, 1383 refugees attempted to kill themselves or hurt themselves for protest against the deportation.

\textsuperscript{81} Presentation of the Non-citizen group in the web side of the refugee protest: \url{http://refugeestruggle.org/en}
political debate by several NGOs, such as Pro Asyl. Germany has a long-standing tradition of anti-racist social movement, constituted by self-organized group of migrant subjects, such as Refugee emancipation, and by NGOs of German citizens involved in the legal, social and political support to migrant subjects in the German territory, among other Flüchtlingsräte and Pro Asyl. Moreover, there are several networks of political activists, churches, NGOs and migrant subjects living in Germany, such as “Die Karawane” (the Caravan), the No Border Camp network, and “Kein Mensch ist Illegal” (no one is illegal). This tradition of anti-racism political struggles and the great number of self-organized groups, played a crucial role in the support and the spreading of the protest.

In Würzburg some NGOs and anti-racist political activists started to put pressure on the local political authorities of the Bavaria region, considering them responsible of the death of Mohammad Rahsepar. The protest developed through several forms, as the hunger strike started on 19th March 2012 from around ten Iranian asylum-seekers living in the Wohnheim of Würzburg. From then on, a durable protest tent camp was build in the city center, where the German part of the global social movement Occupy supported the hunger strike of asylum-seekers, which took three weeks. The public and political debate in Würzburg focussed on the asylum-seekers situation, with several meeting with local authorities, journalists, the asylum-seekers and the supporter groups. The discussion around asylum and its borders – categories borders and rights borders – experienced a comeback, through the word of the President of BAMF (Bundesamtes für Migration und Flüchtlinge, Federal Office for Migration and Refugee), Manfred Schmidt, who said that «asylum is a blurred word, I prefer to speak about international protection».

The German word for international protection is Flüchtlingsschutz. The word “Flüchtling” is used to indicate refugees but also these people escaping from a natural or human disaster and have not yet obtained an international protection. This example, like the one from Italy discussed above, sheds light on the blurred nature of and blurred borders between the categories of “refugee” or “asylum-seekers”, that allows the asylum issue to be a “negotiating place” with a high level of discretionary action

---

82 Pro Asyl is a German NGO grounded in 1986 by the National Working Group, which comprised of refugee councils, churches, unions as well as welfare and human rights organizations. The aims are to protect refugees rights and to give voice to their concerns.

83 Refugee emancipation is a project initiated by asylum seekers, which goals are to improve the quality of life of refugees in Germany by using the Internet as a tool to reduce their isolation, connecting them with each other, with their homelands, and with their local community. The Project conducts and maintains a Website where refugee issues, advocacy information and personal stories can be published.

84 The “Caravan for the Rights of refugees and Migrants” is a network of individuals, groups and organizations of refugees, migrants and Germans based on anti-imperialism and anti-racism. We are engaged in the struggle for socio-political justice, equality and respect for the fundamental human rights of everyone.

85 Article of the Journal Main Post, on 12 July 2012, Würzburg. Beschleunigte Streik Asylverfahren?
from both the pro-migrants actors and of the actors of restrictive policies.
The reaction of the local and regional authorities was contradictory. Four of the Iranian asylum-seekers active in the protest received particularly quickly an international protection, although it was denied by the public authorities in the public debate. Nevertheless, the protest tent camp remained active. Between July and October 2012 the refugee protest extended to other cities in the region of Bavaria. There were several meeting by the protest tent camp in Würzburg, where also asylum-seekers from other Wohnheime in Bavaria participated. They were already involved in small local protests such as hunger strike and sewing of their mouths. In the summer and autumn 2012, the protest spread to the whole German territory and several protest tent camps where build in the cities of Aub, Bamberg, Düsseldorf, Nürnberg, Osnabrück, Passau, Regensburg, and Schwäbisch Gmünd.
The decision to march towards the capital of Germany was taken by the network\textsuperscript{86} build on these different protest tent camps. On 8\textsuperscript{th} September 2012, a refugees march protest of around 50 asylum seekers together with 20 political supporters started from the city center of Würzburg; the march was accompanied by a second group moving by bus. The march was fuelled by the idea by breaking the Residenzpflicht through a march that criss-crosses the whole German territory.
«We want to start walking to spread our voice with our steps».
(Non-citizen group of the “Refugee Struggle for Freedom”)

On the 6\textsuperscript{th} October 2012, after 28 days and 600 km of walking, the protest march arrived in Berlin, where around 70 asylum-seekers and refugees and 100 political supporters met on Oranienplatz, a square in the center of the city within the neighbourhood of Kreuzberg. There they build a protest tents camp, which should remain until the Residenzpflicht would be abandoned.

On 13\textsuperscript{th} October around 6,000 people held a demonstration to support the asylum seekers, refugees and undocumented migrants, claiming above all the abolishment of Reseidenzpflicht and the practice of migrants deportation. One of the main active political supporter was the network of “Kein Mensch ist Illegal”, i.e. “No human is illegal”: this is a network of anti-racist and church groups that supports undocumented migrants in Germany. The slogan refers to the “Sans Papiers” movement in France (Nichollos 2013), and pleads the idea that every human being is free to autonomously decide where he or she want to live, thus, they fight against the criminalization of border-crossing mobility and hence the national-borders order.
Several protest forms evolved after the construction of the Oranienplatz camp such as

\textsuperscript{86} The protest network of asylum-seeker communicated through their web site: \url{http://refugeetentaction.net/}
demonstrations on the street, occupation of embassies – as for example the Nigerian Embassy on 15th October –, the hunger strike of 25 asylum-seekers at the Brandeburger Tor on 24th October; all these protests were faced by a massive deployment of police force that led to several fights. The behaviour of local authorities played a crucial role from the beginning. Indeed, the municipalities of the neighbourhood Kreuzberg silently tolerated the refugee protest and indirectly allowed the construction of the protest tent camp.

The political and administrative situation in Germany is important in order to understand what happened around the political protest of Oranienplatz. Germany is a federal country, and every region – Bundesland – has an executive organ, named Senate in Berlin. Moreover, in Berlin every neighbourhood has a municipality – Bezirk, i.e. administrative district – and a mayor. For each level corresponds several power and responsibility according to a multilevel governance system. The city of Berlin, such as that of Hamburg and Bremen, are an exception because they are Bundesland too, i.e. city-states. From 2011, Berlin is governed by the coalition of SPD and CDU. This coalition has been problematic and weak from the beginning, because of the different values and political views of the two parties: the conservative CDU on the right, and the socio-democratic SPD on the left. Indeed, the more “natural” coalition would have been between the SPD – that was the majority party with 28,3% of votes – and the Green party – the Grüne, which obtained the 17,6% – that has been the historical ally within the left-wing coalition. After several days of a controversial discussion for the formation of the Berliner government, the SPD decided to ally with the CDU, which had obtained the 23,3%.

The mayor of Berlin, Klaus Wowereit (SPD), was confirmed, and Frank Henkel (CDU) was appointed as the senator of the interior.

The Bezirk Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg – which involved the two neighbourhood of Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg – has traditionally been a leftist and alternative neighbourhood in Berlin, with an old tradition of political fights and house squatting movements. The district assembly is composed by the coalition of SPD and Grüne, and the major is Monika Hermann (Grüne). I will highlight forthcoming the central role that the political relations between these different parties played in the definition of the “Oranienplatz issue”.

The protest camp in Oranienplatz went on longer than expected, ending one and a half years

---

87 Indeed, there is still a debate if the Oranienplatz square was occupied or not, since the Kreuzberg municipality allowed it.

88 The main reason was the disagreement between the SPD and the Grüne party on the construction of the highway A100 that should criss-cross the city, supported by the SPD and not by the Grüne party.

89 Klaus Wowereit has been the major of Berlin from 2001 to 2014. He retired at the end of 2014, and Michael Müller (SPD) took his place.
later in April 2014. During this time, the Oranienplatz tent camp became a reference point for the political protest and for most of the new migrant subjects that arrived in Berlin: almost every day there were around 100 people, both migrant subjects and supporters groups, meeting in the square. The number of migrant subjects around Oranienplatz quickly increased during the one year and half: asylum-seekers, refugees, undocumented migrants and migrants with a document obtained in southern European countries – such as Spain, Italy and Portugal – started to head to Berlin, since the news of a big political fight claiming migrants rights spread in whole Europe through migrants networks and activists networks.

On 8th December 2012 people from Oranienplatz occupied an empty building of a former school named Gerhart-Hauptmann Schule placed in the Ohlauerstraße in Kreuzberg. “Oranienplatz people” decided to occupy this empty building because of the very cold winter with a lot of snow and because of the ever increasing number of migrants that could not all sleep in the tents that only had space for more or less 30 people.

Since January 2013, the number of migrant subjects with Italian documents arriving in Berlin increased steeply. Some of them were already living in other German cities or North European city, others arrived directly from Italy. The majority of them were people that had experienced the Emergenza Nord Africa program, and had obtained one-year humanitarian protection – a small number was holder of a subsidiary protection. The refugee protests kept going through the demonstration against the “Business Day Sudan, South Sudan and Germany” on 29th January 2013, and the solidarity demonstration together with Roma during the Roma International Day on 8th April 2013. The political protests did not only happen in Berlin. In Munich the “Refugee Struggles Congress” took place between the 1th and the 3th of March where the networks of non-citizen met. From 26th April to 8th June 2013 the “Refugee Liberation Bus tour” was organized in the region of Bavaria and Baden-Wüttemberg: the bus full of asylum-seekers, refugees and supporters has been in 22 cities visiting the Wohnheime and trying to raise awareness of asylum-seekers living there. Migrants and refugees protests were also very active in the city of Hamburg: from 12th to 19th April 2013 the “Refugee Women Conference” took place, and in May 2013 several big demonstrations started, held by migrants who landed in Italy in 2011 and had obtained there a humanitarian or subsidiary protection. Once the Emergenza Nord Africa program ended, these people decided to leave Italy because of the economic crisis and the difficult life condition in which they were living,

There was a big heterogeneity among the people that occupied Oranienplatz and those who have supported the political protest, and soon they create a network where both migrants and European supporters were active in making the decisions. Thus, it is possible to speak about “Oranienplatz people” when we refer to the protest network that was build around the Oranienplatz occupation.
namely homelessness and unemployment. These migrant subjects holding Italian document arrived in Hamburg in February 2013, and they were included in the Winterprogramm (Winter Program)\(^\text{91}\) of the city of Hamburg. Once the Spring had come, the sleeping structures of the Winter Program closed, and these people found themselves again on the street. At the beginning the group of migrant subjects with Italian documents politically active in Hamburg consisted of around 300 people, supported by a big network of anti-racist groups, churches operating in pro-migrants activities and artists. In autumn 2013 there was a big demonstration of around 15,000 people walking around in the city of Hamburg and claiming the Bleiberecht of the paragraph 23 of the national immigration law (the Ausländerrecht), i.e. the right to stay. There were several demonstrations with high tension with the police, also with some arrests of migrants. As well as in Berlin, the citizens, NGOs and political activists of Hamburg were very active in the support of the refugee protest, as for example the priest, Pastor Sieghard Wilm, which designated his church as sleeping place for some migrant subjects. Directly outside the central train station of Hamburg, a protest tend was built that worked as “info-point” for the refugee protest. The local media gave a lot of attention to these protests, and started to name these people «Lampedusa Flüchtlinge» (Lampedusa's Refugees). Thus, the migrant subjects raising the protest appropriated this expression and decided to name themselves as «Lampedusa in Hamburg» group:

«Countless people fled Libya crossing the Mediterranean sea towards Italy because of the NATO war. Many of them were forced to do so. Those who survived the passage are regarded as refugees for humanitarian reasons. They were administered with EU funding following the Italian immigration law. When the external funding for war refugees from Libya ended, the Italian government tried to get rid of the refugees and started throwing them out of the camps. Many refugees and migrants in Italy are forced to live on the streets. The country does not offer work or other perspectives and has been target of criticism by lawyers and NGOs because of the humanitarian disaster created by the authorities. Further on, the Italian government issued papers which allow the refugees to travel legally within the Schengen area. But the papers do not include permission to work neither do they grant any medical or social assistance, which makes them practically worthless. The refugees were advised to travel to central Europe and received money for this purpose. At that point many refugees did not realize the consequences of the conflict between European governments being carried out on their backs. During winter many of them lived in seasonal emergency accommodation facilities that were closed 5 weeks ago. Since then most of them, about 250 people, are forced to live on the streets. The German state, which itself was involved in the war in Libya and the senate of Hamburg are not willing to take any responsibility and hope for the situation to pass by without them taking action». (Interview of Affo Tchassei, from the web site of Lampedusa in Hamburg group).

The idea of this name was also to highlight that the European borders are not just on the

---

\(^{91}\) The winter program is usually oriented to homeless people, offering sleeping places.
island of Lampedusa, instead they are also within the European territory and they appear through the mobility restriction and prohibition of work, referring hence to the Dublin Regulation and the Schengen agreement. For these reasons “Lampedusa”, i.e. EU borders, is in Hamburg. It is also an example of a social icon, as explained in the previous paragraph: the construction of “Lampedusa” as the icon of EU border control and EU external frontier where the “illegal” migration is being fought, entails the creation of a cultural and social imaginary that impacts the policies implementation and hence the biographies of migrant subjects. “Lampedusa” is no longer the small island on the coast of Sicily, “Lampedusa” is fragmentarily displaced in the whole European territory.

The two centers of political fights connected each other during the spring and summer of 2013, converging to the two demonstrations on 17th August 2013 in Hamburg and Berlin enacted respectively by the groups Lampedusa in Hamburg and Lampedusa in Berlin92, claiming the right to work and stay in Germany.

«We are refugees coming from Italy with international protection, but no rights! We survived the NATO bombings and the civil war in Libya, to be homeless in Italy. Thousands of us are now in Germany in the same conditions: no housing, no access to social help, no access to the job market. We demand for a political solution.

We are here and we won't go back!

If we had found possible conditions in Italy, we would stay there. There was no perspective any more. Italian government closed the programs of reception – the so-called Emergency North Africa – throwing the people basically on the street. 500 Euro were given to each refugee with the suggestion to go away. Where? To North Europe.

The problem is now on a European level. Germany is one of the most powerful states, decision maker for the migrants and asylum policies in Europe. The Dublin II System – which says, that the Refugees “belong” to the first country in Europe they arrive – is aimed to deny the right of the Refugees to choose they want to live. The same ideology which is the base of the Residenzpflicht in Germany.

We want human right in whole Europe. Lampedusa in everywhere!»

(Lampedusa in Berlin group self-description, on Facebook page of Lampedusa in Berlin).

92 The group Lampedusa in Berlin was inspired by that of Lampedusa in Hamburg for the name.
Summary

In this chapter I have shed light on the complexity of the power relationships that are involved in the European border regime: the role of several actors with different sovereignties has been highlighted, which act on supranational, national and local levels. The interactions between state actors, NGOs, political activists networks, international organisations such as UNHCR and IOM, and migrant subjects lead to the production of the European border regime as a space of negotiating practices, where the rules and borders are constantly redefined through the power relations.

The genealogy allows to shed light on these power relations, highlighting how the sovereign power attempted during the last century to govern the migrant mobilities through several categories that influence the laws and bureaucratic practices, and create cultural and social imaginaries. The “refugee” and “asylum seeker” together with the “illegal migrant” are becoming the contemporary “internal enemies” from which the reception society must be defended. Moreover, the borders of these two categories became progressively blurred through the interconnection of securitarian devices and humanitarian concerns deployed to govern them. That is highlighted by the example of the Emergenza Nord Africa program in Italy and by the characteristic of the very restrictive German asylum system, notably the camp system and the mobility restriction. However, the migrant subjects have always managed to move towards and within the EU border regime, tracing different migratory routes that change according to the control system deployed to block them. The part on the Mediterranean area shed light exactly on this tension between the autonomous mobilities of migrant subjects and the attempt to govern, sort, rank and sometimes block these mobilities by the actors of European migration govern. This part allows also to trace more complex “migratory cartographies” that deconstruct the idea of a unique road directly connecting the countries of origin to Europe. The linearity of migratory movements is also deconstructed through the focus on the action of EU border regime on the temporal dimension: interruption, waiting, discontinuities, and fragmentation are the main characteristics of migrants experiences. Furthermore, the paragraph provided with “Lampedusa” and “Libya as transit country” two examples of the construction of imaginaries and the production of “crisis”, which directly affect the laws and governance practices implemented to govern migrant mobilities. The German case shed light on the tension between a very restrictive system of management of
asylum-seekers, and the social practices worked out by them in order to resist, overcome and break this system.

A mosaic of historical and present migratory routes emerge from the interaction between European policies of border control and migration management, the actions of supporters' networks, and the autonomous mobilities of migrant subjects, which try to open space and time for their life projects. It is a fragmented and sometimes interrupted mosaic, which has a historical continuity and hence has to be interpreted within the complexity of power relations that criss-cross the Mediterranean and European area. In this mosaic the biographies of migrant subjects are both autonomously constructed by the subjects and shaped by the EU policies and governmental practices. Furthermore, the temporal dimension emerges here as one of the crucial dimensions through which the EU border regime acts and has hence real effects on the subjects' lives. Drawing on my empirical data, in the next three chapters I will highlight the effects of this hybrid control and management regime on the biographies of migrant subjects, and I will shed light on their everyday life practices through which they face the border regime, and the resulting form of subjectivity.
In this chapter I address the time dimension with the theme of migration and borders. I focus on time as both a dimension on which the European Border Regime acts (Rigo 2011; Mezzadra & Neilson 2013), and as a crucial part of the subjective experience of migration. I here refer to the studies that focus on time rather than space dimension, underlining how migrants' experiences are characterized by flows and moments, rhythms and cycles, tempos, synchronicity and disjuncture, and the future (Griffiths, Rogers, and Anderson 2013; Anderson R., 2014). I shed light on how the migration and asylum policies, which combine a mix of abandonment and control practices, entail the temporalities of migrant subjects' biographies. The combination of policies of abandonment and control reflect the main characteristic of the migration and asylum management system that interconnect humanitarian and securitarian concerns. I grasp the effects of these policies of abandonment and control setting the research fields in the cities of Milan and Berlin, and how they act on the everyday life of migrant subjects, which experience time suspension, a lengthened wait, and a high level of uncertainty and precariousness. Hence their everyday lives are spatially and temporally fragmented, and they experience a continuous oscillation between a process of invisibility and high visibility in the urban space. The migrant subjects with temporary resident permits, thus, live the margins of the state, which emerge as shadow zones of institutional intervention. Within these shadow zones of the state, migrant subjects enact between and across the borders in order to build their lives.

In the third chapter, I shed light on migration as a non-linear path focussing on the migratory routes within the African-European borderlands, analysed through a processual perspective. In this chapter I further problematize the notion of migration as a linear path. I highlight the temporal disruptions and ruptures that occur in the migratory experience through the EU migration's control and management system. I focus on the post-arrival experiences of migrant subjects in two different countries and cities, namely Milan and Berlin.
4.1. Transitaly: no country for mobile-migrant man

In the previous chapter, I highlighted that the ENA (*Emergenza Nord Africa*) “system” can be interpreted as a temporal *rupture* within the migratory journeys of the migrant subjects. The emergency regime shaped the experience of migrant subjects as temporary, since it produced laws, legal statuses and management policies that prevented long-term planning. In this paragraph, I will highlight how the ENA program has influenced the temporalities of migrant subjects also after its closure. I will further show that also the process of invisibilization that started during the ENA (Dal Zotto 2014) continued after the closure. Caused by the ENA program, “emergency refugees” (Marchetti 2014b) distinguish themselves by the technical and political apparatus used for their management, rather than by their personal story or origin countries. The ENA plan has shaped the biographies of migrant subjects, whose everyday lives became characterized by the fragmentary nature, the temporariness, the invisibility and uncertainty, and the blurred nature of the juridical condition. The biographies of my research protagonists here presented, highlight this phenomenon.

When in December 2012 the Italian government declared the end of the state of emergency, the hotel-reception-centers closed and evicted the migrant subjects living inside. Since the Italian government did not plan a “second assistance program”, the majority of the people with humanitarian and subsidiary protection obtained during ENA found themselves on the street without any home and work, and without knowing where they should go. Each one received from the Italian government 500 Euros as “severance money”; furthermore, the local authorities\(^\text{93}\) that gave out this money suggested informally to all the migrant subjects to go abroad, because in Italy there was the economical crisis. The following narration of Rashid, a man from Nigeria, tells us what happened:

«Ehm, ok, how I can explain it to you. I went in Italy, I arrived in Lampedusa. From there they moved me to Manduria, and from Manduria they transferred us directly to Milano. There they took me to a hotel, we were seven people like myself, and we lived in this hotel in a small village called Gavirate for one year and seven months. After this time, they said “the camp is finish! You have to go outside”. And they give to every one 500, 500 and 500. We were told that there was a crisis in Italy, and there was no work for us. They told us “Italia have crisis, a very strong crisis”, Italia has problem by himself. Even citizen didn't have work, no work for citizen! So of course less work for we foreigners. So they told us that the government will do nothing for us at this time, because our problem

\(^{93}\) These were the staff of the reception centers or the police officers of *Questura*, the immigration office that deals with migrant issues.
was the last problem. I was so angry, I did not know where to go! So we asked “how we can do?” and they said that maybe anyone can take care by himself. There was just a possibility, if you want to go back to your country, they buy you a ticket and give you 1.500 Euros. That is what assistente sociale explained us, you understand? But anybody was agree, because 1500? nobody could cross the sea for this money, nobody could risk his life for that! Me also! Because .... you know, I don't know how I can explain it to you ... this one year and eight months, to wait for the documents, it was too much long!! too much! You loose your time just for wait a document. And then, they give you just a year's document! At least they should give us one year and eight months' document, because we loose that time! After that, nothing append! Nothing to do, no work, nothing! After the camp was finish, we just collect our money, and that's all. I take my money and I go to Germany with two friends [...] But the problem is the Italian document! I arrived in Germany, and I discovered that I couldn't work because of this document! I was so angry!». (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

The Italian local authorities omitted to inform migrant subjects about the rights and the restriction linked to their humanitarian and/or subsidiary protection. Both documents imply the so-called “reduced legal status”, i.e. a temporary protection that is time-limited and that denies the access to some rights. The main restriction is the freedom of movement, notably the circularity among the Schengen area. According to Schengen Agreement and Dublin III Regulation, the beneficiaries of a temporary protection obtained in a EU member state have to live and work in the country in which they first arrived. They cannot live and work in the country they choose. Temporary protection allows to freely move in Europe for just three months and as “tourists”, it denies the possibility to work and settle outside the country of first arrival. Thus, the migrant subjects that left Italy heading North Europe discovered that in the “new country” they were again treated as “illegal” migrants; but this time without the possibility to apply for asylum.

In the first time after the ENA plan closed, the majority of the dismissed people remained in Italy and started to move across the whole national territory looking for a job and a place to sleep. The unemployment and homelessness was the main experience of the migrant subjects, being completely abandoned by the reception system and, hence, by the state. Some research reports (Giovannetti 2013) have analysed the consequence of the ENA plan, highlighting how the protraction of intervention aimed just to absolve the basic needs of migrants entailed the “emergency” to became chronic. Indeed, a sort of “charity system” emerged, that was unable to understand the complex situation of these people and, thus, adequate orientation services and “integration” perspectives. The abandonment policy strengthened the invisibilization process that already started during the Emergenza Nord Africa. The trajectories of migrant subjects became more invisible, slipping into the «shadow of the law» (Malkki 1996: p.378) at the margins of the state. These migrant subjects dwell the margins, far away from the state

94 Assistente sociale is a social worker.
assistance, criss-crossing abandoned places and occupied houses, and experiencing high levels of economic poverty (Pinelli 2013b). Indeed, the migrant subjects who found a job did so in the shadow zones of the Italian economy, i.e. the informal economy. Many migrant subjects found employment – on a temporary basis and off the books – in the agricultural sector, following the rhythms of the seasons and moving between the places where harvests are collected. In periods of rest between a harvest and the next, the most desired destinations were big cities like Rome, Milan, Naples and Turin, where it is easier to find work and temporary shelter – in occupied or derelict buildings, or in homeless dormitories. Once the next agricultural season would start, they would leave the big city again and move to the regions of agricultural work. This is the experience of Essien, a young man from Burkina Faso arrived in Lampedusa in 2011:

«I have done the camp in Gavirate. I was working at the restaurant as dish washer, and it was black job. In Italy you can find just black job [he smiles]. Then, once they close the camp, they sent us away. I went to Foggia to work in the fields. I had many friends there, so I called them and asked if I could work with them. They told me that I could go there and find some work. I stayed in Foggia six months. I did the grape harvest and also picked peppers and tomatoes. I took up a lot of jobs there. But very bad! I slept in the fields, we looked for some cardboard and then wood, and we built a hut. That’s where we slept. But with this life you’re dead! [he laughs] You work an hour and they pay three Euros. You can spend one year like this, but not a lifetime. Then my residence permit expired and so I came to Milan to renew it and look for work» (Interview with Essien in Milan, April 2014)

Thus, rather than places of arrival and permanence, large cities become temporary stopovers to look for work and deal with the bureaucracy to gain the right papers. Furthermore, large cities have been practice as gateways to cross national borders. Mobility remains the predominant feature of migration even after the landing; these people keep moving through the whole national territory also several years after their first arrival, looking for a haven place to settle. Specifically, the mobility of the people “coming from ENA” is characterised by the circularity of their paths, since it does not followed the typical one-way line from south to north. Circularity in and out of Italy, and even within the same city. The paths of mobility traced throughout the country are thus a succession of arrivals, departures and returns, and often change from person to person. As the experience of Radu, a young man from Mali with a subsidiary protection, shows:

«After Lampedusa they moved me to Apulia, Brindisi. I was there for a year. When the time at the hotel came to an end, “the camp is shut”, they said. They gave everyone 500 Euros. And many left for other countries. “Go away!!” This is what they said. They closed the dormitories, everything. But with 500 Euros you cannot get home, how can you?! There is no dormitory, because they closed it, there is no home, what are you
supposed to do?! [...] I went to Foggia. There is what they call the “Gran Ghetto” [he laughs] there they make their homes with cardboard and plastic. Then you look for work in the countryside, with tomatoes, grapes .. lots of stuff [...] Then the countryside is over, there is no more work, I have to change, I try another job. I go to Rosarno. Picking oranges. [...] You know how it works! When you are in Italy, after a while you know where there's work: tomatoes in Foggia, apples in Torino, then grapes here, peppers there. [...] Then from Rosarno I went to Holland, a friend of mine lives in Amsterdam so I went there to find work. But the problem there is the Italian permit, it’s not good to find work. I was there for nine months, I worked off the books, but the problem was that I couldn’t find a job to pay for the house, so I went back to Italy. And I went to Torino, Saluzzo, to pick apples. I stayed there five months, and then I came to Milan to look for a job»

(Interview with Radu in Milan, April 2014)

The migrant subjects move along paths based on the networks that they built during the migration process, from the country of origin to the country of transit – in this case Libya – up to the country of first landing and beyond. Within these networks, they exchange information and relationships are established, which lead people towards a city rather than another, or towards a certain European state. Sometimes the migrant subjects get also jobs through the networks, for example in the agricultural sector. Hence circulatory territories emerge (Tarrius 2010), which describe the socio-spatial movements of the population that moves between and beyond borders. The concept of circulatory territories helps to highlight new territories of exchange, circulation and hybridization that emerge in some European and Mediterranean cities such as Marseilles, Istanbul, Alicante, Damascus, Milan, Turin and Naples. According to Tarrius (2010) these ongoing transnational networks of people, goods and activities that criss-cross the cities entail a model of globalization from below. This ongoing process interacts, deals and conflicts with the mainstream process of globalization, and it differentiates itself through its main feature – the invisibility. Indeed, some authors speak about «shadow circuits» (Schmoll and Semi 2013) in order to highlight an invisible set of interactions within a circular territory, in which migrant subjects act and move across borders taking advantage of the gap between different states' regulations and structures. With their different mobility and transnational networks, these migratory circuits are often underestimated by the dominant sedentary narrative but are essential for a revised view of the role of cities as places of connection rather than as points of arrival.

Western societies respond to this new reality in movement by strengthening their sedentary culture and putting in place a system of reception and control of mobility that proves out of step with such changes. This tension between the migrants mobilities and the attempt to control and organise it on the part of local, national and European authorities bears direct consequences on the lives of the protagonists of my research. Furthermore, my research sheds light on the ambivalence of the polices of abandonment and control deployed by the state in
order to govern its margins (Das and Poole 2004). In the next paragraphs I will highlight the ambivalence of the reception system in the city of Milan, where the biographies of migrant subjects are antithetically enclosed within the tight structures of the assistance circuits or abandoned into the state margins (Pinelli 2013b). This tension leads to a fragmentation and invisibilization of the migrants’ trajectories and biographies.

**Milan as the gateway to North Europe: city of arrivals, transits and further departures**

The city of Milan provides an interesting ground to examine these tensions. Some works in urban studies shed light on the transformation of the urban life and space through the migrants’ experiences within the Italian metropolis. Time and space characterising the lifestyles of urban populations highlight the inadequacy of the local administration of the territory, which considers permanence as the only model in the space-society relationship (Pezzoni 2013). According to some urban theories, the characteristics of the contemporary city and, thus, of the dwelling are mobility and temporariness (Chambers 1996, La Cecla 1993, Augé 1994, in Pezzoni 2013). The inhabitants the contemporary city have been labelled «frontier subject» (Chambers 1996) and the analysis about the way to inhabit the city focussed on the precariousness (La Cecla 1993) and “nomadism” (Augé 1994) as main characteristics. Thus, multiple spatialities and temporalities influence the ways of dwelling the city, and the local authorities appear unprepared to this complexity (Pezzoni 2013). The temporary settlement of migrant subjects, “asylum seekers” and “refugees” in Milan highlights the inconsistency between the space of social practices and the political and administrative space of the local authorities.

Milan has always been among the top destinations for many migrant subjects arriving in Italy. In the national context, it is the only urban metropolis – an economic and business hub – which is also strategically located in geographical terms, as it is a gateway to Northern Europe. During and following the Emergenza Nord Africa, the role of Milan as a place of arrival, transit and further departure was significantly enhanced. This was due to a particular reception policy that, once the end of the state of emergency was proclaimed, “showed the door” to most recipients of humanitarian protection. The lack of a real commitment in the provision of long-term reception, coupled with the lack of shelter and the difficulty of finding work, drove most migrant subjects to travel around Italy in search of housing and employment, and many of them steered towards Milan.

The role of Milan as crossroad for a heterogeneous population of migrant subjects has been
highlighted in research conducted in the past decades (Schuster 2005; Armelloni et al. 2008; Marras 2008), but the year 2011 can be considered a turning point also in the further transformation of this city as a transit place\(^5\). One of the main contradictions of the Emergenza Nord Africa program was the incongruity between the policies at the national level with those at the local level, as highlighted in the previous chapter (Campesi 2011b). The Italian government had indirectly pushed the “ENA population” to leave Italy towards Northern European countries, closing the reception system without planning a “second reception” for integration. That provoked a high mobility of migrant subjects, but this mobility was not accepted and understood by the local authorities that had to renew their resident permit or to give them a place to sleep. Their mobility has been even treated as dangerous, according to the sedentary culture that still characterizes the western society.

The head of immigration office look at us [me and one protagonist of my research, Rashid] behaving aggressive, and tells me: “You ask me if there are problems?! Of course, Miss, and I’ll explain them straight away: this is a nomad! [referring to Rashid, that needed to renew his humanitarian protection] and we are a sedentary society, do you know what I mean?! [...] The problem is that he does not respect our culture and our civilization! Because if one is a nomad, it means that he does not accept who we are, sedentary! But he’s here with us, so either he accepts it or there will be trouble, do you understand?! [...] Isn’t somebody who is homeless a nomad?! Isn’t it the same thing?! So somebody sleeping at the Casa della Carità, which is a dormitory open during the cold season, is a nomad. Also, here it says that he sleeps at Milan’s railways station, and what does that tell us?! That he is a nomad who does not respect our culture! [...]” (From ethnographic notes in Questura of Milan, in January 2014)

The words of the head of immigration office in Milan shed light exactly on the contradiction between the policies of abandonment and control deployed in the management of migration, and the gap between the national and local policies. The fact that Rashid, a person with humanitarian protection obtained during ENA, lives in a homeless dormitory is a consequence of the abandonment policy acted by the Italian government; but his homelessness together with his mobility is treated as dangerous, as something that has to be controlled because is a threat for our western sedentary society. Several structural characteristics of Italian society contribute to the definition of the extreme precarious living condition of Rashid that is valid for the majority of migrants subjects. A “familism” welfare state – that is based on a model where the family rather than the state is the main resource basin for people (Esping-Andersen 1990). Together with a little developed asylum system and labour market mainly through the

\(^5\) The role as gateway to North Europe further increased during the years 2013 and 2014, when people escaping from Syria and Eritrea landed on Italian shores and refused to give their fingerprints in order to continue their migratory journey towards North European countries. See Marchetti (2014b), and Brekke & Brochmann (2014).
informal economy entails the migrant subjects in precarious life conditions (Brekke and Brochmann 2014). Furthermore, the economic financial crisis that started in 2009 played a crucial role in the definition of the migratory paths of the protagonists of my research, because in the aftermath of the crisis it was very difficult to find a job in Italy.

**Fragmented lives in the reception system in Milan: waiting, turning around, and queuing.**

«From the first moment I arrived in Lampedusa, the first thing they had us do was to get in line. ‘I don’t like this queue – I thought – there is something wrong!’ And I was right. This would only be the first of many queues: all of us in line waiting to get in, with a piece of paper with our name on it, documents, photos, cards, a lot of cards! A lot of queues! This is Europe. I immediately realised that queue was not a good sign ... it was a nightmare!»

(Interview with Dakari, January 2014)

Several problems and ambivalences characterise the reception of asylum seekers and refugees in Milan. The ambivalence inherent in the notion of “refugees” – recipients of help (a vulnerable group) but subject to control by reason of their status (criminalization) – is reflected in the organisation of the reception, divided between emergency measures and assistance procedures.

The implementation of reception services for vulnerable groups is developed through a network of initial assistance and further support services, partly provided by the City of Milan but also by both Catholic and non-Catholic private social organisations. Dormitories, soup kitchens and public showers are some of the initial assistance services disseminated in the Milan area. It is a system of critical importance, because it creates an “assistance network”, which is difficult to escape from: the daily lives of asylum seekers and refugees adapt to the patterns set by such services which, by directing the trajectories of these subjects, make them dependent on the system and act as an impediment to creating autonomous subjects. The narration of Essien, a young man from Burkina Faso with humanitarian protection who has lived in Milan for 8 months, describes his typical day:

«I wake up at 7 am, because I have to leave the dormitory at 8 o’clock. I would like to take a shower, but since we only have a few showers and there are so many of us, I should wake up at 4 am, and it's too early! So I go to the public showers, the ones close to
the Rai [Italian State Television]. Once I get there, I get in line. I wait and wait in the queue. Finally I can go in and take a shower. I come out and it is 10.30, now I have to eat, because the soup kitchen at the church closes at 11:30. I get to the soup kitchen, and I have to queue again. I wait in the queue, again! Queues, queues, queues, we always have to queue to get in somewhere, that’s how we live in Italy! Also, I’d rather not eat in that place, I am ashamed! I don’t like to be given free food ... I would like to buy my own food, and cook! But it’s impossible because I don’t have a job. And after eating .... I have nothing to do. What could I do?! I walk around! Around, around, around, walking around, that’s all we do. I look for work, leave my resume, but without hope; I have been living like this for three years now, but no work! This isn’t living» (Interview with Essien in Milan, April 2014)

The fragmentation of daily life is reflected in the urban space: the places where basic needs such as eating, sleeping, and taking a shower can be met, which are usually satisfied in private places like homes, are instead scattered all over Milan.

The reversal of the public and private spheres in everyday existence is the first effect this has on the lives of individuals. Activities that are usually carried out in the private sphere take place in public settings, and the lack of a space of intimacy generates a high level of frustration, as Essien has explained above. In addition, the difficulty in carving out spaces of autonomy means that the entire day is used up finding places for the fulfilment of basic needs which, being scattered around the city, involve long journeys to get from one place to another.

The following ethnographic note of Radu's typical day stresses exactly this fragmentation of activities, occurring in the public space and scattered in the whole city:

Radu sleeps in the dormitory in via Aldini, which is placed in the northern periphery of Milan. He has to go out the dormitory at 8:30 am. I am there at this time, in front of the door. “You are lucky, is a beautiful day, the sun is shining!” Radu tells me immediately when we meet, “So we can do our rounds without problems” he smiles. From the dormitory several guys continuously go out, and I recognise some of them, which are usually frequenting the Naga. They look at me very surprised, they say hallo to me, and they go further. We go to the bus stop, where we meet spontaneously Dakari, who is living in another dormitory close to that of Radu. Dakari is very happy to see us, and we wait together for the bus. No one besides us is on the street. Is a typical cold and clear winter morning, the street is empty, I see just migrant people walking alone or in groups of two or three people. “They are all living in the dormitories – tells me Radu – we are a lot” he smiles. We take the bus and Radu tells me that now he has to take a shower, because in the dormitory there are just common showers and there are not so many, so he should had wake up at 4 o’clock in order to have a shower, because they are a lot of people. “So, I prefer the public showers! You know, in the dormitory we are around ten or eleven people in one bedroom, is not good at all! It is very uncomfortable!” He shakes his head “In winter is ok, but in the summer … the people smell bad!! Because they don't take a shower very often ... so bad!”. We take the tram 12, and we start small talk with Dakari and Radu that make fun of themselves. There are also other people who usually come to Naga, so we talk together. They ask me why I am there, and I explain to them. “Very bad is our situation, you see! – one of them starts to talk – if you want to understand which are our problems, just stay with us all the day! And then you will understand”. At one point, me and Radu go out of the tram, we say goodbye to Dakari and we go to the tram 19. We are just people of the dormitory, around 15 people. At the
tram stop we meet other people that usually come to Naga. They ask me why I am there, and I explain it to them. One of them, Essien, seems very interested in what I am doing “If you want, one day, I can also help you to understand how we live and which are our problem in Milan”, I say to him that I will be very happy to meet and “follow” him another day. I turn to the other “Naga guys” and I ask them where they are going. “Giro96! What else?!? giro, giro, giro!” they answer. Radu looks at me and tells me “what we can do all the day long is just that: giro. There is no work, no place to stay, and so what you do?! You walk around!”. I look at these guys and I start to understand how they carry out their everyday life in the reception system of Milan. Continuous movements and displacements all around the city, by foot or by public transport such as tram and bus. […] At one point, we have to get out the tram, we have arrived to the place of public shower: the RAI UNO97 station. We take a perpendicular street of Sempione street, and we walk along the big RAI tower, then at the end of the street we turn left in a secondary empty street that is along the rail tracks of a train station: here there are the public showers. There are six or seven people waiting outside the closed door. We sit on the side-walk and we wait. At one point, one man leans out of the building’s window and scream a number “Twenty-four!”. He comes down the stairs and opens the door. The person with the number 24 goes inside, and the man look at us and asks: “how many of you want to take a shower?”. All the seven people besides me tell him that they want to have a shower. The man distributes some piece of paper with a number, then he goes inside and closes the door. Me and Radu wait outside, and we talk. “Strange! Usually there are a lot of people here outside, but today not so many – says Radu – sometimes, the police comes”, “why?” I ask, “the most of the time there is no reason, but when there are a lot of people there is some noise, thus the police comes and remains outside with us, looking that everything is ok”. Radu tells me that there are other public showers, in via Turati close to the Questura, but they close it at 11:00 am and it is very difficult to get inside. These public showers, instead, are very good. “The man is a nice person, they give us a soup and pieces of papers to dry, they are very nice here!”. At one point, the man comes outside again and invites all the people to enter and wait inside for the shower, because it is warmer. Radu invites me to go inside with them, but I decide to remain outside in the sun. I sit on the side-walk, I take the notes book out of my bag and I start to write some ethnographic notes. The street is extremely quiet, no noise, no one is there, the feeling is that time has stopped. I look at the clock: is 9:40 am, so early! I wait until 10:20 am, when Radu comes outside with a big smile on his face. “I am so relaxed after the shower!” We go away, and Radu tells me: “Now I go to eat. There is a place close to here, where we usually eat”. I see that he is a bit hesitant, and I ask him if there is any problem. He tells me that he is afraid that for me that soup kitchen is not a good place. “I am afraid that you will get embarrassed there!”. I explain to him that for me there is no problem to go there, but if for him it is a problem, I can wait outside. “No, no, no! – he smiles – I am happy if you come with me. I just was wondering if it could be a good place for you … I was afraid for you, that you feel ashamed there, because there are a lot of people like me that you don't know. But I am happy if we go there together”. We arrive at the soup kitchen that is inside a Church. Outside there is a queue. We stand in the queue and wait. Radu looks at me and starts to laugh: “You see how we live? What do you think?? Queue for the showers, queue for the mensa98, always queues … and then? You doing nothing!”. We stand some minutes in the queue, around me I see just men. Behind us there are two Italian men, they are speaking about their life, that is difficult because they loose their jobs because of the economical crisis. I don't want to hear their personal talk, but it is impossible not to follow, because the queue is very narrow and you are very close to other people. We get inside the soup kitchen, down the stairs, it is underground

96 “Giro” means in Italian “go around”. I decide to keep the Italian word because several migrant subjects that usually speak in English or French used the Italian word “giro”.

97 The RAI is the Italian State Television.

98 “Mensa” is the Italian word for “soup kitchen”.
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the Church. The people that are working there look at me and tell me that if I want I can skip the line because there is a lot of space for the women. I thank them, but I tell them that I want to stay together with my friend Radu. Radu tells me that I have to eat something, because there is good food. I am not hungry at all, I look at the clock: it is 10:40 am. But Radu tells me that if I don't take something to eat, it could be strange that I am there, so it is better if I eat something. “This place is open between 10:30 am and 11:30 am, so we have to eat now”, he smiles. I agree, and I take a salad with a mozzarella, because a pasta with tomato sauce could be too much for me at this time in the morning. We take the food and we want to sit at a table, but one man of the Church asks me: “maybe you want to sit at this free table, it is specific for women”. I thank him, but I say that I would prefer to sit together with my friends. The man tries to explain me that there is no option: I have to sit on the women table, just with women. So, Radu tells me to sit there, and he sits around the male table close to me, and says “bon appétiti!” I sit around the table and in front of me, put on the wall there is a sign: “solo donne”. There are three tables for women and five tables for men. The tables are places one close to the other in line, because we are in a corridor underground the Church. There is not so much light and the space is narrow, but the situation is very quiet. People are eating, and almost no one is speaking. It is possible to hear just the voices of the two Italian men, that were behind us in the queue, speaking and laughing. There is a young guy sitting close to Radu, he looks at me and he smiles. I try to understand where I have already seen his face, but I am a bit confused. At one point, he tells me: “hallo”, and he continuous to eat. I answer “hallo”, continuing eating. “Ah, it is Paki!!” I thought for myself, “a refugee coming often to Naga!”. He understands that I realised just in that moment who he is, and he laughs and smiles at me. Radu and Paki didn't talk to each other, and once we finished to eat, Radu waves his head telling me to go outside. We stand up and head to the exit, and Paki says: “see you in Naga!”. Now Radu wants to go to some employment agencies in order to leave his curriculum. “I need to find a job!”, he tells me. We start to walk, but he seems disoriented and a bit confused. We talk a lot during our walking, and he tells me that he doesn't have a good sense of direction. “I loose always the way in this city – he smiles – now we have to go back to the public shower, and from there I can find the way again”. We walk around for a while, sometimes speaking, sometimes in silence. He shows me a piece of paper where there are some addresses of employment agencies, and the way to reach it by bus and tram. We take the tram to Stazione Centrale, because from there Radu can orient himself, “is like the central place, from there started all the trams and buses, and is the place where is always easy to reach”. [...] In Stazione Centrale we take the tram. It is around 12:00 am. We sit in the small old tram, and we wait until the final station. Once we arrive at the last stop, we realise that we took the tram in the wrong direction. “Oh!! It happens always to me!” says Radu. He looks at the hour, and it is 12:50 am, too late to try to reach the employment agency, because the office will close at 13:00 am. “So, where are we going now?” I ask to Radu, and he replies “usually, when I want to rest a bit and keep quite, I go to the bingo” he smiles “there I can watch football, I love football! And I meet a lot of friends. Is a nice place; my favourite is close to Porta Romana, let's go there!”. We go back to Stazione Centrale, and we take the tram 9 direction Viale Monte Nero, where there is the bingo. [...] Once there, we meet a lot of friends of Radu, which are all people coming often to Naga, so we know each other and we start to talk. I talk above all with Tahar that explain me how he met Radu for the first time: “We met in Saluzzo, we were both working there by the farmers. We harvest apples!”. He tells me how the life is difficult in Milan for him, no job, no house. All the day long just walking around the city “giro, giro, giro!”, for this reason he comes to the bingo, to keep quiet and rest. “Exactly like Radu”, I say. In the meantime, Radu has taken a game sheet for bet. He explain me how it works, and then we try to play. They are all surprised that I like football, and also that I know it very well. So we decide to see some football matches together. It is 14:00 am, now Radu, Tahar and the other guys want to go.

99 “Solo donne” means “just women”.
to Naga. So we go out of the bingo, and we wait for the bus that will bring us to Naga. (Shadowing with Radu in Milan, February 2014)

The everyday rhythm that Radu experiences is articulated by the activities he does for satisfying his basic needs. Moreover, the use of the expression «giro, giro, giro» was usually repeated by all the protagonists of my research and their friends. This highlights the circularity of the movements that occurs within the city as well as the “turning around” movements that are characterized by inactivity. The turning around involved a particular temporality that is characterized by the waste of the time. The sentences «What we can do? Giro, giro, giro, we have nothing else to do.» shed light on a particular time with a decelerated and fragmented rhythm. The lack of work and the organisation of the reception system in Milan based on “charity”, make it difficult for migrant subjects to develop autonomy. The frustration and feelings of shame – as Radu has explained me when we went to the soup kitchen – are one of the consequences of this reception system, which will be analysed in more detail in chapter six. The following figure 4 gives a visual impression of this scattered and fragmented everyday all over the urban space.

According to the literature on time and migration (Griffiths, Rogers, e Anderson, 2013), the mobility is a crucial factor in order to grasp the temporalities of migrants (Cwerner 2001). Looking at the everyday experiences of the protagonists of my research, their movements within the Milan city take shape as circuits, that however presents a particularity. On one side, their temporal rhythm is that of cyclical and repetitive time, often presented as an alternative to models of linear time (Bauerkemper 2007, in Griffiths et al. 2013). Indeed, their everyday life is repetitive and follows circular lines instead of linear ones. On the other side, these circuits are not entire and continuous, but fragmented. The frequent movements are sometimes interrupted, and migrant subjects experience a time suspension typical for the limbo condition. They “get stuck”, unable – for a limited time – to progress spatially or legally (Griffiths et al. 2013; Brekke & Brochmann 2014).
This liminality (Donnan and Wilson 1999) can extend indefinitely, according to the (im)mobility (Glick-Schiller and Salazar 2013) condition that the migrant subjects experience. The following narration of Dakari highlights how these temporal disruptions occurred in his everyday life in Milan:

«You know how many dormitory I have changed? You can stay there just three months, or maybe four. And than, outside! On the street! I arrived in Stazione Centrale\textsuperscript{100}, and the first days I didn't know where I should go. I was sitting there and thinking "Mamma mia!"

\textsuperscript{100}The main train station of Milan is named Stazione Centrale, and usually the protagonists of my research use the word Centrale to refer to it. I prefer to remain as close as possible to the original words used by the migrant subjects.
The life is hard!", then I meet people like me, Africans! They told me to go to Centro Aiuto\textsuperscript{101}. I went there and they gave me a place in a dormitory. The day after I had to go to the hospital for blood exam, Centro Aiuto asked me! After one week, I had to leave the dormitory. They send me to another one, Barsachi was the name, I think. I staid there three months. Then, finished! It was a place of Cooperative Arca. I asked them another place, but at that time, they didn't have it. So I went again to Stazione Centrale, and I slept there. On the bench! One day, the girl of Arca called me, and told me that maybe she found a place for me, in a dormitory. I had to go to Barabino\textsuperscript{102}. I went there, but nothing! So, they send me to Casa della Carità\textsuperscript{103}, but nothing! No place! So I went to the mosque, a place where I keep calm. There I can stay quiet, the stress was so much. I slept outside, in park, abandoned houses, you know the story. I cannot say how many time it was, for me was infinite time. I was sleeping in giardini di Corvetto [park of Corvetto, a neighbourhood of Milan], that was a good place for me, because was close to the mosque. At this time there was the Ramadan, so I was always in the mosque. After, I was used to go to this park, and there you meet a lot of people, Italians, foreigners, a lot of people and you talk with them! I liked it! When the night came, I was used to remain there, and sleep on a bench. One day, in Naga, I met a guy who told me that there was an abandoned house, in Lodi. In Piazzale Lodi [Lodi square]. So I went there, and I slept there for … I don't know any more, I cannot remember. Days, weeks, I don't know. One day, the girl of Arca calls me: she had a place for me! I was so happy! I wouldn't had to sleep outside any more! It was a hotel room with young workers. I could just sleep there, no food, nothing. There was another guy with me, from Guinea. I stay there three months, after … I had to go away, again! Again I slept outside, in the street … I don't remember any more how much time. While I was sleeping the abandoned houses in Piazzale Lodi, the Arca girl calls me again. There is a place for me in the dormitory Mambretti. Now I am there, but at the end of March I have to leave it again … soon![he sighs] I told you, these queue … I understood immediately that were negative for us. Queue is bad! Queue for eating, for sleeping, for doing everything. And sometimes, you remain outside. For me, maybe, is better to leave this country … is better than waste so much time in Italy!» (Interview with Dakari in Milan, April 2014)

Living in abandoned houses and sleeping outside between one dormitory and another have been usual experiences for the protagonists of my research. In the fifth chapter, I will deeply analyse the nature that such “border places” and “transit places” according to the use by the migrant subjects, and the particular temporality they experience there. From Dakari's words emerge how the experience of dwelling such places leads together with the inactivity and the uncertainty of the future to a particular time experience: the suspension is extended and becomes indefinite, and it is difficult for the subject to keep aware of the linearity of time, «I slept there for … I don't know any more, I cannot remember. Days, weeks, I don't know». These temporal ruptures fragment the everyday lives of migrant subjects, and increase the level of frustration, as Badu tells us:

«I have done the camp in Calabria. During the time in Italy, I slept a lot outside, in the

\textsuperscript{101} Centro Aiuto (Help Center) is a service of the City Milan placed in the train station Stazione Centrale with the purpose to guide the vulnerable population to the reception and assistance services within Milan.

\textsuperscript{102} The main office of social services in Milan is placed in via Barabino.

\textsuperscript{103} Casa della Carità (House of Charity) is a private social organization that works as dormitory, cultural and social center for vulnerable subjects.
street. In Milan, I slept one month on the street, at the train station, Centrale. But now I am in a dormitory, in via Assietta. I ask for a normal house, I have the documents, three years! I have everything! But nothing. Dormitorio [dormitory] is like this, sometimes ten days, sometimes three weeks, sometimes two months. But at the end, you have always to go out! Dormitorio is not good! Dormitorio is for people ill in their head, but now I am not ill! Not yet … ! You understand, the crazy people sleep in the dormitorio, but I am good! I have the head that is good, my hands are good [he shows me his hand], I am all good! Anyway, I have to sleep on the street, why?! So is not good. Here there is maybe some work, better than Calabria. But friends told me that they didn't give work to black people … they don't like us. In this time, in Italia, is strange … is always like this: I found casa [home], a dormitorio, but you have to go out. So I take my bag, and I go out. Then I found casa again, and than again I take my bag and go out, and so on. Like this, the life, is not good. I don't like it!» (Interview with Badu in Milan, April 2014)

Works that focus on the trajectories of migrant subjects (Schapendonk 2012; Brekke and Brochmann 2014), which are not considered as just a movement from A to B, highlight the variety of temporalities that migrant subjects experience, which cannot be reduced to just “travel time”. Waiting, accelerating, queuing, being still, stopping, repeating etc. are among the different experiences of the journey. Usually these experiences are considered as typical of the first arrival time, being associated with the experience of asylum-seekers or immigration detainees (Griffiths 2014). In the case of the protagonists of my research, they are people who have obtained a humanitarian or subsidiary protection, and at the moment of the research they were living in Italy for almost three years. Thus, the particular temporality they experience during the reception time in Emergenza Nord Africa, has been extended also to after the end of the program, shaping their everyday lives.

This fragmentation occurs both in time and space. The temporary nature of the legal status on the one hand and the fragmented rhythms of daily life on the other hand lead to experiencing time as dilated, hindering the creation of future projects. The time dilation is caused by several factors, like the repetitive waiting in line to access soup kitchens, public showers, legal advice centres, the inaction resulting from lack of employment or the time spent waiting in offices to process the paperwork needed for the permit. Queuing up is a common activity in the lives of the migrant subjects, involving protracted waits for access and imposing slower, dilated rhythms. Waiting and inactivity due to the lack of work can result in increasing passivity as well as frustration. The feeling of “wasting time” is the main problem experienced by the protagonists of my research. Being stuck between a bureaucratic process and the other, often for years, unable to find work, is a strong obstacle against developing future projects.

It is 8:30 am, I go to the park behind Porta Romana, close to ring road Tibaldi. This is the favourite place of Dakari: he goes there every morning in order to do some sport. He
explains me that when the weather is warm he comes everyday to do some jogging. Now that it is cold, he comes just three or four days a week. I sit on one bench, and he starts to do some gymnastic exercises. The park is quite, no one is there besides us. Dakari is very well organized, he does a good work out for his body. Sometimes he stops, and we converse a bit. “The life is difficult” and he starts to tell me his story, about his family, the situation in his origin country […] He tells me that he is blocked in Italy, because of his Italian document. “I didn’t want to come to Europe! I was so happy in Libya! I had a job, a lot of money, a house! But than, the war started, and the way to go back to my country was blocked … the Arabs … they are very very bad! I can tell you, what they have done to some friends of mine […]”. He tells me how he arrived in Lampedusa, and what happened later […] Sometimes someone passes through the park and Dakari greets that person. He knows a lot of people there. Around 10:15 am Dakari ask me if we can move further. He wants to go to the public Library, because he has to study for the driving licence. He tells me that he goes to the public Library because it is a free and warm place, and outside it is very cold. We start to walk through the park, direction via Tibaldi. I am impressed that it is so early, the time passes very slowly. We walk on the ring road Tibaldi, where usually I travel by bus. Dakari shows me a place where outside there is long queue of people – most of them are migrants. At the beginning, I thought it was a soup kitchen, but Dakari tells me that is a place where people distribute food, such as vegetable, fruits, meat. The name is Pane Quotidiano [daily bred]. The queue is long, there are women, children and men. “Here come above all Arabs and Rumanian”, explain me Dakari. We walk alongside the queue and I see some people from Afghanistan that usually come to Naga. They look at me surprised, and we say hello to each other. Dakari explains me a lot of things: “this is like an informal market, usually the Arabs go there … look!” He points to the 90-91 bus stop: there is an old man, who is selling a lot of old cloths and shoes. “He sells cloths and shoes for 1 or 2 Euros – Dakari explains me – and he stays there because he is close to Pane Quotidiano, so here he has the better buyers – he smiles – but sometimes the police comes, and he has to go away”. I look at this place: the man is selling some clothes and shoes, the merchandise lays on a white bed sheet on the ground. The man is negotiating around the price with some clients, and one meter close to him there are a lot of well dressed Italian people, waiting for the bus and probably going to work. We stay there for a while, looking at these two very different worlds that meet within four meters of street. Dakari smiles, and tells me “this is our life, now you understand?”. We arrive in the public library Tibaldi, and we enter inside. Dakari knows a lot of people, so he starts to talk to them and he introduces me. We sit at a table, Dakari start to study for the driving licence and I write some ethnographic notes. Sometimes someone passes by and speaks with Dakari. One guy that usually comes to Naga, comes to us and he says hello, looking at me surprised. It is 11:30, I feel very tired and full, the feeling is that the day is at the end, but we are still in the morning. Around 12 we move in order to go to the soup kitchen, the biggest one in Piazza Tricolore. Dakari tells me that he usually doesn’t eat at noon, only in the evening. But today, because I am there, he will enjoy that we eat together. He takes a card out of his pocket, it is the soup kitchen’s card. He gives it to me, and tells me: “this is the soup kitchen’s card of a friend of mine, we started together the Milanese adventure – he smiles – but after some time he decided to go to Germany, looking there for his luck” […] We arrive in Piazza Tricolore, and outside the soup kitchen there is a queue. Dakari points the queue and exclaims “I told you!! Look! Queues, always queues! That’s not good! I told it the first time I arrived in Lampedusa, no one trusted me! My friends, they were laughing and saying ‘Dakari, what are you telling!!’ But I was right! Queue is negative!!”. We stand in the queue, the space is very narrow, just two people can stay close to each other; we go upstairs and there is a rotating gate. We insert the card and we get inside. I don’t know exactly what I should do, so I follow Dakari. There are a lot of people, most of them migrant people, but also some Italians. I am almost the only woman. We stand in a queue in order to take the tray, and the same for the food. We sit around a table, and I recognise several people that come usually to Naga. They look at us, Dakari smiles and says hello. They also say hello,
also to me, but no one come to us. I ask Dakari if there is some problem that I am there with him, but he told me that it is always like this “the people don't like this place! They don't like to be here, to eat for free … we just come inside, we eat quickly, we don't talk, and then go again outside”. So we do the same, we eat quickly, we don't talk so much, and then we go outside. It is 13:00 am, but I feel it is later. Outside the soup kitchen we meet a friend of Dakari, he knows him since he arrived in Milan. They start to talk, because this friend doesn't live in Milan any more. He works in Udine, but when the work is finished he comes back to Milan for a while, and then he goes back to Udine again[…]

We say good bye to the friend of Dakari, “Now – says Dakari – there is nothing to do – he smiles – sometimes I take the tram 9 and I go to Tibaldi ring road, and then I take the bus 90-91 along the all ring road! I like it, it is my place. I know it very well. So, I get to know the city”. I follow him, and we decide to do exactly this tour, as he always does […] (Shadowing with Dakari in Milan, February 2014)

The city is thus experienced in a different way in comparison with Italian people or other migrant subjects that go through a “normal” life characterized by private housing, paid work and leisure time. It is interesting to consider how migration illuminates the disjuncture within and between “national times” (Cwerner 2001), characterized by the “cultural and industrial time” that shape the habits and the everyday (Griffiths, Rogers, e Anderson, 2013). The everyday life of Dakari and Radu shows how their city is composed by functional places – such as dormitories, soup kitchens, public showers, lawyer offices, “rest places” – such as the bingo or the parks –, “transit places” – such as abandoned houses and the train stations –, and by trajectories that link these different places.
Thus, the city is marked by lines that represent points of reference connected with the role that the places play in the daily lives of individuals. Forced to stay out of the dormitories and without a job to go to, migrant subjects spend their days riding public transport or walking around the city, thereby increasing the level of mobility within cities and also their visibility in the public space. Indeed, the overturning of the public and private dimensions in the everyday lives of migrant subjects entails a paradoxical effect: although their biographies are invisible for the state and the bureaucracies, they have a high level of visibility in the public space, being all the day long outside, walking in the street, resting in parks and spending a lot of time in the public transport.

We are in the back-seats of the tram 9, it is 1:00 pm, and I am surprised because there are just migrant people and me. The Italians are all sitting in the front of the tram. Radu smiles and tells me: “This is the population on the move. You have a particular population that moves from Centrale to Tricolore [the soup kitchen], and then back to Centrale. Here we are!” he smiles. (Shadowing with Radu in Milan, March 2014)

This visibility in the public space of a “migrant without job” (Gatta 2012b) has been argued to produce «moral panic» (Cohen 2002), which in turn leads to a strengthening of control by the local authorities of the population in shadow. Exactly this contradiction – the production of an urban errant subject and the attempt to control it enacted by the local authorities – sheds light
on the effect of this policy that mix control and abandonment, humanitarian and securitarian devices. The previous words said by the police head highlight exactly this moral panic on “nomad subjects”, «this is a nomad! and we are a sedentary society! [...] The problem is that he does not respect our culture and our civilization! [...] Isn’t somebody who is homeless a nomad?!? Isn’t it the same thing?!». A «culture of disbelief» emerges in the bureaucracies and administrative offices dealing with asylum, in line with the shift within the social imaginary on “bogus asylum-seekers” and “illegal migrants” (see also chapter three). Hence, the “asylum-seekers” and “refugees” became a figure that entailed the «moral panic», since they “flood our country and swamp our services” (Cohen 2002). Moreover, the protagonists of my research, are “black young men”, which is – in conjunction with the “unemployed” – a further figure that evokes moral panic.

«This young boy, fa il furbetto104! Believe me!» tells me the police man at the entrance of the immigration office. I try to discuss with him, but there is no way to let him change his mind: Obiang cannot get inside the immigration office and do his bureaucratic procedure. He has to take another appointment and come back. That means that Obiang has to wait at least one month. (Shadowing with Obiang in Milan, February 2014)

During my research, I was used to hear sentences like the one above said by the police man. Such sentences highlight how the culture of disbelief penetrates the bureaucratic world and influences the behaviour of administrative staff dealing with asylum – this issue will be analysed in chapter five in more detail.

The feeling of wasted time is also caused by the time dilation in the bureaucratic space: with “bureaucratic space” I do not mean the places where administrative processes are carried out, but rather the space-time of the wait and the suspension created by the slowness, instability and uncertainty of the red tape involved in obtaining the documents. The wait for the renewal, the short duration and precariousness of the documents, the problems arising from the discretionary powers exercised by police officers trap migrant subjects in a suspended state whereby building their future becomes extremely difficult.

The inadequacy of the receipt and management model for refugees characterised by an attempt to conciliate assistance and mobility control, is emphasised by the contradictions that arise from the process of permit renewal: on the one hand, migrant subjects with humanitarian protection are required to submit evidence of a domicile or residence address as proof of their progressive “integration” in Italian society; on the other hand, the pattern of hospitality based on dormitories lasting up to three months, combined with Italy’s socio-economic conditions,

104 “Fare il furbetto” is a typical assertion used in order to underline that the person is sly, i.e. he is cheating (the police man or the state, depending on the context).
push in the opposite direction, increasing forced residential mobility and reducing stability. Some research highlight how local authorities create obstacles in the “housing integration paths” of refugees through both informal practices and administrative provisions, underlining hence the gap between the national legal framework and its local implementation (Bolzoni, Gargiulo, and Manocchi 2015).

The integration requisites requested by the local authorities and the structural characteristics of the Italian society reveal another gap that is difficult to bridge for the migrant subjects with a temporary document. Problems arise with the typical criteria of “good integration”, i.e. a high level of Italian language skills and several education courses. The criteria should test the “high level of motivation” of the migrant subject to integrate itself and not to be a passive subject waiting for state charity.

«In Milan, there are some few places in home-dormitory for the “second reception” of refugees, but is not easy to get a place there […] According to me, when I do the interview and I try to do not filtering to much, I try to insert all the people in the “second reception homes”. It is important that the person has not psychiatric problem, then I have to chose a particular integration path for that person. But all the others are included … the important thing is that they don’t have problem with alcohol, this is important! We had persons that were usual to drink a lot, and that can be a problem, unfortunately … […] The criteria is to look the single integration path of each individual, and one of the main criteria is the autonomy: economic independence and self-employment. […] Eh, the ENA people are a problem! When I look at their personal paths … I already know what has happened. […] It happens to see persons that are here since three years, they were in ENA plan and then they come back asking for a place to sleep and without job. They played wrong their chances! Are people who are not guided and channelled in a program.»

(Interview with a social worker of Caritas in Milan, March 2014)

The problem of these “integration” criteria, which can be include in the wider phenomenon of neo-assimilationism that involve the whole Europe (Ambrosini 2014), is their incongruity with the structural mechanisms of Italian society and the characteristics of the labour market, as underlines Asad – a young man from Niger – in this conversation:

We are in Naga Har, I am doing the legal consulting. Asad arrives and ask me to write a letter for him. He has to go to Foggia in order to renew his document, but since he has no money – he is unemployed – he needs a Naga-letter where it is written that this person has not the economical means for buy a train ticket. […] We drink a tea together, Asad is very frustrated because of his situation: “I was a minore [minor], when I arrived in 2011. Now they give me this one-year document more, but next time when I will have to renew it again, I must have a work contract. Without a work contract, no renewal! How can I do?! Look all these people! All of them are looking for a job since years, but nothing! So, I have a problem, you understand it?!” I tell him that I understand very well his problem. He continues: “Work, Lavoro [work]! That’s our problem! Nothing else! Lavoro, lavoro, lavoro. Ah, Elena, I am so angry! You have an idea how many time I waste?! They told me ‘You have to do the Italian language classes, you have to learn the language’! So, I have done it! I learned Italian. Since I arrived in Lampedusa until now, they always tell
me the same thing: 'you have to learn Italian'. Again! Since three years I am learning Italian!!’ I tell him that he speaks also a very good Italian, and he replays: “I don't care! You know why? Because I have a lot of friends that have found a job, and they are speaking a very bad Italian! Even someone, doesn't speak Italian at all! So, I need Italian language to find a job?” I ask him which kind of work are his friends doing, but he goes on with his discourse: “When I was in Palermo, in the comunità\textsuperscript{105}, they told us that the Italian class would be good for us. We trusted them, and we have done it. And then? Nothing! So they told us to do the exam of terza media\textsuperscript{106}, because we were minors. Well, we have done it! And then? Nothing! After, they told us to do formazione\textsuperscript{107}. Well, I do an education course in Palermo, as computer technician. They told us that formazione would be good for us, it has let us inside in the Italian labour market. So, we have done it. After formazione? Nothing! So, I go to Foggia, there is another center for minors. And what they do? Again, they channelled me in an education course, this time for mechanical. It takes one year. After? Nothing! So I come to Milan, I thought that maybe I could find a work in the big city. I come to Naga, people like me told me that you [reference to people working in Naga] are good people, you help us. So I come to Naga, and what they told me? Do a corso di formazione!!! This time was an education course for baker and pizza maker. I have done it! Four months! And now? No-thi-ng! So, I don't want to hear any more about these corso di formazione!!! I have closed! Stop! I go away! I waste so much time, Elena! So much time, three years!! During this time other friends have found jobs, without corsi di formazione and without the language! Why? Can you tell me why?! I try to explain to him the fact that in Italy there is the economic crisis, but I see immediately that he knows it very well. “I don't trust you Italians! Just for the Africans there is the economical crisis! All the young guys that have done the formazione with me in Palermo, now they have a job … the Italian ones! The others like me, Africans, nothing! […] Picking up tomatoes?! That you want? This job, is not a good job for me! Is just for some days, and you are bad paid, and what living condition … no, no, not at all, that is not a job!! I go away, Elena, I tell you!”. (Participant observation with Asad in Milan, April 2014)

The high level of mobility and the circularity of these movements reflect themselves outside the city of Milan, across the whole Italian territory. The drawn maps of Italy setted out in the appendix 2 give a visual impression of such movements. As the title of this paragraph states, Italy is not a country for mobile-migrant man, it is a transit country – with transit cities – whose national and local institution have not yet realised it, thinking still through the lens of a sedentary culture. The experiences of the protagonists of my research in Milan are also a consequence of the way through which the local policies deal with a transitory reside, which is treated just as social emergency (Pezzoni 2013). As we will see in the next paragraph and chapters, these transitory dwellings involve a wider geographical space, in which Milan emerges as a knot, a crossroad of networks, which extends beyond the national borders. The national borders constrain the migrant subjects to a regime of (im)mobility, of which Radu is aware. Radu's following clear and direct words tell us:

\textsuperscript{105} Comunità is here the center for unaccompanied children.  
\textsuperscript{106} Terza media is the third class, which exam allow the children to access the high school.  
\textsuperscript{107} Formazione is here education course.
«Italy becomes a prison for us! Because for us who are here, it's like being in prison! For example I have protection, right? What does protection mean? [...] Ah, ok! So [he laughs] why do I sleep outside?! Why do I have nothing to eat? Is this protection?! I don’t think this counts as protection! So in Europe we talk about rights? That’s why I say that in Europe there are no human rights, freedom does not exist! People who have political refugee status sleep outside! People who have subsidiary protection sleep outside! They do nothing, live like crazy people, you know? I do not want to stay in Italy like this, three years I have been like this! Life cannot be like this! I have to do so many things in my life, I should be married, I should build the house where to sleep ... Italy is not my country, I will not stay in Italy!». (Interview with Radu in Milan, April 2014)
Figure 6: Pinnacles and spires of the Cathedral I

Figure 7: Pinnacles and spires of the Cathedral II
**Fragmented circuits: shadows on the move within Italy**

The high mobility of the protagonist of my research across the whole Italian territory is on the one hand a forced mobility produced by both the lack of a reception system with a long-term perspective, and by the economic crisis. On the other hand, it is also a consequence of the agency of migrant subjects, which are moved by feelings between frustration and desire of a better future that let them go on looking for better life conditions. Research conducted in the early 2000s have already shed light on the high mobility of migrant subjects in Italy, linked to some structural characteristics of Italian society such as the welfare state system and the labour market's structure. Liza Schuster (2005) highlights how the geographical mobility is paralleled by mobility between different migration statuses. A mobility backwards and forwards between different legal statuses emerges, and the migrants subjects usually experience two, three or more of these different statuses, and on occasion slipped backwards and forwards between them (Carfagna 2002, in Colombo and Sciortino 2002). It is possible to observe a variety of migratory movements with the characteristic of multi-directionality, contrasting single and unidirectional journeys. The continuous, circular and return journeys that gave rise to transnational networks and communities of people transcending the national borders have been analysed by the scholars of transnationalism.

Focusing on Italy, an ongoing physical or geographical mobility emerges where migrant subjects are spending some years en route (Schuster 2005). The Mediterranean peninsula is characterized by internal seasonal movements of non-EU migrant subjects, most of them undocumented migrants but also refugees and asylum-seekers (Brekke and Brochmann 2014). According to some research (Korac 2005), before the economic crisis of 2009 in Italy the refugees could find “integration paths” thanks to the informality of the Italian labour market and a society that allowed the refugees to develop considerably strong social ties outside their ethnic group. The lack of state organization forced refugees to find their personal way in Italy based on their personal skills, and to develop contacts and networks. Furthermore, the Italian way to govern this “submerged presence” of migrant subjects within the national territory has always been to tolerate their “illegal” presence or legal presence in the institutional shadow, legitimizing it from time to time through several amnesties (Colombo and Sciortino 2002; Ambrosini 2015).

Looking at the experiences of migrant subjects that were channelled in the Emergenza Nord Africa system in 2011, the economic crisis had a strong effect on their everyday lives after the
closure of that emergency system. Furthermore, the emergency nature of that system and the lack of a second assistance led to a high level of fragmented mobility characterized by fast movements countered with points of stasis, i.e. temporal ruptures. The following experience highlights how the city of Milan is also considered as a point of stasis, being experienced as a transit place by the migrant subjects, who move throughout Italy for temporary work:

Outside the soup kitchen we meet a friend of Dakari, he knows him since he arrived in Milan. They start to talk, because this friend doesn't live in Milan any more. Dakari asks him why he is again in Milan, and the friend answers that in Udine there is no work any more because of the snow. I ask him if he works in Udine, and he explain me that he works there as bricklayer. He works in Udine, but when the work is finished he comes back to Milan for a while, and then he goes back to Udine again. Dakari explains me that this friend was within the Arca Cooperative, where he had done a borsa lavoro. After that, he found a job in Udine like all the other guys that where within the Arca Cooperative. The friend of Dakari nods and says that now he will stay in Milan until the end of March, when he will start again this work. We say good bye to him, and go on. Dakari sighs, he tells me that the only way to find a job in Italy is through relationships! If you have a good network, then you can find a work! You have to know Italians, they are the only ones that can insert you in the labour market. He tells me that he is frustrated, without friends he found nothing! (Shadowing with Dakari in Milan, February 2014)

The relevance of the social relations in order to find a work emerges in all the interviews I have conducted. Above all for people who are moving in the shadow, and working in the informal economy, networks assume a crucial role as resources and supports in the movements throughout Italy. Indeed Dakari, who was not so well included in the networks of the agricultural work, has difficulties to find a seasonal job in that sector, nevertheless most of the people he knows have been working there:

«I really wanted to harvest in Foggia! There was a guy that I met for the first time in Stazione Centrale, and he told me that he wanted to go to Foggia. So I told him that I wanted to go to Foggia too! I asked him, if I could go with him. But I don't know why, he runs away! […] He just doesn't call me any more! He went alone! I don't know why, but he never called me. After some months I met him in my dormitory, Mambretti, so I asked him what was happened! And he told me that he forgot to call me … gosh! It is impossible! They do always like this with people from Niger! We are different from them, I don't know why, they don't like us! Anyway, let's move on, I don't like this discourse» (Interview with Dakari in Milan, April 2014)

The relations are even more important in those informal sectors of the economy, notably the agricultural sectors, as Dakari's experience highlights. Moreover, the relations are important also for the accommodation, as the following experience of Badu shows us:

108 Borsa lavoro means “work-sheep” and is a public service issued by the region Lombardy that facilitate the integration of people within the labour market. Furthermore, it should improve the relationships between the people looking for work and the companies and private enterprise.
«I arrived in Italy in may 2011, in Sicily. After I have done the camp in Calabria, in a village … I stay there two years. Then the camp closed, and they said: “go away! This is not your house any more!” […] No, they didn't give me the 500 Euros … […] So, I slept outside for five months. I was in Cosenza, but no work. So I went to Napoli. I went alone to Napoli. Then I harvest in the countryside in Napoli, tomatoes. One month I worked there, but few money!! They paid me three Euros each tomatoes box. If I do ten or twenty boxes … for each one always three Euros. It works like this. […] I found this work thanks to a friend that I met in Napoli, he gave me this work. The first day I arrived in Napoli, I slept at a friend of mine, I knew him from Libya. I called him when I was in Calabria, and he told me that in Napoli there was job, so I decided to go to Napoli, and I slept at his place. […] In Calabria, forget about it! There … I call it? Mafia. You know what I mean … I found a job there, but without a contract … 650 Euros every month. It was not good, it was black job! […] After Napoli? I went to Milano! [he laughs] I knew Milano from Africa! But once in Italy, it was not easy to find Milano. I paid the train and the bus, and then I arrived in Milan, in January. Once in the station … I slept there. I slept inside a train for one month. We were a lot of people, all sleeping in that train! At one point, I met a friend in Centrale and he told me that there is a place that can help us: so I went to Naga.» (Interview with Badu in Milan, April 2014)

The social ties built before the landing in Italy allowed Badu to move across Italy and found some work – even if precarious and temporary. Also the following narration of Harun, a man from Niger with a subsidiary protection, highlights the importance of the social ties in his movements within Italy. Furthermore, it sheds light on the effects of the economic crisis on his life, and how it entailed a continuous circular mobility and a permanent precarious condition:

«I arrived in Italy in 2011, it was August. I was in Sicily, in Caltanissetta, no .. sorry, Catania. And I remained there in the reception centre for six months, waiting for the interview. After the interview, I found a document for three years. Then I wait two weeks in the camp, and after I moved. When I decided to move, the law of the 500 Euros was not yet done, so I didn't get the money. After some weeks a friend of main called me, and he told me that in the camp they were giving 500 Euros to each of us, and with this money we could go to France, Germany, in the whole Europe. So I thought that maybe that money could be good for me. And I went back to the camp, but they didn't give me the 500 Euros, because I had already signed that I had left the camp. So is the life. Then, I went to Rome where I have done the residenza109. Because in Catania they didn't make you the residenza, you have to go to Caritas and they make a dichiarazione ospitalità110. I went to Rome because I was interested in that city, I wanted to see so many things like the monuments, the history of the city. Moreover, I had seen in Internet that in Rome there was a lot of projects, like Don Bosco's project111, or something like this. There were also a lot of education courses. So I decided to go to Rome. From Rome I always have moved to a lot of other cities, always visiting my friends! I always go to city where I knew somebody: people I met in Libya or in Italy, or in Sicily in the camp. I was living for a while in Pordenone, close to Udine, I was living with friends that I had met in Africa.

109 “Residenza” is the residence, which is very important for the renewal of the residence permits of migrant subjects.

110 “Dichiarazione di ospitalità” is “declaration of hospitality”, which is usually issue by some private social organisations and it works as the residence.

111 In Italy there are several Church organisations that named Don Bosco according to the figure of a Priest, Don Bosco, who lived in Italy in the XIX century.
From Pordenone, I went back to Rome, in order to study the language. I already knew a bit of Italian, there is a story why I could already in Libya understand a bit Italian […] So, I have done a language class close to Termini\textsuperscript{112}, for three months and also the course for terza media. Then, I have done the exam and I got the certificate of terza media. After that, I decided to do other courses for being an electrician, but also a bricklayer and a barman. You know, in Africa I had studied to become a technician for solar energy. Then, I found a company called XXX, close to Ostia\textsuperscript{113}. And I started to work there. Before I have done a tirocinio\textsuperscript{114}, for six months. After, they make a work contract, for three months. But at one point they had some problem, and they blocked everything. I don't know which kind of problem, but it has to do with the taxes, was a fiscal problem because the Italian finance police came. So, after some months, I found a work as waiter in a bar. It was a beautiful bar! A bar-restaurant close to Colosseo. I worked there also one month, or maybe something more. And then the owner told me that he was tired, and he wanted to close the restaurant. So he sell the restaurant and one girl from Napoli had bought it. So we started to work for this girl, but after one month she wanted her people, the people of the other restaurant she had before, so no job more. So I started a course for learning Spanish language, for one month. I found a work in a supermarket, for two months. But after this time, they tell us that there was no job more. We were three people, me and two Italian guys. So I keep going, I wanted to find a work; I also went to Milan, looking in some cooperatives and agencies. Then, in 2013, I found a work in a cooperative for people that translate in the commission for asylum. For me was good to find a work in Rome, because I had the residence there! Every time I was moving around Italy, I always wanted to go back to Rome. Now I have the residence in Centro Astalli\textsuperscript{115}, but I have it also in Trastevere and Cornelia\textsuperscript{116}, because I was living there with some friends. I had lived in Trastevere neighbourhood for nine months with other three friends: they are still living there, but at one point I decided to move away and I went to Cornelia. The house in Cornelia was a house of a friend of mine, a childhood friend. So I leave the house in Trastevere, where I was living with another friend of mine and one girl from Sicily and another one from Sardinia. You know, at the beginning when I arrived in Rome, I was sleeping outside, in Roma Termini, the train station. I lived there for six months. I was working in a bar, and sleeping in the train station. Then, I met a Kenya guy, and we found together a house, in Trastevere. We were living there with other friends. When I had money, I paid the rent. When no money, they help me. And I have done the same: sometimes I had job, and they not, so I could help them. Was like this. I decided to leave that apartment because in that time I was living with my girlfriend, close to Termini.»

(Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

The experiences of Harun and Badu show us the precarious lives of migrant subjects holding humanitarian and subsidiary protection, once the Emergenza Nord Africa had finished. The reference place for Harun remains the city of Rome, but he has moved around Italy looking for a job, supported by his social ties and networks built during his migratory journeys. He went to several cities visiting his friends, who he had met in Libya or even before, in his origin country. Moreover, he established relationships with Italian people that also affect his

\textsuperscript{112} Termini is the name of the main train station in Rome: Roma Termini.

\textsuperscript{113} In order to maintain the anonymity of the protagonist of my research, I prefer to not write the name of the private enterprise by which he has worked, thus I replace the name with XXX. Ostia is a small city close to Rome.

\textsuperscript{114} Tirocinio is a traineeships.

\textsuperscript{115} Centro Astalli is a private initiative of the Jesuits that decided to focus their social intervention on the figures of asylum-seekers and refugees establishing the Jesuit Refugee Service.

\textsuperscript{116} Trastevere and Cornelia are two neighbourhoods of Rome.
movements across Italy:

«There is a beautiful story how and why I went to Sardinia. I told you that there was a time when I was sleeping at the train station Termini, in via Marsala. I was becoming a homeless, but I am not a homeless. [...] Close to Termini there was a Caritas: they open at 7 o’clock in the morning until 6 o’clock in the evening, and you can take a shower and leave your bag there. [...] One day, I met a woman, Clotilde, she was bringing us water and bread during the night in Termini. She asked us what does it happened to us, why we were sleeping outside. Clotilde gave me a piece of paper with an address and she told me to meet there the day after at 3 pm. I went there, it was a place run by the Church, I knew it! So, I got inside and I started to talk with a nun who knows me. Then Clotilde came and she asked me whether I already knew that place. I said: “yes, I have done four months classes here”. [...] I start to meet Clotilde frequently, she even asks me to interview me. She told me that she was a University professor in Cagliari [main city in Sardinia]. She is a person that has respected me a lot, a very good person. She always gave me a lot of suggestions, and one time she even helped me! I had found a job in a bar, but the owner wanted the documents and the residence. I gave them to him, but I had a residence in Centro Astalli and it was not enough. He asked me if I knew some Italians who could grant for me. The day after, Clotilde came with me to that restaurant and she spoke with the owner granting for me. I respected Clotilde so much! She gave to him the photocopy of her ID! [...] Since that time, we remain in contact and she invited me in Sardinia to know her family. Clotilde is the first Italian person who respected me as a sister!»

(Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

Also in the later decision taken by Harun to leave Italy heading Berlin, the social ties played a crucial role in the choice of Germany as destination of his second migratory journey. The decision to leave Italy was developed as an interconnection between structural factors – i.e. the economic crisis that lead to a very precarious existence – and the personal attitude to move on looking for the next possibility:

Harun is drawing on the paper, he is tracing his routes within Africa towards Italy and further, across the whole of Europe. He is drawing and speaking at the same time, he explain us how he came to Berlin: “When I was in Rome, I was working in a restaurant. But then, I lost this job, so I decide to come to Berlin because I know Saeed! Saeed was back in Italy in order to renew his documents, and he explained me the situation in Berlin. So I decided to try to come to Berlin. I told him: “I come with you!”. At the beginning I didn't plan to remain here, I wanted just to stay two weeks or something like this. But now I am here, and for a while I will remain. Saeed … I met him the first time in Italy, but I already knew his family because we come from two villages that are very close to each others – he points to the map and shows us where these village are – but we met in Questura in Rome, because at this time I was the interpreter for many people. You know, usually in Questura they have an interpret for the Tuareg language, but at this time he was not there. So, Questura called me and asked me to translate because there was a young boy that was Tuareg. So I came there, and that boy was Saeed! [...] The world is small!” (Participant observation during the maps drawing with Harun, Obasi and Issa; Berlin, January 2015)

The social ties build during the migratory journeys are the main support for the protagonists

117 The name of the Italian woman is invented in order to grant the anonymity of the woman and the protagonist of my research.
of my research. First of all, this sheds light on the fact that the migratory journey does not finish once the migrant subjects landed in Europe – in this case in Italy – but instead continues as secondary movements towards other European countries. Thus, Libya and Italy assume a crucial role as transit countries, where the transit is not a movement from a point A to a point B. Instead, the transit is a permanence period, a point of stasis or temporal rupture within the migratory path. Some of these “transit” countries can become also the definitive place of stay, although it was not planned by the migrant subjects that became “stuck” in transit (Brekke and Brochmann 2014).

The migrant subjects build thus a personal network developed by more or less weak and strong ties, which influences their movements. The following narration of Essien highlights the crucial role of his social ties build en transit – in Italy and Libya – in the orientation of his movements:

«I was in the camp, in Varese. I was sleeping in the Hotel for one year and eight months […] I worked there doing dish-washing for four months, helping the Hotel owner. It was a black job, I asked him to make a contract, but he said no, because they didn't like to have black people in the kitchen. When the camp closed, they asked us to give the identity document back and they gave us 500 Euros, telling us to go away. We asked where we could go, because we didn't know that country! And they said “we don't care, just take these 500 Euros and leave”. So, I called some friends that I had met in Libya, and who were in Foggia. I knew these friends from Libya, they were a lot. I asked them whether I could work in Foggia with them, and they told me yes, but the work was badly paid. I worked six months in Foggia: grape harvest, and red pepper, and also tomatoes. We worked without contract and I slept in the countryside … we built a hut with wood and cardboard, and we were four people sleeping there. […] There you move always alone, or maybe two people, but not more. Because, you know, if they [referring to the Italian farmers] see us in group of four or five people … they don't like it! There are a lot of boss that didn't like to see so many of us […] But with this life you will die! You work one hour and they pay you 3 Euros. You can live like this for one year, but not any longer. So I decided to move away, also because my document had expired and I had to renew it in Varese. So I went there passing through Rome, where I stayed one week sleeping at the train station Roma-Termini. There I met a lot of people, a lot of brothers like me, that told me that life in Rome is difficult; so I decided to keep moving heading north. I arrived in Varese where I slept at a friend's place. […] But to renew the document I needed the registration in the communal register to prove that I was living there. Since I was not registered there, I had to go to Milan, where I knew I could ask for this certificate of residence with the help of NGOs. […] The problem in Varese was also that there was no place in the dormitory. I was sleeping by this friend of mine, but I didn't like to stay there without paying … so I was looking for a dormitory, and the people of the dormitory told me: “go to Milan! It is a big city, of course you can find a place to sleep in a big dormitory there”. So I went to Milan. I didn't know anybody in Milan, but in the train station I meet a lot of African brothers like me, so I asked them where I could sleep, and they suggested a public dormitory. In that station it is easy, you meet a lot of friends! The first days I was sleeping in that train … you don't know it?! Ah, is famous [he smiles] in the last rail track in Centrale there is a train that Ferrovie dello Stato118 gave to us. They open it every night and we can sleep there. Then at 4:30 am they wake us up, and we have

118 Ferrovie dello Stato is the name of the public railways in Italy.
to go out. And than you hanging out in the train station … so I get to know many friends, and they help me to find a dormitory […] Now I am working with … how you call it? Borsa lavoro. Yes, I am working in a strawberries greenhouse. Is a work for three months … after I don't know. But now is good». (Interview with Essien in Milan, March 2014)

The migrant subjects move within these networks also to overcome some internal borders produced by the administrative and bureaucratic practices, usually linked with the legal status.

The experience of Essien highlights how the high mobility is also forced by the administrative practices linked to the renewal of the one-year humanitarian protection. Indeed, Essien leaves the Gran Ghetto because he has to renew his document and he moves to Varese, where he can sleep at a friend's place. Since in Varese it is difficult to obtain the “hospitality declaration” – a necessary document in order to renew the humanitarian protection – he moves to Milan, where it is easier to obtain that document; and he remains there.

These informal networks are the support of the mobility of migrant subjects and also the channels of important information such as where it is possible to find a job and/or a place to sleep. These relations, which at first glance appear only as weak ties, function as one of the main resources for the errant subjects moving around in Italy.

The networks are spread to the entire national territory and within them single places function as nodes of that networks. These places are not just cities, but also certain train stations – such as Milano Centrale and Roma Termini – or occupied houses – such as ex-MOI in Turin – or informal settlements in the hinterland of agricultural areas – such as the “Gran Ghetto” in Rignano Garganico close to Foggia. These places will be deeply analysed in chapter five. It is important to underline their function as transit places, where migrant subjects temporary live and to which they regularly come back. Through these transit places, a circular mobility of people developed, and with them a constant exchange of information occurs that strengthens the networks. Some of these places are known even before the people went there for the first time, as Amal tells us:

«I already knew Rignano! I have heard about the Ghetto of Rignano already before I went there. The cultural mediator of our camp told me about that place: he explain us that there was a Ghetto full of immigrants where it was possible to work. He has seen it in the television! So he told us about the Ghetto, everybody then knew it. So, after one year, once they gave me the one-year document and they left us out in the street, I went to the Rignano» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

The following narrations of Dakari and Amal are just few of the many biographies of protagonists of my research that criss-crossed such transit places such as the Milan train station and the Ghetto:
We are sitting in our kitchen and Amal tells me that yesterday he saw a documentary on Ghetto of Rignano Garganico, that he knows very well because he was doing the camp in Foggia. He shows me his friends in facebook. He points on one of them, who is living in Turin. “He is a friend of mine, we know each other very well! We were together at the camp close to Foggia. This camp was close to Rignano Garganico … this Ghetto there, is very big! There are around 2000 people, or maybe more! Women, man, children, families, there is everything!” He shows me a video on his phone, where there is a space with a lot of electric light and music: “this is the disco – he smiles – I have dance there sometimes. You know, there are a lot of Italian girls there, and they have done a Radio for the Ghetto, I know them, they are very very nice!” […] Then in the video there is an image with a parked car and Amal explains to me: “In the Ghetto, there are the black boss. They have a car and they bring you to the place where you have to work, because from there the people are moving every day to different cities in Apulia. But this car is not a real car, it is a car without insurance! You pay 5 Euros to them and then they drive you. By the way, this friend of mine decided to move to Paris. But there the situation was difficult [he makes the gesture of shooting his head] so he decided to go back to Italy, but not to Rignano Garganico. He decided to go to Torino, because he has some friends there”.

(Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, November 2014)

«I arrived in Stazione Centrale, but it was my first time in Milan, I didn't know anyone. I sleep there the first days. I was very sad, I didn't know where I should go, what I should do! I was thinking “Mamma mia! The life is hard!!”, and at some point I met a friend of mine! I had met him in Lampedusa, and we were on the same ship that brought us to Genova, and we have done the same camp! Once the camp closed, he came to Milan, because he has friends here. So, I just met him in Centrale, I was so happy! So I ask him where I should go, and he told me to go to Centro Aiuto» (Interview with Dakari in Milan, April 2014)

The examples of biographies highlight how the life of migrant subjects holding humanitarian and subsidiary protection is scattered across the whole Italian territory and how they experience it in a fragmented way. It usually happens that the place of residence, the place of work and the place where there are the responsible administrative offices, are settled in different cities. Thus, the mobility of the migrant subjects increases, being forced by socio-economic condition and by the administrative and juridical constrains. This forced mobility should not be interpreted as absolute, but also entailed by the migrant subjects' agency, who attempt to move between and beyond the borders and try to open interstices where they can autonomously build their lives – this issue is analysed in chapters five and six. A collective knowledge grows through the movements and the information that circulates within the networks. This collective knowledge is about the bureaucratic practices and in which cities they are more or less strict, where it is possible to find a job in the seasonal harvest, and where it is possible to sleep.

“Everyone knows where to go, harvest of kiwi, of oranges, of tomatoes. You know where they are, and you move following the seasonality: Foggia, Rosarno, Saluzzo, and so on. […] Once you arrive in Italy, after some time you start to know everything.” Explained
The collective knowledge is used by the migrant subjects to overcome or bypass the juridical borders that constrain their movements and future life projects. For example, Obasi – a young man from Nigeria – who should renew his humanitarian protection in Florence, where he has done the camp, transferred his bureaucratic procedure to Turin, because there he has the possibility to find a temporary accommodation until his renewal will be ready. Indeed, in Turin there are several squats where refugees and asylum seekers are living, and the biggest is the so called ex-MOI, in the southern part of Turin near the railway station Lingotto. The occupation of these houses, which were build for the Olympic Games in 2006 but emptied once the Games ended, occurred on March 30th 2013: once the ENA program ended, a group of 200 refugees together with supporter groups of Italian activists occupied the four buildings within the former Olympic Village. Since many refugees leaving the ENA plan had no place to sleep, that place became quickly a reference point where around 600 refugees are still living (Bolzoni, Gargiulo and Manocchi 2015) and using it also as transit place during their journeys across Europe (Borri 2016)\textsuperscript{119}.

The circular mobility involves not just people and information, but also objects. During the research field, I was always surprised how the protagonists of my research had several bags and suitcases scattered in different cities and sometimes even in different countries.

«I have lived in that abandoned houses for …. I don't remember any more, but some time. Look there – he points a door in the abandoned house – that was my door! My room is there! – he smiles – I still have a rucksack inside this house. Some t-shirts and some shirts are still there. You know, I cannot move everything every time! I have to change dormitory every month, or two months, sometimes maybe I sleep outside. So I leave my stuff up here and there. I have also one of my bag in Naga!» (Shadowing with Dakari, Milan February 2014)

Dakari has his rucksack and suitcases scattered in the city of Milan, in different places where he lives and had lived, but also places which he trust such as the association Naga Har. The same is valid for Obasi and Mabula, both have lived for almost two years in Italy, notably in Florence. At a certain point they decided to move further heading north Europe, and they arrived in Berlin, but still they prefer to leave their important documents with a trust person in Florence:

Obasi looks at me and tells me: “I have a lot of documents in Florence! I have done the camp there. And I have also a suitcase there! Every thing is with Giovanni, this friend of mine that lives close to Firenze”. Mabula looks at us and says: “I have also my

\textsuperscript{119}Here the reference is to the PhD thesis of Giulia Borri, forthcoming in the year 2016
Obasi comes to my flat and brings his suitcase with some important stuff inside. Willy has done the same with Zike: he leaves his red suitcase with Zike in Turin. Before, Willy had left this bag in Verona, where he was living during the North Africa Emergency. Now, he thought that Turin was the best place, because he is going there for renewing his documents. So, also Obasi asks me if he can leave his bag in our flat, because it is a save place. (Participant observation with Obasi in Berlin, November 2014)

The objects move between the cities like the people. Hence in the same way, also the objects are embedded in a regime of (im)mobility: the migrant subjects leave their important objects with some friends or trusted person that can keep it. Since they frequently move – as we will see in chapter five – backwards and forwards between different cities and places, and across several national borders, also their material objects are geographically fragmented and scattered across the European territory. Obasi, for example, has some important documents in Berlin, the city where he lives, and others in Florence, with a friend of him, with whom he has a trusted relationship. Moreover, he has some cloths in his room in the occupied houses in Turin – ex-MOI – where he usually goes when he has to renew his documents.

Obasi narrates: “I went back to MOI and I was looking for my shoes in my room. I knew I had left it there! You know, I had these winter shoes and I leave it there because the last time I went to Turin it was May and it was really hot. So I thought 'I can leave it here, also in Berlin I don't need it'. But when I arrived there this time and at the beginning I didn't find it I thought: ‘Dammit! Some one has stolen my shoes’. But I was wrong, the shoes were still there, under the bed in the back! For me it is important to have these shoes, I cannot stay now in Berlin in winter with such shoes!” and he points to his canvas gymnastic shoes. (Participant observation with Obasi in Berlin, November 2014)

However, the protagonists of my research have not always found persons who maintain their personal objects, as happened to Jawara and Kalule, two young man respectively from Guinea Conakry and Chad holding humanitarian protection:

Lamar and Jawara are coming to Milan in order to renew their documents. They left Berlin in the early morning, and they should arrive in Milan around 22:00 pm. I am waiting for them. […] We are checking if Lamar and Jawara have all the documents they need for the renewal of their humanitarian protection. Seems that everything is good. I ask them if they have the decision of the commission, this document where it is written that the commission gave them the humanitarian protection. There is a moment of silence. Lamar and Jawara open their bags and start to look for it, but they do not find it. Lamar looks at me and tells me: “I left all my documents in Vicenza, where I have done the camp, before I came to Germany. The papers are with a friend of mine, so I can go there, without problem”. Jawara remains very calm, and he tells me: “I also left a bag in this little village in Apulia, where I have done the camp. There was the Caritas boss, I left him my bag … I had all the documents inside this bag. It was almost one year ago, or something more. I will go there tomorrow, and then I come back to Milan, for
renewing my documents”. [...] Jawara comes back to Milan, and he tells me how it was in the small village in Apulia: “It was good. I found all the people I want to find, without having the phone number. I also met the Caritas boss, but he didn't have my bag any more! He tells me that he threw it away, because he didn't know what to do with this stuff! We fought a bit, because I told him that he threw important documents away, but at the end we could do nothing”. (Participant observation with Lamar and Jawara in Milan, March 2014)

Kalule didn't have the fiscal code, he had left it in Palermo. So, he tried to call the camp in Palermo, where he was during the North Africa Emergency, but the people told him that the camp has been closed and all the stuff they had such as bags and documents have been moved, but they don't know where exactly. (Participant observation with Kalule in Berlin, November 2014)

The development of fragmented circuits of people, information and objects, stretches beyond national borders. The networks extend to the whole European territory, and the migrant subjects move within them backwards and forwards, within Italy, abroad, and sometimes back to Italy. This is the experience of Radu, who after some period as seasonal worker in the agricultural sector in Italy decided to look for better life condition in the Netherlands, where he knows an old friend of him; but since he couldn't work there with his Italian document, he decided to come back to Italy.

«When the camp closed, they gave us 500 Euros. For some people, they even have done a train ticket or fly ticket for some country in Europe! They ask them: “where you want to go? Germany? France?” and than they bought them a ticket! So they gave us this money, and a lot of friends of mine went to Germany, France, Switzerland, Sweden. I went to Foggia. [...] I knew “Gran Ghetto” before! I already had this information. In Brindisi I was alone, but then you meet a lot of friends, a lot of Africans like me, and they give you all the information. So, when you arrive there, you meet friends that help you, they explain to you how it works in the Ghetto. How to build your house with cardboard, and so on. [...] In Foggia? Ok, I explained to you. There, you don't talk directly with your boss. For example: if I have an Italian friend that has a tomatoes field, I speak with him and I tell him that I can work for him. And I ask him how many people he needs. So he gave me a box, and he tells me that he will pay me 4 Euros every box. Then, I speak with you and other people and I tell you that if you want to work, I will give you 3 Euros every box. You understand the system? The boss give me 4 Euros, and I pay the other people 3 Euros. So, these persons that have contact with the Italian boss … they were Africans! Like us! [he smiles and shout his head] In Foggia I knew so many people! We were used to cook together, rice or something like this. Because, you know, you don't have so much money, so you share everything! Once the harvest finished in Foggia, I already know that there was the orange harvest in Rosarno. So I went there, alone, by myself. There you find a lot of people, a place to sleep in the barracks in the countryside … and so on. [...] In Saluzzo, it is different. I mean, the life and work condition are bad in the same way! But in Saluzzo you have the direct contact with the Italian boss, you don't have these African people between you and the boss. And this is better, because in Foggia they pay you less than in Rosarno, because these person in the middle take some of your money! [...] How I decide to go to Amsterdam? Ok, once in Rosarno the harvest finished, I didn't know where I should go. I had a friend in Holland, a friend from Mali, my country. So I called him, and he told me to go there, maybe I could find some job. I went there in order
find some work. But once I arrived, I discovered that my Italian document doesn't allow me to work there! I stayed there nine months, working illegal, black work. I was sleeping at this friend's place. This friend lives there since three years, without document! He manages to work, black work, but he manages to pay a rent. He lives in a home with other two people, and he pays the rent. So, I was working there, I distribute newspapers, then I helped the people in the market early in the morning and later in the evening. Then, I was helping people with the suitcases: I was carrying their suitcases to their car, and they gave me 20 Euros. These were the works … but I didn't manage to pay the rent, so I decided to leave Amsterdam and come back to Italy. There it is difficult if you don't know many people, it is difficult to find jobs. My friend, he has a lot of networks, so it is easier. But for me it was difficult, and I did not want to stay there without paying the rent! Relationships! That is important for work! [he smiles] So, I went back to Italy, and I go to Saluzzo.» (Interview with Radu in Milan, April 2014)

A similar experience occurred to Cheryll, a young man from Mali, who tried his luck in Malta visiting his brother, but decided to go back to Italy:

We are sitting in the train Station, and Essien is playing with his phone. We speak a lot, and Essien starts to tell me his story  […] At one point, Cheryll comes close to us. He is also coming to Naga, so we know each other. He is a friend of Essien. He sits close to us, and he starts to play with his phone. […] Essien is explaining me his feeling about sleeping in the dormitory, and Cheryll starts to participate in our conversation “Dormitory is bad, Elena! We cannot live like this! You have to go out at 8 o'clock in the morning, and then giro, giro, giro! No work, nothing! […] I have a friend with whom we have done the same camp in Italy. Then we got the humanitarian protection, and he decided to go to France. He arrived there, and now he is working there without problem! I visited him in Paris! He has a job and a house. Me too, when I received the humanitarian protection I decided to move to Malta, because my brother is living and working there”. I asked him to explain me his experience in Malta and he continues: “You know, my brother, real brother! is living there and working at a farmer in a vineyard. Also my brother has humanitarian permit form Italy! Like me! He works in this vineyard since one year without problem. He pays also a rent for a house, without problem. So I went there, in order to find a job. My brother helped me to find a job, it was a black job. But once it finished, I didn't find nothing else. And you know, I didn't want to stay with him without doing nothing! I felt so ashamed! So I decided to come back to Italy, and find my way!”. […] Cheryll goes on with his story: “I had lived with an Italian family, in Cinisello Balsamoii. They were very kind with me, and they helped to find a job. But it was a terrible job! I had to take care of an old woman … 87 years old, so terrible! So I told them that I didn't want to go on with this work, it was not for me!” at this point Essien interrupted him and says: “are you crazy? It was a job!! how could you leave a job??!”, and Cheryll replayed: “That was not a good job for me! I was coming home, and I was not eating, because I was frustrated! I had so bad thoughts in my mind! So I decided to stop it! I am young and strong! That was not a good job for me. Now, I am working as warehouse worker in a shop, a clothes shop close to Duomo.” (Shadowing with Essien in Milan, March 2014)

Other biographies, such as that of Issa, didn't go back to Italy and remained in the new European country:

«After Lampedusa, I was close to Siracusa … in a small village 40 kilometres far from Siracusa, we stayed there some months. […] But during the wait for the answer about my

120 Cinisello Balsamo is a suburb in the hinterland of Milan.
document, I went to Foggia. I didn't want to stay in the camp doing nothing! I thought, “if I go to Foggia, maybe I can work” [...] Well, all people know it, in Foggia there is this country work. All people know that if you go there, you can find something [to work]. I have a friend that I met on the boat from Libya. We arrived together in Lampedusa, and then he was transferred to Foggia. I called him and he told me that there was job, so I went there. I worked there, but after some time, I went back to the camp in Siracusa, because I heard that the documents were ready. And I received the document. The day I received the document, I decided to go to Hamburg! [...] I didn't know anyone there, but I thought that maybe I could find there my luck. [...] So, I didn't find anything in Hamburg, and a friend of mine called me and told me that the camp in Siracusa was still open, and there was place to sleep. So I came back to Italy, to Siracusa. I arrived in Siracusa, but then they closed the camp. Then, we all went to Rome. [...] I found a school there, but I was not happy. I had a good friend in Rome, Saeed. He was still sleeping in his camp. I was sleeping at the Caritas, but it was a bad place ... yes, a dormitory. I wasn't happy, so I decided to go to Marseilles. I have a good friend there, we have done the camp together in Siracusa. We met in the boat to Lampedusa. He was since some weeks in Marseilles, so I left my bag with Saeed, and I went to Marseilles. I had two friends there, and we started to look for a job. But at one point the police stopped us, and because of our Italian documents we had problem! We couldn't stay in France [...] So, they send us to Ventimiglia. There, I took immediately the ticket for Nice, I had another friend there. I went to Nice and I started to look for a job there. But I don't find anything. So, I decided to go to Turin. I had a friend there, we met on the boat to Lampedusa. I was sad in Nice, so I called him and I asked him: “where are you?” and he said “I am in Turin, come here!” I went to Turin, and he picked me up at the train station Lingotto. He had found a place in a room for me in that squat [referring to ex-MOI] I stayed there for one year. [...] In this year living in Turin, I sometimes went to Foggia for harvest work in the countryside. After Foggia I went to Rosarno, and I worked there. But my house was in Turin [...] I came back to Turin, but there was nothing to do, just the school. So I decide to move on, and I went to France, to Dijon. [...] I went to Dijon because I had a friend there. We slept in a place of people who wanted to help us, I don't know how to call them ... it was a squat. France is not like Italy, they help us! But in Dijon there is nothing, so I called a lot of friends asking where they were. I had a lot of friends from the camp, and also a lot from Libya. Some of them were in Berlin and they told me how was the situation there. So I decide to go to Berlin, and I arrived in Oranienplatz». (Interview with Issa in Berlin on March 2015)

All the three experiences of Radu, Cheryll and Issa incorporate fast movements – when they decide to move further in order to change their life condition –, alternating with points of stasis. These points of stasis are usually understood in the literature of migration as detention time or waiting for a document (Griffiths, Rogers, and Anderson 2013). As points of stasis I here address also the seasonal work in the countryside and the time of the everyday in the big cities, as highlighted in the paragraph on Milan. Indeed, within the fragmented circuits the migrant subjects experience different temporalities, such as accelerating, waiting, queuing, stopping, repeating, and turning around; the precariousness emerges as the main characteristic of their everyday lives even if they are working sometimes. Here the mobility of migrant subjects is understood as non-linear, recognizing the importance of repetition, simultaneity, seasonality and cycles; but being this mobility characterized by temporal ruptures and precariousness, it has to be considered as fragmented rather than unitary.
The seasonal agricultural work in the shadow economy plays an interesting role in the production of a particular temporality within the fragmented circuits. According to several research, the uncertainty about temporariness and permanence of migrants' condition – linked also to their legal status – helps to trap migrant subjects into precarious work, which can be thought of as work without temporal rhythm (Ahmad 2008; Anderson 2010; Anderson and Ruhs 2010), in which the routines and security of employment may be absent. These precarious works are conducted in poor working condition as Essien and Radu narrate when speaking about their experience in the harvest work, and according to the empirical research conduct on the agricultural work in the southern regions of Italy (Corrado and Perrotta 2012; Perrotta and Sacchetto 2013). These poor and precarious conditions entail a specific experience of temporality: long hours work for little money, in places where the time rhythms are very different from that of the city. Moreover, the time-space of work and that of house are also blurred, because the errant migrant subjects inhabit temporary places – such as barracks in the countryside – where they temporary work, and then move further. Thus, the precariousness affects both the work and home dimension. The increasing frustration is one of the main consequence, as Radu explains in the following narration:

Today I meet Radu and Dakari, in order to explain them exactly which kind of research I am going to do, and ask them if they can help me. They give me an appointment at 15:00 pm in the park close to the public library Tibaldi. I have some of my previous works with me, as the master thesis and the work on deportation prisons, in order to let them exactly know which kind of work I am doing […] Radu starts to talk, without asking me anything: “If you want to understand how we live in Italy and which are our problems, you have to go to Saluzzo”, I repeat “Saluzzo?”, “Yes, Saluzzo, close to Torino. You don't know it? I explain you: Saluzzo is better than Rosarno … but it is very bad. You know … how can I explain it to you. Ok, I am here since almost three years, I don't have a job, I don't have a house, I don't have stability, nothing. Since three years nothing happens, and I am afraid to run crazy. You know, I never would have imagined that my life could be like that, never! I never would have imagined that I could have lived in so bad condition, and that I could have accepted it! In Saluzzo we harvest apples, and every season there are around 400 or 500 people that go there for working, Africans like us. The living conditions are terrible: you sleep outside, no blankets, nothing! You build a barrack with cardboard and materials you find there. You want to understand our life? Go there, to Saluzzo! They are not human beings! They are animals, or even worse. There was no water! The water in our fields, where we were sleeping and working, was not drinkable! You had to move far away in order to drink! I never had a hard time like that, never! […] People like us, the Africans, we go there in April: you find a bike, and then you start to bike around in all the fields looking for a boss that can give you some work. You go to the boss, you leave your telephone number, and you bike further. Like this for weeks! So you wake up at 5 o'clock in the morning, you take your bike, and you start to turn. Giro! – he smiles – and you leave to all the farmers your phone number. I found a boss, but no contract – he smiles – I know that employment contract is good … but what should I have done? Don't accept the job?! Of course you accept it, also when you know that is illegal, black work! There are also groups of people, how you call them? Like anti-racist groups, people that tried to help us. They manage to bring there a tap with a pump, so we had
Finally water! We could drink and have a shower. But the police arrived, and they closed everything. No water any more”. Radu stops to talk, he looks at the horizon and stays silent. For a moment no one talks, then Radu says again: “If you want to understand how we live in Italy, go there!” (Milan, January 2014, pre-research meeting with Radu and Dakari)

Several research addressed the role of time in relation to control of migrant workers, highlighting how the enforced migration controls gives employers greater control over labour mobility (Anderson 2007; Pijpers 2011), and how the employers may be able to confine migrant subjects to specific time-space in a way that would be less possible for citizen workers, as the experience of Radu highlights.

According to a research conducted with smuggled migrants in London, it emerge that in their everyday lives they are constantly compelled to adapt to their immediate circumstances given the instability of life. This instability makes it virtually impossible to achieve any kind of upward mobility or progress, thus the migrants subjects are stuck in a vacuous present characterized by anxiety and question marks about the future (Ahmad 2008). Thus, since migrant subjects do not have a strong certainty over their future continuation in the job, they often accept works that have no regularity and lay in the irregular sector. The experience of being stuck in a present of question marks emerges also in the words of the protagonists of my research, above all through the statement «I waste to much time». Many empirical research have highlighted how the illegal employment and hence the life condition as “illegal” person renders migrant subjects invisible. They are territorially present but socially and legally absent (Crowley 2005; Coutin 2005). Accordingly, they experience a ghost labour. The border is under these circumstances a sort of revolving door that invites people and pushes them back at the same time (Pijpers 2011). However, at one point this permanent present and the acceptance of bad working conditions is overcome, when the migrant subjects decide to move further looking for better condition. Indeed, the border should be understood also as a performative space, in the sense that only the apprehension of illegal migrants who attempt to cross it makes it real (Pijpers 2011). The experiences narrated in this paragraph, highlighted how the migrant subjects move between and beyond the borders on the base of their networks build during the migratory paths. The previous narration of Issa’s biographical trajectories across Europe highlights exactly his attempts to break the waiting and instability of his everyday life, looking always further for better life conditions. This emotional drive – deeper analysed in the chapter six – is one important part of the migrant subjects’ agency that let them cross several territorial and juridical borders. In the next paragraph, I will narrate the experience of those migrant subjects who after the Emergenza Nord Africa moved to Berlin
and attempted to live there, although they were not allowed and “unwanted”.

We went out from the bingo, the football match was over. It was very cold, typical autumn weather of a November in Berlin. Asad is complaining because he wasted too much time in Italy learning the language, but it was for nothing, he found no job.

Amal sighs and comments “eh, c'amma fa'!?” 121 Asad replays surprised: “are you foggiano122 or what?!” Amal: “how did you understand it?” Asad: “you said: c'amma fa’! That is foggiano, you are foggiano!” Amal: “yes, yes, I am foggiano! From Foggia! And you? Also you from the Ghetto?” Asad: “no, no, I was in a center for minors … ” Amal: “Ah, ok. I don't know that place”.

(Participant observation in Berlin with Amal, November 2014)

121 The expression “c'amma fa’” is a form of the local language in the Apulia region and means “what can we do?”.

122 Foggiano is an inhabitant of Foggia.
4.2 Berlin, Open City?

In chapter three, I detailed how the protest of Oranienplatz in Berlin started in the autumn of 2012, and how the group of Lampedusa in Berlin was formed. From January 2013 on, simultaneously with the closure of the ENA plan in Italy, several migrant subjects ejected from the emergency system started to head to northern Europe and some of them arrived in Hamburg and Berlin. During the first six months of the year 2013 the groups of “Lampedusa” in Hamburg and Berlin numerically increased, and with them the demonstrations and political protests were rising.

The city of Berlin became the center of the protests, and the Oranienplatz tent camps together with the occupation of the Gerhart-Hauptmann School in Ohlauerstraße emerged as symbols of this political struggle. Both places have an ambivalent role: on the one hand, they were protest places where several rights were claimed, on the other hand, they were accommodation places for migrant subjects without housing.

In order to understand why the protest of Oranienplatz resisted for long, it is important to give a brief historical context on the neighbourhood Kreuzberg that was the place were the protest was embedded. Indeed, this neighbourhood has an old tradition of lefties political fights and house squatting movements started in the middle of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s. Moreover, migration and ethnic issues and the consequent discriminating and racism phenomena are embedded in that neighbourhood. During the 1960s and 1970s, the neighbourhood Kreuzberg was considered an unattractive place: the historic buildings were deteriorated and immigrants who often could not access the housing in other neighbourhood started to live there. The expression “Ghetto Kreuzberg” emerged in the 1970s and was usually compared to US ghettos such as Harlem neighbourhood in New York (Stehle 2006). During that time, several research in urban sociology highlighted the risk of a high level of ethnic segregation in that neighbourhood, considering it a social problem. Thus, the history of Kreuzberg is marked by racism lines linked to the housing policies, as the “Zuzugssperre” of 1975 highlights, and consequently also by anti-racist struggles and resistance movements.

At this time, Kreuzberg in Berlin was the main example of the threatened “ghettoization process” within the German cities enacted by the so-called “invasion of the Turks”

123 “Zuzugssperre” means “block of moving in”, it was a moving restriction in Germany based on nationality, which was thought to decrease the ethnic segregation in the neighbourhood of German cities.
(Häussermann and Kapphan 2000). As we can read in the news magazine *der Spiegel* in 1973:

> The flood of people from the Bosporus is fuelling the growing crisis of foreigners crowding the urban centres. Cities like Berlin, Munich, or Frankfurt can hardly cope with this invasion: ghettos emerge, and sociologists predict a rise in crime and the rate of social decay similar to that of Harlem. (31/1973, 24)\(^{24}\)

The image of the ghetto was built not just on ethnic factors, but also social ones, notably the fact that people living there were belonging also to the working-class.

In these years the process started that turned Kreuzberg into a “multicultural” neighbourhood, a reputation that remains also today. Since the post war time, the neighbourhood has been considered the main place in Berlin with a dynamic cultural activity. In the 1960s it was considered the alternative cultural neighbourhood, dwelled by a Bohemian population and the similarity with the neighbourhood Montmartre in Paris was often underlined. During the 1970s and at the beginning of the 1980s the alternative culture turned towards a more radical leftist political culture through several social struggles and squatting movements. During the 1980s the Punks’ culture emerged that saw Kreuzberg as an “Utopic island” isolated from the rest of Germany and the world. The “*myth of Kreuzberg*” has been built in that time, when the image of a free and separate world was rising: “*freie Republik*” and “*freies Land im unfreien Staat*”\(^{125}\) were the mottoes that characterized Kreuzberg at that time (Lang 1998). Thus, Kreuzberg has always been treated by the “external world” and lived by its inhabitants as a separate place criss-crossed by alternative subcultures and political fights. Nevertheless, during the 1970s the process of gentrification already started, it has been strengthening in the 1980s and was imposed in the 1990s: the neighbourhood Kreuzberg because of its “ethnic diversity” was turned as an attractive *Multikulti*\(^{126}\) place where the so-called “Yuppi culture” imposed themselves. In the newspaper *Neue Zeit* in 1992 it is possible to read: „*Das Mekka der Alternativen im Wandel zum exklusiven Yuppie-Viertel*”\(^{127}\), that highlighted exactly the change within the neighbourhood. Nevertheless, Kreuzberg remains marked-out by its history and myths, and the political culture of social struggles and squatting houses once in a while emerges again.

Thus, the tradition of political fights in Kreuzberg played a role in the decision of Oranienplatz as the place where to build the refugees protest camp. Moreover, also the more

---

124 Cited in the article *Narrating the Ghetto, Narrating Europe: From Berlin, Kreuzberg to the Banlieues of Paris*, of Maria Stehle, 2006.
125 “Free Republic” and “free country within an unfree state”.
126 *Multikulti* is used to point the multicultural nature of a place.
recently political struggles in Berlin occurred in that neighbourhood: two protest camps were build close to the square in 2012. A refugees and asylum-seekers protest camp was built on Heinrichplatz following the protest started in Würzburg – explained in chapter three. A second was built at Kottbusser Tor: the Gecekondu\textsuperscript{128} building by the initiative Kotti&Co. The Gecekondu was the ending point of a protest movement against high rents and displacement issued by the Berlin Senate that facilitated the process of gentrification in that area. The aim of the initiative Kotti&Co was to make what was institutionally considered as a “private” problem, i.e. the increase of a high rent caused by the gentrification above all in the public houses, as a public issue to put pressure on the local authorities. The protest-house in Kottbusser Tor became a meeting point, as it is possible to read in the web-site's presentation of Kotti&Co:

Our Gecekondu is an open space. Here, we get to know each other (better) over a cup of tea or coffee and it is here where we exchange ideas. We organize events, movie nights and concerts. We provide information about our protest and about tenant rights, meet new people or simply enjoy Kotti at summer time.

Everyone who comes to the Gecekondu is welcome. It is a special place because we all feel responsible for making sure that everyone can feel comfortable and that this space is open and welcoming. Considering all our differences, the Gecekondu already represents a bit of lived Utopia – or as a matter of fact, ordinariness.

The protest of Kotti&Co criss-crossed different political issues: from the gentrification policies to public housing policies; and from migration policies to citizenship policies, since some of the participants are people with migration background:

We are Kreuzberg – and not just since yesterday. We! There really is not one term that can grasp us, no category. In fact, the following colloquial expressions reflect how helpless the German language is at the moment since it cannot even adequately describe us: “Germans”, “foreigners”, “guest workers”, “people with a migration history”, “Turkish-Germs”, etc.

We are a community that the world of Sarrazin & Co\textsuperscript{129} has no space for. We are trainees, terirees, doctor’s assistants, nurses, engineers on unemployment; we are insurance sales people who studied sociology, we are metal workers who are writing their dissertation,

\textsuperscript{128} “Gecekondu” is a Turkish word that means “built overnight” and is a reference to houses built by migrants moving from rural areas to small and large cities in Turkey. If built between dusk and dawn, the government is not allowed to tear down these houses without engaging in legal proceedings in court.

\textsuperscript{129} Thilo Sarrazin is a German politician and writer, famous for his conservative and provocative book Deutschland schafft sich ab (“Germany abolishes itself”) published in 2010. In this very popular book, he writhes anti-Muslim theses – also on genetic argumentation – in order to discuss the failure of several immigration policies applied in Germany in the last decades.
marketers, designers who work in the cultural industry; we are the children of people who have worked hard all their lives after coming here through the recruitment agreements Germany upheld with Turkey and other nation-states form the 1950 to the 1970s. We are a little bit German, Turkish, Iranian, Circassian, Afghan or Kurdish – whatever that may mean. Some of us have names that the teachers at school don’t know what to do with or that prompt them to tell us that we are not suited for finishing school. We’ve had to fight racism and social exclusion all our lives, as well as Hartz VI\textsuperscript{130} and poverty among the elderly in this society. We are old, and we are young. We believe in Allah, God, or simply in a just society.

According to an analysis drawn by several Scholars\textsuperscript{131} (Bojadžijev, Karakayali and zur Nieden 2014) supporting the protest in Kottbusser Tor, the tenant’s initiative Kotti&Co managed to turn a summer street fair into a permanent protest camp. The people from Kotti&Co are supported by activists and neighbours, and hence they manage to remain on the street 24 hours a day. The early generations of tenants witnessed and welcomed many changes in their neighbourhood, be it when students and “lefty” communities moved here in the 1970s and 80s, or when international tenants and tourists arrived over the last few years. The Scholars highlight this special “integration” attitude of the activists and neighbours of Kottbusser Tor, being those who created the space and place in Kreuzberg many people would like to move and live.

We know this much: we represent a diversity of political stances, social opinions, assessments, histories and ways of life. We are tenants. More or less by chance, we share a roof over our heads and more – such as the trouble with the rent here at Kotti. We have an open heart and like to discuss with one another, and sometimes we don’t. In the beginning of our organizing we came together with respect, curious to get to know each other. Today, after over a year of Kotti&Co and many months at the Gecekondu at Kotti we know that we did the right thing. Many friendships were formed at Kotti&Co and conspicuous protest has grown out of it.

We did not choose this fight against rent increase. The fight came to us. We are neighbours that have to engage in politics because the policy makers are ignoring us. But through this political protest we created something beautiful together: a space that is open to anyone who comes here. This is not just a meeting point for neighbours: in these past weeks and months we have encountered the most diverse group of people from all over Berlin and elsewhere. The media sometimes portray us as wanting to stay amongst ourselves, but you just have to step inside the Gecekondu and you will start meeting new people and having conversations with them.

The protest of Kotti&Co speak a “different language” because they are taking their protest to public space and by inviting the people for a tea at the Gecekondu, and they are doing this by noisy protesting with sounds of pots and pans. Thus, the atmosphere at Kottbusser Tor was

\textsuperscript{130}Hartz IV is the unofficial term referring to Arbeitslosengeld II (subsidy for unemployed people II), which is the system of public subsidy for long-term unemployed people in Germany.

\textsuperscript{131}In order to read the whole text, see: http://kottiundco.net/english/#_ftn1
one of openness, everyone is invited to the conversations, to participate and to contribute to the protest. According to the Scholars supporting Kotti&Co, «the protest at Kotti teaches us to see our world through the eyes of others, as a society in movement, a society of migration» (Bojadžijev, Karakayali and zur Nieden 2014, p. 135).

The experience of Kotti&Co has an influence in shaping at least at the beginning the protest camp in Oranienplatz, as we can read from the flyer of the meeting for the build-up of the protest camp in autumn 2012:

Ähnlich wie bei dem 'Gecekondu' am Kottbusser Tor von Kotti&Co und dem Berliner Flüchtlingsprotestzelt am Heinrichplatz, geht es beim dem Protestcamp am Oranienplatz darum, die Forderungen der Protestierenden öffentlich sichtbar und hörbar zu machen. Das Camp soll ein offener Anlaufpunkt für Diskussionen und politischen Protest sein132.

(From Collection Flyer + Protests in the exhibition and archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin)

Moreover, exactly this “integration” attitude of the activists and neighbours of Kreuzberg played a crucial role in the support and lengthening of the Oranienplatz protest. In the following subparagraph, the experience of Oranienplatz as both a protest place and a sociality place will be presented.

---

132 Translation from the author: Similar to the ‘Gecekondu ’ at Kottbusser Tor of Kotti&Co and the Berlin refugee protest camp at the Heinrichplatz, the protest camp at Oranienplatz is about making the claims of the protesters publicly visible and audible. The camp will be an open meeting place for discussions and political protest.
Voices emerging from the shadow: the Oranienplatz protest

The experience of my research’s protagonists as narrated in the previous paragraph have shed light on the difficulties they found in Italy once the Emergenza Nord Africa ended. They moved and lived in the shadow for several months after the end of the emergency program. Some of them crossed the national borders heading to other EU countries, where they also experienced an overshadowing existence as “illegal” people. Some of them ended up in Berlin, and after a short time of disorientation they were guided to Oranienplatz, as Amal narrates:

«The first time I met friends like me in Berlin, they immediately told me about Oranienplatz. I thought “If I go there, maybe there is some possibility for me to stay there”. So I was very happy, because I didn’t know where to sleep. I had slept in the train station, Hauptbahnhof … I had no place. They brought me to Oranienplatz, and I see the place … let me say something: in Africa, I never seen a place like this! In Africa, I never slept in such a bad place! That was the first time, but I had no choice, so I meet there some friends, some Africans, but we didn’t know each other. But I had the contact to Oranienplatz with those guys I met in the station. So I started to talk with them and we became friends. Then, there was no place to sleep there, the square was full. But one guy
told me that they were in the same situation, so even if there was no place to sleep for me, we'd found it! He has a place, a very small mattress. We slept together in that small mattress. After some days, I found another mattress and we build a tent for two persons. So I remained there, with all the other people, we stayed there, together. […] I stayed there from the autumn of 2013 until April 2014» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

Amal managed to find a place to sleep within the protest camp in the square, but other persons as Rashid found other accommodation solutions, sometimes because there was no place left, and sometimes because the living conditions in Oranienplatz where to hard.

«We come outside the Airport [of Berlin], we see a taxi man, one Turk. We thought he was Arab, because he was looking like an Arab man, so I go to him speaking Arabic, but he didn't answer. He started to speak in English, and he told us that he was Turk. I explain him my problem, I told him that I wanted to go where African people live. But he said that he didn't know it, so he bring us to Neukölln133, in front of Hermannplatz, and we slept there for three days! We pay him 25 Euros, but it was not a place where African people lived. He carried us in front of a mosque. And there we start to see Africans!! In the mosque! Even if they where new in Berlin, they come to mosque, because it was so cold! So cold!! It was snowed so much! Terrible! So much! You understand? We reach that place, we get inside and we explain our problem, they said “no problem”, and we could stay there three days. Sleep there, but no toilet, no shower, just sleep. So after three days everyone moved. I met one Ghana man, and I explained him my problem: I needed a place to sleep. He brought me to a hotel, in which I paid 12 Euros per night. I paid ten days at the same time! Because it was so cold!! I paid 100 or something more, because I wanted to sleep well, to rest a bit. You understand? I sleep in that Hotel, and then I see other Africans people, that didn't have house like me. Some people had house before, with women, because they had living in Berlin for a while, but they had problem with the women, I don't know, but at the end the women give them the money for the hotel. We meet every day, and we talk, talk, talk, so I get to know about Oranienplatz. The Ghana man told me to go to Oranienplatz. I go there, and it was full!! So much people, it was full! And I thought that it was not possible for me to sleep there. I see that it was outside!! At that time my money never finish! So I decide to go back to the hotel. You know, for me it is not possible to sleep in Oranienplatz, I don't want to try to kill myself for nothing! I go back to the Hotel. But I should pay again. So I payed three days. But after that, my money was finished! Finish!!! Nothing! But I didn't want to sleep outside. So I left my bag in the hotel, I discussed with Hotel people, because they wanted to know if I wanted to sleep there one more night or not. I tell them, yes I sleep here. Also if I didn't have money at this time, but I told them that I had slept there this night. Because, you know, it was better to leave my bag there, if I am alone in the city, without bag, it is easier! You understand? With my bag, where I should go? So I go to a church, all the church that we meet, we just get inside. We enter, we explain our problems, sometimes we got some food, good food!! Not every church was good, but one was very good, they help you. Other church were bad, in one we get inside, and they tell to us to go outside, because it was a church and they didn't have food. We explain them our problem, and they said “we call police”, we answered “ok, no problem”, and we go away. Some church give us 5 Euros or something like this. There was a church that gave us 60 Euros!! The priest told us to apply for asylum, that was the only chance we could have. That priest was Italian!! He was living there long time, but he was Italian! So it was nice, because we were speaking Italian. He told to us that this time was the first and the last time, he could help us. He said “with this money you pay the transport and you go to apply for asylum”. After

133 Neukölln is a neighbourhood of Berlin close to Kreuzberg.
I go for hotel again, I wanted to pay. I paid one day again, because I didn't want to sleep in Oranienplatz. I sleep there again, only one day, and I didn't eat!! Because the money were finish, I could pay just the room, no food. So we decide to mosque, and we try to speak with the Imam. We explain him our situation. The Imam told us that he give us food just that day, not always. So he buy good food! After we go back to hotel. The day after, come the control, to keep us out of the room, because we have payed just one night. I asked to the hotel people if I could leave my bag there, because I couldn't move me and my bag in all the city. I told them “I go out to get money, if I got money I come back and I sleep here! Because no house for me!”", outside it was so cold, so cold! They said “ok, 24 hours”. I go to Oranienplatz, and there we talk, we talk a lot, with all people. Then, I see a Sudan man, I explain him my situation, and he told me to go to the High school [referring to the occupied school in Ohlauerstr.]. If I would have it known it before, I would have slept there since the beginning!! I use all my money to pay that Hotel! Nobody told us about that school. Why do nobody of the other people explain us about this school?! We meet a lot of Nigeria people, why they didn't tell us about it?! This Sudan man was living in the school, so he told us to go there, we spoke a bit Arabic, and he told us “no problem, come in this school there are many people that sleep there”. I asked him how much we should have to pay, and he say that it was for free. But anything is for free!! I don't trust him. I thought “that is not a good place. If you sleep for free, you don't have to pay anything, is not a good place”. I had understand well! The Sudan man told me that the government had given the school for us for free, for the foreigners. I don't trust him, you understand?! I told him that I would like to see that place before. He give us an appointment, at three o’clock. We enter at this time in the school, it was so cold!! it was cold! It was cold! We wait, we wait, wait. Then we go back to hotel, we pick up our bags, and then we move to the High school.» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

The migrant subjects with humanitarian and subsidiary protection obtained in Italy were coming to Berlin day by day, and the group of Lampedusa in Berlin grew up: in the summer of 2013 they where the majority of the people protesting in Oranienplatz. There were around 80 people sleeping in Oranienplatz and around 200 people sleeping in the occupied school Gerhart-Hauptmann. The situation of the people was very heterogeneous, most of them were those outgoing from the ENA plan, but there were also undocumented migrant subjects, or migrant subjects with a document from Spain or Portugal, or the so called “Dublin cases”, i.e. migrant subjects without a document but whose fingerprints were taken in another EU country. Not all the people were active at the same way, some one of them even didn't belong to the group Lampedusa in Berlin. Amal and Masud became very active subjects of the group, as they explain us through their narrations:

«I had just arrived, and I met the friends of Lampedusa in Berlin. The group was already existing. I remained there with them. I found them, and they were in the same situation like me, so I thought “I have to follow them in everything they do, I have to do like them, I have to get together with them, I have to follow them!”. So, I remained with them, and I became like them. I became a Lampedusa in Berlin. And we stayed! We found a lot of friends there, they were coming to visit us every day with a lot of supports. We organized a lot of strikes, political meetings. I have done so many demonstration!» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)
In Eisenhüttenstadt [the asylum seekers camp where the people apply for asylum in the region of Brandenburg] I met lots of people from my origin country and it was them who told me about O-platz. Some people they knew had put up tents in Oranienplatz and were living there in protest against European law. Since I was often going to clubs in Berlin on the weekends, I once went to have a look and see what they were doing there. That’s how I met people from O-platz, and ever since I was often going to clubs and then sleeping there, because it was better than to go back to Zaira [small city where there is a residential accommodation for asylum seekers] every time! And after some time they started doing meetings, to speak about the situation in the lagers, to demonstrate against deportation and to talk about political issues that are important to be informed about, so I was very happy because for me this is very important. And then I also started meeting people that were coming from Italia, they were coming to O-platz every day and were increasing in number. So that also made me happy because they were coming from Italia, and we were fighting for our rights together. I asked for support in finding a sleeping place and the supporters that are active in O-platz helped me, so I started to live there and go back to Zaira just now and then to take the monthly money and my mail» (Interview with Masud in Berlin on January 2015).

The role of the “supporters” was crucial in the protest of Oranienplatz. As underlined in the chapter three, in Germany there is a long tradition of political activism that supports the rights of migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees. In Berlin, immediately a supporters network was build, where groups form the Church, private citizens, anti-racist activists, and migrants’ rights NGOs came together in order to sustain the Oranienplatz protest and the occupation of the Gerhart-Hauptmann school. Furthermore, Kreuzberg had experienced several protests in the public space few months before, like that of Kotti&Co close to Oranienplatz. The main square of Kreuzberg became hence a meeting point as in the flyer was wished for. Indeed, Oranienplatz quickly became a central point also for the other protests that were already occurring in Berlin, as for example the protest of a group of activists from Chad, or the protest against the government in Sudan, or that against the situation in Nigeria, or older networks of refugees that arrived in Germany several years before. An important space was build also by feminist women straggling against racism, i.e. the International Women Space (IWS). Everyday there was a political meeting, and everyday there were more or less 100 people living the square, also in order to prevent a possible eviction or police intervention. In the middle of the square close to the tent camp, an info-point was build where it was possible to get information about the protests.

I have to meet Nadhim, and he gives me an appointment at Oranienplatz. It is already dark and it is cold, but this winter is better than the last one. I decide to wait for him close

134 O-platz is the contraction of Oranienplatz, usually used by the protagonists of the protest, the supporters and the activists of Oranienplatz.

135 In order to maintain the anonymity of the story and biographies of the protagonists of my research, I will use the name of the cities of the book The invisible cities of Italo Calvino (1972). Here Zaira points to a small village in Germany where there is a residential accommodation for asylum-seekers waiting for the answer of their asylum request.
to the info-point tent. Some guys come close to me and start to talk with me. One looks at me: we meet last Sunday during the demonstration, and he recognises me. Another guy comes to me and introduces himself “Hi, I am Uchi” and we shake our hands. We talk about me, what I am doing there and what I was doing in Italy. I tell him why I am there now: I have to meet Nadhim who has received a letter about Dublin regulation, and I have to translate it for him, because it is in German. Uchi asks me when we will meet again, and I tell him that the day after I will be there, because I have to meet another person, an asylum seekers from Esmeralda. And Uchi replays: “Cool! You know, you can always come here. If you are looking for someone or you need information there is always someone in the info-point that can give you some information about soliparty, demonstrations, political meetings. Ah! It's nice, it's really nice!” (Participant observation in Oranienplatz, Berlin December 2013)

The info-point was since the beginning also a place where the “newly arriving” migrant subjects could get in contact with several supporters' networks to find a place to sleep. That highlights how the “Oranienplatz place” developed since the beginning an ambivalence: place of protest and place of accommodation for “people who are not allowed to stay”. Indeed, the main slogan of the group Lampedusa in Berlin was: “We are here, and we will stay!” facing the prohibition of settling in Germany set by the Dublin Regulation and Schengen Agreement. Together with the political activities, other activities were carried out within the square such as artistic workshops and German classes.

«We started on pieces of paper – from the very first [German] words and sentences caught around the table inside the Info-point tent, without any teaching program – just in the precariousness so hard to be disentangled of that sort of Lampedusa-isle in the middle of Berlin, between the dust of the tent, the cardboard boxes of cloths and books, the thousands of interruptions, questions and discussions, and among the coming and going of many people». (Beatrice Borri, in GliAsini 2015, p.88)

Oranienplatz became a sociality place where people meet, stay together, and learn to know each other. Several concerts, parties and other social events were organized by the supporters network and the migrant subjects active in Oranienplatz. Thus, the political protest activities were alternating with fun activities, making hence the everyday life of Oranienplatz people very busy.

«In O-platz you can find everything: friends, home, you can ask if there is some job. If you are looking for something, you go to Oranienplatz. And if you don't find someone there, you go to Kotti Café and you find always someone. And also if you want to give an appointment to friends, it is always in O-platz. Maybe the people don't remember the name of other places and streets, but everyone knows where is O-platz» (Participant observation with Obasi in Berlin, July 2015)

136 Here Esmeralda – a invisible city of Calvino's book – is a small village in Germany where there is an asylum-seekers camp.
137 Soliparty means party of solidarity that is partly organized by supporters groups in order to collect some funding for any issue linked with a struggle.
In the orientation of the city, Oranienplatz became the center, the crossroad of many biographies of people that decided to stop there after they have moved and turned around Europe, hoping and believing that a political change would have been possible. Kreuzberg was almost the only daily lived neighbourhood, where migrant subjects and supporters were moving between Oranienplatz, Kottbusser Tor - where Kotti Café is placed mentioned by Obasi – and the squatted school in Ohlauerstraße. The figure 8 of Kreuzberg well shows the proximity of these places. The activity of fund-raising enacted by some NGOs or private people played an important role: they collected around 75,000 Euros that were used for the basic need as food but also for the transport tickets when the migrant subjects had to move to Italy – for renewing the documents – or to the small cities in Germany where they applied asylum – for keeping the monthly pocket money. Furthermore, a lot of neighbours brought food, mattresses, cloths, chairs and tables to the square every day; and many soliparties have been organized. A network of legal consulting was build, that was daily in contact with Italian lawyers and NGOs trying together to understand the situation and find a solution. Moreover, a group of translators was built in order to translate all the flyers, important communication, documents, and discourses in as many languages as possible (see appendix 3).

The supporters networks also provided a sort of “informal welfare system” for people who did not have the access to the official German one. It was based on associations and NGOs that provided the basic services, such as MEDI BÜRO for basic medical supports, the KuB and other groups for legal consulting – also several private lawyers were daily present in Oranienplatz –, some Church organisations provided sleeping places in their residential accommodations, and they built several web-sites for finding solizimmer. Furthermore, the daily presence of supporters and NGOs such as Flüchtlingsrat guaranteed a continuous update of the situation in the square through doing press work and texts on Oranienplatz protest website. The central square in Kreuzberg became an alive and dynamic place, where artist workshops, German classes, concerts, soliparty, and political protests came together. Also the people came together building friendships, love affairs, and artistic projects like theatre groups or music bands, such as the Antinational Embassy that wrote the following song:

138 Kotti Caffé is a bar placed at Kottbusser tor run from people active in the political supports of several social struggles such as that of Kotti&Co and anti-racist movements.
Do you really know how it feels to flee from your country, seeking for security? Do you really know what it means to be a refugee in Germany? It means:
Discrimination, segregation, fear of deportation, isolation
Discrimination, segregation, fear of deportation, isolation
Discrimination, segregation, fear of deportation, isolation

Refrain:
Hey, come a little closer, cause I don’t wanna fight alone
Hey, come a little closer, cause I don’t wanna fight alone
If you are black or white, raise your fist and fight
against these racist laws they made to divide us
If you are black or white, raise your fist and fight
against these racist laws they made to divide us
Cause we are one, we are one, we are one, it doesn’t matter
where we are coming from
Cause we are one, we are one, we are one, it doesn’t matter
where we are coming from
Cause we are one, we are one, we are one, it doesn’t matter
where we are coming from
Where the cacao is coming from?
Where the coffee is coming from?
Where the platinum is coming from?
And where the WEAPONS ARE COMING FROM?
All these things can travel free, where is the freedom of movement for refugees?
All these things can travel free, where is the freedom of movement for refugees?
All these things can travel free, where is the freedom of movement for refugees?

Refrain:
Hey, come a little closer, cause I don’t wanna fight alone
Hey, come a little closer, cause I don’t wanna fight alone
If you are black or white, raise your fist and fight
against these racist laws they made to divide us
If you are black or white, raise your fist and fight
against these racist laws they made to divide us
Cause we are one, we are one, we are one, it doesn’t matter
where we are coming from
Cause we are one, we are one, we are one, it doesn’t matter
where we are coming from
Cause we are one, we are one, we are one, it doesn’t matter
where we are coming from

Through the song’s words of the Antinational Embassy it is possible to understand the claims raised by the protest group of Oranienplatz. First, it is important to highlight the heterogeneity of the “O-platz group”: indeed, there were in particular two numerous and active subgroups with different characteristics and hence claims. The group of asylum-seekers who had applied asylum in Germany, who fought for the abolishment of the Residenzpflicht (the restriction of
mobility for asylum-seekers in Germany), of the *Lagers* (all kinds of camps and deportation prisons for migrants), and to stop all deportations. The second group was the *Lampedusa in Berlin*, who claimed the access to the German labour market – *Arbeitslaubnis* – and the right to reside in Germany – *Aufenthaltserlaubnis* –, and in general they fought for the freedom of movement for everyone in Europe (see appendix 4). Together with the protest of the *Lampedusa in Hamburg*, they demanded the abolishment of the Dublin Regulation and the application of the article 23§ of the *Aufenthaltsrecht* – the German law about the right of residence – usually issued for refugees fleeing a war (see appendix 5). Furthermore, together with the supporters a political discourse was developed around colonialism and the responsibility of Europe, and above all the role of Germany, engaged in many wars and the economic exploitation of African and Middle East countries. A critical discourse was developed also among the “*O-platz group*” itself focusing on the power relations within the group between the so-called “supporters”, i.e. above all German/European white citizens with a high level of education¹⁴⁰, and the so-called “refugees”, challenging both these categories. This sheds light on the heterogeneity of the group, it would therefore be better to speak about groups, or “Oranienplatz people”. At the beginning the struggles were bring together, and the majority of the people participated in the political meetings and demonstrations. The following flyer for one demonstration highlights the main claims raised by the “Oranienplatz people”:

We are asylum seekers, refugees, undocumented migrants, migrants from many European countries, we are Europeans with a “migration background”, we are all those who have no full privilege of citizenship, but also citizens who share a common anger against the racist EU migration policy.

We have a dream:
Freedom of movement and of residence for all asylum seekers
Stop the Dublin trap and the obligatory residence in lagers throughout Europe
Permanent documents without criteria (not depending on working contracts or individual state prosecution)
Stop the imprisonment and deportation of migrants
Same working conditions for all
Same political, social and cultural rights for all: right to study and to work
Stop the European imperialist policies: no more free trade treaties and Nato-wars
Abolish Frontex, Eurosur and other anti-migration policies and measures

¹³⁹ The article 23§ is usually applied by a federal state, notably by the Minister of Interior, and it allows to issue a residence permit in Germany for a particular group of people that otherwise do not have the right to obtain it under European or national law. The issuing is a sort of political decision by the region or city. It was already applied in the 1990s for a group of Palestinians from Lebanon, and for Roma people from Yugoslavia just in the city of Munster. Thus, there were already juridical precedents in Germany for the use of this article for the people of Oranienplatz.

¹⁴⁰ Among the “supporters” there was also people who have been asylum-seekers in the past, and at the moment had stable legal statuses; and thus increase the complexity of the composition and positions within the *O-platz* people.
When the negotiation with the local authorities began, the different claims and political practices started to divide the “O-platz people”. Moreover, several conflicts and tensions occurred among the groups: between women and men, among the migrant subjects who have different claims, between some supporters and some migrant subjects, and among the supporters who have different political values and practices. After one year, some supporters abandoned the protest because of conflicts or not feeling comfortable in Oranienplatz or in the squatted school. Above all, the situation within the squatted school turned complex and complicated: there were strong ethnic divisions built by some inhabitants, and the fights among people living inside grew up also due to the long waiting for a solution from the local authorities, which was never came up.

«The school is ghetto!! Nobody can go inside, nobody can go outside. We are 300 people, up and down. But in the second flour, we Africans cannot go there! Just Arabs! You know, in that school, every day you have problem, problem. Police come inside the school every day, and always problem!» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

Furthermore, many of the “new coming” migrant subjects didn't participate to the political meetings and to the protest. The lengthened wait for a solution that never comes has been the main factor that brought tension and fragmentation into the groups. Moreover, also the harsh weather conditions in winter entailed the increase of frustration and dejection, as Amal narrates:

«I remained there with the others, but then the winter came and there was no place where we could go to sleep, so we remain there. During the winter we were sleeping on the snow, because we were sleeping in the tents and it was snowing, the snow came inside the tend from down, and then it was remaining on the ground within the tents. We put the fire within the tents, otherwise we could die! 24-hours a day we had the fire, otherwise it was too much cold! In winter, if you wanted to take something with your hand, you had first to warm up your hand, and then you could take it. Sleeping on the snow let freeze your body, we didn't have the energy any more. We couldn't move. We could clean us three time sa week, the Senate gave us the possibility to use a place close to Oranienplatz, 1 km far away. Some people came with food, bread, spaghetti. I stayed there one year and half, I lived in Oranienplatz. We organized so many demonstrations and strikes, around all Germany, in many cities: Stuttgart, Frankfurt Oder, Dessau, Leipzig, Köln, Dortmund. In these cities there were a lot of Lampedusa and we got in contact with them. We have done all this in order to find better life conditions, for all the refugees. The government of Berlin saw that we have done a lot of things in order to improve our life conditions. There was this situation for two years, but we reached nothing! No agreement! We explained to the Senate our situation so many time, so many!» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

141 I will not enter into the details of these internal conflicts, I just outline it because it is important to shed light on the heterogeneity and complexity of the situation and protest in Oranienplatz.
In order to understand the complexity of the situation, which the protagonists of my research are experiencing in Berlin, it is crucial to understand the role of the local authorities in the negotiation with the people of Oranienplatz.

**Filtering through lists: the Oranienplatz (dis)Agreement**

The power and political relationships among the local authorities in Berlin played a crucial role in the definition of the “Oranienplatz situation”. I explained in chapter three that Berlin is a city-state and hence has an executive organ named Berlin Senate; moreover, every neighbourhood has a municipality – Bezirk, i.e. administrative district – and a mayor. When Oranienplatz was occupied, the coalition SPD and CDU constituted the Senate of Berlin. This coalition has been build since the beginning on several political tensions. The major of Berlin was Klaus Wowereit (SPD) and the senator of interior was Frank Henkel (CDU). The traditional ally of the SPD, i.e. the green party die Grüne was not part of the government of the German capital. Monika Hermann from the party die Grünen was Major of the Bezirk Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. Thus, Oranienplatz was itself spatially and politically at the center of many local political tensions.

The fragility of these political balance emerged in the way the “Oranienplatz issue” was managed and governed. The interior senator Frank Henkel pursued since the beginning his zero tolerance\(^{142}\) position, considering the eviction of Oranienplatz and the deportation of the Lampedusa people back to Italy the only solution and way to act. The major of Kreuzberg, Monika Hermann, positioned herself at the beginning on the opposite side of Henkel, considering the open dialogue with the protesters refugees the only way that should be followed in order to solve the “Oranienplatz problem”. The major of Berlin, Klaus Wowereit, and all the politicians of the SPD assumed at the beginning the position of passive observers, entailing thus an impasse that has been lengthen over many months. At the beginning the opposite position of the CDU and the green Party was just one declared in the news papers: indeed, the first real intervention of the local authorities was exactly the “non-intervention”. During almost the complete first year, the local politicians ignored the political claims of the Oranienplatz people, in particular the group of *Lampedusa in Berlin*. The local government felt legitimate to not intervene and even to not start to thinking about a solution for these

\(^{142}\)The expression “zero tolerance” came from a tradition of restrictive policy applied in the USA, namely in New York. This policy give more power to the police that applied an inflexible repression on categories of people who are considered “social dangerous” for the public order. The politician Frank Henkel had always declare his intent to apply a “Null-Toleranz” policy in Berlin, even before to get elected.
people, since the Italian government was the real responsible of that group and their condition. Thus, the local authorities sent back the Lampedusa claims to the national and European level, i.e. to the Dublin Regulation and Schengen Agreement, which in turn diverted the Lampedusa claims back to Italy.

This first phase of non-intervention linked to the “non-responsibility” of the German authorities, led to a lengthened waiting time for the people of Lampedusa in Berlin. They hence found themselves again in a situation that they had experienced just one year ago in Italy: waiting long time in order to be allowed or not to get inside – now inside to the political space of Europe, in this case of Germany.

I arrive in Oranienplatz with Giulia. It is very cold, and on the street there is some snow. There are around 20 people outside, most of them are migrants but there are also some supporters. Giulia introduces me to Nadhim and we start to talk Italian. At this moment, other guys that were sitting in the info-point exclaim in Italian: “Ah, ma sei italiana tu?!”. So, I go to them and we introduce each other. We start talk and they ask me where I come from. I say that now I am living in Milan, and one of this guy says me: “Ah, Milano! Io sono di Milano!” and he starts to explain me that he has lived there for two years, but then he decided to come to Germany because in Italy he has no job. I ask him how it is now in Berlin, if they like it, and they answer: “Here?! Here it is like Italy! Nothing happens! We stay, we just stay and wait. That's all!”, one of them stands up and goes out of the info-point. He takes a ball and he starts to play with his feet. “Italia bad, and Berlin bad – he says – I am napoletano! – he smiles – when I arrived here I thought that we, refugees, could have more possibility. But now, look at us! They don't care about us […] they promise, promise … but they really don't care. And we wait”. He shoots the ball in my direction, and I stop it with my foot. “Oh! – he exclaim – you can play football! Let's play!” and we start to play with other people there. At one point, one German guy come to us, he has a big camera with him. He ask where is Baakir, and one of the guy playing football points to a tent and says: “Baakir is there”. The German guy thanks and goes to the tent. “Journalists! If you come here in O-platz, you can meet a lot of journalists. They interview us, they ask our claims. For what? Nothing! I have done it so much time, so much!! So many interviews, so many! For nothing! Because we are still here, and nothing happens. And we sleep on the snow, and we wait like in Italy. Oh!” he does like shooting his head. And we continue to play football. (Participant observation in Berlin, January 2014)

At this time, in January 2014, just around 30 people of the group Lampedusa in Berlin were living in Oranienplatz, the most active in the political mobilization. Indeed, already since October 2013 the main “inhabitants” of Oranienplatz were just the Lampedusa, because some of the asylum-seekers who started the protest have gone back to their residential accommodation also because of the conflicts and internal divisions among the two groups. In that autumn the only intervention that the Senate did, was to ask to Caritas to provide some sleeping places for the winter. The program Berliner Kältehilfe (Berlin winter assistance) was

143 “Ah, but you are Italian?!”.  
144 “Ah, Milan! I come from Milan!”
a service provided by the Caritas which opened some dormitories for homeless during the winter. Thus, in November 2013 many migrant subjects that were hanging around or living in Oranienplatz were transferred to a residential accommodation of Caritas in Marienfelde, a southern periphery neighbourhood of Berlin. Moreover, also the major of Kreuzberg was looking for sleeping solutions within the neighbourhood, and she found in accord with the Caritas a residential accommodation in Wedding, a northern neighbourhood of Berlin, and a hostel in the neighbourhood Friedrichshain. The decision whether and who should have to move in that Caritas residential accommodation and hostels have been always collectively taken, with migrant subjects of Oranienplatz sitting in a circle in the square for hours.

In Oranienplatz the people often used the tool of name lists in order to count the people and to find a way to manage who should go where. The problem with these buildings devolved by the local authorities was the limited number of available places, thus not all the people protesting in Oranienplatz had the possibility to sleep there. The way through which the senate organised the accommodations shed light on the fact that “Oranienplatz migrant subjects” were never treated as one single group, instead they have been progressively divided by the local authorities through the scattered accommodations. For example, for the decision who should go to a hostel in the neighbouring district of Friedrichshain, many lists were drawn up for each origin countries of the migrant subjects: 60 people from Mali, 22 from Niger, 10 from Togo, and 22 from Chad. Sometimes, the promised accommodation was not opened to the “O-platz refugees” that were hoping for weeks to sleep in these places, and at the end received a deny – as happened with the hostel in Friedrichshain. This increased the level of frustration among the groups and the mistrust in the Berlin Senate and in the possibility for change of their juridical and political condition.

The list has become a central way to manage the non-manageable number of O-platz people that changed every day. The problem of all the residential accommodation, sleeping places in dormitories and hostels was that they were just a temporary solution for the cold winter: indeed, the refugees from O-platz should have lived in them just until the end of March.

According to several supporters and journalists, the Senate hoped to “peacefully” evict the square through the placement of the “O-platz migrant subjects” in several Caritas dormitories scattered in the whole city. Several migrant subjects however decided to remain in the square. The disappointment of the press and politicians becomes apparent in the news papers when they realized that some – but not all – migrant subjects moved from Oranienplatz to the Caritas' dormitories (see appendix 6). Indeed, after the move of the most of the migrant subjects to Caritas' dormitories, the police went to Oranienplatz to pull down the tents. Once
the police arrived in the square and started to look inside the tents, they discovered that there were still people living inside: they were the “kernel of the protest”, around 30 migrant subjects that didn't want to leave the square. Thus, the major of Kreuzberg prohibited the police to evict the occupation. A “push and pull” started between the Green party of Kreuzberg, which apparently supported the refugees' protest, and the CDU within the Senate, that considered the eviction and deportation to Italy as the only solution. This local internal fight, together with the non-positioning of the SPD, led to a lengthened wait that affect the moral of the migrant subjects, as highlighted in the ethnographic note. The feeling to be stuck again, after having experienced it in Italy, was the main emotional state of the protagonist of my research at that time, as the following words of Jawara tell us:

Jawara sits on the bed and starts to explain me how the situation is going on in Oranienplatz in Berlin: “Elena, the situation is stuck. Nothing is moving on. Always the same, the CDU want to evict the camp and they want to send us back to Italy … you know, they say that 'we are competence of the Italian state'. The German state has no responsibility for these people”. He stops to speak and his gaze is looking down. I wait for some time. Silence. I wait until our gaze meet again, and I ask him: “and the SPD?”. Jawara sketches a smile: “the SPD tries to mediate, but there is no way out because the problem is that they don't want to give us the permit to stay and work in Germany, you know which is the problem?! It is simple: they don't want to create a precedent!”. Jawara seems really demotivated, it is very different from the last time we met, in Berlin in autumn: back then he was more convinced about the fight and the possibility to find a solution. “Moreover – he continues – the situation in Hamburg also doesn't resolve. Some people of the Lampedusa in Hamburg have accepted a Duldung …. other people have refused it, but it seems also there that there is no willpower to unblock the situation”.

(Participant observation with Jawara in Milan, February 2014)

The growing number of migrant subjects with Italian documents led to some problems for the management of the sleeping places within the Caritas's residential accommodations: the number of people increased every day, and there were no sleeping places left.

The interior senator Frank Henkel continued with his attempts to evict the square, but every time the supporters and those migrant subjects, who were sleeping in the dormitories, managed to arrive timely at Oranienplatz to defend and support the 30 “kernel people” still living at the square. At this time the “Oranienplatz situation” was in focus of the local media, and that increased the political fight between the different political parties and the use of that issue as ideological tools for solving several local and internal institutional tensions (see appendix 7). A similar situation has been highlighted in the paragraph of Emergenza Nord Africa in Italy, where the political coalitions and the local government also mixed their electoral interests with the attempt to manage what they considered a “problematic” phenomenon.
The behaviour of the Berliner local authorities can be understood as an interrelation between abandonment policies and control devices. The fact that during the first year the German authorities did not want to take a decision and claimed Italy being responsible for these people has postponed their intervention, abandoning hence these people in a threshold of suspended present. According to other research on the migration control regime, avoiding the responsibility upon a particular category of people, which are considered “people who are not of our concern” (Tazzioli and Garelli 2016), is a typical behaviour enacted by institutions and/or international actors within the humanitarian regime of asylum management. Moreover, the interconnection of abandonment and control, well exemplified by the Oranienplatz situation, is a typical example of the hybrid system of migration control, i.e. the mix of humanitarian and securitarian devices.

According to the humanitarian-securitarian regime logic, people who are outside the jurisdiction of that institution or international actors do not exist. They are treated as “illegal”, “outlaw” – or shadows – through a process of invisibilization. The latter institutional behaviour means that the authorities are aware of the presence of such “illegal” people, but they tolerate them on condition that they are not visible. Hence, the problem is their visibility in the public space – for matters of public order and “moral panic”. Thus, if they are public visible, the only way they see to intervene is through the control and surveillance devices such as deportation prisons. The “problem of the Oranienplatz people” was their daily hypervisibility in a central square of the capital of Germany: thus, even if the Lampedusa were not under the German jurisdiction, after one year of their noisy public presence, the local authorities had to intervene. Hence a second phase of negotiation started, which brought in April 2014 to the so called “Oplatz Agreement”. The local government of Berlin wanted to solve a problem that had become, according to them, a problem of public (dis)order: indeed, the fact that one of the central squares of Berlin was occupied for one year was considered unacceptable.

The tensions and conflicts increased during the years 2013 and 2014, above all after the repeated attempt to evict the square enacted by the police under orders from the internal senator Henkel. The attempts of eviction of both the school and the square intensified also the tensions among the local politicians, since the order of the eviction should be issued by the major of the neighbourhood, i.e. Monika Hermann, who at the beginning was strongly against the eviction, supporting the refugees' claims. Furthermore, the fact that the Caritas gave their houses just until the end of the winter, notably until the end of March 2014, was an additional problem for the management of the “orphan population”. The Caritas provided also the food...
and tickets for the public transports, but just for some dormitories. Migrant subjects living in Marienfelde, for example, absolved their basic needs thanks to fund raising activities by the Church and the NGO Flüchtlingsrat. Moreover, the winter assistance program – Kältehilfe – was paid by the Kreuzberg district, because the migrant subjects with Italian documents – according to the law – had no rights to obtain the “official” money from the German government. Thus, these “orphaned half-citizens”, abandoned by Italy and not accepted by Germany, mostly lived thanks to the fund raising by German civil society. As highlighted in chapter three, the humanitarian regime led to processes of victimization and infantilization of the migrant subjects, in particular of the category of “refugees”. Despite the the local authorities' refuse of responsibility for the “errant orphans”, the migrant subjects were strongly against the charitable institutional intervention, claiming their access to the German space of rights and labour market, and the freedom of movement. The title of a news paper article well points to the claim of autonomy rather than “charitable assistance” addressed by the Oranienplatz refugees: «Zukunft statt Zimmer» 145 (image 19). Also the refugees' words of an open-letter written to the Senate highlights their claim for autonomy, namely for having the possibility to work and settle in Germany:

_We ask you to reflect about the demands of the movement. We think if you do this you will find that our protest is legal. An eviction is no solution, then we will still be on the streets but without tents, and who is from the Lagers will not go back to the Lagers and Lampedusa. […] A former CDU politician said Monika Herman is not enough dictator to evict the protest camp. It seems Mr Henkel wants to be enough dictator. This is not in the law of a democratic state where the political parties also have to accept that there are districts where they are not elected. If you evict Oranienplatz and school you will misuse your political power against the people living in Kreuzberg. […] Our demands remain, we want to abolish the Residenzpflicht […] also we don't accept the Dublin system. We want to close the Lagers […] We want to abolish deportation because deportation kills. We want to have the right to work […] Instead of an eviction we advise you to name “Oranienplatz” in “Refugee freedom square” and the school in “Refugee Embassy”._

_We are not here for humanitarian help._
_Before you want to evict the camp and the school you should come and talk to us on our demands._
_(From Negotiation + Eviction in the exhibition and archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin. See appendix 8 for the complete letter)_

The Senate decided to start a negotiation with the “Oranienplatz people”, and elected Dilekt
Kolat (SPD) as responsible for the negotiation. Officially, the negotiation started at the end of February 2014 and at the beginning of April the so-called Oranienplatz Agreement was reached.

The negotiation was crossed by several tensions and conflicts, due to the heterogeneity of the “Oranienplatz people” and due to the fact that the Senate was strongly reluctant to open some possibility for resident permits in Germany. The people who took part in the negotiation were: a delegation of refugees and asylum-seekers from Oranienplatz, the senator Dilet Kolat as “mediator”, Monika Lüke – the representative of the Integration Ministry in the region Berlin, Barbara John – the ex-representative of the Berlin Integration Ministry, the personal assistant of senator Kolat, Christian Berg, and the press officer of senator Kolat, Mathias Gille. Among the delegation of “Oranienplatz people” there was some asylum seekers who had occupied the square at the beginning, some people of the Lampedusa in Berlin group, some supporter of the NGO Flüchtlingsrat, and a German lawyer who had followed the protest since the beginning. The decision to open a negotiation was also a political strategy enacted by the SPD and the major of Berlin, Klaus Wowereit, being against the repressive position of the interior Minister Henkel that was feared to have a negative impact on the image of Berlin as “open city”.

The first step in the negotiation was to categorize the heterogeneous migrant subjects of the protests to sketch the criteria to manage them. The categories were: the application of asylum or not – asylum seekers or undocumented migrants; holders of international protection and which kind of protection, and from which European country. The federal region Berlin was not juridically responsible for the most of that people. The asylum seekers who had applied asylum in Germany, had done it in other regions. The refugees with Italian, Spain and Portuguese documents were officially under the responsibility of the respective EU countries. Thus, a juridical problem should be overcome through a political agreement. The informal – but obvious – declaration of Berlin to take a de facto juridical responsibility on these “people cases” through the Agreement was the transition to the second step of the negotiation.

This second step was to find a compromise between the heterogeneous claims of migrant subjects and the possibility and will for the region of Berlin to satisfy them. Among the asylum seekers, the majority had applied for asylum in other regions: the solution for them would have been to move their asylum bureaucratic procedures to Berlin – overcoming hence the Residenzpflicht. Among the Lampedusa in Berlin, some had applied for asylum in other regions in Germany, and few already had received the Dublin procedure. Others Lampedusa

---

146 Dilekt Kolat is the senator for work, integration and women in Berlin.
people have not applied for asylum in Germany and were just holders of a humanitarian or subsidiary protection. Moreover, there were some people with a *Duldung* obtained in Germany, and some undocumented migrants under the Dublin regulation that had left their fingerprints in other EU countries before immediately moving on to Germany. The informality of the promises done by Dilekt Kolat was the main obstacle in this second step of the negotiation. The SPD senator saw the main problem in the tension between the SPD and the CDU within the Senate. She explained that it would be impossible to agree on a very open solution in favour of the refugees, because the senator Frank Henkel would block it. Kolat then suggested that Berlin would take the responsibility for all the bureaucratic procedures and would review the cases one-by-one. The “case-by-case” was highly problematic, because the refugees never accepted it, considering themselves as a group rather than as single individuals. The proposal of the so-called *Einzelfallprüfung* – case-by-case review – highlights the attempt of the Senate to avoid the juridical precedent: the Senate opted for an individual ways of integration rather than a collective one, not threatening the *Lampedusa* people as a single group. There was a juridical and political problem in the case-by-case review, because the people of *Lampedusa in Berlin* group present a high heterogeneity of biographies. They have origins in several countries of the Sub-Sahara region that they had left many years before for several reasons, and they were all living in Libya; they escaped the Libya war, but nobody of them was a Libyan citizen. Thus, doing a case-by-case review according to the national and European laws would have meant to analyse the situation in their origin countries, avoiding the fact that they were “refugees” of the Libya war. Even Italy had treated them as a group just two years before, recognizing the fact that the war in Libya had forced their movements.\(^{147}\)

During this second phase of the agreement, there were meetings almost every week, among the “negotiation team” and among the Senate itself, where the senator Kolat should manage the tensions between the political parties in the coalition. This lengthened further the waiting time for the migrant subjects of Oranienplatz, entailing several consequences on their biographies. Indeed, those who had the one-year humanitarian protection would have renewed it. Those who were asylum seekers in Germany would have been back to their administrative district according to the *Residenzpflicht*. They were risking juridical sanctions, because they were not absolving their administrative obligations. Thus, while the Senate took time for a solution, their Italian documents expired and the sanctions of the *Residenzpflicht* would be

\(^{147}\) Just one year later, the German government would do exactly this procedure with the refugees from Syria: in the Summer 2015 the Chancellor Angela Merkel declared the suspension of Dublin III Regulation for all the people fleeing from Syria, considering them hence as a group rather than as single individuals.
applied by the administrative districts, in which the asylum seekers where juridically embedded.

At the beginning of April, the senator Kolat wrote the Agreement and asked the migrant subjects to sign. At the beginning, just two of the nine migrant subjects within the O-platz delegation have signed, because it was not clearly stated that all the people of Lampedusa group would receive a permit in Germany in the agreement – which however was unofficially promised to them during the negotiation. A high level of confusion emerged as a consequence of the several political interests and power relations enacted at different levels: the senator Kolat went to the press declaring that the Agreement was signed, and all the local and national news papers spread this news. One day later, the NGO Flüchtlingsrat together with some refugees of Oranienplatz declared that there still was no Agreement, since just two of nine had signed it. Senator Kolat was under pressure within the Senate of Berlin and also within the whole city of Berlin where the tensions around Oranienplatz were increasing (see appendix 9) – as the fight with the chef of the Berliner public transport shows (see appendix 10). Thus, the senator Kolat has to quickly reach the Agreement: she opened a new negotiation, but this time just the migrant subjects could participate; the NGOs and lawyers were excluded. In this second closed negotiation process nothing was written down, there were only oral promises: the asylum seekers can transfer their procedure to Berlin, all the Lampedusa people would receive a humanitarian protection in Germany, and the undocumented people would be enrolled in the Dublin procedure (see appendix 11). This time, five of the nine migrant subjects of the delegation signed the Agreement.

«No!! I disagree! They [the Senate] proposes us to sleep in another place, and then we leave Oranienplatz. They gave us the possibility to go to German classes, they even offer us a Duldung. But not everyone was agree. Me, I don't wanted a Duldung. So, I didn't want that agreement, but it was the first time for us handling with the Senate. We didn't really know what to do». (Interview with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

«This is a plan to … uhm … a plan about … why would somebody sign something then you say you are the person who has to sign and your assistant signs, so this agreement is not a good agreement [not valid]. What is this? This agreement, they didn’t want it!»
(Participant observation with Willy in Berlin, November 2014)

At the beginning of April, the Agreement was evaluated as reached, and the process of Oranienplatz eviction started. Also in this process there were several ambivalences and ambiguities, that shed light on the heterogeneity of the people and on the complexity of that situation. Indeed, some migrant subjects of the group Lampedusa helped to demolish the
tents, while others protested against the police during the eviction. Furthermore, one asylum-seeker woman climbed up a tree in the middle of Oranienplatz protesting with a hunger strike against the eviction for one week (see appendix 12 and appendix 13).

The Agreement issued that the Oranienplatz should be evicted and just the info-point could remain there, since the square should remain the center of refugees protest. The “O-platz people” would be distributed to several accommodation places scattered in the whole city.

The decision who was belonging to this blurred group of “O-platz people” was established through the Oranienplatz list (see appendix 14). During the negotiation, the Senate asked a list of names of people in order to insert them into the Berlin administration procedures. The way how this list was created presents some critical aspects. First of all, the list is a way the make the name and the legal status of people visible, passing information to the local authorities. Second, the list is a closed system, since not all the people can be put on it.

Indeed, in the specific case of Oranienplatz list, it remained “open” for just two weeks in which the migrant subjects could have written their name; after these weeks it was no longer possible to be included in the list. That led to several problems for those people active in the Lampedusa group, which at this moment where not in Berlin: some of them were in Italy renewing their document, others were in other German cities working or visiting friends. Once they came back, it was impossible for them to be included in the list even though they were active in the protest of Oranienplatz.

I am biking and I arrive in Oranienplatz, where I decide to stop in order to see what is going on. The tent camp is no longer there, just the info-point. There are some people hanging around the square, and always the permanent presence of the police. […] Salif [a person from Mali with a subsidiary protection obtained in Italy] talks to me in a very good Italian. He tells me that he also came from Milano, where he lived for two years but he decided to come to Germany because he didn't find some work. “I was here since the beginning of the protest – he tells me – I am one of that who have built the tent!” he smiles proudly “But you know, after months and months the time never passed, and nothing happened. So, before four months I decided to leave Berlin looking for job. I went to Munich with some friends and we worked there a bit, three or four months … of course black work! But now, I come back to Berlin, and the camp is no more there! And they told me that people have done this list! But I cannot find the list, and I don't know where I can go!”. I ask him where he is sleeping now and he replays that he is sleeping in the occupied school. “In that list there are more than 400 people, from Italy, Spain, Portugal … also people with no documents. But now the list is closed, I am so angry! I also want the possibility to be included in the list! I was here since the beginning!” I decide to call my colleague Ingrid, which is involved in the negotiation with the Senate, and she tells me that she can do nothing because the Senate has decided that the list is closed. She explains me that there are still some offices that take the names of those people excluded from the list, but there is no guarantee that at the end they will effectively be included in the Agreement. I explain it to Salif, and I tell him that he has to go tomorrow morning between 11am and 1pm to this office. (Participant observation in Berlin, April 2014)
The list acted as an internal border, filtering arbitrarily between those people who could be included in the Agreement and those who were excluded. The offices that could take the migrant subjects’ names also once the Agreement was signed were scattered in the whole city and it was often impossible to know which office was competent. Indeed, it was only in the early morning possible to obtain the information which office was open at what time that day. All this information was running through informal networks, thus it was particularly difficult for people not well connected. Although the Senate attempted to categorize the people in order to manage them within the German asylum system, *de facto* the list was drawn up without clear criteria: people who never participated in the political protest have been included and people like Salif, which instead were part of the *Lampedusa* group, have been excluded. At the end, the only criteria that emerged was the limited time in which the list remained open. Thus, the Oranienplatz list was like a *sliding door* through which just a restricted number of people – around 462 – got the access to the Agreement. They should consequently have been given access to the German political and juridical space.

**After the agreement: fragmentation, invisibilization and list proliferation**

The Oranienplatz agreement was signed at the beginning of April 2014, and after one year and six months of everyday presence and political protests the occupied square was evicted. Overshadowing the unauthorised presence of the occupants migrant subjects was one of the main attempts of the local authorities. Splitting and decentralizing the protest group was a further aim. Both these efforts were implemented through two operations: the fragmentation in the urban space of the accommodations, and the juridical case-by-case analysis.

The accommodations allocated for the “Oranienplatz migrant subjects” were scattered across the whole city. The following map of Berlin shows the fragmentation of the Oranienplatz groups through the scattered sleeping places issued by the Senate with the help of the Church organisations such as Caritas and Diakonie.
The accommodation for at least those 462 migrant subjects belonging to the list appeared as the first problem to be solved after the eviction of Oranienplatz. Indeed, the Kreuzberg's square was at the same time the political protest's fulcrum and the “home” for those migrant subjects who were not officially allowed to stay in Berlin and Germany, as Obasi explains in the following narration:

«Many refugees didn't want to leave Oranienplatz and neither to do the negotiation. Many refugees were afraid because for many many months the authorities have not shown signs of opening up. To leave Oranienplatz meant for us to not have a home any more, so to have nothing. I sat around the table with Kolat 12 times! I told that I didn't want to sign for all the refugees, I wanted first to speak with all the other. But then, I heard that someone of the Lampedusa had done the negotiation and had signed the agreement without speaking with all of us. So, they let us dismissing the tents camp.» (Interview with Obasi in Berlin, September 2014)

The group of Lampedusa in Berlin was split into several small groups of five, ten or fifteen

Figure 9: Map of Berlin and the scattered accommodations after Oranienplatz’s eviction.
persons and assigned to different accommodation centers. Just the info-point remained in Oranienplatz as agreed\textsuperscript{148}. For the first months after the Agreement there were always around ten to twenty people – supporters and migrant subjects – granting a daily presence in the square. The police was also daily present in Oranienplatz, granting the public order and obstructing the possibility to build another protest camp. Nevertheless, the role of Oranienplatz as meeting place of political protests and as fulcrum of the social life slowly decrease during the months after the Agreement as Willy, a man from Ghana with humanitarian protection, explains:

«Now that there is no Oranienplatz any more it is difficult to meet, we all live in different places now. I live far away, far far away, I tell you! It’s close to Marienfelde but even more south. Bus and train maybe one hour before I get to the school. I can’t go by bicycle, I would get lost as I don’t know the road! Now maybe it can be one month or two months that we do not meet each other, because now we are separate. But before, when we were living in Oranienplatz you went there and there were many of us, every time! We could sit together, talk…» (Participant observation with Willy in Berlin, November 2014)

The role of Oranienplatz as social and meeting place was replaced with the occupied school in Ohlauerstraße, which became a central reference point for the protest and migrant subjects until June 2014, when it was more or less evicted.

Nadhim is living in Marienfelde, the Caritas place, but he tells me that he is just sleeping there: “It is far away, very far. So I just arrive there at 23:00 pm, just for sleeping. During the day, I am here in the school … all the time”. I observe how the school has become the new meeting point, now that Oranienplatz doesn’t exist any more. (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2014).

The situation of the occupied school was particularly complicated, as I explained before, because there were around 300 people living inside and several conflicts and fights have occurred. The police was every day inside the school, arresting some people for reasons such as knife fights, light drugs consumption, or document situation. The people living in the school where heterogeneous, some persons of the Lampedusa group, some undocumented migrants, some asylum-seekers, and other migrant subjects arrived after the Oranienplatz protest, as Asad:

Asad tells me that he has arrived in Berlin three days ago, and he doesn't know how long he will remain in Berlin. I ask him where he is sleeping, and he tells me: “I am in that school, but I don't like it! I don't want to sleep there any more! There are people also with drugs, I really don't like it, is a bad place. Always police inside, I am afraid”. Salif agrees with Asad and tells me that today there was a fight, a bad fight and maybe someone has been hurt. I call Ingrid in order to understand what happened, and she tells me that the

\textsuperscript{148} The info-point has been definitively “evicted” from Oranienplatz in August 2015.
situation there is very difficult: after a fight between two people, one of them has killed the other. She tells me that it is better not to go there now also because it is full of police. Ingrid explains me to tell Salif and Asad to not go there, because now the police is controlling all the “black people” that are walking around the school, asking documents and arresting some of them. Thus, Asad and Salif decide to go to Görlizer park where there are other friends of them, and wait there until the situation in the school would turn better. Then we say goodbye, they go to the park and I go home.» (Participant observation in Berlin, April 2014)

In the months after the Oranienplatz Agreement the occupied school in Ohlauerstraße became the focus of the local authorities and, like with Oranienplatz, several attempts to evict it were implemented. As it is possible to see in the document in the appendix 15, the local authorities of the neighbourhood Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg intervened in the “school situation” after the tragically deceased person. Until then the school had been “abandoned” by the political responsibility. The political authorities started to organize alternative living spaces for the people in the school, and again a list was drawn up:

«Urgent: Being registered on the list is the absolute pre-condition to achieve alternative accommodations according to the agreement with Senator Dilekt Kolat and her administration. Only registered people will be provided with alternative accommodations»
(Document issue by the administrative district Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg to all residents of the occupied school – April 2014)

To renew the old school building and create an international center for refugees was the declared project of the municipality Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg – a project that never started. The unfulfilled promises issued by the municipality of Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg led to a strong mistrust in the Green Party of that neighbourhood, usually supported by the “Oranienplatz people” and their supporters. The school became exactly like Oranienplatz the battleground of the already existing local political tensions: the Berlin Senate, namely the CDU, programmed the school eviction without opening any dialogue, and the Green Party of the municipality Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg pushed for «a solution without violence». The tensions and conflicts among the local political parties reached their climax in June 2014, when the Senate of Berlin organised a big eviction plan. Since the 24th of June a big eviction operation started, and 1800 police men in counterinsurgency coming from all Germany surrounded the school's block with barriers and their armoured police trucks. Around 160 inhabitants of the occupied school were taken out of the building and carried to the alternative accommodations, but others – around 40 people – refused to come outside and went up to the roof where they stayed until this police operation finished. The school's block remained confined by the police for twelve days. The reaction of the supporters and the neighbourhood was very strong: since the first day a big number of supporters settled on the streets
surrounding the police blockade and granted a 24 hours presence for the people protesting inside. The supporters organized tables, chairs and some food, and they started dwelling the streets around the school; every day there was a concert, a political meeting, and many people protesting against the eviction. Moreover, the whole neighbourhood district participated in the protest: many shops, restaurants and private tenants showed solidarity by hanging signs and banners against the police and in solidarity with the refugees, as the following photos highlight.

Photo 3: Solidarity from the neighbourhood: "No deportation, no mobility restriction"

Photo 4: Demonstration of supporters against the school eviction
Photo 5: Protesting and living the streets around the school

Photo 6: Neighbourhood shops supporting the refugee protests
The reaction of the neighbourhood's inhabitants has to be linked to the old tradition of leftist fights and squat culture that characterizes Kreuzberg. This tradition had a strong relevance for the power relations around that issue. Although the police surrounded and confined the school for twelve days, they never evicted it, because the municipality of Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg needed to order and allow the eviction but was against it – also under the pressure of its electoral population. The Senate of Berlin was however pushing for the eviction through the police. On the 30th of June the police head gave the Senate of Berlin an ultimatum: either the Senate issues the eviction through an official request or the police will abandon the blockade. These lengthened tensions poured on the lives and biographies of those migrant subjects living inside, since some of them protesting on the roof would be arrested and imprisoned, with consequence on their legal status.

On 5th July the police released the school blockade, and the negotiation between the municipality Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg and the inhabitants of the school started. A new “population” was created in this moment, namely the “school people”: the list was drawn up in April 2014 and closed some weeks later, had the function to count and organize the “blurred mass of people” living within the school. This had the same function as the Oranienplatz list, a sort of sliding door that remains open just for a limited time. The school negotiation produced similar results as the Oranienplatz negotiation. Granting sleeping accommodation was the first action of the local authorities, tickets for public transport, a daily meal, and German classes. The problem of the restricted time of the list led to filtering mechanisms, since those people who were not within the school during the open list days remain excluded. The experience of Calvin, a young man from Sudan, highlights the arbitrary of this list's filtering mechanism, on the one side, and its rigidity, on the other:

I call the secretary Schmidt in order to understand how to solve the accommodation situation of Calvin. She tells me that I have to call Herr Jansen, because he is responsible. So I call the activist Gerdi, usually she has all the phone numbers of the responsible people, and she gives me the number of Herr Jansen. I call him, but he is on holiday and he gives me another number where I should call: he gave me the number of the secretary Schmidt! I call her again, but she strongly insists that she is not responsible of Calvin. So, I don't know what to do: all the people seem not responsible of the situation. Then, I call Eva of the Martha Gemeinde Church, because Calvin has her number. Eva tells me to call Miss Helmut. I call Miss Helmut and she tells me that she has a place for Calvin for just two nights, but it is better than nothing. The problem of Calvin is that he was sleeping in the occupied school, but when the police attempted to evict it and the list was drawn up he was abroad in order to renew his Italian document. Thus, he did not get the Schulausweis and now he is excluded from many things: he cannot sleep in the

149 All the names in this ethnographic note are invented in order to grant the anonymity of the people.
150 Schulausweis means identity card of the school. It was a card that was given to the school's inhabitants whose names were on the school list. The school ID just gave the access to the accommodation devolved for
structures where the people of the school are sleeping, and he has no document that attests he was part of Oranienplatz and the Lampedusa in Berlin movement. So, he can just be supported by the solidarity network of activists and Churches. (Participant observation in Berlin, June 2014).

Calvin was in Italy to renew his Italian humanitarian protection when the school list was created. Thus, when he came back, the majority of the “school people” were living in alternative accommodation and the 40 people who resisted inside the school were the only ones allowed to live inside. Indeed, after the fighting days of June, the municipality of Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg allowed the 40 migrant subjects to remain in the school with the presence of some guards at the entrance granting that just those 40 people, holding a particular ID card, could get inside and outside. Calvin hence could not get inside any more, but he also was denied the access to the alternative accommodations. None of the authorities seemed to be responsible for the situation of Calvin – and of all the others that were in his same condition being randomly excluded from the list. Thus, the persons who remained outside the filtering net that randomly took some inside and others outside, became invisible for the institutions that did not feel responsible for them: they have an Italian document, thus the German institutions are not responsible; they are not on the school list, thus the local institutions are not responsible. They are invisible orphans that can just be assisted by the supporters network.

“So, where do you live now?”, I asked to Calvin.

Calvin shake his head and start to snigger: “well that… that’s a good question!” and he stays some minutes in silence. Then, he starts to explain to me in a serious tone: “you know, that before I lived in Marienfelde, for some days I could stay there. But I had no ausweis for the school, no ausweis. So Ingrid she found me the possibilità to stay in Marienfelde for just some days, and after that I could stay here (he points up) at the 5th floor, at Isa’s place, you remember? I stayed there for I think maybe two months and then I had to leave again. And I found a place in the old family house of Isa, but it is very far. It’s in Lichterfelde south, you know? Ah! You have to take bus and u-bahn [the underground] and it’s long way, I tell you! And there, now, it’s good but it’s also bad. Because I live there alone you know?” […] Calvin seems very demotivated and lost, I also understand that he has drunk the day before, the frustration is to high. “You know – he continues – I feel like a lion in the cage. Yes, because I can never rest. There is no rest. My mind is always thinking thinking about things you know? It’s like my mind is not free. I have to think of documents and maybe also a place to stay, because also sometimes I cannot go to school [German classes] because I cannot concentrate. So I didn’t go to school for a long time. But now I want to start again.” (Participant observation in Berlin, October 2014)

The policies of abandonment is here accompanied to that of control: indeed, if the person did not have a school ID or an Oranienplatz ID, it became an “illegal” presence within the
German territory and if the police had controlled him, it could have arrested and deported him to Italy.

The other side of that policy to manage migration, namely the control attempt, emerged some months after the Oranienplatz and school agreements. In the last summer months and the autumn of 2014 the local authorities attempted to “peacefully” evict the school through the offers of alternative accommodation, see appendix 16. In parallel, the case-by-case analysis started and the migrant subjects belonging to the lists had to visit the German immigration office, the Ausländerbehörde, in order to let their personal case be analysed. The agreed-on procedure was similar to the asylum procedure, thus the subjects should leave their documents in the immigration office, do the interview, and then wait for the decision of the commission based on the analysis of their origin country situation. Some people of the Lampedusa group were channelled into this second examination of their cases, but others refused it, as Amal explains:

«When the Senate decided to close Oranienplatz and the school, they gave us another place, and we slept there. But after two months, they told us that we had to do the interview at the Ausländerbehörde. We asked why, and they told us that we had to apply for asylum. But a lot of people already had an Italian document, Italy is a European country, isn't it?! So we wanted the right to work here in Germany with the Italian document. Moreover, if you do the interview again, after six months they deport you back to Italy. So, we disagreed. They told us “ok, who doesn't want to do the interview has to leave the house”. The houses were in Osloerstraße and Frankfurterallee: Caritas' houses. Those who disagreed to do the interview, they kicked them out! […] Yes, me too! They told me some time before: I had the appointment for the interview, and they told me that if I wouldn't do it, I'd had to go out from that house. You know, if you do the interview they send you back to Italy … they even take your Italian document! So, I said no! Some of my friends went to do the interview, and after two months they told them: “you have done the asylum application in Italy, so you have to go back to Italy”. Like this! I stayed with the supporters, in the solizimmer. First time, just one night. Then, I went to another place and also there three or four days. And then, again, to another place for two weeks. Some of us are living like this, today here, tomorrow there, three days like this, two days like that, some of us live like this. What else you can do? After some time, I lose some contacts with friends … I think they left Berlin, some of them came back to Italy, others further to France or to Belgium. Many get the deportation letter to Italy. I don't know where they are. But a lot of people remain in Berlin» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

The narration of Amal explains what happened during the analysis of the case-by-case: the people who accepted to go to the Ausländerbehörde and made the interview (see appendix 17) received the deportation letter to Italy after some months. The letter stated that this person was holding an Italian document, and thus did not have the right to stay in Germany and would be forced to go back to Italy. Exactly this juridical problem was the starting point of the political negotiation that should have been resolved by the political solution. Thus, after
some months it became clear that de facto the Oranienplatz Agreement was fake, since every person who went to Ausländerbehörde received the deportation letter. The migrant subjects holding an expired Italian document were accused of “illegal” stay in Germany; those who held a regular Italian document were accused of “illegally” crossing the borders, according to the renewal date on their document; and those who had to renew soon their Italian document were rejected with the reason that they first should renew their document. Thus, for several technical bureaucratic reasons all the migrant subjects obtained the deportation letter to Italy. Once a person has received the letter, the Ausländerbehörde communicated it the manager of the residential accommodation that kicked out that person. The letter led thus to the loss of the sleeping rights in the residential accommodation.

We are sitting in Görlitzer Park, me, my colleague Giulia and several other friends of us. It is around 17:30 pm but it is not cold, and the sun is still shining. The park is full of people that are lying down, or sitting in groups, or walking around. There is also an open air concert, a live rock band. At one point, Nadhim arrives and he smiles at us. He gave us the appointment in the park, since he was already there. […] He narrates the news of Marienfelde: “you know, now they are throwing us outside. All the people of Oranienplatz are thrown outside. They said that the three months are expired and we have to go out!” […] “The problem – continues Nadhim – is that the Senate promised us a big house in Kreuzberg, and we had to wait six months until when they would have finished to renew it. But nothing happened! Six months are gone, no house and then we have to leave the dormitories. And the Senate? They don't take position and temporise”.

I hang up the phone: it was Ingrid. She told me that from tomorrow the last 50 people will be thrown out from the accommodation centers. More or less there are now 80 people that still live inside. The others have been thrown out in different moments through a fragmented way during the last months. The only solutions are now the solzimmer and some support by the Church. She confirmed me that all the people who have done the Einzelfallverfahren [case-by-case analysis] have obtained the negative response, and they have to go back to Italy. With Giulia we are trying to understand what is going on, Ingrid told us that even the press releases are not working any more. So the divide et impera of the Senate has worked? (Participant observation in Berlin, October 2014)

At the end of the summer 2014 and during the first months of autumn, several migrant subjects were kicked out from the residential accommodations and found themselves again on the streets (see appendix 18). Those who refused to do the interview were immediately kicked out, and those who did the interview were also kicked out after the deportation letter. This process did not occur at a certain point in time, but in a fragmented way: temporally and spatially fragmented, since every week just around 5, or 10, or 15 people received the letter and were kicked out from different places. This way of fragmented action aimed to avoid a concentration of many people on the streets that could potentially collectively organize
themselves in new protest actions. Moreover, the institutions attempted to act in the shadow and in silence in order to avoid the strong attention of the media on this topic, which had been on the first pages of local and national newspapers for almost two years. Thus, a process of invisibilization and fragmentation was implemented that led to the increased and strengthened precariousness of the migrant subjects' live conditions. The precariousness in the residential condition was one of the stronger structural mechanisms that influenced the subjects' lives: they experienced a highly fragmented housing situation that increased their mobility within the city of Berlin and hence the difficulty to settle.

«During the negotiation with the Senate of Berlin, some of us that were living in Oranienplatz left to go to live in the Caritas dormitory in Wedding. We should have stayed there for three months, after which they promised that we could move to a real house. They even showed it to us, a normal house in Kreuzberg! But after three months they changed their mind, and told us that this house was not habitable. So, the Senate extended our stay in Caritas place for other three months, although the Caritas chief did not agree. Some days there was no water, the showers and the toilets were broken, nothing was good there. After this time they transferred us to another place, in Blaschkoallee. In those weeks the Oranienplatz agreement was signed, and the decision was taken to examine the single case of each refugee. But a lot of us refused to go to the Ausländerbehörde for the interview, because we didn't want to ask again for asylum, we already had the Italian document! Those who went to the Ausländerbehörde received a denial letter and had to leave the dormitory and go back to Italy. Since they sent us out of the dormitory, we stayed some months in the occupied school in Kreuzberg until it was evicted. And then we slept in a building of the church close to Rosenthalerplatz, but we could only stay there for three weeks. This place was a student dormitory: the students are sleeping in the normal rooms upstairs, and we were sleeping in the big hall downstairs. After that, they split us into groups: ten of us were moved to Wedding, other ten to Friedericichstr., and other ten to … . So here we are, but we don't know what's going to happen, how the situation will end. I don't see anything that makes me think of us having a good future, but the problem is that I don't have a choice. I don't know what to do»

(Interview with Amal in Berlin, September 2014)

The level of frustration increased, and several people started to also have some psychological disturbances and depression due to the frustration and stress, lengthened for a long time, as the following experience highlights:

I am standing in the garden of the Church, where they are building the boat for the protest against the Senate. I am speaking with Harun, Amal and Obasi, when a friend of them comes to me and starts to speak with me in an aggressive way: “what are you a journalist?!” he points at my camera. Then Harun tries to calm him and he tells him that I am a good person, a friend of them. Then this man introduces himself: “Hi, I am Jabir, and you know what?! The white people are all criminals! You are the worst criminals in the world!” Harun starts laughing and he tells me: “don't pay attention to him, Elena, he is crazy!”, and Jabir continues: “yes, I am crazy! I became crazy in Europe! Before I was ok, I lived 15 years in Libya, but I am from Niger. I was working well there, in Libya, money, house, everything. But you know the story! I arrived in Italy where I stayed 3 years, without work and living as a homeless. Then I decided to come to Berlin. And now I am living worst than before!!” […] “And you should have the human rights in
Europe? – continues Jabir – making us living like that? Who would have thought something like this?! I ask just to have the possibility to work! But you let me stay without doing nothing for 5 years! I am dead, you understand it?!”. I try to show him that I understand his situation […]. (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2015)

The temporal dimension here plays a crucial role in the experience of the migrant subjects, since they experienced the same condition in Italy and two years later in Germany again, feeling *on the move* and *en transit* for four years – this issue will be explained in chapter six in more detail. In Berlin the invisibilization and fragmentation process was temporally long and fragmented, entailing thus the lengthening of the uncertainty around the juridical and political situation – and hence the future – of these people. The uncertainty of their juridical condition reflected back on their housing condition. There were people kicked out on the street still in spring 2015, as the following narrations highlight:

Obasi is looking for a room, because they stay with 11 people in a house, which they have to leave. They will be thrown outside at the end of this month. “They told us that we could stay there just for one month, but after that we have to go away! But then they prolong the time for one month again, and then one month again. But now they are not doing it any more, we have to go away”. (Participant observation in Berlin, March 2015)

Outside the bingo I meet Obasi that was in Kotti Cafè: he seems really worried because of his accommodation situation. He explains me that the Church can let them stay in that house just until the end of April. But the end of April is now and he does not know where he has to go. “I don't know where to go, I don't know anything” he says. He seems particular disoriented, that is not a characteristic of Obasi. (Participant observation in Berlin, April 2015)

Astrid arrives at my home around 15:00 pm. She needs some legal consulting for two people from Oranienplatz that she and her Church are trying to help. We sit around the kitchen table and we start to talk about the situation. She informs me that Quenton has now obtained a *Duldung* for six months, so they are calm for a while, but it is just temporary. But at least this *Duldung* allows Quenton to sleep in a residential accommodation for asylum seekers in Spandau. […] She tells me that the other people of the Church are supporting still 100 people, both economically and residentially. “The problem is that not all these people are from Oranienplatz – argues Astrid – you know in one room with 10 beds there are 15 or 16 people sleeping inside. And it is like this everywhere”. She tells me that the Church has told to the Senate that they could grant the rooms and the economic support until the 30th of April, but of course they cannot throw 100 people on the street. Thus, in these days they are thinking what to do, and they are planning a protest against the Senate, because they are sure that the Senate is voluntary ignoring and neglecting that situation, and doesn't want to take any responsibility. (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2015).

In these months progressively the responsibility of the migrant subjects living on the street falls back to the supporters networks, which should provide the basic needs such as sleeping places and food. The definitive abandonment of the politics occurred already at the beginning
of September 2014, when the senator Frank Henkel declared the Oranienplatz Agreement not valid because he had not personally signed it.

We are sitting in the Café and Ingrid explains us the situation with the people of Oranienplatz and the Senate. “The problem – says Ingrid – is that the decisions and the Senate's implementation are moving stealthily. Just the activists and the voluntary workers take concretely care of the situation! The institution should do it, but they just don't intervene!”. We say Ingrid that we know it very well, because in Italy exactly the same happens. “Now they even declared the Agreement not valid! You know why? Because Kolat has signed and not Henkel, who was the responsible person that should have done it, according to the regional law! So they kid us!”. We ask to Ingrid what we can do now, and she continues: “Now the only way should be again another occupation …. but there isn't the motivation and power any more. All the Oranienplatz people are fragmented, and they are tired. The problem is that the winter is coming … and you know how winter is in Germany!”. (Participant observation in Berlin, September 2014).

«Then there was the agreement on Oranienplatz, which I am part of, and since I had asked asylum in Eisenhüttenstadt and the agreement said that the cases outside Berlin were to be brought to the Land Berlin, I thought that I could then stay here. But then Kolat and Henkel declared that the agreement was not valid and after they pushed 81 of us from the caritas in Osloerstrasse, where we had stayed for 8 months, to Blaschkoallee, where we were kicked out a week ago, and put others in other places in other parts of the city. So we started to look for a house with the supporters». (Interview with Masud in Berlin on January 2015)

At the beginning the Lampedusa group and the supporters responded by organizing themselves in new collective protest actions, as roof protests, daily demonstrations and occupation of houses and churches. Moreover, the fact that the Lampedusa protest had spread in the whole Europe (see appendix 19) encouraged the migrant subjects that were still in Berlin carried on with the protest.

«When they kicked us out, we remained there … outside the Caritas. Then the supporters arrived and they stayed with us. We remained there two weeks, outside! Some of us went up on the roof, others were outside protesting. We remained there two weeks, I slept outside two weeks! After that the supporters tried to find a sleeping place for us. They found places where we could sleep three, two or four days, but nothing more. The supporters, they were so many people, I don't remember how many, but many! And they are very good! They helped us! They were finding solution for each of us, for two or three days. […] No, I wasn't on the roof, because when the police closed the place, I was outside. Because they decided to close that place, and we knew it, so for many days we resisted inside. But one day, some of us get outside that place, and while we were outside the police closed it. So, when we came back, the place was closed, and some friends of us were on the roof protesting. We couldn't get inside any more, we could just wait outside. After these weeks of protest … also that people on the roof should go outside.» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

Nevertheless, after some time the number of people decreased and also the motivation, as the following ethnographic note shows:
We are walking on the demonstration, there are a lot of people this time. We meet some Lampedusa people, Obasi and Saeed, and we talk. Saeed seems very disillusioned, usually he was always positive: “Well, these demonstrations are for nothing! We are not going to achieve anything, nothing changes! By now, we are here since already two years and the politics has done nothing. They don't want us”. (Participant observation in Berlin, November 2014)

Until the end of the year 2014, several political meetings were held where still some political representatives accepted to meet the “O-platz refugees”, but the rejection of responsibility was the only behaviour of the local institutions. One of the last big protest actions was the occupation of the Church St. Thomas in Kreuzberg, together with the supporters and the people of that Church. The awareness of the attempt to invisibilize and to silence the migrant subjects’ protest was clear to all the protagonists, as Amal's words highlight:

We are walking on the street in Kreuzberg and Amal explains me that there are a lot of people who are daily thrown out from the residential accommodation, because the six months given by the Senate are finished. “We have done a list – explains Amal – with all the names of the people thrown out. Now we will do something, we have to organize ourself, we have to do an action, we have to make them feeling our presence!!” (Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, September 2014)

There is a political meeting in a Church in Kreuzberg, where there should be a group of refugees from Oranienplatz and some politicians. […] The occupied Church has been just “spontaneously” evicted, and there are still a lot of people without a place to sleep. Above all, there are several refugees from Oranienplatz that are temporary living with some German families, through the solizimmer. The problem is that they are now invisible for the local authorities, but once they will have to leave these private houses, they will have no place to sleep again. So, this will be one of the issues in the discussion of today’s meeting. […] I arrive in the Church with Amal, and we meet Obasi, Mabula and Bashir in the garden. There are a lot of people that are speaking in small groups […] The Church is full of people, and there are the chairs in the middle of the room arranged in a circle.

There are several political delegates […] the discussion is around the problem of the people of the Lampedusa group and their juridical situation. Moreover, the fact is discussed that the Oranienplatz Agreement was signed, but not respected by the local authorities. The refugees are asking to change the law, to give them the access to the labour market in Germany. They are all thrown outside from the dormitories and accommodation where they live since Oranienplatz and the school has been evicted. And now they are again on the street. The consequence of the internal struggles and fractures of the coalition that governs Berlin emerge in this meeting. Indeed, the SPD politicians justify themselves around the failure of the agreement, accusing Frank Henkel who apparently agreed with that output of negotiation. The migrant subjects seem very discouraged. One of them stands up and talk: “Since 2011 we are lost, no life, no freedom, we are on the streets. This law is totally out of human rights and democracy, so please – he looks at the politicians delegation – sit down and have a look at this law, we need to change it”. (Participant observation in Berlin, September 2014)

There was no answer from the local political authorities, thus the supporters network organized themselves looking for residential accommodation for the errant orphans invisible
to the institutional eyes.

“We used to live in O-platz like homeless, it was very difficult, we came from Italy with our Italian document so we didn’t need to seek asylum in Germany. It is not possible to seek asylum in two European countries, so we came with our Italian documents and asked Germany to give us the permission to work. But the German politicians tried to push us into the asylum system here, but we didn’t need it! We just want to work here, since Germany and Italy are both countries of the EU. So we didn’t rely on any social care, we were collecting bottles to get everyday meal. […] Politicians manipulate us: they said that we should not stay in O-platz any longer and promised us education and a house and work permit. Then they came and demolished Oranienplatz one morning when many of us were still sleeping. They told us we could stay somewhere else but only for 6 months and after that they came to the places they had put us in: Blaschkoallee, Osloerstr., Marienfelde, Frankfurter Allee and kicked us out. […] Some refugees protested against this going on the roof staying there without food for two weeks, not because they were on hunger strike, it was not a hunger strike in fact, it was the police that was impeding supporters and anyone to go on the roof to bring water and food. There was also a person who couldn’t take his medicine and had to go to the hospital! You cannot call it hunger strike! […] Luckily then we could stay in S. Thomas church that gave us asylum, people listened to us to our reasons and our desires. They accepted us, and we could sleep in some places in Mitte close to Rosenthaler platz and Friedrichstr. Because church does not have such big buildings as the state does, where we could be hosted all together. They gave us tickets and pocket money, and support ever since.” (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2015)

The refugees leave the occupied St. Thomas Kirche on Sunday, after having drawn up a list with 62 names. These 62 people have accepted to live in a house of a theological school in Borsigstraße. I meet Marike that explains me what happened: “the priest has drawn up the list at 5:30 am, and he wrote down the names of the people that at that moment where in the Church, i.e. around 51 persons. The problem is for all the other people that were not in the Church at that moment! They remain excluded. Just 10 of them manage to be added on the lists, because of the insistence of the occupants. So, more or less we have now 62 people that can sleep in Borsigstraße, but the refugees thrown out form the residential accommodation in Marienfelde and Blaschkoallee are 200!”. We discuss how absurd this way is, to draw up several lists in a such a limited time, and therefore a lot of people remain excluded […]. (Participant observation in Berlin, September 2014)

Several ethnographic research have highlighted how the clandestine condition of undocumented migrants entails a temporal suspension and an official cancellation of their presence on the national territory (Coutin 2005; Gatta 2012a). The fact that the Senate of Berlin did not intervene in the “Oranienplatz situation” for finding a solution entailed these two consequences for the migrant subjects: on one side, it produced the invisibilization of their presence, on the other side, it lengthened the temporalities of their transit experiences and condition. The political and juridical invisibility was ensured through the border of the legal status: according to the Dublin Regulation and Schengen Agreement, the people holding an Italian document are not allowed to settle in Germany. Through the bureaucratic practices
of the Ausländerbehörde that were justified by the technical application of the laws, the political Oranienplatz Agreement was de facto cancelled. The protagonists of the Oranienplatz protests became hence again “illegal” according to the institutions. Although the protagonists of Oranienplatz protest experienced the same condition as the undocumented migrants, their juridical situation was different. It was an in-between blurred position: they were “documented migrants” but not authorised to stay in the German territory, and hence “illegal” – but just outside Italy. As usual for the undocumented migrants (Ambrosini 2015), also in Berlin the presence of the “unauthorized” subjects has been tolerated on condition that they remain invisible and silent. This abandonment policy has been accompanied by the policy of control: the group was split and many subgroups were built on the basis of the lists. Who remained outside these lists has been again treated as “illegal” person to be deported and detained. Indeed, some of these people, who fell by chance through the filtering net, were detained and deported to Italy or even to their origin country, which they left many years ago and to which they often lost any relation.

The experiences of the protagonists of Oranienplatz highlight the interconnection of policies of repression and control with policies of compassion (Fassin 2005), due to the humanitarian spirit that the category of “refugee” evokes in the western societies. This policy that combines abandonment and control measures entail strengthened precariousness of migrant subjects' living conditions and the lengthening of their temporariness and transit experiences. Moreover, frustration increases due to the uncertainty and arbitrary of the political mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion, as the examples of the lists have shown. The list acts as an internal border that randomly filters the migrant subjects: some of them have the access to some rights, others remain excluded without any way to get inside any longer, becoming thus completely invisible. Time has been a crucial dimension of this mechanism of management, since exactly the limited time of the draw up of the lists ensured the that not all the migrant subjects could obtain the access to Germany. The access for all, a “collective solution” to the problem, was deliberately avoided by the Senate, which strongly opposed the creation of a precedent juridical case. One of the main characteristics that penalized those migrant subjects who remained outside the lists was their mobility: the fact that they were not in Berlin for a short time excluded them from the access to the rights. This mobility, however, is not a completely voluntary act of the subject and also not a totally forced movement; indeed, it is a consequence of the tension between the structural mechanism of migration control and management, and the subjective attempts to open free space and time in that control grid. This issue will be analysed in the next chapter.
4.3. Errant orphans: the effects of policies of abandonment and control

«Je suis un mouton errant»

The ethnographic research addressed in this chapter has highlighted the way through which the migration phenomenon is managed in Europe: focussing on the experience of a particular group of migrant subjects that have lived in two different countries – Italy and Germany – it has underlined a general tendency of the European border regime. The latter must not be understood as a single political actor that unilaterally decides on the lives of people. It must instead be seen as a space of negotiating practices where several actors are involved. National and local institutions, the supporting civil societies – political activists, churches, NGOs, and private citizens –, and the migrant subjects are protagonists in the negotiation of the borders and rights within the European space. Thus, the power relations at different levels – European, national and local – emerge as the crucial factors that influence the management and control of migrant subjects.

Several actors were involved in this narrated story. The European Union through the Schengen Agreement and Dublin Convention played a role in the definition of the (im)mobilities of migrant subjects within Europe, confining them to the first arrival country. The tension within the Europe Union were relevant too, since Italy as a first arrival country aimed to share the responsibility of those people fleeing the Libya war with the other EU member states, which on the contrary refused this shared responsibility. Furthermore, the Italian government played an important role by the application of an emergency regime, entailing thus the consequences described in the paragraph Transitaly: no country for mobile-migrant man. The German state also had a crucial part: at the beginning it strongly opposed the Italian claims to share the reception of this “fleeing population”, and later on it refused a responsibility for the persons of Lampedusa in Berlin group. Moreover, the City of Berlin and its internal political conflicts and tensions between parties were crucial in the definition of the (not)solution around the “Oranienplatz issue”. And the latter has been produced by the confluence of the attempts of migrant subjects to break the constraints of the EU migration

151 «I am an errant sheep», from participant observation with Mabula in Berlin, January 2014.
control system\textsuperscript{152}, and of the holding up of the supporters constantly granting political support and informal social aids.

Although this story highlights the complexity and heterogeneity of the relations and mechanisms deployed in the “migration field”, it is possible to find some general features that characterize the European migration control and management system. My ethnographic material provides an empirical basis for the combination of humanitarian and securitarian devices as explained in chapter three. Indeed, the combination of policies of abandonment and control can be found in both the Italian and German way of managing the migration phenomenon through the asylum system. Despite the structural and cultural differences of the city of Milan and Berlin, in both cases the “temporary refugees” have been treated as a blurred figure of half-citizen, sometimes considered as victims and sometimes as internal enemies. The process of infantilization has been applied through a charity assistance system that only aimed to absolve the basic needs rather than providing the means to develop autonomy. This institutional intervention of only “tamponing the basic needs” is alternated by a control and surveillance system that sanctions the people who do not belong to the western space of citizenship. The treatment of the urban errant subjects as “dangerous nomad persons” in the police office of Milan is one example. Further examples are the invisible unwanted subjects dropped out from the inclusive mechanism of the lists in Berlin, who were treated in the same way as dangerous “illegal” people. In both cases it emerge that the local authorities are not aware of – or deny – the structural mechanisms and the political responsibilities that entail that migrant subjects live in these conditions. Thus, the “illegal” condition as well as the “errant” behavior are considered as completely dependent on the single migrant subject, denying the structural mechanisms and the institutional responsibilities involved.

The stories presented here shed light on how the disagreement and national tensions embedded in the European Union penetrate into the biographies of the persons fleeing the Libya war, being bounced from one country to another. Both Italy and Germany – and the whole Europe – remain reluctant to take the responsibility of these “errant orphans”. The term “errant orphans” is applied here to underline the process of infantilization that occurs in the management of migration and the denial of responsibility by the state institutions for that group of people. This refers to the logic of the national state that considers one state responsible for the population that is allowed to reside in its territory. This is managed\textsuperscript{152} Specifically, the asylum-seekers against the German asylum system and the Lampedusa in Berlin against Schengen and Dublin system.
through the tool of the legal status, namely the citizenship. The term of “errant orphan” or “orphan half-citizens” is not meant to obscure the agency of the protagonist of my research. Moreover, the term sheds light on the role of legal-statuses and citizenship in the logic of the national states, and how the institutions arbitrarily decide when to intervene on the lives of their population and when to abandon some categories of persons, letting them only live – or survive.

The consequences of the policies of abandonment and control relapse on the lives of the migrant subjects, their precarious condition is lengthened in time and stretched in space. The high level of mobility is one of the first effect of the policies of abandonment, and the consequent production of fragmented circuits through which the migrant subjects experience temporal ruptures in their migratory experiences. These fragmented circuits are traced within the city, as the biographies in Milan have highlighted, and within the national territories and abroad, as the experiences of the “shadows on the move” in Italy have showed. The term “shadow” is applied here in order to highlight the mechanism of invisibilization enacted by the institutions through the policy of abandonment. Such policy is discussed by several ethnographic research as the way through which the state governs its margins, namely the shadow zone of the state. The protagonists of my research have experienced thus a high level of invisibility that was temporarily interrupted during the protest of Oranienplatz, where the contrary – a hypervisibility – occurred. After the closure of the ENA plan in Italy the migrant subjects became invisible to the institutional eyes, even though they were daily present and hyper-visible in the urban space of the Milan. Similarly, the local authorities in Berlin attempted to invisibilize and silence the noisy and hypervisible “Oranienplatz people”. The state institutions were present where they had to grant the public order and the security of their citizens – through the control policies –, but absent where the “temporary citizens” needed to build autonomously their lives. The abandonment entails a reduction of the historical subjectivities of the asylum seekers and refugees to an anonymous body that can be deported or confined to the community’s margins (Pinelli 2013a). This leads to a depoliticization of the category of refugees and the construction of an ahistorical and universal humanitarian subject in that depoliticized space (Malkki 1996). Nevertheless, the migrant subjects refuse and face the processes that produce them as ahistorical and humanitarian subjects, as highlighted in the paragraph on Berlin.

The experiences of the protagonists of my research have highlighted the impact of immigration control and management policies on the temporalities of their lives and mobilities, namely how these policies enforce the temporariness of their existence. The
experiences are characterized by a lengthened waiting time that is typified by strong feeling of uncertainty, insecurity and precariously. This particular temporality finds a good expression in the metaphor of the queue, namely the long-lasting and repetitive queues that the migrant subjects do in their everyday life. One queues for getting inside. The queue involves a long wait and the possibility to remain outside, and usually there is someone – it can be a person of a mechanism – that selects at the entrance. The final decision is usually subject to randomness, subjectivity, prejudice, or selection and filtering mechanisms.

Similarly, the metaphor of the list characterizes well the experiences of the Oranienplatz people. Indeed, a list has a mechanism of random selection and entails a waiting time. The list allows the possibility to remain outside and hence sentiments of insecurity and uncertainty emerge exactly as for the queue. Both the queue and the list entail the process of individualization in the biographies of migrant subjects: being lined up, the persons who are queuing or registered on the list are treated as single units that can be randomly filtered. The filtering mechanism was discussed in the paragraph on Berlin.

The discretionary power and the randomness through which the selection occurred are another feature of the mechanisms of the control and management system of migration. The lists in Berlin highlighted the missing political and even juridical criteria for the filtering mechanisms, underlining hence the process of depoliticization of asylum. The only criteria was the limited time span, in which people could write their names on the list. These mechanisms of lists and queues fragment, individualize and split the group of migrant subjects into single cases.

Several ethnographic research have highlighted how the wait, insecurity and eventual refusal characterize border experiences for those without the economic, social and cultural capital needed to deploy “flexible citizenship” in a world on the move (Ong 1999; Anderson, R. 2014a). Thus, a link emerges between waiting and cross-border movement that highlights the strong relationship between power, the state and the management of time (Griffiths, Rogers, and Anderson 2013).

The effects on the temporal dimension can be understood as both a structural mechanism and a subjective experience. Several authors shed light on waiting-as-technique, i.e. a governmental tool applied to manage and control the “undesirable” mobile people that became stuck within the national territories (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013; Anderson, R. 2014a); other scholars highlight the bidding to the time as a tactic (de Certeau 1984) or strategy of defiance of the migrant subjects (Khosravi 2014). The protagonists of my research experienced a “permanent temporariness” that entails the extension of the experience of
transit and denial to settle. Thus, their biographies experienced the lengthening of insecurity, frustration and precariousness. According to Alain Rey (2006 [1992], in Fassin 2011a) the concept “precarious” does not correspond to the static description of a condition, it rather involves a dynamic relation of social inequality. The legal term linked to precariousness describes something exercised only by concession, by a permission that can be rescinded by the person who granted it. Migrant subjects developed several strategies and tactics to face their precarious lives. The high mobilities based on the networks that the migrant subjects have build during their migratory paths is one example of the attempts to autonomously build their lives. The protest of Oranienplatz in Berlin is as well an example of attempts to break the system of management and control that spatially and temporally confined them. The political activists, NGOs, churches and private citizens supporting the migrant subjects and their mobilities contribute to the definition of this battleground. The consequence of the tension between the structural mechanisms and the agency of the subjects and their supporters is the production of fragmented lives that move in the shadow of the European space, lengthening the subjects’ transit experience.

The next chapter will address a further crucial element that allows to more deeply understand this process, i.e. the role of the borders and the movements across and beyond the borders. The mobilities of the protagonists of my research needs to be understood as a mix of forced and voluntary act, influenced by several elements, as I will highlight in the next chapter. The role of the internal borders and the implementation of the control through the local bureaucracies is crucial in the definition of the migrant subjects' experiences. The tempos of the bureaucratic procedures are different and contradictory, and also contribute to the production of a particular temporality. In the next chapter the tensions between the mobilities of migrant subjects and the internal borders will be highlighted, focusing on the legal status as internal border and on the production of border places within the national territories.
In this chapter the concept of border is applied as analytical tool to shed light on the power relations that occur between the European border regime and the attempt to freely move enacted by the migrant subjects. The relation and tensions between the structural and agency dimension are illustrated through the presented empirical material. Indeed, the mobility of migrant subjects between and across the juridical and geographical borders allows to shed light on Europe as a space of negotiating practices. I focus on the internal borders, and notably on the borders of legal status. The protagonists of my research have crossed several legal statuses: being “migrant workers” in Libya, they became “asylum seekers” fleeing the Libya war, obtain hence a protection in Italy – humanitarian and subsidiary – and being thus considered “temporary refugees”, before becoming again “illegal” and “unwanted” in Germany, namely Berlin. The mobility of the migrant subjects is hence spatial and juridical, and must not be understood as a progressive linear movement, but rather as a circular and fragmented one. The juridical condition is not gradually improving from the worst to the best legal status, and the latter becomes a crucial element in the tension between these contested mobilities and the EU internal borders. Following the movements of migrant subjects holding Italian humanitarian and subsidiary protection between Italy, Germany and backwards, I highlight how the EU internal borders act and how the migrant subjects respond in order to cross and overcome them. A proliferation of borders within the cities emerge, which are individually and randomly activated by the migrant subjects on the move. Another consequence of this tension is the production of border places within the national territories, where control and surveillance are deployed, but in which also information and contacts are shared. The border places can hence be turned into transit sites by migrant subjects' practices. The tensions and frictions between migrant mobilities and the attempt to block and filter them lead to the creation of interstices, which are juridical (living between different categories) and urban (the transit sites). The concept of interstice highlights the agency element of migrant subjects within the power relations and tensions between them and the European border regime.
5.1 Categories on the move, mobilities between categories

The experiences of my research protagonists highlight a crucial element in the deconstruction of the idea of migration as a linear movement: the dynamism between the juridical categories and how the migrant subjects constantly cross them not in a progressive increasing way. Liza Schuster (2005) highlights how the geographic mobility of migrant subjects is accompanied by a status mobility, i.e. shifting backwards and forwards between categories, without often improving the legal condition. Similarly, other works highlight the recent tendency to “turn refugees into ‘illegal’ migrants” (Scheel and Squire 2011; Schuster 2011; Giudici 2013) as a consequence of the association of migration with criminality. Such link has gained popularity in the last decades and oriented the govern of migrant mobilities in western societies (Khosravi 2007). These analyses shed light on the way through which bureaucratic labels such as “irregular migrant”, “asylum seeker”, “Dublin case”, “refugee”, have been the result of the tension between the attempt to classify and regulate migrant subjects enacted by the state authorities and the performed counteraction of migrant subjects facing these ascribed categories.

I here expose the interaction between the migrant subjects, the different laws and the actors that implemented that laws, i.e. the bureaucratic practices. Indeed, the protagonists of my research lived in Libya as “migrant workers” being treated as “guest workers”. There were heterogeneous reasons why they went to Libya: some people did not plan to go to Libya when they started to emigrate, they just moved to find better conditions of life and ended up in Libya. Other people escaped some political trouble in their origin country, and yet others started to move for a mix of several reasons. Some persons even had lived in Libya since they were children, because the parents had emigrated there many years ago, as Masud explains:

«I was born in Chad, but I grew up in Libya, I moved there with my family when I was 7 years old. I spent 18 years there, living in Tripoli, while my family was living in Ersilia153, a city in western Libya. Things were going well, I was working, life was going well, until the uprisings began. One day, after the uprisings had started, the police of Gaddafi came to my place offering me money, and asking me to fight against the rebels. But this is not my country, I said, how could I fight for a country that is not mine? So I decided to leave the place, because otherwise I would get in trouble. In Tripoli I could not stay, it was too dangerous, and I couldn't go to my family either, because the rebels and Gaddafi’s police where checking everybody that tried to go to other African countries. So Europe was the only way that was open for me.» (Interview with Masud in Berlin,

---

153 Ersilia is an invisible city of the book of Italo Calvino (1972), and it refers here to a city in western Libya.
Most of them lived in Libya without a document, but they worked without problem. Libya’s pan-African labour recruitment policies after the UN air and arms embargo in 1991 led to a large number of Sub-Saharan migrant subjects settling there, outnumbering other countries in the region. They lived a migratory experience different from what they would experience some years later in Europe. Harun, a man from Niger holding an Italian subsidiary protection, explains us how the condition of migrants in Libya related to their legal status:

«In Africa it is different, it is really different. Because in Africa the document is not valid, it doesn't exist, never! You make the document just if you want to travel around, but if you stay in a country, you don't need it, no one will come to you and ask to show your document. In my country the document is not important, there are so many people who have even never seen a document. If you need to go to the hospital, the important thing is that you can speak the language. […] Also if you go out of Niger, you can go to Ghana, Nigeria, Chad and even Libya without document … you know in that countries there is more corruption. For example, if you enter Nigeria from Europe, you just need to give them money and that's all! They will never ask you a document. […] By the way, the document is important, I had the document in Libya, because I was born in Libya but after three months my parents came back to Niger. Then, when I was 16 years old I came back to Libya. I had a document, it is like a permit to stay with a photo. With that document you can move all around Libya, and it is an indeterminate document. You can move like the citizens, but on the document it is written your origin country. That was the politic of Gaddafi, and also of Niger. But not everybody could have that document, just the Tuareg. Because historically the Tuareg are a population that moves a lot and cross several countries, thus the Tuareg have a lot of possibility in Libya. The rules in Africa and Europe are very different. In Africa some people know how a document is important, most of them are those who like to travel a lot […] In Africa there is no safety as in Europe, the African governments did not grant the security. For example, when I was 14 years old I was living like a homeless with some friends, we were doing hip hop and rap songs. One day we made a party, singing rap songs against the government and the corruption, it were political songs. Then the police arrested us and they put us in prison for one year. Also when I arrived in Libya, some years later, I went to prison for three years! In Africa it is like this, if you are in prison there is no lawyer that can help you! You remain there for years, maybe for nothing! […] Then in Libya I was working as a tourist guide, for this reason I could understand a bit of Italian already when I was living in Libya, because I met there so many Italian tourists! I have to tell you one story: when I went to Stockholm last year – I already had the Italian document – I was sitting in a bar and at one point a women around 50 years old came inside. I thought “I know that woman!”, we look at each other and then she came to me and we spoke. I knew her since 2003, because she was working in the London's Embassy in Tripoli! Since at that time I was working as translator for tourist agencies, I was always at this Embassy. She takes out her phone and found a photo of us!! She said: “You are that person!” The world is small!» (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015).

The experience of Harun sheds light on the life that Sub-Saharan migrants had in Northern Africa, temporary living in Libya but moving a lot between several countries. His narration shows the centrality of the document as a tool for travel and as an internal border through which the police or local authorities can control and stop a person. The dynamic fragments of
Harun’s life shed light on the migratory experience as a fragmented and non-linear process, characterized by temporal interruptions such as periods in prison and many movements across several countries. In this chapter the mobilities of the migrant subjects will be highlighted and the way through which they create frictions crossing and crashing on the internal borders, shedding light on how the state power acts on its territory through the tool of the legal status.

Being “migrant workers” in Libya, after the war in 2011 the protagonists of my research became “asylum seekers” in Italy. For one year and eight months, they were treated as “asylum seekers” living in the camp-hotels ruled by the Emergenza Nord Africa plan, and finally they received a humanitarian protection in December 2012 – just few of them obtained the subsidiary protection. At this point they became “temporary refugees” or “holders of humanitarian protection” in Italy. Moreover, they became a specific category of people. The local bureaucracies treated them differently as compared to other subjects with the same juridical statuses but obtained before or after the plan Emergenza Nord Africa.

“I never have a house! I went to the municipality of Milan, in the office where they usually help refugees, and I asked them a house. They answered me that they do not give a house to those people of 2011, because we have obtained the 500 Euros, thus they cannot help us with a house!” (Interview with Badu in Milan, April 2014)

In chapter three and four I highlighted how the bureaucratic practices of that emergency plan implemented in Italy have produced a specific category of people: the “emergency temporary refugees of 2011”. After a period of homelessness and unemployment, those who decide to move further looking for better life condition and hence abandoning Italy, became “yet another category”: i.e. “half-legal and half-illegal” migrant subjects. Indeed, they were treated as “tolerated legal temporary refugees” at the beginning of their stay in a new European country, but after the expire of the allowed three months – according to Schengen and Dublin Agreements – they were turned into “illegal migrants”. In Berlin, those who participated to the Oranienplatz protest were treated as “unwanted” and “illegal” migrant subjects once the Oranienplatz agreement was cancelled. Furthermore, among the group Lampedusa in Berlin, there were different experiences of people holding several juridical statuses. Indeed, some of them have been channelled into the German asylum system and became thus, again, “asylum seekers”. When some of these new “German asylum-seekers” obtained the expulsion letter to Italy, they became “Dublin cases”. Moreover, after the failure of the political negotiation, some people became “illegal migrants”, others obtained the Duldung and became hence “tolerated” in the German system, and others obtained an indeterminate residence permit.
marrying or having a child with a German woman. Among those who remained with the Italian document only, some were “temporary tolerated” holding the Oranienplatz ID card or the school ID, which were not residence permits but at least gave some access to the city of Berlin, such as sleeping places and German classes. A very dynamic and fragmented variety of legal statuses emerged, and highlights how these juridical and social categories are an outcome of that space of negotiating practices the European border regime is.

Several social science works with a critical perspective have developed concepts around the migrants’ categories to analyse the dynamic, fragmented and blurred nature of these people: “flexible non-citizens” (Giudici 2013), “illegal citizens” (Rigo 2007), “internal enemies or additional citizens” (Balibar 2010), “citizenship’ shadows” (De Genova 2013a). All these concepts highlight a blurred nature that characterizes the juridical condition of the migrant subjects that are half-authorized and half-recognized, but live at the margins of the states – in the shadow of the law – and are treated as “suspicious” persons. Moreover, these concepts underline the tool of citizenship as a mechanism of selection within the western societies and reveal the societies’ reluctance to give the rights access to migrant subjects which are living at the margin and shadows of our societies.

The works with a critical approach to transit migration (Collyer, Düvell, de Haas 2012) have also highlighted the inherent problems involved in policies that build categories of “types” of migration. They have shed light on the growing significance of migration policy in shaping migration outcomes and migrant categories, claiming for a more dynamic application of such categories, allowing for migrants to cross them (Collyer and de Haas 2012). I have explained in the paragraph “The hybrid Regime of migration control: interconnection of humanitarian and securitarian devices” of chapter three how the categories and “figures” of migrants are socio-legally constructed, and how the knowledge and the discourses produced around these categories create both cultural imaginaries and laws, which influence each other and affect the biographies of the migrant subjects (Pinelli 2013a). These figures of migrant subjects changed over the time through to the dialectical relationship between national and super-national policies and the subjective drive that is inherent to any form of human mobility (Karakayali and Rigo 2010). In this chapter I will shed light how they are produced, resisted and changed in the empirical reality: the embeddedness in the social and power relations entail blurred categories and blurred legal statuses, which sometimes work as strong internal borders and sometimes as a tool for free move across and beyond the borders.

The mobility of the subjects assumes a crucial role, since it is possible to discover through mobility the way through which the internal borders of Europe act and how they are activated.
The crucial feature that characterizes the experiences of my research protagonists both in Italy and Germany is the *fragmentary nature* of their lives. Michael Collyer (2007) has advanced the idea of «*fragmented journeys*» as a way of conceptualising migration as a process, in which people shift from one categorization to another. Empirical research on “transit migrants” conducted in transit countries have shed light on that fragmentary nature of migrants' movements as a result of the tension between the subjective drive to freely move and the control mechanisms of the European border regime. Such mechanisms are externalised past the EU borders towards “neighbourhood countries” such as Turkey, Morocco, Libya and Ukraine (Düvell 2012; Hess 2010; Collyer and de Haas 2012). According to this literature, “transit migration” has always been treated by the EU control and management policies as “illegal migration”. Thus, a blurred category emerges that refers to “irregular” and “circular” migration, pointing to migrant subjects that are suspected to intentionally head towards Europe and treated as dangerous (Düvell 2012).

In this chapter, I shed light on this tendency to consider “circular” and “half-irregular” migration as dangerous within the European territory. Moreover, I will deconstruct the idea of fully intentional movements and decisions of the migrant subjects that migrate a second time. The interconnection of structural and agency levels that emerges from the biographical narrations of my research protagonists sheds light on a more complex reality, that cannot be understood simply as “intentional movement” or “forced movement”. Instead, it is a social and conflictual process of negotiation.

*Abandoning Italy. Turbulent trajectories heading North*

During the migratory paths, the movements may be more or less forced and more or less voluntary, highlighting hence the continue negotiation that occurs between the migrant subjects on the move and the European and national policies which attempt to govern these mobilities. The literature on the migrants' trajectories (Papastergiadis 2000; Grillo 2007; Schapendonk 2012) is useful to grasp and understand this process. It helps to deconstruct the idea of migration as a linear process, stressing how the migratory paths are not close corridors, but rather open and process-like phenomena. The trajectories are influenced by several factors, which are both structural and relational-subjective. The latter refer to the aspirations of migrant subjects (de Haas 2010) and the relationship that they conduce with some people «at certain moments in certain places» (Schapendonk 2012). According to the trajectories literature, the journeys of migrant subjects are *fragmented* and defined by three
components: the motivation, notably aspiration, that involves dreams, wishes and future perspectives; the facilitation of the journeys, namely the help of other people with whom the migrant subject related; and the velocity of journey. The latter stresses that migration trajectories are not only about mobility, but also about periods of rest, re-orientation and (un)expected and (un)intended temporary or long-term settlements. In chapter four, the temporary ruptures and interruptions of migrant subjects' experiences in Europe have been highlighted, stressing the fragmentary nature of migrants' biographies as output of that temporality. I highlighted how the fragmented lives in Milan and Berlin are produced by the interplay of the European asylum policies with the national and local policies, between which power relations and different political interests emerge and conflictual negotiations occur. However, migrant subjects are not passive victims and observers, but active subjects in the negotiation practices that are developed upon their lives. Scholars working on trajectories use the notion of turbulence (Papastergiadis 2000) of migration to stress the multi-casuality and multi-directionality of contemporary migration phenomena. Moreover, the term turbulence points to the frictions occurring between migrant subjects' mobilities and EU and national efforts to control their movements. Thus, turbulence is applied in these works as an alternative to the metaphors of migration as flows and waves that suggest that migration patterns are unidirectional, invasive and encounter little resistance (Schapendonk 2012).

Indeed, the reaction of some protagonists of my research to the policies of control and abandonment in Italy has been to move further looking for their “life solution” in another country, as Amal's biographic narration stresses:

«When they closed the camp, they gave us 500 Euros and we had to leave the hotel. [...] I remember that we remained some days there, in that village in Apulia, outside the hotel without knowing where to go. The people of the village were making fun of us! Then, we divided us, the group was spilt. Every one has to go to his way, to find his way. So I went alone to Rignano Garganico, to Gran Ghetto. But there was no work for me, so I had to move further. I arrived to Napoli! I went there because I had the phone number of a friend of mine that I knew was living in Napoli. I met him in Libya, we were together there. We also came together to Lampedusa, and then in Lampedusa we separated. I staid two weeks in Napoli, sleeping at his place. But I couldn't stay there to much time, he has to pay the rent and I couldn't help him. So, I decided to move forward and I arrived in Bologna. There I lived in the train station for one week. During this time, I walked a lot around all the city looking for a work or a place to sleep, but nothing! I was sleeping in the train station, there are so many people sleeping there, people who have no house. At this time the 500 Euros were almost finished, so I decide to move further. I decided to go to Munich. [...] I decided to go to Munich because I have informed my self: if I wanted to go to France, there was a train from Bologna to Nizza and then from Nizza to Paris, but it was expensive, 250 Euros. I didn't have it! But the train from Bologna to Munich was around 80 or 90 Euros, so it was cheaper. For this reason I decided to go there. Moreover, I had the phone number of the brother of a friend of mine, that I met in Italy. I had spoken
with his brother and he told me that if I would need a place in Munich, he could help me. So I called him, but he didn't answer. I called him all the time, but he never answered. In the meanwhile, I arrived to Munich and I slept in the train station, waiting that the brother of my friends answers. When I understood that he will never pick up on the phone, I slept in a hotel room, 12 Euros every night. I slept one week in the train station and one week in the hotel. Then, I was looking for the Caritas in order to ask them help … I didn't know what to do. I tried to ask people information, but no one answered me … and I couldn't speak German at that time! So, I went to the police! I wanted to ask them information around the Caritas. And the police told me that I should have to apply for asylum in Germany. They gave me the address of a place, and they told me that I should have to take the train in order to go there. I took the train, thinking that I was reaching a place in Munich where I could find the Caritas. But after 2 hours in the train, I started to think “How big is that Munich!”? But I didn't know the language, so I couldn't ask to people. I was so tired, because the weeks before I hadn't slept well, in the train station and then a lot of thoughts! So I fell sleep. I wake up at 6 o'clock in the morning, we arrived in a city called Leipzig. The train stooped there, and all the people went out. So I went out too. Then the conductor asked me where I wanted to go, and I showed him the piece of paper written by the police in Munich. They told me that I was in the wrong city, and I had to take a train to Phyrra\textsuperscript{154}. I arrived there, and I saw that there was a big refugees' camp and a lot of people inside. The police asked my name, date of birth etc. I gave them my document, and they asked me where I came from. I answered “from Italy”. They showed me my new room: there were 7 people inside, with me we were 8! I ask to the people in which kind of camp we were, and they told me that was a camp where people are applying for asylum. So, I went to the police and I tell them that I didn't want to apply for asylum, because I had my Italian document for one year, and I didn't want to loose that document. The police answered that I was not the only one, there were many people with an Italian and Spanish document in that camp, who had applied for asylum. But I didn't want to stay there, so I asked them to buy a ticket to Munich or to Italy, because I wanted to go back. But they told me that they wouldn't buy any ticket for me, and the only way out was to apply for asylum. So I was forced to apply for asylum in Germany, but I didn't want it! After 6 months, they gave me the letter of negative, where there was written that I had to go back to Italy. Then I thought “But how?! Six months ago I told them that I wanted to go back to Italy and it was not possible, and now you send me a letter where it is written that I had to go back to Italy?! I don't understand this system!”. At the end, I didn't go back to Italy, and they wanted to put me in prison, thus I ran away of that camp. I went to the closest city, and there I met other people like me, Africans. They told me that also there it was difficult to find a place to sleep, and they suggested me to go to Berlin. They told me that there were a lot of people in Berlin, so I took a train and I arrived in Berlin. I slept two days in the train station, Hauptbahnhof, and at one point I met there some Africans that told me about Oranienplatz.» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, September 2014)

The narration of the biographic fragment of Amal sheds light on the migratory trajectories as open process-like phenomena. First, the personal social ties and the networks built during the migratory paths play a crucial role, as highlighted in the chapter four. Indeed, Amal orients some of his movements based on his networks: he went to Naples because there a friend of him lives. A brother of another friend staying in Munich led him to the decision to move further to Germany. Nevertheless, the personal networks are not the only component directing Amal’s movements: the structural factors such as the economic crisis that made him sleeping

\textsuperscript{154} Phyrra is an invisible city in the book of Italo Calvino (1972), and here it points to a city in Germany where there is a big camp where asylum-seekers are accommodate during their asylum application.
in the train station of Bologna without finding a work together with the closure of the ENA residential accommodation strongly contributed to the decision of taking the train to Munich. Moreover, the fact that the train to France was more expensive than that one to Germany influenced Amal's trajectory too. Also the relation with the EU internal borders influenced his path, notably his legal status and the interaction with the people who embodied the control, i.e. the police men and the administration staff of the asylum seekers camp in Germany. Indeed, the fact that Amal was channelled into the asylum procedure in Germany influenced his biography, since he became a German “asylum-seeker” holding an Italian document and turned into a “Dublin case”. Amal managed to keep his Italian document with him. This allowed him to not turn into an “illegal migrant” once the Oranienplatz Agreement would have been cancelled.

The opposite happened to Masud, who was channelled into the German asylum system as well, but lost his Italian document:

"After the reception centre was closed I slept on the streets for two nights, but I could not go on like that, it was impossible to live like that, on the street! So then I decided to go to France. I had no exact plan, I thought maybe I find asylum there, or a job … I actually wanted to go to Germany: I had heard from other people in Italy that Germany is a good country to go to, and also in Libya in the newspapers and in TV, Europe and especially Germany seemed to be a good place to look for work. I didn't have a specific reason why I had chosen to come to Germany, I thought I just try and see. I was told by some friends from the camp in Alessandria, that in Germany, France, the UK if you are allowed to work you find a job quite easily and so you can look for your future and your life, but they had been to France themselves and had come back to Alessandria telling me that it was not easy to find a job in France unless you have friends. I decided to try anyway, because I couldn't find any job in Italy – If I had found a job in Italy I wouldn't have left. I didn't know that I was not allowed to work in European countries with the Italian documents. I was very happy at the beginning, I thought that from now on I can travel and look for a job in any country in Europe and then go back to renew it when I needed to, and then go back to the place where I work. You know, this is how it works in Libya: there were many many people from other countries, also not African countries, that worked there. They could work in Libya, then go visit friends or family in other countries and then go back to work, or if they didn't find any job they could go to other countries as well: you do not need different documents to work in different countries in Africa. You just start working! The day I got my permit in Italia in the questura I was very happy and I said “now I can go to work to France or Germany” but the police told me “no, this is not for working abroad! this is only for Italia, you can only work here with this document!”. I said “then this is not a document, what is it good for? It is just a piece of paper!” They broke my heart down that day! I needed something that would make my life better, and they said “you can travel around Europe with this document!”, so I can travel but I cannot work? what do I do with a document that allows me to travel but not to work? What do I travel for, then? And how can I travel if I cannot earn the money to pay the ticket? I was very angry, I was mad, but I said nothing and decided to leave Italia anyway. So, I didn't know how to get to Germany, but during the year I had spent in Italy doing all that classes, corso di italiano [Italian classes] and so on, I had looked on the maps in the classroom and I had seen that Germany is very close to France. And I didn't want to pass
through Austria. That's why I went to France. So I took a train from Alessandria to Torino and then Ventimiglia and Nice, over to Marseille and then I reached Paris. In Paris I went to the information office, to ask what train I can take to go to Germany. The man at the desk asked me where I wanted to go exactly, and I told him “I don't care, the closest Germany city to France!”. So he made me a ticket for Bayern- München but I took the wrong train, and when the control came he told me that the train I was on was going to Hamburg. I told him I didn't know, because I had never been to Germany before, but since I had a ticket it was not so bad and I could stay on the train. So I arrived in Hamburg, that was on December 2012. I arrived at night, I think it was around 3 am or so, and I didn't know anyone, it was really cold … so I was wandering around the station for a while and the next morning a German woman came to me and asked me if I needed help. She told me that she could help me if I was new there. So I told her that I was looking for some refugee centre because I am a refugee from Italy, and she brought me to the police saying that they could help me. You know, there is a police station in the Hamburg central station so we went there together and she told the police that I needed help because I am a refugee from Italy. The police told me that they can help and they brought me into a little room. I had to sit down and they started asking me questions: they wanted to see the documents of my country and asked me if I had them with me. I said no. And then they controlled all over my body – and found the Italian passport. The policemen asked “what is this? You said you had no documents…” And I replied that that was an Italian passport but Italy is not my country, so it is not what they had asked me for. They kept me there for one hour, they called some office in Italy, I didn't know what was going on, I didn't understand, then they sent fax to Italia, wrote e-mails… they did not tell me what was going on. In the end they gave me the address of a refugee camp in Hamburg and let me go. So I went to this camp. The people of the Verwaltung [administration staff] of the camp asked me what I wanted to do in Germany, and why I had come there. “I don't know – I said – I would maybe ask for asylum” because they had told me that I could not work. So they checked and asked me what my country of origin is, and I said Chad, so they told me I had to go to Zemrude, the place where all people from Chad, among other nationalities, have to go. That was on December 2012. So I left Hamburg and went to Zemrude – there I was interviewed – and the people working there took my Italian passport. I asked them when I will have it back and they said that I can forget about it because now I have made an asylum request in Germany and the Italian document is no longer useful, nor valid. I didn't like this, that document allows me to travel in Europe, how can I do without? I told them I need to work and they said “you can work only after 4 years, or if you get married or if you have a child with a German woman”. At that point I was very surprised and I didn't want to go through that, so I asked “is it possible to take my documents and go back now?” and they answered “no, that's impossible, the government keeps the documents. Only in case of a deportation you get your documents back”. But Italia was very bad for me you know? Life there is very bad for me, my situation is very bad there: I have no place to stay! And now I am scared because they could come to deport me but my Italian document has expired two years ago! I never went to renew it because I left immediately…so I cannot go back, you know? The Italian police would tell me “you are too late, your permit has expired too long ago, where were you? Why didn't you come to renew it? Now we cannot renew your permit because you are late.” So I thought about what I should do, and in the end I thought that I had to do what was good for me in that moment and I said ok. I was given an Ausweis [ID for asylum seekers] for three months, two of which I spent in Zemrude until February 2013 when I was sent to a Heim in Zaira [residential accommodation where asylum seekers have to wait for the answer of their request], not far from Berlin. I stayed there for a long time and there was nothing to do, just staying, waiting, sleeping all the time! Then one day I got the letter that I had to go back to Italy, you know, because of the Dublin 155 Zemrude is an invisible city in the book of Italo Calvino, and here it points to a city in Germany where there is a first accommodation camp for asylum-seekers, where they are placed in order to fulfill the asylum procedure.
agreement. So Germany had asked Italy if they wanted me back: if Italy said yes I had to go back and I would get back my Italian passport, otherwise I could stay. You know in the EU it works like this, the EU has decided that the first country where you have fingerprints is the one responsible for your case, but in Italia there is a really bad situation, no work, no house, so I didn't want to go back. In Zemrude I met lots of people from Chad and it was them who told me about O-platz, some people they knew had put up tents in Oranienplatz and were living there in protest against European law. Since I was often going to clubs in Berlin on the weekends, I once went to have a look and see what they were doing there. That's how I met people from O-platz, and ever since I was often going to clubs and then sleeping there, because it was better than to go back to Zaira every time! And after some time they started doing meetings, to speak about the situation in the lagers, to demonstrate against deportation and to talk about political issues that are important to be informed about, so I was very happy because for me this is very important. And then I also started meeting people that were coming from Italia, they were coming to O-platz every day and were increasing in number. So that also made me happy because they were coming from Italia, and we were fighting for our rights together. I asked for support in finding a sleeping place and the supporters that are active in O-platz helped me, so I started to live there and go back to Zaira just now and then to take the monthly money and my mail. Here in Berlin it's better in terms of working possibilities, even if it is on the black market, and you can meet many people, there in Zaira you just eat and sleep. Currently I am living in a flat with other 6 people, I moved in a month ago and I can stay as long as I want, and I do not have to pay a rent. Before that I lived with a family, parents and one child, it was nice but then they told me that I had to go because they could not keep me there any longer.» (Interview with Masud in Berlin, January 2015).

The experience of Masud highlights another crucial issue that will be stressed in this chapter, namely how the legal status acts as internal border within the EU space. The comparison he does about how people move and work in Africa and in Europe sheds light exactly on the function of the document as flexible internal border for the movements across the national states and for the access to the national space of rights. Indeed, once Masud understood that the Italian humanitarian protection allowed him to work only in Italy and not abroad, and because he experienced the socio-economic difficulties in Italy, he realized the limits and impediment to his freedom linked to that document: «then this is not a document, what is it good for? It is just a piece of paper!».

Moreover, the experiences of Masud and Amal shed light on the main characteristic of the EU borders, notably their filtering function. Although Amal and Masud have passed through a very similar experience, one could keep the Italian document – and then going back to Italy and renewing it without loosing the possibility to live in Italy in the future –, the other instead had to give his Italian document to German authorities, losing thus the possibility to renew it and hence to have a place in Europe where he is treated as “legal” person. A high level of discretionary power is present. Coincidence is therefore an important factor, influencing the biographies of the migrant subjects: who they meet at the administrative or police offices, and how the negotiation between them occurs has impact on their migratory path.
The “bureaucratic space” emerge as a crucial element through which it is possible to grasp the tension between the crossing borders mobilities of migrants and the action of the EU internal borders. The concept “bureaucratic space” does not refer to the places where administrative processes are carried out, but rather the space-time of the wait and the suspension created by the slowness, instability and uncertainty of the bureaucracy involved in obtaining the documents and the renewal.

The lack of information from both sides – the local administrative staff of both countries and the migrant subjects – sometimes plays a crucial role in the definition of a space of uncertainty, discretionarity and insecurity, which is typical for the bureaucracies dealing with migration control. Exactly this blurred bureaucratic space makes the internal borders of EU regime to act as filters, as the experience of Issa in France shows us:

«So, after moving around the whole Italy and without finding job and places to sleep, I decided to go to Marseille. There was a friend living there, with whom we have done the camp in Italy; I had met him on the boat to Lampedusa. He was in Marseille since 4 days. So I went to him. The travel was ok, I had the document, so when they controlled me there was no problem. When I arrived to Marseille there was this friend and another friend. We started to looking for work for several days. But one day, the police stop us in the city, and they ask us the document. We show them our Italian document and they told us that with that document we were not allowed to stay there. Thus, they brought us to the prison. […] yes, it was a prison, more or less. There were so many people! Africans, most of them. It was full. It was a closed place, we couldn't get outside. And they took our telephone too. At one point, they ask us to show them where we were sleeping. We go there, and they wanted to watch within our bags! They took everything out of our back, looking for something. And they took my Samsung phone. They never gave me it back! […] The lawyer in the prison told us that we couldn't stay in France with the Italian document, thus they brought us to Ventimiglia. There we took the train ticket to Nizza. I had a friend from the Côte d'Ivoire that was living in Nizza at this time. Now he is living in Paris. So, we went to Nizza, and also there we had look for work. We were sleeping in a big place, also a dormitory or something like this. I was sad in that time, because it was impossible to find a work in Nizza, so I call another boat's friend and I asked him were he was. He told me that he was in Turin, and he told me to go there because he was sleeping in an occupied place in Turin and he could find a place for me. So, I waited some days until one place in that occupied houses became free, and then I went to Turin. I lived in Turin for one year. During that time I went sometimes to Foggia were I could work on harvest. In Turin I was doing a school … but I wanted to work, that school was not for me, you know, I was in Italy already since almost three years! I couldn't go again to school! So I decide to move further, and I went to France. To Dijion. I had a friend there. We slept in a place of people who wanted to help us, I don't know how to call them … it was a squat. France is not like Italy, they help us! But in Dijion there is nothing, so I called a lot of friends asking where they were. I had a lot of friends from the camp, and also a lot from Libya. Some of them were in Berlin and they told me how was the situation there. So I decided to go to Berlin, and I arrived in Oranienplatz. It was 2014.»

(Interview with Issa in Berlin, March 2015)

The narration of Issa sheds light on the discretionary power applied by those who embody the control: Issa had the right to move and stay on the French territory because he was holding an
Italian humanitarian protection and according to the European laws he has the right to move around Europe for three months. Thus, the French police that stopped Issa in Marseilles had no right to put him in prison and to send him back to Italy. The national borders are thus extended into the national territories and cities through the daily document controls enacted following *racial profiling* mechanisms (Harcourt 2004). Obasi made a similar experience as Issa, being stopped in France close to the Italian border. The police asked him the documents and he showed the Italian humanitarian protection and the *Titolo di Viaggio* (document that functions as Italian Passport), both valid documents. Then, they asked him how much money has with him at that moment, and he answered that he has 800 Euros because he had worked in Italy. The police told him that 800 Euros were not enough money to stay in France, and consequently they put Obasi in prison for five days, after which they brought him to the Italian-French border at *Ventimiglia*.

The rejection of Obasi because of the few money highlights the arbitrariness through which the laws are applied. The document is the decisive factor that provides the possibility to stay in France, but a reason is found to still send him back to Italy. A similar experience occurred often during the two years of my ethnographic research: the criteria ruling the “legality” or “illegality” of the stay in a EU country depended sometimes on the validity of the documents and sometimes on the amount of money that the person was holding. The same happened regarding the act of crossing the national borders with or without a valid documents: sometimes migrant subjects could travel just with the Italian ID card without showing the humanitarian protection, and sometimes they were blocked although they were holding valid documents. Thus, the interaction of migrant subjects with the internal borders and their watchdogs create *frictions* that open up *interstices* of negotiation possibility, where the asymmetry of power relations emerge.

Furthermore, the interaction between the subjective agency and the internal borders influence the trajectories and biographies of subjects, together with the other structural, relational and subjective components explained before. The borders as *arbitrary filters* have been already highlighted in the previous chapter through the example of the lists in Berlin. The ethnographic notes presented in this chapter highlight a similar mechanism. The experience of Rashid completes the picture of the *arbitrary filter*: he could fly from Milan to Berlin with a valid humanitarian protection without problems, according to the European laws. Exactly such border crossing was denied to Issa and Obasi.

“I decide to go to Berlin because I hear “German is better, German is better”. Because I
lost much time!! too much! For one year and eight months I didn't do anything. Because, you know, I have family! My father married four wife! So I have a big family! My problem is different on comparison with all the other people with whom I was living together in that Hotel, you understand?! I have only one brother, he is small. I do everything to survive in my life, but I have to help my family. [...] When I was living in that Hotel, sometime tourists were coming and speaking a lot. They speak French and English, so if we see somebody speak French we go close to him to get informations, because we were in this small village, you understand?! We need something to survive our life! That way we hear somebody speak English, we go close to them and we tried to have connection with them, because they know something about Europe! And they told us that maybe it was better for me to go to Germany. [...] Yes, French tourist and above all those from Switzerland, because they come there anytime! They told us “if you go German, you must make political asylum”, because political asylum is good, they give you more money, they give you a house, you learn the language, etc. so they told us that that was the only way in Germany. The other way could be to get a German woman, but if you don't marry a German women, is not possible to get a German document. Only to marry or asylum. You know, we have Italian documents for one year, but in Germany they pay you more money, 300 Euros, something like that. 300!!! is a lot! Nobody have touched 300 Euros in one time in Italy! Maybe 100, not more. So for this reason I decide to go to Germany, and the two friends of me wanted to do it too. But I didn't know how to do, so I went to Milan to buy a ticket. I arrive in Stazione Centrale, and I see fly companies everywhere, so I just go inside and I bought a ticket. Because I didn't know anybody!! So I just enter in the office, the people speak English and French, I was speaking with one girl of the office, and she was trying to explain me how to go to Germany. At this time, one friend that was living with me in the camp, come inside the office! I didn't expected it! He didn't know I was there, and I didn't know that he wanted to go to Germany too!! He enter and asked how he could reach Germany. Because, you know, when the camp has finished, everyone was gone for his own way! We all said to each other “Hallo, goodbye, and good luck”, and than we move alone. So, I buy my ticket, and the women explains me how to get to Germany. She asks me where I was supposed to sleep, if had a place or not. And I told her don't worry, I had my money, these 500 Euros, so I could sleep in a Hotel. After I go Centrale, because I didn't have any place to go. So, before I moved to Germany, I send money to my family; I send 250 Euros. Because I collect 150 Euros from the job, and the 500 Euros from Italian state; so 650 Euros. I send 250 Euros to my family. It remain 350, because 100 I send to my piccolo brother, because he is small! I know that if he grows well, he can help me and my family. Because he will do anything for me and my family, I'm sure! He is small, he goes to school now, I'm trying to give him courage, energy! I try to give him courage to go to school, because maybe he can do better than me. I couldn't go to school, but I can give him the possibility to do it, you understand? I send him 100 Euros, to my small brother. So I had just 350 Euros remained, I buy the fly and I move to Germany. [...] The tourists people! Those from Switzerland and France. They said Berlin could be good for me. They said me that France is full, that I couldn't find anything! Only Berlin, not Munich, not France, just Berlin. Because we, Africans, are plenty there, in Berlin, we are a lot a lot! Because if we go there, maybe someone can tell us how to save our life, what to do. Because if you go there, you are not alone, there are many many other people like me that are in the same situation. You understand? So that has helped me to calm down little, to be more quiet, so I decide to go there. We reach Airport in peace. We move from here in peace and we arrive there in peace. No one have controlled us, even in Berlin Airport! We just go out, without control! I was surprised!! I also was thinking, maybe police control us, our documents, passports, ticket, but nothing!!» (Interview with Rashid in Berlin, February 2014).

The narration of Rashid together with these of Masud, Issa, Obasi and Amal, highlight the
high heterogeneity of the biographical trajectories of migrant subjects within Europe and stress their fragmented, circular, multi-casual and multi-directional nature.

In the experience of Rashid the casual encounter with some tourists within the camp-hotel during the ENA plan, has been crucial in his decision to move to Germany, since he did not have any information before. Thus, also a “blurry collective knowledge” such as the fact that Germany is the country in Europe where during the crisis it is easier to find work, has played an important role in the direction of some migrants' biographies. Moreover, accidental encounters can be the determinant factor for the decision, as happened in this case through the encounter of two “categories” on the move: a migrant subject, whose mobility is limited, and a tourist, who can freely move. Thus, a central role of some “transit places” in re-orienting the trajectories of migrant subjects emerges from the exposed narrations. Indeed, the train stations of some cities as well as airports, and hotels, notably those places where mobile people constantly are in transit, became crucial crossroads where people meet and can exchange information and relations – underlining hence how these places cannot be considered as “non-places” (Augé 1992), at least not for all the categories of people on the move. The transit places became sometime knots of the networks that migrant subjects built during their migratory paths: places where they have transited, stopped and re-oriented their trajectories, and to where they regularly come back. These places have an ambivalent nature: they can turn into “border places” when control and surveillance are strongly deployed – as I will explain in the paragraph 5.2 of this chapter.

The fact that the category of “refugees” has become a social figure that has to be controlled and kept under surveillance was already stressed in chapter three. Thus, the protagonists of my research, although holding valid documents, have often been subjected to several controls in the act of crossing the national borders within the European Union, and in the act of living and moving in the European cities and national territories. The strong suspicious culture of the western societies that treats the “migrants”, “refugees” and “asylum-seekers” as criminals or “suspected persons” entailed their biographies and also influenced their perception of the legal status they were holding.

In the next paragraph the ambiguity of the legal status as border within the national territories is explained to shed light on how the EU internal borders act in a fragmented and scattered way, often being individually activated.
“Interrupted citizens”: ambiguous legal statuses and the omnipresence of internal borders

«Italia gave us a document: a piece of paper, with which you can just eat, and nothing else!»
(Interview with Radu in Milan, April 2014)

Linked to the legal status, there are two important issues that I will highlight through my ethnographic material. First, the flexible and sometimes discretionary way through which the document works as an internal border consistent with the literature of critical citizenship studies (Ong 1999; Morris 2003; Rigo 2007). Second, how the legal status is perceived and performed by the migrant subjects. Indeed, the ambiguous nature inherent in the border's category (Zanini 1997) reflects itself on the legal status, which becomes a document with a blurred nature. The following comments of Radu about the usefulness of the document in Italy stresses the blurred image they build around a valid document, in this case the document of international or humanitarian protection:

I ask Radu which kind of document he has obtained, and he answers that he has the subsidiary protection. I ask him if he feels some differences in comparison with Dakari who has the humanitarian one, and he replies: “Here, in Italy there is no difference! You have a permit of five years, or three years, or one year, or no permit, and it is the same thing!” He seems very angry speaking about this topic. He continues: “If you have a subsidiary protection, where do you sleep? In a dormitory just because of the emergency program in winter. If you don't have a document, where do you sleep? In a dormitory because of the winter emergency! If you have the subsidiary protection, where do you eat? At Tricolore, in the soup kitchen! If you are without a document, where do you eat? In piazza Tricolore! If you want to work and you have a document, there is no difference with people who do not have a document!”. He stops for a moment, and then he says: “Ah, no. Sorry, I was wrong. If you want to work and you have a document it is even worse! Because in south Italy they prefer to take people without document! That was my experience, if I want to find a work, I don't have to show my document there!” He stops to look at me, and turns his eyes to the horizon: “It is like this”. (Shadowing with Radu in Milan, February 2014)

Radu's narration is just one of many comments that I collected, which were highlighting the same perception that in Italy the document is not useful to improve one's living condition. There are several elements that lead to this perception. First, the socio-economic condition in Italy after the financial crisis of 2009 that led to a general decline of the national employment and to an increasing impoverishment of the population. Second, the structural condition linked to the way how Italy's reception of asylum seekers and refugees is organized, with the
particular example of the emergency regime deployed in 2011.

«I thought that now that I have the document in Italy, I can work and have a home! But in Italy it is difficult! I have not found a work, and I have not found a home. I have the documents and I sleep outside!» (Interview with Badu in Milan, April 2014)

Indeed, the people channelled into the Emergenza Nord Africa plan experienced an exceptional condition, being treated as a separate category of people: «those people of 2011».

Besides the structural elements, the high level of discretionary power in the offices together with the high level of informality in the labour market entailed blurring the nature of the legal status perceived by my research protagonists. The following experience narrated by Dakari sheds light on that:

«During the Emergenza Nord Africa I was working in the hotel as dish washer, and the people of the hotel wanted to keep me working there! They gave me around 20 or 30 Euros every day. But the Caritas boss discovered it, and he was very angry! He went to the hotel people and told them “Dakari cannot work here! He is a refugee, he has no document, he cannot work!” I was confused. I was a refugee without document? Any way, at the end the hotel’s boss didn’t call me any more, and I lost my job … I was so sad! Then I started to looking for a work, but nothing! The Arab people were working, Italians too, but not me. […] In Italy it doesn't matter if you have a document or not! In Sophronia there was a guy from Senegal, he was illegal, without documents! But he has Italian friends of his parents, and they helped him to find a job, without documents! After some time, he received the documents, but at the beginning he was working without permit. In our school [referring to the Italian classes during the ENA plan] all the people told us that the residence, the humanitarian and subsidiary documents were the only important things in order to work. The carta d'identità, the residenza [ID card and residence] seems to be the only way to get the possibility to work. But it was not true!! I have another story: I knew a Pakistan guy, I met him in the mosque and he could speak just his language, and nothing else! No Italian! He also has a three years document, but not the Italian language. But he has Italian and Pakistan friends. We went together looking for a job in a place, and some days later they called him offering the job, and not me! Then, I went to another place where you can work as mechanical, and I asked them if I could work there. They asked me the Italian ID card and the residence, but I didn't have it yet. They told me that if I wanted that work I would have to do the ID card and the residence. But it was not true! A Palestinian guy I knew went there some days later and they gave him that job! And he has no documents!! No Italian ID and residence, like me!! Like this is working in Italia, you know now how it is here!» (Interview with Dakari in Milan, January 2014)

Dakari’s experience is linked to the lack of information he has around his juridical situation and the rights and restrictions connected with it: for example the fact that as “asylum seeker” he is not allowed to work according to the law. Moreover, the fact that the head of the reception center uses a wrong category referring to him, such as “refugee” instead “asylum seeker”, contributes to the confusion and uncertainty perceived by Dakari. So he is confused which category he belongs to and which right are connected to it. Furthermore, though it is
true that a regular work contract needs an identity card and a residence certificate, in reality a lot of informal contracts are done – above all in the sectors of labour market where migrant subjects are looking for job. Dakari became confused by the contradiction of officially needing documents to start working and seeing other migrant subjects of different nationality or skin colour but with the same juridical condition obtaining the jobs. Also Willy experienced a similar paradoxical situation, since he could work as “undocumented” person, notably as “asylum seeker”, but once he got the humanitarian protection and he asked for a regular work contract, he lost the job:

«I was working in Sicily in the wine production: the working was hard but good. I was loading boxes of grapes into the van to bring them to the place where they press them. I worked hard and the chief told me I was doing a good job, he was also paying me well, 40 Euros a day. I also worked for his brother, it was good man! I tell you! In Italy this kind of things go easily, you know? I asked him if he knew about also somebody else I could work for and one day we were driving in the car and he just stopped in the middle of the road to speak to the man that was coming with his car from the other direction, it was his brother and he asked him if I could work for him. Just like this you know? Ah man, I tell you! But Italy it’s also difficult huh? …. Until I had no document I worked there, and when I got my document then I asked the man “you have to give me a contract now, because I want to keep working for you but now I have my document so you have to give me a contract!”. And you know, from that moment on he told me I could not work for him any more… he didn’t want to give me a contract huh?…. oooohh, it’s difficult I tell you!! So what was I supposed to do then? No work, no money, ah! It’s hard …»

(Interview with Willy in Berlin, November 2014)

In Italy the so-called “informal economy” dominates the agricultural labour market in the countryside, as highlighted in the previous chapter. Thus, migrant subjects who gained the first work experiences in this shadow sector of Italian economy did not developed immediately an understanding of the importance of the validity of the document, as the following narrations highlight:

«No, in Napoli they didn’t asked me the document. In Napoli you can have work if you have the document and also if you don’t have the document, it is the same. We don't need the document. If it is a work in the countryside, you don't need the document. If you have the document, they must make you a contract, but that was a black work, you know? So they don't want the document!» (Interview with Badu in Milan, April 2014)

«No, the document doesn’t help me for nothing! My subsidiary protection is not useful. The only useful thing would be to find a job! If I work, then I can find a house, that is the only way here.» (Interview with Radu in Milan, April 2014)

The discretionary power and the different ways the migrant subjects were treated during the Emergenza Nord Africa in Italy have increased the uncertainty and the confusion around their rights and limitations:
«There was another guy like me, but he was from Guinea. [...] Like me means with the same document! Exactly the same humanitarian protection obtained in the same place! The municipality of Sophronia, where we were working for little money, send him to a place where he has everything: food, public transport ticket, everything! And he has also more money than me, he could receive some monthly money! And me, nothing! And he also arrived in 2011 from Libya, exactly like me! But for me? Nothing! I don't know why the municipality helped him and not me … I didn't understand why. With me are all bad, I don't know why they help him, and not me! All so bad with me, I don't know why. Maybe things will change … I don't know how, let's hope.» (Interview with Dakari in Milan, January 2014)

Although the first reaction was to be confused about the rights and limitations connected to their legal status, after some time the migrant subjects started to build awareness and knowledge about the situation in Italy and its economical and social conditions, also in comparison with other European countries.

«Italia … I don't understand Italia! Why they give documents to people, and then they let them sleeping outside? Why do they not give us a house? I don't understand! Look, in France, Germany, Holland and Switzerland, all the refugees have a house! The country gives them the document and then the house!» (Interview with Badu in Milan, April 2014)

«Here the documents are important just for travelling. You can go to Germany, to Africa, and that's all! Then if you have five years, or three years, or one year, or no document, it doesn't matter! You need it just for travel» (Interview with Radu in Milan, April 2014)

The awareness that the Italian document at least allows migrant subjects to freely move around Europe and to stay on the Italian territory persisted over time, also for the people who participated in the protest of Oranienplatz and had to manage their “half-illegal” condition in Berlin.

«The Italian document is important just to stay here [in Italy]! Nothing else! Just to stay here for other six months, finish. Maybe for this six months you are not allowed to work, maybe, six month are nothing! So it is important just for to stay here six months, but I don't want to stay here six months without doing nothing. [...] No, I mean, documents help me to move free here inside wherever I want. It helps you to stay here, no one stops me, ok. I can stay without problem in this country, if any one ask me the document I can show it, and I have no trouble. I'm regular here, ok, but I'm doing nothing here. But the central problem is that there is no work for me, no job, nothing. It is not a meter of document, no job here in Italy.» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

The migrant subjects belonging to the Lampedusa in Berlin group experienced greater difficulties with their legal status. Also in Berlin the informality and discretionary power within the offices and the German society entailed blurring the documents' nature. Sometimes
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the Italian humanitarian protection worked as a border to the labour market and sometimes not, as the following experience of Rashid and other “Lampedusa people” narrates:

«I stayed in Berlin 9 months. In that time, I get the information from the people in the school: all of them were going to Alexanderplatz, so I go there, and I enter in each Hotel, one by one. Some Hotel told me to give them my documents, and then they told me that I was not allow to work there. Some Hotel said that at that time there was not so much work, because there were few costumers. In other restaurants they told me to leave my phone there, if there was work, they would call me. But nobody call me. Nobody call me. […] Because many people work in Italian restaurants, because only them take black work, you know?! You work there washing plates, and you can work illegal, you know? Because if control comes, police come, they cannot enter directly to the kitchen, so the Africans have time to escape. If you don't have paper, you can work there also because the consumers didn't see you. I didn't get this job, but my friends, many many. And you get money.» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

I arrive in Marienfeld with Nadhim and Moussah. There are around 30 people of Oranienplatz living there, in one building of the Caritas accommodation center. Nadhim brings us to his room, where there are other two persons. We remain there some time, speaking about the situation in Oranienplatz and in Berlin. At one point, they ask me about Ingrid and the money they should receive for the tickets to Italy. They all want to go back to Italy to renew their documents. All of them are very worried, they are afraid to arrive late in Italy and that their documents will be expired. I distribute the money for the tickets, that money collected by the fund raising done by the supporters and NGOs. Some of them are cooking, and I ask them how they get that food. They explain me that sometime there are women coming there and bring food for them, women that live in the neighbourhood. We start to eat, and at one point arrives Sule. He is happy to see us, and he sits with us. He tells me that he is frustrated, because he has found a job in Berlin but the employer cannot employ him because of his Italian document. “I don't understand! He wanted me! He says, that I could get the job! But then, I cannot because of that document!” We all nod, showing him that we can understand his frustration. (Participant observation in Berlin, January 2014).

Furthermore, those people of the Lampedusa group who where channelled into the German asylum system found themselves with different temporary and precarious legal statuses, that sometimes gave them the access to both countries and sometimes locked them in confusing and contradictory bureaucratic meshes.

Nadhim has obtained a Duldung, but they let him keep his Italian subsidiary protection. I try to understand which kind of Duldung he has, because this document allows to access of the German labour market just after a long time of several years. But in the last months, Germany changed the law, and maybe, if Nadhim has a particular kind of Duldung, notably for humanitarian reasons, maybe he gets an earlier access to the labour market. By the way, Nadhim tells me that he is aware of the fact that with the Duldung he can be always be deported to Italy. He shows me all his letters, also the old one, when the German authorities put him in the Dublin system with the aim to send him back to Italy. Now they gave him a Duldung. I ask my German colleagues, and they also do not understand the behaviour of German authorities. Nadhim looks at his Duldung document and puts it into his pocket. (Participant observation with Nadhim in Berlin, September
Thus, the migrant subjects are caught in different bureaucratic procedures that criss-cross different kinds of laws – administrative, European or international laws – from different countries and at different levels – local, national and European. This increases the confusion and uncertainty also on which document is valid in which country, as the narration of Nadhim highlights:

Nadhim shows me his papers. He has applied for asylum in Germany, and now he is waiting for the answer in the asylum-seekers Heim [residential accommodation] in Despina. He does not like that place because it is very small and far away from everything. He is in Berlin, at Oranienplatz, since several months. He shows me a document written in Italian: it is a paper that certifies that he has done an education course for mechanics in the Italian city where he has done the camp. He asks me if he has to show it to the German police or not. He does not understand yet which kind of documents he has to show and which not, he is a bit confused. I even do not know what is better, since the situation in Oranienplatz is exceptional, and also the police or German authorities act every day differently with people who have the same documents. (Participant observation with Nadhim in Berlin, December 2013)

The uncertainty and confusion around the documents is reflected also on the people and offices that are responsible of migrant subjects’ legal procedure. A feeling of mistrust towards the local authorities strongly increased, above all in situation such as that of Berlin after the Oranienplatz Agreement was declared invalid.

«I don't trust people, even if they are lawyers. I don't want to show to the lawyer my Italian documents and letters, why should I do it? I am afraid! Look what has happened to all my friends?! She doesn't need my Italian document!» (Interview with Mabula in Berlin, March 2015)

The badly informed local authorities also influence the level of uncertainty and the ambiguities of the legal statuses. The following experience of Mabula shows that the bureaucracy in Berlin seems to not consider the extraordinary condition and situation of the people of Lampedusa group, and technically apply the usual rules – cancelling thus indirectly the political Agreement:

Mabula comes to us with the letters from the Ausländerbehörde and BAMF, where they asked him to specify the reasons why he is applying for asylum. They write that they are aware of the fact that he has already applied for asylum in Italy in 2011. There are two letters, and in one there is a list of legal statuses and he should mark his juridical condition. The case of Mabula is new for us, because usually if they discover that the person has left the fingerprints in Italy, they issue the deportation letter to Italy. At least it

157 Despina is an invisible city in the book of Italo Calvino, and here it points to a small village in Germany where there is a residential accommodation for asylum-seekers waiting for the answer of their asylum request.
has always worked like this for the “Oranienplatz people”. The BAMF considers the case of Mabula as a zweitverfahren [second procedure] and thus, according to the German law, his case will be quickly analysed because they assume that it was already analysed a first time. The first time was however in Italy during the North Africa Emergency, where there was not an analysis of every single-case, but instead a collective solution on the basis of the Libya war. It seems that the German authorities did not consider this historical fact, looking just at the technical rule. Thus, also for Mabula the chances are very low, as well as for all the Oranienplatz people. (Participant observation with Mabula in Berlin, May 2015)

Blurry questions like “where do you come from” can reach a similar significance as real documents, because the answer decides if you are deported or not (normally only documents can play that role).

This fosters the uncertainty and the feeling of uselessness and arbitrariness of the documents the migrant subjects hold. Moreover, that question is particular difficult for mobile subjects as the protagonists of my research, who could answer «from Libya», or «from Mali» or another South Saharan countries, or «from Italy».

«The German police wanted to see the documents of my country and asked me if I had them with me. I said no. And then they controlled all over my body, and found the Italian passport. The policemen asked “what is this? You said you had no documents…” And I replied that that was an Italian passport but Italy is not my country, so it is not what they had asked me for.» (Interview with Masud in Berlin, January 2015)

The ambiguous nature of the documents held by the protagonists of my research together with high level of discretionary power in the offices and bureaucracies led also to the creation of “false truths” or “legends” as in the following case of Obasi:

Obasi is convinced to go to Italy in order to apply for the Identity Card. I ask him why he wants to absolutely have that document, and he replies: “Because carta d’identità è bellissima [identity card is very beautiful] you can travel around without they control you! If you have the carta d’identità the police can do nothing to you, you are safe!”. I try to explain him that it is not like this, he needs anyway the humanitarian protection, but there is no way to convince him. His friend Saeed has done it and he manages to travel around Europe without problems, thus, he absolutely wants it too. “I will go to Turin and apply for the carta d’identità, and then I will also renew my Italian document”. (Participant observation with Obasi in Berlin, November 2014)

Nevertheless, it is possible to find a high level of migrant subjects’ awareness on the categories applied on their biographies, as Masud explains well with his words:

«And about the thing my friend told me about racism, I now agree with him: I never saw so much racism before. If you go to Africa nobody makes a difference if you are from Germany or Italy, why? No one cares about the documents there. Here the police controls me just because I am black! My family was surprised when I told them this. I don't know why it is like this, we just don't know racism, I never heard about racism or capitalism in the terms you speak about it here, I think it is a stupid thing: I am a person, you are a
person. But in European countries it is like this, racism is everywhere. I don't understand it, how are you not allowed to work? *What does it mean that I am illegal?* You make the problem in my country and I come here and you tell me I am illegal! You are illegal! If you are not allowed to work, nor to stay, but you want to stay here because elsewhere you have no chance what can you do? You start selling drugs, what else can you do? It's not a choice, it is a necessity to survive. And then you become a criminal! But if you Europeans come to Africa everyone treats you good. The EU is very bad, we do not have freedom, rights, anything to do, no right to stay, no right to work. But we are like you, if you have freedom for everybody then nobody is illegal!» (Interview with Masud in Berlin, January 2015)

Although there are differences between two countries such as Italy and Germany, the ways to manage the migration phenomena entailed migrant subjects to perceive their legal status as an ambivalent tool in both countries: sometimes it gives the access to rights and free movements, sometimes it blocks and confines them due to different criteria discretionary applied. They are not neither completely “illegal aliens” nor totally “citizen”, but “interrupted citizens”, since they have the access to only some rights and are excluded from others, experiencing hence marginal living conditions. This concept highlights also the selective mechanisms that are applied through the reduced legal statuses they are holding. Moreover, it sheds light on the migratory experience in Europe as characterized by movements and temporal and juridical interruptions that leads the migrant subjects to oscillate between a condition of “almost citizen” and one of “illegal person”. The legal status as internal border must not be understood as universal; indeed, its main characteristic is that the border is *individually* activated according to criteria that range from skin colour, the mobility across the national borders to the documents’ validity. This is both a consequence and an effect of the fragmented nature of migrants' biographies, as the cases of “Lampedusa people” in Berlin have highlighted. The internal borders are hence scattered within the national territories and cities, and – being latent – are individually activated in different places and in a fragmentary way. The way through which the internal border takes shape also differs, it is sometimes connected to the legal status and sometimes to discretionary behaviour, as the following experiences of Bashir and Harun in the cities of Milan and Rome highlight:

I pick up Bashir in the train station of Milan, and then we have to go to the hostel where we reserved a room for him. Bashir is very shy, he almost does not speak with me during the travel to the hostel. I ask him how his document situation is. He has the expired humanitarian protection and the receipt of the renewal that he has done in Turin. We arrive in the hostel, and the woman at the reception asks Bashir the document to register him. Bashir gives her his expired document. I hope she does not notice it. On the humanitarian permit there is no date of birth, thus the woman looks at Bashir and asks him when he was born. Bashir answers that he does not know. She looks at me surprised.
She cannot understand how a person does not know when it is born. I do not know what to say, I just say that it usually happens because in some countries they do not issue a document when a person is born, but only when a person wants to leave the country. Bashir nods. She is suspicious, and she decides to ask also the passport. Bashir shows her the Titolo di Viaggio. The reception woman looks at that document and she states: “What kind of document is that one? I have never seen something like this, I don't know this kind of document”. Then I explain to her that Bashir is a refugee, and in Italy a refugee holds a Titolo di Viaggio that functions as the passport. She listens to me, and then she says: “Ok, ok, I have understood. It is good”. Then she finishes to register Bashir and she gives him the keys of his room. (Participant observation with Bashir in Milan, January 2014)

«For me it was better to remain in Rome, because I have the residence there, so everything is easier. So every time I moved to another place, then I always came back to Rome, because of my residence! Now I have it in Centro Astalli, but for one year I had it in a house in Trastevere, where I had lived with some friends […] I mean, it depends. The residence is sometime important and sometime not so much. One time I found a job in Rome, in a restaurant. And they asked me to see my residence. I showed it, and they saw that it was in Centro Astalli, then they asked me if I knew some Italian person that could grant form me. That residence was not enough.» (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

The internal borders connected to the legal status emerge during the everyday life within the city; activities such as looking for a job or sleeping in a hostel room require the exposure of one's legal condition. Nevertheless, the hold of a regular document is not always the criteria through which the latent everyday borders act, as the example of Bashir and Harum highlight: Bashir can sleep in the room with his expired document, and Harun's valid document is not enough to obtain the work. Also the subjective perception of which are and where are the borders within the city plays an interesting role. Indeed, since the migrant subjects get used to be controlled in the streets and to daily live under surveillance, they internalize the symbols and images of that control and the persons who embody it. The following experience of Essien is interesting: he was living in Milan since more than one year, always hanging out in the main square of the city, namely Piazza Duomo, but he never got inside the cathedral because the presence of the soldiers and police at the entrance immediately reminded him of their control function and the fact that he as a “migrant” could be denied to get inside.

It is 11:15 am, and Essien tells me that he has never been in the cathedral of Milan, because he thought that it was not allowed to get inside. “It is not prohibited? I was sure it was prohibited to get inside because there are the soldiers and the police at the entrance. So I stayed always outside the cathedral and I never tried to get inside. I am afraid”. We decide to go there together and we move to the cathedral square. Once in Piazza Duomo, I ask again to Essien if he wants to come with me inside. He looks very happy, but also a bit afraid. He asks me again: “are you sure that I can come inside?”. I try to reassure him, but I do not want to force him. “Are you sure that they will not control me? My document has expired, I have to renew it …”. He hesitates some minutes in front of the entrance,
and then he tells me: “ok, let's try it”. We go to the entrance and I tell Essien to stay close to me. I can perceive his agitation. The soldier tells us to open our bags because he want to control it for security reason; I smiles to Essien in order to communicate to him that everything is fine and it is normal that they control our bags. The soldier lets us go, but another soldier stops us and says: “one second! Where are you going?”, Essien look at me afraid, but the soldier who controlled us says: “everything fine, I have already controlled them”. And they let us get inside. Essien asks me if everything is ok, and I tell him that there is no problem. We go inside the cathedral of Milan, and Essien looks all around very surprised “It is amazing!”, he exclaims. He asks me a lot of questions about the cathedral and I try to explain him something remembering the school lesson of art history. After ten minutes we go outside, and we leave the cathedral square. Essien looks at me and says: “Thank you to bring me there”. (Participant observation with Essien in Milan, March 2014)

The blurred nature of legal statuses as internal borders shape also the subjective perception of the borders in the cities. The internal border can be an effective mechanism of selection, as the legal status, or just a perceived border as in Essien's experience, which at the end also acts as a real border. Asking the protagonists of my research to define the borders they experienced, several different answers emerged:

«The borders are every where. Both in Italy and Germany. Germany I never get problem with the government because I'm not asylum there, I didn't make asylum in that country, so the German government doesn't care about me. My problem in German is that I don't have work, and I don't have house. Because this High school is not a house, is worst than nothing, is a non-house. Is not good for me. In Italy, I have problem with my document, with all the bureaucratic staff, because they register me here, so I have to stay here in order to get my document, I lost my time; this is the problem with Italy. Everything disturbs me here. Is different, both country are different. No more change, I came to Italy to get renew, but nothing change, my situation is like before!» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

«Which is the border? The job! I need to work in order to help my family, my friends, the Africans here in Italy! I need a work! My dream is to study physics, but how can I do it without work? I cannot do it … so maybe, I will go to France in the army … yes, I will became a soldier in France! After five years in the army, they give you the citizenship! You understand?! It is sad, but maybe is the only way … » (Interview with Dakari in Milan, January 2014)

«One thing is the main border: Italy has to speak with the other European countries! They have to give the possibility to people with Italian documents to work abroad. That is the problem! We cannot go to Germany or other countries. The problem is the hand …. yes, you understand what I mean! If you call it, the hand … yes the finger prints! We would like to have the freedom to decide where we want to put our hand! [referring to finger prints]» (Interview with Radu in Milan, April 2014)

«For me? The main difficult is the fact that since three years I am in Italy, and I don't have Italian friends, no one! If you are a foreigner, they [Italian people] don't want to come close to you. I didn't find Italian friends. I don't know why, maybe they don't like me, they
don’t like our skin colour. Oh, I had so many bad experiences! Many many people run out
on me! I am black, they run away. If you don’t have the Italian citizenship, they don’t like
to stay with you. This is the main border I met in Italy. It hurts so much! So much!»
(Interview with Essien in Milan, April 2014)

The subjective borders’ perception ranges from a strong awareness of the European laws
(Radu’s narration), to the lack of economic autonomy, i.e. of work (Dakari’s perception), to
the feeling that borders are everywhere (Rashid’s words), up to the perception of racism in the
relationships with the European people (Essien’s concerns). That sheds light on the space of
negotiations that occur within the European border regime, where the interrelation of different
laws at different levels with migrant subjects and the European citizens is involved in the
production and definition of borders.

The power relations within a city, or a state, emerge as a crucial factor in the definition of the
internal borders, as the example of Berlin highlighted. Indeed, the Oranienplatz protest
entailed the city of Berlin to experience two years of political tensions and social conflicts
present also in the everyday life of the city, notably in the neighbourhood Kreuzberg. The
following narrations shed light on some examples of the permanent presence of the police in
the urban space and streets of that “insurgent neighbourhood”, and the way through which the
control was activated:

«At the beginning, when I arrived in Berlin all the people told me that it would be
difficult here to take the bus and metro without a ticket and a valid document, because
here it is not like Italy, you know?! In Italy you can move free! I feel I can enter in a bus
or a train whenever I want. But in Berlin, is not so easy, not at all! There are a lot of
controls there! Even in the school police came and they block them, they block people
that didn't have tickets! Because you have the right to go without ticket one time, two
time, three time, but if you don't pay the penalty then they lock you! They catch you! You
go to prison! In Italy is not like this!» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

Nadhim explains us that the previous night the police came in the squatted school and
they have beaten a lot of people, including him. They even arrested four or five people,
and he was one of them. He stayed all the night long in prison, and the day after they let
him go. “I really have no idea what they were looking for. They came inside and started
to control the documents”. (Participant observation with Nadhim in Berlin, December
2013)

«In the other countries of Europe where I have travelled like Sweden, Holland and
Norway, they never controlled me, I never had problems. Only in Germany they control
you. But in Germany it happened just one time, when I was in Kottbusser Tor. There were
some guys fighting a lot, then the police came and started to control documents. They
asked documents to everybody, also people like us that was not fighting. They controlled
Turkish and African people! So we were walking there, and they stopped us and
controlled our documents. I showed them my Italian ID card. They had a look and then
they gave it back and they told me that I could go. I arrived in Berlin when Oranienplatz was already over, so I have no other document to show them such as the O-platz ID or the school ID. I even have not done the asylum in Germany, so I had just the Italian ID, the subsidiary protection and the Titolo di Viaggio. At the beginning they asked me: “Did you do the asylum request?” and I said “no”. Then they looked at my documents and they exclaimed: “but it is an Italian one!” and I said: “yes, it is an Italian document, I have just this one”. Then, they let me go. But you know, it is strange and it depends on many other things. For example, I have many friends here that have an Italian document and also applied for asylum in Germany, and they are not calm! They are also worried, because they can always be deported to Italy or receive a letter that say that they cannot stay here. Then they have to look for a lawyer …. and so on. But they will never give you a document to stay here in Germany! They just let you turn around, and at the end they tell you: “ok, you have an Italian document? Go back to Italy!”. So if then they stop you on the street, they will arrest you.» (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

In Berlin during the Oranienplatz protest and afterwards, the neighbourhood Kreuzberg became a sort of battleground where police granted a daily presence on the streets and occasionally and randomly controlled people through racial profiling mechanisms. Kreuzberg's inhabitants and “Oranienplatz people” were protesting daily against these control measures.

The streets to reach the hostel where there are some refugees of O-platz protesting on the roof are almost all blocked. We want to reach the info-point where there are several activists, but the police blocks the way to reach it. We start to walk around the block, and then we discover that the info-point is not there any more; they dismantled it. The police managed to push the supporters to the other side of the S-Bahn [local railway] bypass to spatially separate them from the protesters. Sometimes there are some ringing bicycles passing close to us; we see a group of women playing some music in a crossing road next to the hostel. But still, we cannot reach the place where refugees are protesting on the roof. The police closed many streets also in the blocks close to the “protesting hostels”, hence it is very difficult to reach it. We just can hear the supporters doing some noise with music and whistles, but we cannot reach them. At the end, we manage to reach the hostel, completely surrounded by the police, and we see the supporters and many refugees from Oranienplatz protesting close to the hostel in order to give some support to the people on the roof. (Participant observation in Berlin, September 2014).

The squatted school in Ohlauerstraße became a “border place” into which the police occasionally entered and randomly arrested several migrant subjects. Thus, Berlin and Kreuzberg experienced in that period a high manifestation of borders within the urban space, activated by the daily police control:

Obasi came to our place and tells us that Iyasu went out of the prison yesterday. Iyasu has been arrested during a demonstration last week. “He is a refugee from Oranienplatz – says Obasi – like all of us. We were in that demonstration and at one point there was some chaos, then the police took him and put him in prison. Oh, man! They have beaten him! Now with his lawyer, they are trying to do something because he was bodily harmed!”. (Participant observation in Berlin, March 2014)
After the main “hot” period of protests, after the Oranienplatz Agreement was cancelled and the squatted school evicted, the internal borders remained present and manifested themselves through the legal statuses, notably through the proliferation of ID cards, documents and special cards. As explained before, the protagonists of my research experienced a high mobility between several legal statuses that was also reflected in a high mobility between different local bureaucracies. Sometimes “caught in mobility” (Hess 2012) and sometimes opening interstices between the intersection of different laws at different levels, the protagonists of my research experienced the everyday life in perpetuate motion – juridical and territorial.

I met Amal close to Kotti Café as usual. We sit around a table and we start to talk a bit, looking the football match which has already started: Bayern Munich is winning 1 to 0. Amal is a bit frustrated because everything goes slowly in Berlin, many people do not have trust any more, and the problem of document is not solved. He is doing an internship in Berlin for asylum-seekers, since he is registered as German asylum-seeker. But he is worried about his Italian document, because he is waiting for his renewal since many months and it has never arrived. He is sure that they will not renew it that time. I tell him that I heard they became slower, but to be confident that will be renewed. He seems discouraged. “You know, at least people as Obasi have that card!” “Which card” I ask to him: “The card of an internship they are doing with some associations and activists. They give you a card with your picture and your name, and at least when you are walking on the street and the police controls you, you can show that card and they know that you are doing an internship there, so they let you go. You can move and be quiet in Berlin”. He repeats me that he feels insecure without some cards moving in Berlin. (Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, May 2015).

«Now I am doing an internship as gardener. I work there for three months, but they didn't pay me. For me it is a problem, because how can I earn money?! Now I want to go back to Italy and go to my country Embassy and ask a passport, because I want to visit my family! Here I cannot do it, I didn't understand .. but in Italy I can do it, so I will go there. For me the Italian document is still important, also if I have a Duldung here! Because the Italian document allows me to travel around, you know?! It is very important» (Participant observation with Nadhim in Berlin, May 2015)

Amal and Nadhim attempt to live their lives within the juridical interstices created by the multilevel law systems of the European border regime, where the intersection of European, national and local laws sometimes creates juridical frictions, which are also produced by the daily negotiating practices enacted by the migrant subjects and their supporters. The protagonists of my research are subjected to different law systems and through their blurred legal statuses they move and live between and beyond the borders:

Calvin looks very stressed, he is drunk. “To much stress, oh man! I tell you, they will send me back to my country!” He has to go to the Ausländerbehörde the next day, because he was stopped by the police on the street. “The people from Ausländerbehörde,
they said I should bring my passport on Monday, and just like this I will get my documents back. Because they took all my document. They want to send me back to Italy. There was many people like us that have been arrested many times, and they received their document back on the plane to Italy!”. Calvin is afraid, and he doesn't know if he wants to go to the appointment in the Ausländerbehörde, but he also knows that without his Italian document it is very difficult for him to stay in Germany, or even to move to another country. So he feels he has no choice. (Participant observation with Calvin in Berlin, November 2014)

We are sitting in the corridor, waiting that the lawyer receives us. Amal is under stress, he has received these letters because by living in Berlin, in Oranienplatz, he has broken the rule of Residenzpflicht [limitation of movement for asylum seekers in Germany]. The Oranienplatz Agreement has been declared a fake, so now he has to pay the money, otherwise he risks the prison. But of course, he has no money because he is not allowed to work. (Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

«If the police blocks me here and they find the document of Despina [asylum seeker document] they would ask me 300 Euros, because that document does not allow me to be in Berlin, so I leave it there and I am around here just with the Italian one.» (Interview with Nadhim in Berlin, September 2014)

The insecurity and uncertainty around their juridical situation increases also due to the fact that the control and surveillance are deployed in a fragmented, randomly and discretionary way. The following narrated concerns of Nadhim well shed light on the feeling of insecurity, uncertainty and mistrust they developed during the years living in Berlin:

Nadhim has a subsidiary protection, but when he arrives in Berlin he applies for asylum. Now he shows us the letter of the Dublin procedure, because they have discovered his finger prints in Italy. We are looking for a lawyer for him and we ask him where he sleeps. “I was sleeping in Oranienplatz, but now I went to Marienfelde, the Caritas place. But I am always in the school during the day”. […] We are waiting in the corridors of the medical clinic, Nadhim has to be visited by a doctor because he has been beaten by the police the previous night in the school, and he has a lot of pain on his back. Nadhim seems suspicious, he is looking all the time around him and he asks me: “Will the people here ask for my documents?”. I reassure him, telling that these are good people that help refugees and undocumented migrants for free, and they will never ask him the document. He tells me he is concerned, and he has still not understood where the people ask him the documents and where not. (Participant observation with Nadhim in Berlin, December 2013)

After Oranienplatz Agreement was declared invalid, the local authorities started to behave following the control and abandonment policy explained in chapter four. The “extraordinary” juridical situation of the Lampedusa people suddenly was not taken into consideration any longer, and the local bureaucracies acted as usual treating thus migrant subjects with Italian document as “illegal” persons. Thus, Calvin is afraid to go to the Ausländerbehörde because he has no guarantee that they will not send him back to Italy, and Amal has to pay a lot of
money because he breaks the *Residenzpflicht* rule, although in the Oranienplatz Agreement the Berlin authorities promised to abolish this law for the people on the Oranienplatz list. The lists acted as a temporary border, suspending laws such as the *Residenzpflicht* for a limited time, and then randomly activated them again once the Agreement was cancelled. The *Lampedusa* people hence found themselves suddenly alone – helped just by the supporters – and had to face individually the German bureaucracies. The following narrations of Amal and Nadhim are further examples of that:

Nadhim shows me the letter he has received from *Despina*\(^\text{158}\) [a small village where the asylum-seekers residential accommodation is located]: it is a Dublin measure. Nadhim tells me that he is afraid they would send him back to Italy, and he does not want. Thus, he does not want to go back to *Despina* any more, because he is afraid that if he will go there, they will send him directly to Italy. The problem is that if he does not go to *Despina* any more, he will lose the asylum-seeker document, according to the German law of *Residenzpflicht*. Any way, he prefers to remain in Berlin because he feels more secure there. (Participant observation with Nadhim in Berlin, June 2014).

«I received a letter that I have to go back to Italy [Dublin Regulation] so now I do not want to go back to *Isaura*\(^\text{159}\) [place where the camp for asylum seekers is] because I fear that I will be deported to Italy! Now let's see how to do with the lawyer. This one that I have [document of asylum seeker in Germany] is not a document! It is a wait. For that I have to keep that Italian one, which in contrary is a document. With this [German document of asylum seeker] now I do a training course. But it was hard! Because, you know, with this document only connected to *Isaura* I am not allowed to do things in Berlin, I have to do things just in *Isaura*. But I have found training in Berlin, and training people want me. So I went to *Ausländerbehörde* and they did not give me permission! They told me “you can not stay in Berlin, you have to stay in *Isaura*”. I was so angry. Those of training they told me that they had taken the place for me, but they could not give it to me without the permission of *Ausländerbehörde*. The problem is that law there, what’s his name? Yes, *Residenzpflicht*! Then I went back many times to *Ausländerbehörde*, always arguing, always! I wanted to do that course, I didn't want to waste time any more! Then, the fifth time, so they gave me permission, because that law was cancelled. So now I do that training [...] the problem now is that I have to renew the Italian document. So I have to figure out when to come back to Italy .. but I can not waste too much time.» (Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, April 2015)

The process of individualization and fragmentation of migrants' biographies well emerges from the ethnographic notes presented in this chapter. This process of fragmentation led to an invisibilization of the migrant subjects within the urban space, which is the main feature of the “irregular migrants” (Coutin 2005). Nadhim and Amal are treated as “Dublin cases” and also as “illegal migrants” because they break the *Residenzpflicht* law. They are furthermore “unwanted people” because of their Italian documents that do not allow them to stay more than three months in Germany. They turn hence into “illegal migrants” although they are

\(^{158}\) *Despina* is an invisible city of the book of Italo Calvino (1972).

\(^{159}\) *Isaura* is an invisible city of the book of Italo Calvino (1972).
temporary regular because of their Italian humanitarian protection and their asylum-seeker status in Germany.

“Illegality” in Germany is an exceptionally fluid and often transitory category, produced by shifting practices of inclusion and exclusion. According to several scholars (Ellermann 2006; Castañeda 2010), Germany is a contested place regarding the “migration and asylum issue”: it has very restrictive immigration and asylum policies, usually well received by the German citizens, but there are also many public resistances to their implementation. The particular case of Duldung sheds light on how the German system manages the mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion through the legal status. As explained in the chapter three, the frictions between these exclusion-inclusion mechanisms led in the case of the Duldung to the creation of a juridical threshold that is lengthened in time. Moreover, the Duldung sheds lights on the “moral reason” (Fassin 2011a) of the contemporary system of managing the migration and asylum phenomena, i.e. the humanitarism. The Duldung, notably the suspension of deportation, is based on the state “benevolence” based on ideas of humanitarism, along with migrant’s deservingness (Castañeda 2010). When the Duldung has been proposed as solution for “Oranienplatz people”, there was a contested discussion whether that could be a good or bad solution, as the following ethnographic note explains:

I met Obasi and Mabula in Kotti Cafè. Obasi tells me that he has to go back to Italy in order to renew his documents and he asks me if I know somebody at whose place he could sleep for some days. Mabula explains us how his work in Berlin is going, he seems tired. “I have to wake up around 4 o’clock in the morning and go close to that supermarket and pick up cardboards that then I have to bring to another place. And so on around all the supermarkets until 5:00 pm. I not always get paid for that, but when I get paid I receive 30 Euros a day. Ah, it is so difficult for us Lampedusa to work here in Berlin!”. Obasi starts also to talk very angry: “I would have found three jobs! One as warehouse worker, one in a supermarket, but every time they asks me for the document and the Italian one is not good for working here!”. He makes a pause, and then starts again: “Now the politicians in Berlin want to give us the Duldung, to all the Lampedusa, and 750 Euros per month and a place to sleep. Many people agree with this proposal, but other disagree! I mean, a Duldung is a suspension of deportation! We are already refugees because of Libya war, so why should we accept a suspension of deportation? We need just the permit to work here!” (Participant observation with Obasi and Mabula in Berlin, January 2014).

The main problem of the Duldung is its juridical nature, i.e. the fact that it is not a residence permit but a suspension of deportation. Besides its temporary nature, the combination with the strong regulation of the German labour market makes the Duldung the document that most effectively activates the internal borders and entails exclusion.

Nadhim asks us which kind of work possibilities he has now that he has obtained a
Duldung. We don’t know which kind of Duldung he has, but more or less we explain him which kind of possibilities and restrictions he will have connected to that legal status. The good news is that the German law was recently modified, and now people with the Duldung can obtain the access to the labour market after just 3 months after they received that document – before they had to wait 12 months and for some kind of Duldung also 4 years. Nadhim listens to us. We explain him that the problem with the Duldung is the so-called “precedent rule”: in the German labour market, when there is a free workspace the work agency assigns it according to a “precedent” mechanism, i.e. the first who have the right to take that workplace are the unemployed German people, then the unemployed European citizens, then the non-EU citizen with a long-term residence permit, and then all the other temporary people with residence permits and finally the more temporary and precarious one. The Duldung is the very last one: the most precarious and temporary non-residence permit, since it is a suspension of deportation. Thus, in Berlin nowadays it is almost impossible for Nadhim to find a job. (Participant observation with Nadhim in Berlin, September 2014).

Thus, people of Lampedusa group who individually obtained a Duldung were at least “tolerated” within the German territory, but subjected to the internal borders that this legal status activates and to the selective mechanisms that are typical for governing migration through temporary resident permits (Morris 2003; Ong 1999). Indeed, Germany operates a strengthened surveillance within its territories through several channels and mechanisms that inspired some scholars for the term “borderland” when they analysed German cities (Lebuhn 2013). Germany operates the surveillance within its territory through dual channels: one the one side through restrictive laws implemented by local authorities and on the other side through promoting civilian collaboration in the migration control. For example, the German Border Patrol (Bundesgrenzschutz) collects citizens reports about “suspicious persons” using posters with a hotline number where citizen can call. In addition to this voluntary citizen control, other forms of denunciation are written into the law, as for example the article 96 that states that assisting such “illegal” person is a crime punishable with a fine or imprisonment for up to five years. Moreover, the article 87 of the Residence Act (Aufenthaltsgesetz) mandates that persons residing “illegally” in Germany have to be reported to the appropriate authority if they seek services at public facilities (Castañeda 2010). This control over “illegality” occurs through legal statuses and documents, that can be requested to be presented at every place and time. Thus, local state agencies and private and semi-private institutions on the local scale increasingly participate in the monitoring and in the enforcement of migrants’ legal statuses (Lebuhn 2013). For these reasons, the protagonists of my research perceive a higher level of control and surveillance in Germany in comparison with Italy, as Harun tells us in this narration:

«I already explained you how it is different the document in Africa and in Europe. For example, in Germany if you want to go to Frankfurt or Hamburg you go to the train
station for the ticket. But before to make a ticket for you, they ask you the document: you have to be recognized. Who are you, where you came from, and where you have the residence. It is like this!» (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

It is interesting how in Germany “illegality” is strongly linked with the topic of asylum. According to several studies (Pieper 2004; Castañeda 2010) the large number of estimated one million of undocumented migrants in Germany are people who would have qualified as “refugees” before the strong restrictions of asylum rights in 1993. Besides them, also rejected asylum-seekers who decided to remain in the country and people who likely qualify as refugees but, discouraged by the low approval rate, do not bother to apply, can be counted under the category of “undocumented migrants”. The surveillance and control upon these blurred categories of people that oscillate between “tolerated”, “suspicious” and “illegal” persons are scattered in the German territory and within the urban places, but found their main concentration in the so-called “strategic knots of transit”, notably train routes and train stations, interstate highways and large public city places, which have been reclassified as “strategic transit areas” (Hecker 1998, in Lebuhn 2013). In the next paragraph 5.2 I will highlight how the internal borders are individually activated by the movements of migrant subjects between the national territories and through such strategic transit areas and routes. Indeed, exactly the “circular and fragmented journeys” of these “suspicious” people, who are half-tolerated and half-rejected, put the bureaucratic machines in motion and activate the strengthening of controls.

«I have crossed the desert in my country. You cannot imagine … and then I arrived in Algeria, then Libya. My brothers are all dead, and no one of my family has documents. So my birth date is that of my brother, not mine. But in Africa it is usually like this. This document, I have done it in Libya. So I arrived in Libya without documents, and then my cousin sent me the document. Because in Africa the documents are not so useful! You can travel where you want also without document, it doesn't matter. But in Europe, you always need documents! And then, if you want to travel in Europe, you need many money, eh!» (Interview with Obasi in Berlin, November 2014)

Pendular movements back and forth between Italy and Germany

In the previous paragraph I shed light on the way through which the internal borders manifest themselves within the urban spaces of the European cities. Reduced and blurred legal statuses emerge as one of the main mechanism to activate the borders and their selective mechanisms together with the power relations embedded in the cities or places where migrant subjects are living.
Also the mobility between the EU countries activates the internal borders of the European regime of migration management and control. A blurred nature that oscillates between “regular” and “illegal” border-crossing action is the main characteristic of the mobility enacted by the protagonists of my research. This is also a consequence of the nature of their legal statuses and the contradictions that emerge from the intersection of different national, local and supra-national laws. Being subjects holding an Italian humanitarian or subsidiary protection, they are allowed to move in Europe just for three months and in possession of two valid documents: the humanitarian or subsidiary protection and the Titolo di Viaggio serving as Italian passport, or alternatively their country passport – if they hold it. The people of Lampedusa in Berlin group started to go back to Italy one year after they left it; they wanted to renew their documents and then come back to Berlin, where they were living. Berlin became the “elected” city where many migrant subjects “autonomously” decided to live, also once the Oranienplatz negotiation had failed and they were experiencing again very precarious living conditions. As the humanitarian protection is a one year document, the research protagonists with Italian documents have to move back to Italy every eight months to renew it, and then come back to Berlin. Thus, “pendular-movements” have developed between Italy and Germany, and exactly these mobilities shed light on the internal borders of Europe and the way how they act as a filter. The movements make visible the contested connection between the national state, its sovereignty upon its territory and the power enacted through legal statuses that regulate and categorize people living within the national space. The following narration of Rashid is one example of how the national states' borders are activated by mobile “interrupted citizens”:

«I stayed 9 months in Berlin, then I had to go back to Italy, to renew my document. We don't have enough money, but the supporters help us. Thus, I took the bus and I travelled through Germany with two other friends, Jamel and Nuru. We were in the bus, and we travelled through Germany. Then we arrived at the Switzerland border, we stopped there. The bus stopped. The driver ask passports and permesso di soggiorno [resident permit]. He collects documents of everyone, documents of all the people in the bus. And he gave it to the police. Then the police came inside the bus, and said that everyone should take its bag and go out from the bus. Then the bus was empty, we were all outside. After come the dogs, they check every bag, bag, bag, bag, the dogs go to every bag. They were smelling this bag, smelling that bag. After that they finish, they said “now everyone can enter inside the bus”. And we enter all inside the bus. Then police come into the bus and give to the driver all our documents. Then the driver call all the names, and give to each one its document. Then he calls us, but he told us that the police holds our documents, he doesn't have our documents. We said “how is it possible? We need it!”, he said “ok, go down to the bus”. After came the police and they said “anyone that doesn't get its documents have to come with us”, so we follow them into the office. The police didn't give us the document, I don't know why, they wanted maybe to control us, I didn't understand why! Inside the police station, there were some other Africans, but they were not of our
Pullman, maybe other Pullman. For our Pullman, only we three. After, we sit down in the police station, and a police man come and told us that we were not allowed to enter in Switzerland. And I asked him “why?” and he answered that as a first thing our Italian document were no more valid. Second, two of us had their country passports, so we had to find a visa before we enter there. I told them “I don't want to come to Switzerland!!”. I show them my Berlin ticket, from Berlin to Milano, I told them that nobody for we three people wanted to come to Switzerland. We just want to come down to renew our documents, it is not my fault that Switzerland is there between Italy and Germany! We don't wanted to come in that country! Then, the police said “no problem, you just have to pay money because you pass through our country and you don't have the authorization”. 350 Euros!! Of course I didn't have that money! Then they search us, everywhere, everywhere, everywhere!! […] I mean that they look everywhere in our bag, in our clothes, they remove everything from our body, and then up and down, up and down to our body, searching I don't know what! They remove our clothes!!! I told you! Everything, empty body! Naked!! Completely naked. They look at me every where … without nothing on my body … well...! [pause, he shake its head] No, no, I don't want to talk … I don't want to explain you that … that's why I don't like that country, not at all! I don't like that country. They where looking maybe for money, or drug, maybe. They said “this is border”, so they have to check everyone. And I said “ok, but among all the people, only we three?? why?”. I don't have money, so I didn't pay! I told them “I'm not gonna pay, you understand??”. Then, they separated us, one in a room, the second in another room, and the third in an other room, all separate rooms. They carried us in different places, and they were big police men, you understand? Big persons! I don't know what happened to the other two, I just know that they wanted that I signed a paper. But I didn't want to sign it! Because if I sign it, I have to pay! I told them: “I'm not signing, I can't sign! It is not my fault, I don't have money, I don't sign!”! I mean, why they make me naked??! you understand?? I was angry! Why they make me naked? Then I said “I'm not signing”. They told me that if do not sign, they bring me to prison. I said “do what you want, I'm ok with my self, I'm not a criminal, so what you want?! Put me in prison, I don't mind!!”. They saw that I was so angry! I had no money. The police told me that Mr S and Mr N had money, I told him that we were not together, I don't have money! Than they let me go first, because when I go outside, I saw that the bags of Mr S and Mr N were still there. They told me “outside, go outside, quick, quick”… Elena, he wanted to slap me!! To slap me!! Because I didn't want to sign! He tried to slap me, you understand?? Because I was forced to sign, and I didn't wanted to do it. The police man told me: “If you don't sign, I'll sign it for you!” and I told him: “do it! Sign, if you want! You sign, not me!”.

The policeman sign it, and told me to go outside: “go go go, I don't want to see you any more, go away! In Switzerland no more, I don't want to see you in Switzerland again, never! If you come to Switzerland again you go to prison, to prison!”. I told him “don't worry, I don't want to come back, I go on my way!”. I go away, I took my bag and everything and I went out. I was outside, and it was 7 or 8 in the morning, I ask to people how I could reach Italy, they told me to get a train or a Pullman, but they told me that it was far away. They told me, you must go here, then take train to there, then bus, then train again. I follow there, I ask to everyone, I try to find the way. I see an old woman and she brings me to the place in which I had to take Pullman, she enters with me in the train, and she bring me to the other city, where I should take the bus. I was alone! My phone was torn off! Completely alone. I know that Jamel and Nuru. were still inside the police station, but I didn't know what I could do! We all have problem, I also had problem. So, I arrive in Zürich with this old woman, it was so far away! I go, I see the Pullman, I tried to get one Pullman with the old ticket, because I had a ticket to Milano, I wanted to use it! But they don't let me inside. In Switzerland everything is expensive! Everything! I try to go to Hotel, but it was so expensive!! So I slept in the Pullman station, outside! Because train station, they closed it. If you don't have the train ticket you cannot sleep inside the train station, they lock you out. I didn't want to buy that ticket, because my money were little, little. I even didn't eat anything! I only buy a coffee, only one coffee! I was getting
crazy, so I said, if I remain in the Pullman station here, I risk my life for nothing, you understand? I slept in the bus station, and control come two time in that night! They wanted to check my documents, they carried my document and me. I was together with a Ghana man, that I meet on the Pullman station, he had also Italian documents. The police man started to ask me questions but I just answered: “I don't respond, I don't respond” After they asked me the bus ticket, I show them and they let me go. After one our an other police group come again. They ask me document again, I gave it to them! They talk, talk, talk, ask, ask, ask, I don't respond them, I didn't mind! They control me again, and then they give me my document again. I was so angry. They day after, I was still angry!! I was so tired, I just wanted to leave that country, so I go to the train station and I bought a ticket to Milano, 79 Euros or something like this. I didn't want to spend that money, but I couldn't stay in that country! So I paid the ticket and I come to Milano. That Ghana man, he didn't pay, he risk. He had only 25 Euros, so no way. He enter in the train without ticket. And he has luck, no one controlled him. But you know, every time the train stopped, the police enter and control us!! every time the train stopped, that means so much time! Police controlled ticket and document, all my document, any time the train stopped. I reach Milan. I know a bit the city. I follow the address you gave me in Berlin, the address of Naga. So I arrived in Milano, and I tried to look for you, for Naga. I arrived around 11 or 12 in Centrale, there was so much foreigners like me!! so much! I asked to all of them about Naga, and all of them know it! They told me, go here, go there, they explain me how to reach Naga. Than I go to Naga, and I meet you. I met also Jamel and Nuru in Naga!! I was so surprised! I was thinking that I had left them there in Switzerland. They were there some days before me! So I was happy to see them. They told me that the same night, when police stopped us, they bought a ticket and they come to Milano. That is the story.» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, January 2014)

The experience of Rashid highlight how the legal status *individually* activates the internal borders of the European Union through the mobility of “interrupted citizens” with a blurred juridical condition. The fact that the Italian humanitarian protection of Rashid was expired didn't allow him to move across the national states, although he showed the policeman his appointment in the migration office of Milan for his document's renewal. Moreover, the Swiss local authorities applied the international rules for visa, as two of the three “illegal” mobile persons had the country passport and thus they should have applied for a visa in order to enter Switzerland. That is another sign of how the local bureaucracies work and act within the European border regime, applying the technical rules without looking at the situation: indeed, the three protagonists of my research have just to pass through Switzerland and it would be unrealistic to apply for a visa just for passing through it. Nevertheless, the way how Rashid fights and interacts with the policeman highlight how the border regime in Europe is a space of negotiating practices, in which the internal borders are latent and are individually and randomly activated, and negotiated. Furthermore, Rashid's experience shows how the borders of legal statuses are embodied in the person who holds them and hence how they follow the person through their movements. Indeed, Rashid “meets” the borders at the frontier between Germany and Switzerland, which is a “usual” border place where controls often occur, but also in the bus station in Zurich and in the train from Switzerland to Milan. Also in the
following narration of Obasi it is possible to observe how the borders of national states are projected on the legal statuses, and thus embodied by the persons on the move that hence carry the borders with them.

«One time I went to Torino to renew the documents, and they gave me the receipt that certifies that I was waiting for the renewal. But I had to wait too much time in Torino, and I couldn't because, you know, in Berlin I have a lot of things to do! So I decided to move to Berlin just with the receipt, but when I arrived in France, Nice, the police controlled me and they brought me to prison! I stayed in prison for three days, there was other people like me in the room! There were four cells with iron doors, and we slept there. I wanted to absolutely speak with a lawyer, I asked it all the time, because I wanted to go back to Berlin, since people of the theatre group were waiting for me!! Then, they let me speak with a lawyer and I explained her my situation. And she talked a lot, a lot, she explained me so many things! At the end she told me that I couldn't stay in France and I had to go back to Italy. Then I told her: “You are not working for the human rights, you are working for the rights of France state!” Then after three days they let me go, and I managed to arrive in Berlin.» (Interview with Obasi in Berlin, November 2014)

The border is hence not placed on the “real” frontier between Italy and France any more, it rather “follows” Obasi and his movements within the whole European territory that emerges thus as a “borderland” (Lebuhn 2013). Indeed, Obasi is stopped in Nice, a city within the French state where he was controlled on the street through racial profile mechanisms.

The treatment of Rashid, Jamel, Nuru and Obasi as “criminal” highlights again how blurred the category of “transit migrants” is, which immediately refers also to “irregular” and “circular” migration. Local bureaucracies and authorities thus consider people on the move with a blurred juridical condition as “dangerous” and “suspicious”. Furthermore, the way they are treated sheds light on how the local bureaucracies define and categorize migrant subjects through their mobility, in this case “illegal” (Coutin 2005). The following experience of Bashir, a young man from Mali, is another example of that:

Ingrid tells me that Bashir will arrive in Milan in two days and she asks me whether I can take care of him because he is traumatised. She explains me how this did happen: Bashir lives in Berlin and is part of the protest group Lampedusa in Berlin. He wanted to renew his Italian document, thus he took a bus from Berlin to Milan. When the bus crossed the region of Bayern, the police stopped it and controlled the documents of the people. The humanitarian protection of Bashir has expired, thus the German police arrested him and put him in prison for five days. Once out from the prison, Bashir managed to arrive in Turin, where he had to renew his documents. He remained two weeks in Turin, sleeping in ex-MOI, the houses squatted by refugees. He went to the Questura, where they gave him a receipt of his renewal document. They told him that with this receipt he can stay in Italy without problem, but it is not the same as the document so, for example, he cannot go abroad. He should wait in Turin around two months in order to get the renewal of his document. Ingrid explains me that Bashir doesn’t want to remain so long away from Berlin, because he is a traumatized person and in Berlin he has people who take care of him. Thus, he tried to move directly to Berlin just with the receipt. In France, namely in Marseilles, the police stopped Bashir and because of his unclear and not completely
“regular” document, they put him in prison. He remained there five days and he got beaten by the French police men. Fortunately, he could make a phone call, and he has called Ingrid that managed to take him out of the prison, and told him to go to Milan because there was me, a trust person, waiting for him. Bashir has been accompanied by the French police to Ventimiglia, and then he took the train to Milano Centrale. (Participant observation with Bashir in Milan, January 2014)

Also the experience of Bashir highlights the way through which the internal borders are activated by the combination of mobility and a blurred and precarious legal status. Thus, the temporariness of the legal status plays a crucial role since it positions migrant subjects between statuses, neither fully legal nor fully “illegal”. They therefore experience a continuous shift between their invisibility to a hypervisibility and back (Coutin 2005).

The individual activation of internal borders is highlighted also in the following experience of Obasi and Amal, that sheds light on the random and discretionary way through which the control is deployed:

Obasi explains me how his travel from Berlin to Turin was: “I take the mitfahr160 from Berlin to Trento. And it was everything fine. Then in Trento, I take the train to Milano, where I change and I take the train to Torino. It was a long travel but everything went ok, no one controlled me! We were passing through Munich but everything was good, no one control us even there! But for Amal, eh, it was different! He get controlled!” . I ask to Obasi what happened to Amal, and he explains me: “Amal has left Berlin with a mitfahr just two hours before me, the same day! But in Munich, police stop the car where he was, and they controlled the documents. He didn't shows his documents, because were expired, and thus they put him in prison. You know that they even put him the handcuff!?! Incredible! He stayed a lot of time in the police office and he told them that he doesn't want to go to prison, because he had done nothing wrong! He just didn't have the renewed documents, but should a person go to prison because of that?!”, I listen to the story, and I think that I have to call Amal to understand if everything is good. […] I call Amal, he is fine, now he has reached Italy, after some days in prison in Munich. He is concerned because he is in Italy and he has to wait for his renewal, but he also has to come back to Germany because he got a letter from the local authorities and he has an appointment in Berlin in one week. So he doesn't know how to travel back to Germany, since he will never get the renewed document back in one week. The problem of Amal is that he breaks the Residenzpflicht rule because he was living in Berlin during the protest of Oranienplatz but he was registered as asylum-seeker in Isaura. Thus, he got a penalty payment and he didn't manage to pay two months, therefore he is now risking to go prison. “I was already in prison in Munich, I cannot do prison any more!” he explain me very angry and worried. “Here in questura, they told me that they will give me the renewed document in two months! But I have to come to Germany in one week! So, how can I do it?! You get the problem? If I wait here [Italy], I get problem there [Germany]! I have already so many problems”. (Participant observation with Obasi and Amal in Berlin, January 2015)

Amal and Obasi have made the same route with the same transportation mean, and were both holding an expired document. Thus, the internal borders are latent and manifest themselves randomly through the turbulent mobilities of half-authorized migrant subjects. The borders

160 Mitfahr is an informal system of shared cars among people travelling in Europe. It is the German equivalent of the Italian Blabla car system.
emerge through the control enacted by the police and the local authorities, but can also be shifted by private European citizens as happened during the year 2014 through the informal travels in shared cars. Indeed, looking for a shared passage in cars between Germany and Italy, we observed that on the website of *Blablacar* a new advice appeared in the beginning of 2015:

> Attention: you are going to contact a driver for an international route! You must have with you a valid identity document that authorizes you to cross the border. The driver should ask you to see your document before starting the travel. (From the website Blablacar.it on January 2015)

Also private citizens sometimes decide to embody the function of borders control, and the vehicles through which people move become also *border places* in which one’s valid documents act as a selective mechanism, as the image in the appendix 20 highlights.

The mobilities for the documents renewals must not be understood as linear and aim-oriented movements, because the migrant subjects spend long periods in Italy waiting for the renewed documents. In this time, they live and dwell Italian cities and they continue looking for work and for a more stable situation to settle. Thus, the protagonists of my research experience a lengthened transit condition regularly moving back and forth, sometimes being stuck in Italy as Obiang and sometimes moving back and forth many times, as Amal:

> «I had often some problems with the movements between Italy and Germany, because I have to go to Italy every six months since this Italian humanitarian protection is a one-year document. The problem is that you have to take the appointment in *Questura*, but if you don't manage to arrive that day because you run into problems during the travel – like me in Munich – then they give you another appointment in two months! And what you do in that two months?! I decided to come back to Germany, because there there is no place to sleep and no work. But the problem is that I travel then with expired documents. And hence you can meet many problems. For example, now I left in *Foggia* my document, and I have to go back in three months, they told me!» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, November 2014)

Obiang is part of the group *Lampedusa in Berlin*, and he has arrived in Milan in order to renew his documents. “I had some problems during the travel to Italy – he tells me – because in the bus they controlled me! In Switzerland, the police stopped the bus and they control us, and me … my document has expired, so they put me in prison! Yes, in prison. They ask me all the money I had, so I gave them, what should I do? But I didn't have so much money, just for the travel. So, when I came out from the prison I had to take the train from Switzerland to Milan, and they controlled me a lot of time, and of course I couldn't buy the ticket! Any way, I arrived in Milan”. While he is telling me his story, we are waiting outside of the immigration office and the police man from the window tells us that we have to wait. “I have always to wait! I am already in Milan since two months, and my renewal is not yet ready! Always ‘non è pronto, non è pronto’ [it is not ready] they say to me! The first time they give me the receipt of the renewal, and they told me that I
should have to come in two weeks in order to collect the document. I came after two weeks and ‘non è pronto’ I have to come back in two week, and again ‘non è pronto’! And I am here since two months like this! My friends in Germany, they are afraid something is wrong, I tried to explain to them, but they don’t believe me!”. The police man calls us, I am together with Dakari that also has to renew his document. We come close to the window where the police man is sitting, and he points to Obiang saying: “No, no, he already knows that he cannot come inside! I already spoke with him! This young boy, *fa il furbetto***! Believe me!” (Participant observation with Dakari and Obiang in Milan, February 2014)

They are considered as “errant subjects” in transit with a blurred legal status, and are consequently treated as dangerous by the local authorities, that act with a very high level of discretionary power as the two following different experiences of Harun and Asad highlight:

«For me living in Rome is like to be in my country, because no one controls me and disturbs me. No one has never asked me “Do you have the document? Show me the document”. In Rome these things do not happen, the police there is ok. Since when I arrived in Italia, the police never stopped me or asked me documents, and no one told me that I had no right to stay there. So, in Italia I feel at home! Even when I was travelling in Italy, in the train or bus, they never controlled me, they never make me problems. It is a matter of the way how you travel, I guess.» (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

«I had to renew my document, so I had to travel from Milano to Foggia. I took the train without the ticket! But it is easy, you know?! If you met the ticket inspector you have to explained to him that in Italy there is no work, and then everything is ok! When control came, I started to discuss and talk, and discuss and talk: I explain that I was looking for a job, but in order to do that, I had to move around all Italy, otherwise I couldn't find a job! But how can I travel without money?! And without travel, no job. So, I have to travel in the train without ticket! And I didn't take the regional train, but the high-speed train! [he smiles] So I arrived in Foggia without problem. But one time, I made a mistake. Eh, big mistake. I was fighting with the ticket inspector in the train from Foggia to Milano. He wanted the ticket, I didn't have it. He asked me to show the document, and I show my document. He saw that it had expired, and he asked me why I didn't renew it. Then I said: “you are just a ticket inspector, you cannot ask me the document! This is the job of the police, asking for my document! Your job is just to check the train ticket!”. So he was angry, and he called the police. At the next station, in a city in Abruzzo [region in central Italy], I had to get off and there was a lot of police waiting for me! At least twenty police men! When the chief of police looked at me, he said to the ticket inspector “he should be the problem?! That guy?!”. [he laughs] The police chief understood immediately that I was a good guy! So all the twenty police men went away, and the police chief brought me to the police office in the train station. There they asked me about my document and I explained to them, that my document had expired and for this reason I was in Foggia to renew it. But I had to wait a lot of time in Foggia in order to get the new document, and I live in Milano. So I decided to go back to Milano in order to keep looking for a job there. I will go to Foggia when my new document will be ready, maybe in two months. Then the police man asked me a lot of questions, and controlled my identity in the computer. But there was a problem: in my old document my date of birth was wrong, so they couldn't find my name in the computer because in Foggia they had just changed it with

161 “*Fare il furbetto*” is a typical assertion used in order to underline that the person is sly, i.e. he is cheating the police man or the state, depending on the context.
The correct one. The police man started to ask me if I had stolen the document, because of this misunderstanding and I told him “look at the photo on the document! That’s me! Look at my face!”. The police man asked me to show him Titolo di viaggio with the correct date of birth. But I told him that I didn't have it. Then the police man decided to bring me to the Immigration office of that city, in Questura. There they controlled all my personal information, and they asked me to prove my correct date of birth. Then I took out of my pocket the passport and I show the correct date of birth. At that moment, the police man of the train station did like this on my head [he mimes a slap with the hand] and he told me “you made fun of me! You had the passport! You told me you didn't have it!” I was surprised, he asked me about the Titolo di Viaggio, not the passport. I was confused! Eventually they let me go, and the police man brought me to the train station. He asked me how I was going to pay the ticket, and I told him that since we had met this morning, my job situation had not changed! I still had not found a job, so no money, no ticket. He laughed and told me “be good! Have a nice trip!”. I took the train and I arrived in Milano». (Interview with Asad in Berlin, November 2014)

The problem of the wrong date of birth that Asad faced in his experience is a bureaucratic obstacle that often makes the migrant subjects stuck in a juridical limbo that can lengthen their transit situation in Italy. The following experience of Rashid sheds light on the way through which even one wrong character of his name pushes him into the “bureaucratic space” of suspended time and lengthened wait. The time dilation in the bureaucratic space has to be understood as a time interruption that fragments the mobility circuits and biographies of the migrant subjects – an issue that I explained in the previous chapter. The wait for the renewal, the short duration and precariousness of the documents, the problems arising from the discretionary powers exercised by police officers trap migrant subjects in a suspended state and make it extremely difficult for them to build their future.

We are in the immigration office in Milan at the police station, namely “questura”. Rashid has the number in his hand and we await our call. At one point, they call our number and we go to the window where a young woman asks Rashid all his documents. Rashid has to renew his humanitarian protection. The woman looks at me and asks me who I am. I explain it to her. She starts to register all the documents of Rashid in the computer. At one point, another police man comes and asks who I am. I answer. The police woman look at both the documents of Rashid and she notices that the surname of Rashid is written in two different ways: in the humanitarian protection with a H and in the passport without that H. She asks us which is the real name of Rashid, and he replies that it is that one on the passport, with the H. The police man becomes nervous and says: “now this is a real problem, eh! Now it is a chaos! You have to go to your country Embassy and ask a certificate that confirms that your real identity is with the H! Then you have to come back to Milan and go to the prefecture, and they have to give you a stamp. Otherwise, you can keep the false name, as you prefer!”. Rashid seems a bit confused and stressed, he replies that the people in the police office wrote the wrong name when they gave him the humanitarian protection, he has no fault. The police man looks at him in a suspicious way and tells me: “I make that work since many years, your friend [referring to Rashid] collected his passport just after having obtained the humanitarian protection! Eh, I know it very well! They[referring to a general category of migrant subjects] do always like this!”. I don't understand exactly what he means, since it is obvious that asylum seekers collect their country passport just after have received the international
protection. Rashid decides to remain with the false name, because it would be too difficult to change it. The police man looks at us and says: “Bah, it is your problem if you go around with a false identity!”. Rashid becomes nervous and replies that it is not his fault if the Italian authorities have written the wrong name, and it is just an H less, so it is not a false identity. [...] Even after a long discussion, there is no chance to change the mind of the police man, thus Rashid has to change his name in a long procedure. He cannot yet renew is document, and he seems very disappointed: “Why?! I have something wrong!! Yesterday Jamel and Nuru got the renewal without problem! And me?! Now I have to go to Rome to my Embassy, with which money?! I don't have it! And just for an H?! Makes in Italia an H so much difference?! They wrote it wrong, not me!!”, he shakes his head and looks down. (Participant observation with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

The transit time of Rashid in Italy for renewing his documents has been lengthened by three months, while he was living as a homeless in Milan sleeping sometimes in the train station and sometimes in dormitories for homeless. The main problem for Rashid was exactly his “errant” nature that “scared” the police chief once he discovered that Rashid was a mobile person with a blurred housing condition:

The police chief came also to us, and asks to the police woman which was the problem. She tells him that he has two residence certificates and she doesn't know which is the right one. They start to look in the computer, and I ask if there are some problems. “If there are problems?! Of course, Miss, and I’ll explain them straight away: this is a nomad! [referring to Rashid] and we are a sedentary society, do you know what I mean?! [...] The problem is that he does not respect our culture and our civilization! Because if one is a nomad, it means that he does not accept who we are, sedentary! But he's here with us, so either he accepts it or there will be trouble, do you understand?! [...] Isn’t somebody who is homeless a nomad?! Isn’t it the same thing?! So somebody sleeping at the Casa della Carità, which is a dormitory open during the cold season, is a nomad. Also, here it says that he sleeps at Milan's railways station, and what does that tell us?! That he is a nomad who does not respect our culture! [...]”. I tell him that the majority of people with humanitarian protection obtained during the North Africa Emergency plan are now sleeping in a homeless dormitory, and he interrupts me: “I don't care about the others! I am speaking about him, and just about him! In this moment, the other people don't interest me! And he is a nomad! Also, he has written down a German cell phone number, why is that?! Why did he go to Germany?! How does it work, he comes and then goes once his permit has been renewed?! And I should not say that he is a nomad?! Somebody that writes Central Station and Casa della Carità as the places where he sleeps, that gives me a German cell phone number, what does that tell me, Miss? That this is somebody who travels around. Got it?! Somebody who travels around, hence a nomad! And on top of that he has no respect for us and for what the Italian state has given to him, which is the opportunity to legally reside in Italy without problems!””. We discuss a bit and the police man continues: “Miss, I connect my interpretation with the logic! This is my work! So, now I will write to the Commission and ask to examine his case, evaluating whether it is the case to renew his document or not!”. I tell him that this is an abuse of power, and he asks me my ID document telling me that he will send my personal data to the Interior Ministry. I give him my document without concern, I understand the situation. He starts to asks me a lot of question about my work to understand who I am and to make some pressure. After some discussion he tells me: “For this time, I spare you and I don't make the signal to the Internal Ministry, but just for this time!”. Then he looks at the police woman and he commands: “The Mister here [referring to Rashid] has to go to his Embassy and has to certify his real identity, because he doesn't make fun of us! Eh no, he
won't be kidding us! Then we ask to the Commission to examine his case for the renewal!”. Then he went away. Rashid is confused and stressed, and he exclaims: “But yesterday Jamel and Nuru have obtained the renewal without problems! And they also write that they are sleeping in Casa della Carità and in the train station!!! And they also have written their German phone number, so why just me?!”. The police woman doesn't look at us, she prints a paper and she says: “The identity is just one. A person cannot have two identities, either that with H or that without H!” . Rashid replays that the name in the passport is the right one, they made some mistakes. “Your friend has two identities, and we cannot accept it!” , says the police woman. (Participant observation with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

Rashid's experience underlines the contradictions and the high level of discretionary power present in the local bureaucracy dealing with migration and asylum management. Several research reports of NGOs and lawyers associations have highlighted the high level of discretionary power within the police immigration offices – Questura – in the Italian cities that lead sometimes to the violation of human rights and the right of asylum 162. «These are the rules here, Miss, we don't have general rules or universal practice, we evaluate case by case, sometimes something works and sometimes not!» 163explained me another day a policeman responsible of the immigration office in Milan.

The “culture of disbelief” that entails a “moral panic” (Cohen 2002) is wide-spread in the local bureaucracies dealing with migrant and asylum management and control, as the assertion of the policeman highlights: «they do always like this!» referring to a blurred general category of “migrant”. Moreover, the experience of Rashid sheds light on the moral panic that the blurred categories on the move, namely “mobile interrupted citizens”, entail in the local authorities that directly link the transit and circular mobility with the “illegality”. The inadequacy of this model for the reception and management of refugees and migrants holding temporary statuses characterised by an attempt to conciliate assistance and mobility control is emphasised by the contradictions that arise from the process of permit renewal: on the one hand, humanitarian and subsidiary entrants are required to submit evidence of a domicile or residence address as proof of their progressive “integration” in Italian society; on the other hand, the pattern of hospitality based on dormitories lasting up to three months, combined with Italy’s socio-economic conditions, push in the opposite direction, increasing the lack of stability, forcing residential mobility and affecting the life of migrant subjects holding precarious legal statuses. Thus, often even the local authorities do not know how to face the “half-homelessness” and “hypermobile” condition of the majority of humanitarian and subsidiary protection holders, as underlined in the following note:

163From ethnographic notices in Milan, January 2014.
Obasi calls me and he asks me if I can help him with the bureaucratic problems. He is at the ASL [local health authorities] in Turin and he needs to renew his health insurance card. I have to speak over the phone with the ASL’s worker, who tells me: “We cannot send the new health insurance card at the address your friend gave us! It is a place where maybe there is no letterbox, and if the card doesn't arrive?! Maybe you have another address that you can give us? Or someone else can come here and collect the card when it will be ready, but we need an ID copy and a written authorization. As you prefer, but we need a save place to send the document”. (Participant observation with Obasi in Berlin, November 2014)

Moreover, the fact that the plan Emergenza Nord Africa has produced a multitude of “mobile interrupted citizens” in Europe, like highlighted in the previous chapters, is not considered by the local authorities in charge for the renewal. It is the same authorities that issued earlier the humanitarian protection, suggested to look for work in other European countries and hence passed the responsibility of that “errant” behaviour to each single migrant subject. Also the fact that the “errant subjects” dwell transit places such as the train station in Milan or squatted houses in Turin are not considered as a consequence of the public policies – or the lack of policies – around the housing situation for refugees in Italy. Instead, the migrant subjects are accused for “illegal” or suspicious behaviour:

The police man in the “questura” of Turin looks at Obasi, who is there for renewing his document. “You must show me the hospitality declaration164!! Without that, no renewal!”.

Then Obasi shows the hospitality declaration to the police man, who exclaims: “Ah! This is clear! Via porporati! Of course! I wonder what there is there, eh?! Maybe there is there an underground canal that directly links the ex-MOI with that place!! Because all the people bring the hospitality certificate from there! It could be a house?! I don't think so”. We don't react to this provocation, and Obasi remains calm. (Participant observation with Obasi in Turin, November 2014)

Also in Berlin, I could observe the same culture of disbelief in the bureaucratic offices, notably the foreigners' office Ausländerbehörde, as the following ethnographic note with Quenton, a man from Guinea Conakry, highlights:

Astrid arrives at my place, we have to check the document’s situation of Quenton. She tells me that Quanton has obtained a Duldung, and now we can remain calm for at least some time since he has a place to sleep and some food. Astrid is apparently upset because of her experience in the Ausländerbehörde with Quenton. “You know, they are not good persons [referring to the administrative staff working in the German foreign office], they are strange, I don't understand them! They behaved as if they will put Quenton in prison, and then they have given him a Duldung! But it was a terrible experience there! Quenton had to bring his birth certificate, then we went to the window and a woman had a look at his certificate and in one second she accused that it was a false certificate! In one second! So they started to speak in French with Quenton, because in the region where he is born

164 In order to get the renewal of a humanitarian and subsidiary protection, the migrant subjects have to present a document that certifies where they sleep at night. That can be the residence certificate, if the people are living in a house, or a “hospitality declaration” that is a document usually used for homeless people and issued by dormitories or associations.
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people usually speak French, but Quenton cannot speak French! So they were speaking in French, and Quenton was answering in English, and they again answered in French! Then I tried to intervene and say something, because I know Quenton's story and why he cannot speak French, but they didn't allow me to speak. Nothing! I couldn't say a word, they verbally attacked me saying that if I said one word more, they would throw me out of the room. But I couldn't stay in silence, then I fought a bit with the social worker there and then they told us to go out from the room. After some hours they call us back in the office, and they gave the renewal of six-months to the Duldung of Quenton! They behave strange there!” concludes Astrid. (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2015)

The problem of the language in the communication with the administrative staff in the Ausländerbehörde in Berlin is well known by the several NGOs, activists and lawyers that daily accompany migrant subjects to that office. The next ethnographic notes underline this problem as well as the time dilation that occurs within the bureaucratic space:

Rashid and me are waiting in theAusländerbehörde. Rashid has obtained a letter that he has to pay a penalty because the police found him with some drugs in his pocket. “You know that law in Berlin, that you are allowed to hold something like 15 gram of light drugs?! Eh, this law is just for you Europeans, because for us black people it doesn't work!” We are waiting a lot of hours, the Ausländerbehörde is full of foreign people that are waiting for their appointment. Rashid looks at me and says: “the last time I was here, it was terrible! You know that they don't speak English with you?! Just German … last time I was here with a friend, and we can just speak English. They spoke all the time in German, impossible for us. And then, at the end, they said that if we want to live here we have to learn the language, but they said it in English!! So, they could speak that language! Moreover, they like that we waste our time, I don't know why! But a lot of time you arrive here, and they send you away telling you to come back another day! Just like this, without reasons! It is a bad place. And it takes always so much time! In Italy, it is easier! In Italy bureaucracy is more quickly! Here you waste so much time!”. At one point they call us in the office. The administrative worker is surprised that I am there, and I explain to him that Rashid doesn't speak German and for that reason I am with him. He looks at the paper and says to Rashid: “You have a penalty here!! And you are illegal! When did you arrive in Germany?”, and Rashid answers “Nine months ago”, and the administrative worker replies: “Oh, then you are illegal here! We should put you in prison because of that!”, at this moment Rashid takes out of his pocket the tickets from Berlin to Milan that certifies that he will travel to Italy next week. “Look – says Rashid – I will go back to Italy on my own next week! You don't need to deport me there! I already have the ticket, but please give me back my passport”. The administrative worker starts to speak with me and Rashid and explains us the situation. He prints a letter where it is written that Rashid is illegal in the German territory and he has one week time to leave the country, and then he has to wait at least one year in order to come back. We tell him that we know it. Then he gives Rashid that letter, and Rashid asks for the passport that the police took when they stopped him. But the administrative worker says: “I cannot give you the passport today, you have to come tomorrow.”, Rashid is nervous and reply: “but why?! I am here now! Why should I come also tomorrow?! You have already given me the deportation letter, I will go back to Italy on my own next week, why should I waste time tomorrow and come here again and wait all the day long?! Can you give me now the passport?”. The administrative worker looks at me and starts to speak German: “These here are the rules. You have to come back tomorrow, and your friend has to stay calm”. I explain it to Rashid, and we go out of the office. Rashid has a lot of papers and letters in his hands and looks down shaking his head: “They will drive me crazy, I tell you!”; he says to me. (Participant observation in Berlin, January 2014)
The “bureaucratic space” allows to clearly grasp the nature of EU internal borders and the negotiating practices that continuously discuss and redefine these borders. The randomly and discretionary nature of the internal borders becomes also visible through the different durations of the renewed documents that the protagonists of my research have received. During the seven months of ethnographic research in the Naga association in Milan, I could observe how some people obtained one-year-renewal document and others just six-month-renewal documents, without any juridical reason.

«Yes, they apply for asylum! Also if they have an Italian document. Or Spain document, or Portugal document. I didn't do it, because I thought that I could have problem if I wanted to renew my document in Italy. But, nothing!! I came to Italy to renew, and I didn't get any money, and above all they renew it just for six months!! ah, I'm so angry. Many people receive a one year document, maybe they paid more money, but I don't have money! I don't understand.» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

Amal just returned from Italy, and he is very angry and sad. I try to understand why, and he explains to me: “They gave me a renewal just for three months!! Why?!” He was in the questura in that small village in Apulia, where he has done the camp in 2011. I tell him that they are famous to do very short renewal without reasons, during my experience in Naga in Milan we observed that fact. Amal seems confused and frustrated, he tells me that all his other friends obtained a longer renewal and that he doesn't want to go there any more. “I will never go to that village any more! I remain here in Berlin with the expired document, I don't care! They told me that if the next time I wont bring there my passport, they wont renew my document! How can I manage it?! Should I go back to Ghana and ask to the Embassy my document?! It is impossible! Next time, they say that they want to take the finger prints … but why?!”. I don't know what to answer, every months the bureaucratic practices change and in every Italian city are different, it is impossible to find some general rules or practices. (Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, September 2014)

The high level of discretionary power increases the uncertainty and the precariousness of the people, who are confused how the juridical procedures are working and which possibility they have with their documents, as the previous narrations have highlighted. Furthermore, during the time of renewals the immigration office of Milan suddenly stopped to renew the Titolo di Viaggio, the document that was issued linked to the humanitarian protection and works as passport. Thus, without Titolo di Viaggio and just with the humanitarian protection, the migrant subjects cannot move around Europe and are hence “stuck in transit”, blocked in Italy. The non-renewal of the Titolo di Viaggio occurred also randomly, some people obtained it and others not, without juridical or administrative reasons:

Jamel seems very stressed, he looks at me and he asks me why they did not renew his Titolo di Viaggio. He was in questura together with Nuru, and also Nuru is living in Berlin and they gave the same information to the police, so he can not really understand
what does happen to him. “Now how can I go back to Berlin? I have a project there, a work with artists … they are waiting for me, how can I pass the borders now?”.

(Participant observation with Jamel in Milan, February 2014)

The “bureaucratic space” emerges as a contested place of negotiating practices, where the people fight to barely shift the borders or even to break them, opening some juridical interstices, into which migrant subjects individually insert themselves. This is the case of Jawara that obtained the renewal of his documents immediately without waiting for the usually two or three months:

Jawara was with Ingrid and they explain me how they have discussed long and strongly with the head of police in the immigration office. The problem of Jawara was also that in the humanitarian protection he has a wrong written name, also an H more. Moreover, he has lost the document of the Commission that certifies that he has obtained the humanitarian protection. […] After several discussions and having done the charge of the loss of that document, he obtains the renewed document the same day. But the name remained written wrongly, although he has all the right documents from his Embassy attesting his “real” identity. Moreover, the renewed document he obtained was just a six-months document. (Participant observation with Jawara in Milan, February 2014)

Also Essien obtained a six-months renewed document, although he never abandoned the Italian territory and he was even working with a three-months employment contract:

«The first time, they gave me a humanitarian permit for one year. After, they renewed it just for six months! I was disappointed, I couldn't understand why, then I asked to the policeman why they give me a six months renewal and not a one year like all my other friends. And he answered: “Luck!”’. He says that sometimes they give one year, sometimes six months, sometimes two months, and it is just a matter of fortune, he says! So, I had to take this six months. But why? How can I manage my life like this? Six months, and maybe next time three months? Why they do not give me three years at least, then I can breathe!» (Interview with Essien in Milan, April 2014)

During my ethnographic research in Italy, it seemed that there were informal bureaucratic practices strongly depending on the place of renewal. In Turin, for example, the protagonists of my research obtained always one-year renewals exactly in the same time when other protagonists of my research obtained six-months renewals in Milan, or even shorter renewals in Foggia, as Amal's experience:

«I am so angry! Oh, so angry! I just got back from Italy yesterday, you know how many time they gave me? Three-months renewal! Just three months!! What a hell! In the last year I was there three times, I cannot move so much every time! I am tired, I decide that this is the last time, I don't go back to Italy any more! I will remain here with the expired document!» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, September 2014)

Although the migrant subjects are caught in the schizophrenic dynamics of bureaucracy and of the unfavourable socio-economic conditions of the host societies, they still carve out spaces
of autonomy and resistance practices to overcome these internal contradictory borders. Indeed, during the renewal of document the migrant subjects base their movements on their social networks scattered in several European cities. As showed in the chapter four, the mobilities of my research protagonists across Italy are characterized by a fragmented nature, and it is based on their social networks. During the pendular-movements for the renewals these networks are activated again.

Obasi, for example, went to Turin because he has friends there that found a place for him within the squatted house ex-MOI; Harun instead went to a small city in central Italy because he has the possibility to dwell in a house of friends of Berliner supporters.

I am sitting with Amal and he seems very tired. He has to renew his Italian document, but he doesn't want to go back to that city in south Italy where he always makes the renewal procedure, because every time they gave him just three or six months, and he is tired to go back and forth so often. “I maybe decide to go to Turin, you know, all my friends there have no problems. Do you know someone there?” I explain him that there is the squatted house ex-MOI where maybe he can find a place to sleep during the renewal time. “Ah, yes, I know that place! All my friends go there! I think I will contact Kalule, he is still there… since five months I guess! You know him? He was also in Oranienplatz, he is also a Lampedusa! We have done together a theatre project in Berlin! I will call him”.

(Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

Thus, the informal networks built during the migratory route from the origin country, through Libya and Italy, up to Germany, influence the capacity of movement between and beyond the borders of Europe also several years after the first arrival. Moreover, a “collective knowledge” emerges on where it is easiest to renew the documents or to obtain a “hospitality declaration”. It orients the trajectories of migrant subjects, as Amal has explained. Also information on the safest route towards Italy with less control are part of this “collective knowledge” in the informal networks.

«You know, in Austria the police takes so much money from the people like us travelling like this! When you cross it heading Italia, they take you so much money! Like 300 Euros, or something like this. They take money from Bashir, and also many other friends. They ask you documents and then money! And if you don't have money, you go to prison! So, in Europe it is like this, you need money, otherwise, prison! Sometimes they take your money and sometimes not, but always they control your document! […] the problem is always when you go out from Italy, not when you come in! I mean, the Germans, they always will let you go back to Italy! But they don't want that you stay in Germany without a German document.» (Interview with Obasi in Berlin, November 2014)

Each person developed his tactics to travel around Europe, basing them on his personal networks and on the information that circulates within the “collective knowledge” built by the “mobile interrupted citizens”. Nevertheless, sometimes migrant subjects remain caught within
the net of local bureaucracies and individually activate the internal borders. These movements between and beyond the borders have to be understood as one part of the migratory experience that is characterized by temporal ruptures, like the time in prison or the long waiting time for the renewal, and immediate acceleration of movements, and then again temporal interruption in points of stasis. The places that are criss-crossed and dwelled during these movements emerge as “transit sites” characterized by an ambivalent nature, since also the control and surveillance are sometimes there deployed – they hence become border places.
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5.2 Dwelling the transits: border places and transit sites

«The problem is that the people that look at me going inside and outside of that squatted school, will always think that I am a criminal! They immediately associate the idea of criminality and marginality to that place!»
(Interview with Harun in Berlin, January 2014)

The previous paragraph has highlighted how mobility regimes (Schiller and Salazar 2013) emerge in the space of the European Union, where several categories of people – notably the EU citizens – are allowed to freely move, and other categories – notably the migrant subjects with reduced legal statuses – experience instead a strong limitation of their freedom of movement. New cultural and normative conditions regulate this regime of im-mobility, which is based on a “paradigm of suspicion”: individuals, groups and certain categories have suspected identities related to the risks of immigration, crime and terrorism, and become hence a social problem (Shamir 2005). The categorization and classification of people is one of the main attempts of migration control, which is implemented through the legal status. In the last decades, a proliferation of several reduced legal statuses occurred. This blurred their juridical nature and created contradictions in the access to rights. “Interrupted citizens” emerge as a category of people who do not belong to a national state but are “tolerated” within its territory, and experience a perpetuate precarious legal condition oscillating between “legality” and “illegality” – but not in a progressive way. These subjects, that are “half-legal” and “half-illegal”, increase their suspected nature once they start to move across the national borders, and lead thus to short-circuits within the local bureaucracies. The “mobile interrupted citizens” are thus treated as a social problem that has to be under surveillance, and thus mechanisms of control are deployed within the national territories and the cities. Nevertheless, the migrant subjects are living and moving between and beyond these deployed borders, sometimes overcoming them and sometimes remaining caught in them. The frictions between this phenomenon of im-mobility lead to the production of border places within the national territories, notably places where it is possible to confine certain categories of people who don't belong – asylum-seekers and “illegal” migrants – and people who belong – holding
reduced legal statuses. The classical example of border places are the asylum-seekers' camps and the deportation prisons for “illegal” migrants. These places spatially – and sometimes also juridically – confine these people and limit their freedom of movement and their access to the host societies. The border places can also emerge within the urban territory, where they have a more blurred nature since they are not closed structures but rather spaces where strengthened control and surveillance are deployed.

The whole territory of European Union can be understood as “borderland” (Lebuhn 2013), where the sovereign power which are involved in borders control, is no longer defined by different spaces of political and legal appropriation, but by the management of flows across the territory (Mezzadra 2006; Rigo 2007). Scholars of critical Border Studies have addressed the concept of “border zone” as zone of indistinction (cfr. Agamben 1995), characterized by a confusion between inside and outside of sovereignty. These are spaces of legal and political uncertainty, which expose individuals to the discretionary powers of the authorities, where bureaucratic agents have the power to define the situation. And the process of control is enforced exactly through these zones of confinement (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013; Campesi and Sbraccia 2014). According to Brighenti (2014) the multiplicity of territories reflects the power relations among human beings, considering power not as a vague superior omnipotent essence, but a set of immanent relations; and the territories being ways of imagining and performing such relations. Thus, border places reflect the tensions and frictions within the European Union and the different categories of people living there.

These border places have effects on the people who transit through them, influencing their lives, projects and bodies. Several ethnographic research (Kasparek and Hess 2010; Tsianos and Karakayali 2010) have highlighted how the production of these border zones are an effect of both the European Union border regime and the migrant's own objectives and strategies. The European border regime, indeed, does not stop the movements of migrant subjects, it rather keeps people caught in mobility and transforms border-regions into zones of heightened circulation (Hess 2010). The anthropologist Aihwa Ong (1999) has also stressed how the mutually reinforcing dynamics of discipline that control and manage migrant subjects and the escapes of subjects on the move lead to the creation of “zones of graduate sovereignty”. These zones are subjected to different kinds of governmentality and vary in terms of the mix of disciplinary and civilizing regimes. The zones do not necessarily follow political borders, and often contain ethnically marked class grouping, whose practices are subjected to regimes of rights and obligations that are different from other zones. The complexity of the power relations that criss-cross the contemporary societies and the new fragmented ways through
which the different sovereign powers act at different levels are central findings of these several scholars working on globalization from a critical perspective. They highlight also how the subjects move and face these social constrains creating thus *frictions* that take shape also in the space. The border regime reduces the social, economic and political rights by several degrees and thus *interrupts* the trajectories of migrant subjects and re-directs them, accelerating hence the process of fragmentation (Hess 2010).

The experiences of the protagonists of my research will shed light on how these “border zones” emerge not only in the border regions close to the EU, but also within the Schengen territory. In chapter four, I have underlined how the migratory experiences of migrant subjects with a temporary legal status in Europe are characterized by *temporal ruptures* and *fragmented circuits*. In this paragraph, different border places are presented as spaces dwell and criss-crossed during the *temporal ruptures* of migratory experience. Moreover, stressing the blurry nature of these places allows to shed light on their strongly connection to the stratified hierarchy of legal statuses of migrant subjects.
“Despina can be reached in two ways: by ship or by camel. The city displays one face to the traveller arriving overland and a different one to him who arrives by sea.

When the camel driver sees, at the horizon of the tableland, the pinnacles of the skyscrapers come into view, the radar antennae, the white and red windsocks flapping, the chimneys belching smoke, he thinks of a ship; he knows it is a city, but he thinks of it as a vessel that will take him away from the desert, a windjammer about to cast off, with the breeze already swelling the sails, not yet unfurled, or a steamboat with its boiler vibrating in the iron keel; and he thinks of all the ports, the foreign merchandise the cranes unload on the docks, the taverns where crews of different flags break bottles over one another's heads, the lighted, ground-floor windows, each with a woman combing her hair. In the coastline's haze, the sailor discerns the form of a camel's withers, an embroidered saddle with glittering fringe between two spotted humps, advancing and swaying; he knows it is a city, but he thinks of it as a camel from whose pack hang wineskins and bags of candied fruit, date wine, tobacco leaves, and already he sees himself at the head of a long caravan taking him away from the desert of the sea, toward oases of fresh water in the palm trees' jagged shade, toward palaces of thick, whitewashed walls, tiled courts where girls are dancing barefoot, moving their arms, half-hidden by their veils, and half-revealed.

Each city receives its form from the desert it opposes; and so the camel driver and the sailor see Despina, a border city between two deserts.”

Invisible places: from train stations to abandoned buildings to squatted houses to a former railway yard

The biographies of my research's protagonists are characterized by a crossing-border hypermobility alternating with periods of stasis that are characterized by long waiting and suspended time. These experiences crystallize in the space, producing “a series of new territories” (Brighenti 2014) that are overlapping and criss-crossing other territories at the same place and time. The example of the main train station in the city of Milan – Stazione Centrale – can shed light on the ambivalent nature of these places, that are dwelled by people transiting between juridical categories and national territories. Indeed, the main train station in Milan is the first place that errant subjects encounter once they arrive in the metropolis of North Italy, and for many migrant subjects it has been also the first “house” where they have slept. According to other research conduct in Milan, the Stazione Centrale reflects the image of a city where people arrive and leave again, the image of a city as a front door that receives the new people and let them stand and settle in a place of passage, i.e. a transit area (Pezzoni 2013). Furthermore, ethnographic research at that train station (Colombo and Navarini 1999) have shed light on the liminal nature of that place, which is socially constructed by the several persons and groups that dwell and pass through it. According to the ethnographers, the experiences of “in-between”, wait and time suspension criss-cross the train station of Milan, which emerges as an ambivalent place in which the continuous production and negotiation of boundaries occur. Thus, the homogeneity of the territorial space of the train station is contrasted by the high heterogeneity of the social space. The latter emerge as a strongly differentiated space constituted by a multiplicity of interdependent micro-territories, which are the outcome of the temporary relations and conflicts between the different groups that dwell the train station. Stazione Centrale appears hence as an ambivalent place composed by a multiplicity of connected territories, where the continuous redefinition of borders emerge as the main feature of that social place. According to Brighenti (2014) the making of a territory is inherently related to the drawing of certain boundaries: in the today societies, thus, the proliferation of mobilities is matched by a simultaneous proliferation of bounded territories, and the segmentations are not confined to traditional disciplinary institutions but take place at city scale, too.

Following the protagonists of my research in their everyday lives in Milan, I could experience the ambivalent nature of the train station as both a site of socialisation, where to meet friends and exchange contacts and information, and a border place where surveillance is heavily
deployed. The ambivalence of *Stazione Centrale* is also produced by the ambivalent nature of the mobility of migrant subjects, which is both a forced and contested mobility – treated as “dangerous” – and based on the informal networks, i.e. a result of the people's subjective agency. Being constantly in transit, the search of work and of a better place to live converges into an idea of “further departure”, that finds in the train station of Milan the perfect place where it can be expressed. *Stazione Centrale* has been experienced as crossroads of individual trajectories, a *transit site*, a gateway to Northern Europe, and a place to temporarily settle, or a layover before reaching work destinations for seasonal agricultural work. In the maps of fragmented circuits and temporal interruptions, the Central Station appears as both a transit site and a border place: a dangerous place for the continued presence of police and surveillance cameras, but also a perfect place for networking and exchanging information.

«I always go to *Centrale*, because there are many brothers like me. We talk, we keep each other company, I relax ... it makes me feel safe. Also we can get a lot of information, about where I can sleep if I am on the street, where there is work. And it was the first place where I slept when I arrived in Milan!» (Interview with Essien in Milan, April 2014)

«I do not like *Stazione Centrale*! It is hell. There are people who have stopped looking, and given in to alcohol and depression. I'm afraid I might end up like them, because they are “brothers” like me! I don’t like going there much! And then, it is full of police!» (Interview with Radu in Milan, April 2014)

The two different perceptions of the Central train station narrated by Radu and Essien shed light on its ambivalent nature, and on the way through which different places are produced through the experiences of people dwelling and crossing this space. As the following narration shows us, *Stazione Centrale* was the first place where Essien has slept in Milan. Afterwards it became the main place of sociality where he spent his time opening an *interstice* for a rest through liberating himself from the “assistance circuit” that trapped him in the daily fulfil of survival needs.

Essien gave me the appointment at the train station, because he usually goes there in the morning, after he leaves the dormitory. We meet at 9 am, and Essien is already waiting for me outside the station. Then, he brings me to the place where he usually spends the time. We arrive in a zone within the station, where there is the free wifi for internet. This zone is an open space close to which there are several shops and bars; there are two long benches facing each other, on which many Africans guys are sitting and playing with their phones. Essien tells me that this is the place, and those are his friends. They look up and then look at me, some say a shy “hello”, others just stay silent and continue to look at their phone. Essien points at a chair and he tells me: “we can sit there, if you want”. We sit there and close to us there is Cherill, a friend of Essien that usually comes to *Naga*. We sit down, and Essien doesn't speak for some minutes. I also remain silent and I look
around. “You see how we are living – starts Essien at one point – we are just hanging out without doing nothing! I come to Centrale, and I stay here all the day long, doing nothing! I look for a job, and I don't find it. At least, I can come here and meet some friends! Here it is warmer than outside, so it is good for us, because we can stay here and meet people, and no one disturbs us.” (Shadowing with Essien in Milan, March 2014)

Although Essien uses the space of the train station as a social place where he meets people and rest, he still perceives the perpetuate precariousness of their live condition that this place reflects:

We are speaking while sitting on the benches, and Cherill is telling us his story when he went to Malta in order to work with his brother, while a friend of Cherill and Essien comes close to us: “What are you doing here?” he smiles at me, and I explain him why I am there with Essien. He seems interested and we speak a bit about the situation of the people who arrived in 2011 from Libya. After some minutes, he greets us and goes away. Cherill continues his discourse: “this is not a life, Elena! I am looking for an apartment where I can live, I have a job now! But nothing! I cannot find a house, I have to live in the dormitory! You know that they will throw me outside the dormitory, once the cold emergency will be ended? Soon, since we are already in March!”, Essien interrupts Cherill and replies: “For me it is the same! They will throw me out too! So, probably, I will come back here, to Centrale, and I will sleep again in that train”. I ask him which train, and he explains me that he has slept already in the train station, when he arrived for the first time in Milan. “The first days I was sleeping in that train … you don't know it?! Ah, it is famous [he smiles] in the last rail track in Centrale there is a train that Ferrovie dello Stato\textsuperscript{165} gave to us. They open it every night and we can sleep there. Then at 4:30 am they wake us up, and we have to go out. And then you are hanging out in the train station …”. Cherill intervenes in the conversation: “You know which is also the problem? I tell you: if you are sleeping in the dormitory, you have to go out at 8 o'clock in the morning, and then you hang out all the day long in Centrale! You turn around all the day wasting time. I am ashamed about this situation! I feel so embarrassed! I have a very good friend who is living in Paris, he also has Italian documents. But in Paris is everything good. And I visit him! It was cool! He is living in a real house! Now, he wants to visit me in Milan … how can I do?! I told him no! And now he is angry with me, because he cannot understand why I don't want he comes here … but how can I explain it to him?! I am ashamed! So much! If he would come, I would bring him here! To Centrale! Is that possible?!”. He shakes his head and looks down. (Shadowing with Essien in Milan, March 2014)

The diverse uses that people make of the train station make it a polysemic space of relaxation and socialization despite the presence of police and cameras, but at the same time a space where one is exposed to social reprobation for hanging out aimlessly in an evident condition of homelessness and unemployment. Dakari and Radu did not like the train station because it reflects exactly their precariousness condition, or even illustrates them a possibly “dangerous” future, as they explain:

We take the bus in direction of Stazione Centrale, the main train station of Milan. “I want to bring you there, because I want that you understand why I don't like that place” tells

\textsuperscript{165}Ferrovie dello Stato is the name of the public railways in Italy.
me Radu. We arrive in the train station and we get inside. Radu brings me to different
places, he knows it very well and he knows exactly where to go. He shows me where
these people who feel bad are usually placed: “You see there?! That is the place of
desperate people … drunk people. You understand now? I don't like this place, because I
see these desperate people that are like me! Migrants. A lot of people I know come here to
rest a bit and to meet friends, but not me! I am afraid when I come here … I don't know, I
have a bad feeling seeing all these African people hanging out all the day long. I am
afraid to become like them!”. We move to one level underground, and Radu brings me to
a zone where there are some chairs and tables. This place is in front of Mc Donalds and I
can recognise many African people that usually come to Naga, who are sitting there and
playing with their phones. “You see? The people come here to rest, because here it is not
so cold like outside! And you spend the time here hanging out, because usually you have
nothing to do, and you cannot stay in the dormitory. So people come here”. I ask him
where he usually goes, since outside it is very cold and he doesn't like the train station,
and Radu replies: “Me? I like to go to the bingo! That is my place! I can watch football
and meet friends there, but it is not so sad like the train station!”. (Shadowing with Radu
in Milan, February 2014)

We go out of the Caritas office and Dakari is frustrated: he wanted to find a possibility to
get an apartment because he is tired to live since three years in a dormitory, but
unfortunately they cannot help him. “What we can do now? I can bring you to Centrale
… yes, let's go there”, tells me Dakari. “I don't like so much that place – he continues –
there are drunk people and people who looking for charity, and that makes me sad! And
you know what?! People like me are beaten! Yes, people from my country, not from all
Africa, just from my country!”. We arrive in the train station and we get inside, Dakari
wants to walk around, but he doesn't want to sit in a place. We are walking around the
train station, high and low, up and down. At one point, Dakari points to some African
guys that are standing close to the ticket machines: “You see? Look! People are coming
here to rest and to try to make some money. Look at them! They help Italian people or
tourists to do the tickets, and ask money for that! And look there!! – he points to an
African man looking for something in the rubbish – I don't like this place for these
reasons!”. We keep walking, and Dakari shows me all the people that he considers 'like
him', notably African people. There are many sleeping on the benches in different floors
of the train station, and others hanging out in small groups or alone. Dakari does like
shooting his head and tells me: “Ok, let's go to another place, please! I don't like it!”. We
go out from the train station and we stand at the tram 9 station. I ask Dakari why we are
standing there, if we are waiting for someone, and he explains me: “this is the place of my
brothers”. I ask him to explain me who are his brothers, and he tells me: “people of my
country! From Niger! Usually we meet here, this is our place where we hang out. Usually
there are a lot of brothers, really a lot! And we met all here! But today, I don't know why,
no one is here!”. So we wait for the tram 9 and we decide to reach Piazzale Lotto, since
we have nothing to do we can see the city from the tram, Dakari suggests me.
(Shadowing with Dakari in Milan, February 2014)

The Central train station is a crucial place in the everyday life for those “urban errant migrant
subjects” in Milan that move from a dormitory to another, looking for a job and a place to
settle, see chapter four for a detailed discussion. The train stations in general, not only that
one of Milan, are places where migrant subjects usually transit through and experience
temporal interruption, often dwelling these space as a “home” for a certain time; it is a “home
crossed by trains” (Gatta 2012b). The following narration of Harun sheds light on how also
other train stations in Italy function similar to that in Milan:

«At the beginning when I arrived in Rome, I didn't have a place to sleep. So I was sleeping outside in Stazione Termini [main train station in Rome] and I remained there for long time. I was sleeping on the side of the station, in via Marsala. I was sleeping there since so much time that I became a homeless, but I am not a homeless, but I didn't have a place to sleep and there it was full of African people like me. A lot of friends I met there. But I didn't tell to them where I came from, because it was better like this. I could speak houssa the language of Ghana, and people from Ghana were thinking that I come from that country, but it is not true. But there were also a lot of Arab people that already knew me from Sicily, and I didn't want that they knew where I come from, they were thinking I was Sudanese and I wanted they continue to think like this. Because, you know, I can speak also Arabic. I remained there six months, maybe even more. It was 2012. Close to Termini you can take a shower at the Caritas, and you can also leave there your rucksack. But I didn't want to sleep there at the Caritas, I wanted to stay with the other friends in the train station. You know, some people offered me a place in dormitory, but at that time I didn't want it! I had so many friends all around, I could sleep on the street, in the train station, sometimes in the bars or discos. But I didn't want to leave my friends. […] At one point, a friend of mine arrived and told me that we can share his apartment. Then I left the train station.» (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

The train station emerges as a crucial space for the errant migrant subjects that are characterised by a high border-crossing mobility, i.e. the protagonists of my research that enacted “pendular-movements” for renewing their documents. The following experiences of Rashid, Jamel, Nuru, and Bashir shed light on the function of Stazione Centrale as a knot of the informal nets through which the “mobile interrupted citizens” base their movements.

Bashir had been caught in France, close to Marseilles and the police put him to prison for five days. Bashir's document was expired and hence he came to Italy in order to renew it. He stayed some weeks in Turin, but when he understood that he had to wait too much time in Italy in order to get the document renewed, he decided to move back to Berlin but he was controlled by the French police. After the five days in prison, the French police brought Bashir to Ventimiglia and they put him in a train to Milan. Bashir managed to call me and tell me that he was in Ventimiglia and he had taken a train to Milan, but we didn't finish the phone call because the battery of his phone was empty. So, I could not know which train Bashir took, and I tried to look on the train schedule in order to understand when he would arrive in the train station. […] I arrived at the train station of Milan, and I remained there for more than one hour, but it was impossible to meet Bashir because we did not know each other and the train station is full of people. […] The day after, I received a phone call: it is Bashir that calls me from a public telephone box! He has slept in the train station and he has met a guy that has helped him. He tells me that his phone is broken and he gives me an appointment in two hours at the train station. I arrive there and I meet Bashir that is accompanied by another African guy: “We met here today – explains me Bashir – he is a brother, he comes from my country! He gave me the money to call you and also his phone! Without him I don't know how I could manage to do!” The guy looks at me smiling and he introduce himself: “I am Garon, I also arrived in 2011 here, like Bashir! I found Bashir today, he was a bit lost. So, for this reason I decide to help him and I stayed with him until you arrived!”. I see that he has a cart in his hand, and I ask him if he is going to work, and he explains me: “Yes, I am working here in the train station. Not always, sometimes I am doing casual jobs here. Better than nothing!” he smiles. And then he gives Bashir his phone number and tells him: “call me again, if you
need some help here in Milan”. (Participant observation with Bashir in Milan, January 2014)

I meet Rashid and Jamel and I ask them where are they are sleeping now. Rashid explains me: “now we are in a dormitory! Oh, so much better! There, in the train station … it was crazy! So crazy! Nuru is still there, I don't know why! He just doesn't want to come with us to the dormitory, he prefers to stay there also if it is so bad, because he doesn't like the changes. But you know, sleeping in the underground … oh my God! They put so many mattresses! Many, many, many! And so many people are sleeping there! But it smells so bad! Oh!! It stinks so much! So, after three weeks we were almost dead!”. Rashid shakes his head, and Jamel continues: “And you have to stand up around 5 o’clock in the morning! So bad! I mean, now in the dormitory, also we have to go outside at 6:30 am! Nuru decides to remain in Centrale, also because from there it is easier to orient yourself within the city! Our dormitory now is very far away, for this reasons at the beginning we wanted to stay in Centrale, because Centrale is the center for all of us, and it is easier to go everywhere from Centrale!”. (Participant observation with Rashid and Jamel in Milan, February 2014)

During the renewal the migrant subjects have to wait a long period of time and thus they dwell again the Italian cities where they have the bureaucratic procedures. The protagonists of my research spend periods between two and five months in Italy waiting for the renewal, and the fact that they temporary dwell several places such as the train station – or squatted and abandoned houses – make migrant subjects produce these as transit sites. Thus, a multiplicity of social territories emerges, with Stazione Centrale being a place to rest and meet friends in the everyday life for Essien, and also a “home” for Jamel, Nuru and Rashid during their renewal time. The time-space created by these different experiences is hence reflected in the place of the train station. For example, Rashid explains us how the waiting and suspended time entailed by the bureaucratic practices for the renewal is reflected in the train station:

«I am doing nothing! You arrive and they give you three months [referring to the renewal], after three months they give you other six months … many many offices I go!! many many office! After three months, after six months, after three months …. time goes, time goes, time goes. […] When I arrived in Milan for the renewal, I came from Berlin passing through Switzerland .. and I arrived in Centrale around 11 or 12 am. In Centrale, there were so many foreigners like me!! so many! I asked to all of them about Naga, and all of them know it! And they told me where I should have to go. […] Now I am here since one month waiting for the renewal, and I have slept one month in the underground of Centrale, in that place that people have organized for us … so bad!! so much stink! Now I am in the dormitory, very far away, but better. But you know, during the day I am doing nothing! I have to leave the dormitory at 6:30 am and then I go to Centrale!! Because inside in Centrale it was hot! At that time in Milano it was cold, so I needed a hot place to go. I go direct to Centrale, I go up where all the people are, it is hot and you meet people like you. Then you sit down, sit down, sit down. Then we go eat in Tricolore [the soap kitchen], and the day is finish. You know it very well. I meet many people in Centrale, from every country, they come back to renew their documents, exactly like me. So this place is good! […] But I lost my time: this is the problem with Italy!» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)
The crossing-borders mobility is hence characterized by \textit{temporal ruptures} that sometimes are materialized in border places such as prisons – as happened to Bashir in France – and other times set in transit sites where the waiting and suspended time of the renewal crystallizes. These places are criss-crossed and dwelled during the movements, and absolve a multiplicity of functions such as sleeping place, sociality place, or temporary work place. The following narration of Kalule, a young man from Nigeria, shows how also the airport has been experienced as a transit site by the “errant population” moving back and forth, and how these transit sites can be also places of temporary and precarious works:

«Oh … this trip … it was crazy, I tell you … The day I had to fly I thought I had my flight at 9 pm, I was mistaking because I confused the time of departure with the time the gate closed, which was actually 20:30 … So I arrived at the gate and they told me my plane had already left. This was in \textit{Linate} Airport. So I called a friend asking him to get another ticket for me. This time the plane was leaving from \textit{Malpensa} Airport, so I had to go there. But the flight was after one week or so, maybe 8 days, I don’t remember. So I went to \textit{Malpensa} with the bus and I stayed there the whole time. Since I had no money, I couldn’t call you to tell you and I could not even buy anything to eat. So after some time walking around in the airport, I noticed some guys that were waiting for the buses outside, I was looking at them asking the people that got out of the bus whether they needed help with the luggage, and then I saw them accompanying the people with the luggage inside the airport or also just putting the luggage on the … how do you call those in Italian … \textit{carrioli}? [\textit{carrello}, the trolley to carry the luggage]. So after some hours I went to ask them if I could also do so, and they said yes. My first client was a lady, I just approached her asking “Hello, do you need help with your bags?” and she said yes, so I put her luggage on the trolley and brought it at the entrance. You know, at that time I didn’t feel ashamed, because that is a work, and I needed the money to buy myself things to eat. Usually for this work I got 2 or 3 Euros per client, and in a day the maximum that I reached was 30 Euros. Depending on whether you brought the trolley until the gate or not you could get more or less money, for example if I bring the trolley just until the entrance I know I can get 2 or 3 Euros, but if I bring it until the gate I could maybe get 5 Euros! But sometimes when I was bringing people inside I was stopped by the police that said “no no, leave these people alone, go away!” because they didn’t want us to do that work. And the people didn’t know that we were working there without permission so they never intervened in our favor. So when the police saw you, you knew you had lost a client. But sometimes you could also bring them to the gate, you just had to ask “where are you flying to?” and then you knew where to bring them. So … it’s not easy … but it’s work, so I can save some money to buy a telephone card and call my friends to say I’m fine. When I figured out that I had lost the plane it did not make sense to go back to \textit{Torino} you know? It’s too expensive to go back with the bus, and then I would have to come back after some days so … I was sleeping at the airport. The police and the people working in the airport let me sleep there because I had the ticket, they were doing me this favor you know? Then when I had to fly back they checked on me at the gate, they asked me everything, all my documents. I had my passport and the \textit{ricevuta} [the receipt] of the renewal of my new permit, and my \textit{carta d’identità} issued in Palermo. They told me that the \textit{carta d’identità} was no valid to leave Italy, and they kept me there at the gate for a long time, one of the people there was talking on the phone with somebody, I don’t know who, maybe the boss who had to tell them what to do. After talking for a long time on the phone the man hung up and told his colleagues looked at me saying “go, go, quick, you can go”. So I was glad they let me go, but I don’t know the reason. I was just so happy that I could come back to Berlin, you know! But for this other flight that I missed I was
so angry! I spent 110 Euros and now I just lost them … I am still angry with myself about this!» (Interview with Kalule in Berlin, November 2014)

The narration of Kalule well sheds light on the blurred nature of that places and on the way through which the borders manifest themselves through the control of police, as explained in the previous paragraph. Thus, transit sites can suddenly turn into border places where the hold of a regular document can be the decisive factor to activate the border. People en transit cross several territories and during their movements manage to open territorial interstices where they can rest, temporary settle in the shadow, and even temporary work, and then leave again. These places can be more or less visible, depending on the practices of the migrant subjects. The sites are characterized by a high invisibility in Italy, which reflects the policies of abandonment implemented in the Mediterranean country. The practices enacted by the migrant subjects are movements in the shadows based on informal social ties. The informal networks on which people base their movements sustain themselves on these transit sites where the circular mobility of migrant subjects occur and where information and contacts are exchanged and a “collective knowledge” of mobile people develops. The networks are scattered in the whole European territory and their knots are such transit places that migrant subjects practice as “home”, as place of transition during their movements and as place into which they reorient their migratory routes thanks to the information and contacts they share inside those sites. For example, Amal slept in the train station of Munich for one week and in that of Berlin for three days, and exactly in that place he met the people who told him to go to Oranienplatz. The same experience happened to Nasri, a young man from Niger, as he narrates in the following text:

«I came to Germany in 2012 and went to Hamburg, there I met Kodowo at the Caritas, but we couldn’t stay longer than some days, so we lived on the streets for four months eating at Caritas and collecting bottles to get some money. After four months in Hamburg we came to Berlin although we didn’t know anyone there. We arrived by train and at the beginning we stayed in Hauptbahnhof [main train station] for some days because we didn’t know where to go. Then we met there somebody who told us we should go to Caritas, but after some days the people from Caritas told us that we could not stay there for a long time, that we should go to Oranienplatz, where other refugees were living» (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2015)

The transit sites that are criss-crossed by people on the move are not just places of where the mobility visible occurred, as airports and train stations, but also other places that adopt the same function through the action of the migrant subjects. One already cited example is the squatted houses ex-MOI in Turin, as the following narrations of Obasi and Kalule highlight:
«I have to go back to Torino in January, because then my permit is probably going to be ready. They told me it takes a couple of months, so I am going back then. But I could not stay there long time. The people in the house [squatted house ex-MOI] are great people you know! There was this one guy, who is the only one working, and he always buys food for everyone in the two rooms close to ours. I was staying at Zahid’s place and Edy was in the other room, and then there was another guy and the one who is working. Very nice people, really. But I didn’t have anything to do there, and they were also not working, so we were staying home for so much time and then maybe we were going out but doing nothing … it’s hard, too hard.» (Interview with Kalule in Berlin, November 2014)

«You know, I have already done this journey two times, because I have done the camp in Firenze, so I know it very well. It is a long trip! I usually take the bus, but I am travelling alone, I don't like to travel in group, it is better if we travel alone. For this reason I take also the mitfahr, that is good! Maybe for the return journey from Torino to Berlin, I will take the mitfahr, let’s see. I now asked to Issa if I can take his room in Lingotto [squatted houses ex-MOI], because he is done with his document and now he is in Berlin again. So I can sleep at his place now, and I can renew all my stuff. I love his room, it is the best one! You can also take a warm shower! But unfortunately now, someone else has taken that room! So, Issa told me that I will have another one.» (Interview with Obasi in Berlin, November 2014)

The squatted houses are an example of places where the transits of migrant subjects and their ambivalent juridical condition are more visible, reflecting the social and political conflicts that are developing around this issue. It reflects also the policies of abandonment and control: on the one side, the local institution of Turin officially denounce the “illegal” act of occupying a place, on the other side they “tolerate” it being a housing solution for the errant people that remained “orphan” of an authority that provides them the means to satisfy their basic needs. Generally, I could observe in Italy how invisibility was the main characteristic of the places through which migrant subjects transited. There is a particular temporality in these places. I observed how one of the main borders that emerges in the experience of errant migrant subjects is the temporal one, which is produced and strengthened by the bureaucratic practices and connected hence to the legal status. The concept of “transit” must in this context not be understood just through its spatial dimension, but also and above all through its temporal one. Indeed, my research protagonists experience a lengthened transit condition, they have not yet settled after more than four years after their landing in Europe. They hence perceive themselves as “not yet arrived” and the wait condition and precariousness are lengthened in time. The “transit” can be understood as a stage of transition, as a movement towards another place, as a non-settlement; it becomes a state of being and involves hence the subjective dimension with experience of liminality, suspension, wait and transition. The migrant subjects sometimes move from this transit condition to a more settled condition, and then back again, which highlights how their mobility does not mean to become more similar and equal to
European citizens, i.e. doesn’t involve a social mobility. Sometimes they instead remain caught in this mobility and become “stuck in transit”, experiencing an extended “threshold” condition of wait and suspension. The following example of a former railway yard placed in the center of Milan and used by migrant subjects as both a house and a transit place highlights well how the people live the experience of transit from a spatial, temporal and juridical point of view.

We arrive on the street that overpasses the former railway yard of Porta Romana, the so-called Scalo di Porta Romana – rail yard of Porta Romana. I have heard a lot of things about that place, in which several migrant people live since many years. I explain to Dakari that it is very close to my apartment, and I often walk close to it, but I never went inside. Dakari smiles and tells me: “So, we have been neighbours!”. Dakari stops in the middle of the overpass and leans his arms on the bridge handrail, and looks down. The sun is rising, and the former railway yard seems completely empty. Dakari remains in silence, and at one point he starts: “No one is there now, not yet. We have to wait that the sun goes down and then people come back home”. There is one abandoned house that we can observe looking down from the balustrade, and there are many cloths hanging on a string. I ask Dakari whether these cloths are of the people living there and he nods. “Look at this door – he points to an open door of that abandoned house – this was my entrance! I have slept there, my room is there. I have still some cloths and a rucksack inside! Now, I leave my place to a man from Togo”. We keep looking down in silence and we wait that the sun goes completely down the horizon. “If you want – tells me Dakari – one day we can enter together that place, and I show you how people live there”. (Participant observation with Dakari, in Milan February 2014)

The abandoned railway of Porta Romana in the center of Milan is a place where around 200 migrant subjects are living since many years. It is a spatial threshold in the middle of the city that is the most of the time treated as invisible place by the Milan municipality, which infrequently intervenes there only through police actions of control. The police operates in the former railway yard coherently to the policies of control and abandonment explained in the previous chapter, destroying the informal barracks-homes where migrant subjects are living, that are afterwards arranged in the winter emergency dormitories. Once the winter is over, the dormitories are closed and the migrant subjects find themselves again on the streets, and thus go back “home” to the former railway yard in Porta Romana.
Photo 7: Former railway yard: abandoned houses destroyed by police

Photo 8: View of the destroyed abandoned house on the former railway yard
These places can be understood as an urban interstice that allows “interrupted citizens” to survive. According to scholars working on “urban interstices”, these “unwanted people” are usually tolerated in the public visible space, but the interstices are the only place where they are allowed to be (Mitchell 2013). These places involve all the dimensions of the subjective experience and their nature is internalized by the subjects dwelling them. The spatial threshold becomes therewith also a temporal one since the policies of abandonment leave that place in the middle of the city to its own temporal rhythms, and the people who dwell it experience a strongly different temporality in comparison to that of the city.

«One day, in Naga, I met a guy who told me that there was an abandoned house, in Lodi. In Piazzale Lodi [Lodi square is close to the former railway station of Porta Romana]. So I went there, and I slept there for … I don’t know any more, I cannot remember. Days, weeks, I don’t know any more.» (Interview with Dakari in Milan, April 2014)

The following ethnographic note aims to report exactly the temporal rhythms and atmosphere that people experience in that place:
We arrive in Piazzale Lodi. On the right there are the stairs leading to the railway, we go down the stairs, and we arrive at the rails. To the left the still active rails disappear under the overpass. A couple of people are waiting for the train. On the other side, on the right, there are the unused rails that also run underneath the overpass. Beyond the pillars supporting the overpass, I can glimpse the abandoned railway yard. Dakari looks at me and asks: “So, are you ready? Shall we go?”, I nod. We go under the overpass to cross it and arrive on the other side, the abandoned one. Under the overpass among the pillars there are heaps of garbage and some mattresses abandoned on the tracks. Dakari points to the mattresses and shows me that one person is sleeping under the blankets. “Here – he whispers – are sleeping those who are in the worst condition!”. The place smells really bad, I can hardly breathe and I have to cover my nose. “The hygienic conditions are the worst here!” tells me Dakari. We go out from under the overpass and on the left there is an abandoned house. “I was sleeping here” he says pointing to that house. In front of this abandoned building there are around three guys speaking, and when they see us they ask to Dakari if he is sleeping in that yellow house. Dakari says no. Then they ask him whether he knows who is sleeping inside, and Dakari replies: “I don't know … I know that there are seven people sleeping inside, but I don't know them”. At this point, the guys asks to Dakari: “you know where are the Moroccans? Where are they sleeping?”, Dakari doesn't answer, he just points with his finger to another abandoned house on the opposite site of the railways. This house is surrounded by iron enclosure and iron sheet: I can see a hole between the enclosure through which it is possible to glimpse some mattresses. The guys go directly to that house. “They are Moroccans!” tells me Dakari. Then, we go close to the yellow house and Dakari looks inside the windows, the glass of the window is broken. He gestures that I have also to have a look inside, so I go close to window and I look inside: there are many mattresses and blankets, which are used as curtains in order to divide the already narrow space of that abandoned house. In the meanwhile Dakari is already close to the entrance door and gestures to follow him. We enter into the house and it is very dark, it is impossible to see anything. I remain at the door, and Dakari makes some light with his phone. “Don't be afraid – he whispers – follow me”. I follow him, and I have to walk between and upon mattress that are placed everywhere. It seems that no one is there. In the darkness I can glimpse many scattered cloths and bottles. I notice that there are two people sleeping there, and I look at Dakari in order to understand what we should do. He signals to follow him further. He opens a small door and we are in another room that is very narrow and small. Here there are just two mattress, Dakari tries to light up but it is impossible: this room has no windows. Then, he illuminate a rucksack against the wall and he whispers: “this is my rucksack!”. We go out from the small room and Dakari asks me: “have you understand now, how people are living in Milan?”, I nod and I tell him to go outside. Dakari points at a mattress and says: “this is my bed! I have slept here! Now a friend of me is sleeping here, a Sudanese”. We go out from the yellow house, and the daylight seems very strong to us. We need some second to open the eyes. Dakari tells me to follow him, he wants to show me another thing. We go behind the yellow house, and I see another house that has one wall completely destroyed. “Here were living also many people”, explains Dakari, “it was a huge house, well organized! But one day the police came and they teared it down! They destroyed our house!”, he does like shooting his head. In the open air space behind the yellow house, there is a pile of rubble, the residues of the destroyed house. To the left there is a large metal container where there are hanging many clothes and towels. Dakari points at them and tells me that all of them are coming here to wash their things, also now that they are living in other places. He shows me a faucet stuck in the ground, more or less at the ankle's height, from they get the water. “Here we wash, we take the shower and we wash our clothes” explains me Dakari, “I have no idea if this water is good! But we drank it as well”. We decide to go further, and we come back to the front of the yellow house and we cross the tracks reaching the opposite side. At this side, there is a very broad abandoned area, in which there are some abandoned small houses and on the right side it is surrounded by a long wall that divides that place from the city of Milan. We start walking in the broad area, on
the right I see a first small red building surrounded by a mesh on which several cloths are hanging. “This is the dormitory of Arca” explains me Dakari, “it is not a beautiful place for a dormitory! You see every day from the windows your brothers living like homeless, in such an abandoned place!” We pass the dormitory building, and I observe that there are some curtains in the very narrow interstice between one wall of the dormitory’s building and the wall that separates the rail yard from the city, around three meters wide, not more. The curtains are made with some bed sheet and blankets, and at one point I see one hand passing through the curtains, but no one appears. “There are the Eritrea’s people and the Somalis living” explains me Dakari. I am surprised how people can sleep in such a narrow space between two walls. We keep walking and now we are in the middle of the abandoned area, far away from the overpass from which we got inside. Dakari is explaining me how the area is ethnically divided, and where the people from North Africa, or from Eritrea or from Sudan are living. While he is explaining me, I look at the wall that separates us from the city and I see through some bigger holes how several people are quickly walking and speaking on their phone or eating a sandwich, or bicycling. The city life continues to run fast, and instead in the Scalo di Porta Romana the time seems to stand still and remain suspended. I comment on this time perception and Dakari replies: “Oh, yes! You got it! Here is another place, here the time is different”. He explains me further how the area is ethnically divided, pointing to a building very far away: “There is the place of Sudanese people, I never went there! Better to not go there”. We keep walking and we pass close to other small buildings, some of them have no doors any more, just bed sheets’ curtains. “This house is of Arabs!” tells me Dakari pointing at a small white house with an old sign of Ferrovie dello Stato [state railway]. Close to this building and along the wall that separates us from the city there is a lot of junk and mess, even a very old car, and some ruins and old cloths. In the middle of this mess and ruins there is an opened manhole from which a flowing water flows out through a small pump. There is a guy that is washing his teeth and his face. “There it is where I usually make a shower, after having done some gym in the park close to viale Tibaldi” explains me Dakari. The young man stop to wash himself, and he wears an elegant long black winter coat, he walks next to us but he doesn't look up and avoids us. He walks away in the direction of the Sudanese’s area, and slowly he disappears from our sights. “Here there are all the people you can imagine! People without documents, those with subsidiary protection and those with the humanitarian one. Even those with asylum! Yes, trust me! I see people with the asylum protection living here since many years!”, I ask him if there are also some women and children, and Dakari replies: “Of course! There are women from Eritrea above all”. We arrive close to a gate fitted in the wall that separates us from the city, and Dakari is surprised that it is closed: “Why?! I don't understand! Usually it is open! Oh, we have to go all the way back, I am sorry”. I tell him that it is not a problem for me. We walk all the way back and Dakari asks me if I am starting to understand how the people are living in Milan. I nod. We arrive close to the place where the people from North Africa are sleeping and Dakari comments: “I am afraid of that place! There are not good people sleeping there! They make business! I am afraid”. We cross again the tracks and we go under the overpass in order to reach the stairs from which we entered. We get back upstairs and we are again in Piazzale Lodi. “Are you shocked?!?” asks me Dakari laughing, and I reply that I am ok. I look at my watch and I observe that it is 12:40 am and I am surprised since we entered there just one hour before, at 11:30 am. I have the feeling we remained inside the former railways yard for many many hours, but it was just one. “Now let's go eat something at the soup kitchen” tells me Dakari. (Participant observation with Dakari in Milan, February 2014).
The transit experience of migrant subjects is here understood through a threefold lens, involving the spatial, temporal and legal dimension. From a spatial point of view, they are dwelling a multiplicity of places, and they repeatedly move back and forth between different territories. From a temporal point of view, migrant subjects experience a fragmented life that entails living several presents simultaneously. Indeed, according to anthropological research (Coutin 2005) migration, contrary to a travel from point A to point B, moves territories, reconfigures scale, and multiplies temporalities. Migrant subjects move across as well as through time. They do not move just from past to future but also from one present to another. This is deeply connected with the juridical condition, the third dimension. Indeed, those who are “illegal” or with a temporary legal status experience a continuous shift between a condition of visibility and invisibility, notably an unofficial visibility alternates with an official invisibility. Thus, migrant subjects en route are unable to be fully present in a certain place and time and move between different temporalities (Coutin 2005). The transit emerges also as a legal condition: the mobility being not just territorial but also juridical entails continuous movements between categories – from “illegal” to “legal” and the way back – producing hence mobilities between categories. The transit sites presented in this paragraph appear most of the time invisible to the institutional eyes, which alternate in “tolerating” these marginal living condition and applying policies of abandonment, control and surveillance.

The biographies of migrant subjects in this paragraph have highlighted how the tension between the mobility of individuals and the ways in which local institutions control and manage their movements generates a multiplicity of urban territories that emerge both as border places and transit sites. The ambiguous nature of these places is expressed by the fact that migrant subjects experience fear and at the same time perceive how useful these places are in offering opportunities for establishing relationships and exchanging information. Places such as abandoned railways, the squatted houses in Turin and the train stations absolve multiple functions: they are used as “home”, as sociality places and are also knots in the networks of cross-border moving, being practised thus as transit sites. Nevertheless, once control and surveillance are deployed they turn into border places where the legal status acts as and activates the internal borders. In the next paragraph we shed light on a situation in which these urban places dwell by people on the move are transformed and strengthen as border places according to the power relation that criss-cross the city.
Photo 12: Former railway yard: abandoned houses destroyed by police

Photo 13: Former railway yard: two mattresses
Photo 14: Former railway yard: water tap

Photo 15: Former railway yard: petrol point
Contested places: from Oranienplatz to the squatted school, to the «zero tolerance zone» of Görlitzer Park

In the previous chapter the centrality of the neighbourhood Kreuzberg for the migrant subjects protesting in Oranienplatz has been highlighted. The migrant population on the move has produced several places in the German capital city that present the same ambivalence as these previously described in Italy. In Berlin, contrary to Italy, the transit sites crossed by the “mobile interrupted citizens” are characterized by a hyper visibility. This is because they have been turned into border places with a strengthened control according to the power relations that criss-crossed this city for more than two years. The protagonists of my research dwelled Berlin's contested places. Several conflicts and tensions emerged in these places, underlining contested issues such as asylum and citizenship, European Union borders control and local fights within the Berliner political coalitions.

Oranienplatz is the first example of a place that has been dwelled both as a transit site and a border place. In chapter four the narrations of my research protagonists have shed light on the double use of Oranienplatz as both a “home” and a space of political negotiation and right claiming. The process of home-making that involved the Oranienplatz space was twofold: it was a space where “non-authorized people” could sleep and also a place to build strong social relationships among the Lampedusa group and with the supporters. Kreuzberg's inhabitants made a “feeling of home” possible that influenced the migrant subjects in their decision for Berlin as the “place to live”, although they were not completely legally authorised. Oranienplatz became hence a sort of “haven” (Duyvendak 2011) for some migrant subjects who practised it as a source of “derived domesticity”. In the next chapter we will see how this “derived domesticity” of Oranienplatz developed based on the strong relationships built during the political fights that remained also after the Oranienplatz eviction.

Oranienplatz has been experienced also as transit site, where migrant subjects temporarily settled and from which they moved to other cities looking for a job and came back if necessary. The main square of Kreuzberg turned hence into a crossroad of migrant subjects' trajectories among Europe, an intersection of biographies on the move that temporarily settled and stopped there, finding a place where they could decelerate their movements and re-orient their projects and routes. It was possible to meet other people in the same condition there and share information and social contacts, exactly like in the central train station of Milan. Oranienplatz and Stazione Centrale were two interconnected knots of the European migrant movements' net.
Oranienplatz can be interpreted as a temporal interruption within the migratory experience, where the temporality of the migrant subjects' trajectories decelerated and where a “space of possibility” was opened for a short period of time. Oranienplatz became an *urban interstice* as an outcome of the frictions resulting from the power relations. I apply here the concept of “interstice” following to the urban studies that grasp the “in-between” and blurry space within the city. An *interstice* is a “small space” that inherently signifies a power issue.

«Rather than a mere gap in the urban fabric, the interstice is in fact an active component. From this perspective, interstitial territorialities can only be appreciated by taking into account the dynamics of power and resistance, of fluidity and boundedness, of mobilities and moorings, of smoothness and striatedness that occur in the contemporary city» (Brighenti 2013, pp. 23).

Oranienplatz as an urban interstice highlights the power relations that criss-crossed this place and how the political fight transformed it into a space of right claiming that can be interpreted as struggle for citizenships, since the selective mechanisms of the reduced legal statuses were tackled and contested. According to critical citizenship studies (Isin 2008), the city is the «site of social» insofar as it enables the social formation of citizens as *rights-claimants*; that means also to understand city as a *battleground* of various social groups that come into existence through it. According to Sassen (2012), the city is becoming a strategic *frontier zone* for «those who lack the power, the outsiders»: they can grant *presence* in cities, presence vis-à-vis power. Indeed, the people who dwelled and enacted – or performed – Oranienplatz protest can be considered as the “outsiders” of the national system, which tackled the logic of citizenship as basis for the recognition and access to rights. Through the protest they attempted to open a *juridical* and *political interstice* within the European and national laws. According to Brighenti (2013), the “interstice” is sometimes also a *rupture* and sometimes an opening up enacted by “interstitial subjects” that represent minority populations which often struggle for their right to the city. Oranienplatz can thus be understood as a threefold interstice: urban, juridical and political. Accordingly, interstice must not be understood as a “space in between”, but instead as the “space in the middle”, that refers to a space of struggles (Philippopoulos-Mihalolopoulos 2013). Grasping the etymology of the word “interstice” helps to better understand its meaning. It derives from the Latin word *interstitium* which can be divided into the prefix *inter* and the verb *sistere*. The prefix *inter* means “in”, “within”, “inside”. Thus it does not refers to the meaning of “exclusion” but rather “marginality”, notably something that is “inside”. Grasping further, we observe that it derives from the Akkadian prefix *atru, etru, itru, utru*, that means “additional”, “in excess”, “oversize”,
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“excessive”, “superfluous”. Thus, this word contains also the meaning of something in excess. “Inter” means also “between” and “in-between”. The word stitium derives from the Latin verb sistere (sisto, sistis, stiti), that means “to stay”, “to set”, “to establish”, “building up”, “to found up”, “to appoint”, “to assign”. This reveals an interesting meaning of an action: the agency of someone that is doing something. Thus it is rather an active than a passive verb. Marginal subjects, who are in excess, hence build up, establish a small space in the middle of the law through struggles, namely an interstice.166

Scholars working on urban interstices (Brighenti et al 2013) add an event-oriented theoretical perspective to the structural one: the interstice as a left-over space and also as a composition of interactions and affections among a multiplicity of actors that coexist within a given spatial situation. They add the movements to the understanding of interstice, allowing a shift from the structuralist perspective to the event-oriented. The experiences of the “mobile interrupted citizens”, their hypermobility, and their protest actions at Oranienplatz well fulfil the theoretical understanding of “interstice”.

Several political and juridical issues were at stake in the two years when Berlin could have become an “open city”. First of all, the fact that holders of humanitarian and subsidiary protection obtained in a EU member state – Italy – have no right to settle in another EU member state – Germany – has highlighted the selective mechanisms of European Union through the juridical statuses. Indeed, in the European Union selective mechanisms are implemented through a rights governance, where the elaboration of rights for categories of non-citizen also provides the opportunity and the means for exercising surveillance and control (Morris 2003). Second, the process categorization of “people on the move” implemented by the western bureaucracies – and by the scientific knowledge – has demonstrated signs of criticality, since the protagonists of my research are continuously moving between categories in a non-linear and progressive way: “migrant guest worker” in Libya, “asylum seekers” fleeing a war, temporary “refugees” or holder of international and humanitarian protection, “illegal” persons in the act of crossing the national borders, “tolerated” people in the German territory, “Dublin cases” once the Italian document was discovered. Thus, the international law of Geneva Convention has been tackled together with the gap between it and the several national jurisdictions. Third, the power relations at the local level come to the fore through the protest of the “interrupted citizens”, and the political coalitions wobbled because of these frictions. It also shed light on the problematic issue of

166 The etymologies of the words “interstice” has been grasped through the consultation of the old Greek and Latin etymological dictionary written by the Italian linguist Giovanni Semerano (1994).
city as a legal space and its jurisdiction, i.e. who has the legal and technical authority to do something (Blomley 2013): who should have the legitimacy in authorizing the eviction of Oranienplatz and the school, Berlin or the municipality of Kreuzberg?

Between the autumn of 2012 and the summer of 2014 the city of Berlin became a dynamic battleground where the European asylum and migration policies were put into crisis, affecting also the system of European Union and the relation between the national states within it. Furthermore, the “natural” connection between citizenship-sovereignty-national territory has been tackled. The city being a border space in which several actors negotiate the borders (Lebuhn 2012), allows to understand Oranienplatz as a border place where control and surveillance upon a category of people were deployed. According to Foucault «the strategy of struggles constitutes a frontier for the relationship of power» (1982., p.794), and this frontier materializes itself in a place. Oranienplatz became a border place due to the daily presence of the police within and around the square. During the square occupation there were many daily police controls together with the attempts of eviction, and that led to a sort of militarization of the area in Kreuzberg surrounding Oranienplatz and the squatted school in Ohlauerstraße.

I meet Ingrid that has just come back from the prison where Jawara is incarcerate. “They will let him leave soon – she explains me – we were there with the lawyer and they have no reason to keep him inside!” The evening before the police arrive in Oranienplatz and arrested Jawara without reason. They started to beat him on the street, he was sitting alone on the street in front of the tents camp, and yesterday evening there were not so many people in Oranienplatz. “The other guys living in Oranienplatz tent camp came outside when they understood that something was wrong. But it was too late, the police had already put Jawara into the van very quickly. But the good thing is that there is someone who has filmed the situation, so we have proofs that Jawara was beaten by the police without reason!” (Participant observation in Berlin, March 2014)

The experience of Jawara was just one of the many events when the police randomly controlled and incarcerated several migrant subjects, keeping thus a very high level of tension in that neighbourhood. The control of the “interrupted citizens” occurred in the whole territory of Kreuzberg, with a particular attention of the places where people usually meet and live such as the squatted school, Görlizer Park and Kottbusser Tor.

The squatted school, which was the “right arm” of the Oranienplatz protest, was the second place where the strengthened bordering practices came to the fore. Also the squatted school assumed a twofold function: as “home” and as a place of rights claiming. This was highlighted in the previous chapter through the story of the roof protest during the attempt to evict the school in summer 2014.
Figure 14: Flyer to support roof protest - From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin

Bis 19. März sollen die Bewohner_innen die Schule in der Ohlauer Straße verlassen...sonst wird geräumt!!!
(Bezirk Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg)

Figure 15: Flyer to support roof protest - From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
The following ethnographic note shows the school's atmosphere and its ambivalence:

I have the appointment with Nadhim at 16:30 outside the main entrance of the former squatted school. When I arrive it is dark and cold. Nadhim comes ten minutes late, he shows me the rucksack on his back, and he tells me that he wants to leave it in his room inside the school and he asks me if I want to go with him inside. While we are walking on the driveway, perhaps to reassure myself, he puts an arm around my shoulders and says: “je vais te protéger” [I will protect you], and tells me not to worry. The entrance area of the former school is bare: the space where the building is located is surrounded by a fence of metal mounted on a brick base, and to get from the entrance to the school building itself one must continue along a path that leads into the inner courtyard. Passing through the main entrance, there is the beginning of the driveway and on the right there is a low building. It is a brick structure, with painted walls, covered with graffiti. It has two large windows that are a little dirty. Looking inside one can see the big rooms that seem to be used as places where people do the political assemblies: there are many tables and a few sheets of paper spread on the ground. On the left behind the metal fence there is the garden area with a playground for children. We go into an inner court in the middle of the courtyard, where there are two large trees around which somebody has built wooden chairs. The green areas around the base of the trees are now only mud. The courtyard is paved and there are plastic sheets, cardboard, and other materials left on the ground or close to the walls of the school or the trees. Passing through the two large trees we arrive in front of the facade of the former school. It is a very large building, with 3 floors. It has two entrances, one to the left and one to the right. The entrance of the left seems to be permanently closed and above the door a spray pink writing evokes the struggle of refugees; the entry of the right is the one usually used. After passing a first iron door we go up 4 or 5 steps, we pass another glass door and we arrive in a hallway: in front there is a staircase that goes up and then turns left, and on the right a corridor extends longitudinally. On the left there are tables with information materials about the refugees' fight and some boxes. I follow Nadhim in the direction of his room, I see many bicycles leaned at the wall, and many closed doors. Nadhim opens one of these doors and we enter his room. The room is very big, on the right along the wall there are 6 or 7 mattresses with blankets and sheets; in the middle of the room there is a table with three chairs and two people sit and look at their phones. On the ground there are a lot of things: objects, clothes, everything is very chaotic and Nadhim says: “It is not so clean here”. One of the two men stands up and offers me a chair, the other one keeps looking on his phone. Nadhim throws his rucksack on the mattress and takes out some letters that he received from the German foreigner office. I came to translate them. “Ok – says Nadhim – let's go outside”. We go back to the hallway where we see Uchi who is making a phone call. He smiles at me, surprised to see me there, and he tells me “so, we meet in O-platz this evening, right?”. I nod. We greet Uchi and we go out from the school. (Participant observation with Nadhim in Berlin, December 2013)

Like Oranienplatz, the squatted school became a symbol of the refugees protest and a mirror of the internal tensions and contradiction within the Berlin governing coalition. The Berlin senate responded to the situation, notably through the senator of interior Frank Henkel, by police force aiming at evicting the former school. In chapter four I highlighted the “border spectacle” that took place in June 2014. The police surrounded the school’s block with the aim to evict it and the Kreuzberg's inhabitants in turn surrounded the police blockade supporting the migrant subjects inside the squatted school. The fact that the squatted school and its
“inhabitants” have been caught in the spotlight of the media every day entailed the intensification of the political tensions around that place. Rashid narrates his perception of the school in that time, when he was living inside:

«Is Ghetto!! the school is ghetto! Nobody can go inside, nobody can go outside. We were 300 people, up and down. You know, in that school, every day you have problem, problem. Police come inside the school every day, and always problem, and problem! And sometime they send us back here to Italy. If you go there now, you don't find so much people, because a lot of them are gone to asylum camps, in Germany, because they have applied for asylum in Germany. [...] In Berlin, police control everywhere! In the street, in the bus, everywhere! And if you don't have tickets … problems! Even in the school police came and they block them, block people that didn't have the ticket. Because you have the right to go without ticket one time, two time, three time, but if you don't pay your penalty, then they lock you! They catch you! You go to prison.» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

Thus, a population that usually is invisible to the institutional eyes became suddenly hyper-visible and hence, because of their blurry juridical nature, was put daily under surveillance. According to anthropological research, the non-authorised migrations are rather invisible and exactly the “border spectacle” makes them visible (Coutin 2005; Gatta 2012a). Despite the process of progressive invisibilization, that the local authorities implemented to mask the “integration” process of these “interrupted citizens”, they were suddenly again emerging from the shadow in these contested places where bordering practices were strongly deployed. Nadhim's narration sheds light on how this process occurred in their everyday life:

I met Nadhim at 8:00 am in front of the occupied school. We have to go to a politic collective in Kreuzberg where people can document the lesions and wounds on Nadhim's body. The night before the police broke into the school and they have beaten several migrant people; some of them have even been put in prison, like Nadhim. “It was around 22 pm, when the police suddenly came into the school – explains me Nadhim – they asked us to show the documents and they didn't give us the time even to show them, then they started to beat and hit us! It was crazy, they just started like this! I have so much pain in my back and chest! Here.” and he shows me the point that hurts. “They have beaten me on the back so I fell down and when I was on the floor they kept hitting on me … they were six police men. They threw me on the ground and then they handcuffed me. Then they rose me and one of them threw a punch on my stomach. After that they brought me to prison!” (Participant observation with Nadhim in Berlin, December 2013)

Quickly the former school became a place where migrant subjects with blurred legal statuses were more in danger to be controlled and arrested than in other places. Some migrant subjects who went up to the roof and protested there for all the days during the police blockade have been arrested and remained in prison for several weeks, some also for several months. Moreover, some people have been deported to Italy and other few even to their origin country, despite the Italian document. Nevertheless, being one of the centers of the refugees protest,
the strong network of supporters kept its presence inside the school as well as outside when the police wanted to evict it. Supporters were constantly in contact with the people living inside. To the contrary, Görlitzer park, the main park in Kreuzberg being another border place in the neighbourhood, did not receive such a strong support\textsuperscript{167}.

This public park placed close to the squatted school and Oranienplatz has been dwelled during day and night by several migrant subjects both belonging or not to the refugees protests. Görlitzer Park is also a place of some hashish and Marijuana dealing. One main promise of the CDU before the elections, notably of Frank Henkel, was to find a solution for the urban and social decay occurring in Görlizer park, even though there were very sporadic complaints by the inhabitants living close to the park. It became a symbol of Henkel's politics, that aimed to bring back a “urban decorum” to the City of Berlin. The main “dangerous” population were the drug dealers, equated with African migrant subjects hanging out in the Kreuzberg's park, and they became the target of Frank Henkel's local policy. The later protest of unauthorised migrant subjects in Oranienplatz further entailed a blurred image of a general “black African migrant”, evoking above all the “illegality” of his presence. Thus, the “population of Görlizer park” and that of “Oranienplatz” were considered as and treated as a single “dangerous population” by the institutional and police operation together with the culture of suspicion built by the local media. This led to the implementation of an exceptional regulation for this public area, which became juridically and spatially a border place.

I am cycling with Giulia in the direction of Kreuzberg. It is around 20:00 pm, and we are late. We arrive close to the park and we enter it. We are surprise that we do not see nobody at the end of that entrance walkway, that is usually dwelled by several African people. We move further and we cross the park. It is very dark and quiet, but at the opposite side at the park's way out we see a lot of police men. Strong lights start pointing at us, making difficult to see. We slow down, and we stop at the exit gate's threshold. There are around 10 African guys in line close to the wall of the Park and many police men that control their documents and are checking their cloths. Just outside the exit gate there are four big police vans, with some African people inside and some German people discussing with the police in order to let them free. “They have no document”, says one police man. I am close to one police car and I try to speak with one African guy sitting in the van. I ask him whether he has a document, and he says that he has an Italian one. We start to speak Italian and then two police men place themselves between me and the police van and tell me: “you cannot speak with this person”. I tell them that he has an Italian document, thus they are not allowed to arrest him because of no document. They reply that this is not my concern, thus I should move away from there. We remain there some minutes, and from time to time the police bring a person with handcuffs inside the police vans. We notice that many other police vans are coming, and we understand that we cannot do anything in that moment, so we decide to get back on our bikes. (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2015)

\textsuperscript{167} But also several solidarity initiatives were organized, such as a bar close to the park run by some Germans together with some migrant subjects that were staying in the park every day.
Since the beginning of April 2015, the Interior senator of CDU, Frank Henkel, has declared the «Null-toleranz-zone» (zero tolerance zone) in Görlitzerpark, the main park of Kreuzberg. The local law that in Berlin allows to hold 15 gram of hashish or Marijuana for personal use was suspended in the area of the park, and the police started to daily monitor and control the park, and this allowed to arrest people who have smallest amounts of drugs with them. Thus, the senator Henkel turned the park into a Sonderzone – a zone of exception – where the regional law of Berlin is suspended, giving more power to the police rules. The regulation has been strongly criticized not just by the left wing parties such as Grüne, Linke, Piraten and Hanfverband, but also by the police trade union and by the association of lawyers of Berlin. According to the head of Kreuzberg's municipality, Monika Hermann (Green party), this regulation is applied just to increase the tension within “that leftist protesting neighbourhood”, while in reality being the zero tolerance politic a de facto flop\(^\text{168}\).

Furthermore, the creation of the exceptional zone allowed to pursue a second and hidden aim: to install a regulation that allows more control and arrest migrant subjects with a blurred legal condition. Indeed, the associations and groups of activists strongly criticized the racial profiling mechanisms applied by the police, since no “white person” was controlled, but only the African people. «Our findings are these ones: in the Görlitzer Park 95 to 98 percent of drug dealers are black Africans»\(^\text{169}\) declared the head of police, Stefan Weis, in these days in order to justify the accusation of racial profiling by the police in the park. The “population of Görlitzer Park” was very heterogeneous, sometimes people selling drugs were arrested and other times people holding a humanitarian or subsidiary protection. The following ethnographic note highlights the complex heterogeneity that characterized the situation in Görlitzer Park, where people from the Oranienplatz protest mixed with other groups but were classified in one category, i.e. the “dangerous black Africans” of the park.

\[\text{168} \text{From the article of the local newspaper Taz, “Null Toleranz im Görlitzer Park” (Zero tolerance in Görlitzer Park), 16.03.2015}\]

\[\text{169} \text{From the article of the local newspaper Taz, “Kein Recht auf Rausch” (No right to intoxication), 23.04.2015.}\]
The production of the park as a «zero tolerance zone» has increased the level of tensions within the neighbourhood, and several inhabitants of Kreuzberg have expressed their discontent to have police in their park that has transformed it into a permanent zone of surveillance. Moreover, the residents of Kreuzberg have noticed that the police operations have pushed the drug dealing into the streets adjacent to the park, thus not “solving” the problem but only shifting it to other places. Furthermore, fights between the police and the migrant subjects usually dwelling the park have increase, with police sometimes randomly arresting migrant people. Occasionally people got hurt. The police did two raids per day on average; the first week of the zero tolerance regulation, 183 persons were checked by the police, 18 people were arrested and 67 penal charges were issued. Four months after the state of exception was declared in the park, the situation has not changed significantly although the City of Berlin invested a large amount of money for the massive deployment of police force in Görlitzer Park. The example of Görlitzer Park as border space within the city sheds light on what Blomerly (2013) considers a “police/rights collision” that usually takes place in public spaces dwelled by marginal people. Moreover, the scholar sheds light on the park as one example of a public space that becomes a “political space” once a certain system of control and surveillance is deployed with police power put above the local and national laws. The park as a political space refers to a place in which political identities are constantly in formation. It is a space of democracy and the regulation of which is the marker of citizenship. Indeed, some protagonists of my research that usually dwell the park turned into “illegal dangerous” persons. Their valid Italian humanitarian protection was obscured by their presence in the park. Thus, the identity linked to the legal status became weaker in this space because the identity linked to being “black Africans in Görli” gained dominance. They were thus equally treated as criminals. Some of them have been arrested and deported to Italy or even to their origin country, highlighting how the production of border places allows to implement more restrictive measures.

170 From the article of the local newspaper Berliner Morgenpost, “Polizei-Gewerkschaft gegen Null-Toleranz-Zone im ’Görli’” (Police trade union against the zero tolerance zone in Görli), 28.04.2015.
171 Information taken from the online local newspaper Taz.de, article “Schuss im Görli” (shot in Görlizerpark), 30.07.2015.
172 Information taken from the online local newspaper Berliner Zeitung, article “Im Görlitzer Park wird weiter gedealt” (In Görlitzer Park they continue dealing), 09.04.2015.
173 Information taken from the online radio and television website rbb (Rundfunk Berlin-Brandenburg), article “Grüne kritisieren hohen Polizeiaufwand am ’Görli’” (the Green party criticizes the high police costs in Görli), 17.08.2015.
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5.3. Urban and juridical interstices

In this chapter the biographies of my research protagonists shed light on the internal borders of the European Union, their selective and filtering mechanisms, and how and where they emerge. The focus on the mobility enacted by the migrant subjects with Italian protection criss-crossing the European space has allowed to grasp the functioning of EU internal borders. A space of negotiating practices emerges, where several actors are involved in the redefinition of borders. I here focussed on the tensions between the attempt to control and manage the migrant mobilities implemented by the European border regime and the drive for an autonomous life – and freedom of movement – enacted by the migrant subjects. These tensions between structural constrains and agency of migrant subjects produce frictions, that entailed the creation of juridical and territorial interstices. The concept of “interstice” is here deployed to shed light on the active action of “subjects in excess” that manage to move within social and juridical constrains, sometimes remaining caught in the bureaucratic meshes, and other times opening “spaces in the middle” through several struggles. These are not just political struggles, as that of Oranienplatz, but also the everyday practices within the European cities, such as in Milan, and the practices of crossing-border mobility.

The interstices are marks of a European geography where the sovereignty is fragmented at several levels: international, European, national, regional and urban laws intersect each other creating a multiplicity of jurisdictions in one space and upon a single category of people. This lead to several juridical – and political – contradictions, which influence the migrant subjects' lives. The ambiguity and blurry nature of the temporary legal statuses that my research protagonists hold is one example of these contradictions. The production of “border places” within the national territories is another consequence of the fragmented sovereignty that uses citizenship as a tool of sorting and ranking the people. Border places are marked by an implementation of strong control and surveillance within them upon a “dangerous category” of people. Nevertheless, these places are performed and practiced by the migrant subjects as sites of temporary dwelling. Thus, they are also social places where they meet people and share information and relations, turning them hence into transit sites.

In the concept of “transit site” I chose the word “site” instead of place to distinguish it from the latter, referring indeed to the deeper meaning of the Latin word si-tu, from root *tkei-, i.e. “to settle, dwell, be home”. The meaning of “dwelling” and “being at home” better
characterize the transit sites crossed by my research protagonists. Moreover, the Latin word *situs* includes also a meaning of “connect,” “bond”, referring to a place with which people are tied. To the contrary, when speaking of “border places” I want to shed light on the bordering process that occurs *through* these places.

The bordering process has been highlighted through the biographies of my research protagonists that shed light on how the national state's borders manifest themselves within the national territory and how they are implemented by legal and administrative instruments in a fragmentary way, and hence scattered over the whole national space. This reflects the fragmented sovereignty that constructs Europe as a “borderland” in which the internal borders are activated through the reduced legal statuses and take shape in *border places* within the national territories and the cities. The internal borders can be materialized in the form of different legal statuses – more or less reduced –, detention prisons, reception camps of asylum seekers, mobility restrictions, arbitrary controls by the police within the city, train stations, airports or bus stations, and also in the form of arbitrary behaviour of public authorities. These borders are not visible in just one place, but *mobile*: the migrant subjects embody the borders both through their legal status or through their socially constructed figure. They carry them with them and activate them through their movements. The legal status, which binds the migrant subjects through the administrative procedure to certain places, leads to regular forced movements between the places of bureaucratic offices and those where the people decided to live – in this case Berlin. Nevertheless, the migrant subjects work out strategies and tactics to live within and beyond the structural constraints they face, opening juridical and territorial *interstices* where they can find space of autonomy and a possibility to build their future.

A fragmentation of places emerges where the place of work, that of residence, and the place where the bureaucratic procedures take place are scattered in different cities across Europe. The protagonists of my research move from one place to another, sometimes easily crossing the borders and sometimes remaining trapped in the borders’ net. The hypermobility that criss-crosses the national borders is both forced by the socio-economic conditions and by the normative constraints, and also a result of autonomous decisions of the subjects. The fragmented movements make visible the internal borders, their nature, and the way through which they act: a *blurred* and *arbitrary* border emerges, that is individually activated by subjects treated as “suspects”.

Indeed, the borders of national states exist also within the national territories but are latent and are activated by certain categories of people and through certain actions. Moreover, they
manifest themselves through different effects: sometimes the borders are directly linked to the legal statuses and the residence permit, in other cases they are linked to the socio-economic conditions which these precarious legal statuses produce, as for example the homelessness. Borders emerge also through the housing situation: the fact that migrant subjects use all the energy for the basic survival actions entails that they have no autonomous time and are consequently caught in a *time threshold* of turning around. The waiting time of the administrative procedures also leads to a time suspension that makes people being stuck in transit, and the resulting temporal limbo emerges as a strong border for the realizations of their future projects.

The “bureaucratic space” allows to well grasp the arbitrary and blurred nature of these internal borders activated by my research protagonists. The high level of discretionary power implemented by the local bureaucracies and the consequently random and individual way through which the borders are activated entail an increase in uncertainty and the perception of precariousness, which leads to a perceived omnipresence of borders in the everyday lives of the migrant subjects. Nevertheless, they keep moving within the national territory, across different EU countries, enacting circular and fragmented movements back and forth. This crossing-borders hypermobility is not just territorial but also juridical, the migrant subjects move between different juridical categories as the examples of my research protagonists showed. These *movements between categories* enacted by *categories on the move* within Europe entail the people to be subjected to different local bureaucracies and different kinds of laws – administrative, European or international laws – from different countries and at different levels – local, regional and national. This complex and contradictory legal net sometimes traps migrant subjects, but in other cases allows them to insert themselves into the interstices created by the holes of the bureaucratic mesh. “Mobile interrupted citizens” emerge as a category of people who had started a process of being officially recognized by the national state system – i.e. through a legal status –, but their “integration” route was interrupted. The use of the term “citizens”, although they are rather non-citizens, is here applied to underline how citizenship is not just a top-down tool implemented by the bureaucracies, but also a social practice from below enacted by people which are not officially allowed to reside in the national territory. The «act of citizenship» (Isin and Nielsen 2008) highlights exactly the practices of becoming claim-making subjects. Accordingly I apply this concept being aware of the very reduced access to the rights that my research protagonists have. I add the adjective “interrupted” to first shed light on the fragmentation of the migratory experience and thus of the everyday experience of migrant subjects within Europe, and
second to underline the *incomplete* and *temporary* nature of their reduced legal statuses. I add the adjective “mobile” to highlight the hypermobility of my research protagonists that is linked also to a precariousness of their living condition and a temporariness of their settlements.

The *errant nature* of people with a blurred legal status contributes to the definition of “suspected persons” in the eyes of the local bureaucracies that still look at the society through sedentary lenses. Moreover, literature on transit migration has already highlighted how the link between “transit”, “circular mobility” and “illegality” developed within the cultural logic of western bureaucracies dealing with migration and asylum issues. The “suspicious culture” influences the bureaucratic practices and contributes to blur the juridical nature of these people on the move.

The regime of im-mobility in Europe and its contradictions and ambiguities take shape also in urban spaces within the national territories. The production of places whose nature is ambivalent – *border places* and *transit sites* – reflects exactly these contradictions and tensions that criss-cross the battleground of migration and asylum in Europe. Train stations, airports, squatted houses or schools, former railway yards and occupied squares are territories where a multiplicity of social places occur, being practised by errant migrant subjects with a blurred legal condition. The nature of these places reflects, indeed, the contested nature of my research protagonists mobility between and beyond territories and juridical categories. Sometimes they emerge as invisible places, highlighting thus the abandonment and control policies of western institutions, in other cases they emerge as border places where control is strongly deployed, following also the contested power relations of that particular city or region. The invisibility and (hyper)visibility of these places is linked to the institutional policies of invisibilization, but also to the social practices enacted by the migrant subjects that are dwelling these *transits*, which are spatial, temporal and juridical. Moreover, the characteristics of visibility or invisibility must not be seen as fixed and definitive, but rather as two extremes of a continuum in which different grades of visibility and invisibility are experienced by the subjects.

The turbulent trajectories of these “errant interrupted citizens” move between and beyond – and crash against – the internal borders of the European Union. The internal borders take sometimes shape in the legal statuses and the selective rights mechanisms, and other times in border places where the control and surveillance is deployed also through racial profiling mechanisms. Nevertheless, these border places are also performed by the transitory dwellers as sources for their movements. They are knots and crossroads through which they transit
many times, and where they temporary dwell, decelerating hence their migratory experiences and reorienting their life projects. A multiplicity of places and territories emerges, that overlap with each other, produced by the frictions between the movements of migrant subjects and the bordering processes that attempt to filter them.

In the next chapter I will shed light on how these fragmented experiences between and beyond the borders entail also the wider existential dimension of the migrant subjects, highlighting the process of production of subjectivities.
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In this chapter I focus on the concept of subjectivity as the basis for subjects' agency (Ortner 2005; Butler 1997). This allows to grasp the effect of the power relations and the practices of self formation enacted by subjects within the structural constrains in which they move. According to several scholars, subjectivity has to be understood both as cultural formations and the inner states of acting subjects. Therefore, I first stress the understanding of subjectivity as “complex structures of feeling”, namely as the ensemble of modes of perception, affect, thought, desire, fear, and so forth, which animate acting subjects (Ortner 2005). A particular attention is given to the perception of future by migrant subjects to shed light on agency as a temporal phenomenon. Second, I focus on the everyday life practices enacted by the migrant subjects in the cities of Milan, Berlin, and in the movements back and forth between Germany and Italy. Practices of space and time re-appropriation and survival tactics (de Certeau 1984) emerge, both stressed as political because they highlight the effects of the power relations and hierarchies on the subjects' lives. Here I apply an understanding of subjectivity in relation to forms of power that affect the everyday life through experience of space and time. Through this chapter I underline how the protagonist of my research build their subjectivities en route through the experience of a lengthened transit that involves the subjective spatial and temporal dimension.
6.1 “I feel, therefore I act”

This paragraph focusses on the understanding of subjectivity as “complex structures of feeling” (Ortner 2005), stressing the aspirations, desires, fears, projects, and perception of future that have oriented the actions of the protagonists of my research. Following the literature on trajectories (Papastergiadis 2000; Schapendonk 2012) and the anthropological and sociological studies on subjectivity (Ortner 2005; Luhrmann 2006; Biehl, Good, and Kleinman 2007; Ong et al. 1996), I here consider these feelings and emotions as one of the main components that orient the trajectories of migrant subjects (de Haas 2010) rather than stressing the intimate and private dimension of subjects through an individualistic perspective. The focus on these “complex structures of feeling”, including aspirations and perception of the future, highlights how the agency is a temporal phenomenon (Griffiths, Rogers, and Anderson, 2013; Anderson, R. 2014), and thus how migration is a process of becoming, in which the route assumes a crucial role in the definition of subjectivities (Coutin 2005). Thus, the experiences of my research protagonists as migrant subjects, that are repeatedly en route between and beyond the borders, involve also an existential dimension due to the internalization process that occur during the route. It is possible to understand through their narrations how their inner lives have been influenced by the structural conditions and constrains they have encountered, and how they build their subjectivity through this tension. Indeed, this process of becoming is the result of the tension between the structural and legal constraints and the attempts of the migrant subjects to act autonomously.

Subjectivity allows to grasp the subjection practices deployed by power relations and the process of self-creation within these power relations. The combination produces the “subject”. Drawing the theory of subjectivity means to shed light on the effect of the power upon the individuals as well as how the subjectivity resists to such power and develops and transforms itself within the social, cultural and political constraints. According to Judith Butler (1997) the word “subject” refers exactly to both the process of submission to the power and the active process of becoming subject. The power relations hence shed light on the subjection forms and the “conditions of possibility” of the subjects. The power forms can be elaborated by the subjects that react through social practices intervening hence on the social reality.

The feelings and desires of the subjects are considered together with the social and resistance practices as one base of the subjective agency that drives people towards one direction or
another. According to Ortner (2005) subjectivity allows to grasp the relationship – and tension – between the power and the subject:

«I see subjectivity as the basis of ‘agency’, a necessary part of understanding how people (try to) act on the world even as they are acted upon. Agency is not some natural or originary will; it takes shape as specific desires and intentions within a matrix of subjectivity – of (culturally constituted) feelings, thoughts, and meanings.» (Ortner 2005; p. 34)

The understanding of the relation between the structural condition experienced by the subjects and the ways through which they shape cognitive structures and emotional states is stressed here. «An ensemble of modes of perception, affect, thought, desire, fear, and so forth that animate acting subjects» (Ortner 2005, p.31) is here treated as base of subjects' agency. The focus on emotions and feelings is in the social science studies hence linked to the cultural and historical structures. The subjectivity can imply the emotional experience of a political subject caught up in a world of violence, state authority and pain (Biehl, Good, and Kleinman 2007). The reference to the shared inner life of the subject, to the way subjects feel, respond and experience the world (Luhrmann 2006) sheds light on the knotty problem stressed by the subjectivity, namely the issue of “domination” and “freedom”, the tension between the subjection of the subject and the subject’s agency. According to Ortner (2005), research on subjectivity explores how the condition of subjection is subjectively constructed and experienced as well as how subjects find creative ways that allow to overcome such condition.

In the previous chapter I showed how the geographical and juridical hypermobility of my research protagonists emerged as a consequence of both forced movements produced by the social and juridical constraints and the autonomous decisions taken by migrant subjects that creatively act and move within the constraints. Since the subjectivity issue is associated with human nature, social control, agency, and culture (Biehl, Good, and Kleinman 2007), I here apply it to grasp the experiences of my research protagonists. I will first focus on the feelings and emotions that my research protagonists externalized during the ethnographic research. This will shed light on the subjective dimension as a basis through which the migrant subjects act and orient their biographies. Second, I will highlight the process of awareness building that my research protagonists experienced, which lets them realize their existential transit condition. The awareness of being subjectivities en transit is crucial for understanding my research protagonists' experiences through the concept of subjectivity. Indeed, anthropological works highlight this point:
“Yet subjectivity is not just the outcome of social control or the unconscious; it also provides the ground for subjects to think through their circumstances and to feel through their contradictions, and in so doing, to inwardly endure experiences that would otherwise be outwardly unbearable.” (Biehl, Good, and Kleinman 2007; p. 14)

Building awareness en route is a process of becoming, which sheds light on the temporal dimension of the agency and subjectivity. Viewing subjectivity as temporal (Griffiths, Rogers, and Anderson 2013) and agency as a temporally embedded process, informed by the past and orientated to the future (Emirbayer and Mische 1998), allows to consider the protagonists of my research as social actors. This also overcomes the risk of turning them into rational choice actors or passive victims within my research.

The work about agency’s theory of Emirbayer and Mische (1998) sheds light on the importance of intersubjectivity, social interaction, and communication as critical components of agentic processes:

«Agency is always a dialogical process by and through which actors immersed in temporal passage engage with others with collectively organized context of action.» (Emirbayer and Mische 1998, p.973-975)

They analytically divide human agency into three constitutive elements: iteration (through habit), projectivity (through imagination), and practical evaluation (through judgement). This division corresponds to the diverse temporal orientations of agency, and allows us to examine forms of action that are oriented towards either the past, the present or the future. In the following paragraph, I will expose several emotions and feelings narrated by my research protagonists, looking at the «subtle play of indigenous trajectories of desire and fear with global flows of people and things» (Appadurai 1996, p. 29) with particular focus on the importance of the future dimension.

Anthropological and sociological studies (Clough et all 2007) have given rise to the so-called “affective turn”: they address the focus on emotions and feelings to the issue of agency, drawing their works on the theory of the philosopher Baruch Spinoza. The relationship between the body and the mind is central, considering the affects as the element that straddles this relationship because it indicates the current state of both the mind and the body. Furthermore, Spinoza proposes a correspondence between the “power to act” and the “power to be affected”, that sheds light on the similarly knotty problem inherent in the issue of subjectivity. Thus, the potential of affect studies lies in the body's capacity to affect and be affected. How the body shifts its affection into action emerges as one of the central issues (Anwaruddin 2015). A contested debate has developed around the question if there is a
difference or not between affects and emotions. I will here use the term “affect” in a generic sense to encompass affect, emotion, feeling, desires and impulses, following the scholars that defend the inseparable-ness of affect and emotion. For example, Sarah Ahmed (2004) offers a model of sociality of emotion in order to overcome the dichotomy between the psychological and social approaches. Accordingly, emotions do not move from inside out – the psychodynamic approach – or from outside in – the social constructionist approach –, it is rather the object of emotions that moves and circulates. She claims to focus not on “what emotions are”, but rather on “what emotions do”, notably on how emotions operate to “make and shape” bodies as forms of action, which also involves orientation towards others. Moreover, Sarah Ahmed sheds light on the fact that emotions are relational: they involve (re)actions or relations of “towardness” or “awayness” in relation to such objects. Emotions are after all moving, even if they do not simply move between people. Sarah Ahmed provides an interesting etymological reference for the word “emotion”: the word comes from Latin emovere, i.e. “to move on, to move out”. Moreover, she underlines how emotions are not just about movements, but also about attachments or about what connects us to this or that.

«What moves us, what makes us feel, is also that which holds in place, or gives us a dwelling place. Hence movement does not cut the body off from the “where” of its inhabitance, but connects bodies to other bodies: attachment takes place through movement, through being moved by the proximity of others.» (Sarah Ahmed 2004, p. 11)

According to those scholars of the “affective turn”, emotions and feelings are part of the agency and hence contribute to the self-construction of subjects in relation to power relations and the structural constraints they encounter in their everyday life. Referring to Ortner (2005) I understand subjectivity in its relation to forms of power that saturate the everyday life through experiences of time, space, and work. Thus, I grasped the feelings and emotions of my research protagonists in their everyday life, highlighting hence how they entail the constitution of subjective agency that orient their biographies.

Moving on: desires, fears, frustration, anger, aspirations and perception of future

According to the trajectories literature (Papastergiadis 2000; Schapendonk 2012) and the critical approach to transit migration studies (Collyer, Düvell, and de Haas 2012), there are three main components of journeying, and the “motivations” are one of these. The motivation to move can also be defined as “aspiration” (Van Meerten, Engbersen and Van San 2009; de Haas 2010). Aspiration differs analytically from migrants’ intentions because the former is not
directly linked to feasible plans and may include *dreams, wishes, and future perspectives*. There is a number of words used for the projective capability of human beings: goals, plans and objectives, but also desires, wishes, dreams, anxiety, hope, fear, and aspirations. The projective dimension of agency – oriented towards the future – is neither radically voluntary nor narrowly instrumentalist; the formation of projects is an interactive and culturally embedded process by which social actors negotiate their paths towards the future, receiving their driving impetus from the conflicts and challenges of social life (Emirbayer and Mische 1998).

It is important to underline that also projects, motivations and aspirations are *on the move*, they change and develop during the migratory route rather than being already clearly structured and definitively decided before the departure.

According to anthropological literature on migration experiences in Europe the narration of the experiences and feelings is a process of building subjectivity enacted by the marginal people whose voices are made silence or are not listened (Gatta 2011). The issue of the voice also brings that of subjectivity to the fore, because both involve historical processes of self-construction through an ensemble of positions within the social and power structure to which the subject is subjected (Pinelli 2011). I will here present the narrations of experiences, feeling and emotions that my research protagonists have shared with me during the ethnography.

The first desires and aspirations that my research protagonists have externalized were related to the basic survival needs such as finding a job and building their home. The following narrations of Dakari, Radu and Kalule shed light on the centrality of work perceived by the migrant subjects with humanitarian and subsidiary protections obtained in Italy:

«Making this work in Malpensa airport, carrying the bags, was not bad. You know, at that time I didn’t feel ashamed, because that is a work, and I needed the money to buy myself things to eat. Usually for this work I got 2 or 3 Euros per client, and in a day the maximum that I reached was 30 Euros. […] Of course it is not easy, but it's work! So I can save some money and I could call you and friends, and say that I was at the airport.» (Interview with Kalule in Berlin, November 2014)

I ask to Dakari whether he would like to live in a big city or in a small one, and he replies that he doesn't care about the size of the city, everything is good, the only central thing is the work. “If there is work, everything is good!” he exclaims. (Shadowing with Dakari in Milan, February 2014)

Radu seems worried and nervous. “I am worried for the work, Elena”, he tells me, “I know that give my curriculum here is for nothing: no one will call me. But I have nothing else to do, so I will move on to bring my curriculum”. (Shadowing with Radu in Milan,
February 2014)

The concrete desire to find a work is the *conditio sine qua non* to become an autonomous subjects, notably not depending any longer on the welfare system of the reception society and starting to build a life. A further desire, linked to that of work, is to have a “home”, a place where migrant subjects can *feel at home*, as Radu and Dakari explain us:

«Look, I am African, from Mali. And I am now living with 15 different people, with a very different attitude from me. There is the Arab, there is the African, there is the Albanian … all of them are different, ten, fifteen people all together in a room, this is not a home! Me, now … I cannot desire a home, I cannot!! First, I have to find a job, and if I find a job then maybe I can desire a house and take it. And after that, I can say: “this is home!”». (Interview with Radu in Milan, April 2014)

«The day will come when I will feel at home. It will come! I know it … I hope it, that one day will come. Now … there isn't. Maybe just Naga lets me feel sometimes at home … but sometimes.» (Interview with Dakari in Milan, January 2014)

The words of Dakari highlight another crucial element, i.e. the desires and hope – in this case to feel at home – oriented towards the future. Indeed, the deep aspirations which are *stormily moving inside* migrant subjects and that *move* them *on* are linked to the future perspectives and perceptions. According to several scholars (Griffiths, Rogers, and Anderson 2013) migration could be considered as a “tactic of creating futures” (Cole 2010), and the agency a temporal phenomenon informed by the past and orientated to the future (Emirbayer and Mische 1998). The following narrations of Dakari and Masud well explain how the orientation to the past and to the future is experienced by migrant subjects that feel themselves still en route and not yet settled:

We sit in the tram 9 in direction of the soup kitchen in *piazza Tricolore*. Dakari is explaining me how he feels in these days where everything seems to be difficult. “You know – he tells me – we say something in Africa: it is better not to think of the past, otherwise you will be angry. So you have only to look at the future, so you will have hope and you are peaceful and kind. But if you think of the past, then it is a problem, because you become angry and then sad”. (Shadowing with Dakari in Milan, February 2014)

«If I think back it makes me sick [he places his hand on the stomach and he bends on himself] I have to look forward now, and I still wish that something changes, but I don't know how I could change my situation if the system does not change.» (Interview with Masud in Berlin, January 2015)

Having a future perspective, albeit vague and blurry, means having a “condition of possibility” that allows the subject to act and move on, looking for a better life condition. In
the previous chapters the narrations of Dakari and Radu about the people hanging out in the central train station in Milan well shed light on this subjective perception about the future: «I do not like Stazione Centrale! It is hell. There are people who have stopped looking, and given in to alcohol and depression. I’m afraid I might end up like them, because they are brothers like me!» 174. The sentence “people who have stopped looking” well underlines the future dimension as a possibility for the subjective agency.

«I look for my life, this is my home! I want to live well … the dormitory … you know it! It is not good! It is very bad, very bad! Is not a place that I feel mine! Is not a home. When I arrived here, I saw that my life would have been changed. The first time in Lampedusa when we were in the queue for eating, I understood that in my future I should have done many queues. And the queue is bad! I told to many friends “this queue is our future!”: In fact, we are still queuing. […] I was not happy when I saw that my future will become like this.» (Interview with Dakari in Milan, January 2014)

The awareness about their difficult condition as unwanted foreigners in the European societies, well represented by the lengthened waiting time in the queues, does not block the possibility to imagine a better future, as Obasi tells us:

«I am young, you know! I can do everything in my future! I am young and I can … I must do everything in my life!» (Interview with Obasi in Berlin, November 2014)

But some times the motivation to move on and the hope for a better future slows down, due to the lengthening transit condition that the migrant subjects experienced during the years after their first landing in Europe. Some people of the Lampedusa in Berlin group, for example, experience a long condition as “unwanted” subjects, first indirectly rejected by the Italian society and then directly rejected by the German state agencies through the failure of the Oranienplatz agreement. Thus, as Amal externalizes, the imagination of a positive future sometimes turns into a negative perception:

I am sitting with Amal in the bingo and we are watching the football match of Champions League. Amal tells me his feeling: “you know, I am moving on with this training course in Berlin, but I am not so happy …” he looks down and murmurs: “I am not happy because I don't see a positive future for me. There are many people in this training course, and I don't know if I will have possibilities. I see a negative future for me, and that makes me sad”. (Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, May 2015)

Nevertheless, a strong awareness about his own condition helps Amal to find the way to move on, despite the negative emotions he felt during his migratory experience:

«My future? I have the experience in order to do a lot of things, but I don't have the right

174 Interview with Radu in Milan, April 2014.
to do it. They don't give me the possibility. The law doesn't let me do things, because I
don't have a German document, thus it is difficult. That one-year Italian document doesn't
allowed me to do things, it just allows me to stay here three months, that's all. I have the
experience to do many things, but not the possibility.» (Interview with Amal in Berlin,
October 2014)

The feeling of “moving on” is the stormy inner drive that “fire up” the migrant subjects to
looking for better possibilities for their lives, and sometimes it turn into action – such as move
further to another place. “Moving on” means the attempt to realize their aspirations, which are
usually not linked with a definitive permanence in Europe, or at least are not placed in a
specific geographical area. Indeed, many protagonists of my research often have expressed
the wish to go back to their origin countries, highlighting hence the circularity of their
biographies and aspirations rather then a linearity. We can read from Radu's narration how he
would wish to go back to Libya where he lived for many years, if it was be possible.

«I wouldn't want to do it, but if I don't find anything … I have to go back to my country!
What should I do else?! I am here since three years and I am doing nothing .. but I don't
want to think about that possibility! [...] Ok, look: I don't want to leave Italy in order to
reach another country, because it is worthless. [...] I would like to go back to Libya, but it
is impossible: there is the war! But there was good, I had a job, a house, money,
everything! But now is impossible. Europa should do the police in Libya, not the war! I
was happy there, working a lot and sometimes go back to my country to visit friends and
family. I would like a life like that, but now is impossible … that region is full of conflicts
now, you know it very well!» (Interview with Radu in Milan, April 2014)

Other people, such as Nadhim, wish to go back to their origin country but not definitively,
underlining thus the process of moving on and becoming that migrant subjects are
experiencing:

«I guess that sooner or later I will leave Berlin and I will go back to my country, not
forever but for long time. Here in Germany for me there is nothing to do, with this Italian
document, no job, nothing, just thoughts.» (Interview with Nadhim in Berlin, June 2015)

Thus, through these narrations it is possible to understand how the desires and aspirations are
not always fit and stable, but circulate and move exactly as the migrant subjects do.

«Me, now …. my future … just Lord knows! Now I am in Berlin, but tomorrow I don't
know» (Interview with Issa in Berlin, March 2015)

«Ah, projects for my future?! I have all these problems I told you! I am looking for job. I
told to myself: “I have to remain in Milan and look for a job!” . So I remain in Milan,
now, and I look for a job. But I am not finding a job … so maybe I will go away, in
another place. But of course, if I find a job, I remain here! But once I find a job …. after
some time, I think I would like to go back to my country.» (Interview with Badu in Milan,
April 2014)
«My future? First, I would like to have a job. Then, I would like to go back to my country, I miss it. But there are many problems there … but I would like. But I had to leave my country, because I have a problem there … no work problem .. political! But I don't want to talk about that now. The life like this is not good.» (Interview with Essien in Milan, April 2014)

«My future? I plan to go back to Berlin. Because now the cold is finish, you understand. So I expect better, you understand, maybe this time is going better in Berlin. I just think maybe if I go back … I expect that something happens …. I don't know …. I just try my best, you know? Just try my best. Because I must do something for my self. You know, I don't want to stay in Europe forever, not at all! I just cannot go back to my country now, like this. I have to do something before. I want to get married, I want to create my family, me too! As everyone. I want to go married, but I don't have money, so I don't have house. I must build the house before I go back, and I need money to do it. Is not so easy. I don't want to stop me here, I always try my best, every time, you understand? And I expect that one time, everything will change.» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

The experience of transit assumes here a temporal dimension, since the migrant subjects experience themselves still in transit and “not yet arrived”, meaning not yet arrived in a point in their life where some of their projects or desires are realized. Thus, migration can be understood as a process of becoming where the geographical – and juridical – routes involve the whole existential experience of the subjects on the move. Here is possible to observe the tension and relation between structural constraints and the self-construction that involve migrant subjects. The transit is a subjective experience that is co-produced by structural constraints and by practices of self-construction of migrant subjects that involve also the future perception. The structural constraints such as the juridical – legal statues and European, national and local laws – and political one – ENA program in Italy, the Oranienplatz negotiations in Berlin, and the EU policies of asylum management and control – have been presented in the previous chapters. In this chapter I expose how the subjects embodied some structural constrains, from one side, and how they re-elaborate them attempting to overcome the borders, from the other side.

The protagonists of my research have embodied the transit condition, that was experienced by the spatial, temporal and juridical dimensions. We have already observed how the transit experience of migrant subjects doesn't stop once they enter the gates of Europe, it rather becomes a lengthened experience of suspension, liminality and passage. This experience is not linear and stable, but interrupted and fragmented; therefore migrant subjects live different temporalities, some are quick and other are fragmented or suspended. Hence, the feelings and emotions also alternate, following the temporalities and movements of the migrant subjects. The alternating feelings and emotions like frustrations for the wasting time with shame, fear
or anger also foster the “inner drive to move on”, together with the desires and aspiration.

In chapter four the difficult life conditions experienced by the protagonists of my research in Italy, notably in Milan, were presented. Polices of abandonment and control had the consequences of the creation of an “errant” subjectivity in the urban area of Milan, where the migrant subjects of Emergenza Nord Africa program were subjected to structural constraints. The state as “errant urban subjects” without job and home entails strong feelings of frustration and shame about their condition, as the following narrations underline:

I see that Dakari is getting tired and annoyed. We speak a lot about his feelings, and he explains me: “I don't understand why here in Italy, assistenti sociali (social workers) always ask me where I have slept and which is my work situation in Italy. I don't like to speak about that! I feel shame to say that I have slept outside, like a homeless! I cannot understand why they want to know that! It is not easy for us to tell our situation in Italy, without work, without house, you feel bad when you think about that. So usually, I don't talk too much”. He looks at me and sighs. “I am frustrated – he says – that is a problem!”.
(Shadowing with Dakari in Milan, February 2014)

We are walking with Radu and he is explaining me how it feels for him to be without work. We are looking for a place where he would like to leave his curriculum, but we are not finding it. I propose to ask some people where is that place, and Radu says smiling: “I usually don't like to ask things to people in Italy! I don't like that people think I am without work and I want to ask them money, you know, I will never do it: ask for money! I don't know why some African brothers are doing it, they ask for money in the street, for me is horrible! To much shame!” and he shakes his head. (Shadowing with Radu in Milan, February 2014)

Cherill continues his discourse: “this is not a life, Elena! I am looking for an apartment where I can live, I have a job now! But nothing! I cannot find a house, I have to live in the dormitory! You now that they will throw me outside the dormitory, once the cold emergency will be ended? Soon, since we are already in March!” […] Cherill continues: “You know which is also the problem? I tell you: if you are sleeping in the dormitory, you have to go out at 8 o'clock in the morning, and then you are hanging out all the day long in Centrale! You turn around all the day wasting time. I am ashamed about this situation! I feel so embarrassed! I have a very good friend who is living in Paris, he also has Italian document. But in Paris is everything good. And I visited him! It was cool! He is living in a real house! Now, he wants to visit me in Milan … how can I do?! I told him, no! And now he is angry with me, because he cannot understand why I don't want he comes here … but how can I explain it to him?! I am ashamed! So much! If he came, I would bring him here! To Centrale! Is that possible?!”. He shakes his head and looks down.
(Shadowing with Essien in Milan, March 2014)

Frustration and being ashamed about their condition are emotions that recognize the subjection position within a power framework felt by the migrant subjects. This recognition can be latent, i.e. unconscious, or can emerge through a process of rational awareness. Both the more “unconscious” and the more “rational” recognitions of a power relation upon
themselves, influence my research protagonists to move on and out of that bad situation, as Essien and Obasi are telling us in the following interviews:

«For a while I was living at a friend of mine in Varese. He is living in Italia since five years. But I couldn't stay there too much time, you know, he was working and buying the food ... and me without doing nothing ... I couldn't stay there like this! So I decided to move to Milan. I was ashamed to eat and sleep for free at this friend!» (Interview with Essien in Milan, April 2014)

«I had the possibility to go to New York when I was in Algeria, but the papers and bureaucracy was too much long! Too much time! So I decided to go to Libya, where I have lived for years. I also have an uncle here in Germany, he is a doctor! I was living at his place with his family, when I arrived in Germany. But I was all the day long doing nothing in his home, and he was working ... and me just eating and sleeping, that is not life! I couldn't stay there more time, I couldn't! I wanted to use my time in some way, not doing nothing. He told me that it was no problem, I could stay there, but I didn't want it! I prefer to work, not to use the money of other people! I am still young, I can do everything! And I also didn't have friends there, so I decided to move further and I came to Berlin. I knew it, because some people I met in Italy and in Libya were already here and they told me about Oranienplatz.» (Interview with Obasi in Berlin, November 2014)

Essien, as well as Obasi, decided to move from Varese to Milan although he had the possibility to stay at a friend of his, but the feeling of shame together with the frustration due to the unemployment pushed him to the decision to move further. They feel ashamed in front of people with similar migratory experience, but also in front of Italian people as Radu has explained. Indeed, also the relational problems with the European citizens increased the frustration for the protagonists of my research, that are aware of the issue of racism in the western societies.

«The problem is that people in Italy didn't like the blacks like us! I was working in the kitchen of the hotel during the camp, I was cleaning the dishes. But always black job! I ask for the contract, but nothing! So, black people in Italy work just in black jobs [...] The main difficulty is the fact that since three years I am in Italy, and I don't have Italian friends, no one! If you are a foreigner, they [Italian people] don't want to come close to you. I didn't find Italian friends. I don't know why, maybe they don't like me, they don't like our skin colour. Oh, I had so many bad experiences! Many people run out on me! I am black, they run away. If you don't have the Italian citizenship, they don't like to stay with you. [...] It hurt so much! So much! Why are the Italians so afraid of black people?! I can understand that you don't like a person, but why you run away from me??! I am not crazy! I am not a mad person! Since three years I am here ... I have to make some friends! Make no sense that after three years I have no Italian friends!! That hurt so much! In a country like this I cannot stay, in a country where I cannot have friends! I had to escape from my country, but I don't want to stay in a place where the inhabitants don't like people like me! This is the main problem in Italy ... it hurt! [...] I have friends in France and in Germany, they tell me that there is better with the people, they are more kind! The citizens of France are Germany are more open, they told me, and this is beautiful! In France and Germany you cannot work with the Italian document, but at least the people there are good and kind with you, also if you are black. If the people are good
with you and treat me nice, then my heart is doing better!” (Interview with Essien in Milan, April 2014)

Jabir is complaining that we European are all criminals and we are against the black people. “You put always the blacks under you, whites! Why?! You like to do it! If there is a black person, he is always inferior to you! If an Italian work in Niger, he get 5000 Euros! But if I work in Niger, the same job, I get 200 Euros, why?!!” (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2015)

«When I was in the train station of Munich, I wanted to ask information or something like this, I needed help. So, I try to ask to some people, but no one has stopped to listen to me, no one! They have all run away from me, I don't why, they where afraid! No one stopped and listen to me, so I decided to go to the police.» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

As a consequence, these difficulties in building relationships with European citizens can increase the mistrust and sometimes lead to misinterpretation, as Asad and Badu explain us:

“I don't trust you Italians! Just for the Africans there is the economical crisis! All the young guys that have done the formazione [education course] with me in Palermo, now they have a job … the Italian ones! The others like me, Africans, nothing! Just for us, Africans, is difficult like this, because we have the skin of this colour! Why all the Italian guys are working and we Africans not?! I think that the crisis in Italy is just for us Africans, this is the problem in Italy, that we are Africans!” (Participant observation with Asad in Milan, April 2014)

«The problem in Italy is that there are a lot of racists! When you apply for a job in the agencies, and there are one black man and one white man, they take the curriculum of the black man and they throw it away! The curriculum of the black! And then, they call the white man for the job. So, it is not good like this.» (Interview with Badu in Milan, April 2014)

I already mentioned the mistrust in chapter five when I highlighted the feelings of fear and doubt that migrant subjects develop due to the blurry nature of their documents and due to the discretionary power present in the local bureaucracies. The following narrations of Calvin, Masud, Nadhim, and Mabula shed light on the fear as consequence of the mistrust they experienced linked to their documents' situation:

Calvin is clearly under stress and I think he has drunk. He tells me immediately that he feels bad, and that he has a lot of problems. He says that he is stressed because the police took his document and now he has to go to the Ausländerbehörde and bring there his country passport. “They were looking for me since years, and now they found me! They wanted me!!” We try to explain him that the police was not looking exactly for him, but they just entered in the squatted school in order to randomly control some people, but Calvin doesn't listen to us: “They were looking for me the whole time, and now they found me, and they send me back to Italy. I am afraid because people of
Ausländerbehörde said that I have to go there with my passport and I will get the document back. They want to send me to Italy!”. (Participant observation with Calvin in Berlin, November 2014)

«But the police told me “no, this document is not for working abroad! this is only for Italia, you can only work here with this document!”. I said “then this is not a document, what is it good for? It is just a piece of paper!” They broke my heart down that day! I needed something that would make my life better […] I was so frustrated!!» (Interview with Masud in Berlin, January 2015)

I meet Nadhim at Karl's place. We have to go to the lawyer because of his juridical situation and I ask him whether he has brought all his document. Nadhim is suspicious and uncertain, he explains me that he has fear and he doesn't trust the lawyers because they surely work together with the government, thus he doesn't want to give his documents to the lawyer. I try to explain him that we can trust that lawyer, but he replies: “one months ago a guy from the squatted school went to the lawyer and they have deported him to Spain, exactly the day when he went to the lawyer. The lawyer told him to remain at home, and then the police arrived to arrest him and they brought him in prison! So I am afraid of lawyer!”. (Participant observation with Nadhim in Berlin, December 2013)

Also Mabula seems to not trust the lawyer because he tells me that he doesn't want to show her the Italian document: “I don't want to show her my document! She just has to help me to fill this paper and that's all. So, I don't need to show her my document!”. (Participant observation with Mabula in Berlin, March 2015)

Fear is also an emotion that keep the migrant subjects constantly on the move, together with frustrations and shame. Due to their blurred and uncertain juridical situation they are constantly searching for trust persons and reliable information. The feeling of uncertainty, fear and frustration can push to move on to look for better condition, as Amal explains below, or instead can trap the subjects, loosing themselves in the labyrinth of their mind, as Calvin tells us:

Amal seems very frustrated, he tells me that he doesn't see a good future for him. I try to find something positive in order to make him feel better. We speak about his girlfriend and he smiles, but immediately he gets serious again and says: “I am still waiting for the renewal of my Italian document, but I think that this time they wont give it to me! I am waiting since too many months! Four or even five! Why? I guess they don't want to renew it again ...” and he shakes his head. “You know – he continues – I cannot feel good until when I will be legal in Germany! I have to do something to be legal here, otherwise it will be always worse and worse. I cannot wait any more, doing nothing! I need to do something, I am getting tired doing nothing! The first step is to be legal in Germany, and then the rest.” (Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, May 2015)

175 Karl is an invented name used for referring to a German activist man.
«You know, I feel like a lion in the cage. Yes, because I can never rest. There is no rest. My mind is always thinking about things you know? It’s like my mind is not free. I have to think of documents and maybe also a place to stay, because also sometimes I cannot go to school because I cannot concentrate. So I didn’t go to school for a long time. But now I want to start again.» (Interview with Calvin in Berlin, October 2014)

The problem of “thinking too much” expressed as “lost in the thoughts”, is often grasped in the research on the condition of asylum seekers and migrant subjects living in a lengthened, suspended and limbo condition. Radu and Rashid explain us their fear to run crazy because of doing nothing and hence thinking too much.

“Ok, I am here since almost three years, I don't have a job, I don't have a house, I don't have stability, nothing. Since three years nothing happens, and I am afraid to run crazy. You know, I never would have imagined that my life could be like that, never! I never would have imagined that I could have lived in so bad condition, and that I could have accepted it!” (Milan, January 2014, pre-research meeting with Radu and Dakari)

«I don't know why, but you know that I'm strange since I'm in Milano ... I think too much, I lose my time, I'm seeking in my head, you know it.» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

And this feeling can lead also to some extreme act such as the attempt to suicide, as the following ethnographic notes underline:

Ingrid explains me that Bashir was desperate in the prison in France, and he attempted suicide. It was the second time in one months that he got arrested, and Bashir is a traumatised person, thus this second time he could not bear it psychologically. (Participant observation with Bashir in Milan, January 2014)

The time dimension emerges here as a crucial element on which the border regime in Europe acts and through which the biographies of migrant subjects are influenced. Moreover, these narrations have highlighted how the power structures penetrate into the everyday lives of migrant subjects entailing also their inner subjective lives. The main problem experienced and perceived as such by the protagonists of my research was the “waste of time” produced by the structural conditions explained in the chapters four and five. In the following narrations the awareness about the problem of time wasting for people en route clearly emerges.

We are walking on the streets of Milan without a particular aim. Radu explains me how he feels in these days. “I waste too much time, Elena, that is the problem! Three years without doing nothing! You know, I could work, I would buy a house with 2000 Euros in my country. Then, with 1000 Euros I would open a shop, and with other 100 Euros – or maybe less – I would have a beautiful wedding. And what do you want more in life?! But until when I am here doing nothing, I just waste my time!” (Participant observation with Radu in Milan, February 2014)
«But I didn’t have anything to do there [in the squatted house in Turin, ex-MOI], and they [other migrant subjects with humanitarian protection living in the houses] were also not working, so we were staying home for so much time and then maybe we were going out but doing nothing … It’s hard, too hard. Sometimes I thought my head was going to explode because I had so many thoughts in there. I had to do something you know, work, whatever work! So I am glad to be back in Berlin. Here I had a job, I lost it unfortunately, because the man I was giving it to after I left finished it, so now I have no job, and also from January I have to find a place to stay because the place where I am now … they told me that I have to leave at the beginning of January. So now I don’t know … I am looking for something … I don’t know [he takes his head in his hands and he sighs]» (Interview with Kalule in Berlin, November 2014)

Radu’s and Kalule’s words shed light on the central problem of the forced wasted time, namely how it fragments and interrupts the future plaining of migrant subjects. The following narrations of Dakari and Asad underline how the problem of wasting time is a shared feeling among the migrant subjects living en transit between Italy and Germany or criss-crossing Europe:

«The more difficult things in the camp was that we were wasting our time! Days went by, weeks went by, months went by! And we just wait for a document!! Mamma mia! I was so angry! We were just eating and sleeping, and nothing more! […] I started to smoke cigarettes! I never smoked before! Never! It was so bad, Elena, so bad!» (Interview with Dakari in Milan, January 2014)

We are in front of the squatted school in Ohlauer straße, and we meet Asad. We talk how he is doing, and he explains to us that he has been in Dortmund for one month, looking for a job, but nothing. […] Now he is in Berlin and he will remain here for some time. Giulia asks him whether he is following the German classes in order to learn the language, and Asad replays: “No! No more school!! I am tired! I have done so much school in Italy following the suggestions of Italians …. ! They said ‘do terza media’ [the third class, which allows the access to the high school], I have done it. ‘do corso di formazione’, I have done three!! but no job! And all my friends that are in Belgium, Germany, or France … they are working!! Just studying, studying, studying! So, how can I find the courage to start learning German?! Since now, I want just work! I waste too much time!” (Participant observation with Asad in Berlin, June 2014)

A feeling of anger emerges from Asad’s words, produced by the frustration due to the wasted time. This anger can be glimpsed also in the following narrations of Rashid and Casim:

«The problem is that I have to do something! I cannot stay any more! I have to help my family, I have a family! You understand?! I’m doing nothing! You arrive and they give you three months, after three months, they give you other six months … many many office I go!! many many office!! After three months, after six months, after three months …. time goes, time goes, time goes. For this reason I want to go back to Berlin, because maybe there I can find my way, if I stay there two months I can maybe collect 100 Euros or 70, and than I send it to my family. Is better, is better than nothing.» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)
Harun speaks about his situation in Berlin, as refugee with Italian document. He seems to be aware of his legal condition and the possibility he has in Europe. Casim, instead, seems very stressed and nervous, he explains me that he has found a job in Berlin, but once the employer discovered his Italian document, he withdrew the job offer. “Every day like this – exclaims Casim – is a lost day! I have to find a solution, I must find a solution, I cannot waste so much time! But I have no idea which kind of solution!!”. (Participant observation in Berlin, January 2014)

The reactions to the anger feeling are different and follow the subjective attitudes. Some protagonists of my research use it in order to find the motivation to move on, and others started to developing hate feelings for the European society, as Asad and Jabir tell us below:

«I am so anger with you! […] you all, Italians, Germans, people from Europe! You are just kidding us! All the time! You say that you want to help us, but at the end the government pay you to let us suffer like this! Because look at us! Look at all these African guys! All of them are suffering, no one is happy here, so what? You make me waste too much time in Italy, three years for nothing! And now in Berlin, I cannot work with this document, how can I be not angry with all of you?!» (Interview with Asad in Berlin, March 2015)

“Hi, I am Jabir, and you know what?! The white people are all criminals! You are the worst criminals in the world!” Harun starts laughing and he tells me: “don’t pay attention to him, Elena, he his crazy!”, and Jabir continues: “yes, I am crazy! I became crazy in Europe! Before I was ok, I lived 15 years in Libya, but I am from Niger. I was working well there, in Libya, money, house, everything. But you know the story! I arrived in Italy where I stayed 3 years, without work and living as a homeless. Then I decided to come to Berlin. And now I am living worse than before!!” [...] “And you should have the human rights in Europe?! – continues Jabir – making us living like that? Who would have thought something like this?! I ask just to have the possibility to work! But you let me stay without doing nothing for 5 years! I am dead, you understand it?!” [...] Gaddafi was right! You know what he was telling us? He was saying that Europe is bad! He never lie! You know what he was saying about Europe?! That you, European people, you are not free! You don't have work, and you don't have space for live … yees, space, you even don't have space for parking the cars! It is true, you are not free! Gaddafi was saying that you are not free because the money you earn after many effort, you put in the banks! So the banks are controlling you! In Libya, we could do everything we wanted with our money! I always had money in my pocket, always! We were free in Libya … not in Europe! In Europe the people love more dogs than human beings! And it is true!! Look at us, human beings living on the street since four years! You know that in Germany there is a law that says that the dogs have the right to sleep in 2 meters in an apartment?! So dogs are treated better than us, that we have no right to apartment!! I lost the 80% of my life in these years in Europe … I am so angry that if I see a white person in my country, I will kill him! I will go back to my country now, the life here in Europe is crazy! You don't want me? Ok, I go back to my country! But then, you have also to leave our African countries in peace, ok?! So you have also to go back to Europe and leave us in peace!”. (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2015)

Getting tired of wasting time usually leads to the feeling of anger, often making a spark fire up inside the subjects, who take the decision to abandon their situation and move on to another place or country in order to find better life conditions. The anger feeling can give rise
to a decision to act and fight for improving their personal situation, as Amal expresses in the following, as well as to an act of protesting and claiming one's rights, as Dakari tells us:

Amal tells me how he is angry because he cannot participate in an educational course in Berlin, since he has a document as asylum-seeker in another region. “I was so angry, Elena, that also if I knew that that law [Residenzpfl] doesn't allowed me to do it, I went any way every day to the Ausländerbehörde in order to ask the same thing: the permit to do this course. I didn't care it was not allowed! I needed to do it! I need to do something! I was ready to fight with them every day without pause … I am doing nothing since too much time!” […] Moreover, Amal explains to me that he is waiting since too much time for the renewal of his Italian document, and he will never go back any more to Italy, because it is too much stress. “I have been waiting since too much time, I cannot wait any more. I will find my life in another way!”, he tells me. (Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, April 2015)

«In the camp in Brescia the Caritas boss always told us to wait. “Wait, Dakari, wait and the things will be going to happen” he was used to say. So we wait, days, weeks and months. I couldn't wait any more, I told you, I started to smoke for the anger! The other people, from Cameroon, they were working without getting money, for free! I thought they were crazy! […] I started to work for the Comune [municipality] of this small village close to Brescia, we were cleaning the streets. But they didn't give us money. So I started to pick up cigarettes from the street … I never would have imagined that I could do something like this. So, one day I was so psychologically destroyed that I decided to make a mess, I was so much angry! So much!! I was there in the municipality asking for money and making a crazy mass! Then, they call my Caritas boss. He came and he has physically stopped me, because I was crazy. I was working and they were not paying me!! Then, they gave me 100 Euros, like this [he imitates the act of throwing something on the floor], throwing the money on the floor! Then, I went to police, carabinieri, everybody! They were all bad persons, all of them!! so I thought that maybe it would be better to leave that place, and change the city!» (Interview with Dakari in Milan, January 2014)

The spark that leads to the decision to leave a city or a country occurred oft inwardly the protagonists of my research, that decided to leave Italy towards another country, although they had already passed through some difficult migratory experiences. During the ethnographic research I could observe a strong feeling “to move on”, an “inner drive” that motivates and entail the secondary movements within Europe. The “drive to move on” is also a “need to move on”, highlighting the ambivalent nature of these circular and fragmented secondary movements in Europe, that are produced by the combination of structural constraints and subjective drive, as emerges from the following narrations of Essien, Rashid and Masud:

«I call always my friends that are living in other European countries, in Belgium, in France, they are all working there! I would like to go there, I want to leave! I was three years in Italy, looking for something, looking for my life. And I didn't find anything! So, after this small job of three months contract, if I don't find anything else, I will leave this country!» (Interview with Essien in Milan, April 2014)
«Why I decide to move to Germany? Because I hear “Germany is better, Germany is better”. Because I lost much time!! too much! For one year and eight months I didn't do anything. Because, you know, I have family! [...] Because we, Africans, are plenty there, in Berlin, we are a lot a lot! I though if we go there, maybe someone can tell us how to save our life, what to do. Because if you go there, you are not alone, there are many many other people like me that are in the same situation. You understand? So that has helped me to calm down a little, to be more quite, so I decide to go there.» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

«After the reception centre was closed I slept on the streets for two nights, but I could not go on like that, it was impossible to live like that, on the street! So then I decided to go to France. I had no exact plan, I thought maybe I find asylum there, or a job … I actually wanted to go to Germany: I had heard from other people in Italy that Germany is a good country to go to [...] I didn't have a specific reason why I had chosen to come to Germany, I thought “I just try and see” [...] I needed something that would make my life better, and they said “you can travel around Europe with this document!”, so I can travel but I cannot work? what do I do with a document that allows me to travel but not to work? What do I do for, then? And how can I travel if I cannot earn the money to pay the ticket? I was very angry, I was mad, but I said nothing and decided to leave Italia anyway.» (Interview with Masud in Berlin, January 2015).

Nevertheless, the “drive to move on” is not always produced by feelings of frustration or anger, but sometimes also by feelings of adventure and curiosity, as Harun tells us:

«I decided to go to Rome because I am interested in many different things, from the artistic monuments to the history. Because I wanted to study something about the history of Rome but also about the history of the rest of Italy, for these reasons I went to Rome and I remained there. [...] Then, when I understood that in Rome there was no work any more, I decided to go to Germany, but at the beginning just for visit it. I went to Berlin to visit a friend, and to have a look of how is Berlin, I never thought that I wanted to remain here. [...] Now in Berlin it is difficult, because we are all scattered in different church dormitories, and we know that soon we have to leave it and we don't have the right to work here. But you know, is not a problem, we will keep looking for another place, for something else. We don't know what will happen in the future, we will just look for a place to stay. The problem here is the work, we don't have work. But the money are not a problem: sometimes you have it and sometimes you don't have it, that's the life. It is not always necessary to have money! [he smiles]» (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

Harun's narration sheds light on the three components that orient migratory routes according to the literature on trajectories (Schapendonk 2012), namely the motivation (aspirations, dreams, wishes and future perspectives), the facilitation of journey, and the velocity of journey, i.e. alternation between quick mobility and periods of rest and re-orientation. The fragmented migratory routes are hence an important experience in the creation of the subjectivity. Through this experience the migrant subjects progressively build awareness about their condition of subjectivity en transit, as Lamar, a young man from Mali, is telling us:
Lamar and Jawara are explaining me how the situation is in the protest camp of Oranienplatz in Berlin. In the last days, there have been some attacks on the camp from right-wing people: “So, the situation in Berlin is worse … and dangerous – explains me Lamar – but my aim now is just to renew my Italian document and then go back to Berlin. I need to move on, you understand? I want to freely move everywhere, I want to stay in Italy if I want to stay in Italy, or to move to Berlin if I want to do it. I cannot understand why some people can do it and others can not! I want to go on”. (Participant observation with Lamar and Jawara in Milan, March 2014)

Lamar’s words highlight his awareness about the im-mobility condition they are subjected and about the related power relations. The frequent movements back and forth between Germany and Italy for the document renewal are experiences through which migrant subjects develop a process of self-construction. During the travels and the encounters and crash with the European border regime, they build awareness about their positions within the social and power structure to which they are subjected. The protagonists of my research have experienced shared feelings and emotions (Luhrmann 2006) that allow to consider them a subjectivity *en transit*, notably people that share an historical consciousness.
«When a man rides a long time through wild regions he feels the desire for a city. Finally he comes to Isidora, a city where the buildings have spiral staircases encrusted with spiral seashells, where perfect telescopes and violins are made, where the foreigner hesitating between two women always encounters a third, where cockfights degenerate into bloody brawls among the bettors. He was thinking of all these things when he desired a city. Isidora, therefore, is the city of his dreams: with one difference. The dreamed-of city contained him as a young man; he arrives at Isidora in his old age. In the square there is the wall where the old men sit and watch the young go by; he is seated in a row with them. Desires are already memories.»
(Italo Calvino, The invisible cities, 1972. p. 8)
Building awareness en route

Zuhri: “Well, that's what we are: we keep going around Italy and Europe”
Elena: “Who are 'you'? Who do you mean with 'we'?”
Zuhri: “We, people of the generation 2011!”
(Participant observation in Milan, February 2014)

In chapter four, the biographies of my research protagonists have highlighted how their mobilities across Europe are based on the informal networks build during the migratory process. The role of these networks are crucial also for the circulation and exchange of information and relationships that produce a sort of “collective knowledge” of migrant subjects on the move. The collective knowledge became a resource that supports and orients the movements across Europe of that “unwanted errant population”. It should not be considered as a structured knowledge, but rather as a fluid set of social practices, discourses and information produced from below by the experiences of migrant subjects on the move.

The anthropological concept of “culture of migration” (Cohen 2004; Connell 2008) is useful here in order to shed light on this social process. Moreover, it is interesting for my work to apply this concept on the arrival societies (Pinelli 2013a), rather than on the departure contexts as traditionally is done in anthropology. “Culture of migration” is used to argue for migration being central and having pervasive influence on the population living in the departure social contexts. Hence, the decision to migrate emerges from an interplay of individuals, their households and their communities as well as national and international socio-economic forces (Cohen 2004). Moreover, this concept points not just at the practices of migrate, but also at the knowledge around the mobility, desires, and cultural representations of migration embedded in the departure societies. This knowledge circulates and moves among the people and influence their practices and decisions to emigrate. Speaking of “culture of migration” in the arrival social contexts (Pinelli 2013a) means to consider both the shared public and institutional discourses that legitimate the exclusion of migrant subjects and the social practices and social discourses that migrant subjects produce and through which they attempt to move between and across the structural constraints. Thus, the social practices from below of the errant population en transit across Europe contributes to the creation of a
fluid knowledge that circulates among the fragmented circuits. In this paragraph I will shed light through the narrations of my research protagonists on how they have built their awareness through their mobility experiences. Building awareness *en route* is a process enacted by the migrant subjects through their everyday practices, the mobility across the borders, and their constant relations with the very different parts of European societies – from the solidarity of the supporters to the EU and national borders.

«I was very angry, do you think that we didn't understand? They [referring to Italian local authorities] arrive and gave us 500 Euros and many lies! [...] In Italy they say that there is no job, but there is! But they don't give it to us. If you are son of an engineer, or a manager, then you find a job. But if you are a son of poor people, you don't find a job. Italians and foreigners that are children of poor didn't find a job» (Interview with Dakari in Milan, January 2014)

«In Holland it is difficult that you find someone who suffers like we in Italy. The problem is that *Italia* gives more documents than Germany and Holland. In Italy, if ten people apply for asylum, they [the Italian authorities] give the document to seven of these ten. If in Germany or Holland ten people apply for asylum, they give three documents and not more. But the difference is that if they give you a document, then they give you everything! House, work, money. In *Italia*, they give you a document and they tell you “go away!”. There [referring to Germany and Holland] dormitories didn’t exist! They don’t accept people living on the streets. I never see people sleeping outside in Amsterdam! In Italy, everybody is sleeping outside! [he smiles]» (Interview with Radu in Milan, April 2014)

Ibulaim stands up and start to talk: “Since 2011 we are lost, no life, no freedom, we are on the streets. This law is totally out of human rights and democracy, so please, [turning to the German politicians present at the assembly] sit down and have a look at this law, we need to change it”. Two other people from Oranienplatz protest intervene and the delegates of local authorities are listening. [...] At one point, also Tamarr wants to says something: “There are many German people in Africa, and they are all wealthy! They live better than you, people, that are living in Berlin! They can work in Africa, all of them are working, and no one labels them ‘illegal’!”. (Participant observation in Berlin, September 2014)

«You know in the EU it works like this, the EU has decided that the first country where you have fingerprints is the one responsible for your case, but in *Italia* there is a really bad situation, no work, no house, so I didn’t want to go back.» (Interview with Masud in Berlin, January 2015).

The words of Dakari, Masud and Radu highlight the awareness they built during the experiences in Italy and Germany. They know the European and national laws as well as the informal bureaucratic practices. The protagonists of my research who have experienced the Oranienplatz protest in Berlin have built also a political consciousness about their condition
and their rights as “refugees”, which has influenced also their identity, notably their way to perceive themselves as “refugee”, as the following interviews highlight:

«So I told her that I was looking for some refugee centre because I am a refugee from Italy, and she brought me to the police saying that they could help me.» (Interview with Masud in Berlin, January 2015).

I am with Amal in the bingo and we are looking at the football match. At one point, a friend of Amal arrives and joins us. “I am Pongwa, and you?”. I introduce my self and we start speaking about Italy. “Where are you coming from?”, asks me Pongwa, “I come from Venice”, I reply. “Ah, Venezia! I have done the camp in Venezia! Because, you know, we are refugees!” (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2015)

«When I arrived in Laudomia I told them I cannot live in the camp because I will die, because the life in Libya was really different! The camp was …ah man! It’s mafia, they gave us to mafia! They put us in a hotel it was not a camp! But we were maybe 15 people in few rooms, and there were always problems, everyday, it was hard. I was stubborn and I said I cannot live here, so in the end they gave me my own flat. Before a man took me to stay in his house for four days, and told me I could stay with him and his family, but I said no! I am a refugee I cannot stay in the house with him, his wife and his daughter! So they gave me another house to stay.» (Interview with Willy in Berlin, November 2014)

The interview with Willy highlights also his awareness of the social context in Italy where he first lived in the reception camp. Indeed, knowledge and discourses from below emerge also around the life conditions and the social contexts in European cities and countries. These help the migrant subjects on the move to give their further movements a direction. The following interviews with Asad and Harun shed light on the knowledge of how to move and survive and how to work and live as “semi-illegal” migrant subjects in Europe:

Asad is sitting with us and he starts speaking and laughing as usual: “You know what? Next time that I have to renew my document, I go directly to the police and I tell them that I have an Italian document, so they deport me to Italy and I don't have to pay the ticket!” We all laugh at Asad's jokes. “It is not a bad idea – he continues – if you go to the police and you tell them that you want to go back to Italy, they are very happy! And then, after three months we can come back to Germany, it is our right! And then, I mean … this law about the three months makes no sense, is not right! If you stay here and you don't have a work and a house, why should we go back to Italy where also we don't have a work and a house? Why we are forced to go back to Italy? We didn't do nothing wrong!” (Participant observation in Berlin, November 2014)

«In Hamburg it is different, I was there two months ago. You know that in Hamburg there is more movement than Berlin? Hamburg is like Napoli in Italy, there are many foreigners and refugees, more than in Berlin. Because Hamburg is a city like Napoli, all people go

176 Laudomia is an invisible city of the book of Italo Calvino, and it refers here to a small village in Sicily where there was one hotel-camp during the Emergenza Nord Africa plan in 2011.
there because living in Berlin is more difficult for the foreigners. In Hamburg you can work better than in Berlin, because you can find also black jobs. Berlin is the capital city so is good for the students and some kind of workers, or people which are doing some artistic projects, but the industries and business companies are all outside Berlin, in Munich in Bayern for example. Here in Berlin you have more business politicians, but not industries. Is often like this in the capital cities.» (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

Amal looks at me and says: “You know, Lyca tariff for mobile phone is the telephone number of poor people. We are the poor that call in Europe!” he smiles. (Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

Being aware of the laws and of their own life conditions allows migrant subjects to claim their rights and fight politically as happened in Berlin:

«Italy is a European country, isn't it?! So, we claim the right to work in Europe with our Italian document! We cannot understand why we are forced to work only in Italy! Are we in Europe or not?!» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

From Amal's words we can observe how some protagonists of my research started to build their own image of Europe, deconstructing the one they had before the first arrival. Radu's discourse highlights well his awareness built during the experiences in Italy, Holland, and again Italy:

«When you are in Africa, you have another idea of Europe. I was speaking with African and Arab people and we had an idea of Europe that was very different! For example, Europe has the image of many things that are not true. When you are in Africa and you speak about Europe you immediately think about “freedom”, “human rights”, but all that things didn't exist in the reality! I understood it immediately when I arrived here. […] The point is that Italy is the door. Italy cannot face alone this things! Europe has to be together. Libya now cannot control any more, there is the war there! So now many people came, make their hand here [referring to finger prints], make commission [referring to the interview for asylum], Italia accept all and then we sleep in the street. The problem is that we don't want to make the hand here! Why they force us to do it?! […] The problem is that our documents are not valid in other European countries, how it is possible?! And in Italy there is no work, so how we are supposed to do?! Is like if you build a canal and you fill it with water, but then you don't build doors in order to let the water come out, and you continue to fill up the canal. What happens? It explodes! [he smiles] Many many people come to Italy, and Italy gives them the document, this piece of paper with whom we can just eat and that's all. […] Italy has to speak with other European countries, they have to accept that if I have an Italian document I can work in Germany, France or Swiss, everywhere I find a job! […] If you force people to remain in Italy, and tomorrow new people will arrive, how we can do? Don't take the finger print in Italia any more! If there is no work, no food, if we have to sleep in the street, why you take us the finger prints?! […] Ok, you say that Germany doesn't want. But if Germany doesn't want, why has Italy signed this agreement? Like this, Italia becomes a prison for us! Because for us who are here, it's like being in prison! For example I have protection, right? What does protection mean? […] Ah, ok! So [he laughs] why do I sleep outside?! Why do I have nothing to eat? Is this protection?! I don’t think this counts as protection! So in Europe we talk about
Moreover, some migrant subjects became aware about the power relations in politics, both the international ones like colonialism, though they do not name it as such, and the local ones as for example in Berlin during the Oranienplatz protest. The following narrations and discourses shed light on this shared awareness of national, local and international power relations that migrant subjects have built after their first arrival in Europe:

“Politicians manipulate us: they said that we should not stay in O-platz any longer and promised us education and a house and work permit. Then they came and demolished Oranienplatz one morning when many of us were still sleeping. They told us we could stay somewhere else but only for six months and after that they came to the places they had put us: Blaschkoollee, Osloer Str., Marienfelde, Frankfurter Allee and kicked us out.” (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2015)

“If we are here it is because of Germany!” exclaims Rago during the political assembly, and he takes some piece of paper out of his pockets. On the papers a list of names of German industries is written that have the production in Africa and exploit the African workers, explains Rago. “It is because of these industries that we are here! These industries are in our countries in Africa and there are many Germans working there, they come from Europe to Africa and work there and nobody cares: they just do so, and why shouldn’t they? But if we come to Europe from Africa we are not allowed to work! We are treated like criminals, put into prison for no reason and marginalized in everyday life. We have no house, we have no work! But if you come to Africa you will be working and finding a house very quickly!” (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2015)

«Because, you know, “democracy” is just a word, it doesn't exist in the reality, even in Europe! Everyone talk about that, but there is no country where democracy exist!” (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

The experience of Oranienplatz helped to quickly strengthen the awareness and the feeling of shared condition of the migrant subjects who escaped from Libya war and obtained a temporary protection in Italy, as Masud tells us below:

«And after some time they started doing meetings, to speak about the situation in the lagers, to demonstrate against deportation and to talk about political issues that are important to be informed about, so I was very happy because for me this is very important. And then I also started meeting people that were coming from Italia, they were coming to O-platz everyday and were increasing in number. So that also made me happy because they were all coming from Italia, and we were all fighting for our rights together.” (Interview with Masud in Berlin, January 2015).

Nevertheless, the Oranienplatz political experience is just one part of the process of building awareness and must not be understood as the only one, because also the less visible everyday
practices of migrant subjects that are not considered “political” played a crucial role in the
construction of subjectivity en transit. The sentence cited at the beginning of this paragraph
«We, people of the generation 2011!», well sheds light on the awareness of a shared condition
produced by the interplay of several structural factors such as the Libya war and the
Emergenza Nord Africa program in Italy.
A subjectivity on the move across and beyond the borders of Europe emerged, characterized
by people who are experiencing a transit condition that cannot be considered as a temporary
state any more. The following narration of Willy well represents this experience:

«I want to keep my Italian documents, I am not going to change it: Italy got me, they
received me, every other place I am going, Italy was the one that gave me the documents.
I like Italy, when I came here they asked me for my visa, and I said: “I don’t have one, I
don’t need one”. You know, in Libya we travelled like that, everywhere! No documents,
no visa. Now on January I am going back to Italy to take my documents. I left everything
there, all my things are in Lingotto [squatted house in Turin] now: it’s Jason who has all
my stuff you know, my bag with all the things. Right now I am travelling with my carta
d’identità. I am going back by bus with my passport and carta d’identità.» (Interview
with Willy in Berlin, November 2014)

The majority of my research protagonists living in Berlin externalized their affection to Italy,
despite the feeling of anger and frustration because of the difficult life conditions they faced
in Italy. As Willy said above, they are aware to the fact that Italy have recognized them –
«Italy got me» – and together with the long time spent there, they feel attached to that country.
Moreover, also the fact that they are “legal” in Italy through their humanitarian or subsidiary
document lead to feel attached to that Mediterranean country.

I am in the garden of the Church where the people are building the boat that will be
carried during the tomorrow demonstration against the Berliner Senate and its politics
against the Lampedusa in Berlin group. I see Harun that is sitting around a table with
other persons, and I join them. “We build this wooden boat in order to go back to our
countries” says a guy smiling at me, “assuming that they will allow us to do it, because I
am not even sure they will let us do it. Nowadays, I am not sure of anything any more”.
There are other guys sitting with us, and they see that I am speaking Italian with Harun,
so they ask me: “Ah, but you are Italian too! Like us!”. I smile and nod. They ask me
where I come from and I ask them the same question: “Pordenone, Napoli, Lecco” they
answer. We speak a lot about Italy and I can see how the memory and tie with that
country is still strong for them. (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2015)

I say to Willy: “Now you are a Berliner!”, and Willy replies: “actually I am not really a
Berliner because my documents they are Italian, so I cannot have an Italian document and
be a Berliner. No. But I still have to be here in Berlin because we are the founders of
Lampedusa [in Berlin] we came to Germany, stay here in Oranienplatz, for long time one
year and one month, outside.” (Participant observation with Willy and Calvin in Berlin,
November 2014)
Giulia asks to Asad which country he comes from, and Asad replies: “Me? I am Italian!” and all people around the table start laughing. “Foggiano! I am from Foggia”. And Amal says laughing: “So you should be Italian, eh? Yes, we all are Italians!”. Asad continues: “We all are Italians, we from Lampedusa! We are Italians! Italy is my country!” and he starts to sing the Italian national anthem. “Italia is good – explains Asad – is our country of us, African people. But there is no work, that is the problem. But we are Italians, I have the Italian document and I am happy about that. I am Italian! Also the language, I am speaking Italian, right?” and we all nod. […] “We are all Italians – affirms Asad – we are the Italian blacks!”. Amal laughs and replies: “All right! We are the Italian blacks, those of Lampedusa! It is like this!”. (Participant observation in Berlin, November 2014)

The multiplicity of belongings that Amal, Asad, Willy and the friends of Harun are expressing reflects the experience of being still in transit and dwelling different places without having already found one to settle. They consider themselves as Italians, or better “the Italian blacks”, though they are living for at least two years in Berlin. Nevertheless, they feel a strong sense of belonging also to the political group of Lampedusa in Berlin through which they experienced the shared political fight. The narrations about their future perspectives have highlighted how the aspirations and future projections of my research protagonists are not necessary placed in a geographical area, instead they are rather directed towards the satisfaction of their life projects and wishes. That emerges also through the often expressed multiplicity of belonging. The awareness of being subjectivity en transit is well expressed by Harun’s narration below, where he points to his mobility experience through the world “travel” and he considers his migratory experiences as an “adventure”:

«You know, it depends on how travel. I have always respected the rules, and I have always paid the ticket. Whenever you want to do a travel, you always have to think about the rules. I guess that's why no one has never said anything to me [...] You know, I'm fine like that, with the Italian document. The important thing is to have a place to stay. You can not ask for political asylum here, then ask for political asylum there ... then where are you staying? Here [in Germany] too it is not safe, so ... In Italy however when you get the document, you can be sure that you are already recognized there. The document of Italy for me is a great fortune, it is a great opportunity because right now I can go to all the places where I wanted to go, 27 countries in Europe without any problems, I can visit them for three months, each country of the European community ... I can go there, so it's something that is very important to me. If you do not have that [Italian document] you can not even visit Africa or other countries. The document must be always near me. This document in Italy is good. I can say that I am a citizen of the territory but not of blood. [...] To me, Rome is now my home. When I travel, I always return to Rome. I've been in so many cities, but Rome is a place where I always return, even now that I'm in Berlin [...] My situation has a bit improved, in my opinion, because before coming here and decide to stay for a while, I did not know much things. The adventure for me is always positive because I always learn things you did not know before, so now our situation is better because I saw new things, better or worse, so my situation has improved because I learned new things. Here I learned, in Europe, in Italy I saw a system. And then, when I got out of there and I went to Germany, I did not know it, the German laws, nothing. And now, just because I was here, I can say that Germany is better than Italy for some facts and vice versa. If I had not come here, I would not have been able to know these
differences! […] Now I'm here in Berlin, seeking a job and maybe something to do, but I have to go back to Rome, certainly, even to visit friends and even if I find a work here, I always have to go back to Rome! I have many friends, and most of all I have to go back to Rome always, because it is the place in Europe where my head has more opened: I have done so many different experiences there, and met so many things there. Rome is my home, so when I am travelling around, then I always want to go back to Rome. It is the place where I will always go back … Rome for me is a place like home, even if I am not Italian. […] Italy is a country that when I come back, I feel at home: in Italy the people are more open, but generally in Europe if you meet an Italian person that has lived abroad, you meet an open person, more than others. When I meet Italian abroad, I feel at home. The Italians that live abroad are more open than Italians that remain in Italy, who are mostly more racist and closed. So, with Italians that lived abroad like me, I feel at home!» (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

According to Harun the migratory experience is an adventure that opens his mind, and the place where he feels at home is that place «where his head is more opened», i.e. Rome. Harun's words shed light on the travel experience not just as a source of dangers and sufferings, but also as a representation of wish to do many experiences and as a “desire to a future” (Gatta 2011). This “travelling” through the world enacted by my research protagonists can be understood as the combination of a movement forced by structural constraints with the subjective stormy inner drive, as Dakari explain:

Dakari explains me what he feels during the travel: “the travel is something that moves within your belly. When you are travelling your heart is strongly palpitating …. my way was to rely on Lord. Every time I have crossed a border, I always thought ‘if Lord wants, I will make it!’ and it was like this!”. (Participant observation with Dakari in Milan, February 2014)

To consider the adventure, notably the migratory experience, as positive does not mean to be unaware of the difficulties you can meet as a “traveller” across a world divided by different borders. Indeed, the following words of Harun highlight both his awareness of borders and his awareness of being persons constantly on the move.

«Berlin now is quite good, but it is also not so good because there are many important things in the life of a man. We live a “crazy life”, so a life in which you have to be always ready to leave, to travel in every moment. You don't have a job and you don't have a place where you can stay for long time. Then you have to move. This is what I was looking for when I arrived here, because also in Italy there was no long-term solution for me. So, it is not so easy to live when you don't have a home; now we have a place where we can stay, I live in Friedrichsr. with other people, but it isn't a place with a guarantee. We can stay there until March. The most important thing is that we, the foreigners, we have difficulties because our brain is … let's say, we have a lot of ideas but these ideas didn't have a place yet. So, we need to use our brain in order to understand what we have to do, because our brain is divided into two: you are thinking forwards and you are thinking backwards. You think all the time what you can do now, in order to find some job and how to solve your problems. This is the most important thing. So, if you don't have a place where you can stay at least for one year, you cannot even start to think which plan
you can start in order to solve your other problems. And this is a big problem for us. For me, it isn't a big problem, because I am *une aventurier*, as we say in French, I have always travelled a lot, also when I was in Africa, I always moved a lot. I think that the most important thing is the health, because you know, every day could change something and could turn in a better situation, maybe.» (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

The fact that the migratory experience towards Europe is just one stage in the biographies of the people on the move also helps to deconstruct the view on migration as a linear movement and migrant subjects' decisions to move as a rational choice taken by actors that already know where they want to go. The following narration of Calvin highlights the controversial feelings that migrants subjects en transit experience: being forced to move and at the same time feeling “free” to move where they want because of their experience of being en route since many years:

“Right now I have many appointments because they [the German police] got me and now they stay on me, I am afraid they will send me back to Italy, they already said they want to see my passport on Monday [Calvin has to go to the *Ausländerbehörde*]. Now they get me, I know. Let me tell you, government and politicians they have their law, lawyers work for the law! My problem is I am living here … ok I explain you: if always I am coming to your home, it is because I like it. If I didn't like it, the second time you called me I wouldn't come. But always I am coming here. That means I like here! But always when I am coming here they are stopping me! You understand?”. Calvin makes a pause and drinks some water. Then he continues: “Anyway, everything that happens in life has to happen, but this is a small thing for me, I didn't do anything wrong! So believe me this for me is small, small thing! They don't want me? I am a person of the world! I can go everywhere in the world, the world is big! If they don't want me here, I go to another place”. (Participant observation with Willy and Calvin in Berlin, November 2014)

Also Willy explains us how he feels on the move after he had left Africa and how “being in transit” belongs to his biographical experience:

«After three years we are still moving … through the desert, three times, going to Africa and coming back to Libya, going and coming, in the end I have known the rebels very well, because every time when I was crossing the desert I made some friends and they helped me. Many people that were going back from Libya to Africa they die in the desert. It happens very often, after the war people were fleeing and just died in the desert, women, children, everyone. They died!» (Interview with Willy in Berlin, November 2014)

The decisions to move were sometimes rather autonomous choices, at other times forced by events such as the Libya war, or by structural difficulties such as the homelessness and unemployment in Italy; at other times they were a combination of structural and subjective dimensions. The forced movements that occurred in the experience of my research protagonists – illustrated in chapter four and five – entailed ambivalent feelings of being free
and forced at the same time, which are reflected in the discourses of migrant subjects:

«I try to manage everything, but it is everything by force, you understand? I'm forced to stay, I'm forced to move. So I try to go to Berlin, lets see.» (Interview with Rashid in Milan, February 2014)

We are travelling in the bus, and Obasi is explaining me why he wants to obtain the Italian ID card: “You know my friend Saeed?! Exactly! He is travelling through Europe with that document and no one has stopped him .... so I want to travel through Europe because I was forced to come here, so now I want to have the possibility to travel! Without force I wouldn't have come to Europe!” (Participant observation with Obasi in Berlin, November 2014)

Subjectivity en transit emerges, experiencing the transit through the spatial, temporal, juridical dimension. The transit experience is hence internalized by migrant subjects and becomes thus existential. Indeed, existing in multiple places, migrant subjects en route can be unable to be fully present anywhere, in particular if they experience an “illegal” condition. The law denies them the authorisation of their presence, positions them “elsewhere” and leads to a living in the shadow (Coutin 2005). The presence of migrant subjects in multiple places and temporalities is also produced by fragmented circuits and continuous circular and interrupted movements of coming back to, re-orienting, and departing again. The transit as temporal and existential experience is here underlined as a consequence of the hypermobility of migrant subjects, which is a combination of forced and subjective processes. The following situations with Obasi and Amal well shed light on the multiplication of temporalities that occurred through the migratory process, and notably through this particular experience of fragmented circuits that characterized my research protagonists:

We are sitting in our kitchen and talking about the situation in Oranienplatz. I observe the absent gaze of Obasi and I ask him if everything is good. He smiles: “ah, sorry. I was elsewhere now”, and I ask him: “Where you are?”, and he replies: “Now? Now I am in Libya. In Tripoli at my friends […] you know, I often move to other places with my head!”. (Participant observation with Obasi in Berlin, October 2014)

We are walking in the underground of Berlin, Obasi and Amal are making fun of each other. We pass near a billboard of a perfume advertisement that shows a desert. Amal looks at this image and tells me: “oh, Elena … you cannot imagine that place … the desert! The sky and the land are touching together. You cannot see where did it start and where did it end. Sometimes, because you are tired, you cannot even distinguish the sky from the sand. You are there since many days, maybe weeks … walking without knowing where to go … you cannot understand any more since how many time you are there. Oh, I forgot that I have experienced it. Now we are in Berlin … it is another world. It is like if I had two different life … the desert, is another life.” (Participant observation with Amal and Obasi in Berlin, May 2015)
Subjectivities on the move emerge that are characterized by temporalities *en transit*: this is a process where migrant subjects enact continuous negotiations with the structural constraints they encounter during their migratory experiences. The negotiating practices are both juridical because linked to their juridical status and its blurry nature, and spatial and temporal because the migrant subjects develop practices of self-creation and internalize the transit. The concept of subjectivity allows to grasp this social process, shedding light on the power relations and their effects on the subjects, and also highlighting the practices of negotiation. In the next paragraph I focus on the different everyday practices enacted by the protagonists of my research in order to open spaces and times “free” of the control and surveillance mechanisms.
We leave the bus and we are looking for the next bus station where we should enter the second bus. But we don't find it. We walk around for 30 minutes trying to find the second bus station, but we fail. We go back to the first bus station where now there are just some people from Africa packed with bags and suitcases. Obasi looks at them, and tells me: “We have to ask them information, the travellers can always help! They know everything”. (Participant observation with Obasi in Italy, November 2014)

«The time, in which lives even the person who has no home, becomes a palace for the traveller who leaves no home behind» (Walter Benjamin, Städtebilder 1963)

«Marco Polo imagined answering (or Kublai Khan imagined his answer) that the more one was lost in unfamiliar quarters of distant cities, the more one understood the other cities he had crossed to arrive there; and he retraced the stages of his journeys, and he came to know the port from which he had set sail, and the familiar places of his youth, and the surroundings of home, and a little square of Venice where he gamboled as a child. [...] All this so that Marco Polo could explain or imagine explaining or be imagined explaining or succeed finally in explaining to himself that what he sought was always something lying ahead, and even if it was a matter of the past it was a past that changed gradually as he advanced on his journey, because the traveler's past changes according to the route he has followed: not the immediate past, that is, to which each day that goes by adds a day, but the more remote past. Arriving at each new city, the traveler finds again a past of his that he did not know he had: the foreignness of what you no longer are or no longer possess lies in wait for you in foreign, unpossessed places. [...] By now, from that real or hypothetical past of his, he is excluded; he cannot stop; he must go on to another city, where another of his pasts awaits him. or something perhaps that had been a possible future of his and is now someone else's present. Futures not achieved are only branches of the past: dead branches.

“Journeys to relive your past?” was the Khan's question at this point, a question which could also have been formulated: “Journeys to recover your future?” And Marco's answer was: “Elsewhere is a negative mirror. The traveler recognizes the little that is his. discovering the much he has not had and will never have.”»

6.2. Everyday practices of space and time re-appropriation

«Everyday life invents itself by *poaching* in countless ways on the property of others.» (de Certeau 1984, p. xii)

In this paragraph the everyday life practices of migrant subjects are illustrated. I will first stress the distinction between the concepts of strategies, tactics and acts for a better understanding of the human agency. According to the one theory of action (Emirbayer and Mische 1998), which attempts to overcome the classical dichotomy between the instrumental rationality and the moral and norm-based action theories, the analysis of human agency should focus on the “condition of possibility” of the subjective perception and action within the context of social experiences. Social actors are not considered as atomized individuals, but rather active respondents within nested and overlapping systems, namely within a temporal-relational context. The understanding of human agency focusing on the social practices refers to one of the three constitutive elements of agency: the practical-evaluative element. This corresponds to the temporal orientation of agency towards the present, and points to the capacity of actors to make practical and normative judgements among alternative possible trajectories of action, in response to the emerging dilemmas, demands, and ambiguities of evolving situations (Emirbayer and Mische 1998). This dimension of agency is related to the *contingencies* of the present, thus the problematization of experience in response to emergent situations is questioned. According to anthropological studies on subjectivity (Kleinman and Fitz-Henry 2007, p.53), «experience is intersubjective in as much as it involves practices, negotiations, and contestations with others with whom we are connected». Experience is always simultaneously social and subjective, collective and individual, and thus cannot be separated from the shifting demands of practical and everyday life. The focus on the everyday life and on the experiences of subjects allows to move away from the idea of a universal human nature and towards the understanding of the variety and multiplicity of human condition. According to these anthropological research, to talk about subjectivity means to take into account that the subjective is always social and vice versa. The dialectic of intersubjectivity, not just that the one internal to the self, has to be analysed in the framing of
In the literature, different concepts are applied to analyse the practices enacted by subjects within structural constraints. Looking at social practices through which the subjects resist and act within fields of power, different concepts have been developed such as that of strategies, tactics and acts. The understanding of the “act” in the social theory of action was introduced by Isin (2008) through his work on citizenship. Contrary to the concept of “action”, the “act” has a focus on the passage between a performance and its outcomes. According to the author, an ethical act is always oriented toward its objects before calculation, responsibility or intention; therefore, an act precedes and indeed makes possible any subjects. Thus, the subject arrives later and is constituted by the act itself; as consequence, a mere subject without a social world is impossible. Isin attempts to explain hence that if an act produces the subjects, then it is possible to define «acts of citizenship» as those acts that produce citizens and their others. Referring to this theorization, several research have been conducted in order to analyze the struggles enacted by “unwanted” or/and “illegal” migrants within western societies. The «act of citizenship» highlights exactly the practices of becoming claim-making subjects in and through various sites and scales: if acting produces subjects, then «acts of citizenship» are those acts that produce the citizen and non-citizens (Isin and Nielsen 2008). I will just use this concept here as an interesting analytical insight looking at Oranienplatz protest, but cannot be applied to explain the multiplicity of everyday practices of my research protagonists. Indeed, Oranienplatz, Kreuzberg and Berlin became the site through which social and power relations around the citizenship issue and asylum right were produced, reproduced and transformed. Nevertheless, it would be reductive to consider just the act of claim-making as an expression of agency and subjectivity. Also the multiplicity of everyday practices that at first glance could not appear as “political” or as resistance practices, are here however understood and analyzed in relation to the power relations and the structural constraints in which the practices occur. Thus, everyday practices that didn't involve a claiming act are here analyzed as a manifestation of agency and subjectivity.

For that, the work of Micheal de Certeau (1984) is interesting: he discusses the appropriation or re-appropriation – within the language system – as a practice that establishes a present relative to a time and place. Such practices posits a contract with the other in a network of places and relations. Moreover, he introduced the distinction between strategies and tactics, the former being the practices of the “strong” and the latter being the “art of the weak”. The perspective of de Certeau is both the same and the opposite of the Foucauldian one: he attempts to «bring to light the clandestine forms taken by the dispersed, tactical, and make
shift creativity of groups or individuals already caught in the nets of “discipline”.» (de Certeau 1984, p. xiv). The “antidiscipline” is the kernel concept of his book, and the everyday practices creatively worked out by the subjects the empirical focus. According to his theory, many everyday practices are tactical and, more general, “ways of operating”, notably the victories of the “weak” over the “strong”. He sheds light on the tactic as the art of getting around the rules of the structural constraints, being determined by the absence of power:

«I call a “strategy” the calculus of force-relationships which becomes possible when a subject of will and power (a proprietor, an enterprise, a city, a scientific institution) can be isolated from an “environment”. A strategy assumes a place that can be circumscribed as proper (propre) and thus serves as the basis for generating relations with an exterior distinct from it.» (de Certeau 1984, p. xix).

«I call a “tactic”, on the other hand, a calculus which cannot count on a “proper” (a spatial or institutional localization), nor thus on a borderline distinguishing the other as a visible totality. The place of a tactic belongs to the other. A tactic insinuates itself into the other's place, fragmentarily, without taking it over in its entirety, without being able to keep it at a distance. It has at its disposal no base where it can capitalize on its advantages, prepare its expansions, and secure independence with respect to circumstances. The “proper” is a victory of space over time. On the contrary, because it does not have a place, a tactic depends on time – it is always on the watch for opportunities that must be seized “on the wing”. […] It must constantly manipulate events in order to turn them into “opportunities”.» (de Certeau 1984, p. xix).

I will use some insights of these two concepts for the understanding of the experience of my research protagonists. In the definition of tactics it is possible to observe some characteristics we have already found in the description of the experiences of my research protagonists, notably the fragmented way through which the tactics “insinuate” themselves in the place, and the centrality of time dimension. De Certeau’s framework, which describes the complexity, plurality, temporality and improvisation of subjects’ actions, can be helpful in the analysis of the relation of subjects with the practice of governance, since his analysis shows how the “weak” make use of the “strong” and create for themselves a sphere of autonomous action and self-determination. Moreover, according to de Certau the tactics of survival are based on complex intersubjective relations of sociality, intimacy and affect (Napolitano and Pratten 2007).

The concept of “creativity” is a further interesting point in the understanding of human agency when looking at the social practices. De Certeau stresses the everyday practices of the “weak” as creative action within the structural constraints. Several authors (Foucault 1988; Butler 1997; Deleuze and Guttari 1980; White 2008) have analysed the agency and the everyday practices within fields of power relations and structural constraints through the
concept of creativity. The concept of creativity is an interesting insight for the understanding of human agency, above all if we look at its etymological analysis. It derives from the Latin verb *creare* which means “to make”, “bring forth”, “produce”, “beget”. Interesting is that it is related to the verb *crescere*, namely “arise”, “grow”; both verbs *creare* and *crescere* have the same linguistic root from the Sanskrit KAR. In the Sanskrit language *kar-tar* means “the person who makes”, “producing out from nowhere”, thus it includes a meaning of a production from a “free” space. The word has also been related to the Akkadian verb *karāru*, which means “to lay a foundation”, “to put an object in a place”, “to set”, “to cast” 178. The previously cited authors that have worked on agency and power relations stress how creativity “opens spaces” that can be “free” of power relation, or at least can get around the imposed rules and structures. “Producing out of nowhere” means hence a space “free” of power relations, a “condition of possibility”. It is also linked to the construction of the self as subject, highlighting hence the connection to the meaning of “arise” and “grow”. Indeed, tactics of resistance have been understood also as “situational awareness of individuals” (Emirbayer and Mische 1998). According to the philosophers that give to creativity a temporal meaning (cfr. Henri Bergson and Gilles Deleuze, in White 2008), this concept is expressed in terms of an “aspiration to change”. Creativity, hence, is neither evaluated as a product nor as an end result; rather it is best expressed as a tendency to change, as an expression of movement through time. Bergson argues that creativity is found in the aspiration to openness, which is “fired up” by the emotions that are considered as “affective stirring of the soul”. Creative emotions are organized in aspirations towards openness, that is, an openness towards movement and change that provokes us to break old habits and to embrace new insights and ideas.

In the previous paragraph the emotions and feelings that move inside and on the migrant subjects have been presented, highlighting the variety of the stormy inner drive that “fires up” the action – to move to another European country, for example. In the next paragraph, I will shed light on the everyday re-appropriation practices of migrant subjects in both cities, Milan and Berlin.

**«Here I can calm down»: time re-appropriation practices in Milan**

The fragmented everyday life of my research protagonists in Milan was presented in the

178 The etymologies of the words “creativity” were built through the consultation of the old Greek and Latin etymological dictionary written by the Italian linguist Giovanni Semerano (1994).
previous chapters, where I have focused on the structural mechanisms that influenced the lives of migrant subjects with humanitarian and subsidiary protection. Here I will shed light on the everyday practices of re-action enacted by my research protagonists in order to get around the structural constraints or even to break them. These social practices are here understood as (re)actions of the more or less aware recognition of the subjection position within the power structures.

The everyday life of migrant subjects with humanitarian or subsidiary protection obtained in the Emergenza Nord Africa program is characterized by frequent and fragmented movements across Italy and within the city. The move from a dormitory to another, with intermittent periods when they live on the street and sleep on park benches or in abandoned houses. In this way they make extensive use of the city’s public space, which was the first space they got to know when they learned to navigate the new urban context. If, at first, use of the urban space is dictated by emergency as a response to the lack of a place to sleep, there is a more intimate dimension emerging later, an opportunity to tame the city, shaping it to suit one’s sensibility and investing it with new meanings (Brivio 2013). The following ethnographic note with Dakari sheds light on the park as the place where he usually spends most of the time, since he has to leave the dormitory.

We meet at 8:30 am in the park close to Porta Romana. Dakari is going there every morning and he is doing training and sport there. “We have to leave the dormitory early, so I always come here” he says to me “that is one of my favourite places! When I was living in the abandoned house in Lodi, I also came always in this park, I like it! I can do some sport, and meet some people, also Italians!”. I sit on a bench and wait until when he finishes his workout. (Participant observation with Dakari in Milan, February 2014)

The park is the place where Dakari goes every morning, in order to do some body activity. Otherwise he is afraid to run crazy, as he told me one day: «you know, park is good because I can do sport … in this life, where I find no job and I have no place to stay, because you know the dormitory! Yes, in this life, I have to move my body, otherwise I get crazy. I already started to smoke because of frustration, and I don't want that it happens again!»179. The park assumes a central role in the everyday of Dakari, also because is a place where he can get in contact with some Italian people, as the following ethnographic note shows:

I arrive in the park close to Porta Romana around 9:00 am and I see Dakari doing some body training with another Italian guy. Dakari introduces me to the Italian guy, who tells me: “You know that Dakari is my persona trainer?! and we all laugh. “Yes – continues the Italian guy – I meet him every morning, and he gives me many suggestion how to better make training for my body”. I sit on a bench and wait until they finish. I see that

179 Participant observation with Dakari in Milan, March 2014.
Dakari and the Italian guy are speaking about many things, jobs, dreams, women, and sometimes Dakari helps him to do some exercise. “He has to do many work – screams Dakari to me – he is a bit fat!” and we all start laughing. (Participant observation with Dakari in Milan, February 2014)

The dormitory, which only offers guests a night’s rest but not the opportunity to spend the day there, can be hardly seen as a “home”. Thus forced to stay out during daylight hours, the protagonists of my research often experience public space as a place to rebuild a sense of intimacy. It takes on a particular meaning following the function it performs for people crossing it, and hence its nature is transformed. A bench can be seen as a “bedroom”, a park as a “home”, a quiet street as “a place to relax”. The following conversation between me and Dakari well shows how the attachment he builds with some places is a consequence of his active practices of re-appropriation of these places, attributing to them a function and a meaning:

Dakari finishes his body training. “Today I want to show you my favourite places! Follow me, we will go to places where I have lived and slept … but are secret!” he says to me laughing. We start walking outside the park and we talk about many things. “Now you will see that places where the life for people like us is very difficult” tells me Dakari. We walk in the direction of Corvetto neighbourhood, which is the favourite one of Dakari: “I love this place, Corvetto, because it is close to the mosque, my mosque, where I am going every day! I like it very much! It is the place where I feel at home … also because I have sleep in some benches and parks of this neighbourhood … places that I really like”. We are walking along Viale Ripamonti and Dakari is telling me his story. […] After the neighbourhood tour where Dakari has showed me all the places where he has slept, I ask him: “but are you more happy now in the dormitory or before?” he doesn't answer immediately. He looks down, and then he looks at me and answers: “you know … it is difficult. Of course now I am happy because I have a bed and a roof on my head … but dormitory is not a house … I don’t feel at home there. When I was here, in Corvetto, it was always good. I was feeling good because I was going to the mosque, and then I was relaxing my self in that park or in my favourite place, that of the benches. I know all these streets very well, the parks, every corner! So, if I wanted to stay calm, I had a place. If I wanted to see people, I had another place. And here it is very calm … therefore I love it. Also now, that I have the dormitory, if I want to keep calm and relax myself, I come here to these places … I feel they are mine.” and he smiles at me. (Participant observation with Dakari in Milan, February 2014)
“This bench is my bedroom!” tells me Dakari smiling.
( Participant observation with Dakari in Milan, February 2014)
Photo 17: Park in Milan

Photo 18: Quiet place
In the absence of more permanent reception structures beyond initial reception facilities, Dakari has identified his “refuge” in a district of the city where his mosque is located, the only place where he has managed to create the more intimate dimension typical for private space. Indeed, the neighbourhood of Corvetto is particularly important for Dakari because of the mosque: the place where he feels at home and where he can go when he is stressed, “I always go to the mosque when I am sad or stressed! But just in that one of Corvetto, not the others! This in Corvetto is mine – he smiles – I feel really good there, I pray, and then I am better.” Moreover, a small park in Corvetto and the benches in some urban corners of this neighbourhood are “quiet places” where he can keep calm, and where he always goes when he feels stressed. During the ethnographic research I could observe how the re-appropriation practices were not only directed to the space re-appropriation, the time re-appropriation seemed even more important. Being trapped in the “survival circuit” moving from the dormitory to the shop kitchen, from lawyers to bureaucratic offices, and always looking for a job, my research protagonists have difficulties to find some “quiet time” where they don’t think too much about the difficulties of their lives. The narrations in the previous paragraph have shed light on the problem of “thinking to much” that imprisoned the minds of the people, as Calvin said: «I feel like a lion in the cage. Yes, because I can never rest. There is no rest. My mind is always thinking, thinking about things you know? It’s like my mind is not free». Thus, autonomous time in which it is possible to “calm down” leads to “open the mind”, that means to activate again the possibility to aspire, desire, and project a future. Dakari as well as the other migrant subjects with whom I have conducted the research, often stressed their need to “calm down” and to find a “quiet place”:

Dakari tells me: “Now, I will show you a special place. My place”. We move away from the street where there is his mosque and we follow several streets, I lose my orientation. We arrive in a crossroad, and we take the smallest street. Around the bend the street enlarges itself and on a corner surrounded by a wall with graffiti there are two benches on a small green zone with a tree. “Ah – exclaim Dakari – that is my favourite place! Here I was coming every day, when I wanted to rest a bit because of all the stress we have during our day. I come here to eat something, to keep calm, to have time for myself. And that makes me so happy! I can calm down here!” We sit on the benches and he asks me: “do you like it?”, and I say: “yes, it is a quite place”. There are two big grey building in front of us. No one is passing through that place, where we sit quiet for one hour. “This is my home” tells me Dakari. (Participant observation with Dakari in Milan, February 2014)

The words of Dakari are very important to highlight the centrality of the re-appropriation of a place in order to reach autonomous time, as also de Certeau states: «The “proper” [of a place]
is a triumph of place over time. [...] It is a mastery of time through the foundation of an autonomous place.» (de Certeau 1984, p. 36). Dakari needs to re-appropriate a small urban interstice in order to open up an autonomous time that gives him some peace and calmness.

«Tactics [pin their hopes] on a clever utilization of time, of the opportunities it presents and also of the play that it introduces into the foundations of power. Even if the methods practiced by the everyday art of war never present themselves in such a clear form, it nevertheless remains the case that the two ways of acting can be distinguished according to whether they bet on place or on time.» (de Certeau 1984, p. 39)

The border regime of migration control and management impacts and influences the temporal dimension of subjective experience, thus practices of time re-appropriation are fundamental in order to not feel oppressed by the narrow net of structural constraints. The possibility to have a “free mind” allows also to re-orientate the subjective aspiration and life projects, and maybe taking the decision to move on toward another city or country, as Essien is explaining us:

«I like this place [the Central train station of Milan] because I meet many friends. And here, I can use internet with my phone … I can talk to people and see which are the possibilities, because you know, our life is difficult. I also relax myself … I was thinking that after this tirocinio [traineeships], I move to another country … maybe to France … I have many friends there. I cannot stay here like this any more! I am tired!». (Interview with Essien in Milan, April 2014)

Essien considers the Central train station of Milan both a place to rest and also a place of sociality, where he can meet friends and spend time together. Indeed, the practices of time re-appropriation are diverse. Some subjects like Dakari prefer to “open” a free personal time in a hidden place to calm down and relax himself, other people like Essien or Radu prefer instead to re-appropriate “free time” for hanging out with friends and doing simple everyday practices of sociability (Gatta 2012b) such as conversation (de Certeau 1984).

Radu explains me that he doesn’t like the Central train station in Milan because there are people like him [people from Africa living in Milan as homeless] that are hanging out there without doing nothing. “Many of them are drunk, or just lost people … I don’t like to see it, to see how people like me can live so in a bad way”. I ask Radu which are the places where he likes to spend the time, and he replies: “I always go to the bingo! This is the place where I always go, I can go there and rest a bit, is a very quiet place, I like it. And I meet so many friends there! Because, you know, we love football, so we meet there and we watch football match and spend the time together … that relaxes me. We also speak about politics, about our life, about everything … we discuss also about Renzi [the actual prime minister of Italy]!” and he starts laughing. (Participant observation with Radu in Milan, February 2014)

Radu found in the bingo hall close to the main shop kitchen the place where he can calm down and relax. During the shadowing with him, we always ended up in that place. There it
was possible to meet several friends of Radu that were also people “coming from” the Emergenza Nord Africa program. These “resting places” where migrant subjects re-appropriate an autonomous time can be considered as urban *interstices* according to the literature that sheds light on meanings of agency and struggles inherently with this concept (Brighenti *et al* 2013). In chapter five the creation of juridical and spatial interstices has been presented as a consequence of the frictions between the power and structural constraints and the attempt to freely move and live enacted by the migrant subjects. The *interstice* can be seen as a rupture within power fields and a result of “opening up” enacted by “interstitial subjects”, This fits well with the concept of creativity as an aspiration towards openness, that is, an openness towards movement and change. This creative opening up towards movement and change is not always a concrete action as moving to another country – as some protagonists of my research have done – but can also be a process of building awareness of one's condition, and thus a process of construction of the self, of “growing into” a new difficult situation. Re-appropriation of autonomous time means to not lose the potentiality of the future (Gatta 2012b), with the power being, through the act upon time, the real limitation to the agency and to the construction of one's subjectivity. The attempt of the power to deform and cancel any inner time dimension of the subjects, as for example the dimension of action and the dimension of mind and of soul, has been highlighted in works about the absolute power and close structure of confinement such as the camps (Sofsky 1995; Pieper 2004).

Furthermore, several authors have stressed how the capitalism and the neoliberal politics have reorganized the capital accumulation and, consequently the labour market through a control and reorganization of time (Thompson 1967; Griffiths, Rogers, and Anderson 2013; Mezzadra & Neilson 2013). Thus, working on the power relations implicate a focus also on the temporal dimension from both perspective: the power influence and the re-appropriation practices enacted by the subjects. Of course it is impossible to separate the time dimension from the spatial one, and the inextricable interconnection of it is not questioned here. I aim here to shed light on the temporal dimension because it is less well explored in research. Above all, the everyday practices of migrant subjects in Milan emerge more as time re-appropriation than space, although the possibility to reach autonomous time occurs also through the opening up of urban interstices where my research protagonists can “calm down” and relax themselves. The public space plays, indeed, a crucial role in the re-appropriation practices enacted by the protagonist of my research, becoming the area where the agency develops itself. Anthropological research (Gatta 2012b) have highlighted how the public sphere and space enacted by migrant subjects through the sociability is a crucial everyday practice within the
structural constraints of migration control’s power. The concept of “sociability” (Simmel 1917; Gatta 2012b) means here the set of interactive practices where people have conversation only for the pleasure to have it, and not for other instrumental aims. Exactly this pleasure to meet people and having a conversation is a way of time re-appropriation enacted by the protagonists of my research: Radu does it in the bingo, Essien in the interstices of the Central train station, and Dakari in the park or in his “favourite place”, i.e. a bench in a corner of his favourite Milan's neighbourhood. According to Gatta (2012b) this particular form of social relation is at work in the struggles of recognition and the affirmation for subjectivities that are still negated. It is places like the bingo, the park or the train station where the not heard voices have the possibility to express themselves. During the ethnographic research within the **interstices of sociability**, I have observed the subtle but constant circulation of information and the building of relations that constitute the informal networks used for the mobility across Europe and/or Italy – as explained in chapter four and five. The following ethnographic note sheds light on that:

We are on the tram 9 and Radu tells me: “now I would like to go to the bingo, as usually” and smiles. I tell him that for me it is good. We arrive at the tram stop close to the bingo, and we get off the tram. We enter into the bingo, and close to a table there are four friends of Radu that I also know because they usually come to Naga. They greet us and we join them. They are watching a football match, but since it is in the afternoon and is not the weekend, the football match is of a secondary league and I don't know it. Radu takes a football bet slip and we joke imagining how to play. Two friends of Radu are conversing about a job that one friend of them has found in Naples. “I maybe will go back to Naples – tells me one of them – because I heard that now there is job there. I have lived there already two years … so I have friends where I can stay”. Radu asks him whether he will stay there long time, and he replies: “No, no! Just if I get this job … and then I come back, maybe, but let's see how the life turns” and he smiles. Then, no one speak any more and we keep watching football. At one point another friend of Radu starts speaking about an information he got last week, that maybe there is the possibility to get a house in Milan. The other guys are interested in this information, and Radu as well. They talk a bit, and they decide to meet tomorrow at the Caritas office where in theory should be the possibility to get a house. Again the conversation wanes and we keep watching football. “I heard that this Renzi is good … isn't it?” suddenly a friend of Radu asks me, and we start to converse about politic in Italy for some minutes and then the conversation slows down again. […] We leave the bingo, and Radu asks me if everything is good. I reply that everything is ok, and he says: “I don't know if this is a good place for you, but for me it keeps me calm … you understand? It is really a good place”.  (Participant observation with Radu in Milan, February 2014)

The observation of migrant subjects' everyday practices allows to shed light on the (re)action they enact in order to open up interstices where they can manage their autonomous time, re-appropriating hence also their dreams, aspirations and future projects. The routine dictated by the reception system is often interrupted by the search and appropriation of public spaces
where the different moments of the day can be decided autonomously. The practices of appropriation of urban interstices are not limited to the search for a place to sleep, but for real “haven”: places that are “free” from the power dynamics that migrant subjects experienced every day in the reception system and bureaucratic offices – such as victimization and infantilization (Fassin 2005, 2009). It is therefore a re-appropriation of living space but also of time that breaks the routine established by the waiting rhythms, the long queues, and the continuous moving around in the city. The achievement of some autonomy happens in places like the Central Station, public parks, bingo halls, or the Naga, locations that are experienced as and transformed into places of sociability. In these places migrant subjects meet and have conversation, but also exchange contacts and information. A circularity of information is thus created, linked to the circularity of the places: soup kitchens, dormitories, interstices of sociability, public transport connecting these places, they are all used by many migrant subjects that are constantly on the move. The exchange of important resources such as information about a job or about places where it is possible to sleep, cities and countries where to settle, are the basis for a new project involving mobility. Even if at the end migrant subjects remain in Milan and don't move to another city or country, still the aspiration to change is a sign of creativity at the base of agency, highlighting how subjects are on the move both physically and mentally (Ong 1999, p. 2). The characteristic of the everyday practices of migrant subjects in Milan is in line with the one that emerged in the chapter four in which I detailed their situation, i.e. the invisibility.

The everyday life of my research protagonists in Milan is spatially and temporally fragmented, which makes them live and move in the shadow zones of the state as a consequence of the policies of abandonment implemented by the local and national institutions. In the shadow of the state, migrant subjects enact between and across the borders in order to build their lives. They open up interstices, which are spatial, juridical, and temporal, where they attempt to re-appropriate autonomous time. De Certeau describes this as «Innumerable ways of playing and foiling the other's game, that is, the space instituted by others, characterize the subtle, stubborn, resistant activity of groups which, since they lack their own space, have to get along in a network of already established forces and representations.» (de Certeau 1984, p.18). “People without their own space” struggle in their everyday in order to open up autonomous time that allow them to aspire and creatively move on – not only geographically. Autonomous time means also be free from emotions like frustration, fear and depression – i.e. to calm down – that imprison the subject's minds, blocking the possibility to see and organize a future project.
«We are here, and we will stay»\textsuperscript{182}: space re-appropriation practices in Berlin

In the city of Berlin the everyday practices of my research protagonists were characterized for a long time by a hypervisibility, on the contrary of those in Milan. The hypervisibility is linked the story of Oranienplatz and the political protest that was at the center of the city’s life for two years. Another difference is related to the centrality of the space re-appropriation practices over the that for time, with the main activities being the occupation of the square and the demonstrations. Nevertheless, the occupation of Oranienplatz should not be seen only as a re-appropriation practice enacted by subjects with political awareness, it is a more complex and ambivalent phenomenon. In the previous chapters I have highlighted the ambivalent nature of Oranienplatz as social place, being both a private space of derived domesticity and a public-political space of right claiming. The public visibility and the collective character, which usually refers to the work- and cultural-political sphere (Duyvendak 2011), was here related also to the private space of domesticity, with Oranienplatz being also a “home” for many migrant subjects.

This ambivalent nature can be understood also through an etymological analysis of the two concepts, to “occupy” and to “inhabit”. The verb “occupy” derives from the Latin \textit{occupàre}, composed by \textit{ob} and \textit{cupàre}, i.e. \textit{càpere}. The prefix \textit{ob}, \textit{obs} means \textit{in front of}, \textit{against}, \textit{face}, \textit{in view}. The verb \textit{càpio}, \textit{capere} means \textit{take control of}, \textit{take in the hand}. This verb refers to the old Greek form \textit{káptω} that means \textit{succeed to take} (something), which recalls the term \textit{kapādu} from the Akkadica language that means \textit{to desire}. The act of occupation implicates hence the subjective dimension of the desire, which pushes the migrant subjects to the act of re-appropriation of a place. The agency dimension of migrant subjects emerge here also through their act of \textit{take control of} and \textit{take in the hand} (\textit{càpio}, \textit{capere}) a public space, \textit{facing} (\textit{ob}) a political power that doesn’t allow them to freely move and autonomously decide the place to live. The process of square occupation was not always linear and clear for the protagonists of my research. As highlighted in chapter four and five, many of them arrive in Oranienplatz thinking to find a place to sleep without having any idea – and intention – to join a political struggle. Others, instead, after few time understood what was going on in terms of political struggles and found it fundamental to take part in it. It is important here to shed light on the process of building political consciousness. Not all inhabitants of \textit{O-platz} went to this process. Nevertheless, also those who “only inhabit” the square without a political consciousness have to be considered subjects with a level of agency just like the others, and the etymology of the

\textsuperscript{182} Political slogan of the group \textit{Lampedusa in Berlin} during the protest of Oranienplatz.
verb “inhabit” helps to explain it. Indeed, this word also includes the meaning of re-appropriation: the Latin word *habitus* derives from the verb *habeo - habere* that means *to have, to own (to possess)*. The word refers to the Akkadian language *habu*; cfr. *kappu “capio”* that means “cup in the hands”, which has influenced *habeo* in the direction of “have in the hands”, i.e. *to possess*. *Inhabit* a place is not just a space where people sleep and live, but is a place built and produced by the subjects through their everyday practices, a place that they have *taken in their hands*. This helps to understand how the feeling of home, built by the migrant subjects in the neighbourhood Kreuzberg, is strong enough to choose living in Berlin as “illegal”, rather than going back to Italy as “legal”, but temporary, people.

The following words of Amal well shed light on the attachment they build with this particular neighbourhood that has concretely welcomed them:

“Now that Oranienplatz doesn’t exist any more, we have other places where we meet and make political reunions. […] The most of the time, we are hanging out in Kotti [abbreviation of Kottbusser Tor, the crossroad in Kreuzberg close to Oranienplatz]. Yes, in Kotti Café, but also outside, when it is not cold. But we are also in several streets in Kreuzberg … yes, also Görlicher Park, but I am not going there so often, but other friends are always there. I am always in Kotti, also because we are watching the football matches there! […] Let’s say that the place in Berlin where I feel at home … yes, is the neighbourhood Kreuzberg. In Kreuzberg there are many many places to go, where we hung out during the refugees’ protest in O-platz … there the people know us very well, we can stay there, in Kreuzberg! There are some restaurants and bars were we can go, they know us. This is our neighbourhood!”. (Interview with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

In chapter four the crucial role of the neighbourhood Kreuzberg in the support of the Oranienplatz protest was presented, highlighting the influence of the left-wing culture of political struggles that is embedded in that “Utopic island” (Lang 1998). After the Oranienplatz was evicted and some time later also the squatted school, Kreuzberg remained the central place where the “O-platz population” spent most of its time. A process of fragmentation and invisibilization was implemented and, as the Berlin’s map (image 9) shows, migrant subjects were scattered in the whole city. Nevertheless, the strong network of supporters remains active, and the many activities with the people of *Lampedusa in Berlin* and the other Oranienplatz groups continued.

These activities took the shape of less politically practices in comparison with the previous occupation of the square, but any way have to be understood as re-appropriation practices that open up space of autonomy. The public space of Kreuzberg has been experienced as “home” and several places were daily practiced by migrant subjects for encounter, conversation and

---

183 The etymologies of the words “occupy” and “inhabit” have been built through the consultation of the old Greek and Latin etymological dictionary written by the Italian linguist Giovanni Semerano (1994).
exchange of information. New places of sociability emerged in the neighbourhood, such as Görlizer park and, above all, the crossroad Kottbusser Tor. The latter became the substitution of Oranienplatz for the people of Lampedusa in Berlin group; during the ethnographic research we could observe how the protagonists of our research always met and spent their time there. Café Kotti was a crucial place, a “political bar” typically visited by a heterogeneous group of German and European people – most of them political activists – and people with migration background. Also during the Oranienplatz protest it was often frequented and once the square was evicted the bar became central in the urban everyday trajectories of my research protagonists.

After Oranienplatz was evicted, the everyday life of the migrant protesters became difficult because of the fragmentation and the everyday encounter and crash with the internal borders, as highlighted in chapter five. The group of Lampedusa in Berlin was scattered and many small groups emerged, based on friendship relations or thanks to the strong ties with the supporters. The everyday life, thus was more focussed on finding individual ways to “integrate” in the German society, although the collective political aim remained active for long through the regular political meetings. The following narrations of Amal, Issa and Nadhim shed light on the difficulty in the everyday life for people who are “unwanted” because treated as “illegal”:

Amal explains me his current everyday activity: “Yes, let’s say it is work. I am passing out flyers for friends that are doing auto mechanical work. They give me around 15 Euros per day, but not every day. And I have to move from one neighbourhood to another!” (Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, September 2014)

“At the moment, I am working as gardener and I will keep doing it in the next two months. But they are not paying me, so is not so good.” (Interview with Nadhim in Berlin, June 2015)

“I have nothing to do now, so at least I have a place to stay! Because, you know, now that I don’t have that job any more, I will stay a lot of time at home”. Issa is explaining me his house situation and his everyday life in Berlin. “The person who I was substituting came back, so he took his job again. They paid me 400 Euros, but now I have no job any more. I have to look for another one, immediately!”. (Participant observation with Issa in Berlin, October 2014)

Being the access to the labour market very difficult because of the document situation, the majority of the protagonists of my research spend their everyday life doing German classes – organized by the supporters, notably church associations – and participating to some artistic projects, as the following interview with Harun and Obasi tell us:
"At the beginning here, I wanted to do movement … that means music! Because is what I was doing before, also in my country. I have done rap and underground music. And I met in Berlin that guy, Chioke, you know him! He comes from Togo, and he is doing some concerts and music there in Warschauerstraße [a street in the neighbourhood Friederichshain, close to Kreuzberg] with other people. My friend Saeed was also playing some music with them, always rap and underground. I told them that I also make music, I write songs but I don't want to keep my songs just for me, I want to share it with all the people, with the movement, I do music for the party. So we meet and we started to do music together. […] For me the music is to tell and reveal the stories of that places where I have lived. For example I have written songs about the rebellion of Tuareg, when they have done it in my country. You know, in my country there are many many problems, political and economical. The people of the government keep all the money for themselves, and let us live in poor, without nothing. I wanted to denounce all these things … thus, I wrote a song." (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

Obasi is explaining me how his life is in Germany: “Berlin for me is really better! Here there are a lot of things to do! I have many projects with the supporters and artists, I meet so many people and associations. But they don't pay so much, eh!” he laughs and keeps speaking: “In Italy they were paying me more than here in Berlin! But there I have worked just six months and then they told me that I couldn't stay there any more because of the crisis”. (Participant observation with Obasi in Berlin, November 2014)

The role of the supporters network was fundamental in the long term: it was a relationships' net that avoids the “fall” of O-platz migrant subjects into the holes of the control mesh that individualizes every single story and person. Indeed, the fact that the supporters together with the active kernel of “O-platz people” were always active in finding places for sleep, artistic projects, lawyers once there was a police arrest, allowed the migrant subjects to not feel individualized and alone in face of the control and management mechanisms. Thus, the role of the supporter's network in Berlin can be interpreted as a “mediator of tolerance” (Ambrosini 2014) and of “informal integration”, since the formal one through a legalization process did not occur – with the exception of the marriage.

Different places where the supporters groups are settled became “welcome places” for the migrant subjects, as the following narration of Harun underlines:

"There are many places in Berlin to go, places where I go …. but just one is the place where I can meet friends and receive information, it is like a hausprojekt [squatted house with political activities] where there are Germans and some Africans, refugees. There is also an African community in Spandau, of people from Cameroon! I knew them before coming to Berlin, when I was living in Rome, so sometimes I go there." (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

The activities of the supporters were crucial also for the everyday life: artistic projects and political meeting allowed a regular forming and establishing of relationship between German and European people, namely those who are “wanted” and “regular”, and the migrant subjects
Fabian explains to me that he is a political activist, and since many years he is active in the political network that support the refugees in Germany. He tells me that he has met Nadhim in Oranienplatz thanks to the teachers that were doing German classes there. “The teachers active in O-platz came to us and asked us whether we wanted some refugee from O-platz in our project. Of course it sounded immediately a great idea for us, and we decided to meet some O-platz people. So I got to know Nadhim, Amal and the others” explains Fabian to me. “Now they are coming to our collective gardens and they are working sometimes with us, that is great! I also want to look for an apartment or room for Amal, because I know that he will have no place to sleep soon!” I ask him if he knows well Amal, and Fabian replies: “Of course! He comes really often to my house and we have dinner together with my wife! He is like one of the family for us! And he names us ‘mama’ and ‘papa’ as well!” he laughs. “With Nadhim it is different – explains me Fabian – he is more shy and reserved, but we have a great relationship as well”. (Participant observation in Berlin, December 2013)

As already explained in chapter four, Oranienplatz was a situation that brought people together, many friendships started. Also love affairs that ended in marriage or the birth of a child started there: the only ways through which it is possible to become “regular” in Germany for the “irregular”. The following narration of Asad explains that in a funny way:

Asad is speaking about his situation in Berlin: “you know what have told me the people when I arrived here? They told me ‘find a woman, so you can remain in Germany! Make a child, so you can stay in Germany’. They are all crazy!! I don't want to take whichever woman and marriage her just for the document! Furthermore, the women here in Germany are not serious persons! They are one day with one man, and another day with another! And I should take one just for a document?! You know how many friends of mine are crazy because of the German women?! The women are make my African friends crazy … they break their hearts! I don't want to get crazy like them! I am happy alone! Yes, I am happy alone! You suffer so much for a woman … and just for a document?! That's crazy!”. (Participant observation with Asad in Berlin, November 2014)

Still, many couples “born” in Oranienplatz came together not because of documents, and are still living together in Berlin and trying to build their dreams of a “normal life”: around 30 “Oranienplatz children” were born, and around 20 couples have married. In general, many love affairs, friendships and mixed families were formed.

The first activity organised by the supporters network was the organisation of sleeping places through the informal system of “solizimmer”. Literally, solizimmer means “solidarity room” and it is an informal practice enacted by the people in Germany that share an apartment and have a free room, which is given to a person that has not the possibility to pay for it for political reason. Usually the solizimmer are a temporary solution, for people like migrant subjects considered “illegal” or asylum seekers that are not allowed to leave the camp. At the time after Oranienplatz eviction and for the years later, around 400 of the O-platz people
found an accommodation through the *solizimmer* practices. The following narrations shed light on the centrality of the informal support that the *solizimmer* practice gave after the eviction of the square:

«It was like this: I stayed with the supporters, in the *solizimmer*. First time, just one night. Then, I went to another place and also there three or four days. And then, again, to another place for two weeks. Some of us are living like this, today here, tomorrow there, three days like this, two days like that, some of us live like this. […] now I am living in the small apartment of a friend of Fabian [a German supporter], it is really great! To have a place just for me! I have to thank Fabian so much! He told me that I can stay there until when I want … it is incredible!» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

I met Asad in Kottbussertor, and he tells me: “Ehi, now I have a room!” smiling. “Ah, fantastic, where?!”, I ask to him. “In Kreuzberg, with other people … is fine, they all speak French so we don't have communication problem! But they are all Germans, eh!”. I ask him how he found it, and he says: “Eh, this people there … in O-platz. There is a list very big, with many names … and you go there and you say that you don't have a place to sleep. And they found room for us, African people … how you call that system?”, “*Solizimmer*?!” I reply, and Asad: “Yes, exactly! It is fine … now I have my room and they told me that I can stay there until when I will find a better solution …”. (Participant observation with Asad in Berlin, June 2014)

«Currently I am living in a flat with other 6 people, I moved in a month ago and I can stay as long as I want, and I do not have to pay a rent. Before that I lived with a family, parents and one child, it was nice but then they told me that I had to go because they could not keep me there any longer.» (Interview with Masud in Berlin, January 2015)

Furthermore, the role of the churches and related associations was crucial, being also part of the so called supporters networks. Above all the Evangelic Church played an active role, being one year and a half after the square eviction still politically active and strongly engaged in the economical and accommodation support for at least 100 migrant subjects from Oranienplatz:

I go to the Evangelic church because I know that there are Obasi, Harun, Amal and other people from Oranienplatz that are building a wood boat for a demonstration against the Senate of Berlin. The Evangelic church is the only one that still is active in the support of people from Oranienplatz: still 100 people are sleeping in their dormitories, and they are trying to find some legal solution for each one, but of course it is very difficult, because they are too many and they don't have so many money and places. Thus, they decide to organise a demonstration in order to put some pressure on the Berliner Senate and also in memory of the 700 people that died in the Mediterranean see in the last week. (Participant observation in Berlin, May 2015)

The churches have been used also as places where the political meetings could be held after the Oranienplatz eviction, as for example the Heilig-Kreuz Kirche in Kreuzberg. The Sankt
Thomas Kirche in Kreuzberg was occupied in autumn 2014, thus also the church was a place of space re-appropriation practices. In Germany the role of the church – above all the Evangelic one – in the support of refugees' and migrants' protests has a long tradition that started in 1983 with the campaign promoted by the movement Kirchenasyl (Church asylum). This movement is based on the idea that seeking asylum in the church has deep historical roots, reaching back to the fifth century, and rests on theological foundations. During the 1990s there were fifty participating parishes in twenty cities nationwide (Castañeda 2010), as the following ethnographic note highlights:

The political meeting is at the end, so people start to stand up and move within the church room. One man comes near to me, he looks like a motorcyclist in the way he is dressed. He says: “do you like my church? It is beautiful, isn't it?! I had restructured it! And already in the 90s it was a central place, when there was all these refugees doing so many political initiatives … at this time they were all from the ex-Yugoslavia”. (Participant observation in Berlin, September 2014)

In addition to the accommodation solutions, the supporters network filled up the everyday life of the O-platz migrant subjects through the organisation of German classes, artistic projects, educational courses and soliparty. The artists groups and above all the theatre's activities played a particularly important role. There are at least six theatres in Berlin that are politically active in the migrants' and refugees' struggles, and many of them activated workshops and projects during the Oranienplatz protest and after it. The following ethnographic note sheds light on their role:

I call Obasi because we want to go together to the political meeting in Ballhaus, we decide to meet in Kottbusser Tor and then to go there together. […] We arrive there and the room is full of people, there are several tables scattered in the room and each one has a particular theme. The first table is that of artists and theatre actors: there are almost all the famous theatre groups from Berlin that are also socially and politically engaged such as Gorki theatre, the Volksbühne, the Gripps theatre and the HAU. Around another table there are the private citizens active in the support of Oranienplatz people, many lawyers and German and European citizens that have done several activities in Oranienplatz. We go to another room where there are old political groups that also have supported the Oranienplatz political fights, such as those from housing struggle movement and others from several hausprojects. In all the table the issue at the stake is how to react to the fact that the Oranienplatz agreement has been cancelled and many people from Oranienplatz are living now in Berlin as “illegal and unwanted” and also without a place to sleep and the possibility to work. From the artists' table it is suggested to use art practices as a space re-appropriation practice and as a small source of income for the refugees of O-platz with Italian document. I recognize in that group Chioke and Moussah that already participate in some theatre group, and they strongly argue that they have to find a way to occupy a new place or to re-appropriate spaces where they are allowed to live and do some activities. The main idea is that a solution should be found without the help of the local

184 Soliparty means party of solidarity that is partly organized by supporters groups in order to collect some funding for any issue linked with a struggle.
and national institutions, because all the negotiations have failed and the people from Oranienplatz are living on the street and cannot access the labour market since two years; there is no hope any more that legally and politically the situation will change. Thus, the only way is to work out strategies and tactics through which the refugees from O-platz can live and work in Berlin without problem. Actions of fund raising are organized, as well as new artistic projects, but still the awareness remains that these things are not enough. Several projects are presented such as CUCULA, the theatre Ballhaus and the Kulturzentrum in Schlesische Str. 27, that manage to include a small group of refugees from O-platz in several projects through which a sort of income is produced. (Participant observation in Berlin, November 2014)

The Gorki theatre, the Volksbühne (literally “the people stage”), the Gripps theatre, the HAU, the Zentrum für Politische Schönheit and the Ballhaus theatre are the examples of these theatres politically active. Above all, the Ballhaus theatre in Kreuzberg bases its artistic project on the racism issue in the German society and works around the idea of a Postmigrantische Gesellschaft, namely a post-migration society.\(^{185}\)

The artistic activities were a way to fill the time in the everyday, but also a way to earn some money beyond the national borders. The project CUCULA is another example, the Refugees Company for Crafts and Design. CUCULA is a word of the Hausa language of western central Africa, and means “to do something together” as well as “to take care of each other”.

«CUCULA is an association, a workshop and an educational program all in one. It is for and together with refugees in Berlin. In contrast to the theoretical debate about the situation of refugees in Germany, the initiators strive for a pragmatic, immediate and action-oriented approach. The aim and object is to achieve something “together with” the refugees and not simply “for them”. Launching as a pilot project, CUCULA wants to give people, for whom the doors of society are locked, access to education. CUCULA wants to establish a ‘welcoming culture’, which helps refugees to break with the notion of ‘victimhood’, and at the same time unfold their self-efficacy and to open up a perspective for a self-determined life.» (From the official website of the association CUCULA)

CUCULA produces and sells design manufacture and premium design objects, and through that also conveys basic technical qualifications with focus on furniture production. CUCULA was built as a start-up by five migrant subjects of Oranienplatz together with five German people, and at the beginning their products was explored the work of the Italian designer Enzo Mari. The idea at the base of his book “Autoprogettazione” written in 1974 was to build your own furniture, when required, as a practice of democratisation of design through the creation and provocation of an alternative to the capitalist paradigm of mass consumption. Migrant subjects working in CUCULA are hence producing furnitures following their personal stories: «they integrate relics of their perilous journey across the Mediterranean into the traditional wood construction», and through that «they make a statement, which goes beyond the

\(^{185}\) For deep analysis of the concept “Post-migrant societies” see “Deutschland postmigrantisch I. Gesellschaft, Religion, Identität – Erst Ergebnisse” (2014) of N. Foroutan et al.
furniture’s sheer practical value: they transform a personal and universal catastrophe into a constructive future»

This project struggles against the local, national and European laws since there are “unwanted” people working there without a work permit. As they declare in their presentation, this is exactly that the aim of CUCULA:

«What is reality? I believe reality is something that we create together. It’s something we negotiate. CUCULA is a project that doesn’t accept the current reality of refugees in Germany, and instead strives – together with a group of refugees – to create a different reality. CUCULA is a bottom-up project, that shows how utopia can become reality. We desperately need projects like this one, and they need our support. Such projects don’t just benefit refugees, but rather our society as a whole. We need these projects because they support us, they help us reimagine our society.» (Olafur Eliasson, from the official website of the association CUCULA)

Many other artistic projects like CUCULA are running in the streets, theatres and ateliers of Berlin, where the migrant subjects of Oranienplatz found an occupation. The following experiences of Obasi and Amal are other examples:

Obasi shows me the photos of the film project he is doing in Berlin with a group of supporters, he is very proud. “The film will speak about the story of Oranienplatz – he explains me – and will end with some shots in the dormitory where we are living now”. I tell him that I am very curious to watch the film as soon as it will be ready. (Participant observation with Obasi in Berlin, January 2014)

The bell rings at my home: it is Amal. He enters the apartment, it was unexpected. “Amal, everything ok?”, I ask him. “Yes, yes, every thing super!” he smiles “I am going to the Berlinale, the film festival! The film where I have done the actor will be presented!! they told me just yesterday, so I am running there now, because in two hours it will be shown!”. I am surprised, I didn’t know that Amal was an actor of a short film; he continues: “Yes, I am the only actor! It is a film about my story … but also about Oranienplatz … I have some tickets also for you, if you want to come!” (Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, February 2015)

The projects that involve migrant subjects from Oranienplatz are not dealing only with art (see appendix 21), but also with other activities such as cooking or sport, like the following ethnographic note highlights:

Wembe is explaining me his situation in Berlin. We are sitting on the steps down of Kotti Café, many people are around us, above all African people, friends of Wembe and Amal. They sometimes interrupt us, and sometimes we can talk without interruptions. “At the beginning it was difficult here in Berlin, you know the story, because of our Italian document. But now I found my way … and now it is ok”. I ask him which way he has

186 From the official website of the association CUCULA
187 Like for example the project Über den Tellerrand Kochen (translation: cooking over the edge of a plate) that aim to bring together Germans, Europeans, and people with migration underground through the activity of cooking together. Here the website: www.ueberderrntellerrandkochen.de.
found in order to remain in Berlin, and he explains me: “I mean, it is not a definitive way ... of course, but at least I am doing something now. I am playing football in a team here in Kreuzberg. I am good in football!” and he smiles. “Also this was difficult at the beginning. Because here you need like a license or something like this. So, I couldn't get it, always for the same problem ... Italia document! So ... I have played in different teams, and was good, but I could just do the training, but not the official match ... so it was bad! Then, I found a team here in Kreuzberg and they give me the licence, so now I can play the official match! I am so happy! Kreuzberg is very good for us, refugees!”.

( Participant observation in Berlin, February 2015)

The supporters network in Berlin was very active on several fronts, fulfilling all the typical activities of advocacy pro-migrants groups: activities of promoting networks, of political protest, of legal protection, and those of producing services (Ambrosini 2015). Despite this, some problems remain that make the everyday life of migrant subjects still precarious. Indeed, the main problem of these different projects is their temporary and precarious nature: despite the good intention, the migrant subjects didn't manage to earn a real wage. These activities are hence experienced as temporary and transitory toward a more stable condition that since four years hardly occurs.

Photo 19: Exhibition about Oranienplatz protests at Gorki Theatre
Nevertheless, the role of the social relations and the feeling of being welcomed in Kreuzberg play a crucial role in the decision to remain in Berlin, despite the strong awareness of the limitations because of the legal status. The following narrations of Obasi and Amal well shed light on that:

«For me it was the first time that I do demonstration and political activity. But I met a lot of supporters and I saw day by day that they were really good people and they wanted to help us and support us. So we started to stay together many time, we have done all the things together! A lot of demonstration, political meeting, many many things together with the supporters ... they are great! Also they bring us food, sometimes clothes, like this .... I like it here.» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)

«Here in Berlin I met many different people, from different countries, and they do many things: a lot of political meetings, political things, many! Instead, in Italy I was thinking just to work, to job, there are no political activities, you go to work, you work, and then you go back home and sleep. It is a pity, because also speaking with many people that have done many different experiences ... also this means learning and studying! The world is big, there are many things to get know and many things that we don't know, so it is great to meet people. I sleep 4 hours in Berlin! Yes! I have many many things to do!» (Interview with Obasi in Berlin, November 2014)

In the everyday life of Berlin, my research protagonists open up interstices of autonomy that are spatial and temporal, but also political and juridical – as the Oranienplatz experience has highlighted. Here the opened interstices have a collective nature, contrary to those in Milan, due to the multiplicity of actions of many small groups of migrant subjects and supporters that remain connected thanks to the shared experience of Oranienplatz protest.

Migrant subjects with Italian document feel “at home” in Kreuzberg despite their “illegal” status. Their everyday life remains however fragmented and precarious. Indeed, in chapter five the mobility practices for the document renewals were presented in order to shed light on the fragmented life rhythms experienced by my research protagonists. Still at the end of the year 2015, they have to go back to Italy in order to renew their documents, the “solutions” in Berlin are not yet stable enough to “abandon” the security of the Italian document.

The frequent and continuous border-crossing mobility has to be understood as another everyday practices that sheds light on migrant subjects’ agency and its level of creativity; these practices have been already presented in chapter five. Thus, the everyday life of migrant subjects is alternated by everyday practices of space and time re-appropriation, practices of mobility and borders crossing, moments of rest, improvise departures, re-orientations, accellerations and interruptions. Indeed, also those who are living in Berlin and feel at home, didn’t see this situation as definitive or stable; they always take into account the possibility to
move to another place sooner or later, as the interviews about the future perception have highlighted. Amal’s words shed lights on that:

We are watching the football match in the bingo at Kottbussestor. Amal is calm, now he has a paid job: “This job is ok, I have to work and study a lot, but at least I get paid. And I have a three years contract … at least”. “Fantastic! So, you are set now!” I tell him, and he replies: “Me? No, not at all! I am tired, I was here in Berlin for two years and everything was so difficult … and also now, everything is so slow! I would like to go to London! If I manage, I remain there!”. I am a bit surprised, and I ask him again: “But now you have a contract for three years … and also a document, right?”, “Yes – replies Amal smiling – I am now ok with the document for here. But I told you, Berlin has made me tired … to much hope and for to long nothing happens, if I go to London, I won't come back!” and he smiles. (Participant observation with Amal in Berlin, October 2015)

Amal’s perception of the future and his stormy feelings moving inside him creatively open up his aspirations.

Another example sheds light on this feeling to be constantly en transit: the fact that the majority of my research protagonists don’t want to forget the Italian language. This highlights their feeling to leave an open door to come back to Italy, as Asad is telling us:

Asad is explaining us that for him it is important to maintain the Italian language: “I don't want to forget this language, the Italian one! Now I am living in Berlin for one or two years, but when I will go back to Italy, I need this language, so I try to maintain the exercise! For example, I met an Italian man here in Berlin and we became friend! So I can speak always Italian with him and I don't forget the language.” […] He continues: “I need the Italian language when I go to Questura for my documents! If you don't know italiano then people there are angry! Oh, yes! Very angry!” all the other people around the table laugh. (Participant observation in Berlin, November 2014)

Furthermore, the migrant subjects living in Berlin strongly attempt to learn the German language, being aware that it can open a door in this country where the economy and the labor market are doing better than in Italy. The following words of Wembe and Harun shed light on this language issue, highlighting another everyday practice that entails improving their autonomy:

I am at the bingo with Amal and we are watching the football match. At one point a friend of Amal arrives close to us and hears us speaking Italian, he introduces himself: “Sei Italiana? [are you Italian?] Hallo, ich bin Wembe! Woher kommst du? [Hi, I am Wembe! Where do you come from?]” I ask him whether we should speak in Italian or German, and he replies that he knew Italian but now he has learnt German, so it is better to speak German: “Il tedesco mi ha rubato l’italiano! [the German language has stolen my Italian!]” he says laughing. (Participant observation in Berlin, February 2015)

«Our problem in Germany is that we don't understand the language yet. But this is also people's fault, who are here since two or three years and they don't speak the language
yet. Because, you know, we have to find the integration. The integration depends from us and from what we want to do, you can do a language course or you can look for a job. Now I am following a German class in Alexanderplatz, for me the important thing is to have the possibility to read, I don't care about the certificate, I am interested just in two things: be able to communicate with the people, and be able to understand the things written in German.» (Interview with Harun in Berlin, February 2015)

Harun's words “we have to find the integration” shed light on the idea and awareness around “integration” as a practice enacted by the subjects; thus, according to people moving from one country to another, the language is the first practice that has to be learned in order to live in a society. They learn German language, but they don't want to forget the Italian one, being aware of their condition of subjects on the move, notably still \textit{en transit}.

What emerges from these biographies, from the subjective feelings and emotions, from the everyday practices and from the creativity toward an openness, is a \textit{subjectivity en transit} that is moving and living across Europe between and beyond – and sometimes crashing against – the geographical and juridical borders.
«Ok, this thing we're telling is to make people understand that the refugees is … I mean, no one is born as refugee, so refugee can be any person. Each of us can find himself as refugee. So, the refugee has also his own country, but the problem is just that the situation there is complicated, in his country, that's why today he is in another foreign country. So, I want to make people understand that even though today is good, in the future you would find a bad situation for you ... and then you have to escape, and if not your self, then maybe your relatives! Perhaps your relatives found themselves in the same situation that the refugees are experiencing now. Then you have to think about the future of your kids or your cousins, you have to think about this thing: if you have not found the problem, you have to think that in the future it can happen. No one is born refugee, so ... No one is born not refugee. It's just the situation that is changing, so is life. It constantly changes. It is the impossible that becomes possible, and the possible that becomes impossible. That's life.» (Interview with Amal in Berlin, October 2014)
6.3 R-existence practices of non-European subjects

In this chapter the agency dimension of my research protagonists was highlighted through the analytical concept of subjectivity. I have grasped both the inner emotions and feelings of migrant subjects, and their everyday practices of resistance and existence between the structural constraints. Shedding light on the multiplicity of human conditions looking at the experiences of the subjects allows to understand how the world and societies change, and how it thus remake the conditions of our lives and also our most intimate inner processes, namely emotions, cognitive style, and our deepest sense of the self (Kleinman and Fitz-Henry 2007). The concept of subjectivity allows here to shed light on the power relations and the frictions that occur between the structural constraints of migration control and the subjective drive of migrant subjects. The subjection practices deployed by power relations and the process of self-creation within these power relation enacted by the migrant subjects were here highlighted through the different emotions and feelings expressed by my research protagonists, and also through their practices of time and space re-appropriation in their everyday life. The agency emerges here as a temporal phenomenon, and migration can be thus understood as a process of becoming: the sentence of Harun «we have to find the integration» is an interesting insight for this issue. Looking at migration as a process of becoming and at the agency as a temporal phenomenon does not mean to obscure the structural constraints and the responsibility of the institutions and several political actors in the management of this phenomenon – and the negative consequences on the migrants' biographies. The aim of this chapter is to deconstruct the image of migrant subjects, notably “refugees”, as victim and passive people, shedding light on the negotiation practices in which they are involved as active subjects. Moreover, highlighting their emotions and feelings – above all their future dimension – allows to present them as social actors that have “ordinary” desires and aspirations, rather than represent them as merely bodies that are passively bounced from one place to another, treated as objects to be integrated. Treating the category of “refugees” as victims means to deny their agentic capability and above all to deny the fact that they also have desires and life projects (Ambrosini 2015).

The different structural constraints and events that influenced the biographies of my research protagonists – such as the Libya war, the ENA program in Italy, and the Berliner institutions' behaviour – have entailed feelings of frustrations, fear and shame, which sometimes turned
into anger, and have also influenced the perception of future expressed through the aspirations and desires. I consider the multiplicity of these affects as a “stormy inner drive” that moves the subjects internally and allows them to move on – in interaction with other structural and relational factors as the trajectories literature has highlighted. Indeed, with emotions and feelings being relational, they involve a re-action of the subjects. “Moving on” means the attempt to realize their aspirations, which are usually not linked to a definitive permanence in Europe, highlighting hence their detachment from a specific geographical area. Rather, aspirations and wishes are more linked to the realization of some life projects and desires that are parts of the future perspective. Having a perspective for the future, albeit vague and blurry, means for my research protagonists to have a “condition of possibility” (Butler 1997) that allows them to act and move on looking for better life conditions.

The drive to “move on” is linked to the feeling of “not yet arrived”, i.e. to be still en transit. The transit experience hence becomes existential, being internalized by the migrant subjects through its temporal, spatial and juridical dimensions. “Not yet arrived” in a point in their life where some of their projects and wishes are realized shows that migration can be understood as a process of becoming and agency as a temporal phenomenon. The lengthened experience of transit transforms the transit into a more definitive stage, which cannot be seen any more as a passage stage.

The experience of migrant subjects criss-crossing Europe is not linear and stable, but interrupted and fragmented, characterized by different temporalities and the hypermobility. Hence, also feelings and emotions are on the move and changes according to the circumstances and situations encountered by the migrant subjects. The circularity of people, together with that of their emotions, feelings, and resistance practices entail to the establishment of a collective knowledge about a “culture of mobility” within and across European borders. The narrations of my research protagonists have highlighted a process of building awareness en route, highlighting the centrality of the travel as experience, rather than as a merely movement from A to B. The awareness of being subjectivity en transit is not a fix and stable knowledge, it is rather a fluid set of social practices, discourses and information produced from below by the experiences of migrant subjects on the move. The awareness of their condition was well highlighted by the sentence «we, people of the generation 2011!» said by a protagonist of my research.

Building awareness should not be confused with a strong political consciousness, exactly like speaking about subjectivity en transit does not mean to speak about “political subjects” that are always strongly aware of the power relations occurring upon and through their
biographies. This is a crucial point in order to understand the agency of the protagonists of my research, an issue linked also to a further question: whether their everyday practices can be understood as “resistance” or “existence” – or even survival – practices.

Looking at the everyday practices of my research protagonists in the cities of Milan and Berlin, but also in their movements between the national borders, it is a challenge to understand whether these practices can be considered as resistance or not. Usually, speaking about “resistance practices” means to refer to political struggles enacted by subjugated and/or marginal subjects. Instead, I here use the concept of “resistance practices” to point to everyday social practices enacted by subjects that more or less consciously recognize – or feel – a domination upon them, i.e. a power relation. A resistance act or practice does not necessary involve a strong awareness of the subject to act against a power, and much less does it necessarily mean a political claim. Rather, a resistance practice means – according to my research – recognising a power relation and the subjugation condition, and consequently the attempt to overcome, break, or getting around this power constraint. The recognition can be at a rather unconscious level, namely at the emotional dimension, or at a more rational level including a process of awareness. In the narrations of my research protagonists it is possible to observe not only both the dimensions but a variety of awarenesses that can be placed on a continuum with the two endpoints of rational and emotional recognition.

Thus, the protagonists of my research who participated in the protest of Oranienplatz have undertaken a process of political-consciousness building about their condition and about the political and power relations. On the contrary, the protagonists living in Milan did not develop a political consciousness, but nevertheless have enacted re-appropriation practices in order to open autonomous interstices “free” from the power relations they were experiencing in the everyday life. A multiplicity of different awarenesses can be grasped in the practices and discourses of my research protagonists, which allows to overcome the dual opposition resistance/existence, that I name “r-existence practices”, which incorporates different levels of awareness. Thus, some everyday practices are consciously resistance while others are rather existence or survival tactics, but both are characterized by a certain degree of awareness and feeling about the power relations.

The agency that is at the base of the everyday r-existence practices can be understood through the concept of creativity, which has already been applied by a number of scholars. The temporal meaning of creativity can be expressed as “aspiration to change”; it is a process of openness and an expression of movement. It also involves the emotional dimension, which is crucial for breaking the habits and embracing new insights and ideas.
In the city of Milan, the creativity of my research protagonists allowed them to open urban *interstices* in order to re-appropriate autonomous time. The everyday practices of time and space re-appropriation in Milan were characterized by the practice of invisibility: migrant subjects “open up” places where they could “calm down” and be quiet, and were they could converse without being in the spotlights of migration control mechanisms. Places of sociability emerge, where the narrations of the migrant subjects' experiences can be heard and they can freely express themselves, which does not happen during the everyday life of migrant subjects with “denied subjectivity” (Gatta 2012b). Moreover, together with the conversation an exchange of important information occurs that is part of this “culture of mobility” of subjectivity en transit built from below. The sociability places can be understood as *interstices*, highlighting their small dimension and marginality, but above all the power dimension and the agency/struggles that are inherent in the concept of interstice (Brighenti *et al* 2013).

To the contrary, in Berlin the re-appropriation practices involved more the space dimension because of the Oranienplatz protest experience that involved the occupation of a square and a school together with many street demonstrations and roof-protests. The everyday practices of re-appropriation in the German capital were accompanied by a process of political-consciousness building. Once the square and the squatted school were evicted, the everyday practices of migrant subjects occurred above all in the neighbourhood Kreuzberg thanks to the relationships with the supporters' network built during the political protests. Thus, the attempt to individualize and invisibilize the “unwanted” population of *O-platz* implemented by the local institution has partially failed thanks to the frequent activities that the supporters and the migrant subjects carried on. Theatre groups, artistic projects and the friendship and love relations with the supporters allowed the “interrupted citizens” to decide Berlin as the place to live, despite their “illegal” condition. Also in Kreuzberg sociability places emerged such as Görlizer park and the crossroad Kottbussertor. A process of “*integration without reception*” (Ambrosini 2014) has been started, as a response to the abandonment policies implemented by the German local authorities. Nevertheless, without a legal recognition that allows the access to the labour market, the lives of my research protagonists remain fragmented and precarious also in Berlin, where the transit condition was consolidated and became existential. Indeed, migrant subjects living in Berlin move back and forth between Italy and Germany in order to renew their Italian documents, and often consider the possibility to come back to Italy one day – or to move further to another European country.

In this regard, the experiences of my research protagonists moving between and beyond the
borders of Europe well fit the de Certeau's description of tactic, which «cross-cuts, fragments, cracks and lucky hits in the framework of a system» (de Certeau 1984, p. 38). In this chapter, I considered the distinction between strategies and tactics of de Certeau not in his totality, but just as insight that is useful for shedding light on some aspect of my research analysis. Therefore, I prefer to use the wider term “social practices” in order to point to the everyday practices of my research protagonists that present different degrees of awareness and political consciousness. Nevertheless, the insight of de Certeau about the tactics as the “art of the weak” well fits in representing the everyday experiences of my research protagonists in Europe. The description he gave how «they [the tactics] circulate, come and go, overflow and drift over an imposed terrain, like the snowy waves of the sea slipping in among the rocks and defiles of an established order» (de Certeau 1984, p. 34) highlights the fluidity of my research protagonists concrete journeys but also aspirations and emotional conditions.

The subjectivities en transit are built through the power relation of the European border regime of migration control and through the attempts to open up autonomous space and time practiced by the migrant subjects and their supporters networks. An historical subjectivity emerges and is characterized by repeated movements of migrant subjects between and beyond the European borders, and the resulting tensions open up juridical, spatial and temporal interstices through which the migrant subjects re-appropriate autonomous time, their desires, aspirations and life projects. The narrations of my research protagonists allowed to observe how their stories are at the same time private and political (Pinelli 2013b). The variety of emotions and feelings expressed by my research protagonists present a private dimension, due to the fact that involve the subjective intimacy. But a political dimension is also present, since this intimacy tells us the effect of the power relations and social hierarchies upon the lives and biographies of migrant subjects.

The everyday practices shed light on biographies of non-European subjects that are attempting to experience Europe as one single place, and thence clash with the short-sightedness of the European laws and institutions; this highlighting the multiplicity of negotiation practices in redefining the borders.
CONCLUSION

This work aimed to shed light on a fragmented and heterogeneous reality of social life linked to the issue of global migration and the attempt to control and manage it deployed by the European Union. To conclude, I will briefly summarize the results that emerged from my ethnographic research, which I detailed in the chapters three, four, five and six.

A first issue is related to the nature of the European border regime that govern and manage the migrant mobilities in Europe and beyond. Building on secondary social science literature and on the analysis of the EU asylum laws in chapter three, I highlighted how the European border regime was created through several contradictory and contested processes that involved many actors at different levels. Political and non-political actors, the heterogeneous civil societies, and the migrant subjects itself contributed to the redefinition of borders and policies in the space of negotiating practices that Europe embodies. A fragmented sovereignty emerges, on which several borders and policies intersect and act at the supranational, national and local level. This leads to the creation of multiple juridical spaces that overlap with geographic space. I found the interconnection of humanitarian and securitarian devices as a main characteristic of the European system of control and management of migrant mobilities. The interconnection takes place above all in the figure of “refugee”, treated both as a victim and an internal enemy. My case-studies of the Mediterranean crisis discuss in detail how this mixed humanitarian and securitarian system concretely works, exemplified by the creation of an emergency regime in Italy. A blurred category of migrant subjects has been produced that is characterized by the ambivalent nature of securitarian and humanitarian concerns, i.e. the “emergency temporary refugee”: a person who has the (temporary) right for protection but has to be controlled. Furthermore, shedding light on the restrictive asylum system in Germany I showed that the interconnection between humanitarian and securitarian concern is becoming a common way to manage migration for asylum, being embedded in two different countries such as Italy and Germany – with some differences concerning the national varieties.

A second issue I addressed in this work aimed to exactly understand which are the effects of the EU control and management policies, notably the asylum policies, upon the biographies of the protagonists of my research. I discussed this issue in chapter four and argued based on the empirical data that the Italian emergency regime has shaped the experience of migrant subjects as temporary, since it has produced laws, legal statuses and management policies that
prevented long-term planning. This temporariness is linked to a hyper-mobility experienced by my research protagonists around Italy and across Europe and leads to a lengthened state of precariousness in their lives. The precariousness and temporariness were maintained and reproduced in Berlin, due to the failed political agreement during the Oranienplatz protest. This highlights a similarity in the management of these errant “temporary refugees” between the two countries, despite the main structural differences. This similarity, manifesting itself through the common interconnection of policies of control and abandonment, can be identified in the local policies and in the institutional behaviour. The interconnection affects the biographies of my research protagonists and forms their everyday life as fragmented circuits. Their ongoing mobility in fragmented circuits in search of better life condition is intertwined with temporal ruptures, which highlight how points of stasis, interruptions, and re-orientation also compose their migratory path. The protagonists of my research experience in their everyday lives a continuous shift between invisibility and hypervisibility in the urban space. They emerge as an errant orphan population that transitorily dwells different places and experiences precariousness and uncertainty. I briefly sketched in chapter four how the errant subjects react to this precariousness and discussed the informal networks on which their mobilities are based.

The analysis of the crossing-border mobility deals with the third issue addressed in my work, i.e. where and which are the EU internal borders and how they interact with the “temporary refugees” on the move. I exposed in chapter five through the ethnographic material the control mechanisms of internal borders, shedding light on the heterogeneity of how they manifest themselves and how they influence the lives of my research protagonists. The internal borders are scattered in the national and urban territory, are usually latent and come to the fore through the contested movements of my research protagonists. Crossing-border mobility highlights that the borders of national states are projected on the legal statuses, and thus embodied by the persons on the move that hence carry the borders with them. This could be grasped through the racial profiling mechanism they experience as “travellers” across Europe holding a temporary document. The internal borders can be individually activated, being dependent also on the negotiating practices that occur between the migrant subjects and the persons who embody the control – such as policemen and bureaucratic staff. A high level of discretionary power was grasped in the “bureaucratic space” of asylum procedures and control of migrant mobilities. A blurry category of people on the move emerges from the tensions between the control mechanisms and the crossing-border mobilities in a twilight zone between “regularity” and “irregularity”. Hence, the legal status, according to its blurry nature,
sometimes works as a strong internal border and sometimes as a tool to freely move across and beyond the borders.

I shed light on the mobilities of my research protagonists within Europe and the way through which they create frictions while crossing and crashing on the internal borders. These tensions and frictions create what I called interstices, namely “spaces in the middle”, opened up by migrant subjects in excess that manage to move within the social and juridical constraints. They sometimes remain caught in the bureaucratic meshes, and other times – through their everyday several struggles – they open up “spaces of possibility” that are juridical, spatio-temporal and political. I interpreted the Oranienplatz experience as a juridical, spatio-temporal and political interstice, where interrupted citizens on the move struggled for their rights.

The production of border places within urban and national territories is a further consequence of these frictions. My empirical research adds to existing works on border places, which mainly focussed on national territories and on closed structures such as refugees camps and deportation prisons. Complementing this research, I here show how border places can also be produced in urban territories such as public parks, train stations and abandoned houses, due to the process of bordering that is implemented through the control mechanisms deployed on subjects that cross and dwell such places. Furthermore, my ethnographic research shed light on how these places present an ambivalent nature, as they are sometimes experienced as border places and other times as transit sites. I defined transit sites as the places dwelled by my research protagonists where they get in contact and build relationships with other migrant subjects. These relationships entail the creation of informal networks on which the mobilities of my research protagonists are based, through which information and contacts are shared and through which a collective knowledge on border-crossing practices is produced. The ambivalent nature of such border and transit places highlights how through the mobilities of my research protagonists a multiplicity of different social territories emerges in one geographical space.

The informal networks relate to the last issue addressed in my work: how do the temporary refugees work out social practices in order to autonomously live and move between and beyond the borders. Focussing on the agency dimension through the concept of subjectivity allowed me to understand the effect of the power relations on the subjects and the practices of self formation within the structural constraints. I focussed on the emotions and feelings in order to shed light on the inner stormy drive as an important component of the subjective agency. Aspirations, desires, orientation toward the future, fears, frustration and anger contribute to the decision to act in one way or in another. The formation of life projects
emerges as an interactive and culturally embedded process by which social actors negotiate their paths towards the future, receiving their driving impetus from the conflicts and challenges of social life. The narrations of my research protagonists allowed me to highlight how their transit condition presents not just a juridical and geographical dimension, but also a spatio-temporal one, namely an existential one. The protagonists of my research experienced themselves still in transit and “not yet arrived”, meaning not yet arrived in a point in their life in which some of their projects or desires are realized. Furthermore, this existence in transit made them build an awareness *en route* about their condition, which is shared in the collective knowledge. The awareness of being *subjectivity en transit* is not a fixed and stable knowledge, it is rather a fluid set of social practices, discourses and information produced from below by the experiences of migrant subjects on the move. This highlights how agency is a temporal phenomenon, and thus how migration is a *process of becoming*. My research allowed me to understand how time – in its different forms of temporalities – is the dimension that mainly characterizes the migratory experience in the contemporary age.

I connected the agency dimension also to the everyday social practices of my research protagonists, which re-appropriated spaces and time “free” of the power relations they usually experienced. These spatio-temporal re-appropriated places can be also experienced as sociability places where neglected subjectivities express themselves. In Milan the re-appropriation practices concern rather the temporal dimension, in Berlin to a lager extent the spatial and political one. The strong network of supporters in Berlin was crucial in order to support and build social practices together that attempt to overcome the internal borders in the everyday life in Berlin. Indeed, the long-term relationships built between the “*O-platz* refugees” and the supporters allowed to protect the migrant subjects treated as “illegal” from the control mesh of the local authorities. Furthermore, it allowed them to build an affective relation with the neighbourhood of Kreuzberg, where they felt “at home” despite being “unwanted” in the German territory because of their legal condition. I grasped the subjective agency that is at the base of the everyday practices through the concept of *creativity*. This concept is here understood as an “aspiration to change” and a process of “opening up” autonomous interstices which are spatio-temporal, juridical and political. The everyday practices are here understood as *r-existence* practices, shedding light on the variety and heterogeneity of the social practices enacted by my research protagonists in order to turn around, overcome, or break the borders. I understand the everyday practices in a continuum with at the extremes of a strong political awareness and an unconscious sensibility for power relations. Indeed, the *recognition* of a subjection position is crucial within a power framework.
and allows the subjects to work out r-existence practices in order to autonomously live. This recognition can occur at a rather unconscious level, through for example the feelings of frustration, fear, anger, and being ashamed about the living condition. At a more conscious level it can occur through building political awareness, as during the Oranienplatz protest. The heterogeneity of this recognition of power relations and subjection position leads to a subjective (re)action that can take different forms as the ethnographic notes showed.

Subjectivities en transit emerge, that criss-cross the European territory and attempt to autonomously build their lives while moving between the social and juridical constrains. The contradictory attempt to control and host them in their ambivalent image as victim and internal enemy, as deployed by the institutions, leads to a lengthened temporariness and a hypermobility in the migrant subjects biographies. Their precariousness is strengthened and shapes their lives as fragmented, still, they open up interstices of autonomy.

Outlook: Which Europe, for whom?

Observing the biographies of my research protagonists that arrived in Europe in 2011 and still are precariously on the move at the end of 2015, it is possible to state – though it is provocative – that their everyday practices criss-crossing and dwelling different European places are the beginning of a process of “Europeanisation from below”. Indeed, the whole European territory is experienced and perceived by my research protagonists as one single place: living in Berlin, renewing the documents in Milan, attending education courses in Turin, and working seasonally in Sicily or Apulia, always with an open possibility to move further to France or Belgium. Moreover, the multiplicity of belongings they have externalized, such as the “black Italians”, or the “Lampedusa in Berlin” or belongings linked to the region or city, or even neighbourhood where they felt “welcomed”, sheds light on a sort of “freedom” from national attachment that could allow us to consider the «migrants as the real Europeans» (Brighenti 2007). In a time where the European Union is experiencing a strong political and structural crisis, some non-European subjects do experience Europe as a whole. They crash against the internal borders and the structural constraints, such as European and national laws, economical crises and different welfare systems. Indeed, the fragmented European biographies of my research protagonists can be understood as a consequence of the tension between the structural constraints and the movement of the migrant subjectivities that try to overcome the several internal European borders and open autonomous space and time. Observing the events now occurring in Europe related to the migration and asylum issue, my
research protagonists can be seen as pioneers for a change – or attempt of change – of the European asylum laws, notably as the initiators for the *de facto* breakdown of the Dublin Regulation. Indeed, during the years 2013 and 2014 the “asylum-seeker newcomers” – above all people from Syria and Eritrea – landing in Italy refused to leave their fingerprints in the Mediterranean peninsula, moving directly further to other northern European countries. This was partly due to the behaviour of the national institutions that applied what Ambrosini (2014b) calls a “*passive tolerance*” – i.e. they did not take the fingerprints, allowing hence the migrant subjects to move further. The process found its climax in summer 2015, when the Chancellor of Germany, Angela Merkel, suspended the Dublin Regulation and thus started a process of negotiation in order to overcome the Dublin system on the level of the European Union institutions. Of course, my research protagonists did not act alone, their movements and everyday practices together with the action of several supporters' networks across Europe have trigged a crisis of a European asylum system, which is still based on the logic of national-states and is seen by many as short-sighted. Schengen agreement is now challenged by the reluctance of some national-states to receive and host (forced) migrant subjects that in the year 2015 arrived in Europe in large numbers. European and national institutions should now carefully observe and understand the changes that are occurring within their societies. The migration phenomenon and the mobility of “non-Europeans” within Europe should not be considered as emergency and exception, but as a “normal” everyday social phenomenon linked to the wider process of globalization that are together remaking our world.
I am speaking with Amal about the terrorist attacks of Paris that occurred on November 2015. We both lost a good friend, they were both young people coming from the cities where we were born. We discuss about this event, that interconnects migration, international power relations and globalization with our personal lives. During our conversation I make some thoughts about this issue, and I use the pronoun “us”, referring to the target of the terrorist attacks. Amal asks me: “who do you mean with ‘us’? Not you European, don’t you?! right?! Because it involves all of us! All of us, young people on the move, living around the world! Me, you, my friends and your friends. We, that move through Europe and beyond, that try to build our lives in this world that runs too fast and where we are all so precarious … you for some reasons and me for others. But don’t divide us, don’t consider you as European and me as what? These events connect us, and look at you and me: we are more close and similar to each other than you with an Italian businessman working and living in Africa. Isn’t it? So why we should still think us divided? You can live under the spotlights in your everyday life, me … I have to live in the shadow. But our lives, ideas, dreams and life projects … are they so different?”
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Figure 1: Translations in many languages in Oranienplatz. From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 2: Flyers of the Oranienplatz protest - From the Archive in progress
WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 3: Flyer of Oranienplatz protest - From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 4: “Clueless in Kreuzberg”

From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 5: “Chaos? There was no chaos”: From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Letter to the senate and especially to the interior Minister Frank Henkel from the protesting refugees in Oranienplatz and school,

we ask you to reflect about the demands of the movement. We think if you do this you will find that our protest is legal. An eviction is no solution, than we will still be on the streets but without tents, and who is from the lagers will not go back to the lagers and Lampedusa. Also an eviction is not humanitarian and it will not stop the protest. Oranienplatz and school is not the only place in Germany where we refugees and also other organizations protest against the from us and several organizations as inhuman clarified asylum system.

A former CDU politician said Monika Herrman is not enough dictator to evict the protest camp it seems Mr. Henkel wants to be enough dictator. This is not in the law of a democratic state where the political party's also have to accept that there are districts where they are not elected. If you evict Oranienplatz and school you will misuse your political power against the people living in Kreuzberg.

The planed take over from Mr Henkel is a misuse of the law-state. We like to quote from a statement written by more than 100 lawyers arguing for the paragraph 23, which allows Mr. Henkel, to accept a group of refugees: “The thought of a law-state is part of the fundamental right concept, that was developed as a concept for defending the right of an individual against government interventions. Guarantees like for example the right of an effective rights protection, the right of a fair treatment by law or the self-incrimination should protect the people against interventions in there fundamental rights and state despotism. With concern we see the interventions in the law-state in the recent debate is more and more used, to legitimize repressions against individuals.”

Also we want to say that, we want to stay on Oranienplatz and School until our demands are fulfilled and the talking we only stay because we are convinced by supporters to do so is a wrong presentation of hysteric facts and a defamation of the self organized refugee protest. And it is a very colonial perspective we refugees dont accept.

Our demands remain, we want to abolish the residenzplicht which is a law without any use for the german society. It is a law which was first used by germany in the colonization of africa and there is also no other country in the world who needs this law to make a good politie. So the protest against the residenzplicht which is existing since this law is existing, is very much legal and necessary and was also accepted politically during the protestmarch from wüzburg to berlin and also now when people say we don’t accept this racist law because it is in conflict which a lot of other laws like Paragraph 13.1 in human right declaration.. Also we dont accept the dublin system.

We want to close the lagers, German institutions force refugees to live in lagers, where we are being isolated from access to social, health and infrastructure services and have faced Neonazi attacks. The lager system is a prison system which we are resisting with our protest on the streets. Our protest is part of the big German wide campaigns against lagers. If you want to know more about protest against lager system read the reports of many humanitarian organization.

We want to abolish deportation because deportation kills.

We want to have the right to work, there is many studies, which point out that having a good migration will be good for economics and work situation.

Instead of an eviction we advice you to name “Oranienplatz” in “Refugee freedom square” and the school in “Refugee embassy”.

We are not here for humanitarian help.

Before you want to evict the camp and school you should come and talk to us on our demands.

First: Evict Lagers, evict Deportation, evict Residenzplicht, evict the ban of work permission
Than the last eviction will be Oranienplatz and school by ourself.

Figure 6: Letter to the senate from refugees in Oranienplatz and the school
From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 7:
Upper panel: “The politicians of Berlin proudly present NO solution.”
Lower panel: “Will the refugee camp stay forever?”

From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 8: Boss of BVG (local transport authority) angry at Kolat’s travellers without ticket

From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 9:
Upper panel: “Refugees shall get the right to stay”
Lower Panel: “Lampedusa can also be in Berlin”
From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
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Figure 10:
Upper panel: “refugee trouble about new home”
Lower panel: “fight for Oranienplatz”

From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE.
Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 11: “No more Oranienplatz”

From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 12:
Upper panel: “the everlasting O-platz”
Lower panel: “A question of point of view”

From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
### Figure 13: The Oranienplatz list - From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Aufenthaltsgestattung in Deutschland und italienische Papiere</td>
<td>u.a.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Aufenthaltsgestattung</td>
<td>35 in Brandenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67 in Niedersachsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 in Sachsen Anhalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Duldung in Deutschland</td>
<td>2 in Bayern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Im Dublin Verfahren in Deutschland</td>
<td>u.a. mit Spanien, Ungarn, Italien, Frankreich, Niederlande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Subsidiärer Schutz in Italien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Spanische Aufenthaltspapiere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Aufenthalt aus Humanitären Gründen in Italien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ohne Papiere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Politisches Asyl in Italien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete: 462
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/</th>
<th>Name/</th>
<th>Nationality/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: The Oranienplatz list without name - From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
To all residents of the former Gerhart-Hauptmann-School

We, as being the political responsible persons for the district Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, are deeply affected by the tragic occurrence in the school in the last days. We would like the family of the deceased person, his friends and companions to accept our deep sympathy.

In consideration of this fact and to protect the people living in this space we are forced to arrange certain changes within the school and herewith inform you about the following procedures:

1. It is the aim of the district’s department of social affairs to organise alternative living space for the Roma-families as soon as possible.
2. The district of Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg awaits the offer of Berlin’s Senator Mario Czaja to provide alternative housing to the registered refugees living in the school.
3. Urgent: Being registered on the list is the absolute pre-condition to achieve alternative accommodation according to the agreement with Senator Dilek Kolat and her administration. Only registered people will be provided with alternative accommodation.
4. The district of Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg stands by to offer transfer of the school to a future international information centre for refugees. Our plan is to create accommodation for 70 refugees together with a clearing-post for refugees with unknown status. The Diakonisches Werk, the social organisation of the protestant church of Berlin, will be host for this accommodation facility.
5. For the time of reconstruction the school has to be emptied completely. Living on the construction side is not allowed due to humanitarian and security reasons.
6. For the time of reconstruction a maximum of 35 out of the future 70 inhabitants can reside as a “construction site group” in the pavilion. This is the equivalent of four classrooms.
7. The 35 people will be chosen by a qualified social agency and should be trained construction workers.
8. Also the other group of 35 future residents will be chosen by a qualified social agency.
9. The reconstruction of the school building will be organised with a social agency.
10. A delegation up to 10 people out of the refugee-community will be involved in planning the future residential area. This working group named “Creating future living space” will have one month time for their work with the people in charge for the reconstruction. There will be more opportunities to cooperate in creating concepts for the future refugee centre.

Hans Panhoff, District Councilor Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, Department of planning, building, ecology and real estate

Figure 15: Letter of the district Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg to the migrant subjects living within the squatted school

From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 16: Proposal of the neighbourhood Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg for the squatted school

From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 17: Data entry form for O-platz people in order to do the interview in the Foreign Office - From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 18: Data entry form for O-platz people in order to do the interview in the Foreign Office
From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 19: Data entry form for O-platz people in order to do the interview in the Foreign Office

From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 20: Letter through which the protagonists of O-platz protest were kicked out from the residential accommodations

From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin
Figure 21: “Oranienplatz is everywhere” - newspaper article about the spread of the O-platz protest in the whole Europe

*From the Archive in progress WE WILL RISE. Refugees Movement – Berlin*
Per evitare problemi o spiacevoli discussioni, come mi è capitato in passato, prendo a bordo SOLO CITTADINI NATI E RESIDENTI NELLA UE.
Vi prego di tenere presenti i seguenti punti:

- non fornisco il mio numero di telefono se prima non ci siamo accordati qua per il passaggio, quindi non chiedetemelo subito;

- non vi chiamo io se prima non ci siamo accordati qua per il passaggio, quindi non chiedetemelo;

- Blablacar ha un efficientissimo sistema di messaggeria, quindi usatelo e scrivetemi qua quali sono le vostre necessità, vi risponderò nel minor tempo possibile;

- Vi chiederò di mostrarmi i documenti prima di farvi sedere in macchina. Ho lavorato 10 anni in un Consolato Italiano all’estero, sono perfettamente in grado di riconoscere un documento falso!!!

I’m travelling for job, so the timing could change
Meeting points
Milano - Famagosta Metro station (M2)
Bregenz - Railway station
Nurnberg - Fischbach S-Bahn station
Chemnitz - Neefpark (McDonalds)
Dresda - Elbepark (McDonalds)
Lubbenau - Railways station

To avoid problems or unpleasant discussions, as happened to me in the past, I take aboard only PEOPLE BORN AND LIVING IN THE EU.
And please take note of the following points:

- I will not give you my phone number if you are not yet a passenger, so don’t ask;

- I will not call you if we do not have agreed the ride, so don’t ask;

- Blablacar has a very efficient messaging system, use it and write in the message your necessities, I will answer asap;

- I will check your ID documents upon the beginning of the trip. I’m a former Embassy employee, so I’m able to recognize false documents!!!

Figure 22: From the website of Blablacar, the informal system of shared cars
Figure 23: Flyers of theatre performance in Berlin done by a group of Oranienplatz people
Figure 24: Flyers of theatre performances and artistic exhibition in Berlin done by a group of Oranienplatz people.
Illustration 1: Poster of the live multimedia storytelling Storm•i performed during the annual conference of Escapes in Milan, 11-12 June 2015