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Abstract

This thesis analyses the Italian externalization of migration and border management policies in Libya, to see whether and how the Europeanization and concurrent securitization of migration policies played a role to legitimize these contested policies. Between 2000 and 2011, Italian cooperation with Libya improved in many areas, with migration control being one of the most important subjects covered by the agreements signed between those two countries. Such cooperation in controlling third country nationals’ mobility to Italy and the European Union included the re-admission to Libya of unauthorized migrants, combined with the exchange of information and surveillance technologies, as well as financial and material assistance. This bilateral collaboration in managing migration is not unique in Europe, as for instance Spain signed very similar agreements with Morocco and Mauritania already in 2006. Besides, the signing of these treaties was explicitly promoted also by the European Union since the 90s, as officially stated in the conclusions of the 1999 European Council of Tampere. However, despite the wide institutional support and legitimation of these policies, externalization had quickly attracted the condemnation of non-governmental actors and human rights courts. In 2012 Italy was condemned by the European Court of Human Rights for the non-application of the non-refoulement clause with asylum seekers coming from Libya. It is within this contested field that this thesis thus aims at analysing the many ways in which externalization was legitimized and justified by Italian authorities. Empirically, I analyse political discourse and see whether the increasing Europeanization and concurrent securitization of migration was used to justify and thus legitimize these contested policies.

Keywords: Italy, Libya, migration control, externalization, Europeanization, securitization.
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I. Introduction: The externalisation of migration control, a contested policy

Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi died on the 20\textsuperscript{th} of October of 2011, following the civil conflict which started in 2011 and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s (NATO) intervention in the North African country. With Gaddafi’s death, over forty years of totalitarian regime in Libya went to an end, generating numerous consequences to the country. First, as the civil war erupted, Libya entered into chaos, violence, and the substantial absence of a sovereign government.\textsuperscript{1} Seven years later, the fights are still dividing and destabilizing the country, even more since the terrorist organization Islamic State gained increasing influence and control in many regions.\textsuperscript{2} Obviously, the conflict had immediate repercussions also on the other side of the Mediterranean sea, as the lack of a sovereign government in Libya lead bilateral agreements with Italy to be suspended, with a consequent increase of boat migration from Libya. Today, migrants arriving in the European coasts are not only Libyans as they also come from other countries experiencing similar conflicts like Syria and Egypt, and the rest of Africa and Asia. Before the conflicts, almost the totality of those emigrating from Libya came mainly from the African Horn and Sub Saharan African countries. After all, since the creation of the Schengen space of free movement of people, North Africa became one of the main transit regions for undocumented migration into Europe. Yet, in Libya major humanitarian issues have soon been denounced with respect to the treatment of transiting migrants, as many of them faced malnutrition, enslavement and violence.\textsuperscript{3}

Before the fall of the Gaddafi regime, national authorities put a lot of effort in controlling migration in their country on behalf of Italy and Europe. This happened because of the improving relations that Libya maintained with European countries, and especially Italy. After

decades of international isolation consequent to Libya’s alleged links with international terrorism, in the 2000s the regime begun setting and signing a series of bilateral agreements as a sign of Gaddafi’s rapprochement with Western states.⁴

It must be reminded here that Libya has historically a special relation with Italy, as the North African country was invaded and colonised by the Italian Kingdom already in 1911. Another important element in this bond is the proximity of the Italian and Libyan coasts, making of the Sicilian Channel separating them one of the main routes for unauthorized migrations to the European Union (EU). The first agreement between Italy and Libya which included a reference to the need for Libya to take care of migration control on behalf of the Italian government was signed in 2000. Other agreements signed by Italy – mainly under the government of Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi - with Libya followed in the very next years. These bilateral documents covered many areas of cooperation, from the re-admission of migrants, to cooperation schemes between national police forces, and the transfer of knowledge and infrastructures. The cooperation between the two States has been strengthened in 2003, 2004 and 2007, to reach its momentum with the signature of the Treaty of Friendship, Partnership and Cooperation of 2008 - also called the “Benghazi Treaty”. Entered into force in March 2009, this agreement covered diverse areas of cooperation such as energy, cultural and historical relations, the economy and so on.⁵ Article 19 of this treaty deals with migration control. In particular, it sets a series of joint border control missions which were officially planned to control and tackle terrorism, organised crime, drug trafficking and unauthorized migration. Within such framework of collaboration, a joint Italian – Libyan border control mission was launched on May 15, 2008. This sort of operations did not constitute a novelty for Europe, nor they are limited to Libya. For example, an agreement on sea border control was signed between Italy and Tunisia already in 2004, while similar agreements were already implemented by Spain with Morocco, Mauritania and Guinea-Bissau. This latest agreement allowed Spanish ships and helicopters to enter the Guinean territory.⁶

This sort of operations, which take place outside the territory of the EU, are at the core of the increasing “externalization” of migration control. Here, the European Union (EU) is the

---

main player when concentrating on such policy shift. With the signing of the Schengen agreement in the 1980s, the ‘*acquis communautaire*’ was introduced to regulate the free-movement of persons within Europe. Today, the Schengen area includes 26 countries, including non-EU members like Switzerland and Norway.\(^7\) As internal borders were progressively eliminated, the EU worked at reinforce its external border. Cooperation between European member States on migration control was strengthened, to the point that today’s European Border and Coast Guard Agency (FRONTEX) was established in 2007.\(^8\) Within this broader reform, cooperation with third countries was also promoted at the EU level as an effective strategy to counter undocumented migration. This was discussed by European bureaucrats in Brussels already in 2010 as they negotiated an agreement on migration control with Libya.\(^9\)

An issue which is frequently raised by those opposing the increasing externalization of migration control is the lack of guarantees for the respect of migrants’ fundamental rights in some of the EU neighbouring – and, thus, bordering - countries. For example, Libya never signed the 1951 Geneva Convention on asylum, so that the country cannot provide effective international protection. This, of course, raises concerns within the civil society: numerous NGOs, and important international institutions like the United Nations High Commissioner for refugees (UNHCR) expressed deep concerns about externalized border and migration control practices.\(^10\) For many activists and experts, European countries started cooperating with violent dictators, leaving migrants and asylum seekers under severe threat when on the other side of the Mediterranean. As no guarantee of international protection could be expected in a country such as Libya, externalized border and migration control which prevents potential applicants from accessing international protection, violates the principle of *non-refoulement* as defined in article 33 of the 1951 Geneva Convention on refugees,\(^11\) as well as in article 3 of the United Nations Convention against torture.\(^12\) From 1979 to 2006 Libya was included in the ‘list of

---


\(^8\) A. W. Neal, ‘Securitization and Risk at the EU border: The Origins of FRONTEX’, *JCMS*, vol. 47, no. 2, 2009, p. 344.


\(^12\) T. D’Acquisto, ‘I processi di esternalizzazione dei controlli delle frontiere e la deviazione istituzionalizzata dello sguardo’, *Rivista di Storia delle idee*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2014, pp. 104-105, *n.b:* NGOS also called onto the European Commission for the violation of the prohibition of collective expulsions provided in article 4 of the 4th protocol
states sponsors of terrorism’ established by the United States (US) Department of State, and until 2004 was under an arm embargo from the EU and from the United Nations (UN) due to the country’s alleged involvement in terrorist activities - notably, the Lockerbie air bombing - and the efforts made to acquire weapons of mass destruction.\textsuperscript{13} It is in light of these and other considerations that, in 2012, the Italian state was condemned by the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) for pushing back asylum seekers to Libya - the “Hirsi v. Italy” case.\textsuperscript{14} Eleven Somali and Thirteen Eritrean presented a complaint to the Court, as they were part of a group of 200 migrants that left the Libyan coasts to reach Italy by boat in 2009. Italian coast-guard rescued and handed them over to Libyan authorities in Tripoli, without allowing them to apply for international protection. The allegations were based on the risk that such interceptions and push back manoeuvres at sea could expose them to torture or other degrading treatment in Libya, or they could simply be returned to their home countries where they could face further persecution. To defend this policy, however, Italian authorities affirmed that they were acting in accordance with the EU principles concerning the control of immigration through cooperation with transit or origin countries such as Libya.\textsuperscript{15}

It is within this contradiction – i.e. a policy which is promoted by the EU and its member state, is also recognized illegal by international organizations, Human rights courts and the public opinion of several member states – that this thesis analyses how the externalization of border and migration control is discursively legitimized by authorities in Italy. The focus will be on the Italian-Libyan case study which allows me to analyse how both Europeanization and the increasing securitization of migration were strategically mobilized to justify such an illicit and contested policy.

The aim of this study is thus to answer the following research question: How did the Italian government discursively legitimated a policy which was judged illegal by the

---


\textsuperscript{14} European Court of Human Rights. Case of Hirsi Jamaa and others v. Italy. (application no. 27765/09).

competent European court of Human Rights - because of its incompatibility with human rights norms and international Law?

As a democratic and liberal country, decisions taken by Italian authorities must go under public scrutiny and be eventually interpreted as legitimate from the public. The externalization of border and migration control to Libya violated international commitments taken by the Italian state. Yet, national authorities defended their choice of keeping unwanted third country nationals away from Europe, regardless of the proved violations of their most fundamental rights. It is thus interesting to understand the process through which such illegal practice was legitimized by different Italian governments. This will shed light on those discursive tactics which were used by politicians to support their illegitimate decisions.

Most studies on the increasing externalization of migration control in Europe assess the EU as a whole, or the cases of single member states such as for instance Italy and Spain. What I do here is instead to analyse the externalization of migration and border control in Europe by looking at the ways in which the EU institutions and one of its member states – i.e. Italy - influence each other throughout the process.

We have to bear in mind that the externalization of border and migration control is still very popular in Brussels, as confirmed also recently with the 2016 agreement that the EU signed with Turkey in response to the so-called “refugee crisis” which started one year before. This agreement included substantial financial support from the EU to Turkey, in exchange externalized policies of migration control and asylum reception in the country.\(^\text{16}\) Apparently, it is within such spirit that Italy – and other EU member states such as France – is trying to reintroduce the existing agreements with the yet to form Libyan government.\(^\text{17}\) A process which was formalized in February 2017 with the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Italian Prime Minister Paolo Gentiloni and the president of the Libyan Government of National Unity, Fayez Al-Serraj.\(^\text{18}\)


As for the structure of the thesis, I start in the State of the Art by presenting a review of the existing debates in the field of International Relations with respect to the externalization of migration control and on the case of the Italian-Libyan cooperation. Then, I explain my choice of opting for a constructivist approach to analyse public discourse on the externalization of migration control through a legitimacy, Europeanization and securitization lens. Next, I present the data collection and analysis techniques which I used for this thesis. Finally, I discuss data by concentrating on core public discourse made by Italian authorities to support externalized migration control in Libya.
II. State of the Art: externalization of migration policies in the academic literature

This section provides an overview of existing studies concentrating on the externalization of migration control in Europe, with a look at those works which have focused on the case of Italy and Libya.

II.1. Externalization of migration control policy

International Relations scholars have moved their interest towards the externalisation of migration control only since relatively recently. Externalization appears first in academia within the field of Economics. Yet, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) used first this same expression for all sets of European policies which were developed and implemented to transfer EU border and migration control responsibilities to non-EU countries.\(^{19}\) It is only at that stage that both the press and the academia started using this term not only for economic matters, but also to describe European cooperation schemes with third countries on migration control.

Policies are ‘externalized’ once one state or a group of states – i.e. the EU - delegate border and migration control to other countries, thus transferring sovereignty partly also outside their national territories. The EU refers to the “external dimension of migration and asylum”,\(^{20}\) to describe what the academic literature calls externalization: a practice which is anyway not just European, as also other countries recur to very similar strategies to curve migration – e.g. Australia\(^{21}\) and the US\(^{22}\) since the 1990s.\(^{23}\)

---


\(^{22}\) B. Frelick et al., ‘The Impact of Externalization of Migration Controls on the Rights of Asylum Seekers and Other Migrants’ *Journal of Migration and Human Security*, vol. 4, no.4, 2016 p. 191

Boswell\textsuperscript{24} concentrated on externalization by focusing exclusively on Communitarian policies. According to her, there are two distinct approaches to externalization. One is mainly about cooperating with third countries on migration control, which means engaging transit and sending countries in agreements to strengthen their national borders, fight smugglers and human traffickers, or readmit migrants who entered unauthorized in Europe. The other approach is also about cooperation with third countries, but in the attempt to reduce the incentives for people to emigrate. Seen as an alternative to migration control, these practices emerged in the 1990s with the deepening of international relations across the globe and the growth of humanitarian organizations assisting refugees.\textsuperscript{25}

As for these two alternative understandings of ‘externalization’, in this thesis I concentrate on the first interpretation of the term as it is the one which better characterizes the nature of the EU and Italy’s cooperation with Libya and other north African Mediterranean countries (NAMCs) on migration control. Here there are two core strategies to externalize migration control; the first consists of exporting classical migration control tools, for instance supporting third countries in their border surveillance operations. The second strategy concentrates on readmission agreements: here, a series of provisions are adopted to facilitate the return of unauthorized migrants to sending or transit countries.\textsuperscript{26}

The first externalized policies started being negotiated in the late 1980s, following the signature of the Schengen agreement and the consequent lifting of internal borders among member states. She explains that, at the time, externalized logics emerged within different European institution as the Justice and Home affairs (JHA) Council and the European Commission. Here, externalization resembles the “natural continuation of a Europeanization of migration control that was already under way”, and which was justified to the public as the only possibility to protect Europe from the threats of unauthorized migration, organized crime, and terrorism – \textit{de facto} making the connection between these different phenomena.\textsuperscript{27}

Lavenex\textsuperscript{28} instead highlighted how externalization is also about bypassing formal legislative procedures, since externalized policies take place abroad and are defined as being operational measures – as clearly stated in the 2003 Action plan on illegal immigration, external borders and return policy adopted by the European Council. Cooperation with third countries

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid., p. 622
\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., p. 622, p. 634.
\textsuperscript{27}Ibid., pp. 622-624.
started then constituting an opportunity for member states whose legal and societal constituencies might oppose violations of migrants’ fundamental rights, if taking place inside their national territories.\textsuperscript{29} Externalization would also be more efficient to prevent unwanted flows of migrants reaching the national territory:

\textit{The engagement of third countries in the control of migration flows to Europe has obvious advantages for the EU member states. If successful, it reduces the burden of control at their immediate borders and increases the chances of curtailing unwanted inflows before they reach the common territory.}\textsuperscript{30}

Different from Lavenex, Guiraudon\textsuperscript{31} addressed the increased Europeanization of migration policies since the Schengen agreement of 1985, and the following Amsterdam Treaty that incorporated that agreement in the \textit{acquis communautaire}. She argues that ever since, the EU is becoming progressively competent in matter of immigration and asylum policies. From her perspective, this Europeanization of the governance of migration does not concern only policies and law making; it also has societal effects, it changed the players interacting within a renewed policy field, characterized by new systems of values and beliefs. The political transfers, from one Member State to the other, are important; immigration norms and knowledge now circulates at a European level. She uses the term ‘horizontal Europeanization’ because there is coordination, emulation, re-interpretation, appropriation, of immigration policies and beliefs between the Member States.\textsuperscript{32}

Within this framework, the High Level Working Group (HLWG) on asylum and immigration supports Member States initiatives in matter of externalization. As noted by Giraudon, “Italy finances infrastructures in Libya while the European Union legitimizes Muammar Gaffafi’s regime on the international stage, by re-establishing diplomatic relations and by negotiating on these issues”.\textsuperscript{33} This is an interesting element for the research question of this thesis, one of the main concerns about externalization is that the third country cooperating on migration does not guarantee same Human Rights and protection to asylum seekers than in Europe. Here the legitimization of the Libyan regime also serves the legitimacy

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Ibid}, pp. 338-340.
\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Ibid}, p. 337.
\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Ibid}, p. 13, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Ibid}, trans. L. Geyer, p.18, original: “L’Italie finance des infrastructures en Libye tandis que l’Union Européenne légitime le régime de Mouammar Kadhafi sur la scène international en rétablissant des relations diplomatiques et en négociant sur ces questions”.
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of the practice of externalization with this regime. Plus, Italy being part of the EU might be promoting policies favouring the legitimization of its own practice within the EU institutions.

Rodier\textsuperscript{34}, did address the legitimacy of externalization at the EU level, by mentioning its humanitarian justification. She presents international protection just constitutes a facade to justify the practice of externalization and argues that the EU is pretending to offer a more efficient protection for asylum seekers by implementing externalization of migration policies. The example of Morocco is presented, that has been given the label of ‘host country’ by the EU, while it has not the resources, nor the will to host properly the influx of persons in need of international protection. While these humanitarian purposes were advanced, the EU was at the same time securing its border with Morocco, by placing the Gibraltar strait under electronic surveillance, and setting up walls and sophisticated defence system around the enclaves of Ceuta and Melilla. Another example of EU’s incoherence in its migration policy developments was the Belorussia case. This country was also presented as a partner in the cooperation on asylum and migration, and the externalization with Belorussia was justified with humanitarian arguments, while the EU suspended cooperation with this country in other fields, because of the lack of democracy, and Human Rights respect.\textsuperscript{35} Addressing this aspect in our case study can be an important element in my response to the research question, because Italy could also have used the same kind of humanitarian argument to defend its policy choice in the collaboration with Gaddafi’s regime.

While most works concentrate on the EU as a whole, all the analysed authors provide a series of theoretical and conceptual tools to analyse the externalization of migration control, and a set of practical information about the main developments of the policy. Other works have instead focused on the Italian-Libyan case.

\textsuperscript{34} C. Rodier, \textit{op. cit.}, 2008, pp. 105-122.
\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 112-114.
II.2. Cooperation on migration Control between Italy and Libya

Cuttitta\(^36\) concentrated his analysis on the cooperation between Italy and NAMCs to secure its Southern European Maritime Border. He focuses on Libya, but also on cooperation with Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Egypt. The urgency to establish cooperation is explained based on two main interconnected dynamics: First, “arrivals by Sea have stronger mediatic impact on public opinion that overstayers and immigrants entering the country illegally by land do have”. Second, the frequency with which Italian policy-makers have connected the fight against illegal immigration and that against terrorism in their discourses, has increased societal anxieties towards the arrivals from NAMC countries. The involvement of the EU in favouring this cooperation on governing immigration with NAMCs is something that Italy requested since the early 2000s.\(^37\) This attempt from the Italian government to include the EU in externalization policies is something that I will explore in this thesis, to understand what were the motives for Italy, of this will to include the EU in externalization policies. Legitimacy could be one important in this process, as Guiraudon already established that the EU was giving legitimacy to the Libyan regime.\(^38\)

With respect to the issue of the protection of migrants’ Human Rights, according to Cuttitta Italy attempted to ‘humanise’ national migration policies – for instance in 2006 when renaming the Lampedusa’s migrants detention centre (\textit{Centro di permanenza temporanea}) into a ‘Centre for first aid and assistance’ (\textit{Centro di primo soccorso e assistenza}). Since that year, while migrants are still in detention, humanitarian organisations such as the UNHCR or the Red Cross are finally allowed to provide assistance to detainees sided by NGOs like Save the Children - which enters the centres in 2008).\(^39\) The participation of humanitarian NGOs in such policies related to externalization can also be a legitimizing element, again justifying such policies with humanitarian purposes.


\(^{37}\) \textit{Ibid}, pp. 48-49.

\(^{38}\) V. Guiraudon, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 34.

\(^{39}\) \textit{Ibid}, pp. 57-59.
Paoletti\textsuperscript{40} explored power relations in the migration field between Italy and Libya, from the 1990s to 2009. She focused on the impact of externalization for the countries that have signed bilateral agreements with EU countries. As she noticed, Italy finds itself on a relatively vulnerable position. Even if in many other fields there is an existing asymmetry of power in favour of Italy, the country finds itself anyway dependent on internal stability in Libya. The social construction of migration as a societal threat and a security concern plays an important role throughout the process, and especially when linking "migration with terrorism and a hybrid and fluid notion of international crime.\textsuperscript{41} This construction of migration as a security threat to the Italian society is something that I have to explore to know if this is related to the legitimization of externalization policies.

Andrijasevic argues that the externalization of asylum – i.e. implementation of the detention and return schemes - does not actually relocate asylum procedures outside the EU, as it rather prevents asylum seekers from accessing international protection. According to her, the increasing number of obstacles which were set to prevent asylum seekers from filling their asylum requests in Europe, increases the incentives for irregular migration.\textsuperscript{42} As she noticed, since Italy started externalizing migration and border control, \textit{de facto} the country pushed back asylum seekers whose applications were never really examined while in North Africa.\textsuperscript{43} Debate within the EU, is instead characterized by opposing stances and forces with respect to the externalization of migration. The European Parliament called on Italy to respect of Human Rights and the principle of \textit{non-refoulement}, while on the other hand, the EU, through other institutions, promotes cooperation with Libya in migration control.\textsuperscript{44}

Interesting contributions were reviewed here, I saw mentions of elements that could be decisive to respond to the research question and deserve more exploration in this thesis, notably Europeanization and security elements that were identified as pivotal in the implementation of externalization policies. Even though the externalization of migration control has been well conceptualized and studied, considering actual developments in Europe and Italy, more analysis of the Italian-Libyan case is relevant. Even more considering as only little concentrated on the

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Ibid}, p. 278 and p. 283.
\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Ibid}, p. 159.
discursive practices through which externalization is legitimized, while concurrently looking at the relationship between the EU and one of its member states – i.e. Italy - through the process.
III. Theorizing the externalization of migration policies

This section provides an explanation of the theoretical tools that I use through this thesis to analyse the externalization of migration and border control from, Italy and the EU, to Libya. It is however essential first to present here the main hypotheses of this thesis.

III.1. Hypotheses

This analytical work generates from two main hypotheses which, in turn, derive from the core research question of this work as it was formulated in the previous section. As such, this study aims at demonstrating how,

1) the externalization of migration and border control policies has been legitimized in Italy also through the development and promotion of it at the EU level;

2) the increasing securitization of migration in Europe has also served to legitimize exceptional measures which included the externalization of migration control policies;

As highlighted before, scholars have focused mainly on the development of externalized border and migration control policies at the EU’s level. Besides, such major policy shift took place while the governance of migration became increasingly European because of the expansion and deepening of the Schengen space of free movement of people. It is from this perspective that I consider here the EU one of the main sources of legitimacy for externalized policies implemented by the Italian governments. Furthermore, as demonstrated by the abundant literature on the issue, the increasing securitization of migration certainly provides a frame to legitimize governments’ extraordinary measures against migrants in order to ensure safety for nationals. The externalization of migration and border control policies can certainly be understood as one of these exceptional measures – even more for the Libyan-Italian case.45

Obviously, other social, political, cultural, and economic mechanisms contribute in legitimizing externalization. Yet, for analytical reasons, I will limit myself to analyse the case of Libya and Italy by concentrating exclusively on both Europeanization and concurrent securitization of the governance of migration in Europe. Before presenting my research methodology and the analysis of data, however, I first describe here which specific understandings of the concepts of Legitimacy, Europeanization and Securitization I will operate throughout this work.

III.2. Theoretical framework

Deriving from the research question and the two hypotheses presented above, three theoretical tools will prove central to develop this thesis: Legitimacy, Europeanization, and Securitization. In the following pages I thus define my understanding of these multifaceted concepts as they will be used throughout this thesis.

III.2.1. Legitimacy

Legitimacy is pivotal for this research. Yet, legitimacy is certainly a well-studied and multifaceted concept, so that it is important to define it before moving ahead. Originally, ‘legitimacy’ derives from the Latin term ‘legitimus’, which literally means lawful. Nowadays, legitimacy is no longer used exclusively for legal purposes, as it is increasingly recalled in the semantics of the justification. An action, an idea or a practice can be legitimate or illegitimate based on legal, but also ethical and moral parameters. Within the broad family of International Relations studies, scholars often discuss the validity of a specific political action against the law in terms of its ‘legality’. From my perspective, I decide to concentrate on a more ethic and morality centred understanding of legitimacy.

As for Italy, there is ground to prove that the country did not respect international rules in externalizing migration and border control to Libya. However, such violation is voluntary and different Italian governments have actively promoted the externalization of border and migration control to Libya by presenting the policy to the public as legitimate. Yet, national policymakers might think that one violation of international legal commitments is legitimate as it prevents greater dangers to their national constituency. It is exactly this gap that this thesis wants to investigate.
Claude describes legitimacy as an important feature of political life. Politics is not just about struggles for power: statesmen are bound, like any other human being, to the need of satisfying their own consciousnesses. As anyone else, also policymakers must convince themselves of the rightness of their actions. The concept of political legitimacy articulates the notions of law and morality. These two notions can complement themselves, but they can also be in contradiction. Indeed, morality can make you violate the law if you consider it unfair or unjust.

Closely related to the notion of legitimacy, the concept of legitimization is also important. According to Reyes, “legitimization refers to the process by which speakers accredit or license a type of social behaviour. In this respect, legitimization is a justification of a behaviour”. He also argues that legitimization is enacted by providing arguments which explain and justify specific actions, ideas, and practices. Here, any effort to legitimize is related to a specific goal or purpose, as the enacting actor is seeking the approval and support of her/his interlocutors. As such, legitimacy is about maintaining power and consensus, or to gain popularity.

Beetham and Lord worked on the legitimation through the recognition of an authority or a practice, by another external authority. They argue that it is important for a regime to demonstrate to its own population that his actions have won international recognition. They argue that single States can express this external support, but it is way more powerful when the recognition comes from a ‘family’ of liberal democratic States. The European Union is cited as an example, and more precisely, how the adhesion to the EU can be fundamental for the legitimacy of a State.

For this thesis, here we are thus questioning how a specific set of contested policies is see as legitimate for the Italian government. In order to achieve this analytical goal, we look at the ways in which Italian authorities legitimized a practice which was declared illegal by the
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51 Ibid., pp. 8-9.
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ECHR. Now I have to elaborate how Europeanization and Securitization can be related to this concept of legitimacy.

### III.2.2. Europeanization

According to Boswell, the externalisation of migration and border management implemented by European member states took place within the broader framework of Europeanization.\(^53\) This gives me a first view of how Europeanization matters in the externalization of migration control policies. However, I am dealing here with a very wide concept which refers to a multitude of processes and interpretations.\(^54\) It is thus necessary here to define which specific understanding of Europeanization will be used throughout this thesis.

The term appeared first in the literature during the 1990s, parallel to the advancement of European integration and the signing of the treaty of Maastricht. One of the first Europeanization scholars was Ladrech\(^55\) who concentrated on the Europeanization of domestic politics and institutions in France. In particular, he looked at changes in French politics in terms of behaviours, practices, rules, and procedures emanating from the European Community (EC) of the time. It is from this angle that he describes Europeanization as “an incremental process reorienting the direction and shape of politics to the degree that EC political and economic dynamics become part of the organizational logic of national politics and policy-making”.\(^56\) In the author’s view Europeanization does not emphasise the supranational nature of the EU, as it attributes legitimacy and authority to national governments. Yet, it is noted that such authority is being increasingly influenced by the EU, as Communitarian directives and regulations are internalized by national politics and policymaking. This is a process which involves multiple actors both external and internal to a given state, governmental and non-governmental. It is important not to overlap Europeanization with the homogenization or harmonization of European domestic policies. Europeanization rather refers to the adaptation to a new environment: in fact, a re-orientation of national policies which takes place through “organizational change of new environmental inputs, alternate resources, costs and competitive calculations”\(^57\).

---


\(^56\) Ibid., p. 69.

\(^57\) Ibid., pp. 70.
This is obviously a specific and top-down approach to the notion of Europeanization, as institutional and organizational change in domestic politics is seen as coming from new rules and procedures which emanate from the EU.

In the early 2000s, Borzel and Risse added some important elements of analysis to the study of Europeanization. For these authors, there are three different areas in which the EU can have a domestic impact on its member States: politics, policies, and polity. The bigger is the gap between European and domestic processes, policies and institutions, the higher will be the ‘adaptational’ pressure. From this perspective, Europeanization is inconvenient, as if European norms were totally compatible with domestic structures there would have been no issue of compliance or effective implementation. Or, in other words, if there is no domestic change, no Europeanization is thus taking place. Adaptational pressure implies some sort of clash with domestic structures which, in turn, shows European norms to have a certain authority on national ones.

Here it is interesting to concentrate on a further aspect which relates to Europeanization: the logic of consequentialism according to which all actors involved are rational and purposeful. They engage in strategic interactions using their resources to maximize their own benefit or that of the organization they represent. From this perspective, Europeanization is largely conceived as an emerging political opportunity structure which offers to some actors’ additional resources to exert influence - while severely constraining the ability of others to pursue their goals. Liberal intergovernmentalists suggest that European opportunities and constraints strengthen the ability to act of national executive powers, as it enhanced their autonomy vis-à-vis other domestic actors.

As for the case of Italian migration and border control policies externalized to an unsafe country as Libya, there certainly is some degree of incompatibility between these practices and the international commitment subscribed by the Italian governments.

Like Ladrech, Radaelli’s work also analyses primarily the top-down effect of Europeanization: yet, the Italian political scientist also added a view of the bottom-up component of Europeanization. According to him, Europeanization takes place at several

institutional as well as non-institutional levels, by involving both actors and a variety of different instruments. According to him, Europeanization consists of:

...the construction, the diffusion and the institutionalisation of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, ‘way of doing things’ and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the making of EU decisions and then incorporated in the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures and public policies.60

Here, the cognitive dimension of Europeanization is absolutely relevant, as the author concentrate on the understanding and interpretation of European policies and practices made by national actors. In Radaelli’s view, two types of mechanisms can be relevant for Europeanization. The first one is close to what Ladrech developed which is a clear demarcation of the EU and domestic level, where EU dynamics are incorporated in national politics. However, the horizontal mechanism describes a sort of circular and interactive process where nationals and European actors, policies and discourses interact and influence each other trough patterns of socialization.61 In his critic of exclusively top-down Europeanization, Radaelli rejects the idea of a simple and unilateral domestic reaction to ‘Europe’. Europeanization is thus a complex process: after all, domestic “actors can use Europe in many discretionary ways. They may discursively create impacts”.62 This may be done without major adaptational pressures from the EU, which consists in a major difference compared to Borzel and Risse’s view.

Radaelli’s view on horizontal Europeanization is relevant to analyse the Italian externalization of border and migration in Libya, as the policy was both promoted and contested at the national and EU levels. Such more comprehensive understanding of Europeanization allow us to spot both a) the strategies used by Italian actors to legitimize the policy at the national level by referring to the EU directives; and, b) the ways in which the Italian authorities were able to make externalization an increasingly legitimate policy also in the eyes of the EU and the other member states.

Articulating the two concepts of Europeanization and legitimacy is an original feature of my thesis. Indeed, the European Union has gained influence in international relations and

61 Ibid., pp. 40-41.
I have become a prominent actor in the international arena. The EU has consequent economic power, political power but also normative power. The latter is a notion developed by International Relations scholars in the past decades. Manners is one of them, he conceptualizes the normative power as being an ideational form of power, that involves “[…] principles; actions; and impact; as well as having broader consequences in world politics”. Here it is fundamental to highlight the fact that this institution has the power to diffuse its views, its practices, and actions on its member states, but also on a larger scale, to impact the whole globalised world. The norms that are promoted by the EU mainly include peace, rule of law, democracy, freedom and respecting Human Rights.

However, Manners does not discuss the possibility that this normative power might be used by a single Member States, or by a group of states that can have the same interest in developing a practice and making it accepted on the international scene. In my case study it could be possible that southern Mediterranean countries such as Italy, but also Greece and Spain want to develop a contested practice of externalization, thus, to achieve this kind of policies without being subject to that much criticism, they can use the EU institutions to promote externalization and making it widely accepted thanks to the powerful EU normative power. Hence, externalization could, through this process, be considered as a broadly accepted norm.

III.2.3. Securitization

Concern for security has always been central to the international stage, and has been historically at the core of the realist school in the field of International Relations studies. For the classical realists, security is about survival of the nation state. This perspective has certainly not changed during the Cold War era, marked as it was by a permanent threat of nuclear warfare. At the time, mainstream studies kept seeing only sovereign states as the only actors able to guarantee security at the international level though peace or war. However, towards the end of the Cold War, some scholars noticed how the field of security was expanding to include new spheres of social and political life such as for instance the economy or the environment.

The Copenhagen School of Security Studies produced possibly the first structured effort to academically account for this change, by developing a theory of securitization already in the
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mid-1990s. Here, securitization is primarily a speech act since something goes securitized only after a person with high responsibility and public recognition – i.e. legitimacy - frames a specific social interactions or groups as a security concerns.65 Such view on securitization goes way beyond the traditional idea of national and international security being just the military and geopolitics more broadly. In the 1980s, as the end of the cold War approached, analysts recorded a general move to broaden the security agenda. It is at this stage that states started dealing not only with national security but also with the security of its own people. According to this new security paradigm, threats to the individuals which have to do, for example, with economic welfare, cultural identity, political rights and so like.66 As the state remains the core actor of politics, governments can establish an exception for a specific subject or a group of individuals, if they treat them as security issue.67 According to this shift, institutions now deal with two spheres of security: national and societal security, with migration being included in the latest category as international mobility started being framed increasingly as a threat to host societies.

Bigo68 further developed the analysis of migration. He stresses the importance of political discourses that associates and links immigration with security at both the national and at the European levels. As he observes, the change in the public discourse concerned with migration made migrants being perceived – and thus treated - increasingly as a security problem by politicians, but also the police, the military, customs officers, border patrollers, and judges.

According to securitized approaches in fact, the migrant is an outsider coming inside a given national society to constitute an existential danger to that nation state and its national society. A transformation which certainly accelerated in response to the 9/11 terrorists attacks of 2001 in New York. The biggest difference with Waever is that he is focusing on transnational networks of professionals. He analyses, for instance, discourses of police officers, border guards, anti-terrorist units

Bigo also conceptualized the ‘exceptionalist’ dimension of the securitization process, saying that certain extra-ordinary practices can be used in a context of insecurity. When a regime starts to use arguments about the necessary unity and centralization, and combine them with the deviation away from the judiciary, considered as too slow and lax, exceptionality is
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66 Ibid., pp. 46-47.
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introduced. The regime can develop a ‘permanent state of emergency’ that allows it to use ‘exceptional’ practices that would be characterized as non-liberals even in a liberal state.\(^6\) This element is very relevant for my thesis, because Italy is indeed using extraordinary measures that are violating human rights norms. Bigo is talking about a form of “governability by concern where, to reassure the population and make them obey, we exacerbate their fears with a discourse about risk and suspicion”.\(^7\) This form of governability is also characterized by a common understanding that action, secrecy, sovereign and rapid decisions are needed.

To sum-up, the two approaches presented will be useful for my analysis. First, Waever’s speech act, and second, Bigo’s notion of exceptionnalist practices. I will see if the Italian policy-makers legitimized an exceptional measure such as externalization trough the conception of migration as a security issue threatening in different ways the Italian society and individuals.

### III.3. The social-constructivist approach

To articulate legitimacy, Europeanization and Securitization within one academic work, it is imperative to first frame the overall discussion from a theoretical perspective. Here, the choice is been made for a constructivist approach as I consider it most efficient in bringing together all these elements of sociological and political analysis – i.e. the complex ensemble of norms, identities, and shared beliefs that influence the behaviour of political actors.\(^7\) Wendt\(^7\) described the two widely accepted and basic components of constructivism in International politics as being:

\[(1) \text{that the structures of human association are determined primarily by shared ideas rather than material forces, and (2) that the identities and interests of purposive actors are constructed by these shared ideas rather than given by nature.}\] \(^7\)

Following a constructivist approach means considering human beings including policy-makers as social beings. Social relations between them are constructing what they are and the society that they form. There is a reciprocal relation between the individuals and the society,
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\(^7\) Ibid., p. 65.

\(^7\) D. Battistella, Théorie des Relations Internationales, 2\(^{\text{e}}\) édition, Paris, Presses de Sciences Po, 2006, p. 289.


\(^7\) Ibid., p. 1.
the individuals construct the society but the society also constructs the individuals.⁷⁴ Every individual, called social agents in the constructivist lexicon, has its own goals and objectives, but they are living in a society so they have to follow certain social rules. In our thesis, the policy-maker that choose to externalize Italian migration control follow its objective, but has also to follow certain rules, that are not always written. The fact that in liberal democratic states any policy has to be legitimate to a certain extent can be considered as a social rule.

Today, to speak about immigration in most affluent societies raises issues of identities, shared beliefs and norms – all elements which are central to analyse the legitimacy of an action, which can in fact be socially constructed.⁷⁵

Such a constructivist approach is obviously compatible with securitization. As demonstrated by most works on this subject, security and insecurity are constructed through an intersubjective process which lies in the language and actions of political actors. The threat to security does not have to be real or objectively proved, as it can be constructed by the interactions that politicians have with the public, interactions that are made mainly through political discourses.

Similarly, the Europeanization process described by Radaelli has its roots in the constructivist ideas, as the focus is on processes of socialisation. With respect to the externalization of border and migration control, the EU has certainly played a core role in making these policies increasingly popular, as it produced discursive frameworks promoting them. This has certainly been facilitated by the EU functioning somehow as a forum for discussion and a platform for policy transfer which provides for state actors a whole series of opportunities for learning.⁷⁶ A process that is called “facilitated coordination” and that have socialisation at its core, which can change the cognitive and normative frames used by domestic policy-makers.

To conclude this section, the socio-constructivist approach will help me to have a better understanding and use of the concepts of Europeanization and securitization. These two

concepts form the core of my work, because they are the theoretical instruments behind my hypotheses. It is thanks to their conceptualisation that I will find out the response to my research question, how the Italian government legitimized externalization?

The theory that I precisely described in this section will be determinant for the choice of an efficient methodology, which I will present in the next section of the thesis.
IV. Methodology: The analysis of political discourses

In this section I describe and elaborate on the methods which I selected to test my hypotheses, which consists basically of discourse analysis. Here I thus explain how this specific methodological choice is, in my view, extremely appropriate to analyse the Italian-Libyan case study.

IV.1. Discourses in politics

According to Fairclough, discourse is not an individual act, but a social practice. It is a mode of action and a mode of representation of the social world and how people act upon it.\(^{77}\) He emphasized the socially constructed nature of discourses by saying that:

*There is a dialectic relationship between discourse and social structure. [...] Discourse contributes to the constitution of all those dimensions of social structure which directly or indirectly shape and constrain it: its own norms and conventions, as well as the relations, identities and institutions which lie behind them. Discourse is a practice of not just representing the world, but of signifying the world, constituting and constructing the world in meaning.*\(^{78}\)

Discourses are a fundamental element in the political domain. They are carefully prepared, often by experts which assist politicians in writing them. After all, communication to the public is pivotal for politics.\(^{79}\) As for what account for political discourse, they are all speeches made in public to reveal policymakers’ plans and agenda. The specific socio-political situations in which political discourses generate are important.

Since, as we have seen, securitization is a speech act, political discourse stays at the foundation of this major transformation in the management of migration.\(^{80}\) Similarly, political discourses are pivotal for Europeanization to take place:

*Policy-makers and stakeholders construct Europe through language and discourse. Discourse is not just language. It is also an interactive process. Indeed, it is a set of*


\(^{78}\) Ibid., p. 64.


ideas and an interactive process. The ideational dimension itself divides into two activities: A cognitive activity which enables actors to make sense of reality [...] and a more normative activity of assessing and judging reality, which thus refers to the world of norms, values, and principles. The interactive dimension of discourse covers the relations between policy-makers at the stage of policy formulation, and how policies are communicated to the public. 81

According to Radaelli, it is important to find European elements in national discourses to prove the eventual influence of Europeanized political debates at the domestic level: they are fundamental to form new rules, values, and practices. On the same page, political discourse also produce and reproduce legitimacy. 82 As Burnham and others pointed out, “discourse provides legitimacy to political institutions, including the state, and to the policies and actions of politicians and other political actors”. 83

Here it becomes interesting to concentrate on the work of Milliken, since she explicitly understands discourse as a productive element. According to her, discourse can make “intelligible some ways of being in, and acting towards, the world, [while] operationalizing a particular ‘regime of truth’ [by] excluding other possible modes of identity and action”. 84

Thus, discourses can operate in the legitimation of a certain choice of policy, and the de-legitimation of the alternative choices. It is the productivity of specific discourses what directs us towards studying them, to analyse how speeches are connected to the implementation of particular practices which are made “intelligible and legitimate”. 85 It is from this perspective that discourse analysis becomes thus extremely appropriate to analyse how the externalization of migration and border control was preferred by Italian – and European – policymakers, despite the availability of numerous other policy options. 86

85 Ibid., p. 230.
86 Ibid., p. 236-237.
IV.2. Critical discourse analysis

Critical discourse analysis became increasingly popular parallel to the emergence of constructivists approaches to the study of International Relations. From this theoretical angle, scholar’s attention concentrates on those processes by which the social world is constructed and consolidated – even more since the development of new modes of communication such as the web multiplied the opportunities to access a variety of different discourses. However, no common understanding has emerged on what is the most effective way to study discourses. In fact, there is a wide range of different analytical angles, including ‘critical discourse analysis’ (CDA). Approaching discourse from this specific perspective means to consider language as a social practice, which is immersed in the sociocultural context in which the linguistic elements are produced. Here, power relations are pivotal to understand the way discourses and the social world interact, as depending on individual or group’s power each discourse produces different impacts in the social reality.\(^\text{87}\) For example, going back to the Libyan Italian case study object of this thesis, the members of different Italian governments produce dominant discourses which they will try to impose in order to pursue their agendas.

To conclude, discourse analysis consists in an original method since previous works about externalization of migration control usually don’t analyse this type of sources. Cuttitta did use Italian policy-makers discourses in his article to support his arguments but we cannot consider this method as a proper discourse analysis, as discourses are just cited without being closely scrutinised.\(^\text{88}\) This methodology suits my main concepts and my theoretical framework. I will look at how the political figures can legitimize the practice of externalization in the specific case of the cooperation with Libya. Now I still have to know which discourses will be chosen for the analysis, and what will be the precise technique of analysis.


\(^\text{88}\) P. Cuttitta, op. cit., 2008, pp. 48-49.
IV.3. Case selection, temporality, and data analysis

Concerning the selection of the political discourses which I will analyse, I chose to divide the sources between:

a) Media or journalistic sources
b) Institutional sources

For the first one I will base myself mostly on what was published on the main national newspapers and their websites. As such, I decided to concentrate mostly on three of the most popular outlets in the country, such as ‘La Repubblica’, ‘La Stampa’ and ‘Il Corriere della Sera’ and their archives available online. To find all articles dealing with the selected case study, I selected the key words ‘Libia’ (Libya) and ‘immigrazione’ (Immigration) and launched an advanced search on all three newspapers’ websites. However, all articles generated by this research did not contain political discourses, I had to select the articles containing substantial speeches from Italian members of the government in office at the moment of the speech. Moreover, I will combine data coming from the selected articles, with the corresponding official communications which I found on the official website of the Italian ministry of Foreign Affairs – which includes also the videos of public declaration made mostly on Italian TV and Radio channels of the then Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

However, I will not limit the analysis to newspapers, TV and Radio discourses. To insure diversity of the sources, a second kind of discourses will be analysed, which are institutional discourses. By this, I mean the discourses that are made in national institutions, mainly in Italian Parliament sessions, where Policy-makers are discussing the policies that are being implemented. For that I will use the website of the Senate of the Republic, that gives access to different transcript of discussions in various Senate sessions, and the website of the Chamber of Deputies.
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89 *La Repubblica* archives are available on this website: [http://ricerca.repubblica.it/](http://ricerca.repubblica.it/); *La Stampa* archives are available on: [http://www.archiviolastampa.it/](http://www.archiviolastampa.it/); *Il Corriere della Sera* archives are available on: [http://archivio.corriere.it/Archivio/interface/landing.html](http://archivio.corriere.it/Archivio/interface/landing.html)

90 Videos and radio files of the Intervention made by the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs are available at: [https://www.esteri.it/mae/it/sala_stampa/archiviomultimedia/audiovisivi/](https://www.esteri.it/mae/it/sala_stampa/archiviomultimedia/audiovisivi/)

91 Transcripts of Senate sessions are available at: [http://www.senato.it/](http://www.senato.it/)

92 Transcripts of Chamber of deputies sessions are available at: [http://www.camera.it/leg18/](http://www.camera.it/leg18/)
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As for the time span over which I developed my analysis, I decided to concentrate on the period which starts with the signature of the first agreement between Italy and Libya in December 2000, to end with the beginning of the uprisings in Libya of February 2011. Over this period, I thus focused on all discourses I could detect which emanated from those placed in relevant political offices of the Italian government, who dealt with the setting and signing of these agreements. The assumption is that, given their institutional position, their public stances reflect the views and beliefs of the Italian government. As such, by taking account also of the eventual variations among these different discourses, I also tried to spot whether any hegemonic voice and reasoning exists and is shared by those in power. Heterogeneity in the sources will be important for this aspect, because focusing, for instance, on only one newspaper could reveal a specific editorial line instead of the hegemonic aspect of Italian policymakers’ discourses.

As I will concentrate my analysis on both securitization and Europeanization, I will employ two codes one for each of these components. Then, I selected a series of key information I wanted to collect for each code – i.e. Europeanization and Securitization – in order to make them comparable. These codes are resumed in tables 1.1 and 1.2, the first one address my first hypothesis about Europeanization while I concentrate on secuiritisation elements in the second one.

Table 1.1: Encoding of the information found in the discourses (Europeanization hypothesis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Europeanization features</th>
<th>Semantics / Key Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is EU support / action in externalization policies demanded by Italian policy-makers?</td>
<td>‘L’Unione Europea deve…’ (The EU has to…); ‘aspettiamo dell’Unione Europea…” (We expect from the EU to…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Supp)</td>
<td>‘…rispette le norme/regole/legge/ dell’Ue’ (…respects EU norms/rules/laws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the EU’s norms / political activity mentioned to support Italian externalization</td>
<td>‘Problema europeo’ (European problem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies? (Norm)</td>
<td>‘interessa tutti paesi dell’Ue’ (In the EU interest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is migration control depicted as a European issue, interest or problem? (pb)</td>
<td>Naming of one or multiple other EU member states’ immigration policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is other EU Member States’ action mentioned to support Italian externalization policies?</td>
<td>Naming of one or multiple other EU member states’ immigration policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2: Encoding of the information found in the discourses (Securitization hypothesis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Securitization features</th>
<th>Semantics / Key Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is Security mentioned? (Sec)</td>
<td>‘sicurezza’ (security)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the terrorist threat mentioned? (Ter)</td>
<td>‘terrorismo’ (terrorism); ‘jihadismo’ (jihadism); ‘l'estremismo islamico’ (extreme Islamism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the cultural/Identity threat mentioned? (Cul)</td>
<td>‘religione’ (religion); ‘cultura’ (culture); ‘identità’ (identity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the economic threat mentioned? (Eco)</td>
<td>‘Lavoro nero’ (Black Labour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is International criminality and/or Human trafficking mentioned? (Crim)</td>
<td>‘criminalità organizzata’ (organised crime); ‘traffico degli esseri umani’ (Human trafficking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the situation described as an emergency, or as exceptional? (Eme)</td>
<td>‘emergenza’ (emergency); ‘situazione eccezionale’ (exceptional situation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before analysing the discourses, I must determine, for each discourse who is the actor, by locating her/him into a political spectrum. Italy is often governed by coalitions governments, so governmental positions can be held by different political sides within the same cabinet. Thus, by keeping track of the specific party of belonging, I aimed at understanding whether there is any variation in the way the same policy is legitimized to the public by different governing parties. The date of enunciation of the discourses will also be important to see if there was an evolution of the legitimization of the practice of externalization trough the period of study.

I insert in the tables a list of key words, expression or semantic elements that will help me to determine through the analysis if a feature is validated or not. For example if I find in a discourse, key words such as ‘Europa’ (Europe), Unione Europea (European Union), ‘Europeo’ (European), ‘Europei’ (Europeans), I can determine that the European Union is mentioned in the discourse. I will still make sure that the utterances of these words are related to externalization or at least to immigration issues.

While for securitization, I concentrate on a variety of terms all relating to different threats which are often associated with migration – i.e. terrorism, identity, labour market,
culture, organised crime and human trafficking. Strongly connected to securitization process, I look for the utterances of the notion of ‘emergency’, or any reference to the immigration situation as ‘exceptional’ which can be used to proclaim a ‘state of emergency’, where extraordinary measures can be easily and quickly implemented.\footnote{D. Bigo, \textit{op. cit.}, 2005, p. 64.}

The abbreviations in brackets are made to improve the visibility of the results of the analysis when I will present them in tables 5.1 and 5.2.
V. Setting the context: how the externalization of migration control was developed?

As just discussed, throughout this thesis I dedicate great attention to the political context in which discourses generate. At what stage was the development of the externalization, both at the EU and Italian levels. I also look at the date of the agreements, the different political parties that were governing Italy at this period. For this reason, here I first summarize the main political developments in Italy over the 2000-2011 period: this allows getting a better understanding as I chronologically contextualize the analysed discourses. Concurrently, I also define and describe the major actors whose discourses I analyse. Thus, I analyse the key developments of the cooperation on migration control between Italy, the EU and Libya between 2000-2011. Finally, I describe when and whether Italy plaid any role at the European level to define and promote externalized practices of border and migration control.

V.1. The Italian political system and its main discursive actors

Italy is a Parliamentary Republic where the executive power is in the hands of the President of the Council of Ministers - who is more commonly called the Prime Minister. Over the period analysed for this study, Silvio Berlusconi was the Italian Prime Minister between 2001 and 2006, and then again from 2008 to 2011. In between – thus among 2006 and 2008 - the Prime Minister was Romano Prodi, who headed a centre-left coalition: he was also an important European figure, as he served as president of the European Commission between 1999 and 2004.

Given the object of this study – in fact the negotiating and signing of a series of international agreements - it is however important to concentrate also on the different Ministers of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation which took office in Italy over the same period. Between 2000 and 2011, four different ministers alternated themselves in that office: Renato Ruggiero, Franco Frattini, Gianfranco Fini and Massimo D’Alema. Here, Franco Frattini plaid a pivotal role as he was minister from 2004 to 2006, and then again between 2008 and 2011. He worked at the implementation of the 2008 Benghazi treaty, and he also served as the Vice-President of the European Commission and the European Commissioner for Justice, Freedom and Security between 2004 and 2008. It is in this latest Communitarian function that
he directly collaborated at setting the European agenda on migration – which included externalized policies as well.

Besides the Prime Minister and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, however, another relevant institutional actor is certainly the Ministry of the Interior, especially considering as s/he is given the power to negotiate directly with third countries any bilateral agreement in the field of migration management. This power was provided by November 2004 law n.241 that was passed in Parliament. Article 1-bis stipulates that:

\[ \text{The Minister of the interior, in the field of the support interventions to the preventive policies fighting illegal immigration developed by countries of origins, contributes, for the years 2004 and 2005, to the realisation, in countries concerned, of structures useful in fighting irregular migration fluxes towards the Italian territory.}^{94} \]

As for the period analysed here, the different Claudio Scajola, Giuseppe Pisanu, Giuliano Amato, and Roberto Maroni alternated themselves in the office.

Last but not least, discourses from Ministers of the Defence will also by analysis, as they might also deal with immigration control, the involvement of a Minister of the Defence in immigration issues can already consists in a securitising element per se, as security, defence and military constitute his main areas of competences.\(^95\) Ministers of the Defence were from 2000 to 2011, Sergio Mattarella, Antonio Martino, Arturo Parisi and Ignazio La Russa.\(^96\)

As due to institutional design, Italian governments are formed by coalitions of different parties, it is essential to locate the different discourses analysed within the Italian political spectrum. For instance, in May 2006, power shifted from a centre-right to a centre-left coalition, making it interesting to analyse whether there was any change concerning the ways in which the externalization of border and migration control in Libya was discussed and legitimized o the public. Also, one interesting aspect to look at is whether the same individual used different discursive tactics to try legitimize the externalization of border and migration control at the


national and European level – even more for those institutional actors who served in high offices both in Brussels and Rome. On this matter Guiraudon argued that:

 [...] effects of Europeanization can also depend on the presence of multiple-role actors, carrying positions at the European, national and international levels, prone to interpret at their own ways, and their own purposes, the European vulgate.\textsuperscript{97}

Thus, particular attention will be given to the two Italian politicians who assumed important position both in the European Union and in Italy, their discourses as Italian and European officials are interesting to analyse and to compare.

Table 2: List of relevant politicians in Italian migration policies.\textsuperscript{98}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister</td>
<td>Giuliano Amato</td>
<td>Silvio Berlusconi</td>
<td>Romano Prodi</td>
<td>Silvio Berlusconi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of the Interior</td>
<td>Claudio Scajola</td>
<td>Giuseppe Pisanu</td>
<td>Giuliano Amato</td>
<td>Roberto Maroni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of the Defence</td>
<td>Sergio Mattarella</td>
<td>Antonio Martino</td>
<td>Arturo Parisi</td>
<td>Ignazio La Russa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Renato Ruggiero</td>
<td>Renato Ruggiero</td>
<td>Massimo D’Alema</td>
<td>Franco Frattini</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 summarizes the important politicians in immigration issues in the period of study. Even though these thirteen politicians will be the principal discursive actors of the analysis I will also analyse discourse from others political figures, secretaries of state, or vice-ministers for example.

Now that I presented how Italy was politically organised in the 2000-2011 period, it is time to demonstrate how the abovementioned political figures participated in the development of the cooperation with Libya in immigration control issues.

\textsuperscript{97} V. Guiraudon, \textit{op. cit.}, trans. L. Geyer, 2010, p. 23, original: “Les effets de l’européanisatoin dépendent aussi de la présence d’acteurs multi-positionnés dans le milieu européen, national et international susceptibles de traduire à leur façon et à leurs propres fins la vulgate européenne”.

V.2. Evolution of the cooperation between Italy and Libya, between 2000 and 2011: main developments

Before moving to the analysis of the different discourses used by Italian politicians to legitimize externalization to Libya, it is essential to get a view of the main steps through which the cooperation between the two Mediterranean countries developed between 2000 and 2011, to spot the main features characterizing this bilateral relation.

One way to look at the evolution of this cooperation is to look at the visits of each country officials (or delegations) in the other country. Official visits are pivotal to the structuring of international relations, as besides their heavy symbolic value, they also constitute the loci where different views are debated and opposing interests are negotiated. Furthermore, since these meeting are often highly mediatised, official visits constitute an opportunity for politicians to discuss publicly the policies they are negotiating with their counterparts. In other words, these visits represent platforms to produce and reproduce political discourses – including those on the externalization of migration control policies. A list of the most important official visits which I considered for this investigation are reported below, on Table 3.
Table 3 – Official visits of government members between the two countries in the period of study.\(^\text{99}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Motive of the visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 1999</td>
<td>Massimo D’Alema visits Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2001</td>
<td>Visit of the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs Renato Ruggiero in Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2002</td>
<td>Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs Renato Ruggiero joins the 5+5 conference in Tripoli. The subject of cooperation in migration issues is addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2002</td>
<td>Silvio Berlusconi visits Libya to settle divergences on historical views between the two countries and to work on cooperation on controlling unauthorized immigration and fighting terrorist organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2003</td>
<td>Giuseppe Pisanu, Minister of the Interior visits Libya, signs technical agreement between Italian and Libyan police to control unauthorized immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2004</td>
<td>Silvio Berlusconi and Giuseppe Pisanu visit Libya to discuss the implementation of the 2003 operative agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2004</td>
<td>Giuseppe Pisanu visits Libya to discuss end of EU embargo and cooperation on fighting illegal immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2004</td>
<td>Silvio Berlusconi visits Libya to discuss with Muammar Gaddafi about Lampedusa and fighting illegal migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2005</td>
<td>Giuseppe Pisanu visits Libya to settle joint intervention squads to fight irregular migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2006</td>
<td>Giuseppe Pisanu meets Muammar Gaddafi in Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2006</td>
<td>Newly-elected Prime Minister Romano Prodi visits Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2006</td>
<td>Minister of Foreign Affairs Massimo D’Alema and Minister of the Interior Giuliano Amato meet Gaddafi in Tripoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>Silvio Berlusconi visits Libya to negotiate the Treaty of Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2009</td>
<td>Minister of the Interior Roberto Maroni visits Libya to sign implementing protocol of the Treaty of Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2009</td>
<td>Silvio Berlusconi visits Libya to sign the Treaty of Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>Minister of the Defence Ignazio la Russa visits Libya, meets Libyan Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2009</td>
<td>Muammar Gaddafi visits Italy for three days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2009</td>
<td>Official visit of Silvio Berlusconi in Libya to celebrate the first anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2009</td>
<td>Muammar Gaddafi back in Italy, Rome, for a FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization) meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2010</td>
<td>New visit of Muammar Gaddafi in Italy to celebrate the second anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{99}\) Diverse articles emanating from La Repubblica archives and Il Corriere della Sera website were used to produce this table, [http://ricerca.repubblica.it/](http://ricerca.repubblica.it/) ; [https://www.corriere.it/](https://www.corriere.it/).
Initially, official visits between Libyan and Italian officials happened mostly between Ministers. Yet, increasingly from 2008 to 2010, visits were made by both national leaders – i.e. the Italian Prime Minister and Gaddafi. It must be remembered that Massimo D’Alema’s visit of 1999 was the first of an occidental head of State in Libya since the beginning of international sanctions in 1986. At least officially, this visit as well as Berlusconi’s 2002 visit served to negotiate the terms of the Italian retribution to Libya, in order to remedy to the past domination. This is why a lot of negotiations concentrated on economic, historical and cultural issues and policies. Yet, migration certainly covered quite a central role in the agenda. This is certainly proved by the many agreements which concentrated on “irregular migration” – see Table 4.

Another important feature of the cooperation is the agreements that the two countries signed on fighting illegal migration, here we can see the evolution of this collaboration. They are also important for the context of the analysis because every agreement is also an occasion to have discourses justifying and explaining the content of these agreements.

Table 4 – Agreements signed between Italy and Libya on migration during the period of study.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place and date of signature</th>
<th>Agreement/Treaty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rome, 13 December 2000</td>
<td>Agreement between Italy and Libya to fight terrorism, organised crime, drugs traffic and irregular migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripoli, 3 July 2003</td>
<td>Operative agreement between Italian and Libyan police to block irregular migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabat, 23 October 2003</td>
<td>Agreement on migration control recommendations in the framework of the “5+5 dialogue”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripoli, 7 February 2005</td>
<td>Technical agreement on mixed investigators patrols and exchange of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripoli, 29 December 2007</td>
<td>Agreement on joint Italian-Libyan teams near Libyan coasts to fight irregular migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benghazi, 30 August 2008</td>
<td>Treaty of Friendship, Partnership and Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripoli, 4 February 2009</td>
<td>Implementing Protocol of the Treaty of Friendship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


101 Diverse articles from *La Repubblica* website were used to realise this table as well as P. Cuttitta, *op. cit*, 2008, p. 51.
Rome, 28 February 2011

Italy suspends Treaty of Friendship with Libya

In 11 years, seven agreements were signed between Italy and Libya, all of which included entire chapters dedicated to the governance of migration in the North African country.

As for the 2003 agreement, it was signed during the first month of the Italian presidency of the European Council and within the framework of the 5+5 dialogue – in fact a forum for discussion and cooperation in the Mediterranean composed by five EU member states and five southern Mediterranean countries, including Libya. According to Lavenex, migration was one of the key subjects discussed through the 5+5 dialogue platform which was, until 2006, “the most important multilateral project” in the South Mediterranean area. As for the internal political situation in Italy at the time when these agreements were negotiated and signed, cooperation between Libya and Italy started in late 2000 under the Giuliano Amato’s centre-left government. As the centre-right government of Berlusconi took office, the cooperation continued based on one operational agreement. In 2006, when the Italian centre-left coalition guided by Prime Minister Romano Prodi takes back power, another agreement is signed in 2007. According to Hafed Gaddur, the Libyan ambassador in Rome, this agreement had been already negotiated by the previous Berlusconi’s government. Clearly, then, the setting of cooperation agreements with Libya was a priority of all major political forces in Italy, regardless of their location in the political spectrum.

Besides, while official negotiations and agreements continued being negotiated without breaks, many other more or less official arrangements were set in secrecy, as their content was never disclosed to the public. For instance, the content of the Implementing protocol of February 4th, 2009, remains unknown to the public. Also, in 2003, the details of the operative agreement remained secret based on not better specified ‘security reasons’.

---

102 The participating States were: Spain, France, Italy, Malta, Portugal, Algeria, Libya, Morocco, Mauritania and Tunisia.


In the framework of the abovementioned agreements, a series of coordinated operations related to the control of undocumented migration took place between Italy and Libya.

In the early stages of this increasingly close bilateral relation, Libya and Italy had already concluded a substantial number of forced repatriation of undocumented third country nationals (TCNs), from Italy to Libya. Between October 2004 and March 2005, more than 1 500 expulsions to Libya were executed directly from the Italian and European border island of Lampedusa.\[107\] As highlighted by the NGO Human Rights Watch, this practices raised concerns since the very beginning of its implementation:

> In October, Italy expelled several hundred persons to Libya without a proper assessment of their asylum claims or any access to fair asylum procedures. These persons are believed to have been sent to detention camps in Libya. Libya has not ratified the 1951 Refugee Convention, signed a cooperation agreement for a formal relationship with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), or developed addition to Libya’s appalling human rights record with respect to its own citizens, reports regarding its treatment of migrants and asylum seekers raises special concern about placing processing centres there.\[108\]

As for the camps mentioned in the report, in 2003, Italy funded the building of a migrant camp in northern Libya, in Gharyan. Soon later, in 2004 and 2005, two other camps were realized with Italian support, the first in Kufra, at the south-eastern border between Libya, Egypt and Sudan, and the second in Sebba, in the south-western part of the country. While these activities were described by Italian authorities as ‘humanitarian support’, the details of the operations remained secret.\[109\]

This increasingly tied cooperation stopped in 2011 as a direct consequence of the fall of the Gaddafi regime: however, cooperation was already decreasing since the year 2010 because of the increasing demands of the Libyan government. In Rome in August 2010, Gaddafi demanded five billion Euros per year to the European Union to keep stopping illegal immigration.\[110\] This demand was reiterated in November 2010 in Tripoli in a EU-Africa summit.\[111\]

---


As for Italy, then, the externalization of migration and border control to Libya developed fast and under relatively low contestation – even though some section of the agreements had to be maintained secret. It is now time to have a look at how the EU positioned itself throughout this process.

V.3. Developments of the practice of externalization within the European Union

In order to control whether Europeanization played a role in legitimizing externalized border and migration control in Libya, I now provide a view of how the EU dealt historically which these specific practices.

V.3.1. The birth of the practice and its development at the EU level

Even though externalization was discussed and debated from the early 1990s, it appeared in official EU documents only in the late 1990s. The Treaty of Amsterdam, signed in 1997, facilitated this process by expanding the competence of the JHA, the department dealing with migration issues. This treaty also brings a change in the European approach to migration and asylum cooperation, as it became a supranational issue since it was moved from the intergovernmental ‘third pillar’ to the supranational ‘first pillar’. Hence, the European Commission was given a greater role in initiating migration and asylum policies.112

First, externalization was mentioned in the strategy paper on migration and asylum policy of July 1998. In October 1999, the Dutch government proposed to set up a high-level working group (HLWG) in the Council of Minister of the EU to “prepare cross-pillar Action plans for selected countries of origin and transit of asylum seekers and migrants”.113 Later in the same month, externalization was mentioned also in the Presidency conclusions of the European Council in Tampere:

The European Council stresses the need for more efficient management of migration flows at all their stages. It calls for the development, in close co-operation with...
countries of origin and transit, of information campaigns on the actual possibilities for legal immigration, and for the prevention of all forms of trafficking in human beings.\textsuperscript{114}

The HLWG pursued the work towards cooperation with third countries, mostly on migration control. Action plans were drafted, for cooperation with Afghanistan, Pakistan, Albania, Morocco, Somalia, and Sri Lanka.\textsuperscript{115} Numerous NGOs as well as the UNHCR brought up strong critics about these action plans, concerned about the implications that it could have for refugee protection.\textsuperscript{116}

As in 2004 FRONTEX – today’s European Border and Coast Guard Agency - had been established, externalization gained further momentum at the EU level. One of the priority tasks of this new agency was in fact that of facilitate the “operational cooperation between member States and third countries, in the framework of the external relations policy of the European Union”.\textsuperscript{117}

In 2008, the Council of the European Union adopted the ‘European Pact on Immigration and Asylum’. The member States agree to “control illegal immigration by ensuring that illegal immigrants return to their countries of origin or to a country of transit”.\textsuperscript{118} To that end, the need to conclude readmission agreements at EU or bilateral level with third countries was emphasized, “so that each member State has the legal instruments to ensure that illegal migrants are expelled”.\textsuperscript{119}

\section*{V.3.2. Application of the externalization to Libya}


\textsuperscript{116} C. Boswell, \textit{op. cit.}, 2003, p. 630.


\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 7.
Concerning specific actions taken by the EU with Libya, there were basically no relations until the North African country was considered a Pariah state.\(^{120}\) However, as the arm embargo towards Libya was lifted in October 2004, the EU immediately started cooperating with Libya. The Libyan leader soon visited the EU institutions in Brussels, opening the way for a progressive rapprochement in diverse fields like arm deals, oil, and migration control. In late 2004, the European Commission conducted a first technical mission in Libya to see how to strengthen border control in the country. One year later, the Libyan government received two million euros for training and institution building within the frame of a EU action plan aiming at securing Libya’s southern borders.

As in 2006 the European Ministers of the Interior meet in Tampere, they accepted the proposal made by Franco Frattini as the vice-President of the European Commission, and provided material support to Libyan police forces – for a corresponding amount of three million Euros.\(^{121}\)

Yet, in 2007 the EU sent a second technical mission under FRONTEX command. The agency invited Libyan authorities to take part in the maritime border surveillance and control operations carried out in the Sicilian Channel. However, Libya refused the offer as authorities considered the EU’s financial support insufficient.\(^{122}\) In June 18th of 2009 FRONTEX coordinated EU Member-States push-back operations of boat migrants, as 75 TCNs were rescued at sea to be handed to a Libyan patrol boat.\(^{123}\) Finally, in 2010, the European Commission reached another agreement with Libya and transferred further financial resources to support the country to enhance its border patrol and surveillance capabilities.\(^{124}\)

Thus, in terms of timing, the externalization of migration control seems to become popular at the EU level just a few years before this policy approach was embraced also by the

\(^{120}\) A pariah state has “precarious diplomatic isolation, absence of assured, credible security support or political moorings within big-power alliance structures, and are targets of obsessive and unrelenting opprobrium and censure within international forums such as the United Nations”, R.E. Harkavy, ‘Pariah states and nuclear proliferation’, International Organizations, vol. 35, no. 1, 2003, p. 135.


Italian government in its relation with Libya. Yet, the actual implementation of externalized policies developed instead quicker in Italy. This is interesting considering how, of course, also Italy contributed in making externalization increasingly popular among European bureaucrats.

After describing the European developments in externalization policies, in general and in particular with Libya, I will explain what was the role of Italy in these processes.

V.4. Italian contribution to the practice of externalization at the European Union level

An example of this comes from the period when Italy was presiding the EU (presidency of the Council of Ministers and Council of the EU) during the second semester of 2003. The role of the president country is that of promoting political initiatives and specific priorities. One of the five priorities presented by the Italian presidency was actually that of “establishing effective measures to combat transnational crime and illegal immigration”.

In his inaugural discourse, the Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi stressed the need to cooperate with third countries in order to limit and control unauthorized migration.

[The] European citizens ask for democratic and transparent institutions, a prosper economy, a free society, but also a space of freedom and security. At Tampere, Seville, and Thessaloniki, the European Council recognised the need to improve the European capacity to fight organised transnational crime, illegal migration, [...] at the external border of the Union. We will concentrate our work on these themes, emphasizing the investment of adequate financial resources, and the gradual realisation of a common politic of repatriations, as well as an integrated management of the external border. But, above all, we emphasize need to include the control of unauthorized migration in any negotiation made between the EU and migrants’ origin as well as transit countries. [...] Collaboration [with] neighbouring countries, especially in the Mediterranean basin and the Balkans, to control and manage migration should be prioritized.

127 Ibid., p. 353.
The need to collaborate with third countries on migration control is then re-affirmed in the presidency conclusions:

*Finally, the European Council reaffirms the importance of the dialogue with third countries of origin and transit of migratory flows and underlines the importance of continuing to assist those countries in their own efforts to stem such migratory flows. This was also emphasised at the meeting of five Western Mediterranean EU Member/Accessing States and the five countries of the Maghreb Union held in Tunis on 5 December 2003. It welcomes the interinstitutional agreement reached by the European Parliament and the Council on the Regulation establishing the new financial instrument relating to cooperation with third countries in the area of asylum and migration. It also welcomes the adoption by the Council of the mechanism for monitoring and evaluating third countries in the area of the fight against illegal migration and invites the Commission to present the first report on its implementation by the end of 2004 at the latest.*

While thus Italy promoted externalization at the EU level, national authorities were also active in facilitating the development of good relations between the EU and Libya – as proved by the many visits of Italian officials in Libya during the months that preceded the end of the embargo – see table 3. As stated by Alessandro Pansa - the responsible of the central direction of immigration and border police of the Italian Ministry of the Interior - in 2003, “Italy is committed at the EU level to clear the embargo because Libya needs material resources to fight illegal immigration”. As the embargo made illegal to provide material assistance to Tripoli’s regime in the area of border control and surveillance – which involves military derived technologies – then the EU contributed in ending sanctions against Libya in 2004. The then Italian Minister of the Interior Giuseppe Pisanu defined the decision to end the embargo as an “Italian success that is in the interest of the entire Europe”. Adolfo Urso, Vice-Minister of Economic Development also admitted that “Brussels decision [to put an end to the arm embargo

---


on Libya], to which the Italian government has worked so hard, open a new economic season with Libya - with Italy being already the country’s first commercial partner’. 132

The fact that Italy played a major role in the rapprochement between Libya and the EU, was also confirmed by the words of the Libyan Minister of Foreign Affairs, Abdul Rahaman Shalgam, during an interview with La Stampa:

[Italy played a] decisive [role to end the embargo]. The situation changed when during the European meeting Minister Pisanu announced that Italy would have gone ahead bypassing the embargo even without an internal European agreement. I think I can say that both I and Minister Pisanu were aware that we had to deal together with the issue of Mediterranean security. By solving the problem of illegal immigration, we are also fighting the dangers represented by international terrorism and drug trafficking. 133

The Libyan Minister even stated that the Italian threat to bypass the embargo was also agreed with him in advance. This proves the importance of the Italian involvement in the rapprochement between the EU and Libya, constituting a further element supporting the legitimization of the externalization of border and migration control in Libya. To ‘normalize’ the situation of Libya in the international stage, was necessary to legitimate the cooperation with the country.

Last, but not least, Italy included the European Union in the 2007 agreement with Libya on joint patrols in the Mediterranean. According to journalist sources, "The agreement also prevails that Italy commits to cooperate with the European Union in providing a control system for Libyan land and sea borders, in order to fight illegal immigration". 134

Clearly then, Italy was very active at the European level to promote externalization: a practice that was already emerging at the domestic level. It was also important for Italy to have a normalisation of the UE-Libyan relations, to obtain the end of the arm embargo. Lifting the embargo was more important for the legitimization of the externalization policy than for the

---


133 G. Ruotolo, ”Africa e Ue, insieme si batte l’immigrazione clandestina”, trans. L. Geyer, La Stampa, 27 September 2004, p.5, original: “Decisivo. La situazione si è sbloccata quando il ministro Pisanu, alla vigilia degli incontri europei, ha annunciato che l’Italia, in assenza di un accordo all’interno della Ue, sarebbe andata Avanti per la sua strada, aggirando l’embargo”.

actual material support. The signature of the 2003 agreement, that prevailed Italian furniture of ships, helicopters, radars, and jeeps in spite of the EU embargo proves that Italy still engaged in furniture of material even while the embargo was still in force.¹³⁵

Now that I have presented the main elements of the cooperation between Italy and Libya in Immigration matters, as well as the relation and participation of the European Union in this process, I can go on to the Analysis of political discourse.

VI. Discourse analysis: How the Italian policy-makers justify externalization?

In his inaugural discourse in front of his European counterparts of July 2003, the then Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi made explicit the link between migration and ‘security’, with references to organized transnational crime. This of course is just one immediate example of the intertwine between externalization, securitization and Europeanization. As for the discourse analysis which starts next, after presenting the overall results in table form, I decided to divide it into four parts which will look at a) references to Europeanization, b) to Securitisation elements, c) the strategies used by Italian institutional actors to respond to the critics and d) at Parliamentary discussions.

In terms of data, I analysed a total of 46 media discourses which emanated from diverse political actors. As for the period when such speeches took place, even if a first agreement with Libya was signed already in late 2000, externalized migration control policies were scarcely debated by Italian newspapers until 2002. This is why the first relevant article that I found presenting a discourse about externalization only goes back to June 2002.

Discourses emanating from newspaper articles are usually quite short, they are in most cases quick comments or responses gave by the policy-makers in relation to a specific policy or political event that are reported in newspapers as press dispatches. Hence, it is not always possible to find an argumentation that contains all the arguments that the policy-makers could use to legitimize the concerned policy. To compensate this weakness, I tried to select as many discourses as possible.

In addition to these media discourses, to guarantee a better heterogeneity of the sources, I also looked for longer discussion about migration issues on official websites of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies. These were intense debates, where Ministers can interact with Parliament members, that belong to diverse positions of the Italian political spectrum. Confrontations of different views on immigration issues can be found in these discourses. I will look at four discourses of this type, representing three distinct governments.

---

VI.1. Overview of the results of the analysis

Thanks to the encoding techniques detailed in tables 1.1 and 1.2, I draw two tables summarizing the results of the analysis. The discourses are filed chronologically in the following tables. Each time a feature gets validated, I tick the correspondent case with an ‘X’, to have a better visual representation of the results. These tables only contain media sources since Senate and Chamber of deputies discourses will be analyse individually.

Table 5.1: Results of the analysis of Media discourses (2000-2007).137

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Europeanization</th>
<th>Securitization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Supp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

137 For the correspondent speakers, the date of the discourses and the references of the articles used, see the list in Appendix 2.
Table 5.2: Results of the analysis of media discourses (2008-2010).\textsuperscript{138}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Europeanization</th>
<th>Securitization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Supp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results depicted in tables 5.1 and 5.2 allows me to determine that the most featured elements in media discourses are:

- the references made to the European Union (39 recurrences);
- the demand for EU action or support (31 recurrences);
- the connection between undocumented migration and international criminal organisations (24 recurrences).

The economic argument was limited the to link between immigration and black labour and it was not used very often – only three recurrences found trough the discourses, It is more or less the same observation for the cultural threat, that appears in only four discourses.

\textsuperscript{138} For the correspondent speakers, the date of the discourses and the references of the articles used, see the list in Appendix 2.
As for the terrorist threat, even though it was mentioned in eight discourses before 2008, it remained very rare, after this date, to see this kind of threat in the justification of the externalization measures, this could be explained by the weakening of the terrorist group Al Qaeda, that was representing the major terrorist threat in the period of study, their major attacks in western countries were realised between 2001 and 2005.\textsuperscript{139}

After seeing the general presentation of the outcome of my discourse analysis, I will now elaborate in details, concrete examples of how I proceed to critically analyse this set of media discourses, in order to have a better understanding of the results mentioned in tables 5.1 and 5.2.

\textbf{VI.2. Europeanization dynamics in media discourses}

Europe is often mobilized by Italian policymakers when discussing migration publicly: as for the period being studied here, there were more than 30 different interventions where the EU was at least mentioned once in relation to migration. The EU and migration are linked mainly for two purposes:

- The fight against unauthorized immigration is very often characterised as an ‘European problem’, or that the action of externalization that Italy is implementing is in the interest of the European Union;
- The Italian policy-makers’ demand for EU support or EU actions in externalization measures with Libya.

To problematize migration as European, is already important in the legitimization process. National politicians shift the responsibility for their policies in Libya to the EU. Very often, they present externalization to journalists as a European rather than national priority. In fact the two purposes are related and can be combined. Indeed, when defining migration as a European issue, a European response might also be perceived as the solution to the problem. Hence, a EU action can be solicited by Italian politicians to deal with immigration issues. This solicitation can have obvious material reasons, benefiting from EU’s funds in migration operations is very likely to be an objective from the policy-makers. But the shift of externalization policies to the EU can also be important from a normative point of view. As we

saw with the work of Beetham and Lord,\textsuperscript{140} recognition of a practice by liberal a group of States is important for its legitimization. Plus, Italy, without EU support, could find itself isolated in facing the critics of various NGOs and International Organizations.

This is what Franco Frattini\textsuperscript{141} responded to a journalist who was questioning him about the allegation of the United Nations concerning push-back manoeuvres in the Sicilian Channel:

\textit{Italy is not isolated, because when Europe will speak... European governments will speak, and [they] will say what they always said: that a country like Italy, but also smaller countries like Cyprus and Malta, operates push-back \textbf{in the interest of the entire EU}. Because now that we have abolished internal borders, illegal migrants that arrive in Lampedusa do not stop there. They migrate towards the north, towards other European countries. \textbf{Hence, it is an absolutely shared interest [to stop them in Libya].} However, so far, the EU has done less than what they should have done. \textbf{We hope that in the future a decisive intervention of the EU institutions can finally take place.}\textsuperscript{142}

Here Frattini justifies illegal push-backs made thanks to the close collaboration with Libya, by Europeanizing the issue. He upgrades a national policy into a European interest - since migrants landing in Italy will then move to other European countries. Classic justification of policies would tend to mobilize the national interest. Yet, here, the interest mentioned is not just Italian, but concerns the European Union. And the Minister of Foreign Affairs carefully explains how it is the case, and what will happen if no actions are engaged.

There is an accentuation of this element in the discourse since Franco Frattini repeat two times this element, with a different formulation. Plus, the use of the superlative ‘absolutely’ makes the emphasis even stronger. He ends his response by clearly demanding the EU to take similar action, arguing that they should have done more.

However, the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs is not alone in the Italian national government using this argument. The same day, the then Minister of the Interior Roberto Maroni\textsuperscript{143}, stated:

\textsuperscript{141} Franco Frattini is a centre-right politician, member of Forza Italia and Popolò della Libertà, from 1994 to 2013.
\textsuperscript{143} Roberto Maroni is a far-right politician that participated in the \textit{Lega Nord} foundation in 1989. He has been member of this political party ever since, he was named minister in three different Berlusconi governments, including two times as Minister of the Interior.
[UN accusations] are prejudicial [...] We are investing our resources also to protect European countries. But we want the EU to take decisions to help the countries that are exposed the most on this front [...] There is a moral obligation to fight the traffic of illegal migrants in any possible way.144

We see here that Italy is directly encouraging and asking for the European Union to take actions in the migration control field. Maroni even says that it is a ‘moral obligation’ to take whatever it takes to fight illegal migration. This obviously also supposes extra-ordinary practices such as externalization. In 2010, Roberto Maroni went even further on the European Union:

On Immigration matter, not only the government always acted within European norms, but also the agreement with Libya that reduced considerably migrants’ arrivals is taken as a model in the entire Europe [...] I am convinced that the actions taken are in line with European standards and are used for a better coexistence. We will pursue this path. [...] Italian government acted and will always act respecting European norms. Who says the opposite is dishonest or does not know what he is talking about.145

Here, we have in a few sentences, four enunciations of the word ‘Europe’. The Minister is claiming that the agreement with Libya respects EU norms. The core of his justification is lying in this aspect. We have, once again a repetition of this same argument three times in a rather short discourse. The last sentence shows the strong determination that the Minister has in justifying the cooperation with Libya, he even states that it is not possible not to share his view, unless being dishonest or ignoring the subject. Maroni is not specifying which norms in particular he is referring to.

Still in 2010, Maroni was mentioning a European pact, to justify externalization of migration control with Libya:


The policies that we developed are efficient, and they are part of the European framework on managing illegal immigration fluxes. [...] There is one document in particular, a European pact approved by EU heads of State and government in 2008, its name is ‘European Pact on Immigration and asylum’, this pact defines rules that Member States have to follow. It means fighting immigration, and preventing arrivals of migrants [...] Hence, we cannot develop a national policy in conflict with this general political document of the European Union.146

The argument of the previous discourse is repeated here, but this time, Roberto Maroni is directly justifying immigration measures by citing a specific European official document. As we saw in the previous section of the thesis, the pact did mention the externalization of migration control. Maroni referring to a EU document to justify the policy can be interpreted as a feature of the concept of Europeanization. Indeed The Italian migration policy is made under the European Union framework, and has, according to the Italian Minister to adapt to these European directives. This is what Ladrech intended in his top-down definition of Europeanization.147 The 2008 EU pact on immigration and asylum Italy, become part of Italy’s domestic organizational logic, since the Minister is arguing that the country has to comply with this norm. However, an interesting aspect is that we saw in the previous section of the thesis that Italy was promoting the practice of externalization at the EU level, whereas here Pisanu is arguing that Italy cannot go against European directives. This proves that this process reports both top-down and bottom up approach of Europeanization. First, Italian policy-makers promoted the externalization policies in the EU agenda, and second, they used these European norms to justify domestically the externalization of migration control policies.

These European elements were already present in discourses about externalization since the very beginning of the implementation of the practice. In June 2002, the then Ministry of the Interior, Claudio Scajola148 stated that:

Countries beyond the Mediterranean have to understand that more actions to fight illegal migration fluxes are needed [...] It’s a success for Italy that the ‘contrast at sea’ has become a priority absolutely shared also by the rest of the EU [...] Six months ago it was still hard to understand that this was not only a Greek and Italian issue.149

---

148 Claudio Scajola is a Forza Italia and Popolo della Libertà member. He was named four times Minister of Berlusconi’s governments.
To upgrade externalized migration control at the EU level is presented by Scajola as necessary, and the progresses made in this direction are discussed here as a ‘success for Italy’. This extract shows that it was an objective for Italy to have the EU’s support in externalization policies, already in the early stage of their developments.

Hence, with the results of the analysis we observed that European elements are dominating the discourses on externalization. The EU is almost always mentioned when it comes to justify these policies, migration is very often depicted as a European issue. However, Italian policy-makers are, in their discourses about externalization, more often demanding for the EU to support them in these policies, than justifying these potentially illegal actions with references to European norms, directives or discussions. This is illustrated in tables 5.1 and 5.2 where we only see 14 times the mentions of EU developments, while the demand for EU support were featured in 31 discourses. One could argue that Europeanization originally refers to the transfer of European norms, policies or ideas at the domestic level. Yet, the results of the analysis would rather points the opposite phenomenon since it is mostly Italian policy-makers that are trying to take domestic policies to the European level.

However, as I showed with my elaboration of the Europeanization concept in the theoretical framework, there are various uses and definitions of this concept in International Relations literature. Europeanization has been viewed differently according to the authors and their purposes. Especially taking into account the socio-constructivist approach, we cannot restrict our understanding of Europeanization by thinking that it can refer only to domestic change in a Member State under EU pressure. It is also an interactive process, where EU functionaries, and domestic policy-makers can interact and influence each other. In fact, this aspect can fall into Radaelli’s horizontal mechanism of Europeanization, which combines the bottom-up and top-down effects of the notion.
VI.3. Securitization

In this section, I concentrate on discourses which frame migrants and migration as a security threat for the hosting society – and see how this had been reinforced by the permanent emergency characterizing the governance of migration in Italy. In this regard, I refer to a variety of discursive tactics that construct migration as a security threat.

VI.3.1. Securitizing elements

I found two arguments to be particularly relevant within the national discourse on migration and security:

- Crime: unauthorized migration as related to international criminal organizations.
- Terrorism: unauthorized migrants and asylum seekers as potential terrorists.

I will start by addressing discourses linking the terrorist threat to undocumented migration, this is a powerful discursive practice, especially given the specific time of reference for this research. What follows is the declaration of the then Minister of the Interior, Giuseppe Pisanu, in September 2004:

*Italy has reacted to a real assault to our coast organized by organized international human traffickers [...] as in a week, we rejected the entrance of 1153 people [...] They were unfortunate decisions as much as they were absolutely necessary: if we had not sent a clear and strong message, we would have attracted other thousands of hopeless people towards Lampedusa, facilitating criminal groups in managing their traffics. These criminal organisations are] more and more intertwined with international terrorism. [...] illegal immigration is the emergency of the next years, a problem that the entire country and the rest of Europe has to face together”.*

152 Lampedusa has been symbolically constructed by European and Italian policy-makers as ‘the border island’, as Cuttita stated: “Lampedusa high degree of ‘borderness’ [...] depends on political choices: on policies, practices and discourses that have been developed in and around the island, ‘borderizing’ Lampedusa and transforming it into the quintessential embodiment of the Euro-African migration and border regime”. P. Cuttita, “’Borderizing’ the Island, Setting and Narratives of the Lampedusa ‘Border Play’”, *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2014, p. 199.

The words of Minister Pisanu are filled with extremely interesting references. First, the arrival of boat people is considered an assault – which constitute a term typical of the military word, and warfare more broadly. Clearly, undocumented migrants, refugees and asylum seekers arriving to the Italian shores by boat are described as a danger and a threat for the country. Although the Italian Ministry of the Interior admit the toughness of the measures he implemented to push back migrants, he presents such choices as necessary so that he and Italy were left without alternatives – consequently legitimizing these policies on the basis of security concerns. This becomes absolutely clear when boat migration to Italy is linked with organized crime and, even more, terrorism. We must remember that these words are dated only three years after the shocking attacks of 09/11 in New York, and at less than one year from the Madrid train bombings. Important to note the combination of security and European arguments, as in the last sentence of this extract, the then Minister of the Interior emphasizes the importance of facing the ‘Illegal immigration emergency’ together with the rest of Europe.

Few months later, Giuseppe Pisanu reaffirmed his position when visiting Libya to discuss operational measures to fight undocumented migration.

[We] support the Libyan government’s fight against illegal migration, and search for solutions that can favour legal immigration and reduce the root causes of undocumented migration, also by fighting vigorously against the criminal organizations that are responsible for it. [This is why the Italian and Libyan governments reaffirmed their] willingness of cooperate in the strategic sectors of security, in particular to fight terrorism and those criminal organizations which exploit illegal migration phenomenon.

Giuseppe Pisanu’s words refer explicitly to the need to externalize migration control to Libya in order to ensure Italians and Europeans’ security against the threats generated by unauthorized migration. This is even more interesting if we consider that the Minister of the Interior pronounced this discourse while in Tripoli, after signing an agreement with the Libyan government on controlling human trafficking and smuggling in the country. As he said, to control migration constitute a ‘strategic sector of security’, especially for what concerns

---


terrorism and international crime. Here, ‘criminal organizations’ are framed as central for undocumented border crossing into Europe, further enhancing the perception of undocumented migration as related to a criminal activity.

In a discourse pronounced in 2009, the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs Franco Frattini remarked the connection between migration and terrorism, stating that: “substantial migration movements can constitute an opportunity to hide terrorists. Within big groups of people who move abroad simply to find a job, there can be groups or individuals that are related to jihadist and terrorist cells”. Here, the terrorist threat is directly linked undocumented migration as he argues that part of the migrants can be related to terrorist organizations.

One final mention of the terrorist threat can be presented here, it is not taken from a newspaper article, but from the official site of the Defence Ministry. In November 2004, the then Minister of the Defence, Antonio Martino, stated in a discourse for the opening of the academic year of the Centre for High studies in defence that:

At strictly military affairs must be added more general measures in terms of security: Here, I refer to the agreements with Libya on illegal immigration control. As it has already been established, [illegal immigration] is not only infiltrated by Al-Qaeda, but also often managed by terrorists to bring persons, arms and drugs into Europe, it constitutes for the terrorists a financial weapon, that provides them with substantial financial resources.

This is surely the most evident link made between terrorism and illegal immigration in the analysed discourses, this intervention was also cited by Cuttitta, to prove that there was an attempt from Italian policy-makers to construct this link discursively in the early 2000s. Fighting immigration is thus described as a way to tackle international terrorism at the same time. It is important to notice that these allegations are almost never supported by proofs or

facts. Martino is arguing that it has already been established that illegal immigration is strongly linked to terrorism, but he does not precise when and by who such connection was made.

Yet, undocumented migrants were discussed also in relation to other threats – as for Pisanu again, in June 2005.

*Our problem is to avoid undocumented migrants to leave, so that we will continue working on bilateral agreements with the countries of transit and origin. [...] In 2004, 237,229 persons were arrested. They were non-EU citizens staying irregularly staying in Italy, they were undocumented or stateless people. Based on the national average, these persons constitute the 38.8% of all arrests made our country. [...] The 30.84% of the prison population in Italy is represented by non-EU citizens, almost all of which are irregularly residing in Italy: this is just to give the dimension of this problem, which clearly requires from authorities the concern and commitment that I am personally dedicating. [...] The annual turnover made by human traffickers today became comparable to the global turnover generated by the trafficking of drugs. [It is] a business that grows year by year. [...] The CPT's are necessary facilities to control illegal immigration. Who wants to close them wants the free movement of the illegal migrants. As it is well known today, [undocumented migrants] constitute the main supply for the black labour market, for prostitution, and they are the labourer of criminal organizations.*

The ministry uses statistics on crime to problematise undocumented migrants reception in the country – further criminalizing newcomers as they are arrested by authorities more frequently than natives are. Drug trafficking is also compared to human trafficking and smuggling, and migration is linked to other typologies of crime such as prostitution and undeclared work.

The presence of the economic threat can also be raised here, by saying that migrants constitute the main supply for the black labour market, the migrant is constructed as a threat to the effective operation of the Italian labour market, and thus, a threat to Italian economy. This argument is the only one found in the discourses about economy, I would have expect to see

---

159 N.h.: CPTs are centres for undocumented migrants’ ‘temporary stay’ before being deported.
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more reference to the difficult economic situation of the country and the incapacity to provide the resources that the migrants need, but this was not the case, at least for the set of discourses analysed in this thesis.

As if this was not enough, in 2006 Pisanu refers to migration as a threat for the religious – and thus also cultural – identity of Europe.

Libya is committed to the fight against terrorism and illegal immigration [...] Today, in Europe there are already twenty million Muslims. In ten years ’ time, this number will double, [as Muslims] will constitute the 10 percent of the entire European population.161

Here, statistics on the presence of Muslims in Europe is not presented explicitly as a threat. Yet, this kind of religious argument is often mobilized in discourses that aim at legitimize measures that limit migration to reduce risks for the national identity and culture in receiving countries.162 This is even more controversial, as statistics about religious affiliations in Europe can be quite contested - i.e. in France, where it is forbidden to record or register statistics concerning ethnic or religious belonging, to prevent abuses and stigmatisation that could derive from this kind of statistics.163

In a discourse of 2009, Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi was more explicit in framing migration as a threat to cultural identity, rejecting an idea of a multi-ethnic society: “[Our government] will not open the doors to everyone like the left [did because of] their idea of a multi-ethnic society. Our idea is not the same, as we only want to host those who meet the conditions for asylum”.164 This excerpt precedes another part of Berlusconi’s discourse when he then defends Italian choices to manage and limit migration across the Mediterranean: “I


164 Corriere della Sera, ‘Berlusconi: Si ai rimpatri, non apriremo le porte a tutti” 9 May 2009, https://www.corriere.it/politica/09_maggio_09/maroni_immigrati_respinti_da84e542-3ca2-11de-a760-00144f02aabc.shtml (accessed 7 June 2018), original: “La sinistra con i suoi precedenti governi aveva aperto le porte ai clandestini provenienti da tutti i Paesi. Quindi l’idea della sinistra era ed è quella di un’Italia multietnica. La nostra idea non è così […] non apriremo le porte a tutti come la sinistra. La linea del governo in maniera d’immigrazione è quella dell’accogliimento solo per chi ha diritto all’asilo politico”.
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don’t see any scandal [with externalization.] At sea we have to provide assistance, but we are in line with European dispositions and nothing violates our international commitments”.\(^{165}\) He establishes an opposition between the ‘right-wing’ and ‘left-wing’ ideas, arguing that his political side will not let undocumented migrants turn Italy into a multi-ethnic society. This is argued besides the fact that the previous centre-left coalition realised the same kind of immigration policies, especially in the cooperation with Libya.

Pisanu’s successor at the Ministry of the Interior for the centre-left the coalition led by Romano Prodi, Giuliano Amato,\(^ {166}\) has also mobilized similar argumentations:

\textit{We must act as we do for anti-terrorism and anti-mafia operations, because illegal immigration is a phenomenon that has the same criminal relevance and the same intensity of barbarism […]} It is necessary to identify the gaps and fill them, as we must be able to hit beyond the single smuggler, to get to the whole criminal organization he is working for, and hit the networks of human traffickers which are often at the roots of undocumented immigration. […] We are working well with Libya, but we need to broaden the areas of collaboration.\(^ {167}\)

Compared to the past, here the Minister is framing the relation between undocumented migration and terrorism from another perspective. Yet, even in this case one could see how his words further criminalize undocumented migration, as networks of human traffickers and smugglers are described as dangerous as terrorist groups and mafia. Although in different terms, then, also the centre-left coalition of Romano Prodi seems to use security-related-arguments to justify and promote the externalization of migration control in Libya. A practice which is accepted and, to a certain extent, normalized – as is shared by actors located across almost the entire spectrum of Italian politics.


\(^{166}\) Giuliano Amato is a centre-left politician, member of the Democrat Party. He was two times Prime Minister of Italy between 1992 and 1993 and between 2000 and 2001. He was also Minister of the Interior during the mandate of Romano Prodi between 2006 and 2008.

We have thus seen how the increasing securitization of migration was both produced and reproduced to justify externalized policies of migration control in Libya. Undocumented migration – which is an administrative violation - is always named by policymakers as ‘illegal’ so that it is more easily associated with crime. It must be said, however, that at the time to name unauthorized migration as a crime has also become a new standard for the entire EU, whose institutions at the time frequently framed undocumented migration as ‘illegal’ and, hence, as a criminal activity.\textsuperscript{168} Tables 5.1 and 5.2 show that the ‘criminality’ feature appeared 23 times on the total 46 discourses analysed.

I will now look at another dimension of the securitization, which consists in constructing an issue as an ‘emergency’ to legitimise use of exceptional measures to tackle it.

VI.3.2. The exceptional character of externalization

As seen before in reference to the work done by Bigo, exceptional practices can be implemented when a specific regime of power generates a ‘permanent state of emergency’ by strategically and discursively mobilizing fear of societal insecurity.\textsuperscript{169} As for the speeches I analysed for this thesis, the word ‘emergency’ appeared 24 times in 13 different media discourses. In December 2008, during a radio interview the then Ministry of the Interior Roberto Maroni justified the repatriation of migrants as follow: “we must make clear to those who want to reach Lampedusa that we will be repatriate them within a few days and directly from the island […] That in Lampedusa is a real emergency […] and we must respond to the emergency with emergency”.\textsuperscript{170} Here the ministry is justifying an exception measure – i.e. a mass expulsion which violates the principle of non-refoulement – on the basis of the emergency which generated in the island because of the extraordinary number of unauthorized migrants who had it - about 2,000 people – against the limited reception capacity of the local centre – which was

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{168} A. Morice and C. Rodier, ‘Politiques de migration et d'asile de l’Union Européenne en Méditerranée, Confluences méditerranée, no. 87, 2013, p. 112.
\item \textsuperscript{169} D. Bigo, ‘La Mondialisation de l'(in)sécurité? Réflexions sur le champ des professionnels de la gestion des inquiétudes et analytique de la transnationalisation des processus d’(in)sécurisation’, Culture et Conflits, no. 53, 2005, p. 64.
\end{itemize}
designed to host a maximum of about 800 people at the time. Yet, over the period analysed for this thesis and also today, emergency continues to be mentioned by Italian policymakers in reference to migration – making Bigo’s argument on the ‘permanent state of emergency’ absolutely valid and relevant. Actually, a state of prolonged crisis which is today normalized also at the European level, as proved by the so-called “migrants emergency” which started in the Balkans in 2015. This is illustrated by this European Commission announcement which states that: “Leaders meeting at the invitation of President Juncker on Sunday 25 October have committed to take immediate operational actions to address the unfolding emergency in the countries along the Western Balkans migratory route”.

Around the emergency description of the situation, I observed in the discourses a lot of references to the humanitarian aspect of the externalization measures. From this perspective, policy makers argued that Italy is left with no other choice than to implement these kinds of policies, as the country is facing a continuous humanitarian emergency. Migrants’ lives are in danger and externalization is necessary, because it can prevent people from taking the risk to cross the Mediterranean Sea.

However, the humanitarian argument is also frequently associated with the criminalisation of undocumented migrants’ cross border mobility. Following the signing of the 2007 agreement, Giuliano Amato made the connection:

*Now it will be possible to carry out Search and Rescue Operations with mixed teams [of Italian and Libyan officials] closer to the Libyan coasts, in front of the port and the bays from where human traffickers organize departures. This will give us the opportunity to oppose with the greater efficiency traffickers, while saving many human lives.*

Even though the interest of saving human lives is mentioned, saying that the agreement with Libya has a humanitarian purpose, I also note that other kinds of arguments are used in the same paragraph that mention ‘trafficking’ two times, and criminal groups that needs to be take

---

down. Plus, the term ‘patrolling’ is used, which has a security connotation in its meaning and uses. In fact, I observed that Italian policy-makers, in their discourses, almost always refer to these kinds of actions as ‘pattugliamento’ which means ‘patrolling’, a word that is commonly used in the military and warfare area. For instance, it would be very rare to see this kind of wording used by humanitarian or Human Rights NGOs, they would rather use ‘search and rescue operations’ in their documents, as it has been used in Amnesty International and Médecins sans Frontières in the presentation of their humanitarian actions in the Mediterranean. We cannot observe the word ‘patrolling’ in these documents.\textsuperscript{174} Hence, I can argue that most of the time, when the humanitarian argument is advanced, security semantics also intervene and are used in the justification of the practice.

The supposed humanitarian argument was already presented in the State of the Art, as developed by Rodier to express the incoherent and masked justification of its externalization policy.\textsuperscript{175} We can have the same reasoning for cooperation with Libya, as Gadhafi’s regime was well known for its human rights abuses, as we saw that in the numerous NGOs and International organizations critics to externalization of migration control to Libya.\textsuperscript{176} Hence, because humanitarian arguments were often incoherent and presented along security elements, we cannot consider that the humanitarian aspect had the same relevance in the legitimization of the externalization than the security and European elements. In fact, it contributed to the construction of the state of emergency regarding the immigration situation in Italy.

VI.4. Reaction to the critics

One way to look at how both security and the EU were strategically and discursively mobilized by Italian policymakers to justify externalized migration control in Libya, is to look at their reactions to the most direct and authoritative critics of this policy. One of the most controversial of these discussions generated in response to Laura Boldrini’s – the UNHCR spokeswoman in


\textsuperscript{175} C. Rodier, op. cit., 2008, pp. 112-114.

Italy – denounces of the inhuman treatment of migrants in Libya. As she highlighted, the UNHCR was refused access to migrants’ detention centres in Libya, as the country does not recognise formally this UN agency.

*To return migrants to Libya collides with legal provisions to guarantee international protection and the right to Asylum, as it is regulated by national, European and international laws. People in need of international protection must be guaranteed their right of non-refoulement [...] They are not [illegals] as in most cases they are genuine refugees, as it is also demonstrated by the fact that half of those arriving in Lampedusa and ask for asylum receive it after a very scrupulous procedure. [...] Libya did not signed the Geneva Convention on the status of Refugee, it does not have an asylum system that fits the prevailed rules and we cannot enter in all the detention centres.*

The then Italian Ministry of Defence Ignazio La Russa, did not waited to react to the accusations made by Laura Boldrini. It is important to know that Ignazio la Russa was co-founder and until 2009, president of the political party ‘Alleanza Nazionale’ (National alliance) which was a right-wing nationalist party, in his reaction to Laura Boldrini’s critics, he stated that:

*She [Laura Boldrini] has no humanity or she is a criminal, who is famous because she is the member of the actual Communist party in Italy, and she owns the surname of a famous leader of the Italian partisans. [...] The UNHCR is an international organisation that does not matter at all, unless the press decides it has to.*

Strong attacks were addressed to the UNHCR and its representatives in Italy, so that criminalization expanded to include also those supporting the rights of migrants.

Even the then Minister of Foreign Affairs, Franco Frattini, responded to the critics advanced by the UNHCR.


178 Note that the Minister used the Italian expression ‘non contano un fico secco’
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There has been no order coming from the Chief of the Italian Navy to the commander of the Spica ship which returned migrants and used force.\(^\text{180}\) Force has never been used, there was no coercion, and the law of the sea was respected as it states that it is the duty of a sailor to escort shipwrecked people to the nearest port, once asked so from those rescued.\(^\text{181}\)

According to Franco Frattini ‘push back policy’ did not constituted a violation of the non-refoulement principle as it responded to the request of boat migrants. Soon after, within the same speech, he then attacked the Italian parliamentary opposition constituted by a centre-left wing coalition. Actually, he described previous “immigration politics promoted by that side of the Parliament as a danger for “the Italian and European identity”\(^\text{182}\) – thus combining elements of both securitization and Europeanization to justify externalized policies.

Following the critics raised by Johannes Laitenberger and Denis Abbott, spokespersons for the European Commission against the push back to Libya of 70 migrants that were intercepted in the Sicilian Channel in September 2009, then Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi responded with vigour.

*It is a problem that I will carry on the table of the next European Council. We are not going to give our vote anymore, blocking the functioning of the Council, unless it is determined that no Commissioner or their spokespersons can intervene publicly on any issue […] I will ask for the dismissal of those who keep doing it […] With these critics, EU Commissioners give to opposition parties in different Member States [unconsistent] arguments to contest governmental forces.*\(^\text{183}\)

\(^\text{180}\) The Spica ship is a military vessel of the Italian navy, it was used from 1998 to 2012 for the patrolling of the Sicilian channel; Ministero della Difesa, ‘Spica, pattugliatori Classe Cassiopea (PG), [http://www.marina.difesa.it/uominimezzi/navi/Pagine/Spica.aspx](http://www.marina.difesa.it/uominimezzi/navi/Pagine/Spica.aspx) (accessed 6 June 2018).


\(^\text{182}\) *ibid.*, trans. L. Geyer, original: “La politica della sinistra sull’immigrazione è a scapito dell’identità italiana ed europea”.

\(^\text{183}\) Corriere della Sera, ‘Berlusconi attacca i commissari UE: “Tacciamo, parli solo il presidente”’, 2 September 2009, [https://www.corriere.it/politica/09_settembre_01/berlusconi_attacco_opposizione_portavoce_ue_1be9ec76-96f3-11de-864c-00144f02aad0.shtml](https://www.corriere.it/politica/09_settembre_01/berlusconi_attacco_opposizione_portavoce_ue_1be9ec76-96f3-11de-864c-00144f02aad0.shtml) (accessed 8 June 2018), original: ” È un problema che porterò sul tavolo del prossimo consiglio europeo. Non daremo più il nostro voto, bloccando di fatto il funzionamento del Consiglio, ove non si determini che nessun commissario e nessun portavoce di commissario possa intervenire più pubblicamente su alcun tema […] Chiederò che vengano dimissionati. […] danno alle opposizioni di ogni Paese delle armi che invece non esistono.”
Here, it is as if the Italian Prime Minister wanted to draw a line between European institutions and the government in Italy, thus setting the limits of the EU role and weight in legitimizing the externalization of migration control in Libya.

I found that when the legitimacy of the externalization of migration control policies was questioned, the responses were not always supported with rational and concrete arguments. From the personal attacks of Ignazio la Russa to the threats made by Silvio Berlusconi, we can understand that externalization was a delicate subject to tackle. Besides that, other responses containing more argumentations were given, with elements that, like the conformity of the practices with EU norms, are compatible with the hypotheses of this thesis.

VI.5. Analysis of parliamentary discussions

I now analyse another type of discourses, looking at the intervention of the different competent Ministers not in front of the medias, but in a parliamentary environment, mostly through Senate sessions. The Senate is one of the two chambers that constitute the Italian Parliament, the other chamber is called Chamber of Deputies. Senators that are elected on a regional basis, and former Presidents of the Republic compose the Senate, while the Deputies of the other chamber are elected by direct and universal suffrage. Italian Ministers can intervene in the Senate sessions to discuss with the Senators various issues. According to the Senate rule number 145, a Senator can express a question to “solicit information or explanations on particular issues from the Minister responsible”. One Senate session per week is reserved to the questions for the Ministers. As discourses given in Senate are quite long and well argued, it is then justified to analyse them one by one, without dividing the analysis in different themes.


I will start to analyse a discourse from the then Minister of the Interior Giuseppe Pisanu. The theme of the discourse is a communication on immigration matters, which Senators will comment afterwards.  

The most important element in this discourse is securitization, the word ‘security’ is pronounced five times, and the words ‘criminal’, ‘crime’ and ‘criminality’ are pronounced seven times throughout the speech. Although he specifies at first that an illegal migrant is not necessarily a criminal, saying that they are rather the victims of criminal acts, Giuseppe Pisanu still emphasizes that:

> [...] this reaction capacity [by the police] is also due to the articulation of the security dispositive, taken in response to illegal immigration’s most serious outcomes, which are black labour, prostitution, violence, and criminality. I did not wait for Milan and Bologna’s events to denounce these risks and in particular, the constant degradation of many aspects of illegal immigration towards common delinquency, mafia and even organised criminality.

I saw in most media discourses that immigration was discursively connected to criminality because of the human traffickers that are part of international criminal organisations and are taking advantage of undocumented migrant’s desperation situation. In addition to this argument, Pisanu also establishes, in this case, a direct connection between unauthorized immigration and Italian domestic criminality. Before this extract, he started the speech by reminding the serious crimes (Murders and rapes) committed by undocumented migrants on the Italian territory. He is constructing a direct connection between the crimes committed and the fact that the criminals concerned were undocumented migrants, by pointing specific events. Latter in the discourse, Giuseppe Pisanu declared that:

---

187 Ibid., p. 32, n.b.: Here, the minister refers to serious crimes committed in the weeks preceding this discourse by ‘illegal immigrants’ in Varese, Bologna and Milano. More precisely, it was a homicide in Varese and rapes in Bologna and Milano.
188 Ibid., trans. L. Geyer, p. 32, original: “Ma questa specifica capacita di reazione e’ dovuta anche all’articolato dispositivo di sicurezza messo in atto nei confronti degli esiti piu gravi dell’immigrazione clandestina, i quali, come e’ noto, sono, oltre al lavoro nero, la prostituzione, la violenza, la criminalita. Non ho certo aspettato i fatti di Bologna e Milano per denunciare questi rischi e in particolare il continuo degradare di larghe frange dell’immigrazione clandestina verso la delinquenza comune, la manovalanza criminale e perfino la criminalita organizzata”. 
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The suppression of CPTs would mean the exclusion of any possibility to expel illegal migrants and the indiscriminate opening of the borders, placing Italy out of the Schengen agreement and violating the national, communitarian, and international law […] I will not, as Minister of the Interior risk an institutional collision and compromise Italian citizens’ security. 189

This extract is interesting both for securitization and for Europeanization, Giuseppe Pisanu is saying that CPTs are necessary to comply with Schengen requirements and communitarian law. This is once again a Europeanization feature. Following this reasoning, migration issues are Europeanized mostly through the Schengen agreement so the member States have to comply and take the necessary measures to respect the European directives. Just before that, he was reminding to the Senators that same kind of facilities are present in other European countries, such as France, Belgium, United Kingdom, Spain, Hungary and many more. 190 Here, he justifies Italian measures by saying that other EU member states are implementing same policies. Hence, I can observe in Pisanu’s discourse a vertical Europeanization, meaning that Italy adopts domestically European directives – i.e. The Schengen agreements - and a horizontal one, meaning that Italy adopts similar actions of other EU Member States. 191

Other European elements can be found in the discourse, Giuseppe Pisanu addressed the cooperation with Libya, reminding that it is implemented since the 2000 agreement, and that the cooperation has been strengthen ever since. The Minister of the interior declare at this subject that, on Italian initiative at the European Council of Ministers of the Interior and Justice, a document on Euro-Libyan cooperation in immigration matters has been approved. This document states that the EU commits to support Libyan capacities in immigration management, but also in refugee protection. Giuseppe Pisanu also assures that this initiative will be maintain in the next semester, by the British presidency. 192 Hence, this communication presented both European and Security elements.

189 Ibid., trans. L. Geyer, p. 39, original: “E chi, sopprimendo i CPT, volesse cos’i escludere qualsiasi possibilità di espellere i clandestini e, per dirla tutta e chiara, aprire indiscriminata- mente le frontiere, chi davvero volesse fare questo deve sapere che metterebbe cos’i l’Italia fuori dagli Accordi di Schengen. Siamo dunque di fronte a possibili violazioni della legalità interna, comunitaria e internazionale. […] Non sarò io, da Ministro dell’interno, da Ministro di garanzia, a cercare lo scontro istituzionale. Ma sia chiaro a tutti che non verro’ mai meno al dovere di far rispettare la legge e tutelare la sicurezza dei cittadini.”

190 Ibid., p. 38

191 Guiraudon, op. cit., 2010, p.21 ; n.b.: Guiraudon’s view of Horizontal Europeanization must not be confused with Radaelli’s ‘horizontal mechanism’ explained in the theoretical framework.

192 Ibid., pp. 36-37.
I observed in this first discourse that the arguments were more detailed than in the newspaper article. I will now look at two 2006 discourses, while Romano Prodi’s centre left coalition was governing Italy.

VI.5.2. Giuliano Amato and Marcella Lucidi, 2006

I now analyse Giuliano Amato’s intervention in the Senate, about the European Union Council of Ministers on immigration issues,\(^{193}\) as well as an intervention in the Chamber of Deputies made by Marcella Lucidi,\(^{194}\) undersecretary of State for the interior at this period.\(^{195}\)

The then Minister of Foreign Affairs started his Senate intervention by referring to the 1999 Tampere presidency conclusions on immigration issues of the European Council of Minister. As I already established, the Tampere presidency conclusions were one of the first documents to introduce the practice of externalization at the European level. He goes further saying that Italy “cannot disregard, therefore, an efficient European Union action, especially for the patrolling of the northern African coasts”.\(^{196}\) Here, we directly see the importance of the European elements in his discourse, which is not surprising, since this intervention is a communication on the outcome of a EU council of Ministers. However, security elements were not found in this discourse.

As Amato’s intervention was quite short and concentrated mostly on the European dimension of immigration issues, I also selected Marcella Lucidi’s intervention in 2006 that is longer. She is undersecretary of State for the Interior, I did not find intervention on immigration from the Minister of the Interior in this period. But the discourse is interesting because it


\(^{194}\) Marcella Lucidi is a centre-left politician, she was elected deputy for the parliamentary group ‘L’Ulivo’ in 1996 and in 2001. Between 2006 and 2008, she was undersecretary of State for the Interior, in the Immigration section.


addressed migrants’ arrivals in Lampedusa. European arguments are present as she mentions the EU a few times during the speech, but a particular extract of the discourses had my attention:

*There is a strong concern, already expressed in 2005, by Minister Pisanu on the evolution of the phenomenon of migrant arrivals, that makes necessary that Italy is not alone to fight a problem that interests the whole European territory. The coordination between European countries […] is an essential condition to fight more efficiently the illegal immigration phenomenon, both in purely operative and normative point of views. In this perspective we already have some initiatives taken in agreement with the EU, that results in the decision to send in Italy a technical mission of Frontex experts in the design of a joint aero-naval patrol operation in the Mediterranean (Jason 1), and in the will to intensify dialogue between the European Union and Libya.*

I observed in this extract almost all the Europeanizing elements that were listed in the encoding technique. There is first the definition of the problem of immigration as a European problem, then the need for EU’s action is strongly emphasized, describing this action as an ‘essential condition’ in the illegal immigration fight.

More importantly, and this is something that I did not find often in discourses, is the fact that the undersecretary of state admits the importance of the European Union from a normative point of view. This is very important to respond to the research question and to verify my hypothesis about Europeanization. I already mentioned in the theoretical framework the relevance of the EU as a normative power. The involvement of the EU in the externalization practice can be decisive for the normalization, and thus, the legitimization of the practice. Plus, a reference is made here to the former Minister of the Interior Giuseppe Pisanu, despite the fact that he was working under the opposite political side. This is another element that shows the common understanding on externalization, both from the left and the right.

Security elements are also mobilised by Lucidi, She presents the usual reference of the illegal migration phenomenon as related to international criminal organizations’ actions that we saw repeatedly in the analysis of media discourse. In addition, Lucidi also mentions the terrorist threat, emphasizing that:

---

197 XV Legislatura, op. cit., 2006, p. 19, original: “forte preoccupazione che già espresse, nel 2005, il ministro Pisanu sull’evoluzione del fenomeno degli sbarchi ci sollecita a considerare necessario che l’Italia non sia sola a fronteggiare un problema che interessa l’intero territorio europeo. Il coordinamento tra i paesi europei, nonché tra questi ultimi e quelli nordafricani, è da ritenere condizione essenziale per fronteggiare più efficacemente il fenomeno dell’immigrazione clandestina, sia dal punto di vista normativo sia da quello più prettamente operativo. In questa prospettiva si collocano alcune iniziative già assunte d’intesa con l’Unione europea, che si sono tradotte nella decisione di inviare in Italia una missione tecnica di esperti dell’Agenzia per la gestione della cooperazione operativa alle frontiere esterne degli Stati membri (Frontex), nella progettazione di una operazione congiunta di pattugliamento aereo-navale del Mediterraneo (Jason 1) e nella volontà di intensificare il dialogo tra Unione europea e Libia, una collaborazione più ampia che investa il loro confine sud”

198 I. Manners, op. cit., 2009, p. 11.

---
The progressive intertwine of illegal immigration exploitation not only with human, arm, and drug trafficking, but also with international terrorism obliges us to pay particular attention in the surveillance of illegals coming from the African Horn, as well as those coming from the Sub-Saharan zone, where Islamist extremism spreads quickly.\footnote{Ibid., trans. L. Geyer, p. 20, original: “Il progressivo intrecciarsi dello sfruttamento dell'immigrazione illegale non solo con il traffico di esseri umani, di armi e di droga, ma anche con il terrorismo internazionale ci obbliga ad una particolare vigilanza sui clandestini provenienti dal Corno d'Africa, così come su quelli provenienti dall'area subsahariana, dove l'estremismo islamico si diffonde rapidamente.”}

I can observe once again in this discourse, that the elements advanced by politicians can verify my two hypotheses, in this last extract, the word ‘obliges’ is interesting because it stresses the fact that Italy has no other option, and that a ‘particular surveillance’ is necessary.

VI.5.3. Roberto Maroni, 2009

In an informative notice at the Senate, the then Minister of the Interior, Roberto Maroni addresses immigration issues.\footnote{Senato della Repubblica, ‘Legislatura 16a, aula, resoconto stenografico della seduta n. 214’, 25 May 2009, pp. 2-10. \url{http://www.senato.it/service/PDF/PDFServer/BGT/00424000.pdf} (accessed 30 May 2018).} The main subject is directly related to the topic of this thesis since the discourse is about the interception in international waters and return to Libya of 471 foreigners, between the 6\textsuperscript{th} and the 10\textsuperscript{th} May 2009. Hence, it will be interesting to see how the Minister can explain and justify this specific event to the Italian Senate.

He starts by emphasizing the legal aspect of the practice, basing his reasoning on the conformity of Italian actions with several international conventions and protocols – i.e. UN Convention on the Law of the Sea-, with Italian law, and with the 2008 Treaty of Friendship and its protocol.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 3-4.} This is something that has been done quite often in the discourses, to respond to the alleged violation of the principle of non-refoulement policy-makers claimed the conformity of this practice with other legal provisions.

The first European element cited is the co-involvement of FRONTEX in patrolling activities.\footnote{Ibid., p. 4} Maroni is also emphasizing:
that the Italian-Libyan agreements are framed within European Union policy, favouring solidarity dynamics between Member States and collaboration with third countries to fight illegal fluxes ad demonstrated by partnership initiatives with countries of origins and transit of migrants, first of all, with African countries, and joint patrols operations in the southern sea borders of the EU carried out in the FRONTEX framework.\textsuperscript{203}

This element is pretty similar from the arguments advanced in media discourses, we have once again the European framework pointed out. The agreements signed with Libya on migration control are, according to the Minister, done within a wider EU policy. Arguments based on the European Union are omnipresent in this discourse, the words ‘Europe’ and ‘European’ are mentioned 25 times in his speech that is ten pages-long, and the FRONTEX agency is mentioned five times.

Security will also be explicitly mentioned latter in the discourse, Roberto Maroni states that he is:

\textit{... convinced that an immigration policy, seemingly solidary but in fact lax, will lead to the increase of fear, mistrust, and hostility towards migrants, even regular ones, and to a deep sentiment of insecurity. A lax policy of this kind, as we knew in the past years, leads to daily rejections in the life of our cities, in schools, in workplaces, and in our social relations, and this increase citizens’ fear. Only firmness in the fight against illegal immigration can create conditions for a positive management of regular immigration, only rigour can guarantee major security for all. This is the hard and patient work that we carry on, and we will not stop. Because this is how we defeat fear, and how we build real integration.}\textsuperscript{204}

Roberto Maroni describes rigour and firmness in immigration control policies as being necessary for Italians’ security. Once again we have this presentation of immigration measures as being necessary for the Italian government. That the policies implemented are the only

\textsuperscript{203}Ibid., trans. L. Geyer, p. 6, original: “Voglio altresì sottolineare che le intese italo-libiche vanno inquadrate nell’ambito della politica dell’Unione europea, volta a favorire dinamiche di reale solidarietà tra gli Stati membri e di collaborazione con i Paesi terzi ai fini del contrasto dei flussi illegali, come dimostrano le iniziative di partenariato con i Paesi di origine e transito dei migranti, primi fra tutti i Paesi dell’Africa, e le operazioni di pattugliamento congiunto alle frontiere marittime meridionali dell’Unione Europea effettuate in ambito FRONTEX.”

\textsuperscript{204}Ibid., trans. L. Geyer, p. 9-10, original: “Sono convinto che una politica solo apparentemente solidaristica, ma in realtà lassista in materia di immigrazione clandestina faccia crescere la paura, aumenti la diffidenza e l’ostilità nei confronti degli immigrati, anche regolari, e generi un senso profondo di insicurezza. Una politica lassista di questo tipo, come quella che abbiamo conosciuto negli anni scorsi, provoca respingimenti quotidiani nella vita delle nostre città, a scuola e nei luoghi di lavoro, negli spazi del tempo libero e nelle nostre relazioni sociali, e questo si aumenta la paura nei cittadini. Solo la fermezza nella lotta all’immigrazione clandestina può creare le condizioni per una positiva gestione dell’immigrazione regolare. Solo il rigore può garantire maggiore sicurezza per tutti. E’ il lavoro faticoso e paziente che stiamo portando avanti. Non ci fermeremo. Perché così si vince la paura, così’ si costruisce la vera integrazione.”
possible way of facing undocumented immigration. The sentiment of fear is also mobilised by
the Minister of the Interior in this discourse, to accentuate even more the construction of the
threat represented by undocumented migrants. Also interesting is the fact that the security that
Maroni is mentioning is the Italian people’s security, and not the security of the Italian State.
We saw this phenomenon in the writings of Waever, and more broadly, of the Copenhagen
School, which developed the progressive move on the security agenda from the security of the
state to the security of the people. This is actually one of the bases of the securitization theory,
because it is mostly the individuals that can be affected by such economic, criminal or cultural
threats.\textsuperscript{205}

To conclude this part, I have found, in parliamentary discussions more or less the same
elements and arguments than were present in newspaper articles or other media discourses. The
main difference is that the discourses were longer so it was easier to find all the arguments
listed in the encoding table in a single discourse, whereas it was common in newspaper articles
that transcriptions of policy-makers’ discourses concentrate on one argument only.

One slight difference that could be mentioned here is about Europeanization, in
parliamentary discussions, policy-makers made more direct references to European norms
promoting externalization – i.e. the Tampere presidency conclusions - This was the case for
Giuseppe Pisanu, Roberto Maroni and Giuliano Amato’s discourses. One reason could be that
the audience of these discourses – i.e. Senators and Deputies - are more aware of the
developments of externalization at the EU level, thus, they have the necessary knowledge to
understand what the policy-makers are referring to. Whereas in media discourse, most of the
public opinion probably does not know much about the various EU norms, or directives that
could promote externalization policies.

VII. Conclusion: Europeans and security dynamics in the Externalization process

This thesis addressed the legitimation of the externalization of migration control policies, shedding light on the Italian – Libyan case between 2000 and 2011. I can say that the formulation of my hypotheses on securitization and Europeanization as determinant factors of the legitimation of externalization of migration control was justified. Firstly, I demonstrated in the State of the Art that the previous works on externalization did mention that these elements are important in the development of this practice, both at the European Union level, and through the cooperation between Italy and Libya. The choice of the socio-constructivist approach helped me to have a better understanding of the concepts of Europeanization, securitization and legitimacy and gave me the theoretical tools to articulate them, while Critical Discourse Analysis was, as I established, an efficient method that suited my case-study and theory. Then, the description of contextual elements was fundamental to understand the issues surrounding the cooperation between Italy and Libya on migration control, and the relation with the UE in this matter. Finally, a consequent set of discourses gave to the media, but also in official political institutions such as the Italian Senate and Chamber of Deputies was analysed.

On Europeanization, we saw that developments of externalization policies at the EU level occurred sooner than in Italy, but the latter has been quicker at implementing practical collaboration with countries like Libya. The externalization of migration control was highly Europeanized during the 2000-2011 period, as demonstrated by the developments of the practice within EU’s intergovernmental platforms such as the EU Council of Ministers. Italy did play an important part in these developments, notably during its 2003 presidency. Italian pressure was also decisive in the normalisation of the EU-Libyan relations, with notably the end of the arm embargo in 2004. The results of the analysis showed concrete elements pointing towards the great importance of European dynamics used in political discourses to legitimate Italian actions of externalization. While this practice suffered of a lack of legitimacy, and was target of strong critics, from respected International institutions like the UNHCR and numerous NGOs, Italian politicians tried to promote a stronger action at the EU level and often described their alleged illegal activities as in the European interest. This mobilisation of European elements in immigration discourses shows Italian policy-makers’ will to operate a bottom-up Europeanization on this specific issue. Interactions between Italian and EU level were constant during the period of study as top-down Europeanization dynamics were also used, notably when
references to the need to comply with European immigration norms – i.e. 2008 EU Pact on immigration and asylum - were used by Italian policy-makers to justify externalization policies.

In a lot of discourses, the European and securitising elements were associated, I managed to find in immigration discourses, some securitising elements that we could have predict thanks to the works of Waever and Bigo. It was well established that undocumented immigration was considered as a criminal activity, something that is valid as well for European Union’s phrasing. The terrorist threat was, especially in the first half of the period of study mobilised. Finally, we also saw a recurrent description of the situation as an emergency throughout the period of study, a permanent state of emergency was discursively constructed by Italian policy-makers, so that it can provides the government with the justification it needed to use of extraordinary measures such as the externalization of migration control policies.

One important aspect was the homogeneity of the discourses throughout the period of study. Italian politicians established a dominant discourse, they were using the same arguments, presented with the same terminology, to describe and justify cooperation with Libya on migration control policies. The diverse positions of actors in the Italian political spectrum did not make a great difference. As it was illustrated by the majority shift between 2006-2008, even when the centre-left was in power, I did not notice a lot of differences in the discourses that were made before or after this period. Cooperation with Libya was still considered as essential to the fight against illegal immigration. In fact, the opposition to these measures did not come from opposing political force, but mostly from Human Rights NGOs and International institutions such as the UNHCR.

This thesis implies conclusions that can be applied to a broader scale. First, how the normative power of the European Union can be used by its member States to legitimize contested policies. Indeed, being member of such a powerful group of States allows the national policy-makers not to be isolated in facing the critics, if the policy in question is Europeanized. Second, This work also demonstrated the importance of the securitization process, and constructing emergency situations as a way to legitimise the use of extraordinary measures. We recently saw an illustration of this phenomenon with France’s response to the November 2015 terrorist attacks in Paris, and the declaration of a ‘state of emergency’, that provides
extraordinary powers to police and border services. Initially, this state of emergency was supposed to last 12 days but it was only lifted in October 2017.\textsuperscript{206}

However, it must be reminded that this thesis, like every academic works, contains limits and weaknesses. Firstly, this work concentrates on only two principal arguments: Europeanization and securitization, while the legitimization of a policy is a complex process that contains way more elements than that. The methods used in this thesis can also present disadvantages: analysing Italian discourse in an English thesis can be complicated, even if I tried to be as neutral and precise as possible in my translations, I cannot avoid the differences in the senses, and in the social perception of the words between the two languages. Another weakness is that this thesis only analyse discourses related to the externalization policies, while the construction of immigrants as a threat to the society is a much more complex process, which is not only political, but also cultural, economic, historic, educational and so on.

On the impulse of this thesis, further research on externalized migration control could be initiated. It would be interesting to have, for instance, interviews with policy-makers actively involved in the externalization process. A comparative study could also be engaged between several EU States, Italy, Spain, or Greece, to see if the same discursive elements can be find in different member states.

Nowadays, externalization of migration control policies is still very relevant in EU and Italian immigration policies, we can even say that its uses grew and that it is now one of the main policy option to deal with immigration issues.

Recently, the European Union externalized its migration control with Turkey, on 18 March 2016 an agreement was reached to stop the flow of irregular migrants entering the EU territory from Turkey. This deal planned a consequent financial support given by the EU to its neighbour: three billion euros were to be allocated under the facility for refugees in Turkey. In exchange, “all new irregular migrants crossing from Turkey into the Greek Islands as from 20 March 2016 will be returned to Turkey”.\textsuperscript{207} A support from the UNHCR is included in the statement.


Italy and the European Union are also trying to re-establish the cooperation with Libya, from 2014 to 2017, the EU mobilised 182 Million Euros for migration-related project in the country.\(^{208}\) As mentioned in the introduction of the thesis, a Memorandum of understanding was signed between Italy and a new transitional government in Libya on 2 February 2017.\(^{209}\) It is interesting to notice that the first two articles of this Memorandum of Understanding make explicit reference to the 2008 Treaty of Friendship, Partnership, and Cooperation. Hence, even though Gaddafi’s fall resulted in a suspension of the agreements of the 2000-2011 period, they are, still today, the foundations of the current cooperation with Libya, which make the relevance of this research even more important.

Even if some measures have been taken to improve the humanitarian aspect of the practice with, for instance, the involvement of the UNHCR in the EU-Turkey deal, Human Rights NGOs are still criticizing this kind of collaboration. Amnesty International expressed concerned about the EU-Turkey deal, arguing that: “thousands of asylum-seekers and refugees in Turkey were sent back to a risk of serious human rights violations in Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria, in clear violation of the prohibition of *refoulement*.\(^{210}\)

As for the externalization practice, if lessons can be drawn from this 2000-2011 period, I would say that its efficiency can be contested, because, despite the human rights violations, externalization is still a costly policy to operate. Plus, Italy, as Paoletti argued, by externalizing its migration control policy finds itself dependent on a third country that, at least in the Libyan case, is very precarious. The situation following the fall of Gaddafi’s regime is an example of the risk of implementing such cooperation. In fact, this argument can also be applied to the cooperation with Libya’s new transitory government, which even if it is recognised by some European countries, is still very fragile. Also in the light of the cooperation with Turkey, beyond the Human Rights violations, the stability of the Erdogan’s regime is not ensured, as proved by the military coup attempted only two years ago.\(^{211}\)


Immigration issues are now in the hands of a new government in Italy, as resulted from the Italian general election held in March 2018. *Lega* leader Matteo Salvini is the new Minister of the Interior, he is well known for his anti-immigration positions and already planned to strengthen externalization policies previously undertook, both to Libya but also to sub-Saharan countries like Niger.\(^{212}\) Salvini has already started to generate a lot of critics as he turned down a boat of 629 TCNs coming from the North African Coasts that were rescued by the humanitarian NGO SOS Mediterranée. He accused Malta of avoiding its responsibilities in the Mediterranean and already launched a Twitter hashtag: ‘#chiudiamoiporti’ (‘*We are shutting the ports*’). Salvini also demanded NATO support to help Italy defend its southern sea borders from the influx of migrants.\(^{213}\) Hence, it will be important to keep a close eye on the further developments of Italian migration policies.
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Appendix 1: Glossary of key actors and political parties

**Political Parties:**

*Forza Italia – Popolo della libertà:* Forza Italia is a major centre-right party, founded in 1994 by Silvio Berlusconi, it merged in 2009 into ‘Popolo della libertà’.

*Lega Nord:* Founded in 1989 as a gathering of autonomists movements, part of the ‘Casa delle Libertà’ coalition with *Forza Italia* form 2001 to 2008 and to the centre-right coalition from 2008 to 2011. This party promotes strong nationalism and anti-immigration, but also euro-scepticism.

*L’Ulivo - Partito Democratico:* L’Ulivo was a centre-left movement founded in 1995, it merged in 2009 into ‘Partito Democratico’ (Democrat Party).

**Actors:**

*Amato, Giuliano:* Member of the Democrat Party, Two times Prime Minister of Italy between 1992 and 1993 and between 2000 and 2001. He was the successor of Giuseppe Pisanu as Minister of the Interior during the mandate of Romano Prodi between 2006 and 2008.


*Boldrini, Laura:* Spokesperson of the UNHCR in Italy from 1998 to 2012.


*La Russa, Ignazio:* Minister of Defence between 2008 and 2011, National Alliance party member.

*Lucidi, Marcella,* centre-left politician, undersecretary of State for the interior, delegated in immigration issues between 2006 and 2008.

*Maroni, Roberto:* Participated in the foundation of the *Lega Nord* in 1989, has been a member of this party ever since, minister of the Interior from 2008 to 2011, but also from 1994 to 1995, also under Berlusconi’s government.
**Pansa, Alessandro**: Functionary, he was from 2003 to 2007 responsible of the central direction of immigration and border police of the Ministry of the Interior.

**Pisanu, Giuseppe**: Forza Italia member, Minister of the Interior between 2002 and 2006.

**Prodi, Romano**: Centre-left politician, President of the European Commission between 1999 and 2004, Prime Minister of Italy between 2006 and 2008.

**Scajola, Claudio**: Forza Italia member. Minister of the Interior from 2001 to 2002
### Appendix 2: List of Media discourses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>14/06/02</td>
<td>C. Scajola</td>
<td><a href="http://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/2002/06/14/immigrati-europa-si-spacca-non-vinceasse.html?ref=search">http://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/2002/06/14/immigrati-europa-si-spacca-non-vinceasse.html?ref=search</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CdS</td>
<td>29/10/02</td>
<td>S. Berlusconi</td>
<td><a href="https://www.corriere.it/Primo_Piano/Cronache/2002/10_Ottobre/29/berlusconi.shtml">https://www.corriere.it/Primo_Piano/Cronache/2002/10_Ottobre/29/berlusconi.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>29/06/03</td>
<td>G. Pisanu</td>
<td><a href="http://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/2003/06/29/pisanu-intesa-con-la-libia.html?ref=search">http://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/2003/06/29/pisanu-intesa-con-la-libia.html?ref=search</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CdS</td>
<td>04/07/03</td>
<td>De Gennaro / G. Pisanu</td>
<td><a href="https://www.corriere.it/Primo_Piano/Esterni/2003/07_Luglio/04/immigrazione.shtml">https://www.corriere.it/Primo_Piano/Esterni/2003/07_Luglio/04/immigrazione.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>06/06/05</td>
<td>Viminale</td>
<td><a href="http://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/2005/06/06/in-arrivo-15mila-clandestini.html?ref=search">http://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/2005/06/06/in-arrivo-15mila-clandestini.html?ref=search</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>09/06/05</td>
<td>G. Pisanu</td>
<td><a href="http://www.repubblica.it/2005/0/e/sezioni/cronaca/corelliarresti/pisanucpt/pisanucpt.html?ref=search">http://www.repubblica.it/2005/0/e/sezioni/cronaca/corelliarresti/pisanucpt/pisanucpt.html?ref=search</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>01/08/06</td>
<td>G. Amato</td>
<td><a href="http://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/2006/08/01/il-viminale-stop-agli-sbarchi-salvaggi.html?ref=search">http://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/2006/08/01/il-viminale-stop-agli-sbarchi-salvaggi.html?ref=search</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>03/08/06</td>
<td>F. Frattini</td>
<td><a href="http://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/2006/08/03/pattuglie-in">http://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/2006/08/03/pattuglie-in</a> mare-entro-agosto-con-ghedda.html?ref=search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>CdS</td>
<td>29/12/07</td>
<td>G. Amato</td>
<td><a href="https://www.corriere.it/politica/07_dicembre_29/accordo_italia_libia_974a4ac7b-b60a-11dc-ac5d-0003ba99c667.shtml">https://www.corriere.it/politica/07_dicembre_29/accordo_italia_libia_974a4ac7b-b60a-11dc-ac5d-0003ba99c667.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>17/06/08</td>
<td>I. La Russa / F. Frattini</td>
<td><a href="http://www.repubblica.it/2008/02/sezioni/cronaca/sbarchi-immigrati/ita-ue/ita-ue.html?ref=search">http://www.repubblica.it/2008/02/sezioni/cronaca/sbarchi-immigrati/ita-ue/ita-ue.html?ref=search</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>12/05/09</td>
<td>S. Berlusconi</td>
<td><a href="http://www.repubblica.it/2009/05/sezioni/cronaca/immigrati-7/cronaca-12mag/cronaca-12mag.html?ref=search">http://www.repubblica.it/2009/05/sezioni/cronaca/immigrati-7/cronaca-12mag/cronaca-12mag.html?ref=search</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>15/05/09</td>
<td>R. Maroni</td>
<td><a href="http://www.repubblica.it/2009/05/sezioni/cronaca/immigrati-7/maroni-ue/maroni-ue.html?ref=search">http://www.repubblica.it/2009/05/sezioni/cronaca/immigrati-7/maroni-ue/maroni-ue.html?ref=search</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Esteri</td>
<td>15/09/09</td>
<td>F. Frattini</td>
<td><a href="https://www.esteri.it/MAE/video/20090515_1.wmv">https://www.esteri.it/MAE/video/20090515_1.wmv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>16/05/09</td>
<td>F. Frattini / I. La Russa</td>
<td><a href="http://www.repubblica.it/2009/04/sezioni/cronaca/immigrati-6/frattini-vertice-ue/frattini-vertice-ue.html?ref=search">http://www.repubblica.it/2009/04/sezioni/cronaca/immigrati-6/frattini-vertice-ue/frattini-vertice-ue.html?ref=search</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>18/05/09</td>
<td>I. La Russa</td>
<td><a href="http://www.repubblica.it/2009/05/sezioni/cronaca/immigrati-8/governo-compatto/governo-compatto.html?ref=search">http://www.repubblica.it/2009/05/sezioni/cronaca/immigrati-8/governo-compatto/governo-compatto.html?ref=search</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>CdS</td>
<td>2/09/09</td>
<td>S. Berlusconi</td>
<td><a href="https://www.corriere.it/politica/09_settembre_01/berlusconi_attacco_opposizione_portavoce_ue_1be9ec76-96f3-11de-864c-00144f02aabe.shtml">https://www.corriere.it/politica/09_settembre_01/berlusconi_attacco_opposizione_portavoce_ue_1be9ec76-96f3-11de-864c-00144f02aabe.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Euronews - Appendix 2</td>
<td>19/02/10</td>
<td>F. Frattini</td>
<td><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-1XlsrVVSs8">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-1XlsrVVSs8</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Bocconi - Appendix 2</td>
<td>26/04/10</td>
<td>R. Maroni</td>
<td><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=et1jE4iLZIU">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=et1jE4iLZIU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>CdS</td>
<td>10/09/10</td>
<td>R. Maroni</td>
<td><a href="https://www.corriere.it/politica/10_settembre_07/vanno-espulsidall-italia-sarzanini_5016aec0-ba4d-11df-a688-00144f02aabe.shtml">https://www.corriere.it/politica/10_settembre_07/vanno-espulsidall-italia-sarzanini_5016aec0-ba4d-11df-a688-00144f02aabe.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Transcript of TV and Radio Discourses


Grazie, buonasera a tutti, grazie a Bocconi e al Corriere per aver organizzato questo momento di confronto su un tema che suscita sempre grande passioni, e che, proprio per questo, deve essere affrontato con la sufficiente razionalità.

Per poter parlare appropriatamente di temi legati all'immigrazione, bisogna fare alcune necessarie precisioni. La prima che riguarda principalmente il ruolo che io rivesto, come autorità nazionale di pubblica sicurezza. Io sono il responsabile per l'Italia della sicurezza pubblica come ministro dell'interno. La distinzione principale è tra immigrazione legale e immigrazione illegale, o come si preferisce dire in Europa, tra immigrazione regolare e immigrazione irregolare.

C'è una differenza semantica, una differenza anche filosofica, culturale, sociologica che non voglio qui affrontare, diciamo che grossolanamente i termini si equivalgono. Cioè un'immigrazione che viene fatta nel rispetto delle norme di legge e un'immigrazione che avviene contro i sistemi giudici dei vari paesi. Ho usato il Plurale proprio perché è stato fatto un riferimento da chi mi ha preceduto.

Le responsabilità nella gestione di questo che è un fenomeno biblico, epocale, il tema della migrazione hanno i singoli governi, i singoli stati membri.

E un ruolo importante perché il tema dell'immigrazione è di competenza ancora dei singoli stati membri dentro l'Union Europea, ma è un ruolo decrescente nel corso degli ultimi anni, l'Unione Europea ha reclamato, ha preteso, o meglio è stata costretta ad occuparsi sempre di più dei temi dell'immigrazione, e l'ha fatto, principalmente dal punto di vista della sicurezza, e cioè del contrasto all'immigrazione illegale, irregolare, clandestina, chiamiamola come vogliamo, occupandosi nemmeno dell'aspetto dei diritti umani, cioè dei requienti asilo e sistema protezione, occupandosi meno dal punto di vista pratico non dei principi. Perché in Europa abbiamo grandi convenzioni, però poi di fatto l'attuazione di questi principi lascia molto desiderare e occupandosi ancora meno dell'integrazione nel mondo del lavoro e nelle società dei paesi europei, questo è il ruolo dell'Europa. Dobbiamo qui tener presente questi due aspetti per inquadrare il fenomeno. Quando nel titolo si dice l'immigrazione conviene, io distinguerei tra l'immigrazione che viene fatta in modo regolare rispetto all'altra.

Nella mia vesta di ministro dell'interno, mi sono occupato principalmente della seconda parte, cioè, di quei flussi migratori che sono aumentati nel corso degli anni, che hanno portato in Italia decine di migliaia di cittadini extracomunitari in modo irregolare, violando le norme di legge, e portati, fatti arrivare in Italia da associazione criminali che lucrano sui bisogni di queste persone. Quindi, il primo aspetto è: come contrastare
l'immigrazione irregolare? Il che non significa non favorire quella regolare o viceversa. Sono due terreni che io voglio tenere distinti anche se c'è un collegamento, perché l'approccio dei governi deve essere diversa anche dell'Europa deve essere diversa nel primo caso rispetto al secondo.

Voglio già anticipare, una cosa che da molti viene contestata, di questo stretto legame, o presunto legame tra immigrazione e criminalità. Non c'entra immigrazione e criminalità in generale, ma c'è certamente tra immigrazione clandestina e criminalità. E sono i dati a dimostrarlo, i dati statistici che abbiamo, il numero dei reati commessi nel 2009, sono diminuiti rispetto al 2008 la criminalità complessiva, ma noi abbiamo estrapolato i reati commessi anche dei cittadini non italiani, e questi per la prima volta nel 2009 sono diminuiti anch'essi rispetto al 2008, sono diminuiti, mentre c'è sempre stato un incremento, sono diminuiti più del complesso della diminuzione della criminalità, e io credo che questo sia collegato anche al fatto che gli sbarchi, l'immigrazione clandestina, che nel 2009 ha diminuito del 90% rispetto al 2008 ha portato una diminuzione. Ma perché c'è un collegamento? Anche perché chi conosce i meccanismi di gestione dell'immigrazione clandestina da parte dei racket, sa bene come funziona. Questi che venivano portati in Italia e che vengono portati in Europa sfuggiti da racket, ciascuno di questi cittadini è costretto a pagare importi variabili da 12 a 15 000 dollari. Ovviamente non hanno questi soldi, li portano ugualmente pretendendo da loro che per un certo periodo successivamente al loro ingresso in Italia paghino il loro debito attraverso le azioni criminose nella maggior parte dei casi, non avendo la possibilità di fare un lavoro regolare. Quindi l'azione che abbiamo svolto i questi due anni è stata quella di contrastare principalmente l'immigrazione clandestina fermando i flussi che arrivavano almeno quelli sottoposti al nostro controllo.

l'Italia, come sapete, non ha più il controllo dei propri confini, neanche più con la Svizzera, che è entrato nell'area Schengen un anno e mezzo fa, i nostri confini sono controllati dalla Slovenia, sono controllati dalla Polonia, sono controllati dai paesi baltici non sono più controllati da noi se non i confini aeroportuali per i voli intercontinentali che vengono da fuori dell'Europa.

Noi possiamo controllare limitatamente i confini che abbiamo con l'Africa nel Mediterraneo. Limitatamente perché anche qui c'è un'area che ci viene assegnata per il controllo ma se quest'area viene aggirata, non siamo neppure in grado di controllare bene, poi controllare in mare non è una cosa semplice.

Ci siamo concentrati sugli strumenti a nostra disposizione per ridurre l'immigrazione clandestina e i risultati, come ho anticipato, sono dal mio punto di vista, molto soddisfacenti, perché i flussi di cittadini extracomunitari clandestini nel 2009 sono diminuiti dal 90% rispetto all'anno precedente, attraverso una serie di azioni, che non voglio qui ricordare tutti, ma principalmente attraverso la politica di accordi bilaterali con i paesi di provenienza, o di origine dei flussi migratori, in particolare con tutti i paesi dal Maghreb, dal Egitto fino al Marocco.

Su questo fronte quindi, le politiche che abbiamo sviluppato, sono efficace, sono politiche che rientrano nel quadro europeo di gestione del fenomeno dell'immigrazione clandestina che fa riferimento principalmente ad un documento, ad un patto europeo approvato dai capi di stati di governo nel 2008, che si chiama patto europeo per l'immigrazione e l'asilo, che definisce alcune regole, a cui gli stati membri debbono attenersi, e cioè quella di contrastare, e di evitare gli ingressi di clandestini, perché se entra qualcuno in Italia, in Spagna o in Grecia, poi può girare liberamente nell'area
Schengen. Quindi principalmente i paesi di confini devono controllare e monitorare questo aspetto, e di evitare, dice il patto europeo, evitare 'le regolarizzazioni generalizzate', procedere solo caso per caso o in specifici settori, questo dice il patto europeo per l'immigrazione e l'asilo. Non è un documento giuridicamente vincolante, non è una direttiva o un regolamento, ma è forse di più vincolante sul piano politico perché è approvato dai capi di Stati e di governo dei 27 paesi membri dell'Unione Europea. Quindi non possiamo sviluppare noi una politica nazionale che contrasti con questo documento politico generale dell'Unione Europea, e infatti, quello che siamo facendo tra mille difficoltà e mille limiti è esattamente l'attuazione del patto europeo per l'immigrazione e l'asilo.


[Journalist] Italia, Spagna, Malta, e a quel punto anche la Grecia, ogni state sono prese d'assalto da migliaia di migranti in fuga dai rispettivi paesi, come sta agendo il governo italiano per controllare il fenomeno dell'immigrazione clandestina sul lungo periodo

[Frattini] La questione è europea, non è italiana o maltese o greca, se i migranti clandestini arrivano in Sicilia, visto che le frontiere interne non ci sono più, si muovono rapidamente verso l’Austria, poi verso la Germania, poi verso l’Olanda, ed allora il problema è di tutti. Abbiamo chiesto che l'agenzia europea per il controllo delle frontiere fosse potenziata, che i pattugliamenti sul Mediterraneo, coinvolgessero più paesi, rispetto a quanto accada ora e abbiamo chiesto con forza che ci siano le stesse regole per tutti i 27 paesi, per richiedere lo status di rifugiato, per essere ammessi oppure espulsi. L'Italia ha fatto molto al livello nazionale per frenare l’onda degli immigrati clandestini, abbiamo con la Libia un accordo che ci ha permesso di ridurre in un anno del 90%, gli afflussi di migranti clandestini sulle coste Siciliane. Ma questo non basta, noi posteggiando la Sicilia, proteggiamo l'intera Unione Europea.

[Journalist] Sulla base della sua esperienza come commissario alla giustizia, che valutazione da del potenziale della Commissione Barroso II e quali sono le aspettative dell'Italia, magari su temi sensibili come l'immigrazione?

[Frattini] Io credo che la Commissione Barroso abbia messo insieme una buona squadra, anche nel secondo mandato di Barroso. Certamente sull'immigrazione ci aspettiamo molissimo, ci aspettiamo molto sull'immigrazione, molto sulla sicurezza energetica, molto sul mercato interno. E ci aspettiamo, direi, un'Europa attore internazionale.

I grandi flussi migratori possono essere anche l’opportunità per nascondere all’interno di grandi flussi di persone semplicemente in cerca di un lavoro gruppi o individui che sono invece legati alle cellule del Jihadismo e del terrorismo.


[Journalist] alcune strutture dell’ONU hanno criticato l’Italia per i respingimenti degli immigrati clandestini, l’Italia rischia l’isolamento?

[Franco Frattini] Ma L’Italia non è isolata a facto, perché quando l’Europa parlerà, quando parleranno i governi dell’Europa, cioè quelli che hanno per ciascun paese la responsabilità di milioni e milioni di cittadini, i governi d’Europa diranno quello che hanno sempre detto, e che non viene mai abbastanza sottolineato, cioè che un paese come l’Italia, o anche piccoli paesi come Cipro, Malta opera gli interventi di respingimento, di espulsione di migranti, nel interesse dell’Intera Europa. Perché ormai abbiamo abolito le frontiere interne, gli immigranti clandestini che arrivano a Lampedusa non si fermano a Lampedusa, l’80% migra verso nord, verso altri paesi europei, quindi viene un interesse assolutamente comune. Sono le istituzioni europei, invece, che hanno fatto finora meno di quanto avrebbero dovuto. Noi contiamo che invece, nel prossimo futuro finalmente un’azione decisiva delle istituzioni europei.
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Summary

Migration control between Italy and Libya: Contested policies

Italy engaged cooperation on migration control with a series of transit and origins countries in the late 90s. Libya, being one of the main transit point for migrants coming mostly from the sub-Saharan zone and from the African horn, was an important partner in migration control for the various Italian governments in the 2000-2011 period. This cooperation started effectively in December 2000 with an agreement signed between the then Italian Prime Minister Giuliano Amato and Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi. This document expressed a first reference to the need for Libya to take care of migration control actions on behalf of the Italian government. Such cooperation was strengthen during the following decades, peaking in 2008 with the Benghazi treaty, until being suspended following the Libyan uprising and the military intervention in the country that took down Gaddafi’s regime.214

This kind of collaboration has been called ‘externalization’, first by NGOs, and then in academic writings on the subject. Policies are ‘externalized’ once one state or a group of states delegate border and migration control to other countries, thus transferring sovereignty partly also outside their national territories. This process, before being implemented by Italy with various African countries, was already popular in Brussels, here, the European Union (EU) is the main player when concentrating on such policy shift. With the signing of the Schengen agreement in the 1980s, the ‘acquis communautaire’ was introduced to regulate the free-movement of persons within Europe.215 As internal borders were progressively eliminated, the EU worked at reinforce its external border. Cooperation between European member States on migration control was strengthened, to the point that today’s European Border and Coast Guard Agency (FRONTEX) was established in 2007.216 Within this broader reform, cooperation with third countries was also promoted at the EU level as an effective strategy to counter undocumented migration.

An issue which is frequently raised by those opposing the increasing externalization of migration control is the lack of guarantees for the respect of migrants’ fundamental rights in some of the EU neighbouring – and, thus, bordering - countries. For example, Libya never signed the 1951 Geneva Convention on asylum, so that the country cannot provide effective international protection. This, of course, raises concerns within the civil society: numerous NGOs, and important international institutions like the United Nations High Commissioner for refugees (UNHCR) expressed deep concerns about externalized border and migration control practices.\textsuperscript{217} For many activists and experts, European countries started cooperating with violent dictators, leaving migrants and asylum seekers under severe threat when on the other side of the Mediterranean. As no guarantee of international protection could be expected in a country such as Libya, externalized border and migration control which prevents potential applicants from accessing international protection, violates the principle of non-refoulement as defined in article 33 of the 1951 Geneva Convention on refugees,\textsuperscript{218} as well as in article 3 of the United Nations Convention against torture.\textsuperscript{219} From 1979 to 2006 Libya was included in the ‘list of states sponsors of terrorism’ established by the United States (US) Department of State, and until 2004 was under an arm embargo from the EU and from the United Nations (UN) due to the country’s alleged involvement in terrorist activities - notably, the Lockerbie air bombing - and the efforts made to acquire weapons of mass destruction.\textsuperscript{220} It is in light of these and other considerations that, in 2012, the Italian state was condemned by the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) for pushing back asylum seekers to Libya - the “Hirsi v. Italy” case.\textsuperscript{221} Eleven Somali and Thirteen Eritrean presented a complaint to the Court, as they were part of a group of 200 migrants that left the Libyan coasts to reach Italy by boat in 2009. Italian coast-guard rescued and handed them over to Libyan authorities in Tripoli, without allowing them to apply for international protection. The allegations were based on the risk that such interceptions and


\textsuperscript{218} Article 33, Prohibition of expulsion or return (“refoulement”), al. 1: “No Contracting State shall expel or return (“refouler”) a refugee in any manner whatsoever to the frontiers of territories where his life or freedom would be threatened on account of his race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion”. UNHCR, ‘Convention and Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees’, p. 30, 2010, \url{http://www.unhcr.org/3b66c2aa10} (accessed 7 June 2018).


\textsuperscript{221} European Court of Human Rights. Case of Hirsi Jamaa and others v. Italy. (application no. 27765/09).
push back manoeuvres at sea could expose them to torture or other degrading treatment in Libya, or they could simply be returned to their home countries where they could face further persecution. To defend this policy, however, Italian authorities affirmed that they were acting in accordance with the EU principles concerning the control of immigration through cooperation with transit or origin countries such as Libya.\footnote{A. Vogt, ‘Italy violated human rights by returning migrants to Libya, court rules.’, \textit{The Guardian}, 23 February 2012, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/feb/23/italy-human-rights-migrants-libya (accessed 19 May 2018).}

It is within this contradiction – i.e. a policy which is promoted by the EU and its member state, is also recognized illegal by international organizations, Human rights courts and the public opinion of several member states – that this thesis analyses how the externalization of border and migration control is discursively legitimized by authorities in Italy. The focus will be on the Italian-Libyan case study which allows me to analyse how both Europeanization and the increasing securitization of migration were strategically mobilized to justify such an illicit and contested policy.

The aim of this study is thus to answer the following research question: \textbf{How did the Italian government discursively legitimated a policy which was judged illegal by the competent European court of Human Rights - because of its incompatibility with human rights norms and international Law?}

As a democratic and liberal country, decisions taken by Italian authorities must go under public scrutiny and be eventually interpreted as legitimate from the public. The externalization of border and migration control to Libya violated international commitments taken by the Italian state. Yet, national authorities defended their choice of keeping unwanted third country nationals away from Europe, regardless of the proved violations of their most fundamental rights. It is thus interesting to understand the process through which such illegal practice was legitimized by different Italian governments. This will shed light on those discursive tactics which were used by politicians to support their illegitimate decisions.

Most studies on the increasing externalization of migration control in Europe assess the EU as a whole, or the cases of single member states such as for instance Italy and Spain. What I do here is instead to analyse the externalization of migration and border control in Europe by looking at the ways in which the EU institutions and one of its member states – i.e. Italy - influence each other throughout the process.
We have to bear in mind that the externalization of border and migration control is still very popular in Brussels, as confirmed also recently with the 2016 agreement that the EU signed with Turkey in response to the so-called “refugee crisis” which started one year before. This agreement included substantial financial support from the EU to Turkey, in exchange externalized policies of migration control and asylum reception in the country.\(^{223}\) Apparently, it is within such spirit that Italy – and other EU member states such as France – is trying to reintroduce the existing agreements with the yet to form Libyan government.\(^{224}\) A process which was formalized in February 2017 with the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Italian Prime Minister Paolo Gentiloni and the president of the Libyan Government of National Unity, Fayez Al-Serraj.\(^{225}\)

**Theoretical framework**

Reviewing the literature, I found that externalization of migration control policies was well-studied by academic scholars. However they tend to focus only on the EU developments in this process. Some like Andrijasevic did studied the Italian-Libyan case, but further deepening on the analysis is needed.

Nevertheless, some elements in the literature reviewed were interesting to build my hypotheses. Firstly, I discovered that the European Union played a decisive role in the development of this process, Boswell described externalization as a policy that resembles the “natural continuation of a Europeanization of migration control that was already under way”, and which was justified to the public as the only possibility to protect Europe from the threats of unauthorized migration, organized crime, and terrorism – *de facto* making the connection between these different phenomena.\(^{226}\) We have here, not only the EU described as determinant in the externalization process, but also the construction of undocumented migration as a security


threat for the society. As demonstrated by the abundant literature on the issue, the increasing securitization of migration certainly provides a frame to legitimize governments’ extraordinary measures against migrants in order to ensure safety for nationals. The externalization of migration and border control policies can certainly be understood as one of these exceptional measures – even more for the Libyan-Italian case.

Consequently, this State of the Art allowed me to develop a set of two hypothesis that could respond to the research question. As such, this study aims at demonstrating how,

1) the externalization of migration and border control policies has been legitimized in Italy also through the development and promotion of it at the EU level;
2) the increasing securitization of migration in Europe has also served to legitimize exceptional measures which included the externalization of migration control policies.

To explore these elements, I need to set a theoretical framework that will allow me to articulate the different concepts deriving from the research question and hypotheses. First, the notion of legitimacy is pivotal for this thesis, I choose here to concentrate on an ethic and morality centred understanding of this concept. Closely related to the notion of legitimacy, the concept of legitimization is also important. According to Reyes, “legitimization refers to the process by which speakers accredit or license a type of social behaviour. In this respect, legitimization is a justification of a behaviour”. He also argues that legitimization is enacted by providing arguments which explain and justify specific actions, ideas, and practices. Here, any effort to legitimize is related to a specific goal or purpose, as the enacting actor is seeking the approval and support of her/his interlocutors. As such, legitimacy is about maintaining power and consensus, or to gain popularity. I will thus look, in this thesis, at the justification of the measures of externalization provided by Italian policy-makers.

As for Europeanization, I am dealing here with a very wide concept which refers to a multitude of processes and interpretations. It is thus necessary here to define which specific understanding of Europeanization will be used throughout this thesis. Even if the works of Ladrech (2004) and Boswell and Risse (2003) are interesting, I will mainly take into account the definition proposed by Claudio Radaelli, According to him, Europeanization consists of:

---

228 Ibid., p. 782
[...] the construction, the diffusion and the institutionalisation of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, ‘way of doing things’ and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the making of EU decisions and then incorporated in the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures and public policies.  

Here, the cognitive dimension of Europeanization is absolutely relevant, as the author concentrate on the understanding and interpretation of European policies and practices made by national actors. In Radaelli’s view, two types of mechanisms can be relevant for Europeanization. The vertical mechanism is a clear demarcation of the EU and domestic level, where EU dynamics are incorporated in national politics. While, the horizontal mechanism describes a sort of circular and interactive process where nationals and European actors, policies and discourses interact and influence each other through patterns of socialization. In his critic of exclusively top-down Europeanization, Radaelli rejects the idea of a simple and unilateral domestic reaction to ‘Europe’. Europeanization is thus a complex process: after all, domestic “actors can use Europe in many discretionary ways. They may discursively create impacts”. Radaelli’s view on horizontal Europeanization is relevant to analyse the Italian externalization of border and migration in Libya, as the policy was both promoted and contested at the national and EU levels. Such more comprehensive understanding of Europeanization allow us to spot both a) the strategies used by Italian actors to legitimize the policy at the national level by referring to the EU directives; and, b) the ways in which the Italian authorities were able to make externalization an increasingly legitimate policy also in the eyes of the EU and the other member states.

Next, Securitization takes its roots in the effort from the Copenhagen School of Security Studies to academically approach the expansion of the field of security, to include new spheres of social and political life such as for instance the economy or the environment, already in the mid-1990s. Here, securitization is primarily a speech act since something goes securitized only after a person with high responsibility and public recognition – i.e. legitimacy - frames a specific social interactions or groups as a security concerns. Such view on securitization goes way beyond the traditional idea of national and international security being just the military and geopolitics more broadly. In the 1980s, as the end of the cold War approached, analysts recorded a general move to broaden the security agenda. It is at this stage that states started

231 Ibid., pp. 40-41.
dealing not only with national security but also with the security of its own people. According to this new security paradigm, threats to the individuals which have to do, for example, with economic welfare, cultural identity, political rights and so like.\textsuperscript{234} As the state remains the core actor of politics, governments can establish an exception for a specific subject or a group of individuals, if they treat them as security issue.\textsuperscript{235} According to this shift, institutions now deal with two spheres of security: national and societal security, with migration being included in the latest category as international mobility started being framed increasingly as a threat to host societies. Bigo added his view on the ‘exceptionalist’ dimension of the securitization process, saying that certain extra-ordinary practices can be used in a context of insecurity. When a regime starts to use arguments about the necessary unity and centralization, and combine them with the deviation away from the judiciary, considered as too slow and lax, exceptionality is introduced. The regime can develop a ‘permanent state of emergency’ that allows it to use ‘exceptional’ practices that would be characterized as non-liberals even in a liberal state.\textsuperscript{236} This element is very relevant for my thesis, because Italy is indeed using extraordinary measures that are violating human rights norms. Bigo is talking about a form of “governability by concern where, to reassure the population and make them obey, we exacerbate their fears with a discourse about risk and suspicion”.\textsuperscript{237} This form of governability is also characterized by a common understanding that action, secrecy, sovereign and rapid decisions are needed.

Finally, these three concepts are articulated through a socio-constructivist approach as I consider it most efficient in bringing together all these elements of sociological and political analysis – i.e. the complex ensemble of norms, identities, and shared beliefs that influence the behaviour of political actors.\textsuperscript{238}

\textsuperscript{234} Ibid., pp. 46-47.
\textsuperscript{235} Ibid., p. 55.
\textsuperscript{236} D. Bigo, ‘La Mondialisation de l’(in)sécurité? Réflexions sur le champ des professionnels de la gestion des inquiéitudes et analytique de la transnationalisation des processus d’(in)sécurisation’, Culture et Conflits, no. 53, 2005, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{237} Ibid., p. 65.
\textsuperscript{238} D. Battistella, Théorie des Relations Internationales, 2\textsuperscript{ème} édition, Paris, Presses de Sciences Po, 2006, p. 289.
Critical Discourse Analysis

To verify my hypothesis I will proceed to a critical analysis of political discourse. Approaching discourse from this specific perspective means to consider language as a social practice, which is immersed in the sociocultural context in which the linguistic elements are produced. Here, power relations are pivotal to understand the way discourses and the social world interact, as depending on individual or group’s power each discourse produces different impacts in the social reality.239

Concerning the selection of the political discourses which I will analyse, I chose to divide the sources between:

a) Media or journalistic sources

b) Institutional sources

For the first one I will base myself mostly on what was published on the main national newspapers and their websites. As such, I decided to concentrate mostly on three of the most popular outlets in the country, such as ‘La Repubblica’, ‘La Stampa’ and ‘Il Corriere della Sera’ and their archives available online.240 To find all articles dealing with the selected case study, I selected the key words ‘Libia’ (Libya) and ‘immigrazione’ (Immigration) and launched an advanced search on all three newspapers’ websites. However, all articles generated by this research did not contain political discourses, I had to select the articles containing substantial speeches from Italian members of the government in office at the moment of the speech. Moreover, I will combine data coming from the selected articles, with the corresponding official communications which I found on the official website of the Italian ministry of Foreign Affairs – which includes also the videos of public declaration made mostly on Italian TV and Radio channels of the then Ministers of Foreign Affairs.241

However, I will not limit the analysis to newspapers, TV and Radio discourses. To insure diversity of the sources, a second kind of discourses will be analysed, which are

240 La Repubblica archives are available on this website: http://ricerca.repubblica.it/ ; La Stampa archives are available on: http://www.archiviolastampa.it/ ; Il Corriere della Sera archives are available on: http://archivio.corriere.it/Archivio/interface/landing.html
241 Videos and radio files of the Intervention made by the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs are available at: https://www.esteri.it/mae/it/sala_stampa/archiviomultimedia/audiovisivi/
institutional discourses. By this, I mean the discourses that are made in national institutions, mainly in Italian Parliament sessions, where Policy-makers are discussing the policies that are being implemented. For that I will use the website of the Senate of the Republic, that gives access to different transcript of discussions in various Senate sessions,\textsuperscript{242} and the website of the Chamber of Deputies.\textsuperscript{243}

As for the time span over which I developed my analysis, I decided to concentrate on the period which starts with the signature of the first agreement between Italy and Libya in December 2000, to end with the beginning of the uprisings in Libya of February 2011. Over this period, I thus focused on all discourses I could detect which emanated from those placed in relevant political offices of the Italian government, who dealt with the setting and signing of these agreements. The assumption is that, given their institutional position, their public stances reflect the views and beliefs of the Italian government. As such, by taking account also of the eventual variations among these different discourses, I also tried to spot whether any hegemonic voice and reasoning exists and is shared by those in power. Heterogeneity in the sources will be important for this aspect, because focusing, for instance, on only one newspaper could reveal a specific editorial line instead of the hegemonic aspect of Italian policymakers’ discourses.

As I will concentrate my analysis on both securitization and Europeanization, I will employ two codes one for each of these components. Then, I selected a series of key information I wanted to collect for each code – i.e. Europeanization and Securitization – in order to make them comparable. These codes are resumed in tables 1.1 and 1.2, the first one address my first hypothesis about Europeanization while I concentrate on securitisation elements in the second one.

\textsuperscript{242} Transcripts of Senate sessions are available at: \url{http://www.senato.it/}
\textsuperscript{243} Transcripts of Chamber of deputies sessions are available at: \url{http://www.camera.it/leg18/1}
Table 1.1: Encoding of the information found in the discourses (Europeanization hypothesis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Europeanization features</th>
<th>Semantics / Key Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is EU support / action in externalization policies demanded by Italian policy-makers? (Supp)</td>
<td>‘L’Unione Europea deve…’ (The EU has to…); ‘aspettiamo dell’Unione Europea…’ (We expect from the EU to…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It the EU’s norms / political activity mentioned to support Italian externalization policies? (Norm)</td>
<td>‘…rispette le norme/regole/legge/ dell’Ue’ (…respects EU norms/rules/laws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is migration control depicted as a European issue, interest or problem? (pb)</td>
<td>‘Problema europeo’ (European problem) ‘interessa tutti paesi dell’Ue’ (In the EU interest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is other EU Member States’ action mentioned to support Italian externalization policies? (MS)</td>
<td>Naming of one or multiple other EU member states’ immigration policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Encoding of the information found in the discourses (Securitization hypothesis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Securitization features</th>
<th>Semantics / Key Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is Security mentioned? (Sec)</td>
<td>‘sicurezza’ (security)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the terrorist threat mentioned? (Ter)</td>
<td>‘terrorismo’ (terrorism); ‘jihadismo’ (jihadism); ‘l’estremismo islamico’ (extreme Islamism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the cultural/Identity threat mentioned? (Cul)</td>
<td>‘religione’ (religion); ‘cultura’ (culture); ‘identità’ (identity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the economic threat mentioned? (Eco)</td>
<td>‘lavoro nero’ (black labour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is International criminality and/or Human trafficking mentioned? (Crim)</td>
<td>‘criminalità organizzata’ (organised crime); ‘traffico degli esseri umani’ (Human trafficking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the situation described as an emergency, or as exceptional? (Eme)</td>
<td>‘emergenza’ (emergency); ‘situazione eccezionale’ (exceptional situation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discourse analysis: How Italian policy-makers justify externalization?

Thanks to the encoding techniques detailed in tables 1.1 and 1.2, I draw two tables summarizing the results of the analysis. The discourses are filed chronologically in the following tables. Each time a feature gets validated, I tick the correspondent case with an ‘X’, to have a better visual representation of the results. These tables only contain media sources since Senate and Chamber of deputies discourses will be analyse individually.

Table 2.1: Results of the analysis of Media discourses (2000-2007).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Europeanization</th>
<th>Securitization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU Supp Pb Norm MS</td>
<td>Sec Ter Cul Eco Crim Eme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the correspondent speakers, the date of the discourses and the references of the articles used, see the list in Appendix 2.
Table 2.2: Results of the analysis of media discourses (2008-2010).245

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Europeanization</th>
<th>Securitization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Supp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results depicted in tables 5.1 and 5.2 allows me to determine that the most featured elements in media discourses are:

- the references made to the European Union (39 recurrences);
- the demand for EU action or support (31 recurrences);
- the connection between undocumented migration and international criminal organisations (24 recurrences).

The economic argument was limited the to link between immigration and black labour and it was not used very often – only three recurrences found through the discourses, It is more or less the same observation for the cultural threat, that appears in only four discourses.

---

245 For the correspondent speakers, the date of the discourses and the references of the articles used, see the list in Appendix 2.
As for the terrorist threat, even though it was mentioned in eight discourses before 2008, it remained very rare, after this date, to see this kind of threat in the justification of the externalization measures, this could be explained by the weakening of the terrorist group Al Qaeda, that was representing the major terrorist threat in the period of study, their major attacks in western countries were realised between 2001 and 2005.246

Concerning the analysis of institutional discourses, I found in parliamentary discussions more or less the same elements and arguments than were present in newspaper articles or other media discourses. The main difference is that the discourses were longer so it was easier to find all the arguments listed in the encoding table in a single discourse, whereas it was common in newspaper articles that transcriptions of policy-makers’ discourses concentrate on one argument only.

**Conclusion**

This thesis addressed the legitimation of the externalization of migration control policies, shedding light on the Italian – Libyan case between 2000 and 2011. I can say that the formulation of my hypotheses on securitization and Europeanization as determinant factors of the legitimation of externalization of migration control was justified. Firstly, I demonstrated in the State of the Art that the previous works on externalization did mention that these elements are important in the development of this practice, both at the European Union level, and through the cooperation between Italy and Libya. The choice of the socio-constructivist approach helped me to have a better understanding of the concepts of Europeanization, securitization and legitimacy and gave me the theoretical tools to articulate them, while Critical Discourse Analysis was, as I established, an efficient method that suited my case-study and theory. Then, the description of contextual elements was fundamental to understand the issues surrounding the cooperation between Italy and Libya on migration control, and the relation with the UE in this matter. Finally, a consequent set of discourses gave to the media, but also in official political institutions such as the Italian Senate and Chamber of Deputies was analysed.

On Europeanization, we saw that developments of externalization policies at the EU level occurred sooner than in Italy, but the latter has been quicker at implementing practical collaboration with countries like Libya. The externalization of migration control was highly Europeanized during the 2000-2011 period, as demonstrated by the developments of the practice within EU’s intergovernmental platforms such as the EU Council of Ministers. Italy did play an important part in these developments, notably during its 2003 presidency. Italian pressure was also decisive in the normalisation of the EU-Libyan relations, with notably the end of the arms embargo in 2004. The results of the analysis showed concrete elements pointing towards the great importance of European dynamics used in political discourses to legitimate Italian actions of externalization. While this practice suffered of a lack of legitimacy, and was target of strong critics, from respected International institutions like the UNHCR and numerous NGOs, Italian politicians tried to promote a stronger action at the EU level and often described their alleged illegal activities as in the European interest. This mobilisation of European elements in immigration discourses shows Italian policy-makers’ will to operate a bottom-up Europeanization on this specific issue. Interactions between Italian and EU level were constant during the period of study as top-down Europeanization dynamics were also used, notably when references to the need to comply with European immigration norms – i.e. 2008 EU Pact on immigration and asylum - were used by Italian policy-makers to justify externalization policies.

In a lot of discourses, the European and securitising elements were associated, I managed to find in immigration discourses, some securitising elements that we could have predict thanks to the works of Waever and Bigo. It was well established that undocumented immigration was considered as a criminal activity, something that is valid as well for European Union’s phrasing. The terrorist threat was, especially in the first half of the period of study mobilised. Finally, we also saw a recurrent description of the situation as an emergency throughout the period of study, a permanent state of emergency was discursively constructed by Italian policy-makers, so that it can provides the government with the justification it needed to use of extraordinary measures such as the externalization of migration control policies.

One important aspect was the homogeneity of the discourses throughout the period of study. Italian politicians established a dominant discourse, they were using the same arguments, presented with the same terminology, to describe and justify cooperation with Libya on migration control policies. The diverse positions of actors in the Italian political spectrum did not make a great difference. As it was illustrated by the majority shift in 2006, even when the
centre-left was in power, I did not notice a lot of differences in the discourses that were made before or after this period. Cooperation with Libya was still considered as essential to the fight against illegal immigration. In fact, the opposition to these measures did not come from opposing political force, but mostly from Human Rights NGOs and International institutions such as the UNHCR.

This thesis implies conclusions that can be applied to a broader scale. First, how the normative power of the European Union can be used by its member States to legitimize contested policies. Indeed, being member of such a powerful group of States allows the national policy-makers not to be isolated in facing the critics, if the policy in question is Europeanized. Second, this work also demonstrated the importance of the securitization process, and constructing emergency situations as a way to legitimise the use of extraordinary measures.

However, it must be reminded that this thesis, like every academic works, contains limits and weaknesses. Firstly, this work concentrates on only two principal arguments: Europeanization and securitization, while the legitimization of a policy is a complex process that contains way more elements than that. The methods used in this thesis can also present disadvantages: analysing Italian discourse in an English thesis can be complicated, even if I tried to be as neutral and precise as possible in my translations, I cannot avoid the differences in the senses, and in the social perception of the words between the two languages. Another weakness is that this thesis only analyse discourses related to the externalization policies, while the construction of immigrants as a threat to the society is a much more complex process, which is not only politic, but also cultural, economic, historic, educational and so on.

On the impulse of this thesis, further research on externalized migration control could be initiated. It would be interesting to have, for instance, interviews with policy-makers actively involved in the externalization process. A comparative study could also be engaged between several EU States, Italy, Spain, or Greece, to see if the same discursive elements can be find in different member states.