

'FRIENDSHIP' OF ITALIAN FOREIGN POLICY WITH ITS FORMER COLONIES

Amy McMinn

A thesis submitted to the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Political Science, Concentration TransAtlantic Studies.

Chapel Hill
2015

Approved by:

Rahsaan Maxwell

Robert Jenkins

Milada Vachudova

© 2015
Amy McMinn
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Amy McMinn: “Friendship” of Italian Foreign Policy with its Former Colonies
(Under the direction of Rahsaan Maxwell)

In 2008, Italy and Libya signed the *Treaty on Friendship* which promised \$30 billion to Libya and represented the first formal and explicit apology from any European state for colonialism. Although this aid was justified on colonial damages, Italy did not provide its other former colonies with similar measures. The primary reason Libya received preferential treatment in terms of financial aid and colonial apologies is due to its status as a transit country for migrants who were attempting to enter Europe through Italy. Under the Gaddafi regime, Libya provided the best opportunity to have an immediate and drastic effect on migration. Since Libya has been in civil war, Italy has shifted its foreign policy to the countries of origin. However, Italy still does not provide nearly as much aid or any apologies for colonialism because they don't provide as great of an opportunity to immediately and drastically effect migration patterns.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2: SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ITALY AND LIBYA.....	8
Gaddafi's Personality.....	8
Italian-Libyan Economic Cooperation.....	12
Libya as a Transit Country for Migration.....	14
Libyan Civil War.....	19
CHAPTER 3: ITALY AND ALBANIA.....	24
CHAPTER 4: HORN OF AFRICA.....	31
Somalia.....	36
Ethiopia.....	41
Eritrea.....	44
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS.....	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	52

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

On August 30, 2008 Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi and Libyan Colonel Muammar Gadhafi signed the controversial “Treaty on Friendship, Partnership and Cooperation,” otherwise known as the *Treaty on Friendship*. Although this treaty could be considered a step forward in terms of diplomacy with a country who had been isolated from the international political sphere, it was also highly criticized for the drastic rhetoric and provisions of resources to a controversial world leader. In a speech to the Libyan people in Benghazi upon the day the treaty was signed, Berlusconi explained how;

“Affection and cordial thanks to your Leader, who so much strongly wanted to come to sign this agreement. An agreement which arrives after those tragic and dramatic moments of Italian occupation of your country. In the name of the Italian people, as chief of the government, I feel obliged to offer my excuses and manifest our sorrow for what happened many years ago and affected many of your families. Your leader wanted to end this period, all these long years in which our two countries have collaborated, yes, but have been divided in the memory of what happened in those years”¹

This sentiment is reflected in the *Treaty on Friendship* itself and is particularly significant because it is the first instance where a head of state of any European country formally apologized for harm caused during colonialism. This high level of recognition is surprising when considering the huge distance Italian society and academia has created from its colonial past, which is so closely associated with the Fascist period. The *Treaty*

¹ Federica Ferrari and Alessandro Pejrano, “Con Stile: Personality and Leadership Styles in Italy’s Foreign

on Friendship provides Libya with \$5 billion worth of compensation by creating a coastal highway which will cross the Libyan border from Egypt to Tunisia, building 200 houses, offering funding for young Libyans who wish to study in Italy, and to pay pensions to victims of mines placed by Italians in the colonial age. Furthermore, the Treaty of Friendship reinforces bi-lateral agreements concerning scientific, cultural, and energy issues and the fight against terrorism, crimes, and organizations exploiting clandestine migration.

Considering that colonialism justified the Treaty of Friendship with Libya, one may ask if Italy has made similar agreements, made apologies, or provided compensation to its other colonies or areas that faced Italian aggression. Unsurprisingly, the answer is no. When, and if, the Italian government refers to its colonial history with other countries, it is clear that Italy portrays the past quite differently depending on the country. Toscone explains the early development Italian relations with former colonies, as

“The ‘strange decolonization’ has certainly contributed to stress and widen the limits of Italian development and cooperation policy: the delay with which Italy confronted itself with its own colonial past, and the peculiar way in which the Italian political establishment portrayed the success of its presence in Africa. Representing Italians as the only good colonialists and so reiterating the myth of the “*brava gente*” has certainly contributed to let the Italian governments and public opinion feel exempt from committing seriously to Third World economic development.”²

However, this feeling of exemption is primarily utilized when convenient for the Italian government and Italy’s relationship with Libya is a clear exception to this traditional pattern of perpetuating the Italian “*brava gente*.” For example, Deputy Foreign Minister Pistelli visited Asmara in the summer of 2014, which was the first time an Italian

² Lorella Toscone, “Cooperation for Development: A ‘Natural Vocation’ for Rhetoric?” *UNISCI Discussion Papers, No 25* (January/Enero 2011), 6.

politician visited Eritrea since 1997. After meeting with Eritrean leadership, Pistelli released a statement saying

“If we can manage to restart collaborations, forgetting about respective recriminations that by now concern only the historic dimensions of our relationship and that must stop to condition the present, the potential for Italy and Eritrea are enormous and all will have reciprocal advantages.”³

This statement not only does not apologize for the harms caused during colonialism as it did with Libya through the *Treaty of Friendship*, but it implies that Eritrea has wronged Italy in the past and it insists that Eritrea should simply forget about that aspect of their history. Why is it that Italy offers its forgiveness to one former colony but asks another to forget? Why is Italy more engaged with foreign aid and apologizes for colonialism with Libya as opposed to its other former colonies?

There are many potential reasons for why Libya receives such preferential treatment through Italian foreign policy. One common explanation for this relationship is the personalities and special friendship of their two former, controversial leaders; Gaddafi and Berlusconi. Furthermore, this special treatment that is justified in terms of colonialism, could be explained by the fact that Gaddafi was the only leader to pursue an apology from Italy for colonial damages. Italy and Libya also consider each other to be strong economic allies and have several economic and energy agreements that could have contributed to this preferential treatment among former colonies in Italian foreign policy. However, I argue that the most significant force for Italy’s preferential treatment in foreign policy towards Libya is the fact that Libya is a transit country for migrants into

³ Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione Internazionale, “Missione del viceministro Pistelli nel Corno d’Africa. Visita in Eritrea”
http://www.esteri.it/mae/it/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/comunicati/2014/07/20140702_eritrea.html/

Italy. Italian foreign policy is often driven by migration, to different extents and with different techniques depending on potential benefits for Italy. Libya received more benefits because it is a transit country for migrants, while the other former colonies are primarily countries of origin. Italy is concerned about migration from all of the countries, but under Gaddafi, Libya provided the best opportunity to have an immediate effect on migration from all over the Middle East and Sub-Saharan African. Since Libya has been in civil war, Italy has shifted its foreign policy concerning migration to the Horn of Africa and countries of origin since Libya can no longer enforce its borders to the same extent. Even though Italy is focusing on these countries more than in the past, they still don't provide nearly as much aid or apologies for colonialism because they don't provide as great of an opportunity to immediately and drastically effect migration patterns.

In order to fully understand the extreme preferential treatment received by Italy in terms of foreign aid and colonial apologies, it is important to examine Italy's foreign policy towards its other former colonies. Each of the former colonies receives varying amounts and forms of aid, which are related to specific circumstances in each country. Some of these states have similarities to Italy's relationship with Libya, especially the willingness to work with controversial leaders. However, there are also clear differences, especially among economic cooperation and recognition of the colonial past. Italy does not always recognize (or ever apologize for) damages caused by colonialism to any country other than Libya. Migration is also a common theme seen throughout Italy's relations with former colonies, but also to different extents.

Preference to particular former colonies has also varied since Italy lost control after the end of the Second World War based on opportunities they provided to Italian

politicians to pursue their goals in Italy (whether political or personal) or abroad.

Throughout the Cold War, the Italian Christian Democrats and the Communist and Socialist parties fought for ideological control both within Italy, and provided aid and preferential treatment to particular former colonies based on their alliance with the West or the East. After the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the second Italian republic, the new political parties continued these patterns but with new and different political goals, one of the most prevalent being immigration control.

Migration first became a significant political issue in the mid-1980s. In 1980, the total migrant population was at about 1,109,000 representing approximately 2% of the Italian population, 1,541 of which were asylum applications.⁴ However, by the early 1990s, these numbers began to grow even more with 1,428,000 migrants in Italy and 23,317 asylum applications lodged in 1991.⁵ These numbers continued to rise throughout the past decade, reaching 4,798,701 migrants in Italy by 2010 and 5,721,457 by 2013.⁶ This increase in migration drastically shifted public and political discourse towards migration. In the 1990s, the majority of the migrants entering Italy were from the Balkans, and throughout this time Italian foreign policy reflected the need to control migration from the Balkans. At the turn of the century, migration from Sub-Saharan countries began to drastically increase which is also when Italy began a series of bilateral agreements with Libya. Throughout the 2000s, Libya was the priority among former colonies, with minimal attention paid to the ongoing conflicts in the Horn of

⁴ “International Migrants by Country of Destination, 1960-2013,” Migration Policy Institute, <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/data-hub/charts/international-migrants-country-destination-1960-2013?width=1000&height=850&iframe=true>

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

Africa. However, after the collapse of the Gaddafi regime and the outbreak of civil war and Libya's inability to enforce border controls, Italy's focus shifted the providing aid to the Horn of Africa to combat migration into Italy.

In this analysis, I will begin with a discussion of the Italian-Libyan relationship and show the profound preference given to Libya in Italian foreign policy, especially with the provision of aid and apologizing for colonial damages. I will then discuss the potential factors that contribute to this preferential treatment, including the economic interdependence between the two countries and the unique personal relationship between Gaddafi and Berlusconi. However, I argue that Libya's status as a transit country for migrants entering Italy is the primary factor for special treatment. I will also discuss Italy's response to the Arab Spring and Libyan Civil War and show how migration is the primary factor driving Italian foreign policy.

Next, I will show how each of Italy's other former colonies (Albania, Ethiopia, Eritrea and Somalia) is approached with foreign policy. Albania provides an interesting insight into how Italy first approach migration with foreign policy, as there were massive influxes of Albanians throughout the 1990s during the Balkan Wars. Albania is comparable to Libya in the sense that it is also a transit country for migrants entering Italy by boat, although not to the same extent as Libya. This has caused a relatively similar approach to Albania, however Albania did not have the same economic or personal ties as Libya which gave them a disadvantage in terms of receiving aid or recognition of their colonial ties. I will also explain how the approach to the Horn of Africa has been relatively general until the collapse of the Gaddafi regime and how Italy shifted foreign policy approach in an effort to continue migration control. Seeing as how

each of these states are significant countries of origin for migrants and asylum seekers entering Italy, Italian foreign policy towards these countries since the emergence of migration as a political issue can show how they did not provide as many opportunities for Italy to combat migration. Italian foreign policy towards these states does resemble that with Libya, especially through showing a willingness to cooperate with a controversial leader and through lucrative economic and foreign aid agreements. However, they do not provide significant economic benefits and using a humanitarian aid approach towards combating migration in countries of origin is a long-term process compared to the immediate border controls imposed by Libya.

CHAPTER 2: SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ITALY AND LIBYA

Libya's privileged position within Italian foreign policy is an extremely complex phenomenon with several competing factors. Although former colonies from all European states typically receive a general privilege in terms of foreign aid and migration agreements, the relationship between Italy and Libya shows Libya's preference among Italy's former colonies and within all of Italian foreign policies. Gaddafi's outspoken nature, especially concerning damages from colonialism, and his friendship with Silvio Berlusconi surely contributed to the unique relationship. Furthermore, investments in each other's respective economies influenced the privileged relationship. Ironically, this resulted in Italy's richest former colony receiving the most foreign aid, despite widespread poverty and conflict in the other countries, especially in the Horn of Africa. However, I argue that Libya's geographical location and situation as a transit country for migrants into Europe is what triggered the extreme foreign policy measures that apologized for colonialism and mass provision of aid.

Gaddafi's Personality

Following Libyan independence in 1951, the Italian government attempted to have relative diplomacy through bilateral agreements in 1956 and formed diplomatic relations with King Idriss. However, after Gaddafi's military coup in 1969, the new

leader initiated an extremely outspoken campaign against Italians and the damages they caused during colonialism. Gaddafi immediately expelled over 20,000 Italians who had settled in Italy during colonialism. All of their assets were confiscated and all companies, including Italian gas and oil companies, were nationalized under the Gaddafi regime. This aggression towards Italian colonialism culminated as Gaddafi declared October 7th and an official ‘day of vengeance against the Italians’ in 1970. Gaddafi continuously denounced Italian colonialism, even throughout the recent negotiations and agreements with Italy. When Gaddafi was invited to speak at the Italian Senate in 2009, he made a symbolic statement when he brought the son of the resistance leader, Omar Mukhtar who was executed by colonial authorities.⁷ Gaddafi himself also pinned a picture of the late Mukhtar to his jacket as a reminder of Italian colonial damages.⁸ This strong stance against Italian colonialism and outspoken approach to history is undoubtedly a factor in why Italy provided apologies for colonialism, especially considering leaders from other former colonies did not have as strong rhetoric and actions towards Italy. However, the provisions of such an apology and amounts of foreign aid cannot simply be explained by Gaddafi’s demands, especially considering the collective lack of historical memory concerning colonialism throughout Italian society.

Furthermore, the privileged relationship and apologies for colonialism are often attributed to the close friendship between both controversial leaders, Gaddafi and Berlusconi. This relationship has been criticized and sensationalized world wide,

⁷ “Colonel Gaddafi’s over here, Mr Berlusconi... Silvio is rather taken by Libyan leader’s honour guard,” *Daily Mail*, June 11, 2011, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1192117/Colonel-Gaddafis-Mr-Berlusconi--Silvio-taken-Libyan-leaders-honour-guard.html>

⁸Nicola Chelotti and Elisabeth Johansson-Nogués, “An Assessment of Italian-Libyan Relations,” in *Italy’s Foreign Policy in the Twenty-first Century: A Contested Nature?* Ed. Ludovica Marchi et al. (New York: Routledge, 2014), 188.

especially after the heads of state had official visits to the respective countries.

Criticisms of this relationship persisted in Italy as well, as Chelotti explains;

“Gaddafi’s trip to Italy was condemned by the part of the opposition (DP) largely on the basis of its ostentation and colorful features. In this vein, a more sober approach would have probably considered the decision to invite the Libyan leader to address the Italian Senate in 2009 inappropriate; likewise, the decision to send the air force aerobatics team to Libya to join the 40th anniversary celebrations marking Gaddafi’s military coup was considered a sign of excessive deterrence and subservience to the Libyan leader.”⁹

This extravagant meeting was also criticized worldwide, including from the Obama administration. The White House Press Secretary explained how “Washington itself has since long re-established its relationship with Tripoli...but it manages it with great caution and, by consequence, does not understand the reasons why its Italian ally has let a notoriously unpredictable guest to dominate the national scene for ‘so many days.’”¹⁰

Berlusconi and Gaddafi both have unique and controversial forms of diplomacy, which undoubtedly influenced the drastic measures allotted to Libya within the *Treaty of Friendship*.

Berlusconi’s speech upon the signing of the *Treaty of Friendship* exemplifies their unique friendship and the importance it played in the agreements. He expressed how the *Treaty on Friendship* “will end 40 years of misunderstandings. It is a complete and moral recognition of the damages which have been inflicted by Italy on Libya during the colonial period.”¹¹ Furthermore;

“Your leader wanted to end this period, all these long years in which our two countries have collaborated, yes, but have been divided in the memory

⁹ Chelotti and Johansson-Nougés, 186.

¹⁰ Ferrari and Pejrao, 101.

¹¹ Ferrari and Pejrao, 102

of what happened in those years. Your leader wanted us to look forward and build a friendship which could render our peoples happier, for everybody, but for and foremost for our young people.”¹²

This speech shows a personal and direct appeal to the Libyan people in the name of Italian people, showing a typical populist attitude.¹³ Ferrari explains how;

“The insistence on the semantic fields of “friendship” and “happiness” ... are respectively responding, first, to a move away from foreign policy considerations in the direction of establishing informal as well as special personal relations (*personalization* and *deinstitutionalization* of politics); and, second, to a tendency to use emotional arguments and appeals in political speeches, which sometimes, whether directly or indirectly, recalls religious discourse.”

Berlusconi and Gaddafi clearly had a unique friendship that influenced the controversial negotiations and *Treaty on Friendship*, however, Berlusconi was not the only Italian leader to provide special treatment to Libya and its leader, and this personal relationship cannot be the primary factor for the colonial apology and aid package.

While both of their unconventional attitudes towards diplomacy and foreign policy undoubtedly influenced the negotiations, it is clear that Libya would have still received privileged treatment in terms of Italian foreign aid. The initial rapprochement for the agreements occurred under Prodi’s and D’Alema’s governments and merely continued under Berlusconi’s center-right administrations.¹⁴ Both the center-left and center-right coalitions lobbied for ending the embargos against Libya within the United Nations and the European Union, which occurred in 2003 after a decision from the UN

¹² Ferrari and Pejrano, 102.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Chelotti and Johansson-Nogues

Security Council.¹⁵ Furthermore, the majority of the Italian-Libyan agreements were never discussed in Parliament and generally did not receive criticisms from any party or opposing coalitions.

Although Gaddafi's charismatic and bold personality clearly influenced the negotiations with Italy, the special privilege given to Libya must also be examined within the other areas of interest within the *Treaty on Friendship*, especially with economic cooperation and measures aimed at preventing migration.

Italian-Libyan Economic Cooperation

By the early 1980s, Italy and Libya were already economically intertwined despite political tensions. However, Pisano argues that the economic cooperation between the two countries was based on Libyan control over Italy's energy needs. By 1982, Libya controlled 15-17% of Italy's energy needs.¹⁶ Furthermore, Libyan-Italian trade increased by \$1.3 billion between 1977-1979, reaching \$3.7 billion.¹⁷ However, the balance of trade favored Libya by \$550 million.¹⁸ Pisano explains how "the economy's need for Libyan markets, petroleum, and investments, and the governments concern for the safety of Italy's labor force in Libya are the principal factors that account for the restraint in dealing with the various forms of intimidation perpetuated by the Tripoli regime."¹⁹ This

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Vittorfanco S. Pisano, "Libya's Foothold in Italy" in *The Washington Quarterly* (1981), doi:10.1080/01636608209477565.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

shows how although Italy held economic interests in the area, Libya held more power due to its oil and natural gas supply.

This situation became more controversial after the Libyan bombing of a German disco in 1986 and the implementation of an arms ban and economic sanctions on Libya. Although these embargos did not significantly harm the economy, lifting these bans became a rallying point for Italian politicians within the European Union. After significant negotiations under Prodi's presidency of the European Council, the bans were lifted and Italy has been Libya's largest supplier of arms since.²⁰

The Italian commitment towards lifting the economic sanctions from the EU and the UN show the importance of a strong Libyan economy for Italy. The preamble of the *Treaty on Friendship* explicitly recognizes the Italian diplomacy's contribution to the eventual decision to lift the international embargo against Libya, which shows tribute to the countless Italian politicians and diplomats who relentlessly pursued this task, despite the fact that lifting international sanctions was highly unpopular at the time.²¹

The mutual investments in the Italian and Libyan economies have also undoubtedly played a role in determining Libyan preference within Italian foreign policy. Italy is essentially dependent on Libya for energy imports, as Libya is the primary supplier of oil (30%) and the third greatest for natural gas (13%).²² In 2004 under an agreement between Gaddafi and Berlusconi, the Greenstream pipeline was created which served as a natural gas submarine pipeline from Libya to Italy with a capacity of 8 (later

²⁰ Rachel Donadio, "Turmoil in Libya Poses Threat to Italy's Economy," in *New York Times*, March 6, 2011, p. 10.

²¹ Chelotti and Johansson-Nogues.

²² Ibid.

increased to 11) billion cubic meters of natural gas per year.²³ This accounts for approximately 10% of Italy's daily oil demand.

Although there is a clear economic interdependence between Italy and Libya, this relationship is unique in the sense that Libya held control over Italy's oil and energy sectors. Italy's other former colonies are some of the poorest countries in the world, so Libya does have a clear advantage in terms of economic cooperation. However, this economic interdependence still does not fully explain why Italy would provide \$5billion of colonial reparations to only its richest former colony.

Libya as a Transit Country for Migration

After the discovery of hydrocarbons in Libya in the 1950s and the development of the oil industry, economic migrants flocked to Libya for work. Gaddafi promoted this immigration into Libya by signing multiple bi-lateral and cooperation agreements with various African countries in order to utilize workers and to promote pan-Arab and pan-African movements throughout the 1980s. The Libyan government highly monitored incoming migrants and was able to direct them to areas that required labor. Libya even recruited migrants to come work in Libya by placing advertisements in daily newspapers throughout Africa. However, after accusations of Libyan involvement in shooting down the Lockerbie flight in 1988 and over Niger in 1992, the UN Security Council imposed air and arms embargoes, which relatively hurt the Libyan economy. Although the sanctions and the oil recessions did not help the economy, the strong oil presence allowed the economy to stay relatively strong. It was in this context of a country heavily geared

²³ Ibid.

towards migration that perpetuated the idea to travel beyond Libya to Europe which attracted a significant proportion of refugees and migrants.²⁴

Migrants and asylum-seekers from Sudan and the Horn of Africa, including Italy's former colonies Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Somalia, typically enter Libya illegally in the south-eastern corner of Libya, in Kufra. Reportedly between 10,000-12,000 people pass through Kufra every month and typically use it as a transit point to other cities in Libya.²⁵ These migrants are typically dependent on smugglers who can demand large fees for their services, which brings them on the most common routes out of Kufra to Ajdabiya, to Benghazi, or to Tripoli.²⁶ Once arriving in a major coastal town, migrants must then prepare to cross the Mediterranean Sea, most often from Benghazi or Tripoli, but also from the smaller towns of Zuwarah and Zlitan.²⁷

Libya has over 4,000km of land borders with Tunisia, Algeria, Niger, Chad, Sudan and Egypt that provides a path for migration. While some citizens of neighboring states have the legal right of entry, others and those migrating from greater distances typically take longer and more dangerous journeys. Two common points of entry were at the border with Sudan and Libya and Chad and Libya. However, in May 2003 the border crossing at Sudan was closed after Italy and Libya signed a *Cultural, Scientific and Technological Cooperation Agreement* on May 6 that emphasized the cooperation

²⁴ Sara Hamoon, "African Transit Migration Through Libya to Europe: The Human Cost" *Forced Migration and Refugee Studies*, January 2006, p 18.

²⁵ Hamoon, 48.

²⁶ Hamoon, 49.

²⁷ Hamoon, 50.

concerning “science of the earth and of the sea.”²⁸ This agreement resulted in what Torressi defines as “regulatory regionalism” where by providing “scientific and technological assistance,” Italy is essentially externalizing border control practices.²⁹

Furthermore, following the cooperation agreements between Italy and Libya in the early 2000s, the Italian government began carrying out a series of mass deportations upon arrival of large influxes of foreign nationals.³⁰ These diplomatic agreements include; to fight terrorism, organized crime, drug trafficking and illegal immigration (2000); the establishment of a permanent liaison on organized crime and illegal immigration involving collaboration with Italian police officers (2003), and provisions of training and equipment to Libya, in particular to assist in border surveillance and management.³¹ These funds also contributed to building detention centers for illegal immigrants at points of entrance, including in Kufra. These agreements also allowed Italy to begin deporting migrants back to Libya, regardless of their country of origin and without access to the asylum process, solely based on their illegal entrance into the country. The Italian government was clearly willing to take these steps which violated multiple international human rights agreements, as they deported thousands of foreign nationals in 2004-2005. Within one week in October of 2004, 1,787 migrants arrived in Lampedusa and of them, 1,153 were readmitted to Libya in 11 charter flights of

²⁸ “Accordo di cooperazione culturale, scientifica e tecnologica: tra la Repubblica Italiana e la Grade Giamahiria Araba Libica Popolare Socialista” *Archivio dei Trattati internazionali Online* (2003), Article 13.

²⁹ Tiziana Torressi, “An Emerging Regulatory Framework for Migration: The Libya-Italy Agreement and the Right of Exit,” *Griffith Law Review* 22, no. 3 (2013). Doi:10.1080/10383441.2013.10877016.

³⁰ Hamoon, 66.

³¹ Hamoon, 66.

commercial and military planes.³² After another massive influx between 13 and 21 March 2005 with 1,235 foreign nationals, the Italian government sent 494 back to Libya and another 76 directly to Egypt.

However, the most extreme preferential treatment and apologies for colonialism culminated with the *Treaty on Friendship* of 2008. The *Treaty on Friendship, Partnership and Cooperation* between Italy exemplifies how Italy used its colonial history to combat migration, by justifying sending aid and clearly giving preferential treatment to Libya compared to its other colonies as it is a transit country for migration. The preamble of the treaty expresses how the two countries are “finally closing the painful chapter of the past...Italy has the deepest regret for the suffering of the Libyan people following Italian colonization.”³³ A content analysis of the preamble of the *Treaty on Friendship* explains how “the treaty pushed the bilateral relations between both sides into a new era, and consequently, the preamble included such words as partnership (7.90%), friendship (5.26%), willingness (5.26%), and closing of the past hostilities (2.63%).”³⁴ Although the word “apology” is only mentioned one in the entirety of the document (in the preamble), its effects extend beyond the quantitative dimension.³⁵ Berlusconi further apologized upon signing the document in Benghazi when he expressed his regret; “In the name of the Italian people, as head of the government, I feel it my duty

³² Ibid.

³³ “Tratto di Amicizia, Partenariato e Cooperazione tra la Repubblica Italiana e la Grande Giamahiria Araba Libica Popolare Socialista” *Archivio dei Trattati internazionali Online* (2008): Preamble.

³⁴ Kashiem.

³⁵ Ibid.

to apologize and express my sorrow for what happened many years ago and left a scar on many of your families.”³⁶

In addition to the goal of ending historical disputes and to establish an equal and new partnership, the Treaty included agreements to help build infrastructure, it created a social fund, and committed to fight terrorism, organized crimes and illegal immigration.³⁷ However, when referring to “historical disputes” many Italian colonial scholars have noted how the Treaty never specifically mentions any abuses. Furthermore, rhetoric about their colonial past “alludes to Italian regret for past colonial abuses, and to settlement of colonial-era disputes, *but only to declare them now settled and resolved*. The words ‘close’ and ‘closure’ recur every time mention is made to the colonial past.”³⁸ This pattern is not unique to Libya, and when Italy does reference the colonial history (even with the other colonies) it is always distancing itself from abuses rather taking responsibility. However, the nature of the reparations for colonialism bring more insight into why Libya received such preferential treatment in terms of colonial apologies and foreign aid.

Although this agreement is based on reparations from Italian colonialism, it is clear that many of the stipulations have restricted the ability for any African citizens to seek asylum or to immigrate into Italy through Libya. These measures included mixed sea, aerial and land patrols for the direct participation of the Italian government in the repatriation of migrants arriving in Libya, mostly from Egypt, Pakistan, Ghana and

³⁶ Natalino Ronzitti, “The Treaty on Friendship, Partnership and Cooperation between Italy and Libya: New Prospects for Cooperation in the Mediterranean?” in *Bulletin of Italian Politics* (2009), 125.

³⁷ Kashiem.

³⁸ Chiara De Cesari, “The paradoxes of colonial reparation: Foreclosing memory and the 2008 Italy-Libya Friendship Treaty,” in *Memory Studies* (2006), 318.

Nigeria.³⁹ These “reparations for colonialism” had a significant impact on the amount of migrants and asylum seekers entering Italy, showing the relative success of the goals of Italian politicians. The amount of migrants who successfully made the journey across the Mediterranean, specifically along the Central Mediterranean Sea Route, shows the vast impact of the agreements. In 2008, almost 40,000 were detected using this route and were primarily from Somalia, Eritrea, Tunisia, and Nigeria.⁴⁰ However, this migration patterns almost stopped completely in 2009 after Italy and Libya signed the *Treaty for Friendship*, with only 4,500 migrants detected. After the Arab Spring and outbreak of civil war in Libya, the numbers increased again as the Libyan state lost control and did not maintain border security to prevent transit migrants, reaching 64,300 in 2011 and 170,760 in 2014.⁴¹

These agreements violated numerous human rights agreements that Italy has previously signed, including the Geneva Convention. The Geneva Convention outlined the rights of refugees and stipulated that a refugee could not be returned to a state where he or she fears persecution.⁴² Furthermore, Italy is required to abide by the European Charter of Fundamental Rights, which guarantees certain rights concerning refugees including asylum, education, work, health care, residence, respect for cultural diversity

³⁹ Chiara Marchetti, “Expanded Borders: Italy and Preventive Refoulement,” in *Migration, Minorities and Citizenship: The Politics of International Migration Management*, ed. Martin Geiger and Antoine Pecoud, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

⁴⁰ “Central Mediterranean Route” *Frontex*, <http://frontex.europa.eu/trends-and-routes/central-mediterranean-route/>.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² “Questions and Answers: The Most Frequently Asked Questions about the Refugee Convention,” in *Refugees* Volume 2, Number 123, edited by Ray Wilkenson (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees), 2001.

and the right to a fair trial, among others.⁴³ The *Treaty on Friendship* infringed upon these rights, primarily through the principle of *refoulement* and preventative push-backs. Although the Italian military is limited to acting within their own territory, including nautical borders, this agreement allowed the Italian navy to patrol the Libyan coast and return migrants who would have made the journey through the Mediterranean and had legitimate claims for asylum.

Libyan Civil War

The outbreak of the Libyan civil war has forced the Italian Foreign Ministry to take a different approach with foreign policy towards Libya, although there is still a clear emphasis on combatting migration into Italy. Since the Arab Spring and the subsequent Civil War, Italy initially attempted to promote foreign policy for a stable Libyan state. Italy continued to emphasize its “friendship” and commitment to cooperate with Libya, and their shared history. However, as the Libyan state has continued to dissolve and more conflict has developed, it has not been able to maintain and enforce the border agreements from the *Treaty on Friendship* and Italy has shifted its foreign policy concerning migration to countries of origin.

Italy was initially reluctant to condemn the Gaddafi regime, further showing the importance of this personal relationship to Silvio Berlusconi. Riots broke out on February 17, 2011 and on February 19, Berlusconi reported that he has not spoken with Gaddafi because he did not want to “disturb” him.⁴⁴ However, by February 21,

⁴³ John McCormick, *Why Europe Matters: The Case for the European Union*, (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010), 84.

⁴⁴ “Italy: Press Gaddafi to Halt Violence Against Protesters,” *Human Rights Watch*, (February 23, 2011)

Berlusconi broke his silence on the situation and called the violence “unacceptable.”⁴⁵ On February 23, Foreign Minister Franco Frattini condemned the attacks further and to a greater extent as he explained, “We are in a grave, most grave, situation whose tragic outcome will be a bloodbath.”⁴⁶ However, the majority of his statement focused on the potential migration flows into Italy, calling for support from the European Union. A press release from the Foreign Ministry states, “As regards the migration emergency caused by the crisis in North Africa, Frattini said that ‘The European Union, acting through Frontex, must assume control of the management of the flows of migrants who could arrive on Italian shores.’”⁴⁷ By not addressing the violence from Gaddafi, the Italian government further showed how their priority and greatest concern was migration.

Even after the fall of Gaddafi, Italian foreign policy continued to emphasize their “friendship” with the Libyan people. Foreign Minister Franco Frattini announced that “In Libya, by virtue of our past and recent history, we were more exposed than others to the uncertainties raised by regime change. Yet I believe we have managed to stay in the front line, in both diplomatic and military terms, in the international coalition and to position ourselves for a role of leading player in the post-Gaddafi era.”⁴⁸ Gaddafi’s personal relationship was not the primary factor in Libya’s preferential treatment, as Italy

<http://www.hrw.org/news/2011/02/23/italy-press-gaddafi-halt-violence-against-protesters>.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione Internazionale, “Libya: Frattini, the situation is extremely grave. Europe must shoulder responsibility for the flows of migrants” (February 24, 2011) http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/approfondimenti/2011/02/20110224_libia_situazione_gravissima.html

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione Internazionale, “Frattini’s mission to Libya- Italy confirms its role of ‘leading player’ in post-Gaddafi Libya” (September 29, 2011) http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/approfondimenti/2011/09/20110929_missionelibia.html

continued its commitment to the Libyan people after his government fell and after his death. Frattini went on to explain how;

“We were one of the first countries to recognize the new representatives of the Libyan people, install a diplomatic presence in Benghazi and send an Ambassador to the new Tripoli... The aim is to reactivate the Italian-Libyan Friendship Treaty: an instrument that underscores and preserves Italy’s unique position in the country.”⁴⁹

This clearly shows that Italy was fully committed to maintaining this relationship with the new Libyan government and to continuing the *Treaty on Friendship*, especially the measures towards combatting migration.

However, migration into Italy drastically increased after the Arab Spring and the fall of Gaddafi. In 2010, only 4,406 irregular migrants arrived in Italy by sea, which is a direct cause of the Italian-Libyan agreements.⁵⁰ In 2011, 42,807 irregular migrants arrived in Italy by sea due to the political instability in the region and widespread violence.⁵¹ This amount of migrants would not have been able to enter Italy had Gaddafi continued to enforce land and sea borders, as stipulated in the various bilateral agreements.

This drastic increase must also be taken into context with the *Hirisi v. Jaama* case heard by the European Court of Human Rights. A group of eleven Somali nationals and thirteen Eritrean nationals brought the case after being returned to Libya after being intercepted by Italian Revenue Police and the Coast Guard. The claimants were not informed of their destinations, there was no attempt to identify the individuals, and all of

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Philippe Fargues and Christine Fandrich, “Migration after the Arab Spring” *Migration Policy Center Research Report* (September, 2012)
<http://www.migrationpolicycentre.eu/docs/MPC%202012%20EN%2009.pdf>

⁵¹ Ibid.

their documents and personal belongings were confiscated.⁵² The Italian Minister of the Interior clearly expressed how this was the goal of Italian-Libyan bilateral agreements stating that the operation to intercept vessels on the high seas and to push the migrants back to Libya represented an important turning point in the fight against clandestine immigration.⁵³ As of 2009, more than 461 irregular migrants had been intercepted and transferred to Libya based on these agreements through a series of nine operations.⁵⁴ The applicants argued “that the decision to push back to Libya clandestine migrants intercepted on the high seas was a genuine political choice on the part of Italy, aimed at giving the police the main responsibility for controlling illegal immigration, in disregard of the protection of the fundamental rights of the people concerned.”⁵⁵ The Court found that Italy had violated the European Convention on Human Rights and the Geneva Convention, and the non-refoulement principle within the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. Transferring the applicants had been carried out without any examination of each individual situation and there was no attempt at identification. The Court also ruled that;

“Italy cannot evade its own responsibility by relying on its obligations arising out of bilateral agreements with Libya. Even if it were to be assumed that those agreements made express provision for the return to Libya of migrants intercepted on the high seas, the Contracting States’ responsibility continues even after their having entered into treaty commitments subsequent to the entry force of the Convention.”⁵⁶

⁵² European Court of Human Rights, “Hirsi Jamaa and Others v Italy,” *Application No. 27765/09* (February 23, 2012). <http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-109231>

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ “Hirsi Jamaa and others v Italy,” Article 139.

These rulings cannot be separated from the drastic increase in irregular migrants arriving in Italy between 2010, in addition to the influx resulting from the Arab Spring movements. After the Court's ruling, Italy could no longer use these sorts of actions which gave migrants a greater opportunity to enter Italy and caused immigration to become an even more significant political issue.

As the Libyan state lost control and massive influxes of migrants entered Italy, there is a clear shift in Italian foreign policy to addressing migration through the countries of origin with humanitarian assistance. Many of these countries are also former Italian colonies, including Somalia, Ethiopia, and Eritrea. Although these states are now receiving preferential treatment within Italian foreign policy due to their historical relationship, they do not receive as much foreign aid or apologies for colonial damages as Libya because this approach does not provide as great of an opportunity to immediately and drastically effect migration patterns.

CHAPTER 3: ITALY AND ALBANIA

Italy's diplomatic relations with Albania highlight the importance of migration in foreign policy. Since the outbreak of war in the former Yugoslavia, Italy has been involved in many bi-lateral and multi-lateral efforts that had the goal of preventing migration from Albania. However, the amount and quality of aid is incomparable to that provided to Libya as Albania. Italy's relationship with Albania can provide insights into its approach to Libya and the Horn of Africa, as Albania is both a transit country for migrants and a significant country of origin. Although the amount of migrants using Albania as a transit country is much less than those through Libya, there is a clear emphasis on border controls and a relatively preferential treatment in bilateral agreements. Furthermore, the efforts to stabilize the country are similar to those within the Horn of Africa. However, more attention is given to border control, further showing Italy's concern with preventing migration with the greatest and most immediate effect.

Italy has collectively signed over thirty agreements and treaties with Albania since 1957. These agreements cover many areas, including issues related to transportation, economic issues, and increased cooperation to combat crime (including combatting migration and police cooperation). Although Italian foreign policy towards Albania covers many areas, it is clear that preventing migration into Italy was a primary concern.

Albania has consistently been a country of origin for many migrants entering Italy. The initial influx of Albanians into Italy is undoubtedly related to the outbreak of war in the Balkans in the early 1990s and the collapse of the Albanian political system. After the fall of communism in 1991, an estimated 40,000 Albanians entered Italy, and Italy declared a state of emergency to deal with the Albanian migrants.⁵⁷ They created the position of Minister of Emigration and Immigration and passed the Martelli Law, which set new procedures for immigration.⁵⁸ Of the Albanians in Italy at the end of October 1991, only 645 obtained political refugee status (of 17,718 applicants), 2,715 were sent back, 315 were expelled, 9,451 found jobs, 711 found vocational training courses, and approximately 8,000 had not found jobs and became illegal immigrants under the new law.⁵⁹ In response to this “crisis,” Italy also initiated a series of bilateral agreements between 1991-1993, which consisted primarily of emergency aid, humanitarian assistance, assistance for the establishment and strengthening of institutions and liberalization processes at the beginning of the democratic transition (1993-1997).⁶⁰ Albanian and Italian delegations agreed on a three-year Development Plan that amounted to 218.5 billion liras with initiatives in infrastructure, agriculture, construction, institutional development and four special working groups to develop cooperation strategies in the sectors of development, economy, culture and immigration.⁶¹

⁵⁷ “Italy Copes with Albanians,” *Migration News* 4, No. 4 (April 1997)
<https://migration.ucdavis.edu/mn/more.php?id=1205>

⁵⁸ Campani “Albanian Refugees in Italy” in *Refugee*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (October 1992).

⁵⁹ Campani, 9.

⁶⁰ Juliana Marko, “Economic Relations between Italy and Albania 1993-2000” in *International Scientific Journal*, 136.

⁶¹ Marko, 137

Despite the Italian agreements that promoted a stable Albanian economy, in 1997 Albania faced great instability as the economy collapsed due to a series of failed get-rich quick pyramid investment schemes supported by the first democratically elected President, Sali Berisha. This economic collapse shows the failure of Italian agreements and the lack of a strong Italian commitment towards genuinely strengthening the Albanian economy after 1991.

At the time, Albania was Europe's poorest country and the failed investment caused as much as \$1 billion of personal savings to be lost.⁶² The fact that Albania was Europe's poorest country could further contribute to the lack of commitment for economic cooperation, especially when compared to Libya who was one of Africa's richest states and was by far the richest of Italy's former colonies. Albania did not have financial investments in Italy, and although the bilateral agreements attempted to increase Albanian imports and Italian foreign direct investment in Albania, these negotiations and economic partnerships did not begin until after the mass influx of Albanians into Italy.

This economic and political crisis caused thousands of Albanians to migrate to Italy. Around 12,000 Albanians arrived just between March 13 and March 24, 1997 adding to the estimated 64,000 Albanians legally living in Italy and another 200,000 illegally in Italy.⁶³ It is likely that over 16,000 refugees from Albania were residing in Italy by the end of April 1997.⁶⁴ The Italian authorities did not want to grant Albanians political asylum, as they considered Albania to be a case of "degeneration of public

⁶² Sean Kay, "From Operation Alba to Allied Force: Institutional Implications of Balkan Interventions," *Mediterranean Quarterly*, (Fall 1999).

⁶³ "Italy Copes with Albanians."

⁶⁴ Kay.

order” rather than a political situation.⁶⁵ Italy was committed to repatriating Albanians without proper entry papers who were seeking political asylum, despite calls from the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and Amnesty International to grant temporary status for Albanians in Italy.⁶⁶ At this time, the Italian political debate framed immigration as a problem of responsibility, and policies mainly consisted of a non-compulsory quota system on the basis of economic needs and possibilities of the Italian welfare state.⁶⁷ Albanians clearly fell under the target group who would be eligible for immigration or asylum in Italy, but the Italian state was not economically prepared for this influx.

Furthermore, Italian foreign policy began to reflect the desire to keep Albanian migrants out of Italy. Italy requested and received a UN mandate to lead a ‘coalition of the willing’ into Albania, after identifying Albania as a regional threat. Italy became a leader in the situation and assembled the multilateral peacekeeping forces dubbed Operation Alba to restore order and distribute humanitarian aid. Italy also led the “Allied Harbor” operation, which housed, fed, and provided medical care to the refugees in Albania from Kosovo. However, Davison argues that this mission is an example where national interests of deferring refugees were more important than the humanitarian rhetoric.⁶⁸

In response to the collapsed economic system in Albania, Italy did initiate another series of bilateral agreements. The agreements signed in December 1997 included

⁶⁵ “Italy Copes with Albanians.”

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Natalia Mangani, “Immigration control in Italian political elite debates: Changing policy frames in Italy, 1980s-2000s,” in *Ethnicities*, 201. doi:10.1177/1468796811432693.

⁶⁸ Jason W. Davidson, “Italy at War: Explaining the Italian Contribution to the Kosovo War (1999),” in *Italy’s Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century: The New Assertiveness of an Aspiring Middle Power*, edited by Giampiero Giacomello and Bertjan Verbeek (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2011).

negotiations regarding “the immediate humanitarian aid to enrich the lives of those who try to leave Albania” which is clearly using humanitarian rhetoric to combat migration,⁶⁹ and the first police cooperation agreement signed by Italy. Police cooperation agreements have allowed Italy to expel entire groups of migrants from Italian territory, who are loaded up and returned to wherever they came from.⁷⁰ In order to fully implement these agreements, Italy has offered limited legal immigration opportunities from cooperation countries, development cooperation, technical assistance, financial assistance and training programs.⁷¹ Italy has signed police cooperation agreements with the majority of countries that provide a transit route into Italy, including all of the Northern African countries.

Albania did receive a relatively high amount of spaces allotted through the Annual Immigration Quotas put in place by the Turco-Napolitano law of 1998. When the quotas were first initiated, only three countries received legal immigration allotments; Albania, Tunisia, and Morocco. In 1998, Albania had 3,000 while Tunisia and Morocco each had 1,500.⁷² In 1999 the quota for Albania raised to 4000 and by 2000 to 6,000.⁷³ Cuttitta attributes this allotment to the fact that Albania was the main country of origin of

⁶⁹ “Protocollo tra i rispettivi ministeri della difesa di attuazione dello scambio di lettere de. 25.03.1997, Relative alla Collaborazione per la prevenzione degli atti illeciti che ledono l’ordine giuridico nei due paesi e l’immediato aiuto umanitario quando e’ messa a rischio la vita di coloro che tentano di lasciare l’albania” *Archivio dei Trattati internzionali Online* (April 2, 1997).

⁷⁰ Marchetti, 169.

⁷¹ Marchetti, 170-171.

⁷² Paolo Cuttitta, “Yearly quotas and country-reserved shares in Italian immigration policy,” in *Migration Letters* Volume 5, Number 1, (April 2008).

⁷³ Ibid.

immigrants throughout the 1990s and that Albania was the first country to sign a readmission agreement with Italy, as early as 1997.⁷⁴

Furthermore, there is no clear sign of a personal relationship between Italian and Albanian leaders that has been utilized to prevent migration. This is partially due to the instable nature of the Albanian government, which saw high turnover in the early 1990s. Albanian Prime Minister Sali Berisha and Silvio Berlusconi showed typical diplomacy, as they assured “excellent relations between Italy and Albania” in 2010.⁷⁵ Berlusconi did address migration when he claimed “we do not want any more Albanians dying in the Otranto Straight or influxes of criminals into Italy.”⁷⁶ Berlusconi did not make any sort of comments about the Prime Minister Berisha specifically, as did so often with Gaddafi. This lack of a personal relationships can also be seen through the lack of mention of Italy’s colonial history with Albania.

Although Italy had historical ties to the Balkans from their invasion during the Second World War, there was no mention of this relationship in Italy’s foreign policy, which was clearly designed to prevent migration from the Balkans, especially from Albania. In 1995, just two years before Operation Alba, Italy and Albania signed a “Treaty for Friendship and Collaboration.” Similarly to the Treaty on Friendship with Libya in 2008, the Treaty on Friendship with Albania focuses on economic development and cooperation, security, and combatting illegal migration. Article 19 of the Treaty for Friendship with Albania stresses how an important issue that must be taken as a priority

⁷⁴ Cuttitta, 42.

⁷⁵ “Berlusconi incontra Sali Berisha,” *Governo Italiano, Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri* (February 12, 2010) <http://www.governo.it/Notizie/Palazzo%20Chigi/dettaglio.asp?d=55381>

⁷⁶ “Trattato di Amicizia e Collaborazione tra la Repubblica Italiana e la Repubblica di Albania” *Archivio dei Trattati internazionali Online* (October 13, 1995).

is the influx of migrants, and that both countries must work to create regulations and groups to combat this problem. However, there is only minimal reference to the historical relationship between Italy and Albania. The Treaty refers to how Italy and Albania are “moved by the geographical proximity and the traditional constraints of friendship between the two countries.”⁷⁷ Although this brief reference acknowledges tensions between the two countries, there is no sense of apology that was later provided to Libya.

When compared to Libya, Albania historically has more migrants entering Italy as it is a country of origin (and transit) while Libya has been primarily a transit country for migration and only becoming a country of origin after the Arab Spring. This fact caused Italy to use different approaches to combat migration, by attempting to strengthen the economy and provide jobs in Albania so they would not have a justification to leave. Furthermore, Albania does not provide Italy with as significant economic opportunities, and although Italy has shown a commitment to strengthening the Albanian economy and Italy has increased investments in Albania, the economic cooperation is incomparable to that of Libya. Albania did not receive as much preferential treatment in Italian foreign policy, despite the fact that both are former colonies and that migration is the primary basis of both relationships. This is due to the fact that Albania did not provide as great or immediate effect on preventing migration, as they did not have the resources or authority as Libya and did not serve as a transit country for as many that travelled through Libya.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

CHAPTER 4: ITALY AND THE HORN OF AFRICA

Italy's former colonies in the Horn of Africa have received relative preferential treatment within Italian foreign policy, primarily in the form of humanitarian aid. However, the amounts of foreign aid is incomparable to that provided to Libya. Since the aid for Libya is justified on reparations for colonial damages, why is it that Italy did not make any sort of significant apologies for colonial harm in Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Somalia? This phenomenon is even more alarming when considering the widespread harm caused by Italians throughout the region, and the fact that the countries in the Horn of Africa are some of the poorest in the world and, arguably, should be provided with more foreign aid.

One of the most obvious explanations for this disparity is the fact that Somalia, Ethiopia, and Eritrea provide very limited economic opportunities for the Italian economy and they do not have significant influence or control over Italy's oil and energy needs. Another possibility to explain this situation is that the leaders of these respective countries did not have a comparable level of personal ties in the Italian government or outspoken, demanding personality as Gaddafi. While this statement is true to various extents among Somalia, Ethiopia, and Eritrea, it still does not fully explain the extreme preferential treatment provided to Libya among Italy's former colonies. I maintain that

Libya's geography as a transit country for migration is the primary factor for the clear special treatment in Italian foreign policy.

Libya is a country of transit for migrants and asylum seekers from each of these states. IOM has identified the "East Africa route," which is typically followed by Sudanese, Ethiopian, Eritrean and Somali migrants and asylum seekers. Migrants and asylum seekers from these countries meet in Addis Ababa in Ethiopia, where they move to Khartoum and change smugglers to make the final leg of the journey (4 to 10 days in the Sahara desert) into Kufra, Libya. Hamood explains how "While women originating from Sudan and Egypt tend not to travel to Libya, women form a considerable proportion of arrivals originating from Eritrea, Ethiopia and Somalia. These women include: young, unmarried women traveling alone; and more often married women, frequently traveling with young children or in varying stages of pregnancy."⁷⁸ Even though the *Treaty on Friendship*'s aim is to make reparations from colonialism, it clearly created a more difficult situation for many citizens of Italy's other former colonies who were attempting to migrate or seek asylum in Europe.

Before examining Italy's relationship with the individual countries, it is important to acknowledge how Italy's approach to the region has been quite general. There is a clear reluctance to become involved with resolving the conflicts in the region, which is even more ironic as many of the conflicts are directly linked to Italian colonialism.⁷⁹ Although these countries faced some of the greatest contemporary humanitarian disasters and extreme levels of poverty, Italy has not shown a full commitment to addressing these

⁷⁸ Hamood, 25.

⁷⁹ Siphamandla Zondi and Emmanuel Rejouis, "The Ethiopia-Eritrea Border Conflict and the Role of the International Community" *African Journal on Conflict Resolution* 6, no. 2 (2006).

concerns. In terms of migration, it could be argued that Italy's relative apathy towards living conditions in the Horn of Africa shows how preventing migration was not Italy's primary concern with the agreements with Libya. However, Italy's approach to preventing migration in foreign policy must also be examined within how migration was framed domestically in terms of security.

In the early 2000s when Libya and Italy were creating their extensive agreements, the political discourse framed immigration control as an internal security emergency.⁸⁰ This idea is clearly reflected in the controversial Bossi-Fini Act that passed in 2002, which abandoned the employment sponsorship program, required residency permits get renewed every two years instead of five, and linked residency permits to work permits.⁸¹ It also expanded migrant detention centers by requiring all incoming migrants to be detained for up to sixty days, although many migrants are now required to stay longer. Illegal immigration as well as aiding an illegal immigrant became criminalized. Policy and political rhetoric was not focused on the living conditions of migrants in Italy, but on how to keep them out and send them back. Similarly, Italian foreign policy was not focused on improving the lives of potential migrants to prevent migration but on how to keep them from entering Italy in the first place.

Before the Arab Spring and the Libyan Civil War, Italy was assured that their agreements would be held and the investments would continue towards their designated purposes. However, after the fall of the Gaddafi regime and the growing instability in Libya, Italy did finally take steps to address the living conditions in the Horn of Africa.

⁸⁰ Magani, 658.

⁸¹ Desiree M. Suo, "The Formation of Immigration Law in Italy: Between Policy, Parties, Press and Public Opinion in 2007" Thesis submitted to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2007, p. 23.

The timing of these efforts is key to seeing how preventing migration is the top priority. It was not until the collapse of the Libyan state, and the subsequent lack of confidence for Libya to enforce the agreements, that Italy started to specifically address the Horn of Africa. These recent initiatives specifically emphasize the need to encourage development and cooperation to help the Italian migration problem. The colonial history is often mentioned, although none are provided with apologies comparable to that received by Libya in 2008.

Between July and December of 2014, Italy held the Presidency of the European Council, which gave it a leadership position to promote policies on the European level. In terms of foreign policy, Italy used this leadership role to initiate the first formal dialogue between the European Union and the Horn of Africa. Italian Foreign Minister Paolo Gentiloni took initial steps for the agreement, which consists of the 28 countries of the European Union, Switzerland and Norway, and 27 African countries.⁸² The agreement, entitled the “Rome Declaration” is based of the Rabat Process initiated in 2006 and it corresponds with a 4-pillar global and multi-dimensional strategy: legal migration/mobility; irregular migration and measures to combat the organized crime related to it; the migration-development linkage; and international protection.⁸³ These actions clearly show the importance of preventing migration into Italy. However, Foreign Minister Gentiolini also emphasized how “immigration is not just a matter of humanitarian initiatives and border controls. It also involves economic cooperation with

⁸² Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione Internazionale, “Immigrants: Gentiloni calls for stronger EU-Africa cooperation 58 countries sign ‘Rome Declaration’ on development and combatting trafficking,” (November 26, 2014). http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/approfondimenti/2014/11/20141126_processorabat.html

⁸³ Ibid.

the countries of the southern shore of the Mediterranean.”⁸⁴ Interestingly, Libya was the only one of Italy’s former colonies to sign the agreement, which could strengthen the argument that Italy’s economic ties were the primary factor in showing preferential treatment in terms of foreign aid and apologies for colonialism to Libya. However, many other factors must be considered with the Rome Declaration. First, Libya was (and continuous to be) in civil war, which is at least partially driven by control of oil that affects Italian investments in Libya. However, the act of signing an agreement during civil war is not representative of the country and cannot be fully enforced. Second, this agreement also includes twenty-seven other partner countries, so there is no specific preferential treatment shown towards Libya.

Although Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Somalia were not signatories in the Rome Declaration, Italy initiated another conference addressing migration specifically in the Horn of Africa through the “Khartoum Process.” The twenty-eight EU members, with Norway and Switzerland, signed the EU-Horn of Africa Migration Route Initiative with Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somalia, Djibouti, Egypt, Sudan, South Sudan, and Tunisia on November 28th, 2014. The agreement emphasizes more humanitarian aspects of immigration, especially involving human trafficking, the hazardous journeys across desert and the Mediterranean, and the importance of prosecuting smugglers and traffickers.⁸⁵ However, the agreement does not provide any significant sources of aid and primarily promotes methods already in places, such as; developing cooperation at bilateral and regional level between countries of origin, transit and destination; assisting

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ “Declaration of the Ministerial Conference of the Khartoum Process” *EU-Horn of Africa Migration Route Initiative* (Rome: November 28, 2014).

in improving national capacity building in the field of migration management in all its components upon individual request of the countries in the region; and assisting in establishing and managing reception centers.⁸⁶ These actions do represent a shift in a more multi-lateral and humanitarian approach to migration in the countries of origin (rather than Libya as a transit country), but there still is not as much actual support for these states. Furthermore, the fact that this approach was not taken until after the fall of Gaddafi's regime shows that Italy is still concerned with migration but it can no longer rely on the strict enforcement of border controls at the Libyan border so it has shifted to an approach with the countries of origin. Although these countries are also former colonies in need of aid, Italy did not provide the same apologies for colonialism and amount of resources, as they do not have as much power over controlling migration.

Somalia

Following the Second World War and the institutionalization of humanitarian aid, Somalia received special treatment among Italian foreign aid and development, which is undoubtedly due to its status as an Italian protectorate. When Somalia officially became an independent state in 1960, it was one of the poorest countries in the world. However, Italy did create a series of agreements in 1960 with Somalia in terms of technical assistance, development plans in health, education, public administration and justice fields, and even a "Treaty of Friendship." Although Italy later used treaties with this type of language to apologize for harms caused during colonialism, this treaty does not show any sort of recognition of colonial damages. Following Somali independence, the new

⁸⁶ Ibid.

Somali government requested the continuance of Italian aid through 1974, and continued to be one of the main recipients. However, Toscone maintains that despite Italian efforts in Somalia, “Italian development cooperation policy was rather a function of the Atlantic and neo-Atlantic policy of the country, than the result of a deep understanding of the need to respond to the requests of the newly independent countries.”⁸⁷ However, after Somalia became independent and merged with British Somalia, Somalia continued to be the main beneficiary of Italian aid throughout the 1960s and 1970s.

The preference accorded to Somalia reflects the conflicting party dynamics within Italy, who were competing (both domestically and abroad) to promote capitalism or communism during the Cold War.⁸⁸ This externalization of internal political issues also reflects the current special treatment provided to Libya to prevent migration. The preferential treatment with Somalia also resembled the relationship with Libya in the sense of close personal relationships between controversial leaders, PSI leader Benito Craxi and Somali leader Siyad Barre. After Siyad Barre’s revolution and the launch of ‘scientific socialism,’ the PSI increased cooperation with Somalia whenever possible. In 1978 a series of meetings between the Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party (SRSP) youth organization and PSI leadership, including Martelli and Craxi, met in both Rome and Mogadishu and reinforced cooperation between the two countries.⁸⁹ Tripodi describes how “when Siyad Barre visited Rome on 11 September 1978 he received the

⁸⁷ Toscone, 132.

⁸⁸ Tripodi, Srivasta 2007.

⁸⁹ Paolo Tripodi, “Italy and Somalia: A Singular Relationship” in *International Relations* Volume 14, Number 3 (April 1998): 56.

warmest welcome from the President of the Republic, the socialist Alessandro Pertini.”⁹⁰ This situation resembles when Gaddafi received such a welcome from Berlusconi upon his first trip to Rome in 2007. Furthermore, after Barre’s visit to Rome, an autonomous budget was created for cooperation with Third World countries, and Somalia was the primary recipient of this fund.⁹¹ Between 1981 and 1983, Italy channeled over 220 billion lire to Somalia and gave \$63 million for its balance of payments deficit.⁹² The Italian commitment in Somalia significantly grew for many years following this meeting and a considerable amount of money was devoted to corruption with the dictator.⁹³

In contrast to Berlusconi’s friendship with Gaddafi, there was minimal resistance or criticisms concerning the Italian support of Siyad Barre’s repressive regime that openly violated human rights. Despite concerns of Italian funds (that were intended to be used specifically to defeat starvation) being openly spent to support slave labor, the Italian commitment to Somalia continued. In a stereotypical Italian fashion, the majority of funds intended for aid and economic development, including the Italian-Somali Chamber of Commerce, ended up being channeled through clientelistic relationships in both countries and supporting corruption. Tripodi explains how “The Somali and Italian representatives reached an agreement that for any deal realized they would share 10 percent of the entire business. The projects supported by the Chamber of Commerce were funded by the FAI or by Cooperation for Development and they were often

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Tripodi, 60

completely useless.”⁹⁴ This shows how economic cooperation was a factor in Somalia’s preferential treatment, but for corrupt, personal gains. Although the political elite who benefitted from these agreements were able to provide preference to the cooperating Somali officials, the Somali economy did not have a significant hold over Italy as Libya does with oil and energy.

However, diplomatic relations between Italy and Somalia ended in 1991 after the escalating violence perpetuated by Siyad Barre and the murder of the Bishop of Somalia and an Italian scientist. Italy did not have any formal agreements with Somalia between 1990-2011, which further shows how the friendship was primarily out of convenience in the moment. Another explanation for the end of this relationship is how Somalia served as a battle ground for influence between the Italian Communist Party (PCI) and the Christian Democrats (DC). After the end of the Cold War both of these political parties dissolved due to mass corruption scandals. However, the new political parties did not re-establish formal relations with Somalia until 2011 when Italy opened an Italian Embassy in Mogadishu.⁹⁵ Somalia was on Italy’s foreign policy agenda, but they were primarily motivated through multi-lateral agencies and did not take any leadership position in the multiple crises, as they did with Libya. Giulio Terzi explains how;

“When Italy was in the UN Security Council, in the mid-90s, each time we tried to bring the Somalia dossier to the Council’s attention (the memory of the tragic end of the American mission was still fresh) we came up against opposition from a whole range of countries. To the extent that we renamed Somalia ‘The forgotten country’: a black hole in the UN’s geopolitics vis-à-vis East Africa. I think that establishing and managing

⁹⁴ Tripodi, 62

⁹⁵ Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione, “Somalia-Italian Embassy to open in Mogadishu by the end of 2011, says Mantica” (October 12, 2011): http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/approfondimenti/2011/10/20111012_somalia_mantica.html

that priority has been, as it was back then, a success for Italian diplomacy. Sadly, however, it wasn't enough to find a way out of a crisis that has become endemic.”⁹⁶

Despite Italy's claims of calling for more support in Somalia, they also did not take any significant actions for the crisis in Somalia.

The timing for reestablishing a formal Italian presence in Somalia was justified by the promises of the transitional government after the state had essentially been in civil war since the ousting of Siyad Barre in 1991. However, this was not the first attempt in Somalia to establish a legitimate government since the civil war, it was only the first time it was backed by the international community. The Transitional Charter of the Somali Republic that established the transitional institutions and roles of the government in 2004, the fourteenth attempt to establish a government since 1991, did not receive international support due to the general instability in Somalia. However, before receiving international backing in 2011, similar concerns persisted. According to the International Crisis Group in 2011,

“So far, every effort to make the administration modestly functional has come unstuck. The new leaner cabinet looks impressive on paper but, given divisive politics and the short timeframe, is unlikely to deliver significant progress on key transitional objectives, such as stabilizing Somalia and delivering a permanent constitution before August 2011, when the TFG's official mandate ends.”⁹⁷

Why was the international community, and specifically Italy, willing to support the TFG under the same previous circumstances in 2011 but not throughout the previous decade?

⁹⁶ Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione, “Somalia at the point of no return,’ says Terzi” (February 23, 2012): http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stamp/archivionotizie/interviste/2012/02/20120223_terzi_somalia.html

⁹⁷ “Somalia: The Transitional Government on Life Support” *Africa Report Number 170*, (International Crisis Group: February 2011).

Although there are many competing factors for this support, it cannot be separated from the increase of Somali migrants and asylum seekers into Italy and the collapse of the Libyan state, which previously enforced border controls for Somali asylum seekers attempting to reach Italy. In 2000, the total population from Somalia in Italy was only 160 persons, which began to drastically increase in 2004 when there were 598 refugees and asylum seekers from Somalia. The number of asylum seekers further increased in 2006 after the Ethiopian military intervention and the subsequent insurgency that opposed Ethiopia opened up a new period of violence and political instability in the country.⁹⁸ By 2008, there were a reported 5,251 people from Somalia with rates increasing every year to 7,747 in 2009, 7924 in 2010, 8497 in 2011, 9778 in 2012, and 12,170 in 2013.⁹⁹ Somalia is clearly a current concern within Italian foreign policy, however Somalia has not received as much aid or any colonial apology as provided to Libya. This is due to the fact that Somalia does not have the capacity to immediately effect migration to the same extent as Libya.

Ethiopia

The Italian relationship with Ethiopia in terms of preferential treatment is relatively similar to that of Somalia. Just as the PCI and PSI supported communist movements in Somalia, the Christian Democrats supported Ethiopia and their Western alignment during the Cold War. Immediately following the war, Ethiopia sided with the

⁹⁸ Petra Mezzetti and Matteo Guglielmo, "Somali Diaspora Associations in Italy: between integration and transnational engagement," *Centro studi di politica internazionale* (October 2009): 6. <http://www.cespi.it/WP/WP%2062%20Mezzetti%20Diaspeace%20FINAL.pdf>.

⁹⁹ UN Population Statistics Database.

West and went to the United States for their security needs. This alignment followed the ideology of the Emperor Haile Selassie who was outspoken about the Italian invasion of Ethiopia. By the end of the Second World War, Selassie was living in exile in England but he was restored to his position after the Italians lost the war. Ethiopia associated itself with capitalism and Western thinking; thus formed stronger relationships with the United States and subsequently the new Italian republic governed by the Christian-Democrats. Ironically, Somalia and Ethiopia had continuous border disputes throughout this time and the different Italian factions were essentially supporting both sides of the conflict. This behavior of supporting both sides of a conflict to promote domestic political concerns persists throughout Italian foreign policy. Throughout the Cold War, ideology was the primary concern while the contemporary issue is migration.

Throughout the 1960s, Ethiopia was one of the top ten recipients of aid from Italy, but the primary form of aid was through debt re-scheduling and war reparations. War reparations to Ethiopia were significantly reduced after representatives from the Italian Commission of Foreign Affairs travelled to Ethiopia for an assessment in 1966. One of the members, Mario Pedini, stated:

“We found Ethiopia in full development. The impetus and activism left by the Italian presence there- which, according to Ethiopians’ evaluations too, has liquidated a past in some respects medieval- has represented a useful foundation to lead the country to a deeper awareness, namely to prepare it for the initiatives needed to pass from a subsistence economy to a developed one.”¹⁰⁰

Not only does this statement perpetuate the myth of the Italian *brava gente*, but it insinuates positive effects from Italian colonialism in order to justify withdrawing war reparations. This shows an early example of Italy utilizing its colonial past for foreign

¹⁰⁰ Toscone,130.

policy, however in this context, the primary concern was withdrawing money since Ethiopia and provisions of the aid did not provide other substantial opportunities for Italy.

Italy's support for Haile Selassie further resembles the personal connections and influence of charismatic leaders in forming Italian foreign policy. Despite Haile Selassie's blatant violation of democratic principles towards the Eritreans, Italy supported and sent aid to Ethiopia. Although Eritrea was not recognized as a sovereign state at the time and no foreign policy documents would reflect support directly to the Eritrean people, the fact that they underwent so much suppression clearly indicates that they would not benefit from Italian aid. These agreements included measures to settle financial issues, loans to the Ethiopian government, economic collaboration, and even creating Italian schools and scholarships for Ethiopian students.

This approach highlights Italy's general apathy towards the region and of the actual situation in Ethiopia, which continued past the Cold War. Ethiopia has been involved in several wars, where Ethiopia has been considered the aggressor including the thirty-year struggle for Eritrean independence. Ethiopia also invaded Eritrean territory in 1998, after agreeing to adhere to the decision of an independent Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission, which ruled in favor of Eritrea.¹⁰¹ Ethiopia has also been involved with multiple border conflicts with Somalia since both states achieved independence. Despite these conditions, Ethiopia has the most bilateral agreements with Italy than any other former colony. These agreements primarily allow for rescheduling debt payments and humanitarian aid and development and have occurred consistently, regardless of Ethiopia's human rights violations or war crimes. However, while Italy provided this aid

¹⁰¹ Zondi and Réjouis, 70.

and debt rescheduling for Ethiopia, it was also establishing economic ties with Eritrea, while the two countries were at war. This allowed Italy to play the role of “peace-maker” while remaining relatively removed from the actual situation.

However, as these conflicts persisted, more Ethiopians began migrating and seeking asylum in Italy. In 2000, 201 Ethiopians arrived in Italy seeking asylum. In 2005, 1,065 Ethiopians arrived and by 2013, there were 2,451.¹⁰² Although this increase is not as drastic as the amounts of migrants and asylum seekers from Somalia and Eritrea, there is still a clear increase. It further represents the overall increase in migration from the Horn of Africa.

Despite this increased migration and the fact that Ethiopian actions in Eritrea and Somalia directly contributed to more migration from those states, Italy did not make any sort of agreements with Ethiopia concerning migration or stipulating conditionalities to promote human rights in the region. As previously discussed, the political framework surrounding migration was based on security and border control which is reflected in its foreign policy priority with strengthening border control around Libya. Libya received more aid due to its status as a transit country for migrants, including those from Ethiopia.

Eritrea

Although Eritrea is a significant country of origin for refugees and asylum seekers into Italy, strengthening Libyan border controls served as the primary means for preventing Eritrean migration. Italy acknowledges but does not apologize for the colonial relationship with Eritrea, as Eritrea only provides limited opportunities for Italy

¹⁰² UNHCR Population Statistics.

in terms of preventing migration. These limited opportunities do resemble those with Libya, especially through lucrative economic cooperation agreements with a controversial leader to justify other political means. For these reasons, Eritrea did not receive as preferential treatment in terms of foreign aid and colonial apologies as Libya in Italian foreign policy.

When discussing Eritrea, it is important to acknowledge the authoritarian nature of President Isaias Afewerki who has held his office since the establishment and independence of Eritrea in 1991. According to the Human Rights Watch, “Eritrea has no constitution, functioning legislature, independent judiciary, elections, independent press, or nongovernmental organizations; it does not hold elections.”¹⁰³ The many controversial practices include forced conscription in the national service, arbitrary arrests, prolonged detention, and reprisals against family members. In Eritrea there is also no freedom of religion, freedom of expression or freedom of association.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, Eritrea is one of the least developed countries in the world, with an average annual per capita income of \$403 in 2010 for a population of about 5.3 million.¹⁰⁵ Eritrea has large fiscal and trade deficits, a high proportion of public debt in proportion to GDP, and limited opportunities for private sector involvement which has resulted in an unstable and weak economy.¹⁰⁶ These conditions have caused international criticism for human rights abuses and have led to thousands of Eritreans fleeing the country.

¹⁰³ Human Rights Watch, “World Report 2014: Eritrea” <http://www.hrw.org/world-report/2014/country-chapters/eritrea>

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ The World Bank, “Eritrea Overview” <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/eritrea/overview>

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

The extremity of the situation in Eritrea is undoubtedly due to the ongoing conflicts with Ethiopia, which are a direct result from border designations from Italian colonialism and subsequent on-going border disputes, despite rulings from international courts.¹⁰⁷ Eritrea is consistently ranked among the top ten refugee producing countries in the world, and according to the UNHCR, 236,059 refugees left Eritrea between 2000 and 2010.¹⁰⁸ These conditions have caused Eritreans to flee and seek asylum, many of which arrived in Italy and now Eritrea is one of the primary countries of origin for asylum seekers and refugees in Italy. In 2000, only 16 Eritrean asylum seekers entered Italy, which rose to 2705 in 2005 and has continuously increased since. There were 7,404 Eritreans who entered Italy in 2007, 10,377 in 2009, 11,206 in 2011, and 13,841 in 2013.¹⁰⁹

Italian involvement in the conflicts has been relatively minimal but Italy has recognized the historical and colonial past with Eritrea, although there have not been apologies as accorded to Libya. For example, Italian politician Alfredo Mantica of the right wing National Alliance Party and the Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs under Silvio Berlusconi in 2008 acknowledged how “Eritrea is ruled by an authoritarian government that is constantly taking on more repressive actions that have caused the collapse of the economy and a mass exodus of the population who are also trying to escape from military conscription that is resulted from the unresolved conflict with

¹⁰⁷ Zondi and Rejouis, 81.

¹⁰⁸ UNHCR Population Statistics.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

Ethiopia.”¹¹⁰ However, at the same time Mantica emphasizes the importance of the “remaining European presence, which is not only significant for the legacy of colonialism but also for the strong bonds that have survived decolonization.”¹¹¹ Furthermore, when Foreign Minister Piselli visited Eritrea in July of 2014, he announced how “if we manage to resume our bilateral collaboration and to forget any recriminations, which belong to the history of our relationship and must no longer influence it in the present, then the potential for both Italy and Eritrea is enormous, and all to our mutual advantage.”¹¹² While this statement does acknowledge the contentious history between the two countries, there is no sense of apology or regret for the damage Italy caused, and insists on moving on rather than making retributions as was the case with Libya.

Piselli went on to explain how

“I came here to enable Italy and Eritrea to embark on the road to cooperation in all sectors of mutual interest, given that many of the security and migration problems that affect Italy actually originate in this part of the region. To achieve that cooperation, I wanted to clarify, in person, to President Isaias here in Asmara that Italy is ready to show a new willingness to engage and to rekindle that mutual trust that has been lacking between our two countries for many, too many, decades.”¹¹³

This statement does resemble Italy’s willingness to work with Colonel Gaddafi who was also a highly criticized world leader. It also clearly states that cooperation between

¹¹⁰ Alfredo Mantica, “Dettaglio articolo” (June 8, 2011) http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/interviste/2011/06/20110608_manticacornoafrica.html

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione Internazionale, “Deputy Minister Pistelli’s mission to the Horn of Africa. Visit to Eritrea,” (June 2, 2014). http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/comunicati/2014/07/20140702_eritrea.html

¹¹³ Ibid.

Eritrea and Italy will help the migration problems in Italy, which further shows Italy's willingness to violate international norms to address migration.

Although there is an emphasis on cooperation, given the weak state of the Eritrean government and economy, Italy has minimal possible economic gains from this cooperation and Eritrea is the main beneficiary. Despite minimal political and economic involvement after the fall of Italian colonialism in 1941, Italy began to establish relations with Eritrea in 1993 after independence in 1991. Italy was one of the first countries to recognize Eritrea's independence and set forth several economic agreements. By 2010, nearly 60% of Eritrean exports to Europe are to Italy, and about 30.5% of all Eritrean exports went to Italy. Furthermore, about 14% of the total 38% of imports from Europe are from Italy.

The Eritrean ambassador in Rome explained in a speech in February 2015 that;

“the most problematic issue is poverty- until there is a development acceptable in Eritrea, there will always be Eritreans fleeing. Eritrea is poor. Our economy is post-war, we are poor, we are not giving our young people a job. But we offer free education from beginning to end. We are making huge efforts, huge investments in our young people, but with a poor economy we are not able to offer young people what they dream.”¹¹⁴

However, at the same meeting where the Eritrean Ambassador met with Federica Mogherini, members of the Italian government, and of the Norwegian Swedish and English delegations, he acknowledged Eritrea's role in Europe's migration problems. He identified Eritreans as the main victims of human trafficking as said “we are willing to exchange information and work together because human trafficking is primarily about us.”¹¹⁵ Although he did not address the numerous human rights violations and those

¹¹⁴ Semere Asmelash, “Eritrean ambassador in Rome: full cooperation on immigration” *Dehai* (February 13, 2015) http://www.dehai.org/archives/dehai_news_archive/2015/feb/0263.html

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*

seeking asylum and cases outside human trafficking, these statements show how the Eritrean government is aware of the need to address migration and cooperation with the European Union and Italy if they wish to have any sort of economic cooperation.

However, past economic agreements between the European Union (led by Silvio Berlusconi) and Eritrea did not end successfully, as Afwerki did not sufficiently meet the European conditions of the €122 million aid and development package from the European Development Funds.

Although the Eritrean government blames the economic situation for the mass exodus of Eritreans into Italy and Europe, the most common reason cited by Eritrean nationals, particularly by men, was the practice of forced military service.¹¹⁶ Women also cited escaping military services as a reason for escaping Eritrea, but also emphasized reasons related to the impact of the 1998-2000 war between Eritrea and Ethiopia and many also mentioned the desire to improve their economic situation.¹¹⁷ All of these competing factors for Eritrean migration influence Italy's foreign policy approach towards Eritrea and how it attempts to prevent migration.

The cooperation agreements between Italy and Libya have allowed the Italian authorities to deny access to the asylum process and entry into Italy for many Eritrean nationals. On 21 July 2004, 110 Eritrean nationals were returned to Eritrea from Libya where they were immediately arrested upon arrival and held in incommunicado detention in a secret prison.¹¹⁸ On 27 August 2004, as 75 Eritrean men, women, and children were

¹¹⁶ Hamood, 28.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Hamood, 38.

being returned on a flight from Libya to Eritrea, a group of them hijacked the military plane and landed it in Sudan so they would not be subject to persecution in Eritrea.¹¹⁹ This type of return is directly related to the technical cooperation agreements between Libya and Italy to strengthen borders and further shows how Libya's status as a transit country for migrants is what gave it so much preferential treatment in terms of foreign aid and colonial apologies when compared to the other former colonies.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSIONS

Italian foreign policy has clearly shown a preferential treatment to Italy, and although this favoritism is justified on colonialism, there are not any sort of consistent apologies or provisions of aid to any other former colonies. Many factors contribute to this special treatment, such as Gaddafi's strong personality and unique form of diplomacy and the connections between the Libyan and Italian economies. However, the primary reason Libya receives significantly more aid and diplomatic recognition is because of Libya's status as a transit country for migration into Europe. Throughout recent decades, political rhetoric in Italy surrounding migration has influenced this relationship. Although other former colonies have been primary origin countries for migrants and asylum seekers into Italy, especially Albania and Ethiopia and Eritrea while at war, Libya's status as a transit country has given it an advantage.

Migration has consistently been a driving force behind Italian foreign policy. Under the Gaddafi regime, Libya provided the best opportunity to have an immediate and drastic effect on migration flows, as Libya is a primary transit country for migrants entering Italy. Since Libya has been in civil war, the foreign policy has shifted to the countries of origin and has provided more negotiations and agreements to its former colonies. However, Albania, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Somalia do not provide as great of

opportunities at combatting migration into Italy so they are not allotted the same level of foreign aid and colonial apologies as Libya.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “Accordo di cooperazione culturale, scientifica e tecnologica: tra la Repubblica Italiana e la Grade Giamahiria Araba Libica Popolare Socialista.” *Archivio dei Trattati internazionali Online*, 2003.
- Ambrosini, Maurizio. “Immigration in Italy: Between Economic Acceptance and Political Rejection,” *International Migration & Integration* (2013) 14: 175-194. DOI: 10.1007/s1213401102313
- Asmelash, Semere. “Eritrean ambassador in Rome: full cooperation on immigration” *Dehai* (February 13, 2015)
http://www.dehai.org/archives/dehai_news_archive/2015/feb/0263.html
- “Central Mediterranean Route” *Frontex*, <http://frontex.europa.eu/trends-and-routes/central-mediterranean-route/>.
- Chelotti, N. and E. Johansson-Nogués. “An assessment of Italian-Libyan relations,” in *Italy’s Foreign Policy in the Twenty-first Century: A Contested Nature?* Edited by Ludovica Marchi, Richard Whitman & Geoffrey Edwards. New York: Routledge, 2015.
- “Colonel Gaddafi’s over here, Mr Berlusconi... Silvio is rather taken by Libyan leader’s honour guard.” *Daily Mail*, June 11, 2011,
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1192117/Colonel-Gaddafis-Mr-Berlusconi--Silvio-taken-Libyan-leaders-honour-guard.html>
- Cuttitta, Paolo. “Readmission in the Relations between Italy and North African Mediterranean Countries.” *Unbalanced Reciprocities: Readmission Agreements*, Middle East Institute Special Edition Viewpoints
- Cuttitta, Paolo. “Yearly quotas and country-reserved shares in Italian immigration policy.” *Migration Letters*, 5(1) 41-51. April 2008.
- Davidson, Jason W. “Italy at War: Explaining the Italian Contribution to the Kosovo War (1999).” In *Italy’s Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century: The New Assertiveness of an Aspiring Middle Power*, edited by Giampiero Giacomello and Bertjan Verbeek, 92–112. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2011.
- De Cesari, Chiara. “The paradoxes of colonial reparation: Foreclosing memory and the 2008 Italy-Libya Friendship Treaty,” in *Memory Studies* 5(3) 316-326. DOI: 10.1177/1750698012443888
- Donadio, Rachel. “Turmoil in Libya Poses Threat to Italy’s Economy,” *New York Times* March 6, 2011, pg. 10.

- European Court of Human Rights, “Hirsi Jamaa and Others v Italy,” *Application No. 27765/09* (February 23, 2012).
<http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-109231>
- Ferrari, Federica, and Alessandro Pejrano. “Con Stile: Personality and Leadership Styles in Italy’s Foreign Policy.” In *Italy’s Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century: The New Assertiveness of an Aspiring Middle Power*, edited by Giampiero Giacomello and Bertjan Verbeek, 92–112. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2011.
- Harbeson, John W. “Ethiopia’s Extended Transition,” in *Journal of Democracy*; Oct 2006; 16, 4, pp 144-158.
- Hamood, Sara. “African Transit Migration Through Libya to Europe: The Human Cost.” *The American University in Cairo: Forced Migration and Refugee Studies*. January 2006.
- Human Rights Watch, “World Report 2014: Eritrea” <http://www.hrw.org/world-report/2014/country-chapters/eritrea>
- International Centre for Migration Policy Development. East Africa Migration Route Initiative Gaps & Needs Analysis Project Country Reports: Ethiopia, Kenya, Libya. East Africa Migration Route Initiative. 2008.
- International Crisis Group. “Somalia: The Transitional Government on Life Support.” Africa Report N. 170- 21 February 2011
- “Italy Copes with Albanians,” *Migration News* 4, No. 4 (April 1997)
<https://migration.ucdavis.edu/mn/more.php?id=1205>
- “Italy: Press Gaddafi to Halt Violence Against Protesters,” *Human Rights Watch*, (February 23, 2011) <http://www.hrw.org/news/2011/02/23/italy-press-gaddafi-halt-violence-against-protesters>.
- Kashiem, Mustafa Abdalla A. “The Treaty of Friendship, Partnership and Cooperation between Libya and Italy: From an Awkward Past to a Promising Equal Partnership.” *California Italian Studies* 1(1): 1-15, 2010
- Kay, Sean. “From Operation Alba to Allied Force: Institutional Implications of Balkan Interventions” *Mediterranean Quarterly*: Fall 1999.
- Magnani, Natalia. “Immigration control in Italian political elite debates: Changing policy frames in Italy, 1980s-2000s,” in *Ethnicities* 12(5): 643-664. DOI: 10.177/1468796811432693

- Mantica, Alfredo. “Dettaglio articolo” (June 8, 2011)
http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/interviste/2011/06/20110608_manticacornoafrica.html
- Marchetti, Chiara. “Expanded Borders: Italy and Preventive Refoulement.” In *Migration, Minorities and Citizenship: The Politics of International Migration Management*, edited by Martin Geiger and Antoine Pecoud. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Marko, Juliana. “Economic Relations between Italy and Albania 1993-2000”
International Scientific Journal 136-141.
- McCormick, John. *Why Europe Matters: The Case for the European Union*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Mezzetti, Petra and Matteo Guglielmo. “Somali Diaspora Associations in Italy: between integration and transnational engagement.” *Centro studi di politica internazionale* (October 2009):
<http://www.cespi.it/WP/WP%2062%20Mezzetti%20Diaspeace%20FINAL.pdf>.
- Migration Policy Institute. “International Migrants by Country of Destination, 1960-2013.” <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/data-hub/charts/international-migrants-country-destination-1960-2013?width=1000&height=850&iframe=true>
- Ministero degli Affari Esteri. Direzione Generale per la Cooperazione allo Sviluppo, Ufficio IV. “Stream” 2013-2015 SOMALIA.
- Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione Internazionale, “Deputy Minister Pistelli’s mission to the Horn of Africa. Visit to Eritrea,” (June 2, 2014).
http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/comunicati/2014/07/20140702_eritrea.html
- Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione Internazionale, “Frattini’s mission to Libya- Italy confirms its role of ‘leading player’ in post-Gaddafi Libya” (September 29, 2011)
http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/approfondimenti/2011/09/20110929_missionelibia.html
- Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione Internazionale, “Immigrants: Gentiloni calls for stronger EU-Africa cooperation 58 countries sign ‘Rome Declaration’ on development and combatting trafficking,” (November 26, 2014).
http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/approfondimenti/2014/11/20141126_processorabat.html
- Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione Internazionale, “Libya: Frattini, the situation is extremely grave. Europe must shoulder responsibility for the flows of

- migrants” (February 24, 2011)
http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/approfondimenti/2011/02/20110224_libia_situazione_gravissima.html
- Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione Internazionale. “Missione del viceministro Pistelli nel Corno d’Africa. Visita in Eritrea.”
http://www.esteri.it/mae/it/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/comunicati/2014/07/20140702_eritrea.html/
- Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione, “Somalia at the point of no return,” says Terzi” (February 23, 2012):
http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/interviste/2012/02/20120223_terzi_somalia.html
- Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione, “Somalia-Italian Embassy to open in Mogadishu by the end of 2011, says Mantica” (October 12, 2011):
http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/sala_stampa/archivionotizie/approfondimenti/2011/10/20111012_somalia_mantica.html
- Philippe Fargues and Christine Fandrich, “Migration after the Arab Spring” *Migration Policy Center Research Report* (September, 2012)
<http://www.migrationpolicycentre.eu/docs/MPC%202012%20EN%2009.pdf>
- Pisano, Vittorfanco S. “Libya’s Foothold in Italy” in *The Washington Quarterly*, 5(2), 179-182, 1982 DOI:10.1080/01636608209477565
- “Protocollo tra i rispettivi ministeri della difesa di attuazione dello scambio di lettere de. 25.03.1997, Relative alla Collaborazione per la prevenzione degli atti illeciti che ledono l’ordine giuridico nei due paesi e l’immediato aiuto umanitario quando e’ messa a rischio la vita di coloro che tentano di lasciare l’albania” *Archivio dei Trattati internzionali Online* (April 2, 1997).
- Questions and Answers: The Most Frequently Asked Questions about the Refugee Convention.” *Refugees* (2001) Volume 2, Number 123: 16-17. Edited by Ray Wilkenson. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.
<http://www.unhcr.org/3b5e90ea0.html>.
- Ronzitti, Natalino. “The Treaty on Friendship, Partnership and Cooperation between Italy and Libya: New Prospects for Cooperation in the Mediterranean?” *Bullitin of Italian Politics* 1(1), 2009, 125-133.
- Siphamandla Zondi and Emmanuel Rejouis, “The Ethiopia-Eritrea Border Conflict and the Role of the Internatinal Community” *African Journal on Conflict Resolution* 6, no. 2 (2006).

Suo, Desiree M. "The Formation of Immigration Law in Italy: Between Policy, Parties, Press and Public Opinion in 2007" Thesis submitted to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2007.

The World Bank, "Eritrea Overview"
<http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/eritrea/overview>

Tiziana Torresi, "An Emerging Regulatory Framework for Migration: The Libya-Italy Agreement and the Right of Exit," *Griffith Law Review* 22, no. 3 (2013).
Doi:10.1080/10383441.2013.10877016.

Tosone, Lorella. "Italy's Policy of Cooperation for Development: A 'Natural Vocation' for Rhetoric?" *UNISCI Discussion Papers*, No 25 (January 2011) ISSN 1696-2206

Tripodi, Paolo. "Italy and Somalia: A Singluar Relationship" in *International Relations*, vol XIV, no 3, April 1998.

Tronvoll, Kjetil. "The Lasting Struggle for Freedom in Eritrea: Human Rights and Political Development, 1991-2009." The Oslo Center. 2009.

Zondi, Siphamandla and Emmanuel Réjouis. "The Ethiopia-Eritrea Border Conflict and the Role of the International Community"