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Editorial

Here we are: London, October 2004, third European Social Forum. We are here as we were in Genoa, in July 2001, where for the first time the global movement met migrants’ struggles...
PARTITION

Shut up in a lonely mansion, with police night and day Paroling the gardens to keep the assassins away, He got down to work, to the task of settling the fate Of colonists, of Notions, of Quora. And the Census Returns almost certainly incorrect, But there was no time to check them, no time to inspect Contested areas, no time to debate. And a bout of dysentery kept him constantly on the trot, But in spite of all his efforts, decisions decided, A continent for better or worse divided.

The next day he sailed for England, where he could quickly forget The case, as a good lawyer must. Return would, for him, be not so easy, As he had told his Club, that he might get shot.

W. H. Auden (on Sir Radcliffe portioning out India in 1947)

The transformation of borders reflects the shift in political strategies towards the management of migration. Nevertheless, it also mirrors the fact that neither physical nor legal barriers can stop people's movement. Migrants are not just the collateral damage of global capitalism; they are active agents of free movement who represent a subverting power in respect to the sovereignty of the nation states as well as the new regimes of hyper-exploration on a global level. The depiction of national and supra-national borders as instruments whose function is simply to stop unwanted migrants is misleading. It is a way of social and political space. While the globalization of border distribution of rights and privileges according to circulation of people define a de facto migration as a social movement and to consider the struggles against borders. The main function of global borders and migration control strategies is not only to keep people outside, but also to direct their actions and behaviour across space leading to what can be described as a system of selective inclusion and exclusion of the migrants. Borders assign people to differentiated social, political and legal spaces which extend towards and include countries across national and supranational territories. Exploitation and discrimination towards foreigners represent a differentiated system of justice aimed at administrating the actions of foreigners outside of the guarantees of civil rights and general legal principles. In the same way, legal mechanisms which limit the free circulation of people define a de facto differentiated regime for migrant workers aimed at expropriating the inner value of peoples' mobility. In contrast to this world's partition migration itself is a contestation of the distinction between citizens and non-citizens to the hierarchical allocation of social and political spaces which are consequence of the regimes is a symptom of the increasing difficulty with which to contain the violence of the commodified mobility. The maps at his disposal with the framework of national borders, the everyday changes, and the fact that same time shows the weakness of this global separation. Borders are not a political utopia. It is a struggle that migrants fight every day when they conquer the European fortress - or any other regime built upon the institution of borders - and when they fight for their social, political and civil rights.

In November 2003 the European Council established the concept of a “virtual sea border” in order to overcome the limitations when carrying out controls at sea. The general principle of freedom at high sea, rather than partitioning it out among states, literally that the sea was a common and free space which “belonged to” - and could be used by - everybody. In contrast, every vessel suspected of transporting illegal migrants is now considered a “virtual border” subject to controls conducted through the most advanced military equipment. On the one hand, this example demonstrates how borders are not only constituted by physical barriers but become increasingly “virtual” by spreading across spaces previously considered “free”. At the same time, it reveals a function of borders which is often overlooked: the very act of dividing the earth and the sea surface by tracing borders whether they are physical, virtual or legal also allows for the appropriation of its resources. However, the resource which borders appropriate is not simply the portioned territory. Rather, it is also the subjective claim of people to freedom of movement the territory which is seen as theirs and the kind of relation they wish to establish with this territory. In other words, borders transform people’s claims to movement in a resource which can be appropriated and exchanged. EU migration policies exploit and make people’s mobility through agreements which represent a new stage of legal warfare for both states those which collaborate in combating illegal migration. The reasons, it was done, it is the movements decided. A continent for better or worse divided.

Borders Are There To Be Undermined...

Nobordercamp 2005 in Greece...

As a European citizen you will probably have the idea of holidays, beaches, sun and no problem of crossing the greek borders. But this is not a reality for everyone! If you heard any state advertisement during the Olympic games about traditional greek hospitality, do not believe a word! Greece is a country full of migrants trying to find better living conditions. As a frontline of the European Union, thousands refugees try to enter every year the greek borders.

The ones that survive sinking in the Aegean or getting killed by the mines or the border guards in Egypt (or in South Africa) are released in detention camps until they are deported - very often illegally. But even if they achieve to get into the country, they have very little chance to have a better life: for 2002 more than 6,000 people asked for asylum but only 36 were accepted as refugees. In 2004 only 3 applications were accepted, a percentage of 0,07%. Thousands of people live in detention camps, under IOM, will be more and more restricted. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle. Italy, Malta (where the ship had stopped) and Germany handed the turning back principle.

For these reasons we invite all of you to participate to a NO BORDER camp that is going to be held in greece the summer of 2005.

For contact: noborderproject@yahoo.groups.com

www.noborder.org

Freedom of movement and settlement are basic human rights. Migration is a fact, its autonomy cannot be regulated, as states and transnational corporations are well aware. In consequence of economic exploitation, political repression and war but also of the legitimate interest of people to find better or different living conditions. Free movement for everyone must become a reality. It will be fought by any means necessary.
Detention and deportation camps for foreigners have been in function in Europe for decades. Along with the externalisation policies and the degradation of asylum procedures, these camps have become a major tool for these policies, and a place for migrants struggles and resistance.

In February 2003, Tony Blair sends to his European partners a report on the creation of Transit Process Centres, camps outside EU borders to contain asylum seekers during the processing of their claims by UNHCR, while IOM looks after the so-called "disappearances" in Libya, Morocco, Ukraine and Albania are mentioned. At Verona informal JHA Council (March 2003), the English project is favorably welcomed by several countries, and above all by UNHCR Libber. But Thessaloniki European Council (June 2003) temporarily postpones it without including it. UK is invited to proceed to "small scale experiments" with other countries, and a few months later negotiates with Tanzania, of course in exchange of an increase of financial help, the opening of camps for Somali refugees denied asylum in UK (Tanzania declined, Denmark has considered sending its asylum seekers in East Africa).

What is at stake here is to export beyond European borders the responsibility European member states have towards that international commitments - here concerning refugees protection - and towards the consequences of their own immigration policies. Management of the camps, under IOM, will be more and more subcontracted to multinational companies such as Group4 Falk, which manages IOM Unaccompanied Minors Agent by the French, Morocco, Ukraine and Albania are mentioned. At Verona informal JHA Council (March 2003), the English project is favorably welcomed by several countries, and above all by UNHCR Libber. But Thessaloniki European Council (June 2003) temporarily postpones it without including it. UK is invited to proceed to "small scale experiments" with other countries, and a few months later negotiates with Tanzania, of course in exchange of an increase of financial help, the opening of camps for Somali refugees denied asylum in UK (Tanzania declined, Denmark has considered sending its asylum seekers in East Africa).

Two tragedies served as pretext, while the European Commission’s renewal was renewed and Libya became everyone’s darling (especially high-tech suppliers).

On July 11th, Cap Anamur, a ship belonging to a German NGO, is authorized for “humanitarian” reasons to dock in Sicily, 20 days after having rescued 156 refugees (in January, in the port of Tanger, in Libya and Sicily, the 37 passengers of a sinking ship, the Italian authorities had been forbidding the docking since July 1st, sooming the non-return of boat rescuers, now the ship had stopped), and Germany handed the responsibility to another another to another another another another one, to another other another one, to another other another one, the states are acting "on their own" on the Convenio Geneva, Nice, Carta and Italian Constitution. These three EU member states, with their independent institutions, insisted on the fact that “humanitarian urgency” was impossible to meet for fear of creating a “dangerous precedent which would lead to numerous abuses.” They also misinterpreted for their benefit Dublin II, which says that in order to determine the state responsible for examining the asylum request, the request must first be presented in a EU member state. The refugees are sent from one CPT to another, then eventually deported to Libya (although ECHR had forbidden their deportation); three memos which the NGO asked for “helping illegal immigration”, Roberto Castelli, Italian minister of Justice and member of the Lega dei Nord/talks of terrorism. Otto Schily, German minister of the Interior realises this interpretation is wrong, so asked that EU opens camps for asylum seekers in North Africa.

A few weeks later, on August 2nd, the German camp is inaugurated, it receives as a first passengers of a small boat which had left Libya a week earlier (with a few weeks after, for supplies and for 2 days, 700 agents of the Italian police had leak 28 others. After the docking in Sicily the migrants are imprisoned, while Italian authorities had been forbidding the docking since July 1st, sooming the non-return of boat rescuers, now the ship had stopped), and Germany handed the responsibility to another another another one, to another other another one, to another other another one, the states are acting "on their own" on the Convenio Geneva, Nice, Carta and Italian Constitution. These three EU member states, with their independent institutions, insisted on the fact that “humanitarian urgency” was impossible to meet for fear of creating a “dangerous precedent which would lead to numerous abuses.” They also misinterpreted for their benefit Dublin II, which says that in order to determine the state responsible for examining the asylum request, the request must first be presented in a EU member state. The refugees are sent from one CPT to another, then eventually deported to Libya (although ECHR had forbidden their deportation); three memos which the NGO asked for “helping illegal immigration”, Roberto Castelli, Italian minister of Justice and member of the Lega dei Nord/talks of terrorism. Otto Schily, German minister of the Interior realises this interpretation is wrong, so asked that EU opens camps for asylum seekers in North Africa.

A few weeks later, on August 2nd, the German camp is inaugurated, it receives as a first passengers of a small boat which had left Libya a week earlier (with a few weeks after, for supplies and for 2 days, 700 agents of the Italian police had leak 28 others. After the docking in Sicily the migrants are imprisoned, while Italian authorities had been forbidding the docking since July 1st, sooming the non-return of boat rescuers, now the ship had stopped), and Germany handed the responsibility to another another another one, to another other another one, to another other another one, the states are acting "on their own" on the Convenio Geneva, Nice, Carta and Italian Constitution. These three EU member states, with their independent institutions, insisted on the fact that “humanitarian urgency” was impossible to meet for fear of creating a “dangerous precedent which would lead to numerous abuses.” They also misinterpreted for their benefit Dublin II, which says that in order to determine the state responsible for examining the asylum request, the request must first be presented in a EU member state. The refugees are sent from one CPT to another, then eventually deported to Libya (although ECHR had forbidden their deportation); three memos which the NGO asked for “helping illegal immigration”, Roberto Castelli, Italian minister of Justice and member of the Lega dei Nord/talks of terrorism. Otto Schily, German minister of the Interior realises this interpretation is wrong, so asked that EU opens camps for asylum seekers in North Africa.

Migreurop

http://www.migreurop.org/

is an initiative of European activists (individuals, researchers or associations) who want to provide information for discussion and action against foreigners camps, asylum detention centres and the projects. A first output is a map of foreigners camps in Europe, regularly updated and stemming from the collaboration of several European groups (for the time being in French, English and Italian).

A l’interieur de l’exterieur, et invernerse

Michel Foucault, Histoire de la folie A l’Age classique

(Boisi-Fire law, 2001).

In France, the legal concept of administrative detention goes back to 1810; the centres de rétention (detention centers for foreigners waiting to be deported) were created in 1981 by the socialist loi Guéant. Some of them already existed in the 30’s or the 50’s, as a proof of the permanence of the administration.

In French, Italian and English camps, there are riots and escaps, there are scarce and hectic communications between the inmates and the activists outside. “No qui, no alto”, “(therefore here nor elsewhere)”; the motto of the Torino demonstration against CPT (Nov 30th, 2002) is indissociable from freedom of movement, ‘there and everywhere’.
Contemporary migration is characterised by a relatively autonomous search by migrants for work and remittances which enables them to build, other temporarily or permanently, a better existence. We know that migrants are pulled everywhere at work. They often have to carry out very precise tasks in the worst conditions, but it is equally true that they are willing, also migrating, to work to a degree of mobility that has, in some cases, to compensate for the rigidity of labour supply, thanks to their capacity to go in search of work.

The rhetoric which describes migrants simply as a necessity for the most advanced economic systems ends up corroborating the demands of the labour market, and thus completely taking in as a subjective decision to adapt to the needs of capital. When this point is viewed as adopted, we are only a short step away from norms such as those proposed today in Europe by EU guidelines. In the first place, the assumption that the labour market offers only one ‘actor’ with the realistic ability to assimilate its own demands: capital. The underlying fact is that the labour market is not a market and it can only exist thanks to a political authorization in the form of norms which institutionalise it by denying legitimacy to any claim other than the basic contract in force where one’s labour is exchanged for pay. On the other hand, in this context, the awareness that the level of pay can neither be easily negotiated, because, as an expression of a political relationship of power and therefore not determined by mere individual negotiation, this tends to be imposed by whoever supplies labour.

For migrants, this institutionalised authority ‘labour’ market therefore means the continual reproduction of the conditions surrounding their exploitation, and so the passing through administrative departments is it ultimately tied to the position that the labour ‘market’ allows them to occupy. Inside Europe, detention centres cease being places of ‘legal exceptions’ to become social institutions, which in their turn displaced a significant role in the regulation of the presence of migrants. This is even more readily for one thinks that these centres are increasingly packed during regular large demonstrations, crises, and become the destination for migrants who dare raise questions over their jobs.

When not dominated by racism and security issues, the destiny of non-citizens of migrants becomes a debate over the migrant question, the response to which is above all integration: migrants ought to be recognized as citizens, albeit a particular kind, who should enjoy the rights assigned to every citizen as well as others which would guarantee the continuity of their history and their ‘culture’. We do not want to deny here that integration makes the life of migrants more tolerable, supporting and validating the subsistence provided by the various communities as well as acknowledging them ways of accessing rights. But any communitarian integration is the administrative assignment of individuals to assumed communities, with the conviction that who is not European necessarily belongs to a community, to a culture, to an ethnicity. This forced identity has many material effects in the possibility of accessing particular services. Moreover, the integration of separate communities confirms the presence of women and men as foreign bodies, collected in communities, which are ultimately placed in competition with each other, and it legitimates mechanisms to reproduce ‘precarious integration’ ‘legalisation’ that today characterizes the socio-governing of immigration. The contradiction is striking: not only should rights be won that are materially denied in labour, i.e. Other rights, but the very instrument chosen to obtain this compensation - i.e. rights - are attacked and increasingly eroded by the capitalist offensive and the reordering of internal relationships within the workplace.

As a result, the acknowledgement that labour is not and can no longer be the terrain that establishes the criteria of legitimacy for the claiming and the satisfaction of the needs of citizenship is at the same time compounded by an indifference to the limits posed by the labour market, the dislocation of the specific levels of social citizenship that work had previously guaranteed to those, even those generally included in civil and political citizenship.

We therefore need to analyse from the strategies and conditions of migrant’s mobility and labour and to avoid conceiving them either as a mere abstraction that is only endowed with rights or as weak subjects incoherently taken action. We do not believe that migrants, as in the case of precarious workers in general, are a set of subjects connoted by a natural political persuasion and by nature destined to submit the order of labour. If these answers are a reality of presence in a constellation of contemporary labour, and is it this last point to which we must begin if we want to capture the contradictions and possibilities.

Migrant labour means acknowledging that however shackled to labour, migrants anticipate a number of conflicts that regard contemporary labour as a whole. Migrants are not nomadic subjects which satisfy the image of someone who is more or less permanently present in western societies. They cross borders not to assert some abstract right of movement: in doing so they pay the price for the devaluation of their labour capacity, but at the same time they connect labour conditions and forms of existence which exist in spite of borders and barriers.

Migrant labour is therefore directly implicated in contemporary social production. It can represent the possibility of overturning the usual way of thinking about and conducting political work with migrants, at the same time as allowing us to perceive the general forms which social production is assuming. We believe that considering migrants a “weak” subject, only on the basis of the condition of daily social and work personal, risks neglecting the claim for freedom which is central to the decision to migrate and which also persists, in spite of all the adverse conditions, on arrival. Moreover, viewing migrants merely as subjects deprived of rights and citizenship means to still think that there is a condition of full employment of those rights that they must obtain. This route of integration conceives the indelible mark of the national construction of systems of rights, and is also involves a demand to be integrated into the national framework of the recognition of labour. Secondly, it takes for certain that this recognition will continue and that it provides a space where labour can politically count. It is obviously a different matter when rights and citizenship act as the arena of political communication between individuals who, in a common search for freedom, place into question, first of all, their differences without ever letting themselves be homogenised and enclosed within legal and national boundaries.

Talking about migrant labour means first of all commencing from the concrete conditions of the distribution of the migrant labour force from factories of varying sizes to families who employ domestic workers and home helpers, to the “green factories” of Italy and Spain, to forms of self-employment, it is clear that different conditions of pay and control correspond to these various forms of work. What unites them is the fact that the migrant worker is forced to endure a condition of social and political insecurity that is neither occasional nor temporary. We believe that migrant labour today is a condition that anticipates and shares the general conditions under which contemporary labour as a whole is distributed. In this sense it can be said that all contemporary labour is becoming migrant. It is certainly true that the jobs of migrants are generally carried out under conditions of precariousness, flexibility, and under the continual threat of blackmail and that this is on the way to becoming, and for most parts already is, the hallmark of all contemporary labour. This very condition has shown that by now the limit is not only not weak if one considers legal guarantees, but ultimately it does not exist if one considers the elements of social and employment precariousness which are intrinsic to both permanent contracts in both the private and public sector. There are certainly specificities which should not be forgotten. The jobs of migrants run the risk of being branded as “black skinned work” and, even when skin colour makes no difference, as a job through which they may be discriminated, imprisoned and expelled only on the grounds of being foreign.

The very fact that migrant labour, by anticipating the general condition of contemporary labour, demonstrates the specific tendencies of crisis of this regulation of social production.

A clearly visible tendency is the tension that migrant labour imposes on trade union regulations of conflicts. We are witnessing a strong demand for unionization on the part of migrants. However, migrants in the world of employment are considered “workers like all the others” whose particular problems should be resolved at a different level. Although a large part of European laws on migrants establish the forms of control and control over the labour market, the limits that these laws impose on the movement of migrants are never treated as “limits” on their labour activity, but as seriously damaging their general rights. The sense of solitude of migrants reflects and highlights the tension between the increasing individuality of contemporary labour and the difficulty of finding general avenues of political communication between struggles. What migrant labour understates, like workers on short-term contracts or the case of female labour, is the impossibility of organizing workers’ struggles on the premise of a unitary subject which is no other than a citizen at work. The political sense they are making cannot be reduced to a job or to a citizenship. They are looking for something more.

Talking about migrant labour means first of all commencing from the concrete of the distribution of the migrant labour force from factories of varying sizes to families who employ domestic workers and home helpers, to the “green factories” of Italy and Spain, to forms of self-employment, it is clear that different conditions of pay and control correspond to these various forms of work. What unites them is the fact that the migrant worker is forced to endure a condition of social and political insecurity that is neither occasional nor temporary. We believe that migrant labour today is a condition that anticipates and shares the general conditions under which contemporary labour as a whole is distributed. In this sense it can be said that all contemporary labour is becoming migrant. It is certainly true that the jobs of migrants are generally carried out under conditions of precariousness, flexibility, and under the continual threat of blackmail and that this is on the way to becoming, and for most parts already is, the hallmark of all contemporary labour. This very condition has shown that by

Not simply a job. Does Migrant Labour make political sense?

This Tuesday — logs on migration, labor, transnational organizing - gathers best-practice information about organizations, projects and campaigns mobilizing and researching contingent and migrant labor.
The Claim for Rights & The Right for Legalisation

Spain let the foreigners in! was the headline of Germany's latest daily. Taz: some weakness. The Taz was praising the latest plan by the new Social Democrats (Spain) Government for a new special regularization. One million "sin papeles" should get the chance to regularize their position. The Taz wrote nothing about the ridiculous conditions governing the procedure. If the migrants sin papeles will have to show a one-year employment contract with Tae. In order to get a residence permit. Also the latest Italian regularization law from November 2002 links residence permits to a work contract. It demands migrants to provide evidence of social insurance contributions for the last two years at least. If, as in most cases, the work was done irregularly then the employer could retroactively pay the social insurance in order to legalize the work contract. However, as employers are rarely charity organizations they later demand repayment from the employee. This turn reinforces the dependence on the employer and hence results in even more precarious labour and living conditions for migrants. As soon as the employer cancels the contract, the employee loses her/his residence permit.

Against this background the Spanish movement "papeleras para todos y todas" rejects the governmental plan of regularization because of the institutional linking of a work contract and residence permit. They occupied the cathedral of Barcelona with 200 of their own "papeleras" and the same rights and obligations like everybody. (www.barcelona.indymedia.org/news/ampil

Also in Italy numerous protests took place the last days against the new regularization laws. First and foremost, the demands were adressed to the incapacity of the employers to employ workers and to re-establish an employment relationship and independence from a work contract. The continuing occupations - such as this year one for the Freight Sevrot, in Paris by 800 sans papiers of the sans paper movement in France which 5 years ago have forced the last government to enact a regularization program. This demonstration that the governmental regulations are far too limited. As Andrea Gorf said: "The right to have rights has expired from labour mark." We have to recognise that neither the right of incorporation nor the development and identity formation can any longer take place in the hands of the employer. The task is to change society in this regard.

However, the Taz is right in one thing. In contrast to Southern European immigration and to the structural class obstacles which periodically use regularisations as central instrument of their migration policy, Germany refuses any regularisation up to now. Even under the contemporary red-green coalition government only few speak about the need of regularisation. Also the leftist movements in Germany rejected the claim for regularization in the last twenty years of anti-racista struggles with the argumentation that the demands for regularization is too state centred and too legalistic.

The Autonomy of migration

In contrast to the rhetoric offorty Europe thousands of people daily transgress and infringe the external borders of the EU. Thirty countries in search of happiness, work, and security. Quite often at the cost of regularization and bodily and psychological damage. They practice what we can call "autonomy of migration and social movement which can not be controlled by various state’s policies of sealing-off of borders and which can not be reduced only to statistical calculations. These so called "illegal" migrants a genuine feature of the new European migration regime - are nowadays counted as one of the central targets of the migration policies of the EU and its member states, as the "offical" statistics which are released at every EU summit demand to take an increasingly tough stance in the "fight against irregular migration".

The most recent Study on the connection between legal and illegal migration (4.6.2004; KOM(2004)12) by the EU Commission even rejects the policy of regularization because in their view it does not lead to a reduction of illegal or irregular migrants. Rather governmental regularization programs are seen as additional "pull factors." The study firmly underlines this point. The Commission stresses that governmental regulations can not be interpreted as a politically binding instruments for regularising movements. Hence, it emphasizes the recomandations of a community based approach which conformed to the large scale regularization programs of the member states. As it is shown in order to get a residence permit. In spite of all these state attempts to restrict migratory movements migration takes and will take place every day. The only question is under which conditions?! And here the claim for rights - the right to have rights, becomes relevant and gains not only political strength but also the potential for a general change of the basic mechanisms of capitalist societies organized in nation states. By transcending the refugees borders migration challenges conventional notions of citizenship as well as national legal frameworks and opens up a new space for a practice of rights which reach far beyond the historically known constitutional settings.

The claim for rights translates the notion of autonomy of migration into a concrete political practice. It refutes the abstraction and demand for open borders by connecting it to the everyday life of the migratory stratum of survival in Schengenland: the right to housing, education, health services, work, etc.

Thereby the claim for rights does not concern the rights of the sans papiers but marks the basic relationship of the European nation state and the social movement against this general. Gradually all migrants are affected by these rights. In Germany the asylum residence status from the labour contract demand papers independent of the employee-employer relationship and independence from a work contract. The continuing occupations - such as this year one for the Freight Sevrot, in Paris by 800 sans papiers of the sans paper movement in France which 5 years ago have forced the last government to enact a regularization program. This demonstration that the governmental regulations are far too limited. As Andrea Gorf said: "The right to have rights has expired from labour mark." We have to recognise that neither the right of incorporation nor the development and identity formation can any longer take place in the hands of the employer. The task is to change society in this regard.

However, the Taz is right in one thing. In contrast to Southern European immigration and to the structural class obstacles which periodically use regularisations as central instrument of their migration policy, Germany refuses any regularisation up to now. Even under the contemporary red-green coalition government only few speak about the need of regularisation. Also the leftist movements in Germany rejected the claim for regularization in the last twenty years of anti-racista struggles with the argumentation that the demands for regularization is too state centred and too legalistic.

Moreover the fight for the right to have rights becomes relevant and gains not only political strength but also the potential for a general change of the basic mechanisms of capitalist societies organized in nation states. By transcending the refugees borders migration challenges conventional notions of citizenship as well as national legal frameworks and opens up a new space for a practice of rights which reach far beyond the historically known constitutional settings.

Regularisation is not enough!

Reaching for the unknown

Many leftists and anti-racists activists consider of little relevance a right for rights because of the limits of the existing regularization programs. In contrast to this, at a recent European wide networking meeting in Venice not only the ESI in London delegates from the movement of the sans papiers (France), the sin papeles (Spain), of the comitato immigranti (Italy), and the association for the rights of legalisation and karakat attic (Germany) took a different stance of regularization policies on the basis of their experiences. Legislation of legal regularization is not enough. However, witnessing them the situation of the sans papier in Spain.

The existing regularization policies open up more chances and spaces for our migratory daily lives and struggles. Precisely the limits of the regularization policies mark an endless space of struggles which edges can be constantly questioned and widened by regular and irregular means. Also the new political spaces speaking up open the political and social realm to construct and negotiate our political subjectivity. The regularisations are highly differentiated in regard to the rights they offer, their conditions and policies. For example: Do they give only temporary or durable work and/or residence permits; do they provide free, reaching social and political citizenship rights and the recognition of migrants as legal subjects?

The concurring believe was that these governmental procedures of regularization, however diverse they might be, have to be distinguished from the struggle for the right to have rights in its broader social context. It was quite a big confusion at the European networking meeting how this whole question should be called and how to name the essential claim. The confusion was not reduced only by the limited space of discussion. Because the notions of rights or citizenship have such a diverent history with different connotations in the different European countries but also because the aim is to transcend the historically known outcome of national or European citizenship rights. We have to think of something new - something between cosmopolitan rights and rights deriving from the residence. Since migration as a
Speaking of Autonomy of Migration...
Racism and Struggles of Migration

No one right in his or her mind would argue that migration takes place in a realm of peace and freedom. No one imagines a migrant calculating the degree of utilization on the global labour market in the morning, deciding on a country of immigration in the afternoon and enjoying the fruits of mobility ever since. The way how racist and fascists would like to see it when they call us the parasites of the European welfare system. The opposite is true: the process of privileging certain migrants goes together with the exclusion of others. Whether they appear as Acts and policy statements or through checks in pedestrian prefects, in train stations and on the streets, they all steal time and space from the people. To say nothing of the attacks on life and limb, that are an increasingly everyday reality everywhere in Europe. This is not only the business of jungle law on the streets, but also one of state asylum and deportation centres. Recently it has been criticized that the concept of Autonomy of migration ignores this misery and the conditions of migration. Is this true? Can we not criticize racist, postcolonial and capitalist structures when we talk about Autonomy of Migration? How can we fight those who white wash and tell us that racism has watered down in modern societies? What role does racism play in Europe today?
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Tavolo Migranti dei Sociali Forum Italiani
Tavolo_migranti@libero.it

Since Genoa 98 until today, Tavolo Migranti has connected a wide and different network of subjects fighting against the Italian xenophobia more than 100 (Writers of Fini Law), and the conditions of living into whose migrants are forced by the progressive dismantling of work and social guarantees. We are not a unitary structure. We comprehend a large spectrum of organizations and groups that have engaged in different parts of Italy, but during the last three years we promoted some political initiatives moving from a common political assumption: a radical rejection of the Borsi-Fini Law and of the connection which it institutes between the visa and the job contract. The “contratto di soggiorno per lavoro” forces migrants into the acceptance of every kind of work condition to avoid clandestinity and detention. For these reasons, Tavolo Migranti’s political initiatives have always been concentrated around the mists of a radical NO to “Contratto di soggiorno per lavoro”; N/O to detention centres. The first issue has been the core of one of the most important mobilisation organized in the framework of Tavolo, the Vicenza. Migrant Work Strike, on May 2002: more than 20.000 were in strike and 10.000 were on the streets against the Borsi-Fini law project. The struggle against detention centres knew its most important episode in May 2003, the so-called “invasion”, by the people of the Frasainit no-border camp promoted by Tavolo, of the Italian Palae detention centre, inside which some of the former detainees were forced. After two days the center has been closed. Three months ago, several subjects with Tavolo “invaded” the centre that Italian authorities are building near the city of Gradioca, on the Italian eastern border. The action demonstrated the adoption of a position favourable to the closure by the local government, and the centre is still not open. After January 31st European demonstration against detention centres, we connected in Italy a wide migratory movement protest against the visas-renew policies of territorial Police. The local demonstration focused on determined to reverse the revision of the Borsi-Fini Law by the Italian Central Government, but the struggle is still open to obtain the abrogation of the law.

Genova, May 2003. The protests against the Genoa 98 summit begin with a loud and massive yell. The cheery crowd atop at three highly symbolic land- and sea-markers: the Genoa, Organization of Migrant (OMI), the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO), and the World Trade Organisation (WTO). The media brightly highlights the discourse of the OMI’s Freedom of Movement and Freedom of Information, “Free Movement and Open Sources” and “Freedom of Movement and Against Global Migration Management.”

The symbolic message is clear. A clamor for free access to the virtual commons of knowledge and the physical commons of geography. While profoundly globalised, global migrations are opposing the enclosures of these commons through global governance. In Genoa, we challenged a global migration management which cares for the needs of the global and exploitative labour markets at the IOM and proclaimed the autonomy of migration. We protested against the regulation of patents, copyright and licences at the WTO in solidarity with software developers and indigenous farmers and for ourselves. We showed once again our common and with the neoliberal trade rules pushed by the WTO.

However: is the connection between free movement and free communication on the global protest circuit more than an addition of claims? More than a tactical link between movements as different as migration, activism and hacking/coding? Can it be seen as a powerful combination of specific everyday practices and political struggles?

The temporary association “everyone is an expert” suggests to see the fights for freedom of migration and informational self-determination “as driving forces in the process of shaping an anthropological multiplicity.” Optimistically, the website claims that movements of migrants in autonomy are undermining the global hierarchies of the labour market and the technologically enhanced border-regimes, constituting “a catalyst for a globalisation from below.” Equally, insisting on freedom of communication is seen as an attack on the enclosure of knowledge through intellectual property rights, licences and patents, undermining the “global hierarchies of knowledge” and question the logic of valuation and paid labor.

A year earlier, at the European bordercamp in Strasbourg, a diverse crowd of geeks, artists, media-activists and anti-racists conducted similar parades and juxtaposed the use of ICT by the East and Empire. People move across a physical and virtual borders. People push the electronic frontier through digital and physical communication. States and multinationals are enforcing control of both flows. Information technology is part of the free-floating culture of resistance and a tool to develop a society of seeming control. A deeply wrong, our picture was conjured: “The border regime is imploding, turning into a flexible system of Restricted Detention Centers and restricted residency for migrants, stop and search for black youth, traffic in intelligence and surveillance for muslims, databases for all” (s.d. sec. call).

On a practical level, both freedoms are merging already. Global movements rely heavily on freedom of communication in their practices within a communication space opened up through internet, free software, peer to peer technologies etc. Grassroots activism wasn’t it what is today without the myriads of email-lists, web-platforms, audio- and videostreams, as well as handheld-devices from mobile phones to PDAs. Based on free software, many of these tools can be adapted to the needs of the moment and don’t cost money. No wonder that the day-to-day communications are leading to political struggles against the wider issue of digital rights management and so-called intellectual property rights in the fields of biological technology, music industry and more. At the same time, the free software community enters the political stage not only with online demos and practical support, but also by lobbying against the taking to life streets. Within the wider social movement of migrants, access to all these fancy tools are finding ways to access the digital communication channels.

Fadaiat/Hackitectura are extending the claim from “freedom of communication/information” to “freedom of knowledge”, and they insert “work” in their analysis. In this framework, the connections appear more organic. Reappropriation and sharing of knowledge constitutes the nucleus of (not entirely) new and immaterial forms of production: from the organization of networks to information and production management. The free software model, based on social cooperation, collective intelligence and communitarian property, constitutes a powerful referent for thinking about livelihoods, forms of producing and their emancipatory, even revolutionary potentials.

Production is happening globally, its networks are distributed beyond local and national borders. The reappropriation of work and its products implies freedom of movement, to achieve equal access to opportunities and wealth.

Control of knowledge and control of mobility (through borders, visa, work permits, digital rights management, copyrights etc.) are two of the main modes of postmodern capitalism to capture social wealth.

Since all of us, to a certain degree, are global and immigrant workers, these two freedoms are fusing into a single one. The freedom and the right to live a full life. Our task is to inform the commons and fight the battle in a thousand assembled humans.

An activist from indymedia estrecho sums it up: Knowledge can’t survive, and can’t evolve, without movement – this is one single demand that affects the worlds we live in, physical spaces, geopolitical spaces, and the way we want to construct them.

For digital and physical bordercrossers! Or, as the Zapatistas say... “Para Todos Tudo”

Indymedia Estrecho / Madiag
Disobeying the Border
To Construct An_Other Territory / http://estrecho.indymedia.org

The Indymedia Estrecho / Madiag, Indymedia of the Straits of Gibraltar, one of the main nodes of the global media network and founded in 2003, is involved in the process of defining a new strategic and political space for bottom-up cooperation between movements and organizations that are fighting for the right to meet, to organize, to create a space for bottom-up cooperation between movements and organizations that are fighting for the right to meet, to organize, to create a space for bottom-up cooperation between movements and organizations that are fighting for the right to meet, to organize, to create a space for bottom-up cooperation between movements and organizations that are fighting for the right to meet, to organize, to create a space. The idea is to create a transnational, transcontinental space, that can react to the demands of resistance to global capitalism/immigration.

The Indymedia of the Straits project has arisen from the need to create a space for communication, encounter, and struggle for the right to life. In the desire to break into each other how we can begin to work together. We plan to a space that is not the virtual, and political frontier that separates us apart, separates emerging processes and new forms of conflict, and to produce a new space, encompassing both in the Andalusia / Southern Border of Europe and the Maghreb. We think of the project as a project of a political-communicaonal space crossing the border, ever that will be built of cooperation and grassroots democracy across the two shores. It is a project of political anthropomorphism, of mutual diplomatic from below creating synergies among rebellious realities; rather than a project, Indymedia Madiag aims to be a safe place within the biopolitical networks of precarious, immortal and imagination workers/scouring the Straits.

The geo-strategic requirement that neoliberal globalization involves, made the Strait of Gibraltar an entry point in the imperial project. The southern frontier presents, controls and distributions at the entrance to Fortress Europe, that leads off the multinational migrant workforce and subsists a migrant in a dysregulation by subordinated controls, the blackmail of residence permits, expels their total defenselessness in labour issues, and denies fundamental rights.

The Straits is a controlled frontier that makes use of the most sophisticated European information, control, and security systems (such as the SS - Schengen Information System), from which migrants daily exercise their right to escape in search of dignity. A border that year after year is traversed by thousands of persons.

A border worthy of disdain/joy!

RELATED PRO JECTS:
Indymedia Canarias: http://canarias.indymedia.org
Red / Chabaa “Dos Drilas”: http://zetecia.org
Ginebra: freedom from movement/freedom of knowledge: http://fsfs.org
Mapping madiaq territory: http://maps.indymedia.net/?c=spain/ga

Disobeying the Border
The Frassanito Network is composed by people from:

Tavolo Migranti dei social forum italiani; Immigrati in Movimento Napoli / Italy; Act Up-Paris / France; noborder London / Britain; indymedia estrecho / Madrid / Spain; Network for social support to immigrants and refugees / Greece; Kanak Attak / Germany; no one is illegal-amplitude / Germany; Association for Legalisation / Germany ...

Following people have contributed to this newspaper:

Teresa Arozena, Manuela Bojadzijev, Nicholas Dines, Marion Hamm, Sabine Hess, Frank John, Serhat Kanakayali, Paul Keller, Hagen Kopp, Olga Lafazani, Sandro Mezzadra, Jose Perez de Lama, Stef, Maurizio Ricciardi, Enrica Rigo, Paola Rudan, Isabelle Saint-Saens, Nicholas Dines, Marion Hamm, Sabine Hess, Frank John, Serhat Kanakayali, Paul Keller, Hagen Kopp, Olga Lafazani, Sandro Mezzadra, Jose Perez de Lama, Stef, Maurizio Ricciardi, Enrica Rigo, Paola Rudan, Isabelle Saint-Saens, Nicholas Dines, Marion Hamm, Sabine Hess, Frank John, Serhat Kanakayali, Paul Keller, Hagen Kopp, Olga Lafazani, Sandro Mezzadra, Jose Perez de Lama, Stef, Maurizio Ricciardi, Enrica Rigo, Paola Rudan, Isabelle Saint-Saens, Nicholas Dines, Marion Hamm, Sabine Hess, Frank John, Serhat Kanakayali, Paul Keller, Hagen Kopp, Olga Lafazani, Sandro Mezzadra, Jose Perez de Lama, Stef, Maurizio Ricciardi, Enrica Rigo, Paola Rudan, Isabelle Saint-Saens, Nicholas Dines, Marion Hamm, Sabine Hess, Frank John, Serhat Kanakayali, Paul Keller, Hagen Kopp, Olga Lafazani, Sandro Mezzadra.

The Frassanito Network has been taken from a place in Puglia, in the south of Italy, where a “NoBorder” camp was held last summer. During seven days we have organized many debates and workshops, but also some actions, most notably an action against a detention center close to Bari (Bari Palese). This action created conditions which allowed some migrants to escape.

The idea of this camp was discussed among activists, mainly from Germany and Italy, who had organized a meeting on migration during the first European Social Forum in Florence.

After the camp, we decided to build a very loose network, sharing a common approach: We consider migration as a social movement and see the role of migrants’ struggles as crucial for the further development of the entire global movement.

Many of us were among the organizers of workshops and assemblies at the ESF in Paris, where we met many other groups and networks.

After the experience of the 1st day of Europeanwide actions on 31st of January 2004, we began to discuss about a follow-up of this initiative and the ESF in London. We felt that it would be very important to organize a preliminary meeting in September, to exchange ideas and to further and deepen the process of networking.

As a practical result of this meeting we made many appointments for activities inside the ESF as well as in the various autonomous spaces (see the calendar on this page). Based on these preconditions, debates, projects and actions related to migration can gain another level of awareness in the global movement on one hand, and a much more transnational character on the other hand. Both seems to be necessary, if we want to go further in the struggle for freedom of movement.

Our contactadress: frassainfo@kein.org
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