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Abstract

Emigration is considered by sociologists an activity that has existed since the beginning of human life, occurs during modern times, and will most likely continue in the future. Having immigrated twice to the United States, I had a natural interest to investigate and learn more about Italian emigration, with particular attention to the current situation. Through the reading of books, journal and newspaper articles, and listening to the news on both Italian and American television, I was able to collect reliable information, which has guided me in writing this personal and historical account of Italian emigration. This thesis explores the exodus of millions of Italians, particularly of those living in the south, covering the following major periods: the Great Atlantic Wave emigration from Italy to the United States from the 1880s to the 1920s; the emigration from Italy to other European countries, the Americas, and Oceania following WWII to the 1960s; and the current exodus of many young educated Italians, called “the brain drain” by sociologists. This study also delves into the unexpected wave of immigration, mainly from Eastern Europe and North Africa, that began to affect Italy from the 1970s and continues to date. From my own personal experience, including that of family and friends, and from the findings of sociologists, the study investigates those factors that lead to the acculturation and assimilation of immigrants to the receiving country. In trying to understand Italy’s current situation, this study further probes into the many problems the country faces in the 21st century and explores possible solutions to manage, on the one hand, the incessant wave of emigration from Northern African countries and, on the other, the constant exodus of young educated people from Italy.
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Introduction – A Dual Experience

It was a hot mid-July morning when an Alitalia plane arrived at J. F. K. airport in New York City. The plane had left Milan nine hours earlier carrying with it a full flight of passengers; some were returning Americans from their holiday in Italy, others were Italians who had left their country to immigrate to the United States. It was in the hot summer of 1965 that my family and I first set foot on American soil. My father Sebastiano, my mother Nunziatina, my sister Linda, four years old, and my brother Tony, sixteen months, and I had left Catania airport very early in the morning to move to the United States via Milan. Many relatives, neighbors and friends had come to the airport to say good-bye; after all, we weren’t going on vacation, but were leaving our country for good, or so it seemed to me at the time. During the flight my little sister wanted to get off the plane, and I kept asking when we would arrive. My little brother of sixteen months was the only one who didn’t talk. My parents looked at each other perplexed and disheartened, as if asking: What are we doing? Where are we going? Are we doing the right thing for our family?

My father had obtained a work visa as a tailor a few months earlier. In the United States there was a great demand for tailors at the time. Therefore, it was fairly easy to find an employer to sponsor him. My aunt Nettie, my father’s aunt on his father’s side, was our co-sponsor, which meant she would provide a residence for us and would help us, in case of need. Before moving to the United States, my father Sebastiano had a successful business in our hometown of Carlentini in Sicily, making custom-made suits from scratch. The town of Carlentini is located on top of a hill on the eastern coast of Sicily; between the cities of Catania, to the north, and
Siracusa, to the south. It is an agricultural center and producer of citrus fruits (among the best oranges in the world), olives and cereals. Sicily is rich in art and history, as it has been conquered by many peoples: Phoenicians, Arabs, Greeks, Spanish, Normans, to mention a few, who left part of their culture and language behind. Sicily has always been behind economically, compared to the north of Italy, and, therefore, has always had a long history of emigration, as we shall see in later chapters.

My father had learned to sew as an apprentice at the young age of ten. When he was twenty-nine years old our family moved to Bologna, where he obtained a very coveted diploma, called “Forbici D’oro”, or golden scissors. We stayed there only two years and returned to Sicily, where my father opened his own tailor shop. With the expertise he had gained in Bologna my father had perfected his tailoring skills and had obtained a good clientele in our hometown in Sicily. He cut and sewed suits to fit even those who had physical defects like a lower shoulder or a hunchback.

My father’s business went very well until the early 1960s when manufactured suits began to be produced and sold in clothing stores. Before this a client would choose the material and style for his suit, would bring it to a tailor, and have it sewn. Manufactured suits were much cheaper than tailored suits and more affordable for people to buy. Needless to say, this caused a considerable reduction in my father’s clientele and business. It was at this point that my father contacted
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his aunt in Omaha, Nebraska and asked her to help him find a job there. Luckily, in
the 1960s there was a demand for tailors in the US and she was able to find him a
job easily.

As we got off the plane that mid-July morning my mother was holding my
little brother in her arms, I was holding my little sister by the hand, and my father was
carrying the two pieces of hand luggage we had brought with us. We were all very
hungry as we had not eaten on the plane. My little brother was the only one who had
eaten his baby food, brought from home. Therefore, my father told my mother to stay
with my brother and sister while he and I went around the airport looking for a place
to eat. We were hoping to find some panini or pizza; something to take away. Instead,
we found a restaurant with no menu on the outside. We didn’t know English and felt
like lost souls. We gave up our intent and headed back to where we had left the rest of
our family; the only problem being, we couldn’t remember the way back. I had a
lump in my throat as we searched and searched. Finally, we found them. They were
so relieved to see us that my mother cried for the joy. I will never forget how lost we
felt that day. Fortunately, we got on the plane to Omaha, where our aunt and uncle
were waiting for us.

The drive from the airport to my aunt’s house was short, compared to our long
journey. We looked around us with open mouths: the buildings were modern and
linear, the streets were wide and big, different from the old buildings and small streets
of my hometown in Sicily. When we got to the residential area where my aunt lived,
we could not believe how much space there was between houses and the yard that
surrounded each house. We were accustomed to seeing houses attached to one
another, two to three stories high, with no yard. We were in awe of all that we were seeing in such a short time. Our aunt showed us the house and our rooms, where we settled after having lunch, which we ate heartily.

My father started his job two days later. It was in a tailor shop downtown, owned by a Czech-American tailor. My mother, my siblings, and I stayed at home and helped our aunt with chores as we slowly settled into our new lives in the United States. I started grade school that August as a fifth grader. Due to a language problem I was put back three years. In Italy I would have started eighth grade. However, having studied English in middle school for two years, I was able to understand and speak English fairly well within six months. This allowed me to advance from fifth grade to seventh grade in a year. In the meantime, we had moved from our aunt’s house and had rented our own place. We slowly became more comfortable with the American lifestyle, especially my siblings and me. My parents continued to rely on my aunt and me to cope with everyday dealings, like going to the supermarket to buy food, paying bills, and any task that required understanding the language.

That was the first time I moved to the United States. The second time was five years ago, when I moved with my own family: husband, son, and daughter. So, what happened in between? Well, after having graduated college, I taught Spanish for two years. The following summer I decided to go back to Italy on vacation, which turned out to be a very long vacation, as I remained there for many years, married, had two children, and worked as an ESL (English as a Second Language) teacher. In 2007 I came to the United States to spend Christmas with my mother and siblings (my father had passed away). It was at that time that, after talking with my family, I decided to
look for a job and found one as a Spanish teacher. The following summer our family moved to the United States. For me, it was a homecoming but for my husband and children, it was their first time, even though they had come to Omaha several times to visit my parents and siblings.

Looking back at the first time I arrived to the United States at the age of twelve, and comparing that experience to the second time, I cannot but notice how different my experiences were. The first time I came as a dependent, who followed her parents, blind as to where I was going or what my future would bring. The second time I was more aware and informed of where I was going and what to expect in the United States. Still, the US of my youth and the US of my adulthood were not exactly the same. Much had changed in the years I had been in Italy. Whereas in 1965 it was more obvious who were those immigrating to the United States, in 2008 it was more subtle, as the cultural gap between Italy and the United States had shrunk. Whereas in 1965 the number of Italians immigrating to the US was quite high, in 2008 those numbers were much lower. In 1965, going through security meant only having your documents and luggage manually checked by customs officers. In 2008, it entailed having your luggage x-rayed, taking off your shoes, jacket, and going to several security checkpoints before reaching our destination. The United States had gone from being a freer, more trusting, and relaxed nation to a more controlled and restrictive one, partly due to the incidents of September 11, 2001.

What had not changed, however, was the reason for moving to the US the first time, with my parents, and the second time, with my own family. My father wished to provide for his family and give his children more opportunity and a better future.
Likewise, I chose to return to the US to provide my children the opportunity to study in an American university and to ensure them a better future. Due to Italy’s current economic problems and high unemployment rate, especially in the south, young people have very few job opportunities and many have started to emigrate, like their ancestors before them. Furthermore, my family and I wished to be close to my mother, siblings, and their children.

Having lived in Italy as a child, and later, as an adult, parent, and mother, I have seen the change Italy has gone through, from the developing and flourishing economy of the 1970s to the late mid-90s (in the south), with a low unemployment rate; to a sluggish economy in the late 1990s; to the poorer current situation, where economic growth is stagnant and unemployment, especially of young people, has soared. I have seen young people from my town in Sicily emigrate to the north of Italy, to Great Britain, and to the United States, producing an imbalance in the population, as they left behind their parents and grandparents. I have also noticed a rapid shift in people who immigrate to Italy (legally and illegally) from North African countries and from Eastern Europe. Consequently, it is my intent to study and explore issues regarding migration from and to Italy, which can address and shed light on some questions like: What forces Italians to leave their country and emigrate? What are some of the issues they face in the receiver countries? Is Italy still a sender country, a receiver country or is she both? What will be the future scenario of Italy? The focus will be mainly on the years that go from the 1960s, when I first left Italy to come to the United States, to 2008, when I left for the second time, leading to the present day situation.
In the following chapters I will attempt to address the above mentioned questions by looking at migration (both emigration and immigration) from the beginning of human existence to today, with particular attention to migration from and to Italy. In Chapter One, I will explore human migration from the beginning to the 1920s, covering the three major periods of human migration: the colonization period of the 1500s and 1600s; the industrial period, and the ensuing internal migration within the country itself; and the Great Wave emigration from Italy to the Americas from the late 1800s to the early 1900s. In Chapter Two, I will look into the fourth wave of emigration, which began after WWII, from Italy to European countries, to the Americas, to Oceania, and the internal migration from the south to the north of Italy itself. Chapter Three will focus on the unexpected turnaround of events which transformed Italy from a country of mass emigration to a country of mass immigration, and the current situation in Italy today. It will attempt to address the current problems of: youth unemployment, the “brain drain,” an aging population, and the subsequent imbalance in its population ratio. Chapter Four will investigate those factors that contribute to the acculturation and assimilation of people who emigrated in the past and emigrate today and look at personal experiences of Italians who have immigrated to the United States. The final chapter will attempt to address future perspectives for Italy and its population, as it attempts to face its many problems, exploring possible future scenarios in the 21st century.
Chapter One – An Historical Overview of Italian Migration until 1920

Migration movements have always been a part of human history. In prehistoric times and before farming became a means of cultivating the land, nomadic existence was the normal way of life. Tribes moved from region to region to hunt and benefit from the fruits of that territory. Once that territory had been exploited, they would move on to another area, in search of new land to utilize. Even in modern times, groups of people, considered outsiders by society, continue to lead a nomadic existence. Some of these are the Romani in Europe, also known as Gypsies; the Bedouin tribes in the Middle East; and the Tuareg tribes in Africa. However, no matter who we are, if we examine our family tree, we will discover that we are descendants of ancestors who emigrated at some point or another in our family history. In this chapter we will explore migration from the beginning of time leading to the major periods of human migration, focusing on the Great Atlantic Migration of the 1880s to 1920s. We will look into the causes that led many Italians to leave their country during this period of mass migration and some of the problems they faced during those years, both in their country of origin and in their receiver country – the United States.

Migration as understood in modern times, however, is not a simple part of human life, as nomadic life was in prehistoric times. Scholars of migration and immigration agree that migration patterns are a result of particular historical conditions produced by globalization, defined as “the growing economic integration and interdependence between countries in the world economy” (Toro-Morn, xvi).
They trace the beginning of globalization to the period of European colonization and the discovery of the Americas, and identify that period as the first major period of migration. During the 1500s a network of sea-routes developed, which allowed not only trading and commerce of Europeans with Asian empires but prepared the migration routes for future generations. “The movement of thousands of Europeans to Africa, Asia, and eventually to the Americas during the sixteenth century represents one of the most important population shifts in the history of the world” (Toro-Morn, xvii).

The second major period of migration, according to scholars, is the Industrial Period, so-called due to the impact of the Industrial Revolution on European population movement during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Scholars identify two movements during this period: first, the internal labor migrations within Europe at the end of the 18th century and beginning of the 19th century; and, second, the Great Atlantic migrations to the Americas at the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century (xviii). Undoubtedly, the Industrial Revolution was a major turning point in human history. As industry developed, families moved en masse from rural areas to urban areas, within their country and outside of it, in search of work in factories and mills. Important urban centers, such as Liverpool, Berlin, Moscow, and Milan, sprang up all over Europe. Milan, in particular, became a textile and engineering center. These urban centers attracted men and women from all countries.

Irish men and women worked in the mills of Lancashire; Belgians manned the looms of northern France; Polish women went to Germany;
Italian women were recruited to work in Swiss textile towns; rural Swedish women went to Stockholm to work as domestic servants; Czechs and Slovaks moved to Vienna and Budapest, also to work as maids (Toro-Morn, xviii).

Industrialization not only changed the population map of Europe but gave rise to a considerable increase in the employment of women who worked outside of their homes and, consequently, led to a transformation of their role within the family. Women were no longer relegated to house chores but became wage earners and contributed to the financial support of the family. This era was probably the precursor to bringing about awareness and attention to women’s importance and rights within the family and within the economy of their country and the world.

The same industrial processes responsible for the internal movements within European countries were also responsible for the second major movement to the Americas. The Great Atlantic Migration, also called “the Great Wave,” took place between 1820 and 1920. It was probably a consequence of many factors, such as: poverty or lack of employment in European sender countries, the economic attractiveness of the New World, and a better means of transportation across the Atlantic. Furthermore, as a result of advances in technology, the development of the steamship made it easier to cross the Atlantic (Cieslik and Felsen, 35). The Irish, for example, left their country due to the great potato famine. The biggest group to immigrate to the United States during this period was the Italians, mainly from the poor south. “About 5 million immigrants came from the newly unified Italy.”
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these 5 million, between 1876 and 1930, four-fifths were from the South, from the regions of Calabria, Campania, Abruzzi, Molise, and Sicily; two-thirds of whom were farm laborers, or “contadini”. The remaining one-third were carpenters, brick layers, masons, tailors, and barbers (Molnar, 1).

In 1861 Italy was finally unified under one state, after many years of internal conflict between its numerous and hostile kingdoms—kingdoms which were, for the most part, governed by foreign rulers. Before being united, Italy was divided into many regions or kingdoms. The north regions of Lombardy and Venetia were under Austrian rule. The central regions of Latium, Marche and Umbria, called the Papal States, were under the rule of the Pope and controlled central Italy. The Kingdom of the two Sicilies was under French rule, having previously been under Spanish rule. Other regions were independent states, like the Kingdom of Sardinia, also called Piedmont Sardinia, and the Duchies of Tuscany, Parma, and Modena.

The strongest, richest, and most liberal of these was the Kingdom of Piedmont Sardinia, which, having received the lands of the region of Liguria during the Congress of Vienna in 1815, had a merchant fleet and a big trade center in the port of Genoa. It was in this city that in 1831 Giuseppe Mazzini started a national revolutionary movement known as Young Italy in favor of a united republic. His ideas spread throughout the peninsula as he organized many uprisings, which drew 60,000 supporters. He also founded an organization in London, called “Amici d’Italia” (Friends of Italy) to raise awareness of the Italian cause.

In 1848 revolutions sprang up in Sicily, Naples, Rome, Florence, Milan, Venice, and Turin. The kingdom of Piedmont Sardinia under the guidance of its
prime minister, Camillo Cavour, together with another revolutionary hero, Giuseppe Garibaldi, and his army of a thousand red-shirted men, freed the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies from the French and succeeded in uniting most of Italy in 1861. Vittorio Emanuele II was appointed as the first king of Italy. The region of Venetia was added to Italy in 1866 and the Papal States were added in 1871 with the establishment of Rome as the capital of united Italy.

The unified Italy of the late nineteenth century was in a very bad state. After the numerous wars it had gone through, it was still in the hands of a few political powers with the majority of the population being in a profound state of poverty. Poor farming conditions, agricultural disease, and high food prices worsened the situation of the Italian peasants (Senner, 650). In the 19th century and until the mid 20th century (1950-52), southern Italy, and Sicily in particular, was still divided into feuds, or large landed estates, “where landlords ruled the land - and charged high rents, low pay, and provided very unsteady employment” (Molnar, 1). Additionally, much of this land were “latifondi,” or large estates owned by the nobility, who lived in cities far from their land and rented it to peasants for pasture at a high price. The land that was not used for pasture was cultivated by “contadini,” who lived on the land they cultivated, away from their families, and who were considered property of their owners, towards whom they had to show submissive reverence.

My grandfather’s brother-in-law Iano Vinci was one of these people. He worked for the “tenuta A Vastedda” (an estate or manor farm, property of the Cavaliere di Modica), for a month, after which he got a three day leave to go home and visit his family. With the money he earned he could barely feed his family and
pay the rent. Furthermore, adding to the unfortunate situation of many farmers, at the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century a disease, called phylloxera, destroyed the grape vines of Europe, including Italy; this lead to falling prices and an extensive market loss in fruit and wine production. Political hardship was yet another cause for the Italian people’s dissatisfaction with life in their country. After their unification, Italians did not enjoy political freedom; on the contrary, political views were repressed by the government (Molnar, 2).

It is not surprising that, given the difficult political and economic situation in their country, many Italians decided to emigrate. Attracted by the prospect of owning and cultivating their own land (two-thirds were farmers), higher wages, lower taxes, political freedom, no military draft in the United States (in Italy, draft was obligatory), and given the ease of entry into the country, many decided to emigrate. Due to their large number, they became a crucial component of the labor supply and the industrial expansion of the United States. Nearly 75 percent of the immigrants were males, 83 percent between the ages of 14 and 45, and more than 35 percent were illiterate (Cieslik and Felsen, 51). The majority of them went to work in mines, as they were unskilled workers. Others found work in construction, the long shoring industry, and the railroad. From the 1870s onward, many American workers in the above-mentioned work categories went on strike to protest against wages, working conditions, and the introduction of machinery. In this period many Italians worked as scabs, a derogatory term to describe temporary workers who fill the position of a person who strikes. Other derogatory terms used against Italians at that time were
“guineas” or “dagoes” (Molnar, 2), which will be addressed in the section on prejudice and discrimination towards Italians.

What seems to be an Italian phenomenon of the time was how many Italians went back and forth from Italy. The so-called “birds of passage” crossed and re-crossed the Atlantic, some as many as ten times (Senner, 651). One of these birds was my great-grandfather Carmelo Pagliaro, on my mother’s side, who crossed the Atlantic four times, before finally rejoining his family and returning to Sicily for good. While in the United States he lived with cousins in Omaha. Between 1901 and 1920 nearly 50% of Italians returned to Italy permanently.³ Many had come to the US with the intent of making money and returning to Italy to buy land, and my great-grandfather was one of them. Some had come alone and hoped to reunite with their loved ones. Others sent money to their poor family and relatives, who would have starved without their income.

In those years, as a reflection of the money sent or brought back by returning Italians, the Italian economy saw a considerable growth. The amount of money taken back to Italy by Italian “birds of passage” has been estimated to be between $4,000,000 and 30,000,000 (651). As a matter of fact, during his trip to Italy as Chairman of the Immigration Investigating Commission in the early 1900s, Commissioner-General Stump observed that “the marked increase in the wealth of certain sections of Italy can be traced directly to the money earned in the United States” (651). The Italian government didn’t seem to oppose this influx at all. The 50 percent of Italians who remained, however, found the US a good place to live.

³ see page 62 - Appendix C- Table 1, Italian Immigration to the United States by Years (Molnar, 2).
Subsequently, those who had initially come alone sent for their families and settled permanently in the US, acquiring, with time, rights and citizenship. In fact, it is estimated that “of some 94,700 Italians who arrived at this port (Ellis Island) from July 1, 1893, to the end of December, 1895, no less than 33,625 came to join members of their immediate families” (Senner, 653).

The year 1913 is among the highest recorded years of immigrant entry to the US from Italy. In that year nearly 266,000 arrived in the US, many of whom came to Omaha. Among them were many relatives of mine: four uncles and five aunts, one of whom later became our family sponsor for our entry into the country. Many of the men arriving in Omaha found employment with the Union Pacific Railroad or at Skinner Macaroni, which at that time was a bakery, a pasta producer, and a meatpacking and cold-storage company. Many women, including my aunt Nettie Saccà who sponsored us, found jobs as seamstresses in the woolen mills of Pendleton.

Living conditions in the United States in the early 1900s were not anywhere near the ones we know today. Bathrooms were outdoors and for Italians from the South, who were not used to cold temperatures and snow, it was hard to get used to. Furthermore, not all were lucky to find a clean job as a tailor or seamstress. For example, my great-aunt Maruzza, who did not have any sewing skills, had to settle for a job plucking chickens. I remember her telling me that when she worked outdoors during the hot and humid summer months, she would keep a pail of cold
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water with a cloth nearby to wet her head from time to time, in order to make the heat more bearable and to avoid sun stroke. However, what my aunts and uncles found the most demeaning was not facing the hardship of the weather but facing the humiliation of prejudice and discrimination.

Italians, probably more than most groups, are marked socially by their distinctive and easily identifiable last names (Alba and Abdel-Hady, 5). Along with the fact that 35 percent of those who came to America during the Great Wave were illiterate and that the majority was lacking the skills necessary to an industrial economy, this made them a targeted group, which could easily be recognized as belonging to the lowest rank of the American social ladder. Another cause of discrimination was due to the fact that the many of the Italian people that came to America originated from the South, where some people are of dark colored skin (due to the Arab influence), placing them in an “in-between” group between whites and blacks (5). As a result, they were called “guineas” or “dagoes”, and “were the only workers to work alongside black people” (Molnar, 2). Furthermore, “it was not uncommon for Italians to be hanged by mobs in the southern states and especially around the city of New Orleans” (Demetri, 2).

Italians were also discriminated against for their small stature and were considered second-rank workers, in comparison to the Slovaks and Poles who had preferential treatment in the railroad and mining industries. Therefore, Italians were hired as low-rank laborers, loaders, and pick miners; “even educated and skilled immigrants could not obtain other jobs besides labor” (2). They were labeled as unintelligent menial laborers, and, according to Demetri, their determination to
support their families was misunderstood as a slave or servant mentality (Demetri, 3). Additionally, in trade unions they were subordinate members and were excluded from election to official positions.

The first Italian immigrants (nearly 5 million from 1880 to 1920) were not well-received. They were seen as taking jobs away from the natives, who in turn took advantage of them, “underselling them by working long hours for much lower wages” (3) For the most part, they were treated like animals crammed in urban ghettos and working six days and seventy hours a week. They were also seen as being clannish, due to the fact that they settled in Italian neighborhoods, called Little Italy. What the natives did not understand were the stumbling blocks these poor immigrants had to overcome, namely: the language and culture, the fierce competition for jobs, living in cramped and unfit spaces, and being marginalized by a non-receptive society.

Life was seen as a brutal competition for those first Italian immigrants, where only the strongest and cleverest could survive. Some turned to illegal means of survival by becoming protectors of their fellow Italians in exchange for money. Given the circumstances of the time, it is easy to understand why some of these Italian immigrants sought their protection. It was in this way that the Mafia activities got a foothold in American society. The first activities were directed at fellow Italians and consisted in receiving payment in exchange for protection, which meant protecting a storeowner from other mobsters, or intervening in case of problems with the police or other citizens. These Mafia activities also helped Italians to organize. Because any attempt on the part of the Italian workers was usually crushed by the labor unions, the Mafia used intimidation to obtain rights for their fellow Italians.
These activities that sprang up somewhat out of necessity, however, were a stigma for Italians who were labeled as criminals. They were discriminated and grouped with other marginalized groups, like the Mexicans and the Irish. Furthermore, because the first Italian immigrants couldn’t speak English, “it was also easy for local law enforcement to pin crimes on men who did not know English or their legal rights” (Demetri, 2). A notorious example of the discrimination of Italians during the early 20th century was the case of two Italian anarchists, Ferdinando Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, who were accused of armed robbery and murdering two men in a Massachusetts shoe factory. They had not committed the crime and, “despite alibis, evidence and even international public support” (3) they were tried and sentenced to death in 1927. Their trial still stands out as an extreme example of anti-Italianism to date.

Given the unpleasant situation in which they lived, the situation of inferiority they found themselves in, and due to the dire needs of the families they had left behind in Italy, it is not surprising that many Italians went back and forth from the US to their home country. Certainly, many came to America with the intent of making money and returning to Italy to buy land. However, it is also true that the majority came alone or, at best, with a brother or sister. Therefore, not only did they miss their family, but they felt as unwanted outsiders in a country that would not accept them into the mainstream of their society. Those who endured and remained in the US were tenacious and strong people, who fought to climb into the mainstream of American society. The climb, however, was not a rapid ascent, but “a generation-by-generation progression” (Alba and Abdel-Hady, 5).
The Italian immigrants’ ascent was far from rapid, as was their assimilation into American society. In order to understand the Italian situation, however, it is necessary to point out “the many intra-cultural differences that existed among Southern Italians. Many spoke dialects very different from one another” (Lalli, 44), and as they came from different villages, they would speak with ill feelings about people from other villages, referring to each other as “forestieri,” or strangers. Marriage was for the most part endogamous and arranged by the families, as the accepted marriage was the one between people who came from the same village. Marrying anyone outside of the village was improbable as the opportunity of meeting anyone else was quite remote, due to the fact that they lived in neighborhoods inhabited by people of the same village. Consequently, anyone marrying outside of the accepted caste met with disapproval and was excluded from the family. My great aunt Nettie once recounted how it took many intermediaries in the neighborhood to bring a daughter and her family together, after having married an American. Some Italian men went back to Italy to find a bride or to get their wife, or perhaps a fiancé they had left in their village. Other marriages were arranged by correspondence with photos of the bride or groom sent by mail. This was the case of a friend of my great-uncle, who married his wife from his hometown of Sutera, Sicily.

As the children of Italian immigrants grew up in close-knit neighborhoods, their assimilation was hindered by the lack of contact with American children. Many “were reared in a sort of boardinghouse atmosphere” (Lalli, 45), interacting only with their mothers, fathers, close relatives, friends of the family, and god-parents, who often lived one or two doors away. The contact these children had at school was also
limited, as the immigrant parents, for the most part, had little or no education themselves and had transmitted to their children the value of family loyalty over educational advancement (Alba and Abdel-Hady, 5). Consequently, the second generation did not take advantage of the opportunities offered by the American educational system to advance both socially and economically. On the contrary, “in the 1930s and 1940s, Italian children were widely regarded as problem students, with high rates of truancy, delinquency, and early dropout from school” (6). It was not until after World War II and the onset of the third generation that Italians entered the mainstream of American society in large numbers and started to blend with the rest of the population of the United States.
Chapter Two - Italian Emigration from the 1920s to the 1960s

From the late 1920s to the 1940s emigration from Italy was drastically reduced due to restrictive measures taken by the countries to which emigrants turned to and by Italy itself (Monticelli, 11). It is estimated that only 1,300,000 people emigrated from 1928 to 1940. Emigration picked up again, in 1946, after World War II. In this chapter we will explore the third wave of immigration that lasted from 1946 to 1966. We will see that the emigration of Italians increased during these years, reaching big numbers comparable to the big Atlantic Wave of the late 19th and early 20th century. However, whereas in the previous wave the United States was the major country of destination, in the years between 1946 and 1966 other countries and continents became destination targets.

During these years “5,650,000 persons emigrated from Italy … two-thirds of the migrants, coming mostly from the Center and South of Italy” (12). This wave of emigration is somewhat different from the previous emigration, during which the emigration of Italians was directed almost exclusively to the United States. During these years the movement of Italians was directed to multiple and diverse destinations. From 1946 to 1947 most of the movement was directed to European countries. From 1947 to 1966 the migratory movements were directed less to European countries and more toward Canada, the United States, Oceania, and Latin America. Additionally, we cannot neglect the internal migratory movement within Italy, from South to North, which was another type of migration during this time, which continues in Italy to date, though, in lesser numbers.

6 see page 64 - Appendix E - Figure 1. Italian Migration Abroad (thousands) 1876-1981 (Del Boca and Venturini, 3).
The immediate aftermath of World War II saw a considerable increase in emigration from Italy to the EEC (European Economic Community) countries and Switzerland. From 1946 to 1951, the movement toward EEC countries was directed almost exclusively to France and the Benelux nations. After 1958, however, there was a substantial decrease in the migratory flux to France and a rapid increase in the migration of Italians to Germany. This migratory movement to European countries, however, was, for the most part, seasonal and temporary in nature. In fact, of those who emigrated, many returned.7 “From the 1946-1951 period to the 1960-1965 period the percentage of the European movement on the whole increased from 55% to 84% of the emigrants and from 74% to 93% of the returnees” (Monticelli, 14). Those who went to work in European countries were unskilled workers or manual laborers, who, similarly to those before them, wanted to make enough money and return to their home town in Italy. In my hometown in Sicily, about one-fifth of the population immigrated to Germany and almost all came back. This was due to the fact that they had gone alone, leaving their family behind. They had also left with the precise intention of making money and returning home.

The Italian migratory movement overseas, however, had a totally different development from the European one. The movement started in 1946, reaching a peak in 1949, decreased until 1953, peaked again in 1955, and decreased again until 1964, only to pick up again considerably from 1965 to 1966 (18). Furthermore, the number of returns was considerably less than that from European countries. Of all the overseas destinations, the migration rate to the American countries was the highest,
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7 see page 65 - Appendix F – Italian Migratory Movement 1946-1963 (Chiari, 28).
constituting 80% of all emigrations by Italians during the years from 1946 to 1966 (Monticelli, 19). As previously cited, the emigration of Italians to Canada and the United States is characterized by a low percentage of returns. On the contrary, in this period a large number of Italian immigrants sought to work and to reunite with family and relatives.

In the years 1965-1966, during which time my family and I immigrated to the United States, immigration to the US was favored by a new law, passed in 1965, permitting an increase in the quotas allowed. It was thanks to this new law that my family and I could come to the United States. Also, in this period, many relatives and friends of my family emigrated from my hometown and neighboring towns. This mass emigration from my area was strongly felt by those who remained. My grandparents, in particular, and all the cousins and uncles we had left behind, wrote telling us how our town seemed a ghost town as a consequence of the number of people who left it.

Of other overseas destinations for Italian immigrants, besides the US and Canada, the most important were Oceania, Australia, and New Zealand. The exodus began in 1949 and maintained an average of 15,000 immigrants and 1,000 returns per year, with 270,000 Italians settling in Oceania from 1946 to 1966 (19). In the same year we left for the United States, 1965, my childhood friend and her parents, who lived in my neighborhood, left for Australia. I will never forget how lonely and sad I felt after their departure, which was a couple of months before ours. My mother’s sister-in-law’s relatives also immigrated to Australia later that same year. The year 1965 stands out for me as a year of mass migration from my hometown in Sicily.
The Italian immigration movement to Latin America was of a lesser extent than that towards the US, Canada and Oceania. Emigration reached a peak in 1949, decreased thereafter and peaked again from 1953 to 1958, receiving a strong impulse “from the plans of assisted emigration by the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) and, in particular, from those aiming at reunion of families (Monticelli, 22). Emigration continued until 1966, however, from 1961 to 1964 returns surpassed emigrations by 6,000. “From 1946 to 1966 more than 625,000 Italians settled permanently in Latin America, especially in Argentina, Brazil and Venezuela” (21). Of these countries, Argentina holds the first place for Italian settlers with nearly 6,000,000 of its population being of Italian origin. In fact, of Argentina’s current population, 90% originate from Europe; of that 90%, 60% are of Italian descent. Brazil holds the second place, hosting about 4,500,000 people of Italian origin, with Venezuela following at 175,000 Italian people, an insignificant number compared to the other two Latin American countries. In 1960 many good friends of my mother immigrated to Argentina, and some to Venezuela, with two of them returning before we ourselves immigrated to the United States in 1965.

Another migratory movement which started after WWII and continues to date, although to a lesser extent, is the internal migratory movement from the South to the North of Italy. In the hope of finding a job and providing for their families, many Southern Italians moved en masse to the so-called industrial Northern triangle of Milan, Turin and Genoa (Chiari, 28). Many were unskilled workers or bricklayers who had to reinvent themselves and adapt to working in the factories of Fiat, Alfa
Romeo, Ferrari (car industries), Pirelli (tire industry), to mention a few, or to other kinds of factory production like textiles, clothing, shoes, food, etc.

The divide between the north and the south has always been a big issue in Italy’s uneven economic development. The north is naturally richer than the south, due to the fact that the Po valley region has fertile soil and flat land, which is good for farming and rice crops, in particular. The north is also richer in natural gas, available to power plants, and hydroelectric power for water and energy production, due to the many streams flowing from the Alps. However, an important reason for the divide between north and south has nothing to do with a difference in natural resources, but with the way Italy was mismanaged politically in the years following WWII and, probably, continuing to current times.

After WWII the Italian government, in an attempt to develop the so-called “Mezzogiorno”, the region that goes from south of Rome and ends in Sicily, funded a program called “la Cassa per il Mezzogiorno”; literally, the fund for the south. The program was intended to finance the development of industries in the south to offset the gap between the north and the south of the country, and to reduce emigration from the south to the north. Unfortunately, the fund “succeeded best at spawning more corruption and mismanagement. Many of the jobs it created had evaporated by 1993, when the fund was shut down under a cascade of scandals” (Bohlen, 1). Therefore, due to the failure of the program, in the 1950s and 1960s “internal migration was encouraged instead of relocating industry to the south” (Barington, 3), and the industrial triangle cities of Milan, Turin, and Genoa had a huge economic boom due
to the enormous influx of immigrants from the south, which resulted in what is called by economists “The Economic Miracle,” lasting roughly from 1950 to 1963.
Chapter Three - Emigration/Immigration – 1970s to date

In the 1970s Italy started to experience two major shifts in its population. On the one hand, it saw an expected return of many of its previously emigrated citizens. On the other hand, it started to witness an unexpected trend: the influx of many immigrants. Italy started to become an immigration destination or receiver country, compared to its previous role as an exclusively sender country. Whereas the first phenomenon was considered normal, given the provisional nature of the immigration movement of Italians to Europe, the second found Italy totally unprepared and unable to manage the big wave that was about to hit it. In this chapter we will explore the changes that Italy underwent from the 1970s onward, changes which are still felt today and that will, most likely, have future repercussions. We will also look at some of the problems that Italy faces in the 21st century, such as: unemployment, a non-transparent job recruitment system, “the brain drain,” and an aging population.

As previously mentioned in Chapter Two, the majority of Italian workers who went to European countries such as Germany, France, the Benelux countries, or Switzerland from the mid-1950s to the late-1960s, were temporary workers. They were considered such not only by their host country but also by the immigrants themselves. They “functioned as a ‘reserve of labour’ for the more powerful and prosperous economies of the north” (King, 6). They became an economic asset for the host country, providing cheap labor for those sectors of the economy that the natives didn’t want or didn’t need to do, like low construction work and low-grade services. Also, due to the fact that Italian immigrants were, for the most part, employed on yearly contracts, they could be easily laid off and sent back home. Furthermore, as a
result of “the rising unemployment provoked by the oil-price recession of 1973-74” (King, 6) many contracts were not renewed and the poor immigrants had no choice but to return home to Italy.

Those who returned, because it had always been their intention to do so, contributed in part to the development of the local economy of their hometown or region. Their returns temporarily fueled the construction sector as the returnees built or remodeled their houses. However, it was in the development of tourism along the coasts of Italy and in the islands of Sicily and Sardinia that the contribution of the returnees was felt the most. With the money they had brought back home, many built and managed small hotels, rooms to rent, restaurants, and other services. This was particularly true of the island of Sicily. In my hometown alone the construction sector saw a boom in those years from those who returned from Germany and built new homes, remodeled their old ones, or built hotels. Some invested their money by opening a shop or starting some kind of fruitful business, which would provide a means of subsistence for their family.

At the local level these initiatives helped in some manner “to repair some of the demographic damage done by excessive outmigration” (6). However, it was only a partial repair, as those who returned were generally older, retired, or semi-retired, who did not compensate for the lack of young economically active people (6), contributing to an imbalance in the population ratio.

If return migration was primarily responsible for the immigration of the 1970s, by the 1980s and 1990s immigration from poorer countries became the main factor (7). According to Russell King, Professor of Geography at Trinity College in
Dublin, of all the developed countries of Western Europe and the OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development), Italy has experienced the most dramatic developments in international migration trends since the early 1970s (King, 283).

From the late 1970s to today, Italy has seen its number of foreign residents increase from 143,834 in 1970 to 1,500,200 in 2000. The biggest single group to immigrate to Italy was from the North African countries of Morocco and Tunisia, followed by the second major group from the Western African countries of Senegal, Ghana, Cape Verde, etc. The third group was comprised of migrants coming from the Asian countries of the Philippines (the largest and most distinct of the group), China, Sri Lanka, India, etc. The fourth group, and probably the smallest, came from Latin America. Of all these groups it seems that the Tunisians were the first to arrive, as they “started to settle in the late 1960s in coastal towns such as Marsala and Mazara Del Vallo (in southern Sicily) where they engaged in fishing, grape-harvesting, and construction work” (7).

In more recent years, with the development of “democracy and freedom of emigration in Eastern Europe” (286), Italy has seen a notable increase in immigration from Albania, Poland and Romania - the fifth group. In 1991 the Albanians, in particular, succeeded in arriving en masse (approximately 15,000) to the port of Bari, on the eastern Adriatic Sea, in a desperate attempt to flee their country. They were deported soon thereafter. However, some later succeeded in obtaining visas and
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8 see page 66 - Appendix G - Table 5 - Stock of Foreign Resident Population ..... (Del Boca and Venturini, 18).
immigrating to Italy legally. My hometown of Carlentini, in particular, has seen a big
wave of immigrants from Poland and Romania from the 1990s to date.

This sudden shift from a country of mass emigration to a country of mass immigration took Italy by surprise, as it found itself unprepared to face the storm of immigrants. Many factors merged and made possible the entry of 1,356,362 immigrants between the years 1970 and 2000. We will focus on seven major factors that contributed to the development of mass migration, which, as we shall see, are correlated to one another. Firstly, an unaware Italy became a “replacement destination” for the northern European countries, which had closed off immigration to their countries. Italy took the place once held by West Germany (King, 288). Having nowhere else to go, immigrants turned to countries like Spain, Greece, and Italy.

Secondly, due to the fact that Italy had never been an immigration destination per se, it was legislatively and logistically unprepared, and therefore, slow to react.

Before the 1970s there had been no need for specific immigration laws or any border controls of its territory or coastline. Therefore, the immigrants found it relatively easy to enter the country, which usually occurred from the south by crossing the Mediterranean on boats; this leads to the third factor, Italy’s position in the center of the Mediterranean. Due to its strategic position as a watery divide separating Europe from Africa, two entirely different economic and demographic systems, the Mediterranean has been called “the Mediterranean Rio Grande” by immigration scholars Montanari and Cortese (4). However, unlike a river, the open sea with its many islands and fragmented coasts is much more difficult to patrol.
Hence, Italy’s geographical position coupled with the difficulty and initial laxness in entry control made of Italy a magnet country for immigrants from poorer countries.

A fourth factor, Italy’s increased prosperity, resulting from the “Economic Miracle” of the 1950s and 1960s, made Italy an appealing country for the poor populations of Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Eastern Europe. This factor accompanied by the segmentation of the Italian labor market (fifth factor) opened niches for immigrant employment. The way in which the Italian labor market evolved during the post-industrial era favored the creation of a dual economic system, “in which the informal or underground economy and the secondary labour market of casual, unorganised labour have flourished” (King, 288). The strategy of the secondary labor market is to maintain competitiveness by reducing labor costs, thus, producing insecure and seasonal part time-jobs, lowly paid and appealing only to marginal workers like women and immigrants (288). In fact, in my hometown of Carlentini the caring for the elderly has become a job carried out exclusively by the Polish or Romanian women who have immigrated and settled there permanently.

The creation of marginal jobs along with a demographic collapse (sixth factor) has further motivated immigration to Italy from poorer countries.

On the N [North] side of the sea [Mediterranean], Italy has the lowest birth rate of the world, a total fertility rate of 1.3 children per women. On the S [South] shore are countries whose populations are growing fast, with the mean number of children per woman at around 4-6, depending on the country (King, 288-289).
Additionally, the United Nations has projected that by 2020 the countries south of the Mediterranean, from Morocco to Egypt, will have an additional 54.2 million working-age people. This makes immigration in the future an unavoidable solution for those countries south of the Mediterranean, who will not be able to satisfy the demand for jobs of their citizens.

A seventh and final factor that researchers have identified is that, in the end, immigration benefits both the sending countries, south of the sea, and the receiving countries, north of the sea (Italy in this case). They argue that, on one hand, emigration from countries like Morocco, Tunisia, and others partially alleviates the respective countries’ problem of overpopulation and lack of jobs; on the other hand, it benefits the receiving country as it offers immigrants its most marginal jobs, the ones that most natives refuse to do, or so it seems. The poor and desperate immigrants are willing to do the menial jobs and accept being paid “below the legal minima since such wages are still several times the levels available in their own countries” (King, 11). The Italian employers prey on the immigrants’ despair by taking advantage of them, employing them at ridiculously low wages, and sometimes without benefits.

Undoubtedly, there is, for the most part, a relationship of exploitation between the employer and the immigrant in Italy. The availability of such cheap labor forces wages to a below survival level and produces a situation whereby only immigrants are willing to do certain jobs, especially in the low-tertiary or service sector, which is the one which employs the highest percentage of immigrants (Cole, 4). In my opinion, if Italian employers could not rely on the poor immigrants, they would be forced to pay fairer wages and benefits to the many unemployed Italians who would
be willing to work or to students who could work part-time or during the summer. In my hometown there are many young men who would be willing to work for a fair wage, but don’t because bar and restaurant owners prefer immigrants as they can pay them 10 Euros a day, a demeaning wage for anyone. Furthermore, the current generation of Italians has received a considerable amount of education and training, and, reasonably so, they refuse to work in the low-grade segments at the same wage as the immigrants.

Immigrants enter Italy from the south but their destination is to reach the urban centers of Europe and Italy, where jobs are more readily available.

Although present throughout the country, foreigners are concentrated in urban areas in the center and north. Regions with the largest foreign populations (in 1990) include: Lazio (197,000 or 25.2 percent), Lombardy (117,000 or 15 percent), Sicily (62,000 or 7.9 percent), Tuscany (61,000 or 7.8 percent), and Veneto (50,000 or 6.4 percent) (Cole, 4).

It is not surprising that immigrants settle more in the regions of Lazio and Lombardy, as it is in these regions that Italy’s biggest cities, Rome and Milan, are located. There they can find more job opportunities than in the smaller cities.

As previously mentioned, the majority of immigrants finds employment mainly in the low-tertiary sector. The males find jobs in: 1) construction as unskilled bricklayers, carrying pails full of cement, bricks, etc.; 2) agriculture as seasonal pickers or tilling the soil; 3) selling trinkets, bags, sunglasses, and other merchandise on beaches of tourist resorts or on street sidewalks. The latter “street-corner” economy has flourished particularly in the city of Naples, where errand-running and
the selling of contraband cigarettes is a normal job for immigrants. As for the female immigrants, they find jobs either as domestic workers or in small workshops. Working as a “colf”, short for “collaboratrice familiare” or family helper, is the most stable and documented job, and usually involves living with the employer (Cole, 5). Unfortunately, a hidden job market has sprung up that employs illegal immigrant women and men manufacturing goods like shoes, clothes, etc. in small, cramped workshops. For the most part, these shops are themselves not licensed and take advantage of the poor immigrants by having them work for long hours in artificially lit warehouses, with no windows or heating, sometimes employing immigrant children as well. Additionally, some also sleep in the workplace.

Illegal immigration has become a major problem in Italy. Even though the Italian government has tried to regularize immigration and has implemented immigration policies in 1987 and 1990, many immigrants still enter the country surreptitiously and live hidden from official view. It is difficult to determine the number of illegal immigrants in Italy; however, estimates have been made based on calculations drawn from information on legalization procedures. The estimate for 1994 was around 500,000, while in 1998 it ranged around 290,000 (Del Boca, 23).

The fact that there was a spontaneous flow of immigrants and an initial difficulty in controlling the border has created the impression that immigrants entering Italy are largely an illegal phenomenon (22). This belief, along with other factors, has led to a sentiment of intolerance and racism towards these immigrants among the native Italian population. Italians feel that they cannot host others in their country as it is already overpopulated. According to the 2011 census, there are
59,464,644 persons living in Italy (Veral). They are also convinced that the immigrants take jobs away from them. According to Alessandra Venturini, Professor of Political Economy at the University of Turin, there does not seem to be a direct and clear competition between legal immigrants and legal native workers, or, at least, not at first sight. However, “it may, nevertheless, manifest itself in illegal work, where the lower wages of foreign workers tend to influence investment decisions, and therefore, indirectly displace regular labour” (Venturini, 138). Reasonably so and as previously mentioned, foreign labor brings down the price of wages in some sectors (agriculture and low-tertiary services) to a level considered below survival by native Italian workers.

As an unfortunate consequence of the above factors, the resentment with which some Italians view immigrants has provoked feelings of intolerance and racial prejudice. There have been instances of violence and racist attacks directed to “extracomunitari”, non-European citizens, some of which may go unreported.

Among specific instances are the brutal arrest and expulsion of street traders from Rimini (1989) and Florence (1990) on the prompting of local retailers, the thuggish control of street traders and agricultural workers in Compania by the Camorra (the Neapolitan Mafia), and the hidden exploitation of domestic workers by their employers who confiscate their passports, subject them to long hours of work and fire them if they become pregnant (King, 291).
Corresponding to the mass immigration phenomenon of “extracomunitari” which began in the 1970s, in the mid-1990s Italy started to experience yet another phenomenon, the emigration, or exodus, of many Italian college graduates, called by economists “the brain drain”. This phenomenon seems to be “unique to Italy, while other large economies in the European Union seem to experience a ‘brain exchange’” (Becker, 1). The “brain drain” consists of college graduates and young people, forty-five years old and younger, departing from all over Italy, including the northern regions that in the past had been the destination of southern Italian immigrants. However, what is surprising, and disconcerting at the same time, is the reversal of tendencies between the North and the South of Italy from 1990 to 1998.9

While in 1990 only 0.07% … of the northern population moved out, as opposed to 0.14% of the southern population, in 1998 the percentages are almost reversed with 0.12% of the northern population moving abroad and only 0.07% of the southern population doing the same (Becker, 13).

As previously mentioned in this chapter, the current generation of Italians (1990s to today) are becoming more and more educated, seeking higher education in the best college institutions, making sacrifices to study in top Italian universities like the Bocconi University of Milan, the LUISS University and the Sapienza University (both in Rome). Economists have discovered that, for the most part, the emigration

9 see page 67 - Appendix H- Table 2 – Indices of the “College Graduates Drain” by Area of Emigration (Becker, 13).
of Italian college graduates seems to characterize precisely those who studied in the best universities, and particularly those who majored in economics, finance, and engineering (Becker, 25). The college graduates who emigrate find jobs in Northern Europe (Holland, Belgium, UK, etc.), the United States, Australia, and, sometimes in unexpected places like Dubai, in the United Arab Emirates. There is the case of Luca Vigliero, a thirty-one year old architect, who, after graduating from the University of Genoa in 2006, accepted a job in Dubai in 2007 (Faris, 1). Luca adds that whereas “in Italy, his résumé had not drawn any interest, at Dubai's X Architects, he was quickly promoted” (1).

So, why are these young brains, the future promise of a nation, forced to emigrate? Besides lack of jobs, as previously mentioned, other equally important factors influence this exodus. Firstly, Italy does not invest enough money in research and, therefore, employs a minimum percentage of its college graduates. Secondly, the Italian labor market is set up in a way that protects those who have jobs, harming those who are looking for jobs. For example, many Italians have tenure and cannot be fired easily, even when they don’t perform their duties to the fullest. This is particularly true in the case of governmental jobs.

Furthermore, in an attempt to decrease the amount of pensioners, which carries a heavy financial burden on the country, in 2011 the “Istituto della Previdenza Sociale” (INPS), the name for the Italian social security system, has increased the years needed for Italians to retire from thirty five to forty-two or at the age of sixty-seven, whichever occurs first, further extending the working years of those already on the job. Without a generational renewal, the younger population has no other resource
but to emigrate or to adapt to whatever basic work they can find and to continue living with their parents, as what they earn is not enough to pay for rent, food, utilities, etc. In fact, “according to figures published in May [2010] by the National Institute of Statistics, 30% of Italians ages 30 to 34 still live with their parents, three times as many as in 1983” (Faris, 1). I know many graduates who have moved from Sicily to the North of Italy to find themselves working as waiters/waitresses, delivery men or women, garbage collectors, etc. Many of them don’t make it to the end of the month and, in some cases, the parents help them to make ends meet.

In addition to the lack of investment by the government in the employment of young people and the protection of those who have jobs, a third factor is Italy’s “entrenched system of patronage and nepotism” (1). Only those who have connections have a good chance of getting good jobs, as there is a total lack of “competitiveness and transparency in hiring practices” (2). Usually a parent, a relative, or a friend will find a job for the son, nephew, or friend in the place where he or she works or in other places where they know someone. Sometimes parents pay money to procure a job for their son or daughter. Of course, this practice is not made known, and is kept a secret; and, if asked, no one will ever tell the truth.

The truth of the matter is that it is so difficult to find jobs through regular channels that, unfortunately, parents are so desperate that they succumb to this corrupt system. Those who do not succumb advise their children to look for a job abroad. In an article published by Time magazine on October 18, 2010, Stephan Faris writes about an open letter, written and published in an Italian newspaper, La
Repubblica, by the head of the LUISS University in Rome, Pier Luigi Celli, to his son, advising him to leave the country. He wrote,

This country, your country, is no longer a place where it’s possible to stay with pride… That’s why, with my heart suffering more than ever, my advice is that you, having finished your studies, take the road abroad. Choose to go where they still value loyalty, respect and the recognition of merit and results (Faris, 1).

The last thing one would expect is to hear the head of such a renowned university, as the LUISS, lose hope and give up on the system. When things like this happen, it gives a distressing indication of the gravity of the situation.

Unquestionably, this unfortunate “brain drain” is harming Italy, as it becomes a less competitive and productive country. Economists consider human capital to be “one of the three fundamental factors of production, along with physical capital and technology” (Becker, 4). What is even more worrisome is that from 1990 to 1998 “the share of college graduates who moved out of the country quadrupled”\(^\text{10}\) and is not expected to decrease in the future. One would think that the loss of the emigrated Italian graduates would have been compensated by the “extracomunitari” who have been immigrating to Italy since the 1970s. Unfortunately, this is not the case. In spite of the entry of legal immigrants into Italy, “this flow was largely biased towards lower levels of education” (17). In other words, the young people who immigrated and continue to immigrate to Italy were

\(^{10}\) see page 68 - Appendix I - column 5 of table 1 - Indices of the “Brain Drain” from Italy (Becker, 10)
and are less educated and cannot compensate for the college graduates who have left and continue to leave the country.

In 1995 two good friends of mine left Italy for the United States: Marisa and Giancarlo. Marisa left Catania, a city on the eastern coast of Sicily, after graduating with a major in Italian and Literature. After looking for a job for two years in all of Sicily, she decided to apply for a master’s program at a university in Chicago in the US. She obtained her master’s degree and went on to obtaining a Ph.D. She now teaches Italian and has never regretted having moved out of Italy. Giancarlo left Bari, in the region of Puglia, after having graduated high school, and decided to study in an American university. Initially, he came to the US to experience studying abroad, but decided to remain thereafter, particularly, since his family in Bari encouraged him to stay in the United States. He married an Italian-American and now teaches in an American high school. He sometimes wonders what his life would have been if he had gone back, but, overall, has no regrets.

Another phenomenon that is harming Italy is its aging population. Italy is among the top countries in the world where its population is long-lived. However, this in itself would not be a problem, were it not for the fact that there is an imbalance in the working age population to the elderly or the pensioners. The income of those who work is starting to be insufficient to cover the pensions of those who no longer work. Italy is “the only European country where the proportion of elderly people is higher than the proportion of young people” (D’Andrea, 6). The young people who are supposed to contribute to the population growth are not able
due to unemployment or emigration. In fact, there is a tendency among young Italian couples to postpone reproductive life (D’Andrea, 22).

Many economists assert that, due to its aging population, Italy needs foreign immigration to balance its ratio of working age people to elderly. However, as we have seen, the majority of those who immigrate are mainly manual workers, with little training or education. Additionally, if Italy continues to lose its brightest young men and women to other countries, who will develop the country’s resources and carry on when the current generation of leaders will have retired? I will address these and other questions about the future prospects of Italy in the concluding chapter.
Chapter Four – Acculturation and Assimilation

From this study on Italian immigration it appears that the first immigrants to the United States (1880s to 1920s) struggled considerably to enter the mainstream of American society. They came to the US in such big numbers that, for the most part, they were not accepted by the host society. This was a period in which “newly-arrived Italians were treated worse than animals” (Demetri, 2), living in ghettos, performing the most menial jobs. Many things worked against them. They came alone, leaving their families behind; they were uneducated, as the majority was illiterate even in their native language; and didn’t understand or speak English. Consequently, they settled close to one another in order to establish that sense of kinship that they had left behind.

Consequently, this sense of wanting to stay close to other “paesani”, or fellow countrymen, was misunderstood by American society; it was interpreted as Italians wanting to live in clans and being unwilling to assimilate. At the time Americans did not understand that the ethnic community that the immigrants sought provided them with a sense of identification and security during their initial period of transition to a new culture (O’Flannery, 201). In this chapter, we will look at factors that influence acculturation and assimilation of immigrants in a host society, and how these factors influenced the Italian immigrants’ integration in American society. We will also gain some understanding of these issues by looking at personal experiences of some of my family members and friends trying to assimilate to the United States in the 1960s when they immigrated, and in the 1990’s when my friends came to study.
Acculturation and assimilation are terms often used to refer to the adaptation of immigrants to American society, and, therefore, have been extensively studied by sociologists and anthropologists. Although the terms are sometimes used interchangeably, there is an important distinction between the two, with sociologists preferring the term “assimilation” and anthropologists preferring the term “acculturation” (Gordon, 61). The latter is defined as “the extent to which an immigrant is socialized in the various values, customs, and behavior patterns of the new society” (O’Flannery, 195). The former, assimilation, or to be exact, social assimilation, is defined by Robert E. Park, considered one of the most prolific and influential thinkers in American sociology, as “the process or processes by which peoples of diverse racial origins and different cultural heritages, occupying a common territory, achieve a cultural solidarity sufficient to sustain a national existence” (Gordon, 63).

From the above definition it seems that acculturation would entail an abandonment of one’s ethnic values and the acquisition or adoption of the host country’s values. Actually, “it only requires the acceptance of the major values, roles, and behavior patterns” (O’Flannery, 200). Therefore, it means that the immigrant has accepted and internalized the norms of the new society to the point that he can function in it. On the other hand, social assimilation requires more involvement on the part of the immigrant. It entails “the participation of the immigrant in the major institutional spheres of the receiving society (200). Therefore, social assimilation means that the immigrant takes part in the political, educational, and occupational areas of the new society, something that requires
more effort and instruction on the immigrant’s part. Whereas an acculturated immigrant has learned how to live in the new society, the assimilated immigrant makes up the society, as he has become a vital component: socially, politically, and economically.

I believe that for the most part, the majority of immigrants, particularly first generation immigrants, succeed, at best, in becoming acculturated and functioning in the new society. For the most part, their objective is probably to assimilate without completely abandoning their ethnic values, which are part of their identity, and can be reason for ethnic and personal pride. It is with the later generations (second and third,) that full social assimilation occurs. This seems to be particularly true of the Italian immigrants that I know, who are, for the most part, first generation immigrants. While integrating to American society, they continue to be attached to ethnic values, carrying on their Italian traditions. They get together on Sundays for the main meal with the entire family, including their married children and grandchildren, cooking and passing on the Italian family recipes. They celebrate baptism, confirmation, and weddings, observing the same customs as if they were still in Italy. In fact, sociologists agree that, in some cases, as in the case of the Italian American, “the immigrant has made a thorough adjustment to the new environment without losing its identity as an ethnic group” (O’Flannery, 197).

Undoubtedly, the main objective for the immigrant is to function in the new society by having mastered the language, participating in the common life without feeling discriminated, and feeling accepted. Sociologists Mary C. Waters and
Tomás R. Jiménez have identified four major indicators that measure assimilation of current immigrants into American society: “socioeconomic status, spatial concentration, language assimilation, and intermarriage” (Waters and Jiménez, 105). They define

(a) socioeconomic status as educational attainment, occupational specialization, and parity of earnings; (b) spatial concentration, in terms of dissimilarity in spatial distribution and suburbanization; (c) language acquisition, in terms of language ability and loss of mother tongue; and (d) intermarriage, defined by race …, and only occasionally by ethnicity and generation (107-8).

There is no doubt that education is a key building block to economic advancement, and, although Waters and Jiménez have singled out four indicators that influence assimilation, some of these indicators are interconnected to one another. For example, educational achievement cannot be attained without language proficiency and equal opportunity. In the case of Italian Americans, educational accomplishment did not occur until the second and third generations. According to Richard Alba and Dalia Abdel-Hady, the second generation of Italian Americans did not take full advantage of the “avenues of mobility afforded by the American school system” (Alba and Abdel-Hady, 5). It seems that the parents hindered their advancement by instilling in them the idea that family loyalty was more important than educational advancement. Therefore, they missed school if someone in the family was sick or if a family issue arose. Many of these children were problem students with a high percentage of drop-outs (6). It was not until the
third generation (after the 1950s) that Italian Americans reached the same average (as far as socioeconomic status is concerned) as the other white Americans (Waters and Jiménez, 6). Sociologists have determined that it takes a period of 20 years for immigrants to catch up to a parallel economic status as native-born people (108).

As we have seen previously, the earlier Italians who immigrated to the United States (1880s to 1920s) settled in urban areas close to “paesani,” forming neighborhoods known as Little Italy. They settled, for the most part, in big cities like New York or Boston, where they could find more employment opportunities. Conversely, the current new immigrants who come to the United States tend to settle in suburban areas. According to “sociologists in the Chicago school … increasing socioeconomic attainment, longer residence in the United States, and higher generational status lead to decreasing residential concentration for a particular ethnic group” (109).

Having immigrated twice to the United States, I find the above statement to be true from my own personal experience. When my family and I came to the United States in 1965, after living with my aunt for about two months, we rented a home near her on 7th and Hickory in Little Italy. We lived closed to other Sicilian “paesani,” most of whom came from the same town of Carlentini or from its neighboring town, Lentini. We did not socialize with anyone outside of that close-knit neighborhood. In short, we had created our own little Carlentini in Omaha, where we could feel at home. When I came back to the United States the second time, after having lived with my mother for two years, my family and I settled in a suburban area of Omaha, where we currently live. My neighbors are not Italians
but Americans from different backgrounds. Also, having lived here before, I feel at home living in a neighborhood with people from diverse origins, as I feel closer to the American culture now than I did when I first came to the United States.

I also feel that I have had a definite advantage over my parents when coming to the United States in 1965. When we arrived I was twelve years old, therefore, I was sent to school to continue my education. My parents, on the contrary, had to go to work to provide for my siblings and me; consequently, they could not go to school to learn English. As previously mentioned, my parents continued to rely on me for many years to pay the bills, translating for them at my siblings’ parent-teacher conferences, and much more. Even though I am considered a first generation Italian immigrant, I came to the US at an age when I could take advantage of the educational opportunities offered me by the American educational system. Furthermore, it seems that children of immigrants tend to perform better in school than native-born ones. Sociologists Portes and Rumbaut in their study of children of immigrants (2001) found that “those who arrive before age 13 and second generation children tend to do better than their native-born schoolmates in grades, rates of school retention, and behavioral aspects such as homework” (Waters and Jiménez, 109).

The final indicator of assimilation, intermarriage, according to Richard Alba and Dalia Abdel-Hady, does not concern Italian Americans until the third generation. When the influence of the first generation became less felt and Italians started to move away from little Italy, they started to marry outside of their ethnic group, becoming more assimilated to American society. Consequently, the rapidly
increasing rates of intermarriage favored the social acceptance of Italian Americans in the white mainstream. Among the Italians that I know, who came to the US from Italy in the 1960s, the majority married Italians. Intermarriage did not occur until the second and third generations. For example, the children of my mother’s friends are, for the most part, married to second or third generation Americans. In the case of my family, my sister married a third generation American of German descent, my brother married a third generation of Danish descent, and I married an Italian, as I married a few years after returning to Italy.

The four indicators discussed above serve to measure an immigrant’s assimilation from a more scientific or sociological perspective. We will now explore what factors are decisive in the adjustment of an immigrant to the new society. Italian sociologist Mario Chiari has identified four factors that can influence the immigrant’s adjustment. For the most part, they are subjective and psychological in nature, and concern the attitudinal and behavioral changes that the immigrant has to deal with when trying to adapt to the host society.

Some of the determining factors of the success or failure to assimilate are the attitudes of receptivity or rejection of new behavioral patterns, the degree of intellectual maturity … the envisioning of emigration as a permanent or temporal fact, the ambition to strive for betterment… and the achievement of those goals that migrants hope to satisfy with emigration (Chiari, 26-27).
The first factor concerns the expectations that an immigrant has upon arrival to the new country and his personality, if he has previous knowledge of what the country is like and whether he is the type of person that adapts easily to change, to new norms and behavioral patterns and, therefore can adjust more easily. Some people are less attached to their previous ways, more flexible, and more tolerant by nature. For example, my father was more open-minded than my mother when we came to the United States. He had the advantage of going to work with Americans and was able to learn English sooner than my mother, who stayed at home to take care of my siblings and me. Also, it was my father’s idea to move to the United States and, at first, my mother had a hard time accepting it, but in those days women obeyed and followed their husbands nonetheless.

The second factor is of a more educational nature but also deals with having the maturity to understand that when leaving one’s country, there are bound to be major adjustments and compromises will be necessary. From my personal experience, it seems that the more educated person assimilates better than the less educated one. The majority of my family’s friends and my parents, who immigrated to the United States in the 1960s, had only a middle school education and, therefore struggled more to adapt than my friends, who immigrated to the US in the 1990s and came with a high school or college education. It seems to me that they acculturated more rapidly than those who came in the 1960s with less education. Evidence of this is the fact that they speak English fluently and hold teaching positions in high school and college. On the other hand, those friends of my family who came in the 60s held manual jobs at Union
Pacific, Wilsie and Company, and Pendleton. I also believe that with education comes a certain maturity of adjustment.

The third factor, the envisioning of emigration as a permanent or temporal fact, is another important indicator of acculturation. When emigrants leave their country with the mindset of making money in the host country and returning to their homeland, having reached that goal, they have, previously and consciously, decided not to become a part of the receiving culture but temporary guests. They are physically in the receiving country but emotionally and mentally in their home country. This was the case, as we have seen, of those “birds of passage” who immigrated to the US during the Great Wave of 1880 to 1920. In the following periods of Italian immigration this mindset had somewhat changed, as the percentage of Italians settled in the host countries. One exception is that of those Italian immigrants who moved to Northern Europe from 1946 to 1951 and from 1960 to 1965 as temporary workers, and therefore, knew with certainty that they would return to Italy.

From the 1990s to today, the more educated Italians who emigrate do so unwillingly, and, even though they are aware that it’s a permanent move, given the Italian economic situation, many still “set out with the intention of returning” (Faris, 4). Italians still have that same mindset that their fellow Italian “birds of passage” had in the early 20th century as Italians are attached to their homeland. However, when they attempt to return, they often find their re-entry difficult, if not impossible, and return to the host country. This is the case of thirty-two year old Elena Ianni, an Italian marketing manager, who had gone to work for a Scottish bank. She returned to Italy during her Easter vacation, sending her résumé to about one hundred top companies
and recruitment agencies and “knocking on doors in Milan” (Faris, 4); unfortunately, no one replied. She came to the heart-breaking conclusion that her country did not want her and returned to Scotland.

The fourth and final factor, the achievement of the goals that the immigrant sets out to accomplish, is of the utmost importance in the decision to remain or to leave the receiving country. When those who immigrate find that their talents are appreciated abroad, are able to express them by landing good jobs, and are able to support themselves and their families, then they find it easier to acculturate and to become an integral part of the receiving society. This is the case of Luca Vigliero, who works as an architect in Dubai (previously mentioned in chapter 3). Among other things, he measures his success by the fact that he and his wife could afford to have a son; “had he remained in Italy, he says they would not have been able to afford children this soon” (2). Whereas he has been able to start a family in Dubai, in Italy the majority of his friends are not married and live with their parents.

Given all the above indicators that lead to acculturation and assimilation, it seems to me that, in the end, the majority of Italians have managed to acculturate well to their receiving country, as they have realized that going back to Italy would not have been feasible. Therefore, they have decided to remain in the country that has welcomed their talent, and in which they can feel gratification both for expressing their personal aspirations and to that country that has made all this possible. Even if inaccessible, the Italians’ desire to return to their homeland is hard to repress. As Giovanni Chirichella, a human resources manager for GE (General Electric) Energy in
Houston, Texas affirms, “Many Italians across the world… are basically homesick for the rest of their lives” (Faris, 4).
Conclusion – Future Perspectives

In this exploration of Italian emigration we have seen that Italians have a long history of emigration, dating back to industrial times when Italy and most of Europe saw a mass movement from the small rural towns to the big urban cities, intensifying in the Great Wave Immigration to the United States of the 1880s to 1920s, and continuing to modern times. Due to a past of feudal economic system and political mismanagement, particularly in the south, many southern Italians had no choice but to emigrate. It seems that, for many Italians, emigration has been and continues to be unavoidable, even at present time. When they emigrate, it is almost always a last resort, as Italians are very attached to their homeland, and many of those who emigrate hold in their heart the intention of returning.

As we have seen, many of those who immigrated to the United States during the Great Wave of the 1880s to the 1920s, the first generation or foreign born, came with the mindset of returning to Italy, were discriminated by the American society of the times, and felt unaccepted. Consequently, they could not or would not assimilate and many returned to Italy or went back and forth (as in the case of the “birds of passage”), before definitely settling in the US. The second and third generations, the children and the grandchildren, having been born in America, had the advantage of assimilating better into the culture. For these generations, America was their native land and English was their native language. Therefore, they could easily take advantage of those educational opportunities that their grandparents (the immigrants) could not enjoy, as they had to work to survive.
Today Italy still faces the same emigration problems. They are no longer due to a feudal system as the Italian government abolished that system in the 1950s. However, issues like political mismanagement, corruption, and unfair employment practices have led to the mass exodus of many young educated Italians. Perhaps, the problem lies in Italy not knowing how to use its resources. The current generation of leaders is reluctant to give leadership to those educated people below the age of forty, and, sometimes, even to those in their forties. Italy is governed by an old political class; evidence of this is the fact that the current Italian “presidente della repubblica”, or president of the republic, Giorgio Napolitano, is eighty-eight years old and has just been elected for another seven year term. According to Stephan Faris, “the country is caught in a vicious circle. The economy will continue to fade as long as it stifles innovation by excluding its young” (Faris, 4). With so many educated and talented young people leaving the country, the fear is that Italy will lose its power to develop and innovate.

Besides the vicious circle of which Faris speaks, there is another more tangible vicious circle that is leading Italy to an uncertain destiny. The rising unemployment among young Italians, accounting for more than half of the total unemployment (D’Andrea, 11), has led to a decrease in marriages and, consequently, to a low birth rate with zero population growth. Fertility has dropped from “2.4 children per woman in 1971 to 1.2 in 1995” (22), and has probably continued to drop to date. As a result, an imbalance has arisen in the Italian population, as the income produced by those who work has started to be insufficient to cover the pensions of the retired elderly. Economists foresee that by the year 2020 the percentage of Italians over 65 years of
age will be much higher than that of the working-age population, “yielding 179 elderly to 100 young people” (D’Andrea, 21), a negative and unhealthy economic ratio.

The above factors, accompanied by the non-transparent practices for recruiting employers, have created uneasiness in the Italian population, who no longer believes nor trusts the political system. In the governmental elections held in February of 2013 the center-left wing party called “Per il Bene Comune,” or Party for the Common Good, won, followed by the anti-establishment party called “Movimento Cinque Stelle”, or Five Star Movement Party. After many years of right wing government under the leadership of Silvio Berlusconi, the election results were a sign that the Italian people want change, and this clearly explains why a new-born party like the “Movimento Cinque Stelle,” led by an ex-comedian, won second place. It also demonstrates that the Italian people are at a loss when it comes to knowing who to trust to solve their economic situation.

Furthermore, the unfair system of recruiting jobs has created an income imbalance among families. In the town of Carlentini, where I lived for thirty seven years, there are few families who live in financial comfort, and others, (the majority) who struggle to survive and don’t make it to the end of the month. For example, in my neighborhood there was a family of four, all of whom had jobs in the post office, while in another family only the father had a job, with the wife and his two adult children being unemployed. The first family had managed to get the post office jobs through connections that the other family lacked. Unfortunately, Italy is full of similar situations in which those who are in certain circles and know influential people continue to thrive, and others who are not in such circles are left out. Consequently,
Italian families are becoming increasingly poorer. According to the Eurispes (Italian Research Institute) report published by Il Giornale, an Italian newspaper, “two out of three families don’t make it to the end of the month and at least half a million families has problems in paying their mortgage” (Sarra, 1).

As Italy tries to navigate in the 21st century, its future does not seem to hold easy solutions to its current problems. Sociologists predict that in the 21st century clandestine immigration will continue, even though the government has enforced immigration policies and, today, is doing a better job of controlling its borders than it did in the 1980s and 1990s. Unfortunately, Italy’s position in the Mediterranean Sea makes it practically impossible to protect the entire coastline from illegal entry into the country. Furthermore, it will be difficult to contain illegal immigrants as they flee from those Northern African countries where demographic (overpopulation), economic, and political problems will continue to be major issues. Boats full of desperate people continue to cross the Mediterranean incessantly, particularly during the summer months. Italy has asked the help of the European Union. However, can Europe turn its back on so many desperate people? Sociologists also predict that illegal employment in Italy will continue, fueled by the surplus of illegal workers and by the Italian labor market system, which seems to favor the much cheaper labor of immigrants to that of native Italians.

The emigration of educated Italians will most likely continue in the 21st century. The young unemployed, who endure long waiting periods in search for a job in their own country, will grow weary and will go abroad to look for jobs, as they have been doing since the 1990s. In some towns in Sicily, emigration of young people is so high
that only the old people have remained. For example, the city of Aragona, in the southern Sicilian province of Agrigento, has gained the title of the Italian city with the highest percentage of emigration as one out of two has emigrated (Dispenza, 1). Furthermore, it will be very unlikely that any of these young emigrants will be able to return to Italy to find a job. As we have seen, those who tried have failed and have returned to their jobs abroad, embittered by the thought that their country does not want them.

Sociologists affirm that migration is a normal part of human activity, which has existed since the beginning of time and that will always exist. However, in the case of the Italian people it seems that emigration is a never-ending story course. Will Italians ever be able to choose if they want to emigrate or not and feel that it’s not their only option? The fact that so many young Italians continue to leave the country is a disturbing signal that the government has failed and the country will not be able to develop as it has in the past. Furthermore, as more young educated Italians leave and more foreign laborers arrive, what future scenarios will take place? Will Italy regress, instead of progress?

The imbalance created by the educated emigrating and the foreign laborers who immigrate could be prevented by appropriate government policies and interventions. Italy’s priority should be to keep the educated from leaving the country by creating jobs to encourage them to stay and to give them the opportunity to access the higher skilled jobs, which are currently being held by the elderly. As for the foreigners who immigrate, the Italian government, in collaboration with the government of the sender countries, could implement policies of cooperation and aid for the immigrants. In a
directive approved in June of 2008, the European Parliament invited the member states to encourage the return of immigrants to their home country by providing incentives (Gentileschi, 18). These incentives would create a climate of solidarity and collaboration between sender and receiving countries. A possible solution could be training immigrant workers in Italy with the future intent of providing them a job in their country of origin. Another alternative could be to offer aid in their home country to avoid their immigration, especially the illegal kind. This would help regulate the circulation of the majority of immigrants and promote a more liberal environment in which both the native population and the immigrants would feel that they have a choice in making future decisions.

It is my hope that in this century the sender countries and Italy can collaborate and find viable solutions to help those who are so desperate that they will cross the Mediterranean, even at the cost of losing their lives. The majority of illegal immigrants cross the Mediterranean crammed on boats like cattle, way over their capacity, some of them dying before reaching their destination. The dialog would benefit all countries involved and perhaps would serve to regulate the flow of immigrants, thus reducing illegal entry into the country. It is also my hope that the Italian government will listen to its young educated people, who have the power to change the world, and will stop the exodus of many bright minds. In a recent trip to Italy this summer, I learned that many young people that I know are no longer living there as they have emigrated either to Germany, England, or other destinations abroad. While there I had a chance to talk to my daughter’s best friend, who said that in the fall she is planning to move to Holland, where her uncle lives, to look for a job. From visiting my hometown of
Carlentini in the last five years, I have observed that there are fewer and fewer young people. Also, many students are discouraged and are becoming less motivated to attend college.

Hardly anybody wants to leave their native country, be it Italian or any other nationality. We are all attached to our homeland and most of us don’t want to emigrate; we choose to do so only as a last resort. When my family and I first immigrated to the United States, my father felt he had no choice but to emigrate, as his custom tailoring business no longer allowed him to provide for his family. When I came back to the United States with my own family, I, like my father before me, felt I didn’t have any choice either. Given the high rate of youth unemployment, I wished to give my children a chance for a better job and future. Therefore, I chose to return to the United States, a country that embraces many people, where my children and I could be given opportunities based on recognition, merit, and what we know, not on who we know. In talking to friends and family who have emigrated, the majority agree that they sometimes feel homesick and that occasionally they need to go back and visit Italy. However, in the end, they are happy to have immigrated to a country where, with their merit, dedication, and hard work, they have had the opportunity to improve their lives and those of their loved ones.
**Appendix B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1871–1920</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1,644,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1,570,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>288,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3,161,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>370,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1,966,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4,170,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1,078,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia/USSR</td>
<td>3,276,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2,494,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>241,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>241,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>326,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1,701,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>276,692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>2,891</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>35,427</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>95,145</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>2,816</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>68,060</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>222,260</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>2,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>59,431</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>40,319</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>13,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>8,757</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>58,613</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>46,674</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>16,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>7,666</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>77,419</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>56,246</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>11,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>3,631</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>100,135</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>6,203</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>12,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>135,996</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>8,253</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>8,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>178,375</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>17,297</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>11,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>4,344</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>230,622</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>17,728</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>8,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>5,791</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>193,296</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>18,008</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>13,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>12,354</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>221,479</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>22,327</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>30,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>15,401</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>273,120</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>13,399</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>40,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>32,159</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>285,731</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>6,662</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>19,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>31,792</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>128,503</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>3,477</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>23,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>16,510</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>183,218</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>4,374</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>16,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>13,642</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>215,537</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>6,566</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>13,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>21,315</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>182,882</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>6,774</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>18,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>47,622</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>157,134</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>7,192</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>20,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>54,558</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>265,542</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>7,712</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>16,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>25,307</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>283,738</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>12,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>52,003</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>49,688</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>5,302</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>10,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>76,055</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>33,665</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>26,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>61,631</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>34,596</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>28,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>72,145</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>25,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>42,977</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>27,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E

Figure 1. Italian Migration Abroad (thousands) 1876-1981

From: Golini, Birindelli, 1990
## ITALIAN MIGRATORY MOVEMENT 1946-1963 (in thousands)\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Movement</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Migrants Returned</th>
<th>Net Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946-1951</td>
<td>1,420,8</td>
<td>471,7</td>
<td>949,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-1957</td>
<td>1,736,4</td>
<td>744,3</td>
<td>992,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-1963</td>
<td>1,938,1</td>
<td>1,147,7</td>
<td>790,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,095,3</td>
<td>2,363,7</td>
<td>2,731,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**European Countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Movement</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Migrants Returned</th>
<th>Net Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946-1951</td>
<td>787,7</td>
<td>350,6</td>
<td>437,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-1957</td>
<td>957,4</td>
<td>554,4</td>
<td>403,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-1963</td>
<td>1,541,1</td>
<td>996,5</td>
<td>544,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,286,2</td>
<td>1,901,5</td>
<td>1,384,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Oversea Migration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Movement</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Migrants Returned</th>
<th>Net Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946-1951</td>
<td>633,1</td>
<td>121,1</td>
<td>512,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-1957</td>
<td>779,0</td>
<td>189,9</td>
<td>589,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-1963</td>
<td>397,0</td>
<td>152,2</td>
<td>245,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,809,1</td>
<td>462,2</td>
<td>1,346,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G

### Table 5 Stock of foreign resident population in absolute value, as share of domestic population and by area of origin and most important nationality of origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Europe of which LatAm</th>
<th>East EU</th>
<th>By main nationality of origin</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>143.834</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>186.415</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>298.746</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>423.004</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>781.100</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>987.400</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>991.419</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1250.214</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1500.200</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 - Indices of the “College Graduates Drain” by area of emigration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>η = ( \frac{E_t}{P_t} )</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>Γ</th>
<th>Γ = ( \frac{G_T}{G_f} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows the values for the following indicators, using the SHIW and AIRE data:

* η is the percentage ratio between total emigrants \( E_t \) and total population \( P_t \) (emigration rate);
* γ is the ratio between the share of college graduates among emigrants \( g^\delta \) and the share of college graduates in the population \( g^\delta_f \);
* Γ is the percentage ratio between college graduates who emigrate \( G_T^\delta \) and college graduates in the population \( G_f^\delta \).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>$\eta_t$</th>
<th>$\psi_t$</th>
<th>$\psi_t$</th>
<th>$\gamma_t$</th>
<th>$\Gamma_t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows the values for the following indicators, using the SHIW and AIRE data:

- $\eta_t = 100 \frac{E_t}{P_t}$ is the percentage ratio between total emigrants $E_t$ and total population $P_t$ (emigration rate);

- $\gamma_t = \frac{S_t^E}{\mu_P}$ is the ratio between the share of college graduates among emigrants $S_t^E$ and the share of college graduates in the population $\mu_P$;

- $\Gamma_t = \frac{G_t^E}{G_t^P}$ is the percentage ratio of college graduates who emigrate $G_t^E$ and college graduates in the population $G_t^P$;

- $\psi_t = \frac{H_t^{0.035F}}{H_t^{0.035F}}$ is the ratio of average human capital among emigrants $H_t^{0.035F}$ and average human capital in the population $H_t^{0.035F}$;

- $\Psi_t = 100 \frac{E_t^{0.035F}}{P_t^{0.035F}}$ is the percentage ratio of total human capital for the emigrants $E_t^{0.035F}$ and total human capital for the population $P_t^{0.035F}$.

All indices are relative to the Italian population in the 26-65 age range.
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