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1 The Call for Consultation

The Ministry for Social Dialogue, Consumer Affairs and Civil Liberties (MSDC), published the following call for consultation on May 5, 2015 under the project “Mind the Gap”. The full text for this call is being reproduced hereunder:

1.1 Background

The National Migrant Integration Strategy 2015-2020\(^1\) states: Maltese Government has pledged to open society, to celebrate diversity, to recognise the social realities around us, to cherish Maltese identity without discrimination, to ensure equality and respect towards minority groups and above all, to safeguard the fundamental human rights and freedoms of all.

It is Government’s belief that the current realities faced by migrants coming from third countries (i.e., countries that are not EU Member States), require immediate attention.

For this reason, the Ministry for Social Dialogue, Consumer Affairs and Civil Liberties (MSDC) has embarked on a project entitled Mind D Gap: Together we can make a difference (IF 2013-17). Its aim is to support efforts that enable third country nationals (TCNs) of diverse national, economic, social, cultural, religious, linguistic and ethnic backgrounds to fulfil the conditions of residence and to facilitate their integration within Maltese society. The project is intended to shape and inform the National Migrant Integration Strategy 2015-2020, which is expected to be launched later on during 2015.

This Strategy will be developed within a framework that promotes human rights, equal opportunities and obligations for all. Amongst other things, it will promote diversity as a basic value to achieving greater social cohesion.

The aim of the Strategy is to bring about real changes for third country nationals within our society, and to build a strong community where everyone, regardless of race, colour, religious or political opinion, age, sex, gender, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity or any other status, can live, work and prosper in a context of fairness, equality, rights, responsibilities and respect.

\(^1\) http://socialdialogue.gov.mt/en/Public_Consultations/MSDC/Pages/Consultations/MDGIntegration.aspx
1.2 Key Policy Areas

The following areas were identified as being relevant and important to achieve the goal of integration of TCNs, thus promoting the common basic value of a society characterised by diversity. These policy areas will establish direction and guidance towards the development of the Strategy.

The Strategy will ensure that measures regarding services, initiatives and interventions are developed, implemented and/or strengthened thus providing for effective integration processes.

The areas are:

1. **Defending rights and fulfilling duties: anti-discrimination and equality**
2. **Resolving social barriers and providing opportunities: education / labour market**
3. **Promoting intercultural relations / Raising public awareness on integration: empowering local communities**
4. **Civil participation: outreach to communities of TCNs**
5. **Institutional dialogue: TCN consultative council / policy-makers and decision-makers**

1.3 Consultation Questions

The National Migrant Integration Strategy 2015-2020 will set out Strategic Objectives under each of these policy areas and aim to establish a structure within which available resources can be more effectively managed and integrated to target the funding strategically, avoid duplication, ensure complimentarily, and maximise the impact on the ground.

1. Do you agree with the general outline of the Key Policy Areas indicated above?
   a. Is there anything that should be included or omitted?
   b. Do you have any proposals that you wish to advance in this respect?

2. Please insert any additional comment or proposal you would like to make with regard to the integration of third country nationals.

3. Please send us any documents referring to integration with regard to the national context that you believe should be considered in the formulation of the Strategy.
2 The Response

2.1 Introduction

This document is presented as a response to the call for Consultation by the Ministry for Social Dialogue and Department, Consumer Affairs and Civil Liberties on a proposed National Migrant Integration Strategy. The very introduction of this call for consultation starts with:

“The Maltese Government has pledged to open society, to celebrate diversity, to recognise the social realities around us, to cherish Maltese identity without discrimination, to ensure equality and respect towards minority groups and above all, to safeguard the fundamental human rights and freedoms of all.”

Primarily one rightly questions where has such a pledge “to open society” and “to celebrate diversity” been made. The PL Electoral Manifesto makes no mention of any such pledge and the key word “Integration” is glaringly missing from the above document that was issued a mere 2 years ago. The only reference to “Immigration” in Section 16 of the said Manifesto speaks at length on a “Border Patrol Squadron” in paragraph 35, on achieving “solidarity” at a European level in paragraph 36 and on strengthening of the role of the Commissioner for Refugees in paragraph 37. There certainly is no reference that may be remotely associated with a full-blown Migrant Integration Policy that this Government is now claiming to have “pledged”.

Moreover the timing of the release of this document following the most serious migrant tragedy presumed to have hit the Mediterranean Sea and the rather discreet publishing of this call for consultation without a strong backing campaign on local mainstream media do not auger well for a proper and unbiased consultation process. I sincerely hope that the keeping of such a low profile was incidental and not due to fearing a negative reception by the general public.

Notwithstanding this I shall attempt to be objective in this document and in my analysis and contributions on the subject matter. I also trust that the strategy formation process will not biased by solely consulting with the relevant NGOs, academia and immigrant representatives but to also take on board and consider all opinions and take heed of the citizens’ concerns in this matter.

---

2.2 Primary Considerations

The first interrogation of the Consultation Process requests whether we agree with the general outline of the Key Policy Areas. Before one can address this matter, one has to state whether one is in agreement with a “National Migrant Integration Strategy” itself. If one were to put such a question to the general public I would dare say that a sizable chunk of the local population would answer with a blunt “NO” and I will explain why.

Simply put our local population did not ask to receive such an influx of illegal immigrants or asylum seekers and simply found itself in the path of these would be economically or politically motivated persons seeking to escape their homeland and even their home-continent to seek better fortunes in Europe. For this matter while I am more than sure that the majority of Maltese would not have anything against the saving of human life, once saved most Maltese would expect that such persons should at best move on. Since it is now becoming more apparent that these “guests” are here to stay, the locals would be rather justified to expect that it is for the immigrants to integrate with the local population, culture and customs and not vice-versa.

The whole concept, wording and approach of the request for consultation do however indicate otherwise. In expecting our society to “celebrate diversity”, to “recognise social realities around us”, to “cherish Maltese identity without discrimination”, and to “ensure equality and respect towards minority groups”, the onus here is clearly on the Maltese Society and not on the Migrants themselves. This approach is already inherently wrong as for any chance of a success of such a would-be Integration Policy, the primary focus ought to be on the migrant doing the biggest effort to integrate and not the other way round.

However much one argues that the argument here is one of fundamental human rights, the generic Maltese national is already feeling as an undesired victim of the immigration issue in general and hence any attempts at forcing our citizens to integrate with whom they may be rightly perceive as the very perpetrators of this rather “unwelcome” issue may backfire and rather deteriorate into open resentment.

What we should be talking about here is rather the “acceptance” of such immigrants by the local population (or perhaps rather the resignation to the fact that they are here to stay), and to “respect” them. However it is crucial that respect must be earned and never demanded.

For this purpose for any chance of a better acceptance of a Migrant Integration Policy, the onus of such integration must be clearly on the person attempting to infiltrate a closed society and not to forcefully “open” that society to accommodate the same person imposing his presence on it.
2.3 Definition of Migrants

The terms *Illegal Immigrant, Immigrant, Migrant, Asylum Seeker,* and *Refugee* are often used and misused liberally and generally taken to be synonymous in meaning and alternate labelling for the same groups or categories. In reality none of the above is identical though overlaps do exist and a person or persons may simultaneously belong to one or more of the above. Since this document refers to a Migrant Integration Policy while the call for consultation refers to third country nationals, it must be clarified what each individual term signifies in the relevant context.

**Immigrant:** an *immigrant* is any person entering a country of which he is not a citizen with intent to reside and work within that country after having acquired required permissions and official authorization typically assigned following a rigid screening process.

**Illegal Immigrant:** an *illegal immigrant* is any person entering a country of which he is not a citizen without government permission or authorization or one who has stayed beyond the termination date of a visa or entry-permit, or who has attempted entry under false identity or documents. Typically an *illegal immigrant* attempts to enter the country by illicit means or across unguarded borders in a clandestine manner (hence the Maltese term ’Klandestin’).

**Migrant:** a *migrant* is a generic term covering both *immigrants* (third-country national entering a country) and *emigrants* (national citizens migrated to third-countries). Legally a *migrant* is any person who travels from one country to another of which he is not a citizen in search of work and whose intent of staying in the host country is for a longer term than allowed by a typical entry visa. However the term migrant also refers to a person moving from one area to another even within the same country. In this manner, within the EU context a *migrant* may be internal (i.e. cross-border flows between diverse EU Countries), and external where such migrants originate from non-EU third countries.

**Asylum Seeker:** an *asylum seeker* is any person who is seeking *refugee status* within a host country, but whose claim has not yet been definitively evaluated. The status of *asylum seeker* is irrespective of the mode of entry of that person into the country where asylum is being requested. For this matter, an *asylum seeker* may or may not be an *illegal immigrant*. So while *illegal immigrants* are typically seeking asylum (unless they are aiming to reside undetected in a host country), *asylum seekers* may also include persons entering the country via legal channels.

**Refugee:** a *refugee* is a person who has requested asylum in a host country and whose request has been accepted. Such a request is typically accepted on the grounds of fear of a person being persecuted on account of race, religion, nationality, and/or membership in a particular social group or political opinion. A *refugee* is not to be confused with an *asylum seeker* who is still seeking to acquire a *refugee status*. If such a status is not granted than *asylum seekers* can be sent back to their home country.3

---

3. UNHCR – Asylum Seekers: [http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646c137.html](http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646c137.html)
Irrespective of the above clear definitions, there is still a lot of confusion in terms as applied in various reports, statistics, and differing interpretations from country to country. For example many countries utilize the generic term migrants to broadly define any illegal or legal immigrants into their country whether they are asylum seekers or. Notwithstanding the additional meaning of the term migrant that also refer to flows of a country’s own citizens (as in the case of returning emigrants or internal movements of citizens based on work requirements), the terms migrants and immigrants are often used interchangeably.

For a definition of such migrants, many countries depend solely on their original nationality of such persons. Since nationality is at times loose and may change, others prefer to base this on the person’s country of birth therefore defining “foreign-born” as the main criteria. Then again this is incorrect in case of foreign-born persons to naturalized parents, therefore pushing the migrant status to the parents’ citizenship as well. For this matter some countries determine migrants as persons of foreign birth to non-citizen parents and yet others also include local-born persons to both parents of foreign origin, sometimes even up to subsequent generations. Yet other countries determine the migrant status depending on the residency status in that a person would be considered a migrant as long as hat person acquires a permanent residency permit within that country.

In view of such loose definitions, it is crucial to determine what the proposed National Migrant Integration Strategy is intending as a Migrant. That is, whether this strategy is to apply to illegal or also legal immigrants, whether it will apply to asylum seekers or only refugees and as to what steps are to be taken in the case of asylum seekers refused a refugee status.

### 2.4 Origin of Migrants in Malta

When we talk of Migrant origins, we typically speak of their home countries that include Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Chad, Gambia, Senegal, Mali, and even Libya, Syria, and Egypt amongst others.4

However when we read reports by international organizations and in the press we often hear of limited countries such as Eritrea and Syria. For example Angelina Jolie, the UNHCR special envoy, speaking on the recent migrant crisis on the Mediterranean, attributed the more than 1,300 migrants drowned at sea over the past weeks as “fleeing Syria and other places”.5 Similarly a 2012 Human Rights Watch article criticizing Malta’s “inhumane and unnecessary” blanket detention policy mentions Somalia and Eritrea as the main countries of origin of illegal immigrants on our shores.6

---

4 8,400 migrants, asylum-seekers reach Italy and Malta: [http://www.unhcr.org/51d6b8a56.html](http://www.unhcr.org/51d6b8a56.html)


Such attributions are not coincidental by any means. The main issues here are the application of any illegal immigrants reaching our country for asylum. In order for an asylum seeker to be accepted as a refugee they have to be classified as such. The 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees has adopted the following definition of a refugee (in Article 1.A.2):

“Any person who: owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality, and is unable to or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country”.

The European Union's minimum standards definition of refugee, is underlined by Art. 2 (c) of Directive No. 2004/83/EC, essentially reproduces the narrow definition of refugee offered by the above convention; nevertheless, by virtue of articles 2 (e) and 15 of the same Directive, persons who have fled a war-caused generalized violence are, at certain conditions, eligible for a complementary form of protection, called subsidiary protection. This form of protection is foreseen for people who, without being refugees, are nevertheless exposed, if returned to their countries of origin, to death penalty, torture or other inhuman or degrading treatments.

When immigrants seeking asylum into Malta are not granted either status then they can officially by repatriated. While this point raises various issues locally with a recent high-profile case attracting media attention, one is given the impression that repatriations are not allowed by the EU or international organizations. In actual fact the issue here was not the repatriation itself but rather the lack of processing the relative migrants for asylum. Still when one listens to statements from public officials, politicians, NGOs and other, it would seem that the very idea of initiating any form of repatriation is simply unacceptable.

One would think that Malta is the only country to consider repatriating migrants not granted refugee or subsidiary protection status. In fact this turns out to be a pretty common occurrence in the EU. Countries like Ireland, Britain, France, Denmark, Germany, Italy, and others have all sent migrants back to their country in addition to refusing them entry.

---

8 69 lawyers file judicial protest against the government over its plans to repatriate migrants: http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20130709/local/69-lawyers-file--protest-over-push-backs.477312
10 Watchdog surprised by Malta’s support for migrant pushbacks: http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20120630/local/Watchdog-surprised-by-Malta-s-support-for-migrant-pushbacks.426537
13 Ireland, almost 2,250 people were deported or removed from the State in the past 12 months: http://www.thejournal.ie/deportation-immigration-stats-1251255-Jan2014/
Conversely Malta has a rather low record of repatriating migrants. According to the European Migration Network Country Factsheet for Malta, which analyzes the years 2010, 2011 and 2012, lists the asylum requests in those years as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Granted Refugee Status</th>
<th>Granted Subsidiary Status</th>
<th>Granted Humanitarian Protection</th>
<th>Negative decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As may be seen by the above while the refugee status granting went down over these years, however the granting of subsidiary status shot up drastically and the overall refusal rate went sharply down.

According to the same report, the number of relocated or resettled migrants throughout the same period was null as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third-country nationals relocated</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third-country nationals resettled</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the same time, it is rather concerning that the refusal rate has gone down from 36% to 10% over this period. Considering this data it would appear that most immigrant asylum requests are in fact justified. However one must keep in mind another EU rule, namely that of the “third safe country” rule. This rule establishes that an asylum seeker genuinely fleeing persecution will seek

---

14 UK, 50,741 foreign nationals removed from within the UK under immigration law: [http://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/briefings/deportations-removals-and-voluntary-departures-uk](http://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/briefings/deportations-removals-and-voluntary-departures-uk)
16 France, police send immigrants back to Italy: [http://www.thelocal.it/20140623/french-police-send-immigrants-back-to-italy](http://www.thelocal.it/20140623/french-police-send-immigrants-back-to-italy)
21 Germany, Austria and Hungary would like to return about 7500 back to Bulgaria: [http://www.novinite.com/articles/165754/Three+EU+Countries+%27to+Send+7500+Refugees+Back+to+Bulgaria%27](http://www.novinite.com/articles/165754/Three+EU+Countries+%27to+Send+7500+Refugees+Back+to+Bulgaria%27)
23 ‘Safe Third Country’ in the European Union: [http://www.academia.edu/2447287/Safe_Third_Country_in_the_European_Union_An_Evolving_Concept_in_International_Law_and_Implications_for_the_UK](http://www.academia.edu/2447287/Safe_Third_Country_in_the_European_Union_An_Evolving_Concept_in_International_Law_and_Implications_for_the_UK)
24 UNHCR Safeguards needed for EU asylum rules on “safe countries”: [http://www.unhcr.org/3f7ac0577.html](http://www.unhcr.org/3f7ac0577.html)
protection in the first safe country entered; any secondary movement will be purely for migration purposes. With this in mind most migrants arriving in Malta would certainly have passed via a number of other “safe” country before reaching our shores. Most notably in this category are Syrians escaping their war-torn homelands. For a Syrian to make it to Malta, assuming a Muslim would wish to avoid Israel, he would have had to traverse Lebanon, Jordan, possibly Saudi, all of Egypt and then Libya before he can source a human trafficker to risk his own life and that of his family to cross the Mediterranean sea. One would find a round trip across all these friendly and safe Muslim countries rather odd for a person fleeing to safety.

Similarly, a person escaping Somalia would need to traverse Ethiopia, Sudan (both rather unsafe) and then through Egypt and Libya or directly to the latter and again risk his life crossing the Sahara desert. Considering the proximity the stability and relative safety of neighbouring Kenya, Tanzania and other southern African countries, one again questions the genuineness of such migrant routes.

Moreover, as the 2011 FRONTEX map below shows, the closest and most common sense route of migrant crossings towards Lampedusa and Sicily would be in Tunisia and not Libya as we would be led to understand.

![Figure 1 – 2011 FRONTEX Map of Immigrant departure points](image-url)
Similarly, recent salvage operations such as the ones being carried out by the MOAS ship Phoenix are being carried out in the proximity of Tunisian shores. The map below taken from satellite tracking of the Phoenix on May 15, the day MOAS picked 369 migrants “close to the Libyan shore” clearly shows the pickup point after which the Phoenix takes a direct route towards Lampedusa. Possible following instructions from Italian and Maltese authorities, the Phoenix then changed direction passed just north of Gozo and made its way with the saved immigrants to the Italian port of Messina.

Figure 2 – MOAS Salvage operation with the Phoenix – May 15

Such actions and the above FRONTEX map raise questions as to whether these immigrants are actually leaving from Libya or from the rather safe and stable Tunisia. Another question one rightly asks is why do rescue ships with hundreds of migrants in possible dire conditions cross the whole Mediterranean rather than make it to the closest safe port as required by international rescue operations. In this case clearly the ports of Zarzis\(^\text{25}\) and Gabes\(^\text{26}\) were even closer than Lampedusa let alone distant Messina in the north-eastern tip of Sicily.

The implications here are rather serious and detrimental to any decisions of granting asylum, Libya is in a state of civil war and hence unsafe, Tunisia \textit{is not}. We ought to be presumably saving lives here not offering a ferry service to Europe.

\(^{25}\) Port of Zarzis, Tunisia: \url{http://www.worldportsource.com/ports/TUN_Port_of_Zarzis_2163.php}
\(^{26}\) Port of Gabes, Tunisia: \url{http://www.worldportsource.com/ports/TUN_Port_of_Gabes_2162.php}
2.5 Malta’s Current MIPEX Rating

According to the Migrant Integration Policy Index of 2015, Malta stands at the 6th from the last position, at no. 33 out of the 38 ranked countries. This is indicated in Figure 1 below which also gives a breakdown of this ranking by category:

![Figure 3 - Malta MIPEX Ranking](image)

As may be seen from the above Malta’s overall ranking of 40 falls in the “Slightly Unfavourable” bracket and our worst performance is apparently in Education, Political Participation and Access to Nationality in that specific order. On the other hand our best ranking is in Anti-discrimination, Permanent Residence (potentially not out of choice), and Family Reunion. In spite of these “positive” indicators, they all float around the 50% mark being “halfway favourable”.

It is interesting to note that all 3 bottom ranked categories, namely Education, Political Participation and Access to Nationality are all factors within the hands of our administrators who are so often quick to label our citizens as “racist”, “xenophobic” and unnecessarily alarmed at immigration whereas the highest scoring category of Anti-discrimination seems to indicate otherwise. Such labelling and “guilt” attribution when it comes to migrants are often political tools to counter public sentiments and mitigate anti-immigrant sentiments however one threads on dangerous ground as this also raises anger and frustration at being unjustly attacked.

---

The MIPEX index also brings to light another (perhaps also politically motivated) misconception that Malta seems to be alone in this dire situation with other countries being considered as armchair critics. It is enough to mention European Commissioner Cecilia Malmström and the backlash she endured on social media from many irate Maltese following her comments on our situation. One sincerely doubts why the efforts of her home country were never highlighted by politicians and local media.

The index also clearly shows that unlike popular beliefs, Sweden is in fact a top-performer when it comes to immigration and integration policies. The 2015 data for Sweden is not yet available but Sweden was at the forefront of this Index both in 2010 and in 2007. Comparisons with Malta show that while we were a mere 3 points less than this year at 37%, Sweden was at No. 1 with a staggering 83% compliance.28

So when one considers that the generic opinion of most Maltese is that we are doing even more than our utmost in this situation, how come Malta is rating so badly in this index? Again since data for 2015 is still not available for all countries,29 I shall be presenting the 2010 statistics in Figure 4 below for comparison purposes. In this Table I am comparing Malta to the European top-performers as well as the main EU Countries we typically look up to as well as our neighbouring Mediterranean countries in similar situations (always excluding our particular over-population density). What is immediately obvious is that in spite of Malta’s efforts and sacrifices in view of the immigration issue, and notwithstanding our citizens’ perception that the country is doing more than its fair share in this regard, Malta was invariably underperforming on all criteria across the board. Not only so but even countries like Italy and Greece who officially appear unfairly burdened as much as us and are also somewhat largely underperforming but are still somewhat ahead of us. The biggest surprises are both in that the top-most performers are in fact the least likely candidates by general perception and that countries at the top of the complaint list like the United Kingdom are in fact not too far off from ourselves.

While we cannot compare how we are faring against the same countries as yet, we do know that our overall position has only shifted from 37% in 2010 to 40% this year, so we may safely assume that we are roughly in the same position as that year. We can however compare individual scores for the relevant categories against ourselves to see how and if we have in fact progressed. A look at these figures quickly reveals that we have had a slight improvement in the Labour Market (+2%) and in Education (+3%), no change in Family Reunion and Political Participation, surprisingly a sharp decrease in Long-Term Residence (-14%), a slight improvement in Access to Nationality (+8%), and a substantial increase in Anti-Discrimination (+15%).

When the generic opinion of most Maltese is that we are doing even more than our utmost in this situation, how shall the public react to an integration policy?

---
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Figure 4: MIPEX 2010 results for selected countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Malta</th>
<th>Cyprus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour Market Mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to General Support</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Support</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Rights</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Reunion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Conditions</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of Status</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights Associated</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Needs</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Opportunities</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Education for All</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Rights</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Liberties</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Bodies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Policies</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Term Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Conditions</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of Status</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Rights</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Nationality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Conditions</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of Status</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Nationality</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anti-Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions and Concepts</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields of Application</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Mechanisms</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Policies</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Score</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Ranking</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: MIPEX 2010 results for selected countries
2.5.1 Key Policy Areas versus MIPEX

Considering MIPEX is a Migrant Integration Policy Index, one would expect that a proposed Integration Strategy would be based on the same. The Key Policy Areas selected as part of the consultation process however do not specifically follow the MIPEX headings. A definite overlap is evident as expected, however an apparent glaring omission appears to be the third-lowest MIPEX ranking sector of Access to Nationality (unless of course this is intentionally or un-intentionally hidden under one or more of the suggested strategy options).

The proposed Integration Strategy seems to suggest addressing the below presumably in order of importance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Key Policy Areas</th>
<th>Related MIPEX Sector (Rating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Defending rights and fulfilling duties: anti-discrimination and equality</td>
<td>Anti-Discrimination (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resolving social barriers and providing opportunities: education / labour market</td>
<td>Education (19), Labour Market (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promoting intercultural relations / Raising public awareness on integration: empowering local communities</td>
<td>Education (19), Political Participation (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Civil participation: outreach to communities of TCNs</td>
<td>Political Participation (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional dialogue: TCN consultative council / policy-makers and decision-makers</td>
<td>Political Participation (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As may be clearly seen from the above table, the proposed strategies not only do not seem to follow the MIPEX Sectors, but also do not appear to prioritize strategies in line with the lower to higher ratings. Also very evident is the apparent emphasis on political participation while entire policy-sectors appear to be omitted as noted above. So while Anti-Discrimination seems to be our top recommended strategy where we have one of our higher ratings, permanent residence, access to nationality, family reunion and health all seem to be omitted. It appears that the suggested strategy is ignoring these sectors and is concentrating highly on education and political participation.

This approach raises a number of questions: Is discrimination a major stumbling block in integrating with third country nationals? Will education and political participation effectively be a catalyst in integrating migrants in our country? Is the labour market geared to face the challenges of a multicultural workforce?
All of this remains to be seen but in order to get a better picture, we first have to analyze what the relative MIPEX sectors stand for and what specific categories are used within each sector to measure and rank the progress and success of its implementation. For this purpose we shall be looking at these sectors in more detail.

### 2.5.2 Analysis of the Anti-Discrimination Sector

Even if Anti-Discrimination is one of our higher ranked policy-sector, at 51% Malta is still deemed to be rather lacking in this area. The above 51% is the overall rating that in itself is the average rating of the individual categories making up this policy-sector. A deeper look at each individual category and the respective rating gives a deeper perspective of where the country stands vis-à-vis the full expected compliance to any policy-sector.

MIPEX breaks the Anti-Discrimination policy into:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Item</th>
<th>2010 Rank</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitions and Concepts</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Definitions of discrimination have to be full and explicit and is to include nationality in addition to race, ethnicity, and religion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields of Application</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>The above definitions have to be applied to largely outlaw such presumed discrimination across various fields such as education, training, employment, social interactions, social benefits, legal frameworks, etc. Malta is considered to have established a “minimum” horizontal approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Mechanisms</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>The actual enforcement of such mechanisms and the assistance and facility of victims to bring forth their case. This includes financial aid, interpreters and support for “class-action” claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Policies</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Policies for guarantees of equality and procedures for governments, authorities and service-providers are not themselves committing discrimination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above breakdown identifies areas that in spite of the overall mid-range ranking, clearly need addressing. So while the country is faring fairly well in defining discrimination and enforcement mechanisms with both sectors rated around 60%, according to MIPEX there is still is a lot to do in these sectors to be fully compliant. Within the former, Malta is has not as yet explicitly prohibited nationality discrimination (as differing from racial discrimination) nor legislation covering multiple discrimination (as in discrimination on multiple factors simultaneously). On the other hand, enforcement mechanisms are deemed to lack of support to class-action lawsuits which one would hardly recommend under the circumstances as well as facilitating potential victims to forward their cases.
More so, MIPEX deems Malta as seriously lacking in the application of such anti-discriminatory measures across the various fields such as education, training, employment, social interactions, social benefits, legal frameworks, etc. Also lacking according to MIPEX, are equality policies as Malta apparently lacks a strong and independent equality body, as well as strong state actions to promote equality.

With all of the above being all in all healthy improvements in any modern society, anti-discrimination policies ought to be the least resisted changes to our society. The main issue here is that they are being recommended simply as lacking and recommendable for immigrants only. Perception that illegal immigrants and asylum seekers are better assisted and better cared for than the average underprivileged citizen are already ripe amongst locals especially those belonging to the lower-income brackets. Implementing such extra rights, protections and legal paths to further such an advantage shall certainly not be a popular move. The issue here is not anti-discrimination in itself nor principles of equality but rather ones of their application and enforcement.

With most immigrants being of north-African Arab or dark-skinned sub-Saharan African origins, it has already become customary to pull the racial and religious discrimination card (if not both) by such immigrants, NGOs, authorities and self-appointed defenders of these supposed disadvantaged minorities. Such individual, groups and organizations seem intent on elevating migrants higher than the very population hosting them. Even raising or disputing the immigration issue itself is indeed deemed racist, and should one dare question the reason driving most immigrants flows towards Europe or the quasi-ferry service most NGOs wish to implement, then one is immediately labelled by a barrage of descriptive adjectives not to mention being named and shamed by the local media and know-it-all bloggers. If we have already reached such extreme levels of positive-discrimination with our current partial-compliance, one can only guess what we can expect once such policies or legislation are in place.

2.5.3 Analysis of the Education Sector

Quite surprisingly, Education is our worst performing MIPEX policy-sector at 19%, whilst this is in fact one of our better services at a national level. So why are we failing so miserably in this sector when it comes to immigration?

MIPEX breaks the Education policy into:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Item</th>
<th>2010 Rank</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Access to education and professional assessment of what migrant children learnt abroad. Additional support to access pre-primary, vocational and higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above breakdown clearly shows not just the overall poorness of our general progress in this sector but discloses areas that are totally ignored or minimally addressed. Starting from access to education were we are hardly handling such additional requirements, vetting, monitoring and special needs analysis for our own local children let alone knowledgeable enough or prepared to do anything likewise for migrant children. We seem to have hardly started on targeted needs and should we spare the finances and the additional teacher training, I doubt we can currently afford either the time effort and more so the required resources to do this effectively.

Clearly with a 0% rating we are totally ignoring the new opportunities and skills that migrant pupils bring to the classroom. How we should get such benefits is rather obscure especially considering that we seem to have little in common with the languages, cultures and beliefs, and modes of attire practised by such immigrants into our country. Yet with the efforts we are already making at preaching diversity as if it is the ultimate blessing to our society than I suppose we should be able to swallow our pride and strive to discover these lost opportunities.

Not only should we be teaching migrant children their own language, culture and religion but it seems that in the name of bridging the gap we should also pass on these values to our own offspring. Apparently we are not giving immigrants enough access to education and we are not specifically targeting their needs in our schools. We being a typical selfish bigoted lot, seem to have just opened our state-owned free-education schools to them and offered them the same opportunities most of us got as kids. But it seems this approach is not up to EU expectations. We ought to be teaching both them and even more so our own offspring about immigrant culture, languages, and perhaps beliefs. That way we would apparently be addressing a true multicultural society by fostering and encouraging the very sub-cultural divisions and issues that threaten to keep our society split into a ghetto-culture well established in the high-ranking MIPEX countries.
2.5.4 Analysis of the Labour Market Sector

Malta’s MIPEX ranking in the labour market at 45% is not at its best but still fares reasonably better that education and political participation. Traditionally the Maltese labour market has been somewhat closed to foreigners with the latter finding difficulty to find jobs locally and worse still to get through the difficulties of acquiring a work permit.

The situation in recent years has however changed drastically and rapidly. Way back in June 2010 we reportedly had 7,441 foreigners officially employed in the island of which 2,277 were declared to be from non-EU countries and 889 as refugees as declared by the Times of Malta.\(^\text{30}\) The same Times had however reported 8,653 foreigners working in Malta a mere 8 months earlier, 4,325 of which were supposedly EU citizens\(^\text{31}\), so the official numbers seemed to be going down. However, by 2014, Employment Minister Evarist Bartolo declared official figures of around 18,000.\(^\text{32}\) This would indicate a drastic increase of 10,559 workers in 4 years. More of concern was the minister’s declaration that 40% of these were hired because Maltese workers could not fill the respective roles. That would result in 7,300 job-posts that our workers were either incapable of filling or ones that they were not interested in taking up. Considering that no specific new industry or new industrial sector had been launched within the same period, it is rather mysterious how 7,300 “new” jobs popped up around our islands which somehow eluded the talents and abilities of the Maltese workforce.

Even more recently more incongruent figures were tabled in Parliament by the Works Minister. This time he was more specific and declared that 6,027 third country nationals, hailing from countries that do not form part of the EU, currently worked in Malta.\(^\text{33}\) He however apparently did not table the total foreign workers so one would assume that we were somewhere above that last 18,000 figure. Giving a breakdown of these figures it results that 1,128 of these are from the Philippines, 793 are Serbians, 346 Chinese, 333 Eritreans, 291 Indians, 263 Libyans, and 213 Russians. Since this breakdown leaves a gaping hole of 3,327 unaccounted for, one must presume that the remainder is made up of fragmented nationalities of insignificant amounts. Amongst these insignificant nationalities is presumably the remaining balance of the above 889 employed refugee-status countries are there supplying us with immigrants?

I guess another serious question would be why are there no significant numbers of either Somalis or Syrians considering both of these are coming from war-zones and with the former being amongst our highest source of illegal immigrants? Well, statistics will be statistics and I guess we would need to import another foreigner to help us make heads and tails of these figures. In the mean time we may have a look at the MIPEX categories making up our ranking.

\(^{30}\) Official figures June 2010: [http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20100623/local/7-441-foreigners-have-permits-to-work-in-malta.314219](http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20100623/local/7-441-foreigners-have-permits-to-work-in-malta.314219)


As may be seen from the above table Malta is doing fairly well as regards to access to the labour market with a 60% rating and similarly in the second category of access to general support. Perhaps the obvious gap here is the expected increase in the public sector and surely enough more can be done in higher education and vocational training. Procedures to recognise certifications, skills, foreign qualifications and experience from work abroad are certainly more challenging especially considering (the supposed) unstable condition of their country of origin. This would invariably add an unnecessary burden on our local resources to score a few extra points with MIPEX. Similarly a 50% rating in the worker’s rights category is reasonable and the biggest stumbling block here is more one of naturalization than of the labour market itself.

Conversely a lot may apparently be done in targeted support considering Malta has a rock-bottom ranking of only 13%. Here targeting the least employable such as the young, the low-educated or women as recommended by MIPEX may improve our standing. That said targeting our own local rather unemployable categories of young unskilled males and over-fifties and targeting middle-aged housewives to return to their careers are also desirable and should certainly be given priority over foreign immigrants. In any case targeting special needs and paving the way for equal rights and opportunities certainly does not guarantee employment or even employability. As stated elsewhere in this document, migrant women present a rather difficult scenario especially those pertaining to the Muslim faith or national customs thereby auto-reducing their own chances of employability as detailed further below. While their male counterparts have fewer issues in this regard, other factors of social behaviour, language limitations and vocational lacking do present significant barriers to steady jobs or to higher-income openings.

One concern that is not that obvious in the MIPEX labour categories but one that is possibly more related to discrimination is one of equal opportunities in enrolment. Regulations against ethnic,
rational, religious, sexual and national bias shall certainly be suggested and enforced at some point or strengthened where already present. To follow suit of most western nations I would not be surprised were Malta to also venture in ethnic, racial or TCN quotas in employment within public entities, if not also within medium to large private corporations. Such a dangerous path may lead to recruiters refusing the best candidates simply because such candidates may not pertain to the desired minority. Minorities may also utilise proposed legislation and statutory frameworks to take advantage of the system by claiming discrimination and potential employers may actually select them in favour of better non-minority candidates simply to avoid any litigation.

As already stated, Muslim women also present a more difficult category. For example, it is often suggested in studies carried out in other countries that they in particular are discriminated against in the labour market\(^{34}\). While statistics may be used to prove such an argument, according to this World Bank report the very practice of veiling and physical segregation of women prevalent in Muslim societies is implicated in preventing them from participating in the labour market in the same way as their male counterparts. Even in such case where Muslim women may be ready to break barriers and venture out into the labour market, to what length are we taking such legislation? Are we to punish a potential employer for having a preference to staff with no issues of donning the company uniform? Are we to punish a potential employer for having a preference to staff with no issues about sharing an office with male colleagues? Shall we force employers to segregate employees, segregate duties or be forced to exclude specific employees from certain duties on grounds of religion, traditions or ethnic customs? Shall we force an employer to refuse the best candidate as he or she does not fit a recommended or imposed gender\(^{35}\) or racial\(^{36}\) quota? Would that not in itself give rise to another form of discrimination?

2.5.5 Analysis of the Political Participation Sector

Not surprisingly, Malta does not rank well in immigrants political participation albeit faring somewhat better than education at MIPEX ranking of 25%. Still being the second lowest policy-sector, we need to analyze why our country is rating so poorly here as well. According to MIPEX, political participation is an area of weakness for integration policy across most countries. Most immigrants have few opportunities to inform and improve the policies that affect them daily, since most authorities design policies for them and are not informed by or accountable to them. Due to this MIPEX judges countries progress on electoral rights, political liberties, consultative bodies, and implementation policies. Malta is only considered to be compliant in political


Electoral rights signify not only immigrants’ right to vote but even more, their right to stand for election. At this point Malta is lacking in both of these areas and limits such rights only to inborn or naturalized citizens. Consultative bodies are present in Malta in the form of multiple NGOs that not only are present but seem to be multiplying rapidly. Such NGOs have not only offered consultation to Governing bodies and policy formations but frequently dictate what should or should not be done without much hesitation. However in consultative bodies, MIPEX is expecting ones made of the same immigrants. Not just, but MIPEX expects such bodies to be strong, non government-led or government appointed, properly funded, and properly consulted in order to engage immigrants and represent their diverse interests.

So again here according to MIPEX, Malta is apparently severely lacking. MIPEX insists we should be giving immigrants voting rights, the rights to stand for elections, and assisted to form consultative bodies that Government ought to consult in the design of any implementation and integration policies. Truly enough lately moves in this direction have been felt or hinted at in the political scene with both of the two major political parties and the highest authorities of the country apparently trying to score points in this area. However this apparently is not going down so well with the local population who more often than not feel rather abandoned in respect to the undue attention that the immigrant minorities seem to be getting at their cost.

2.5.6 Selected Strategies Incongruence with MIPEX

As shown further above the selected strategies do not seem to be in line with the MIPEX sectors, some of which seem to have been omitted and do not seem to follow the priorities as related to our negative rankings. With such incongruence one wonders whether MIPEX was at all considered in the selection of the proposed strategy or whether selected policy-sectors were carefully picked for whatever reason. It is no secret that integration is a difficult path to thread with open resentment from the majority of the electorate on one side and the European Union, International Organizations, NGOs and foreign pressure on the other. Perhaps the selected strategies were carefully picked to score points with the latter without over irritating the former. I would be seriously concerned if this were the case as this would be a short-sighted approach indeed and one that will not take us far. It is quite obvious that the latter will not be appeased by half-measures and will not rest their case until immigration policies are harmonized across the EU and fully implemented. The EU is already speaking of centralizing Immigration across the bloc following dissent and resistance from various points.
With the EU and international organizations there are no half-measures, one either goes the whole hog or puts his foot down in defiance as some notable countries have done. One either braces for international criticism and goes ahead ignoring pressures and countering arguments or bows down and complies. Little or negligible measures will not appease critics. This is more so with local and international NGOs who are known to care little about the impact, sustainability, or effectiveness if their demands and any concessions are simply used to increase their arguments and hence their demands. Case in point are the JRS who on the EUs announcement of a willingness to accept 20,000 migrants immediately raised their bar to 4 million from Syria alone\(^37\), and ADITUS who on the declaration by MEP Marlene Mizzi on mandatory burden sharing reiterated their “embarrassment” on the EUs focus on “responsibility-sharing being termed with exclusive reference to Malta's (perceived) situation”\(^38\).

The fact that integration will not go down well with the local population is obvious especially by the unfortunately increasing lower-income bracket. Yet authorities seem intent on going ahead. Is the country being arm-twisted to comply in order to get heard on the immigrant influx and the unrest south of our borders? In any case we are threading dangerous ground and unfortunately this is somewhat of a catch-22 situation.

### 2.5.7 Is the MIPEX approach the right solution?

MIPEX is a partnership led by the British Council together with Migration Policy Group, Foreign Policy Centre and University of Sheffield, and co-financed by the European Community under the European Commission DG Freedom, Security and Justice INTI (Integrating Third Country Nationals). For this purpose MIPEX aims and policies are based on the integration of Third Country Nationals (TCNs) and are therefore focused on the latter and never on the citizens of the host nation or nations in question.

For that matter so are all major immigrant policies and all actions and recommendations of international and local NGOs. This is so much so that in the whole National Integration Policy Document\(^39\) released by ADITUS on the same subject the word “Maltese” is listed as much as 12 times with reference to Maltese laws and legislation, numerous other times with reference to the Maltese Government, citizenship, labour market and language. The Maltese population however is rather conspicuous by its absence. The only references being once in a diagram reflecting the population-breakdown and another indirect reference is in the “respondents” to a migration survey. NGOs and Integration policies

---


\(^{38}\) ADITUS Facebook: [https://www.facebook.com/aditus.accessingrights/posts/834934949920603](https://www.facebook.com/aditus.accessingrights/posts/834934949920603)

\(^{39}\) Malta Integration Network – A way forward for a National Integration Policy - Dr Carla Camilleri & Dr Neil Falzon - ADITUS
speak solely about migrants’ rights and conditions and never seem to consider the impact on citizens and the protection of their rights. The rights and conditions required and due to immigrants who chose to abandon their homeland and impose themselves on others suddenly become more important than those of the very people they are forcing themselves onto.

MIPEX itself is similarly biased with all its strategies and policies being viewed from and solely aimed for the benefit of the immigrants within the selected host nations. The integration index reflects how well such a country is suited or has legislated in order to accommodate the immigrant or third country national. The citizen of the same country is only there to learn, cooperate, accommodate, respect, tolerate, relinquish rights and freedoms, abandon roots and cultures and bow down his head to new rules and regulations in an enforced cohabitation. No index exists on what the impact is on a citizens’ safety, lifestyle, standard-of-living, social status, family, work, health and society and no index reflects what rights and freedoms citizens are relinquishing. How can citizens accept their role in an imposed integration that never considers them as a stakeholder but rather as a net-contributor?

We cannot see the immigrants who were not invited to come here in the first place as the victims and the local population whose only blame is to be living in their own homeland as the aggressors. Integration implies a harmonious integration of two sides; seeing this as a one-sided argument from a single point of view is a guarantee of failure.

2.6 Integration to Date

“Integration” may be a new buzzword in our local scene but has in reality been with us for years. Before embarking on a new nationwide Integration Policy it is important to note what has been done to date locally.

2.6.1 Past Projects and Funding

According to the European Commission, Directorate-General Justice, Freedom and Security, the Evaluation Report On Implementation Of Actions Co Financed By The European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals shows that Malta had duly submitted the said intermediate report for the European Fund for the integration of third-country nationals (TCNs). This document submitted to the EU by Christopher Magri (Acting Head of the National Authority, Ministry of Education, Employment and the Family) one month beyond the deadline of June 30th 2010, clearly

shows a serious lacking of the country in preparation of a serious effort to this cause. In response to questions such as “Did you have recourse to an evaluation expertise to prepare this report?”, Mr. Magri responded with a “No” and to other various prompts such as “Brief description of the methodology used by the evaluation expertise” the answer was a blunt “N/A”. I am in no way blaming Mr. Magri who was appointed less than a month earlier following the resignation of three Education Ministry officials blamed for the suspension of EU funds for students’ programmes\textsuperscript{41}, and who presumably took over from the same officials.

In short this report highlights that from 9 proposals for 2007 none were selected for funding, the 1 proposal for 2008 was funded and a further 3 out of 4 in 2009.

The beneficiaries and project highlights are listed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description/Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>SOLID “Solidarity lifts Social and Economical development”</td>
<td>Developments in integration policies brought forward by the EU towards third countries. Comparative analysis of the Maltese legislation and policy in relation to access to labour market, anti-discrimination laws, public opinion and political participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>University of Malta</td>
<td>TCNs “The integration of Third Country Nationals in Europe”</td>
<td>Seeks to influence policy makers in establishing a legal framework and a conscious policy that gets TCNs involved and contributes to society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Inizjamed</td>
<td>Third Country National Mediation &amp; Integration Project</td>
<td>Facilitate integration and community cohesion by recruiting/training volunteers/mediators, train staff and provide advice to entities working in the field of integration so that they are in a better position to proffer a better service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Fondazzjoni Temi Zammit</td>
<td>WELCOME “Working towards Migrants Integration Through exchange mutual learning &amp; common modules at EU levels”</td>
<td>Promote mutual learning by creating meaningful networks, social networking, support transnational awareness-raising campaigns, promote the use of state-of-the art technologies. The project also includes design, development and implementation of pilot elearning projects and an “e-learning platform” intended to facilitate practices of involved of the host society and the immigrants’ participation in the integration processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering all these projects allotted around €962,000 up to the date of this report (Budget section in Part V) and considering that most of these projects are in fact addressing and duplicating the very purpose of the call for consultation today, one has to question what exactly was achieved in these projects, to what level of success if any, and what reasons for non-achieving these aims if not.

\textsuperscript{41} Officials in EU funds suspension case resign: [http://www.maltamediaonline.com/?p=25890](http://www.maltamediaonline.com/?p=25890)
No similar report for the subsequent years was traced, however the European Commission Migration and Home Affairs site reports that approximately Malta has been allocated over €500,000 annually from 2007 and going up to €600,000 in 2013 as part of the European Integration Fund (EIF).

Frankly if the basis of the attached 2007-2009 report apparently compiled in a hurry with typos, simplistic responses and all, requesting funding to the tune of 1.5 million euro from the said EIF Fund is to be any basis for a future integration policy implementation, one is forced to question the efficacy of such schemes or the justification of their funding. I believe that citizens have a right to know what is the outcome of such Integration Projects funded by taxpayer’s money before being burdened by a forced integration.

What has in reality been accomplished to date and how effective has this been in achieving these aims? How much of the MIPEX index achieved to date is directly attributable to such initiatives if at all? If such initiatives have in fact been successful to some extent, how has this impacted the lives of TCNs and the attitude of local citizens towards them?

2.6.2  Immigration Statistics & Foreign Influx

This consultation process is requesting citizens to not just accept but to celebrate diversity, and to recognise the social realities around us. However when it comes to numbers of these so-called minorities amongst us, statistics are hard to come by are as diverse as our would-be society. Official figures tend to quote around 5,000 to 6,000 immigrants in our detention and open-centres. With around 420,000 inhabitants this will put our diverse minority at 1.42% of the population. While a reasonable chunk of our locals already speaking of an “invasion” it is good to know where we stand vis-à-vis European norms or expectations in view of celebrating such diversity.

First of all figures from Eurostat, Malta is quoted as hosting 2.28% of its inhabitants. The main issue here is that the former figure is for irregular migrants typically salvaged in our seas while the latter figure consists of a count of non-EU nationals. Contrary to local perception that the EU is ignoring our predicament, most other countries have higher percentages with countries such as Austria, Cyprus, Luxembourg and Spain and Greece having around 6%, followed by with Germany, Italy, France, Denmark, and Belgium with around 5%, and countries like the UK, Sweden, Slovenia and even Ireland around 4%. The bottom line is that as per European totals we are still far from saturation point and still have a lot more potential intake to reach EU “norms”. To put this into perspective an average 6% would put our foreign non-EU nationals at around 25,000 and that figure does not include EU nationals legally here.

What does that mean in terms of integration? To get a clearer picture of what this influx signifies let’s have a look at Malta’s demography in Wikipedia. As may be seen from the below table, the average
births per year are around 4000 with the deaths averaging around 3100. This results in a natural annual population growth of around 900 persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population*</th>
<th>Births</th>
<th>Deaths</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>4,392</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>1,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>393,000</td>
<td>3,957</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>396,000</td>
<td>3,918</td>
<td>3,031</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>399,000</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>3,164</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>401,000</td>
<td>3,887</td>
<td>2,999</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>404,000</td>
<td>3,858</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>406,000</td>
<td>3,885</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>409,000</td>
<td>3,871</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>4,126</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>413,000</td>
<td>4,143</td>
<td>3,221</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>415,000</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>416,000</td>
<td>4,283</td>
<td>3,266</td>
<td>1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>419,000</td>
<td>4,231</td>
<td>3,418</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,609</td>
<td>40,701</td>
<td>11,908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*nearest 1,000

Per Year (average over 12 yrs) 4,046 3,130 916

Since Wikipedia quotes the average population to the nearest 1000, we cannot get an exact figure of the actual population change other than by births and deaths. For this purpose I am quoting more detailed figures of the population growth over the same period from CountryEconomy.com as per hereunder:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>391,415</td>
<td>193,689</td>
<td>197,726</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>394,641</td>
<td>195,363</td>
<td>199,278</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>3,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>397,296</td>
<td>196,836</td>
<td>200,460</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>2,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>399,867</td>
<td>198,099</td>
<td>201,768</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>2,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>402,668</td>
<td>199,580</td>
<td>203,088</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>2,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>404,999</td>
<td>200,838</td>
<td>204,161</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>2,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>405,616</td>
<td>201,519</td>
<td>204,097</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>407,832</td>
<td>202,734</td>
<td>205,098</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>2,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>410,926</td>
<td>204,607</td>
<td>206,319</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>3,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>414,027</td>
<td>206,203</td>
<td>207,824</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>3,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>414,989</td>
<td>206,405</td>
<td>208,584</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>417,546</td>
<td>207,695</td>
<td>209,851</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>2,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>421,364</td>
<td>209,880</td>
<td>211,484</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>3,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>425,384</td>
<td>212,424</td>
<td>212,960</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>4,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we had seen further above the natural growth of the local population by natural means (births and deaths) average around 900 persons annually. However if you follow the total population increase over the same years you will find the average increase per year is on average of around 2,600 persons as per above. This simple statistic shows that on average in a calendar year, for every 900 natural “Maltese” births we are attracting a further 1,700 foreigners. Accordingly the net result is that the foreign population of Malta is increasing at 1.88 times that of the locals. In total a simple calculation of the change is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population as at 2000</td>
<td>391,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Births over period</td>
<td>+52,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deaths over period</td>
<td>-40,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Population Result 2012</td>
<td>403,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Population as at 2012</td>
<td>421,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase due to external Influx</td>
<td>18,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Influx as at end 2015*</td>
<td>26,465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* based on estimate of growth/year)

This figure of over 26,000 foreigners amongst us is not only proven by the above statistics but is in line with the figures of 11,999 in 2005, 18,088 in 2010 and 20,384 in 2011 as quoted by the IOM\(^45\). Factor in the fact that the above official figures only account for registered and known persons and does not take into account free movement from the Schengen Zone who may be considered as “tourists” overstaying the norm and a part of our unregistered workforce; Factor in the fact that immigrant families eventually settling here will have a higher birth-rate per capita than locals and that a potential integration policy will encourage an even higher influx and you are looking at the local indigenous population eventually becoming a minority in its own homeland.

What does this have to do with Immigrant Integration? Well for a start multiculturalism and diversity do not only apply to the odd boatload reaching our shores and at a staggering realistic estimate of around 26,000 foreigners amongst us, the percentage to the indigenous population is already at 5.9%. This puts us at par among the highest ranked EU Countries struggling with foreign influx. However the EU’s Eurostat percentage is solely of Non-EU Nationals and therefore for us to reach such proportions we are still looking at the possibility of the EU elbowing us to take in the difference between the current actual influx of asylum seekers and the expected norm. Considering the official figures of around 5,000 to 6,000 presently here, this means that Malta could potentially be requested to take in another 20,000 Non-EU Nationals even as part of the proposed enforced “burden-sharing”

\(^45\) International Organization for Migration (IOM), Gauci J.P, Malta
amongst EU Countries. Even if this was not to be the immediate case, there seems to be no sign yet of any abating of economic and political migration into the EU so at some point when other EU countries reach their saturation point, we shall inevitably be called upon to do our part. In a country where the population density is already at a staggering 1,300 persons/km\(^2\) as-is, we are looking at a multicultural concentration and a packed diversity of astronomic proportions.

Also considering that one and all including many of the now ever-popping up NGOs, insist on opening our doors further to immigrants without any reserves and we are looking at reaching the forefront of diversity across the whole of the EU. An EU whose individual countries have implemented Immigration Integration and accepted the “blessings” of their newly-acquired diversity before us and who are still struggling to absorb the impact of this “multiculturalism”, an EU seeing the rise of multiple far-right parties fuelled by irate locals seeking to regain control of their countries, and an EU that is pressuring Malta to come up to the European level in terms of accepting incoming migrant flows unquestioningly and in integrating the same into our society. At this point it is no longer a question of \textit{IF} but one of a \textit{WHEN} and in a typical local fervour our country will seek to be in full compliance at all costs. Malta seems to be eager to rush in the same failed path of these neighbouring countries without first seriously analysing the potentially irreversible impact on our society.

2.6.3 Immigrant Integration Strategy Scope

Any proposed Immigrant Integration Strategy has to address the immigrant influx into that country. While this may seem rather obvious, one has to first define who is considered an \textit{immigrant} in the target country of such a policy and for how long that designation may be applied.

A look at the definition of immigrants and the application of such strategies across Europe does in fact vary from country to country and this has a direct impact on the broadness, scope and effectiveness of any such strategy and adopted policies to implement the same.

As a start two albeit loosely affiliated main blocs are present in the EU with diverse views and approaches on immigration, namely the Northern Group consisting of Denmark, Sweden, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom on one side versus the “Quadro” Group formed by Italy, Malta, Greece and Cyprus on the EU southern borders\textsuperscript{46}. Such differences are mainly due to diverse migratory paths, diverse methods of the migratory influx and diverse “push” or “pull” factors behind the relative migration. Whereas the former are more concerned about absorbing and integrating immigrants largely driven by economic and colonial reasons, the latter are more prone to

\textsuperscript{46} Wikipedia, The Quadro Group: \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quadro_Group}
migratory flows of potential asylum seekers and are at the centre of attention due to the potential loss of life involved in immigrants crossing of the Mediterranean Sea. This does not mean that either bloc is limited to one type of migration flow as both blocs in effect receive both political asylum seekers and economic migrants but the perception is that migrants risking their lives in dangerous sea-crossings must belong to the former group.

Without going into the argument of percentages of such migrant types, the approach of these blocs has a direct impact on the individual countries’ immigration strategies. For example in the United Kingdom immigration flows have been largely from its previous ex-colonies and Commonwealth Countries largely from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and a number of African and Caribbean countries, most of whom were British subjects or British Protectorates. Because of this such persons are considered as ethnic minorities rather than asylum seekers or refugees with the latter falling under the remit of the Home Office. Rather than covered by an integration policy, such minorities are covered by mainstream social policies irrespective of immigrant status and are protected by strong anti-discriminatory legislative framework. To this effect, ethnicity, diversity and inclusion policies are considered separately from the government’s immigration policy.\(^\text{47}\) In this way Britain presents somewhat of a paradox in its fervent protection of its ethnic minorities while shying away from the Schengen zone in a somewhat overzealous sealing of its borders against immigrant influx.

Denmark whose immigrant population mainly of asylum seekers and refugees hailing from Afghanistan, Iraq, Turkey, Pakistan and Somalia in relatively recent years in comparison has on the other hand implemented an integration act as far back as 1999 and went as far as establishing a Ministry of Refugees, Immigrants and Integration. In 2011 this was revoked and its various competences were split under various ministries with integration falling under the responsibility of the Ministry of Employment and Education. Local municipalities have however attempted to mainstream policies in their attempt at implementing diversity.\(^\text{48}\) Denmark\(^\text{49}\) as well as Germany has a broader definition of immigrants encompassing foreign born persons as well as first and second generation in-born children. Integration policies, monitoring and control thus have a wider scope.

Sweden has a Migration and Asylum policy covering both refugees and immigrants, including returns and support for repatriation. The country’s Integration policy covers introduction to society of newly arrived immigrants, compensation to municipalities for refugee reception, promotion of integration, Swedish citizenship and urban development. The supposed goal of the integration policy is to ensure equal rights, obligations and opportunities for all, irrespective of their ethnic and cultural background.\(^\text{50}\) Sweden has historically been generous in accepting refugees, offering automatic asylum to applicants from Syria since 2012 and as a result it has received more Syrian refugees per capita than any other European Union country. The overall non-native-born in the country standing at 16% is among the highest levels in Europe.\(^\text{51}\)

\(^{47}\) Collett, Elizabeth and Milica Petrovich, 2014. The future of immigrant integration in Europe: Mainstreaming approaches for inclusion
\(^{48}\) Collett, Elizabeth and Milica Petrovich, 2014. The future of immigrant integration in Europe: Mainstreaming approaches for inclusion
\(^{50}\) Swedish Government - Asylum, migration and integration: [http://www.government.se/sb/d/2188](http://www.government.se/sb/d/2188)
In France\(^52\), on the other hand, in-born children are not considered immigrants with this category being therefore limited to foreign born persons entering the country. Immigrant integration policies are therefore only applied to the latter category and only within the first 5 years of entry. After this period persons in France are no longer considered immigrants and therefore specific assistance and treatment are no longer accessible to them. This unfortunately also affects statistic gathering and integration monitoring. Perhaps the main reason of this diverse approach is that France like Britain has a large influx of ex-colonial citizens and in fact has its largest share of such in-flows from the Maghreb countries of Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco.

The net result is that while the EU is attempting to harmonize immigration and asylum policies, individual countries have unique circumstances and approaches. This has resulted in another diversity of policies addressing this influx. What however is clear is that any integration policy in Malta must clearly have a definite limiting scope for inclusion and this scope must take into account the country’s overly-high population-density of over 1,300 persons/km\(^2\), our GDP and our economy in addition to social, religious, and cultural impact.

So while it is inevitable that Malta implements a Migrant Integration Policy, this must not be taken as an across the board amnesty to all present and future illegal immigrants who have entered the country illegally, and who do not qualify as refugees seeking political asylum. A Migrant Integration Policy should be one to harmonize legally hosted third-country nationals and should never seek to legitimize those who have voluntarily sought to enter Europe for economic reasons. For this purpose an eventual Migrant Integration Policy ought to cover the above listed 18,000 foreigners legally present and working here together with any immigrants who have been granted political asylum as refugees.

While policies and strategies mentioned here may be fine-tuned and addressed to illegal immigrants whether in detention or in open-centres and whether under investigation or under temporary residency status, differing statuses and policies must be applied. To consider an economic migrant who has entered the country illegally with the same respect, standing and treatment as a political asylum seeker is simply irresponsible and sends the wrong message to all those ready to abandon their countries and families for better fortunes elsewhere.

Initially immigrant NGOs and others would have had us believe that all immigrants reaching our shores across the seas were escaping wars and troubled regions and were all justly seeking political asylum. After it became clear that a large number of such immigrants are economically driven no particular efforts are b to cover such being done to cover such facts. Conversely we are now being

elbowed into accepting such migrants because “we have a moral obligation” and they must be justified to “risk their lives to cross the Mediterranean”. Even Madame President herself in the new parliament building inaugural speech spoke on the “shameful scenes for humanity” described the plight of migrants thus:

“They are running from crippling states of underdevelopment with little chance of employment, civil wars whose roots are in the arms industry, the spread of disease like Ebola and the effects of climate change.”\(^{53}\)

Clearly the reasons here for immigrants reaching our shores are no longer relevant. The message is to accept all equally and unequivocally. Similarly the ADITUS Immigrant Integration Report complains on the exclusion of TCNs with irregular migration status, and state:

“The MIN Project focused on TCN groups, which excluded individuals that are citizens of member states of the European Union, asylum seekers and beneficiaries of international protection and persons with an irregular migration status. However we firmly believe that the formulation of a comprehensive national integration policy would be of benefit to TCNs, EU Member State Nationals and beneficiaries of international protection alike.”\(^{54}\)

It would appear that we are being pressured to apply such an Integration Policy to one and all. However we seem to be forgetting that such a comprehensive policy would not just apply to the immigrants in our detention and open centres, and to the above quoted 18,000 foreigners working here but will also apply to the never-ending stream of would-be immigrants reaching our shores in future. Not just, but with such trivial reason, practically anyone from any nation who feels so inclined may follow suit making this tantamount to an open invitation to our country. Our islands have limited resources and even more limited area and we must therefore be pragmatic and realistic in our approach. No amount of goodwill, pity, mercy and compassion will miraculously stretch our landmass and resources to welcome every single wishful immigrant into our country.
2.7 Effects of Integration and Multiculturalism

2.7.1 Anti-Discrimination and Protected Minorities

Discrimination is defined as the prejudice, treatment or consideration based on class or category, such as race or gender.\(^{55}\) In our current scenario of immigrant integration, race, skin colour and religion are the most contributable factors highlighted for such discrimination. The primary pitfall of considering this issue is the underlying principle that only minorities may suffer such discrimination at the hand of the majority. In our context, this will signify that the hosted immigrant is automatically protected and is assumed to be the “victim” while the local population is again automatically labelled or assumed to be the “aggressor”. The addressing of such potential discrimination by measures, legal-frameworks, and anti-discriminatory campaigns shall in effect impose or imply a negative labelling on the host population while again elevating the minorities to preferred and protected elite. This is already evident today in local media coverage,\(^{56}^{57}^{58}^{59}\) and in the way politicians,\(^{60}\) dignitaries,\(^{61}\) NGOs\(^{62}^{63}\) and charitable institutions\(^{64}\) react to and liaise with such minorities. Some have even gone as far as defending the indefendable, seems like if one is “tal-karnaggjon skur”, than he has to be innocent, right?\(^{65}\) This is already causing uneasiness and resentment in the local population especially amongst the lesser-income or disadvantaged bracket. The strengthening of such positive discrimination by eventual laws and regulations which immigrants will surely be tempted to abuse of, can only worsen this situation.

The effect of such positive discrimination is when the same authorities and laws in a society turns on its own indigenous population in order to protect multicultural minorities and worse still when this is done at all costs even at the cost of ignoring reality. Perhaps the epitome of such absurdity is the case of Swedish Democrat Party politician Michael Hess. On May 8, 2014 Mr. Hess was given a suspended sentence as a “first offender” and ordered to pay a $32,000 Kroner fine for
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“hate speech”. His crime? He dared to connect the alarming increase of rapes in Sweden to the increase of migrants from Middle Eastern and North African countries on Facebook. The court noted that “the question of whether Michael Hess’s statement is true, or at least for Michael Hess appeared to be true, is irrelevant to the proceedings.”

Put simply, especially in this case were the protected minority has been imposed on a society, unfair advantages and over protectionism shall only generate hate and resentment. Anti-discrimination frameworks have to take note of this and to implement measures to counter positive discrimination.

2.7.2 Equality and Diversity

Going from the build-up of events in other countries like Britain where foreign influx and economic immigration has been rife for scores of years we may see a very specific pattern. What early immigrants faced was a lack of respect and equality and this led to many movements and protest groups who lobbied for such causes. However as such “rights” were won which rights led to a more supposed integrated and balanced society, the trend took another rather different direction. From a right to be “equal” to have the same legal standing as a local inhabitant we have now veered to a very different right of “being diverse”. The very diversity that we are trying to respect is now creating a new division amongst the very peoples we are trying to unite. Each individual immigrant is now entitled to be different, to have a right to hold differing beliefs, food, mode of dress, way of life, behaviour, customs, languages and to an extent laws.

In other words, we are expected to respect diverse cultures but then again, isn’t the whole argument for multiculturalism to “enrich” our own culture with such diversity? So how exactly do we enrich our own culture when we shall end up militating for the minorities within us to retain their own? Are we expected to discard our own culture by absorbing elements of new cultures amongst our minorities while they themselves not only have the right but are even encouraged to remain tightly-knit to their own insular way of life?
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68 http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20141015/opinion/Is-there-a-Muslim-threat-539776
71 http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20130121/local/-Muslim-women-should-be-able-to-wear-hijab-at-work-454136
73 http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20090508/local/muslims-pray-again-on-the-sliema-front.256059
74 http://www.desertflowerfoundation.org/en/what-is-fgm/
75 http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20121205/local/Language-a-barrier-to-pupil-integration.448218
76 Mind the Gap- The Equality Bill and Sharia Arbitration in the UK http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1696&context=iclr
2.7.3 The Cultural Paradox

Opposers to immigration and to integration often cite the loss of Maltese culture and traditions amongst the primary reasons in addition to financial, security and various other issues. On the other hand NGOs, rights-groups and other defenders often counter this argument by highlighting the already diverse and rich cultural heritage of the Maltese islands. Others take a more drastic approach and go as far as to even negate any semblance of a “culture” as a myth and advocate disowning any sense of belonging to our nation or any presumed cultural heritage as this they argue only leads to division, racism and xenophobia.

So in reality, how identifiable and unique is our Maltese culture and identity? With all the foreign invaders and influence on our islands, is there even such a thing or is our culture inexistent? Do we or do we not have a Mediterranean Culture that in its own way is different to mainland Europe, the Maghreb countries and the rest of the African continent? If we do have a diverse culture and heritage, should we treasure them or should we let them go to embrace new languages, cultures and customs?

To understand this argument we first have to define what culture is. Is it the specific behaviour and customs of a particular group? Yes we can say that, but at the end we all know and argue that culture changes and adapts as the group evolves and changes. Yet we speak of losing culture and of the protecting people’s cultural roots. So if culture can be lost, in reality it cannot therefore be the current behaviour of that group, but rather the behaviour and customs of that group’s predecessors. Consequently culture cannot be defined as the actual behaviour of that group in as much as it is the expected or traditional behaviour of that group or people in respect to their origins.

So when we speak of Maltese people losing their culture we are of course not referring to modern trends and behaviour but to the past expected or traditional behaviour of our Maltese ancestors. If this were not the case then we would not be speaking of losing such culture and traditions. This is of course accepted and even encouraged by liberals and free-thinkers as progress and as a development of our society. That argument is fine in itself were it not for the same liberal views that declare that our modern and progressive society is to respect and assist in the preservation and continuity of the cultures and traditions of the minority groups imposing themselves within our midst.

77 http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20050909/local/maltese-traditions-on-show-at-the-waterfront.7875
78 http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20140720/local/Preserving-age-old-musical-traditions.528395
80 http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20140629/gozo/Keeping-traditions-alive.525587
81 http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20150208/arts-entertainment/Our-history-through-dance.555408
Thus if for example, one were to state that a Somali or a Syrian Immigrant have a right to retain their culture and traditions, we are in reality stating that a such persons have an expected or traditional behaviour irrespective of the fact that they are now attempting to integrate into our society. We would be in effect stating that a person’s behaviour is not related to the society that he now forms part of but rather of the one he originated from. If one accepts this argument than one is accepting that a person’s behaviour is not related to his surroundings and his immediate society but is rather directly attributable to his racial origin. In so doing we are automatically attributing a person’s behaviour and actions on one’s race and isn’t that what racism is all about?

So the bottom line is in respecting and protecting and even encouraging minorities’ rights to preserve and retain their culture we are encouraging racial divisions and we are self contradicting our own vision of an enriched multicultural and diverse society. Are we really enriching our society here or are we creating further divisions of insular and protected sub-groups? Are we creating a truly multicultural society or are we creating multiple societies loosely co-habiting in an uneasy and delicate balance?

2.7.4 Tolerance and Indifference

To continue on the previous argument, liberal attitudes amongst us preach absolute tolerance towards ethnic minorities. This tolerance as we have seen is one that encourages such ethnic minorities the right to be diverse, the right to retain the culture of their homelands, the right to retain their identity. So it is the society as a whole that is expected to be “multicultural” but its individual components are not. Not just, but they are actually encouraged not to be multicultural and diverse but rather to be singular and indifferent to any other sub-group other than their own. So is the multicultural model really multi-cultural or is this diversity expressed solely in the sum of its incongruent components? It appears that the multicultural element is only expected of the host native population and not by its guest minorities. They are somehow excluded from this exercise and retain their right to be diverse. Not just, but such minorities typically not only retain such a right of diversity but also enforce another right of isolation by excluding the very host society that is meant to accept them. In other words the host society is meant to be multicultural only in the sense of tolerating diversities of ethnic minorities amongst them whilst these same minorities are indifferent to the very society hosting them and to their culture.

The truth of the matter is that this tolerance and this philosophy of protecting minorities’ rights to be diverse and different while expecting the host population to abandon their own culture and identity is the very reason of failed multiculturalism in post-modern Europe. If we ignore this factor we will simply thread along unwanted paths and end up in the same ghetto-cultures of many modern
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European cities where diversity is instilled in insular pockets of racial groups enclosing themselves from, and refusing to ever accept the very society and culture that is hosting them. In short we have to respect the human and legal rights of a minority by “assimilation” and not by “diversification”.

2.7.5 Ethnic Groups and the Ghetto Culture

A look at the effects of multiculturalism and diversity in Europe reveals that the above policy of toleration has in effect created ghettos or areas within cities and at times whole cities. In London a city renowned for its diversity and tolerance shows high concentrations of ethnic minorities in specific areas such as the South London areas of Southwark, Croydon, and Lambeth that have the highest Black African and Black Caribbean population. Conversely the borough of Harrow has the highest Indian population, Redbridge with Pakistanis and Tower Hamlets with Bangladeshis and Chinese. In places ethnicity is so strong that a town like Peckham is made up of 35% Black African, 15% Black Caribbean and only 25% White British amongst the other foreign minorities.

In Denmark, a country with an immigration policy going back to 1952, Prime Minister Lars Løkke Rasmussens’ talked in 2014 about 29 Ghetto areas with “major challenges”. To arrive at this figure the government defined a ghetto as:

i. 40% or higher unemployment rate;
ii. 270 or more out of 10,000 people convicted of serious crimes;
iii. 50% or more of the population consists of immigrants and refugees from non-Western countries.

Sweden, a country with a massive openness to migration does not report a better picture with as much as 55 “no-go” zones being reported by the national newspaper Svenska Dagbladet in 2014. A suburb of Gothenburg, Angered, is reportedly one such area with more than 72 percent of residents hailing from an immigrant background. The city suffers from a youth unemployment rate of 15 to 22 percent, high juvenile crime rates and also features territorial gangs and a thriving narcotics market. Reportedly this district has also been a breeding ground for ISIS recruits.
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86 Peckham, a district of south-east London: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peckham
87 Denmark Aims to Dismantle Slums: http://beforeitsnews.com/international/2010/11/denmark-aims-to-dismantle-slums-270169.html
88 The ghettos in Denmark - An anthropological study of the development and debate about ghettos in Denmark: http://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=2157844&fileOId=2158123
89 55 “no go”-zoner i Sverige: http://www.svd.se/55-no-go-zoner-i-sverige-minner-om-parallelsamhallen_4051399
90 Police cede control of more than 55 ‘NO-GO ZONES’ to Muslim criminal gangs: http://investmentwatchblog.com/sweden-police-have-ceded-control-of-more-than-55-no-go-zones-to-muslim-criminal-gangs-2/#VGYIzkg0KkkJXEbC.9
92 From the Welfare State to the Caliphate: http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/02/23/from_the_welfare_state_to_the_caliphate_sweden_islamic_state_syria_iraq_foreign_fighters/
France is perhaps the worst to suffer from this culture with a Muslim population of over 5 million residents made up of mainly Algerian, Moroccan, and Tunisian origins. France calls its ghettos “Zones Urbaines Sensibles” (Urban Sensitive Zones). Such an area is characterized by:

i. A high percentage of public housing, with little home ownership;
ii. High unemployment;
iii. A low percentage of high-school graduates.

Of course not all of the 750 sensitive urban zones listed officially are specifically Muslim enclaves or no-go areas but a CBS News report and footage paints a horrendous picture of the situation in some zones and talks about neglected public housing projects ruled by violent gangs and increasingly susceptible to Islamic fundamentalism. A BBC Report on the town of L'Ile Saint-Denis, north of Paris, also highlights the ghetto culture there. Blighted by bad schools and endemic unemployment, the suburbs are hard to escape, the report says.

2.7.6 Tolerance and Double-Standards

Tolerance should not lead to mini-societies within a host society and more so should not have accepted and expected standards of behaviour dependent on racial origins. While one must administer equal rights and respect to all, one should not gratuitously give racial minorities additional rights and freedoms to ignore the culture, customs, and rules of our society. The down-side of such “tolerance” to diverse cultures is when this leads to different applications of the same national laws. I may revert to quoting scores of stories of brutal rapes, beatings, gangs and no-go areas abounding on the web but I am sure most people in absolute denial would pass them off as exaggerations. Instead I shall be quoting a few episodes that made it to mainstream media:

i. Sweden: Six teenage immigrants gang-raping an underage 15-year-old girl in Tensta, Stockholm get away with a fine and community service. In spite of the girl’s side being “cohesive, long, and relatively detailed account”, the judge felt that the boys “had already been punished to some extent by having their pictures and their personal details exposed on the internet”.

ii. United Kingdom: In just one town (Rotterham, South Yorkshire), up to 1,400 girls as young as 11 were trafficked, beaten, and raped by large numbers of ‘Asian’ men between 1997 and 2013. Shockingly, more than a third of the cases were already known to agencies but the
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93 Zone urbaine sensible, ZUS: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sensitive_urban_zone#Social_problems_within_the_zones](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sensitive_urban_zone#Social_problems_within_the_zones)
96 Ghettos shackle French Muslims: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4375910.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4375910.stm)
sexual abuse went unreported for 16 years because social workers and police feared they would be seen as racist if they took action\(^{100}\)\(^{101}\)\(^{102}\) (‘Asian’ being ethnic Muslims of Pakistani origins).

iii. Germany: Lawmakers plan new law and tough sentences for female genital mutilation. While we are led to believe that this is something only happening in the African continent, it is as much a reality in Germany, as in the UK and the rest of Europe, often rampant amongst African and Arabic immigrants. The women's rights organization Terres des Femmes says some 20,000 cases of genital mutilation are known in Europe, with between 4,000 and 5,000 of these in Germany alone. How do they get away with it and with related forced marriages? Simply because authorities often fail to intervene into “ethnic customs” for fear of being racist.\(^{103}\)

iv. France: Government launched a campaign against forced marriages and genital mutilation, seeking to protect women from practices that quietly thrive in immigrant communities. Valerie Letard, minister for women's and other social issues, says that in spite of laws disallowing such customs, around 55,000 women and girls in France have been genitally mutilated, and about 70,000 women and girls are "under threat" of being forced into marriage.\(^{104}\)

I could go on and source more and more of such cases but the quantity is not the point here but rather that in spite of our fervour and goodwill, efforts at multiculturalism are not creating a harmonized and indiscriminate environment but rather encouraging untouchable minorities thriving in insular protected communities often above the very laws of their host-society. While Malta is still perhaps far from some of the above (albeit debatable especially for cases of FGM, forced marriages, and multiple marriages as no serious investigation has been carried out to date), yet obvious positive discrimination is already rampant. One issue in Malta is that companies risk being penalized for utilizing unregistered Maltese citizens in their workforce,\(^{105}\) however it is a well-known secret that one need only drive by the Marsa open-centre on any morning and one can liberally “recruit” any number of illegal immigrants for similar illegal unregistered and uncontrolled work.\(^{106}\)

So yes we must implement safeguards against discrimination and racism but using the same values to allow such minorities to get away with a light or minimum sentences or living in an isolated and
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protected layer because they are an “endangered ethnic minority” is simply not on. We cannot have societies within societies and untouchable groups within our midst and we cannot bend or stretch any laws to accommodate other religious or cultural backgrounds. If we are to follow the same path by allowing our liberalism to such extremes than we shall embark on a failed multiculturalism of incongruent “diversities”.

2.8 Effects on the Indigenous Maltese Population

In the above sections, and especially in the previous one, we have already seen various impacts and issues affecting the local indigenous population in many ways, however even in these sections the main focus is always on points and matters directly related to the immigrants themselves. Immigration and emigration do however have other serious impacts on any population. The demographic content, make-up, health, behaviour, educational level, sense of identity, social behaviour and above all safety and security are all directly affected. Reports on migration at the EU level and particularly reports by NGOs generally concentrate solely on the immigrant minorities and the local host populations are typically only nominated in their role of welcoming, respecting and accommodating the former. This in itself is the primary reason for failures in integration policies.

The main arguments here by would-be integrationists are that most of these so-called effects are either not real, not of substantial impact or simply overstated. More so, most of such factors are also attributed to irrational fear and racist sentiments. Some even go as far as accusing far-right nationalistic movements of inciting fear and hatred by spreading lies and exaggerations. I will not go into the argument of whether such issues are incited, spread, overstated or indeed real. The point is not the specific veracity of any such issues but is the fact that such beliefs are held by the majority of the population. The fact of whether something is in fact real or perceived is irrelevant, if a large enough section of the population hold such beliefs and fears, then they are real enough for them to affect their behaviour and social interaction to the same.

2.8.1 Health and Diseases

In a 2011 report on Tuberculosis (TB) which is a major cause of illness and death issued on the occasion of World Tuberculosis Day, the Ministry of Health, the Elderly and Community declared that out of 27 cases in Malta 77% were of foreign origin. So much so that the Ministry recommended screening of identified high risk groups like refugees, irregular immigrants and displaced persons. TB
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which had been practically eliminated from our islands is simply one of a number of such diseases creating such a potential risk.

In addition to TB, another well-known risk category in our neighbouring continent is HIV which according to reports has even originated there\textsuperscript{108} as did the recent Ebola\textsuperscript{109} outbreak. While the latter has perhaps given rise to irrational fear and panic, the former is as much a reality and present in Malta as it is elsewhere. Again in a report on HIV announced on Worlds AIDS Day in 2006, the Department of Public Health, declared an increase of HIV in Malta to around 133 cases and states that only 2 out of 5 new reported cases were in fact Maltese.\textsuperscript{110}

A 2006 report on the situation in the UK (Health Protection Agency) noted that most migrants are healthy young adults but in population terms bear a disproportionate burden of infectious diseases such as TB, HIV and even Malaria.\textsuperscript{111} A 2005 Eurosurveillance HIV report states that nearly half (46\%) of the heterosexual infections reported in the EU were diagnosed in immigrants, primarily from sub-Saharan Africa, and most of these infections were acquired in their home continent.\textsuperscript{112}

Of all the above mentioned impacts of immigration into Malta, health concerns are certainly as real as they can get. There is little we can do to avoid this impact except screen incoming immigrants for known and dangerous conditions but then again no such screening and prevention has effectively avoided the above documented rise of certain conditions and diseases in Europe. Certainly low income, low hygienic conditions and low nutrition common in immigrants’ countries of origin which at times seem to persist in host countries do not help to alleviate any such concerns. Yet advocates of integration, multiculturalism and diversity largely ignore or minimize this very real threat.

\subsubsection*{2.8.2 Crimes and Safety}

While many will certainly reject any claims of any connection of immigration and crime statistics in any host country it is an undeniable fact that the perception to his effect is rather strong both at the European and at the local level. In the local scene one simply has to follow our news and media to note an unfortunate tendency to see a near daily occurrence of some crime, petty theft or incident

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{108} HIV/AIDS is said to have originated in non-human primates in Central and West Africa: \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_HIV/AIDS}
  \item \textsuperscript{109} Ebola takes its name from the Ebola River, (indigenous name Legbala), a tributary of the Congo River, in northern Democratic Republic of the Congo
  \item \textsuperscript{110} Health Promotion Department Director Mario Spiteri pointed out that these numbers do not reflect reality as many cases are unreported: \url{http://www.independent.com.mt/articles/2006-12-10/news/maltese-still-ignorant-about-hiv-while-numbers-slowly-increase-166341/}
  \item \textsuperscript{111} approximately 70\% of newly diagnosed cases for each of the diseases TB, HIV and malaria were direct effects of migration: \url{http://www.easac.eu/fileadmin/PDF_s/reports_statements/Migration.pdf}
\end{itemize}
involving immigrants, third country nationals or foreigners. So much so that it has even become a somewhat worrying concern that media these days seem to be casually dropping any reference to the race or national origin of the perpetrators (seemingly to hide or cover or to not further perpetuate this very perception).

A case in point is a recent incident of a mugging and a car-theft in Gzira on 2 women by a group of 3 including a “teenage boy from St Paul's Bay” was reported in the local media as it happened. Two days later however another report revealed that the perpetrator’s accomplices were in fact of Libyan nationality.

Cases are many and as varied as the multicultural backgrounds of the foreigners amongst us ranging from petty thefts, to aggressions, muggings, beatings, burglaries, violence, public indecency to serious offences such as rape and even murder. So much so that even Magistrate Carol Peralta even remarked to this effect in handing down a sentence to a third-country national in October 2013 whereupon he stated that “a great portion of those arraigned on

113 Teenager arrested after three make off with woman’s car: http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20150521/local/teenager-arrested-after-three-make-off-with-womans-car
121 Sudanese Ali Eysa Ali, 46, was knifed by Somali Abdirahman Saeed Ahmed: http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20141218/local/stabbing-victim-says-attack-was-not-deliberate
123 Two indecent assaults by foreigners in as many weeks: http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20150111/local/foreigner-arrested-during-attempted-rape-on-woman-in
Theft are foreigners”. The cases referenced here are just a tiny sample of such incidents involving foreigners in crimes against Maltese victims, foreigners against other foreigners and at times even foreigners against their own nationals.

Once again I must stress that apologists will be quick to state that as much evidence of local generated crimes may equally be produced and I will not attempt to discredit any such claims. However one must point out three major observations here:

i. While Maltese nationals are certainly no innocents when it comes to crime, the Maltese society is a somewhat closed one and perpetrators tend to be weary of committing certain crimes due to the social stigma involved. Crimes of public indecency, rapes, mugging, etc., of locals on locals are minimal. Foreigners however have no such inhibitions.

ii. Even if foreigner induced crime may still be statistically comparable to local crime, any crime committed by foreigners is a crime we could have done without if they were not present here most especially in the case of illegal immigrants.

iii. Foreigners committing crime in Malta apparently get away with light or suspended sentences. The failure of extraditing any such foreigners back to their home countries in case of serious or repeat crimes irritates the locals who in turn feel less safe in their own homes and neighbourhoods.

Whether one admits or not it is factual that many immigrants come to Malta from difficult environments, where crime, lawlessness, rape and violence may be rife. This is even more so with respect to refugees who originate from war-torn countries in states of open violence, civil-wars, where civilians are systematically murdered, raped or tortured in addition to uncontrolled crime, piracy and human trafficking. For one to assume that the moment such persons coming from similar violent and lawless backgrounds step on Maltese soil, will leave such “normalities” behind them and immediately adapt themselves to our standards of accepted civic behaviour is wishful thinking and irresponsible.

### 2.8.3 Labour Market and Work Opportunities

If there ever was a constant fear in any country experiencing a flow of external immigrants, refugees or asylum seekers it certainly is the fear of their taking over jobs and employment from locals. Again whether this is actual or perceived is irrelevant as any fear will still affect the local population and the way it perceives foreigners amongst us. That said, as already noted in the Labour Market Sector
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Analysis above, Employment Minister Evarist Bartolo had declared official figures of around 18,000 foreigners officially employed in 2014. Of course most would consider that figure rather on the conservative side and with foreigners to be found in odd jobs all over the place one can’t really blame them. From salesgirls to waiting staff, to cooking in our restaurants, popping up umbrellas and sunbeds on the beaches, plastering and painting our walls, building our houses, collecting our garbage, sweeping our streets, carrying our furniture, nursing our sick, even driving our buses; wherever you look, there’s bound to be a foreigner doing an odd job that until quite recently was invariably done by a local. Of course there are other anomalous jobs such as masseurs in shady massage-parlours and strippers in gentlemen’s clubs that locals may not be so enthusiastic to take on but the rest are somewhat lost ground for the otherwise busy and flexible Maltese worker.

The usual excuse by employers of course is that “il-Maltin ma jridux jahdmu” (Maltese people don’t want to work). Evidently what that really means is Maltese workers do not want to do that work for that miserly pay or under those substandard conditions. The fact that foreigners or immigrants do accept that miserly pay or such conditions is of some concern indeed and should be looked at. Are immigrants and foreigners submitting themselves to substandard pay because they have no choice? Is it because the job-seeker is irregular and therefore would not be in a position to negotiate? Or is it because the work itself being also irregular and being free of contributions and tax the pay would still be decent? Certainly with an irregular migrant or foreigner doing such work and hence resulting in a double irregularity, I would say that genuine Maltese workers would be more than justified to be concerned and for they simply cannot compete against such situations. The worst part is perhaps the reason that they cannot compete; it appears that double standards apply here. If an employer is caught with irregular Maltese workers then that employer would be in serious trouble, yet the same employer could freely pop by a very public road and pick up a few migrants for a tax-free day-job without any issues.

Other employers insist with the often-made argument that immigrants only do jobs Maltese do not want to do. If this argument is correct, there should be occupations comprised entirely or almost entirely of immigrants. While this may be somewhat true in some sectors such as in the construction industry, other jobs on offer are as varied as the ethnicities of the immigrants themselves. The truth

\[131\] Foreigners queue up for nursing vacancies: http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20100821/local/foreigners-queue-up-for-nursing-vacancies.323297
of the matter, as one contractor privately recently revealed to me, the factors involved are not only financial. It appears that since most third country nationals have no ties or families here and therefore they have less social commitments, they would therefore be more available to work longer hours, weekends, and public holidays. Similarly due to their not being in a strong bargaining position, they would also accept worse working conditions, not demand days off and be less prone to raise health and safety issues.

All in all this creates an unfair labour market disadvantage for bona-fide Maltese workers, one in which they simply cannot compete. This is more so in the unskilled labour sector rendering Maltese persons within this category and especially those over 50 years of age practically unemployable. Unless a clampdown is enforced upon employers abusing of the system, people would be highly justified to complain about foreigners being allowed to work here.

2.8.4 Welfare and Social Benefits

One more perhaps justified perception of low income bracket Maltese is that immigrants have it better when it comes to social benefits and state aid. While Maltese citizens struggle to make ends meet and have had to pay some of the highest energy bills in Europe, illegal immigrants and refugees get a fair share of benefits and assistance. Amongst these we find free accommodation in open centres, allowances for food and transport, assistance with a rent subsidy, free health care, and free education. Unofficial sources also talk of free or subsidised phone-cards, free or subsidised internet connectivity and other benefits such as loan guarantees for would-be entrepreneurs.

The above allowances are calculated on a daily basis depending on an immigrant’s status as follows: €4.65 for a person with temporary humanitarian protection, €4.65 for an asylum seeker awaiting a reply from the Refugee Commission, €3.50 for a rejected asylum seeker. In addition €2.33 is given per child for couples with children, and weekly social security benefits of up to €81.20 plus €8.14 for every dependant for those with refugee status.

In comparison a Maltese citizen employed on minimum wage may have to support all of his family on around €166 gross per week (less taxes and contributions), pay his home loan and car loan instalments, pay his energy bills, gas, water and food, pay for his children’s education costs, and pay for any service charges for internet, telephony and TV as well as fuel charges at the same full rate as any high wage earner. The only assistance one gets is in the form of Children’s Allowance and student stipends at tertiary levels, which assistance will not typically cover all costs concerned in today’s lifestyle and expectations.

In addition, no one will offer a Maltese family any additional economical assistance for any unexpected eventualities such as minor medical or dental expenses, single mothers still in the family

137 Whereas Education is nominally free in Government Schools, uniforms, books, files, stationary, outings, internet, laptops or tablets, etc., are typically expected/demanded by our educators in addition to exam and private tuition fees.
home, unemployment benefits of a secondary wage-earner, or young Maltese couples in search of a new home. In this sense when a typical Maltese family struggling to reach the end of the month sees an immigrant family or group move into the neighbourhood into a house that they or their now near adult children cannot afford, sporting latest-generation mobile phones which they can only dream of, getting freebies and assistance that they will never have access to, practically always around as they do not seem to work, and on top of that see their lights on throughout the night as they are obviously not footing the bills, one cannot blame that same family from feeling left out and abandoned.

### 2.8.5 National Security

The subject of illegal immigration and perceived threats to national security is certainly not new, However recent events in Paris following the attack by fundamentalist Islamic terrorists on the Charlie Hebdo offices in France has most certainly raised concern on a European and even international level. The incident and the ease with which a few gunmen could unsettle a whole country sent shockwaves across European borders and alarmed citizens worldwide. Reactions were wide and immediate and while politicians, organizations and citizens rallied quickly in Paris in “a march of defiance” to show support and solidarity, the same politicians (ours included) quickly rallied to counter any fears and potential negative reactions in their home countries. Citizens were quickly advised that the attacks were not related or instigated by “Islam” but by “terrorists” and that people should not be “racist”, “xenophobic” or “Islamophobic”.

Sentiments were already high in Malta but this came to a peak when ISIS (ISIL) factions “entered” the Libyan conflict. With the dreaded and seemingly unstoppable radical force right on our doorstep, people felt somewhat uneasy. This uneasiness perhaps reached its peak when an ISIS claimed attempt hit our interests directly with the assault on the Corinthia Tripoli Hotel. Raising of security levels and rumours of mysterious movements and actions spread like wildfire possibly leading to biggest perceived threat
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felt by the Maltese population in recent times. So much so that the Home Affairs and National Security Minister Carmelo Abela felt the need to reassure people accordingly.

When soon after, apparent ISIS related threats appeared in mysterious provocative graffiti, the Prime Minister took to the popular “Xarabank” TV program to reassure one and all that the idea of Islamic fundamentalists crossing over to the island hidden amongst boatloads of illegal immigrants was preposterous at best as they would be facing months of detention. He also reassured everyone that the perpetrators of the Hebdo Paris incidents and the subsequent Copenhagen attacks were not immigrants but nationals. The fact that the Kouachi brothers and accomplice Amedy Coulibaly were all children of immigrants with Algerian and Malian origin respectively seemed somewhat irrelevant. Similarly, we were told, the suspect of the Copenhagen attacks is clearly a Dane named Omar Abdel Hamid el-Hussein.

Equally irrelevant seems to be the fact that ISIS seems to have had a rather successful method of recruiting fighters from mainland Europe and the United Kingdom over the internet, and there is of course no connection whatsoever between ISIS and Islam.

So we are led to believe that we are safe in Malta and that any perceived threats and links between illegal immigrants, asylum seekers and potential Islamic extremists are far-fetched. The fact that ISIS may use its proven methods and agents to infiltrate the ever increasing local Muslim community to gain recruits to its twisted cause remains however a very serious reality that we should never underestimate.

If any proof of such occurrence was ever wanted, we got it these last weeks with the arrest of Moroccan Abdelmajid Touil in Italy in connection with the Bardo Museum attack in Tunisia that left 21 dead. It transpired that Touil had entered Italy along with migrants on a smuggler’s boat. Not just,
but in spite of being issued with an expulsion decree on detection in Sicily, he apparently managed to remain in the country and joined his family up north in Milan.\textsuperscript{152} How are we expected to feel safe and to continue to allow additional migrants into our shores when we have such evident proof of the ease of infiltration and practically free movement within our borders?\textsuperscript{153}

### 2.8.6 The Maltese Culture and Traditions

We have already touched on the meaning of culture and a perceived threat of its loss by infiltration of diverse foreign cultures further above. However, that section dealt more with the hypocrisy of some who on the one hand declare that there is no true “Maltese” culture, yet are quick to defend minorities’ rights to guard theirs. Here we are looking at this from another angle; that is if the Maltese do have a culture, how real is that perceived threat?\textsuperscript{154,155} Is this all about our pastizzi, ġobż biż-żejt, ġbejniet, bigilla, tadam imqadded, bebbux, kirxa, raqjul, patata l-forrn, imqarrun il-forrn, a majjalata, or a fenkata or maybe traditional sweets like the pudina, figolla, prinjolata, aqareżimal, kannoli, imqared and other typical delicacies? Or is it about our traditions such as the village festa, l-Imnarja, ir-Regatta, il-Karnival, il-Vitorja, Santa Maria and others?

Well yes it is about such things as well though I am sure that most of the above food and delicacies will be around for some time yet. Yes it is about all that and perhaps more but not only. The Maltese culture goes beyond tastes and plates, further than wines, beers, cheeses, sausages and hot heart-warming soups. Maltese culture goes away from all that and permeates to our very cores. Our identity goes beyond our food and drink and permeates into the very fibres of our society. It is a culture of churches, statues, Good Friday processions, l-irxoxt, is-seba visti, nannu going to the quddiesa tal-ewwel and getting some pastizzi and of nanna saying ir-rurarju throughout November. It’s the awesome smell of a freshly baked ġobza tar-ratal, a cup of warm coffee with anizett and xi musmar tal-qronfol. It’s a culture of yells, bells and smells as Lord Byron so colourfully described us, it is a culture of social gatherings, of extended families, of bickering and boasting, of teasing and toasting and essentially one of sharing and caring. To be Maltese goes beyond explanations and is something that can never be learned nor given nor bought and foreigners who lived amongst us may perhaps have learnt to expect our behaviours but are still far from comprehending them.\textsuperscript{156}
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\textsuperscript{152} Man arrested in Italy for Tunisia Bardo attack was migrant: [http://news.yahoo.com/reports-man-suspected-bardo-attack-arrested-italy-090611322.html](http://news.yahoo.com/reports-man-suspected-bardo-attack-arrested-italy-090611322.html)


\textsuperscript{155} Malta is not yet multicultural enough: [http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20110907/local/-Malta-is-not-yet-multicultural-enough-383613](http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20110907/local/-Malta-is-not-yet-multicultural-enough-383613)

\textsuperscript{156} Ghanaian-Maltese Ahmed Bugri - I’m still learning to be Maltese after 18 years: [http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20090628/interview/im-black-and-i-am-maltese.262774](http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20090628/interview/im-black-and-i-am-maltese.262774)
So why would a bunch of immigrants threaten this one may ask? And first and foremost if all this is not even a true Maltese cultural identity as many are claiming,\textsuperscript{157} why did we bother fighting for this identity within the EU?\textsuperscript{158} Why do we even bother respecting it and passing it to our children?\textsuperscript{159} Why do we bother trying to promote it to others?\textsuperscript{160} \textsuperscript{161} What shall happen to our age-old traditions of making wine, sausages, cheeselets, of hand-building a \textit{luzzu} or weaving \textit{bizzilla}, or of the traditional \textit{Ghana Spirtu Pront}? And what of the language that we so love to express ourselves in? Why are lessons in some government schools being imposed in English because of a foreign minority? Why did we struggle to have our national Maltese language accepted and spoken in Brussels over 1,800 kilometres away if our children cannot use it in our local schools down the road?

Yet many seem to be quick to negate their own roots and are quick to shy away from our forefathers’ ways and discard their traditions in the name of modernity. The fact that the various nationalities infiltrating our midst have their own cultures, traditions and beliefs does however not seem to be an issue at all. The Maltese population is expected to be quick to discard its own identity while being urged to consider, respect and potentially adopt the new cultures imported from our Maghreb and sub-Saharan African neighbours. Obviously if anyone dares raise any concern of integrating with such diverse cultures then of course it must be a question of skin colour, race and religion and we are all quick to label them as racist.

However the problems that such people fail to comprehend at times is that they choose to see all African immigrants as one, seeming to forget that Africa is not a country but a massive continent. And as any continent, it is full of very diverse nations, ethnicities, languages, beliefs and cultures. So much so that the main reason there is so much instability and wars and even civil wars in Africa is because many of such races and ethnic or religious groups are incapable of cohabiting together peacefully within that massive continent let alone in little Malta or better still cohabit peacefully in one of our open-centres.\textsuperscript{162} African issues are many and include Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somalia, Nigeria, Sudan, Central African Republic, Congo, Mali, Uganda, and Libya among others.\textsuperscript{163} We find civil wars with political factions against each other, rebels against government forces,\textsuperscript{164} Muslims against Christians, Muslims against Animists, Muslims against Muslims,\textsuperscript{165} Tribe against Tribe,

\begin{enumerate}
\item Peppi Azzopardi on the Maltese Anthem, Flag and identity: \url{https://youtu.be/YkW1nNoA_34}
\item Maltese Culture and identity: \url{http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20030306/opinion/culture-and-identity.155049}
\item Respect for culture: \url{http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20080408/letters/respect-for-culture.203264}
\item Conflict between Somalis and West Africans in Marsa: \url{http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20090728/local/migrants-protest-over-new-open-centre-rules.267091}
\item Wikipedia, List of ongoing armed conflicts: \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_ongoing_armed_conflicts}
\item Wikipedia, List of conflicts in Africa: \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_conflicts_in_Africa}
\item Religiously-based civil unrest and warfare: \url{http://www.religioustolerance.org/curr_war.htm}
\end{enumerate}
Muslim Militias like Al-Shabaab\(^\text{166}\) and Boko Haram\(^\text{167}\) and lately ISIS\(^\text{168}\), genocides,\(^\text{169}\) mass destruction,\(^\text{170}\) mass kidnappings\(^\text{171}\) and more. Some of these conflicts and troubles are recent, others like Somalia have been ongoing since 1991. We have people coming here from countries where violence, brutality, killing, and rape are the order of the day, and where guns, automatic weapons, knives and machetes are possibly easier to come by than schoolbooks.\(^\text{172}\)\(^\text{173}\) Yet we expect all of these people to forget their pasts\(^\text{174}\)\(^\text{175}\) and all their differences\(^\text{176}\)\(^\text{177}\) and all of their issues.\(^\text{178}\) Once they enter our islands the Maltese Families and their children are to benefit and enrich themselves from these diverse cultures,\(^\text{179}\) beliefs, and opinions and we should all unite together in one big happy family.

The question isn’t much of course one of disrespecting others’ cultures and ways but more of whether they will respect ours and let us be what we are; it isn’t about tolerating others but about how tolerant others will be towards us and our ways.

\(^\text{171}\) Boko Haram Has Kidnapped 2,000 Women And Girls: [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/04/14/boko-haram-kidnap-girls_n_7061550.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/04/14/boko-haram-kidnap-girls_n_7061550.html)
\(^\text{174}\) Hal Far fight was "between tribes": [http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20091009/local/hal-far-fight-was-between-tribes.276740](http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20091009/local/hal-far-fight-was-between-tribes.276740)
\(^\text{175}\) Migrants injured in fight at Safi detention centre: [http://mt.locinews.com/Migrants_injured_in_fight_at_Safi_detention_centre-1133876.html](http://mt.locinews.com/Migrants_injured_in_fight_at_Safi_detention_centre-1133876.html)
\(^\text{177}\) Illegal immigrants fight in detention center: [http://www.maltamedia.com/cgi-bin/artman/exec/view.cgi?archive=13&num=7565](http://www.maltamedia.com/cgi-bin/artman/exec/view.cgi?archive=13&num=7565)
2.8.7 The Clash of Religions

Malta is presently a Roman Catholic country, at least that is what the second article in our constitution says so far. And I am saying so far as indications that this is about to change are already being sounded. We are already hearing of a “2nd Republic” and as we all know this implies a revision of our constitution. Such a revision is already being considered in the Constitutional Reform Process and lies directly under the responsibility of Dr. Franco Debono who is the current Commissioner of Laws of Malta. The President of the Republic Marie Louise Colerio Preca who is also championing the Constitutional Reform said on another occasion that our “catholic religion is no longer central to cultural activities” thus again indicating movement towards this direction.

While non-Catholic minorities and some organizations and associations will certainly welcome this and while the total separation of Church and State is perhaps a step we will have to consider sooner or later, we also have to consider the implications of such a change on the Maltese population. Undeniably the Catholic Church in Malta is neither as strong nor as popular as it used to be. Yet it is also undeniable that Malta has strong Christian roots going back to a fateful shipwreck listed in the book of the Acts of the Apostles in Chapter 27. Those Christian roots are not just a part of our present constitution but are an inherent part of our island’s culture, history and all that we stand for. To negate those roots in the name of multiculturalism is as absurd as negating our very origins and identity. It is one thing to respect others’ beliefs but it is totally another thing to have to negate your own.

While this may seem trivial to most, this will in effect have a major impact on our society. The removal of our religion from its official position will downscale it to the same standing as all the other minority religions and faiths present in our island. It signifies that authorities of the Roman Catholic Church no longer have the duty and the right to teach which principles are right and wrong. It also signifies that the Roman Catholic apostolic faith shall be no longer provided in all state schools as compulsory education. It will also mean the removal of celebrating mass in official ceremonies such as the swearing in of a new President or a Parliament, or even state funerals. Such celebrations if any would have to take a typical multicultural interfaith celebration held between the main influential religions and faiths on the island. Another significant change would be the removal of Article 163 that protects against public vilification or offence of Catholicism and the vilification of its believers, ministers or objects of worship. Basically the Catholic religion would be brought down to

---


183 In spite of being compulsory, this is overridden by the entrenched article 40 which guarantees full freedom of conscience and of religious worship.
equal levels and standing as other religions gaining strongholds locally especially the primary religion amongst illegal immigrants and asylum seekers, namely Islam.

While I would not like to bring religion into this context, unfortunately it is one of the major stumbling blocks of a potential status quo in a supposedly multiculturally enriched society. We all know that most of our African and Maghreb guests are mainly Muslims and we also know but seem intent on ignoring the fact that Muslims and Christians do not seem to co-exist so harmoniously together. In today's political correctness we perhaps fail to say what ought to be said even when the proverbial writing is not just on the wall but the very wall is shaking and crumbling before our very eyes. In the name of liberty and freedom we allow anyone and everyone their right to their beliefs, culture and behaviour but we fail to comprehend that the very ones we distribute such freedoms to, do not and will never reciprocate that favour.

True enough our principles of religious freedom must allow anyone to practice any faith however when such a faith is not just a religion but is also a way of life, a political ideology, one that presents a difficulty to coexist with and one that bears a strong aversion to other faiths, then that religion becomes a threat. Here we are not even talking of the radical elements often harboured within or attributed to Muslims but of the base religion itself or at least its interpretation and adoption by its followers. Islam may very well be the "religion of peace" as we are often reminded and that may very well be so but its followers apparently have a rather bad way of expressing it. It is perhaps no coincidence that all major Muslim countries are in turmoil and that in Islamic countries, state and religion are intertwined beyond recognition. If what is happening in European countries is not enough of a sign of caution we ought to look at the very African countries supplying us with most refugees. Here we find whole countries with Muslim majorities or countries with Muslims and a mix of other faiths in a state of civil war, lawlessness and radicalisms beyond imagination. If this is anything to go by, things certainly do not auger well for our future.

Apart from the obvious links between radical Islam and terrorism that several try their best to convince us otherwise, many seem to forget that the very core traditions and culture of most peoples originating from typical Muslim countries are extreme to us by any standard. Many seem to forget that it is not radicals but normal moderate Muslims who treat women as property, who consider them as half a man in terms of inheritance and also in terms of giving witness, who practice female genital mutilation, who force them in unwanted plural marriages, who force even
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186 [Qur'an 2:282]: “and bring two witnesses from amongst your men; if they are not two men, then a man and two women from whom you will accept their testimony, so that if one of them becomes occupied, then the one can recall the other.” In a Tafsir, Ibn Katheer explains: "Two women are to take the place of one man because women are lacking in reason."
188 WikiIslam, Forced marriages in Islam: [http://wikiislam.net/wiki/Forced_Marriage](http://wikiislam.net/wiki/Forced_Marriage)
underage girls in marriages to middle age or older men,\textsuperscript{189} who may also admonish them and beat them if they disobey or fail to honour their marital duties.\textsuperscript{190} It is moderate Muslims who cut limbs of thieves\textsuperscript{191} and behead others for many an accusation\textsuperscript{192} including apostasy,\textsuperscript{193} who stone half-buried woman for adultery\textsuperscript{194} and at times for being raped\textsuperscript{195} who publicly beat people in the street for any minor religious infraction, who abhor pork,\textsuperscript{196} pigs,\textsuperscript{197} dogs,\textsuperscript{198} alcohol and anything related to them. It is the moderate Muslims who consider us Christians as infidels (Arabic: “kafir”, “kufr” or “kuffar”). We are to be watched closely, at best tolerated\textsuperscript{199}, and never befriended.\textsuperscript{200} We are not talking of radical Islam here but of the ordinary normal Muslim who lives the five pillars of Islam,\textsuperscript{201} who prays throughout the day and who is righteous in the eyes of his society and peers.

Whether we like it or not and whether we choose to realize the seriousness of such cultural diversity or not, it is such Muslims that we are inviting amongst us in Christian and secular Europe. More so, it is these same Muslims that feel out of place in our liberal and “perverted” societies and therefore seek to isolate themselves in protected neighbourhoods and ghettos with fellow Muslims. As long as there is a Muslim family here and there you may not notice much of this very diverse culture behind closed doors, curtained windows and veiled women,\textsuperscript{202} but when numbers increase and neighbourhoods are taken over things will change drastically. Muslims happen to take offence at many of our normalities,\textsuperscript{203} from our churches to crosses in buildings, to crosses hanging around our necks.\textsuperscript{204} From statues in corners and public places,\textsuperscript{205} to religious processions along “their” streets, to festa decorations outside their homes, even mention of Christian feasts on school calendars.\textsuperscript{206} From bars and pubs\textsuperscript{207} where infidels

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Britain's Underage Muslim Marriage Epidemic: http://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/4017/uk-muslim-underage-marriage
\item Ruling about why and how to beat your wife: http://islamqa.info/en/41199
\item Why and when is the hand cut off in the case of stealing: http://islamqa.info/en/14238
\item Punishment of the one who leaves Islam: http://islamqa.info/en/696
\item Why death is the punishment for Apostasy: http://islamqa.info/en/811
\item Iran Infiltrated By Film Of Woman's Stoning: http://wn.com/muslims_stoning_women
\item Arab living in Malta asks about pork: http://islamqa.info/en/49688
\item Raising Muslim children in the West to have an aversion to pigs: http://islamqa.info/en/17171
\item Dogs in Islam: http://www.islamicconcern.com/dogs.asp
\item Principles and guidelines for relations with non-Muslims: http://islamqa.info/en/26721
\item Being friends with Christians and gays: http://islamqa.info/en/71618
\item SHAHADAH: declaring there is no god except Allah, and Muhammad is his Prophet. SALAT: ritual prayer five times a day, ZAKAT: giving 2.5% of one’s savings to the poor and needy, SAWM: fasting and self-control during the holy month of Ramadan, HAJJ: pilgrimage to Mecca at least once in a lifetime if one is able
\item Why Muslim Women Wear the Veil: http://www.islamicreligion.com/articles/2770/
\item Ruling on talking to women at work: http://islamqa.info/en/27304
\item Why Muslims are offended by the cross - Islamic view of Jesus’ death: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Islamic_view_of_Jesus%27_death
\item Prohibition of images and erecting statues: http://islamqa.info/en/7222
\item After Muslim complaints, school removes Christian, Jewish holidays from calendar: http://libertyunyielding.com/2014/11/12/muslim-complaints-school-removes-christian-jewish-holidays-calendar-video/
\item Ruling on a taxi taking passengers to bars and night clubs: http://islamqa.info/en/116371
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
consume the dreaded alcohol to outlets selling pork and other forbidden non-Halal foods. From Christmas decorations or children singing carols to carnival costumes and festivities. From “scantily-clad” women who are asking for it to infidel neighbours who can’t afford to leave the neighbourhood. From basic principles of western society of equality between men and women, to a basic understanding of the concept of marriage.

It is not the Islamic radical that you should be afraid of, at worst he or she may blow themselves up and kill a few hundreds. If we’re lucky he or she may leave the country to join ISIS in Syria but the moderate Muslim will stay on. He will never integrate, he will fill your neighbourhood with kids, do his utmost to spread his faith and given the opportunity he will seek to be represented in local government only to be able to give more powers and freedoms to his own Muslim communities and to possibly enforce Sharia law on whoever happens to live there whether Muslim or not. Even if he appears to be in agreement with NGOs and human rights organizations, this is only as a means to an end.

If you really want to understand how different the Muslim world is and how difficult it is for them to integrate with us, do look up and read the references below. They are not from some Islamic-hate site but mainly from http://islamqa.info/, an Islamic info and question and answer site for Sunni Muslims to ask for guidance about everyday life from the respected scholar Shaykh Muhammad Saalih al-Munajjid, where the said site also includes a question from an Arab living in Malta referenced above.

So am I saying that we should ban Islam from amongst us? No, of course not, if I did that I would be racist. But when Muslim numbers in Malta become large enough, will they demand that a potential Christianity minority be banned from amongst them or else be subjected to their ways? Yes of course
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208 Selling haraam things like pork to non-Muslims: http://islamqa.info/en/40651
209 Foods produced in the West, such as gelatin: http://islamqa.info/en/210
211 Ruling on celebrating non-Muslim holidays and congratulating them: http://islamqa.info/en/947
212 Prohibition on celebrating the festivals of the kuffaar (unbeliever): http://islamqa.info/en/12777
213 Womens clothing - free women and slave women: http://islamqa.info/en/36805
214 Staying in a kaafir country where there is no community or mosque: http://islamqa.info/en/111564
215 Does Islam regard men and women as equal?: http://islamqa.info/en/I105
216 The concept of Islamic marriage is a contract “aqd al-Nikah” (literal Maltese: Ghaqda ghal Nejka), and basically amounts to a contract for sexual intercourse (for Mahr, the payment received by the bride). In such a marriage there is no concept of shared wealth (community of acquests) and there are defined duties, financial responsibilities and payments: http://wikiislam.net/wiki/The_Meaning_of_Nikah
217 The marriage contract in Islam is not a sacrament, therefore revocable: http://www.qiran.com/marriage/an_nikah_the_islamic_marriage.asp
218 Ruling on mixing with the kuffaar (unbelievers): http://islamqa.info/en/59879
219 Encouragement to have a lot of children: http://islamqa.info/en/13492
220 Ruling on teaching Qur’aan to a non-Muslims: http://islamqa.info/en/150158
221 Ruling on democracy and implementing shariah law: http://islamqa.info/en/107166
222 Western human rights organizations and the ruling on referring to them for judgement: http://islamqa.info/en/97827
they will. We only have to look at Britain and Europe. With just around 5 percent Muslims in England, we already have had Muslim protesters take to London's streets to demand shops stop selling alcohol,\textsuperscript{223} to Muslim protesters branding British war heroes as murderers,\textsuperscript{224} to Muslim protesters demanding Sharia Law in Britain.\textsuperscript{225} And then we have controversial figures in Britain like Anjem Choudary who is the spokesman for Islamist group, Islam4UK. He is often in the news for wrong reasons like speaking about stoning women, rejecting democracy and freedom, and why executions are fine.\textsuperscript{226} Choudary may not be considered as the authority on Islam in the UK, but the fact that he is outright outspoken and is freely allowed to spread his hate and extremism unchecked shows you where we are rapidly heading.\textsuperscript{227} Evidently, anyone may wish to believe that in Malta things will be different, but then again we are not seeking to be different but in rapidly applying and following the European and western models. If we fall short in accepting this reality we shall not only fail our future offspring but also the very Muslim minorities amongst us who will find themselves in a radical reality worse than the one they escaped from.

If immigration and multicultural diversity has been as successful and as much of a blessing to the relevant cultures why has opposition to immigration become a central issue in many elections in several EU and European countries including Britain, Switzerland, Denmark, Italy, Sweden, France, Germany, Greece and now Holland?

\section*{2.8.8 Defending Rights and Fulfilling Duties}

The consultation process has suggested a strategy and nominated \textbf{key policy areas} as being relevant and important to achieve the goal of integration of Third Country Nationals (TCNs). One of these policy areas is specifically about "\textit{Defending rights and fulfilling duties: anti-discrimination and equality}". The very title here is already somewhat discriminatory against the local population as I have absolutely no doubt whatsoever that "Defending rights" shall be strictly interpreted as the rights of TCNs while the "fulfilling duties" will invariably be attributed to the local population.

If one leaves from the premise that the third-country national (who in the eyes of locals is an uninvited guest) needs protection, care, and defending while the local indigenous population who never asked for anyone’s presence is to be considered as the one to bear the brunt of this forced co-

\begin{flushright}
\textbf{Any policies or decisions that do not engage or do not take on board representatives of all stake-holders involved are bound to fail.}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{223} Muslim protesters demand shops stop selling alcohol: \url{http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/muslim-brick-lane-protest-muslim-2926404}
\textsuperscript{224} Soldiers' parade marred by Muslim extremists: \url{http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1286784/Muslim-protesters-brand-war-heroes-murderers-homecoming-parade-turns-violent.html}
\textsuperscript{225} Muslims rally for Sharia law in UK: \url{http://rt.com/news/muslim-rally-london-sharia/}
\textsuperscript{226} Anjem Choudary: the British extremist who backs the caliphate: \url{http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/sep/07/anjem-choudary-islamic-state-isis}
\textsuperscript{227} Choudary Justifies Beheading of James Foley: \url{http://www.clarionproject.org/analysis/unks-anjem-choudary-justifies-beheading-james-foley}
\end{flushright}
habitation and moreover shall be enforced by legislation and peer-pressure to “fulfil duties” then one cannot expect anything else than open resentment and opposition to any such initiative.

Of course I also have absolutely no doubt that others will be quick to negate the above and state that both “rights” and “duties” shall apply to all parties concerned. However when one creates regulatory or monitoring boards, holds seminars, designs policies and chooses to consult with or nominates representatives of NGOs, immigrants and other minorities leaving out anti-immigration movements and parties on the grounds of racism and extremism, then such decisive or legislative bodies are bound to be biased in this sense. Any decisions or controlling bodies who choose to ignore, do not engage or do not take on board representatives of all stake-holders involved are bound to fail.

Again I envisage outright disclaimers to the above but if we are realistic we all know that the senior post of Equal Rights and Gender Equality Commissions or legislative bodies are always assigned to a woman on the assumption that the “minority” or the “underdog” shall always invariably be the “victim” and never vice-versa. Any attempt of utilising the same channels for the contrary (i.e. in the cases of positive-discrimination) and the victim is at best met with surprise and indifference and at worst ridiculed.

In the case of immigration, the trend to consult and liaise solely with NGOs and Immigrant representatives is already evident today and already manifested in multiple events and public showings and particularly biased for in practically all of the local media (amongst the strongest bias being manifested by the English-speaking dailies). Addressing of this issue is adamant to achieve more success and more acceptance by the local population. If such an initiative is to be perceived as another way of ameliorating immigrants position and rights at the cost of a price paid in equal and opposite losses by the generic population then we will not only have a guaranteed failure but we will increase a sentiment of resentment by the masses against the “untouchable” and “privileged” minorities.
2.9 Further Recommendations

2.9.1 Policy Scope and Coverage

The Migrant Integration Policy should clearly be limited to:

1. Immigrants granted asylum as refugees;
2. Other third country nationals granted a work permit;
3. EU Nationals settling in Malta;
4. Family members of the above as decided by the policy.

The Migrant Integration Policy should NOT apply or CEASE TO apply to:

1. Immigrants NOT granted asylum as refugees or whose refugee status has been revoked;
2. Other third country nationals NOT granted a work permit or whose permit is revoked;
3. Family members of the above;
4. Any third country national found guilty of a serious crime (violence, armed robbery, rape, child-molestation, murder);
5. Any third country national found guilty as a repeat offender of 3 or more instances of the same minor crime (irrespective of prior sentences given, applied, or suspended);
6. Any third country national proven to have participated in the planning, enactment, execution supporting or incitement of any terrorist act, whether such acts is or was to be carried out on national territory or otherwise;
7. Any third country national found guilty of inciting hatred, disobedience, damage, disrespect, violence or threats to the Country of Malta, its Flag, Constitution, President, Parliament, cultural heritage, and language;
8. Any third country national found guilty of not respecting and not abiding by the very same Migrant Integration Policy with respect to other minorities, locals or EU Citizens.

2.9.2 Policy Formulation and Implementation

While the Migrant Integration Policy may be prepared and formulated, it should NOT be effective before:

1. Effective discussion and participation of all stakeholders and not just of NGOs and immigrant or third-country nationals’ representation;
2. Early decision on the selected approach of a potential integration policy from one of “diversity” to one of “assimilation” by a detailed study of such diverse approaches in various EU countries and a study of the successes and failures in both;
3. A more in-depth study is undertaken to analyse of the effects of the implementing of multiculturalism and diversity in the diverse EU Countries, highlighting the benefits, successes,
shortfalls and issues of methods adopted, of relevant Migration Policies, and of controlling legislation and regulatory bodies;
4. Effective Mandatory Burden sharing is accepted and ratified by all relevant countries and effective counter-measures are put in place to minimize human trafficking and irregular migration flows;
5. Await the outcome of the proposed EU Migration Summit in Malta later this year;
6. Await the commitment of the African Union to support and to curb illegal immigration.

2.9.3 Policy Ratification

In view of the sensitivity of the subject matter and in view of the anticipated resistance by the general public to an eventual it is suggested that:

1. Open public discussion should be held to seek further public participation and input throughout the Migrant Integration Policy formation on key subject matter;
2. Especially in view of non-adoption of key factors protecting local citizens as recommended hereunder, to seek public approval of the final Migrant Integration Policy via a consultative referendum.

2.9.4 Anti-Discrimination Measures

In implementing measures to avoid discrimination on race, colour, religious or political opinion, age, sex, gender, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity or any other status the Migrant Integration Policy must ensure that:

1. We should not elevate other races, colours, religious or political opinions, and/or immigrant/refugee status above our own citizens, their traditional beliefs, values and culture;
2. We should put measures into place to both represent and protect local citizens from positive discrimination and ensure they also have adequate assistance, channels and means to address the same;
3. We should avoid any quotas based on race, colour, sex, ethnic representation or residency status for any board representation, employee make up, or job opportunities whether for official bodies, public or private sector engagement as these would create a different kind of discrimination by exclusion of the best candidate for that role;
4. We should have clear definitions of what constitutes discrimination under different grounds and circumstances and curb indiscriminate abuse of such rights by relevant minorities;
5. We should ensure a balanced make up of any investigative board or executive body controlling, reporting or monitoring such discrimination in order to avoid automatic bias in favour of any relevant minorities.
2.9.5 Equality and Diversity

In protecting equality amongst all while promoting diversity the Migrant Integration Policy must ensure that:

1. The primary emphasis is to be on achieving equal rights and standing between one and all, the right to diversity must never infringe on or supersede the former right;
2. The right to hold and express diverse customs, language, beliefs and actions do not impose the same on locals or on other minorities;
3. The right to hold and express diverse customs, language, beliefs and actions do not in themselves encourage social divisions of insular protected and untouchable sections within our society;
4. The very minority expressing its right for diversity does itself commit to respect diversities and rights of both the host population as well as other minorities, and be held accountable for the same;
5. The right to hold and express diverse customs, language, beliefs and actions do not in themselves counter, oppose or impede the integration of that same minority into the mainstream customs, language, beliefs, actions and legislation of the host country.

2.9.6 Respect of Maltese Culture and Identity

While we accept other ethnic minorities amongst us, the Migrant Integration Policy must ensure that:

1. The primary emphasis will be one of Assimilation and not Diversification, that is all efforts will be done to assist such ethnic minorities to integrate into the Maltese society rather than encouraged and assisted to retain their origins;
2. Migrants are to reach adequate levels of both spoken and written levels of Maltese and English languages;
3. Migrants are familiarized with Maltese history, traditions, festivities, religion and customs;
4. Migrants are familiarised with Maltese laws and accepted civic behaviour, accepted public morals, accepted social behaviour;
5. Migrants are familiarized with and taught to respect Maltese cultural heritage, public spaces, public buildings and public gardens;
6. Migrants are to be clearly advised that specific customs and traditions of their homelands such as female genital mutilation, child-marriages, plural marriages, arranged marriages, or enforced marriages will not be tolerated here;
7. Migrants are to be clearly advised that full respect should be forthcoming with respect to local religion, including churches, statues and symbols, religious festivities and public functions;
8. Migrants are to be adequately advised on personal hygiene, cleanliness, mode-of-dress, dress etiquette, and healthy lifestyles.
2.9.7 Labour Market Participation

While we accept Migrants right to work the Migrant Integration Policy must ensure that:

1. Legal immigrants and asylum seekers acquiring refugee status only are to be given a permit to work locally;
2. Migrants are not unfairly advantaged with respect to local workers in seeking employment by ignoring precarious work conditions of the former while clamping down on the latter;
3. Migrants are not unfairly advantaged with respect to local workers in seeking employment by ignoring rampant tax-free employment of the former who potentially are also in receipt of social benefits while clamping down on the latter;
4. Migrants are not unfairly advantaged with respect to local workers via any diversity quotas within either the public or private sectors;
5. Migrants are not unfairly advantaged with respect to local workers by being given courses, assistance, benefits, unsecured loans for start-ups etc., that are not also available to the latter;
6. Migrants are not unfairly advantaged with respect to local work by allowing unique exceptions towards job roles, donning of uniforms, excepted from serving specific foods, drinks, etc., only applicable to the former.

2.9.8 Freedom of Conscience and Religious Worship

While we accept and respect religious freedom and freedom to personal beliefs, the Migrant Integration Policy must ensure that:

1. The Republic of Malta should not remove or alter Article 2 of the constitution to allow such freedom and liberty that is in itself guaranteed in Article 40 of the same constitution;
2. Any religion or belief’s methods, teachings or spiritual leaders do not conflict with the country’s national religion, and does not attempt to destabilize it or disrespect it in any way;
3. Any religion or belief’s methods, teachings or spiritual leaders do not impose limitations on or request exceptions to the practice, celebrations, festivities or symbols of the national religion or of its followers;
4. Any religion or belief’s methods, teachings or spiritual leaders do not instruct or impose upon its members or followers any form of hate, resistance, disrespect, or intolerance to any other faiths and religions accepted under these same principles and their relevant followers;
5. Any religion or belief’s methods, teachings or spiritual leaders do not give rise to intolerance, disrespect, or somehow contravenes or threatens Maltese law, the stability of the country, our authorities, our national flag, our national emblems, and our traditions and culture.
2.9.9 Access to Residence and Nationality

While we accept and respect the right to assign residence or nationality to deserving Migrants meeting the minimum relative requirements, the Migrant Integration Policy must:

1. Consider that the granting of either residence or nationality to persons attempting to reach Europe in an illegal or an illicit method simply on humanitarian grounds without first considering the safety of and repercussion on Maltese Citizens is irresponsible;
2. Consider that the granting of either residence or nationality to persons attempting to reach Europe in an illegal or an illicit method for economic reasons is both unfair with regards to genuine and required economic migrants as well as creating an imbalance of demand versus supply in missing skills demanded by our industry and economy and giving rise to an excess of unskilled or unqualified workers of which we already have a surplus of;
3. Consider that the granting of either residence or nationality to persons of other diverse cultures, faiths and religions shall introduce potential problems and issues of divisions and difficulties in cohabitation, understanding and cohesion of future generation.
4. Consider that the granting of either residence or nationality to persons shall also grant those persons EU Citizenship and Commonwealth Citizenship with the consequences and responsibilities tied to both.
5. Assure that the eligibility criteria of naturalization of “good character”, “suitable citizen” and “adequate knowledge” of Maltese or English are quantified, qualified and adhered to.