

May 2010

WORKSHOP

The Ethics of International Migration Management*

Organised by
GRITIM-UPF and UNESCO
Location: Barcelona – 31 of May 2010 University Pompeu Fabra (UPF) Ramon Trias Fargas, 25-27 Building: Jaume I Reflection Room Agora

Coordinators:

Ricard Zapata-Barrero Director GRITIM-UPF Dep. Ciències Polítiques i Socials Universitat Pompeu Fabra ricard.zapata@upf.edu	Antoine Pécoud International Migration Section Social and Human Sciences UNESCO - SHS/SRP/MIG a.pecoud@unesco.org
Coordinator Assistant: Jonathan Zaragoza – Gritim-UPF PhD Researcher Jonathan.zaragoza@upf.edu	
Logistic assistance: Loli Martinez – administrative staff - loli.martinez@upf.edu	

For logistic reasons, this workshop is closed to public. We will only accept participants on the strict confirmation of invitation.

* This Workshop is a complementary action of the Project FRONTERAS: *Political Theory on Borders: Policies and movement of persons in the Euromediterranean* financed by the VI National Plan of Scientific Research, Development and Technological Innovation 2008-2011, Ministry of Science and Innovation, Spain Consolidated Group Ref: CSO2008-02181/CPOL.

May 2010

Background

An emerging research agenda exists around the Ethics of Migration. In this context, the present workshop (WS) proposes a debate on the moral constraints of State behaviour towards international migration management (IMM). We aim to promote a discussion, not so much about what States actually do in the area of IMM, but rather about the ways to evaluate normatively the State policy answers to IMM. Specifically, the WS is interested in the ethical implications of public policies and political orientations directed to manage international migrations.

International migration management (IMM) has become an increasingly popular notion that partly challenges existing research on the ethics of migration policy. First, this notion implies going beyond the strictly national level to envisage international (whether global or regional) cooperation in the field of migration policy. Taking into account the interests of all partners, including sending States and migrants themselves, migration could be approached as a common good, thus raising new ethical questions. Second, discourses on IMM put forward arguments that seem partly grounded in ethics. The best example is the so-called migration-development nexus, according to which migration policies should contribute to development and poverty-reduction. This inclusion of (however superficial) ethical concerns in migration policy debates does also raise relatively new questions on how policies relate to ethical principles. Similarly, these discourses regularly claim that the ambition of migration policies should be the so-called win-win (or win-win-win) situations, in which all States (both sending and receiving) and migrants themselves would benefit from migration.

Third, inter-State cooperation on migration raises issues not only about the relationship between governments and individual migrants (as classical research on the ethics of migration does), but also on the relationship between States. For example, how can bi-lateral or multi-lateral agreements on migration be analysed ethically? To what extent do governments, in the South and in the North, reflect the interests of their own people/citizens in the negotiations? What about the parties bargaining power and the possibility for reaching fair deals? What is the impact on the first concerned, i.e. the migrants? Notions such as management often imply a technocratic and depoliticised approach to decision-making processes, thus raising the issue of the liberal and democratic foundations of migration policies.

Contributors to this seminar share the argument that even if one assumes the widely accepted premise that States have a right to control migration and distribute the right of entry according to certain criteria, there are still significant moral constraints on how this control and distribution may be exercised. For example, IMM often implies remote policies to keep people in their region/country (as for asylum-seekers), thus raising ethical issues on Northern States attitude and influence toward South-South flows.

Focus: Contexts of moral dilemmas:

The WS is focused on dealing with several levels of ethical thinking: from normative questions, such as what the main justifications for establishing an evaluative ethical framework for analysing State practices are, to institutional ones, related to the identification of policy contexts where this ethics needs to be applied. Also, the WS will be focused on specific political practices and applied ethics or/and establishing an ethical code for States.

This WS aims to both share and go beyond the framework directly centred on the asymmetrical situations that demonstrate the inconsistencies of political practice, such as the asymmetry between the right of entry (the right of admission, eminently under State sovereignty) and the human right of exit (no State can

May 2010

impede the exit of its citizens), or the disparity between the freedom of movement of people, goods, money and services. The WS will be centred on the management of international migration and will seek to establish, justify and critically discuss the ethical point of view from an applied perspective.

At present, the policy-maker finds himself/herself in situations that are true moral dilemmas, in the sense that it is impossible for him/her to irrefutably know if the decision made is good and right. The dilemmas are not only expressed at the level of principles (which principle to follow) and policy orientations, but also at a practical level (which practice is the most appropriate for following up a principle).

We reflect on the context of the moral dilemmas faced by the policy-maker when responding to issues related to IMM. The WS goal is tackling both the institutional and the normative aspects of ethical thinking on IMM that can contribute to the incipient debate on the Ethics of migrations. Topics to be considered for debating an international migration management ethics can be listed as following: - Bilateral and multilateral agreements - Family reunification policy - Return policies - Visa policies - Externalisation of migration policies (remote control and root cause approaches) - Reception policies - Policy answers to irregular migrants - Migration and development initiatives - Migrants views on fair migration policies and possible clashes with government views.

Dissemination aims of the workshop

This workshop is part of a process for editing a book. Participants provide their first arguments and ideas, and together we will discuss the structure and content of the book, as well as the timetable for drafting, with the background and proposed chapters as a basis for discussion.

A first structure and focus of the paper (or in any case a first Power Point presentation) should circulate to all participants at least one week before (24 of May as deadline).

Papers should be original since they will be considered as a first draft for publication in UNESCO Book Series (edited by R. Zapata-Barrero and A. Pécoud).

Target audience

The workshop will bring together no more than 10 extra participants and institutional observers contributing to the debate, and the proceedings would be off the record.

Seminar Format

- Each paper discussion will last 45 min.
- The paper givers will present the paper in 20 minutes. Then 25 minutes of debate with all participants.

May 2010

Programme

Morning session - Moral restraints for immigration policies

9.15 – 13.30

9.15 – 9.30 Opening remarks and welcome by **R. Zapata-Barrero** and **A. Pécoud**

Chair: Oriol Amorós, Secretary Immigration – Generalitat, Catalan Government

9.30 - 10.15 *Temporary migration, partial citizenship and mobile societies* **Rainer Bauböck**, European University Institute

10.15 – 11.00 *Moral, ethical, and realist dilemmas of immigration*, **Veit Bader**, University of Amsterdam

11.00 – 11.25 Coffee Break

Chair: Xavier Aragall, GRITIM-UPF and FRONTERAS Project member

11.25 - 12.10 *Who is exploited? The moral dilemmas of guestwork programmes* **Lea Ypi**, University of Oxford

12.10 - 12.55 *Just Borders*, **Jonathan Seglow**, University of London

12.55 - 13.40 *International Migration Management: from "anything goes" to the need of an ethical code*, **Ricard Zapata-Barrero**, Universitat Pompeu Fabra

13.40-15.00 LUNCH BREAK

Afternoon session - Practical issues

15.00-18.45

Chair: Xavier Ferrer, GRITIM-UPF and FRONTERAS Project member

15.00-15.45 *Emboldened blood and narrowed mind: the good citizen and immigration controls*, **Bridget Anderson**, University of Oxford

15.45-16.30 *Free movement and migration management. An analysis of the global policy discourse on international migration*, **Antoine Pécoud**, UNESCO

16.30-16.45 Tea Break

May 2010

Chair: Blanca Garcés, Postdoctoral GRITIM-UPF Fellow

16.45-17.30 *Making Aliens: The revocation of citizenship in ethical context*,
Mathew Gibney, University of Oxford

17.30-18.15 *Why not the Whole World?* **Aristide Zolberg**, The New School
University, New York

18.15-18.30 General observations and publication plans

Paper Givers Absent in the Seminar:

Javier De Lucas, Colegio de España in the Cité Universitaire de París

May 2010

Abstracts

Emboldened blood and narrowed mind: the good citizen and immigration controls,
Bridget Anderson, University of Oxford

There are three basic stories explored by those concerned with the ethics of migration. One is a border story: a non-citizen seeks admission to a territory that they are not a citizen of, on what grounds if at all is it ethical to refuse to admit them? The second is a naturalization story: the settled non-citizen applies for citizenship, what is the ethical response? And the third is a story about the 'illegal immigrant' who has no right to reside: what rights (including the right to stay) if any, can they lay claim to? This paper will argue that all three stories share an assumption that it is possible to differentiate between the foreigner and the citizen. Drawing on UK policy and practice it will show how in a non-ideal world, differentiation is extremely difficult and complex, and this is particularly so for the second and third stories. These difficulties cannot be resolved by simple appeal to fact, and I will consider how an analysis of borders/immigration controls as *creating* multiple statuses rather than filtering out non-citizens, shifts the emphasis from problems of differentiation to contradictions and tensions in the production of status. The paper will consider the ethical implications of shifting borders to inside state territory, when immigration enforcement becomes the responsibility not only of the policymaker and the bureaucrat, but also of the 'good citizen' who must manage these tensions.

Moral, ethical, and realist dilemmas of transnational governance of migration. **Veit Bader**, University of Amsterdam

In the first part, I recapitulate my earlier discussion of dilemmas of International Migration Management (IMM) – or, as I prefer, of transnational governance of migration – that have received wide attention during the last decade in politics and in the respective sciences. As we know, moral, ethical (particularly ethno-national), prudential and realist arguments most often do not re-inforce but are in serious tension with each other. I have argued in more detail in other texts that we should not discount these arguments and that we cannot find a context-independent hierarchy (e.g. 'moral arguments' always trumping 'realist' ones). Instead, responsive normative judgment and responsive politics/policies have to take contexts into account but should do so in a way that clearly avoids relativism or 'anything goes'. The main part of the article tries to tackle the problem how 'sciences' can productively deal with the enormous complexity of migration and migration policies, with the uncertainty of our knowledge and the fact that we are particularly bad in predicting the expectable unintended and counter-productive consequences of all policies. In short, sciences and philosophy cannot tell us what we 'should do'. Maybe we are better in telling policy makers what they definitively should not do. This, in itself, is no reason for despair but it puts a lot of strain on institutions of democratic and effective transnational governance of migration and, unfortunately, we have good reasons to expect that – in this as in most other cases such as ecologically sustainable development – they will not be able to live up even to the most minimal requirements.

May 2010

Temporary migration, partial citizenship and mobile societies, **Rainer Bauböck**,
European University Institute

Republican conceptions of citizenship have generally regarded migrants as non-citizens who may, but must not be admitted to full citizenship. Liberals are, however, committed to a human right to citizenship for all human beings. Since citizenship is a status of membership in particular self-governing political communities, the problem how to include those who move across borders is a complex one. Liberal debates have gone through three stages. The first one addresses the problem of inclusion of immigrants who take up permanent residence. Is there a tension between a democratic right to self-determination of membership and a liberal entitlement of immigrants to citizenship? And should the tension be resolved by granting immigrants access to citizenship status or by disconnecting citizenship rights from legal status? At the second stage, liberals have started to take seriously the transnational dimension of citizenship. Migrants carry with them their citizenship of origin and often retain ties and rights across borders after settlement. Which standards of equality apply between native citizens and external ones? Do migrants have a claim to dual citizenship and how can cumulative rights and duties be reconciled with equality of citizenship? The third stage of the debate is about temporary migrants. These may be either multiple citizens who can move freely across international borders and are not interested in full citizenship in any particular state, or they may be migrants subjected to migration control not just at the point of entry but also forced to return after a temporary stay. The former phenomenon raises the question whether citizenship shopping and voluntary non-citizenship should be accepted from a liberal perspective; the latter category raises the problem whether citizenship exclusion can be justified for the sake of migration management goals and the promotion of economic development. My contribution will argue that we should not forget the insights from the earlier two stages of the debate when addressing the difficult dilemmas raised by temporary migration.

Making Aliens: The revocation of citizenship in ethical context, **Mathew Gibney**,
University of Oxford

A key feature of modern states is that their legal authority to deport individuals from their territory applies only to foreigners and not to citizens. This limitation, however, obscures the fact that many states have historically held some power (albeit lawfully constrained) to strip citizenship from nationals for certain types of behaviour (e.g., gross disloyalty, actions prejudicial to the state's vital interests), thus transforming them into foreigners and rendering them eligible for deportation. In this paper, I explore the ethical issues raised by the practice of revoking citizenship by liberal states. I outline and evaluate the range of reasons that have been given for and against seeing citizenship as a conditional upon a certain standard of behavior. Drawing upon UK's Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act of 2002, which expanded the state's right to revoke to citizenship to native born citizens with dual nationality, I ask whether conditional citizenship can ever be compatible with liberal principles.

May 2010

Free movement and migration management. An analysis of the global policy discourse on international migration, **Antoine Pécoud**, UNESCO

Free movement has long constituted a much-debated theme in the literature on the ethics of migration policy. This contribution aims at confronting the arguments in favour of free movement to the global policy discourse on international migration management. Since approximately 2000, migration has been the object of considerable debate at the international level, especially among intergovernmental organisations (IOM, UNDP, etc.) and other stakeholders (such as the Global Commission on International Migration or the Global Forums on Migration and Development). Core arguments of these international discourses regard the valorisation of migration, understood as a potentially positive phenomenon for all, and calls for more flexible and realistic migration policies (in a more or less explicit critique of Western states' attitudes toward migration). Yet, free movement never appears in these discourses, despite their numerous 'ethical' concerns (on migrants' human rights, on development, etc.). This contribution analyses this partial paradox, arguing that it reveals a state-centred approach according to which human mobility is to benefit above all the countries of origin and destination, and that the 'governance' or 'management' of migration convey a set of normative assumptions on why and how people should migrate – thus illustrating a shift rather than a reduction in control (as exemplified by temporary labour migration schemes).

Just Borders, **Jonathan Seglow** University of London

Normative approaches to immigrant admissions may be divided into four categories each of which has a number of adherents. These are open borders, sovereign borders (asserting states' right to determine their own admissions decisions), just borders (principles of justice should determine admissions decisions) and democratic borders (affected parties should collectively determine admissions decisions). This paper defends a moderately cosmopolitan liberal egalitarian view of just borders that may be combined with some elements of democratic borders. First, it defends two assumptions: that states have substantial duties of global redistributive justice independent of how many migrants they admit; and that all those admitted are entitled to at least some of basic rights of citizenship. Second, it critiques some recent defences of sovereign borders proposed by David Miller, Christopher Heath Wellman, Michael Blake and others. Third, it defends the view that individuals everywhere have an interest in freedom of movement. Finally, it sets out four principles of immigrant admissions. These are (i) a universal interest in freedom of movement, which is stronger in the case of individuals suffering (ii) a basic needs deficit such as refugees and impoverished people. Though developed states have duties to admit migrants under (ii) it nonetheless includes a norm of burden-sharing because such migrants usually have no interest in admission to a particular state. (iii) Return migrants, individuals seeking to rejoin their families and some others have an interest, which again augments (i), in migrating to a particular polity. Finally, (iv) states have an interest in restriction where immigrant entry would undermine the effective functioning of liberal democratic institutions and/or where it would compromise the states' ability to ensure that everyone in the state enjoyed the just entitlements of citizenship. Principle (i) may be trumped by (iv), but (ii) – subject to burden-sharing – generally trumps (iv), while (iii) and (iv) need to be weighed against each other.

May 2010

Who is exploited? The moral dilemmas of guestwork programmes, **Lea Ypi**,
University of Oxford

It is often argued that guest-work programmes are exploitative, and that unfair advantage is taken from the vulnerable position of foreign workers in receiving societies. This paper assesses the accuracy of this claim by comparing the position of guest-workers to both that of workers in receiving societies and workers in sending societies. It defends the relevance of a cosmopolitan principle against guest-worker exploitation and illustrates the difficulties in the justification of that principle. More specifically, it shows how attempts to come up with remedial principles against the exploitation of guest-workers in receiving societies will unfairly burden workers in the sending society thus creating an "aristocracy" of the working class. The paper concludes by showing how some of these dilemmas could be avoided by applying anti-exploitation principles to workers, taken collectively as a class, rather than distributively, as individuals. It concludes by examining the kind of policies that would accommodate these cosmopolitan anti-exploitation principles.

International Migration Management: from "anything goes" to the need of an ethical code, **Ricard Zapata-Barrero**, Universitat Pompeu Fabra

Given the current "anything goes" situation, where States rule according to their own self-interested nationalist criteria, I propose to discuss a tentative research programme on the need for an ethical code for States in international migration management (IMM) I propose to deal with this line of research within a broader reflection on first admission policy ethics, and to contextualise it within the current five-year strategy of the EU Stockholm Programme and the migration policies of most European states, where migrants are selected according to determined criteria (skill, education, age, language, religion, etc.).

I interpret IMM as an ethical context characterised by moral dilemmas, insofar as it is difficult to irrefutably know if the decision to 'allow entry' or 'deny entry' of people is good and right. I want to demonstrate the need to codify this ethical context within the framework of applied ethics in international migration management and public policy ethics.

In this article I am not interested in studying whether or not this selective policy works effectively, nor why this kind of policy is taking place here and now. Neither do I ask what attracts skilled immigrants to one country rather than another. Rather, my key-questions seek to answer whether or not this current "anything goes" State behaviour should continue, without any ethical restrictions and why.

As this paper marks the beginning of a research programme, I would like to discuss some basic issues and questions with the other speakers such as: how to justify the need for an ethical code for States, why a European code of ethics is necessary within the current EU Stockholm Programme and how it can be justified. What main contents and structure this ethical code should have and on what information it should be based (civil society claims, ethical theories, interviews with stakeholders, liberal tradition and values). What methodology we should follow, a bottom-up or a top-down model. What normative implications this code of ethics might have in terms of the way inter-state relations have been moulded by real politics and the nature of (sovereign) states. What mechanisms exist for carrying out this ethical code? What effects an ethical code might have on current State behaviour towards people seeking entry. What restrictions this code of ethics should contemplate. Is the (human) rights-based approach the most appropriate foundation for an ethical code or should we consider other approaches? What institutions can ensure compliance to an eventual ethical code for States?

May 2010

"Why Not the Whole World? Ethical Dilemmas of Immigration Policy" **Aristide Zolberg**, The New School University, New York

My title is inspired by a question raised by Herman Melville, the American novelist, author of "Moby Dick" in the face of the first American "immigration crisis" occasioned by the Irish potato famine of the 1840s. But Melville's position anticipates that of today's "Rawlsian cosmopolitans." They did not include Rawls himself who, when he belatedly theorized about justice at the global level, abandoned the "Veil of ignorance." Consequently, in a Rawlsian perspective, to don't know if you are a woman or a man, of what color, religion, level of wealth, but you DO know whether you are part of the population of an affluent country such as the United States or Spain, as against Mali or Haiti. Although I shall not deal in this paper with Rawls's overall theory of justice, I will follow Joseph Carens, who insisted on applying the "veil of ignorance" to an evaluation of international migration practices - and particularly the admission policies of relatively affluent countries - by formulating an argument on behalf of "open borders." Like Carens himself, I admit that under present world circumstances, this is not realistic, but that the stance is vital for a normative discussion of immigration policies. In conclusion, I suggest that this leads us to advocate important modifications of ongoing priorities.

May 2010

CV of the coordinators

Ricard Zapata-Barrero (ricard.zapata@upf.edu) is associate professor of political theory at the Department of Political and Social Sciences. His main lines of research deal with contemporary issues of liberal democracy in contexts of diversity, especially the relationship between democracy, citizenship and immigration. He is Director of the GRITIM (Interdisciplinary Research Group on Immigration) and the Master Programme on immigration management at UPF. He is currently working on different lines of research related to Borders and Diversity: the link between two types of cultural pluralisms: immigration and minority nations, an ethics of migration politics, the political theory of borders, the regional euromediterranean politics of immigration, the diversity accommodation policies and the intercultural approach. He is a Partner of the recently funded EU 7th Framework, 18-country ACCEPT project: *Tolerance, Pluralism and Social Cohesion: Responding to the Challenges of the 21st Century in Europe* (7th Framework Programme, European Commission) and main researcher in Project Fronteras, funded by the Ministry of Innovation and Science. He regularly contributes to media and has served on a number of commissions and government committees. Books in 2009 include: *The Muhammad Cartoons controversy in comparative perspective*, L. E. Lindkilde, P. Mouritsen and R. Zapata-Barrero (Special issue in *Ethnicities*, Sage Publications, Vol. 9 nº 3), (ed.) *Immigration and self-government of minority nations* (Peter Lang editor, Col. Diversitas), *Citizenship policies in the age of diversity* (Barcelona: Cidob Foundation), (ed.) *Políticas y gobernabilidad de la Inmigración en España* (Barcelona: Ariel), *Fundamentos de los discursos políticos en torno a la inmigración* (Madrid: Trotta). Further information: <http://dcpis.upf.edu/~ricard-zapata/>

Antoine Pécoud (a.pecoud@unesco.org) is Programme Specialist at the International Migration and Multicultural Policies Section, Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy of the UNESCO. He is Doctor by the Oxford University and has been Postdoctoral research fellow, *Unité de Recherches Migrations et Société* (URMIS), University of Paris 7 & University of Nice, France. His recent publications are: (2009) *Migration and Human Rights. The United Nations Convention on Migrant Workers' Rights* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (with Paul de Guchteneire and Ryszard Cholewinski); (2008) *La Convention des Nations Unies sur les Droits des Travailleurs Migrants. Enjeux et Perspectives, Hommes et Migrations* 1271 (with Paul de Guchteneire). (2007) *Migration without Borders. Essays on the Free Movement of People*, Oxford: Berghahn (with Paul de Guchteneire); (2009) 'The UN Convention on Migrant Workers' Rights and International Migration Management', *Global Society. Journal of Interdisciplinary International Relations*, forthcoming. He is also referee of some journals like: *Global Networks*, *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *International Social Science Journal*, *Critique internationale*, *International Migration Review*.

May 2010

CV of the participants

Bridget Anderson (bridget.anderson@compas.ox.ac.uk) is a Senior Researcher at COMPAS, primarily working on Migration and the Labour Market cluster. She has a DPhil in Sociology and previous training in Philosophy and Modern Languages. She is the author of 'Labour Exchange: Patterns of Migration in Asia', and 'Doing the dirty work? The global politics of domestic labour'. Bridget is particularly interested in precarious labour, migration and the state. She has worked closely with migrants' organisations, trades unions and legal practitioners at local, national and European level. Her selected publications are: (2008) Anderson, B. and R. Andrijasevic, 2008, Sex, slaves and citizens: the politics of anti-trafficking in Soundings, Winter, Issue 40; (2008) "A Need for Migrant Labour? The micro-level determinants of staff shortages and implications for a skills based immigration policy". A paper prepared with Martin Ruhs for the Migration Advisory Committee (MAC); (2008) Foreigners: Victims or Villains? A political debate, OpenDemocracy, (20th June).

Prof. Dr. Veit Bader (V.M.Bader@uva.nl) is Professor Emeritus of Sociology and Professor Emeritus of Social and Political Philosophy. He is currently involved in the IMES research line on the Governance of Ethnic and Religious Diversity. He is also the coordinator of the Dutch partnerships in the FP7 funded projects Tolerance, Pluralism and Social Cohesion: Responding to the Challenges of the 21st Century in Europe (TAPIS) and RESECEURIA—Religious Diversity and Secular Models in Europe—Innovative Approaches to Law and Policy. His recent publications are: Bader, V. (2008), 'Global Justice in Complex Moral Worlds. Dilemmas of Contextualized Theories'. In: Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy (CRISPP) vol. 11, no. 4, December 2008, 539 – 552; Bader, V. (2008), 'Secularism, Public Reason or Moderately Agonistic Democracy?' forthcoming in: Levey/Modood (eds) Secularism, Religion, and Multicultural Citizenship. Cambridge UP: Cambridge, chapter 5; pp. 110 – 135; Bader, V. (2007), 'How should liberal-democratic states accommodate religious diversity?' IMISCOE Policy Brief No. 8, Amsterdam: IMISCOE; Bader, V. (2007), Secularism or Democracy? Associational Governance of Religious Diversity, IMISCOE Research Series, Amsterdam: AUP.

Rainer Bauböck (Rainer.Baubock@eui.eu) holds a chair in social and political theory at the Department of Political and Social Sciences of the European University Institute. He is on leave from the Institute for European Integration Research at the Austrian Academy of Sciences, where he is also vice-chair of the Academy's Commission for Migration and Integration Research. From 1986 to 1999 Rainer Bauböck was a researcher and associate professor at the Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna. He has taught regularly at the Universities of Vienna and Innsbruck and is a recurrent visiting professor at Central European University Budapest. He was also a visiting academic at the Bellagio Rockefeller Foundation (June-July 2006), at Yale University (Jan-May 2005), the University Pompeu Fabra in Barcelona (2003), the University of Bristol (April-June 2002), University of Malmö (September 2000-February 2001); the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton and Princeton University (September 1998-June 1999); and the University of Warwick (1990-91). In 2003-2005, Rainer Bauböck was president of the Austrian Association of Political Science. In November 2006, he was awarded the Latsis Prize of the European Science Foundation for his work on immigration and social cohesion in modern societies. His research interests are on: Normative Political Theory and Comparative Research on Democratic Citizenship, European Integration, Migration, Nationalism and Minority Rights. He also coordinates a Migration Working Group at the EUI Robert Schuman Centre. The MWG is a multidisciplinary working group

May 2010

open for researchers, fellows and faculty from all EUI departments and the wider Florentine academic community with an interest in migration related topics. Also at present he coordinates jointly with co-director Jo Shaw (University of Edinburgh) the EUCITAC project to build a web-observatory on access to citizenship in Europe. EUCITAC is funded by the European Fund for the Integration of Third Country Nationals and will create a comprehensive data base and research platform on citizenship laws and policies in 33 European countries.

Dr Matthew J. Gibney (matthew.gibney@qeh.ox.ac.uk) is a political scientist who has written widely on issues relating to refugees, migration control and citizenship from the perspectives of normative political theory and comparative politics. His next book will be an analysis of the historical development of deportation as an idea and a practice in liberal democratic states. He is a graduate of Monash University in Melbourne, Australia and completed an M.Phil and a Ph.D. at Cambridge University, where he was a Commonwealth Scholar. He has taught politics at Monash, Cambridge and Harvard universities. He has been a Visiting Academic at Northwestern University in Illinois and at the Faculty of Law at Monash University. At Oxford, he teaches two courses on the M.Sc. in Forced Migration, "Asylum and the Modern State" and "Morality and Movement: Ethical Issues in Border Control". Since 2005, he has been Course Director of the M.Sc. in Forced Migration and was Director of the International Summer School in Forced Migration between 1999 and 2004 and 2006 and 2007. His work has been published in the *American Political Science Review*, the *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal*, *Forced Migration Review*, *Government and Opposition*, and a range of other journals. His books include, *Globalizing Rights: The Oxford Amnesty Lectures* (Oxford University Press 2003), which has been translated into Spanish and Italian; *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum: Liberal Democracy and the Response to Refugees* (Cambridge University Press 2004); and (with Randall Hansen) a three-volume encyclopaedia entitled, *Immigration and Asylum From 1900 to the Present* (ABC-Clio 2005).

Javier de Lucas Martín (jdelucas@colesp.net) is Doctor of Law from the University of Valencia. He is director since 1990 the Grupo de estudios sobre ciudadanía, inmigración, y minorías (Research Group on citizenship, immigration and minorities) at the University of Valencia, which was commissioned by the European Commission from 1992 to 1994, to do the report on legal measures against racism and xenophobia for Spain. As director of that group, he was appointed as an expert by the EU in the European Union-China Human Rights Dialogue on minorities rights, racism and xenophobia (Beijing, October 1998). The group also participates in the Spanish section of the network organized by the European Group on Migration Policy and has participated in the EU Daphne to produce the 2003 report on legal responses to the practice of female genital mutilation. He has published more than two hundred fifty works (books and articles) in Spanish and foreign journals specialized on issues of Theory and Philosophy of Law and Human Rights and Political Philosophy and Law Review, particularly on obedience to law, conscientious objection and draft evasion, and the legal problems related to solidarity, volunteering, racism and xenophobia, immigration, minority rights, multiculturalism.

Jonathan Seglow (j.segnow@rhul.ac.uk) has taught at Royal Holloway since January 2000. He is co-author (with Niall Scott) of *Altruism* (Open UP, 2007) and (co-)editor of other collections on altruism. He has published articles and chapters on liberalism, multiculturalism, the philosophy and politics of recognition, global justice and immigration in *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, *Journal of Moral*

May 2010

Philosophy, Political Studies Review, Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy, European Journal of Political Theory and elsewhere. He is currently writing a book on the political theory of immigration, provisionally entitled *Who is My Stranger?* Jonathan has presented numerous papers at conferences and other events in the UK, continental Europe, North American and the Far East. He is co-editor, with Gideon Calder, of *Res Publica: a Journal of Moral, Legal and Social Philosophy*, published by Springer. He is also Treasurer of the Association for Legal and Social Philosophy. He is Principal Investigator on an AHRC/ESRC funded project on Religion, Justice and Well-Being: the normative foundations of public policy in a multi-faith society under their Religion and Society programme (October 2007-June 2009).

Lea Ypi, (lea.ypi@nuffield.ox.ac.uk) is Post-Doctoral Prize Research Fellow at Oxford University and Doctor from the European University Institute. She is interested both in normative political theory and in history of ideas. From a normative perspective, she has been working on issues of citizenship and distributive justice as they arise in the context of the justification of political boundaries. Her doctoral thesis touched upon these questions and tried to defend a version of cosmopolitanism called "statist cosmopolitanism". In the future she plans to develop an account of global egalitarianism based on a theory of exploitation in the market. From a historical perspective, she is particularly interested in the work of Kant, especially the relationship between the Critique of Pure Reason and the Critique of Judgment as well as the systematic role of teleology in Kant's epistemology and moral philosophy. Other areas of historical interest involve Rousseau, Hegel, Marxism and the intellectual history of the Balkans (especially Albania).

Aristide Zolberg, (AriZol@newschool.edu) Ph.D. at the University of Chicago in 1961, and Walter P. Eberstadt Professor of Political Science. His studies are on Comparative politics; historical studies and theory; international migration; nationalism and ethnicity; Western Europe; North America, World migrations, historical and contemporary; the management of ethnic and cultural differences; and the critique of misleading theories pertaining to an alleged "clash of civilizations," which he terms "The Herodotus Fallacy." His recent and main publications are: *How Many Exceptionalisms? Explorations in Comparative Macroanalysis* (Temple University Press, 2008); *A Nation by Design* (Russell Sage Foundation Books at Harvard University Press, 2006); "The Archaeology of 'Remote Control'," in Andreas Fahrmeir, Olivier Faron, and Patrick Weil (eds.), *Migration Control in the North Atlantic World. The Evolution of State Practices in Europe and the United States from the French Revolution to the Inter-War Period* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2003). Recently he got the distinguished scholar award from the Ethnicity, nationalism and migration section of the International Studies Association, 2008.