



**Open Borders, Closed Borders**

**Europe, Toleration and Immigration**

**July 6-9, 2020**

**University of Minho, Braga - Portugal**



# BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

Room: CP1 Auditorium 4

## July 6

**9:00-9:30:** Registration: CEPS Room of the Institute of Arts and Humanities (ILCH)

**9:30-10:00:** Opening Remarks

Prof. Isabel Ermida (Dean of the Institute of Arts and Humanities)

Prof: Alexandra Abranches (Director of the Centre for Ethics, Politics and Society)

Prof. José Colen (Organizing Committee)

**10:00-10:40:** Lecture 1– Agnieszka Nogal: “The Lautsi Case and European Jurisprudence”

**10:40-11:00:** Break

**11.00-11.45:** Panel A: Europe and Borders

Dario Mazzola, “European Governance of Migration in the Age of the Global Compacts: A Perspective from Migration Theory.”

Rúben Batista, “Anti-Immigration Policies and Liberal Solutions.”

Catarina Maria Santos, “Human Rights and Border Control.”

**12.20-13.05:** Lecture 2 – Agnieszka Nogal: “Models of the Public Sphere in Europe”

**13:15-14:30** - Lunch Break

**14.30-15.15:** Lecture 3 – Michael Zuckert (Notre Dame University): “Locke and the History of Toleration.”

**15.30-16.10** Panel B: Discourses on Toleration

Hélder Telo, “Borders, Cosmopolitanism and Cosmopolitan Friendship in Stoicism.”

Steven Waldorf, “Popular Sovereignty and Religious Toleration: Marsilius of Padua and Francisco Suárez.”

Joel Patomäki, “World System Analysis of Economist Discourses.”

**16:15-16:30** Break

**\*16:30-17:15:** Lecture 4 – Acílio Estanqueiro Rocha (Academia das Ciências and University of Minho): “Toleration, a Philosophical History.”

## July 7

**\*10:00-11:00:** Lecture 5 – J. A. Colen (University of Minho): “Open Borders: a philosophical history”

**11:00-11:20:** Break

**11.20-12.20:** Panel C: Immigration and Political Theory

João C. Ribeiro, “Neorepublicanism and Liberal Egalitarianism: practical implications for free movement under European Union Law.”

José Fabião Rodrigues, “Is There a Common Language for Populism?”

Mohammad Nayyeri, “Popular Morality and Unpopular Immigrants.”

**\*12.30-13.10:** Lecture 6 – J. A. Colen (University of Minho): “Dilemmas in the Ethics of Immigration: Closing Borders and Populism.”

**13:15-14:30:** Lunch Break

**14.30-15.15:** Lecture 7 – Michael Zuckert (Notre Dame University): “Locke and Natural Law.”

**15:15-15:30:** Break

**15:30-16:15:** Panel D: Justice and Immigration

Esma Baycan Herzog, “Immigration, Trust and Equality: Social Cohesion Argument for Just Border Policies.”

Pedro Oliveira, “Towards Less Bordered Immigration.”

Andrew Freck, “Rising Tide Migrations: The So-Called ‘Climate Refugee’ as Hannah Arendt’s ‘Scum of the Earth.’”

João Carlos Ferreira Araújo, “War Refugees: A Philosophical Issue in Need of Political Change.”

**16:15-16:30:** Break

**\*16:30-17:15:** Lecture 8 – Acílio Estanqueiro Rocha (Academia das Ciências and University of Minho): “Toleration and Politics: John Stuart Mill and Karl Popper.”

## **July 8**

**10:00-10:40:** Panel E: Borders and Conflicts

João Barbosa, “Kalingrad Oblast: Dissolution and Integration.”

Karolina Jędrzejewska, “The Absorption of Immigrants: Comparison between the Policies of the European Union and Israel.”

João Rodrigues, “Toleration: A Bad Answer to Conflicts of Value.”

**10:40-11:00:** Break

**11.00-12.00:** Lecture 9 – Agnieszka Nogal: “Religious Freedom as a Human Right: controversies.”

**12.20-14.30:** Conference Lunch

## **July 9**

**10.00-10.40:** Panel F: Nations and Borders

Patrícia Oliveira, “Global Humanitarian Efforts.”

Thomas Whittaker, “Cosmopolitanism, Nationalism, and Immigration in the American Evangelical Experience.”

Sérgio Monteiro, “How Do We Approach Contemporary Immigration Crises?”

**10:40-11:00:** Break

**11.00-12.00:** Panel G: Political Questions and Values

Tannaz Najafi, “The Impossibility of Proving Asylum Need.”

Sandra Marisa Carvalho, “Immigration, Education, and Closed Borders.”

Francisco Charréu “Inglehart and The Silent Revolution”

**\*12.20-13.00:** Lecture – Acílio Estanqueiro Rocha (Academia das Ciências and University of Minho): “Quo Vadis Europe?”

**13:15-14:30:** Lunch Break

**14.30-15.10:** Lecture – Michael Zuckert: “Locke and Natural Rights.”

**15.20-16.00:** Panel H: The Welfare State

Mario Cunningham Matamoros, “Borders and the Welfare State: The Case for Rights Differentiation.”

**16:00-16:10:** Break

**16.10-17.00:** Panel I: Citizenship and Political Rights

Eleonora d’Annibale, “Citizenship and Electoral Rights Differentiation.”

Anthony Vecchio, “Kymlicka and the Paradox of Tolerance.”

José Pedro Mendes, “Immigration and Globalization.”

**17.15-17.45:** Closing Remarks: Scott Nelson (University of Vienna): “Statesmanship in Times of Crisis.”

\*\*\*

Authors:

**ANDREW FRECK** (Wabash College).

“Rising Tide Migrations: The So-Called ‘Climate Refugee’ as Hannah Arendt’s ‘Scum of the Earth.’”

In her analysis of statelessness in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Hannah Arendt shows how persons displaced by the First World War, having lost the protections of citizenship, were reduced to the status of “the scum of the earth.” The phrase highlights the inadequacies of a political order centered on the nation-state, an order which left stateless persons without fundamental rights, or even the right to have rights. The hideous contradiction of a completely organized planet—what Arendt called ‘One World’—which nonetheless pretends that nation-state boundaries are decisive instantiations of authority and sovereignty, when combined with the natural movements of people, inevitably results in refugees similar to those described by Arendt: “having left their homeland they remained homeless, having left their state they became stateless, and deprived of their human rights they were rightless.”

This contradiction has not disappeared, and, to the contrary, has only been amplified as is evident from the tension between increasing globalization, driven by capital, and increasing nationalism, personified by populist leaders who build walls. Tragically, as people continue to naturally migrate, the ‘scum of the earth’ will only multiply. The disastrous effects of climate change will cause hundreds of millions of people to migrate both domestically and internationally, intensifying the humanitarian problem and accentuating the inadequacies of the nation-state. The so-called ‘climate refugee’ is so-called because of a lack of recognition by international governing institutions that climate change will lead to international migration. Solutions to this issue will include empowered international cooperation agreements and specific policy changes like formally recognizing the so-called ‘climate refugee’, as refugee was defined by the 1951 Refugee Convention.

Keywords: Arendt, Capital, Climate-Refugee, Sovereignty.

**ANTHONY VECCHIO** (University of Texas—Arlington).

“Kymlicka and the Paradox of Tolerance.”

In the public sphere, liberal states presumably embody the tolerance of differences by their institutions, education, and citizens’ external behavior. Within current liberal theory, the majority of literature on

toleration has therefore emphasized the “virtue” of tolerance as it pertains to individuals, i.e., not just their external behavior, but also appropriate beliefs, attitudes, and dispositions. However, tolerance as a feature of institutions, as a rule, aims at the kind of civil peace that allows the most diversity of (compossible) forms of individual flourishing. Today we lack any overarching criteria, much less in an institutional setting, for settling deep-seated moral disputes between incompatible ways of life – and disagreements easily turn into conflict.

In this paper, we aim at providing a rough draft of Kymlicka’s account of toleration and why it should in fact be taken into account. The first part seeks to articulate Kymlicka’s problem; the second is to establish his claims on their own terms; the third is an attempt to point out two arguments against Kymlicka’s view: (1) a tolerant society may need to defend liberal values; (2) a tolerant society must be open to perfectionist views of the individual.

Keywords: Multiculturalism, Minority Rights, Tolerance, Will Kymlicka.

**CATARINA MARIA SANTOS** (School of Economics and Management, University of Minho).

“Human Rights and Border Control.”

The contemporary world has been experiencing large movements of people, notably victims of displacement from violent conflicts – as was the case in 2018 – with approximately 70,8 million people being forced out of their homes. On the other hand, natural disasters and socio-economic conditions are also on the list of situations that force people to leave their country in order to find better living conditions. Consequently, one of the problems associated with this issue is border control. Notwithstanding the Universal Declaration of Human Rights presented by the United Nations, which requires all democratic liberal member countries to support these citizens through humanitarian aid and controlled border opening, tight border control is justified by the right of self-determination, authorizing and approving which migrants citizens the receiving country finds as a best fit to their idea of an ideal society.

Even if the citizens of the receiving democratic countries have the right to self-determination, tight border control can lead to even bigger and more problematic international conflicts. Therefore, we must call for better management across land borders and cooperation between all countries around the world. Furthermore, Europe, while fulfilling its duties, must contribute to the establishment of agreements with the United States so that they can be more flexible and understandable with Mexican citizens, for example.

Keywords: Human Rights, Border Control, Self-Determination, United Nations.

**DARIO MAZZOLA** is a migration and political theorist, a Postdoctoral Researcher at the University of Bergen, Norway, and Executive Scientific Coordinator of PROTECT.

“European Governance of Migration in the Age of the Global Compacts: A Perspective from Migration Theory.”

That the European Migration Governance (EMG) needs fixing, especially with respect to refugee admission and distribution, can be easily proven to anyone: even the recently elected President of the European Parliament considers reforming the Dublin System an absolute priority. More generally, the European public decries migration and what has been denounced as the “grand delusion” of multiculturalism: in 2018, 52% of Europeans saw them in a negative light. It is also an all-too-known fact that EMG has become an existential issue for the EU: it played a prominent role in Brexit and is vocally protested by Hungary, which went to the point of speaking with an independent voice in international institutions.

Yet it still might be the case that Europe is the world region where integrated migration governance is most developed and, according to many, the only one which could realistically establish and enforce distribution schemes in adherence to justice rather than institutionalizing chance and blindly following the divides of political power and interests. It is thus unsurprising that political theorists, including in recent times, have used the possible futures of the EU as a “thought experiment” for migration governance, and have sketched detailed and realistic distribution schemes and architectures of governance. In my paper, I build on this debate and add a close consideration of the normative requirements of the Global Compacts for Migration and Refugees, whose impact has so far been almost completely neglected by political theorists.

Keywords: Migration Governance, Global Compacts, EU, Migration Theory

**ELEONORA D’ANNIBALE** is a PhD fellow at KU Leuven in Political Philosophy. She received her MA in Applied Ethics from Linköping University and her BA in Letters and Humanities from Genoa University.

“Citizenship and Electoral Rights Differentiation.”

In this paper I will conduct a normative inquiry on the idea of political rights differentiation between citizens and non-citizen residents, i.e. denizens. Millions of people today cannot vote or run for office in their country of residence (currently over 30 million in the EU, and 21 million in the US, for instance). Presenting the differences between the grounds for the right to vote, the grounds for the right to run for office and the requirements for naturalization, I aim to show that there are good reasons to disentangle electoral rights from citizenship. In my proposal, citizenship would maintain the important function of providing legal rights as well as a symbol for social membership.

I will claim that electoral rights differentiation between citizens and denizens is a concern of justice for two distinct reasons: when denizens are morally entitled to certain political rights of which they are deprived, 1) we face distributive injustice of important social goods and 2) the democratic legitimacy of the government at stake is compromised. Scholarly attention has been brought to the proposal of disentangling certain rights from citizenship, however all previous attempts justify this proposal basing their claims on cosmopolitan assumptions on personhood. By contrast, my line of argument draws merely on the differences between the moral basis of the three different entitlements to the right to vote, the right to run for office and access to naturalization.

Keywords: Electoral Rights, Rights Differentiation, Citizenship.

**ESMA BAYCAN HERZOG** (University of Geneva).

“Immigration, Trust and Equality: Social Cohesion Argument for Just Border Policies.”

Given the transformation brought about by immigration, what kind of borders does social cohesion require in egalitarian post-migration societies? The question of the compatibility of immigration and social cohesion has attracted significant attention, both in the public debate and scholarly literature—in normative political philosophy, in political economy, sociology, migration studies and political science. Prominently, social egalitarians have argued that open borders and immigration are incompatible. Despite few criticisms, it is important to mention that in contemporary normative political philosophy, the weight of the argument falls on the side of incompatibility.

This paper focuses on a version of this incompatibility argument, one linked to support for welfare state policies motivated by a shared common (national) identity. It argues that if it really were the case that social cohesion is valuable, then social egalitarians cannot but defend just border policies. Just border policies are not only far more open than the restrictive border policies, but also take the sociological diversity brought

about by immigration seriously. When societies are conceptualized as culturally diverse, then the traditional defense of restrictive border policies for the sake of safeguarding social cohesion becomes both counterproductive and insufficient to motivate all to support the welfare state policies in respecting the stability they claim to require.

Keywords: Immigration, Welfare State, Social Cohesion, Motivation, Discrimination, State Borders.

**FRANCISCO CHARRÉU** is a Master's student in Political Science at the University of Minho.

“Inglehart and The Silent Revolution.”

The main objective of this paper is to expose the model of social change and values that Ronald Inglehart presented in the 1970s, based mainly on the most famous work, *The Silent Revolution* (1977). In making this presentation we intend to clarify the fundamental concepts involved in his theory, highlighting the contrast he establishes between materialist and postmaterialist values.

A secondary objective is to observe if the changes have prevailed until today, and what it could mean.

Inglehart sees a transformation in political priorities in Western Europe, and he tries to present a model that explains it, based on the following two hypotheses: 1) Individuals have various needs, which are perceived as of more or less importance/priority. One of the factors for this hierarchy of priorities depends on their degree of satisfaction: if the needs are already satisfied, their importance decreases, but in turn the importance of those that are not satisfied increases; 2) the values of a generation correspond to this priority of needs, but instead of changing with the changing situation throughout life, individuals tend to maintain the values since their formative years, even much later in adult life.

Keywords: Safety, Tolerance, Values, Materialism/Post-Materialism.

**HÉLDER TELO** (NOVA Institute of Philosophy).

“Borders, Cosmopolitanism and Cosmopolitan Friendship in Stoicism.”

The goal of this paper is to explore the relevance of Stoic cosmopolitanism (and particularly of its emotional dimension) for the question of immigration. The fact that Stoic cosmopolitanism is not only linked to reason, justice and duties (as much of modern and contemporary forms of cosmopolitanism), but it also involves an emotional component (namely, a form of cosmopolitan friendship or love) becomes particularly clear in the context of the Stoic theory of appropriation (*oikeiōsis*). According to Hierocles, one's relation to others is naturally organized in concentric circles – which means that those that are closest to oneself (particularly one's family) are the object of greater friendship and care, whereas more distant people (such as fellow citizens, people of the same ethnicity or even the rest of humankind) receive the least affection and care.

In light of this, it is easy to understand the tendency not to care about immigrants or foreigners and to establish strong borders. However, the Stoics argue that the development of rationality allows for a different kind of relation (or appropriation), which recognizes all human beings as equal and, consequently, brings every human being to the central circle. Guided by Martha Nussbaum's analysis of political emotions and her use of imagination and art, I will briefly explore the possibility of using Stoic thought and its use of cosmopolitan images as a way of developing – both in individuals and societies – not only a form of cosmopolitan friendship, but also a loving tolerance for immigrants and foreigners.

Keywords: Friendship; Love; Cosmopolitan Imagination; Loving Tolerance.



**JOÃO CARLOS ARAÚJO** (School of Economics and Management, University of Minho).

“War refugees: A Philosophical Issue in Need of Political Change.”

When speaking of borders, it is impossible to ignore the European struggles lived in this decade. The Syrian population made in a legitimate call for democracy in 2011 until it became a bigger issue, influenced by the interests of foreign countries and organizations. That western mainstream countries have analyzed and categorized conflicts in terms of nationality as a way of dispensing with responsibility has resulted in destruction and consequent mourning in unprotected countries. Syria is one of them. After the bombings and shootings started in this country, the majority of civilians tried, in an act of desperation, to escape to a safer place; these human beings were left with no resources, were forced to leave their ways of life, and forced to try to survive elsewhere – only to end up having their lives as a mere topic of debate. The economic, political, social implications in this situation are worthy of attention. But I cannot understand how these implications could justify a system that destroys and then debates whether or not human lives are worth saving.

The easiest way to answer this would be “but what can we do then, there’s no way to handle this properly” – Maybe, maybe we’re indeed limited by our context and what we’ve become, but shouldn’t that be a wakeup call? How far do we need to go to understand that we need change? In this small presentation, we should do an exercise with ourselves and try to answer some questions often inside this debate but with the roles reverted. What would be the way to convert them to reality?

Keywords: Refugees’ Dilemma; Syria; European Borders; Humanitarian Crises.

**JOÃO BARBOSA** (School of Economics and Management, University of Minho).

“Kalingrad Oblast: Dissolution and Integration.”

The Kaliningrad Oblast is a Russian enclave among NATO members. Instability during 20th century brought social, economic and political problems. In this presentation, we look for the answer “Why did nobody want the Kaliningrad Oblast and why is it so important in the 21st century?”.

We will address border changes in First World War and annexation after the Second World War, including the changes during the Soviet presence and the solutions created after the dissolution – as well as the versatility in the current world and the possibility of integrating the European Union space.

Keywords: Kalingrad Oblast, Political Enclaves, Territorial Jurisdiction.

**JOÃO C. RIBEIRO** is a Master’s student at the University of Minho - CEPS. He has previously pursued legal studies and received a Master in European Legal Studies from the College of Europe - Bruges.

“Neorepublicanism and Liberal Egalitarianism: practical implications for free movement under European Union Law.”

Freedom of movement and residence constitutes a fundamental right recognised in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union – article 45. Furthermore, freedom of movement and residence is also reaffirmed as a major citizenship right in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFUE) – article 20 and 21. Moreover, European Union (EU) law grants European citizens the right to have access to other member states territory, while at the same time prohibits the hosting state from discriminating against them. The Court of Justice of the European Union has produced a considerable

amount of decisions assessing the legitimacy of Member States interventions that could have the effect of hindering the exercise of this fundamental right.

Against this background, this paper would assess whether one can identify a practical significant difference in interpreting the EU citizenship right of free movement from a neorepublican approach, as opposed to a liberal egalitarian. From a neorepublican perspective, the right to free movement constitutes a guarantee against domination. By contrast, a classic liberal egalitarian approach seems to limit the citizens' aspiration to free movement, inasmuch as it views a democratic society "as a complete and closed social system," to use Rawls' words. This approach relies on a nation-state framework and may fail to answer demands of transnational citizenship.

Keywords: Free Movement of Persons, EU Law, Neorepublicanism, Liberal Egalitarianism.

**JOÃO RODRIGUES** (Institute of Arts and Humanities, University of Minho).

"Toleration: A Bad Answer to Conflicts of Value."

The citizens of a liberal democracy have a right to self-determination, that is, they have a say in what kind of a country they want to live in. And they might decide to live in a country that shuts off its borders to all migrants. One might say that this right is also an obligation—since being a good citizen means striving to achieve the best possible country. And if one believes that shutting off the borders will achieve the best possible country; then as a citizen, one has the obligation to do so. The problem of migration is not necessary, but current affairs show it to be widespread.

This paper defends the problem of migration is best seen as a problem of conflicting values, which expresses itself as a problem of competing obligations. These conflicts of value are not a binary struggle between host population and migrants. Since they occur in liberal democracies, these conflicts are often embodied and resolved in the democratically elected policy maker, who has an obligation to fulfill the will of his constituents alongside the contrary obligation of upholding basic human rights and juggling foreign pressures. This paper will also take issue with the notion of "toleration". A conflict of values is resolved by figuring out how much weight to assign to each conflicting value. In this framework, the phrase "Should we tolerate migrants?" is an answer, not a question, because it presupposes that the values of the host population are to be prioritized.

Keywords: Migrants, Thomas Nagel, Conflict of Values, Toleration.

**JOEL PATOMÄKI** (Jyväskylä University).

"World System Analysis of Economist Discourses."

Some interpretations of Karl Marx have thought economic as primary zone of analysis. Economism is the term in Marxist discourse that was used by Russian communists to attack social democrats. It is paradoxical to use economism as reason to keep borders since economic activity most clearly permeates borders. The term economism has been kept as primary reason to close the state borders from immigration. There are different ideas of which sector of being clearly defined kind of legitimizes the sovereign. The hypothesis of this paper is that in the economic times of third way economic policies just behind us economic is the most clearly defined category to legitimize sovereign and its borders in many senses. Poststructuralist analysis of flows like in Gilles Deleuze or of hospitality in political sense and context in Jacques Derrida. Poststructuralist analyses seek to understand why there is no single category to keep people out like culture or economic. It can also help to see keeping people out of sovereign like the state as question of

governmentality. There are different forms of power that are hospital and seek to refine or bring down barriers as borders.

The argument in this paper is that if and when key destinations of immigrants are liberal states with a social state, then the question becomes technical question of governmentality. For example, if there would be more liberal states with some kind of social state then there would, technically speaking, not be so many flows of immigrants to certain direction, and then there would be flows of immigrants to many destinations. This example presupposes contingencies, but the point is to sketch out the technical governmentality concerning the question of immigration.

Keywords: World System Analysis, Economism, Sovereignty, Liberal Social State.

**JOSÉ PEDRO MENDES** (School of Economics and Management, University of Minho).

“Immigration and Globalization.”

Most people that decide to emigrate encounter major problems due to money issues, long working hours, and not having enough time to spend with their families. However, these are not the only problems immigrants face daily. Most of these problems are connected to the internal restriction politics of the territory they are trying to have a fresh start in. Another cause is that the people who live in the receiving country take issue with accepting some kinds of immigrants.

Despite the globalized world we live in, there are still some countries where border control, internal politics or even small-minded people make immigrants’ adaptation harder. As it is understandable that immigrants tend to search for developed countries to live in, it is also understandable that those countries who tend to receive a massive amount of immigrants per year need to have immigration border control policies in order to ascertain what makes people go to live there and to combat illegal immigration.

This paper proposes that immigration in general should be encouraged and supported by countries, and that cultural differences should be respected. We live in a free and globalized world and it seems right that everyone deserves the opportunity of a new start and having another life. The opportunity to share our culture with others might be a good way of evolving as well, and we can always learn something new. Nevertheless, I also think nations play an important role in border control and they should have that kind of policies to avoid conflicts and overpopulation.

Keywords: Border Control, Globalization, Immigrants, Barriers to Immigration.

**JOSÉ FABIÃO RODRIGUES** (Institute of Arts and Humanities, University of Minho).

“Is There a Common Language for Populism?”

This investigation will explore the possibilities of a religion-based response – in a way like responses based on secularism and the ethics of hospitality – to the attack on immigration from populist spheres.

Mass human migrations have happened throughout human history, yet unexpectedly few societies defend plurality instead of uniformity. Now, in the 21st century, we raise questions about plurality that must be answered later – for example, which types of population groups and religious perspectives should be included? Or how can we fit the historical-cultural context of certain migrants with others, as well as with the members of the society that welcomes them? With this new wave of migration has come a wave of populism around the world. What will be the most effective answer to this problem?

In this paper, I will present a definition of populism which does not distinguish along a spectrum or between political orientations, nor religious response such as faith and scholasticism. The point of all of this to find a common language to solve the problem of several different universes, because the core of the answer lies in international coordination to solve these migratory and political challenges. The need to respond to migration arose with greater relevance in the post-World War II era, both academic, political, social and cultural means, however, the answer remains unanswered. I will try to combat the misinformation created in the last decade in the deception of populism, as well as to present a solution that could be effective.

Keywords: Populism; Migration; Religion; Secularism; Humanism.

**KAROLINA JĘDRZEJEWSKA** (University of Warsaw).

“The Absorption of Immigrants: Comparison between the European Union and Israel’s policies.”

The paper presents the phenomena of immigration, which occurs when people are forced to leave their current place of residence because of deterioration of living conditions or other hostile circumstances. They are attracted to another country where conditions and situations seem to be better. Main objective is to depict the attempts undertaken by European and Israeli authorities to foster absorption of immigrants and consequently establish policies and provide assistance to achieve assimilation of the immigrants as achieving those objectives is still the main issue on the agenda of both European Union and Israel.

The idea is to compare both absorption policies, especially bearing in mind the fact that Israel is a country made up entirely of immigrants and is still believing in fostering immigration as a way of state’s survival. The policies Israel created can be an answer to the EU problems with tackling this issue. Qualitative research methods were adopted, including historical, institutional and comparative approaches as suitable methods to describe complexity of such phenomena as immigration and absorption of immigrants. Research techniques included content analysis and case studies to uncover trends in thoughts and opinions on the presented subject. In this paper answer to the research question on the conduct of immigrants absorption is provided through deep analysis and synthesis of the author’s findings in the conclusions section, presented by confronting them with main assumptions of the prior research on immigration to European Union and Israel and posing questions for further research.

Keywords: Israel, European Union, Immigrants, Absorption

**MARIO CUNNINGHAM MATAMOROS** is a PhD Fellow at the Hoger Instituut voor Wijsbegeerte in KU Leuven. His research focuses on socio-economic rights differentiation of migrant workers.

“Borders and the Welfare State: The Case for Rights Differentiation.”

The preservation of the welfare state is often mentioned as a strong reason that justifies both borders and migration controls. In this regard, some economists and political theorists claim that liberal democratic societies have developed welfare state systems that would not be able to support the economic and social burden pose by migrants in an open borders regime. This given that high levels of migration erodes the political support for the welfare state, and it undermines it economically. This argument points out a tension that liberal democratic societies face when trying to meet their domestic and global justice duties. At the domestic level, the welfare state is one of the primary mechanisms through which domestic justice is achieved. Meanwhile, an open borders policy seems to be the most effective way to tackle global poverty and inequality. Nonetheless, these two policies are exclusive: a state has to choose between a strong welfare state or a lenient migration policy. In light of this dilemma, this paper defends the idea that socio-economic rights differentiation between immigrants and citizens should be seriously considered a possible solution

to it. Focusing on the case of guest-worker programs, I will sketch an account of socio-economic rights differentiation that stands for guest-workers fundamental interests without overburdening the welfare state.

Keywords: Borders, Welfare state, Labor Migration, Socio-Economic Rights Differentiation.

**MOHAMMAD NAYYERI** is a doctoral scholar at the School of Law, King's College London. His main research interests are in the fields of human rights, public law, international law and legal philosophy. His current research focuses on theorising human rights in a time of populism.

“Popular Morality and Unpopular Immigrants.”

Abstract: The current social and political context in Europe is affected by dangerous trends and forces of populism. We are now facing unprecedented attacks on human rights and the rule of law which are undermining the legitimacy of legal institutions and causing division in our societies. Such populist hostility is most observable in connection with issues of immigration and refugees where it functions as a pretext for scrapping legal protections for immigrants and curbing freedom of movement. What is particularly insidious about these developments is the claim, articulated by some theorists, which is that the popular resentment and backlash against immigrants is justified. Human rights laws and legal institutions, from this perspective, are flawed for they are out of tune with popular morality and fail to give effect to nationalistic and often xenophobic agendas regarding immigration and refugees. Such narratives, however, have rarely been challenged and they require critical scrutiny. They also raise serious questions about our understanding of human rights, the rule of law and morality. For instance, should the rules governing the treatment of immigrants be determined by popular views? What is at stake if legal and moral standards are to be shaped by backlash morality? This paper considers these questions and argues that legal constraints on majoritarian biases towards immigrants are necessary and need to be defended against populist moralism.

Keywords: Immigration, Law, Morality, Populism, Backlash

**PATRÍCIA OLIVEIRA** (School of Economics and Management, University of Minho).

“Global Humanitarian Efforts.”

Currently, an unprecedented influx of refugees fleeing war, persecution and extreme poverty is present in the European Union. But it is not just a problem of the countries involved in the conflict. It is a global issue that affects us all. Therefore, the humanitarian problem we are experiencing, and the global involvement of refugees, requires that international politics does not underestimate the real gravity of this problem. Today we have seen the world bow to the pandemic problem, and it is time for us all to question ourselves. Why does the death of someone who contracted the virus have a greater impact on society than refugees who die while crossing the sea? The virus does not choose age, country, social position, we are all vulnerable. In this paper, I will consider how this affects the way we should think of our collective humanitarian efforts.

Keywords: Refugees, Humanitarian Aid, Global Cooperation, Pandemics.

**PEDRO OLIVEIRA** (School of Economics and Management, University of Minho).

“Towards Less Bordered Immigration.”

In the past year over 272 million people were immigrants which means that 3,5% of the world population are immigrants. Immigration is in the essence of every human being, because people are always searching

for better living conditions, so that, in some situations, they either leave or are forced to leave. Despite our globalized and multicultural world, we see gradual barriers being placed in front of those searching for a better life, due to the division of the world in sovereign states where normally liberal democracies (preferred destination of immigrants) chose the acceptance of some immigrants and not others.

In this essay, it is my intention to discuss the importance of nations, its borders, as well as its rules, as key elements to accomplish a safer, equal and less bordered immigration.

Keywords: Immigration, Nations, Borders, (In)Equality

**RÚBEN BATISTA** (Institute of Arts and Humanities, University of Minho).

“Anti-Immigration Policies and Liberal Solutions.”

Migration seems to be an endless problem, mainly because there still exist oppressive political conditions, major economical restrictions, and even lack of freedom in several countries around the world. The painful truth is that there is no easy solution to this kind of issues. Because of this, millions of people are forced to leave their home countries and search for a better life in free democratic countries that have will to accept deprived foreigners. An important question arises: should this welcoming, freer, richer countries accept the entry of these people? If yes, should restrictions be imposed? The more we think about it more questions arise. Obviously, an open mind would think that every needy person should be allowed to cross a country's borders, however that seems impossible in our time simply because the welfare and security of the habitants living in these aimed lands must be guaranteed as well.

Different policies appear trying to solve these highly debated problems. The most conservative ones try to let in as few foreigners as possible, and with this, another type of problem arises: the anti-immigration policy. This clearly is a full restriction of one's freedom and does not seem like a good solution to the migration dilemmas. In this article I propose a liberal solution. This paper will debate possible liberal solutions.

Keywords: Migration, Restrictions, Anti-Immigration, Liberal Solutions.

**SANDRA MARISA CARVALHO** (School of Economics and Management, University of Minho).

“Immigration, Education, and Closed Borders.”

This paper defends the idea that immigration is a fundamental right of humanity that should never be impeded. It is not just a human right, but it also, in our view, is implicit in the human rights declaration. There should be no borders between countries. Land is common to all, and belongs to all the people who inhabit it. No citizen should be advantaged or disadvantaged for being born in America, Arabia or Somalia. No citizen should be advantaged or disadvantaged by being born into a poor family with ten brothers, or into a wealthy family with a single son. Therefore, the right to equal opportunity should enshrine the right to immigrate. Providing for equal rights may be difficult, but as the saying goes, it is better to teach someone to fish than to simply give them fish. Institutions are not enough to provide food, more important would be to equip people with wisdom. Education is a strong reason for open borders.

We uphold, nonetheless, that despite the fundamental right to immigrate, borders must be kept, as a safeguard of welfare of the inhabitants, and the rules and conditions of each nation should be enforced without prejudice.

Keywords: Immigration, Education, State Welfare.

**SÉRGIO MONTEIRO** (School of Economics and Management, University of Minho).

“How Do We Approach Contemporary Immigration Crises?”

Nowadays, immigration is without any doubt one of the most discussed subjects globally. Due to its direct impact in government policies, it continues to be a disputed and divisive issue, not only in the United States, but throughout the whole planet. This concentration of legal and illegal immigration is creating a complex debate when it comes to the safety of borders, or the human rights subject.

Richer countries tend to take political actions, without even thinking on the bad outcome on the life of the ones who were simply frightened by the war in their own countries or were just constantly in situations of severe hunger. As Pope Francis has remarked, we must remember that “migrants and refugees are not pawns on the chessboard of humanity. They are children, women and men who leave or who are forced to leave their homes for various reasons, who share a legitimate desire for knowing and having, but above all for being more.” I would like to urge the debate around the problem of illegal immigration and even try to understand what are the main reasons and solutions involving this contemporary reality in our society.

Keywords: Borders, Immigration, Human Rights, Politics

**STEVEN WALDORF** (Cambridge University).

“Popular Sovereignty and Religious Toleration: The Case of Marsilius of Padua and Francisco Suárez.”

It is often asserted that a government whose legitimacy rests on the consent of the governed provides the strongest vindication of individual rights against state coercion. This is especially true in matters of religion. However, consideration of the late medieval and early modern scholastic tradition of political thought suggests this is not the case. By comparing two thinkers from this tradition who systematically examined the question of religious liberty, Marsilius of Padua and Francisco Suárez, this paper will show that popular consent alone is far from a stable theoretical basis on which to ground religious freedom.

In *Defensor pacis*, Marsilius argues that all authority rests solely on the consent of the governed, which is incarnated in the political ruler. Since the legislator possesses authority in virtue of popular consent, and since this is the sole and unmediated source of coercive authority, the ruler possesses plenary power which should be deployed to preserve civic peace. This includes power over religious matters. Suárez, though not a liberal democrat, suggests a firmer foundation for religious freedom. The state can only legislate what pertains to natural law, a moral norm that limits state authority. Although natural law, and hence the state, can forbid polytheism, it cannot prescribe any particular form of monotheism. Consequently, government must tolerate Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and other monotheisms.

Keywords: Popular Sovereignty, Religious Freedom, Natural Law, Marsilius of Padua, Francisco Suárez.

**TANNAZ NAJAFI** (Università della Svizzera Italiana).

“The Impossibility of Proving Asylum Need.”

From many years until now, we have been seeing in several occasions cases where people seeking for political asylum have not been recognized and approved their request. The reasons behind such an impossibility are many and differ from country to country. Consider for instance Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan or many Islamic countries that are divided between on the one hand radical believers and rulers and on the other the society that asks for peace and respect. People escaping from those countries are usually forced to leave it silently and dangerously. For good reasons, emigrants and refugees must provide proof that their

request of political asylum is well founded and real. However, these proofs are very hard to produce, and radical forces from the emigrant's or refugee's original country may even impose violently.

Thus, the question that deserves to be asked is: how can a refugee prove to really need political asylum if he or she comes from a country where such a one cannot manifest his or her dissent? If one shows disapproval then they put him or her in jail; if one stays silent although totally disagreeing with the system, then that person does not have enough evidence to ask for political asylum. How can we increase awareness about this issue and help refugees that really seek respect and freedom? What roles should already integrated refugees play in order to build bridges among the borders rather than walls?

Keywords: Political Asylum, Refugees, Political Division, Religious Radicalism.

**THOMAS WHITTAKER** (Harvard University).

“Cosmopolitanism, Nationalism, and Immigration in the American Evangelical Experience.”

Evangelical Protestants represent one of the most important political constituencies in American public life. Indeed, for scholars seeking to understand secularization, the pervasive power of conservative Protestantism in the United States remains one of the country's most distinctive features. Yet evangelical Protestantism has always been an international tradition, with its roots in Britain and continental Europe in the early modern period. Since the beginning of the modern missionary movement and especially since the 1960s, evangelicalism has gone global, thriving in sub-Saharan Africa, South America, and East Asia. At the same time, the United States has maintained its importance within global evangelicalism.

Many American evangelicals see themselves as unique defenders of America's identity as a Christian nation. This situation presents an interesting quandary: on the one hand, American evangelicals are cosmopolitans, believers in a religion that makes universal claims upon people everywhere, convinced of the need to convert every tribe, tongue, and nation. On the other hand, American evangelicals are in most cases nationalists, bold proponents of American exceptionalism who seek to renew the nation's grounding in Judeo-Christian values. In this paper, I seek to explore this seeming contradiction by recourse to American religious history, using evangelical approaches to immigration as a case study to unpack these apparent tensions.

Keywords: Cosmopolitanism, Nationalism, Immigration, American Evangelicalism.