

**Disciplining Global Movements.
Migration Management and its Discontents,**

Workshop, IMIS Osnabrück, 13 November 2010

Workshop Sessions and Abstracts

9:00 Workshop Registration

<i>sessions start at 9:30</i>	Session 1: Discourses of Migration Management	Session 2: International Organizations and the Management of Migration	Session 3: Practices of Migration Management
Chair:	Virginie GUIRAUDON (Lille)	William WALTERS (Ottawa)	John BINGHAM (Geneva)
9:30-11:30	Victor Piché (Montréal): <i>Global Migration Management or the Emergence of a New Restrictive and Repressive Migration World Order</i>	Catherine de Wenden (Paris): <i>The Elaboration of a World Governance of Migration</i>	Agnieszka Weinar (Warsaw): <i>With or Without Europe? International Organizations in the External Dimension of the European Migration Policy</i>
	Juan M. Amaya-Castro (Amsterdam): <i>Globalizing with Euphemisms. The Discursive Construction of the "Global" in IGO Narratives about Global Migration</i>	Nur Abdelkhalik (Edinburgh): <i>The European Commission and International Organizations. Looking for an Alternative Venue for Migration Policy</i>	Adèle Garnier (Leipzig/Sydney): <i>Migration Management and Humanitarian Selection: Refugee Resettlement in Europe and Australia</i>
	Christina Oelgemöller (Sussex): <i>Migration Management – a Policy Paradigm</i>	Dimitria Groutsis (Sydney) & Lina Venturas (Corinth): <i>Past Attempts of International 'Migration Management': The Establishment of the ICEM</i>	José Pina-Delgado (Praia): <i>Migration Management – Legal and Administrative Challenges for Small Emerging Economies</i>
Coffee Break 11:30 – 12:00			
12:00-13:30	Bas Schotel (Amsterdam): <i>Migration Management. Transforming Migrants from Subjects of Law into 'Migration Flows'</i>	Fabian Georgi (Frankfurt/M.) & Susanne Schatral (Bremen): <i>Patterns and Effects of IOM's Migration Management Project. Towards a Framework of Radical Critique</i>	Anne Koch (Berlin): <i>The Politics and Discourse of Return. Juxtaposing International and National Perspectives on Migrant Return</i>
	Antonina Levatino (Sevilla): <i>Highly-Skilled Migration and the Global Political Economy of Knowledge</i>	Clotilde Caillaut (Amsterdam) & Nadia Khrouz (Rabat): <i>The Implementation of "Coherent Migration Management" through the Prism of the IOM Programs in West Africa and Morocco</i>	Katerina Stancova (Pisa): <i>Assisted Voluntary Return of Irregular Migrants in Policy and Practice. Case Study of the Slovak Republic</i>

13:30–14:30 Lunch Break

<i>sessions start at 14:30</i>	Session 4: Migration & Development (Discourses of Migration Management)	Session 5: International Organizations and the Management of Migration	Session 6: Practices of Migration Management
Chair:	Malte STEINBRINK (Osnabrück) & Benjamin ETZOLD (Bonn)	Catherine DE WENDEN (Paris)	Paolo RUSPINI (Lugano)
14:30-16.30	Janine Kisba Silga (Florence): <i>Shifting Perspective on the Migration and Development Nexus in the Context of the European Union: From the Migration Management Approach to the Development Paradigm of Mobility</i>	Bernd Kasperek (Munich) & Fabian Wagner (Frankfurt/Main): <i>Frontex and European Migration Management in Greece</i>	Giada de Coulon (Neuchâtel): <i>“Regular Illegality” as a New Way to Manage Rejected Asylum Seekers? Specificity of the Swiss Case Study</i>
	Lama Kabbanji (Paris): <i>Towards a Global Agenda on Migration and Development Policy: Evidence from Senegal</i>	Philipp Ratfisch (Hamburg) & Stephan Scheel (Hamburg): <i>UNHCR and Migration Management: Securitizing Migration through Refugee Protection?</i>	Hideki Tarumoto (Sapporo): <i>Towards a New Migration Management: Care Immigration Policy in Japan</i>
	Tatjana Baraulina (Nuremberg) & Doris Hilber (Nuremberg): <i>Migration and Development. Discourses and Policy Approaches in Germany</i>	Clémence Merçay (Neuchâtel): <i>The Management of Health Workers’ Migration: The Elaboration of the WHO Code of Practice and the Swiss Answer</i>	Gianni d’Amato (Neuchâtel) & Didier Ruedin (Neuchâtel): <i>Practice and Consequences of Social Cohesion Programmes</i>

17:00 Farewell Drink and Closing Address

(Martin Geiger, Osnabrück & Antoine Pécoud, Paris)

SESSION 1: 9:30 – 13:30

Discourses of Migration Management

Global Migration Management or the Emergence of a New Restrictive and Repressive Migration World Order

Victor PICHÉ, Montréal

University of Montréal, Department of Demography – McGill University,
v-pic@hotmail.com, www.demo.umontreal.ca/personnel/Piche_Victor.htm

The notion of migration management is not new and dates back to the 19th century. What is new however is the recently generalization of the “orderly global management” approach. The present essay aims at discussing four propositions:

1. The global agenda is still profoundly embedded in utilitarianism and consequentialism.
2. This global consequentialist approach is characterized by three fundamental contradictions:
 - While globalization of capital, goods and services exert enormous pressures on the liberalization of the circulation of people, States are putting into place restrictive migration policies in the name of national sovereignty.
 - While developed countries (the global north) are facing demographic chocks characterized by a shortage of labour, anti-immigration discourses proliferate in the name of national security and/or of the preservation of national values.
 - While the human rights approach to migrant workers seems to be emerging as an alternative discourse, migration policies are moving towards a contrary pathway granting fewer rights to migrant workers and members of their family.
3. There seems to be a new consensus in international organizations and academic theories dealing with international migration that temporary migration programs are best suited in today’s global world..
4. Canada is good example of a country, which is presently transforming its traditional immigration policy geared towards permanent residence into a vast program of temporary workers.

In conclusion, it is clear that the “new” migration management paradigm intends to bring about a new restrictive and repressive migration world order. This essay will basically deconstruct the discourses of international organizations such as IOM, ILO, UN Commission on Population and Development, the Global Committee etc. It will also rely on the Canadian situation with respect with recent changes in migration policies and programs

Victor Piché is a sociologist and demographer specialised in the field of international migration policies. He has carried out several surveys on migration in West Africa as well as in Canada. For the last ten years, he has been interested in the links between international migration and globalisation, focussing on the rights of migrant workers.

His latest publications include:

PICHÉ, Victor, Eugénie PELLETIER & Dina EPALE. 2009. "Obstacles to ratification of the ICRMW in Canada", dans De Guchteneire, Paul, Pecoud, Antoine & Cholewinski, Ryszard, (eds). *Migration and Human Rights: The United Nations Convention on Migrant Workers' Rights*, Cambridge University Press, p. 193-218.

PICHÉ, Victor. 2009. "Migrations internationales et droits de la personne : vers un nouveau paradigme?", dans Crépeau, François, Nakache, Delphine et Atak, Idil (eds), *Les migrations internationales contemporaines. Une dynamique complexe au cœur de la globalisation*, Montréal, Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, p.350-369.

OUÉDRAOGO, Dieudonné et Victor, PICHÉ (eds). 2007. *Dynamique migratoire, insertion urbaine et environnement au Burkina Faso : Au-delà de la houe*, Paris et Ouagadougou, L'Harmattan et Presses universitaires de Ouagadougou.

Globalizing with Euphemisms. The Discursive Construction of the "Global" in IGO Narratives about Global Migration

Juan M. AMAYA-CASTRO, Amsterdam

Migration and Diversity Centre and the Law School of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam,
j.m.amayacastro@vu.nl, www.rechten.vu.nl/en/about-the-faculty/faculty/faculty/constituional-and-administrative-law/amaya-castro.asp

In the last decade, we have seen a proliferation and elaboration in the production of discourse about global migration. Much of this discourse has been developed in the context of institutional processes that take place in intergovernmental organizations (IGOs). These institutional contexts have particular dynamics, and are places where member states interact under the guidance or persuasion of their specific secretariats. Specific IGOs have their specific take on the world, a take that is determined by mandate and/or institutional identity, a take that has its own vocabulary, its own discursive dynamics of in- and exclusion, its own narratives about what is important, about what is national and what is global. IGOs exist by means of these discourses - they are the articulation of their identity. This identity has a dual task: it needs to convey both a connection with the identity (the worldview, the priorities and sensibilities, etc.) of the member states, as well as articulate a coherent narrative about something that is 'global', meaning: detached from national idiosyncracies and individualities. In short, in order to articulate their global (i.e. non-national) identity, IGOs need to produce narratives about migration that are both national and not national, both global and not global. This paper looks at the discursive conditions necessary for constructing a narrative about *global* migration. It does this by examining the diversity of vocabularies and narratives produced by the broad array of IGOs that have chosen to deal with this topic. The hypothesis pursued in this project is that there are a number of 'code words', such as 'management', 'mobility', or 'development', that function as 'elevators' or 'globalizers', and allow the emergence of an aggregate from a plurality of national agendas. These words or concepts play a central role in the construction of these IGO narratives of dual function: on the one hand they must be the vehicle for the emergence of a coherent and convincing 'we', a discourse that can be easily appropriated by all the relevant

actors. On the other hand these discourses need to be sufficiently flexible to justify the specific (and sometimes controversial) practices that states deploy in pursuit of their own migration agendas. The paper explores the most visible of these code words, as they appear in IGO documents about migration, and tries to discern their dual function (construction of a narrative of aggregates and justification of specific practices) in the development of the various narratives about global migration.

Dr. Juan M. Amaya-Castro is a Senior Researcher with the Migration and Diversity Centre and the Law School of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. His research focuses on international migration governance, and on international legal philosophy, critical legal studies, as well as international adjudication and the law of international organizations.

His latest publications include:

International Courts and Tribunals, in Basak Cali (ed.), International Law for International Relations (Oxford University Press, 2010).

Calculated Rage Calculated Madness: International Law and the War in Gaza: From the Fog of War to the Fog of Law, in Peace and Conflict Monitor, August 2009.

With Hassan El Menyawi, Moving Away from Moving Away, A Conversation about Jacques Derrida and Legal Scholarship, 6 German Law Journal (2005).

Migration Management – a Policy Paradigm

Christina OELGEMÖLLER, Sussex

Sussex Centre for Migration Research, University of Sussex, Brighton,

E.C.Oelgemoller@sussex.ac.uk, <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/migration/profile172763.html>

“Discourse is the site of contrary arguments and contested positions. It has a structure which is defined by its oppositions. Supporting sets of ideas are accommodated as well as those arguments which contradict and oppose them” (Duffield, 1996:175). Migration Management is one such discourse, in which a hegemonic worldview – or paradigm – is formulated. Paradigms are terminological-methodological systems which give a frame, an ordering, that guide problem-formulation and solution-finding (Kuhn). A paradigm, thus, can accommodate positions in an intelligible way which would under a different framing be seen as contradictory – the status quo is not challenged. Migration Management, in commentaries and contemporary use of the paradigm, has come to stand for the recognition that migration is a normal feature of today’s globalized world and should be more than the control of immigration by northern governments. Yet, those writing about Migration Management do not question or at least clarify what Migration Management is and does. On the basis of research conducted in past years, I am arguing that Migration Management is a distinctive treatment of human mobility in that it is an expression of largely European sovereign power to determine access, allocate or deny place and determine who counts as subject and who does not. Within the paradigm of Migration Management, access – the juridical status of an individual combined with assumptions about the individuals’ capacity for productivity – is the sole determining factor. Migration Management individualizes, legalizes and instrumentalizes. Yet, Migration Management does not, crucially, in-

clude the asylum seeker at the external borders of the European Union; the possibly-likely-to-be asylum seeker. Those illegal migrants, who are technically not illegal but are instead nothing or dead, who are statistical ‘guesstimates’ outside of the sovereign space who threaten the stability of freedom and prosperity. Migration management is, in consequence, the reduction of an essentially political problem to a technical-instrumental calculation. In that, Migration Management is about compliance, as it is also about radical violence.

Christina Oelgemöller is currently reading for a DPhil at the University of Sussex, UK. She is a member of the Sussex Centre for Migration Research. Christina is interested in the geopolitics of international relations; in particular in the construction of political subjectivity. Her research focuses on illegal migration and international migration more widely.

Migration Management. Transforming Migrants from Subjects of Law into ‘Migration Flows’

Bas SCHOTEL, Amsterdam

University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, B.Schotel1@uva.nl,
www.english.uva.nl/about_the_uva/object.cfm/53C1ABE3-5172-4844-9BE5AD57C714433A/uid=KDNUPiQ1Si5aTjpUIAo=

With the entering into force of the Lisbon Treaty last December, ‘efficient management of migration flows’ became the official legal and political paradigm for EU immigration policy.¹ Hence, the importance to find out “what ‘migration management’ is actually about”, preferably through critical and empirical explorations.² In support of this inquiry, the paper seeks to make a contribution from a seemingly awkward perspective, the structure of law. Still, if we want to find out what migration management is really about, we should not only investigate what this phenomenon includes. But we must also look for what is left out. This paper contends that migration management drives the ‘law’ out of EU immigration policy. The problem is not that migration management cannot *promote the interests* protected by (fundamental) rights (e.g. social justice, autonomy). Rather, the mechanics of migration management resist or reject the structure of law. In effect, ‘management’ and ‘flows of migration’ are radically non-legal notions. Migration management may lack two basic legal categories: legal directives claiming obedience (norms)³ and individual norm subjects (norm subjects/addressees). The migrant is not a norm addressee who must obey a legal norm. Instead, he has become an *object*, an element of a quasi-natural phenomenon, i.e. migration flow. A migration flow cannot obey; it can only be managed. Legal and social scientists have made critical observations about the dominance of efficiency, disciplinary and controlling dy-

¹ Art. 79 Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (consolidated version).

² IMIS, International Workshop, 13 November 2010, Disciplining Global Movements Migration Management and its Discontents, Call for papers, at 1.

³ In their most basic form: “X ought to” or “X ought not to”.

namics and lagging legal protection under current immigration policies. Yet what remains underexposed is the role of the elimination of norms and norm addressees. The problem is that legal protection only kicks in insofar there are relevant legal norm subjects.⁴ This insight from legal theory may enrich our understanding of migration management. From a descriptive perspective it draws researchers' attention to the actual 'normative' content of migration management: what are the actual norms and who are the actual norm addressees? Furthermore, it may help explain the mechanics behind many of the issues that are on today's research agenda, ranging from the migrant's capability or propensity to be "respectful of the law", the authorities' capacity to "adopt policies that take into account the interests of all" to the allegedly "apolitical and explicitly technocratic nature" of migration management.⁵ Finally, the legal perspective provides an additional point for critical reflection because it is not purely about "what could or should be done" in the abstract.⁶ Instead, it draws on a longstanding concrete and institutional practice, i.e. law.

Bas Schotel (Ph.D. law Vrije Universiteit Brussel; LL.M. Columbia University) is assistant professor legal theory at University of Amsterdam. Prior to becoming fulltime academic in 2009, Bas worked as an attorney at law (Stibbe Simont Monahan Duhot), strategy consultant (Booz Allen Hamilton), and manager (Netherlands Authority for the Financial Markets).

His latest publications include:

On the Right of Exclusion: Law, ethics and immigration policy, Routledge (forthcoming 2010)

"Inclusion for the sake of exclusion. The legal authority of admission laws", in Peter Burgess and Serge Gutwirth (eds.) Security, migration and integration, IES VUB Press (forthcoming 2010).

"Defending our Legal Practices: A Legal Critique of Giorgio Agamben's State of Exception" Amsterdam Law Forum vol. 1:2, p. 113-125 (2009)

Highly-Skilled Migration and the Global Political Economy of Knowledge

Antonina LEVATINO, Sevilla

kefrie@inwind.it

Within the last few years, discourse concerning international highly-skilled migration has changed in a substantial way. Concepts such as brain circulation, intellectual networks, nexus, or diaspora have extended to describe a suppository situation of triple-win or rather, an excellent context of profit for all the implied actors: countries of origin, countries of destinations and migrants. It is argued, especially in terms of brain circulation, that globalization has deeply affected a change in the flow of highly skilled migrants: previously, skilled emigration was permanent and unilateral, but now the flows have become complex, polycentric, multidirectional and temporary.

⁴ Hence, the paradoxical irony of criminalizing migration law. It may enhance the migrant's legal protection against state action because at least it explicitly identifies norms and norm addressees.

⁵ IMIS, Call for papers, at 3.

⁶ Ibid, 1.

The concepts of nexus and diaspora take into account emigrants from developing countries' and encourage links to be created among them, thus forming networks between the native communities and associations, and thereby contribute towards the development of their countries of origin from abroad. These concepts undoubtedly have the merit of demonstrating the complexity of migratory flows and the possibly positive aspects of the internationalization of the knowledge and of scientific cooperation; nevertheless, they suggest the idea of an egalitarian, polycentric globalized phenomenon where all countries or implicated actors have the same importance. In the light of the network theory and the history of the information society, this paper shows that within a network not all the knots are of key importance; a network is not a polycentric or de-structured system, and all networks have a determinate structure. The main goal of this paper is therefore, to demonstrate that there is a structure hidden behind the phenomenon of highly-skilled international migrations. If central and peripheral knots exist, the idea of an egalitarian globalization of highly skilled migration reveals to be an illusion. In such a situation, the win-win panorama described by several reports or studies about this phenomenon becomes improbable. The new discourse concerning highly-skilled migration hides the central point of who has the power to manage and determine the migration flows, as it describes the process of "globalization of highly-skilled migrations" as a natural and a-cephalic. The paper develops around some key-questions: What are the central knots of these nets of intellectuals? Who produces and who consumes knowledge? Where and by whom are the symbolic values of the "globalized society" produced? It seems that controversial matters such as the ownership of intellectual property and the code war appear to be fundamental.

Antonina Levatino is a PhD student at the Department of Public Law of the Pablo de Olavide University of Seville. She is a member of the MAFE-Senegal Project in Spain (Pompeu Fabra University of Barcelona team). Her current research focuses on International highly skilled migrations. She holds a B.A. from the University of Palermo and a M.A. in International Communication from the University of Milan. In 2004 she was an exchange Student at the Ruprecht-Karl University of Heidelberg. In 2007 she did an internship in the sector "French Politics" of the Italian Embassy in France, whereas in 2008 she worked as a scientific collaborator at the Centre of Cultural and General Studies at the University of Karlsruhe. In January 2010 she obtained a second M.A. in "Human Rights, Interculturality and Development" at the Pablo de Olavide University of Seville. She is now doing an internship at the UNESCO's Section on International Migration and Multicultural Policies.

SESSION 2: 9:30 – 13:30

International Organizations and the Management of Migration

The Elaboration of a World Governance of Migration

Catherine DE WENDEN, Paris

CNRS (Centre national de la recherche scientifique) and CERI (Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches internationales), Paris, dewenden@ceri-sciences-po.org,
www.ceri-sciencespo.com/cerifr/cherlist/wenden.php

Since the early years of 2000, the idea of a world governance of migration has taken some importance as a parallel diplomacy of migrations in the area of international relations. thanks to the interest of Kofi Annan, former General Secretary of the United Nations, a High level Committee in 2006, then three World Forums on migration and development have been organised and the process goes on with Mexico in 2010; But the contradictory interests of the multilateral actors involved , their lack of collective claims and the difficult negotiations with the immigration States delays the evolution towards a Bretton Woods of migration, the definition of a World Public Good and a win-win-win approach. The paper will analyse the work in progress, its various trends and evolutions and the organisation of actors and interests involved, in parallel with the reluctant approach of immigration States and the emerging diplomacies of migration by emigration states.

Catherine Wihtol de Wenden is senior researcher at CNRS (CERI Sciences-Po, Paris) and she also teaches at Sciences-Po. She has been trained in political science and public law, she holds a PhD in Political Science (Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, 1986) and two Masters at Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne. Her main research topics are related with international migration, migration policies and citizenship. She conducted several research projects on various topics and she published over fifteen books and more than 150 research articles.

Her latest publications include:

Atlas mondial des migrations (2nd edition), Paris, Autrement, 2009.

La Globalisation humaine, Paris PUF, 2009, Migrats, réfugiés et relatons internationales, Paris, Presses de Sciences-Po, 2010 (to be published).

The European Commission and International Organisations: Looking for an Alternative Venue for Migration Policy

Nur ABDELKHALIQ, Edinburgh

Politics and International Relations School of Social and Political Science,
University of Edinburgh, n.abdelkhalik@ed.ac.uk,
www.pol.ed.ac.uk/student_profiles/nur_abdelkhalik_zamora

Migration is increasingly portrayed as an issue that transcends national boundaries and that needs to be tackled by bringing together a multiplicity

of actors, such as countries of origin, transit and destination, as well as international organisations, NGOs and civil society. The European Commission adopted such a stance with its endorsement of the 2005 *Global Approach to Migration: Priority Actions Focusing on Africa and the Mediterranean*. This strategy aims at coordinating the efforts of stakeholders to tackle all aspects of migration management: irregular migration control, legal migration, and the root causes of migration. One of the arrangements for the pursuit of the Global Approach is through programmes implemented in conjunction with international organisations (IOs). These organisations offer access and expertise, and cooperation is seen as a way of sharing best practices and coordinating efforts⁷. This paper analyses possible reasons behind this arrangement other than practical considerations and the declared aim of involving all relevant stakeholders. The paper will propose that cooperating with IOs such as the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR) offers an alternative for pursuing some of the policy objectives that are difficult to agree on at European Union (EU) level. It will argue that it is better to conceptualise the European Commission as opting for venue-shopping⁸ in response to political deadlock and different prioritisations of policy objectives. The analysis relies on secondary literature and data from semi-structured interviews conducted with European Commission and IO officials between September and November 2009. It is based on a rejection of the view that the EU is a unitary organisation when it comes to migration policy, and looks instead into the divergences between the Commission and the member states, but more so between the concerned Directorate-Generals within the Commission. These divergences reflect often conflicting perceptions as to what the most effective and urgent migration management policies are⁹, and compromise the Commission's ability to pursue a comprehensive EU strategy. This is partly addressed by the Commission working with the IOM and UNHCR. It allows for the implementation of particular goals that cannot be directly pursued by the Commission. However, IOs have their own agendas¹⁰, which means that implementation is dependent on these coinciding with the Commission's. The paper will conclude by presenting some thoughts on how this impinges on the European Commission's ability to implement the Global Approach as initially conceived, and general considerations of how organisational dynamics reflect on migration management priorities.

⁷ Bosch, P. And E. Haddad (2007) 'Migration and Asylum: An Integral Part of the EU's External Policies' *Forum Natolińskie* 3(11)/2007, Centrum Europejske Natolin, Warsaw

⁸ Guiraudon, V. (2000) 'European Integration and Migration Policy: Vertical Policy-making as Venue Shopping' *Journal of Common Market Studies* 38(2): 251-271

⁹ Boswell, C. (2008) 'Evasion, Reinterpretation and Decoupling: European Commission Responses to the 'External Dimension' of Immigration and Asylum' *West European Politics* 31(3): 491-512

¹⁰ Lavenex, S. (2007) 'The External Face of Europeanization: Third Countries and International Organizations' in Thomas Faist and Andreas Ette (eds.) *The Europeanization of National Policies and Politics of Migration: Between Autonomy and the European Union*, (Basingstoke, Palgrave): 246-264

Nur Abdelkhalig is a PhD Candidate in Politics and International Relations at the University of Edinburgh. She holds an MA in Comparative Politics from the University of York, and a BSc in Biology (with a minor in Political Studies) from the American University of Beirut. Her research examines the way in which the European Commission as an organisation interprets and incorporates the external dimension of the European Union's common immigration policy.

Her latest publications include:

Externalising Migration Policy: The European Union's 'Global' Approach, 60th Political Studies Association Annual Conference, 29 March-1 April 2010, Edinburgh, UK.

'The migration-development nexus in EU external policy: Incoherent objectives and shifts over time', 2nd ECPR Graduate Conference, 25-27 August 2008, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain (working draft presented at the 2nd PhD Workshop on Migration and Citizenship, 25 June 2008, University of Edinburgh).

Past Attempts of International 'Migration Management': The Establishment of the ICEM

Dimitra GROUTSIS, Sydney & Lina VENTURAS, Corinth

Groutsis: Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Sydney, Australia,
dimitria.groutsis@sydney.edu.au, <http://sydney.edu.au/business/staff/dimitriag>

Venturas: Department of Social and Educational Policy, University of the Peloponnese,
Corinth, Greece, venturas@otenet.gr, ventura@uop.gr,

http://www.uop.gr/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=112&Itemid=112&lang=en

As the call for papers of this Workshop emphasizes, very little is known about the emergence and processes of international 'migration management'. By focusing on a specific case study drawn from historical research on international organizations, this paper aims to analyze: (i) the convergence of migration debates and policies under the auspices of the US after WWII (ii) the 'hidden' agendas, and (iii) as a corollary, the paper will assess how 'international' international organizations are. These issues will be teased out by examining the socio-economic conditions and the debates and policies which led to the establishment of the Inter-governmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) (now International Organization for Migration, IOM), its purpose being to facilitate and administer post WWII labor migration from parts of Europe to a variety of overseas countries. At the end of the Second World War, the United Nations (UN) established a non-permanent specialized agency, the International Refugee Organization (IRO) to administer the movement of the numerous refugees and displaced persons in Europe. Before the IRO's liquidation in 1952, the question of migration from Europe was discussed in international forums, but mainly in the International Labor Organization (ILO), which convened a Migration Conference in Naples in 1951. The Naples Conference failed, an outcome driven mainly by the US. The US was particularly concerned with economic stagnation and mounting social unrest, related to the 'surplus population' in European countries in this Cold War period. At the same time, it focused attention on limiting international influence over migration and refugee policies and on receiving countries retaining their sov-

foreign immigration policies. Consequently, through a process of negotiation, the US led the creation of an intergovernmental body, outside the UN framework, established in Brussels in the same year. This newly formed organization, initially named the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe (PICMME), was open only to states with a liberal regime and had specifically designed functions based on inter-governmental negotiations. The US, amongst other things, ensured its predominance in 'migration management' through budgetary control and through limiting the duration and mandate of the PICMME. In 1953, the PICMME became a permanent 'fixture' of migration management and was renamed the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM). The ICEM was charged with the administration of migration mobility, a purpose which it achieved while also adhering to the 'hidden agendas' underscoring the management of migration espoused by the Western countries receiving migrants at the time.

Dr. Dimitria Groutsis is a Senior Lecturer in Work and Organisational Studies, University of Sydney. She has conducted research on labour mobility and its policy implications in Australia and Europe. Her main focus has been on low-skilled and high-skilled migration, with a particular emphasis on the health sector labour market. Her research activities have led to publications in national and international peer review journals, book chapters, presentations in national and international forums and success in gaining external and internal competitive grants. Her work has appeared in the Journal of Industrial Relations, Health Sociology Review, the Journal of International Migration and Integration and the Economic and Labour Relations Review. She is involved in an ongoing collaboration with the International Organisation of Migration (Greek division) in association with Associate Professor Lina Venturas on preserving a large historical archive on post war Greek emigration. Her current research draws on an historical perspective of migration to understand labour settlement needs and management responses to diversity.

Her latest publications include:

Groutsis, D and Varoufakis, Y (2010) Introduction in Economic and Labour Relations Review, Special Issue Guest Editors (Groutsis, D and Varoufakis, Y) 2010, Issue 20 (2), 1 - 7.

Groutsis, D and Taksa, L. (2010) Managing Diverse Commodities: From Factory Fodder to Business Asset, Economic and Labour Relations Review (eds. Varoufakis, Y. and Groutsis, D) 2010, 20 (2), 77 - 99.

Taksa, L. and Groutsis, D. (2010) 'Cultural Diversity and Non-English Speaking Background Immigrant Employees', in Burgess, J., French, E., and Strachan, G. (eds) Managing Diversity in Australia: Theory and Practice, McGraw Hill.

Lina Venturas is an Associate Professor of migration and diaspora studies at the Department of Social and Educational Policy - University of the Peloponnese (Greece). She completed her post-graduate and Phd studies in sociology and history in Belgium and France. She is the author of two books: Migration and Nation: Transformations of Collectivities and Social Positions, Athens 1994 and Greek Migrants in Belgium, Athens 1999 (both in Greek).

Her latest publications include:

"'Deterritorialising' the Nation: The Greek state and 'Ecumenical Hellenism'" in D. Tziouvas (ed.), Greek diaspora and migration since 1700. Society, politics, and culture, Surrey, Ashgate, 2009, pp. 125-140.

"Nation-state and contemporary migrations: Policies, tendencies, approaches", Synchrone Themata 107, 2009, pp. 23-36 (in Greek).

“Etat grec et diaspora: Des ‘émigrés’ à l’ ‘Hellénisme œcuménique’” in St. Dufoix, C. Guerassimoff, A. de Tinguy (eds.), Loin des yeux, près du cœur. Les Etats et leurs expatriés, Paris, Presses des Sciences Politiques, 2010, pp. 239-259.

Patterns and Effects of IOM’s Migration Management Project. Towards a Framework of Radical Critique

Fabian GEORGI, Frankfurt on the Main & Susanne SCHATRAL, Bremen

Georgi: Institute for Social Research, Frankfurt on the Main, fgeorg@zedat.fu-berlin.de, www.ifs.uni-frankfurt.de/people/georgi/index.htm

Schatral: Center for Gender Studies, University of Bremen, schatral@uni-bremen.de, <http://www.zgs.uni-bremen.de/zgs/>

In the course of the last decade various social movements and NGOs have criticised the activities of the International Organization of Migration (IOM) and its migration management project. Voiced from a multiplicity of normative and political angles these criticisms revolved around particular aspects of IOM's practice, among them the so called “assisted voluntary return” programmes, the operation of reception and detention camps or IOM's promotion of migration management policies within informal government-led consultative processes. As a result of the conflicts surrounding IOM, the organization has also been made the object of examinations by critical scholars. Up to today, these different critical engagements with IOM have remained fragmentary, co-existing often uneasily side by side, only loosely connected. Referring to the call for papers theme of Migration Management and its Discontents, it is therefore the central aim of this paper to provide a systematically developed comprehensive framework of critique of IOM which could serve as a pattern and example for the critical engagement with other protagonists of the migration management project – and with migration management as a whole. In a first step the paper will reconstruct the “historical” development of the criticisms levelled against IOM and the actors and movements who expressed them. It will contextualize the critique and the conflict of which it is an expression in the wider historical situation of the struggles about neoliberal hegemony and the movement cycles of anti-racist and alter-globalisation movements with their campaigns against Fortress Europe, the IMF or the WTO. The second part of the paper will then systematically examine the various points of critique raised against IOM. On the one hand it will attempt to categorize the confusing variety of criticisms along political and topical lines. On the other it will compare them with the results of our empirical research on IOM's activities and thereby conduct a review – as far as possible – of their factual basis, their scope, gaps as well as their normative, political and theoretical claims. This examination will then serve as the basis for the third part: a systematic overview of the effects that IOM's activities have, namely the commercialisation, de-democratisation and de-politisation of migration policy, and a reconfiguration of nation-statehood and the inter-

national division of labour. These effects will not be analysed as isolated results of IOM activities. Instead they will be situated within the broader global political, social and economic processes of which they are a part. Against the backdrop of the appraisals made so far, the fourth and final part of the paper will elaborate on a more general pattern of a critical engagement with migration management institutions. We will suggest a framework of critique that is theoretically informed by a “radical ethics of struggles” and a materialist conception of critique in the tradition of the Frankfurt School. The proposed paper is situated within an ongoing debate in mainly German-speaking critical academia about elements and patterns of a critical approach to the study of migration policy and control. It aims, therefore, to exemplarily develop these patterns in an English-language context.

Fabian Georgi is a Political scientist (MA). He worked as research associate at the Berlin Institute for Comparative Social Research and lecturer at the Free University of Berlin. His PhD focuses on the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and its migration management strategy. Since December 2009 he is a research associate at the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt on the Main.

His latest publications include:

For the Benefit of Some: The International Organization for Migration and its Global Migration Management. In: Antoine Pécoud/Martin Geiger (ed.): The Politics of International Migration Management: Palgrave Macmillan (forthcoming October 2010).

Georgi, Fabian (2010): Die International Organization for Migration (IOM). Eine kritische Analyse, in: Sabine Hess und Bernd Kasperek (Hg.): Grenzregime. Diskurse, Praktiken, Institutionen in Europa. Berlin und Hamburg: Verlag Assoziation A, 145–157.

Georgi, Fabian (2009): Kritik des Migrationsmanagements. Historische Einordnung eines politischen Projekts, in: juridikum. Zeitschrift für Politik, Recht, Gesellschaft, 81–84.

Susanne Schatral studied Cultural History of Eastern Europe (MA). Since 2007 she is a PhD-student at the Centre Gender Studies of the University of Bremen. Her PhD thesis focuses on IOM implementing EU-financed anti-trafficking-projects in the Russian Federation and in Germany.

Her latest publications include:

2010 Categorisation and Instruction: The IOM's Role in Preventing Human Trafficking in the Russian Federation. In: Tul'si Bhambry et al. (Hg.): Perpetual Motion? Transformation and Transition in Central, Eastern Europe and Russia. London: 2010, forthcoming.

2010 Awareness Raising Campaigns against Human Trafficking in the Russian Federation: Simply Adding Males or Redefining a Gendered Issue? In: Anthropology of East Europe Review, Nr. 28 (1), Chicago: 2010.

2007 Stop Violence. Framing Strategies of Russian Women's NGOs. In: Fischer, Sabine/Pleines, Heiko/Schröder/Hans-Henning (Hg.): Movements, Migrants, Marginalisation. Challenges of Societal and Political Participation in Eastern Europe and the Enlarged EU. S. 43–56, Stuttgart: 2007.

The Implementation of « Coherent Migration Management » through the Prism of the IOM Programs in West Africa and Morocco.

Clotilde CAILLAULT, Amsterdam & Nadia KHROUZ, Rabat

Caillaud: GADEM consultant, clotilde.caillaud@gmail.com

Khrouz: Project Manager, Groupe Anti-raciste de Défense et d'Accompagnement des
Etrangers et Migrants (GADEM), Rabat, gademm@gmail.com

The study on the migration programs in West Africa (Senegal, Mali, and Mauritania) and in Morocco has been conducted within the regional project for the defence of Migrants' Rights in transit and sending countries by GADEM in cooperation with different associations. The study, without claiming to be exhaustive, aims to inform and lobby for migration policies that respect Migrants' Rights. By looking at the IOM programs, the study aims at improving the understanding of migration policies that have been introduced in this region by the European Union and its member states, the concerned states and regional organizations (notably ECOWAS), other IOs (especially UNO, ILO) and executive organizations. This analysis relies on a thorough study of the links, coherences, methods of development and implementation of the different programs as well as on an examination of the criteria in the choice of executive organizations. It furthermore studies the financing and its challenges, the formal and informal orientations towards the issue of "migration management" at the local, regional and international level. The IOM, an organization called "international", is principally an executive body which carries out the projects that have been financed by others. However, the declared aim of the IOM is the strengthening of "orderly and humane management of migration" and the development of 'good practices' in order to help states, migrants and communities to tackle the challenge of irregular migration. What role could and does this organization pursue at present in the definition of migration policies, especially in West and North Africa, in relation to its own strategic orientations, the interests of its donors and the actors of the countries in question (NGOs, Ministries, other IOs, foreign cooperation programs). What role does IOM play in the development and implementation of these programs? How much importance do the various programmes and strategies pay to Human Rights and Migrants' Rights? How is the "introduction of a coherent migration management" that should happen in "dialogue" with "national, regional and international priorities" and "in accordance with the international law" inscribed in these programs? Are the positions and interests of the implementation states and/or civil societies really in accordance with these priorities? Is the migration context as well as the situation of migrants themselves taken properly into account (as all of the programmes are implemented by other actors, e.g. foreign cooperation programs, IOs)? Does the mode of governance of the IOM challenge its status as an international organization and does it confirm its role as executive body considering that that most of the programmes are implemented by the IOM in the framework of increasingly restrictive European policies and benefit mainly from European resources? The multiplicity of actors, the opacity of information concerning the challenges of the decisions that have

been taken are in fact restricting any holistic analysis and understanding of the different strategies in migration and development policies.

Clotilde Caillault obtained a master degree in international cooperation and development at the Bordeaux Institute of Political Science. She is currently studying migration sociology at the University of Amsterdam. After various experiences in NGOs, she has worked for GADEM as a consultant in the study on the migration programs in West Africa and Morocco. She conducted together with Nadia Khrouz, GADEM program manager, the study on Morocco.

Nadia Khrouz works as a program manager for GADEM – the Groupe antiraciste d'accompagnement et de défense des étrangers et migrants [Anti-racist Group for Accompaniment and Defense of Foreigners and Migrants] based in Morocco and created on 18 December 2006. GADEM's mission is to participate in the effective implementation of the rights of foreigners and migrants, to promote respect for their dignity and equal treatment, and to fight against all forms of discrimination and racism. In order to do this, the association bases its work primarily on the monitoring and analysis of migratory policies and their effects, awareness raising and advocacy, legal and judicial action, and the promotion of multiculturalism. It works in collaboration and partnership with associations and with migrants themselves. Since its creation, GADEM has maintained a strong involvement in the field, which enables it to assure the follow-up of violations of migrants' rights and of the general situations of the migrant population in Morocco. Its actions are also anchored in the network of Moroccan and international associations, and it actively participates in various national and international networks such as Migreurop2, Justice without Borders for Migrants (JSF-JWB Migrants), the Euro-African Network on Migration, and the Anna Lindh network.

SESSION 3: 9:30 – 13:30

Practices of Migration Management

With or without Europe? International Organizations in the External Dimension of the European Migration Policy

Agnieszka WEINAR, Warsaw

Visiting Researcher at the University of Kent (2010/2011), University of Warsaw, Centre for Migration Research, Warsaw, aweinar@uw.edu.pl, www.uw.edu.pl

From Tampere to Hague European comprehensive migration policy focused on asylum policy, border management, fight against irregular migration and harmonization in the sphere of rights of legal migrants. These are quite traditional areas of migration policy making. What is less traditional and quite unique is that EU tries to tackle the flows of migrants from both ends, working simultaneously on internal EU harmonization of immigration policy and sharpening the edge of its external dimension. This ambitious agenda of what has become known as the Global Approach to Migration addresses a broad range of migration-related issues, enriching the justice and security policies with a development and external relations angle to enhance dialogue and cooperation on migration with third countries. One cannot but wonder why exactly EU got involved in this approach and what fed the changes. What framing and what legitimization were used to

effectuate that change? The subsequent ever closer involvement of certain international organizations (IOs) as policy partners and implementing partners sheds a new light at these developments. We can understand more if we approach IOs as bureaucracies with an authority and power to shape the policy outcomes on an equal footing with states, even beyond their control. IOs actively create policy needs which subsequently they cater for, using their particular authority based on perceived expertise.¹¹ The special role of IOs in the EU context poses several questions: What are the means IOs use to influence EU migration policy? Does EU rely on them in all policy fields? What is the relation between IOs and EU Agencies? Do the EU Member States lose more sovereignty to IOs than to the EU? Can EU define and implement its external migration policy without IOs? To answer these questions, I will analyse the development of the Global Approach of Migration from multi-actor perspective (European Commission, European Council, EU Member States, IOs and third countries) focusing on political context of varying interests, and resulting new governance arrangements. Secondly, I will discuss in-depth the place of IOs in the EU external migration policy by analysing their role in conceptualisation and implementation of the core Global Approach tools: mobility partnerships, readmission agreements, migration profiles, and migration missions. I will base my analysis on content analysis of relevant Commission and Council documents, as well as interviews with stakeholders and non-classified information gathered during participant observation I conducted while working in DG Justice, Freedom and Security of the European Commission between 15 July 2007 and 16 July 2010.

Agnieszka Weinar received her PhD in Political Science from the University of Warsaw in 2006. She has been affiliated with its Centre for Migration Research since 2001. In the years 2007-2010 she worked at the European Commission as a Policy Officer responsible for international aspects of EU migration policy.

Her latest publications include:

(2010) "Instrumentalizing Diasporas for Development: International and European Policy Discourses" in R. Baubock and Th. Faist (eds.) Diaspora and Transnationalism, Amsterdam University Press.

(2008) with K. Iglicka, "Ukrainian Migration in Poland from the Perspective of Polish Policies and Systems' Theory", Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies, 3 (6), pp. 356 - 365.

(2008) with A. Kicingier, Agata Górny, "Advanced Yet Uneven: The Europeanisation of Polish Immigration Policy", in Th. Faist and A. Ette (eds.), The Europeanization of National Immigration Policies: Between Autonomy and the European Union (Migration, Minorities and Citizenship), Houndsmills and NY: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 181-200.

¹¹ Barnett M. & M. Finnemore (2004), Rules for the World. Cornell UP. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Migration Management and Humanitarian Selection: Refugee Resettlement in Europe and Australia

Adèle GARNIER, Leipzig & Sydney

Politics and International Relations Macquarie University, Sydney; Institut für Politikwissenschaft Universität Leipzig, garnier@uni-leipzig.de,
www.pol.mq.edu.au/PDFs/adele_uni_profile.pdf

Europe is currently rediscovering refugee resettlement, both at national and at EU level. Refugee resettlement is undeniably an international protection policy, yet is also inherently based on selection, covering among others the determination of policy objectives and the choice of individual refugees to be resettled. My paper argues that the current re-emergence of refugee resettlement in Europe features both a migration management impetus, which is at the core of current European migration policies, and humanitarian objectives, while interest configurations in the field are evolving. These conflicting aspects permeate the understanding of “selection” featured in policy documents and interviews with key actors of a European field in the making: European states, European institutions, the UN refugee agency UNHCR and NGOs involved in humanitarian protection. On the one hand, all key actors insist on selecting the most genuine and vulnerable refugees, yet differ on the implications of this focus. On the other hand, European states increasingly require from refugees-to-be-resettled to fulfil integration criteria, a requirement that is overtly criticised by the UNHCR and NGOs and to date not discussed by European institutions. The ambivalences of refugee resettlement are not exclusive to Europe. Briefly retracing the evolution of resettlement in Australia, a country which features a long-standing tradition of migration management and has been resettling refugees for decade, the paper shows that refugee resettlement has been politically used to highlight Australia’s significant participation in the global protection regime when governments were keen to demonstrate efficiency in the management of forced migration. The short study of the Australian case helps fuel hypotheses on the future of refugee resettlement in Europe not only as a protection instrument for people fleeing persecution but also as a potential element of national and EU-wide strategies of migration management. Methodologically, the paper uses a hypothesis-generating comparative design. Empirical findings are based on documents analysis as well as on expert interviews in the protection field conducted in Australia, Geneva and the United Kingdom between 2007 and 2009.

Adele Garnier is about to complete a PhD in political science at the University of Leipzig and Macquarie University, Sydney. Focusing on forced migration policies, her thesis analyses to what extent internationalisation within and beyond state borders impacts on domestic trajectories of migration control.

Her latest publications include:

Types of Migration Policies, Encyclopaedia of Global Studies, Thousand Oaks: SAGE, forthcoming.

Die Logik der Selektion - Einwanderungs- und Flüchtlingspolitik in Europa und Australien [The Logic of selection: Migration and refugee policy in Australia and Europe], Welt-Trends n. 71, pp. 67-75, 2010.

Are states in control of their borders? Testing the venue-shopping approach in the Australian context, Working Paper 6, Graduate Centre Humanities and Social Sciences of the Research Academy Leipzig, Leipzig: Leipzig University Press, 2010.

Migration Management – Legal and Administrative Challenges for Small Emerging Economies

José PINA-DELGADO, Praia

Department of Law & International Studies, Instituto Superior de Ciências Jurídicas e Sociais, Praia, Republic of Cape Verde, jpinadelgado@yahoo.com.br

The recent movement of advocacy and international practice of migration management demands more specific reflections in all the different dimensions that are connected with it. With this study, I propose to analyse legal and administrative challenges for small emerging economies coming from migration management schemes. Having in mind the experience of the former Portuguese colony of Cape Verde, a small island state in the middle of the Atlantic and a traditional emigration nation that recently signed treaties or arrangements of migration with the European Union and some of its members – Portugal, Spain and France –, but with a comparative look to other similar States, we will see if it is possible to find some trends related to legal and political challenges that small emerging economies have or will have to deal with migration management. From a critical perspective, and from real experiences and legal instruments as treaties and other international arrangements, it is possible to question if, on the one hand, small emerging economies, with lack of specialized negotiators in migration matters, have made the best possible deals with developed countries, and, on the other, if they can afford to support the legal and administrative challenges that are natural to migration management without depending excessively from outside partners that have a special interest in the matter. The answer to that question will show that most signals of the above mentioned experience are not very positive. Potential benefits of migration management to small emerging economies may be illusory because, most of times, they don't have local resources to deal independently with legal and especially administrative challenges of migrations management, having still to cope with potential onus and pressure from partners to comply with treaties of migration (obligations of accepting returns, including third countries nationals; allocation of scarce resources to fight other countries conceptions of illegal migration, and so forth).

José Pina-Delgado, born in Lisbon (1975), Capeverdean and Portuguese national, holds a LLB (State University of Maringá – Brazil), a MA (Moral and Political Philosophy, State University of Londrina-Brazil), a LLM (International Law, Federal University of Santa Catarina) and is a PhD candidate in Public Law (Law School, Nova University of Lisbon).

His latest publications include:

“Self-Defence and Anticipation in International Law: Recent Developments”, Revista de Direito Público, a. 1, n. 2, 2009 (in Portuguese)

“The Non-Extradition of Nationals Dogma: the Cape-Verdean Constitutional Discussion”, Revista do Ministério Público, Lisboa, a. 30, n. 119, 2009, pp. 69-120 (in Portuguese)

“Extradition of the Cape-Verdean National” In: José Pina Delgado; Liriam Tiujo Delgado & Jorge Carlos Fonseca (eds.), Aspectos Polémicos da Exatidão de Nacionais em Cabo Verde e no Espaço Lusófono, Praia-Cape Verde, Instituto Superior de Ciências Jurídicas e Sociais, 2009 (in Portuguese).

The Politics and Discourse of Return. Juxtaposing International and National Perspectives on Migrant Return

Anne KOCH, Berlin

Berlin Graduate School for Transnational Studies and the Freie Universität Berlin,
koch@transnationalstudies.eu, www.transnationalstudies.eu

The question of migrant return constitutes an area of contestation between states' sovereign right to control access to their territory on the one hand, and the human rights discourse that demands equal treatment of aliens and citizens on the other hand. It therefore offers valuable insights into the ways in which states reassert their sovereignty, balance competing claims, or make concessions to the demands of international norms and legal obligations. The variety of measures that aim at the return of migrants to their home countries are not normally treated as a distinct policy field. Based on the assumption that in the field of migration policy, the explicit formulation of return *expectations* serves important symbolic functions irrespective of den facto returns, and has at the same time very tangible consequences for the individuals at whom these expectations are addressed, this paper moves beyond previous isolated studies of return-related policies in order to study both outright return procedures and temporary status arrangements under the common heading of 'inherent return expectations'. International actors fulfil various functions in the field of migrant return. Based on interviews with staff members from the International Organization for Migration, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, and the International Catholic Migration Commission, as well as archival research in Geneva, this paper in a first step delineates the international framework for return within which national policy-makers operate. Its findings indicate divergent understandings of key concepts like voluntariness and temporary protection, and marked differences in the narratives that these international actors employ to justify their respective engagement in migrant return. The paper then turns towards migrant return policies in Germany. It investigates temporary protection schemes and voluntary return programs as two types of policies that have recently gained increasing currency, and that capture the normative ambiguity of return policies. The tension between the principle of state sovereignty and the demands of human rights mentioned above creates an inherent need for the state to justify policies aimed at the return of migrants. Even a cursory glance at the literature reveals an array of alternative rationales underlying both coercive and non-coercive migrant return policies. They include the reversal of brain drain; justice-

based arguments that stress the need to "end the refugee cycle"; economic interests that expect migrants to temporarily contribute to the labour force when and only as long as needed; return as one of a menu of equally valid durable solutions; and the enforcement of return measures as an important symbol in the fight against illegal immigration. In order to juxtapose national and international perspectives on migrant return, the paper develops a typology of rationales that allows for a comparison regarding which types of justifications are more prevalent at which venue and with regard to which type of return-related policy. The relative prevalence of principled or ad hoc reasons, of domestic or international references, of economic or normative rationales with regard to migrant return policies offers an insight into inclusionary and exclusionary aspects of the policy-making process, and into a central aspect of the interplay between national and international actors in 'managing' migration.

Anne Koch is a member of the Berlin Graduate School for Transnational Studies, and a doctoral candidate at Freie Universität Berlin. She also works as a part-time researcher on a project studying the authority and legitimacy of supranational human rights courts that is based at University College London.

Her latest publications include:

Cali, Basak and Anne Koch (2010). Enforcing Civil and Political Rights: Lessons from Europe. Paper presented at the Symposium on Enforcement of ESCR Judgments, 6-7 May 2010, Bogota.

Assisted Voluntary Return of Irregular Migrants in Policy and Practice. Case Study of the Slovak Republic

Katerina STANCOVÁ, Pisa

Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies, Pisa, k.stancova@sssup.it, www.sssup.it

Management of migration flows has become a political priority for the national authorities as well as international community. The European Union has been putting the migration management issues such as efficient management of economic migration, prevention of irregular migration, return and readmission of migrants and protection of vulnerable groups such as asylum seekers, trafficked people, women and children on its political agenda systematically since the end of 1990s. Assisted voluntary return (AVR) is a new approach to return of irregular immigrants aiming at combating unlawful migration and thus strengthening national immigration systems. AVR lowers risks of the violation of human rights and preserves migrants' dignity and safety. In addition, it brings less political and financial costs. AVR of irregular immigrants is an integral part of migration management in some European countries. The paper provides a general understanding of the issue of irregular migration and an analysis of policies and practices in assisted voluntary return of irregular migrants in the Slovak Republic. The paper concludes with a discussion on the major issues that need to be addressed in order to achieve sustainable and effective AVR management.

Dott.ssa Katerina Stancová is a PhD Candidate in Politics, Human Rights and Sustainability, Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies, Pisa. Graduated cum laude in International Relations and Politics, University of Pisa. Master Diploma in Expert of Migration Studies, University of Pisa. BA in Politics and International Relations, Charles University, Prague.

Her latest publications include:

Stancova, Katerina. 2009. "Assisted Voluntary Return of Irregular Migrants: Policy and Practice in the Slovak Republic." International Migration, Vol. 48(4) August 2010, pp. 186-200.

Stancova, Katerina. 2009. Integrating EU Migration Policy into the European Neighbourhood Policy. The Origins, Achievements and Prospects. VDM Verlag Dr Muller. ISBN: 978-3-639-19554-5.

Stancova, Katerina. 2010. "Global Challenges, Local Strategies." Regional Insights, Issue 1 (1): 2010, p. 5-6.

SESSION 4: 14:30 – 16:30

Migration & Development

(Discourses of Migration Management)

Shifting Perspective on the Migration and Development Nexus in the Context of the European Union: From the Migration Management Approach to the Development Paradigm of Mobility

Janine Kisba SILGA, Florence

European University Institute (EUI), Florence, Janine.Silga@EUI.eu,

<http://www.eui.eu/DepartmentsAndCentres/Law/People/Researchers/ResearchTopics.aspx>

This paper wishes to introduce a shift in perspective regarding the migration and development nexus from a focus on migration management to highlight its development dimension within the context of the European Union (EU). Most studies on the migration and development nexus in the EU concentrate on the migration policy perspective. Under this approach, development policy instruments are considered (financial) tools for “migration management”. Instead, this paper looks at the migration and development nexus from a development perspective.

Although it dates back to the early nineties, the linkage of migration concerns to development was not clearly formulated at the EU level, until the Tampere Declaration (1999). It was later integrated into migration policy as part of the Global Approach to Migration, in 2005. Two different approaches to the migration and development nexus can be distinguished in the EU context. The first one is the so-called “root causes” approach to migration, of which objective is to find ways to curb “migration pressure” by using development. This perspective refers to the instrumental use of development tools to fulfil migration purposes. The second approach of the EU regarding the migration and development nexus, refers to “co-development”. This perspective rather focuses on the contribution of mi-

grants to the development of their countries of origin. In this respect, it deals with three main issues: “remittances”, “circular migration” and “brain drain”. Initially, the “root causes” approach was favoured when formulating the migration and development nexus. However, the “co-development” perspective has progressively become the leading approach. The policy discourse on the migration and development nexus is essentially shaped by the migration policy, which first defined this notion. However, the EU development policy has paid increasing attention to migration in the context of development. It has formulated its own vision of the migration and development nexus using the notion of “Policy Coherence for Development”. This concept refers to the fact that for development policy to achieve its objectives, a certain degree of coherence with other policies is required, migration being one of them. Despite that, the discourse on migration and development is still dominated by the “migration management” paradigm. In this respect, the 2009 Report on Human Development is an exception in that it envisions mobility (or migration) as a fully-fledged development question.

In this paper, I hypothesise that the main reason explaining the inability of development discourse to contribute to the debate on migration and development lies in the notion of development itself. Development is traditionally understood as a socio-economic phenomenon. From this viewpoint, individual human agency is given little weight, unlike what is contended by the “human development” paradigm of development or the “capabilities approach to development” as conceptualised by Amartya Sen. First, by carrying out an analysis of the EU policy and legal discourse on the migration and development nexus, I would like to highlight the persistent focus on “migration management”. Second, I will argue that, in turn, the EU development policy fails to integrate migration concerns within its conceptual framework, because the latter is outdated. And I will conclude by suggesting that the adoption of the “human development” paradigm as the main way of conceiving the linkage between development and migration could be the solution for the EU to overcome the discrepancy between stated objectives and the actual results.

Janine Kisba Silga holds an LLM in European Law from the University of Exeter and a Master degree in law in the study of the External Relations of the European Union, from the University of Rennes I. She is currently doing her Phd at the European University Institute in Florence on: "The Management of the Links between International Migration and Development by the European Union – A Legal Analysis of the Policy Options" (working title).

Her latest publications include:

Book chapter co-authored with Dr H el ene Lambert : "Transnational Refugee Law in the French Courts: Deliberate or Compelled Change in Judicial Attitudes?" in Goodwin-Gill and Lambert (eds.) The Limits of Transnational Law (Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Towards a Global Agenda on Migration and Development Policy: Evidence from Senegal

Lama KABBANJI, Paris

Institut national d'études démographiques (INED), Paris, lama.kabbanji@ined.fr,
<http://mafeproject.site.ined.fr/en/partners/france/>

The link between international migration and development has been of increasing importance in multilateral migration management initiatives since 2000. These initiatives have mainly tried to address simultaneously, via a “global” approach, three aspects of international migration management: 1) legal migration management; 2) control of illegal immigration; 3) migration and development. The so called global approach have been promoted in particular by European institutional actors such as EC and in particular some member states (France for instance which have signed several agreements on migration management with origin countries including the link between migration and development). Euro-African cooperation on migration management has been in particular focused on the link between migration and development since 2006.

The role of migration in the framework of development cooperation between Europe and ACP countries has been institutionalised since the signing of the Cotonou-Agreement in 2000. However, migration from Africa and the Mediterranean region has received increasing attention in European migration policies in recent years, a development which led to the adoption of the “Global approach to migration: Priority actions focusing on Africa and the Mediterranean” in 2005. The Global approach integrates the link between migration and development as one of the three key elements of migration management, together with policies addressing the restriction of illegal migration and the facilitation of highly qualified regular migrants. This approach has also been integrated by African regional actors such as ECOWAS which adopted a “Common West African Approach to Migration” in January 2008 including an action plan on “Migration and Development”.

The aim of this presentation is to analyse the convergence in discourse and practices on migration and development in the context of migration policies formulated to manage migration between Africa and Europe. We first provide an analysis of the institutional framework on migration and development policies currently in place at the European level (EC, France, Spain, Italy), at the African level (ECOWAS, Senegal) as well as in cooperation initiatives between these two regions (bilateral and multilateral initiatives). We will then focus on the case of Senegal, a country which EU policies targeting the migration-development nexus have identified as a priority target. Concrete projects and programs put in place in Dakar to promote the link between migration and development will be presented and analysed. This part of the presentation relies on interviews conducted in Dakar in November-December 2009 and summer 2010 with international and national institutions and organisations. These include, among others, various Senegalese ministries (Ministère des Sénégalais de l'extérieur, Ministère de la Jeunesse, Direction de l'assistance technique);

French, Italian and Spanish technical cooperations; International organisations such as the IOM and the ILO; internationally active NGOs, such as Caritas, the Red Cross and COOPI; Senegalese NGOs, such as USE and ASCODE.

We will see that multilateral initiatives between Africa and Europe have been multiplying and the number of institutional actors involved has increased significantly. In the case of Senegal, our results show that very few of the programs designed to promote the link between migration and development are formulated by Senegalese institutions. Programs are generally designed by external actors, mainly international organisations such as IOM and European countries (mainly France, Spain and Italy, the main destination countries of Senegalese migrants). European countries or the European Union (EU) funds the majority of these programs.

Our analyses also show that a global agenda on migration and development policy has emerged since 2000 which focus on two main aspects: (1) Promoting the role of migrants in the economic development of their origin countries, in particular via remittance transfers, productive investments in the origin communities and the transfer of competences and know-how by highly skilled migrants, for example through circulation/short returns in order to contribute their expertise to projects in the origin country. These actions constitute the co-development dimension of the migration-development policy nexus. (2) Promoting return migrations, particularly of “irregular” or unqualified migrants, through programs of “voluntary” return.

Lama Kabbanji has completed a PhD in Demography in 2008 at University of Montreal, untitled “Vers une régionalisation de la gestion des migrations en Afrique de l’Ouest: la politique à l’épreuve de la pratique”. She is currently a post-doctoral fellow at the Institut national d’études démographiques (INED) in France. Her research focus on: Migration management and regional integration process in West Africa; Migration and Development policies; Migrations between Africa and Europe.

Her latest publications include:

Piché, Kabbanji, Ouedraogo and Cordell, (forthcoming), “From National to Multilateral Management of Migration: A Century of International Migration between Burkina Faso and Côte d’Ivoire”, in Oucho (ed.), Migration in the service of African development, NOMRA.

Beauchemin, Kabbanji, Sakho et Schoumaker (ed.), (forthcoming), Migrations africaines : le co-développement en questions. Essai de démographie politique, Paris, Édition de l’INED.

Kabbanji, L., 2010, « Migration et développement : quelles politiques menées en Afrique subsaharienne? », in Beauchemin, Kabbanji et Schoumaker (ed.), Entre parcours de vie des migrants et attentes politiques, quel co-développement en Afrique sub-saharienne ?, Documents de travail, no 166, INED.

Migration and Development. Discourses and Policy Approaches in Germany

Tatjana BARAULINA & Doris HILBER, Nuremberg

Baraulina: Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF), Research Unit I: International Migration, Islam, Demography and Policy consulting, Nuremberg, tatjana.baraulina@bamf.bund.de

Hilber: Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF), Research Unit I: International Migration, Islam, Demography and Policy consulting, Nuremberg, doris.hilber@bamf.bund.de

In Germany, migration policy has traditionally been considered as a matter of internal affairs. As a consequence, the dominant discourse frames migration as an issue of security and control. After the fall of the Iron Curtain and the intensive economic growth of some developing countries, migration patterns diversified dramatically. At the international level this created a demand for 'new migration policies', which would not merely focus on the risks but especially on the potential benefits of migration. The fundamental claim is that by linking migration and development policies, a 'triple-win' situation can be achieved, which is beneficial for the receiving and sending country as well as for the migrant. The study analyses how this international 'Migration and Development'-discourse is institutionalized in the German context and which policy approaches emerge. Based on expert interviews with federal, regional and local authorities, with different private actors of the development policy community and external policy advisors, the study seeks to identify how political discourses are translated into actual policies. The study identifies four basic political views on the migration and development nexus: 'migrants are the core agents of development', 'migration contributes to the development of the sending and receiving societies', 'migration is a result of development deficits' and 'migration is a hindrance to the development of the sending societies'. The central argument of the analysis is that these views are partly competing with each other: the lack of coherence is detrimental to a common migration agenda in Germany. German migration policy is still located in the discursive realm of control and security. Only those views on migration and development issues which do not directly challenge this dominant discourse are likely to be institutionalized.

Tatjana Baraulina studied sociology, political science and gender studies at the European University at St. Petersburg and at Bielefeld University. Thereafter she was a scholar within the graduate college "Migration in Modern Europe" of the Institute for Migration Research and Intercultural Studies (IMIS), funded by the German Research Association (DFG). Currently she works as a researcher in the research group of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF). In the Research Area I "International and Irregular Migration, Islam, Demography, Research Transfer" she conducts research on the nexus of international migration and development and aspects of return migration and the local dimension of migration and integration policy.

Her latest publications include:

Baraulina, Tatjana / Friedrich, Lena (2008): Integrationspolitik im Wandel: Bedeutungsgewinn der Kommunen, in: Zeitschrift für Ausländerrecht (ZAR) 9/2008.

Baraulina, Tatjana / Haug, Sonja / Babka von Gostomski, Christian (2008): Kriminalität von Aussiedlern - eine Bestandsaufnahme. Working Paper Nr. 12, Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge.

Baraulina, Tatjana / Bommers, Michael / Tanja, El-Cherkeh / Heike, Daume / Florian, Vadean (2006): Ägyptische, afghanische und serbische Diasporagemeinden in Deutschland und ihre Beiträge zur Entwicklung ihrer Herkunftsländer, Eschborn: GTZ.

Doris Hilber has a background in development, gender and migration studies, obtained at the Institute of Social Studies in The Hague. Currently she works as a researcher in the research group of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF). Within the Research Area I "International and Irregular Migration, Islam, Demography, Research Transfer" her research focuses on the nexus of migration and development and the dimensions of this policy field within German institutions and migrant organizations.

Her latest publications include:

Hilber, Doris Anna (2008): Diasporic Philanthropy in the Migration-Development Nexus: Exploring the Case of a Ghanaian Community. Working Paper 46/2008, Bielefeld: COMCAD - Center on Migration, Citizenship and Development.

Hilber, Doris Anna (2008): Develop Men? Gender Effects of the Migration and Development Mantra, Dossier der Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung.

SESSION 5: 14:30 – 16:30

International Organizations and the Management of Migration

Frontex and European Migration Management in Greece

Bernd KASPAREK, Munich & Fabian WAGNER, Frankfurt on the Main

Kasperek: Institute of European Ethnology, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich, id@berndkasperek.de, <http://www.volkskunde.uni-muenchen.de/aktuelles/index.html>

Wagner: Institute of Social Research, Frankfurt, fawagner@stud.uni-frankfurt.de, www.ifs.uni-frankfurt.de, www.staatsprojekt-europa.eu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=48&Itemid=57

The key actors in Migration Management often describe their approach as a triple win situation: both receiving and sending countries as well as migrants themselves are supposed to gain from Migration Management. Contrary to this rhetoric, we hold that Migration Management is the attempt to both transnationalise as well as de-territorialise control over migration. The European Union has sought to establish its own brand of Migration Management for a long time. While this specific approach offers a broad range of strategies and tools such as the Global Approach to Migration and Circular Migration, it has been noted time and again that these policies merely complement a repressive approach to what is mostly termed illegal migration. To this end, the European Union in 2004 established the European Border Agency Frontex. While by name and task, this specialised agency only deals with border management, it has become obvious that its focus does indeed lie with controlling migration movements not only at the border, but in a larger border area. One particular example is the recent involvement of Frontex in Greece, where the agency is holding its self-proclaimed "largest operation ever" in 2010. In the recent years, Greece has become the main gate for migrants seeking to reach Europe. While

Frontex, together with other actors has been successful in largely closing other routes to Europe, this has not been possible in Greece. For one, the geographic position of Greece vis a vis Turkey does not allow for the tested approach of inhibiting migrants from leaving the shores across the European external border. However, the dysfunctional nature of the Greek asylum and migration system barely offers a toolbox of managing migratory mobility. Since 2009, there have been intensified attempts to regain control over migration. The increasing importance of Greece as a gateway to Europe for migrants has been followed by an involvement of actors on different levels. While various member states of the European Union have pledged assistance, Frontex is involved in sea operations as well as both in establishing a new system of detention and screening and building a deportation system that will ultimately allow for the removal of migrants to their regions of origin. In our contribution, we will examine the actual involvement and practices of Frontex to demonstrate how Migration Management, the asylum discourse and migration control are intertwined. Such close examination of the activities of Frontex in the context of Greece and the specific constellation of actors is warranted for since we argue that the catch-all term *européanisation* does not sufficiently describe the changes in the European border regime brought about by Frontex. In this respect we prefer the term *transnationalisation* or even *translocalisation* of European border and migration management since these terms both reflect the deterritorialised nature of the European border as a tool for Migration Management as well as the fact that a European entity such as Frontex does not step in to replace national structures, but rather ports practices to the specific local conditions.

Bernd Kasperek (Dipl. math.) is currently pursuing his doctoral thesis at the University of Munich's department of European Ethnology, researching the transformations of the European border regime. He was a research assistant in the research/exhibition project "Crossing Munich" in 2009 and is active in the interdisciplinary Network Critical Migration- and Border Regime Studies (kritnet).

His latest publications include:

Hess, Sabine/ Kasperek, Bernd (eds.) (2010): Grenzregime. Diskurse, Praktiken, Institutionen in Europa. Assoziation A.

Kasperek, Bernd (forthcoming 2010): Borders and populations in flux. Frontex' place in the European Union's migration management. In: Geiger, Martin/Pécoud, Antoine: The Politics of International Migration Management. Palgrave.

Ataç, Ilker/ Kasperek, Bernd/ Willenbücher, Michael: Pagani: Das Recht von der Grenze her denken. In: Juridikum. No. 2/2010. Verlag Österreich.

Fabian Wagner (Dipl. Soz.) is working on his PhD about the establishment of the European border agency Frontex. Since May 2009 he is research assistant at the DFG research project "state project europe" at The Institute of Social Research in Frankfurt/M.

His latest publications include:

Nation-State Unbound? Die migrationstheoretische Herausforderung, in: Steffani Wöhl/ Jens Wissel (ed.): Staatstheorie vor neuen Herausforderungen 2008, Münster.

Let's Talk About the State: Anmerkungen zu materialistischer Staatstheorie und kritischer Migrationsforschung, in: Sabine Hess/ Bernd Kasperek (ed.): Grenzregime. Diskurse, Praktiken, Institutionen in Europa 2010, Berlin; Macht Wissen Kontrolle. Bedingungen kritischer Migrationsforschung, in: kulturrisse. Zeitschrift für radikaldemokratische Kulturpolitik H.1 April 2009, together with Fabian Georgi

UNHCR and Migration Management: Securitizing Migration through Refugee Protection?

Philipp RATFISCH & Stephan SCHEEL, Hamburg

p.ratfisch@gmx.de

stephan.scheel@gmx.net

UNHCR emphasizes in its official statements, that it considers 'migration management' to be distinct from but complementary to refugee protection. Following Didier Bigo this paper argues that UNHCR's refugee protection discourse and its political interventions do not only harmonize well with the 'management' of migration, but moreover contribute to the securitization of migration i.e. the construction and framing of migration as a 'threat'. It is maintained that UNHCR's refugee protection discourse and its political interventions establish a distinction between 'genuine' refugees and 'illegal' migrants and thereby help to authorize the implementation and extension of border controls in third countries in order to filter the former out of the latter. Based on the Paris School's understanding of securitization as a 'technique of government' it is argued, that not the speech acts of securitizing actors feature performativity, but their practices, technologies and architectural sites. All of them condense in a security dispositive that aims at the surveillance, control and regulation of human mobility on a global scale.

By drawing on this analytical framework Bigo's hypothesis is explored through the investigation of the narratives, practices, technologies, regulative decisions, architectural structures and bureaucratic routines, which UNHCR deploys in two of the EU's neighbouring countries. Morocco and Turkey have been chosen as case studies, because in neither of the two countries migration has been framed as a 'problem' or a 'threat' until a short time ago.

Based on the results of structured interviews with refugees and UNHCR and NGO representatives the paper addresses the following question: What activities that UNHCR has been undertaken and what technologies that it has been employing have contributed to the securitization of migration in Morocco and Turkey? In the case of Turkey, the status determination of asylum seekers carried out by UNHCR as well as UNHCR's participation in the formation of border guards are analyzed in this respect. Moreover, the relation between the construction of separate detention camps for refugees and 'illegal' migrants and UNHCR's refugee protection discourse is explored. In the case of Morocco, UNHCR's activity of distributing plastic cards for refugees as an identification technique and its way of dealing with refugee protests are taken into consideration. In the final section it is argued, that the refugee protection discourse matches with the state's interest to 'manage' migration flows, because it is based on a dichotomous logic that allows for the criminalization and subsequent securitization of migration considered as 'unwanted'. The refugee protection discourse proves to be exploitable for the interests of states as it is deeply rooted in a 'methodological nationalism'. The latter becomes obvious if one considers, that the three 'durable solutions' promoted by UNHCR to end the 'plight'

of refugees all reproduce and restore the 'national order of things' which creates refugees as a permanent phenomenon in the first place.

Philipp Ratfisch studies sociology at the University of Hamburg, where he is currently writing his diploma thesis on the externalization of the EU migration regime using the example of Turkey. He is an active member of Critical Research on Migration and Border Regimes Network ('KritNet') and of the anti-racist community in Hamburg.

His latest publication is:

Ratfisch, Philipp/ Scheel, Stephan (2010): Versicherunglichung durch Flüchtlingsschutz? Die Rolle des UNHCR im Kontext der Externalisierung des europäischen Migrationsregimes ['Securitisation through Refugee Protection? The role of the HCR in the externalisation of the european migration regime'], in: Hess, Sabine/ Kasperek, Bernd (eds.): Grenzregime. Diskurse, Praktiken, Institutionen in Europa ['Border Regimes. Discourses, Practices, Institutions in Europe']. Berlin (Assoziation A), 89-110.

Stephan Scheel studied political science at the University of Hamburg. Currently, he is a PhD-candidate at the Department of Political and International Studies at the Open University (UK) and studies processes of biometric re-bordering. He is an active member of 'KritNet' (Critical Research on Migration and Border Regimes Network) and an international collaboratory on critical methods in security studies.

His latest publications are:

Ratfisch, Philipp/ Scheel, Stephan (2010): Versicherunglichung durch Flüchtlingsschutz? Die Rolle des UNHCR im Kontext der Externalisierung des europäischen Migrationsregimes ['Securitisation through Refugee Protection? The role of the HCR in the externalisation of the european migration regime'], in: Hess, Sabine/ Kasperek, Bernd (eds.): Grenzregime. Diskurse, Praktiken, Institutionen in Europa ['Border Regimes. Discourses, Practices, Institutions in Europe']. Berlin (Assoziation A), 89-110.

Scheel, Stephan (2010): 'Escaperoutes. Control and Subversion in the Twenty-first Century - Review', in: Darkmatter 1/2010.

<http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2010/04/21/escape-routescontrol-and-subversion-in-the-21st-century/>

The Management of Health Workers' Migration: The Elaboration of the WHO Code of Practice and the Swiss Answer.

Clémence MERÇAY, Neuchâtel

University of Neuchâtel, Institute of Geography, Neuchâtel, clemence.mercay@unine.ch,
www2.unine.ch/Jahia/site/inst_geographie/op/edit/pid/30756

In a context of global shortage of human resources for health, state decision-makers have been more and more sensitive to the international migration of health workers issue and to its consequences in terms of health care access for the population of less developed countries. In May 2010, the World Health Assembly adopted a non-binding Code of Practice for the international recruitment of health workers. This Code of Practice embodies what we call the script on the health workers migration, establishing the terms of the problem and formulating recommendations for its resolution.

Firstly, this contribution aims to understand how the international migration of health workforce phenomenon established itself as a political object, calling countries to address it. We argue that it appeared as the result

of new ideologies both in international health and international migration fields. In particular the growing recognition, that health systems are interconnected and that migration cannot be controlled by destination countries only, has led to a migration approach in terms of management which is illustrated by the Code of Practice. We will also examine the moral foundations of those ideologies. We adopt a framework of analysis in terms of whose interests among citizens and non-citizens should be considered when elaborating national policies. The main observation made is a growing importance of a discourse pleading for taking into consideration interests of non-citizens.

Secondly, we concentrate ourselves more particularly on the study of Switzerland's case in order to understand how the particular views, promoted on the international scene, actually affect national policies. In answer to the concerns expressed about the access to health care in source countries, an inter-ministerial Working Group was set up in 2008 to assess the scope and role of the migration of health workers in the Swiss labour market and to consider possible political measures that need to be taken. We will see then that such a process is precisely in line with an approach of migration in terms of management. But the further examination of the Swiss case also illustrates the challenges that are met when trying to adopt such an approach. National interests and limited prerogatives of the Working Group still constitute hindrances to the full achievement of what may be called a managed migration.

This contribution is based on interviews with State's representatives and on observations realised by the author in the frame of its professional activity at the Swiss administration.

Clémence Merçay is a PhD student and research assistant at the Institute of Geography of the University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland. She is specialized in the international migration of health workers. For the past two years, Clémence has been collaborating regularly with the Swiss administration on this issue and she has recently become a consultant for the World Health Organization.

Her latest publications include:

2009: "Where do the best go? Global competition for healthcare professionals. What role does migration play in their career future?", written with G. Silberschmidt, Careum Working paper 3.

2009: « Le recrutement international d'infirmières en Suisse romande de 1970 à nos jours », *GéoRegards, revue neuchâteloise de géographie*, 2.

2009: "Migration and human resources for health: The Swiss debate". Symposium: "The performance of a national health workforce: How to assess it? How to strengthen it?", Neuchâtel, Switzerland, 14-16 October 2009.

SESSION 6: 14:30 – 16:30

Practices of Migration Management

“Regular Illegality” as a Way to Manage Rejected Asylum Seekers? Specificity of the Swiss Case Study

Giada DE COULON, Neuchâtel

Maison d'Analyse des Processus Sociaux (MAPS), Université de Neuchâtel,
giada.decoulon@unine.ch, www2.unine.ch/maps-chaire/page26695.html

European states face the impossibility to remove numerous rejected asylum seekers living on their territory. Rejected asylum seekers are considered as ‘illegal’ and pressured to leave the country of reception. The concept of regular illegality illustrates the phenomena of administrative coverage of failed asylum seekers by institutions depending on the state although they are considered as illegals. I propose to consider this concept as a way to manage the unwanted immobility of unwanted aliens. My aim, in this paper, is to reflect on local practices and local consequences of this specific migration issue.

My case study concerns rejected asylum seekers in Switzerland. I pursued an ethnographic methodology, performing semi-structured interviews and participant observation, mostly in collective centres (July 2008-July 2010). The specificity of the Swiss regulation emerges from the Federal Constitution (Article 12), which establishes the right for each person living on the Swiss territory to claim for the ‘minimal to survive’. Because of a recent political decision to cut social aid for rejected asylum seekers, and although they are considered illegal, the article 12 of the Swiss Constitution enables them to get a shelter and food in institutions depending on the state. They are denied the right to work but receive in kind the minimum to survive, yet only if they join a collective centre. Failed asylum seekers thus confront the difficult choice to either go underground, or to enter a collective centre. In the latter option, they remain dependent on state help and consequently also visible by the administration. In the case of administrative deportation decisions, the police can find them easily. Hence, from the point of view of migration management, the Federal Office for Migration keeps these unwanted aliens under control until the necessary authorisations are collected in order to send back these people.

The interest of this paper is to point out the complex interface between state imposition and individual agency, in a constructivist perspective. Neither of the two actors seems completely free to take the decision for removal or integration. Although regular illegality can be seen as an implementation of governmentality, the political and human consequences of this situation reveal severe failures. This brings us to think of it as a management by default. Finally, a comparison with other European countries management of rejected asylum seekers will bring to light different practices and very similar outcomes.

Giada de Coulon is currently a PhD candidate. She completed a master degree in Anthropology, Spanish and Journalism at University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland in 2007. Her field of interest focuses on forced migration and refugees, confronting the perspective of both individuals and institutions. Inspired by constructivist thinking, she adopts an ethnographic methodology.

Towards a New Migration Management: Care Immigration Policy in Japan

Hideki TARUMOTO, Sapporo

Department of Sociology, Graduate School of Letters, Hokkaido University, Sapporo/Hokkaido,
tarumoto@bk.iij4u.or.jp, <http://rose.hucc.hokudai.ac.jp/~h31509/>

As cross-border mobility becomes one of normal social processes, the state struggles to manage migration in keeping state sovereignty. Not only for excluding but also for receiving migrants, it necessitates a new strategy of migration management. A recent Japanese experience gives a thoughtful suggestion on it. For a long period, a relatively ethnic homogeneous country, Japan, has kept strict immigrants-receiving policy. But, due to its depopulating and ageing, it decided to begin with introduction of nurses and care workers from Indonesia and the Philippines. The care immigrant policy implies a new migration management. First, the policy is implemented within the bi-national framework of Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) between Japan and Indonesia, and Japan and the Philippines respectively. Second, the governments of the sending countries elaborates institutions to nurture, select and send out care migrants in accordance with global standard of care immigrants. Third, Japan created a special body, the Japan International Corporation of Welfare Services (JICWELS), in order to receive care migrants and allocate them among hospitals and care homes. Finally, the Japanese government puts strict requirement to candidates of care migrants such as educational and job career. As a result, the governments-collaborated regulation has been created, which seems to realize a 'triple-win' situation: the sending countries can send out their nationals as labour migrants who are expected to send back remittances; Japan and, hospitals and care homes within it, can alleviate care labour shortage to supply care services to the elderly; and care migrants from the sending countries can receive secured earnings through their works in Japan at least as long as they can stay in Japan. However, if any, this 'triple-win' situation would be far from complete. the Japanese government requires care migrants to pass national examinations to become formal workers in Japan, while care immigrants stay in Japan for three or four years. This requirement is quite tough because care migrants have to take the examinations in Japanese, although they are all non-native Japanese speakers. This stirred up much criticism that care migrants are considered disposal menial workers, without little hope to become formal workers. To fend off the criticism, actors such as governments, hospitals and care homes utilise the rhetoric that 'we welcome care migrants for "promoting international friendship,"' apart from economic purpose, which originates

from Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA). So, the rhetoric of 'promoting international friendship' seems to function to cover the reality of exploitation. The case of care migrants to Japan demonstrates a possibility of emerging liberal new migration management in providing satisfactions to governments, hospitals and care homes, and care migrants through bi-national agreements and governments-led institutions. But, the new migration management effectively regulates flow of migration. It has a political implication: the migration management of care migrants embodies small liberalism within the framework of big restrictiveness.

Hideki Tarumoto is Associate Professor of Sociology at the Graduate School of Letters, Hokkaido University, Japan (tarumoto@bk.ij4u.or.jp). He received his B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Tokyo, Japan. His research is concerned with citizenship and ethnic stratification of immigrants and ethnic minorities in advanced countries, with special reference to Japan, the United Kingdom and other European Union countries. In addition, he began to undertake a project of comparative research on migration and citizenship regimes of East Asian countries.

His main publications include:

'Change and Continuity of Ethnic Dualism: Ethnic Stratification in 1970s Britain' (1996); 'Is Post-National Citizenship a "Normal" Model?: An Exploration from the Viewpoint of "Transcendental Choice of Identity"' (2001); 'Multiculturalism in Japan' (2003), 'Is State Sovereignty Declining? An Exploration of Asylum Policy in Japan' (2004); 'Un nouveau modèle de politique d'immigration et de citoyenneté?: approche comparative à partir de l'expérience japonaise' (2005); Yokuwaku kokusai shakaigaku (Understandable Transnational Sociology) (2009).

Practice and Consequences of Social Cohesion Programmes

Gianni D'AMATO & Didier RUEDIN, Neuchâtel

D'Amato: Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies, University of Neuchâtel,
gianni.damato@unine.ch, www2.unine.ch/sfm/page27849.html

Ruedin: Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies, University of Neuchâtel,
druedin@gmail.com, unine.academia.edu/DidierRuedin,
www2.unine.ch/sfm/page27853.html

Migration is increasingly global in nature, bringing into contact individuals from very different backgrounds. The differences in social, cultural, religious, and linguistic background are regarded as a challenge to receiving societies, not least with regard to social cohesion. This paper focuses on programmes on social cohesion to explore the impact of global migration. As in other areas of migration policy, programmes on social cohesion are increasingly guided by the notion that migration can be managed in a way beneficial to all actors involved. The focus on social cohesion highlights the challenges of approaches based on management. The complexity of the issue becomes apparent, caused in part by the multiple actors and multiple stakeholders who are involved. The international dimension of migration means that stakeholders may be outside the policy reach of individual countries, adding a further level of complexity. The paper offers a critical analysis of programmes that aim to manage migration, both in terms of contents and outcomes. With a focus on social cohesion, the outcomes of

policies are of central interest, and the paper critically discusses intended and unintended consequences of interventions on social cohesion. It is argued that there are aspects of social cohesion that are beyond the reach of social policy and migration management. Consequently, the paper offers a critical view on the ability of migration policies to effectively manage migration in a way that is beneficial to all stakeholders. In other words, the nature of migration and social cohesion means that not all areas of migration are sufficiently manageable to enable so-called triple-win situations where the sending country, the receiving country, and the migrants all benefit from managed migration. At the same time, it is argued that certain policy interventions can assist the integration of immigrants in the receiving countries, with positive effects on social cohesion. With the focus on social cohesion, the paper addresses both the actions of the migrants and the reactions of the receiving society, considering the link between social cohesion and reactions which may lead to xenophobia and discrimination.

Gianni D'Amato is Professor at the University of Neuchâtel and Director of the Swiss Forum of Migration and Population Studies (SFM). His research interests are focused on citizenship, transnationalism, populism and the history of migration. He is author of Vom Ausländer zum Bürger. Der Streit um die politische Integration von Einwanderern in Deutschland, Frankreich und der Schweiz (Lit Verlag 3rd edition, 2005) and Mit dem Fremden politisieren. Rechtspopulismus und Migrationspolitik in der Schweiz seit den 1960er Jahren (Zürich, Chronos Verlag, 2008). His latest English publications include 'Swiss Citizenship: A Municipal Approach to Participation', in: Jennifer H. Hochschild and John Mollenkopf (eds.): Bringing Outsiders In. Transatlantic Perspectives on Immigrant Political Participation. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009 and 'Switzerland: A Multicultural Country Without Multicultural Policies?', in: Steven Vertovec and Susanne Wessendorf (eds.): The Multiculturalism Backlash. European Discourses, Policies and Practices. London: Routledge, 2010, pp. 130-151.

Didier Ruedin is a post-doctoral researcher for the European project SOM (Support and Opposition to Migration) at the Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies at the University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland.

His latest publications include:

Ruedin, D. 2010. The relationship between levels of gender and ethnic group representation. Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism 10(2): 92-106.

Ruedin, D. 2009. Ethnic group representation in a cross-national comparison. The Journal of Legislative Studies 15(4): 335-54.

Ruedin, D. 2009. The proportion of women in national parliament as a measure of women's status in society. Sociology Working Papers 5. Available at: <http://www.sociology.ox.ac.uk/images/stories/Images/2009-05.pdf> [Accessed October 1, 2009].