



REPORT OF THE ETHOS KICK-OFF MEETING

Trudie Knijn, Dorota Lepianka & Michael Robinson

Document Identifier

D1.4 Report Kick-off meeting

Version

1.0

Date Due

M5

Submission date

M5

WorkPackage

1 Coordination and Management

Lead Beneficiary

1 Universiteit Utrecht

Change log

version	Date	By	changes
1.0	12/05/17	Trudie Knijn	Document created
1.1	15/05/17	Dorota Lepianka	Amendments requested following review
1.2	17/05/17	Michael Robinson	Updated and completed.

Partners involved

number	partner name	People involved
1	Utrecht University	Trudie Knijn, Michael Robinson, Dorota Lepianka

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
ETHOS KICK OFF MEETING	5
PLENARY SESSIONS: 30 th March 2017	5
Plenary 1: Welcome Session	5
Plenary 2: Keynote lecture by Trudie Knijn	5
Plenary 3: Discussing the theoretical deliverables & guidelines for deliverables D2.1, D3.1, D4.1, D5.1 & D6.1	6
PLENARY SESSIONS: 31 st March 2017	7
Plenary 4: Dissemination planning - Presentation of the Communication and (Social) Media Strategy and the European Landscape of justice	7
Plenary 5: Keynote lecture by Halleh Ghorashi	8
Plenary 6: Closing Session	8
WORK PACKAGE MEETINGS	9
Work Package 3	9
Work Package 4	9
Work Package 5	10
Work Package 6	11

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The ETHOS kick-off meeting scheduled on March 30 -31 2017 in Hotel Mitland in Utrecht brought together all Consortium members, to discuss the aims and procedures of the research program as well as the working plans for the first deliverables. At the two-day kick-off consortium meeting a series of plenaries, Work package sessions, and work coordination activities took place, all enthusiastically engaging the consortium participants. Two keynote lectures, the draft website and the proposals for the European Landscape of Justice were presented and participants actively reflected on ETHOS project and its component parts. Researchers from 6 countries attended the Kick-off event representing the ETHOS consortium partners as well as one Advisory board member. For the purpose of involving stakeholders in the ETHOS project it has been decided to invite three young Dutch video-bloggers (vloggers) to the kick-off meeting to present and discuss with them new and alternative ways to reach a wider audience, in particular young Europeans. The three vloggers (Anouk Kragtwijk, Joshua Alagbe and Naomi Louis) have attended both days of the kick-off meeting and have inspired consortium members to various ways of involving – young – journalists, alternative social media or art performers into the ETHOS communication strategy (see also D8.1). In an after session the Dutch vloggers have deliberated with the project coordinators on their ideas and suggestions for developing vlogs on ETHOS.

The purpose of this document is to provide an overview of the kick-off meeting, results of work package sessions and managerial appointments and procedures of the ETHOS Project.

This document specifically covers the following areas:

- The plenary sessions including keynotes, discussions on the Dx.1 deliverables outlining the review of theories of justice in several academic disciplines and the presentations of the European Landscape of Justice
- Work Package sessions focusing on the preparation of the Dx.2 deliverables, its focus and planning.
- Power point presentations presented at the kick-off meeting are available on the ETHOS Intranet.

ETHOS KICK-OFF MEETING IN UTRECHT, MARCH 30-31, 2017

The ETHOS kick-off meeting scheduled on March 30-31 2017 in Hotel Mitland in Utrecht brought together all Consortium members, to discuss the aims and procedures of the research program as well as the working plans for the first deliverables. At the two-day kick-off consortium meeting a series of plenaries, Work package sessions, and work coordination activities took place, all enthusiastically engaging the consortium participants. Two keynote lectures, the draft website and the proposals for the European Landscape of Justice were presented and participants actively reflected on ETHOS project and its component parts (Annex 1; program of the kick-off). Researchers from 6 countries attended the Kick-off event representing the ETHOS consortium partners as well as one Advisory board member.

The purpose of this document is to provide an overview of the kick-off meeting, results of work package sessions and managerial appointments and procedures of the ETHOS Project.

PLENARY SESSIONS: 31st March

Plenary 1; Welcome session

The Kick-off consortium meeting was officially opened on Thursday, March 30 at 9am, with warm welcome by the Scientific Coordinator of the ETHOS project, prof. dr. Trudie Knijn followed by an introduction to the research program, its goals and research question by co-coordinator of the ETHOS project, dr. Dorota Lepianka. At this first plenary session WP coordinators introduced their specific aims and goals and Michael Robinson, support manager of ETHOS, has introduced the management structure and procedures.

The intended REA presentation by dr. Yuri Borgmann-Perbil had to be cancelled due to his obligations elsewhere. In order to ensure all consortium member are informed about REA and its role in the project all consortium members have received his power point presentation. At the second plenary session Trudie Knijn presented a keynote.

Plenary 2; Keynote lecture by Trudie Knijn

Professor Trudie Knijn accentuated in her keynote (see Annex II) the ultimate objective of the ETHOS project: to increase justice and fairness in Europe. She did so by raising the question why the European Commission might want a European and empirically founded theory of justice and fairness. She claimed that there is general agreement on the statement that 'justice is good' for normative, pragmatic and subjective reasons though in defining justice and fairness all kind of voices resonate.



Regarding the empirical focus of the project a balance has to be found by going back and forward from deductively to inductively collected knowledge, which will challenge participants from various academic disciplines in different ways. Concerning the European focus of the project she concluded that in addition to historical consciousness (the colonizing past, wars on nation state borders), European values (Judaean-Christian dominance), philosophical legacy (cross-continental thinking) the main challenge will be to make sense of internally conflicting European values, traditions and legacies. For that reason, she ended with quoting Johann Galtung (1981) in celebrating the rich variety of academic styles as a warning to 'dreadful human intellectual enterprises based on one intellectual style'. Throughout the lecture she presented 'justice' heroines; Virginia Woolf, Olympe de Gouges, Beatrice Webb, and Connie Braam.

Plenary 3; Discussing the theoretical deliverables & guidelines for deliverables D2.1, D3.1, D4.1, D5.1 and D6.1

This plenary (two meetings) have been chaired by the WP2 coordinators Simon Ripon and Bert van den Brink and attended by all participants in the consortium. WP2 is working on providing the philosophical foundations for an empirically-informed European Theory of Justice. The plenary session was used for three purposes. First to introduce the coordinators of WP2. Second, to describe the nature of a philosophical approach to justice and the general outlines of WP2. Third, to begin the dialogue between ETHOS partners that will result in, first, work incorporating reviews of conceptualizations and articulations of justice in various fields (deliverables 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1 and 6.1, summarized as Dx.1). In addition the session intended to already deliberate on the integrative paper to be delivered by WP2 (deliverable 2.3), and finally a report containing a conceptual framework for integration of findings (deliverable 7.1).

Van Den Brink and Rippon gave a presentation explaining philosophical method as concerning conceptual clarification and refinement, examining presuppositions, and following through arguments, emphasizing the fact-value distinction and the difference between normative and empirical questions. They highlighted major philosophical questions of justice and different approaches that focus on, for example, distribution of goods, welfare or recognition. They distinguished five kinds of philosophical methods for theorizing about justice, including reflective equilibrium, contract, and interpretative approaches, and emphasized the distinction between ideal and non-ideal theory, and the relevance of non-ideal theory for the ETHOS project.

Following guidelines provided by the WP2 and project coordinators, other partners each gave a short presentation of their initial proposals for their X.1 deliverables mentioned above, followed by discussions.

For WP3, Orsolya Salat identified central questions of justice in legal theory as questions of the authority of law, and its grounding in political community, and the relationship between law and justice (for example, in terms of the tension between democracy and minority rights). Salat also

noted differing methodologies dominant in narrowly defined legal theory (philosophical), legal scholarship (empirical), and legal practice (interpretative).

For WP4, Ayse Bugra identified a feeling of insecurity and crisis of representation that frames the current cultural political environment, and suggested that attention to such themes as domination, recognition, representation, diversity, intersectionality, dialogue, and common good that have been explored in various areas of the literature are relevant to an analytical framing of justice and overcoming of the present problems.

For WP5, Bridget Anderson and Claudia Hartman introduced a range of approaches used in social theory to discuss justice (e.g. positivism, social constructivism, postmodernism and post-postmodernism). The methodological underpinnings of the majority of work to be completed in WP5 was explained in terms of standpoint theory.

For WP6, Sara Araujo and Maria Paula Meneses offered a critical discussion of justice in dominant economic, in which the theory is generally presented as something purely technocratic and scientific, and as having no alternative – when in fact, it is neoliberal and political.

The discussions already revealed various areas of common ground and interest between the partners, for example it was noted (by Barbara Oomen) that the social theorists' standpoint theory can be a useful way of conceptualizing the part of WP3 which attends to the conceptions of justice in the minds of the founders of the EU legal system. It was agreed that the development of the x.1 deliverables would continue with guidance and feedback provided by WP2 and project coordinators.

PLENARY SESSIONS: 31st March

Plenary 4: Dissemination planning - Presentation of the Communication and (Social) Media Strategy and the European Landscape of Justice

Maddalena Vivona, Klaus Stark and Simone Philipp (all ETC, Graz) shared with the participants their ideas and proposals for the European Landscape of Justice communication strategy and the way the to be developed interactive App could be used in that strategy. They stressed the importance of including stakeholders and citizens all over Europe in the ongoing debate on justice and fairness and bridging the gap between academic scholars, politicians and a diversity of citizens experiencing (in) justice. Raising awareness, discussions among citizens and personal identification are major objectives of this Work Package (8).

The landscapes will be built on a three-dimensional model including information on an ETHOS topic (income, education, media), perceptions of participants and a dimension that is still under discussion, such as statistics, values, capabilities. Filled with information from participants the Landscape will provide tools for comparison of participants' personal situations with those of other participants per country or across Europe. Finally, the Landscape will offer readings lists, videos, webinars and interviews with experts and explore additional tools linked to all kind of social media.

Consortium members showed a lot of interest in the Communication and (Social) Media Strategy, the Landscapes of Justice, in particular. The debate focused on developing a script for Consortium members to fill the content of the Landscapes and the non-conventional dissemination strategies to reach the broad public. The invited young vloggers enriched the discussion. The feedback received from all the participants shall be accommodated by ETC Graz in the revised Communication and (Social) Media Strategy to be submitted as D8.1 in June 2017.

Plenary 5: Keynote lecture by Halleh Ghorashi

In her keynote lecture titled 'Rethinking democracy & solidarity in late modern times' professor Halleh Ghorashi, member of the Scientific Advisory Board, referred to many scholars arguing that in late modern societies it is the rather invisible normalizing aspect of power that is at work instead of visible and forceful forms of domination. In that definition, power is not visible through the dominance of positions, but is shaping our actions through discourses and invisible processes that become routine. Since the turn of the twenty-first century we can observe a growing normalization of othering in many European societies. The dichotomous construction of otherness through culture is a fundamental ingredient in the current trend and is leading to exclusion. The culture (including religion) of migrants is essentialized and imagined as absolutely different and inferior to the culture of natives. In spite of the visible consequences of these othering practices, the discursive foundation of its reproduction is taken for granted. It is particularly this process of normalization which severely limits the possibilities of resistance against processes of othering in late modern times.

Halleh Ghorashi argues for the revitalization of the concept of democracy in order to rethink the possibilities of resistance against normalized foundation of othering practices through engaged solidarity. To do that, Judith Butler's "strategy of subversive repetition" could be helpful, as well as other forms of resistance.

Plenary 6: Closing session

At the closing session Michael Robinson, support manager of ETHOS presented some core issues regarding the practicalities of the project and it was decided that the Deliverable on Ethical Issues would be commented on by e-mail. Regarding the latter it was discussed that the ethical consent should be clear and understandable also for (functional) illiterate participants and that the team should be cautious at the risk of long-term storing of the (not yet) anonymized data.

In addition each of the Work package coordinators presented the results of their meetings and agreements were made on the progress of several deliverables.

Finally, Halleh Ghorasi the only member of the Advisory Boards present reflected on the kick-off by stating that the ETHOS project is very promising as well as challenging. She stressed the need for opening up boundaries and not to accept processes of normalization of othering.

Both the Executive Board and Advisory Board met during the kick off conference with a focus on ethical issues.

WORK PACKAGE MEETINGS

Work Package 3:

WP3 concerns ‘Law as, or against, justice for all’. It considers the interrelationship between law and justice, the role of justice in the period of European integration after the 2nd World War and the way in which different notions of justice do (not) make it into legal rules and their application. Here, there is a specific focus on three domains that seek to cover justice as representation, redistribution and recognition: the right to vote, the right to housing and the right to education. A detailed understanding of how laws in these fields relate to justice in the 6 countries can deepen our empirical understanding of justice as a whole.

The kick-off meeting was used to introduce the WP coordinators and their postdocs: Marie-Pierre Granger with Orsolya Salat (CEU) and Barbara Oomen with Alexandra Timmer (UU). Other WP3 participants at the Work Package session are Trudie Knijn (UU), Sybe de Vries (UU) Bridget Anderson (UOXF), Basak Akkan and Ayse Bugra (CU), Maria Paula Meneses (CES), Klaus Starl and Maddalena Vivona (ETC). Orsolya Salat, who will be working on the first WP3 deliverable, the conceptual paper, set out the various approaches to justice taken in legal theory over time, receiving feedback from the rest of the ETHOS researchers. A central point of departure in legal theory concerns the authority behind the law. In addition, there is the debate to what extent law is about justice at all. It is clear that there is a lot of overlap between understandings of justice in philosophy, political science and legal theory, and WP3 will focus upon “justice with a legal flavor”.

The special working group session was dedicated to establishing a timeframe for the input to be given by all partner universities, and a common understanding of the work at hand. Each partner will appoint one contact in charge of collecting legislation and case law pertaining to voting, housing and education. This input will be collected between June and October 2018, on the basis of a detailed questionnaire discussed in concept in March 2018, and available as a draft in April 2018. In the working group discussion, the main issues pertaining to (in)justice in the countries concerned were explored, and it was agreed to collect examples in the coming year, in order to be able to develop the questionnaire in a grounded and bottom-up manner. The working group members, finally, also used the kick-off meeting to discuss the research, both from a substantive and a planning perspective.

Work package 4:

The working group discussion on WP4 proceeded with the understanding that the WP insists that public discourse is important in the way insiders and outsiders are defined and the policies that affect minority groups are designed, implemented and legitimated. Leading WP coordinators are Ayse Bugra (CU) and Dorota Lepianka (UU), Bert van den Brink (UU), Simone Philipp (ETC Graz), Eva Zemandl and Simon Rippon (CEU), Sara Araujo (CES), Claudia Hartman (UOXF) and Michelle Bal (UU).

“What to understand from discourse analysis and how to use it in such a way that research on different country cases would form a meaningful basis for the comparative investigation of the

political questions that the project aims to explore” was an important question that was addressed in the discussion. While it was agreed that discourse refers to more than language and incorporates the issues that are emphasised as well as the way the discussion on these issues is framed, the participants in the working group felt that it would be useful to make what is understood by discourse analysis explicit in the formulation of the final guidelines. It was suggested that it would be useful to investigate public debates around particular events or issues that reflect what is of common significance to all countries as well as the problems that are salient in individual countries.

The questions that emerged around the way to examine these events or issues include the following: With reference to which group or groups are the issues pertaining to justice addressed in public debate? Who are the actors who participate in the debate? Who speaks for the group? By which NGOs or political parties are the demands and grievances of the group presented and how are they presented? What is the nature of the dialogue? Does the debate consist in particular group interests or does it address questions pertaining to the “common good”? During the session decisions have been made related to task 4.2 and deliverable 4.2. It has been agreed that in May coordinators will send a screening request to all the partners to identify the country specific 'discursive events' to be analysed. On the basis of the input received from the partners (in June), the coordinators will prepare guidelines that shall inform the selection of the research material (documents, interviews) and the analysis; the guidelines will also address the methodology (incl. nature, scope and depth of analysis; method of analysis; the initial coding instrument; extent of linguistic analysis, etc.).

Work package 5:

Deliverable 5.2 will be a study on the relationship between institutionalized political justice and the experienced recognition of national belonging, gender equality, and ethnic and religious pluralism. The task will encompass: developing a template for the document/policy analysis of state responses with regard to national, ethnic and religious minorities (by the coordinators); developing guidelines for the interviews with relevant representatives of vulnerable categories, including both community leaders as well as people who are not members of any community organisations in order to explore the similarities and differences in their positions as to what would constitute justice and inclusion, and what are the grounds for such claims (by the coordinators); case studies conducted by all the partners according to the guidelines/templates, followed by country reports, and preparing a comparative report on the tensions between institutionalised political justice and the experienced (mis)recognition (by the coordinators). The discussion was attended by the WP coordinators Bridget Anderson (chairing) and Trudie Knijn, as well as by Basak Akan, Bert van den Brink (UU), Barbara Oomen (UU) Simone Philipp (ETC), Maddalena Vivona (ETC), Eva Zemandl and Simon Rippon (CEU) and Sara Araujo (CES)

Main issues discussed are how to analyse institutionalized political justice and experienced recognition, how are people ‘turned’ into minorities and how to relate this to gender relations, history and structures in society. Also some deliberation took place on which minorities do states recognize and/or not recognize? From the other side: how does it feel like to be defined as a problem? Why is it a problem? Why is a group imagined or constructed as a problem and how is that

revealed in relevant policy documents? Challenges discussed relate to Institutionalized political justice: focus on policy documents, as well as documentary analysis (government/state documents), case studies, and interviews and to operationalising experienced recognition: a combination of framing, and giving people space to form and express their own ideas, i.e. providing examples on which participants can reflect, allowing for flexibility in personal experience. The meeting concluded with a program of action in which the following research questions are put central: History of minoritization, what are the key minorities (in participating countries), taking a variety of groups into account, who is defined as a minority? Lausanne Treaty, other classifications? Ethnic or other minorities? Taking issues of political status into account. The soon after the kick-off to be answered question is if it is feasible to focus on the Roma as an exemplary group.

The decision on the exemplary group will be made at the end of April 2017. Document analysis, historical analysis of law (how groups have become minoritized in history) will be submitted in June 2017 (4-6k words including tables, part of case study (see following documents and timetable for details). This report will describe how do participant countries' governments respond to their minorities, how do they deal with minorities, are they open about it or do they publicly discuss/raise awareness of this? Analysis of policies that respond to minorities: what politics address this problem? And if Roma are selected: how do governments' approach affect social movements of Roma communities. Access issues of Roma groups in different countries in Europe: citizens in what sense? Additionally, a migration issue of indigenous and traveling groups. Finally; How does gender relate to this?

Work Package 6:

WP6 concerns Struggles for Justice, covering studies in the EU (Portugal, Austria, Hungary, Netherlands, UK) and Turkey). The WP6 meeting was attended by Alexandra Timmer and Dorota Lepianka (Netherlands); Claudia Hartman (UK); Klaus Starl (Austria); Marie-Pierre Granger and Orsolya Salat (CEU); Ayse Bugra (Turkey) and Maria Paula Meneses (Portugal). The first moment was the introduction of the coordination team by CEs-Portugal and UU-Netherlands. The special working group session was dedicated to discuss a common understanding of the work at hand, as well as a timeframe for the input to be given by all partners. This discussion was important, taking into consideration WP6 goals, the specificities of the 6 countries, and the time constraints.

This WP focuses on justice in the context of distributive effects of the recent crises – financial, economic, euro-zone, social – that have been troubling EU and Turkey and the way these relate to the recognition and representation of the interests of the categories of the population that are hit by these crises. As discussed in the kick-off meeting, the countries involved have experienced different levels of economic growth (and decline), have been differently affected by the crises (financial, economic, debt, social) and, by consequence, take different positions and pursue different, sometimes competing or even contradictory measures – both nationally and within the EU politics – to address the distributive justice claims (it was called the attention to avoid overlapping with WP4).

The austerity measures that have followed the recent crises have further intensified the feelings of injustice and mobilized many social and political actors' support for institutional and non-institutional struggles for 'justice'. WP6 aims to contribute to the European theory of justice by exploring the

various forms of (non)institutional struggles for justice in Europe and thus shedding light on the factors and mechanism that impede the realisation of justice, with a special focus on women and youth, two groups that have been identified and specially hit (vulnerable) in current contexts as having their rights eroded. Another variable to be taken into consideration will be class and race.

As agreed, the research will be focusing on economic struggles (labour struggles, compensations, unemployment) through the lenses of redistributive justice. It will encompass a comparative analysis of formal (institutional) and 'informal' struggles (alternative forms of conflict resolution developed to counter the rising vulnerability and social exclusion). It was also agreed to critically analyse and expand on the forms of resistance and resilience present, as a platform to address the possibilities of democratic reinvention of justice, the goal of ETHOS.

