REPORT OF THE ETHOS 2nd ANNUAL CONSORTIUM MEETING

Trudie Knijn, Dorota Lepianka & Michael Robinson

Document Identifier
D1.8 Report 2nd Annual Consortium Meeting

Version
1.0

Date Due
M27

Submission date
M27

Work Package
1 Coordination and Management

Lead Beneficiary
1 Universiteit Utrecht

Change log

version	Date	By	changes
1.0	15/01/19	Mike Robinson	Document created
2.0	01/03/19	Trudie Knijn	Review and corrections

Partners involved

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The ETHOS 2nd Annual Consortium Meeting was held in Budapest, Hungary on 17 to 19 January 2019, and was hosted by CEU.

During the 3-day conference a series of Plenaries, Keynotes and Work Package sessions took place, all enthusiastically engaging the consortium participants. The day before the conference started the members of the Executive Board held their quarterly EB meeting as well as a session focusing on the requirements of the integrative WP7. An Advisory Board meeting in addition to a meeting of the General Assembly were also held. The philosophical workshop started at the second Conference day and the final day of the conference was fully devoted to a philosophical workshop, organised by WP2.

Researchers from 6 countries attended the event representing the ETHOS consortium partners in addition to Advisory Board members and Policy Makers. The purpose of this document is to provide an overview of the conference and agreed outcomes of work package sessions. Note that the philosophical workshop will be reported in a separate Deliverable (D2.4)

This document specifically covers the following areas:

- The plenary sessions included keynotes from Philippe van Parijs and Michael Ignatieff along with an open panel policy meeting following 2 thematic workshops focusing on Justice in Policy Making; Footloose Europeans & Categorizing Dependency & Vulnerability, targeted at policy makers from across Europe.
- Work Package sessions discussing the focus and planning of the deliverables in the final year of ETHOS.

PLENARY SESSIONS:

Plenary 1;

Words of welcome by Trudie Knijn, Simon Rippon and Marie-Pierre Granger

Trudie Knijn opened the conference by welcoming everyone and thanked Simon, Marie -Pierre and the CEU team for organizing the event.

Trudie extended a special welcome to the Advisory Board members and expressed her hopes for a very successful conference with respect to developing the ETHOS outputs through the Work Package sessions and the Policy Event

Policy Meeting : Justice in policy making; redistribution, recognition and representation

Two thematic workshops were held in parallel, with incited Policy Makers making presentations and moderated by two Advisory Board members.

The first thematic workshop focused on ''Footloose Europeans'' which was moderated by **Ayse Caglar** AB member; Professor at the Dept. of Cultural and Social Anthropology (University of Vienna) with presentations from **Bridget Anderson**, Director of the Bristol Institute on Migration and Mobility Studies and Professor of Migration, Mobilities and Citizenship, University of Bristol, UK (ETHOS project), **Iulius Rostas**, Chair of the Romani Studies, CEU, Hungary and **Djamilia Schans**, Senior researcher on Asylum and Migration of the Research and Documentation Centre (WODC) of the Ministry of Justice and Security, Netherlands.

The first presentation by Bridget Anderson (BA) builds on ETHOS D5.2. and she reflected in her talk on how funded research can become overly shaped by a policy agenda. BA argues that it is the role of theory to think beyond existing migration policies, categories and thought. Because what is considered realistic is a political

choice, the abolishment of slavery is an example of something to be thought unrealistic, but here we are. In terms of migration policy, steps should be made in thinking beyond asylum and labour migration. One start is to rethink the relationships between states. As an example BA gives Niger, which is one of the poorest societies in the world but it is at the same time where 90% of France's lightbulbs are made. We could have France say: 'we will take into consideration that we benefit from Niger, we will admit 2000 Nigeriens, people who are poor, people who are not the brightest and the best, and we say, we admit those people as a symbolic gesture, to educate people about our real relations with Niger. If we don't do that, we won't make use of uranium'. So this is to say that we should think beyond policy categories, and use theory to achieve more social justice.

The second presentation by Djamila Schans (DS) gave an insight into migration policies and debates in the Netherlands. DS argued in line with BA, that indeed, migration policies in the Netherlands are based on categories of migrants that are not clear cut and change. But these definitions greatly influence the realities of people. In the Netherlands immigration and emigration numbers show that many people came, but that also many people left. Through this, the Netherlands became much more diverse. Main reasons for those who came to the Netherlands is work, study, family and asylum. The biggest category is family followed by study. Furthermore, immigration policies in the Netherlands are also focused on attracting specific type of labour migrants such as knowledge workers who are active in IT and finance. These knowledge workers are actively attracted through tax reductions and partner visa policies. This does not apply to the working force of unskilled/manual labour. The general public is unaware of these policies and statistics and assumes that it is primarily asylum seekers who are coming. This is also due to the portrayal of migration in the media and in political debates. The presented numbers by DS have been made into a publication to provide information on migration to a wider audience.

In the third presentation by Iulius Rostas (IR) four different policy discourses on Roma policies in Europe are outlined, being the 1) integrationist; 2) poverty; 3) rights and; 4) economic integration discourse. Central to the first discourse is the aim to socially integrate Roma like integrating other groups such as alcoholics that were perceived as deviant. In the second discourse, poverty among Roma is explained as something inherited from previous generations. The third, Rights discourse emphasises both minority and human rights of Roma. The fourth discourse is the economic integration discourse. While these discourses seem to differ, they all share the perspective of Roma as deviant and fail to reflect on what IR calls anti-zyganism. While similar to 'common racism', anti-zyganism is different. Where racism is about the in-group and out-group construction as explained by Social Identity Theory, anti-zyganism involves ideas in which Roma are not considered human in the first place. Accordingly, this makes the human rights discourse not applicable, because the human rights will only apply to those we consider having human dignity. Due to anti-zyganism, there has been little progress for the social position of Roma in Europe. What the case of the Roma teaches IR about justice, is that to him, social justice is not about equality. But it is there to limit the oppression towards different groups. Especially cultural oppression is problematic as it is a form of oppression where others define what your past and identity is. Academia plays an important role in this respect as it can offer vulnerable groups, such as Roma, voice to speak for themselves.

The Second thematic workshop focused on ''Categorizing dependency and vulnerability'' which was moderated by **Eszter Kollar**, AB Member; Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Ethics of Economics at the Center for Ethics, Social and Political Philosophy, Institute of Philosophy (KU Leuven) with presentations from **Dorota Lepianka**, Researcher, Utrecht University, Netherlands (ETHOS project leader), **Ann Campbell**, Co-Director, Validity, Hungary and **Rosa Crawford**, Policy Officer, Rights, International, Social and Economics department, Trade Union Congress, UK

The first presentation by Dorota Lepianka (DL) focused on dependency. She argued that dependency is on the one hand unavoidable for human beings - i.e. that all human beings are dependent in some way or in certain phases of their lives – but that on the other hand dependency is often seen as a burden and/or as a character flaw. Subsequently, she focused on the role of public policy both for the creation of dependency and for promoting justice. Policies can, for instance, create (unnecessary) forms of dependency by making distinction between deserving and undeserving group or by stigmatization. On the other hand, policy can promote justice through more tailored measures which target specific groups and accommodates human diversity. More in specific Lepianka argued that vulnerable groups should be included in public deliberation.

The second presentation by Ann Campbell drew on her work for VALIDITY, an NGO which focusses on the human rights of people with mental disabilities in central and eastern Europe and east Africa. She argued that we should move away from thinking about atomist individuals who are either dependent or independent and undeserving and deserving, towards thinking about the unconditional human rights that every individual has, which should include duties towards individuals. She argued that every individual is vulnerable, not just specific groups. And that the focus should therefore be on situations of vulnerability and not on vulnerable individuals. As examples of policy she mentioned the African Charter and the CRPD, which put forward interpretation of human rights along these lines.

The third presentation was by Rosa Crawford who is a Policy Officer of the UK Trade Union Congress. Rosa identified a set of drivers of dependency of workers in the UK: extreme deregulation, exploitative contracts and 0 hours contracts. Migrant workers are particularly vulnerable and especially in a political climate in which the interests of UK workers are typically framed in tension with the interests of migrant workers. This is something that the union is trying to overcome. She outlined the following policy recommendations: 1) more regulation of labor market 2) Abolishing 0 hours contract 3) a Brexit deals with guarantees workers' rights 4) an acknowledgement that workers' rights are human rights 5) initiatives to make sure that migrant workers join the union

Following on from the successful thematic workshops, a Panel discussion on Justice in policy making was held, chaired by **Trudie Knijn,** University of Utrecht, ETHOS project leader) with panellists representing the ETHOS research team, B. Oomen (Utrecht University), M.P. Meneses (University of Coimbra, Center de Estudios Sociales), **Marie-Pierre Granger** (Central European University) and **Sybe de Vries (**Utrecht University). The panellists reflect on policy recommendations that came up during the respective policy meetings "Footloose Europeans" and "Categorizing dependency and vulnerability".

   1. *Policy recommendations on Footloose Europeans*

Barbara Oomen (BO) addressed three questions that she believes are crucial in connecting research to policy: First, who are we talking about when we talk about vulnerable peoples? BO argues that the people we are talking about are moving targets by themselves. We should be talking about people in Europe and not of Europe. We should also be talking about those who are under the influence of Europe, such as the former colonies. We should think about to what extent European justice also applies to these groups of people. Furthermore, we should be careful of categorizations and that policy makers should be aware of this. Second, how do we share our findings? This question is important as we should also be aware of what we do, e.g. share information as researchers should take into account how politics work in this day and age, for instance, when we talk about migration, this 'talk' takes place in tweets, framing is of importance, politicians know how to make use of this. And the nuanced text in books cannot be reduced to this political reality. Thus, what

would be able to deal with this, are narratives of justice – this is also how populists play the crowd. Then our task is to find a way to move from a legal analysis to big topics of justice. By collecting examples that could provide a direct bridge. The added value of ETHOS is that people are more interested in stories and narratives instead of statistics. Third, with whom do we share our findings? BO finds that at a local level many interesting things are going on in terms of what mayors are doing and accomplishing. They combine principle politics with a pragmatic stance. We see in the Netherlands multiple examples of how local government can effectively work together with social movements and policy makers.

Maria Paula Meneses (MPM) draws a connection between WP6 and other WP's where we talk with people, but we don't write with people, that is the problematic position in which we researchers find ourselves. But common people have the right to be heard. We as researchers should be the middle link between vulnerable people and politicians. But still there is a gap. This gap is constructed by how we think about the economy, e.g. a virtual world of finance. Through this, we are re-enacting the colonial past. This does not renovate the poor, but rather kills the poor. Yet the way the economy functions is neutralized. We are using technocratic languages instead of the language of the people. There is a domination of the market over the social. And what about the role of researchers? We see a lack of ambition among researchers to address these problems. As researchers we should depart not from the principle of multiculturalism, but multinaturalism. We should address the question what it means to be human and how we live with nature. We need a humanity that is responsible in a world that is in the making. Justice is then something that lets us remain in the diversity. Both regarding the ecological question as also in terms of citizenship in Europe.

Trudie Knijn (TK) observes in the two perspectives presented by BO and MPM a commonality. Both are trying to find an articulation of knowledge, a medium to bring forward our knowledge of people that might at first instance not listen to us but nevertheless we have to be sure that they get access to what we have to say. E.g. TK was talking to Hungarian journalists that under the current public administration deal with many problems. Yet what the main problem addressed by journalists is the bubbles in which we live. Everyone is reading their own media. This also translates to policymakers. How can we approach policy makers who live in their own bubbles?

---

2. Policy recommendations on "categorizing dependency and vulnerability"

Sybe de Vries (SV) summarized how the discussion on vulnerability revolved around the question of how human diversity can be combined with ideas of commonalities in the context of vulnerability and deservingness. SV referred to the talk by Ann Campbell from VALIDITY who critically reflected on the common focus on the vulnerable – i.e. a specific category of people who are considered vulnerable versus thinking about vulnerability as people in vulnerable situations.

SV stated that by using this framework we can not only talk about human rights but can look beyond human rights. Referring to the talk by Rosa Crawford, from Trades Union Congress EU, which focused on how migrant workers are used as scapegoats for the problems of UK workers through a vulnerability created by law itself – or enhanced by law. SV made reference to case law of the European Court regarding a case involving a Romanian citizen who was seeking social benefits in Germany. The outcome was that whilst the Court stuck to the law, the language of the court was very revealing in that the court emphasized how the plaintiff did not work and did not aim to ever work. The judgment showed how the plaintiff was undeserving. When comparing this case to others, it shows that law can enforce vulnerability among people. SV continued that this case example shows the potential of law to inform policy. Whilst these judgements of the European Court of Justice are not enforceable in law, they can be used to inform policy making, e.g. via Ethos policy recommendations.

SV relayed his opinion that there is also a limitation of law, and that as an EU lawyer specialized in social market economy, he was very aware of the need to be careful in what is communicated, citing Brexit as an example in that, so many untrue things have been said about the role of the EU.

Marie Pierre Granger (MPG) argued that vulnerability is a useable concept, but at the same time, it is a contested notion which can become counter-productive, given that it produces resistance and conflicts as it is associated with particular groups. MPG continued by supporting the earlier statements of Dorota Lepianka who argued that we are all vulnerable at a certain point of time and that vulnerability is situational. MPG urged the group to look at related issues, other than vulnerability itself, as to tackle vulnerability, consideration must be given to the fact that vulnerability means something different in varying situations. MPG continued stating that in conveying a message it is very important to think of the public, ensuring that you also talk to majorities who somehow feel left out, questioning how the message is conveyed and how to change the way people think. As academics we want to be make sure we can support a case. But what seems to work are stories that make a difference, maybe we need to, without lowering our standards, find ways to tell good stories. MPG conveyed the opinion that a lesson learned from this ETHOS project is that responsibility has different aspects, it can have an individual or collective nature, and that perhaps a change of paradigm by telling stories to reach the desired audience could be a solution.

As a lawyer, MPG stated that she seeks balance, to rebalance the individual and the collective, yet acknowledged the need for a legal instrument to support social justice claims. MPG continued to state that not all claims are individual or individualizable and that principles are enforceable, citing Environmental Justice as an example. In her experience MPG has come across various cases that are trying to make a point that Member States have an obligation to do something about Environmental Justice, although in practice, only obligations that can be enforced in courts put these identified issues on any real agenda.

Trudie Knijn (TK) concluded the session by taking the opportunity to remind everyone that ETHOS is a project that we do at the request of the European Commission implying that the European Commission is eager to know about and to deal with Justice and fairness. Also, policymakers are not the same as politicians, in that they work at a local level or at ministerial level. TK continued by stating that the majority of policymakers try to do the 'just' thing and that it is the media and politicians or who 'spoil the broth' by blaming the European Commission for all manner of issues. TK finished by stating that the regional and local politicians are independent of what the national politicians say and do and that it is the European Commission who wanted to know what building blocks are of a European theory of justice and thus funded this project to do just that.

Plenary 2;

In the 2nd plenary session, 2 keynotes were given. The first was by **Philippe van Parijs** (Professor and director of Hoover Chair of Economic and Social Ethics, University of Louvain) on ''Just Migration, Within and Into Europe''

Abstract:

For the left in rich societies, there is no more cruel dilemma than the tension between maximal generosity towards the weakest among the insiders and maximal hospitality towards the many outsiders who are keen, indeed sometimes desperate, to immigrate.

When endeavouring to determine what immigration policy our country or the European Union should adopt, we should not deny or hide or minimize this dilemma. Nor should we yield to whatever democratic majorities happen to demand. We need a clear conception of what a just world would be like and a pragmatic, no-nonsense, opportunistic approach to the measures that could take us closer to it in the messy world we live in.

The second keynote was given by the CEU President and Rector **Michael Ignatieff** on ''The Ordinary Virtues''
Abstract:

Michael Ignatieff described his research for the book *The Ordinary Virtues* as motivated by questions about moral globalisation: Has moral globalisation accompanied economic globalisation? Have human rights become a global ethics? To what extent have human rights worked its way into the vocabulary of ordinary people? What is the "moral operating system" by which people operate and live side by side? What Ignatieff found as he travelled different parts of the world conducting interviews was a local, contextual morality, rather than the elite discourse of a rules based international order. People expressed tolerance, and the willingness to take people "one at a time", without adverting to the abstract language of human rights and universalizing moral justification. There was, however, one striking finding that did seem to show the impact of the global human rights movement: the fact that all the ordinary people interviewed took it for granted that *what they said mattered*. Materially, things haven't always improved, but a fundamental sense of subordination is gone. This relates to the powerful, modern idea that all peoples are equal, and have a collective right to self-determination. And it has led both to a revolution of expectations and to nationalist revolts. Ignatieff observes that European justice it depends on a painfully acquired, embedded framework of the rule of law. One way to think about the problems in Hungary and Eastern Europe is that they are living through the consequences of recognizing equal rights to self-determination and sovereignty and rejecting this framework. So, can pan-European justice survive the nationalist revolt in Eastern Europe? One reason to think it will, is that when the nationalist regimes say; "we are the law", they thereby deny the intrinsic sense of moral worth and human dignity of their own people. The protests against the "Slave Law" in Hungary, Ignatieff argues, are not motivated by economics, but rather by the sense of insult people feel at what they see as the government's aggressive contempt. A fundamental sense of equality may yet save us.

Concluding Session

Trudie Knijn closed the conference thanking everyone for their attendance and involvement extending a special thanks to the Advisory Board members in attendance.

Trudie Knijn, once again thanked Simon Rippon, Marie Pierre Granger and CEU for being such excellent hosts and also extended that thanks to Katalin Harskuti and Zsófi Jeney during the General Assembly meeting held shortly after.

Trudie then proceeded to close Conference.

WORK PACKAGE MEETINGS

Work package 2

ETHOS researchers of WP2 have participated in he first sessions of Work packages 3 – 6 to get involved in the development, foci and discussions of the empirical studies. At the second Conference day the philosophers workshop started with invited guests. The presentations and discussions of the philosophers workshop are reported in Deliverable 2.4.

Work Package 3:

Session 1

Opening, discussion of the country reports for deliverable 3.4. and 3.6, and discussion of the comparative report for deliverable 3.4.

Barbara Oomen opens the WP3 part of the conference, and explains the schedule.
First Tom Theuns gives an overview of the WP7 integrative work package progress, to which WP3 also provides input, and explains the architecture of the ETHOS project; disciplinary overviews synthetized in D2.3. and empirical findings of each WP contribute to a theory of justice in the sense of understanding what Europeans consider justice, and then it will be integrated and contrasted with a normative theory justice developed on Rawlsian and Weberian bases.

After this introduction, country rapporteurs (or their representatives) presented their findings for the national report on the right to vote. Tom Theuns thereupon discussed preliminary findings and argumentation of the comparative report on the right to vote, and all members discussed what else is needed in the country reports to provide the comparative report with comparable input from all countries.
Finally, country rapporteurs each gave an overview of the findings of the country reports on the right to education.

Session 2&3
Presentation and discussion of preliminary findings for deliverables 3.5 and 3.6, discussion of publication plans, authorship and plan on further feedback on the reports

The make up for the morning meeting by presenting and discussing the comparative reports in progress for the right to education and the right to housing (and not presenting each country report for this latter one.)

Accordingly, Orsolya Salát presented her preliminary findings for deliverable 3.4. She raised the question to what extent could the actual implementation of the legal provisions be asked for and compared, since in some cases it is apparent that education, especially for the disabled, is so underfinanced that the law on the books is not really applied or fulfilled. The decision was made that such information can be included if available, but country rapporteurs cannot be burdened with much more work in this regard, and it is better to focus on contestation in courts which was in the original design as well.

Furthermore, the decision was made to explicitly revisit the questions of which justice conception is visible on the basis of the country studies, and that rapporteurs should not limit their inquiry into a single "R", but include all three "R" (ie. Representation, recognition and redistribution) and other conceptions, especially after having read the extracts of deliverable 2.3.

Hereinafter Marie-Pierre Granger presented preliminary findings on the right to housing (noting several dimensions or comparative angles, such as central or local competence in housing assistance; individualized or collectivized approach to housing (assistance); the role of different players and political institutions and courts – the more individualized, the more court-based, the more collectivized, the more political organ based; emerging institutions of justice – governance of justice issues, and the mobility dimension, as the residential requirement usually excludes mobile citizens.

Thereupon we discussed the special issue plan and preparation for the CES conference in June in Madrid for which our panel proposal was accepted. It was agreed that by the end of February, everybody should come up with five ideas on where to publish either a special issue or three articles.

Maddalena informed us that Veronika was not happy with publishing the country report on the ETHOS website. We agreed we would talk to her directly, since that was the agreement made previously, and otherwise it is very hard to give proper referencing in the respective comparative reports.
The meetimng closed with the discussion of further publication plans, and agreed on the timeline to give feedback on the country reports.

Work Package 4:

In the WP4 first session, in the first part of the meeting, we discussed the Deliverable 4.3 *Discourses on Minorities' (and Vulnerable Groups) Access to Education: Inclusionary and Exclusionary Aspects*, focusing on the most salient themes/elements of the country cases. In the discussion we touched upon issues of access to education, diversity and recognition of difference (managing diversity, difference blindness, misrecognition and the question of values and cultural worth), social cohesion, equal participation in society and capabilities, trust, representation and well-being and capabilities. The partners provided feedback to the report. Some of the feedback received pertain to the; highlighting of the scales of justices (national, municipality, cities, periphery, etc.) discussed in the report; different kinds of sociability and belonging and relation of belonging and well-being of children; tensions between equality and difference, role of broader value creation; history of certain groups in society and recognition barriers to social justice reflected in education.

In the second part of the meeting the work on access to education was linked to research on media; how education-related debates are presented in the (social) media. Partners presented the results of their case studies and highlighted the most relevant outcomes. Interesting cross-overs in the country cases were discussed, including strong polarization of views/frames present in the media, the function of victimization of different groups, topicality of 'white/elite/middle class' flight, discursive appeal of biological racism. A number of themes/tropes were identified as relevant to address in the comparative report and further theoretical investigation, such as the diverging claims to 'truth', competing claims to 'protection'/security; role of and trust to state institutions with respect to securing unbiased treatment; importance of deliberation.

During the second WP4 session discussion focused on the progress made with respect to case studies on historical justice and the practice of commemoration. The methodological challenges related to the sampling of "opinion leaders" and the use of a vignette design were discussed. In short presentations researchers highlighted the main assumptions behind the design of their country vignette, sample selection and recruitment of respondents, and preliminary results (if available). In the discussion that followed links to previously conducted research and deliverables within WP4 and other WPs were drawn. A few themes emerged as relevant for a comparative and theoretical investigation, including the relativity of time (what is history?) and truth (whose truth?), problematization of ethnic/racial categorization and/or moral dilemmas inherent in hierarchization of victimhood.

During the final WP4 session the outline of the WP4.5 *Historical memory and the practice of commemoration in public space – mapping moral sentiments of opinion leaders and other stakeholders* country reports was presented and discussed with all partners involved. Following the discussion of the outline of D4.5, the publication strategy of the WP4 was discussed. Partners have been asked to express their preferences and priorities regarding joined publications spanning a number of country reports and country cases. Pertaining to the publication plans; some partners are willing to write articles from their country reports, collected work could be an option, joint publications (focusing on two or more comparative country cases) could be pursued.

Work Package 5:
Session 1
1. D5.3 – submitted in ECAS. Bridget Anderson described the challenge of applying capability theory to this topic. She outlined key findings in terms of capability, independence and coercion, and capability, temporalities and process. The group discussed the D5.3 policy recommendations, matters of time and temporalities, and possibilities beyond contract and fictive kin.

2. D5.4 (Extended delivery date March 31, ready for internal review February 15)

D5.4 is in progress. Trudie Knijn presented the outline of the report by accentuating that the focus on the boundary lines between public and private care will be reformulated because on the one hand private life is exposed all-over in the public domain and on the other hand public systems are transformative regarding private life. In addition, the country reports focus mainly on publicly paid home care, less so on fully private care and fully public (residential) care. The focus therefore will be on a) boundary lines in care policies between paid home care and paid residential care, and b) on the perception of paid home care versus residential care. In the policy analysis redistributive justice comes to the fore in assessment criteria, accounting and regulating payments for care, and qualifications, salaries and working conditions of care workers. Here the question is who is in- and excluded, how is care work valued and controlled and which care needs and care work are presumed to be private or public responsibilities? Recognitive justice is the central theme in the analysis of the perception of paid home care. Independent living as a hegemonic paradigm at the UN, EU and national level reflects a tendency towards individualization that also includes people in need of care for reasons of age, disability or both. That paradigm however includes the risk of self-responsibility, family dependence and a consumerist attitude towards care workers.

The report will explore if seeing care as an interdependent relationship might contribute not only to more inclusive redistributive and recognitive justice regarding care needs (because it can happen to all) but also to redistributive and recognitive justice regarding care workers (because of the (re)valuation of this highly gendered job). In the discussion national reporters accentuate the importance of distinguishing between interpretations of 'independence'; does it mean making autonomous decisions or does it mean self-responsibility because of austerity reforms. Another issue brought forward is high variation in the quality of both paid home care and residential care service between the selected countries; such as patient oriented residential and home care in some and rigid low-quality service in both sectors in other countries. Generalizations on basis of the D5.3 data is impossible, but the case studies qualified for an indicative analysis of the boundary lines between various kind of redistributive and recognitive justice.

Session 2 on D5.5
The aim of 5.5 is to examine what people understand to be the relation between contemporary welfare states and social justice – if indeed they think that there is a relation at all. We discussed the case study protocol and how this might be captured in ideas of 'deservingness'. It was clarified that we are interested in social assistance rather than social insurance. Bridget suggested that we might want to simplify access by approaching organisations and individuals that we have worked with in relation to other ETHOS tasks and this would also help keep dialogue going. Co-ordinators are appreciative of the limited time and difficulty of access and while of course it would be good to interview social workers who have overseen retrenchment this is not a requirement. Take into account that reforms have hit people who have lost their benefit and who are not traceable anymore.

Country reporters to send bullet points of Part 1 of the national report, plus a list of potential interviewees, and a brief note on how they will translate 'deservingness', and how (if at all) this might be related to 'justice'. Bridget and Pier will then devise a topic guide for interviews on the basis of this and circulate by February 22nd.

Session 3 on publications.
Bridget will submit a paper with Pier on D5.2
Eva is submitting a paper on the Hungarian case study for 5.2
Trudie will submit an article based on D5.3 and D5.4, Bridget considers contributing as co-author.
We recognised the importance to younger scholars of publishing in disciplinary journals, and that given our disciplinary mix we might find it difficult to publish all in the same journal. Therefore, all country report authors are invited to send their ideas for publication on the basis of 5.2, 5.3 and 5.5 to the co-ordinators. They are actively encouraged to co-author cross-national articles with other ETHOS members.

Work Package 6:

Session I:
Presentation by coordinators of WP6 of the overall goals of the 3 sessions planned for Budapest meeting
short presentations by Sara Araujo and Barbara Safradin on preliminary findings of 6.2 - 6.5, Short presentations of each country regarding D6.2 and D6.4

Presentation D6.1:
Theoretical paper in which Castro Caldas shows a trend for economizing on justice, exemplified by a trend to see this discipline as a value-free science, indifferent to or even adverse to redistributive justice claims. This trend, we argue, has detrimental practical implications for the realization of social justice. A positive note is that though economy as a science has been an ally of neoliberalism it does not mean that neoliberalism is the only way as is many times presented. The subsequent deliverables deal with institutional resistance to injustice: D6.3 (fundamental rights), D6.4 (social dialogue) and D6.5 (access to justice and alternative dispute resolution mechanisms - ADR). Three of these reports involve comparative field work – D6.2, D6.4 and D6.5 – and D6.3. is legal comparative paper in the context of social justice in times of crisis.

D6.2. The non-realization of distributive justice
Before the 2008 crisis, the European Social Model was an anchor for the active role of the welfare state in ensuring some levels of social protection. With the crisis, the EU established economic and social policies countering the notion of social investment, opting to align with structural adjustment and austerity measures. The crisis and the austerity measures did not hit everyone in the same way, neither did the 'one-size-fits-all' character of the austerity measures. The countries experiencing greater difficulty and harder deregulation policies in welfare and labour rights were those having experienced stronger neoliberal transformations. Several social vulnerable groups, i.e. women, young people and immigrants, were more affected by the crisis and austerity measures than others. These groups are already in a disadvantaged situation in the labour market and in the economy. In reaction to the crisis, a young and high educated European generation organized public protests against social inequality, demanding a new model of social democracy.

6.3. The impact of the European Charters in times of crisis
The focus was placed upon two main systems of protection of social rights in Europe: the *EU Charter of Fundamental rights*, and the *European Social Charter*. The *EU Charter of Fundamental rights* has incorporated a Solidarity Title IV covering various social and workers' rights, including the right to fair working conditions, protection against unjustified dismissal, and access to health care, social and housing assistance. All EU Member States are bound to this document - except for the United Kingdom and Poland who have secured Protocol No. 30. The scope of the *European Social Charter* is broader in terms of State parties that are covered, and more comprehensive in terms of social rights it contains. Indeed, this document – unlike the EU Charter – is also binding upon Turkey. D6.3 identified several policy recommendations that could allow Europe to move towards a more effective social rights protection for European citizens: elevation of the so-called social principles into real enforceable rights that have the same equal status as civil and political rights; the Court of Justice could recognize more explicitly the significance of the CoE Social Charter in fundamental social rights protection at EU level; the EU legislator should involve the European Social Charter in legislative proposals as initiated by the European Commission; more awareness should be created on the use of the EU Charter in the judicial domain; the EU should prioritize the EU's accession to the European Social Charter to better

integrate its internal market rationale with its social dimension. Re-thinking the division of powers, and particularly whether it is desirable to extend Europe's competences when it comes to the social pillars, remain important questions for today's social justice experience of European citizens.

Comments by the Advisory Board members on the basis of these presentations:
These principles are power resources to be activated and avoid a too legalistic approach. Also, legal relationships should be more present in the papers and problems detected. The trade unions should be more inclusive but how? Other forms of collective action that are being picked up by the media, e.g. collective claims but not through a union should be looked at; power of media to stage authoritarian states; institutions and reality; how to catch up with it?

In the second part of this session, all partners have shortly presented their findings and policy suggestions regarding 6.2 and 6.4. On the basis of these presentations, we have asked the partners to send in their brief policy recommendations to Sara and Barbara by mail on these deliverables.

Session 2. Discussing work to be done for 6.5 and how WP6 correlates to the other work packages
6.5. ADR mechanisms and realization of social justice on the labour market
The comparative report, which is being drafted by Sara and Barbara, will contain three parts: 1) Historical context of ADR in the Western societies; 2) ADR and access to justice, including some statistical/quantitative data on effectiveness of ADR in labour conflicts in Europe; 3) comparative analysis of ADR, including the mapping national realities - analysis of the different realities (type, nature, when was introduced, etc.) and ADR and access to labour justice - Discussion (How is ADR experienced by citizens?), including the advantages and disadvantages of social dialogue per country, focusing on; i) being closer to citizens, ii) costs of ADR compared to civil litigation; iii) power relationships.

(Postponed) deadline for internal review: 15 February by Barbara and Sara
Maria Paula suggested that the partners should send in their comments and add policy suggestions regarding 6.5, to be communicated with Barbara and Sara.

Session 3. Publication and dissemination strategies
Publications: 5 to 9 articles for WP6
- All national reports are going to be published with an ISSN number
- Barbara will submit a paper with Sybe on D6.3
- The idea is to integrate all the deliverables into one special issue/book (especially the country reports on social dialogue 6.4 could serve as a good starting point for this), to be streamlined by Maria Paula and her team
- Review process: could be done internally within our own WP
- Some national reports are too long, but also do not contain enough empirical findings and should therefore be updated
- Hungarian Academy of Sciences: Intersections journal – peer reviewed: we could integrate our findings in this journal as well
- As raised by Volkan, for the publications we have to take into account the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), which Is required by their faculty.
- Book proposal for Routledge on the special issue, e.g. 6.4 on social dialogue mechanisms and their implications on realizing justice in Europe → the added value is our comparative element in discussing social dialogue

   Dissemination strategies
- Podcasts on the findings – short podcasts of 5-10 minutes
- We could discuss our findings with some stakeholders → for example with young women representatives within employment and plan a meeting or two with them
- Short booklets in different languages
- Share our findings on public events, e.g. Festival Europa that takes place in May in Utrecht, as hosted by the European Law faculty: workshop on ETHOS – struggles for justice: Sybe has prepared a meeting with Joost de Laat to discuss this issue further

Work Package 7:

Session 1

The first session of WP7 was attended by all Work Package coordinators (or their substitutes) and has been prepared by distributing D7.1, D2.3 and a working paper on 7.2, written by Trudie Knijn, Dorota Lepianka and Tom Theuns. At this meeting the Trudie Knijn, Dorota Lepianka and Simon Rippon presented the proposed outlines for the methodological framework for integrating normative theory and empirical findings. Four integrative models have been presented and discussed.

Provisory policy-recommendations. In line with a democratic and public ethos, the ETHOS project does not generally prescribe particular policy recommendations as absolute and universal demands of justice. Rather, ETHOS takes the integrative perspective of justice and fairness in Europe – comprising the refined ideal-types of justice resulting from the coherent method of finding a sort of 'reflective equilibrium' of disciplinary-theoretical and empirical conceptualizations of justice – and works out how justice could be furthered were one to adopt such ideal types as political ideals. The resulting recommendations therefore do not take the absolute form 'justice requires reform X' but the provisory 'reform X would further the ideal-type of justice-as-representation' (or, conversely, 'reform Y would take us further from, say, the ideal type of justice-as-recognition').

Policy recommendations derived from the technique of 'real world political philosophy'. Much of the difficulty with prescribing particular courses of action justified on the grounds of their furthering justice-ends is that there is deep-seated and pervasive disagreement over the standards of perfect justice. Yet, as ETHOS deliverable 2.2 reports, there is an alternative approach that can nevertheless bridge the gap between empirical observations and normative analysis: real world political philosophy. This, 'non-ideal', approach insists that in many instances incremental improvements in alleviating manifest injustice converge on particular reform objectives and are not held hostage by disagreements at the level of more fully specified normative theories of 'ideal' justice.

A critical perspective: the integrative perspective on justice and fairness in Europe offered by the refined ideal-types are not ideal in the normative sense, they are ideal in the heuristic sense of helping us explore what Europe understands by justice. The normative analyses developed in ETHOS Work Package 2, and particularly explored in the workshop on 'Justice and Beliefs about Justice in Europe', however, nevertheless allow us to get a critical distance from this integrated perspective to ask to what extent how Europe understands justice in fact corresponds to the demands of justice, normatively speaking. The ideal-types may, after all, reflect European prejudices and exclusions just as much as they reflect European aspirations.

A constructive perspective: none of the above defines an exclusive role for either empirical research or normative philosophy in the articulation of an integrated Theory of Justice and Fairness itself. This question – of the relation of the empirical data to normative theory – is however a specific philosophical question in its own right and one on which the ETHOS project takes no general position, developing instead an integrative perspective combining theoretical and empirical research on how Europe, and Europeans, understand justice. Particularly ETHOS Deliverable 2.4, which reports on a Philosopher's Workshop on 'Justice and Beliefs on Justice in Europe' will explore in further detail the various philosophical views in the vivid debate on the proper

role of empirical data in normative theory. The last 'bridge' therefore, takes the various 'constructivist' positions in this debate.

Session 2
The second session of WP7 was attended by all ETHOS researchers and has been prepared by distributing D7.1, D2.3 and a working paper on 7.2, written by Trudie Knijn, Dorota Lepianka and Tom Theuns. These authors presented the proposed outlines for the methodological framework for integrating normative theory and empirical findings, which were discussed plenary.