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On 22 and 23 May 2015, the Organisation for Universal Citizenship (OUC) and CCFD-Terre Solidaire, in partnership with Espacio Sin Fronteras (South America), the Center for Migrant Advocacy (Asia) and Alternative Espaces Citoyens (Africa), organised a conference on alternative migration governance. In a context marked by shipwrecks in the Mediterranean Sea, the meeting brought together almost 160 people from more than 30 partner organisations.

The seminar aimed to reformulate the ethical, historical, statistical and political framework for the debate on international migration and to focus in on various alternatives to the migratory models existing in Europe and other parts of the world, whether Latin America, Asia or Africa. Another aim was to consider which new stakeholders should be involved in building an alternative form of migration governance (local authorities, universities, migrant networks, etc.). All of the above points were illustrated by testimonies from places such as São Paulo in Brazil, Manila in the Philippines, Niamey in Niger and Grande-Synthe in northern France.

Lastly, a more in-depth discussion was held in order to come up with a new form of migration governance, taking into account four key issues:

1. Freedom of movement and settlement, for universal residence-based citizenship.
2. Migration and economic and social transition.
3. What form of community life should be promoted in order to renew social cohesion in our societies?
4. Migration, crises, wars and climate change.

The above discussions resulted in the drafting of the beginnings of a roadmap towards an alternative and democratic form of migration governance.

During the meeting, a Universal Citizenship Passport was issued to artist and navigator Titouan Lamazou, community activist Gus Massiah and Deputy Secretary of State for Human Rights of São Paulo City Council Rogério Sottili.

Alongside the conference, at the request of around 100 organisations, an event was organised for the evening of 22 May to pay tribute to migrants who had died in the Mediterranean Sea and to condemn French and European migration policies. Almost 500 people attended, including comedian Guy Bedos, who has held a Universal Citizenship Passport since 18 December 2014.

This document aims to reflect the event as accurately as possible, although the exercise is inevitably influenced by the sometimes-subjective views of the rapporteurs and facilitators. Nevertheless, it forms a representative summary that can be referred to when identifying the main concerns expressed during the round tables and workshops, and provides a long-term record of the meeting.

The document is structured as follows:

- Preliminary statement by Bertrand Badie.
- Summaries of the two round tables.
- Summaries of the four workshops.
- Overview of the elements forming the initial basis for a collective debate on an alternative form of migration governance:
  1. Shared principles and visions.
  2. New stakeholders identified.
  3. Specific actions to be carried out.

This document aims to serve as both an assessment tool and a useful working instrument. It is neither a traditional record nor a linear report of what was said during the meeting, but rather a contribution to the debate conducted by a diverse group of stakeholders (migrants, civil society associations, local elected officials, researchers, universities, etc.) and a means of harmonising the work of all those stakeholders, for whom an alternative form of migration governance is an absolute necessity.
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to congratulate you for having organised this meeting at a moment that is both deeply symbolic and deeply tragic, and for having asked the right question. That question is actually a positive question relating to governance, rather than a negative question relating to law enforcement or repression. Let’s adopt this positive point of view. Let’s try to understand. Let’s see what it is possible to do – and believe me, I am not the only person who thinks this, many things are possible. The word “governance” is a weird word. I remember the comedian Philippe Meyer doing a radio show during which he explained that the term was strange and lamented the fact that intellectuals had no idea how to talk like ordinary people. Nevertheless, it is interesting to study the word.

The word governance appeared around 40 years ago, to a certain extent at the same time as globalisation, but the concept is much older. Historians agree that the concept of governance dates back to the early 19th century, possibly to the Congress of Vienna, when “international” began to mean something other than the clash of great powers. As soon it became apparent that there were security concerns to consider, requirements for the well being of populations and values to protect and to respect, the “international” issue was inverted. It no longer related to perpetual conflict but was the beginning of a debate on what was referred to as an international order, and later an international regime.

It is a good sign when the issue of governance is raised. It is a sign of increased awareness, based on two elements – firstly a past failure and secondly a disconnect in the current situation. Everything about our current assessment of migration suggests failure – for example, the failure of repressive policies that have been extremely costly for those poor people in the Northern countries who have had to devote a portion of their wealth to repressing those who have wished to join them. That expenditure has proven completely pointless and largely counterproductive. Repressive migration policy in its various forms has always resulted in failures, and costly failures at that – it is costly for the victims (for what it’s worth), but it is also commonly acknowledged that it is costly for those who are directing the policy. It has also led to the failure of all those programmes we have heard so much about, such as assisted return or repatriation, the result of which we are well aware of. I could go on and talk about the tendency to combine cooperation with the “fight” against migration. How many politicians have told us that by making people less unhappy or more happy in their home countries, we will discourage them from coming to join us in ours? It is absurd! It is absurd because migration is not a question of unhappiness versus happiness – it is frustration that is the main and deciding factor. Disparity. Imbalance. In no way is a successful cooperation policy (which we are very far from achieving, by the way) a factor in reducing migratory pressure. Another failure that is not acknowledged often enough is the failure to predict future developments. Being of a certain age, I have witnessed some amazing moments, such as the collapse of the USSR when we were told that there would be crashing waves of migration from the East that would flood the unfortunate countries of Western Europe. Then we were warned about migration from the Balkans, and later about increasing migratory flows from Africa to Europe. However, in 50 years, migration has increased from just over 2 percent to 3 percent of the global population. Where is the torrent? Where is that unsustainable pressure that would make a mathematician laugh? From 2 to 3 percent of the global population! We must keep all these failures in mind.
The error made by the false prophets who warned us of these tragedies, the error made by political stakeholders who had prefabricated solutions to address migration-related issues and the failure of the whole repressive regime that has brought with it a long series of tragic events. That is the failure side of things. We also need to consider the “disconnect” aspect. The problem with migration governance is that there is a tremendous disconnect between the reality of migration today and the image portrayed by politicians and political stakeholders. There are two discourses on migration. There is a scientific discourse, which many people in this room were involved in developing, and there is a political discourse. The tragedy of migration is that it has become a commodity used for electioneering purposes. The tragic paradox, the root of the problem, is that rather than being seen as a social issue, and by virtue of that a human issue, migration is constructed as an electoral issue. You have referred to the report on emigration that many of us, including Catherine de Wenden who is here today, drafted at the request of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. When we submitted it, a certain Private Secretary told us, “Ok listen, you may well be right but how can we tell the voters that?”

We are now at the heart of the problem. The concept of migration is not constructed by public policies as the international social issue that it should be but as an electioneering issue, which means that the narrative is completely misleading. It is misleading historically, statistically and with regard to the purpose and the very nature of migration. And so irrespective of the reality of the situation, we are told that migration is detrimental to two forms of security – people’s security on the street and job security, not to mention cultural security. And that is a phenomenal disconnect. Secondly, it is important to understand that migration is not the same today as it was 50 years ago. It carries an entirely new meaning. The mistake of politicians is that they have refused to acknowledge this transformation. There is no relationship between migration in a so-called globalised world and migration in a world that we refer to in our jargonistic way as “Westphalian” – a world that was strictly inter-state in nature.

Migration as it should be understood in today’s world has nothing to do with the migration that we remember. Statesmen must work out how to take this fundamental historical transformation into account when establishing a new political position in the globalised context. That new political position has never been discussed. And that is the real issue here. Aside from the meeting we are taking part in today, what other conference would consider reflecting on the new meaning of migration, using that as a starting point to derive maximum benefit for the good of all? What I am proposing, what a great many people are proposing, is that migration should be seen as a form of “good mobility”, a form of mobility that can offer added value to the world, as young people today would say, we should be “thinking positive”. Let’s think positive about migration. Because it offers wealth. It offers tremendous wealth. So what does this change in meaning mean? It is intrinsically linked to the idea of globalisation. Let me make two very mundane and very modest comments on globalisation. First of all, globalisation is a reality that we will never be able to undo. It is mentioned less these days, but there was a time when we talked about “deglobalisation” – indeed, the day the bicycle was invented, some people probably advocated “debicyclisation”. Because, after all, the bicycle could be dangerous. No, globalisation will not be abolished. Why? Because globalisation is based on something irreversible, and something that I consider to be very positive, which is widespread communication. And widespread communication is a significant development. The opportunity for anyone to get in touch with anyone else and the fact...
In an inclusive world where inequality lurks, where social contrasts are more evident and prominent than ever before, reducing those contrasts becomes the number-one security requirement.

To think that we can give borders the same functions in 2015 as we gave them in the days of the Maginot Line or the blue line of the Vosges is madness.

The more we move towards homogenisation, the more people will express pluralistic reactions. That is a logical dialectic of human history.

Migration is becoming a normal phenomenon, a healthy phenomenon that the world needs in order to regulate itself.

When you want to put a student in detention, just ask them to define globalisation – which is an absolutely impossible thing to do! However, it is generally agreed that it has five characteristics:

The first characteristic is inclusion. That is to say, in the world we have inhabited since 1950-1940 – it is difficult to date modern-day globalisation exactly – globalisation has placed all human beings on the same stage for the first time in the history of humanity.

In an inclusive world where inequality lurks, where social contrasts are more evident and prominent than ever before, reducing those contrasts becomes the number-one security requirement. Thinking about migration today means thinking in terms of this vital process of reducing social contrasts. Migration should be viewed as a kind of antidote to these huge social and economic disparities and should not be disregarded. Inclusion means that for the first time in the history of humanity, the international stage is multicultural and – extremely importantly – that otherness prevails over universality. Universality is the product of a little club – we form our own values and assume that they will suit everyone. Otherness is the reverse – it is about saying, “I am going to work with the other to build universally, the universal. I am going to do it in partnership with the other”. Again, that will give migration new meaning. Human mobility is another means of enabling that otherness and its capacity to produce the universal. It is what we refer to in our odd jargon as “cultural hybridisation” and everything that is associated with it. It is a very important phenomenon.

The second characteristic of globalisation is de-territorialisation. I said earlier that globalisation has enabled us to abolish distance, but we have also abolished territory. We are living in a world where it is assumed that goods – and of course finance – must move around. But it is not just finance and goods that are moving around; everything is circulating – sounds, ideas, visions, information. That is something completely new in our long history of international relations. It means that in future – and even today – borders will never mean the same thing that they did in the past. To think – and this is at the heart of any repressive policy – that we can give borders the same functions in 2025 as we gave them in the days of the Maginot Line, the blue line of the Vosges or other hallmarks of our contemporary history is madness. It is a kind of madness that reminds me of the Soviet delegates at the 1976 UNESCO General Assembly held in Nairobi who called for the adoption of an international convention prohibiting waves to cross borders. Let us rethink migration in relation to these borders. I am not saying that they no longer exist, but simply that they no longer have the same meaning they might have once had.

The third characteristic of globalisation is the dialectic of homogenisation and cultural resistance. Globalisation effectively constitutes a set of cultural models that “Macdonald-ise” the world, that “Coca-Cola-ise” the world, that “blue jeans-ise” the world. This phenomenon exists, and it is worth remembering that under the chador of the Iranian revolution, at the time of the marches in Tehran in 1979, young women wore blue jeans and loved to watch Inspector Colombo on the television. That is not a catchphrase – it is something that I observed myself in 1977-1978 in Iran. That kind of universalisation and hybridisation exists; meanwhile, however, never has the individualistic or resistant nature of cultures been so strong or assertive. There is no contradiction there. On the contrary, the more we move towards homogenisation, the more people will express pluralistic reactions. That is a logical dialectic of human history. It is about saying, “I am in solidarity with everyone but I am maintaining my own personality”. That individualism can be used positively and it can also become the emblem of my protest, and perhaps of my hatred or violence – in any event it is an expression of my frustration and dissatisfaction. After all, people have the right to be dissatisfied and they have the right to express their frustration. And that dialectic is at the heart of globalisation today.

The mortar of politics traditionally relies on the idea of distance. The fundamental difference between the ruler and the ruled was that the ruler was in control of distance while the ruled had to go through the ruler in order to control that distance. Well that difference no longer exists. Our new world gives migration a whole new meaning. My second comment is this: globalisation reminds me of cholesterol. Why? Because there is good cholesterol and there is bad cholesterol. Likewise, there is good globalisation and bad globalisation. Good globalisation is what we can build if we work together. Bad globalisation is what will overwhelm us if we cannot to manage it properly. In the case of good globalisation, there is a core value that is at the very heart of our action, and in a more general sense at the heart of our sensibility, which is solidarity. Globalisation enables solidarity and solidarity humanises globalisation.

I do not need to explain to NGO activists to what extent globalisation has increased the scope for building solidarity – something that the inward-looking Westphalian world could never offer. And bad globalisation constitutes the dynamic of inequality that is mechanically generated by any globalisation process. So you have good and bad cholesterol – solidarity and inequality – in opposition with one another. And depending on whether the balance is tipped one way or the other, we will end up with either good or bad globalisation. That form of globalisation will guide us, shape our thinking and lead us to view migration in a different way.

Migration is a normal phenomenon, a healthy phenomenon that the world needs in order to regulate itself.
The fourth characteristic is interdependence. We are living in a world where everyone depends on everyone else. That is why the idea of sovereignty is not longer sustainable. Everyone depends on everyone else, which means that the weak depend on the strong – you’re thinking ‘that’s nothing new’ – but what is new about this situation and the point that I am making is that now the strong also depend on the weak. The strong depend on the weak and power no longer has the capacity it once had. And the strong depend on the weak in terms of their economic future. The German economy depends on what happens in the Greek crisis; in terms of public health, how can AIDS be eradicated in Europe without also being eradicated in Africa? The happiness of others, my happiness – let’s start with my happiness – my happiness now depends on the happiness of others who are suffering. That means that my chance of being happy will depend on my ability to free those who are suffering from their misfortune. That is why I believe that we no longer live in a world controlled by power. Power no longer works, it no longer wins wars; we are no longer living in a world controlled by power, but in a world controlled by suffering. It is suffering that is directing the course of things. And we have the ability to control suffering, which will determine our chance of survival and our future happiness. That is to say, if you want to be happy where you are, ensure that others are a little less unhappy where they are. On that basis, migration is becoming a normal phenomenon, a healthy phenomenon that the world needs in order to regulate itself.

The final characteristic of globalisation is communication and visibility. We are living in a world where everyone can be seen by everyone else, which has changed communication and visibility. We are living in a world where everyone can see what’s going on in another country, which means that the world is aware of frustrations and inequalities. For example, when I mock someone who is oppressed, rejected, marginalised, stigmatised or vilified, I am effectively creating the conditions for a new form of violence. Moral education is about knowing how to respect others. Respecting others is not easy because it means dispensing of some of that limitless freedom that we would like to readily enjoy. But respecting others is far superior to that – the concept of respect is superior to that of freedom, which is a selfish concept and is based on the idea that we have a right to simply enjoy ourselves. The idea of respect is a positive form of freedom – it is about giving others freedom. Freedom in the traditional sense of the word means self-reliance. Respect is about exposing others to freedom and consideration. And the whole issue of migration should be reconstructed in that sense – it is about ensuring that when the other is compelled or forced to come and live with me, they have an absolute right to exist as other, and then work with them to build true freedom. Lastly, what direction could this governance take? What is currently being proposed is not very clever, for two reasons. Firstly because our Westphalian world, a world in which politics are abused, a world that has a tendency to think that security relates first and foremost to politico-military matters, has always neglected social governance in favour of political governance. The UN Security Council, which has now passed far more than 2,000 resolutions, has devoted just two to social issues, the first of which related to AIDS and aimed simply to protect members of UN peacekeeping forces from infection. Yes, global social governance is struggling to establish itself. But social migration governance is struggling most of all insofar as the only relevant body to be established in 1945 was the International Organization for Migration. The IOM was specific in two senses: 1) it was not part of the UN system; and 2) it had extremely weak resources for intervention. That means addressing the issue of migration not between states but with states, and also with social stakeholders from NGOs, churches, representatives of local and regional authorities, and migrants themselves, whether they are organised or not!

The sociology of migration is a sociological analysis of the signs of inequality (...) a straightforward logic of international social integration.

We need a moral education in Durkheim’s sense of the word – a moral education based on a transnational social bond. What is moral education? It is respect. It is otherness.

When we consider that there are currently 33 million working people in Italy but that in less than 10 years, there will be less than 30 million – i.e. 3 million fewer working people in the space of less than 10 years – it’s inevitable that the winds will blow. Natural winds cannot be halted, and we will not halt migration in a globalised context. Similarly, when we consider that there are currently 65 million working people in Nigeria, you don’t need a degree in Economic Sciences to know which way the wind will blow. The sociology of migration is a sociological analysis of the signs of inequality. If we really want our planet to survive, we need an international social policy. We need international social integration, and migration will be the human engine of that. It is inevitable. We are dreaming if we think that we can exist in a context of interdependence and inclusion without re-establishing wealth ratios more fairly, what is more, there is a chance that that dream could very quickly become a nightmare. The great Durkheim emphasised the material nature of social integration. Access to goods. Hence the need for the welfare state to be considered in social policies and integration policies. However, in the language of his time, Durkheim also told us that, ‘this social integration will only be possible through moral education’.

The social bond that is forged is a functional bond, but if that functional bond is not coupled with a shared desire to live together and ensure mutual respect, it will not work. Money is not enough. If we look at things in a global context, we need a moral education that is based on a transnational social bond. What is moral education? It is respect. It is otherness. It means no longer mocking or getting trivial pleasure and delight from mocking the Prophet by placing him on a dog’s body, etc. etc. Because when the weaker party is attacked by a form of humour that is not really humour, they will inevitably interpret it as a rejection of their otherness. I have a right to poke fun at a stronger party, to mock my equal, because we are on equal footing. When I mock someone who is oppressed, rejected, marginalised, stigmatised or vilified, I am effectively creating the conditions for a new form of violence. Moral education is about knowing how to respect others. Respecting others is not easy because it means dispensing of some of that limitless freedom that we would like to readily enjoy. But respecting others is far superior to that – the concept of respect is superior to that of freedom, which is a selfish concept and is based on the idea that we have a right to simply enjoy ourselves. The idea of respect is a positive form of freedom – it is about giving others freedom. Freedom in the traditional sense of the word means self-reliance. Respect is about exposing others to freedom and consideration. And the whole issue of migration should be reconstructed in that sense – it is about ensuring that when the other is compelled or forced to come and live with me, they have an absolute right to exist as other, and then work with them to build true freedom. Lastly, what direction could this governance take? What is currently being proposed is not very clever, for two reasons. Firstly because our Westphalian world, a world in which politics are abused, a world that has a tendency to think that security relates first and foremost to politico-military matters, has always neglected social governance in favour of political governance. The UN Security Council, which has now passed far more than 2,000 resolutions, has devoted just two to social issues, the first of which related to AIDS and aimed simply to protect members of UN peacekeeping forces from infection. Yes, global social governance is struggling to establish itself. But social migration governance is struggling most of all insofar as the only relevant body to be established in 1945 was the International Organization for Migration. The IOM was specific in two senses: 1) it was not part of the UN system; and 2) it had extremely weak resources for intervention. That means addressing the issue of migration not between states but with states, and also with social stakeholders from NGOs, churches, representatives of local and regional authorities, and migrants themselves, whether they are organised or not!
of agreements and conventions have been concluded, the Convention on Migrants’ Rights having been signed by only around 30 states, not one of them European.

What we need is a regime – a form of governance based on three principles. Firstly, we must abolish the status quo by changing our thinking, which we have already talked about. Secondly, we must promote inter-sociality. International relations are finished. I am probably the last professor of international relations and I am retiring very soon. Now, inter-social relations are emerging as a replacement. They are the relations between societies that will result from this new form of migration regulation and governance. And that implies multi-stakeholder governance. It means addressing the issue of migration not between states but with states, and also with social stakeholders from NGOs, churches, representatives of local and regional authorities, and migrants themselves, whether they are organised or not! Lastly, it means building a form of migration governance that is “win-win-win.”

What does that mean exactly? It means that everyone can benefit from the proper management of migration – departure countries, destination countries and migrants themselves. Good migration, good mobility must first and foremost be informed. It is crucial to inform migrants about the countries they are travelling to and the terms and conditions for accessing those countries. It is a form of assisted migration. A form of migration that is seen as a global good. Let us demand from this global good everything that migration can offer in terms of the rebalancing of social budgets, the demographic deficit in the Northern countries, the need for new kinds of employment, the capacity of migration to generate new jobs and the cultural hybridisation that enables all national societies to become more international. If we could ensure that migration led not to forced suffering but to people’s understanding of one another, we could also – based on this social innovation – create the conditions for a new international interpretation of world peace. I truly believe not only that migrants are the future of the world but that migration is the solution for our world.
Three representatives from various associations and one university academic presented migratory models from four parts of the world – Europe, Southeast Asia, West Africa and Argentina. By highlighting various different models, they illustrated that there is an alternative to the criminalisation of migrants and the closure of borders.

Nation states have not adapted to the global challenges represented by migration, climate change or the problem of food security. It is necessary to establish a new form of international governance. However, migratory models are often influenced by security concerns, the legitimacy of which are questionable, and are the result of the interdependence that exists between the image that politicians build from public opinion and the images that are created by public opinion, which in turn is influenced by the dominant political narrative. Therefore, bilateral agreements between countries undermine the right to freedom of movement, for example in the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). In 1979, ECOWAS established a protocol relating to freedom of movement, the right of establishment and the right to residence, which since 1995 has enabled people to move between and settle (for 90 days) in any of the 15 ECOWAS countries without the need for a visa. Since then, Europe’s desire to involve certain African countries in its migration control policy has influenced that protocol and overshadowed the rights enshrined therein. However, the example of Argentina has shown that it is possible to base migration policies on human rights. Jorge Muñoz comments:

Argentina is the first country to have recognised the right to migrate in a law, in its substantive law, in the legal and institutional architecture of the country. (Jorge Muñoz)

These analyses of different migratory models allow us to propose strategies for establishing policies that respect human rights:

**AT THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL**

- Ask the United Nations to organise an international summit bringing together Heads of State and civil society in order to address the issue of migration.
- Build a global form of migration governance that goes beyond the inter-state model, is founded on human rights and is based on:
  - Social protection,
  - Fully open borders, the only viable option viable in the context of current migration challenges,
  - Freedom of movement and settlement.
- Think about coherent and relevant migration policies that find solutions to combat the phenomena of interdependence and state influence (forms of neo-colonialism, the political and economic domination of Western countries, etc.).
- Strengthen the role of local authorities in migration governance by creating a network of towns and cities that can promote alternatives.

**IN THE EUROPEAN UNION**

- Establish a new basis for the European migratory system, which until now has relied on three misconceptions:
  - Since 1976, economic crisis has implied the end of economic migration.
  - Repatriation is the solution to the migration problem.
  - The scale of migration to Europe is so large that the phenomenon will eventually result in the substitution of Europeans by non-Europeans (the “great replacement” demographic theory).
Build communication with the general public based on accessible, clear, pedagogical arguments. Work to combat dominant narratives that are conveyed by the media and the political authorities despite the fact that economic and social context is neither supportive of nor receptive to them.

Build cross-cutting, multisectoral migration policies so as to implement integrated policies that are more coherent and relevant and to move away from a compartmentalised and contradictory approach (e.g. agricultural policies that encourage young people to migrate away from rural areas).

IN ASEAN
- Make use of the dialogue frameworks established by the IOM Regional Consultative Processes on Migration in order to get governments to recognise and open up negotiations with migrants’ organisations.
- Ensure respect for human rights. Adopt, ratify and apply legal texts that could govern the issue of migration within ASEAN, particularly with regard to the rights of women and children.
- Highlight the fact that the majority of ASEAN states have ratified certain fundamental texts for the International Labour Organization (such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families) in order to have greater influence in negotiations and advocacy work with states.
- Build alliances with organisations other than those dealing with migrants and the protection of migrants’ rights, such as trade unions.

We recognise the contribution of migrant workers both to society and to the economy of ASEAN [...] we are already in a win-win-win situation. (Ellene Sana)

IN ECOWAS
- Strengthen the civil society that is emerging in West Africa, which is involved in supporting and welcoming migrants and "returnees" (migrants who have returned to their home countries).
- Address the economic and demographic challenges in the region (food crises, climate change, democratic challenges, etc.) through global responses and not just through bilateral agreements.

IN UNASUR
- Ensure the broad dissemination and communication of information on the implementation of the Argentine law and hold it up as an example to the rest of South America and the world.
- Take action to avoid risking the postponement of the Argentine law in the event of a change in the political regime.
During this round table, three statements by representatives of local authorities and a migrants’ association and one statement by a university professor indicated that alternative governance practices were being implemented in various regions and resulting in certain innovative policy principles that could be replicated elsewhere.

From Grande-Synthe, a small French town in Nord-Pas de Calais, to a metropolis like São Paulo it is possible to make real progress in ensuring access to fundamental rights, integration and the economic, social and political autonomy of vulnerable migrant populations. Grande Synthe, for example, has chosen to transform the accommodation of long-term migrants into solid structures, thereby avoiding the perpetuation of a dominant model according to which migrants are deliberately accommodated in temporary, precarious and unfit conditions. In São Paulo, it was decided that migration issues would be dealt with by a Secretariat for Human Rights, which completely changed people’s attitudes towards welcoming migrants and ensuring that they became fully recognized citizens who were able to exercise their fundamental rights. Those migrants then became aware of the political need to organise themselves at various levels (local, national and international) in order to establish their legitimacy as political stakeholders and to engage in dialogue with governments and social and economic stakeholders.

The stakeholders in a new, democratic form of migration governance must include universities, which, through their research and dissemination work, must support changes in attitudes towards migrants and take part in defining a new form of governance.

These experiences and their positive results for migrants and the societies that welcome them allow us to highlight a number of policy principles:

- Base migration policies on the capacity of municipalities to support migrants by placing human rights, assistance and support at the heart of their interventions.
- Create opportunities for cooperation between municipalities and other stakeholders that are affected by migration (support organisations, state representatives, etc.) in order to promote permanent dialogue on assessing and responding adequately to the needs of migrants. With regard to local public policies, towns must be able to offer opportunities for intersectoral consultation and the coordination of policies aimed at the total integration of migrants (for example, that implemented through the coordination of migrant policies by the São Paulo City Council, Brazil).
- Create municipal infrastructure for welcoming, supporting and providing comprehensive care to migrants, taking into account their cultural diversity, vulnerability and needs.
- Promote the active participation of migrants in the drafting of public policies (political integration) by creating discussion forums and supporting the development of migrants’ organisations.

Our sense of humanity forces us to go beyond legal frameworks to support people in difficulty.

(Damien Carême)

It is necessary to construct a new public policy paradigm that is capable of integrating migrants in all their political, economic and cultural dimensions.

(Rogerio Sottili)
Facilitate access to banks to encourage savings, access to credit and the sending of funds to migrants’ home countries, thus facilitating the economic integration of migrants.

Include the festivals celebrated by migrants in the cultural calendars of towns and cities in order to give visibility to their cultures, facilitate cultural integration and fully establish multiculturalism.

Strengthen the creation of networks of migrants from the same countries, as is the case with Diasporas, which unite people through their sense of belonging to a particular nation and/or the sense of belonging to a socio-professional grouping (for example, domestic workers from the Philippines), in order to reinforce their recognition and acceptance.

Federate migrants’ organisations and promote networking among those organisations at the national and international levels in order to pool their activities and to increase their representation and legitimacy in conducting their work.

Promote interaction with official and institutional stakeholders and bodies (outside strategy) without disregarding the scope for action within civil society (inside strategy).

Ensure that universities play an active role in the production of scientific content on migratory phenomena and in the teaching of these issues. They must be involved in multi-stakeholder forums so that they can enrich the discussions and offer their points of view.

Like university stakeholders, we must do more in the area of migration and work with other stakeholders. (André Mangu)
With regard to the issue of open borders, we must now go beyond idealism and make this concept a reality. In that regard, we can refer to the research conducted by the MobGlob group (CNRS/SciencesPo), which forecasted the impact of open borders on migration. That work resulted in practical scenarios based on various different timescales and “migration pairs”. Below are two key findings that emerged from this work:

1. Open borders will not lead to massive influxes of migrants into one area or another, but will generate greater overall movement of people.
2. They will also lead to the emergence of more pronounced “invisible” internal borders (in terms of access to the labour market, housing, health, etc.).

The issue of open borders presents a certain number of political challenges:

1. Addressing the ideology (on both the right and the left) of immigration, which is seen as a problem that needs to be regulated and controlled through border controls.
2. Addressing the idea that it is necessary to reproduce in future what was done in the past and that it is not possible to start afresh. That idea leads to a purely managerial policy on migration, the only consideration being “how many migrants are there?”
3. Addressing ideological obstacles to open borders – on the right, a major upheaval of identities and on the left, a liberal deregulation of social rights – and addressing the fact that migration has now become an electioneering issue.
4. Addressing the question “who will be the first to dare to open their borders?” which is crucial in the context of globalisation, given that until now the opening up of one border always resulted in the reinforcement of another (Europe, India/Nepal/Bangladesh, Australia and New Zealand).

Workshop 1

FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT AND SETTLEMENT, FOR UNIVERSAL RESIDENCE-BASED CITIZENSHIP

Speakers:
> Paulo ILLÉS,
Coordinator or migration policies, City Council of São Paulo, Brazil.
> François GÉMENNE,
University professor, Brussels, Versailles and the Paris Institute of Political Science.
Participant in the debate:
> Claire RODIER,
Legal expert at GISTI and co-founder of the Euro-African network Migreurop, France.

The first, essential political step is to recognise the reality of migration both as a fundamental good and as a structural world development that is not subject to controls or, paradoxically, governance.

(François Gémennée)

THE EXPERIENCE OF LATIN AMERICA RELATING TO THE ISSUE OF MIGRATION

In São Paulo, with support from the Espacio Sin Fronteras network and the municipality, activists and decision-makers initiated a debate entitled “another possible world”, which focused on freedom of movement and universal citizenship, in spite of a great deal of resistance. In Latin America, borders are open but the necessary migration policies are lacking. Therefore, it is not really a question of freedom of movement but of residence rights. As was the case elsewhere, the primary concern when signing the Mercosur agreement in 1995 was that of the free movement of goods, while the issue of the social and cultural integration of peoples was not raised. The dynamics of social movements and the rise of progressive governments in the region since 2000 have changed the discourse on regional integration. In the region there are 30 million “internal” migrants and there is an urgent need to design a system for the protection of their rights that goes beyond the agreement on freedom of residence within Mercosur that was signed in 2002 (which eliminates the need for a passport and makes identity cards the standard travel document for Mercosur residents). Another parallel process, the Andean Community of Nations, is also underway in the region. That body has offered many thoughts and proposals concerning migration and freedom of movement. Alongside those two processes, the Espacio Sin Fronteras network has emerged, the objective of which is to bring together social movements to discuss an alternative to the current discourse on migration and development.
It is important to be careful and clear when it comes to “regional citizenship” to ensure that we do not end up locking ourselves into a particular region, in confrontation with those outside it (example of the European Union and the creation of the Schengen zone), which complicates future processes to legalise migrants and ensure their rights. Two conclusions could be drawn here:

- Open borders must be linked to the issue of public policies.
- Local, networked initiatives must of course be developed, but there must also be opportunities for dialogue with national governments, and even international organisations.

**THE CONCEPT OF UNIVERSAL CITIZENSHIP**

“Universal citizenship” is not a legal concept, it is a political and social concept that is reinforced through the struggle to guarantee human dignity, but which also implies a certain number of rights. Understanding this concept means understanding that, before the right to migrate even comes into play, people have a right not to migrate, the right to choose their destiny. However, the current economic system denies a great many people this choice, owing to inequalities that have developed. These inequalities must be understood in order construct the paradigm of universal citizenship, which involves guaranteeing happiness, the right to residence, the right to vote and the right to social participation. Extract from the Declaration of the 2010 World Social Forum on Migration in Quito: “We defend the right to settlement and integration as a result of the achievement of economic, social, cultural and environmental rights, the right to free movement and the right of return, the right to migrate and the right not to migrate or be displaced, and the right to peace, given that borders have become rights-free zones. We call for a new United Nations convention that guarantees respect for human rights on all the world’s borders.” To that end, we must develop and coordinate local, national and regional policies. With regard to the right to vote and stand for election, for example, there are some countries that deny migrants all political rights, while a great many others recognise their right to vote at the local level but not the right to stand for election. Bolivia amended its constitution in 1994 to allow foreign citizens to vote in local elections. In 1993, Estonia granted migrants the right to vote locally. The Nordic countries – Norway, Finland and Sweden – recognised non-European migrants’ right to vote at the local level, and even the right to stand for election in the case of Finland (subject to having been in the country for at least two years). Likewise, in South Korea migrants have the right to vote and to stand for election as long as they have been in the country for at least three years. There are numerous examples of positive initiatives that could be discussed.

**WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?**

Based on what we already know and the discussions held during this meeting, how can we move on to the next step? Firstly, let us recall the open letter sent by a group of organisations to Lionel Jospin when he was elected Prime Minister of France in 1997. The letter made a number of proposals in support of freedom of movement, explaining that borders would open up in any case and were already open in some places, but that they were not being opened in an equal manner, thus causing havoc and resulting in the need to monitor the process. The response was the adoption, within six months and with very little debate, of a law that was identical to previous ones. We must work to overcome this total lack of understanding, this refusal to listen.

Various questions are raised:

- With regard to open borders, how should we begin and who will decide to initiate the process?
- Is the local level the appropriate level at which to start challenging the policies imposed on us?
- Can we learn from and reproduce the initiatives undertaken in São Paulo, for example, concerning citizenship that is unrelated to nationality?
- Are we not at risk of creating “fortresses” through these local initiatives?
- How can we integrate the issue of forced migration, which is currently very significant in Europe?
- How can we include the issue of refugees in the debate on universal citizenship and our gradual process to ensure that everyone, irrespective of their nationality, is treated as a citizen when confronted with situations such as those we are currently seeing in Southern Europe?

The primary substantive question seems to be this: can local action be an engine for widespread, international action? We must question the role, place and tools available to local authorities, taking into account the diverse nature of these structures around the world.

The second question is: how can we benefit from the experience of social movements in order to include that element in the dialogue we are trying to have with governments? Is there any point in working with governments; wouldn’t a better solution be civil disobedience?

There is a refusal on the part of the political authorities to listen to the arguments of migration experts and social organisations dealing with the issue.

(Paulo Illes)

(Claire Rodier)
OUR SET OF COMMON PRINCIPLES

1. To change attitudes towards migration and move towards a more peaceful and beneficial vision; to approach migration-related issues from a social perspective, separate from security and law enforcement-related issues, to adopt a cross-cutting, multisectoral approach.

2. To make open borders the basis for a new form of migration governance associated with freedom of movement and settlement and residence-based citizenship.

3. The stakeholders in this new form of governance are not just states but also local authorities, migrants’ associations, social movements, academics and possibly also international organisations.

OUR PROPOSALS FOR ACTION

1. First priority: To work on moral education in order to win the ideological battle and shift the perspective on migration-related issues, notably by mobilising migrants and social movements so that they can be a force for change and to show that open borders is a credible policy (the main form of media in that respect being television, given the need to reach out to groups of people that we are not already familiar with).

2. To work on the organisation of a large international conference on migration, involving all the above-mentioned stakeholders, and to base the discussions on “freedom of movement and settlement and residence-based citizenship”.

3. To seek to link up existing initiatives, particularly at the local level, through the creation of a network of towns and territories (bearing in mind that elected officials change).

To summarise, proposals for the roadmap

- To link up local and national policies relating to open borders and the integration of migrants, while working to ensure that they do not create “invisible social borders”.
- To create opportunities and mechanisms for debate at the local, national and international levels, which will highlight successful experiences in terms of freedom of movement and settlement and the ability of migrants to integrate, based on grassroots work (networks of territories, international conference, etc.).
- To build credible arguments in favour of migration and to improve the way in which we present them to new audiences and elected officials, so that migration can be recognised as a fundamental good and a global structural development that is not subject to controls.
It is crucial that we should understand migration patterns from a rational, scientific point of view, taking into account historical factors and the contexts in which migration has occurred. There are currently 232 million migrants (people living outside their original country of citizenship for at least six months) around the world. The ILO calculated that in 2010, around 105 million of the 214 million migrants around the world (i.e. the majority of adult migrants) were economically active. The labour contribution of migrants to the global economy represents between 2,500 and 3,000 billion dollars a year. In Europe, migrants represent between 10 and 20 percent of workers, depending on the country. Migration provides both a workforce, in particular in areas where it is lacking, and also skills and technological innovation. It also compensates for diminishing populations in a large number of countries. It is clear that development will not survive in Europe without an increase in migration. We often forget about the significant amount of indirect aid that the Southern countries contribute to the Northern countries through the transfer of skills, education and so on.

One challenge when we talk about alternative migration governance is that, while few people have noticed it, a new form of governance has established itself in recent years – one that places responsibility for migration policies in the hands of interior ministries and oversight institutions all around the world, whereas in the past that responsibility was given to ministries of labour, social affairs or social protection. Furthermore, the only body existing currently that discusses these issues at the global level, the Global Forum on Migration and Development, is a governmental body run by states whose leaders are representatives of military institutions, interior ministries and ministries of foreign affairs.

There is a long-term mechanism that seeks to influence and restructure people’s attitudes towards migrants and migration, to ensure that everyone accepts that migrant workers should legitimately enjoy fewer rights, less access to social benefits and less access to territory, at least when they are not needed.

...While Avoiding an Economics-Based Debate on Migration

The migration issue is above all an ethical issue. If someone is welcomed into a country, it is because they need to be welcomed – it has nothing to do with whether it has been calculated that they will be able to contribute something. We must move away from this calculation-based logic, and even from the concept of "foreign", and move towards a rationale based on the idea of a "shared homeland" in which everyone is entitled to live.

This will involve addressing the issue of language – for example, we should no longer talk about “second-generation immigrants” when referring to children born in their parents’ host country, since they are not immigrants. Likewise, we should no longer use the expression "host country" in relation to the reception of migrants specifically. We should consider publishing brochures on linguistic issues and received ideas. This change in attitudes will also – crucially - involve demanding equal treatment for all workers, whether they are migrants or national citizens, in order to discourage the idea.
that "by opening the borders you will put pressure on wages" and to put an end to the alarming social and economic situation of migrant workers (lack of access to social security, labour rights, etc.) that raises the question of neo-slavery. We must reject all reasoning based on the utilitarian nature of migration and maintain that it is natural to migrate and that every human being has the right to exist anywhere at any time as long as he or she wishes to (as stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights).

It is also important to know how to respond to polemical statements – for example, when it was asserted that "there are too many foreigners in France" Coluche simply responded, "there are too many foreigners in the world".

**WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MIGRATION AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION?**

Firstly, we must remember that there are various types of migration – for example, France receives 65 million tourists a year but only asks 2 million of them to present a visa. There are also three main depictions of migrants – the first dates from the Keynesian period (1945-1980), associates migrants with industrialisation and urbanisation and considers that they can be integrated through social protection, the law and national citizenship. The consequence of this portrayal is that, in people’s minds, citizenship is first and foremost linked to nationality, the issue of borders and state regulation. Since 1980 that depiction has been superseded by a neoliberal depiction that involves neither national citizenship nor national regulation. We are putting forward another proposal for development and social transformation, based on access to rights for all. We must accept that, while there are specific territories and equal rights must prevail in those territories, equal rights must also prevail around the world. It is particularly important to highlight what Edouard Glissant referred to as "multiple identities", which are at the heart of the new form of citizenship that we are advocating. We have an alternative economic model – access to rights for all.

**TEN URGENT ISSUES RELATING TO MIGRATION**

1. The lack of legal protection for migrants and refugees.
2. The explicit characterisation of migrants, refugees and foreign citizens in general as being inferior to national citizens and less deserving of the right to equal treatment.
3. The criminalisation of migrants and migration.
4. The focus placed on trafficking by people traffickers, which accentuates the criminal angle, and the simultaneous strengthening of military and control measures.
5. The rise in xenophobia and violence vis-à-vis migrants throughout the world.
6. Abusive and unfit working conditions and working relations.
7. The systematic and structural discrimination and exploitation of migrant women.
8. The suppression of migrant-related work and migrant organisations.
9. The denial of any access to social protection, health care, etc.

**TEN POINTS FOR INITIATING THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION**

1. Fight for the recognition and protection of all migrants, by calling for the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and calling for a new international treaty on the rights of all migrants.
2. Re-establish the dominance of a rights-based narrative, stop referring to migrants simply as economic stakeholders or victims who need our charity.
3. Decriminalise migrants and migration.
4. Conduct positive and explicit campaigns against xenophobia, racism and discrimination, work on multiple identities, win the ideological battle on the issue of migration.
5. Establish decent work for migrants as a global imperative.
6. Encourage and support the participation of migrants in associations and trade unions.
7. Ensure the existence of migration laws and policies, taking into account gender issues.
8. Make health care a universal right.
9. Extend social protection to all people, in order to develop universal social protection.
10. Support the family unit and family support.
WHICH ELEMENTS OF CIVIL SOCIETY SHOULD Collaborate in the INITIATION OF THIS PROGRAMME?

- Migrants' associations.
- Associations that support migrants and civil rights.
- Trade unions.
- Organisations working in the areas of migration and development.
- Women’s organisations.
- Organisations that protect human rights and support international solidarity.
- Refugee organisations and refugee support organisations.
- Organisations working with migrant children.
- Environmental organisations.
- Social protection organisations.
- Organisations working in the area of labour law.
- Progressive faith-based organisations.

To summarise, proposals for the roadmap

We must urgently move towards the social and economic transformation of our societies, based on access to rights for all, at all possible levels of citizenship (local, regional, national and international):

1. Advocate for residence-based citizenship rather than nationality-based citizenship; develop the ideas of regional citizenship and universal citizenship.
2. Begin the construction of a network of towns and cities that will develop social and economic policies based on migrants’ human rights and human dignity.
3. Develop a form of global citizenship, advocating the defence of multiple identities in this globalised world, and promoting universal social protection as a tool for the protection of migrants, and even a form of universal income.

In terms of action, we must urgently encourage an integrated approach to migration governance:

1. Fight for the legal recognition and protection of all migrants.
2. Offer all migrants decent work as a global imperative and thereby apply the standards of international labour law to all migrants.
3. Support and encourage the participation of migrants in social organisations and local unions.
4. Extend social security to all migrants in order to ensure their right to health care.
5. Work on developing a new international treaty on migrants’ rights and universal citizenship.

Win the battle of public opinion and deconstruct received ideas:

1. Work on producing a publication on linguistic issues, to help to deconstruct words and concepts.
2. Produce regular publications on received ideas, to develop a narrative that counters the economic argument.
3. Conduct advocacy work with all relevant authorities (ministries, labour inspectorates, etc.).
Social Cohesion, the Fight Against Racism and Language-Related Issues

The struggle for social cohesion is directly linked to the fight against all forms of racism, xenophobia and discrimination. In that regard, we must question the meaning of various words – deconstruct the semantics in order to update the way in which the “other” is portrayed. The word “integration” must be questioned constantly because “in order to integrate something, something must be disintegrated, differences must be removed”. The everyday use of language is not a trivial matter – for example, someone who comes from Africa is referred to as an “immigrant” while a European who settles in Africa is referred to as an “expatriate”. In fact, they are both expatriates and they are both immigrants. It is the small aspects of daily life that marginalise and exclude people more than anything – cultural codes and behaviour, but also the use of specific language to refer to the other, whom we infantilise, demean and relieve of all responsibility.

One of the benefits of globalisation is that people move around, images and depictions evolve and cultural blends are created. With globalisation, immigrant populations are no longer immigrants. Europe is forced to adopt a multiple, multicoloured identity.

Proposals

In order to deconstruct the social depictions we are governed by, fight against discrimination and facilitate the integration of foreigners, we must:

- Encourage reciprocity in people’s attitudes towards the other and change the way in which the other is portrayed. Work on portrayals, perceptions, stereotypes and prejudices.
- Promote coming-together and respectful dialogue as essential tools for integration (the example of European Neighbours’ Day should be stressed here).
- Reinforce the idea that integration is associated with both rights and responsibilities.
- Combat the idea that integrating a person entails treating them like a child who is forgiven everything. On the contrary, it is about demanding the best from them, and expecting from them what we would expect from ourselves.
- Be open to the meeting of cultures while valuing one’s own roots.
- Improve the use of our vocabulary and our language – use the right words at the right time so as not to discriminate or to pervert the issue of immigration.
- Encourage school trips and exchanges between Africa and Europe.

Integration and Multiculturalism

The way in which African people are portrayed in Europe is largely pejorative, and has worsened over time. The very term “integration” has led to the development of various depictions in French public policies that have helped to define the role of immigration. The French social context does not allow us to think of citizenship in terms of multiculturalism, but is linked exclusively to nationality. Individuals are asked to erase any sign of belonging to family and/or cultural traditions. The paradox is that while they are asked to forget their roots, in practice they are constantly being reminded of the fact that they come from elsewhere. Integration is only possible when a person feels that he or she is being treated the same way as everyone else.

I feel black in the eyes that look at me. I feel doubtful about my integration because other people are always reminding me that I am different. (Fatou Diome)
According to the Court of Auditors, the resources allocated to controlling migratory flows (through management and law enforcement) far outweigh those spent on developing integration policies. We are currently experiencing a selective immigration policy (via the Reception and Integration Contract, or CAI) that is founded on suspicion – proof of one’s integration into French society must be provided by migrants themselves. That is combined with the creation of a new paradigm whereby we no longer talk about equal rights but about equal opportunities, thus promoting neoliberal diversity rather than equal rights.

It is vital to address the issue of diversity in urban areas in order to avoid a situation in which communities turn against one another. In November 2011, according to the National Observatory of Sensitive Urban Zones, 52 percent of residents living in the 751 sensitive urban zones of France were immigrants, that figure reaching 64 percent in Paris. Spatial planning also plays a decisive role in community life.

Integration is also linked to culture – joining a culture and mastering the language is vital. But making language proficiency the sole condition for belonging to that culture is wrong and despotic. Community life is neither a fixed state nor a utopian model – as long as there are living human communities, there will be conflict. Community life in fact involves social cohesion resulting from a real need to combine various forms of solidarity.

The role of school as a platform for socialisation is vital when learning about respect, equality and community life. School is also a great place in which to promote values relating to social cohesion.

The placement of an ethnic focus on community life, which involves resorting to oversimplified so-called “ethnic” categories and is practiced largely by politicians, is problematic because it leads to semantic shifts. For example, the expression la marche des “Beurs” (march for equality and against racism by French Arabs in 1984, the slogan of which was “To be respected like all other citizens”) is an example of ethnic categorisation. This example brings us back to linguistic issues, since the young people taking part in the march stated that, “we don’t want to be tolerated, we want to be respected as French citizens and have the same rights as everyone else”. Again, it is a question of eradicating certain words (tolerance) and promoting others (respect) and of fighting against the oversimplified use of ethnic categories.

PROPOSALS

To rethink citizenship at the European and transnational levels, thereby moving away from the historical model of citizenship, which was constructed at the national level.

To rethink interculturalism as a meeting of communities, a mixing of societies and a mechanism for promoting intercultural exchange.

To find mechanisms for removing the discrimination that affects socio-economic integration and access to the public sphere and rights.

To combat all forms of spatial segregation – to promote social mixing within neighbourhoods through spatial planning and to enhance municipal policies by highlighting diversity as an egalitarian societal asset.

We must promote an uncomplicated relationship with language in order to foster integration.

We must now abandon discussions that are too dogmatic and must not reject the other based on their different cultural practices – let us be more pragmatic in our approach to cultural and religious practices, let us make a distinction between cultural practices and religious practices.

We must work together to develop simple and supportive methods of social cohesion, such as participation in multicultural cooking workshops.

We must return to our fundamental principles, such as equal rights, and reshape the way in which we work. We must also work with public institutions, which have a tendency to create categories and adopt a kind of paternalistic benevolence that reflects the lois scélérates (“villainous laws”) associated with France’s colonial history.

Working for integration involves teaching young people to assert who they are based on reality, rather than on their fantasies.

(Fatou Diome)

To discriminate means to differentiate. Individuals need to categorise in order to establish their own identities. Problems arise when we make certain categories superior to others.

(Rafael Ricardou)
The phenomenon of climate and environmental change generates a number of problems relating to the displacement of populations and forced mobility. The same goes for geopolitical issues created by crises, wars, land grabbing, the reduction of natural resources through various industrial activities, etc. Currently, however, the issue of climate-induced migration is a very hot topic. Owing to the absence of a clear legal position, anything can currently be said on this subject. National and international public authorities do not yet have a legal frame of reference. But the phenomenon itself exists, these realities exist, whether they are the result of natural disasters that have occurred in recent years or of progressive environmental degradation in various parts of the world. A critical approach to the issue needs to be adopted in order to avoid extreme oversimplifications.

Climate-related issues are complex, since environmental or climate-induced degradation either results from political tensions, wars or major water, mining or other projects, or is the cause of such issues (tensions linked to a lack of resources, for example). However, these issues currently tend to overshadow other problems.

The UN is now considering the issue of the status of environmentally displaced persons, which a number of states have brought to the table. These people currently have no precise legal status. And no status means no clear characterisation, no basis on which a legal and political consensus can be achieved. There is now, particularly at the global level, a debate on reaching a consensus that could result in a number of clear, standardised, universally acceptable classifications.

The first observation that should be made is this: The concept of climate-induced or environmental refugees/migrants is difficult to envisage, firstly because such displacement usually occurs over small distances and secondly because the people who are displaced are not always aware themselves of the exact reasons they are leaving their homes. Environmental constraints are rarely the first thing that migrants mention when they talk about why they have left, even when their region of origin has clearly suffered environmental degradation. Three-quarters of all displacement cases caused by new environmental constraints or disasters are not cross-border and do not cover large distances. Also, the term “environmentally displaced persons” should be favoured over the term “refugees” or “migrants”.

The second observation is that, while environmentally displaced persons certainly exist and the situation in a number of regions is serious and will no doubt worsen, displacement caused by environmental constraints is not new and has existed since prehistory. We are not seeing a new phenomenon but find ourselves in a situation that has become difficult to tolerate in a world that has a tendency to become rigid and closed. The question, therefore, is whether or not our societies are ready to welcome displaced persons. Currently, they are not receiving enough refugees. There have always been environmentally displaced persons, but owing to current environmental crises, the phenomenon is growing while our societies are demonstrating much less tolerance for such people and are closing their borders to migrants.

The third observation is that environments do not exist without the people that live in them, and that disproportionate attention is paid to the climate while there are many other things to take into account. (François Mancebo)
within them, and environmental constraints are perceived very differently depending on the population concerned. We are dealing here with the perception of ecosystems rather than the ecosystems themselves – not all societies have the same capacity to adapt in the face of climate change or natural disasters; some societies are more resilient than others.

These observations lead us to consider three major issues:

The first is the importance of the appropriation by local populations of their own environments. If we do not take into account the way in which people manage and adapt to their environments, we will encounter major problems because, under the pretext of helping, we will be contributing to the complete breakdown of those societies. That kind of external aid provided to societies to help them adapt can lead to their disintegration because it prevents them from implementing their own adaptation solutions. Furthermore, indigenous societies do not always have their voice heard by the political authorities in relation to the environmental issues that affect them.

The second issue is the importance of building the capacities of the populations in question, as expressed by Amartya Sen. It is necessary to provide populations with the material, legal, economic and cultural capacity to take ownership of environmentally important matters.

Lastly, the third issue is knowing whether or not people want to leave their homes. When we talk about displaced persons we are talking about people who have already left. It is also necessary to develop adaptation policies and to undertake joint efforts to find options for allowing populations to stay where they are. To develop policies that anticipate events rather than dealing with the damage once it has occurred. Likewise, it is important to ask whether or not people wish to, or are able to, return home.

The issue of time scales is not considered enough - there is rapid migration and slow migration and we cannot adopt the same approach with regard to people affected by a tsunami or a hurricane and people faced with the slow encroachment of a desert, who are displaced gradually.

Today, multinationals are more powerful than states. Who should NGOs now be approaching? Should they be turning to multinationals rather than states?

According to Condoleezza Rice, the tsunami that hit Indonesia was a ‘wonderful opportunity to do business’

(François Mancebo)

THE RISKS OF EXPLOITING THE CONCEPT OF ENVIRONMENTALLY DISPLACED PERSONS

It is important to avoid exploiting the issue of environmentally displaced persons in order to benefit from the opportunities that are associated with it. For example, governments might use a climate-related or environmental disaster as justification for the abusive use of public or emergency aid. It is clear how governments from affected countries seek to use the issue of climate change to secure funds, attract attention and thus glean various benefits that are not necessarily justified by the threat, which in any case is greatly exaggerated when it emerges.

It should also be recalled that natural disasters are sometimes seen as a means of doing business. Such disasters can indeed benefit public or private interests; for example, they can change the social structure of a city if social housing that existed before the disaster is not rebuilt (refer in particular to the case of New Orleans in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina).

Lastly, certain populations, such as the Fula people, are nomadic and move around according to their needs. They are very dependent on the environment and categorising them as environmentally displaced persons could lead to their forced settlement.

PROPOSALS

- Accurately analyse the reasons for displacement in order to find the best response. For example, the encroachment of the Sahara dates back to 1970. In the past, local populations managed to adapt. Their current displacement is not linked solely to desertification but is also due to the fact that the area is now a conflict zone.
- Consider integrating migration policies in all public policies.
- Give local populations the means to express and implement their own solutions in order to avoid the environmental degradation that is at the root of their displacement.
- At the international level, work to ensure that ILO convention No. 169 is not based solely on consultation, so as to integrate the idea of the co-construction of policies.
- Take into account different timescales and do not consider migrants as one homogenous group. Integrate the issue of the ‘right of return’ in our debate, paying attention to its definition (do not confuse it, for example, with the issue of peoples who claim the right to return to their ancestral lands).
- Fight for the establishment of a global tax on CO2 emissions to benefit migrants or societies that need resources in order to adapt (airlines and international transport companies, for example).
- Prepare to receive refugees and displaced persons – for example, create decent reception facilities in large cities so that migrants do not end up living in slums.
- Change people’s perceptions of migrants – work with the media and the national education system.
- Work with local communities so as to be able to take action before disasters occur, work on anticipating events in collaboration with the local population.
How should we move forward? The results of the round tables and workshops conducted during this international meeting entitled “For an alternative form of migration governance” generate material, at various different levels, for discussions and proposals that could form the basis of a road map for mobilisation and advocacy work for civil society stakeholders such as us.

On the basis of shared values and visions and in collaboration with stakeholders that have been identified inside and outside migrants’ organisations, we can implement the future courses of action emerging from this meeting in order to contribute to the implementation of an alternative form of migration governance.

**SHARED PRINCIPLES AND VISIONS FOR AN ALTERNATIVE FORM OF MIGRATION GOVERNANCE**

- Good globalisation is inclusive, deterritorialised globalisation that promotes interdependence and solidarity.

- We must adopt a cross-cutting and multisectoral approach – we must integrate the migration issue in the drafting of national and international public policies. It is vital to anticipate needs and to collaborate with migrant populations in order to value their way of life and begin to acknowledge otherness. Lastly, we must work at various levels, using local experience as a point of departure.

- Freedom of movement and settlement are intrinsically linked to and cannot be dissociated from residence-based citizenship. The implementation of those freedoms will not lead to massive influxes of migrants into a particular area but will encourage increased movement in general. Public integration policies that apply these freedoms must be built in collaboration with citizens and should transcend the strictly national framework, without allowing regions or areas to turn in on themselves, in order to fight against “invisible” social borders.

- There is no alternative to open borders. The security-focused, managerial approach to migration currently being implemented around the world is not only ineffective but also has often-tragic consequences for human rights. We must therefore rethink migration from a social, rather than a security-based and managerial, point of view.

- Migration is an international system that benefits host countries, countries of origin and migrants themselves.

- We must design migration policies using an approach based on objective rights (human rights) and subjective rights (right to settlement and integration), independent of economic issues. We must also create a basis for universal social protection.
IDENTIFIED STAKEHOLDERS: WORKING TOGETHER
FOR AN ALTERNATIVE FORM OF MIGRATION GOVERNANCE

In addition to states and their ministries, which currently have a stranglehold on migration policies, a number of other stakeholders can be identified:
- Local authorities.
- Civil society organisations, in particular networks of migrants (diasporas, etc.).
- University academics and researchers.
- International organisations – UN, ILO, etc.
- Local and indigenous populations.
- Companies involved in social and solidarity-based economy.
- Trade unions, labour inspectors and equivalent bodies.

For each of these stakeholders, we must think about the type of strategies they should develop and their target audiences.

NEXT STEPS

Coordinate various actions at all levels
- Create a network of cities and territories working to support migrants, which can be integrated in a local, regional, national and international approach in order to mitigate the risks associated with changes in government.
- Create opportunities for migrants to participate.
- Develop coordination between various stakeholders working in the area of migration.
- Work to link up local actions in order to better shape our international advocacy work.

Strengthen our demands at the international level
- Pursue the ratification by all states of ILO Convention No. 143 on migrant workers and their families and fight for its effective implementation.
- Establish temporary reception measures, taking into account the right to settlement/right of return.
- Identify new ways of financing those reception measures.
- Draw up our own censuses and citizen databases that are independent of official UN data.
- Convene an international conference on migration.
- Promote a new international treaty on global citizenship.

Develop moral education on transnationality, based on respect and otherness
- Add credibility to our argument on freedom of movement and settlement by developing links with academic stakeholders.
- Build bridges and relationships with sectors that are not related to our activist networks and talk to people from other parts of the political spectrum, in particular those working in the education sector (ministries) and the alternative press.
- Identify best practices and deconstruct the dominant ideology.
- Promote and develop new terminology in order to do away with negative connotations linked to migration.
- Deconstruct and question the messages and language conveyed by policymakers, notably by issuing a publication focusing on prejudices and linguistic issues relating to migration.
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CCFD-Terre Solidaire

CCFD-Terre Solidaire, an international solidarity organisation that has existed for more than 50 years, made international migration a priority in its struggle for solidarity and fair and equitable development.

CCFD-Terre Solidaire believes that human mobility should no longer be seen as a disruptive element in society that undermines political power and national identity. Instead, it should be accepted, valued as an asset and preserved from a cultural, economic and social point of view. Indeed, the modern world is now interdependent and multipolar. States should be able to agree on global solutions and common rules that enable us to break away from systematic bilateralism, or even the unilateralism, when it comes to decision-making on migration. A unilateral view is no longer compatible with the complex nature of migration - a human phenomenon that is deeply social and transnational in nature. The current system of governance is not capable of managing migration in a manner that ensures respect for migrants’ rights. Not only is the right to mobility violated, but the fundamental right of each human being to live in dignity and contribute to his or her development is denied. The choices and positions of civil society are not taken into account and regional and UN governing bodies are not associated with the political decision-making process. Such a vision is neither viable nor promising for the future and, above all, will not ensure the stability or development of our societies. We must now make way for and support other views and possible approaches that are just as legitimate as those promoted by those who simply uphold state sovereignty. Non-governmental stakeholders should be able to participate actively, constructively and jointly in selecting migration policies and sharing responsibilities.

The concept of a new, global form of mobility governance has become increasingly popular in recent years. It seems to be a relevant tool for constructing global affairs in various areas of social and human development and for diverse key political players. It appears to be a possible alternative to the rigid, security-focused and ineffective manner that ensures respect for migrants’ rights. Not only is the right to mobility violated, but the fundamental right of each human being to live in dignity and contribute to his or her development is denied. The choices and positions of civil society are not taken into account and regional and UN governing bodies are not associated with the political decision-making process. Such a vision is neither viable nor promising for the future and, above all, will not ensure the stability or development of our societies. We must now make way for and support other views and possible approaches that are just as legitimate as those promoted by those who simply uphold state sovereignty. Non-governmental stakeholders should be able to participate actively, constructively and jointly in selecting migration policies and sharing responsibilities.

The Organisation for Universal Citizenship is rooted in the struggle for human rights, and specifically migrants’ rights, which is fought by its three founding organisations. Starting in 2011, the universal citizenship project was discussed during World Social Forums, which brought together stakeholders and citizens’ movements from around the world and led to the official creation of the OUC in February 2013. Initiated by Emmaus International, the Utopia movement and France Libertés, the universal citizenship project aims to build a new global political arena for peoples and states that share a common ambition, values and principles, including that of the possible existence of universal citizenship. The OUC was officially launched at a UNESCO meeting in May 2013 that brought together more than 400 participants from all backgrounds and produced the Appeal of 23 May. The OUC founders were supported by keynote speakers (including Christiane Hessel (wife of Stéphane Hessel), Taslima Nasreen, Anne Hidalgo, Carlos Jativa, Riccardo Petrella, Albert Tevoedjre, Tiken Jah Fakoly, Adolfo Kaminsky, Florence Arthaud, Oliviero Toscani, Reza Deghati and Rona Harner) in asserting that, in a context of globalisation and increasing mobility, freedom of movement and settlement was the only credible and realistic option for meeting humanity’s development aspirations.

Organisation for Universal Citizenship (OUC)

In all regions of the world, migration has contributed to the social, cultural and economic development of peoples and societies. Currently, policies relating to migration are characterised by the intensification of controls and an overall decline in the protection of human rights. It therefore seems necessary to view migration from a new perspective and to overcome fears that are based on misconceptions.

The Organisation for Universal Citizenship is rooted in the struggle for human rights, and specifically migrants’ rights, which is fought by its three founding organisations. Starting in 2011, the universal citizenship project was discussed during World Social Forums, which brought together stakeholders and citizens’ movements from around the world and led to the official creation of the OUC in February 2013. Initiated by Emmaus International, the Utopia movement and France Libertés, the universal citizenship project aims to build a new global political arena for peoples and states that share a common ambition, values and principles, including that of the possible existence of universal citizenship. The OUC was officially launched at a UNESCO meeting in May 2013 that brought together more than 400 participants from all backgrounds and produced the Appeal of 23 May. The OUC founders were supported by keynote speakers (including Christiane Hessel (wife of Stéphane Hessel), Taslima Nasreen, Anne Hidalgo, Carlos Jativa, Riccardo Petrella, Albert Tevoedjre, Tiken Jah Fakoly, Adolfo Kaminsky, Florence Arthaud, Oliviero Toscani, Reza Deghati and Rona Harner) in asserting that, in a context of globalisation and increasing mobility, freedom of movement and settlement was the only credible and realistic option for meeting humanity’s development aspirations.
Espacio Sin Fronteras

Created in 2007, the Espacio Sin Fronteras network aims to serve as a platform for civil society stakeholders from various countries in South America to discuss and analyse the issue of migration. The network was officially established in April 2008 as a result of an initiative by immigrants and organisations that wished to be involved in the creation of a regional form of South-American citizenship. The ESF network comprises a set of organisations and national networks in various countries of South America that are involved in the promotion of human rights and immigrants’ rights. The main objective is to make proposals that contribute to the development of migration policies in the region, taking into account the perspective of human rights and regional integration. The network primarily addresses Mercosur, UNASUR, etc. It works to fight against various forms of expulsions and xenophobia in the region and promotes the development of a regional approach to the issue. A study on the policies conducted by each country in the region was officially presented to the public authorities and the media in June 2013. In 2014, it led to the initiation of advocacy work by regional bodies for the construction of a regional form of migration governance. Lastly, the ESF network works within the framework of the World Social Forum on Migration, of which it is a member.

Alternative Espaces Citoyens

Alternative Espaces Citoyens is the Nigerien member of the Alternatives International federation. Since 2007, Alternative Espaces Citoyens has been involved in work to raise awareness and inform the public on migration-related issues. An experienced player in Nigerien civil society that is involved on the national and international level in social forums and collective mobilisation efforts, Alternative Espaces Citoyens has been involved for several years in advocacy, awareness and public lobbying work relating to the issue of the departure of young migrants to the Maghreb. The association conducts communication activities in order to raise public awareness of the situation of migrants. Given the general realisation that migration to Niger should be discussed and be the subject of a renewed public policy, Alternative Espaces Citoyens is strengthening its advocacy and negotiation work with the Nigerien government in order to build a migration policy that respects migrants’ rights. Lastly, it has launched an advocacy campaign on ECOWAS free-movement protocols. Several discussions are underway within ECOWAS and the West African Economic and Monetary Union to promote the idea that the protocol of freedom of movement is not being applied sufficiently.

Center For Migrant Advocacy

The Center for Migrant Advocacy works to protect and promote the rights and dignity of Filipino migrant workers through advocacy work and the provision of assistance to migrants in distress. At the national level, the association lobbies policymakers, Congress, recruitment agencies and Filipino diplomatic services abroad. It also conducts advocacy work at the regional level (POEA, ASEAN, the Abu Dhabi Dialogue, etc.). That work is supported by activities to raise awareness and build a permanent knowledge base relating to the situation of Filipino migrants in host countries in the Middle East and elsewhere.

CMA is also very active on issues relating to international conventions, including the UN International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, which is a tool for building an alternative form of migration governance. In particular, the Center was involved in the drafting of the alternative civil society report in 2013 and has initiated consultative work with the Filipino government on that issue.

CMA also continues to participate and engage critically in the process for the Global Forum on Migration and Development and the second High-Level Dialogue. CMA was an active member in the Filipino organising committee for the fifth World Social Forum on Migration in 2012.

LIST OF SPEAKERS

Bertrand Badie
Hassane Boukar
Damien Carême
Fatou Diome
François Gemenne
Paulo Illes
François Mancebo
André Manyu
Gus Massiah
Jorge Muñoz
Malu Padilla
Rafael Ricardou
Claire Rodier
Ellene Sana
Rogério Sottili
Patrick Taran
Pedro Vianna
Catherine Wihtol de Wenden

LIST OF PARTICIPATING ORGANISATIONS

ACAT
AFVS
Amoureux au ban public
ANAFE
Aplied
Association des Femmes Migrantes de Philippines
Brazilian Embassy
Catred
CIEMI
Cimade
City of São Paulo
Collectif Haïti France
Collectif Sans-Papiers / DIEL
CRID
Emmanus Movement
Fasti
Femmes de la terre FORIM
FSU
GISTI
GMPA
GRDR
Médecins du Monde Migreurop
PASTT
RESF
Sciences Po
Secours Catholique
Secours Islamique de France
Solidaires