

“Introduction: Education and Migration,” Julian Culp and Danielle Zwarthoed

Abstract

This introduction expounds educational problems that arise from transnational migration. It argues that it is high time to critically analyze normative issues of and in education under conditions of globalization, because dominant approaches in normative philosophy of education tend to suffer from both a nationalist bias and a sedentary bias. The contributions to this special issue address normative problems pertaining to migration-related education from a variety of ethical and philosophical perspectives, including analytic applied ethics, continental philosophy, care ethics, Hegelian philosophy, the capability approach and theories of distributive justice. They discuss education of both citizens and migrants in the receiving society as well as in the country of origin, focusing on ethical issues pertaining to access to education as well as to the content of educational programs.

Keywords

Education, migration, global ethics, nationalist bias, sedentary bias

It is a commonplace among contemporary moral and political philosophers that theories of ethics and justice that purport to be action guiding in the here and now have to recognize the globalized nature of social, economic and political life. Thus throughout the last decades there has been a proliferation of theories of global ethics and justice, a great many of which have been focusing on concerns of economic distribution (cf. Rawls 1999, Beitz 1999, Nussbaum 2006, Brock 2009, Singer 2010, Valentini 2012). More recently, however, a considerable amount of attention has been given to a great array of much more specific concerns of ethics and justice within particular areas of global governance. For example, theorists of global ethics and justice have engaged with normative aspects of trade (Hassoun 2012, James 2012), climate change (Moellendorf 2012, Cripps 2016), labor (Young 2007, Barry and Reddy 2012), health (Lennard and Straehle 2014), tax (Ronzoni 2014, Dietsch 2015) and migration (Carens 2013, Miller 2016, Nida-Rümelin 2017).

Following this trend towards specialization, this special issue concentrates on a very distinct set of normative problems arising from globalization. It puts migration-related issues of education on the agenda of normative reflection, and thereby *deepens* the already ongoing debates about the ethics of migration. In addition, this special issue also *widens* the discussion about global ethics and justice by critically analyzing pertinent normative issues of and in education under conditions of globalization. It is high time to widen the discussion about global ethics and justice in this way, because the treatment of core issues within philosophy of education often times continues to suffer from both a nationalist bias and a sedentary bias.

Examples of the nationalist bias include contemporary discussions of educational justice as well as citizenship education. Most discussions of the fair distribution of educational resources and costs seem to assume such distribution will and should take place within the borders of the state – or at least they do not openly address the question (e.g. Jencks 1988; Anderson 2007; Satz 2007; Brighouse and Swift 2009). Yet international inequalities in educational opportunities and outcomes are arguably significant and worrisome in a world in which workers are more and more likely to compete with foreigners for jobs. Prominent philosophical discussions of citizenship education have also confined themselves to a state-centered account of citizenship (e.g. Gutmann 1987; Galston 1991; Callan 1997), with a few exceptions (e.g. Nussbaum 1996, Williams 2003). Topics such as global citizenship education are left to educational scholars, although these scholars tend to overlook the normative aspects of these topics.

Along with the nationalist bias, dominant normative approaches to educational issues suffer from a *sedentary bias*. They tend to assume that those who are educated will stay in their country of education. However, consider a phenomenon such as brain drain. It requires theorists of educational justice to address how the costs and benefits of education should be distributed in a world in which a person might not work and pay taxes in her country of birth. As to citizenship education, several contributions seem sometimes unaware of the fact that a significant proportion of students are not citizens of the country where they are educated. They also ignore the fact that some students might leave their country once they reach adulthood. Yet preparing a person to be citizen in one country does not require the same educational policies as those required to prepare this person to be either a citizen or a non-citizen immigrant in other countries.

This sedentary bias is problematic in at least two ways. First, it may render these philosophical contributions irrelevant to several real-world challenges educational policy-makers, teachers and students face. Second, it tacitly conveys the message that sedentary ways of life are normatively superior over nomad ones. Such assumption is far from self-evident. Should it be true, those who pursue a life of migration would be owed at least a reasonable explanation as to why it is true. As a result, there are several distinctively migration-related normative concerns of education that have not been sufficiently explored in the literature thus far. Such education that relates to migration may be a concern that applies to migrants entering a nation and their children, but also to those adults and

children who are already residents in nations receiving migrants. Particular questions of education that arise from transnational migration include: To what extent, if at all, should adult migrants benefit from specialized educational programs of language development? Should immigrant students receive a greater share of public educational resources than non-immigrant students? How, if at all, should educational policies and practices address the migrants' potential conflict of allegiance between their country of origin and their country of destination? How, if at all, should teaching practices respond to the immigrant children's migration experience?

The contributions of this special issue offer detailed answers to not only these, but also to several other questions about migration-related education. Moreover, the contributions of this special issue also offer more general normative frameworks for critically interrogating questions like these. More specifically, the special issue contains the following four invited contributions by *José Fonseca de Carvalho*, *Tatiana Geron and Meira Levinson*, *Krassimir Stojanov*, and *Carola Suárez-Orozco*, as well as the following four research articles by *Juan Espíndola and Mónica Jacobo-Suárez*, *Faith Mkwanzani and Merridy Wilson-Strydom*, *Senem Saner*, and *Pierre-Étienne Vandamme*:

José Fonseca de Carvalho shows in his intriguing contribution titled "Education as hospitality: welcoming foreigners into a common world" that the concept of hospitality is a fruitful point of departure for determining the values that should inform the educational policies that respond to transnational migration. Indeed, he views hospitality as the *raison d'être* of education itself. Like the newborn, the newly arrived immigrant must acquire familiarity with a new world, its language, and its tacit and explicit rules. Educational activity instantiates hospitality when it involves caring for newcomers and initiating them to their new world. Yet, by entrusting schools with the task of forging a national community, the modern nation-state has rendered school education incapable of fulfilling its promise of hospitality to those newcomers whose personal history does not cohere with the national narrative. The French film *Entre les murs* (2008) communicates an understanding of the isolation and estrangement experienced by immigrant children within school walls. Fonseca de Carvalho concludes by calling for curricular reforms that recognize the importance of more diverse cultural productions.

In their engaged contribution "Intentional Collaboration, Predictable Complicity, and Proactive Prevention: U.S. Schools' Ethical Responsibilities in Slowing the School-to-Deportation Pipeline," *Tatiana Geron and Meira Levinson* start from the premise that all children have a right to free public education regardless of their immigration status. Based on this premise they critically assess the choices and behaviors of (US-)American schools in a time of increasing pressure for anti-immigration law enforcement. Today, schools still have room for maneuver to avoid subjecting undocumented students to the risk of being ultimately deported. Geron and Levinson argue that schools confronted with the "school-to-deportation-pipeline" adopt three kinds of behavior. A few schools deliberately collaborate with officials in charge of implementing anti-immigration law. More frequently, schools are predictably complicit and conform to practices that ultimately put undocumented students at risk, such as allowing police officers in. Only the third behavior, namely proactive protection of immigrant students and their families, positively secures undocumented children's right to education. The normative analysis provided by Geron and Levinson is highly relevant to other North American and European countries, in which young immigrants' access to education is routinely challenged by the alleged need to deport vast numbers of undocumented migrant families.

In his illuminating contribution "Educational Justice and Transnational Migration" *Krassimir Stojanov* begins by noting that public discourses on educational justice often times center on the distribution of the individual opportunities that result from education. Thereby, Stojanov argues, such discourses neglect not only questions of educational justice *in* education that concern, for example, specific teaching methods. These discourses also overlook questions as to which kinds of social and political relationships education should foster. By way of analyzing problems of educational justice that arise from transnational migration, Stojanov shows that the neglect of these two types of questions is highly problematic. In particular, he points out the central importance of inter-cultural modes of teaching

that positively recognize migratory biographies, as well as the need for educational policies that are oriented towards the full societal inclusion of newcomers.

The timely contribution of *Carola Suárez-Orozco*, “Addressing the Needs of Immigrant Origin Children and Youth with an Ecologies of Care Framework,” in turn, responds precisely to these questions that Stojanov argues have been neglected thus far. Concerning specific questions of justice *in* education, she distances herself from a one-size-fits-all model and offers a diverse set of practical suggestions for improving immigrant children’s school experience. Suárez-Orozco’s proposals include after-school activities, services for new and heritage language development as well as parental involvement programs (concentrating on interpretation and translation services). In addition, Suárez-Orozco argues that promoting relations of social and political inclusion requires improving the perceptions of immigrants within the respective contexts of reception. Thus the integration of immigrant origin children also requires educational policies directed at the native born, non-immigrant citizens.

Juan Espíndola and Mónica Jacobo-Suárez’s thought-provoking article “The Ethics of Return Migration and Education: Transnational Duties in Migratory Processes,” however, challenges the idea that immigrant origin children’s full societal inclusion within their parents’ host country suffices as educational end. Rather, because immigrant origin children’s migratory experience is not a singular, one-directional occurrence, but rather a circular flow between their parents’ home and host countries, educational policies must prepare these children for their future participation in both of these countries. In order to render this demand more concrete, Espíndola and Jacobo-Suárez critically examine already existing bi-national educational policies among Mexico and the United States, and offer specific guidelines of how to prepare immigrant origin children for their circular migration flow experience.

Faith Mkwanzani and Merridy Wilson-Strydom’s enlightening article “Multidimensional disadvantages and educational aspirations of marginalised migrant youth: Insights from the Global South” uses the human development and capability approach to discuss marginalized young migrants’ access to vocational and higher education in South Africa. Education has the potential to enhance their capabilities, including the capability to participate in public deliberations and to make their voice heard. Interviews with marginalized migrants in South Africa vividly show the economic, social, personal and institutional obstacles they face. The authors stress that these factors do not only reduce migrants’ educational opportunities, but also constrain their educational aspirations. They call for encouraging marginalized migrants to follow their educational aspirations alongside reforms that aim to tackle obstacles to genuine access to education. Examples of such reforms include study permits, bursaries, regularization of undocumented young migrants, and agreements with corporations to offer part-time jobs to these students.

One of the several merits of *Senem Saner’s* original contribution “Migrants as Educators: Reversing the Order Beneficence” is to challenge a major assumption underlying normative discussions pertaining to migration-related education, namely that the host country is always the provider of education and thus the benefactor of migrant populations. Saner propounds a Hegelian perspective according to which the education of a community involves first enculturation in a second nature, and next critical self-reflection, the capacity to recognize itself as the fruit of its own self-determination. But a mediating force is required to move from enculturation to critical self-reflection. Saner argues that the encounter with foreign others that possess unfamiliar beliefs, values, actions and habits is such a mediating force. In light of Hegel’s condescending depiction of African and Oriental cultures, Saner’s interpretation is surprising. Yet the author convincingly shows that Hegel’s account of the development of the German people illustrates that a people needs an encounter with alien cultures to constitute its self-determined identity. Saner concludes by emphasizing that such encounters with the foreign should not be confused with John Stuart Mill’s “experiments in living”, John Dewey’s “new and broader environment” created by the coexistence of different cultural groups or Carlos Fraenkel’s praise of the “clash of cultures”. The contribution of a Hegelian perspective remains unique.

In a context of rising xenophobia, it seems pressing to cultivate a cosmopolitan ethos through education. *Pierre-Étienne Vandamme's* lucid article "Indirect Cosmopolitan Education: On the Contribution of National Education to Attitudes towards Foreigners" emphasizes that an openly cosmopolitan educational agenda is unlikely to be politically feasible. Cosmopolitan philosophers should thus shift gears and advocate critical national civic education instead. Although critical national civic education is not overtly cosmopolitan, it is likely to produce the sought-after cosmopolitan effects on citizens' attitudes through the pursuit of four educational aims: de-centration, critical thinking, understanding of social facts, as well as empathy and social mix. Although a tension between the hidden cosmopolitan agenda and the aim of national integration must be acknowledged, Vandamme is hopeful that, in the long term, the development of reason will overcome exclusionary tendencies.

The selection of contributions in this special issue illustrates that questions at the intersection of migration and education can be approached from a large number and variety of philosophical perspectives, including but not restricted to analytic applied ethics, continental philosophy, care ethics, Hegelian philosophy, the capability approach, theories of distributive justice. Some of the articles of this special issue emphasize the need for further investigation on neglected issues in ethics and political philosophy, such as return migration, South-South migration or the ethical obligations of non-State agents like schools. We hope this special issue paves the way to areas of emergent interest, and that theorists of global ethics and justice will contribute to a more subtle understanding and fuller recognition of the moral demands in education arising from transnational migration.

References

- Anderson, Elizabeth. 2007. "Fair Opportunity in Education: A Democratic Equality Perspective." *Ethics* 117/4, 595–622.
- Beitz, Charles. 1999. *Political Theory and International Relations*. 2nd edn. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brighouse, Harry and Adam Swift. 2009. "Educational Equality versus Educational Adequacy: A Critique of Anderson and Satz." *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 26/2, 117–28.
- Brock, Gillian. 2009. *Global Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Buchanan, Allen. 2004. *Justice, Legitimacy and Self-Determination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Callan, Eamonn. 1997. *Creating Citizens. Political Education and Liberal Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carens, Joseph. 2013. *The Ethics of Immigration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cripps, Elizabeth. 2016. "Climate Change, Population, and Justice – Hard Choices to Avoid Tragic Choices." *Global Justice: Theory Practice Rhetoric* 8/2, 1–22.
- Dietsch, Peter. 2015. *Catching Capital – The Ethics of Tax Competition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Galston, William. 1992. *Liberal Purposes: Goods, Virtues and Diversity in the Liberal State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gutmann, Amy. 1987. *Democratic Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hassoun, Nicole. 2012. *Globalization and Global Justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

James, Aaron. 2012. *Fairness in Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jencks, Christopher. 1988. "Whom Must we Treat Equally for Educational Opportunity to be Equal?" *Ethics* 98, 518–33.

Lennard, Patti and Christine Straehle. 2014. *Health Inequalities and Global Justice*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Miller, David. 2016. *Strangers in Our Midst*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moellendorf, Darrel. 2014. *The Moral Challenge of Dangerous Climate Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nida-Rümelin. 2017. *Über Grenzen denken. Eine Ethik der Migration*. Hamburg: edition Körber-Stiftung.

Nussbaum, Martha. 1996. "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism." In Cohen, Joshua (ed.). *For Love of Country*. Boston: Beacon Press, 3–20.

Nussbaum, Martha. 2006. *Frontiers of Justice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Rawls, John. 1999. *The Law of Peoples*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Reddy, Sanjay and Christian Barry. 2008. *International Trade and Labor Standards*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ronzoni, Miriam. 2014. "Global Tax Governance: The Bullets Internationalists Must Bite – And Those They Must Not." *Moral Philosophy and Politics* 1/1, 37–60.

Satz, Debra. 2007. "Equality, Adequacy, and Education for Citizenship". *Ethics* 117, 623–48.

Singer, Peter 2010. *The Life You Can Save*. New York: Random House.

Valentini, Laura. 2012. *Justice in a Globalized World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Melissa. 2003. "Citizenship as Identity, Citizenship as Shared Fate, and the Functions of Multicultural Education." In Feinberg, Walter and Kevin McDonough (eds.). *Citizenship*

and Education in Liberal-Democratic Societies. Teaching for Cosmopolitan Values and Collective Identities. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 208–47.

Young, Iris. 2007. *Global Challenges*. Cambridge: Polity Press.