



**Manchester
Metropolitan
University**

Pais, Alexandre, Batsleer, J, Andersson, B, Liljeholm Hansson, S, Lütgens, J, Mengilli, Y, Pohl, A and Wissö, T (2017) Non-formal spaces of socio-cultural accompaniment: Responding to young unaccompanied refugees – reflections from the Partispace project. *European Educational Research Journal*, 17 (2). pp. 305-322. ISSN 1474-9041

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/619335/>

Version: Accepted Version

Publisher: Symposium Journals

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904117716368>

Please cite the published version

<https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk>



**Non-Formal Spaces of Socio-Cultural Accompaniment.
Responding to Young Unaccompanied Refugees: Reflections
from the Partispace Project.**

Journal:	<i>European Educational Research Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	EERJ-16-0057.R3
Manuscript Type:	Contribution to a special issue
Keywords:	Partispace, Refugees, Non-Formal, Negotiated, Third Spaces
Abstract:	<p>Drawing on research in progress in the Partispace project www.partispace.eu we argue for the recognition of the importance of non-formal spaces in response to young refugees across three different national contexts: Frankfurt in Germany; Gothenburg in Sweden and Manchester in the UK. It is argued that recognition of local regulation and national controls of immigration which support climates of hostility makes it important to recognise and affirm the significance of non-formal spaces and 'small spaces close to home' which are often developed in the 'third space' of civil society and arise from the solidaristic impulses of volunteers. In these contexts it is important that practices of hospitality may develop which can symbolically reconstitute refugees as hosts and subjects of a democratic conversation, without which there is no possible administrative solution to the refugee crisis. It is essential that educational spaces such as schools, colleges and Universities forge strong bonds with such emergent spaces.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6 **Non-Formal Spaces of Socio-Cultural Accompaniment. Responding to Young Unaccompanied**
7 **Refugees. Reflections from the *Partispace* Project.**
8
9

10 **Introduction**
11

12 Building on existing theorisations of formal, non-formal and informal pedagogies, the *Partispace*
13 (www.partispace.eu) research project turns to issues of spaces and places as critical to the
14 development of participatory public pedagogies (Reutlinger and Kessler, 2007; Kraftl, 2013) and hence
15 is drawn to particular accounts of critical pedagogy as border-crossing (Giroux, 2005; Coburn, 2010).
16
17

18 **The move from a gated intellectual practice and an anti-public pedagogy to a borderless and**
19 **democratised pedagogy involves the creation of microspheres of public education that enable modes**
20 **of critical learning and civic agency (Giroux, 2013).** This article argues that non-formal spaces of
21 welcome to refugees, might, in consequence of the relative permeability of their borders and
22 boundaries, contribute to the development of such microspheres.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Already framed against the background of economic and political crises, the study experienced the
33 eruption of the ‘refugee crisis’, the recent migratory movements and the war against ISIL (as declared
34 by the French President after the Paris shootings). These challenges are changing the social and
35 political tissue of Europe, with direct implications for how we perceive democratic education and
36 youth participation. Following the questions raised in particular in the work of Etienne Balibar (2004)
37 concerning the possibility of transnational forms of belonging and citizenship, the *Partispace* project
38 is interested in addressing how non-formal educational spaces can induce people into an existing
39 culture of European belonging and, at one fell swoop, enable people to create (perhaps collectively) a
40 new emerging set of understandings of these life experiences. The challenges that the growing “part
41 of no-part” (Ranciere, 2010) of the European social body—groups of people for whom there is no
42 place within the organised totality of the European Union, although they formally belong to or are in
43 Europe—pose to Europe’s identity are understood in this article at the micro level of analysis of
44 spaces of inclusion and welcome/exclusion and hostility within three Northern European cities –
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Frankfurt, Gothenburg and Manchester – from the summer of 2015 to the spring of 2016. We are
4 particularly concerned here with the life of (unaccompanied) young refugees, of minors, within the
5 European territory. Borders and boundaries – between nations, nation-states, citizens and non-citizens
6 – in our reading are social constructions and are maintained – or challenged, shifted or otherwise
7 altered – by interactions and discourses with boundary-shifting understood as the central process in
8 successful integration of newcomers (Wimmer, 2008).
9

10
11 We analyse the re-emergence of practices of creating and supporting safe enough spaces for
12 association in communities, the ways these constitute a response to the levels of anxiety, fear and
13 hostility, and how these may be mobilised in the continuing crises. Just as the issue of the border is of
14 utmost significance at a national and European level, and the nature of its crossing marks the lives of
15 those who move across it as legal or illegal, national or foreign, belonging or not-belonging, to be
16 retained or to be expelled, so the nature of the borders of non-formal spaces of learning and informal
17 practices of community support, and their relative permeability, is of key significance in the account
18 and analysis which follow. However the disputed border and border-markings which affect all
19 migrants do not miraculously disappear in non-formal spaces of the kind discussed and analysed here.
20 State policies and politics as well as cultural struggles and forms of abjection (including those
21 involving racism and patriarchal politics for example) persist in these spaces too and so we attempt
22 here an initial mapping of the micropolitics of such spaces. We do not seek to romanticise them but
23 we do wish to argue for their value.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 These are the ‘third spaces’, the spaces of civil society (Bhaba, 1994), which must be supported and
44 nurtured if the democratic conversation on the subject of war and refugees is to be embarked on let
45 alone sustained, between people of different languages and very different immediate experience, with
46 different kinds of anxiety and different kinds of hope and fear. The provisional nature of all group
47 belongings is made vivid in these spaces of encounter.
48
49
50
51
52

53 Non-formal spaces and informal practices of learning have been recognised as immensely significant
54 in other processes of transformation (most notably in accounts of transversal politics and peace
55 processes of rooting and shifting (Cockburn, 1998). Non-formal spaces emerge initially when
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 relatively less powerful populations seek to negotiate with powerful narratives which define and shape
4 an experience of abjection, and abjected populations are able to claim greater freedom for negotiation
5 and indeed for the possibility of life in such spaces (Tyler, 2013). The emergent transnationalism
6 (Rivzi, 2011) of such spaces is one grounded in the experience of precarity. The openness that
7 characterises them is a significant feature of the experience of cross-cultural dialogue here which we
8 argue is needed currently if the 'refugee crisis' is to be democratically addressed.
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 **Non-Formal Spaces of Learning and Welcome in the Face of Hostility.**

16
17
18 An essential feature of the spaces for association explored is their voluntary nature and this implies
19 the negotiation as distinct from imposition of boundaries and relationships within them (Batsleer,2008
20). Such non-formal spaces are therefore able to enact welcome and may also be vectors of hostility. In
21 understanding this more fully, and especially the experience of welcoming young refugees within
22 these spaces, educational institutions will be able to contribute to the essential work of inter-cultural
23 conversation and dialogue which the times demand of us. Building on significant research literature in
24 the field of social work (Hek, 2005), this paper article seeks to engage further with a number of key
25 findings which are of continued relevance. Firstly we are concerned with the impact of public policy.
26 Save the Children (2004) recognised that young people's attempts to build a future and to keep life
27 going are in defiance of immigration frameworks designed to be punitive in order to discourage
28 migration and placate sections of public opinion. This context of both institutional and political
29 hostility is one dimension of our analysis.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Secondly we are concerned with specific and deliberate practices of welcome. Because
44 institutionalised hostility forms the context for the welcome present in non-formal spaces, specific
45 strategies of affirmation are developed to counter this (Shukra,2010). The need for self-advocacy, the
46 need for an opportunity to enjoy life and be distracted from trauma, the need for 'small places close to
47 home' in which to connect and be together are among the further earlier findings built on here.
48 Earlier research on the issues facing young refugees has emphasised the importance of friendship,
49 social bonds and bridges (Behrens, Hughes, Hek and Spice, 2007). In the vignettes which follow, the
50 continuing issues concerning specific strategies of affirmation are presented, now being amplified by
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the scale of the current crisis. The intention is to argue that there is no merely administrative solution
4 to these crises and to identify the potential contribution of non-formal spaces to a democratic
5 conversation (Ahmed et al, 2003).
6
7

8
9
10 The non-formal educational spaces referred to here are projects outside of school, college and
11 University, which seek to engage nevertheless with children and young people as well as adults,
12 beyond the requirements of school based curricula and assessments (Batsleer, 2008). Sometimes
13 sponsored by public bodies and large charities or religious foundations, and sometimes emerging from
14 the self-help, mutual aid and collective organising of specific groups, such projects enables the socio-
15 cultural development of young people to occur (Walther, 2006; Jeffs and Smith, 1996).
16
17

18
19
20 The term 'non-formal' (as it has emerged especially in youth work) refers to contexts in which
21 learning is arranged intentionally, yet without strict curricula and assessment. In providing space and
22 opportunity for specific experiences and activities, there is an emphasis on negotiation, voluntary
23 relationship and facilitation of young people's own interests and passions. In such contexts, in
24 contrast to schools, emerging situations, such as the arrival of new refugee populations, can be
25 accommodated more rapidly and there is the possibility of strategies and learning processes changing
26 accordingly fast (Norton and Cohen,2000; Thomas,2011). It is therefore very understandable that it is
27 these non-formal spaces in which new populations are engaged and supported.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Research Questions**

40
41
42 The major research questions of the *Partispace* project as a whole concern the spaces, styles and
43 contexts of participation by young people, and the meanings attributed to formal, non-formal and
44 informal scenes of participation. The project is not primarily framed by questions concerning the
45 experience of refugees. It was the presence of refugees in the cities during the first mapping phase of
46 the research which prompted further curiosity. Researchers' interest developed concerning the
47 significance of and tensions in 'small places close to home' as places and spaces of learning and
48 engagement when refugees were present. We wanted to know what was happening now and whether
49 the welcomes and hostilities being extended to young refugees in the cities we were studying was
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 expressed in particular ways in youth participation projects and civil associations, how the spaces and
4
5 places of this welcome/hostility were being facilitated and by whom. The question of the nature of the
6
7 boundaries of such spaces and the potential for learning within them became a key question and this
8
9 will be returned to in the city vignettes which follow.

10
11 Just as, in the overarching research we have an interest in the analysis of the relation between
12
13 Europe wide experiences and orientations and local expressions and orientations, so the discussion
14
15 here of civil society based responses to young refugees required a contextualizing perspective on
16
17 political and historical developments in refugee and migrant reception. In each of the cities familiar
18
19 narratives and visual images have been mobilised to provoke fear of refugees (The Over-crowded
20
21 Boat; the claims on Benefits and Housing; the ‘alien patriarchal’ culture). One of the chief
22
23 commonalities across the three cities is the strong presence of a discourse of abjection against
24
25 refugees. Thus the non-formal spaces of welcome must involve more than merely intercultural
26
27 learning, as intercultural learning is only one part of educational processes at stake; also involved is a
28
29 countering of abjection. There is not the space to document these discourses of abjection here but they
30
31 form one of the most significant aspects of the context and supports the analysis by Holmes and
32
33 Castañeda (2016) (using Gramscian terms) which presents the ongoing struggles about representations
34
35 of the current situation as a “war of position” between different possible European and global futures.

36
37
38 The “war of position” in this sense is the struggle over symbols, discourses, policies, and, ultimately,
39
40 social and material resources.

41
42
43 One main feature of this discursive struggle is the return of the concept of “deserving refugees” as
44
45 against bogus or illegitimate migrants or asylum seekers: “the discourse of deservingness displaces
46
47 responsibility from historical political and economic policies supported by powerful actors in Europe
48
49 and the United States and instead locates it in displaced people themselves” (Holmes and Castañeda
50
51 2016: 13). Graf (2016) also analytically divides the engagement of civil society into “pure” charity
52
53 and the more overtly political solidarity. Our own reflections, starting from observations made during
54
55 the field work for our study on youth participation, are analysed specifically in relation to how
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 counter-hegemonic narratives may be arising, how borders may be crossed as well as re-established
4
5 and what bridges may be temporarily made.
6

7 8 **Methodology and Method**

9
10 The methodology of *Partispace* is a comparative analysis and delineation of spaces, using grounded
11
12 theory **in its more generic meaning of bottom-up inductive analysis and** combining a number of data
13
14 collection methods (Corbin and Strauss, 2008) . The core of the project consists in case studies aimed
15
16 at elaborating local constellations of youth participation in major European cities. Across the seven
17
18 cities of the study, the project teams had undertaken a preliminary mapping of key policy documents,
19
20 undertaken about 100 interviews and were completing field work when the data in this article was
21
22 drawn together. Data is transcribed and coded leading to grounded theory memos. It is necessary to
23
24 state here that whilst this is the ambition of *Partispace*, the material presented here is drawn only from
25
26 the early mapping phase of the project. Since the field work is still in progress the findings presented
27
28 here are provisional. The accounts of developments in each city are based on project fieldnotes and
29
30 developed into a narrative for this article. In gathering together fieldnotes from each context, and
31
32 analysing them, discussion and analysis occurred both in local teams and in the *Partispace*
33
34 consortium.
35

36
37 Qualitative multilevel analysis (QMA) has been developed by Walther et al. (2006) for the analysis
38
39 of individual education and learning processes which involves not only reconstructing individual
40
41 biographies but also the interrelation of the individual level in interaction with others. The
42
43 situatedness of these interactions in institutions and/or milieus, the local environment and finally the
44
45 societal macro level consisting of socio-economic and institutional structures as well as dominant
46
47 discourses are analysed. QMA starts from identifying the ‘bridges and connection points’ between the
48
49 levels and analyses these interrelations. The ‘bridges and connection points’ discussed here in relation
50
51 to the practices of welcome we have identified in each city are: the practices of welcome/hostility;
52
53 practices of regrouping and shifting; practices of friendship and hospitality. We therefore use these
54
55 bridging and connecting terms both in the discussion of the individual cities and to contribute to the
56
57 comparative analysis with which this article concludes.
58
59
60

1
2
3 The three cities chosen are each Northern European cities with different experiences of migration and
4 with different policy and political contexts. Germany has been called a “reluctant” (Bommes, 2010) or
5 “late” (Diehl and Schnell, 2006) immigration country. One important legacy of this is that the only
6 legal way to immigrate permanently to Germany is via the asylum channel. Unlike in other European
7 countries there was never space for a “Sans-Papier” movement such as those in France or Spain. One
8 could speculate on whether this is because the German migration regime was able to absorb all people
9 entering into some kind of “legal” status – no matter how precarious these were. The important
10 consequence is the public perception that immigration is manageable by a mix of border control and
11 channelling people into the bureaucratic system of care for asylum-seekers – as every migrant has
12 come to be called since the 1990’s. In Sweden, the inherent contentiousness of the ‘refugee issue’ has
13 unfolded in contradictory ways. On the one hand Sweden has established itself as one of the main
14 recipients of asylum seekers inside ‘fortress Europe’ during the years of war, conflict and instability
15 in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan and north-east Africa (UNHCR.org). A growing number of refugees have
16 been coming to Sweden during the last years with a sharp increase from the summer of 2015. In total,
17 more than 160 000 people sought asylum in Sweden during 2015, which was twice as many as in
18 2014 (website of the Swedish Migration Agency). Also, the public opinion has on a long-term basis,
19 from 1990 to 2014, moved in a more positive direction towards receiving refugees (SOM-report
20 2015:22, p 49). On the other hand, there has been a growing opposition both against this refugee
21 policy and, in general, against any immigrants coming to Sweden. The right-wing and populist party
22 the Swedish Democrats, with anti-immigration politics as its most significant issue, won 12.9% of the
23 votes in the election 2014 thus becoming the third largest political party in Sweden. The official UK
24 context is one of determined hostility and denial of responsibility for the crisis at the border of the
25 European Union. There is not only a language of hostility to refugees in sections of the press but to all
26 non-British migrants, including Europeans. This was the context in which the referendum on
27 continued membership of the European Union took place. Only 5,000 Syrians had been granted
28 asylum in the UK between 2011 and 2015. When the Government announced it would take 20,000
29 more refugees and 3,000 children, it in fact accepted 350 (Guardian,8/2/2017). There remains little
30 evidence of any official commitment to welcome refugees.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In the presentation of findings which follows, the analysis of the bridging themes at the micro level
4 of spaces, i.e. *border-crossing practices; re-grouping and shifting practices; and practices of*
5 *friendship and hospitality* needs therefore to be contextualised in the following dimensions of the
6 crisis of the European migration regime (Tsianos and Kasparek 2015): (1) the practical discussion
7 about the limitation of resources, the need for infrastructure and support for the newcomers; (2) a
8 theoretical discussion of who is a citizen and what citizenship is like, criteria for the recognition of
9 refugees, religion and culture; (3) a discursive struggle about concepts and terms to position the not-
10 so-new-comers: illegal immigrants, migrants, foreigners, unaccompanied minor refugees, which is
11 also marked by scenarios drawn in mostly nature-like terms, like the “flood of asylum-seekers”,
12 “asylum-tsunami”, but also “full-boat”-scenarios and pictures of a culture attacked by barbarians,
13 heading towards extinction; finally, (4) a discussion about civil society, about what would be a decent
14 and humanitarian society. **These dimensions will provide the analytic framework for the comparative**
15 **discussion with which this paper ends.**

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 In the drawing of a border (at the level of the nation state or the European arena) a hierarchy of access
31 to resources to meet basic needs is established; citizens before non-citizens. The actions reported on
32 here create spaces with permeable borders in which this hierarchy is suspended so that human needs
33 can be met, and it is on this basis- where humanity precedes citizenship rights - that dialogue can
34 begin, and the transitional spaces which create access to a new form of public belonging can emerge.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The findings presented here are given first in their national context and then discussed comparatively.

Frankfurt Contradictions

Theme One: Border-Crossing Practices. The Micropolitics of Welcome.

The unexpectedly friendly face the German public displayed during the world championship in men's football during the summer of 2006 was later labelled the “German summer fairy tale”. The same tale has been written in Frankfurt when the trains from Hungary on the 5th September 2015 reached the main train station and arrivals were applauded, helped and given donations – mostly organised by a non-formal group “Welcome Frankfurt” organised via social media and some unorganised volunteers

1
2
3 Just six days later the supporters started getting tired by their around-the-clock-work and asked for
4 support - the “ecstasy of Saturday evaporated” and a big newspaper titled “State of emergency on the
5 main train station ”.
6
7

8
9
10 The first response from civil society can therefore be seen as one which disrupts a border and attempts
11 to respond to basic needs of other humans, but this was soon complexified. At the start of October
12 2015 sustainable structures began to be implemented and replaced the non-formal organising by more
13 or less formal support. This happened with significant difficulty but illustrates a typical development
14 of “German Coping”, somewhere between hysteria, excessive control, powerlessness and
15 inventiveness. The speed of changing newspaper headlines at this time between state of emergency,
16 professionalisation, distress, solution, hostility and support has to be seen critically and shows a
17 country in a true crisis – the crisis of inner administration rather than a crisis of refugees.
18
19

20
21
22 There are several organisations who offer help for (un)accompanied minor and of age refugees; most
23 of them compensate a lack of existing infrastructure by activating engagement by volunteers; others
24 address a certain kind of refugees by neglecting other refugees, for example inner European refugees.
25 This hospitality was quickly channelled into the established ways of the corporatist German welfare
26 state – often top-down and seldom orientated to the needs of the individuals. Two examples for
27 Frankfurt show different ways of hospitality and solidarity on a formal, non-formal and informal
28 level. The first, *Project Shelter*, is a non-formal network and political group for and with refugees
29 which has shown high engagement, persistence and different styles of participation from practical
30 support to political solidarity. The other is a network, *Frankfurt Hilft*, connected to voluntary support
31 organized top-down by the municipality to organise help offered by private persons and companies.
32 *Frankfurt Hilft* can be recognised as giving a significant opportunity for friendship and peer to peer
33 engagement through which learning and dialogue occurs.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 ***Theme Two Regrouping and Shifting The Micropolitics of Citizenship***

52
53
54 The grassroots-based group “*Project Shelter*” is an example of a project which broadens its social and
55 political work as it is guided by the necessities of its members and thus shows the development from
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 support to solidarity. Again, the response to basic need takes priority. *“Project Shelter”* has existed
4 since December 2014 and started as social support to homeless refugees by providing them with basic
5 infrastructure (i.e. organising shelter) and political support, by criticising the impact of European and
6
7 infrastructure (i.e. organising shelter) and political support, by criticising the impact of European and
8
9 German law towards the situation of the so called “Lampedusa Refugees” who have fled their
10 countries by crossing European borders and were hence neglected in their appeals for integration and
11 social welfare in Germany. The project consisted then and today of a heterogeneous group: socially
12 and politically active students, refugees fled from African countries of all ages and gender, also with
13 their families (or, in their own words, as they name it: the group consists of “passport-Germans and
14 non-passport-Germans”). In this context people from a range of national contexts have come together
15 and claimed the name ‘German’ in part as a means of claiming a new form of belonging and an
16 example of the ‘war of position’ over the representation of refugees. This discursive affirmation is
17 significant. It shifts and makes permeable a boundary rendered powerful in citizenship status.
18
19

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 In January 2016, the group decided that creating immediate support by providing infrastructure was
29 insufficient. They decided to create a social centre where they could work socially and politically,
30 connect, inform and support as well as make offers of temporary housing, cultural and educational
31 offers and plan communication about the situation. This place should not just be for the active people
32 of the inner core but for all refugees and migrants: a communication and consultation café. The idea
33 of a café as used here reflects the open-door approach in direct contrast to the closed borders of the
34 migration system.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 After nearly one year of intensive networking, demonstrating, campaigning, attending political
44 meetings and round tables and meeting politicians the main goal, a centre, still seemed far away.
45
46 *“Project Shelter”* had become well known in the city and had the same trouble as all the refugees
47 had: a lack of support and acknowledgement by the political representatives and institutions of the
48 city. In addition, and making everything worse, was the homelessness during a harsh winter and the
49 fact that the refugees themselves often have no legal status and thereby no chance to demand support
50 by the state. In December 2015 and February 2016, the group occupied long-time vacant buildings
51 but, after confrontation with the police and following injury and arrest of some demonstrators, left it
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 or were evacuated. Prosecution of the activists by the authorities followed in the months afterwards.
4
5 The city, supporting voluntary work for refugees by talking and praising its citizen's engagement, still
6
7 failed to support the work of "Project Shelter". In July 2016, the next occupation followed by
8
9 occupying the next vacant building in the inner city, this time with a partial success: the private owner
10
11 of the building negotiated with the squatter personally and offered a partial use of the ground floor
12
13 and a withdrawal of criminal charges. The intensive renovation work needed less than one month,
14
15 then the new Café opened in August 2016 and, despite a short-time-closing after Neo-Nazi attacks
16
17 and threats on the place in December 2016, has opened for the interested public and the more than 70
18
19 people in need. *Project Shelter* shows the development and intensive, but also highly precarious, work
20
21 of activists, their strong solidarity, but also the marginalisation of refugees, lack of support and
22
23 passivity of the political system, and the entanglement of formal, informal and non-formal structures
24
25 and activities. The Café as a form expresses the openness of the endeavour; the failure to act in
26
27 support of Project Shelter suggests the persistence of the 'border control' of space on the part of the
28
29 City authorities
30
31

32 ***Theme Three Practices of Friendship and the Micropolitics of Hospitality***

33
34
35 *Frankfurt Hilft* is a regional platform of the social work department of the municipality of Frankfurt in
36
37 cooperation with several foundations. *Frankfurt Hilft* functions to distribute offers for engagement
38
39 and donations to interlink them with volunteers and organisations in need. It serves as a platform of
40
41 institutions, private persons and companies who are willing to help/donate. They can match their
42
43 engagement with needs collected via the platform while grassroots groups can communicate the needs
44
45 occurring during their day-to-day work. Furthermore, this platform interlinks institutions with others,
46
47 offers training and supervision of volunteers. *Frankfurt Hilft* serves as a junction which is organised
48
49 professionally on a top-down structure, but is flexible in bringing private persons into face to face
50
51 contact. This person to person contact can be understood as an essential aspect of the regrouping
52
53 process which migrants face, as well as a basis for friendship to develop.
54

55
56 The engagement and its efficacy can be experienced almost immediately. However it can be argued
57
58 that the attitude which is the basis of those offers inhibits self-organisation, as refugees are assessed in
59
60

1
2
3 a bureaucratic manner and their possibilities of agency and presence as equal subjects thereby
4 rendered difficult. Here the relative permeability of the 'helping' and 'welcoming' space shows how it
5 may be open to a range of meanings, including those hostile meanings which the discourses of
6 abjection involve. There are also powerful drivers dividing the sympathies of the public towards
7 welcome and unwelcome groups of migrants. The 'attractive' and 'unattractive', the 'vulnerable' and
8 the 'dangerous' may come to be defined through a bureaucratic screening process, which then
9 suggests that 'volunteers should not ask about the experience refugees have had' just as the State
10 systems themselves work to name and classify asylum seekers as 'genuine' or 'bogus'.
11
12

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 Nevertheless, and within these tensions, there is space, here too, for creativity: one of the youth
21 centres in the *Partispace* project became a centre for emergency accommodation for refugees in
22 autumn 2015. The youth worker (herself a daughter of Kurdish migrants in an earlier generation)
23 regularly facilitated dialogue on the basis of her own language competence and her requests to the
24 platform enabling the newly arrived young people to name their own needs, which, as well as the
25 most basic needs, also included a request for the provision of Pashto/German and Dari/German
26 dictionaries. This practice of language learning from both directions was enabled by the presence of a
27 'small place close to home' and the socio-cultural accompaniment provided in the context of the
28 Youth Centre.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 *Gothenburg Contradictions*

40 41 *Theme One: Border-Crossing Practices. The Micropolitics of Welcome*

42
43
44 Gothenburg, the second largest city in Sweden, is a natural thoroughfare for migrants coming through
45 Germany and Denmark. The responsibility for asylum seekers lies with the Swedish Migration
46 Agency and asylum is sought from the police. The municipal authorities are obliged to arrange pre-
47 school and school activities for all children they host as well as for those who have arrived with their
48 parents. There is a special municipal responsibility to provide for the well-being of unaccompanied
49 children under 18 years of age. Especially during the second half of 2015 a large number of refugees
50 arrived in Gothenburg, many of them unaccompanied children. About 1 700 children came during
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2015, compared with a little more than 400 children during 2014. The number of refugees exceeded
4
5 all calculations and existing resources to take care of the situation were far from sufficient. This was
6
7 met on the part of the municipality, by setting up a special management structure and by temporarily
8
9 moving staff and means from all parts of the organization where possible.
10

11
12 At the same time there was a mobilization of civil society. Particularly distinguished was the
13
14 assistance organized by the network *Refugees Welcome*. It played a major role in mobilizing both
15
16 material assistance and social support, especially in the autumn of 2015. A special agreement was also
17
18 signed between the municipality and eight different NGO's. Through the agreement it was possible to
19
20 cooperate and use resources in an effective way. Aside from this there were several efforts started by
21
22 for example churches and various sports clubs.
23

24
25 However, the presence of many newcomers in the city, many of them young men carrying painful
26
27 experiences, also stirred up feelings of worry and insecurity among parts of the Gothenburg
28
29 population. These feelings have been encouraged by political groups like the Swedish Democrats, but
30
31 also fuelled by media coverage of some very rare, but also tragic, examples of violent conflicts at
32
33 refugee accommodations. An image has been created that the refugees represent a kind of general
34
35 threat against people's everyday security and ordinary life-styles. A group calling themselves 'the
36
37 Soldiers of Oden' has taken on patrolling the streets of Gothenburg during night time in order to make
38
39 them 'safe'. Rather, considering that the members of the group to a high degree have criminal records
40
41 and political sympathies on the extreme right wing, they contribute to the opposite.
42

43
44 However, it would be a mistake to locate this kind of xenophobic hostility only in peculiar groups in
45
46 the margins of society. This has been displayed during the beginning of 2016 when the city published
47
48 plans to build new housing for refugees and decided to locate them in well-to-do areas, where the
49
50 number of immigrants generally is low and the response focussed on presence of social problems and
51
52 threat to property values. Gothenburg is a very segregated city and the main responsibility to cater for
53
54 the everyday needs of refugees has this far primarily been taken by districts with already stretched
55
56 economic resources.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The importance of the Swedish welfare system with its organized top-down steering through
4 authorities and political decisions becomes evident in the Gothenburg situation. The system frames
5 and directs all efforts. The public organization and resources managed to withstand great strains and
6
7
8
9 to solve a number of difficult problems. However, it also had limitations and these were used as main
10
11
12 argument to drastically change the national policy in January 2016. The immediate change the new
13
14
15 policy resulted in at the local level, again illustrates the massive impact of the top-down steering
16
17
18 model.

18 One would perhaps expect that the top-down steering process resulted in passivity at the local level,
19
20 but what we see is rather an extensive activity. Partly it has a complementary and supporting function
21
22 in relation to the public efforts. The organization *Refugees Welcome* was much faster than the city
23
24 administration to organize a reception for the refugees at the central train station. The response to
25
26 basic needs, here as in Frankfurt and Manchester, emerged first from civil society networks, social
27
28 media organising and private individuals, with the public authorities engaging more slowly. This
29
30 citizen action establishes a 'border-disrupting practice.' Many practices by young volunteers, like
31
32 organizing a first reception, arranging a place to sleep and managing school activities, are really
33
34 central in order to help refugees to have a functioning everyday life and a hope for a better future. In
35
36 relation to these efforts social relations and leisure time activities develop. The action to create a space
37
38 of welcome immediately makes the apparently impermeable borders of citizenship more permeable.

41 ***Theme Two Regrouping and Shifting The Micropolitics of Citizenship.***

42
43 The *Biskopsgården* project exemplifies how a combination of formal institutions and non-formal
44
45 associations could manage an effort that compensated the failure of the local administration to provide
46
47
48 refugee children with schooling.

49
50 This volunteering project is a project at the Department of Social Work, Gothenburg University,
51
52 where daily activities are organized for unaccompanied refugee youth living in the suburb
53
54 'Biskopsgården'. Students are responsible for the project and it is situated in premises that the
55
56 students have access to since they take part in a field based study programme. The background is that
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the local administration of Biskopsgården has not been able to provide all young refugees with proper
4 schooling, so instead the students organize social introduction to the Swedish society and language
5 training in combination with sharing social relations and making meaningful activities. This involves
6 peer to peer support and the practices of friendship here. Taking part in everyday and low key social
7 and leisure activities, for example, are the forms through which hospitality is practiced and regrouping
8 may occur. Here the capacity to act from a non-formal space of civil society is seen as enabling
9 learning as belonging while more boundaries and bureaucratic processes of assessment are still
10 occurring.

11
12 Through the project the young refugees have been able to make contacts with other young people,
13 with the students and special 'introduction assistants'. The latter have also functioned as interpreters.
14 This is learning social work as a form of pedagogy while doing it. It is interesting to reflect upon the
15 relation between the different groups involved. Here we have the young refugees, the students and the
16 volunteers who functioned as 'introduction assistants' and interpreters. These were unemployed
17 immigrants living on social benefits. For them the mission was connected to a feeling of having
18 something meaningful to do; they had important knowledge that they could make use of in order to
19 help others. The students were dependent upon the introduction assistants for interpretation and in
20 relation to the newly arrived refugees the introduction assistants could feel useful since they had more
21 experience of the Swedish society. For the students the most important thing was to make a
22 contribution in order to help the refugees, but it was also a situation in which they could try their
23 knowledge of social work and test a professional role. This illustrates clearly how the positions of
24 being 'helped' or 'a helper' shift between participants. The refugees were constructed as receivers of
25 help, but in several ways their presence actually helped both the students and the introduction
26 assistants, whilst in some cases refugees themselves take on the 'helper' role especially in relation to
27 issues of translation and access to language learning. So the complex terrain of mutuality is co-
28 constructed and the boundaries of belonging and not-belonging are rendered permeable in ways which
29 support mutual learning and mutual socio-cultural accompaniment.

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57 *Theme Three Practices of Friendship and the Micropolitics of Hospitality*
58
59
60

1
2
3 Youth Agents started out from a different angle. Already engaged in issues concerning young
4
5 people's position in society, helping young refugees fits well into their overall commitment. In a way,
6
7 they can be seen as a flexible micropolitical unit, ready to become involved in issues that are
8
9 compatible with their agenda.

10
11 *Youth Agents* is a group of about ten girls aged 15 to 17 years living in the west part of Gothenburg.
12
13 They have been working together in the group for three years. . First, they took part in different girl
14
15 groups at local youth centres. Then they joined a number of courses, for example in leadership,
16
17 arranged by the Youth consultants in the local area. Right now *Youth Agents* have focussed their
18
19 interest on newly arrived refugee children. The Agents make contact with the children and try to find
20
21 happy, enjoyable and meaningful activities to do together with them. This is made more possible by
22
23 the resurgence of civil society groups offering opportunities for refugees: many leisure facilities are
24
25 offering specific 'welcome' sessions and this means that local young people can and do accompany
26
27 refugee young people to dance sessions, skate parks, and language classes. These peer-to-peer
28
29 activities are an essential aspect of solidarity building and an orientation to support. As the 'Soldiers
30
31 of Odin' exploit fears of safety, this network counters this by supporting 'safe spaces' for encounter.
32
33 Furthermore, the groups assisting refugees deal with safety, but in contrast, it is the vulnerability of
34
35 the refugees and their need for security that is their vantage point. This illustrates the inherent
36
37 (micro)political character of the safety issue.
38
39

40 41 **Manchester Contradictions**

42 43 ***Theme One: Border-Crossing Practices. The Micropolitics of Welcome***

44
45
46 In the UK, the camp at Calais known as 'The Jungle' became a significant focus for activists of all
47
48 ages, perhaps especially but not only for young people. This included both charitable work, the direct
49
50 delivery of food, clothes and other goods, cultural engagement with music theatre and worship and
51
52 political advocacy and activism. It was possible in Manchester to regularly hear reports from those
53
54 who have visited the camp at Calais taking humanitarian aid. The denial of crisis by the UK
55
56 Government and the official 'refusal to help' seemed to generate an opposing desire among some
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 groups of young people and reference to the needs of refugees and homeless people can be found
4 throughout the range of *Partispace* fieldnotes from 2015 to 2016. The determination of some young
5 people to act with hospitality is strengthened by Government and wider public hostility. The protests
6 against eviction of the camp at Calais were attributed to 'No Borders' activists, but there is also a
7 movement of compassion here which does not especially seek a political voice.
8
9
10
11
12

13
14 Against the national context of hostility and denial, Manchester as a city takes pride in its traditions of
15 welcome. As well as an official civic culture of support to refugees there is a strong activist tradition
16 in the city of justice campaigns in support of individuals and families, and specifically of anti-
17 deportation campaigns. Some of these successful anti-deportation campaigns (dating back to the
18 1970's) became focuses for the development of community organisations and support networks and
19 currently the city's organisations – which unite educational, welfare and political work. Alongside
20 these civil society groups and projects, Manchester City Council has become a 'City of Sanctuary'
21 and part of the City of Sanctuary Network, encouraging local people and communities to take small
22 actions which welcome refugees. This included such actions as offering services, creating
23 conversation circles, promoting membership of sporting clubs, and challenging exclusionary
24 practices.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 ***Theme Two Regrouping and Shifting The Micropolitics of Citizenship.***

38
39 The local Universities have been a source of energy and activism. In 2001, *RAPAR's* (Refugee Action
40 Participatory Action Research) initiator, a researcher at the University of Salford, was approached for
41 help by community health, cohesion and social work practitioners who were confronted with a new
42 population: refugees, forcibly dispersed to these practitioners' localities in North West England
43 conurbations for the first time, became their 'clients'. With support from the Revans Research
44 Institute at the University of Salford, *RAPAR* began as a working group that drew on their skills and
45 networks as clinicians, epidemiologists and social scientists; their personal identities as refugees and
46 second or third generation migrants to the UK; and their professional relationships with community
47 development practitioners. *RAPAR* began to reach the national media with its research about what was
48 happening to people seeking asylum from both Iraq and Somalia and to their local communities here.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 However, during 2004-6, *RAPAR* faced highly concentrated efforts to stop its work in its tracks, when
4 the organisation as a whole came under direct and sustained attack. These attacks were a result of
5 *RAPAR's* continuing exposure of institutional racism and a range of examples of very bad, and in
6 some instances deadly, practices in the maltreatment of forcibly displaced peoples which can place the
7 organisation in direct conflict with police forces, and the statutory, private and third sectors. The turn
8 of the attention to the institutionalised racism which is embodied in the work of the Border Agency
9 leads to difficulties in the development of a more open approach to 'borders' when charitable work
10 and solidarity is essentially politicised.
11
12

13
14
15 It can be said that Manchester remains a city of diversity but little integration. There are significant
16 problems about language learning for new arrivals, and student political engagement with the
17 conditions in 'The Jungle' in Calais needs to be set alongside the marginalisation of 'actually existing
18 refugee communities within the city. The presence of 'homelessness camps' around the city currently
19 has led to claims that 1 in 4 of those camped out in the city centre are Europeans, for whom the City
20 Council has offered to pay for flights home. New militant anti-Muslim far right groups such as North
21 West Infidels are beginning to establish a presence, alongside UKIP, in some of the poorest wards of
22 the City. In the face of such hostility, the reporting by the local press that Syrian refugees living in
23 Greater Manchester formed a contingent to support those from host communities affected by floods in
24 winter 2015-16 was very welcome. This was enabled through a small community association, created
25 with the support of Refugee Action. The support to the development of 'small spaces close to home'
26 by refugees as well as by those welcoming them is integral to the practices and possibilities of non-
27 formal learning and mutual socio-cultural accompaniment.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 ***Theme Three Practices of Friendship and the Micropolitics of Hospitality***

47
48
49 Many people in the Somali community in Manchester arrived from a bloody civil war in the 1990's
50 and early 2000's. Since that time there has been a systematic change in the life chances of young
51 people from the community – their educational achievement has risen significantly and the access to
52 post school opportunities has also been more fully realised than it was at the beginning of the period.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Some of the children who arrived with their parents are now youth workers in the neighbourhood

1
2
3 where they first arrived and they are now responding to the presence of a new group of refugees, this
4 time from Libya. From 2011 Libyan refugees have been arriving into the city and many are being
5 housed on the estate to which the Somali refugees first arrived. This estate was previously home to the
6 City's African Caribbean community and some African Caribbean households remain, but during the
7 1990's became the site of significant gun crime which led many families to seek to protect their
8 children by leaving the area. There is therefore a history here, both of the experience of welcome, of
9 cross-community working and of facing up to and seeking to tackle racism and xenophobia
10 encountered by members of minority
11 communities.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 This is the context in which *The Hideaway Youth Project* operates. *The Hideaway* is housed in the
24 Amani Centre at the edge of the estate and the Amani Centre also houses The Manchester People's
25 Church. Currently the project has two key focuses for its work. The first continues to be an
26 engagement with the local Somali community who are facing a renewed level of scrutiny after the
27 Paris bombings. Initially, newly arrived parents did not wish their children to come to the project as
28 they feared for their safety. But over time they recognised *Hideaway* as a safe space for both girls and
29 boys. For girls, the Girl Talk project is a space for girls only which is mainly attended by Somali girls.
30 They relax after school and take part in simple activities, whilst becoming involved in mutual support
31 and discussions of many kinds. The staff at the project, some of whom arrived themselves as children
32 in the refugee movement from Somalia, were hearing of an increase in harassment of girls wearing the
33 hijab. Together with a local arts project, Odd Arts, they made a film about the experience of
34 harassment, and to support the voice and self-advocacy and rights of Muslim young women. In this
35 context of experiencing abusive comments and 'scarf-pulling' (in case they are hiding a bomb), faith
36 and the right to wear the scarf as an outward and visible sign of faith is becoming a strong marker of
37 identity for young Somali women, who are by no means the submissive young women of Orientalist
38 stereotype.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 However, despite the very recent arrival and settlement of the Somali community, and the fact that all
56 are Muslim, there are emergent tensions with the Libyan community who arrived most recently and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 are therefore predominantly young men, who are, as is well established, often the first to arrive in any
4 movement of people. So, staff are seeking to create bridges between two very different but equally
5 traumatised communities as hostilities and aggression threaten to emerge on the estate. The possibility
6 of negotiating and sharing activities which this relatively open space permits is of central importance.
7 Here football (the Refugee World Cup) becomes a tool to build bridges and establish contact and the
8 local gym becomes a vital point of contact for the outreach workers. The presence of young men from
9 a wide range of migrant communities – not only Libyans and Somalis, but Afghans, Iranians, Iraqis
10 and even one or two Syrians – becomes a possible place where a potential binary divide (Somali's
11 versus Libyans) can be diffused. From here the project contributes to a 'Peace Radio' station on a
12 regular basis. This is what is meant by the potential offered by relatively permeable boundaries in the
13 small groups we are analysing.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 26 **Comparative Analysis**

27
28 The findings presented above have indicated how spaces of non-formal socio-cultural accompaniment
29 have a significance in the ambivalent response to young refugees. Beginning with the idea of border-
30 crossing and border-disrupting practices in the immediate response to human need, we have identified
31 the recurrence of themes of welcome and affirmation, of regrouping and shifting, and of friendship
32 and hospitality within these spaces. Non-formal spaces, with relatively permeable boundaries, have
33 allowed a speed of response to an emergency, an openness to questions of safety, a re-grounding of
34 response in basic human need and recognition, and the possibility of shifting and regrouping of roles
35 of 'helper' and 'helped' from which mutuality and the conditions of dialogue can emerge. In the final
36 section, the argument returns to the four dimensions of the crisis of the European migration regime
37 delineated earlier and considers ways these are present in the non-formal spaces and practices of
38 socio-cultural accompaniment which have been described.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 ***Infrastructure Support, Limitation of Resources and Meeting Basic Needs***

52
53
54 Firstly it can be said that in each case the development of a more permeable border for the welcoming
55 of refugees in particular neighbourhoods of the three cities has been led and mobilised by civil society
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 even when the co-ordinating presence and practices of Local Authorities are positive in enabling peer
4 to peer friendship networks.
5

6
7 These responses have been to immediate basic needs for food and shelter and the 'border-disrupting'
8 response of human solidarity and recognition of need provides the basis on which further 'inter-
9 cultural dialogue' may happen. Nevertheless, the lack of a sufficient response remains evident in the
10 strong presence of asylum seekers in the street homeless communities of Frankfurt and Manchester.
11
12
13
14

15
16 The role of public co-ordinating platforms appears in the accounts in Gothenburg and Frankfurt with a
17 slightly different emphasis. On the one hand in Gothenburg these can seem to further energise and
18 enable civil society actions whilst the perception in Frankfurt is more mixed with some problems
19 associated with the sense of administrative regulation of a deeper crisis are highlighted. Separating the
20 refugee with the right to remain from the asylum seeker and the failed asylum seeker contributes to
21 the discursive division between the deserving and undeserving refugee; a division which threatens the
22 practices of more permeable and open borders in small groups described here, by shaping the
23 allocation of resource and dividing vulnerable populations.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 *Citizenship and Entitlement: Issues of Recognition, Religion and Culture*

34
35

36 It can be argued that a relative openness of borders exacerbates the experience of lack of safety and it
37 is this message which is present in the border-policing action of groups such as 'Soldiers of Oden' in
38 Gothenburg, of North West Infidels in Manchester, and in the border skirmishes between
39 communities in Manchester. The way that such border conflicts also come to be marked through
40 attitudes to women is clear in all the cities. There is in consequence of this border-policing a sense of
41 fragility in responses to and by refugee young people and a set of questions and experiences
42 concerning safety and security which are present throughout the non-formal spaces presented here.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

55 It is notable that when there is a claim to citizenship, this also can legitimate a claim to politics and
56 political struggle which can challenge the institutionalised racism of welfare systems. Differential
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 methods of allocations of resources (through voucher systems for example) and systems of exclusion,
4 for example from participation in paid work, are highlighted. However, in the context of attempting to
5 establish practices of friendship where a humanitarian focus is to the fore, explicit political activism
6 can be destabilising.
7
8
9

10
11 When projects focussing on countering harassment, as with the Youth Agents in Gothenburg and
12 Hideaway in Manchester, it is notable that it is in the local 'host' community in the first case and the
13 relatively long established Somali community in the second, who experience an entitlement to
14 highlight such issues, rather than the most recently arrived refugees.
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 22 23 24 25 26 *Discursive Struggle* 27

28 The context of a discursive struggle over concepts and terms through which to position the not-so-
29 new-comers is marked in all three cities. The response to this is most often in the rejection within the
30 projects of terms such as 'refugee' or 'asylum seeker' and the conscious embrace of terms which
31 equalise the power dynamics within the practices of the projects: terms like 'Introduction Assistants',
32 language teachers/learners, active citizens campaigning for rights/meeting of needs; members of faith
33 communities in dialogue with people of other faiths; volunteers responding to a public emergency (the
34 floods) and supporting new comers. The point here is that this re-inscribing of relationship, together
35 with a care about engagement with stories of loss and trauma and experiences of arrival in the city, is
36 in absolute contention with prevailing hostile discourses of abjection against refugees. In some cases
37 there is a clear political edge to this as in 'Passport and Non-Passport Germans.' Most often though, it
38 is a positive affirmative step away from the effects in day to day encounters of profoundly unequal
39 subject positions, and this creates the basis on which mutual learning occurs.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 53 54 *Practices of Friendship and Civil Society* 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 There is an attunement to every day practices and sharing of resources, pleasures and leisure time
4 which create the channels for further connection and exchange. This is illustrated in the existence of
5 peer to peer volunteering networks in each city, often led by private individuals but with a significant
6 part played by newly emerging associative practices in response to need (City of Sanctuary in
7 Manchester; Young Agents in Gothenburg) and by the role of previously migrant communities in
8 building these channels for new connection (Turkish heritage youth workers in Frankfurt; earlier
9 immigrants in Gothenburg Biskopsgården; the African Caribbean youth workers linking to Somalis
10 and links from Somalis to newly arriving Libyans in Manchester). It is possible to see how a more
11 permeable border in small groups close to home may allow otherness to turn to oursness through small
12 acts of every day exchange including information about safety, dictionaries, and forms of experience
13 sharing, such as of ways of dealing with aggression and hostility.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 **Conclusion: Rising, Emerging, Contradictory Spaces. Microspheres of Learning and Civil**
27 **Agency**
28
29

30
31 In three significantly different political contexts therefore we can re- affirm significance of small
32 places close to home, spaces which are flexible, easy to access, having relatively permeable
33 boundaries. It is apparent that non-formal spaces are emerging and developing from the existing
34 practices in each of the cities and from an engagement between refugees and indigenous communities.
35 Notwithstanding existing and well-established practices of welcome, there is an inherited practice of
36 control and exclusion in some contexts, and of right-wing neo-nationalism and inflammatory press
37 reporting which means that civil society spaces explicitly dedicated to creating affirmation are
38 necessary. (paralleling much established anti-racist thinking, Shukra, 2010).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47
48 In order to create space for democratic encounter, it is essential that newly arrived migrants are not
49 rendered merely as objects of policy interventions but are present as equals and co-producers of
50 emergent responses to and imaginations of new ways of being together in Europe. Non-formal spaces
51 and initiatives seem to support these forms of inter-cultural learning. There can be both 'rooting' in a
52 positive sense of identity and 'shifting' through relationship and dialogue with others and re-grouping.
53 (Soni, 2011). It is absolutely necessary to acknowledge the context of violence and extreme trauma to
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 which these socio-cultural spaces are responding and against which they can provide a fragile but
4 necessary buffer. It is very important that the violence of current global conditions is recognised as
5 present throughout and not merely projected on to and acted out by refugees or the impoverished
6 members of indigenous far-right groups. Given the masculinism through which the violence is
7 currently acted out, and the presence of sexual violence right across the current landscape it is striking
8 that in two of the case studies presented here, it is young women who are leading in attempting to
9 establish peace-building conversations, which do not avoid the realities of violence, but seek to go
10 beyond it.
11
12

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 In terms of enjoying life and providing distraction from trauma there is a recognition of the
21 importance of every day places to gather and get help, enjoy food, take part in sport and cultural
22 activities, share worship perhaps and relax and socialise, as well as more formal educational
23 opportunities for example in language learning. The value of University-community connections in
24 each of these student cities is surely one strong potential source of a renewed democratic
25 conversation, as it is in these small everyday practices that communication channels are being
26 established.
27
28
29

30
31
32
33
34
35 At a microlevel, then, it is possible to see clearly how the channels which establish the possibility of
36 dialogue and exchange might be established and also how State processes may undermine them.
37
38 Therefore, there is a tension between the development of mutuality and solidarity at a micro level and
39 attempts to generalise such solidarity which are frequently seen as overly politicised and dismissed by
40 the municipal authorities and third sector networks (Project Shelter Frankfurt and RAPAR
41 Manchester).
42
43
44
45
46

47
48 Holmes & Castañeda (2016) argue that in situations like this, local communities may react with
49 hospitality towards newcomers and this may constitute a way to resist newly created dichotomies
50 between the “settled population” and incomers, the deserving and the undeserving and the restriction
51 imposed on people fleeing from war and terror. They argue that instead of seeing this as an unpolitical
52 act that neglects the responsibility of the state, it may simply be impossible now to know what new
53 forms of solidarity and political action might emerge from this.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 It is not possible to escape from the dilemma that most of the time engagement fills the gaps in
4 welfare provision that are not the consequence of an accident or natural catastrophe but of the politics
5 of border regimes and that such actions sustain this this regime (Graf, 2016). And that progress from
6 charity to solidarity is only possible if the engagement is based on a reflection of these circumstances.
7
8 One final example from fieldnotes shows that grassroots initiatives also have an influence on the
9 macropolitical setup: by the end of 2015 grassroots activists together with some of the big corporatist
10 welfare organisations succeeded in ensuring that young unaccompanied refugees were granted the
11 same rights to protection and care as their “autochthonous” peers when the German parliament
12 decided that they should fall under the “Children and Youth Act” and not under the general “Asylum
13 Seekers Support Act”. This lead to a massive amelioration of their situation – and a huge gap between
14 those who arrived alone and the children and young people who immigrated together with their
15 families and have to live with the much lower support standards granted by the latter.
16
17

18
19 If we are right to see the possibility of non-formal spaces as contributing to an emerging new vision of
20 European civility, they will need to be recognised and acknowledged and nurtured by those directing
21 more institutional spaces such as schools, colleges and Universities. Volunteer ‘Welcome’ networks
22 deserve nurturing and support as part of new infrastructures and the skills of people who are
23 experienced and qualified to run groups in such ‘third spaces’ need to be acknowledged and valued.
24
25 These may include youth workers, social workers, pedagogues, community educators, and socio-
26 cultural animateurs. Part of the role of such staff is to support the emergence of co-facilitators from
27 the newly arrived communities so that the move from ‘help’ to ‘solidarity’ can be effected.
28
29

30
31 Rozakou (2012) reconstructs two notions of hospitality in Greece: one that places refugees
32 somewhere between the bare physical survival and a real social citizen and another form of hospitality
33 that “symbolically reconstitutes” refugees as hosts and political subjects. There is at least a chance
34 that resourcing and supporting non-formal spaces of inter-cultural meeting and solidarity building
35 might enable a move towards the inter-cultural democratic conversations and imaginations, within
36 which refugees are both hosts and political subjects, without which no merely administrative
37 European solution is possible.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References.

Detailed referencing of local sources for the three cities will be available in an accompanying background paper at www.partispace.com

Ahmed,S.,Castaneda,H.,Foster,A. and Seller,M.(eds) (2003) Uprooting/Re-grouping Questions of Home and Migration Oxford Berg

Batsleer, J.(2008) Informal Learning in Youth Work London: Sage

Balibar,E,(2004) We the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship Princeton and Oxford Princeton University Press

Bhaba,H.(1994) The Location of Culture London Routledge

Bommes, Michael (2010): Migration Research in Germany. The Emergence of a Generalised Research Field in a Reluctant Immigration Country. In Dietrich Thränhardt, Michael Bommes (Eds.): National paradigms of migration research. Osnabrück: V & R Unipress, pp. 127–185.

Coburn,A.(2010) Youth Work as Border Pedagogy in Batsleer,J. and Davies,B. (2010) What is Youth Work? Exeter Learning Matters

Cockburn,C. (1998) The Space Between Us: Negotiating Gender and National Identities in Conflict London Zed Books

Corbin, Juliet M., & Strauss, Anselm L. (2008). Basics of qualitative research: techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory. London: Sage. 3rd edition.

Diehl, C; Schnell, R (2006): Reactive Ethnicity or Assimilation? Statements, Arguments, and First Empirical Evidence for Labor Migrants in Germany. In International Migration Review 40 (4), pp. 786–816. DOI: 10.1111/j.1747-7379.2006.00044.x.

Giroux,H. (2005). Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education New York Routledge

1
2
3 Giroux,H. (2013) America's Education Deficit and the War on Youth New York Monthly Review
4
5 Press

6
7 Graf, L. (2016): Freiwillig im Ausnahmezustand. Die ambivalente Rolle ehrenamtlichen Engagements
8
9 in der Transformation des Asylregimes. In Widersprüche 36 (141), pp. 87–96.

10
11
12 Hek,R.(2005) The experience and needs of refugee and asylum seeking children in the UK. A
13
14 literature review. Birmingham. NECF.

15
16
17 Holmes, S M.; Castañeda, H (2016): Representing the “European refugee crisis” in Germany and
18
19 beyond. Deservingness and difference, life and death. In American Ethnologist 43 (1), pp. 12–24.
20
21 DOI: 10.1111/amet.12259.

22
23
24 Jeffs,T and Smith,M.K. (1996). Informal Education Conversation, Democracy and Learning Derby
25
26 :Education Now

27
28
29 Kraftl ,P.(2013) Geographies of Alternative Education. Diverse Learning Spaces for Children and
30
31 Young People Basingstoke Palgrave

32
33 Norton,R. and Cohen,B. (2000) Out of Exile: Developing Youth Work with Young Refugees
34
35 Leicester YW Press

36
37
38 Philipp E., Geisen T./Studer T. (2015): Migration und Minderheiten als Herausforderung in
39
40 demokratischen Gesellschaften. In: Politische Formen und soziale Grundlagen von Partizipation. VS
41
42 Springer.

43
44
45 Ranciere,J. (2010) Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics London Continuum

46
47 Rivzi,F.(2011) Experiences of cultural diversity in the context of an emergent transnationalism.
48
49 European Educational Research Journal vol 10 Issue 2 pp180-188

50
51
52 Rozakou, K. (2012): The biopolitics of hospitality in Greece. Humanitarianism and the management
53
54 of refugees. In: American Ethnologist 39 (3), S. 562–577.

1
2
3 Reutlinger,C. und Kessler,F. (2007) Sozialraum Eine Einführung Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften
4
5 Wiesbaden

6
7 Shukra,K.(2010) ' Anti-racist youth work' in Batsleer and Davies (eds) What is Youth Work? Exeter
8
9 Learning Matters

10
11
12 Soni,S.(2011) Working with Diversity in Youth and Community Work Exeter Learning Matters

13
14
15 Save the Children (2004) Young Refugees. Providing emotional support to young separated refugees
16
17 in the UK. London Save the Children.

18
19
20 Tsianos, V; Kasperek, Bernd (2015): Zur Krise des europäischen Grenzregimes: eine
21
22 regimetheoretische Annäherung. In Widersprüche 35 (138), pp. 8–22.

23
24
25 Thomas, P. 2011 Youth, Multiculturalism and Community Cohesion Basingstoke Palgrave Macmillan

26
27
28 Tyler,I. 2013 Revolting Subjects. Social Abjection and Resistance in Neoliberal Britain. London Zed
29
30 Books

31
32
33 Walther, A., Du Bois-Reymond, M., Biggart, A. (eds) (2006) Participation in Transition Motivation of
34
35 Young People for Working and Learning Across Europe Frankfurt am Main Peter Lang

36
37
38 Wimmer, A. (2008): The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multilevel Process Theory.
39
40 In *American Journal of Sociology* 113 (4), pp. 970–1022.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review