

to shape the conduct of grassroots humanitarian action in order to increase their influence in domains commonly considered non-governmental. By doing so, I will argue, they seek to govern migration societies through extended state-citizen networks veiled in a cloak of humanitarianism.

I draw on field research conducted between late 2014 and mid-2016 in various localities across the southern German state of Baden-Württemberg. During this period, I spoke to numerous governmental representatives from the level of the state to the level of municipalities. Moreover, I participated in conferences, training schemes and other events that governmental actors organized for volunteers supporting refugees across Baden-Württemberg.

This chapter consists of five parts. In the following section two, I scrutinize how the programmes launched by governmental actors shifted, challenged and (re)produced the contested boundary between ‘state’ and ‘civil society’, while (re)ordering responsibilities in the reception of asylum seekers. Section three explores the discourses and practices with which governmental actors intervened in the self-conduct of volunteers in order to shape ‘socialized selves’. In section four, I illustrate how governmental actors positioned themselves in relation to what one of my interlocutors called kinds of ‘uncomfortable engagement’ through which volunteers expressed their dissent towards governmental decisions and policies. I conclude with reflections on the role of governmental actors in the contested solidarities that emerged around the long summer of migration.

3.2. (Re)Ordering Responsibilities in the Reception of Asylum Seekers

In his seminal essay on the limits of the state, Mitchell (1991) argues that what we think of as “the state” only gains meaning in relation to what is defined and understood as “(civil) society”. He thus calls on scholars to reflect on the processes of boundary-making between what appear to be two distinct entities: “Rather than searching for a definition that will fix the boundary, we need to examine the detailed political processes through which the uncertain yet powerful distinction between state and civil society is produced” (ibid.: 78). In this section, I investigate how the long summer of migration brought about important – but necessarily contested – (re)negotiations of the role and responsibilities of “active citizens” vis-à-vis “the state” in migration societies. I scrutinize how the programmes launched by governmental actors shifted,

challenged and (re)produced the contested boundary between ‘state’ and ‘civil society’, while (re)ordering responsibilities in the reception of asylum seekers.

3.2.1. The Birth of ‘Civil Society’ as a Responsible Actor

From late 2014 onwards, the state government began to present volunteering with refugees as a particularly important task of ‘civil society’, one that needed special guidance and support. This came through very clearly in my interview with a member of the State Ministry of Social Affairs in Baden-Württemberg, Marlies Vogtmann. I met the friendly and good-humoured woman in her forties in April 2016. As a trained lawyer, she had been working as one of the ministry’s deputy secretaries for civil society and citizen participation for two years. In this role, she was involved in the design and implementation of governmental programmes aimed at citizen engagement in support of refugees. During our conversation, she asserted that the design and implementation of these programmes resembled a “process of invention” (Interview with Marlies Vogtmann: 20/4/2016), a process that had begun when the state cabinet decided to allocate funding to such efforts in late 2014. This she summarized as follows:

“Help for refugees through citizen engagement is something that didn’t really exist before ... so we didn’t have a support programme or such like. Before, we were more focussed on citizen engagement in general; that is, after all, part of our mandate. Of course, we are still committed to that issue too, but it’s just down to what’s happening in society that we are now paying so much attention to the refugee issue and that we have launched a dedicated programme.”⁴ (Interview with Marlies Vogtmann: 20/4/2016)

The implementation of “dedicated programmes” was thus a response to the particular developments in late 2014, when the number of citizens willing to volunteer with refugees began to increase sharply. My interlocutor Marlies Vogtmann even claimed that citizen engagement with refugees “didn’t really

4 Translation by LF. German original: “Flüchtlingshilfe durch bürgerschaftliches Engagement gab’s davor in dem Sinne nicht ... also wir hatten kein Förderprogramm oder sowas. Also wir waren vorher wirklich auf bürgerschaftliches Engagement allgemein fokussiert, was eben auch unser Auftrag ist. Das Thema haben wir natürlich nach wie vor sozusagen parallel laufen, das ist einfach durch die Ereignisse in der Gesellschaft, dass uns jetzt das Flüchtlingsthema so stark beschäftigt und dass wir da eben ein Extraprogramm aufgelegt haben.”.

exist before". During my field research, however, I encountered groups and individuals who had been supporting refugees for decades – often with faith-based or more explicitly activist motivations. And yet, practices of refugee support only became visible as a potential field of intervention for the state government from 2014 onwards.

In an interview, the personal assistant to Gisela Erler, Baden-Württemberg's State Counsellor for Civil Society and Civic Participation, explained this impetus for implementing dedicated programmes for refugee support as follows:

"Civil society plays a critical role and so the State Counsellor is, of course, interested in ensuring these structures are explained and managed in a clear way that makes civil society and citizen engagement easier and more pleasant. So, this is the main impetus, how can we [...] contribute so that more people take an interest, so that more people get involved, and so that the integration of refugees or fellow citizens [...] will be a success."⁵ (Interview with Gisela Erler and Annette Brüderle: 17/4/2015)

In the course of 2015, the state government thus began ascribing 'civil society' a critical role in the successful reception and social integration of asylum seekers. At the same time, it felt responsible for "managing" and "explaining" this process, thereby portraying itself as being in charge of the situation. These efforts might thus be read as means to (re)gain control over both the management of asylum seekers as well as the growing numbers of volunteers committed to refugees.

The programmes and instruments, which addressed practices of refugee support across Baden-Württemberg from 2014 onwards, were developed in a specific political context. It was the ruling coalition of Greens and Social Democrats that designed and introduced most of these programmes. Right from the start of its legislative period, it declared enhancing citizen participation in governmental decisions to be one of its top priorities (cf. Stuttgarter

5 Translation by LF. German original: "Da kommt natürlich der Zivilgesellschaft dabei eine ganz wesentliche Bedeutung zu und da interessiert sich die Staatsrätin natürlich insbesondere, wie können die Strukturen so verdeutlicht oder klar geregelt werden, dass Zivilgesellschaft und bürgerschaftliches Engagement leichter und angenehmer möglich ist. Also das ist eigentlich die Triebfeder, was können wir [...] dazu tun, damit mehr Menschen sich interessieren, damit mehr Menschen sich engagieren und Integration auch von Flüchtlingen oder Menschen und Mitbürgern [...] besser gelingt".

Zeitung: 5/11/2013).⁶ During campaigning for the 2011 election, the Greens focused heavily on citizen engagement, something that may even have contributed to its successful election result. Around this time, plans for a new central train station in Stuttgart, the capital city of Baden-Württemberg, gave rise to an unexpected protest movement. Thousands of citizens protested on the streets of Stuttgart for months, demanding that this huge construction project, which was set to cost the state billions of euros, be stopped. These “Stuttgart 21” protests not only received a high degree of media attention across the country but also triggered more general discussions on the extent of citizen participation in governmental decision-making processes (for more information on the Stuttgart 21 protests see Brettschneider & Schuster 2013; Gabriel, Schoen & Faden-Kuhne 2014). The Greens were the only political party in the Baden-Württemberg state parliament to take a stand *against* the construction project from the outset and call for it to be scrapped (cf. Grüne BW: 2010).⁷ This might be partly explained by the historical origins of the party, which arose out of the anti-nuclear, women’s rights and peace movements of the 1970s (see for instance Schmid 1990). Nowadays, the party sees itself as “ecological, social and cosmopolitan” (Grüne BW: 2017)⁸ and is often classified as left of centre.

This background partly contributed to the extraordinary success that the Greens achieved in the Baden-Württemberg state elections in 2011, in which the party won 24 per cent of the vote, compared to 12 per cent in the previous election (Statistisches Landesamt BW: 2016).⁹ This percentage was also substantially higher than the party’s vote share at a federal level: in the 2009 and 2013 elections to the federal parliament, the Greens won around 10 per cent of the vote (Bundeswahlleiter: 2017).¹⁰ With this success in the 2011 state elections, the Greens became the governing party of Baden-Württemberg for the first time in their history, forming a coalition with the Social Democratic Party (SPD, “Red”). In Winfried Kretschmann, they also had the first ever Green first minister of a German federal state. The formation of a Red-Green government

6 See: <http://www.stuttgarter-zeitung.de/inhalt.buergerbeteiligung-gruen-rot-laesst-die-buerger-mitentscheiden.23934955-9780-420a-98b4-e826ad410104.html> (last accessed 1/8/2020).

7 See: <https://www.gruene-bw.de/stuttgart-21-stoppen/> (last accessed 1/8/2020).

8 See: <https://www.gruene-bw.de/partei/wer-wir-sind/> (last accessed 1/8/2020).

9 See: <https://www.statistik-bw.de/Wahlen/Landtag/LRLtW.jsp> (last accessed 1/8/2020).

10 See: <https://www.bundeswahlleiter.de/bundestagswahlen/2009.html> (last accessed 1/8/2020).

coalition thus marked an important shift in the history of the state: since 1953 the ruling government of Baden-Württemberg had been formed by the conservative Christian Democratic Union (CDU).

Right from the start of its legislative period, the Green-SPD government introduced various measures seeking to enhance citizen participation across the state – at that time, however, they were not yet specifically targeted at the section of ‘civil society’ concerned with asylum seekers. This included, for instance, the creation of the special office of “State Counsellor for Civil Society and Civic Participation” by the first minister. In 2014, the state government then published a “Civic Engagement Strategy”, (“Engagementstrategie”) which, in more than 100 pages, outlined the concrete steps needed to foster an active ‘civil society’ (Sozialministerium BW: 2014). And yet, the entire document contained not a single reference to the topic of ‘asylum seekers’ or ‘refugees’. This indicates that, when the document was published in 2014, the reception and social integration of asylum seekers was not yet considered a particularly important or noteworthy responsibility of ‘civil society’.

These insights illustrate how, from late 2014 onwards, a section of ‘civil society’ encompassing citizens supporting refugees was born and institutionalized as an actor that is, together with the state, responsible for the reception of asylum seekers. Meanwhile, the government presented citizen engagement in support of refugees as a section of ‘civil society’ that needed special guidance and intervention. In the following subsection, I outline how this development shifted responsibility to committed citizens – a tendency that, however, remained highly contested among the volunteers themselves.

3.2.2. “Civil Society is the Music between the Notes”: The Impetus for Meaningful Cooperation

The programmes and instruments, which addressed practices of refugee support across Baden-Württemberg from 2014 onwards, built on the notion that the successful reception and integration of asylum seekers could only be achieved if ‘civil society’ and ‘the state’ were willing to cooperate and collaborate effectively. This came across clearly in my interview with Gisela Erler, Baden-Württemberg’s State Counsellor for Civil Society and Civic Participation, and her personal assistant Annette Brüderle. At the beginning of our interview, I asked about the role of committed citizens in the reception of refugees in Baden-Württemberg. Annette Brüderle replied as follows:

“Yes, civil society, of course, plays a very big part, because the state and the municipalities can put lots of things in place concerning accommodation [...], concerning possibilities and finances, how to take care of them and how to integrate them. But the actual integration, of course, needs to come about through civil society. It has to come about through neighbours, through schools, through kindergartens, through church parishes – in other words, through all the different areas in which civil society is active and involved. *In that sense, civil society is a bit like what you find between two musical notes: the music.*”¹¹ (Interview with Gisela Erler and Annette Brüderle: 17/4/2015, emphasis added)

According to my interlocutor, ‘the state’ produces the notes while ‘civil society’ is responsible for transforming what might be perceived as noise into music. In other words, while ‘the state’ is responsible for more technical matters, such as finances or accommodation, and thus lays the groundwork for the reception of asylum seekers, ‘civil society’ is deemed responsible for the step of “the actual integration”. As our interview proceeded, Annette Brüderle also stressed the role of ‘civil society’ in producing “acceptance”, thereby putting further emphasis on the impetus for meaningful cooperation:

“Acceptance can only be reflected by civil society. But the authorities [...] they, of course, need to see that there is transparency, participation from an early stage ... i.e. to work with lots of different instruments that make for a situation where acceptance can develop or be created.”¹² (Interview with Gisela Erler and Annette Brüderle: 17/4/2015)

11 Translation by LF. German original: “Ja, die Zivilgesellschaft spielt natürlich eine ganz große Rolle, weil sowohl das Land als auch die Kommunen letztendlich viel vorgeben können an Unterkünften [...] an Möglichkeiten und Finanzierung, wie man sie betreut und integriert. Aber der eigentliche Schritt der Integration muss natürlich über die Bürgerschaft kommen. Der muss über die Nachbarn kommen, der muss über die Schulen kommen, die Kindergärten, die Kirchengemeinden, also die vielen Bereiche auch in denen Zivilgesellschaft aktiv ist und sich einbringt. Insofern ist die Zivilgesellschaft eigentlich das, was man in der Musik vielleicht zwischen zwei Tönen findet: die Musik.”

12 Translation by LF. German original: “Die Akzeptanz kann nur durch die Zivilgesellschaft widergespiegelt werden, aber die Verwaltungen [...] die müssen natürlich schauen, dass sie dann Transparenz, frühzeitige Beteiligung ... also mit vielen Instrumenten arbeiten, die dann dazu führen, dass diese Akzeptanz dann auch entstehen kann oder hergestellt werden kann.”

To my interlocutor, thus, the primary initiator of the smooth reception of asylum seekers was ‘the state’, while ‘civil society’ bore responsibility for creating “acceptance” of asylum seekers and governmental decisions. Such narratives, which I repeatedly encountered among governmental actors in the area of my field research, clearly depicted ‘the state’ as being the one who determines the key tenets of migration management ‘from above’, while ‘civil society’ was responsible for effectuating these decisions ‘on the ground’.

By doing so, I would argue, governmental actors sought to shift responsibility from ‘the state’ to committed citizens. Lemke (2002: 11) regards such a tendency as part of a wider shift in techniques of governing:

“What we observe today is not a diminishment or reduction of state sovereignty and planning capacities but a displacement from formal to informal techniques of government and the appearance of new actors on the scene of government (e.g. NGOs), that indicate fundamental transformations in statehood and a new relation between state and civil society actors.” (Lemke 2002: 14)

According to Lemke, the state is thus increasingly extending its power over ostensibly non-governmental and civil society actors while modes of governing are becoming “informal”. Others read the outsourcing of governmental responsibilities to domains commonly considered non-governmental as a process of neoliberalization. Seen from such a perspective, the welfare state is increasingly withdrawing from certain sectors, such as the provision of care to those in need, and outsourcing them to what has been called the “third sector” or to private companies (Lemke 2001; Carey, Braunack-Mayer & Barraket 2009; Muehlebach 2012). The developments in the long summer of migration might have contributed to these wider shift in techniques of governing in that they outsourced responsibilities in the reception of asylum seekers from ‘the state’ to committed citizens.

At the same time, governmental authority over the reception of asylum seekers was reinforced, for instance, by the image of *verticality*. I encountered one particularly clear example of this in February 2016 at the conference “Together. Diverse. Colourful” (“Gemeinsam. Vielfältig. Bunt.”), which was organized by the state government of Baden-Württemberg. The event brought together not only volunteers’ initiatives but also governmental representatives from across the state. In his introductory speech, Gerd Maler, the mayor of a medium-sized town in Baden-Württemberg, opened the conference with the following words:

"The motto of this event is not something that can be dictated *from above*, it has to come *from below*." (Field notes: 22/2/2016; emphasis added).

With this statement, the mayor implicitly drew a line between 'state' and 'civil society' while placing the two on a vertical scale. By 'below', he most likely meant 'civil society', while 'above' was presumably the state government. According to the mayor, 'together', 'diverse' and 'colourful' were therefore attributes for which 'civil society' was responsible. Later in his speech, the mayor further argued that in order for the integration of asylum seekers to develop "from below", the requisite space needed to be provided "from above" (Field notes: 22/2/2016). He thus placed 'the state' and 'civil society' in relation to each other on a vertical scale, while shifting power to the state government.

In their essay on the "spatialization of the state", Ferguson and Gupta (2002) point out how 'the state' reifies itself as an enclosed entity and source of power by using spatial metaphors, such as the "image of verticality" that imagines 'the state' to be 'above' an entity called 'civil society' (ibid.: 982). These spatial metaphors, they argue, hold a strategic function as sources of power and domination. They put this as follows: "[These images of verticality] help to secure their [the states'] legitimacy, to naturalize their authority and to represent themselves as superior to, and encompassing of, other institutions and centres of power" (ibid.). In a similar vein, I would argue, governmental actors in the area of my field research sought to extend control and power over volunteers supporting refugees.

This tendency, however, did not go uncontested by the committed citizens themselves. I came across various moments when volunteers did not accept governmental interventions in their role and conduct. A striking example of this came in October 2015, when I attended the third "Forum for Refugee Help", a series of conferences organized by the state government. One of the topics of the conference was the integration of asylum seekers and refugees into the labour market. Examples of 'best practice' were introduced in which volunteers had – from the perspective of governmental actors – successfully placed asylum seekers in jobs. Eventually, a woman in the audience voiced her concerns in this regard. She identified herself as a committed volunteer and recalled with apparent frustration how she had tried her best to integrate asylum seekers into the local labour market, but failed each and every time because of the "Proof of Precedence" ("Vorrangprüfung"). This national law stipulated that employers hiring non-European nationals residing in Germany had to prove that they could not find suitable applicants of German or

EU nationality for the position¹³. With this regulation, the woman declared, ‘the state’ was directly hampering her voluntary work and her efforts to integrate refugees into the labour market. The comment sparked a discussion among several volunteers in the audience who also voiced their criticisms of governmental regulations. For instance, a volunteer in the audience asserted that her efforts to integrate asylum seekers had failed due to the “anti-integration policies” of the state (Field notes: 16/10/2015). Another one remarked: “We need to advocate for the abolition of the Proof of Precedence!”. These dissenting voices made clear that they were not solely responsible for the integration of asylum seekers, while criticizing their legal exclusion and marginalization. They asserted that the inclusion of asylum seekers into society also needed to be ‘ordained from above’ through laws and regulations that were beneficial to the volunteers’ efforts rather than hampering them. Such instances clearly indicated that some citizens were neither prepared to silently accept the basic tenets of the governance of migration nor to cooperate uncritically with ‘the state’.

Despite the government’s efforts to shift responsibility and extend power, the relationship between ‘state’ and ‘civil society’ thus remained open to disagreement and contestation. In the following section, I investigate in more detail how the long summer of migration (re)opened this boundary for negotiation.

3.2.3. Negotiating the Boundary between ‘State’ and ‘Civil Society’

During the final minutes of our interview, Marlies Vogtmann, the Deputy Secretary for Civil Society and Citizen Participation at Baden-Württemberg’s Ministry of Social Affairs, shared some personal insights into the challenges of her work. She acknowledged that there was a central question that she herself repeatedly struggled with:

“I keep thinking that this is a really tantalizing question: how far should the state’s sphere of action extend and how useful is it if civil society assumes certain responsibilities – because you have to also take on board people’s

13 In August 2016, around one year after these frustrations were voiced in relation to the “Proof of Precedence”, the German government suspended this law for a period of three years in order to ease refugees’ access to the German labour market. See for instance: <http://www.spiegel.de/karriere/vorrangpruefung-erleichterungen-fuer-fluechtlinge-am-arbeitsmarkt-a-1162174.html> (last accessed 1/8/2020).

personal attitudes towards these issues if you say: “Okay, that’s the responsibility of civil society”. In other words, if you ask yourself how far should the welfare state extend [...] or is this, in fact, an area where we should work with volunteers – not only because they are cheaper, but also because we believe that this is a fundamental aspect of civil society and such a civil society is a defining characteristic of our society.”¹⁴ (Interview with Marlies Vogtmann: 20/4/2016).

My interlocutor thus struggled to draw a clear line between ‘the state’ and ‘civil society’ in the context of her work. She acknowledged that this distinction and the responsibilities ascribed to both sides were not straightforward but instead open to interpretation. On the one hand, she related this question to the issue of how far-reaching the welfare state should be. If ‘civil society’, on the other hand, assumed certain responsibilities, it would be “cheaper” but you would have to “take on board” citizens’ personal attitudes, she acknowledged.

As our interview proceeded, Marlies Vogtmann also problematized the taking over of governmental tasks by ‘civil society’. If volunteers step in to provide support where they “notice a deficiency”, she argued, governmental reforms aimed at addressing this deficiency become redundant. The central question for Marlies Vogtmann was therefore: in what areas should ‘civil society’ withdraw assistance so that “the state” will finally “do its job”? (Interview with Marlies Vogtmann: 20/4/2016).

This uncertainty pertaining to the boundary between ‘state’ and ‘civil society’ has often been discussed in academic studies (Burchell, Gordon & Miller 1991; Ferguson & Gupta 2002; Gudavarthy 2013). For instance, Mitchell (1991: 88) asserts that “the edges of the state are uncertain, societal elements seem to penetrate it on all sides, and the resulting boundary between state and

14 Translation by LF. German original: “Das ist auch ne wahnsinnig spannende Frage, finde ich immer wieder: bis wohin sollte der Staat handeln und wie wertvoll ist es eigentlich, dass bestimmte Bereiche dann wiederum von der Zivilgesellschaft wahrgenommen werden, denn die persönlichen Einstellungen der Menschen zu diesen Themen, die man sich ja dann eben mitkauft, wenn man sagt: ‚ok, das ist eine Aufgabe für die Zivilgesellschaft‘. Also wenn man fragt ‚wie ausgeprägt sollte der Sozialstaat sein [...] oder ist das eigentlich auch etwas, wo wir gern mit Ehrenamtlichen arbeiten nicht nur weil sei billiger sind, sondern weil wir finden, dass das eine ureigenste Aufgabe der Zivilgesellschaft ist, dass das unsere Gesellschaft auch ausmacht, dass wir das als Zivilgesellschaft leisten.“

civil society is difficult to determine". He thus suggests analysing the contested processes of boundary-making as mechanisms through which power is generated and a given social and political order is maintained (ibid.: 90). Baker-Cristales (2008: 352) points to the co-constitutive nature of conceptions of 'state' and 'civil society': "Civil society does not exist as a prior and primordial unit; rather, civil society is formed in and through the same discourses and practices that create that artificially bounded postulate, the state". The long summer of migration, I would argue, brought this boundary under renewed scrutiny and (re)opened it for contestation and interpretation.

An issue that repeatedly stirred negotiation processes on where to draw the boundary between 'state' and 'civil society' was the question of payment. Both volunteers and governmental representatives problematized the merging of volunteering with forms of paid employment. At a conference organized by the state government of Baden-Württemberg in March 2015, for instance, a governmental representative stressed that volunteering must not replace municipal "administration work" (Field notes: 14/3/2015). Governmental representatives were also critical of moments when the distinction between professional care work and volunteering became blurred. As Marlies Vogtmann, Deputy Secretary for Citizen Engagement at the state government's Ministry of Social Affairs, put it:

"And there's one area where we are always very critical, when a mixture of volunteering and employment arises [...] A hypothetical example: the Red Cross says 'We need helpers for the supervision of children's groups on the ground' [...] they then get expenses of four euros per hour but they also have to sign that they will always turn up at 3 p.m. and, suddenly, you have a mixture of work and volunteering. To me, that's very problematic."¹⁵ (Interview with Marlies Vogtmann: 20/4/2016)

This problematic nature of blended forms of volunteering and employment was often explained with particular advantages arising from unpaid volun-

-
- 15 Translation by LF. German original: "Und an einer Stelle sind wir auch immer ganz kritisch, wenn dann so eine Vermischung von Ehrenamt oder bürgerschaftlichem Engagement und Arbeitsverhältnis entsteht, so dieses Thema, also als theoretisches Beispiel jetzt, das Rote Kreuz fängt an, sagt ich brauch viele Helferlein für die Betreuung von Kindergruppen vor Ort [...] also kriegen die jetzt eine Aufwandsentschädigung von 4 Euro pro Stunde, dafür müssen sie dann aber unterschreiben, dass sie immer um 15 Uhr da sind und schon ist man in so einer Mischform von Arbeit und Ehrenamt. Finde ich ganz schwierig."

tary work. As the statement by Marlies Vogtmann indicates, governmental representatives often asserted that – rather than responding to obligations and strict rules such as fixed working hours – volunteers were more flexible and therefore able to react more immediately to changes or problems that arose in the reception of asylum seekers. Paid employees, in contrast, needed to adhere to bureaucratic procedures and regulations and were therefore not as spontaneous as volunteers in reacting to the uncertainty pertaining to the migration of asylum seekers. This came out clearly in my interview with Gisela Erler, the State Counsellor for Civil Society and Civic Participation. She explained that volunteers followed a particular intrinsic “logic”:

“These are not part-time employees that you hire, they are volunteers with their own logic based for the most part on motivation and reliability, though that is something that’s generated not by an apparent straitjacket of rules but by other means ... I believe that it works, and until now people have been doing it perfectly well ... Only now is there this wave of ‘We have to regulate all of this’. So you’ve got this conflicted relationship between a need to regulate and the logic of volunteering.”¹⁶ (Interview with Gisela Erler and Annette Brüderle: 17/4/15)

With this statement, Gisela Erler pointed to a central issue in the context of her work: on the one hand, volunteering would follow an intrinsic logic that is not based on imposed rules and thus defies governmental control to a certain degree. On the other hand, governmental actors see a ‘need to regulate’ volunteers and thus attempt to extend control over their activities. From her perspective, there was a ‘thin line’ between regulating volunteers through governmental programmes and crushing volunteers with rules and obligations. It was thus the shaping of the volunteers’ self-conduct that gained priority in the course of the long summer of migration – something I will illustrate in more detail in the following section.

16 Translation by LF. German original: “Das sind keine Teilzeitarbeitskräfte, die du einstellst, sondern das sind Ehrenamtliche mit ner eigenen Logik und das beruht im Wesentlichen auf Motivation und Verlässlichkeit, die aber anders hergestellt wird als durch ein scheinbar festes Regelkorsett, ja ... ich glaube, dass das geht und bisher haben das die Leute ja auch immer gemacht ... erst jetzt kommt die Flut von ‚Wir müssen das aber alles regeln. Also das ist so das Spannungsverhältnis zwischen Regelungsbedarf und der Logik von Ehrenamt.“