how such 'activists' built alliances with those who sought to help asylum seekers, using these alliances to promote their political world views and to further their own aims. In stark contrast, governmental actors often drew a clear line between ostensibly 'genuine' and 'bogus' asylum seekers while making committed citizens complicit in the reproduction of this division. As I outlined in the third chapter of this book, the state government of Baden-Württemberg intervened in volunteering with refugees, promoting those practices that it deemed beneficial to its objectives in the governance of migration. For instance, governmental actors portrayed volunteers as being responsible for providing "returnee counselling" to rejected asylum seekers, thus asking them to contribute to the enforcement of deportation orders and expecting them to accept governmental decisions uncritically. Nonetheless, I also identified numerous occasions when volunteers demanded a space for disagreement with governmental actors and refused to recognize the distinction between those deemed insiders of a migration society and those considered deportable.

I would argue that these differing and at times contrasting positions and imaginaries shed light on how the line between insiders and outsiders is increasingly difficult to draw. The line between insiders and outsiders thus presents a highly contested issue in contemporary European migration societies. The ways in which this line is (re)negotiated among different groups and actors involved in relationships of solidarity merits further research. It would be particularly fruitful to learn how this line is contested through relationships of solidarity forged in different geographical areas and temporal contexts.

7.2. The Contested Line between 'the State' and 'Civil Society'

Another issue that provoked different understandings and positions was the relationship between 'the state' and its citizen-subjects. As one of my interlocutors, a representative of the state government of Baden-Württemberg, put it, she struggled with the following question: "How far should the state's sphere of action extend and how useful is it if civil society assumes certain responsibilities?". The unprecedented willingness to support refugees around the long summer of migration indicated that established residents felt a growing responsibility for the 'public good' and perceived an obligation to volunteer on behalf of migrants. These tendencies not only led to new ways of relating among established residents and newcomers in migration societies, they also

substantially altered and (re)shaped the relationships between governmental actors and citizens: tasks and responsibilities were (re)ordered between the entities imagined as 'the state' and 'civil society', while the boundary between these entities often became blurred. I would suggest that these findings indicate how the German 'summer of welcome' also served as a laboratory that produced contested understandings of the role and responsibility of the individual vis-à-vis 'the state' in migration societies.

When governmental actors appeared to be underequipped for the growing numbers of asylum seekers arriving in late summer 2015, established residents often felt compelled to 'step in' in order to improve the deteriorating conditions on the ground. In the second chapter, I argued that a feeling of being morally obligated to help in an extraordinary emergency situation mobilized many to take action. However, it was often not only an impulse to alleviate immediate human suffering but also a desire to re-establish 'public order' that drove them to refugee support. With their commitment, they joined in with governmental efforts to ameliorate the perceived 'crisis' and bring order to the tense situation. For instance, one of my interlocutors, a committed volunteer and retired school teacher, told me that he considered his helping practices as "a means to give something back to the welfare state". This example clearly illustrates how many of those supporting refugees felt responsible for the functioning of the 'public good'. One of my interlocutors, a governmental representative whose job was to facilitate citizen engagement across the state, summed this up when he remarked "the state – is that not all of us?". Indeed, my empirical investigation indicated that those who got involved around the long summer of migration often – but not always – acted in concert with 'the state' in order to facilitate the reception of asylum seekers.

This led to a situation where migrants increasingly became governed through extended state-citizen networks wrapped in a cloak of humanitarian care and compassion. In many places, those who sought to help took on responsibilities in the reception of asylum seekers that were formerly carried out by 'the state'. In the course of my field research, I came across numerous instances of volunteers providing for the basic needs of asylum seekers. I argued that they thus acted as "street-level bureaucrats" (Lipsky 2010 [1980]), compensating for the lack of professionally employed social workers and caretakers and bringing relief to underequipped local authorities. In consequence, 'civil society' emerged as a responsible actor in the reception of asylum seekers, while tasks and responsibilities passed from the level of 'the state' to the level of committed citizens (see Chapter 3).

In order to (re)gain control over these developments, the state government of Baden-Württemberg introduced numerous programmes seeking to regulate, coordinate or facilitate citizen engagement across the state. Such programmes were often based on the notion that refugee support needed governmental intervention in order to be "effective". I argued that, through such means, governmental actors aimed to shape the (self-)conduct of committed citizens in a way that was beneficial to wider aims and objectives in the governance of migration, while depoliticizing practices of refugee support. This argument connects with academic works that have pointed to a shift from 'welfare states' to 'active societies', one that outsources responsibilities from 'the state' to 'responsible citizens' and places an emphasis on self-conduct (cf. Walters 1997; Dean 2010; Lessenich 2011). In parallel, scholars in the field of the anthropology of humanitarianism have discussed how humanitarian actors have come to govern in areas abandoned by the state. Such writers have blamed humanitarians for acting in concert with governmental actors, arguing that this situation perpetuates exclusions and fosters new discriminations. For instance, Ticktin (2011) problematizes how, in what she calls "regimes of care", ostensibly non-governmental organizations govern marginalized subjects through an emphasis on human suffering, while Fassin (2016) identifies a shift from "right to favour" that makes the situation of asylum seekers increasingly dependent on the goodwill of benevolent citizens.

Although such works provide valuable insights into the questions of power that pertain to refugee support, my study revealed that the effects and meanings of migrant solidarity are actually much more ambivalent and contested than such a reading suggests. This book highlighted numerous moments when those supporting refugees problematized their part in sustaining flawed asylum and border policies, while making governmental reforms redundant. Many of my interlocutors admitted that they felt generally uncomfortable with the idea of being seen as "unremunerated labour" for 'the state', to be deployed at the whim of governmental actors. Others reflected on the ambivalent effects of having 'stepped in' when local authorities proved underequipped and asylum regimes appeared inadequate. I also explored numerous instances of volunteers openly criticizing governmental interventions over their role and conduct in the reception of asylum seekers, volunteers who insisted on remaining "independent" of governmental actors and their objectives, while demanding space for disagreement. My investigation thus revealed that measures to extend governmental control

over committed citizens did not go uncontested, while volunteers proved to remain to a certain extent *ungovernable*. Volunteers did often not hesitate to voice dissent towards governmental actors, to point at shortcomings in the handling of asylum seekers and to demand reforms.

What is more, my investigation illustrated that the shifting of responsibilities from 'the state' to committed citizens not only extended governmental control and power over the sphere of 'civil society' but, at the same time, opened up new possibilities for political action. The enhanced role of committed citizens in the management of asylum seekers might therefore also be read as a greater capacity to exert influence and foster change towards a different alternative on a grassroots level. The (re)ordering of responsibilities around the long summer of migration, I would suggest, redistributed power from formal governmental actors to individual citizens striving to build a 'better society'. Assuming a position that does not stand in opposition to 'the state' but instead puts an emphasis on cooperation can thus provide quite a strong position from which to foster political change. Often, those supporting refugees also demanded a say in local political decision-making processes and in the handling of asylum seekers on the ground. Local authorities that, in their view, did not take volunteers "seriously" or consult them on matters concerning the handling of asylum seekers were a major source of frustration.

I would thus suggest that committed citizens did play an active part in shaping the ways in which asylum seekers were governed and managed on the ground. My findings illustrate that the line between the entities imagined as 'the state' and 'civil society' is opened up for reconsideration and renegotiation in light of increased migration movements. The ways in which intensified migration is causing the relationship between 'the state' and its citizen-subjects to be reshaped is a topic that merits further research and consideration and provides an interesting avenue for future research.

7.3. The Contested Relationship between 'the Local' and 'the World Out There'

Last but not least, my empirical findings illustrate how those supporting refugees (re)considered the relationship between 'the local' and 'the global' in the course of their practices of solidarity. The increased willingness to get involved on behalf of migratory newcomers spoke both to a growing awareness of the transformative effects of intensified *global* migration movements and