grounds and different imaginaries come together in order to elaborate the parameters of contemporary living-together. Refugee support might thus be read as a prism that sheds a new light on current social and political developments in European migration societies. Practices and discourses of migrant solidarity are revealing in terms of how people imagine the world around them, at the same time as they are also world building. They forge new relations among different groups and actors; produce collectivity and enact ideals of a 'better society'. Therefore, practices of refugee support should always be read in relation to the political and social context in which they take place.

The long summer of migration in 2015 epitomized strikingly how intensified global migration movements are profoundly altering European societies. Perhaps more than ever before, this situation led long-term residents to reflect upon their ideals, wishes and needs concerning living-together in an increasingly heterogeneous migration society. The contested solidarities of the migration summer thus responded to a desire to build new forms of collectivity and togetherness amidst migration movements.

In this concluding section, I draw together the findings of this book and discuss how they contribute to our understanding of contemporary migration societies. I suggest that the German 'summer of welcome' might be read as a telling case that sheds a new light on wider challenges, tensions and issues surrounding living-together in contemporary migration societies. In what follows, I conclude this study by highlighting three *lines of contestation* that crystallized in the course of this book. It was along these lines that actors disagreed with each other and struggled with the question of how to position themselves. These lines of contestation, in my view, mirror not only the differing and contested social imaginaries pertaining to migrant solidarity, they also point to the contested question of how an increasingly heterogeneous and diverse society should look like. Over the following pages, I scrutinize these three *lines of contestation* in more detail.

7.1.   The Contested Line between Insiders and Outsiders

One issue that repeatedly inspired differing positions among those who participated in the contestation of solidarity was the question of where to draw the line between 'genuine' and 'bogus' asylum seekers; between those to be included and those to be excluded from relationships of solidarity and help; between victims and villains of migration. This categorization of newcomers

into unwanted economic migrants, on the one hand, and those who could potentially be integrated as fellow citizens, on the other, was one of the most challenging and controversial issues among those who supported refugees. Some had quite clear preconceptions of who was deserving of their help and support and who was not; they made their help and support contingent on the asylum seekers' nationality, on their assumed reasons for migrating, on their willingness 'to integrate', on their gratitude, or on factors such as family status, gender and skin colour. Others, however, took a more universal approach, claiming to give their support to each and every member of 'humanity' whatever their origin or reason for migrating. In either case, the line between insiders and outsiders clearly transcended the distinction between recognized citizens and non-citizens that, according to some scholars, represents the central pillar of the modern nation-state and the source of sovereign power (cf. Agamben 1998; Papastergiadis 2006). Those who supported refugees built relationships of solidarity that clearly stretched across this divide. I would suggest that this illustrates how residents in contemporary European migration societies are (re)shaping the parameters of inclusion and exclusion, increasingly moving beyond national citizenship as the primary expression of community membership.

At times, the tendency to include certain newcomers as potential co-citizens and exclude others coincided with governmentally institutionalized distinctions between 'genuine' and 'bogus' asylum seekers. For instance, one of my interlocutors – a committed volunteer in a medium-sized town in Baden-Württemberg – told me that, for reasons of "efficiency", he only wanted to help those asylum seekers who had a good "perspective of staying", i.e. a high statistical probability, based on past cases from their country of origin, that their asylum claim would be accepted. Scholars in the field of critical migration studies have long outlined how the production of different categories of migrants is a cornerstone of the governance of migration (Papadopoulos, Stephenson & Tsianos 2008; De Genova 2010; Squire 2011a). During the long summer of migration, asylum seekers originating from Syria were generally depicted as 'rightful' subjects of help and support by those who engaged in refugee solidarity. This might partly be explained by the extensive media coverage of the civil war raging in that country. Whether asylum seekers from eastern European and sub-Saharan African countries were equally 'deserving' of help and support, however, was a more controversial issue among helpers. Recognition rates for asylum seekers from these countries were almost zero, while governmental actors in the area of my field research openly stigma-

tized them as 'economic migrants' whose presence was deemed illegitimate (see Chapter 5). While some nevertheless offered help and support to these ostensibly 'bogus' asylum seekers, other volunteers openly called for their effective deportation. At times, those who supported refugees thus deliberately excluded certain groups from relationships of solidarity, thereby perpetuating their marginalized status and becoming complicit in the governance of migration. In consequence, such ostensible 'economic migrants' were often relegated to the status of outsiders who should be excluded from 'rightful' membership of migration societies.

However, my findings also illuminated numerous moments when those supporting refugees took a critical stance towards the exclusion and marginalization of those deemed 'bogus' refugees. Critical migration scholars have long pointed out that closer inspection shows migration movements to always be much more complex than distinctions between 'bogus economic migrants' and 'suffering refugees' suggest (cf. Ratfisch 2015). The inconsistencies surrounding this binary categorization of newcomers also became an issue for many of those who were drawn into supportive relationships around the long summer of migration. Indeed, the line between insiders and outsiders appeared to be highly contested among those who engaged in practices of refugee support. This was most apparent around the issue of deportations, which repeatedly sparked heated debates during my field research. I highlighted several instances when committed citizens voiced their dissent towards deportation orders or challenged the exclusion of those deemed 'bogus' asylum seekers in other ways. Often, volunteers did not distinguish between different groups of migrants but instead deliberately offered help and support to each and every one arriving in their town, village or neighbourhood, even if some had little chance of staying. In Chapter 4, I argued that many forged relationships of solidarity with whoever was 'there' on the ground. In doing so, they positioned themselves in relation to a *politics of presence* that articulated new modes of belonging revolving around 'the local', thus clearly eschewing distinctions based on national citizenship and instead emphasizing *co-presence*.

The question of where to draw the line between inclusion and exclusion in contemporary migration societies also became the focus of numerous interventions in the 'right' conduct of solidarity. Those who openly depicted their actions as "left-wing political activism", for example, often called for radical equality and unrestricted openness, demanding an "unconditional right to stay" or "equal rights for all". In the second and fourth chapters, I outlined

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