THE "EUROPEAN REFUGEE CRISIS" AS THE CRISIS OF LIBERAL TOLERANCE: THREE MODALITIES OF LIBERAL EXCLUSION

LİBERAL TAHAMMÜLÜN KRİZİ OLARAK "AVRUPA MÜLTECİ KRİZİ": LİBERAL DIŞLAMANIN ÜÇ FORMU

Hande SÖZER[*]

ABSTRACT

This article examines European residential responses to migrations after 2015. The literature meticulously analyzes their historically-contextually changing variances and inner diversities while imposing a binary view: the anti-immigration response is the negation, and the solidarity response is the affirmation of liberal tolerance. Contrarily, I argue that both responses utilize the liberal tolerance idea and its operational principles. First, they border the European Self and the migrant Other; re-border "the intolerable" and "the tolerable" migrant; and then exclude the former while only partially including the latter. Refugees' inclusion and exclusion are seen either as a zero-sum (i.e., they are either included or excluded) or a dialectical state (i.e., the inclusion of some means the exclusion of others), but I claim that even the most inclusive responses are excluding the very subjects they claim to include. Inclusion is partial, while exclusion is constant. Thus, I discuss the migrants' permanent yet differential exclusions in three modalities of liberal tolerance: Liberal intolerance, differentiating tolerance, and indifferent tolerance.

[*] Assistant Professor, Middle East Technical Univ. Northern Cyprus Campus, Political Science and International Relations, KKTC, hsozer@metu.edu.tr, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7288-5192

ÖZ

Bu makale, Avrupa sakinlerinin 2015 sonrası göçlere yanıtlarını inceler. Literatür bu yanıtların tarihsel ve bağlamsal olarak değişen farklılaşmalarını incelerken bir ikilik kurar: göç karşıtı yaklaşım liberal tahammül nosyonunun inkârı, dayanışma yaklaşımı ise liberal tahammülün onaylanması olarak varsayılır. Literatürün aksine iki yanıtın da liberal tahammül kavramından ve liberal tahammül kavramının dışlayıcı işleyiş prensiplerini kullandıklarını savunuyorum. Yani önce Avrupalı Özne ile göçmen Öteki arasında, sonra tahammül edilebilen ve edilemeyen göçmen arasında ayrım yapılır, sonra da tahammül edilemeyen Öteki dışlanırken tahammül edilen Öteki ancak kısmen içerilir. Bu durum ya bir hep ya da hiç durumu (yani biri ya içerilir ya da dışlanır) ya da diyalektik bir durum (yani birinin içerilmesi diğerinin dışlanması demektir) olarak görülürken ben en içeren yaklaşımların bile içerdiklerini iddia ettikleri özneleri dışladıklarını iddia ediyorum. İçermek kısmi ve dışlama bakidir. Bu nedenle göçmenlerin sürekli ancak farklılaşmış dışlanma formlarını liberal tahammülün üç formu, liberal tahammülsüzlük, ayırt eden tahammül, kayıtsız tahammül, açısından ele alıyorum.

Anahtar Kelimeler: "Avrupa Mülteci Krizi," Liberal Tahammül, Liberal Tahammülsüzlük, Ayırt eden Tahammül, Kayıtsız Tahammül.

INTRODUCTION

In September 2015, Syrians' mass migrations toward European borders became globally visible. Commonsense accounts frame the issue as the "European refugee crisis," while academic accounts criticize such depiction. Although some continue to use the "crisis" phrase (e.g., Buananno, 2017; Sebastian, 2018), others underline that the real crisis is not about the refugees but "a crisis of political solidarity" (Crawley, 2016: 18), "a crisis of the Schengen Area,…as a crisis of sovereignty, as a crisis of values or social cohesion, as a crisis of security, as a

humanitarian crisis, and as a crisis of international protection" (Squire, 2020: 15-36), a crisis of "the management of migration" (Archibugi, Cellini, Vitiello, 2021: 4). This article argues that the so-called "European refugee crisis" is also the crisis of the liberal tolerance idea, which has historically inspired different modalities of Europe's dealing with "the different," "the stranger," and "the outsider." It claims that the European residents' anti-immigration and solidarity responses adhere to the liberal tolerance idea and cause a permanent yet differentiated state of exclusion of the refugees inside and at the borders of Europe.

Mass migrations to Europe after 2015 caused European civilian responses by residents in two forms: anti-immigration approaches reject immigration to Europe, while solidarity approaches welcome migrants in Europe. Academic literature on both public responses is specialized in either anti-immigration approaches (e.g., Badano and Nuti, 2018; Minkenberg, 2000; Vaughan, 2021 and for systemic analysis, see Kentmen-Cin and Erişen, 2017) or solidarity approaches (e.g., Karakayalı, 2019; Rozakou, 2017; van der Veer, 2020; Vandevooord and Fleischmann, 2021, and for systemic analysis, see Bauder and Juffs, 2020). Consequently, these approaches are studied in-depth by concentrating on their inner variations and contextual peculiarities while their relationality is underemphasized.

A relational analysis of anti-immigration and solidarity responses remains limited. Some studies examine their relations in specific national contexts as they are "temporarily and spatially configured" (van der Veer, 2020: 369). Still, they risk provincializing these responses and detaching them from the broader European migration management context. Other studies compare their relation in specific national configurations across Europe (Pasetti and Garcés-Mascareñas, 2018). Alternatively, others universalize these responses merely as versions of a social movement; the anti-immigration responses are "social movements" and solidarity movements are "counter-movements," when the latter is viewed as "contentious politics" against exclusion (Ataç, 2016: 643), for claiming human rights and global citizenship (Ataç, Rygiel, and Stierl, 2016: 540). Still, these studies display a dichotomous view of the European responses to migrations.

The dichotomous presentation of European residential responses is widespread in academic and policy studies. Accordingly, anti-immigration approaches are seen as illiberal, intolerant, irrational, emotional, malevolent, violent, and exclusive, and solidarity approaches are seen as liberal, tolerant, rational, reasonable, humanistic, virtuous, and inclusive. Further, the solidarity movements are seen as morally superior, even by the studies recognizing both approaches' complexities, such as the historical evolution, inner heterogeneity, and internal complexities of solidarity approaches (e.g., Cantat, 2021) and anti-immigration approaches (e.g., Brubaker, 2017). This article is an outcome of

skepticism against such moralizing views; since our normative presumptions on "how things should be" may blind us from seeing "how things are" in all their complexity. It suggests that both approaches need to face, rather than be immune from, academic scrutiny.

A relational and distinctly critical account of Slajov Žižek problematizes moralizing approaches to European residential responses to post-2015 migrations. To him, anti-immigration approaches (or "anti-immigration populism") reject refugees knowing that non-European communities would never thrive in Europe. In contrast, the solidarity approaches (or "left-liberalism") welcome refugees knowing that *all* refugees will never be allowed in Europe (Žižek, 2015, 2016). He sees both responses as problematic: the former is open and direct in its refusal to defend European lifeways, while the latter displays "hypocrisy" and "arrogant moralism" because it claims to unconditionally protect refugees' lives while promoting the protection of European lifeways (Žižek, 2015, 2016). This article expands Žižek's argument on anti-immigration and solidarity responses' shared concern for "European lifeways." It aims to answer why and how both reactions are concerned with defending European lifeways despite their opposing stances on migrations to Europe. The proposed answer is as follows: both responses carry the anxiety of how to engage with migrants, and they address it by resorting to the liberal tolerance notion and its exclusive principles in dealing with migrations and migrants after 2015.

The article makes a theoretical account of an uncomfortable truth: both anti-immigration and solidarity responses, despite their opposite stances and contrary practices regarding migrants, are rooted in the European liberal tolerance notion. "Tolerance" means the endurance of one against another when the latter's idea of good is normally unacceptable for the former (Hage, 2000); it is "liberal" when both sides are free subjects (Kautz, 1993); and it is "European" considering the concepts' intellectual trajectory (see Brown, 2006). Liberal tolerance relation is one of power where only one side controls the limits of tolerance, and it is exclusionary since only one side decides what, when, and who will be tolerated or suspended from tolerance (Hage, 2000: 93). Both anti-immigration and solidarity approaches to migrations utilize liberal tolerance notions' exclusionary principles: first, "the tolerant Self" separates itself from the Other by demarcating their differences; second, it categorizes the designated Other into "the tolerable" and "the intolerable" versions; third, it excludes "the intolerable" Other for supposedly unbreachable civilizational differences between the Self and "the intolerable." Then, "the tolerable" Other is welcomed but, on the terms and conditions set by "the tolerant" Self, which entails keeping its distinction from "the tolerable" Other permanent and salient. The article intends not to implement a post-structuralist

critique of the Self and the Other dichotomy in the migration context[1] but to discuss the pattern of migrants' exclusion driven by the liberal tolerance notion underlying European residential responses to post-2015 migrations.

One legitimate question is whether the liberal tolerance notion and its deployment for the local-migrant relations are particularly "European." Historically, the liberal tolerance notion has European intellectual roots (Brown, 2006), but its implementation may not be exclusive to the European context (see Hayden, 2002) and may be seen in various migration contexts, such as Lebanon, Jordan, and Turkey. Yet, the scope of this article is historically and contextually limited to the "European refugee crisis" after 2015. Another question is whether such portrayal essentializes Europe, Europeans, migrants, and their relations. The literature has established well that "Europe" is under a constant state of defining and re-defining; that "European identity" has historically remained contested (see Goddard, Llobera, and Shore, 1994; Green, 2013); that the meanings of the phrase "European" are heterogeneous (see Delanty, 2004). Yet, the literature also discusses historical cases where "Europe," as a contested and heterogeneous agglomeration, still could uniformly act as a homogenous "entity" against an external or internal "outsider" (see Stolcke, 1995, Stråth, 2010). Indeed, specifically for the post-2015 migrations, scholars state that "Europeans" essentialize themselves and migrants in racial terms (see De Genova, 2018: 1770). Thus, by examining "European" responses to post-2015 migrations, this article does not essentialize Europe, European identity, Europeans, or migrants, but it examines such self-essentializing and other-essentializing based on the literature (e.g., Badano and Nuti, 2018; Minkenberg, 2000; Hinger, 2020).

The literature examines migrants' inclusion and exclusion by numerous actors, policies, and practices with various models. One view presents migrants' inclusion and exclusion as a zero-sum condition: refugees are either included or excluded. For instance, the anti-immigration response is seen as exclusive, and the solidarity approach is seen as inclusive (e.g., Ataç, Rygiel and Stierl, 2016; Baban and Rygiel, 2017). Another view presents migrants' inclusion and exclusion as a dialectical process. For instance, Michael Collyer, Sophie Hinger, and Reinhard Schweitzer examine the "(dis-) integration" of refugees, according to which the disintegration of some migrants serves the integration of others (2020: 3) because integration is "a stratified" and incomplete process (2020: 3-4). Such stratification divides migrants into "deserving" and "undeserving" segments with contextually

---

[1] The modernist structuralist conceptualization of the Self and the Other (Saussure, 1916) the modernist view of the Self, as a rational, unified, coherent subject, as opposed to its essentialized Other, have been criticized by post-structuralism (see Derrida, 1976) and then by feminist, post-colonial, and critical race theories.

changing and actor-dependent "deservingness" criteria (see Holzberg, Kolbe and Zaborowski, 2018; Marchetti, 2020; Sözer, 2020; Maneri, 2021).

This article differs from these studies on migrants' inclusion and exclusion. First, contrary to the zero-sum approach, it claims that the difference between the anti-immigration and solidarity approaches is not that the former is excluding migrants while the latter is including them; both anti-immigration and solidarity responses exclude migrants although differently. Second, contrary to the dialectical approach, I argue that the problem is not how only some ("deserving") migrants are included at the cost of the exclusion of the other ("the undeserving") ones. It is that even the most "deserving" migrants are excluded. Alternatively, I argue for a permanent state of exclusion of migrants (including the most welcomed migrants and even the most welcoming responses) when their exclusion is differentiated in terms of the exclusionary modalities based on studies on anti-immigration approaches (e.g., De Genova, 2018; Maneri, 2021, Heizmann, 2016; Badano and Nuti, 2018; Minkenberg, 2000) and solidarity approaches (e.g., Cabot, 2016; Rozakou, 2017; Baban and Rygiel, 2017).

The article claims that European residential responses to migrations after 2015 indicate a new form of exclusion: a permanent yet differentiated exclusion. It utilizes but differs from earlier conceptualizations of migrants' exclusion. For instance, Stephen Castles' "differentiated exclusion" term stands for migrants' partial inclusion in the host society to prevent their permanent settlement (1995), while Genova, Mezzadra, and Pickles' "differentiated inclusion" (1995) stands for migrants' inclusion in one sphere while encountering "various degrees of subordination, rule, discrimination, racism, disenfranchisement, exploitation and segmentation" (Casas-Cortes et al. 2015: 25). These conceptualizations are for nation-states' policy-level responses while my study is on non-state, civilian responses. I claim that European civil initiatives may actively contribute to migrants' exclusion by reproducing the policy level power asymmetries between citizens and non-citizens, locals, and migrants. This situation indicates the continuity and permanency of migrants' exclusion, i.e., this exclusion is not only by the states but also by the civil initiatives, and it is not only by anti-immigration movements but also by solidarity movements as revealed in academic studies that discuss such exclusion directly (e.g., Koca, 2016; Rozakou, 2017; Baban and Rygiel, 2017) or indirectly (e.g., Holzberg, Kolbe and Zaborowski, 2018; Koca, 2019; Monforte, Maestri and D'Halluin, 2021).

The term "exclusion" for the acts of denial of the migrant communities' access to resources and rights, which includes migrants the denial of entry to host territories, their denial of being accepted into the symbolic boundaries of the host society, their denial from deciding its own terms of engagement with the rest of the society, and their denial from even voicing to what degree and how they want

to relate to the host society, i.e., whether they desire remain as a "migrant" community or blend into the society. Such conceptualization might also require conceptualizing "inclusion" but the literature questions viewing inclusion and exclusion as opposite to each other by stating their complex relations (see Mezzadra and Neilson, 2012). Therefore, I opt for pursuing a non-exclusive engagement with migrants is more viable than their "inclusion,"[2] and such a non-exclusive civil initiative could actively support migrants' defining and monitoring of their own group boundaries in broader society.

The literature shows how some solidarity movements attempt for a non-exclusive engagement with migrants, but they resort back to inserting structural power asymmetries (see Koca, 2016; Rozakou, 2017; Baban and Rygiel, 2017). Furthermore, the proclaimed excuse for migrants' deprivation from managing their own group boundaries has been that migrants are not autonomous subjects yet. This excuse, however, is paternalism since it claims to know what is best for migrants when migrants presumable cannot know it. Unlike state paternalism in humanitarian contexts (e.g., Barnett, 2017) civilian movements' paternalism is understudied (for volunteer paternalism see Kukovetz and Sprung, 2019; and for local humanitarian actors' paternalism see Sözer, 2021a, 2021b).

Considering the European civilian responses' above-mentioned forms of exclusion, I argue that *for "the intolerable" migrant, the exclusion is complete but for "the tolerable" migrant, the inclusion is only partial.* On the one hand, in the case of "intolerable migrants," both anti-immigration and solidarity approaches may exclude them by actively preventing their entry at the borders or by contributing to the formation of public opinion to prevent their entry or stay (see Hinger, 2020). They may also exclude "intolerable migrants" already in Europe, by deploying racist or cultural fundamentalist discourses (see Stolcke, 1995; Heizmann, 2016; Brubaker 2017; De Genova, 2018), by depriving them of assistance and protection, or by supporting their surveillance and containment (see Marchetti, 2020). On the other hand, in the case of "tolerable migrants," strikingly, European residential responses may exclude them by setting, controlling, and monitoring the European resident and non-citizen migrant intercommunal boundary (see Hinger, 2020), by deciding the terms and conditions of the engagement with migrant communities (see Koca, 2019; van der Veer; 2020, Boccagni and Giudici, 2021), and by defining the expected behavior for those who are allowed for entry (see Badano and Nuti; 2018; Monforte, Maestri and d'Halluin, 2021). Thus, European responses including the most welcoming solidarity approaches may create "new

---

[2] European responses' to drawing the local-migrants border is exclusion while the inclusion is *not* the erasure of this border, e.g., their incorporation (via assimilation) or their adjustment (via integration) to the host community. In my view, the exclusion is not about the presence or the absence of an inter-group border but making border-drawing (or erasing) unilaterally, without allowing the other party to have a say leaving aside negotiating it.

boundaries of exclusion" (Monforte, Maestri, and d'Halluin, 2021: 686), new "bordering practices" (Koca, 2019: 546), and "mix care with control" (van der Veer, 2020: 337). In return, "the tolerable" migrants are expected to permanently be "migrants," and perform the role designated for migrants for receiving support in host societies in Europe (see studies on performing "the deserving migrant" such as Huschke, 2014; Borrelli, 2020; Ratzmann, 2021).

One relevant issue for examining exclusion is how migrants' exclusion is recalibrated, i.e., how migrants may be excluded in diverse ways by civil initiatives. Many studies examine "which migrants are excluded" by focusing on various "deservingness" frameworks for migrants while they also disclose these frameworks' contextual, historical, arbitrary, and actor-dependent nature (see Holzberg, Kolbe and Zaborowski, 2018; Marchetti, 2020; Sözer, 2020, Sözer, 2021b). For this reason, I suggest a shift of focus from residents' views of various migrants to the residents' various acts causing migrants' exclusion. This also means the shift of the question from "who are excluded?" to "how are various groups of migrants excluded?"

Conceptually, the article answers the question that "how are various migrants excluded?" by stating that migrants face permanent yet differential exclusion and by introducing three modalities of liberal tolerance idea: *liberal intolerance, differentiating tolerance, and indifferent tolerance.* First, *the liberal intolerance modality* characterizes the anti-immigration approaches to migration. It totalizes all migrants, collectively, and as "intolerable." Then, migrants are collectively denied entry to the European territories for protecting a self-essentialized European identity, or they face various forms of exclusion in the European territories (see Stolcke, 1995; De Genova, 2018). The liberal intolerance modality excludes all migrants collectively, at the borders of "Europe" and from the symbolic borders of an essentialized "Europeanness." Second, the *differentiating tolerance modality* is used by some solidarity approaches that differentiate between migrants as "the tolerable" and "the intolerable" migrants along with some "deservingness" frameworks Holzberg, Kolbe and Zaborowski, 2018; Marchetti, 2020; Maneri, 2021). The "intolerable" migrant is straightforwardly excluded from European territories and from the European society (as in the anti-immigration approaches), while "the tolerable" migrants are included but only partially by allowing their entry from the borders of "Europe" yet excluded from the symbolic borders of an essentialized "Europeanness." Third, the *indifferent tolerance modality* is deployed by some solidarity approaches that welcome all refugees (e.g., in Rozakou, 2017; Baban and Rygiel, 2017). Indifferent tolerance totalizes migrants; *all* refugees appear as collectively welcomed, i.e., it is indifferent to categorizing migrants internally it is not indifferent to migrants' welfare). This modality seems to be the most inclusive one as it allows all migrants' entry to Europe, but it is also

conditional because, in the end, all migrants as the "tolerable" migrants are expected to comply with the designated roles affiliated with "the migrant" in the terms and conditions by European residents and they are not allowed to question, challenge or breach, the symbolic border between the resident and the migrant.

The broader theoretical concern of the article is problematizing the liberal tolerance notion by stating that the "European refugee crisis" is the crisis of the liberal tolerance notion. The article shows how liberalism with its classical promise of liberty, equality, and fraternity for all free subjects has become incompatible with pluralism, which actively supports the plurality of the diverse people, groups, ideas, and opinions.[3] Instead, the liberal tolerance notion serves *re-organizing the plurality in accordance with the liberal subject's own priorities, in its own terms and conditions* as European civil initiatives intend for defining their relation with migrants in their own terms. A better way of managing the difference seems to question the liberal promise and to defend pluralism in case of a conflict between liberalism and pluralism, even when the local and migrant communities' values are incommensurable.

Methodologically, the theoretical and conceptual orientation of the article determined its underlying research, which utilized a qualitative research design with secondary source analysis. It examined academic studies on European residential responses as secondary sources for their theoretical arguments and for the displayed data. The research follows the social science tradition that sees the value of the qualitative research design not in its being systematic or all-inclusive or not the "breadth and scale" but in the "depth" of the analysis (Bryman, 2012: 392). Such commitment to the qualitative design required using non-probability sampling, mainly theoretical sampling, which "involve[s] a strong theoretical logic in the selection process, this need not and often should not be based on the idea of empirical representation" (Mason, 2002: 124), and purposive sampling by using secondary sources on anti-immigration and solidarity approaches that directly or indirectly referring to the themes of European identity, liberalism and illiberalism, and tolerance.

1. THE "EUROPEAN REFUGEE CRISIS": THE CRISIS OF THE LIBERAL TOLERANCE IN EUROPE

Critical literature problematizes the phrase "European refugee crisis." The first problem is about how it is framed as a "crisis" and such a framing causes alarmist feelings and respective "crisis" interventions (Rajaram, 2015), such as the simultaneous deployment of security, humanitarianism, and human rights

---

[3] Richard Bellamy (1996) argues that liberalism has been challenged by pluralist demands especially when such demands are seen as pre-liberal or anti-liberal; therefore, contemporary liberalism may not be compatible with pluralism.

discourse (Perkowski, 2016: 332) or the physical interventions for of spatial-technological segregation at the borders of Europe (van Reekum, 2016). The second problem is about placing the displaced populations as the source of the problem instead of subjects trying to manage the problem despite existing structural constraints. It causes "blaming refugees for their own suffering" (Mavelli, 2017: 824). The third problem is its Eurocentric implications: it implies that a social issue has crisis-level significance only and only if or when it is a problem of and to Europe. In other words, it implies that the problem would not exist, only if we could get rid of its link to Europe. Thus, it victimizes "Europe," of "unfathomable conflicts erupting elsewhere, derived from the incapacity or incompetence of (postcolonial) 'others' to adequately govern themselves" (De Genova, Tazzioli, and Alvarez-Velasco, 2016: 12).

Despite its unique historicity, the "European refugee crisis" is not a new one; it has a continuity with the historical cases of Europeans' dealing with" variously designated Others, who may be an "outsider" (e.g., migrants) or even an autochthonous insider (e.g., European Muslims. The earliest post-colonial studies literature recognizes the self-essentializing and other-essentializing in Europe in varying historical configurations. Therefore, "the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West)" (Said, 1978: 1) as much as "Europe is the creation of the Third World" (Fannon, 1961: 102). Recent literature also recognizes continuity with colonialism and post-colonialism not only for European strategies of essentializing themselves and the others in racial terms but also for excluding the others, by xenophobia, Islamophobia, even though actually existing European (post-)colonialisms vary nationally and multiple and differentiated in discourses and practices (see Ponzanesi, 2012: 57). Furthermore, specifically for the "European refugee crisis," scholars such as Caoimhe ODwyer link "the crisis" to "the colonial enterprise of the European nations with the mindset of civilizational superiority" and present the "crisis" as "[Europe's] struggle against itself and its preconceptions of what Europe and European values stand for" (ODwyer, 2018).

The "European refugee crisis" is, indeed, a reflection of the European residents' anxiety regarding defining "Europe" "Europeans," "Europeanness" in relation to the post-2015 migrants. It is worth noting that such anxiety may not be unique to Europe or would not always cause the deployment of the "crisis" discourse (for a discussion on how mass migrations may not be framed as "crisis," see Sert and Danış, 2021). Yet, European residential responses to migrations after 2015 reveal such a shift from anxiety to "crisis", regarding the physical and symbolic borders of Europe.

This article proposes a new way of seeing the "European migration crisis," as a crisis of liberal tolerance idea. Accordingly, European residents have attempted to resolve "the crisis" about Europe's physical and symbolic borders by

resorting to the liberal tolerance notion. Yet, such resolve by resorting to the liberal tolerance notion, however, created its own crisis: the permanent yet differential exclusion of migrants. Based on the empirically grounded literature, I claim that migrants face *permanent* exclusion, from either the European territories or the European identities' symbolical boundaries and more importantly from the possibility to define, control, and monitor their own communal boundaries and their relationship with the broader society. Such exclusion is, however, *differential* considering how migrants face differentiated exclusionary modalities by European civilian responses such as those against all migrants, those welcoming all migrants, and those welcoming only some migrants. I name these modalities of exclusion as liberal intolerance, indifferent tolerance, and differentiating tolerance. The next section examines the conceptual and operational aspects of the liberal tolerance notion before discussing the modalities of exclusion by European civilian responses in the last section.

2. LIBERAL TOLERANCE NOTION AND RESPONSES TO "EUROPEAN MIGRATION CRISIS"

The "tolerance" notion is affiliated with liberal political thought in Enlightenment Europe. Classical literature presents liberal tolerance as one free subject's neutral, open, and permissive relation with another when they have different versions of "good" (Kautz, 1993) while critical literature sees it as an asymmetrical relationship of endurance and investigates its conceptualization, central tenets, operational principles, and outcomes.

First, "tolerance" is neither transparent nor virtuous or universal; it is "historically and theoretically variable in purpose, content, agents, and objects" (Brown, 2006: 4). For instance, under contemporary liberalism, the tolerant subject is implied as civilized, and "free," from Western societies and the tolerated subject is presented as the "barbarian," "fundamentalist," from non-Western societies (Brown, 2006: 177). The tolerance notion is rooted in the intellectual trajectory of European liberalism and has historically been utilized by European communities in relation to various "outsiders" (see Stolcke, 1995); however, tolerance may be deployed by "non-Europeans" to other communities or by European communities for each other (e.g., "the nesting Orientalisms" concept refers to such Orientalizing within European communities as "primitives," see Bakić-Hayden and Hayden, 1992; Bakić-Hayden, 1995). Therefore, tolerance discourse is adaptive to the context while its operation of essentializing the Self and the Other and their relationship is constant. Therefore, I examine the deployment of the liberal tolerance by European residents, who variously draw and re-draw the border between the "Europeans" and "migrants" within the context of the "European refugee crisis."

Second, the liberal tolerance idea indicates that "the tolerant" subject essentializes itself and the designated others and categorizes them into various segments. Ultimately, a relation of tolerance implies that of "intolerance," i.e., not enduring an unacceptable version of good (Pierpan, 1996). Thus, the world of the liberal tolerant subject is divided into at least three versions of good, of "the tolerant" subject, "the tolerable" subject, and "the intolerable" subject. Furthermore, "the tolerant" subject is located as the normal, neutral, and unmarked while the rest are attributed with presumably inherent ethnic, racial, sexual identities (Brown, 2006: 44-45), which serves "depoliticization" of the political issues (e.g., inequality or marginalization) and their reduction to individual or group troubles (Brown, 2006: 15). In Europe after 2015, such essentialization is done either by racializing (De Genova, 2017) or by culturalizing the other (Minkenberg, 2000; Badano and Nuti, 2018; Brubaker, 2017). The "tolerable" and "intolerable" migrant distinction is made in terms of various "deservingness" frameworks, as discussed in the literature (e.g., Holzberg, Kolbe and Zaborowski, 2018; Marchetti, 2020; Hinger, 2020; Sözer, 2021). Both "tolerable" and "intolerable" migrants are presented as "culturally different," but the former is seen as culturally compatible while the latter is seen as incompatible, with the residential culture (see Hinger, 2020; Marchetti, 2020).

Third, the liberal tolerance idea entitles "the tolerant" subject for defining the terms and conditions of the relationship with others since the tolerance discourse is "a discourse of power" (Brown, 2006: 15). The tolerant subject decides the "threshold of tolerance;" it controls not only what and how is tolerated but also when and how it suspends tolerating (Hage, 2000: 87, 93). This also means the tolerant subject is empowered to be able to act intolerantly (Hage, 2000, 86-87). In contemporary liberalism, tolerance suspends based on the tolerant subject's assumptions about "civilization": The limits of tolerance are the limits of civilization and perceived threats to civilization cause suspending the tolerance (Brown, 2006: 191). Therefore, those who are seen as "the intolerable" ones are framed as "externally dangerous since inherently internally oppressive" (Brown, 2006: 203), and "the civilized" may act in an uncivil manner. Therefore, contemporary liberalism "legitimizes liberal polities' illiberal treatment, … without tarring the "civilized" status of the aggressor" (Brown, 2006: 178-179). In the case of post-2015 migrations, several examples of uncivil acts in the name of civilized values are witnessed, e.g., the rise of surveillance of the borders and people in the name of humanitarianism and human rights; the criminalization of assistance to irregular migrants; the use of Frontex at the European borders; incidents at the Hungary border and the Balkan route.

Fourth, most importantly, tolerance is an antagonistic way of engaging with "the difference." It is "neither neutral" nor "respectful" to the differences; on the contrary, it has "an attitude or a condition of disapproval, disdain, or revulsion

with a particular form of overcoming" (Brown, 2006: 25). Strikingly, the tolerance discourse both bares and tries to "manage" such antagonism by "normalizing" and keeping the difference a constant. (Brown, 2006: 26-28). "The tolerant" subject, simultaneously, "incorporates" and "maintains" its "differences" from the Other (Brown, 2006: 27-28).

Such engagement characterizes anti-immigration and solidarity responses as well. Specifically, on the one hand, anti-immigration approaches claim the incommensurability of migrant and local cultures, as a pretext for presenting all migrants as "intolerable" (see Badano and Nuti, 2018; Brubaker, 2017; Minkenberg, 2000) and, on the other hand, solidarity approaches present tolerable migrants' cultures as compatible with the local culture. Yet, both approaches take the local and migrant "differences" for granted and "maintain" and strictly monitor differences, even when migrants are allowed entry to European territories (see examples in Baban and Rygiel, 2017; Koca, 2019; van der Veer, 2020). Then, as I argue, migrants framed as "the intolerable" (by both anti-immigration and some solidarity approaches) are straightforwardly denied entry into European territories. The migrants framed as "tolerable" become liminal by neither fully accepted nor fully rejected while facing "incorporation" into the political borders of "Europe" while denied from the "incorporation" to the symbolic borders of "Europeanness." Further, to remain "tolerated," they "perform" "deserving migrant" roles (for empirical studies on such performances, see Huschke, 2014; Borrelli, 2020; Ratzmann, 2021). Therefore, I argue that for both anti-immigration and solidarity approaches the underlying liberal tolerance idea has caused *migrants' exclusion* in differentiated modalities, namely, the liberal intolerance, differentiating tolerance, and indifferent tolerance modalities. In the next section, I discuss these modalities based on the empirically grounded studies on anti-immigration and solidarity responses after 2015.

3. EUROPEAN RESIDENTIAL RESPONSES TO "EUROPEAN REFUGEE CRISIS"

This section examines the European responses to migrations in Europe after 2015 in terms of three modalities of migrants' permanent yet differentiated exclusion, i.e., liberal intolerance, indifferent tolerance, and differentiating tolerance. All three modalities are rooted in the liberal tolerance notion while they indicate different "thresholds of tolerance" (Hage, 2000: 83). The section explores such thresholds in three modalities of liberal tolerance focusing on the empirically grounded literature. First, the liberal intolerance modality of the anti-immigration responses rejects *all* migrants and totalizes them as "intolerable" ones. Second, the indifferent tolerance modality also totalizes migrants by seeing all as "tolerable" ones, as they are utilized by those solidarity approaches that welcome *all* migrants. Third, differential tolerance modality is seen among some solidarity approaches

welcoming only some migrants; it is a conditional form of tolerance. Empirical studies reveal that both various anti-immigration and solidarity approaches exclude migrants in differentiated forms, ranging from denying migrants from European territories to denying migrants from the symbolic borders of the European identity, and more importantly, denying migrants from controlling their own communal borders, envisioning their place in the host countries, and forming relationships on their own terms in the broader society.

Anti-Immigration Responses with Liberal Intolerance Modality

Anti-immigration Responses as Liberal but Intolerant Responses

The academic literature affiliates the anti-immigration approaches with the rise of far-right, populism, irrationality, and nativism (see Vaughan, 2021). This rise is seen as exceptional and explained in terms of socio-economic developments, e.g., competitive threat (see Polavieja, 2016; Kuntz, Davidov and Semyonov, 2017), ideological formations, e.g., racial prejudice (see Gorodzeisky and Semyonov, 2016), cultural differences (see Heizmann, 2016), or fear of crime and intergroup contact particularly regarding the Muslims, Jews, and Roma (see Gorodzeisky and Semyonov, 2019).

The rise of anti-immigration approaches has been presented as alarming since they are illiberal, but I argue that anti-immigration approaches are acting in harmony with liberal principles even when they are intolerant. Some scholars argue that they are illiberal since such approaches deny migrants refugees "the status of equal persons" or deprive them of using the "capacity to become fully a cooperative member of the society" (Badano and Nuti, 2018: 150). However, they also note that the supporters of anti-immigration approaches neither identify with illiberalism nor want to destroy liberal institutions (unlike racists or neo-Nazis); on the contrary, they present themselves as the "guardians of liberal values against the threat posed by 'others' whom they (unreasonably) see as inherently unfit for citizenship in a liberal society" (Badano and Nuti, 2018: 150-151). The difference between perceptions of scholars and perceptions of the members of the anti-immigration movement is striking. I argue that the difference is not about how anti-immigration approaches are illiberal when they claim otherwise. It is about how anti-immigration approaches, in fact, utilize the exclusionary mechanisms of liberal tolerance, specifically as "the tolerant subject" they may suspend tolerance (Hage, 2000) and "the liberal subject" they may act illiberally (Brown, 2006) for "defending civilization."

Other scholars see anti-immigration approaches as illiberal because they emphasize "a populist and romantic ultranationalism" as opposed to "liberal and pluralist values of freedom and equality and the related categories of individualism and universalism" (e.g., Minkenberg, 2000: 174). They see

nationalism as "radicalizing ethnic, religious, cultural and political criteria of exclusion" (Minkenberg, 2000: 175). They reduce liberalism to individualism when nationalism as a collectivist ideology is presumed illiberal. Yet, critical scholarship on nation-states (e.g., Hayden, 1996), nation-state system (e.g., Malkki, 1992), and democracy (e.g., Mann, 2012) state that the nation-states and nation-state system is inherently exclusionary in collectively including only members of titular nations and excluding the rest, such as minorities and refugees; therefore, anti-immigration approaches are not particularly illiberal.

Anti-immigration responses, indeed, are too heterogeneous, contextually and historically changing to be tagged as "illiberal." Scholars such as Rogers Brubaker state that far-right anti-immigration stances do not act uniformly; on the contrary. "a new cluster" of right-wing populism emerged "in Northern and Western Europe –especially those of the Netherlands, France, Scandinavia, Belgium, Austria, and Switzerland" which promote not "nationalism" but "civilizationism." This civilizationism stresses "an identarian Christianism, a secularist posture, a philosemitic stance, and an ostensibly liberal defense of gender equality, gay rights, and freedom of speech" (Brubaker, 2017: 1193). Another example is the anti-immigration responses to Syrian migrants in Turkey, which originally entails not the right-wing conservatives[4] but the central left-wing parties within the context of opposition to the JDP government.[5] In sum, the anti-immigration responses to migrations after 2015 are neither illiberal nor violate liberal norms but within the framework of liberalism; they utilize the liberal intolerance idea while declaring all migrants as "intolerable" and utilize various patterns of exclusion for them, as I discuss in the next part.

Patterns of Exclusion under Liberal Intolerance Modality

Anti-immigration responses exclude by totalizing all migrants as "intolerable," and their modality exclusion is meaningful within the broader historical framework of the patterns of migrants' exclusion in Europe, such as racism, new racism, and cultural fundamentalism (Stolcke, 1995). First, "racism" highlights the arbitrarily picked biological differences between the European and its Other for justifying a hierarchical order. This order is seen as permanent due to the interminable nature of biological differences; therefore, racism causes dehumanization, enslavement, and physical extermination, for instance making migrants "disposable" via biopolitical tools in and at the borders of Europe.

---

[4] The issue of Syrian refugees in Turkey has polarized pro-and anti-JDP stances in the 2011-2015 period (Altındağ and Kaushal, 2017) while the polarization is reduced through time (see Apaydın and Müftüler-Baç, 2021). The JDP's support of refugees is presented as for "ideological-sectarian reasons" (Gümüş and Eroğlu, 2015) with "a pragmatic and selective approach" favoring Sunni Arab Syrians (Korkut, 2016: 18).

[5] In Turkey, political parties' propaganda material before the 2015 elections as rhetorical tools reveals the distinctions across the political parties.

Second, "new racism" highlights the cultural differences in justifying a hierarchical order. Therefore, presumably culturally superior "Europeans" bare the "white man's burden" by transforming the supposedly culturally inferior via "civilizing missions" in colonies or by integration projects in the host country. Third, "cultural fundamentalism," also emphasizes the *incommensurability* of cultural differences between "Europeans" and others (Stolcke, 1995). Cultures are seen as isolated, coherent units; they are not hierarchically located, and all deserve respect, but the culturally separate groups should enjoy their culture in their own spaces. This suggestion often causes the ghettoization and the physical exclusion of migrants (e.g., via non-acceptance or deportation).

In the literature particular literature on anti-immigration approaches only a few scholars affiliate anti-immigration approaches with traditional racism. Such hesitancy is related to Europe's historical reductionism of "racism:" As David Theo Goldberg argues, "racial Europeanism" operates on the principle of "referring to the presumptive elision of the analytical concept of race with the essentialist conceits of race-ism, and the pervasive reduction of any question of "racism" in European contexts to the historical experience of the Nazi Holocaust" (in De Genova, 2016: 77-78 and De Genova, 2018: 1769). Yet, as Nicholas De Genova argues, the recent European refugee crisis is all about race. Accordingly, "putative non-Europeans are overtly de-racialized as a heterogeneous group but then re-racialized by using supposedly more inclusive terms such as "Muslims" or "refugees" for "Blacks" or "Arabs" (De Genova, 2018: 1777-1778). Refugees are also racialized visually as stated by Marcelo Maneri: "On one side were light-skinned Syrians, whose portrayals were marked by more frequent close focus, the expression of human emotions, familial settings, and occasional eye contact with the photographer" (Maneri, 2021: 15).

Alternatively, anti-immigration approaches underline the cultural differences; yet they do not utilize "new racism" since it translates sees cultural differences hierarchically and transforms them into integration policies for migrants. Anti-immigration approaches utilize "cultural fundamentalism" in claiming the incommensurability of residents' and migrants' cultures in national or civilizational terms (see Badano and Nuti, 2018; Brubaker, 2017; Minkenberg, 2000). Migrants' integration is seen as neither possible nor desirable; they need to be outside the sight of the residential communities. Thus, anti-immigration responses cause exclusion, by migrants' denial of entry at the borders and their deportation, if not their segregation and ghettoization inside the host country. For instance, David Miller and Michael Waltzer make cultural fundamentalist justifications for denying entry to the refugees, such as "the preservation of the culture," "social coherence," and "communal independence and self-determination," (see Miller and Waltzer in Wellman, 2008: 118-119), while Heath Wellmann utilizes a nativist justification for the denial of entry on the grounds

that states have the responsibility to "the compatriots" rather than the "foreigners we do not equally owe" (see Waltzer in Wellman, 2008: 139).

In sum, the anti-immigration view is a liberal form of intolerance. It is *liberal* in exclusion of the migrants as "illiberal," "uncivilized" or "culturally incompatible" with the host society and therefore as "intolerable" ones. The intolerable others are excluded in the end by racialization or culturalization for their national or civilizational cultural differences that caused their support for policies, and practices against the entry of migrants and for the segregation or the deportation of the already arrived.

Solidarity Approaches with Differentiating and Indifferent Tolerance

Solidarity Responses as Differentiating or Indifferent Tolerance

After the post-2015 migrations solidarity approaches are the other residential, civilian responses that include volunteers, grassroots initiatives, and political activists. Their welcome to refugees inside and at the borders of Europe is affiliated with liberalism and positive values such as humanism, universalism, freedom, and equality. Although academic and policy studies present solidarity approaches as morally superior for their seemingly inclusive stances, as I argue, they are also rooted in the liberal tolerance notion and display its two modalities: differentiating and indifferent tolerance.

The *differentiating tolerance* modality is a conditional form of solidarity for distinguishing "tolerable" and "intolerable" migrants, and it excludes "intolerable" migrants straightforwardly (no different than the anti-immigration) and includes "the tolerable" migrants only conditionally and partially. The *indifferent tolerance* modality appears unconditional in welcoming *all* migrants; it is indifferent to distinguishing "the intolerable" and "the tolerable" migrants. Yet, such a seemingly unconditional welcome is also conditional. Conditions for an unconditional welcome are migrants' compliance with the "tolerable" migrant role, their permanent performance of the migrant identity, their compliance with the tolerant Self's terms and conditions for the migrant and local relationship, and their silence about controlling and monitoring their own group boundaries within the broader society.

Existing literature on the solidarity approaches often stresses the perspectives of the residents, i.e., the "tolerant subject." Specifically, it examines solidarity approaches for their actors' motivations and their place in the humanitarian space. The first theme is about the motivations of the residents in solidarity movements. Some mention individualistic motivations, e.g., their impulsive and emotional urge (Povrzanovic and Mäkelä, 2019) or rational justifications (Karakayalı, 2017: 13). Others mention interpersonal motivations for generating "mutual

expectations …and evolving and open-ended relationships" (Boccagni and Giudici, 2021: 10). Others state their unplanned and unintended apolitical engagement leads to political results, such as how acts of "private hospitality," i.e., volunteers' provision of private housing" might oppose governments and anti-refugee groups (see Monforte, Maestri and d'Halluin, 2021: 686) or when volunteers' "practices of care" initiate new forms of citizen-refugee engagement in informal spaces (see Stock, 2017: 11). A second theme is about the solidarity approaches' place in the humanitarian space. Earlier literature presents them as supplementary to the states for "solidarity and hospitality" that "the state institutions cannot provide" (Karakayalı and Kleist, 2016: 66) and for "the initial care and integration needs of the refugees" that are absent in official interventions (Simsa, 2017: 90). Others see solidarity approaches as a challenge to the states for transforming their policies on refugees by persuading the government to accept migrants (Koca, 2016: 105). In examining solidarity movements, these studies stress on the residents' concerns, without problematizing solidarity movements' envisioning of the migrants or their relations with migrants.

Studies on solidarity movements often focus on their intended impact on migrants without examining whether they are actualized. For instance, Katerina Rozakou underlines solidarity movements' intentions for "radicalization of solidarity" as a political position (Rozakou, 2017: 99) by rejecting both humanitarian and volunteer identity; remaining skeptical of NGOification and bureaucratization of humanitarianism and seeing their own work beyond the distribution of aid and for forming lateral, egalitarian relations with the refugees (Rozakou, 2017: 103). Similarly, Baban and Rygiel recognize the solidarity initiatives' intention for "radical communitarianism" by forming egalitarian relations between residents and migrants and by challenging the citizen vs non-citizen, insider vs outsider dichotomy and hierarchy" (Baban and Rygiel, 2017: 98). On the other hand, such intentions do not mean their realization automatically. For instance, Robin Vandevoordt and Larissa Fleischmann argue that solidarity movements are torn apart between present-day concerns about relief activities and future concerns about bringing "structural changes to refugees' living conditions" (Vandevoordt and Fleischmann, 2021: 195). Similarly, Health Cabot discusses that the solidarity movements recognize their movements' unfulfilled potential due to uncontrollable circumstances, and their movements' emergence within the existing forms of inequalities instead of showing "a radical break from the neoliberal present" (Cabot, 2016: 154). These studies regarding the political intentions of solidarity movements, whether they are fulfilled or not, indicate one point: the resident and migrant relations, howsoever they are intended to be egalitarian, are defined in terms and conditions of European residents in solidarity movements.

In various modalities of liberal tolerance, including the differentiating and indifferent tolerance of the solidarity approaches, the "tolerant subject," decide the "threshold of tolerance" (Hage, 2000), i.e., to whom, when, and how to display

"tolerance" and migrants' have no control or even a say on any of these processes or their own communal identity or their relationship with the broader society. In both differentiating and indifferent tolerance modalities, the resident-migrant distinction is essentialized and accentuated; migrants are carved into "intolerable" ones and "tolerable" ones, unless they are totalized as the "tolerable" ones (in the case of indifference tolerance); the "tolerable" ones are accepted while "intolerable" ones are rejected.

The distinction between the "tolerable" and "intolerable" migrants is based on various criteria. On the one hand, indifferent tolerance causes some solidarity approaches' welcoming *all* migrants as "tolerable" due to "common humanity" (Baban and Rygiel, 2017), in symmetry with liberal intolerance of anti-immigration approaches rejecting all immigrants by declaring them "intolerable" by racializing or culturalizing their differences (De Genova, 2017; Brubaker, 2017). On the other hand, differentiating tolerance causes some solidarity approaches to categorizing migrants as "tolerable" or "intolerable" ones based on pre-defined "deservingness" frameworks (Holzberg, Kolbe and Zaborowski, 2018; Marchetti, 2000; Hinger, 2020).

Imposing categories for forced migrants is not a new development. Earliest, Roger Zetter discusses "the proliferation of new labels" (e.g., refugees or migrants, forced or voluntary migrants; economic or political migrants) which "at best nuance interpretation, at worst discriminate and detach claimants from the core attribute of being a refugee—international protection" (Zetter, 2007: 176). To complicate things a little more, these newly emerged categories further divided forced migrants. For instance, the category of "vulnerable refugee" emerged in the early 2010s due to the neoliberal transformation of humanitarianism, which indicates a shift in the humanitarian concerns from assisting all refugees to only the "vulnerable refugees" (Sözer, 2020: 2167). A similar shift from "a regime of rights" to a "regime of deservingness" emerged (Marchetti, 2020: 244); the deservingness brings migrants protection while "undeserving" ones are left alone (Marchetti, 2020).

The categories of "deserving" or "vulnerable" refugees are historical, contextual, and depending on actors' political-ideological, gendered, ethnoreligious orientations (Sözer, 2021a) The elusiveness of the "vulnerability" concept causes its incoherent, contradictory, and even subversive implementations on the ground (Sözer, 2021b). The framework of "deservingness" is no less ambiguous. For instance, Sophie Hinger states "the link and tension" at the municipal and national levels regarding the "deservingness" frameworks (Hinger, 2020: 20). On the national level, migrants' "deservingness" is measured regarding their relation to "the German national culture," "likelihood to stay," seeking for "integration" in the labor market and integration courses (Hinger, 2020: 23-27)

while on the local level, migrants' "deservingness" is decided by municipalities before migrants' arrival in terms of their likelihood to stay (Hinger, 2020: 35).

Second, "deservingness" frameworks reflect the expectations of the European residents from migrants in material and moral terms. For instance, Chiara Marchetti points out the significance of "moral consideration" for the "deserving" status of asylum-seekers in Italy: they need to prove that they really are refugees; that they "demonstrate the willingness to fully integrate into their receiving country's community of value (or to prove they can become a 'good citizen')" (Marchetti, 2020: 240); that they need to take "the economic burden they supposedly placed on the economy;" that they need "to demonstrate… willingness to join the community of value, express their gratitude towards Italian society and institutions" by joining to voluntary projects and showing good behavior (Marchetti, 2020: 244). Similarly, Holzberg, Kolbe and Zaborowski also state the moral and material consideration for the "deservingness" status of refugees in Germany by calculating their advantages and disadvantages to the host society, particularly to the economy (in terms of productivity, educational attainments, and skillsets), state security (as Muslims who constitute a potential security threat vs Muslims open for assimilations) and gender relations (men as "bad" refugees and women and children as "good" refugees) (Holzberg, Kolbe and Zaborowski, 2018: 535-536).

Often, particular "deservingness" and "vulnerability" frameworks may operate in tandem with existing essentializing discourses and racializing and culturalising assumptions. For instance, European responses to various groups of forced migrants in reveal such complexities: European responses use racialization in treating African and Syrian migrants and categorizing them as "intolerable" and in treating Bosnian, Kosovar, and Ukrainian refugees as "tolerable ones" in defining entry and assistance (see Sajjad, 2022). Further within the same group of refugees, for instance, in the recent case of Ukrainian refugees, a further division is made between the "blond and blue-eyed" "tolerable" Ukrainian refugees and racially marked groups from Ukraine, such as African students as "intolerable" ones in deterring or allowing entry (see Dovi, 2022). Even more, the existing "deservingness" frameworks are further complicated by the "vulnerability" discourses that permit not all "genuine" Ukrainians but only the vulnerable ones in line with the essentialized yet generic categories of vulnerable groups: women, children, elderly and disabled (Schlegel, 2022) when only women and children could flee (VOA, 2022). The next part focuses on forms of exclusion under differentiating as well as indifferent liberal tolerance modalities of solidarity responses.

Patterns of Exclusion under Differentiating and Indifferent Tolerance

248

The literature presents solidarity approaches as humanistic and inclusive due to their efforts for the betterment of migrants' lives and their intentions for radically transforming the migrant and resident relations compared to states, and international actors, humanitarian organizations. Such efforts and intentions, however, do not automatically prevent migrants' exclusion. On the contrary, solidarity responses also become exclusive when they resort to liberal tolerance principles in defining their relations with migrants. This part discusses how solidarity responses may recalibrate migrants' exclusion and reproduce their already-existing exclusion by anti-immigration responses, the states, or humanitarian actors.

The literature on European responses to migrations underlines the exclusion of only the "undeserving" or "intolerable" migrants while "deserving" and "tolerable" migrants are also excluded. First, "deservingness" frameworks result in a "stratified process" of integration and disintegration (Hinger and Sweitzer, 2020: 4), i.e., the disintegration of some migrants serves to the integration of others and vice versa (Hinger and Sweitzer, 2020: 3). Second, "deservingness" frameworks may cause migrants' exposure to either humanitarian or securitization discourses (Holzberg, Kolbe and Zaborowski, 2018). Such frameworks operate as "a staircase model," i.e., "a scalar, reward-and-punishment model to better discipline individuals and educate them on the community of value" (245). As a result, migrants are promised gradual inclusion based on their behavior and they face punishment in the cases of non-compliance by means of discipline, surveillance, tracking, and containment (Marchetti, 2020: 246-247).

This article argues that it is not the "intolerable" migrants who face exclusion; all migrants face a permanent yet differential exclusion. Solidarity responses are neither unconditional nor all-inclusive. On the one hand, "the intolerable" migrants are excluded by being denied access to the host territories, and if not, by containment in detention centers or other territorially confined areas, e.g., hotspots or ghettos at the urban centers; and by deportation from the host territories (see Hinger, 2020; Marchetti, 2020). For the solidarity approaches as well, *for the intolerable Other, the exclusion is complete but for the tolerable Other, the inclusion is only partial.* On the other hand, the inclusion of "the tolerable" migrants are imperfect; they are seemingly included by being physically allowed for entry to the host territory, provided with accommodation, and granted social rights; yet they are excluded from the European identity. They must remain as "the migrant" and perform the designated "migrant" roles, (see Huschke, 2014; Borrelli, 2020; Ratzmann, 2021). The most exclusionary aspect of solidarity approaches is their insistence on defining the terms and conditions of the migrant-resident relationship, without allowing migrants to define their own communal boundaries or to decide their terms of engagement with the broader society.

The patterns of migrants' exclusion are trackable in the empirically grounded studies on solidarity approaches. First, "the tolerable" migrant status is not permanent; the "tolerable" migrants face constant alertness and may turn into "intolerable" ones when they do not fulfill the residents' expectations. As stated by Leike van der Veer, solidarity movements should not be affiliated with merely "care" because their activities in the name of caring for the refugees can be controlling if refugees are at once considered as "at-risk" and "high risk" (van der Veer, 2020: 376). Solidarity movements also utilize the "risk" narrative to justify their engagement with refugees: "refugees contain future risks" unless help is offered (van der Veer, 2020: 377). Furthermore, seeing migrants as a potential risk factor causes solidarity approaches to utilize "an exclusionary logic that condemns those who do not live up to the ideal of active citizenship as scroungers." Then, the welcomed "tolerable" refugees may become the "intolerable" or "unwanted" refugees since they are portrayed as dependent, passive, and far from being self-reliant (van der Veer, 2020: 377-378).

The literature presents solidarity approaches as progressive projects with a political agenda that poses an alternative to the power-laden institution, such as NGOs, INGOs, and the states, and that challenges the structural power asymmetries between the resident and migrant, citizen and non-citizen, giver and receiver. Yet, anecdotal evidence reveals the emergence of new forms of exclusion during resident-migrant encounters on an everyday level. The resident-migrant relationship is characterized by mutual expectations while the impact of the unmet expectations is not symmetrical; the unmet expectations of the "tolerant" residents may lead to "tolerable" migrants' exclusion. For instance, Monforte, Maestri and d'Halluin examine volunteers' provision of private housing for migrants as "private hospitality." Accordingly, "hosts feel responsible towards their guests because, as 'new family members,' they are recipients of their affection and love" (Monforte, Maestri and d'Halluin, 2021: 686). Thus, refugees unfulfilling the expectations, e.g., "willingness to share their time, thoughts, and stories… (either because of communication barriers or because of an emotional distance)" are framed as "ungrateful," and sometimes risk being excluded from the host's circle of affection" (Monforte, Maestri and d'Halluin, 2021: 686). The authors clearly state that "private hospitality" might have challenged the existing macrostructural exclusions but in fact forms "new boundaries of inclusion and exclusion" in the private sphere (Monforte, Maestri and d'Halluin, 2021: 686).

Solidarity responses may employ the categories, concepts, criteria, methods, and language of those which exclude the refugees in the first place. For instance, Burcu Toğral Koca states that grassroots solidarity movements have challenged "local bordering practices" in "statist bureaucratic and institutional structures, regulation of rights and entitlements and cultural/ideological boundaries, and

spatial differentiation" in addition to challenging the existing spaces of exclusion (in housing and labor market) and creating "new spaces of inclusion" (such as sporting activities, cooking days, dinners, art initiatives, local festivals) (Koca, 2019). Yet, the same grassroots movements at the end get "integrated with formal state structures" and thereby started employing states' "bordering practices" between "the deserving" and "undeserving" refugees (Koca, 2019: 546). Simply, solidarity movements got appropriated; they became agents of global humanitarian discourse and engage with migrants by using the host's methods, means, and aims for "migrant's empowerment" (Koca, 2019: 558).

Furthermore, some solidarity initiatives, despite their original intent for transforming the resident and migrants' power asymmetry, may suggest setting limits to these relations on their own terms. For instance, Fevzi Baban and Kim Rygiel examine the solidarity movements that pledge to the idea of "radical communitarianism" (i.e., the "desire to live and engage with others but also be transformed by those considered as potentially different or as an outsider" in Baban and Rygiel, 2017: 101) and the idea of "radical cosmopolitanism," (i.e., the desire to engage with the other in these terms owing to common humanity (2017: 103). These movements suggest a non-exclusive relationship with the migrants; they underline the need for open and mutually transformative relationship that actively destabilizes the resident-migrant dichotomy. Such engagement would be under the control of "not the host but the guest;" more importantly, it requires not ignoring but embracing the Other's particularities as "unconditional hospitality" (Baban and Rygiel, 2017: 103-104) following Derrida's conceptualization (2017). However, even these scholars who recognize the politically transformative potential of such solidarity approaches admit the potential for conditionality in this relationship. They explicitly state the following: "the circumstances of limiting 'unconditional hospitality' are only justified when there is a need to secure the conditions of hospitality" (Baban and Rygiel, 2017: 104). The limits for "unconditional hospitality," in the end, are set by the resident; the residents re-install the very power asymmetries they intended for overcoming.

The anecdotal evidence from the empirically grounded literature on solidarity initiatives reveals that macro-structural power asymmetries dictated by the nation-state system, states, international organizations, and humanitarian actors either infiltrate into or are undone and redone in new ways. Solidarity approaches, even the radically transformative ones, may resort to the exclusionary operational principles of liberal tolerance principles. Migrants in Europe need to perform the roles designated to migrants, render the resident and the migrant distinction unchallenged; and more importantly, have no voice in the terms and conditions of engagement with the broader society but comply with the host's notions.

4. CONCLUSION

This article argues that the so-called "European refugee crisis" is also the crisis of the liberal tolerance idea. Despite its unique historicity, the "European refugee crisis" indicates a historical continuity with the cases of European engagement with varying Others including indigenous insiders (e.g., European Muslims or Roma) and "outsiders" (e.g., post-colonial migrants). Thus "Europe" have acted as a homogeneous unit (Fanon, 1961; Said, 1978, De Genova, 2016) despite its inner diversities in colonial and post-colonial contexts (Ponzanesi, 2021) by self- and other-essentializing in racial or cultural terms (ODwyer, 2018, De Genova 2016) and by exclusionary discourses such as racism, new racism, cultural fundamentalism (Stolcke, 1995). The "European refugee crisis" reflects the historical anxiety in defining the physical and symbolic borders of "Europe;" European residential responses, howsoever they are internally and externally diverse (Cantat, 2021; Brubaker, 2017), indicate an attempt to "manage" the "crisis" by resorting to the exclusionary principles of the liberal tolerance notion; yet, such resorting caused its own "crisis:" the permanent yet differential exclusion of varying groups of migrants after 2015.

The European residential responses to the migrations are presented in binary terms: the anti-immigration responses as illiberal, intolerant, irrational, emotional, violent, and exclusive (Minkenberg, 2000; Brubaker, 2017) and the solidarity responses as liberal, tolerant, rational, humanistic, and inclusive (Rozakou, 2017; Baban and Rygiel, 2017). Contrary to this moralizing view, I suggest that both responses are intellectually, historically, and operationally rooted in the European liberal tolerance notion. Further, both follow the same exclusive operational principles of liberal tolerance idea: first, the tolerant Self separates from the Other; second, it categorizes the Other into "the tolerable" and "the intolerable" versions; third, welcoming it excludes the "intolerable" ones while including the "tolerable" ones buy only partially, considering the physical borders and symbolic boundaries in the relation of the Self with the Other.

European residential responses after 2015 show that for the intolerable migrant, the exclusion is complete but for the tolerable migrant, the inclusion is only partial. On the one hand, the "intolerable" migrants are straightforwardly excluded from European territories (see Hinger, 2020) and from the European society due to their presumed unbreachable racial or cultural differences that are seen as incompatible with "Europe" (see Stolcke, 1995; Heizmann, 2016; Brubaker, 2017). On the other hand, "the tolerable" migrants are included but only partially by allowing their entry from the borders of "Europe" yet excluded from the symbolic borders of an essentialized "Europeanness." Their "inclusion" is on the condition that they remain "tolerable." by that they keep European resident and migrant boundary remain intact and unchallenged (Hinger, 2020); that they

act on the terms and conditions defined by the residents (Koca, 2019; der Veer 2020; Boccagni and Giudici, 2021).

The article examines European civilian responses of anti-immigration and solidarity approaches and argues for migrants' permanent yet differentiated exclusion. By exclusion, I refer to acts of denial of migrants' access to sources and rights, including their denial of entry to hosts' territories, denial of the symbolic boundaries of the host societies, and more importantly, denial of re-defining, controlling their own communal boundaries in the and deciding their own terms of engagement with the rest of hosting society. They must remain as "the migrant" and perform the designated "migrant" role, (see Huschke, 2014; Borrelli, 2020; Ratzmann, 2021). The most exclusionary aspect of solidarity approaches is about migrants' denial from physical borders of Europe or symbolic boundaries of European communities but their facing impositions about the terms and conditions of the migrant-resident relationship and their inability to re-define their own communal boundaries and their own terms of engagement with the broader society. Instead, to prevent suspension of the tolerance, migrants must remain as "the migrant" and perform the migrant designated "migrant" role (see Huschke, 2014; Borrelli, 2020; Ratzmann, 2021), indicating the permanency of migrants' exclusion.

The article examines the migrants' permanent exclusion by focusing on its differential forms by asking not just "who is excluded?" (i.e., migrants variously located in accordance with varying "deservingness" frameworks") but "how are they excluded?" (i.e., these various migrants facing different modalities of exclusion). It problematizes the power asymmetry in the relation between the residential approaches and migrants, even in the case of seemingly the most inclusive responses and it examines the patterns of residential responses' border-drawing between various groups of migrants and themselves. Different than the earlier studies on "differential exclusion" (Castles, 1995) and "differential inclusion" (De Genova, Mezzadra, Pickles, 2015), I focus on not the state policies but civilian initiatives that appear to extent migrants' exclusion on the state level to the society level.

Accordingly, it names three modalities of exclusion by both anti-immigration and solidarity approaches in line with the liberal tolerance principles. First, anti-immigration approaches' *liberal intolerance modality* excludes all refugees categorically. On the other hand, solidarity responses exclude in two forms. The first, the *differentiating tolerance modality* causes exclusion by segmenting the refugees into real refugee vs non-refugee, deserving vs undeserving refugee, tolerable refugee vs intolerable refugee groups; then rejecting the latter group straightforwardly (no different than the anti-immigration approach in methods such as denial of entry, containment or deportation) and accepting the first group

by creating a constant state of struggle to prove their deservingness as the refugee (see Holzberg, Kolbe and Zaborowski, 2018; Marchetti, 2020; Maneri, 2021). Second, the *indifferent tolerance modality* causes exclusion, surprisingly, by welcoming all to the territories and the polity of Europe but at the cost of excluding them symbolically from the European identity. The inclusion is conditional; they must remain as "the refugee," take on "the refugee" label and perform the refugee role. Thus, the resident-migrant intergroup boundaries are re-drawn and fortified, even by the most welcoming responses and even for the most "deserving" refugees.

Finally, the article makes a broader, critical point regarding the liberal tolerance notion, by focusing on several findings of my analysis of European anti-immigration and solidarity approaches as civilian responses to migrations after 2015. These findings are as follows: first, both responses are rooted in and resort back to European liberal tolerance idea in relating to migrants despite their contradictory claims, inner complexities, and opposite practical impact on immigrants' lives. Second, the so-called "illiberal" anti-immigration approach is, in fact, in line with European liberalism and the so-called "inclusive" solidarity responses are no less exclusive than their anti-immigration counterparts if the issue is defending European identity's symbolic borders. Third, moralizing presumptions based on unjustified sympathies and antipathies prevents us from diagnosing the gap between these approaches' intentions and the realization of these intentions, which primarily have an impact on migrants. Then, the article makes some broader points: The liberal tolerance notion is a form of engaging with the plurality without embracing it, but it only serves to re-organize the plurality, only in accordance with the liberal subject's own priorities, and only in its own terms and conditions. As the case of migrations to Europe after 2015 reveals, in such cases of conflict between liberalism and pluralism, an alternative resolution may be defending pluralism, radically.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altındağ, Onur and Neeraj Kaushal (2021), "Do Refugees Impact Voting Behavior in the Host Country? Evidence from Syrian Refugee Inflows to Turkey", Public Choice, 186 (1): 149-178.

Apaydın, Samet and Meltem Müftüler-Baç (2021), "The Syrian Refugee Crisis Through the Lenses of Turkish Political Discourses: An Analysis of Deliberations in The Turkish Parliament", International Migration: 1-20. DOI: 10.1111/imig.12949

Archibugi, Daniele, Marco Cellini and Mattia Vitiello (2021), "Refugees in the European Union: from Emergency Alarmism to Common Management", Journal of Contemporary European Studies: 1-19. DOI: 10.1080/14782804.2021.1912718

Ataç, İlker (2016), "Refugee Protest Camp Vienna: Making Citizens through Locations of the Protest Movement", Citizenship Studies, 20 (5): 629–646.

Ataç, İlker, Kim Rygiel and Maurice Stierl (2016), "Introduction: The Contentious Politics of Refugee and Migrant Protest and Solidarity Movements: Remaking Citizenship from the Margins", Citizenship Studies, 20 (5): 527-544.

Baban, Feyzi and Kim Rygiel (2017), "Living with Others: Fostering Radical Cosmopolitanism through Citizenship Politics in Berlin", Ethics & Global Politics, 10 (1): 98-116.

Badano, Gabriela and Alasia Nuti (2018), "Under Pressure: Political Liberalism, the Rise of Unreasonableness, and the Complexity of Containment", Journal of Political Philosophy, 26 (2): 145-168.

Bakić-Hayden, Milica (1995), "Nesting Orientalisms: The Case of Former Yugoslavia", Slavic Review, 54 (4): 917-931.

Bakić-Hayden, Milica and Robert M. Hayden (1992), "Orientalist Variations on the Theme 'Balkans': Symbolic Geography in Recent Yugoslav Cultural Politics", Slavic Review, 51 (1): 1-15.

Barnett, Michael N. (Ed.) (2017), Paternalism Beyond Borders (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Bauder, Harald and Lorelle Juffs (2020), "'Solidarity' in the Migration and Refugee Literature: Analysis of a Concept", Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 46 (1): 46-65.

Bellamy, Richard (1999), "Liberalism and the Challenge of Pluralism", Iain MacKenzie and Shane O'Neill (Eds.), Reconstituting Social Criticism (London: Palgrave Macmillan): 153-170.

Boccagni, Paolo and Daniela Giudici (2021), "Entering into Domestic Hospitality for Refugees: A Critical Inquiry through a Multi-scalar View of Home", Identities, 1-20. DOI: 10.1080/1070289X.2021.1909359

Borrelli, Lisa Marie (2020), "Should (S) he Stay or Should (S) he Go? – Street-level Suspicion and the Construction of the '(Un) deserving Migrant'", Geopolitics, 1-24. DOI: 10.1080/14650045.2020.1814257

Brown, Wendy (2006), Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire (New Jersey: Princeton University Press)

Brubaker, Rogers (2017), "Between Nationalism and Civilizationism: The European Populist Moment in Comparative Perspective", Ethnic and Racial Studies, 40 (8): 1191-1226.

Bryman, Alan (2012), Social Science Methods (New York: Oxford University Press).

Buonanno, Laurie (2017), "The European Refugee Crisis", Dinan, Desmond Neill Nugent and William E. Paterson (Eds.), The European Union in Crisis (London: Palgrave Macmillan): 100-130.

Cabot, Heath (2016), "'Contagious' Solidarity: Reconfiguring Care and Citizenship in Greece's Social Clinics", Social Anthropology, 24 (2): 152-166.

Cantat, Céline (2021), "Refugee Solidarity Along the Balkan Route", Journal of Refugee Studies, 34 (2): 1348-1369.

Casas-Cortes, Maribel, Sebastian Cobarrubias, Nicholas De Genova, Glenda Garelli, Giorgio Grappi, Charles Heller, Sabine Hess et al. (2015), "New keywords: Migration and Borders", Cultural Studies, 29 (1): 55-87.

Castles, Stephan (1995), "How Nation-states Respond to Immigration and Ethnic Diversity", Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 21 (3): 293-308.

Collyer, Michael, Sophie Hinger and Reinhard Schweitzer (2020), "Politics of (Dis)integration–An Introduction", Sophie Hinger and Reinhard Schweitzer (Eds.), Politics of (Dis) integration (Cham: Springer): 1-18.

Crawley, Heaven (2016), "Managing the Unmanageable? Understanding Europe's Response to the Migration 'Crisis'", Human Geography, 9 (2): 13-23.

De Genova, Nicholas, Martina Tazzioli, and Soledad Álvarez-Velasco (2016), "Europe/crisis: New Keywords of 'the Crisis' in and of 'Europe'" Near Futures Online, (1): 11-45. https://refugeesproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/New-Keywords-of-the-Crisis-in-and-Europe.pdf (25.05.2022).

Delanty, Gerard (2004), "Is there a European identity?", Global Dialogue, 5 (3/4): 76-86.

Derrida, Jacques. (2005). "The Principle of Hospitality", Parallax, 11 (1): 6-9.

De Genova, Nicholas, Sandro Mezzadra and John Pickles (2015), "New Keywords: Migration and Borders", Cultural Studies, 29 (1): 55-87.

De Genova, Nicholas (2016), "The European Question: Migration, Race, and Postcoloniality in Europe", Social Text, 34 (3): 75-102.

De Genova, Nicholas, Sandro Tazzioli and Solledad Alvarez-Velasco (2016), "Europe/crisis: New Keywords of 'the Crisis' in and of 'Europe'", Near Futures Online, 1: 11-45.

De Genova, Nicholas (2018), The "Migrant Crisis" as Racial Crisis: Do Black Lives Matter in Europe?", Ethnic and Racial Studies, 41 (10): 1765-1782.

Dovi, Vivviene (2022) "The treatment Africans are facing in Ukraine is despicable, but why are we surprised?" Euronews, April 1, https://www.euronews.com/2022/04/01/the-treatment-africans-are-facing-in-ukraine-is-despicable-but-why-are-we-surprised (25.05.2022).

Fanon, Frantz (1961), The Wretched of the Earth (Farrington: Constance).

Gümüş, Burak and Deniz Eroğlu (2015), "Partial Integration of Syrian 'Escapees' under the Rule of Turkey's Justice and Development Party (JDP)", Contemporary Arab Affairs, 8 (4): 469-487.

Goddard, Victoria A., Josep R. Llobera and Chris Shore (Eds.) (1994), The Anthropology of Europe: Identity and Boundaries in Conflict (London: Routledge).

Goldberg, David Theo (2006), "Racial Europeanization", Ethnic and Racial Studies, 29 (2): 331-364.

Gorodzeisky, Anastasia and Moshe Semyonov (2016), "Not Only Competitive Threat but also Racial Prejudice: Sources of Anti-immigration Attitudes in European Societies", International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 28 (3): 331-354.

Gorodzeisky, Anastasia and Moshe Semyonov (2019), "Unwelcome Refugees: Sources of Opposition to Different Refugee Groups among Europeans", Frontiers in Sociology, 4 (24), https://frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fsoc.2019.00024/full (25.05.2022).

Hayden, Robert M. (1996), "Constitutional Nationalism and the Logic of the Wars in Yugoslavia", Problems of Post-Communism, 43 (5): 25-35.

Hayden, Robert M. (2002), "Antagonistic Tolerance: Competitive Sharing of Religious Sites in South Asia and the Balkans", Current Anthropology, 43 (2): 205-231.

Hage, Ghassan (2000), White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society (New York: Routledge).

Heizmann, Boris (2016), "Symbolic Boundaries, Incorporation Policies, and Anti-immigration Attitudes: What Drives Exclusionary Policy Preferences?", Ethnic and Racial Studies, 39 (10): 1791-1811.

Hinger, Sophie (2020), "Integration through disintegration? The Distinction between Deserving and Undeserving Refugees in National and Local Integration Policies in Germany", Hinger, Sophie and Reinhard Schweitzer (Eds.), Politics of (Dis)integration (Cham: Springer): 19-39.

Holzberg, Billy, Kristina Kolbe and Rafal Zaborowski (2018), "Figures of Crisis: The Delineation of (Un)deserving Refugees in the German Media", Sociology, 52 (3): 534-550.

Huschke, Susann (2014), "Performing Deservingness. Humanitarian Health Care Provision for Migrants in Germany", Social Science and Medicine, 120: 352-359.

Karakayalı, Serhat and J. Olaf Kleist (2016), "Volunteers and Asylum Seekers", Forced Migration Review, 51: 65-67.

Karakayalı, Serhat (2017), "Feeling the Scope of Solidarity: The Role of Emotions for Volunteers Supporting Refugees in Germany", Social Inclusion, 5 (3): 7-16.

Karakayalı, Serhat (2019), "The Welcomers: How Volunteers Frame their Commitment for Refugees", Margit Feischmidt, Ludger Pries, Celine Cantat (Eds.), Refugee Protection and Civil Society in Europe (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan): 221-241.

Kautz, Steven (1993), "Liberalism and the Idea of Toleration", American Journal of Political Science, 37 (2): 610-632.

Kentmen-Cin, Çigdem and Cengiz Erisen (2017), "Anti-immigration attitudes and the opposition to European integration: A critical assessment", European Union Politics, 18 (1): 3-25.

Koca, Burcu Togral (2016), "New Social Movements: Refugees Welcome UK", European Scientific Journal, 12 (2): 96-108.

Koca, Burcu. Togral (2019), "Local Bordering Practices, Refugees, and Civil Society: The Case of Berlin", Geographical Review, 109 (4): 544-561.

Korkut, Umut (2016), "Pragmatism, Moral Responsibility, or Policy Change: The Syrian Refugee Crisis and Selective Humanitarianism in the Turkish Refugee Regime", Comparative Migration Studies, 4 (1): 1-20.

Kuntz, Anabel, Eldad Davidov and Moshe Semyonov (2017), "The Dynamic Relations between Economic Conditions and Anti-immigration Sentiment: A Natural Experiment in Times of the European Economic Crisis", International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 58 (5): 392-415.

Kukovetz, Brigitte and Anette Sprung (2019), "Questioning Power Relations: Learning Processes through Solidarity with Refugees", Fergal Finnegan and Bernie Grummell (Eds.), Power and Possibility (Leiden: Brill): 131-142.

Malkki, Lisa (1992), "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees", Cultural Anthropology, 7 (1): 24-44.

Mason, Jennifer (2002), Qualitative Researching (London: Sage).

Maneri, Marcello (2021), "Breaking the Race Taboo in a Besieged Europe: How Photographs of the "Refugee Crisis" Reproduce Racialized Hierarchy", Ethnic and Racial Studies, 44 (1): 4-20.

Mann, Michael. (2005), The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Marchetti, Chiara (2020), "(Un)Deserving Refugees: Contested Access to the 'Community of Value' in Italy", Elżbieta M. Goździak, Izabella Main and Brigitte Suter (Eds.) Europe and the Refugee Response (New York: Routledge): 236-252.

Mavelli, Luca (2017), "Governing Populations through the Humanitarian Government of Refugees: Biopolitical Care and Racism in the European Refugee Crisis", Review of International Studies, 43 (5): 809-832.

Mezzadra, Sandra and Brett Neilson (2012), "Between Inclusion and Exclusion: On the Topology of Global Space and Borders", Theory, Culture and Society, 29 (4-5): 58-75.

Minkenberg, Michael (2000), "The Renewal of the Radical Right: Between Modernity and Anti-modernity", Government and Opposition, 35 (2): 170–188.

Monforte, Pierre, Gaja Maestri and Estelle d'Halluin (2021), "'It's Like Having One More Family Member': Private Hospitality, Affective Responsibility, and Intimate Boundaries within Refugee Hosting Networks", Journal of Sociology, 57 (3): 674–689.

Odwyer, Caoimhe (2018, August 28), "A Postcolonial Analysis of the European 'Refugee Crisis'", https://www.e-ir.info/2018/08/29/a-postcolonial-analysis-of-the-european-refugee-crisis/(25.05.2022).

Pasetti, Francesco and Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas (2018), "Who is Responsible, for What and to Whom? Patterns of Politicisation on Refugees and the European Solidarity Crisis", Ceaseval Research on the Common European Asylum System (16), http://ceaseval.eu/publications/16_PasettiGarces_WP5_Crossnat.pdf (25.05.2022)

Perkowski, Nina (2016), "Deaths, Interventions, Humanitarianism and Human Rights in the Mediterranean 'Migration Crisis'", Mediterranean Politics, 21 (2): 331-335.

Pierpan, Jonathan Parks (1996), Liberalism and Toleration: Competing Concepts of Toleration in Liberal Thought (Unpublished Master's Thesis) (Virginia, US: The College of William and Mary). DOI: 10.21220/s2-vwn5-qq34.

Polavieja, Javier G. (2016), "Labour-market Competition, Recession and Anti-immigration Sentiments in Europe: Occupational and Environmental Drivers of Competitive Threat", Socio-Economic Review, 14 (3): 395-417.

Povrzanovic Frykman, M. and Fanny Mäkelä (2019), "Only Volunteers? Personal Motivations and Political Ambiguities within Refugees Welcome to Malmö Civil Initiative", Feischmidt, Margit, Ludger Pries and Celine Cantat (Eds.), Refugee Protection and Civil Society in Europe (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan): 291-318.

Ponzanesi, Sandra (2012), "The Postcolonial Turn in Italian Studies", Lombardi-Diop, C. and C. Romeo (Eds.), Postcolonial Italy: Italian and Italian American Studies (New York: Palgrave Macmillan): 51-69.

Rajaram, Prem Kumar (2015, October19), "Beyond Crisis: Rethinking the Population Movements at Europe's Border", http://focaalblog.com/2015/10/19/prem-kumar-rajaram-beyond-crisis (25.05.2022).

Ratzmann, Nora (2021), "Deserving of Social Support? Street-level Bureaucrats' decisions on EU Migrants' Benefit Claims in Germany", Social Policy and Society, 20 (3): 509-520.

Rozakou, Katerina (2017), "Solidarity #Humanitarianism: The Blurred Boundaries of Humanitarianism in Greece", Etnofoor, 29 (2): 99–104.

Said, Edward (1978), Orientalism: Western Concepts of the Orient (New York: Pantheon).

Sajjad, Tazreena (2022, March 9), "Ukrainian refugees are welcomed with open arms – not so with people fleeing other war-torn countries", Conversations, https://theconversation.com/ukrainian-refugees-are-welcomed-with-open-arms-not-so-with-people-fleeing-other-war-torn-countries-178491 (25.05.2022).

De Saussure, Ferdinand (1916), Course in General Linguistics (London: Duckworth).

Schlegel, Simon (2022, March 16), "Mitigating the Gendered Effects of Ukraine's Refugee Crisis", International Crisis Group, https://crisisgroup.org/europe-central-asia/eastern-europe/ukraine/mitigating-gendered-effects-ukraines-refugee-crisis (25.05.2022).

Sebastian, Paul (2018), "The Implications of Devastating Conditions in Refugee Camps on the European Refugee Crisis", Köz-Gazdaság-Review of Economic Theory and Policy, 13 (3): 204-221.

Sert, Deniz Ş. and Didem Danış (2021), "Framing Syrians in Turkey: State Control and No Crisis Discourse", International Migration, 59 (1): 197-214.

Simsa, Ruth (2017), "Leaving Emergency Management in the Refugee Crisis to Civil Society? The Case of Austria", Journal of Applied Security Research, 12 (1): 78-95.

Stock, Ina (2017), "Daring to Care? How Volunteers and Civil Society Organisations are Shaping Asylum Seekers' Access to Citizenship Through Social Support", COMCAD Working Papers, 156 (Bielefeld: Universität Bielefeld). https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168ssoar-54606-8 (25.05.2022).

Stolcke, Verena (1995), "Talking Culture: New Boundaries, New Rhetorics of Exclusion in Europe", Current Anthropology, 36 (1): 1-24.

Stråth, Bo (2000), "Introduction: Europe as a Discourse", Bo Stråth (Ed.), Europe and the Other, Europe as the Other: Multiple Europes (Brussels: Peter Lang): 133-44.

Sözer, Hande (2020), "Humanitarianism with a Neo-liberal Face: Vulnerability Intervention as Vulnerability Redistribution", Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 46 (11): 2163-2180.

Sözer, Hande (2021a), "Categories that Blind Us, Categories that Bind Them: The Deployment of the Notion of Vulnerability for Syrian Refugees in Turkey", Journal of Refugee Studies, 34 (3): 2775-2803.

Sözer, Hande (2021b), "Neoliberal Küresel İnsaniyetperverliğin Yerel Tezahürleri: Türkiye'de Suriyeli Mültecilerle Çalışan İnsaniyetperverlik Aktörlerinin Anlatıları", METU Studies in Development, 48 (1): 77-110.

Squire, Vicki (2020), Europe's Migration Crisis: Border Deaths and Human Dignity (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Wellman, Christopher Heath (2008), "Immigration and Freedom of Association", Ethics, 119 (1): 109-141.

van der Veer, Lieke (2020), "Residents' Responses to Refugee Reception: The Cracks and Continuities between Care and Control", Ethnic and Racial Studies, 43 (16): 368-387.

van Reekum, Rogier (2016), "The Mediterranean: Migration Corridor, Border Spectacle, Ethical Landscape", Mediterranean Politics, 21 (2): 336-341.

Vaughan, Kenneth. R. (2021), "Anti-immigration Sentiment and Opposition to Democracy in Europe", Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies, 19 (4): 540-556.

Vandevoordt, Robin and Larissa Fleischmann (2021), "Impossible Futures? The Ambivalent Temporalities of Grassroots Humanitarian Action", Critical Sociology, 47 (2): 187-202.

VOA (2022), "Elderly, Disabled Unable to Flee Ukraine War, Charities Say", Voice of America, March 9, https://www.voanews.com/a/elderly-disabled-unable-to-flee-ukraine-war-charities-say/6478084.html (25.05.2022).

Zetter, Roger (2007), "More Labels, Fewer Refugees: Remaking the Refugee Label in an Era of Globalization", Journal of Refugee Studies, 20(2): 172-192.

Žižek, Slavoj (2008), "Tolerance as an Ideological Category", Critical Inquiry, 34 (4): 660-682.

Žižek, Slavoj (2015), "The Non-existence of Norway", London Review of Books, 37 (17), https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v37/n17/slavoj-zizek/the-non-existence-of-norway (25.05.2022).

Žižek, Slavoj (2016), Against the Double Blackmail: Refugees, Terror and Other Troubles with the Neighbours (London: Penguin).