July 2020
Volume: 17, **No**: 4, pp. 541 – 550
ISSN: 1741-8984
e-ISSN: 1741-8992
www.migrationletters.com

MIGRATION LETTERS

First Submitted: 20 February 2019 Accepted: 16 January 2020
DOI: https://doi.org/10.33182/ml.v17i4.711

Feeling Strange. The Role of Emotion in Maintaining and Overcoming Borders and Boundaries

Paul Scheibelhofer[1]

Abstract

This article argues that a focus on emotion and affect helps to understand the processes of constructing and negotiating borders and boundaries critically. To do so, the article analyses two distinct yet connected cases in Austria: On the one hand, it discusses political discourse after the so-called "refugee crisis" of 2015 and shows, how a "politics of fear" was employed to regain control after a brief moment of relative freedom of movement. The second part of the analysis presents outcomes of an interview-based study with Austrians who engaged in a very intense form of refugee help by entering sponsorships with young male refugees. The analysis shows the role of emotions in legitimate restrictive border practices as well as their potential of creating solidarity across boundaries.

Keywords: *borders; boundaries; emotions; social processes; political discourse.*

Introduction

This article argues that a focus on emotion and affect helps to understand the processes of constructing and negotiating borders and boundaries critically. To do so, the article analyses two distinct yet connected cases in Austria: On the one hand, it discusses political discourse after the so-called "refugee crisis" of 2015 and shows, how a "politics of fear" (Wodak, 2015) was employed to regain control after a brief moment of relative freedom of movement. The second part of the analysis presents outcomes of an interview-based study with Austrians who engaged in a very intense form of refugee help by entering sponsorships with young male refugees. While, in the political sphere, negative emotions were used to gain public support for restrictive measures, the sponsorships are driven by emotions of pity, intimacy and solidarity in a context of complex power hierarchies. The analysis shows the role that emotions can play in maintaining boundaries and legitimating restrictive border politics. But it also shows how emotions can instigate the transgression of established boundaries of "us" and "them".

In this analysis, territorial borders, as well as social boundaries, are not viewed as static entities, but outcomes of complex social processes and practices. Following the seminal work of Fredrik Barth (1969) on ethnic groups and boundaries, social groups are seen as the outcome of "boundary work" rather than a sign of a pre-given cultural essence. Through "selective labelling" (Narayan, 2000) particular cultural practices are elevated to represent core aspects of a groups' authentic culture. The invention of traditions and linear historical narratives of cultural heritage facilitate the creation of imagined communities (Anderson, 1983) and the drawing of boundaries to others. As feminist and postcolonial theorists have shown, issues of race, gender and sexuality often intersect in these practices of constituting the self and the other (McClintock, 1995; Nagel, 2003). Rather

[1] Paul Scheibelhofer, Department of Educational Science, University of Innsbruck, Austria. E-mail: paul.scheibelhofer@uibk.ac.at

Copyright @ 2020 MIGRATION LETTERS
Transnational Press London

than asking how migration causes “integration problems” or “culture clashes”, such a perspective asks, how social differences are produced in migration situations and how this is related to intersecting forms of power.

A sociological perspective also changes the view on borders. Rather than being seen as mere geographic demarcations, walls or fences, this perspective understands borders as complex outcomes of diverse practices, institutions, regulations and discourses (Newman, 2006). From this perspective, borders fulfil the function of shaping, channelling, decelerating and exploiting migration processes (Mezzadra & Neilson, 2013). In that, they are flexible and changing reactions to the flexible and changing practices of movement by migrants. Political migration discourses, as analysed in this article, can thus be seen as one facet of bordering practices (DeChaine, 2012). In these discourses, technologies and regulations of border control are made sense of, legitimised or challenged.

The analysis thus adopts a praxeological approach, interested in processes of *doing boundaries* and *doing borders*, while focusing on the role that emotions play in these processes. Such a focus on affect and emotions can shed light on some of the intricacies of the creation, reproduction and shifts in societal relations of difference. It also highlights some of the ways that the workings of boundaries and borders are entangled with each other. While boundaries and borders are distinct social institutions, they do not work detached from each other. Border regimes are codified practices of differentially allocating rights and resources to groups of people according to nationality and migration experiences. In that, they create an institutional context which naturalises the drawing of particular social boundaries and endows these practices of boundary making with social power. But border regimes, in turn, also need to be legitimised socially. A fact, which becomes particularly salient in times of crisis and political attempts to change established border regimes, as the below analysis shows. It documents, that drawing upon, and discursively shaping popular understandings of social boundaries between “us” and “them” is a political strategy to attain approval and legitimise particular migration policies. As the analysis also shows, emotions and affects are a key site where this entanglement between practices of doing border and doing boundary takes place. The first empirical case is an example of how emotions around questions of difference could successfully be shaped politically in order to push restrictive asylum laws. The second one, in turn, shows the power of emotions to instigate critique of and even opposition to established social boundaries and the border regime that codifies them. The relationship between emotions, boundaries and borders is thus complex and multifarious.

The personal is political: Theorising Emotions

The study of emotion and affect has recently proliferated in what has been termed “affective turn” or “emotional turn” in a range of academic disciplines (e.g. Clough & Halley, 2007; Greco & Stenner, 2008). Challenging the superiority of reason and objectivity over subjectivity and affect this research argues that emotions are not as private and personal as they often seem. Rather, emotions are understood as shaped by social context and relations of power. Through emotions, the personal is connected with the social, and it is through emotions, that the social is engaged with in everyday life.

Important predecessors to contemporary debates around emotion and affect were feminist scholars and activists (Gorton, 2007). Ever since the slogan “the personal is political” was coined, feminists engaged vigorously with the social nature of seemingly personal aspects of life (cf.

Cvetkovich, 2012: 133). They have long since identified the ideological and institutionalised division between a feminised private sphere (imagined to be a space of harmony and emotionality) vis-a-vis a masculinised public sphere (supposedly organised around rationality and reason) as a cornerstone to the reproduction of male dominance (Schneebaum, 2014). Engaging with the complexities of care work, feminists have highlighted how emotion is embedded in social relations of power both within private and corporate contexts (Hochchild, 1983) and the role that global hierarchies and colonial legacies can play therein (Gutiérrez Ródriguez, 2010).

Feminist literature thus "has long recognised the critical links between affect and gendered, sexualised, racalised and classed relations of power" (Pedwell & Whitehead, 2012: 116). As this literature argues, emotions are not detached from wider social structures of privilege and exploitation. *Who* can feel *what*, *where* and *when* is not a private matter but an expression of social relations and distinctions. In that, they are of central importance to the creation of groups and boundaries, as feminist theorist Sara Ahmed has pointed out. Drawing on the etymological origins of the term, Sara Ahmed (2004a) argues that emotions both "move" people as well as "connect" them with others. They have the potentiality, according to Ahmed, to "align" people towards others and thus form groups while moving them away from others. In her study, *The Cultural Politics of Emotions* Ahmed (2004b) shows the important role that the political sphere plays in shaping these processes of alignment and separation. As she shows, right-wing politics, in particular, manages to develop emotional thrust and persuasive power. This is accomplished by promoting the notion of a community of equals that "naturally" belongs to a particular territory. A territory its members are invited to *feel* to belong to and *feel* entitled to inhabit, undisturbed by strangers. In that, Ahmed diverges from approaches like "xenophobia", which locate the source of animosity to strangers in their objective difference. Rather, it is social processes that turn some strangers into "strange strangers" while at the same time drawing the contours of a community of insiders, to which its participants are emotionally attached. While socio-linguist Ruth Wodak importantly analysed the role of negative emotions in right-wing "politics of fear" (2015), Ahmed's approach highlights another aspect. Discussing the notion of "love" (for the nation, for the white family etc.) in right-wing discourses, Ahmed (2004b: 122) shows, that these discourses are never just directed *against* othered persons but also *for* selves and for what binds them together. Politics of fear and politics of love thus go hand in hand. What this theoretical literature shows is, that spurring particular emotions and thus establishing hegemonic "feeling rules" (Hochchild 1983) is an important facet of such politics, as emotions move people to identify with groups and boundaries and to get personally invested in their reproduction. A final body of work relevant to the present analysis is concerned with the contradictions of emotions in the context of helping.

While "regarding the pain of others" (Sonntag, 2003) and empathising with it can be a powerful motivator for solidarity and action, theorists have pointed to problematic aspects. Lauren Berlant criticised dynamics of "national sentimentality" (2000) when privileged citizens care for the suffering of marginalised people without engaging with the structural conditions that create differential life chances. The very act of compassionate help, Ildiko Zakarias points out, can enforce processes of boundary-making between helpers and the helped when "suffering and needs are emphasised on one side, while capacities and resources are stressed on the other" (Zakarias, 2015: 146). Focusing on the topic of the present article, we see that these problematic dynamics also exist in refugee contexts. As Castro Varela and Heinemann (2016) have shown in their analysis of refugee help projects in Europe after the so-called refugee crisis in 2015, "compassion" played an ambivalent role there. Depending on how it is employed, the authors argue, compassion can be both

Copyright @ 2020 MIGRATION LETTERS

a powerful motivation to engage with the suffering of others in ways that empower refugees, or work as a justification for paternalistic interventions that mainly aim at demonstrating the magnificence of the helper. But problematic dynamics around emotion and affect not only take place on the level of individual refugee help projects. As Miriam Ticktin (2014) and Didier Fassin (2005) pointed out, refugee politics have recently shifted from a logic of rights to a "regime of humanitarianism" in which asylum seekers must demonstrate appropriate forms of (bodily) suffering in order to be seen as eligible for compassion and thus for legal protection. As also the Austrian case analysed below shows, this shift takes place within a wider political climate of increased mistrust against asylum seekers and the drafting of ever more restrictive policies (Fassin, 2011).

Negotiating borders and boundaries

In what follows, the role of emotion in the production and negotiation of borders and boundaries is analysed drawing on data from Austria. Two different, but connected, cases are analysed, namely anti-refugee politics after the so-called refugee crisis in 2015 and the practice of refugee sponsorship, where Austrian citizens care for and establish close ties with unaccompanied young male refugees. The analysis presents data from an ongoing study conducted by the author. For the analysis of political discourse, articles relating to refugee politics in Austrian news outlets (mainly *Die Presse* and *Der Standard*) that appeared from August 2015 to November 2016 were analysed using methods of Critical Discourse Analysis (Jäger, 2015). The analysis of refugee sponsorships is based on eleven qualitative interviews that took place between February and May 2017. Interviewees were Austrian citizens between the age of 40 and 65 that have engaged in sponsorships with young male refugees who came to the country in 2015, fleeing from Afghanistan, Syria and Iran. The interviews were analysed using the approach of Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Anti-Refugee politics and fear of othered masculinities

Politics of emotion, Ahmed showed, often draw upon notions of gender, sexuality and race (Sara Ahmed, 2004b: 157). So too did politicians in Austria to regain control after the summer of 2015, when thousands of refugees crossed Austrian borders, leading to a partial break-down of the European border regime and creating a space of relative freedom of movement. The arrival of refugees was accompanied by a wave of public solidarity. Voluntary help projects ranged from first aid at camps or railway stations to practices such as providing legal advice or helping refugees to safely cross borders using private cars (Ataç, 2015). This public solidarity was sided by a political openness from the then ruling Parties *SPÖ* and *ÖVP*.[2] In August 2015 the *ÖVP*-Interior Minister demanded safe passage ways for refugees to Europe[3] and the *SPÖ*-Chancellor publicly criticised Hungary for its mistreatment of refugees.[4] In September, Austria decided to let thousands of refugees pass the borders and suspended border control, while the Austrian President lauded police and volunteers for their humanitarian engagement.[5] But this openness did not last long and soon after summer 2015, a gendered and racialised discourse of danger and threat arose within Austrian politics that fundamentally eventually changed public perceptions and later secured support for restrictive measures. Already in fall 2015, members of the right-wing *FPÖ* warned of the imminent

[2] As in several legislative periods before, the Christian-conservative *ÖVP* was in a coalition with the center-left *SPÖ* in 2015.
[3] In *Der Standard* of 28.08.2015.
[4] In *Die Presse* of *12.09.2015*.
[5] In *Die Presse* of 11.09.2015.

threat of an "Islamisation" of Austrian society by refugees and asked for a closing of the borders as the lax controls were "inviting terrorists into the country".[6] After that, the trope of the problematic male refugee was evoked repeatedly. As when the then-Interior Minister Sebastian Kurz (ÖVP) asked that "those who want to stay must respect our rules of coexistence. Amongst these basic values are the rule of law or gender equality"[7] or when the afore-mentioned Interior Minister called for barbed wire at Austria's Eastern borders because refugees "have become more impatient, more aggressive, more emotional over the last days and weeks".[8] While this drastic measure was not implemented due to resistance by the coalition-partner SPÖ, other ways of stopping refugees were found. A first measure was the introduction of an annual limit of asylum applications, which was introduced with the help of an "emergency decree" ('*Notverordnung'*) and promoted by ministers of both ruling parties and the leader of the SPÖ[9] as a much needed corrective to save the small country of Austria from the "masses of refugees"[10] yet to come. But safeguarding Austrian borders was not enough. In January 2016, Minister Kurz stressed the need to close EU's external borders, even if this would "not work without ugly pictures".[11] In February he hosted a "West Balkans Conference" in Vienna, where the subsequent closing of the "Balkan route" was set in motion.

To regain political control after the crisis in 2015, refugee migration was reframed from an issue of humanitarianism and protection to a security threat. Central to the establishment of this "securitisation of migration" perspective (Bigo, 2002), was the depiction of male refugees as religio-culturally problematic and physically dangerous. The figure of the dangerous male refugee was important for this "politics of fear" (Wodak, 2015) to gain credibility and persuasive power. In that, a discourse of dangerous male refugees, that had been established in Austria in the 1990ies (Scheibelhofer, 2012) was taken up and merged with anti-Muslim sentiments. While this shift of perspective was well underway in winter 2015, the events during New Year's Eve 2016 in Cologne were used to further the new view on dangerous male refugees. At the beginning of 2016, German newspapers reported of "North African-looking" men attacking German women on a public square during New Year's Eve festivities. While concrete information was scarce, newspapers soon invoked gendered racist imageries (Boulila/Carri, 2017) in reports about attacks of up to 1.000 young male refugees in Cologne and other cities.

Austrian politicians soon took up this discourse and identified a misogynistic Arab culture and archaic Muslim religiosity of male refugees as the cause of the incident. Thus FPÖ politicians warned of Muslim refugees undermining hard-won women's rights,[12] Minister Kurz stated that he already had "anticipated tensions, assaults and violent clashes"[13] and a politician of the right-leaning *Team Stronach* explained that this was to be expected when thousands of young Muslim men without wives came to Europe.[14] Many of these statements blamed lax refugee policies as well as the naïve "goodwill" of parts of the society for making the attacks possible. Consequences were thus called for, and the demands ranged from completely closing the borders to stricter deportation

[6] In Die Presse of 25.09.2015, all direct quotes have been translated into English by the author.
[7] In *Die Krone* of 22.09.2015.
[8] On the national radio station *Ö1* on 28.10.2015.
[9] In *Kleine Zeitung* of 21.02.2015.
[10] From an article published on the website of the ÖVP, www.oevp.at/team/kurz/Kurz-Wir-muessen-Obergrenzen-festlegen.psp, accessed on 14.11.2016.
[11] In *Die Welt* of 13.01.2016.
[12] Press release of the *FPÖ* from 07.01.2016.
[13] In *Die Welt* of 13.01.2016.
[14] Press release of the *Team Stronach* of 07.01.2016.

Copyright @ 2020 MIGRATION LETTERS

laws and compulsory DNA-testing of all male refugees at EU borders to curfews for male refugees. To counter the perceived threat, several cities founded vigilante groups.[15]

The debates after the incidents in Cologne added sexualised imageries to the already unfolding politics of fear against male refugees. These "ethnosexual" (Nagel, 2003) imageries combined notions of racial difference with dangerous sexuality, building on long established colonialist ideas of a pervert, archaic Orient, as already critically discussed by Edward Said (1979). Taking up these long established imageries, the gendered and racialised discourse alluded to fears and called for action. It positioned white women as in danger of being violated by sexually devious refugee men and accorded white men the role as saviours of these women. It made use of a discursive strategy that Ahmed (2000: 29) termed "stranger danger", by which some-bodies are identified as dangerous bodies and thus fixing them as "strange strangers" against whom protective measures need to be taken. Stranger danger creates "suspects", with seemingly perilous bodies and mores, and "subjects" who are united in vigilance and fear of the danger emanating from strangers. But the imperilled women in this narrative symbolically stood in for more than just themselves, as politicians drew upon what Sara Farris (2017) termed a "femonationalist" discourse, in which supposedly stark differences in gender relations between societies of the West vs the global rest are invoked in order to draw boundaries between an enlightened "us" and problematic strangers. The need to protect white women from sexual harm was thus linked to the need to protect the nation from male refugees in general. In Austria, the process of reframing refugee migration as dangerous was successful: In early elections in 2017, both the ÖVP and the FPÖ won seats and formed a new right-wing government with a strong anti-refugee agenda. Refugee-help projects were increasingly viewed with suspicion and cut back considerably. The new government hence introduced several restrictions in migration and refugee law without sparking major public criticism, on the contrary, enjoying high approval rates.

Shifting the dominant feeling rules towards refugees was obviously successful. The universalistic notion of refugees as being individuals in need of help and aid was shifted after the "crisis" of 2015. Employing a gendered and racialised politics of fear, stark boundaries between dangerous others and an imperilled self were drawn. This formed a fertile ground to gain approval for new restrictions in the Austrian migration regime.

Negotiating hegemonic feeling rules in refugee sponsorships

What happens, when the social boundaries promoted by a politics of fear are subverted and divisions between "us" and "them" are transgressed? As the following analysis of refugee sponsorships with young unaccompanied male refugees shows, such transgressions can be a site of friction and contradictions but also a powerful driver of social change. Emotion and affect, the analysis also shows, play a central role in these dynamics.

In creating intimate and family-like relationships with those deemed dangerous strangers, the women and men who engaged in these sponsorships obviously subverted the "feeling rules" (Hochchild, 1983) promoted by politics of fear. But building this closeness across boundaries did not happen straight forward. None of the interviewed sponsors initially planned to enter in a refugee-sponsorship in the first place. Rather, becoming a sponsor was the outcome of a process that began with coincidental encounters during acts of spontaneous help during summer 2015 and gradually intensified. As one sponsor described it: "It was a matter of feeling, you know? I never actually had

[15] On the national radio station Ö1 on 11.02.2016.

the plan to get a godson." For several interviewees feelings played a complex role in this process: While compassion motivated them to engage in refugee help in the first place, it was sympathy that drew them closer to the individual young men that they would later establish sponsorships with. This sympathy was often stimulated by character traits described by the sponsors as "cleverness", "intelligence" or "ambition". The young men needed to show willingness to learn German, go to school or take up work. For the relationship between helper and refugee to intensify beyond the point of mere assistance, the young men thus had to distinguish themselves by a likeable and promising personality.

At the time of the interviews, the sponsorship-arrangements differed to some degree. However, strong ties had established in all cases and nearly all sponsors either explicitly stated that they saw the young men as "part of the family" or at least drew strong parallels to familial ties when describing their relationships. To reach this closeness all parties involved – the refugees, the helpers and also their close kin – had to transgress boundaries and open up to persons that were strangers not long ago. This process could involve frictions and hesitations from all sides. Thus, one sponsor recounted that she disliked being called "mum" by the young man at first, "because it just did not feel like it for me". Eventually, most sponsorships took on family-like forms and ended up feeling much like a new child entered the families. This, in turn, caused trouble in some cases. The new person in the family caused jealousy amongst children, parents as well as partners of sponsors, which could be resolved in several cases but lead to one cancellation of a sponsorship as well as one break up of a partnership. Some sponsors thus had to deal with struggles over the distribution of attention, affect and care work within their family. But also the young refugees themselves had to overcome boundaries and sponsors recounted that some of the men were very timid and introverted at the beginning of the relationship, while others seemed to distrust the sponsors' motivations at first. Most of the young men also stayed in contact with their actual parents and kin in countries across the globe. For them, entering into the sponsorship meant having to juggle relationships and loyalties within a complex, extended, transnational family. The sponsorships were thus sites of "doing family" (Hertz, 2006) under complicated and a-typical conditions. But framing the relationship as "almost family" allowed the persons involved to transgress boundaries and establish very strong and intimate ties with recent strangers. Here, it was the *female* sponsors in particular, that tended to establish closer relationships to the young men due to the gendered division of labour amongst sponsors. While the husbands engaged more in helping solve practical and legal problems, the female sponsors spent more time actually communicating with them. Listening to the young men's thoughts, experiences, stories and grievances created a bond between the godsons and their "sponsor-moms" that did not exist in a similar way with the "dads". Several of the women interviewed told about the intense closeness that had established between them and the young men.

However intimate the sponsorships became, they were not free from hierarchies and power differences. Thus sponsors recounted instances of frustration, when the young men did not react appropriately to offers by the sponsors, e.g. by not attending a German course organised and paid for by the sponsor or not accepting the old clothes that sponsors and their friends collected. In one case, the sponsor explicitly told the young refugee that he could only go on staying in their home when he visited the school and finished with a degree, as she did not want to watch him become a "problem case". In these situations, the power differences in relations of help and assistance surfaced. While the sponsors felt pride about their altruism, these situations pushed the refugees in recurring situations of having to accept, to abide and be thankful. As Kerstin Duemmler (2014) argued, this "paradigm of thankfulness" is a recurring feature in contexts of ethnic boundary

Copyright @ 2020 MIGRATION LETTERS

making. Analysing social relations in Swiss schools, Duemmler shows how migrant youth was relegated to the position of “guests” and were thus expected to “adapt to local customs and show gratitude for the hospitality of their patrons” (Duemmler 2014: 192, translation P.S.) for being allowed to live in Switzerland. As the case of refugee sponsorships indicates, this need for thankfulness does not arise in a social vacuum but is connected to existing negative stereotypes. Showing gratitude and thankfulness was one of the many acts expected from the young refugees, to prove that they were not one of the problematic foreign men. Never the less, in some sponsorships, issues of gender norms and the supposed backwardness of the young men became recurring issues of debate, that one sponsor commented on in the interview with the half-joking words: “After all, he is a Muslim macho.”

These struggles notwithstanding, all interviewed sponsors formulated a clear and decisive critique of the dominant representations of young male refugees on the basis of their experiences. This critique was not only articulated against representations in media and political discourse but also entered the personal arena. Virtually all sponsors had experienced disagreements, fights and alienation amongst friends and family. Sponsors told about heated discussions at parties or Christmas dinners and about relatives that did not approve of the sponsors bringing along their godson to vacations. Through the young men’s stories, sponsors also learned about the realities of discrimination and racism in Austrian society. The extend of which shocked several of the interviewees, be it negative experiences with schools or in trying to find a job, at legal hearings or with racial profiling of the police in public space.

Facing these experiences amongst relatives and in wider society, a spill-over effect of the strong emotional connection they had established with the young refugees became visible. They confronted friends and families as well as authorities and institutions such as the police. Several sponsors eventually began to participate in political groups for refugee rights and became regular attendees of demonstrations against deportations, refugee laws and the government in general. Also, the relationship with the young men had pushed them further and further as to what they were ready to invest in order to help them start a successful life in Austria or to prevent deportation, “hiding him if needed” as sponsors stated, using almost identical words. Reflecting upon their own development during the sponsorship, several interviewees were astonished about their decisiveness and courage. But, in the words of one interviewee, refugee sponsorships have the tendency to “radicalise you”.

Conclusion

This article argues, that acts of “doing border” should not be understood as happening detached from processes of “doing boundary”. Focussing on the role of emotions was proposed as a way to grasp these intricate entanglements better. One context, where this was shown, was the political efforts to regain control after the Austrian migration regime was virtually put out of order by refugees in summer 2015.

In such moments of crisis and reconfiguration of social structures oftentimes, their workings become more apparent. As the analysis showed, new and stricter migration laws directed against refugees could not be introduced right away, against the then existing wave of solidarity for the men, women and children arriving in great numbers in dire need for help. The so-called “welcome culture” of this period can thus be understood as a phase, where considerable fractions of society put into question the drawing of social boundaries along ethnocentric and nationalist lines. These lines had to be redrawn, in order to legitimate the political introduction of restrictive migration laws

and gain public support for these measures. The analysis claims that emotions and affect were a central site where this shift was accomplished. After the summer of 2015, a political discourse in Austria gradually proliferated, that shifted the perspective on refugees as a humanitarian issue to a symptom of crisis and danger. A gendered and sexualised politics of fear, circling around imageries of dangerous foreign masculinity, managed to establish new "feeling rules" and the re-drawing of boundaries in the name of saving women and saving society as a whole.

These politics of emotion were widely successful in reframing the refugee question but did not go uncontested. In establishing particularly intimate relationships with unaccompanied male refugees, sponsorships are a site, where boundaries are transgressed. This transgression is not devoid of frictions and, as the analysis showed, not completely free of the powerful dynamics of boundary making. Hierarchies, imageries, expectations, and dependencies structure this relationship and hinder an encounter as equals.

But the analysis also showed, how the intimacy and emotional attachments that developed in many of these sponsorships can unsettle established not only social boundaries between "us" and "them" but also spur critique against a restrictive "doing borders" on a societal level. The intimacy and emotional connection created in these sponsorships had the potential to turn into solidarity with those deemed dangerously different. It would thus be wrong to blind out issues of emotions as "merely personal" from the analysis of boundary and bordering practices. The analysis documents that emotions can have divergent effects and lead both to "social reproduction and social change" (Gould, 2010: 32). And it shows that suffering of intimate others can lead to anger as a political emotion (Lorde, 1984), motivating engagement with how borders and boundaries are drawn and transgressing spheres of the personal and the political.

References

Ahmed, S. (2000). Strange encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality. London: Routledge.

Ahmed, S. (2004a). "Collective Feelings: Or, the Impressions Left by Others". Theory, Culture and Society, 21 (2): 25-42. DOI: 10.1177/0263276404042133

Ahmed, S. (2004b). The cultural politics of emotion. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Anderson, B. (1983). Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism. London: Verso.

Ataç, I. (2015). "Freiwilligenarbeit als Notnagel oder Neuformulierung der Zivilgesellschaft?". Kurswechsel, 4/2015: 80-85.

Barth, F. (1969). Ethnic groups and boundaries. The social organisation of culture difference. Boston: Little, Brown.

Berlant, L. (2000). "The subject of true feeling: Pain, privacy and politics". In: S. Ahmed, J. Kilby, C. Lury, M. McNeill and B. Skeggs (eds.) Transformations. Thinking Through Feminism. London: Routledge, pp. 33-47.

Bigo, D. (2002). "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Gouvernmentality of Unease". Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, 27: 63-92. DOI: 10.1177/03043754020270S105

Boulila, S. C. and Carri, C. (2017). "On Cologne: Gender, migration and unacknowledged racisms in Germany". European Journal of Women's Studies, 24 (3): 286–293. DOI: 10.1177/1350506817712447

Castro Varela, M. d. M. and Heinemann, A. (2016). "Mitleid, Paternalismus, Solidarität. Zur Rolle von Affekten in der politisch-kulturellen Arbeit". In: M. Ziese and C. Gritschke (eds.) Geflüchtete und Kulturelle Bildung. Formate und Konzepte für ein neues Praxisfeld. Bielefeld: transcript, pp. 51–66.

Clough, P. T. and Halley, J. (eds.) (2007). The Affective Turn: Theorising the Social. Durham: Duke University Press.

Cvetkovich, A. (2012). "Depression Is Ordinary: Public Feelings and Saidiya Hartmann's Lose your Mother". Feminist Theory, 13 (2): 131-146. DOI: 10.1177%2F1464700112442641

DeChaine, D. R. (2012). Border rhetorics. Citizenship and identity on the US-Mexico frontier. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Duemmler, K. (2014). Symbolische Grenzen. Zur Reproduktion sozialer Ungleichheit durch ethnische und religiöse Zuschreibungen. Bielefeld: transcript.

Copyright @ 2020 MIGRATION LETTERS

Farris, S. (2017). In the Name of Women's Rights. The Rise of Femonationalism. Durham: Duke University Press.
Fassin, D. (2005). "Compassion and Repression: The Moral Economy of Immigration Policies in France". Cultural Anthropology, 20 (3): 362–387. DOI: 10.1525/can.2005.20.3.362
Fassin, D. (2011). "Policing Borders, Producing Boundaries. The Governmentality of Immigration in Dark Times". Annual Review of Anthropology, 40: 213-226. http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/full/10.1146/annurev-an40
Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
Gorton, K. (2007). "Theorising Emotion and Affect: Feminist Engagements". Feminist Theory, 8 (3): 333-348. DOI: 10.1177%2F1464700107082369
Gould, D. (2010). "On Affect and Protest". In: J. Staiger, A. Cvetkovich and A. Reynolds (eds.) Political Emotions. New Agendas in Communication. New York: Routledge, pp. 18-44.
Greco, M. and Stenner, P. (eds.) (2008). Emotions: A Social Science Reader. London: Routledge.
Gutiérrez Ródriguez, E. (2010). Migration, Domestic Work and Affect: A Decolonial Approach on Value and the Feminization of Labor. New York: Routledge.
Hertz, R. (2006). "Talking about 'Doing Family'". Journal of Marriage and Family, 68 (4): 796-799. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00293.x
Hochchild, A. (1983). The managed heart. Commercialisation of human feeling. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Jäger, S. (2015). Kritische Diskursanalyse. Münster: Unrast Verlag.
Lorde, A. (1984). "The Uses of Anger: Women Responding to Racism". In: A. Lorde (ed.) Sister Outsider. Berkeley: Crossing Press, pp. 124-133.
McClintock, A. (1995). Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest. New York: Routledge.
Mezzadra, S. and Neilson, B. (2013). Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor. Durham: Duke University Press.
Nagel, J. (2003). Race, Ethnicity and Sexuality: Intimate Intersections, Forbidden Frontiers. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Narayan, U. (2000). "Undoing the 'Package Picture' of Cultures". Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 25 (4): 1083-1086. DOI: 10.1086/495524
Newman, D. (2006). "On borders and power: A theoretical framework". Journal of Borderlands Studies, 18 (1): 13-25. https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2003.9695598
Pedwell, C. and Whitehead, A. (2012). "Affecting Feminism: Questions of Feeling in Feminist Theory". Feminist Theory, 13 (2): 115-129. DOI: 10.1177%2F1464700112442635
Said, E. W. (1979). Orientalism. New York: Vintage Books.
Scheibelhofer, P. (2012). "From Health Check to Muslim Test: The Shifting Politics of Governing Migrant Masculinity". Journal of Intercultural Studies, 33 (3): 319-332. DOI: 10.1080/07256868.2012.673474
Schneebaum, A. (2014). "All in the family: patriarchy, capitalism, and love". In: A. Jónasdóttir and A. Ferguson (eds.) Love: a question for the twenty-first century. New York: Routledge, pp. 127–140.
Sonntag, S. (2003). Regarding the Pain of Others. London: Penguin Books.
Ticktin, M. (2014). "Transnational Humanitarianism". Annual Review of Anthropology, 43: 273-289. https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-anthro-102313-030403
Wodak, R. (2015). The politics of fear. What right-wing populist discourses mean. London: SAGE.
Zakarias, I. (2015). "The Production of Solidarity: A Case Study of Voluntary School Programs of Hungarian Ethnic Kin Support". In: J. Kleres and Y. Albrecht (eds.) Die Ambivalenz der Gefühle: Über die verbindende und widersprüchliche Sozialität von Emotionen. Wiesbaden: Springer, pp. 145-169.