



DiGeSt

Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies

Intersectional Solidarities and Resistances in Face of Violent Migration Regimes

Editorial

Sarah Murru, Robin Vandevordt, Naïké Garny, A. Tancredè Pagès

DiGeSt Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies, Volume 11, Issue 2

<https://doi.org/10.21825/digest.93159>

Print ISSN: 2593-0273. Online ISSN: 2593-0281

Content is licensed under a Creative Commons BY

DiGeSt is hosted by Ghent University Website: <https://www.digest.ugent.be/>

Intersectional Solidarities and Resistances in Face of Violent Migration Regimes

Sarah Murru

KU Leuven

sarah.murru@kuleuven.be

Robin Vandevooordt

Ghent University

robin.vandevooordt@ugent.be

Naïké Garny

KU Leuven

naïke.garny@kuleuven.be

A. Tancredè Pagès

Ghent University

alexis.pages@ugent.be

Introduction

Migration regimes affect people's mobility differently along the lines of their gender, race, class, nationality, age, sexual orientation, and more, exposing them to varying degrees and types of violence (Spijkerboer, 2018; Ansems De Vries & Guild, 2019; Kalir, 2019; Welander, 2021). Single men who cross borders irregularly are often hyper-securitized and subject to the constant risk of being detained and deported (Wyss 2022); along their migration journeys, women and men are exposed to different kinds of economic and sexual exploitation (Turner, 2020; Orsini et al., 2022; Freedman, Sahraoui & Tyszler, 2022); applicants for international protection based on SOGI (Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity) claims are indirectly forced to mould their narratives to Eurocentric understandings of non-heteronormative sexuality to have their applications assessed (Dustin & Ferreira, 2021; Giametta, 2017); persons seeking to apply for asylum, family reunification or regularisation are often subjected to the slow violence of 'waiting' due to long, complicated procedures (Hage, 2009; Näre, 2020) and, increasingly, their exclusion from the welfare state endures for several years after they have acquired formal residence status (Hinger & Schweitzer, 2021; Bendixsen & Näre, 2024).

While the effects of violent migration regimes on variously marginalised people have been extensively documented, less attention has been paid to the equally intersectional forms of solidarity and resistance that have emerged in response (Zajak et al., 2021; Ataç & Steinhilper, 2022). We see that the rise of alliances and conflicts between actors with different biographies, backgrounds, and statuses, is at the heart of a debate on practices of solidarity and resistance in face of violent migration regimes. On the one hand, scholars criticise such practices for reproducing gendered, racial, and neocolonial power relations between people that provide support and those that receive it (Pette, 2015; de Jong, 2017; Braun, 2017; Ngombe, 2020; Sahraoui & Tyszler, 2021; Vandevordt & Verschraegen, 2019). On the other hand, scholars showcase the potential of emerging practices to create new social subjectivities and to mobilise actors into collective political action (Stierl, 2018; Deleixhe, 2018; Della Porta, 2018; Vandevordt, 2019; Mescoli & Roublain, 2021; Schwiertz & Schwenken, 2021; Della Porta & Steinhilper, 2021; Costa Santos & Garny, 2022). However, while most of these studies draw upon feminist and decolonial theories, they seldom use an explicitly intersectional framework. This is surprising, given the increasingly common call for a reflexive turn in migration studies encouraging scholars to embrace intersectional understandings of human mobility (Gatt et al., 2016; Lutz & Amelina, 2021; Cleton & Meier, 2023).

This special issue brings together a wide range of recent case studies of practices of solidarity and resistance, each informed by an intersectional understanding of the relations between the people that are involved within them. The emphasis of each contribution varies between a critical analysis of how power relations are reproduced and how they are countered. Central to each paper is at least one of three questions that cannot be fully disentangled from one another: how can acts of solidarity and resistance avoid reproducing gendered, neocolonial, or ageist power relations? How can these power relations be countered in a context of structural violence that is unevenly distributed across race, gender, class, sexual orientation, and age? What new political subjectivities and social imaginaries emerge through the collective efforts of persons with sometimes radically different positionalities?

To address these questions, we have brought together analyses on cases involving a diverse array of actors and practices. Some contributions are more theoretical, others more empirical; some focus more on how power is reproduced along intersectional lines, others explore how these power relations can be undone. While the authors in this issue draw on different concepts such as solidarity and/or resistance, they speak to each other through a sensitivity to the distinct positions of the actors involved, and to the dynamic, shifting balance between power and resistance. Rather than situate ourselves firmly within one line of research (e.g. 'autonomous solidarity' or 'constructive resistance'), we explicitly seek to bring together a variety of approaches revolving around the same, broad issue. In this editorial, we

spell out some of the guiding assumptions behind three concepts that are often loosely defined in the context of violent migration regimes: intersectionality, solidarity and resistance. By doing so, we hope to shed light on the relation between these concepts and to identify the common threads that could tie together an otherwise fragmented field of inquiry.

Intersectionality

Intersectionality is a concept that serves as a theoretical, methodological, epistemological, political, and ethical tool, not only in academia but also in civil society (Hill Collins, 2019; Freedman et al., 2022). First approached and reflected upon by the Combahee River Collective (1981) to apprehend the ‘interlocking systems of oppression’ (Hill Collins, 1990), it was coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991) through the metaphor of ‘street crossings’ to convey women of colour’s particular experience at the crossroad of both racial and gender discrimination. The concept has fostered scholarship that complexifies understandings of power and domination by highlighting how social inequalities and marginalisation unfold at the intersection of various power relations (Bilge, 2010). If the theoretical understanding of oppression entails looking into a variety of directions to locate the imbricated forces at play, then methodologically, this has led scholars to think in new ways about how to unveil what lies at the margins (Carbado et al., 2013; Marfelt, 2016; Rice et al., 2019) and how to stay true to experiences that are situated in specific places and times (Yuval-Davis, 2015). Moreover, the gradual establishment of intersectionality as a central concept, interdisciplinary field (Cho et al., 2013), or critical social theory in social sciences (Hill Collins, 2019), emphasises that it cannot be disconnected from the political commitments towards social justice that gave birth to it (Hill Collins, 2015). Strong epistemological and ethical dedications thus anchor scholarship mobilising intersectionality within a broader transformative, political, and justice-oriented project. Unsurprisingly, these ideals, and the concept of intersectionality itself, have been embraced as guiding paradigms for civil society efforts and social movements striving to fight inequalities (Chun et al., 2013; Laperrière & Lépinard, 2016).

In migration studies, intersectionality is used to address the interconnectivity between race, gender, class, and sexuality, by illustrating the interrelated nature of the othering process ‘in the context of powerful postcolonial orders of migration’ (Manalansan, 2006 in Lutz & Amelina, 2021, p. 66; see also Cassidy et al., 2018; Merla et al., 2024). Despite the criticism levelled at the various categorical approaches to intersectionality and their tendency to essentialise the social dimensions it addresses (McCall, 2005), the concept of intersectionality has facilitated an unprecedented examination of the specific situations and positions experienced by ‘migrantised’ individuals in their entanglement with other dimensions of inequality (Lenz, 1996, in Lutz & Amelina, 2021, p. 63; see also Cleton & Meier, 2023; Gatt et al., 2016). In this sense, the value of bringing an intersectional perspective to the study of solidarity and resistance to violent migration regimes, is that it helps shed light on how the experiences, actions, and strategies of the actors involved within them are shaped differently by the broader power structures in which they are entangled.

At the same time, intersectionality has traditionally been used as a tool to not only analyse distinct forms of oppression, but to challenge these as well (see Hill Collins, 2015). Cho et al. (2013, p. 800), for instance, coined the term ‘intersectional politics’ to refer to ‘dual concerns for resisting the systemic forces that significantly shape the differential life chances of intersectionality’s subjects and for shaping modes of resistance beyond allegedly universal, single-axis approaches.’ More recently, Ishkanian and Peña Saavedra (2019) have argued that what they describe as ‘intersectional prefiguration’ entails:

[...] more than the recognition of diversity or a bid to integrate diverse voices or interests (Bygnes, 2013; Roth, 2008), but is rather concerned with acknowledging, challenging, and transforming relations of inequality and oppression both within group spaces and beyond (2019, pp. 988-989).

In other words, the use of an intersectional perspective implies a sensitivity to the distinct ways in which people are affected by multiple structures of oppression, and to how these structures can be effectively dismantled.

Solidarity

The concept of solidarity has a long, complicated history in social theory as well as real-life politics (Dean, 1995; Featherstone, 2012; Oosterlynck et al., 2016; Rakopoulos, 2016). It is deployed by both the political left and right, and it can refer to phenomena as divergent as the rise of ethno-racially bounded national welfare states and the prefigurative practices of autonomous collectives. ‘Solidarity’ is thus heavily imbued with ‘ontological assumptions’ about what it is, what it should be, and who can be involved in it (Kapeller & Wolkenstein, 2013, p. 477). In the past decade, the concept has taken flight in critical migration studies, mainly in response to the increasingly violent nature of migration regimes across the global North. In this context, solidarity with people on the move refers to a wide array of practices, ranging from stop-gap forms of support to acts of civil disobedience and collective protest (Della Porta, 2018). It is practised across a multitude of geographies, from the rugged terrain of mountain- and sea-scapes to urban centres, and from public fora to the privacy of individual homes.

Within this literature, solidarity has been conceptualised in ways that are both fragmented and consistent (Bauder & Juffs, 2020). While it is usually defined in an imprecise, intuitive way that implicitly builds on a variety of theoretical traditions, solidarity invariably implies a *political* dimension that sets it apart from ‘humanitarianism’, ‘charity’ or even ‘civil society’ (Della Porta, 2018; Vandevoordt, 2019; Mezzadra, 2021). In a recent article, for instance, Dadusc and Mudu (2021) describe humanitarianism as ‘filling the gaps’, whereas solidarity seeks to ‘create cracks in the system’ while, at times, simultaneously enacting alternative visions and practices of migration/mobility. It is not difficult to find examples to support such a clear-cut distinction: humanitarian NGOs that do not publicly question European migration regimes face a lower risk of criminalisation than those that do; and while ‘search and rescue’ operations near the Libyan coast may be discursively framed as life-saving endeavours, they may de facto help strengthen European borders by returning those rescued to Libyan shore, exposing migrants to a litany of human rights violations. ‘Solidarity’, by contrast, refers to practices that help to facilitate migrants’ escape from state control (e.g. Papadopoulos et al., 2008; Picozza, 2021), thus ‘creating cracks’ in the coloniality of asylum and citizenship.

While this clear-cut distinction obviously has the advantage of offering a sense of (normative) orientation, a growing group of scholars has demonstrated the ‘hybrid’ nature of many existing practices of solidarity (Rozakou, 2016, 2017; Sandri, 2018; Steinhilper & Fleischmann, 2017; Stierl, 2018; Sinatti, 2019; Feischmidt et al., 2019; Vandevoordt, 2019; Vandevoordt & Fleischmann, 2021; Della Porta & Steinhilper, 2021; Schwiertz & Schwenken, 2021). Drawing on his analysis of the political nature of different search-and-rescue operations in the Mediterranean Sea for instance, Stierl (2018) urges researchers and activists alike to explore ‘the possibility for political dissent to be formulated and enacted *within* humanitarian reason’ (Stierl, 2018, p3). At the same time, in a context of multiple crises, radical actors may find themselves in a situation where their political actions are put on the backburner in favour of immediate social action (Rozakou, 2017; Vandevoordt & Fleischmann, 2021).

In both its ideal-typical and hybrid conceptions, the term ‘solidarity’ has thus been used mainly to underscore the political and collective nature of a wide range of actions. Through its lens, even seemingly banal forms of practical support may appear as the prefiguration of a more egalitarian society, while conflicting encounters between people with varied positionalities may be found to catalyse a new social movement. Whenever it is used in this context - responses to violent migration regimes - solidarity points to the potential to

transform social relations and to reimagine political subjectivities. This would make 'solidarity' complementary to, and congruous with, an intersectional perspective: while the latter is most powerful as a tool that helps to elucidate the specific experiences of people who find themselves at the crossroads of different structures of oppression, 'solidarity' works best to explore how more egalitarian relations are already being put into practice. Both concepts, then, could be used as tools to 'resist' violent migration regimes.

Resistance

Similar to the body of work that has emerged around intersectionality and solidarity, the relatively young field of 'resistance studies' has developed from a commitment to understand oppression, as well as to how change can emerge from the proverbial margins (Seppälä, 2016). Spread across disciplines, and inspired by, among others, Subaltern Studies, E.P. Thompson's 'history from below' or 'people's history', and Foucauldian perspectives, this scholarship aims to foster 'resistance knowledge' (Vinthagen, 2015a) that can explain social change. So far, two big tendencies have guided these works. One focuses on a more structuralist, state-centred approach to 'contentious politics' (Tilly & Tarrow, 2015; Tarrow, 2022) encompassing the study of social movements, revolutions, civil conflict, guerrilla warfare, and terrorism (Chenoweth & Stefan, 2011; Vinthagen, 2015b). The other investigates less confrontational, everyday forms of resistance (Johansson & Vinthagen, 2020), the 'weapons of the weak' (Scott, 1985; Scott, 1990), and the 'quiet encroachments' of ordinary people within the public space (Bayat, 2010). This broad interpretation has facilitated the exploration of the diverse, multifaceted, and complex means that people use, create, or foster to resist domination, marginalisation, and violence.

Recent scholarship tries to bridge these two big streams of understanding by going beyond binary categories such as collective/individual, (un)organised, or public/private (Lilja, 2022; Lilja et al., 2023). These efforts showcase a complexified view of resistance that approaches it, rather than just a moment of opposition, as an ongoing process (Murru & Polese, 2020). In a similar vein, the concept of 'constructive resistance' - understood as 'initiatives where people start to build elements of the society they desire independently of and in opposition to the dominant structures already in place' (Sørensen et al., 2023, p. 1) - has been helpful to grasp how people both 'resist' oppression and 'construct' more desirable living conditions in small, 'low-key' actions as well as in larger, self-organised endeavours (Lilja, 2021; Sørensen et al., 2024).

When conceived in this way, (constructive) resistance has much in common with how 'solidarity' has been used in critical migration studies. Both terms are often used interchangeably, with 'resistance' carrying the assumption that the people who are acting 'against' violent migration regimes are less powerful than those enforcing such regimes (e.g. Busse & Montes, 2024; Martin et al., 2020; Merla et al., 2024; Rigo, 2019; Tyszler, 2019, 2021; Vandevordt, 2021). Like 'solidarity', 'resistance' is often used in an intuitive, imprecise way that conflates different theoretical traditions. A notable exception can be found in Maurice Stierl's *Migrant Resistance in Contemporary Europe*, which starts from the premise that:

If we accept that we live in a time of hegemonic mobility control, itself inscribed in global systems of inequality, can or should we conceive of unruly acts of border crossing as acts of resistance? (Stierl, 2018, p. 5)

In his use of the term, resistance is synonymous with struggle and political movement. In the context of migration, resistance is inherently connected to the kinetic movement of people across borders (see also Hess & Kasperek, 2017; Achiume, 2017). Through this lens the archetype of the passive and vulnerable migrant is subverted. Resistance is practised when migrants dissent against the politics to which they are subjected. Resistance is seen in

migrants' unsanctioned crossing of the border(s). Resistance is made manifest in their self-organisation into larger entities of solidarity across intersectional identities.

Similar to Stierl, in her book *Les Damnées de la Mer*¹, Camille Schmoll (2020) conceptualises the resistance of migrant women in reception centres as an embodied practice that is situated in a specific space. This helps to highlight that, while women (and others) find themselves confined to the margins of Europe, on the fringes of citizenship and in a situation of waiting, isolation, and boredom (Mountz, 2011; Kobelinsky, 2010, 2012), the centres in which they gravitate can become 'a place for experimenting with new practices and a new relationship to oneself and to the space of migration, a politics of life that resists, an autonomy in tension'² (Schmoll, 2020, p. 157). In other words, while 'resistance' may have much in common with 'solidarity' and 'intersectionality', it helps us to shift our gaze towards less visible practices that appear less ambitious in terms of transforming broader social and political structures, yet have consequences for the people involved. In a context where overturning violent migration regimes may seem improbable to relatively fragmented actors, 'resistance' can provide an accurate vocabulary to analyse piecemeal forms of support and transformation.

Insights and contributions: the intersectionality of solidarity and resistance

The articles in this special issue contribute in three different ways to debates on solidarity and resistance in face of violent migration regimes. The first three papers highlight how placing our focus on the intersectionality of solidarity and resistance inevitably results in unveiling power relations and imbalances within these practices, even when they are aimed at countering oppression. In her paper, **Liselot Casteleyn** explores what unfolds within solidarity practices that happen at the intersection of various power relations and structural marginalisation. In particular, she highlights how solidarity practices, while providing much needed care and support to migrant people, are partly responsible for maintaining a certain status quo by helping asylum seekers in SOGI procedures confirm the dominant, heteronormative, and Euro-centred narrative on LGBTIQ+ sexualities. Two other contributions follow a similar critical assessment of power relations within solidarity practices. First, the contribution of **Glenda Santana de Andrade and Jane Freedman**, drawing from the French context, powerfully analyses transactional sexual relationships happening between refugees and volunteers as embedded within broader racial capitalism. Second, **Zinaïda Sluijs** builds on the concept of 'maternalism' to emphasise how discourses of intimacy and care can conceal structural inequalities differentiating, in her case, morally superior white Swedish women volunteers from passive, dependent, and infantilised asylum seekers.

Second, two papers add more theoretical depth to solidarity and resistance from an intersectional perspective. While documenting alternative reception practices, **A. Tanocrède Pagès** deploys Marianna Fotaki's (2022) concept of 'embodied solidarity' in documenting squatting practices in the Parisian metropolitan region with an emphasis on an ethics of care revolving around radical inclusion. Given the heterogeneous profile of the squatters, he explores how intersectional identities are foundational in shaping the provision and reception of care in a shared space. **Naïké Garny and Sarah Murru** build on the concept of 'constructive resistance' to document a feminist shelter for migrant women in Brussels. In doing so, they question if 'intersectional resistance' might be understood not only as a set of ethical guidelines for inclusive resistance practices but as practices that, because they are located at the intersection of power relations, emerge from experiences of violence informing their intersectional approach to resistance.

Third, the last three papers all contribute to understanding how intersectionality allows to foster new identity formations within progressive movements, and looks at

¹ *The Damned of the Sea*

² Translation of the authors.

practices of solidarity and resistance as a collective project (Cho et al., 2013). Two contributions highlight how Ukrainian refugee mothers mutually support each other. Located within the Belgian context, **Hannah Grondelaers** documents the way in which specific intersectional identities of refugee mothers shape mutual solidarity. In a similar vein, **Rachel Bencheikroun** draws a typology of solidarity practices by lone racially minoritized mothers in the UK with insecure immigration statuses to highlight the role of social infrastructure in facilitating solidarity practices. Finally, **Chiara Martini**'s contribution explores the practices of autonomous organisations and collectives along the Balkan Routes, particularly the creation of 'safe spaces' within urban areas accommodating the needs of both people on the move and local precarious populations. Martini demonstrates how the seemingly innocuous provision of humanitarian material support can quickly become a practice of contentious solidarity within an increasingly hostile mobility regime.

This special issue ends with a commentary by Jasmin Lilian Diab and Maybritt Jill Alpes (2024) who offer a reflection on the concept of time and the use of participatory approaches in the context of humanitarian aid and research in Lebanon. They suggest unpacking the preconceived notions of time in order to develop an inclusive understanding of intersectional resistance and solidarity in both fields.

In conclusion, looking at solidarities and resistances in the context of violent migration regimes from an intersectional perspective allows to better understand (a) the transformative potential of people and their doings, and the structural barriers with which they are confronted, (b) the complex, contradictory and spatially embodied experiences, in which power relations are both reproduced and countered, and (c) the new tensions and dilemmas that arise from practices of solidarity and resistance as they take place in face of violent migration regimes.

Acknowledgements

This special issue follows from a two-day workshop that we organised in October 2023 under the same title, with the generous support of the Centre for the Social Study of Migration and Refugees, the Ghent Centre for Global Studies, the Department of Social Work and Social Pedagogy (Ghent University), and the Centre for Sociological Research (KU Leuven). We owe great gratitude to all participants for engaging with us in such a slow-paced, in-depth exchange, and to An Van Raemdonck, Louise Benson James, Chloé Janssen, and Femke Beutels at DiGeST, as well as and Florian Vanlee, for their exceptional support throughout the publication process.

References

- Achiume, E. T. (2019). Migration as decolonization. *Stanford Law Review*, 71, 1509–1574.
- Agustín, Ó. G., & Jørgensen, M. B. (2018). *Solidarity and the 'Refugee Crisis' in Europe*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91848-8>
- Ansems De Vries, L., & Guild, E. (2019). Seeking refuge in Europe: Spaces of transit and the violence of migration management. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(12), 2156–2166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1468308>
- Ataç, I., & Steinhilper, E. (2022). Arenas of fragile alliance making: Space and interaction in precarious migrant protest in Berlin and Vienna. *Social Movement Studies*, 21(1–2), 152–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2020.1837099>
- Ataç, I., Schwiertz, H., Jørgensen, M. B., Vandevordt, R., Hinger, S., & Spindler, S. (2024). Negotiating borders through a politics of scale: Municipalities and urban civil society initiatives in the contested field of migration. *Geopolitics*, 29(2), 714–740. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2022.2129732>
- Ataç, I., Rygiel, K., & Stierl, M. (2021). Building transversal solidarities in European cities: Open harbours, safe communities, home. *Critical Sociology*, 47(6), 923–939. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920520980522>
- Bauder, H., & Juffs, L. (2020). 'Solidarity' in the migration and refugee literature: Analysis

- of a concept. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(1), 46–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1627862>
- Bayat, A. (2010). *Life as Politics: How Ordinary People Change the Middle East*. Stanford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.5117/9789053569115>
- Bencheikroun, R. (this issue). Mothers experiencing legal and financial precarity post-migration: Solidarity practices, everyday resistance and the role of social infrastructure. *DiGeST Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies*.
- Bendixsen, S., & Näre, L. (2024). Welfare state bordering as a form of mobility and migration control. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 50(11), 2689–2706. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2023.2298540>
- Bilge, S. (2010). Recent feminist outlooks on intersectionality. *Diogenes*, 57(1), 58–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0392192110374245>
- Braun, K. (2017). Decolonial perspectives on charitable spaces of "welcome culture" in Germany. *Social Inclusion*, 5(3), 38–48. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v5i3.1025>
- Busse, E., & Montes, V. (2024). Dreamer moms and their struggle for legal reunification: Maternal acts of public disclosure as a form of constructive resistance. In L. Merla, S. Murru, G. Orsini, & T. Vuckovic Juros (Eds.), *Excluding Diversity Through Intersectional Borderings: Politics, Policies and Daily Lives* (pp. 149–166). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-65623-1_9
- Bygnes, S. (2013). 'We are in complete agreement': The diversity issue, disagreement and change in the European women's lobby. *Social Movement Studies*, 12(2), 199–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2012.703831>
- Carbado, D., Crenshaw, K., Mays, V., & Tomlinson, B. (2013). Intersectionality: Mapping the movements of a theory. *Du Bois Review*, 10(2), 303–312. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X13000349>
- Cassidy, K., Yuval-Davis, N., & Wemyss, G. (2018). Intersectional border(ing)s. *Political Geography*, 66, 139–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2018.08.004>
- Casteleyn, L. (this issue). 'I had the feeling I had the rehearsal with you': Autoethnographic reflections on preparing applicants for their asylum interview within LGBTIQ+ organisations. *DiGeST Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies*.
- Chenoweth, E., & Stephan, M. J. (2011). *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*. Columbia University Press.
- Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. W., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 38(4), 785–810. <https://doi.org/10.1086/669608>
- Chun, J. J., Lipsitz, G., & Shin, Y. (2013). Intersectionality as a social movement strategy: Asian immigrant women advocates. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 38(4), 917–940. <https://doi.org/10.1086/669575>
- Cleton, L., & Meier, P. (2023). Contesting policy categories using intersectionality: Reflections for studying migration governance. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 46(14), 3014–3036. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2023.2171737>
- Combahee River Collective. (1981). A Black feminist statement. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldúa (Eds.), *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color* (pp. 210–218). Kitchen Table/Women of Color Press.
- Costa Santos, A., & Garny, N. (2022). Créer des liens et revendiquer des droits. *Revue Akène*, 4, 20–26.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Dadusc, D., & Mudu, P. (2022). Care without control: The humanitarian industrial complex and the criminalisation of solidarity. *Geopolitics*, 27(4), 1205–1230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2020.1749839>
- Dean, J. (1995). Reflective solidarity. *Constellations: An International Journal of Critical*

- and Democratic Theory*, 2(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8675.1995.tb00023.x>
- De Jong, S., & Ataç, I. (2017). Demand and deliver: Refugee support organisations in Austria. *Social Inclusion*, 5(3), 28–37. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v5i3.1003>
- Deleixhe, M. (2018). L'évènement de la rencontre: La Plateforme citoyenne de soutien aux réfugiés en Belgique. *Esprits*, 2018(7–8), 130–138. <https://doi.org/10.3917/espri.1807.0130>
- Della Porta, D. (2018). *Solidarity Mobilizations in the 'Refugee Crisis'*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71752-4>
- Della Porta, D., & Steinhilper, E. (2021). Introduction: Solidarities in motion: Hybridity and change in migrant support practices. *Critical Sociology*, 47(2), 175–185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920520952143>
- Dustin, M., & Ferreira, N. (2021). Improving SOGI asylum adjudication: Putting persecution ahead of identity. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 40(3), 315–347. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdab005>
- Featherstone, D. (2012). *Solidarity: Hidden Histories and Geographies of Internationalism*. Bloomsbury Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350222670>
- Feischmidt, M., Pries, L., & Cantat, C. (Eds.). (2019). *Refugee Protection and Civil Society in Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92741-1>
- Fleischmann, L., & Steinhilper, E. (2017). The myth of apolitical volunteering for refugees: German welcome culture and a new dispositif of helping. *Social Inclusion*, 5(3), 17–27. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v5i3.945>
- Fotaki, M. (2022). Solidarity in crisis? Community responses to refugees and forced migrants in the Greek islands. *Organization*, 29(2), 295–323. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13505084211051048>
- Freedman, J., Sahraoui, N., & Tyszler, E. (2022). Asylum, racism, and the structural production of sexual violence against racialised women in exile in Paris. *Social Sciences*, 11(10), 426. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci11100426>
- Freedman, J., Sahraoui, N., & Tastsoglou, E. (2022). *Gender-Based Violence in Migration: Interdisciplinary, Feminist and Intersectional Approaches*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-07929-0>
- Garny, N., & Murru, S. (this issue). The Sisters' House as an intersectional, feminist reception project for migrant women: Exploring the concept of constructive resistance. *DiGeST Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies*.
- Gatt, S., Hazibar, K., & Sauermaun, V. (2016). Migration from a gender-critical, postcolonial and interdisciplinary perspective. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 41(3), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11614-016-0236-4>
- Giametta, C. (2017). *The Sexual Politics of Asylum*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315561189>
- Grondelaers, H. (this issue). Liminal solidarity: How Ukrainian refugee mothers negotiate situational kinship in a collective reception centre in Belgium. *DiGeST Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies*.
- Hage, G. (2009). Waiting out the crisis: On stuckedness and governmentality. *Anthropological Theory*, 5(1), 463–475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1463499605059232>
- Hess, S., & Kasperek, B. (2017). Under control? Or border (as) conflict: Reflections on the European border regime. *Social Inclusion*, 5(3), 58–68. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v5i3.1004>
- Hill Collins, P. (1990). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*. Routledge.
- Hill Collins, P. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142>
- Hill Collins, P. (2019). *Intersectionality as Critical Social Theory*. Duke University Press.

- <https://doi.org/10.1215/9781478007098>
- Hinger, S., & Schweitzer, R. (2020). *Politics of (Dis)Integration*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25089-8>
- Ishkanian, A., & Peña Saavedra, A. (2019). The politics and practices of intersectional prefiguration in social movements: The case of Sisters Uncut. *The Sociological Review*, 67(5), 985–1001. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026118822974>
- Jackson, R. (2015). How resistance can save peace studies. *Journal of Resistance Studies*, 1(1), 18–49.
- Johansson, A., & Vinthagen, S. (2020). *Conceptualizing Everyday Resistance: A Transdisciplinary Approach*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315150154>
- Kalir, B. (2019). Departheid: The draconian governance of illegalized migrants in western states. *Conflict and Society*, 5(1), 19–40. <https://doi.org/10.3167/args.2019.050102>
- Kapeller, J., & Wolkenstein, F. (2013). The grounds of solidarity: From liberty to loyalty. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 16(4), 476–491. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431013479689>
- Kobelinsky, C. (2010). *L'Accueil des Demandeurs d'Asile: Une Ethnographie de l'Attente*. Éditions du Cygne.
- Kobelinsky, C. (2012). Des corps en attente: Le quotidien des demandeurs d'asile. *Corps*, 10(1), 183–192. <https://doi.org/10.3917/corp1.010.0183>
- Laperrière, M., & Lépinard, E. (2016). Intersectionality as a tool for social movements: Strategies of inclusion and representation in the Québécois women's movement. *Politics*, 36(4), 374–382. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263395716649009>
- Lilja, M. (2021). *Constructive Resistance: Repetitions, Emotions, and Time*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lilja, M. (2022). The definition of resistance. *Journal of Political Power*, 15(2), 202–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2022.2061127>
- Lilja, M., Vinthagen, S., & Wiksell, K. (2023). Beyond "individual" or "collective" resistance: A critical assessment towards an agenda for future research on dissent. *Journal of Resistance Studies*, 8(2), 31–49.
- Lutz, H., & Amelina, A. (2021). Gender in migration studies: From feminist legacies to intersectional, post- and decolonial prospects. *Zeitschrift für Migrationsforschung - Journal of Migration Research*, 1(1), 55–73.
- Marfelt, M. (2016). Grounded intersectionality: Key tensions, a methodological framework, and implications for diversity research. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 35(1), 31–47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-05-2014-0034>
- Martin, D., Minca, C., & Katz, I. (2020). Rethinking the camp: On spatial technologies of power and resistance. *Progress in Human Geography*, 44(4), 743–768. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132519856702>
- Martini, C. (this issue). Contesting borders through spaces and practices: Transformative forms of grassroots solidarity along the Balkan routes. *DiGeST Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies*.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(3), 1771–1800. <https://doi.org/10.1086/426800>
- Merla, L., Murru, S., Orsini, G., & Vuckovic Juros, T. (Eds.). (2024). *Excluding Diversity Through Intersectional Borderings: Politics, Policies and Daily Lives*. IMISCOE Research Series. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-65623-1>
- Mescoli, E., & Roblain, A. (2021). The ambivalent relations behind civil society's engagement in the "grey zones" of migration and integration governance: Case studies from Belgium. *Political Geography*, 91, 102477. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2021.102477>
- Mezzadra, S. (2021). Abolitionist vistas of the human: Border struggles, migration, and freedom of movement. In H. Schwiertz & H. Schwenken (Eds.), *Inclusive Solidarity and Citizenship Along Migratory Routes in Europe and the Americas* (pp. 20–36).

- Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003190585-2>
- Mountz, A. (2011). Where asylum-seekers wait: Feminist counter-topographies of sites between states. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 18(3), 381–399. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2011.566370>
- Murru, S., & Polese, A. (2020). Introduction: One, ten, thousands of resistances and where/how to find them. In S. Murru & A. Polese (Eds.), *Resistances: Between Theories and the Field* (pp. 1–18). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Näre, L. (2020). "Finland kills with a pen": Asylum seekers' protest against bureaucratic violence as politics of human rights. *Citizenship Studies*, 24(8), 979–993. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2020.1769559>
- Ngombe, M. (2020). Les couloirs humanitaires : un régime d'exception pour gérer des réfugiés "désirables". *Revue Internationale des Études du Développement*, 1(241), 65–86. <https://doi.org/10.3917/ried.241.0065>
- Oosterlynck, S., Loopmans, M., Schuermans, N., Vandenabeele, J., & Zemni, S. (2016). Putting flesh to the bone: Looking for solidarity in diversity, here and now. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(5), 764–782. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2015.1080380>
- Orsini, G., Smit, S., Farcy, J.-B., & Merla, L. (2022). Institutional racism within the securitization of migration: The case of family reunification in Belgium. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 45(1), 153–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2021.1878249>
- Pagès, A. T. (this issue). Embodied solidarity: Feminist care and vulnerability in Parisian squats. *DiGeST Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies*.
- Papadopoulos, D., Stephenson, N., & Tsianos, V. (2008). *Escape Routes: Control and Subversion in the 21st Century*. Pluto Press.
- Pette, M. (2015). Les associations dans l'impasse humanitaire? *Plein Droit*, 104, 22–26. <https://doi.org/10.3917/pld.104.0022>
- Pezzani, L., & Heller, C. (2013). A disobedient gaze: Strategic interventions in the knowledge(s) of maritime borders. *Postcolonial Studies*, 16(3), 289–298. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2013.850047>
- Picozza, F. (2021). *The Coloniality of Asylum*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Rakopoulos, T. (2016). Solidarity: The egalitarian tensions of a bridge-concept. *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale*, 24(2), 142–151. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12298>
- Rice, C., Harrison, E., & Friedman, M. (2019). Doing justice to intersectionality in research. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 19(6), 409–420. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708619829779>
- Rigo, E. (2019). Re-gendering the border: Chronicles of women's resistance and unexpected alliances from the Mediterranean border. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, 18(1), 173–186.
- Roth, S. (2008). Dealing with diversity: The coalition of labor union women. In J. Reger, D. J. Myers, & R. L. Einwohner (Eds.), *Identity Work, Sameness and Difference in Social Movements* (pp. 213–231). University of Minnesota Press.
- Rozakou, K. (2016). Socialities of solidarity: Revisiting the gift taboo in times of crises. *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale*, 24(2), 185–199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12305>
- Rozakou, K. (2017). Solidarians in the land of Xenios Zeus: Migrant deportability and the radicalisation of solidarity. In *Critical Times in Greece* (pp. 188–201). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315299037-14>
- Sahraoui, N., & Tyszler, E. (2021). Tracing colonial maternalism within the gendered morals of humanitarianism: Experiences of migrant women at the Moroccan-Spanish border. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics*, 3, 642326. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2021.642326>
- Sandri, E. (2018). "Volunteer humanitarianism": Volunteers and humanitarian aid in the

- Jungle refugee camp of Calais. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(1), 65–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1352467>
- Santana de Andrade, G., & Freedman, J. (this issue). Exploring the frontiers of solidarity and intimacy in refugee "solidarity" movements in France. *DiGeST Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies*.
- Schmoll, C. (2020). *Les Damnées de la Mer*. La Découverte. <https://doi.org/10.3917/dec.schmo.2020.01>
- Schwartz, H., & Schwenken, H. (2021). Introduction: Inclusive solidarity and citizenship along migratory routes in Europe and the Americas. In *Inclusive Solidarity and Citizenship Along Migratory Routes in Europe and the Americas* (pp. 1–19). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003190585-1>
- Scott, J. C. (1985). *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. Yale University Press.
- Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the Art of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. Yale University Press.
- Seppälä, T. (2016). Feminizing resistance, decolonizing solidarity: Contesting neoliberal development in the Global South. *Journal of Resistance Studies*, 1(2), 12–47.
- Sinatti, G. (2019). Humanitarianism as politics: Civil support initiatives for migrants in Milan's hub. *Social Inclusion*, 7(2), 139–148. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v7i2.1968>
- Sluijs, Z. (this issue). "I am like their Swedish mother": Conceptualising maternalism and power asymmetries during solidarity practices with asylum seekers. *DiGeST Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies*.
- Sørensen, M. J., Vinthagen, S., & Johansen, J. (2024). *Constructive Resistance: Resisting Injustice by Creating Solutions*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Spijkerboer, T. (2018). The global mobility infrastructure: Reconceptualising the externalisation of migration control. *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 20(4), 452–469. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718166-12340038>
- Stierl, M. (2018). *Migrant Resistance in Contemporary Europe*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351270489>
- Tarrow, S. (2022). *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009219839>
- Tilly, C., & Tarrow, S. (2015). *Contentious Politics*. Oxford University Press.
- Turner, S. (2020). *Bordering Intimacy*. Manchester University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526146946>
- Tyszler, E. (2019). Derrière les barrières de Ceuta & Melilla: Rapports sociaux de sexe, de race et colonialité du contrôle migratoire à la frontière maroco-espagnole. [Thèse de Doctorat, Université Paris 8]. Academia.
- Tyszler, E. (2021). Nous sommes des battantes: Expériences de femmes d'Afrique centrale et de l'Ouest à la frontière maroco-espagnole. *Genre, Sexualité & Société*, 25. <https://doi.org/10.4000/gss.6548>
- Vandevoordt, R. (2019). Subversive humanitarianism: Rethinking refugee solidarity through grass-roots initiatives. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 38(3), 245–265. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdz008>
- Vandevoordt, R. (2021). Resisting bare life: Civil solidarity and the hunt for illegalized migrants. *International Migration*, 59(3), 47–62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12715>
- Vandevoordt, R., & Verschraegen, G. (2019). Subversive humanitarianism and its challenges: Notes on the political ambiguities of civil refugee support. In M. Feischmidt, L. Pries, & C. Cantat (Eds.), *Refugee Protection and Civil Society in Europe* (pp. 101–128). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92741-1_4
- Vandevoordt, R., & Fleischmann, L. (2021). Impossible futures? The ambivalent temporalities of grassroots humanitarian action. *Critical Sociology*, 47(2), 187–202.

- <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920520932655>
- Vinthagen, S. (2015a). Editorial: An invitation to develop "Resistance Studies." *Journal of Resistance Studies*, 1(1), 5–11.
- Vinthagen, S. (2015b). *A Theory of Nonviolent Action: How Civil Resistance Works*. Zed Books. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350251212>
- Welander, M. (2021). The politics of exhaustion and the externalization of British border control: An articulation of a strategy designed to deter, control and exclude. *International Migration*, 59(3), 29–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12778>
- Wyss, A. (2022). *Navigating the European Migration Regime: Male Migrants, Interrupted Journeys and Precarious Lives*. Bristol University Press. <https://doi.org/10.56687/9781529219623>
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2015). Situated intersectionality and social inequality. *Raisons Politiques*, 58(2), 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.3917/rai.058.0091>