On mediation and brokerage in humanitarian action and migration governance

Some key research issues

Evthymios Papataxiarchis

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

This paper introduces a brief theoretical framework on mediation and brokerage in humanitarian settings and more generally in migration. It is inspired by my ethnographic experience on the humanitarian mobilization and the establishment of the humanitarian regime in Aegean Greece during the 'European refugee crisis' and based on a review of the relevant literature on mediation in anthropology and the social sciences. The following text is a working document that aims to clear the theoretical ground for the Human(c)ity project. In this respect it does not include a comprehensive argument, but it is rather built around a set of points which I hope will encourage some further thinking around a set of questions about mediation and brokerage in humanitarian action. For example, what are humanitarian mediation and brokerage, in theory and, in actual practice, on the ground? Which cultural logics inform the practice and the subsequent organization of humanitarian mediation? What kind of resources are mobilized through mediation, by what kind of actors and to what effect? How do mediators and brokers account for their mediating activities? How are the mediating activities perceived by the involved parties as well as by outsiders? What is the impact of mediation on humanitarian management and how is it related to the type, the subject, and the logic of mediation?

Here, I argue that the *critical rethinking* of mediation and brokerage and their employment in our ethnographic work can be very productive in approaching some key dimensions of humanitarian management and humanitarian governance such as relief, protection in its multiple dimensions, and integration. It particularly allows the ethnographic grasp of features of humanitarian action in the context of the recent 'European refugee crisis', such as the multifarious production of connections, networks and assemblages in the course of humanitarianization, the wide spread of initiatives of different kinds and the circulation of meaning in translation, features that have impressed me as particularly interesting, not to say intellectually exciting. It also offers a window to approach the impact of humanitarian action in relation to the wider processes of globalization in the context of which humanitarianization takes place. In one word, I believe that the analytical emphasis on mediation is ethnographically promising, and that *brokerage is good to think with*.

My reading of the relevant social science literature is not exhaustive but rather eclectic. It is guided, to a certain extent, by the research interests that dominate Human(c)ity. Based on my current understanding of this literature I could briefly distinguish two main areas or research on mediation. On the one hand, there is an older literature on mediation and brokerage in the domain of (humanitarian) *development and migration.*[1] On the other hand, there is a more recent research trend about mediation in *humanitarian relief* in 'Third World' countries. In one part of this recent literature mediation is approached as an ingredient of NGO action that does not deserve special treatment.[2] Another part gives special attention to the role of intermediaries in the realization of humanitarian projects.[3] Also this upcoming literature on mediation and brokerage in humanitarian relief increasingly includes works on Europe.[4]

2. WHAT IS MEDIATION?

In the earlier literature, mediation is taken to suggest action that *connects, communicates, mutually refers, and translates* disparate social worlds and orders of reality, world views and knowledge systems, cultural spheres and value frames, social groups, and levels of social and political integration. In the above approach mediation suggests separateness, distance (or in-betweenness) and connection between somehow fixed and clearly demarcated levels and entities. However, clarity and fixity of boundaries has stopped being a property of the world in the current era of globalization (see the new vocabulary built around the notion of 'scape' by Arjun Appadurai), and therefore the use of the term today requires, among other things, taking into consideration these new, 'scape-like' realities.

The triad

Simmel's (1950) early and, otherwise, formalistic analysis of the triad is still inspiring some analyses of mediation. According to Simmel mediation is a form of interaction between three parties. The mediator (often in the capacity of the gate keeper into a field) usually occupies a given middle position, in-between the other two parties, standing at equal distance (Bierschenk 2021) and looking in the direction of both. Analytically speaking the practice of mediation can be approached 'from within' (Brauchler et al, 2021), i.e., from the (emic) perspective of the three involved parties. The interaction between the three parties

[1] For a recent review, see Koster and Van Leynseele 2018. Most of these studies focus on the postcolonial 'Third World'. For example, see the following anthropological works: Bierschenk et.al. (2002) on Africa, Fechter (2019) on Cambodia, James (2011) on Africa, Lie (2020) on Ethiopia, Mosse and Lewis (2006) on Asia and Africa and many others. Works on intermediation and brokerage in migration include Alpes (2017) on migration brokers in Cameroon, Ambrosini (2017) on intermediaries in irregular migration into Europe, Fernandez (2013) on Ethiopia, Lindquist et.al. (2012) and Shrestha and Yeah (2018) on Asia [but also see Brauchler's (2021) study of activist mobilization in Indonesia].

[2] For example, see Hilhorst 2014.

[3] This is the case, for example, of the works of Combinido and Ong (2017) on humanitarian aid in the Philippines, of Fechter (2019) on the role of brokers in the transnational flows of resources in Cambodia and of McKay and Perez (2019) on 'citizen aid' brokerage in the Philippines.

[4] For example, see, Accoroni (2017) on medical aid to African migrants in France, Brinker (2021) on the role of intermediaries in asylum seeker accommodation in Spain, Cabot (2014) on asylum in Greece, Rozakou (2009) and Dahlvik (2019) on the role of interpreters in the asylum process in various European countries, Tuckett (2018) on self-styled migration advisers in the Italian immigration regime or Üstübici (2022), on service providers mediating refugee reception in the urban context of Istanbul.

often includes the strategic negotiation of flows of resources and political support between, and the subsequent connection of, the local, national, and/ or international level (Hönke and Müller 2018).

To analytically delve deeper in the practice of mediation I suggest approaching it in terms of two perspectives, one that combines agency (motive), meaning and social relation, and another that raises issues of power, morality, and impact.

(a) *Agency/ meaning/ social relation*

Mediation has an agential, not to say performative, quality. The extent to which agency in mediation is analytically recognized and the way it is treated depend on the theoretical lens we use. In the past structural-functional perspectives had a difficulty to acknowledge this particular property on mediation. On the other hand, agency was analytically recognized by anthropological transactionalism, yet in a limited and problematic way, on the basis of Eurocentric assumptions about the maximizing homo-economicus (see below). This difficulty has been surpassed by new, more open, paradigms, such as a 'actor-network' theory, that recognize the historical and cultural specificity of agency.

As all action, the practice of mediation is culturally constructed, i.e., is informed by a particular, cultural *logic* that varies depending on the historical and sociocultural context.[5] One way to approach the logic of mediation is through an analysis that situates the *motives* of the individual or collective actors who perform it in its wider socio-cultural context. In this regard we can distinguish a wide range of logics: legal and technocratic, political, philanthropic or entrepreneurial.

At the level of the circulation of meaning, it should be stressed that mediation between different world views and value system or even bureaucratic regimes involves '*translation*'. In this regard mediation is *inventive,* in the sense that it entails the active production and (re)production of meaning rather than its mechanical transfer between the parties. This important point is raised by Bruno Latour (2005:39, in Lindquist 2015: 873) who distinguishes between 'intermediaries' who just 'transport meaning' and 'mediators' who 'transform, translate, distort, and modify the meaning of the elements they are supposed to carry'.[6] As meanings, ideas and norms circulate between different contexts, they are subjected to novel *interpretations* and, therefore, redefined. The description of brokers as 'creative hustlers' by Anna Tuckett (2018b:248) is a good illustration. This point becomes particularly pertinent in the current era of increased capacity for communication because of the electronic revolution and, particularly, the spread of the social media, when mediation adopts a strong performative profile and becomes very creative.

At the relational level, mediation suggests the making of networks. Mediation may be practiced on the horizontal axis (taking the form of networking or assembling, depending on the type of, territorialized or de-territorialized, space involved), or the vertical one (thus giving rise to multiscalar connections and producing hierarchical integration). In some instances, we may have a whole chain of mediating acts/actors. The connections that are forged by an (inter)mediator often take the form of inter-personal relations, i.e., they are *personalized* in ways that are reminiscent of traditional patron/client relations. Alternatively, they may be more technocratic and formal.

[5] This is equally true for translation (see Burke on 'cultures of translation').

[6] This point is nicely illustrated in the ethnographic analysis of the creative work of 'interpreters' in the asylum process (see Dahlvik 2019) or in 'street work' among irregular migrants (see Rozakou 2009).

(b) *Power/ morality/ impact*

At the political level, mediation has an *enabling* function and may work as a base and source of social, political, and economic empowerment (and social mobility). Yet, at the same time, it may reflect as well as produce hierarchies and dependencies. *Power* is a particularly salient property of the practice of mediation when the later takes place in a hierarchically stratified socio-political environment thus reproducing a chain of hierarchical relations and dependencies.

The in-between position of the intermediator is a source of '*moral ambiguities'* (that analytically remind earlier discussions around hierarchical, exploitative patronage). The ambiguities surrounding mediation may be stronger if the mediator bridges different, and possibly antagonistic, world views and value systems that are mutually suspicious or if s/he connects different levels/ entities within a single, hierarchically stratified system, where the power differentials make exploitation possible. The moral ambiguities of mediation become manifest in heated, on the ground, debates about the motives of the mediators and they seem to be stronger when mediation is personalized.

Mediation in its various forms has significant impact at the social, political, and cultural level. For example, in the current condition of globalization, mediation turns into a *transnational* process that connects the local to the global. This transformation is evident in studies that approach mediators and brokers as *assemblers* in processes of globalization and neoliberalization (Koster and Van Leynseele 2018). When mediation operates in the messy and complex environment of transnational governance (Lewis and Mosse 2006, also Hönke and Müller 2018) it becomes particularly effective as it turns the globe, as some put it, into a 'brokered world' (see Dietze 2018, also Schaffer 2009). Put otherwise, in globalization mediation assumes a key role as it becomes a complex field of activity that goes beyond connection and transmission to assume a creative character and a formative function.[7]

Mediation may take various forms (also, see below). It may be individual or collective, institutionalized (taking place in the context of an institutional entity, e.g., NGO) or (economically or politically) entrepreneurial, legal or illegal, it may rely on old or new modes of communication and connectivity (internet, social media), it may be structural (see mediating role of the humanitarian regime between the asylum seekers and the Greek state and society) or personal/ized or impersonal (group to group), it may be conjunctural (i.e. related to special circumstances) or systemic (and therefore leading to specialized roles). Also, it is important to note that mediation is often confused with the services to which it offers access, especially when the mediator offers the service him/herself. In other words, mediation may be embedded in professional roles in various fields and this mixing impacts both the roles and the mediating activity. Last, but not least, we should not forget that mediation (as much as translation) is at the core of ethnographic praxis and, therefore, anthropology.

3. CLEARING THE ANALYTICAL GROUND FOR THE STUDY OF BROKERAGE AND MEDIATION

Mediation is often confused with brokerage. It is true that the practice of mediation and brokerage corresponds to roles, professions and even identities which could be put under the conceptual umbrella

[7] On NGO intermediaries 'gluing globalization' in Haiti, see Schuller (2009).

of the 'broker'. What is a 'broker'? Johan Lindquist (2015: 870) suggests to think of the broker as a human actor who 'gains' something from the mediation of valued resources that s/he does not directly control. I would be tempted to rephrase this reference to 'gain' (that suggests economic profit?) with a more open-minded reference to (material or immaterial) motives. So, *brokers* are *people, who are motivated to mediate necessary resources that they do not control*. In this respect private individuals, officials, translators, NGO leaders or staff, or holders of government or municipal authority may be brokers (see Hönke and Müller 2018:333).

Brokers may be circumstantial, part-time, or full-time. Their brokering activity may be linked to or be an important property of other roles or professions. What is required, besides holding a position between the parties that must come together, being comfortable in multiple spaces, and mediating skills, are also languages, abilities in communication and social capital (personal connections).

(a) *Rethinking brokerage*

Brokerage is an old wine. The concept has a rather long history in the social sciences and a particularly interesting one in anthropology. It originates in economics, as it has been an emic term in the European linguistic context (Bierschenk 2021, Röschenthaler 2021). It was very useful in the study of 20th century processes of modernization and nation-state building in the 'Third World' after the collapse of the empires. In anthropology, in particular, in the 1960s and 1970s brokerage was a key term. It was part of the analytical vocabulary of 'economic and political anthropology' and was productively employed in the context of many theories, including structural-functionalism, dynamic structuralism and transactionalism.

Yet brokerage as an analytical construct later fell victim to the battle between antagonistic theoretical paradigms. It almost 'disappeared' from our analytical vocabulary as it was subjected to a dismantling criticism on multiple grounds (see Hönke and Müller, 2018, James 2011 and Lindquist 2015). From the perspective of an older value hierarchy, that privileged the sovereign control of bounded space and, in particular, the territoriality of the national state (designed to be the chief marker of political autonomy), social structure (which in the Durkheimian tradition was placed against the allegedly 'rational' individual) and autonomy in terms of production, brokerage became *discredited* (for example, see the Marxist view of brokers as amoral individualists and brokerage as unproductive labor or 'non-work'). It was devalued and eventually abandoned because of its eclectic association to in-betweenness, individualism, interestedness (immorality), hierarchical dependence and exploitation.

Since then, there has been a major paradigm shift in the social sciences. A new hierarchy of values, which, among other things, rejects the priority of production over distribution and consumption, goes beyond the ontological distinction between material and immaterial and recognizes the material effects of 'immaterial' entities and processes, shifted social and anthropological theory away from both a production-centered Marxism and the antagonistic pair of structuralism/ transactionalism.

In the conditions of the electronic revolution, deterritorialization, neo-liberalization, (deregulation) and globalization a new priority has been given to agency over structure, to mobility, to culturally constructed sociality (via Simmel) and to a new spatial imagination (see Appadurai). New theoretical frameworks, such as anthropological constructionism, Latour's actor/network theory[8] or even Deleuzian assemblage theory

[8] This has been an important inspiration in the study of 'development brokers' (see Mosse and Lewis 2006).

(on connectivity), provide productive vantage points to *rethink* mediation and brokerage and approach them in a refreshing manner, that acknowledges their key role in the processes that remake the world today as an emergent globalized order. As Martjin Koster (2021:339) rightly points out, 'in the past decade, the anthropology of brokerage has experienced a revival, *as brokerage appears to be thriving in governance transitions* across the globe, often spurred by neoliberal state retrenchment, the emergence of new commercial actors and interests, and administrative modernization' (my emphasis). Under such conditions the return of the broker/age at the analytical level has been made possible (James 2011).

In the context of this important theoretical re-orientation, we have to *de-pathologize brokerage* and rethink its normative devaluation (which has been historically premised on its allegedly intrinsic connection with interested entrepreneurship). Brokerage as a particular form of economic, political, and moral enterprising has no universal color -it is not governed by a given, universal rationality, nor it carries any endemic (negative or positive) moral value.

Subsequently we must carefully consider the terms of redeploying brokerage as an analytical tool in anthropology. From this revisionist perspective, Martjin Koster and Yves van Leynseele (2021) consider the relative analytical advantages of using the term brokerage and suggest analyzing it as a process in terms of action (verb=brokering) or in a more static way in terms of identity/role (subject=broker).[9]

(b) *Differences between mediation and brokerage*

Mediation has a wider scope than brokerage and offers analytically space to think about network (relations, links, connections) and even structure. Brokerage, on the other hand, is *narrower* and *analytically privileges agency*, which according to some scholars takes the universal form of interested (individualistic) action (for example, see Bierschenk 2021:419), mostly in economics or politics. It is important to define brokerage in a narrow way, thus clearly differentiating it from mediation, action (in the 'spheres' of economics or politics), more generally, or even, representation. Yet we should *avoid* grounding this narrow concept of brokerage on a priori assumptions concerning the allegedly universal motives that govern brokering activities, motives such as 'profit' (Bierschenk 2021), thus reproducing the reductionist, Eurocentric premises of anthropological transactionalism and its ideological ancestor, the neo-classical theory of 'homo-economicus'. As I have already suggested, the motives for brokerage are wide ranging, going well beyond material gain. For example, they may involve what Anne-Meike Fechter (2019: 13) calls 'anthropological imperative', i.e., the motive to personally connect with a 'social Other', which is regarded to be an important ingredient of the purely philanthropic impulse. Or they may include 'moral reasons' (Ambrosini 2017). Brokers, in other words, can have altruistic motives, i.e., act based on disinterestedness.[10]

The emphasis on brokerage shifts the focus to the agential aspects of mediation in settings and circumstances where these are particularly stressed. The concept of brokerage suggests move, initiative or, even, entrepreneurship, and in this regard, it allows to approach the outcomes of brokering activity, i.e., connections and assemblages (see Jensen 2018), in a *dynamic, processual* way that gives emphasis to the production of connections rather than seeing connections in themselves, simply as a given structural, and therefore, constraining factor. It is characteristic that brokerage in operational terms becomes

[9] Bierschenk (2021) also speaks of a bundle of practices.
[10] See the example of brokers of transnational 'citizen aid' in Cambodia (Fechter 2019).

particularly significant in conditions of rapid social change and of crisis, when previously unrelated actors and entities must come together and merge, for example, in a single framework of governance (see James 2011). In fact, in conditions and areas of 'limited statehood' brokerage can even become a mode of governance (Hönke and Müller 2018: 334).

In brokerage certain other properties of mediation are also further stressed. For example, brokerage, as much as mediation, has a *creative* function (in relation to meanings, positions, and identities) and in this capacity it may linked to (inventive) modes of self-fashioning and to the emergence of new roles and even professions (e.g., professional humanitarian roles in the recent Greek case). On a different level, brokers as well as mediators, translate official discourses and models into local (actor) terms. At the same time, as the case of the Americas shows, brokers may be 'exposed to hybrid cultural influences for long periods' and gain 'a unique ability to perform a variety of cross-cultural tasks' (Hinderaker 2002:358).

The study of brokerage as a form of action invites thinking about *resources*, or, to put it in a better way, the lack of them. The classical literature on brokerage makes it clear that often brokers do not actually control resources (such as land, credit, services, specialized knowledge) themselves. Yet, as Boissevain (1974:148) has noticed, they control 'second order' resources, i.e., access to 'first order' resources.

(c) *On brokers, old and new*

It is important to note the important differences between the new style (humanitarian) brokers from the traditional ones (see Brauchler et al, 2021, 289-294). In the current age brokers create their own position and role, they are involved in processes of '*self-fashioning*' which are intrinsically connected to upward mobility (Tuckett 2019), rather than building on an already established patron status. New technological possibilities, particularly the use of the internet and the social media, make the difference in the increased capacity for self-fashioning.

The humanitarian field has proved to be quite important in the exercise of brokerage. Humanitarian crises, such as the recent 'European refugee crisis', have created a huge opportunity as well as demand for brokerage. In such moments of crisis, new style brokers have to exercise important intermediating roles and operate in an environment full of flux, where nothing is fixed. The boundaries of socio-spatial entities, roles and identities are blurred. Under such conditions, moral uncertainty and the relentless questioning of the ('real, authentic') motives of people who are placed in interstitial spaces increase, and, subsequently, the moral ambiguity that surrounds brokering activity intensifies (see Walther 2021). As it has become clear in the case of 'development brokers' in West Africa who refuse to relate the term to themselves, the concept of the broker goes on having 'a strong alienating effect' (Bierschenk 2021:421).

Yet, at the same time new style brokers may be involved in new types of projects, with an *emancipatory* orientation. As the work of Birgit Brauchler (2021) on brokerage in indigenous activism in E. Indonesia shows, brokers mobilize for resistance on various scales. Thus, they play a key role in bridging larger geographical and ideational divides but also in translating global activist jargon to make it intelligible to local communities. In this regard, at the political level, current forms of brokerage (and new style brokers) may produce dependencies but also, they may empower the parties that they mediate between.[11]

[11] On the (re)production of social inequalities through brokerage in cross-border mobility, see Faist (2014).

Brokering, therefore, may be beneficial for all parties involved -asylum seekers, locals, and brokers themselves.

4. ON THE CRITICAL, REFLEXIVE APPLICATION OF MEDIATION AND BROKERAGE IN THE 'EUROPEAN REFUGEE CRISIS': AN ICONOCLASTIC AGENDA

As we saw above, the analytical use of the terms brokerage/brokering/broker is particularly challenging because of the historical association of these terms with interested action that aims at profit and (re)produces hierarchical (clientelistic) forms of sociality. Brokerage seems to be entangled in the politics of the gift and therefore its analysis part-takes to and is de facto affected by debates on disinterested reciprocity and sociality.

As the recent literature shows the features that were underlined in an earlier debate on the transactionalist anthropological paradigm are not endemic to brokerage. So, brokerage does not necessarily operate on a vertical, hierarchical axis nor does it have to be based on superior/hierarchical status.

However, this theoretical legacy in the anthropological study of brokerage is certainly a disadvantage. As we saw to deal with it one has to radically rethink this terminology in a critical and cognitively reflexive direction that will allow to productively 'exploit' some of its key features, particularly the ones associated with initiated mediation, assembling/connecting, personalized relations, moral ambiguities and conceptual reworkings. If we clear the ground in the directions that have been previously described, we can enjoy the merits of the analytical use of brokerage.

I believe that mediation as well as brokerage are useful as vantage points to think productively, in an iconoclastic, ethnographic direction, some of the defining features of the 'European refugee crisis'.[12] These features include the moves from below and the initiatives (see grassroots humanitarianism) aiming to meet the needs of the displaced travelers, the creative, and sometimes innovative, reworking of humanitarian protection (in its multiple dimensions) at the levels both of concept (e.g., 'solidarity') and practice, the personalization of humanitarian links and the moral ambiguities that surround humanitarian action, the assembling and networking in the de-territorialized space of the crisis and, more generally, the processes out of which humanitarian governance is born, the great variety of (vertical) connections and linkages between the multiple levels of humanitarian governance.

I want to insist on the critical function of this analytical vocabulary in the study of aspects of the recent 'European refugee crisis'. In humanitarian action some forms of brokerage look self-evident for the very simple reason that their interested character is explicitly acknowledged. These are the cases of, for example, private mediation for profit in travel, accommodation, or integration of displaced people (see Bierschenk 2021: 422-3) or even professional NGO mediation in the provision of humanitarian care, protection, and integration. Such versions of brokerage, to the extent that they conform to the historically dominant stereotype of the 'broker', easily assume an, otherwise ambiguous, visibility.

[12] Lindquist (2015: 874) speaks about the broker as an 'ethnographic entry point'.

Other forms of brokerage, however, look *paradoxical*, and, because of this, they are *not* acknowledged. I think that humanitarian brokerage by 'solidarians' is a good example. Analytically, the 'solidarian' who mediates could be described as, to use Thomas Bierschnek's (2021:423) term, a 'partisan arbitrator', i.e., one who is not standing at equal distance from both parties and, therefore, does not meet one important analytical requirement to be defined as a broker. I believe that this is quite debatable, particularly in situations where all parties share the same attitudes towards the displaced people. However, what I find more interesting is that in the public mind the 'solidarian' broker remains an impossibility.[13] Reflecting on the paradox of the 'solidarian' broker could be very instructive.

In Europe the discussion of forms of professional, voluntary, and activist humanitarian action has been placed in a *heavy normative frame* organized around the notion of 'solidarity', suggesting the disinterested and egalitarian character of support to asylum seekers and people in need more generally. This frame further gains constraining disciplinary force by the fact that many researchers identify as 'solidarians' and, therefore, feel committed politically to a cognate normative orientation. Yet we must be careful on how we deal with the ethically loaded and contentious terms (see Witcher and Fumado 2022: 2-4). A more normatively 'neutral' analytical vocabulary may help researchers to achieve the necessary critical distance and be more reflexive, i.e., be more ready to acknowledge the impact that (their) political commitments has on (their) cognitive practices. It is interesting that a good part of this more iconoclastic vocabulary, which, besides brokerage, includes other terms, such as 'citizen aid' (Fechter and Schwittay 2019, McKay and Perez 2019), that capture behavioral patterns, has been mostly applied in relevant Asian and African studies, and is adopted rather slowly in studies of Europe (on Greece, for example, see Witcher 2020).

In analytically excluding the possibility of brokerage being linked to disinterestedness we are in fact reproducing the transactionalist fixation with interested motives (for profit), which are thus upgraded into a defining feature of brokerage. The analytical conception of humanitarian brokerage as a form of mediating behavior that does *not* have a privileged connection with a particular category of motives and does *not* carry an endemic, moral value is, therefore, an important step in the critical and reflexive study of humanitarian action.

If we analytically accept that brokerage can be informed by altruistic as well as by interested motives, and that is up to our interlocutors to decide and speak about the 'nature' of their motives, then we cannot a priori exclude the possibility of solidarian brokerage. This line of inquiry is in line with the study of 'solidarity' in emic terms (Papataxiarchis 2016b). Mediation/brokerage and sociality are placed on the same level, as analytic constructs that are culturally informed in ways that vary in time and space. Their social and political impact cannot be decided a priori but must be decided through a detailed, on the ground ethnographic study of relevant humanitarian practices.

The same analytic program can help us to deal with the cognitive effects of the overarching and encompassing moralization of politics, one vehicle of which is humanitarianism itself. It offers the necessary analytical distance from the powerful humanitarian discourse that is shaping the social realities that we study as well as co-opting or even shaping our own, analytic discourse.

[13] In Greece this is part of a powerful legacy of the 'movement against middlemen' (see Rakopoulos 2014, Agelopoulos 2017).

5. MAPPING MEDIATION IN HUMANITARIAN MANAGEMENT (INCLUDING RELIEF, PROTECTION AND INTEGRATION)

I suggest approaching humanitarian action in a broad way that includes relief, protection in its multiple dimensions and integration. In this regard mediation and brokerage in the humanitarian field can be analyzed into alternative typologies on the following criteria: the form of mediating activity, the humanitarian field in which mediation is exercised, the agent of mediation and the logic of mediation (that refers to the motives as stated by the mediators themselves). These typologies are useful in mapping the phenomenon of humanitarian mediation and brokerage.

All typologies face the problem of *blurred* boundaries between fields, roles, identities, and logics. We should also notice that in humanitarian action mediation is not restricted to the relation between humanitarians and the recipients of humanitarian support. There is an extra and quite important parameter, that of mediation between the humanitarian agents (e.g. NGOs) and their donors (see Fechter's (2019) analysis of the role of brokers in the transnational flow of donations).

A typology of *forms of intermediating activity* depends on how broadly we conceive it. A characteristic example of a very broad typology is offered by Maurizio Ambrosini (2017) on mediation in irregular migration. He distinguishes five main types: connection (link migrants with opportunities for travel, accommodation or work), provision of services (for profit or on moral grounds), help to face immediate needs, tolerance (in evading internal legal controls) and political pressure by political actors. Yet, it is difficult to differentiate between these alternative forms. Particularly the notion of 'services' encompasses too many things (including intermediation itself).

A second typology refers to *fields* of humanitarian action and management and the types of (inter)mediaries and brokers who specialize in these fields. This includes travel (see 'smugglers' as travel agents who enable irregular travel), accommodation (particularly in private and alternative forms), provision of basic services (including the handling of migration bureaucracy and 'papers' by 'migration advice brokers' and the 'help' offered by 'street-level bureaucrats'), and cultural translation, particularly in asylum (see 'cultural intermediaries', interpreters etc.), sociality, education, medical care, entry into the labor market and integration more generally.

A third typology could be in terms of the *providers* of protection, i.e., the types and identities of intermediaries. This includes official collective humanitarian agents (NGOs), unofficial civil society (individual volunteers and activists), migrant associations and co-ethnic, probably refugee, networks (refugees for refugees), philanthropic institutions (church), private entrepreneurs.

A fourth typology could refer to the different *logics of humanitarian mediation.* We could distinguish humanitarian (legal and technocratic) logics focusing on human rights, political logics (with an emphasis on emancipation and political equality) focusing on citizenship (political) rights, con-social and co-ethnic logics focusing on needs, philanthropic logics that approach mediation in terms of moral values and focus on needs, and entrepreneurial logics that approach mediation in terms of profit and focus on needs translated into services. Again, here we face the challenge of the blurred boundaries between the different types and logics (e.g. between NGOs and activists or migrant associations) and the overall

humanitarianization (and professionalization) of the field of protection and care that we have observed, for example, in Lesvos.

This classificatory exercise could be extended to the properties of mediation (inter-personal relation of trust, hierarchy, subjection to political manipulation from above, dialogical character, inclusiveness), socio-political impact and other parameters.

6. KEY ISSUES

I would like to give greater attention to certain key aspects of brokerage on the basis of my ethnographic experience on the humanitarian management of the 'refugee crisis' in the Aegean islands. These include the agency and the motives of intermediators in humanitarian initiatives, the connections and relations that were forged in the form of brokerage chains and assemblages, and the translation of official humanitarian norms and models in local contexts. These key issues can be classified along the three-dimensional (action/relation/meaning) axis through which I initially defined mediation.

(a) Action

As the relevant bibliography shows, in conditions of rapid change brokerage is often born on the ground and in response to a growing demand for mediation and on the ground knowledge. In such settings mediators and brokers are 'extracted' from the local social environments in which they historically belong to assume emergent statuses and roles built around a quasi-local identity.

This has certainly been the case of the recent 'European refugee crisis', *a generative historical moment in which the demand for mediation significantly increased*. In fact, mediation and brokerage seem to have been important features of the refugee crisis, and particularly salient one in the large constellation of initiatives of first reception, relief, protection, or education that has been coined as 'grassroots humanitarianism' (Rozakou 2017). They emerged together with the birth of the humanitarian regime and referred the humanitarian action in two directions: the locals/local communities and the asylum seekers (Papataxiarchis 2016a). One could say that *local mediators played the role of the maid in the birth of the local humanitarian regime, they shaped it as much as they were shaped by it.*

In response to the great demand for mediation two principal types of brokers and mediators emerged. First, *self-made brokers*, among whom some gradually became full scale humanitarian entrepreneurs who mixed brokerage with the offer of particular services (e.g., NGO leaders, owners of informal advice 'bureaus' or quasi-professional leaders of 'initiatives'). Second, *institutionally dependent mediators* (of refugee or local origins) who offered their services to (and are on the pay roll of) humanitarian organizations. A key question arises here: how is the 'freedom' of intermediaries to shape their identity (self-fashioning) as well as the relation with the asylum seekers is limited by the institution (NGO, municipality or other) in which they belong and the framework in which they operate?

Through mediation and brokerage, a number of locals as well as asylum seekers and migrants crafted their own path of *upward mobility*. This was an important ingredient of the wider path of *professionalization* of the humanitarian action (see Papataxiarchis 2018). No doubt, as in the past, intermediators and brokers often benefitted from their mediating activity (see debate on interested motives and profit as the guiding

force of NGO activity). They accumulated symbolic capital, the more able ones achieved wider visibility and recognition, and most of them further moved upwards. In one-way, current forms of humanitarian mediation and brokerage that are born at the grassroots, could be viewed at the level of the individual actor as part of the developmental cycle of migrant work and a stage in upward mobility, away from manual labor (Tuckett 2018). Yet, as Eva-Maria Walther's (2021) study of the Slovak refugee support organizations shows, these new style brokers also paid the cost.

(b) Relations/ brokerage chains/ assemblages

At the beginning of the 'refugee crisis', as the various actors rapidly assembled in the humanitarian field, where the massive entry of the displaced people gave the tone, a patchy scene came into existence. It was composed of the myriad of new encounters between the various actors who were 'using' (most for the first time) the island as their meeting place and marked by the (often self-made) spaces of more systematic interaction between them.

People with social capital and, particularly communicational, skills (e.g., languages, social media), who were strategically placed within the emergent humanitarian field, assumed the role of mediators and, in this capacity, played a key role in giving a certain shape in this rather anarchic scape -the shape of an *assemblage of mechanisms* without a visible center of power. This was the golden age of the humanitarian (inter)mediators. At the regional level, the authority of state officials was in decline. *Unofficial power was dispersed*, and a good part of it was hold by the mediators whose ability to shape things on the ground rapidly increased.

Yet, with the official establishment of the *humanitarian regime* under the aegis of the UNHCR, the humanitarian field started taking a recognizable shape. Its official form was produced by the UNHCR (through the coordination meetings) in its (structurally) mediating role between the Greek state and municipal authorities, on the one hand, and the asylum seekers, on the other. The more fully formed became the humanitarian regime, the more it achieved the control of the humanitarian management, the more hierarchical became the humanitarian field. At the same time the humanitarian regime mediated between the asylum seekers and the local. It worked as a buffer zone protecting to a certain degree the asylum seekers from local reactions.

In this clearly stratified scene brokers often operated in hierarchical '*brokerage chains*' (Brauchler 2021) or 'layered networks' (McKay and Perez 2019). The easiest way to think of chains of brokerage is in reference to various levels (local, regional, national, international) of social-spatial and political integration. Brokers occupied positions at the different levels. In this respect, brokerage circulated downwards, when the initiative (and the corresponding 'demand') stemmed from an actor occupying a place at a higher socio-spatial level, or, rarer, upwards, when the initiative was taken at a lower level. There were also fewer instances of a non-hierarchical and rather horizontal version, when all the parties occupied the same level.

(c) Meaning/ translation

Translation is an important dimension of humanitarian mediation, yet the creative circulation of meaning that follows mediation becomes even more significant when the field of humanitarian action in which intermediation is exercised is *ethno-culturally differentiated* to a large extent. This is quite common and

has certainly been the case with the humanitarian scene in the frontline islands of the Aegean during the 'refugee crisis'. In a schematic way, and as it has been shown in 'ethnographic reports' from the frontline (Papataxiarchis 2016a), the crisis brought together at a massive scale three, highly ethno-culturally diverse parties -the locals, the displaced people from the 'East' and the many thousands of foreign humanitarian actors from the 'West' (mostly from N. Europe). The humanitarian scene was over-loaded with cultural difference. The efficient management of the humanitarian crisis demanded the building of 'bridges', the operation of effective lines of communication and, therefore, translation between the disparate parties in this highly diversified scene became absolutely necessary.

No doubt, professional or amateur, self-made, 'interpreters' were key (inter)mediators in various areas of humanitarian management such as asylum or medical aid. Yet if we limit mediation to linguistic translation we face the danger of leaving out other, possibly more important, forms of mediation that involve *the translation or even brokering of ideas, norms not to say models and patterns of thinking*.

Intermediating between the multiple actors in this highly differentiated, tripartite humanitarian field involved intensive exercises in *cultural brokerage*. Geertz's (1960) analysis of the changing role of the Kiaji, the traditional Muslim teacher, in postrevolutionary Indonesia is an important point of departure in thinking about translation and cultural brokerage. In communicating the abstract nationalist ideals of the 'New Indonesia' to their local followings the Kiajis translated the former into the concrete (religious) idioms of rural life and, therefore, acted as 'cultural brokers'. [14]

In a similar way and in an equally transitional moment, the more extrovert humanitarian actors, with local or refugee background and the necessary (communication) skills and social capital, mediated in the communication of the new humanitarian, 'global solidarian' or philanthropic, ideas, values, norms, and models of governance to the concerned audiences of asylum seekers and locals. They translated in a 'friendly' manner, for example, the UNHCR technocratic language of humanitarian management, which is organized around a few key concepts, such as 'rights', '(humanitarian) protection', 'asylum seeker', 'vulnerability', or 'security', to the local idiom.[15] At the same time a whole new generation of Greeks, either locals or from Athens, Lesvos, and other parts of Greece, were 'educated' in professional humanitarianism by the experienced 'external' officers of the major organizations, mostly in practice but also in institutional settings, such as the weekly coordination meetings which were administered by UNHCR. Other mediators played a key role in 'localizing global solidarity' (Shults et.al. 2021) in humanitarian aid. Or they mutually referred to one another both, the official, mostly international, UNHCR humanitarian technocracy and the activist 'grassroots solidarity' of the Greek extra-parliamentary Left. The examples are many.

In translation the communication of meaning followed diverse routes, each one of which often involved not a single individual actor but several, positioned at different levels -local, regional, national, international. To the extent that they cross various levels of social and political integration these routes correspond to 'layered networks' (McKay and Perez 2019) and are reminiscent of the 'chains of

[14] See the interesting example of 'street-level bureaucrats' acting as cultural brokers in southern Ethiopia (Epple 2021).

[15] On the circulation, translation, and local reception of the transnational human rights approach of violence against women, see Merry 2006.

translation' discussed by Bruno Latour (see Mosse and Lewis 2006:15). Such routes are punctuated by a multiplicity of 'nodes'[16], i.e., *spaces of interaction* between the involved parties.

Some of these spaces, for example, the coordination meetings, 'educational' meetings, or even the classical asylum interviews, are *official*. Although they are part of the division of humanitarian labor, they perform other functions as well, particularly in integrating 'newcomers' (with little or no humanitarian background and technical knowledge) to the programmatically orderly function of the humanitarian regime. In this regard, they remind the 'invited spaces' of translation that Koster and Leyseele (2018) analyze in the case of top-down development. In spaces of this kind, a reflexive mode of humanitarian governance, reflexive in the sense that it is aware of the constructive role of mediations/ors and keen in shaping the intermediating activity according to the broader goals of the humanitarian regime, educates humanitarians into a new profession, that of 'cultural intermediators', thus turning mediation into a tool of (mutual, symmetrical?) accommodation between the asylum seekers and the wider environment.

Other spaces, such as those of everyday sociality, are *unofficial*, yet equally important. They remind the 'negotiated spaces' that, according to Koster and Leynseele (2018), emerge when the state is fragmented and internally divided. Particularly in 'negotiated spaces' translation may adopt a programmatically agonistic tone leading to the subversion of official policy categories, i.e., becomes part of a sort of 'subversive humanitarianism' (see Vandevoordt and Verschraegen 2019) as it is the case with 'street-level bureaucrats' in Athens who helped the displaced people to attain their rights (see Witcher 2020).

Overall, meaning circulated along mostly downward paths, reflecting the hegemonic position of both the UNHCR and the big, experienced, humanitarian organization. The international actors hold the initiative in translating with various means their official discourse in local and asylum seeker terms. The prevalence of anglophony was an important side effect of the whole process. It was much more rare to have more horizontal or even bottom-up interactions leading to the translation of the local to the global. If I had to select a good example of the latter, I would be tempted to consider the re-construction and upgrading of (low level) 'solidarity to refugees' into a wider patriotic concern, a project which relied on local solidarian knowledge and experience that was accumulated in frontline island communities (see Papataxiarchis 2016b). Yet again this was mostly a state and media project rather than a widespread grassroots movement that set the terms of dealing with the displaced people.

In the brokered world that the emergent humanitarian scene is 'pure products go crazy'.[17] Official humanitarian or activist categories, which are clearly grounded on carefully defined ideological principles and guarded by often elaborate protocols, are redefined as their meaning is negotiated between the involved parties in the multiple spaces of interaction that constitute the routes of translation. And as many actors -professional humanitarians, volunteers, asylum seekers and locals- often change positions and shift roles, they are further implicated in the blending of the conceptual (ideological and wider and cosmological?) orders to which they primarily refer. In this unstable environment, where mobility and flux prevail, the guarding of institutionally or ideologically fixed meanings becomes extremely difficult (and this is an important source of continuous friction and antagonism).

[16] I am inspired by Jon Lie's (2020: 929) use of the term in order to describe how development indicators '"travel" from the top, through the aid chain's multiple nodes, to the level of beneficiaries'.
[17] I borrow the term from James Clifford's (1998) analysis of culture in the age of the electronic revolution.

Under such circumstances the mixing of meanings becomes the order of the day. By taking mediation as our vantage point and by focusing on translation, we can analytically recognize the creative, and definitely fascinating, work done on the ground: the blending of official categories and patterns of thinking with local idioms and ways, the struggle of grassroot experiences to gain official recognition, the syncretisms and the subsequent emergence of synthetic or hybrid formations, all the above being a continuous source of trouble for orthodox humanitarian practitioners, ideologically principled activists or purists of all kinds.

Overall, the net outcome of these processes of networking, assembling, and translating is contradictory: mutual adjustment and accommodation of the disparate worlds, yet also conflictual situations arising from the mixed loyalties of the involved actors who struggle to keep together mutually competing local, professional, solidarian and other aspirations.

Con-fusion of boundaries and meanings is the other facet of the moral dilemmas and ambiguities that seem to be endemic in the multiple spaces of humanitarian interaction. They also provide the ground on which conflict grows.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CITED WORKS

Accoroni, D. (2017). Transcultural Psychiatry and the French Provision of Health for Migrants: Between Mediation and Misunderstanding. *Transtext (e) s Transcultures: Journal of Global Cultural Studies*, (12).

Agelopoulos, G. (2017). Put the blame on potatoes: Power relations and the trajectories of goods during the Greek crisis. In D. Dalakoglou and G. Agelopoulos (eds), *Critical Times in Greece* (pp. 217-225). Routledge.

Ambrosini, M. (2017). Why irregular migrants arrive and remain: the role of intermediaries. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *43*(11), 1813-1830.

Bierschenk, T. (2021). Afterword: Brokerage as social practice. Cultural Dynamics, 33(4), pp.418-425.

Bierschenk T., Chauveau J.P. and Olivier de Sardan J.P. (2002) *Local Development Brokers in Africa. The Rise of a New Social Category* (working papers of the department of anthropology and African studies 13). Mainz: Johannes Gutenberg-Universität. Available at: https://www.ifeas.uni-mainz.

Boissevain, J. (1974). *Friends of friends: Networks, manipulators and coalitions*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bräuchler, B., Knodel, K. and Röschenthaler, U. (2021). Brokerage from within: A conceptual framework. *Cultural Dynamics*, p.09213740211011202.

Bräuchler, B. (2021). Facilitating resonance: Brokerage in indigenous activism. *Cultural Dynamics*, *33*(4), 382-400.

Brinker, L.D. (2021). Security net and ambassadors for social inclusion? The role of intermediaries in host–refugee relationships in homestay programs. *Social Inclusion*, *9*(4), pp.232-242.

Cabot, H. (2014). *On the doorstep of Europe: Asylum and citizenship in Greece*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Clifford, J. (1988). *The predicament of culture: Twentieth-century ethnography, literature, and art* (Vol. 1). Harvard University Press.

Combinido, P., & Ong, J. C. (2017). Silenced in the aid interface: Responsible brokerage and its obstacles in humanitarian interventions. *Philippine Sociological Review*, 39-64.

Dahlvik, J. (2019). Why Handling Power Responsibly Matters: The Active Interpreter Through the Sociological Lens. In Gill (ed), Asylum Determination in Europe: Ethnographic perspectives (pp. 133-154). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Dietze, A. (2018). Cultural brokers and mediators. In Middel (ed), *The Routledge handbook of transregional studies* (pp. 494-502). Routledge.

Epple, S., (2021). When 'street-level bureaucrats' act as cultural brokers: The normative dilemmas and personal commitment of government officials in southern Ethiopia. *Cultural Dynamics*, *33*(4), pp.348-364.

Faist, T. (2014). Brokerage in cross-border mobility: social mechanisms and the (re)production of social inequalities. Social Inclusion 2(4): 38–52

Fechter, A. M. (2020). Brokering transnational flows of care: The case of citizen aid. *Ethnos*, *85*(2), 293-308.

Fechter, A., and A. Schwittay (2019). Citizen Aid: Grassroots Interventions in Development and Humanitarianism. *Third World Quarterly* 40 (10): 1769–1780.

Fernandez, B. (2013). Traffickers, brokers, employment agents, and social networks: The regulation of intermediaries in the migration of Ethiopian domestic workers to the Middle East. *International Migration Review*, *47*(4), 814-843.

Geertz, C. (1960). The Javanese Kijaji: The changing role of a cultural broker. *Comparative Studies in society and history*, *2*(2), 228-249.

Hilhorst, D. J. M. (2003). *The real world of NGOs: Discourses, diversity and development*. Zed Books.

Hinderaker, E. (2002). Translation and cultural brokerage. *A companion to American Indian history*, 357-376.

Hönke, J., & Müller, M. M. (2018). Brokerage, intermediation, translation. In *The Oxford Handbook of Governance and Limited Statehood* (pp. 333-352). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

James, D. (2011). The return of the broker: consensus, hierarchy, and choice in South African land reform. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 17, 318–338.

Jensen, S. (2018). Epilogue: Brokers–pawns, disrupters, assemblers?. *Ethnos*, *83*(5), 888-891.

Koster, M., & van Leynseele, Y. (2018). Brokers as assemblers: Studying development through the lens of brokerage. *Ethnos*, *83*(5), 803-813.

Koster, M. (2012). Mediating and getting 'burnt'in the gap: Politics and brokerage in a Recife slum, Brazil. *Critique of Anthropology*, *32*(4), 479-497.

Lewis, D. and Mosse, D. eds., (2006). *Development brokers and translators: The ethnography of aid and agencies*. Kumarian Press.

Lie, J. H. S. (2020). Performing compliance with development indicators: brokerage and transnational governance in aid partnerships. *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie sociale*, *28*(4), 929-943.

Lindquist, J.A. (2015). Anthropology of brokers and brokerage. In: International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences 2: 870–874.

Lindquist, J., Xiang, B., Yeoh, B. (2012). Opening the black box of migration: brokers, the organization of transnational mobility and the changing political economy in Asia. Pacific Affairs 85, 7–19.

Lindquist, J. (2015). Of figures and types: brokering knowledge and migration in Indonesia and beyond. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, *21*(S1), 162-177.

McKay, D., & Perez, P. (2019). Citizen aid, social media and brokerage after disaster. *Third World Quarterly*, *40*(10), 1903-1920.

Merry, S. E. (2006). Transnational human rights and local activism: Mapping the middle. *American anthropologist*, *108*(1), 38-51.

Mosse, D., & Lewis, D. (2006). Theoretical approaches to brokerage and translation in development. *Development brokers and translators: The ethnography of aid and agencies*, 1-26.

Papataxiarchis, E. (2016a). Being 'there': At the frontline of the 'European refugee crisis', Parts 1 and 2. *Anthropology Today* 32(2): 5-9 and 32(3): 3-7.

Papataxiarchis, E. (2016b). Unwrapping solidarity? Society reborn in austerity. *Social Anthropology* 24(2), 205-210.

Papataxiarchis, E. (2016c). Μια μεγάλη ανατροπή; Η 'Ευρωπαϊκή προσφυγική κρίση' και ο νέος πατριωτισμός της 'αλληλεγγύης ["A big reversal: The 'European refugee crisis' and the new patriotism of 'solidarity'"]. *Σύγχρονα Θέματα* 132-133, 7-28.

Papataxiarchis, E. (2018). Pragmatism against austerity: Greek society, politics, and ethnography in times of trouble. In D. Dalakoglou and G. Agelopoulos (eds), *Critical Times in Greece: Anthropological Engagements with the Crisis*, London: Routledge.

Rakopoulos, T. (2014). The crisis seen from below, within, and against: from solidarity economy to food distribution cooperatives in Greece. *Dialectical Anthropology*, *38*(2), 189-207.

Röschenthaler, U. (2021). Brokers in the tea trade between China and West Africa. *Cultural Dynamics*, *33*(4), 401-417.

Rozakou K. (2009). Ο απρόθυμος διερμηνέας: Μετανάστες ως πολιτισμικοί μεσολαβητές. *Σύγχρονα Θέματα*, 107, 81-89.

Rozakou, K. (2017). Solidarity# humanitarianism: The blurred boundaries of humanitarianism in Greece. *Etnofoor*, *29*(2), 99-104.

Schaffer, S. et al. (2009). 'Introduction', in S. Schaffer (eds) The Brokered World: Go-betweens and global intelligence, 1770–1820, Sagamore Beach, MA: Science History Publications: 1–48.

Shrestha, T., & Yeoh, B. S. (2018). Introduction: practices of brokerage and the making of migration infrastructures in Asia. *Pacific Affairs*, *91*(4), 663-672.

Simmel, G. (1950). The triad. In: Wolff KH (ed.) The Sociology of Georg Simmel. New York, NY: Free Press, pp.145–169.

Schuller, M. (2009). Gluing globalization: NGOs as intermediaries in Haiti. *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review*, *32*(1), 84-104.

Shults, L. M., Haaland, H., & Wallevik, H. (2021). Localizing Global Solidarity: Humanitarian Aid in Lesvos. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 63.

Tuckett, A., (2018). *Rules, paper, status: Migrants and precarious bureaucracy in contemporary Italy*. Stanford University Press.

Tuckett, A. (2018). Ethical brokerage and self-fashioning in Italian immigration bureaucracy. *Critique of Anthropology*, *38*(3), 245-264.

Üstübici, A. (2022). 'Street-level justifications': Service providers mediating refugee reception in the urban context of Istanbul. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *35*(1), 74-92.

Vandevoordt, R., & Verschraegen, G. (2019). Subversive humanitarianism and its challenges: Notes on the political ambiguities of civil refugee support. In *Refugee protection and civil society in Europe* (pp. 101-128). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Walther, E. M. (2021). Brokers in straitjackets: The moral quandaries of refugee support organisations in Slovakia. *Cultural Dynamics*, *33*(4), 316-330.

Witcher, A. (2021). Greece's Discriminatory Migrant Regime: Volunteers, Informal Street-Level Bureaucrats, and Moral Rationalities. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *34*(2), 1540-1559.

Witcher, A., & Fumado, V. (2022). Informal citizen volunteering with border crossers in Greece: the informality double-bind and intimate solidarity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *48*(17), 4049-4065.

Zihnioğlu, Ö. and Dalkıran, M. (2022). From social capital to social cohesion: Syrian refugees in Turkey and the role of NGOs as intermediaries. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1-18.