WORKING PAPERS

Decolonizing Migration Studies: The Case of Hospitality, Sanctuary, and Solidarity

Harald Bauder, Nick Dreher, Omar Lujan & Oluwafunmilayo Asolo

Working Paper No. 2023/03
March 2023

The *Working Papers* Series is produced jointly by the Toronto Metropolitan Centre for Immigration and Settlement (TMCIS) and the CERC in Migration and Integration

www.torontomu.ca/centre-for-immigration-and-settlement
www.torontomu.ca/cerc-migration

Toronto Metropolitan University
Canada Excellence Research Chair in Migration & Integration
Toronto Metropolitan Centre for Immigration and Settlement

Working Paper

No. 2023/03

Decolonizing Migration Studies: The Case of Hospitality, Sanctuary, and Solidarity*

Harald Bauder
Toronto Metropolitan University

Nick Dreher
Toronto Metropolitan University

Omar Lujan
Toronto Metropolitan University

Oluwafunmilayo Asolo
Toronto Metropolitan University

Series Editors: Anna Triandafyllidou and Usha George

Toronto Metropolitan University | Canada Excellence Research Chair in Migration & Integration | Toronto Metropolitan Centre for Immigration and Settlement

The *Working Papers* Series is produced jointly by the Toronto Metropolitan Centre for Immigration and Settlement (TMCIS) and the CERC in Migration and Integration at Toronto Metropolitan University.

Working Papers present scholarly research of all disciplines on issues related to immigration and settlement. The purpose is to stimulate discussion and collect feedback. The views expressed by the author(s) do not necessarily reflect those of the TMCIS or the CERC.

For further information, visit www.torontomu.ca/centre-for-immigration-and-settlement and www.torontomu.ca/cerc-migration.

SOLI*CITY

*This project was supported by the Urban Sanctuary, Migrant Solidarity and Hospitality in Global Perspective (Soli*City) partnership, funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (895-2021-1000). We thank *Soli*City* International Advisory Board Member, Brenda Yeoh, for discussions that inspired this paper. We also thank research assistants Rachael Gustave and Tara Tarana for their support of this project.

ISSN: 1929-9915

Abstract

The field of migration studies continues to perpetuate Eurocentric and colonial perspectives. In this paper, we present the results of a scoping review of the literature to explore if and to which degree the concepts of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity are implicated in this practice. In addition, we introduce the alternative concepts of Buen Vivir from Latin American and African ubuntu to conceptualize migrant and refugee inclusion in a non-Eurocentric way. We propose that such alternative non-European and non-Western concepts offer a way to decolonize migration studies.

Keywords: migration; refugees; hospitality; sanctuary; solidarity; cities; Eurocentrism

Table of Contents

Introduction

In recent decades, the field of migration studies has incorporated decolonial perspectives and adopted decolonial approaches. Research has criticized the assertion of sovereignty of former colonial powers to exclude migrants from their former colonies (Achiume, 2019) questioned Western migration policies and practices in relation to migrant labour exploitation (Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, 2013), denounced the ongoing colonial relations and imperial practices embedded in asylum policies and practices (Humphris, 2022; Picozza, 2021), and condemned the international migration regime for criminalizing people from the Global South (Díaz, 2019). These studies emphasize the historical continuity of colonial relations related to human migration.

Despite this decolonial critique, Eurocentric perspectives, theories, and concepts continue to perpetuate colonialism within the field of migration studies (Bauder, 2019; Collins, 2022; Landau, 2010; Landau & Bakewell, 2018; Squire, 2022). In this paper, we turn our focus from empirically studying colonial relations connected to migration, towards reflecting on the way that migration studies as a field of inquiry reproduce Eurocentric perspectives and scientific imaginations (Bauder et al., 2018; Gregory, 1996). Thus, our focus is on decolonizing the scientific language and knowledge production (Chapman, 2023; Phillipson, 1992; Santos, 2014). In particular, we examine the concepts of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity,[1] which have recently drawn attention from migration scholars as concepts associated with practices and politics to overcome colonial relations; in particular the focus on the urban scale has attracted attention to these concepts liberatory and transformative potential vis-à-vis the hegemonic nation state (Agustín & Jørgensen, 2019; Bauder, 2017a, 2022; Darling, 2009; Walia, 2013). Our thesis is that even these concepts continue to reflect Eurocentric genealogies and theoretical and philosophical underpinnings. The purpose of this paper is twofold. First, we examine if and how the migration literature applies the concepts of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity in Eurocentric ways. We make this argument through a review of the intellectual lineages and contemporary uses of these concepts in migration studies. Second, we explore alternative concepts that have been neglected in the migration literature. Specifically, we suggest that Buen Vivir and ubuntu are distinct concepts that can exist in dialogue with the Eurocentric concepts of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity. Buen Vivir and ubuntu represent two examples of alternatives to the European concepts under investigation.

To investigate our thesis that these concepts are intrinsically Eurocentric, we conducted a scoping review (Lockwood et al., 2019; Sarrami-Foroushani et al., 2015), consisting of a search of academic journals and books using the keywords “hospitality,” “sanctuary,” “solidarity” in combination with “migration” and “urban migration.” In addition, we expanded the sample by including relevant works from the reference lists of the articles, books, and book chapters, which our search identified. We limited our sample to works published between 2000 and 2022 and that include a definition or conceptual discussion of one or more of the three concepts hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity. This timeframe provides a long enough time frame to provide significant relevant literature for review while also maintaining a focus on contemporary studies of migration. As Massey (2018) argues, the dynamics of twenty-first century migrations are in many ways distinct from those of the previous century. We excluded articles that use these concepts only peripherally and without providing a definition or discussion of their meaning. The final sample includes forty-seven sources.

The paper proceeds as follows: in the next section, we present the results of the scoping review investigating the way in which the migration literature interprets the concepts hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity and whether these interpretations reflect Eurocentric viewpoints and Western intellectual histories and traditions. Thereafter, we introduce two alternative framings to

[1] We list the three concepts of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity in alphabetical order and treat them as equally important.

hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity that can be applied to the study of migration: the Latin American concept Buen Vivir and African concept ubuntu. We end with a conclusion highlighting how Buen Vivir and ubuntu contribute to the migration literature and engage in dialogue with the concepts of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity, and offer suggestions for future research.

Eurocentric Intellectual Lineages

In this section we examine the Eurocentric lineages of the concepts of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity. In addition, we investigate in which way typologies and frameworks related to these concepts reflect Western philosophical traditions. Western scholarship has a propensity for categorization and binary divisions that enable and perpetuate social and political domination (Cloke & Johnston, 2004). Aníbal Quijano (2007) points out how taxonomies and in particular dualisms lead to a reductionist vision of reality that denies the validity of non-Western worldviews and to a macro-historical subject in the West that requires the existence of the "other" (Quijano 2007, p177). In particular, we explore binaries, such as between host and guest, or migrant and citizen (Agustín & Jørgensen, 2016), the scholarly preoccupation with asymmetrical power relations, and Eurocentric spatial imagination that is referenced in the Westphalian nation state (Agnew, 1994; Bauder, 2022).

Hospitality

Discussions of hospitality in the migration literature draw heavily on the work of European scholars, including Emmanuel Levinas (Derrida, 2001; Kelz, 2015), Michel Foucault (Bagelman, 2016; Bulley, 2016), Julian Pitt-Rivers (Berg & Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 2018), Francisco de Vitoria (Boudou, 2020; Chamberlain, 2020), Emmanuel Kant (Boudou, 2020; Chamberlain, 2020; Derrida, 2001), Anne Dufourmantelle (Chamberlain, 2020) and Jacques Derrida (Baban & Rygiel, 2017; Bagelman, 2016; Berg & Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 2018; Bulley, 2016; Chamberlain, 2020; Dausner, 2018; Kelz, 2015). A further exploration of our sample unveils the nuances of the Eurocentric lineage of hospitality. Chamberlain (2020) initially situates hospitality as a universal notion based in prehistoric necessity for survival and genetic diversification before shifting to a Western European genealogy of the concept. The English term originates from the Latin words *hospitalia* and *hospitia,* which refers to dwellings specifically for the use of travelers. In Roman culture, the practice of hospitality was a virtue. Francisco de Vitoria, a 16th century theologian identified hospitality as part of humanity's "right of natural partnership and communication" and "a right under the law of nations" (Pagden, 2003, p. 185). Significantly, de Vitoria defends hospitality as the right to residence, which has be interpreted as a justification for colonialization (Bauder & Mueller, 2023), in contrast to Kant (1795) who articulated limits to hospitality as the right to visitation to prevent the colonialization of foreign lands.

Benjamin Boudou (2020) engages in a similar genealogy of hospitality as it relates to migration. This genealogy begins with the ancient relation of dependence between guests and hosts in Greece and Rome. In Greece, ritualized hospitality developed as a political institution that aimed to protect and present the foreigner in the city without treating them as an equal. Roman hospitality shifted from a reciprocal to a patronage relationship around 300 B.C.E., but significantly was based on the binary identification of all foreigners as either enemy or Roman (i.e., from a political partner to Rome or part of the Empire). Hospitality in this case was reserved for Romans. Conversely, the medieval and Christian forms of hospitality equated with charity (an unconditional duty to help the deserving poor). Finally, the modern meaning of hospitality emphasizes the rights of migrants as illustrated in the Enlightenment philosophies of Montesquieu, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Francisco de Vitoria, Hugo Grotius, and Immanuel Kant.

Our review revealed that a key reference point for contemporary discussions of hospitality in migration studies is the work of Jacques Derrida (Berg & Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 2018; Chamberlain, 2020). Derrida (2001) relates hospitality to cosmopolitanism, which he traces from Stoicism and Christianity to the work of Kant, who discussed hospitality as natural law (Kant, 1795). Derrida challenges this Kantian understanding and points out that the desire to provide unconditional hospitality to migrants and refugees also requires distinguishing the migrant from the citizen who has the right to offer hospitality. Contemporary migration scholars who draw on Derrida's discussion of hospitality are skeptical of the plausibility of unconditional hospitality and emphasize the gap between unconditional hospitality and the practical application of hospitality. For example, Chamberlain (2020, p. 66) remarks that Derrida "does not leave us well positioned to make such decisions in the most just manner, simply implying that the fewer conditions the more just our hospitality." Derrida's efforts to link hospitality to dynamics of power and dispossession represent a current focal point of migration scholarship on hospitality.

Derrida follows a common Western philosophical approach (Cloke & Johnston, 2004; Pile, 1994; Yunkaporta, 2021) when he establishes a binary between conditional and unconditional forms of hospitality. These binaries are almost always characterized by asymmetrical power relations (Pile, 1994). Unconditional hospitality is unattainable as it requires the host to relinquish all privileges of ownership to the guest, thus negating their role as host. Derrida (2001) argues that in practice hospitality is always conditional; for migrants and refugees, there are always limitations on the rights of residency. Interestingly, the articulation of unconditional hospitality is Derrida's attempt to deconstruct the binary power relationship that distinguishes host and guest. The negotiation between unconditional and conditional hospitalities frame much of the discussion on migrant hospitality in the literature (Baban & Rygiel, 2017; Bulley, 2016; Chamberlain, 2020). This literature tends to reject the utopian and impossible notion of unconditional hospitality, suggesting that hospitality is necessarily conditional. In doing so, they reinforce the guest-host binary.

Some research refers to another concept developed by Derrida (2000), *hostipitality*, which highlights the interlinked nature of hospitality and hostility, and the host's power to welcome the guest (Berg & Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 2018; Daley et al., 2018; Daskalaki & Leivaditi, 2018; Wagner, 2018; Wilkinson, 2018), for example, in the context of contemporary refugee camps or global cities (Bulley, 2016). Kelz (2015) points to the importance of the relationship between home, host and guest in Derrida's work. According to Derrida (2001), home suggests a sovereignty over space, which is not a primordial condition and thus requires dispossession.

The connection between hospitality and sovereignty also appears in the work of Kant (1795). In this work, the right to hospitality—limited to visitation rather than settlement—is an important aspect of maintaining peace between sovereign territorial nation states. This sovereign territorial nation state, however, is also deeply implicated in colonialism and settler colonialism (Bauder & Mueller, 2023). This problematic spatial imagination of hospitality is not lost on Derrida (2001), who thought to shift the scale of hospitality from the nation state to the city. In fact, contemporary scholarship often associates hospitality with the urban scale (Darling, 2014; Darling & Bauder, 2019; Samanani, 2017).

Sanctuary

The migration literature applies sanctuary in an equally Eurocentric way as hospitality. Historically, this concept has been associated with various religious traditions, including Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Judaism, Hinduism, and Sikhism (Bagelman, 2016). However, the concept, as it is discussed in migration studies literature, is most often associated with the Christian tradition; the Biblical "cities of refuge" protected individuals who accidentally killed another person (Bauder, 2017a; Derrida, 2001). The migration literature often associates sanctuary with asylum practices

among Christian churches (Lippert, 2005). Church sanctuary goes back to Ancient Roman law and was practiced in medieval Europe. In different parts of the world, churches continue to practice sanctuary for migrants and refugees who are subject to deportation by national authorities (Lippert, 2005). In the United States, churches provided sanctuary to refugees who fled violence in Central American through the 1970s and 1980s, a practice that has been compared to the Underground Railroad that offered a pathway to escaped slaves in the 19th century (Chomsky, 2021).

Today, sanctuary for migrants and refugees is often associated with the urban scale. The contemporary notion of urban sanctuary has its origin in the social and political context of the United States in the 1970s. The city of Berkeley, California, can be considered the birthplace of the contemporary sanctuary-city practices with reference to the 1971 offer of protection to soldiers resisting participation in the Vietnam War (Ridgley, 2011). Later, the US city of San Francisco offered urban sanctuary to Latin American refugees and passed a "City of Refuge" resolution in 1985 and a "City of Refuge" ordinance in 1989 (cf. Bau, 1994). The latter was the foundation of the modern sanctuary city model in North America, prohibiting the use of municipal resources to assist federal immigration enforcement, denying cooperation with investigations by foreign governments to request, and refusing to share information about an individual's immigration status (Bauder, 2017b). The literature in our sample points out that models and theories of urban governance tend to be based on Western contexts and do not always apply to postcolonial or Global South contexts (Beckett, 2014; Landau & Kihato, 2020). Correspondingly, the literature rarely discusses the concept of sanctuary outside of North America and Europe. Only slowly is a literature emerging that examines urban sanctuary in the context of the Global South (Bauder, 2019; Bauder & Gonzalez, 2018; Kassa, 2019; Missbach et al., 2018; Salifu, 2022).

Our literature review found that sanctuary at the urban scale is framed as a set of policies and practices (Bauder, 2017b). This literature often sets up a binary opposition between urban sanctuary and the hegemonic territorial state with its exclusionary border, migration, and citizenship laws, policies and practices (Bauder, 2017b, 2022; Darling & Bauder, 2019). As in the case of hospitality, this binary distinction between the state and the city reflects a Eurocentric spatial imagination and tendency for dualistic categorisation.

Solidarity

The migration literature discusses a variety of interpretations of solidarity, with the most prominent lineages drawing on the European philosophers (Agustín & Jørgensen, 2016; Bauder & Juffs, 2020; della Porta, 2018; Mellino, 2016). In a review of the migration and refugee studies literature, (Bauder & Juffs, 2020) find that most interpretations of solidarity follow various European Enlightenment philosophical frameworks associated with Thomas Hobbes, David Hume, Immanuel Kant or Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. A portion of migration and refugee scholarship also employs alternative frameworks, such as solidarity as loyalty to a group, which can be a national community affirming the Westphalian nation state. There is also a small portion of the literature that addresses Indigenous solidarity that challenges colonial logics.

A large proportion of migration research involving the concept of solidarity follows the tradition of Hegel and Marx (Agustín & Jørgensen, 2016; Bauder & Juffs, 2020; Siim & Meret, 2020). In this context, solidarity often represents a means to overcome social and economic injustices. Solidarity challenges power asymmetries and hegemonic systems (such as border regimes) and structures (such as capitalism) that are implicated in the migration process. Migration researchers who follow this tradition often draw on David Featherston's seminal work on solidarity, which critiques the Eurocentric histories of the Left and frames solidarity in Western Marxism and Western nationalist social movements terms (Featherstone, 2012). In so doing, Featherstone highlights the role of anti-colonial movements to contribute to European Left politics

and south-south solidarity to combat European imperial ambitions (Featherstone, 2013). Among those drawing on Featherstone's critique of solidarity, Agustín and Jørgensen (2016) and della Porta (2018) view contemporary solidarity movements around migration politics in dialogue with Gramsci's work on the role of alliances among heterogeneous actors.

There are considerable efforts to develop various typologies of solidarity. Bauder and Juffs (2020) distinguish between six forms of solidarity: solidarity as loyalty, Indigenous solidarity, self-centred solidarity, emotional reflexive solidarity, rational reflexive solidarity, and recognitive solidarity. Agustín and Jørgensen (2016, 2019) differentiate between social solidarity, institutional solidarity, and anti-solidarity, and between autonomous solidarity, civic solidarity, and institutional solidarity. At the urban scale, a descriptive taxonomy offers top-down, bottom-up, hybrid, and limited categories of solidarity (Özdemir, 2022).

Similar to the concept of sanctuary, the migration literature often frames solidarity as a social and political practice that challenges and transcends the territorial nation state. Mirroring Marxist class politics that cannot be confined to national territorial borders (Marx & Engels, 1969), Featherstone (2012) begins his book with a description of transnational solidarity between abolitionist movement in the United States and textile factory workers in the UK; Agustín and Jørgensen (2016, p. 26) discuss solidarity and alliances across borders and engage with questions of "(1) where is solidarity produced (from institutional to appropriated and everyday spaces?; and (2) which scales are connected (local, national, trans-local or international)." In the same vein, recent research highlights how urban solidarities with migrants and refugees challenge the hegemonic sovereignty claims of the nation state (Bauder, 2022). Similarly, Chomsky (2021) examines the solidarity between US citizens and revolutionary and anti-oppressive movements in Central America in the 1970s and 1980s, describing a "here-there" relationship that is inherently transnational.

Alternative Framings: Buen Vivir and Ubuntu

To address the Eurocentric linage and applications of the concepts of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity in migration research, in this section, we present a decolonial approach (Quijano, 2000) that takes into consideration non-Western concepts that complement existing understandings of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity. First, we examine the Latin American concept of Buen Vivir; second, we review the African concept of ubuntu.

Buen Vivir

Buen Vivir, or *Sumak Kawsay* in Kichwa, refers to Indigenous Andean principles of harmony between the individual, society, and nature (Altmann, 2017). Buen Vivir can be described as a "biocentric, holistic, approach to wellbeing […] a plural concept arriving from traditional Indigenous cosmologies and influenced by political discourse intended to emphasize traditional Indigenous knowledge" (Chassagne, 2021, p. 2). According to Eduardo Gudynas (2011, pp. 442–443), similar concepts to Buen Vivir have existed for centuries in South America, such as Guarani ideas of harmonious living *ñandereko*, the idea of the good life of the Shuar people in Ecuador, *shiir waras*, or the concept of harmonious living of the Mapuche in Chile, *küme mongen*. Differences in the conceptualization of Buen Vivir can be found in the way this concept was introduced in the Ecuadorian and Bolivian constitutions. In Bolivia, the concept of Buen Vivir (sometimes also referred to *Vivir Bien*) is related to the Aymara concept of *suma qamaña*, which means living well together (Artaraz & Calestani, 2015; Ranta, 2018) and which was used in the Bolivian constitution of 2009 as an ethical principle to promote social inclusion and sustainable economic development (Gudynas, 2011). In the Ecuadorian constitution of 2008, Buen Vivir is used as "a set of rights

conducive to fulfil the rights of nature or *Pachamama*, a biocentric posture that recognizes intrinsic values of the natural environment" (Gudynas, 2011, pp. 442–443). Irrespective of regional differences, Buen Vivir has served as an alternative to Western and particularly neoliberal development models in the Andean region, representing an effort to move away from development models that prioritize economic growth over social and environmental concerns (Artaraz & Calestani, 2015; Chassagne, 2021; Gudynas, 2011, 2019; Merino, 2016; Ranta, 2018). Buen Vivir can help complement Western notions of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity by understanding migrants and refugees in relation to – and not in isolation from – nature, land, spirituality, and a communitarian approach towards society (Villalba, 2013, p. 1430).

The various approaches to Buen Vivir are "distinct from Western knowledge rooted in Western ideas of modernity, and have emerged as expressions of decolonial efforts and attempts to strengthen cultural identities in the region" (Gudynas, 2011, pp. 442–443). According to Anibal Quijano (2011, p. 4), coloniality represents a Cartesian dualism, which separates reason from nature and justifies the exploitation of the natural world in a similar manner as the exploitation of colonized and racialized people. Buen Vivir's biocentric focus reflects a worldview in which human needs and environmental needs coexist in a mutually constitutive relationship, and a holistic approach that differs from traditional Western and colonial approaches that view the natural environment as a commodity (Chassagne, 2021). Indigenous world views often challenge corresponding colonial practices and Eurocentric ways of separating reason from nature (Cubillo-Guevara et al., 2016).

The literature on migrant hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity covered in the first section of this paper focuses on social and political participation and on access to rights and services but neglects the relationship to and protection of nature and land. The concept of Buen Vivir complements this Western perspective by adding an ecological and spiritual dimension. We suggest that in the context of migration, Buen Vivir implies recognizing the right of migrants and refugees to develop connections to the land and natural environment where they live. This idea is consistent with the holistic, biocentric, and communitarian approach of Buen Vivir and on how this concept has been used in the Ecuadorian and Bolivian constitutions to promote social inclusion (Artaraz & Calestani, 2015; Gudynas, 2011). In addition, we propose that fostering the right to develop connections to the land and natural environment can also open opportunities for dialogue between newcomers and Indigenous peoples in immigrant receiving settler countries like Canada and the United States where holistic Indigenous concepts of the Good Life such as *Minobimaatisiiwin* are used by Indigenous scholars to articulate relationships between people and land (LaDuke, 1999; McGregor, 2005).

The concepts of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity imply a dichotomy between host and guest, migrant and citizen, inclusion, and exclusion. In contrast, Buen Vivir is "a concept and lived practice that aspires to collective well-being through reciprocity, complementarity, and relationality principles […] inspired by Andean Indigenous cosmologies" (Jimenez et al., 2022, pp. 1636–1637). Buen Vivir is not conceptualized in the form of social hierarchies and relationships between individuals but rather as a form of being with others as part of "a unit of life made up of all forms of existence" (Villalba, 2013, p. 1430). Considering migrants and refugees as an intrinsic part of the community, the natural environment, and the land, implies a relationship of equality and interdependence that challenges the perceptions of migrants and refugees as the other. As such, Buen Vivir can foster a more holistic, inclusive, and less Eurocentric approach to migrant and refugee inclusion and participation in the Andean region that complements Western notions of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity. In addition, the connection to land, rather the territorial nation state, differs from the Eurocentric perspective of migrant and refugee inclusion in an imagined national community (Anderson, 1991).

Ubuntu

Ubuntu is a pan-African concept, philosophy, value, belief system, and mindset governing many African people's ways of life (Mugumbate, 2020). It has been one of the cornerstones of community action and thinking across many African societies (Hailey, 2008; Nyathu, 2004). The concept originates from an isiZulu proverb, *Umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu*, which translates as “a person being a person through other people” (Mlondo, 2022, p. 1). Today, the word ubuntu is common to languages and dialects in the Nguni language group spoken in parts of South Africa, western Cameroon, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Uganda, Kenya, and southern Somalia (Mojolo, 2019; Nurse, 2006). There are various expressions and a plethora of definitions of ubuntu among African societies. Generally, however, ubuntu signifies compassion, reciprocity, dignity, harmony, and humanity to create and maintain a community with justice (Hankela, 2015; Moyo & Osunkunle, 2021; Nussbaum, 2003). Ubuntu implies that people are bound together in a delicate web of interdependencies that emphasize values related to human nature, humanity, connectedness, and collective consciousness to cultivate a peaceful, productive, ethical, and sustainable society (Makalela, 2018). Individual security, safety, and well-being depend on ensuring such for others (Akinola & Uzodike, 2018).

Rooted in African humanism of mutual respect (Kayira, 2015), ubuntu offers an alternative to Western individualistic and utilitarian philosophies and corresponding social and political practices (Bolden, 2014). Politically, ubuntu educates people to act with social responsibility to advance Africa's renewal (Thakhathi & Netshitangani, 2020). In this way, ubuntu has been central to African efforts of decolonization (Estifanos et al., 2020; Rodrigues, 2020). The ubuntu principle implies that Africans can draw strength from their diversity, honour its rich and varied traditions and cultures, and work together to develop, protect, and benefit those around them (Kayira, 2015). Swanson (2015) argues that ubuntu philosophies provide alternatives to Western ideologies that are implicated in current global injustices and ongoing colonization.

In the context of migration, ubuntu fosters connectedness and common humanity within communities with shared experiences of migration, displacement, and diaspora (Nussbaum, 2003). A key component of ubuntu is the idea of an “extroverted community” (Onebunne, 2019), where locals encounter outsiders with genuine love (Chowdhury et al., 2021). The resulting unity between locals and outsiders provides a basis for peace, harmony, justice, and freedom based on social diversity (Ewuoso & Hall, 2019; Rapatsa, 2014).

Uganda's open-door policy to refugees reflects these ubuntu principles. According to the United Nations, Uganda's open-door policy is based on the traditional concepts of African hospitality, which differs from more restrictive Eurocentric informed approaches for managing migration flows (Momodu, 2019). For the Ugandan government to maintain its open-door refugee policy, it depends on the willingness of local communities to offer their land for the settlement of refugees. Correspondingly, local communities in different regions of Uganda such as the West Nile region have voluntarily given away their lands, and their generosity has even gone so far that refugees now outnumber residents in Adjumani District (Vogelsang, 2017). While the Ugandan government and communities provide refugees with land, the refugees are encouraged to contribute to their own sustenance, and improve and support their livelihoods, and in this way contribute to Uganda's social and economic development (Ronald, 2020). In traditional African thinking, ubuntu encourages embracing guests and strangers. In contrast to the Eurocentric viewpoint that emphasizes individualism, the African perspective related to ubuntu espouses harmony and collectivity (Venter, 2004).

Johanne Mhlanga (2020) argues that ubuntu resonates with the 1951 Refugee Convention principles of non-discrimination, non-penalization, non-refoulement (non-return), and flexible refugee movement to facilitate interaction with destination communities. Ubuntu values and principles challenge Eurocentric notions of human security that place the nation state at the center of security. In contrast, ubuntu places the human being at the center of security efforts. In this

context, human security entails the provision of protection to individuals and communities that are at risk because of events beyond their control in a way that is institutionalized, responsive, and preventative instead of being episodic, rigid, and reactive (Odok, 2019).

Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper, we examined the concepts of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity in the migration literature and found that the application of these concepts continues to perpetuate Eurocentric perspectives. In addition, we explored Buen Vivir and ubuntu as non-Eurocentric alternative concepts. Rather than replacing the concepts of hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity, however, we suggest positioning these concepts in dialogue with Buen Vivir and ubuntu. In doing so, we seek to open the possibility of bringing other ways of knowing into the scholarly discussion of migrant and refugee inclusion.

We recognize that our selection of the concepts of Buen Vivir and ubuntu was arbitrary. Other concepts exist that can also serve a similar purpose. For example, the Arabic definition of the term “neighbour” seems to offer a similar complexity and heterogeneity as Buen Vivir and ubuntu compared to binary European expressions:

> A clear example of this schism of interpretation is embodied in the very definition of the term “neighbor” offered in Lisan Al-Arab, the authoritative and encyclopaedic Arabic dictionary: The one whose house is next to yours, the stranger, the partner, the beneficiary, the ally, the supporter, the spouse, the intimate parts, the house that is closer to the coast, the good, the bad, the hypocrite, the changeable, the kind (Berg & Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 2018, p. 4).

We hypothesize that there are other concepts outside the European tradition that can inform migration studies and contribute to developing new ideas of migrant and refugee inclusion. Further research should seek to identify such concepts.

Interestingly, such alternative concepts may also share features with Eurocentric terms such as hospitality, sanctuary, and solidarity. Ubuntu, for example, resonates with a Kantian interpretation of solidarity toward migrants and refugees that emphasizes common humanity and equality, Hume’s views of solidarity related to compassion, and Hegelian perspectives of relationality (Bauder & Juffs, 2020). In addition, ubuntu also connects to the Western ideas of human rights and social, economic, and political justice (Akinola & Uzodike, 2018; Murithi, 2006, p. 14). However, ubuntu has also been central to decolonization in Africa because it respects the particularities of the beliefs and practices of African societies. Similarly, while Buen Vivir originates from a distinct Andean Indigenous worldview, it shares important ethical features with the concept of migrant solidarity in the tradition of Hegel and Marx. The conceptualization of Buen Vivir as an alternative to capitalist exploitation opens opportunities for dialogue with critical approaches aiming to challenge power asymmetries and social and economic injustices, as in the case of migrant solidarity.

Despite their potential contributions to the literature, neither ubuntu nor Buen Vivir have yet received much attention among migration scholars. In fact, ubuntu philosophies may be fast disappearing in today's individualistic African societies that have been disrupted by colonialism and capitalism (Fagunwa, 2019). Consequently, ubuntu may become less relevant as a social practice related to migration. Buen Vivir has been actively promoted by Andean governments in the political left as a socially, culturally, and environmentally responsible model of development. In particular, it has been applied as a guiding principle in national development plans, such as in National Plan for Buen Vivir (PNBV) in Ecuador (Calisto Friant & Langmore, 2015) and in rural communities (Chassagne, 2021). There is potential for the application of Buen Vivir in the local

urban context. As the number of migrants within Africa and Latin America continue to rise (Cedillo González & Espín Ocampo, 2021), the migration literature can benefit from exploring the relevance and application of non-Western concepts such as Buen Vivir and ubuntu in the context of migrant and refugee inclusion. This exploration could be a critical step towards decolonizing migration studies.

References

Achiume, E. T. (2019). Migration as Decolonization. *Stanford Law Review*, *71*, 1509.

Agnew, J. (1994). The Territorial Trap: The Geographical Assumptions of International Relations Theory. *Review of International Political Economy*, *1*, 53–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692299408434268

Agustín, Ó. G., & Jørgensen, M. B. (Eds.). (2016). *Solidarity Without Borders: Gramscian Perspectives on Migration and Civil Society Alliances*. Pluto Press.

Agustín, Ó. G., & Jørgensen, M. B. (2019). *Solidarity and the "Refugee Crisis" in Europe* (1st ed.). Springer International Publishing: Imprint: Palgrave Pivot. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91848-8

Akinola, A. O., & Uzodike, U. O. (2018). Ubuntu and the Quest for Conflict Resolution in Africa. *Journal of Black Studies*, *49*(2), 91–113. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934717736186

Altmann, P. (2017). Sumak Kawsay as an Element of Local Decolonization in Ecuador. *Latin American Research Review*, *52*(5), 749–759. https://doi.org/10.25222/larr.242

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso.

Artaraz, K., & Calestani, M. (2015). "suma qamaña" in bolivia: Indigenous understandings of well-being and their contribution to a post-neoliberal paradigm. *Latin American Perspectives*, *42*(5), 216–233. https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582X14547501

Baban, F., & Rygiel, K. (2017). Living with Others: Fostering Radical Cosmopolitanism Through Citizenship Politics in Berlin. *Ethics & Global Politics*, *10*(1), 98–116. https://doi.org/10.1080/16544951.2017.1391650

Bagelman, J. (2016). *Sanctuary City: A Suspended State*. Springer.

Bau, I. (1994). Cities of refuge: No federal preemption of ordinances restricting local government cooperation with the INS. *La Raza Law Journal*, *7*, 50–71.

Bauder, H. (2017a). *Migration Borders Freedom*. Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Migration-Borders-Freedom-1st-Edition/Bauder/p/book/9781138195608

Bauder, H. (2017b). Sanctuary Cities: Policies and Practices in International Perspective. *International Migration*, *55*(2), 174–187. https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12308

Bauder, H. (2019). Urban Sanctuary and Solidarity in a Global Context: How Does Africa Contribute to the Debate? *MIASA Working Papers on Migration, Mobility, and Forced Displacement*. https://www.ug.edu.gh/mias-africa/miasa-working-papers-migration-mobility-and-forced-displacement

Bauder, H. (2022). *From Sovereignty to Solidarity: Reimagining Human Migration*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Bauder, H., & Gonzalez, D. A. (2018). Municipal Responses to 'Illegality': Urban Sanctuary across National Contexts. *Social Inclusion*, *6*(1), 124–134. https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v6i1.1273

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

Bauder, H., Lujan, O., & Hannan, C.-A. (2018). Internationally mobile academics: Hierarchies, hegemony, and the geo-scientific imagination. *Geoforum*, *89*, 52–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.01.004

Bauder, H., & Mueller, R. (2023). Westphalian Vs. Indigenous Sovereignty: Challenging Colonial Territorial Governance. *Geopolitics*, *28*(1), 156–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2021.1920577

Beckett, G. (2014). The Art of Not Governing Port-au-Prince. *Social and Economic Studies*, *63*(5), 31–57.

Berg, M. L., & Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E. (2018). Introduction to the Issue: Encountering Hospitality and Hostility. *Migration and Society*, *1*(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.3167/arms.2018.010102

Bolden, R. (2014). Ubuntu. In D. Coghlan & M. Brydon-Miller, *Encyclopedia of Action Research*. Sage. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259849297_Ubuntu

Boudou, B. (2020). Migration and the Duty of Hospitality: A Genealogical Sketch. *Transitions: Journal of Transient Migration*, *4*(2), 257–274. https://doi.org/10.1386/tjtm_00026_1

Bulley, D. (2016). *Migration, Ethics and Power: Spaces Of Hospitality In International Politics*. SAGE.

Calisto Friant, M., & Langmore, J. (2015). The Buen Vivir: A Policy to Survive the Anthropocene? *Global Policy*, *6*(1), 64–71. https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12187

Cedillo González, C., & Espín Ocampo, J. (Eds.). (2021). *Human displacement from a global South perspective: Migration dynamics in Latin America, Africa and the Middle East*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Chamberlain, J. A. (2020). Responsibility for Migrants: From Hospitality to Solidarity. *Political Theory*, *48*(1), 57–83. https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591719877543

Chapman, E. (2023). Revocalising human geography: Decolonial language geographies beyond the nation-state. *Progress in Human Geography*, *47*(1), 24–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/03091325221131852

Chassagne, N. (2021). *Buen vivir as an alternative to sustainable development: Lessons from Ecuador*. Routledge.

Chomsky, A. (2021). *Central America's Forgotten History: Revolution, Violence, and the Roots of Migration*. Beacon Press.

Chowdhury, Wahab, Rashid, Saad, Roy, Hamidi, & Ahmad. (2021). *Ubuntu Philosophy: 'I Am Because We Are' – A Road to 'Individualism' to Global Solidarity*. https://www.igi-global.com/chapter/ubuntu-philosophy/281428

Cloke, P., & Johnston, R. (2004). *Spaces of Geographical Thought: Deconstructing Human Geography's Binaries*. SAGE.

Collins, F. L. (2022). Geographies of Migration Ii: Decolonising Migration Studies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 03091325221100826. https://doi.org/10.1177/03091325221100826

Cubillo-Guevara, A. P., Hidalgo-Capitán, A. L., & García-Álvarez, S. (2016). El buen vivir como alternativa al desarrollo para América Latina. *Iberoamerican Journal of Development Studies*, *5*(2), 30–57.

Daley, P., Kamata, N., & Singo, L. (2018). Undoing Traceable Beginnings: Citizenship and Belonging among Former Burundian Refugees in Tanzania. *Migration and Society*, *1*(1), 22–35. https://doi.org/10.3167/arms.2018.010104

Darling, J. (2009). A City of Sanctuary: The Relational Re-Imagining of Sheffield's Asylum Politics. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *35*(1), 125–140.

Darling, J. (2014). From Hospitality to Presence. *Peace Review*, *26*(2), 162–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/10402659.2014.906872

Darling, J., & Bauder, H. (Eds.). (2019). *Sanctuary Cities and Urban Struggles: Rescaling Migration, Citizenship, and Rights*. Manchester University Press. https://manchesteruniversitypress.co.uk/9781526134912

Daskalaki, I., & Leivaditi, N. (2018). Education and Hospitality in Liminal Locations for Unaccompanied Refugee Youths in Lesvos. *Migration and Society*, *1*(1), 51–65. https://doi.org/10.3167/arms.2018.010106

Dausner, R. (2018). *Humanity and Hospitality: An Approach to Theology in the Times of Migration*. https://doi.org/10.30674/scripta.70067.

della Porta, D. (2018). *Solidarity Mobilizations in the "Refugee Crisis": Contentious Moves*. Springer International Publishing AG.

Derrida, J. (2000). Hostipitality. *Angelaki*, *5*(3), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/09697250020034706

Derrida, J. (2001). *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* (M. Dooley & Hughes, Trans.). Taylor & Francis Group.

Díaz, S. P. (2019). Undocumented Migration From the Other Perspective: Coloniality, Subaltern Subject, and Migrant Mapping. *Chicana/o Latina/o Law Review*, *36*(1). https://doi.org/10.5070/C7361042816

Estifanos, Alemu, Negussie, Ero, Mengistu, Addissie, Gebrehiwot, Yifter, Melkie, Gebrekiros, Kotecho, Soklaridis, Cartmill, Whitehead, & Wondimagegn. (2020). I exist because of we': Shielding as a communal ethic of maintaining social bonds during the COVID-19 response in Ethiopia. *BMJ*, *5*(7). http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003204

Ewuoso, C., & Hall, S. (2019). Core aspects of ubuntu: A systematic review. *South African Journal of Bioethics and Law*, *12*(2), 93–103. https://doi.org/10.7196/SAJBL.2019.v12i2.679

Fagunwa, T. (2019). *Ubuntu: Revisiting an Endangered African Philosophy in Quest of a Pan-Africanist Revolutionary Ideology*. https://www.mdpi.com/2313-5778/3/3/45

Featherstone, D. (2012). *Solidarity: Hidden Histories and Geographies of Internationalism*. Zed Books.

Featherstone, D. (2013). Black internationalism, anti-fascism and the makings of solidarity. *Soundings*, *55*, 94–107.

Gregory, D. (1996). *Geographical imaginations*. Blackwell.

Gudynas, E. (2011). Buen Vivir: Today's tomorrow. *Development*, *54*(4), 441–447.

Gudynas, E. (2019). Value, growth, development: South American lessons for a new ecopolitics. *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*, *30*(2), 234–243.

Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, E. (2013). Domestic Work-Affective Labour: On Heteronormativity and the Coloniality of Labour Within the Context of Eu Migration Policies. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, *45*, 123–134.

Hailey, J. (2008). *Ubuntu: A literature review.* [Document]. Tutu Foundation. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=5af48f144b75fd4662b36934e26b52bdf0629e97

Hankela, E. (2015). Elaborating on ubuntu in a Johannesburg inner-city church. *Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis*, *26*, 366–378. https://doi.org/10.30674/scripta.67462

Humphris, R. (2022). Legacies of British Imperialism in the Contemporary UK Asylum–Welfare Nexus. *Social Sciences*, *11*(10), Article 10. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci11100432

Jimenez, A., Delgado, D., Merino, R., & Argumedo, A. (2022). A Decolonial Approach to Innovation? Building Paths Towards Buen Vivir. *The Journal of Development Studies*, *58*(9), 1633–1650. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2022.2043281

Kant, I. (1795). *Zum ewigen Frieden*. http://gutenberg.spiegel.de/buch/zum-ewigen-frieden-8301/1

Kassa, D. G. (2019). *Refugee Spaces and Urban Citizenship in Nairobi: Africa's Sanctuary City* (Vol. 32). Lexington Books.

Kayira, J. (2015). (Re)creating spaces for uMunthu: Postcolonial theory and environmental education in southern Africa. *Environmental Education Research*, *21*(1), 106–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2013.860428

Kelz, R. (2015). Political Theory and Migration. Concepts of non-sovereignty and solidarity. *movements. Journal for Critical Migration and Border Regime Studies*, *1*(2). http://movements-journal.org/issues/02.kaempfe/03.kelz--political-theory-migration-non-sovereignty-solidarity.html

LaDuke, W. (1999). *All our relations: Native struggles for land and life*. South End.

Landau, L. B. (2010). Inclusion in Shifting Sands: Rethinking Mobility and Belonging in African Cities. In C. W. Kihato, M. Massoumi, & B. A. Ruble (Eds.), *Urban Diversity: Space,*

Culture, and Inclusive Pluralism in Cities Worldwide (pp. 169–186). Johns Hopkins Univ Pr.

Landau, L. B., & Bakewell, O. (2018). Introduction: Forging a Study of Mobility, Integration and Belonging in Africa. *Forging African Communities*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-58194-5_1

Landau, L. B., & Kihato, C. W. (2020). The Informalisation of Migration Governance Across Africa's Urban Archipelagos. In *Routledge Handbook of Migration and Development* (1st ed., pp. 157–167). Routledge.

Lippert, R. K. (2005). *Sanctuary, Sovereignty, Sacrifice: Canadian Sanctuary Incidents, Power and Law*. UBC Press.

Lockwood, C., dos Santos, K. B., & Pap, R. (2019). Practical Guidance for Knowledge Synthesis: Scoping Review Methods. *Asian Nursing Research*, *13*(5), 287–294. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anr.2019.11.002

Makalela, L. (2018). *Community elders' narrative accounts of ubuntu translanguaging: Learning and teaching in African education*. *64*, 823–843.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1969). *Mannifest Der Kommunistischen Partei*.

Massey, D. S. (2018). The perils of seeing twenty-first century migration through a twentieth-century lens. *International Social Science Journal*, *68*(227–228), 101–104. https://doi.org/10.1111/issj.12173

McGregor, D. (2005). Traditional ecological knowledge: An Anishnabe woman's perspective. *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice.*, *29*(2), 103-109.

Mellino, M. (2016). Gramsci in Slices: Race, Colonialism, Migration and the Postcolonial Gramsci. In Ó. G. Agustín & M. B. Jørgensen, *Solidarity Without Borders: Gramscian Perspectives on Migration and Civil Society Alliances* (pp. 58–75). Pluto Press.

Merino, R. (2016). An alternative to "alternative development"?: Buen vivir and human development in andean countries. *Oxford Development Studies*, *44*(3), 271–286. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2016.1144733

Mhlanga, J. (2020). Refugee protection in the era of complex migratory flows: A reflection on ubuntu and social work practice. *African Journal of Social Work*, *10*(1), Article 1.

Missbach, A., Adiputera, Y., & Prabandari, A. (2018). Is Makassar a 'Sanctuary City'? Migration Governance in Indonesia After the 'Local Turn.' *Advances in Southeast Asian Studies*, *11*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.14764/10.ASEAS-0003

Mlondo, N. (2022). *Umuntu Ngumuntu Ngabantu (a Person is a Person Because of/or Through Others) and the Notion of Inclusive Education* (p. 13). https://www.igi-global.com/chapter/umuntu-ngumuntu-ngabantu-a-person-is-a-person-because-ofor-through-others-and-the-notion-of-inclusive-education/297870

Mojolo, A. (2019). Ubuntu in the Christian theology and praxis of Archbishop Desmond Tutu and its implications for global justice and human rights. Ubuntu and Reconstitutions of Community. In *Ubuntu and the Reconstitution of Community* (pp. 21–39). Indiana University Press.

Momodu, S. (2019). Uganda stands out in refugees hospitality. *Africa Renewal*. https://www.un.org/africarenewal/magazine/december-2018-march-2019/uganda-stands-out-refugees-hospitality

Moyo, L., & Osunkunle, O. (2021). *Exploring the Interface between Discrimination of Immigrants and Ubuntu Concept in South Africa: A Case of African Migrants in Alice Township of the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa*. https://journals.co.za/doi/epdf/10.31920/2516-5305/2021/18n2a2

Mugumbate, J. (2020). Samkange's theory of Ubuntu and its contribution to a decolonised social work pedagogy. In *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Pedagogies for Social Work*. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781351002042-

34/samkange-theory-ubuntu-contribution-decolonised-social-work-pedagogy-jacob-mugumbate
Murithi, T. (2006). African Approaches to Building Peace and Social Solidarity. *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, *6*(2), 9–33.
Nurse, D. (2006). *"Bantu Languages". In Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. 2nd Edition*.
Nussbaum, B. (2003). African culture and ubuntu: Reflections of a South African in America. *World Business Academy*, *17*, 1–12.
Nyathu, N. (2004). *The Ubuntu dialogue: Decolonising discourse and dualism in organisation studies* [Doctoral dissertation, Masters Thesis]. Warwick University, UK.
Odok, G. E. (2019). Economic or climate migrants? Human security experiences of Nigerian migrants in South Africa. *Journal of Conflict and Social Transformation*, *8*(2), 15.
Onebunne, J. (2019). IGWEBUIKE: An African Metaphysics of Communal Strength. *IGWEBUIKE: An African Journal of Arts and Humanities*, *5*(6).
Özdemir, G. Ş. (2022). Urban solidarity typology: A comparison of European cities since the crisis of refuge in 2015. *Cities*, 103976. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2022.103976
Pagden, A. (2003). Human Rights, Natural Rights, and Europe's Imperial Legacy. *Political Theory*, *31*(2), 171–199.
Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. OUP Oxford.
Picozza, F. (2021). *The Coloniality of Asylum: Mobility, Autonomy and Solidarity in the Wake of Europe's Refugee Crisis*. Rowman & Littlefield. https://rowman.com/ISBN/9781538150108/The-Coloniality-of-Asylum-Mobility-Autonomy-and-Solidarity-in-the-Wake-of-Europe's-Refugee-Crisis
Pile, S. (1994). Masculinism, the Use of Dualistic Epistemologies and Third Spaces*. *Antipode*, *26*(3), 255–277. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.1994.tb00251.x
Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology*, *15*(2), 215–232. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005
Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality. *Cultural Studies*, *21*(2–3), 168–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601164353
Quijano, A. (2011). "Bien vivir": Entre el "desarrollo" y la des/colonialidad del poder (Tema Central). In *Ecuador Debate. Acerca del Buen Vivir* (Vol. 84, pp. 77–87). Centro Andino de Acción Popular CAAP. http://hdl.handle.net/10469/3529
Ranta, E. (2018). *Vivir bien as an alternative to neoliberal globalization: Can indigenous terminologies decolonize the state?.* https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315180441
Rapatsa, M. (2014). A Perspective on the Principle of Social Solidarity in South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *5*, 966–973. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n27p966
Ridgley, J. (2011). Refuge, Refusal, and Acts of Holy Contagion: The City as a Sanctuary for Soldiers Resisting the Vietnam War. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, *10*(2), Article 2.
Rodrigues, L. (2020). Ubuntu and Moral Epistemology: The Case of the Rhodes Must Fall Movement. *Philosophia Africana*, 64. https://doi.org/10.5325/philafri.19.1.0040
Ronald, M. A. (2020). An assessment of economic and environmental impacts of refugees in Nakivale, Uganda. *Migration and Development*, *11*(3), 433–449. https://doi.org/10.1080/21632324.2020.1787105
Salifu, M. (2022). *Sanctuary and Solidarity Cities in Global Context: Copenhagen, Denmark and Accra, Ghana as a Case Study* [University of Aalborg]. https://projekter.aau.dk/projekter/files/484263631/FINAL_DRAFT__10_SEMESTER_THESIS_PRJECT.pdf

Samanani, F. (2017). Introduction to Special Issue: Cities of Refuge and Cities of Strangers: Care and Hospitality in the City. *City & Society*, *29*(2), 242–259. https://doi.org/10.1111/ciso.12125

Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide* (1 edition). Routledge.

Sarrami-Foroushani, P., Travaglia, J., Debono, D., Clay-Williams, R., & Braithwaite, J. (2015). Scoping meta-review: Introducing a new methodology. *Clinical and Translational Science*, *8*(1), 77–81.

Siim, B., & Meret, S. (2020). The Politics and Art of Solidarity: The Case of Trampoline House in Copenhagen. In F. Baban & K. Rygiel (Eds.), *Fostering Pluralism through Solidarity Activism in Europe* (pp. 31–58). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56894-8_2

Squire, V. (2022). Hidden geographies of the 'Mediterranean migration crisis.' *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, *40*(5), 1048–1063. https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654420935904

Swanson, D. (2015). Ubuntu, Radical Hope, and an OntoEpistemology of Conscience. *Journal of Critical Southern Studies*, *3*, 1–23.

Thakhathi, A., & Netshitangani, T. (2020). *Ubuntu-as-Unity: Indigenous African proverbs as a 're-educating' tool for embodied social cohesion and sustainable development*. *18*(4). https://doi.org/10.1080/14725843.2020.1776592

Venter, E. (2004). The Notion of Ubuntu and Communalism in African Educational Discourse. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *23*, 149–160.

Villalba, U. (2013). Buen Vivir vs Development: A paradigm shift in the Andes? *Third World Quarterly*, *34*(8), 1427–1442. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2013.831594

Vogelsang, A. (2017). *Local Communities' Receptiveness to Host Refugees A Case Study of Adjumani District in times of a South Sudanese Refugee Emergency* [Utrecht University]. https://studenttheses.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/20.500.12932/27204/Thesis%20Ard%20Vogelsang.pdf?sequence=2

Wagner, A.-C. (2018). Giving Aid Inside the Home: Humanitarian House Visits, Performative Refugeehood, and Social Control of Syrians in Jordan. *Migration and Society*, *1*(1), 36–50. https://doi.org/10.3167/arms.2018.010105

Walia, H. (2013). *Undoing Border Imperialism*. AK Press.

Wilkinson, O. J. (2018). "It's Being, Not Doing": Hospitality and Hostility between Local Faith Actors and International Humanitarian Organizations in Refugee Response. *Migration and Society*, *1*(1), 111–126. https://doi.org/10.3167/arms.2018.010110

Yunkaporta, T. (2021). *Sand Talk: How Indigenous Thinking Can Save the World*. Harper Collins.