DOI: https://doi.org/10.2298/GEI2002397L
UDC 314.15(497.11)
Original research paper

Uršula Lipovec Čebron

Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Arts,
University of Ljubljana
Ursula.CebronLipovec@ff.uni-lj.si

Eva Fekonja

Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Arts,
University of Ljubljana
evafekonja@gmail.com

Tina Ivnik

Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Arts,
University of Ljubljana
tina.ivnik@ff.uni-lj.si

Criminalized Hospitality: The Case of Velika Kladuša

The article examines how discourses of hospitality towards migrants/refugees are changing in Velika Kladuša, a town in Bosnia and Herzegovina close to the Croatian border. Since 2018, this city has been confronted with the presence of a large number of people on the move, and has seen the development of a multi-layered tension between the spontaneous hospitality of the local population and the increasingly repressive policies of the European Union and restrictive local measures that criminalize not only migrants/refugees but also all forms of solidarity with them. In the introductory part of the article, the concept of hospitality is briefly analysed on the basis of concepts presented in various anthropological sources as well as in contemporary research on migration and hospitality. In the succeeding chapters we explore the dynamics that arise where hospitality intersects with the public and the private spheres. Our fieldwork material from Velika Kladuša have shown that the attitude of the local population towards migrants/refugees is influenced by the interference of authorities (police, inspectors, etc.) in the area of hospitality, and indicates a transformation of local hospitality practices towards migrants/refugees, which we have defined as a shift from open to criminalized hospitality. Under these changed circumstances, some residents of Velika Kladuša react to the criminalization of hospitality with acceptance, some by negotiating with it and others by openly opposing it.

Key words: migrants, refugees, criminalization of hospitality, Bosnia and Herzegovina, anthropology

⇦ Гласник Етнографског института САНУ LXVIII (2); 397–418 ⇨

Криминализовано гостопримство: случај Велике Кладуше

У раду се истражује како се мењају дискурси гостопримства према мигрантима/избеглицама у Великој Кладуши, граду у Босни и Херцеговини који се налази у близини хрватске границе. Од 2018. године, овај град се суочава са присуством великог броја људи у покрету, што доводи до развоја вишеслојне напетости између спонтаног гостопримства домаћег становништва и све репресивније политике Европске уније, као и рестриктивних локалних мера које криминализују не само мигранте/избеглице, већ и све облике солидарности са њима. У уводном делу рада анализира се концепт гостопримства на основу постојећих концепата изложених у различитим антрополошким изворима, као и у савременим истраживањима миграција и гостопримства. У даљем тексту истражујемо динамику која настаје тамо где долази до пресецања гостопримства са јавним и приватним сферама. Наш теренски материјал из Велике Кладуше показује да су ставови локалног становништва према мигрантима/избеглицама под утицајем мешања ауторитета (полиције, инспектора, итд.) у област гостопримства и указује на трансформацију локалних гостољубивих пракси према мигрантима/избеглицама, коју ми дефинишемо као прелазак од отвореног на криминализовано гостопримство. У оваквим промењеним околностима, поједини грађани Велике Кладуше реагују на криминализовано гостопримство прихватајући га, други преговарају о томе, док се неки отворено супротстављају.

Кључне речи: мигранти, избеглице, криминализација гостопримства, Босна и Херцеговина, антропологија

Introduction

The topic of hospitality is a constant in anthropology, as it has been of crucial importance to ethnographic research since the beginning of fieldwork as a method (Candea & Col 2012, S3). However, while the role of the anthropologist as a guest has been discussed in numerous anthropological texts (Malinowski 1992 [1922]; Mauss 1954 [1925]; Evans-Pritchard 1940; Geertz 1973; Pitt-Rivers 2012 [1977]; Herzfeld 1987; Rivière 2000; Stasch 2009; Candea & Col 2012; Candea 2012, etc.), it has rarely been a central theme of anthropological research. Exceptions include various works by Marcel Mauss (1954 [1925]), Michael Herzfeld (1987) and Julian Pitt-Rivers (2012 [1977]). Pitt-Rivers wrote about the law of hospitality nearly half a century ago. In his analysis, the guest is both sacred and dangerous, for he comes from an "'extraordinary' world" (Pitt-Rivers 2012 [1977], 518). The status of the guest therefore lies between that of a hostile stranger and that of a community member, so the guest is included in the community for practical rather than moral reasons. The law of hospitality is therefore based on the ambivalence between the unknown and the known world: it "imposes order through an appeal to the sacred, makes the unknown knowable, and replaces conflict by reciprocal honour. It does not eliminate the conflict altogether but places it in abeyance and prohibits its expression" (Pitt-Rivers 2012 [1977], 513). Pitt-Rivers' valuable insight is that the status of the guest is characterised by inequality and temporality. The guest can become a hostile stranger if he does not accept the temporality of his role and abuses the hospitality of the host by outstaying his welcome (Pitt-Rivers 2012 [1977], 516–517). In comparing a guest with a beggar, Pitt-Rivers finds that a

guest always needs to demonstrate his inequality and cannot claim any rights, lest he undermine his status and fall into the role of a hostile stranger (Pitt-Rivers 2012 [1977], 509).

Apart from the rare exceptions noted above, hospitality has long been a marginal topic for scholars in the social sciences and humanities. Until recently, the phenomenon had been widely examined only in hospitality studies (see Smith & Brent 2001; Lashley, Linch, & Morrison 2007; Lashley 2017). The provocative philosophical ideas of Jacques Derrida (1999; 2000a; 2000b; 2002; 2005) led to further interdisciplinary research on the topic (see Candea 2012; Shryock 2012; Jelnikar 2015; Bjelica 2018) and influenced research on hospitality in the context of migration (Rosello 2001; Germann Molz & Gibson 2007; Gibson 2007; Rozakou 2012; Harney 2017; Berg and Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2018; Carpi & Şenoğuz 2018).

In contrast to Pitt-Rivers' law of hospitality, Derrida introduces the concept of unconditional and absolute hospitality, which

> requires that I open up my home and that I give not only to the foreigner […], but to the absolute, unknown, anonymous other, and that I *give a place* to them, that I let them come, that I let them arrive, and take place in the place I offer them, without asking of them either reciprocity (entering into a pact) or even their names. The law of absolute hospitality commands a break with hospitality by right, with law or justice as rights (Derrida 2000a, 25).

Derrida places unconditional hospitality in opposition to conditional hospitality or the pact of hospitality, which is determined by norms, rights, duties, and power (Derrida 2000a, 76–77). The difference corresponds to a difference between the ethics and the politics of hospitality. Within the ethics of hospitality, hospitality is an infinite, unconditional, selfless and unlimited gift (in terms of time, place and sources), and goes beyond any kind of law. In contrast, the politics of hospitality always include limitations, such as managing and calculating limited resources, national borders, state sovereignty, etc. (Rosello 2001, 11). Although Derrida is aware of the unattainability of the ideal, he introduces it as a challenge, provocation or invitation to search for better ways of coexisting with diversity (Germann Molz & Gibson 2007; Bjelica 2018, 39).

Various scholars (Rosello 2001; Gibson 2007; Rozakou 2012; Harney 2017; Carpi & Şenoğuz 2018), who have examined the link between hospitality and migration were mostly looking at the effect that – to use Derrida's syntagma – the politics of hospitality have on the life of migrants/refugees, and at the characteristics of hospitality rhetoric in various countries. As noted by some of these scholars (Rosello 2001; Rozakou 2012; Carpi & Şenoğuz 2018), hospitality became a focal concept in the area of asylum and migration politics. They pointed out that the concept of hospitality is used by politicians as well as researchers who continue to carelessly write about "host countries" and "reception" (Rozakou 2012, 566), even though there are fewer and fewer signs of hospitality since migration policies are becoming increasingly restrictive and xenophobic. Mireille Rosello (2001, 6) writes that hospitality is part of the idealized mythic identity of France as well as any other

national identity, and the same is emphasized by Sarah Gibson (2007), who analyses the discourse on national hospitality in Great Britain. She writes that this discourse is legitimized by using various examples of hospitality from history, while at the same time forgetting inhospitable historical events (Gibson 2007, 161). Simultaneously with the discourse on hospitality, the author notes the rise of concerns about the vulnerability of the country, which is "endangered by ungrateful strangers" undermining the mythological hospitality of Great Britain. The discourse on hospitality therefore serves to justify the increasingly restrictive border regimes (Gibson 2007, 159–160): "The very openness to the other, which Britain prides itself on, paradoxically raises anxieties over Britain's vulnerability to the other" (Gibson 2007, 161).

Rosello argues that constructing migrants/refugees as guests and a nation as a host is a "naturalized paradigm" (Rosello 2013, 127). She points out that hospitality as such is often transformed into identity politics, where some subjects are identified as guests and others as hosts, no matter what they are doing in the given context. Their identities as guests and hosts are therefore consolidated and can even be inherited, as is the case with children of migrants (Rosello 2013, 127). Apart from that, constructing the migrant as a guest blurs the reasons why they migrated. Rosello points out the inadequacy of talking about economic migrants as guests, as their presence in a country has nothing to do with hospitality: their labour is not a gift to the employer, nor is the contract between the employer and the employee an expression of the employer's generosity. In political rhetoric, the use of "hospitality as metaphor blurs the distinction between a discourse of rights and a discourse of generosity, the language of social contracts and the language of excess and gift-giving" (Rosello 2001, 9).

Moreover, it seems important to emphasize the link between hospitality and control. Nicholas De Maria Harney (2017, 3) notes that institutionalized forms of hospitality are modes with which countries react to the arrival of migrants/refugees and maintain social order. For him, hospitality "as the choreographed encounter between host and guest, dramatizes reciprocity and temporarily resolves the moral ambiguity of this threatening encounter through the welcoming performance" (Harney 2017, 2). Securitization discourse presents migrants/refugees as a threat to national security, which is why the welcoming performance towards them takes the form of control through the use of biometric measurements, registration and reception centres, integration, language courses and visa forms. The welcoming performance operates as a way to control the duration of the guest's visit and thus "to insure a manageable social encounter and to maintain the host's sovereignty" (Harney 2017, 3; see also Rozakou 2012).

The various aspects of hospitality, however, cannot be reduced to an ideological rhetoric of national hospitality and institutions related to migration policies. Hospitality exists in the political rhetoric and laws of countries, as well as in social practices of individuals, which "exist through constantly reinvented practices of everyday life" (Rosello 2001, 7). The practices of hospitality are never entirely private, especially when they are hospitable towards migrants/refugees, because they exist in categories defined by the state: "the host's house is a subset of the national

territory and […] private gestures of hospitality are always a subcategory of national hospitality" (Rosello 2001, 37). In her book *Postcolonial Hospitality: Immigrant as Guest* (2001), Rosello analyses "subversive" and "dissident" acts of hospitality towards migrants/refugees in France. She argues that the French state has introduced new legislation to control hospitality and has started to persecute its citizens who accept undocumented migrants into their homes on the grounds of "the crime of hospitality" (Rosello 2001, 43). In this way, the state has partially transferred the power to control migrants/refugees to private homes, and disassociated hospitality with personal notions of generosity, while associating it with the country's laws (Rosello 2001, 39).

In this article, we analyse hospitality as a multi-layered and inherently contested concept that contains both the rhetoric of generosity and mechanisms of control. The dynamics between local authorities, the militarization of the European border, and the position of migrants/refugees in Velika Kladuša will be analysed through ethnographic documentation of the changes that occurred in the hospitable acts of the locals in 2018 and 2019. We have divided these changes into two phases, an "open hospitality" phase and a phase of "criminalized hospitality".

Methodology

This paper is based on research carried out in recent years at several locations along the Western Balkan migration route: in February and April 2015 at various locations in Serbia[1] and in April[2] and November 2019[3] in Velika Kladuša, a border town in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Following the changes in policies and the attitude of the locals towards migrants/refugees traveling along the Western Balkan Route and modifications of the trails migrants/refugees follow, we started to observe a similar dynamic in several countries along the Western Balkan Route and decided to document this dynamic in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The topic of hospitality often emerged during our previous fieldwork among local people who had contact with migrants/refugees in Serbia, but was significantly more present in Velika Kladuša. Since the theme of "gostoprimstvo" or hospitality towards mi-

[1] In February and April 2015, field research was conducted at three Serbian reception centres for asylum seekers (Bogovađa, Krnjača, and Banja Koviljača) by undergraduate and graduate students from the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana and by Sarah Lunaček and Uršula Lipovec Čebron (in the role of mentors and researchers).

[2] The fieldwork in Velika Kladuša was conducted by Uršula Lipovec Čebron and her students in the course *Anthropology of Migration* at the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

[3] The research was carried out by Tina Ivnik, Uršula Lipovec Čebron and graduate students enrolled in the course *Contemporary Migration, Citizenship, and Ethnic Minorities* at the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana (Lea Anclin, Martin Bučalič, Eva Fekonja, Maruša Kosi, Karin Robin, Ana Isabel Rodrigues Carneiro, Sofia Margarida Sousa Martins, Katja Tomc, Joanna Urbańska and Eva Žgajner). All of the students' contributions to this article are cited.

grants/refugees arose spontaneously in so many conversations with local people during our first fieldwork in April 2019, we decided to focus our research in November 2019 entirely on this topic. However, in addition to the descriptions of local acts of hospitality in their homes and other places, another topic persistently emerged in our interviews with residents and migrants/refugees: the criminalization of hospitality acts and the numerous dilemmas, doubts and fears they felt in connection with it.

The main source of ethnographic material for this article was therefore the field research carried out in Velika Kladuša in November 2019. The authors and students conducted 35 semi-structured interviews with migrants/refugees, members of the local population (representatives of educational and religious institutions, employees of restaurants, bars and shops) and international volunteers or activists. In addition to the interviews documented in fieldwork diaries and recordings, other types of communication and conversations took place on various occasions (while accompanying migrants/refugees to shops, banks, the post office, helping them with cash withdrawals, etc.) and in precarious situations (occupied houses without electricity and running water, on the streets, in parks; with caution because of the presence of the police, in rare crowded and noisy bars that still allow migrants/refugees to enter).

As the term "gostoprimstvo" [i.e. hospitality] was used so persistently by our interlocutors in Velika Kladuša, we decided to use the concept of hospitality rather than solidarity, a term more commonly used in anthropological and sociological writings on migration. The concept of solidarity, especially concerning the criminalization of solidarity (Tazzioli 2018), has a very similar meaning to hospitality but was not used by our interlocutors in Velika Kladuša - with the exception of international volunteers or activists. Apart from the local perspective, there is also a conceptual reason to use this term. Although the comparison between solidarity and hospitality has not yet been dealt with by other researchers in the field of migration, it seems that the concept of hospitality has different motivations and exists in contexts other than solidarity, as we will argue below. Nevertheless, as will be made clear, we intend to take a critical approach to this concept, distinguishing between the rhetoric of national hospitality and individual hospitable acts and at the same time examining to what extent the concept of hospitality is appropriate in the context of the European buffer zone of Velika Kladuša.

Our own positionality as guests in Velika Kladuša enabled us to experience how hospitality towards us differed from hospitality towards migrants/refugees. However, a longer period of research would be required in order to investigate hospitality in Velika Kladuša more in-depth. The main limitation of our fieldwork stems from the fact that in the short period of our research we were able to analyse hospitality mostly on the basis of statements made by (and not on the basis of the actual practices of) our interlocutors. A similar drawback is that in 2019, the local hospitality acts were already being influenced by the increased pressure of local and state authorities. Therefore we were able to document the transformations in hospitality after they were already in process, whereas research conducted during the

previous months would have been crucial for understanding the reasons behind these transformations.

Hospitality in Velika Kladuša

The externalization of border and migration policies (Flynn 2013) used by the European Union to extend migration control to the countries of the global South has a history. For decades, responsibility for people moving towards the EU has been transferred to Turkey and the countries of North and Central Africa (see Lunaček 2019). Meanwhile, citizens of EU countries have been – unintentionally, unknowingly or out of indifference – contributing large sums of money[4] to keep migrants/refugees at a "safe" distance from the EU population (Andersson 2014). The externalization of the borders at the EU level is therefore nothing new. However, the extension of this externalization to Bosnia and Herzegovina has a unique significance for Slovenia and Croatia, as both countries are actively involved in this process. Many migrants/refugees who have been blocked in Bosnia and Herzegovina have repeatedly tried to pass into the territories of Croatia and Slovenia, from which they were forcibly and unlawfully pushed back by authorities. This new role of Slovenia and Croatia is also meaningful on the geopolitical level. Just few decades ago, all three countries were part of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY), while nowadays Slovenia and Croatia are exploiting the established mechanisms of the EU to transfer its responsibility for people on the move to economically and politically weaker countries. The responsibility of the Slovenian and Croatian authorities for the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina is therefore unambiguous.

The push-backs of migrants/refugees from the border regions of Slovenia (and increasingly also from central Slovenia) and Croatia (see Info Kolpa 2019, Border Violence Monitoring Network 2020) crucially contributed to the fact that contacts between the Bosnian population and migrants/refugees have become an inevitable part of their everyday life since 2018. Moreover, these push-backs ensured that migrants/refugees would become less and less visible to the inhabitants of Slovenia and Croatia. People from the border regions of these two countries usually detect them only through their traces (discarded clothing, food scraps, etc.) or in the form of shadows appearing at the edge of the forest, in secluded and remote areas. The lack of contact and indistinct perceptions of their traces and shadows are fertile ground for deepening anxiety and fear of local populations, thus solidifying xenophobic and racist media representations of migrants/refugees as criminals, rapists and terrorists. This invisibility of migrants/refugees changes when crossing the border into Bosnia and Herzegovina, where numerous migrants/refugees move among

[4] Simultaneously, the budget of Frontex (the European Border and Coast Guard Agency) grew: in 2005 it stood at 4 million euros (Božič 2016, 240), in 2017 it was already 280 million euros, and in the following year around 288 million euros, reaching more than 333 million euros in 2019 (Frontex 2019).

the population, thus putting local hospitality practices into question on a daily basis. Moreover, it is only on the other side of the Croatian-Bosnian border, in the territory outside the EU, that EU migration policy becomes materially present and its consequences are clearly visible. As Andrej Kurnik argues, Bosnia and Herzegovina is seen through the neocolonial gaze of the EU. The paradox lies in the fact that through the militarization and externalization of European borders, Bosnia and Herzegovina has become a "repository of people on the move" (Kurnik 2019, 22) while also being perceived as unable to deal independently with large numbers of migrants/refugees.

The externalization of the EU borders has strengthened and redefined the already existing marginality of Velika Kladuša (Urbańska 2019) and added a new chapter to its unusual history. The border between the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Empire – also known as the border between East and West – had been established for more than two centuries (1633–1878). After WWII, in 1950, the town of Velika Kladuša was part of the "Cazinska Buna" (the Cazin rebellion), the only organized peasant revolt against the communist authorities in the SFRY, which had introduced unpopular measures in this area. The uprising was punished with harsh countermeasures by the authorities, which caused the gradual deterioration of this area in the following decades, including several episodes of discrimination against its inhabitants (Križišnik Bukić 2017, 234–235). During the most recent Balkan war, Velika Kladuša also played an unusual role, as the city became the scene of an armed struggle among Muslims. Fikret Abdić, the central figure in the Agrokomerc banking scandal that traumatised Yugoslavia in 1987, declared the Autonomous Province of Western Bosnia in 1993 (Nation 2016) and set up camps in Velika Kladuša in order to imprison those who opposed the establishment of the Autonomous Province (Nation 2016). The fact that after being recognized as a war criminal and sentenced to imprisonment in Croatia Abdić was nevertheless elected Mayor of Velika Kladuša in 2016 is important to understanding the current political reality in Velika Kladuša (Hvalc & Andrinek 2017). The fact that he still holds this position represents a tangible continuity with the wartime period in this region.

This historically burdened and economically deprived town of 45,000 inhabitants, located a few kilometres from the Croatian border, now faces a mass of migrants/refugees.[5] Many of them are not permitted to stay in the nearby overcrowded Miral refugee camp, and spend their days gathering in Gradski park (City park) in the centre of the town or in the abandoned field near the town stadium. During the night they seek improvised shelters in the abandoned houses of Velika Kladuša that have neither running water nor electricity. Despite their extremely difficult living conditions in Velika Kladuša, during the conversations with them they stated that are not prepared to move to other parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina,

[5] In 2018 and 2019 local authorities and the European Commission recorded 59,000 arrivals in BiH, a significant increase over 2017 (European Commission 2020).

where they might encounter better circumstances, but are determined to wait in the close vicinity of the border for the right moment to "play the game".[6]

How can we understand hospitality in a place that is itself confronted with poverty and emigration, where the consequences of the externalized borders of the EU are noticeable at every turn and where the local authorities are "no longer in control of the situation" (Amnesty International 2019, 30)? Our fieldwork findings show that Velika Kladuša is becoming a scene of multifaceted tensions between the increasingly restrictive policies that criminalize not only migrants/refugees but also all forms of solidarity with them, and practices that oppose these policies, such as the spontaneous hospitality practices of the local population towards migrants/refugees, the activism of international volunteers, and the determination of migrants/refugees to cross borders and reach their destination countries. As a consequence of these tensions, the local hospitality practices are undergoing a rapid transformation, and can be analysed in two phases. The first phase can be defined as a phase of *open hospitality* in which state and local authorities do not interfere with private hospitality practices so they can exist without being disturbed. The second phase can be described as a phase of *criminalized hospitality*, where the acts of hospitality towards migrants/refugees expose local residents and activists to daily checks and threats from the police, visits by inspectors and steep fines.

Similar interventions by the state authorities in the private sphere and the criminalization of solidarity with migrants/refugees has also been observed in nearby Serbia (Stojić Mitrović & Meh 2015; Davy 2019) and in Croatia (Bužinkić & Hameršak 2018; Amnesty International 2019). Similar to the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in Croatia, researchers have observed that the first phase, after the arrival of refugees/migrants, was marked by politicians' calls for solidarity, which in the next phase turned into political rhetoric on the need to increase control over refugees and protect the national borders (Vidović 2016).

Open hospitality

The phase of open or uncontrolled hospitality in Bosnia and Herzegovina can be observed in 2018, when the country became part of the Western Balkan migration route. In this period various sources (Gadzo 2018; 24UR 2018) contrasted the lack of responsiveness of the local authorities with the extraordinary hospitality of the inhabitants of Velika Kladuša: "Locals together with international volunteers are warmly welcoming people at the Bosnian-Croatian border and are trying their best to support them and show solidarity." (Are You Syrious 2018). The situation was remembered in a similar way by the migrants/refugees who stated in our conversations: "The people here were very good"; "The inhabitants of Velika Kladuša were hospitable"; "The people here were willing to help" (people on the move, Velika Kladuša, November 9, 2019).

[6] The 'game' in the jargon of the migrants/refugees represents a hazardous attempt to cross into Croatian territory and the Croatian-Slovenian border without being pushed back into Bosnia and Herzegovina by the authorities.

Moreover, the analysis of the interviews with the local inhabitants clearly shows the tendency of the locals to compare their own refugee experience during the Balkan war with the situation of contemporary migrants/refugees in their city and develop empathy towards them. This attitude can be seen in the statement of a doorkeeper at the local library in his 60s: "these people are humans as we are and are refugees as we were", or the slogan "no one died of starvation in the war, so no one will die of starvation in peacetime" that was displayed at a local diner that began offering free meals to anyone in need upon the arrival of migrants/refugees in 2018. The diner owner's slogan can be understood as an evocation of life-saving solidarity during the war and at the same time as a mockery of the absurd situation of people starving at the EU's doorstep.

Furthermore, the ethnographic material demonstrate that the locals tend to identify some groups of migrants/refugees as "good guests" (Shryock 2012, 22) and are therefore willing to offer them different forms of hospitality. When asked straightforwardly how migrants/refugees were received by the residents of Velika Kladuša, an employee at a local cafe in her 40s replied:

> In the beginning, we opened the door to them, gave everything we could give. My daughter is a person with a big heart and she said to me, "Mom, let's give them dormeo [a type of mattress, author's note]." It was a new dormeo, we hardly ever used it. I said yes. We gave them this dormeo, since they had nowhere to sleep. We gave them food, clothes ... whatever we could (Velika Kladuša, November 8, 2019).

A close connection with the perception of hospitality as an important value in Islam, which is the prevailing religion in Velika Kladuša, also arose from our conversations with local inhabitants. The perception of hospitality as obligation is clear from the words of a local imam in his 30s:

> The guest has the right to stay day and night. That's when the host is obliged to treat the guest to the best he has. True hospitality means that a guest is hosted for three days and three nights. If hosted for more than three days, the host accomplishes a good job or *sadaka* (Velika Kladuša, November 9, 2019).

During the conversation the imam referred to one of the Hadiths[7] that states: "The Prophet Muhammad, a.s., said: 'Whoever believes in Allah and in the Day of Judgment, should serve *his guest* generously'" and thus equating the idea of a good Muslim with that of a hospitable Muslim. Therefore, hospitality in Islam does not mean generosity, but an obligation that applies both to the host to show hospitality and to the guest to accept it. Furthermore, the guest is holy in Islam because "when the guest enters into a house, the blessing of God enters with him" (Porić et. al 2015, 58.). In contrast, a person who does not offer hospitality is regarded as sinful, and accordingly, "the people who reject the guests do not have *hajra* [an ethical notion of good in Islam – author's note]" (Porić et. al 2015, 58).

[7] In the section entitled Good Manners and Forms.

The phase of open hospitality, which marks the first period after the arrival of large numbers of migrants/refugees, is not limited to areas where the majority population is Muslim. Although some of our interlocutors in Velika Kladuša emphasized that their hospitality arises from the Islamic tradition, other researchers have described similar attitude towards migrants/refugees in non-Muslim parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Leslie 2018), Serbia (Stojić Mitrović & Meh 2015) and Croatia (Pavić 2016). The Islamic tradition of hospitality in Velika Kladuša therefore seems to be interwoven with the regional cultural patterns of hospitality. Similar to the findings in other places along the Balkan migration route, in this first phase the state authorities did not interfere with the practices of hospitality in Velika Kladuša that took place in the homes of the local population, in local restaurants and bars.

Criminalization of hospitality

While the records on events in Velika Kladuša in 2018 still present a positive picture regarding the hospitality of the locals towards migrants/refugees, in the following months this began to change. Over the course of 2019 signs such as "Entry forbidden to foreigners without documents" (Krajina.ba 2019) began to appear on the entrances of cafes and restaurants, some institutions placed bars on their windows, and the doors of certain stores remained closed until the shop keeper checked the identity of the person standing outside. Due to our short-term research that began only in 2019 and scarce information from secondary sources, it is difficult to determine the full scope of the reasons for this change. One of them is clearly the increased xenophobic and racist discourse on the national and regional level that arose as a response to the fortification of the EU borders (Are You Syrious 2019) and the massive push-backs from Slovenia and Croatia. The other is the increased pressure from the local authorities (police, inspectors) who from 2019 onwards began to sweepingly impose steep fines[8] on the local inhabitants for providing migrants/refugees with accommodation and food. However, it would be a simplification to understand this situation purely as a top-down process. In the situation where increased numbers of migrants/refugees without shelter are continuously present in the small town of Velika Kladuša, our local interlocutors admitted that some of them called for or approved of interventions by the authorities, since they perceived the situation as unbearable. Meanwhile they were constantly emphasizing the fact that the presence of migrants/refugees was – in their opinion – supposed to be a temporary phenomenon, but was revealed to be more persistent, as the imam states:

[8] From the beginning of 2019, many owners of apartments and houses who provided shelter to migrants/refugees faced misdemeanour charges and fines of up to 1,000 euros from the Una-Sana Canton Inspectorate. On the basis of these charges, the Una-Sana Inspectorate collected fines of 30,000 euros in the first six months of 2019 (Al Jazeera Balkans, July 18, 2019).

> In the beginning, we accepted the refugees. We would buy them food, warm socks; we opened the door of the mosque, so they were able to sleep there. […] We also asked the people to take them into their homes. Many people responded and showed them hospitality. At least one to two hundred people slept in the mosque and in the homes of the people. We thought that this was temporary. But they kept staying for months and months and we could not do this anymore (Imam, Velika Kladuša, November 9, 2019).

As we noted above, providing hospitality is an obligation in Islam, but this obligation is always related to the limited time of the guest's presence. As shown in the introduction to this article, the notion of guests as a temporary phenomenon can be found in various academic writings. According to Harney (2017), hospitality is always connected to the time dimension, as it allows the host to control the duration of the visit, to create the context in which the visit is manageable so as to maintain his sovereignty. Similarly, in the aforementioned works of Pitt-Rivers, the status of guest is always temporary – if the guest stays for too long, this could be considered an abuse that might change hospitality into hostility (Pitt-Rivers 2012 [1977], 516–517). Besides the issue of temporality, the analysis of the fieldwork material shows the ascription of other characteristics to the migrants/refugees that are not in line with their idea of "the proper behaviour of the guest". A resident of Velika Kladuša in his 30s who works in Slovenia told us:

> Some behave well, others do not. They are bad guests, they break into the houses, they burn things down and steal. Nobody is nice to them anymore, because there are too many of them and too many of them are bad. My grandmother has been burgled several times; they broke into her apartment when she was not at home. If they behaved in a better way, everyone would help, and they could be guests. When the migrants started coming, we knew what awaits us, now you have to take care of your things much more, so they do not steal them from you (Resident of Velika Kladuša, November 8, 2019).

A woman in her 70s who has lived in Velika Kladuša all her life similarly said:

> The souvenir they left, when they slept in the mosque, was a dirty expensive carpet. They did not show any gratitude. And we accepted them into the mosque. […] Everything was really dirty because they did not shower. We had to change the carpet. […] They have serious infectious diseases, they are criminals, they fight and smuggle (Resident of Velika Kladuša, November 9, 2019).

These xenophobic and racist imaginaries of migrants/refugees as "ungrateful guests" taking advantage of the local hospitality are in line with the prevailing anti-migration discourse in the countries of the EU. In Slovenia, very similar discourses were already present two decades ago (and they persist and have multiplied into a variety of forms today). The constructs created by politicians and the mass media portrayed the local people as victims, homogenized migrants/refugees (Doupona Horvat, Verschueren & Žagar 1998; Jalušič 2001; Kralj 2008) and portrayed

them as contagious and unhygienic (Pajnik, Lesjak-Tušek & Gregorčič 2001; Lipovec Čebron 2002), morally problematic and inclined towards criminal activities (see Doupona Horvat, Verschueren & Žagar 1998; Jalušič 2001). These constructs have been legitimizing institutionalized violence and normalizing xenophobia and racism towards migrants/refugees in Slovenia since the beginning of the century (Jalušič 2001, 40). In the context of Velika Kladuša similar discourses were reinforced by the fortification of the EU border, and analogously to the Slovene context they were used to legitimize the increased exercise of control over practices of hospitality. As securitization discourse was increasing, migrants/refugees were more and more criminalized, and so were the actions of people helping them. This phenomenon was labelled by Marta Stojić Mitrović and Ela Meh as "the contagiousness of illegalization" (2015, 623). While the content of xenophobic and racist discourse towards migrants/refugees is being echoed across the countries of former Yugoslavia, the transformation from open to criminalized hospitality as occurred in Velika Kladuša is also not unique: recent research in the countries along the Western Balkan migration route have revealed similar dynamics (Stojić Mitrović & Meh 2015; Beznec, Speer & Stojić Mitrović 2017), as have studies in EU member states (Rosello 2001; Fekete 2017; Webber 2017).

> We accepted them [the migrants/refugees – author's note]. They were given food here. At a discount or for free. They also slept at our place free of charge, that was not a problem. Then all of it became a problem, a neighbour reported us to the police! Luckily none of them were here at that time. […] We became more careful, but we were still giving them food and a place to sleep. But we gave less. We would receive fewer people; that's normal, right? Then the inspection came. They came for the first time, they came for the second time. We had just cleaned up after them [the migrants/refugees – author's note] and the inspectors came. They checked everything – the kitchen, the rooms – everything. Others [who hosted migrants/refugees – auhtor's note] were heavily fined. Not us, luckily. Since then, we don't accept them anymore (Bar owner in Velika Kladuša, November 10, 2019).

According to this quote by a woman in her 40s who runs a pub and some international reports (Are you Syrious 2019; No Name Kitchen 2019), the local authorities have increased control over spaces where migrants/refugees spend their time (bars, restaurants, guest houses, private houses), while hospitable residents of Velika Kladuša can be fined for taking in migrants/refugees. Rosello (2001) writes about similar developments in France. According to her findings, the duty of checking the guest's identity is transferred from the state to the host as soon as the country's policies obtrude into hospitality performed in the private sphere. The consequence of such requirements is that hospitality becomes "inextricably linked to each individual's ability to interpret, to decode the other's body" (Rosello 2001, 38). This obliges the host to assume the responsibility for checking the guest's identity, and thus the local inhabitants become an extension of biopolitics in the private sphere.

According to the practices of our interlocutors, the responses to the criminalization of hospitality and the increased control of local authorities are multi-

layered. Schematically, we can classify their reaction to the criminalization of hospitality into three different categories: first, subordination to the criminalization and giving up hospitality practices. Second, negotiation between obedience and rebellion; and third, open defiance and the continuation of hospitality practices. In all these responses a tension can be noticed between the public and private spheres of hospitality, and therefore these categories are not strictly separated from one another but intertwined. This is how the imam of Velika Kladuša answered our questions (November 9, 2019):

> R: Why can't you offer hospitality [to migrants/refugees – author's note] anymore?
>
> I: We closed the door of the mosque to them, they can't sleep here anymore. But they can enter at prayer time – like every other believer.
>
> R: Isn't that in conflict with the duty of hospitality which every Muslim has?
>
> I: Yes, this is a conflict. Maybe Allah has sent them to us to test us. But the state, the law forbids this kind of hospitality and punishes us if we accept them. Our country is secular so we must obey its laws.

The imam's attitude clearly shows that he has stopped hospitality practices due to pressure from the authorities. In contrast to his attitude, the behaviour of some locals shows a negotiation between obedience and rebellion against the criminalization of hospitality. For this reason, they do not completely dismiss their hospitality practices, but modify them:

> A minute ago one of them came to ask for coffee. I had to reject him. I feel bad when I have to say no. I ask myself: What if my son was in their place? He is just about the same age as this boy who asked me for the coffee. […] The boss said that they are not allowed into the bar, because they would disturb the guests. He is afraid that other guests won't come. […] But he is also afraid that he will be fined. And I – when I close the bar – I put *bureks*, cheese *bureks*, bread…everything that was left, outside for them. They already know that, they come when I finish and I give them at least that (Waitress at a bar in Velika Kladuša, November 9, 2019).
>
> Every night, after 1 a.m., I meet these teachers in the woods and they bring some clothes and food. Then I distribute everything to those who need it. […] Many people are afraid to bring things to the woods now, there were many more people doing that before, when they were able to bring things to the main square and everyone took what they needed. […] But some are still coming, every evening or every other evening (Interlocutor on the move, November 10, 2019).

From the above statement of a man from Afghanistan in his 20s it is clear that the practices that were widespread and socially rewarded just a few months ago have now become illegal. Similar tactics of carrying out covert activities resemble the partisan movement during World War II, as we noted in a conversation with an international volunteer and activist in her 20s:

> The volunteer tells us about the "trouble they have with the police. Their apartment is constantly under surveillance; some of her colleagues were accused of working on the black market [while they were gathering food and clothes for migrants/refugees, author's note] and were deported from the country." […] Harassment and prosecution from the police has forced them to start distributing aid (food, clothing and other things) at remote corners of the town or outside of town, especially during the night. They use various complex tactics to communicate with migrants/refugees about the time and place of the meeting (Eva Fekonja, fieldwork note, November 10, 2019).

The situation described in the quote above could be understood, in the words of Vlasta Jalušič (2019), as the last and final step of the criminalization of migration: "Finally, these policies gradually introduce control over the entire population, while at the same time criminalizing and penalizing not only acts of human "smuggling", which is in fact always already a consequence of the definition of "crimes of arrival" (Webber 1996, 2008), but also acts of solidarity, such as basic assistance to migrants, housing, etc. (Provera 2015)" (Jalušič 2019, 107–108). In the case of Velika Kladuša the increased criminalization in bars and restaurants can easily be noticed also by a casual observer. Rare individuals who openly resist the criminalization of hospitality and continue to serve migrants/refugees food and drinks (often at a lower price or free of charge) are constantly harassed by police and inspectors:

> The owner of the bar tells us that seven inspectors from seven different sectors have visited him. Each of them found some "violation", so he needed to close the bar for a week to be able to correct those infractions. After a week he reopened his bar and again he opened it for everyone – the locals and migrants/refugees. There is a kindergarten in the vicinity of the bar, so he keeps getting complaints from the parents. They write that there are too many migrants/refugees on the streets and that it is "bad for children to see them". The complaints came from the nearby school as well. The irony is that this school used to be a shelter for refugees in the last Balkan war (Tina Ivnik, fieldwork note, November 9, 2019).

But even some of the "rebellious" practices of hospitality such as those described by the bar owner in the quote above are frequently guided by a selective logic that divides migrants/refugees into "good" and "bad" guests (Shryock 2012), as can be seen from the following fieldwork note:

> When we sat at the table with two Moroccans, the owner of the bar came to us and asked the Moroccans if they are from Algeria. They said they were from Morocco. Soon after, two people from Algeria joined our table. When they told the owner where were they from, he demanded that they leave. I told him that they were our friends and he said that we could all leave if we wanted to. He gruffly replied that he has other guests, that Algerians always cause problems and that he needs to assure a peaceful atmosphere for his guests who do not cause

> problems. He said all of this in a very nervous tone, he did not want to discuss the issue any longer and he insisted that we leave the place immediately (Tina Ivnik, fieldwork note, November 9, 2019).

Conclusion

At first glance, it seems cynical to talk about hospitality in the context of migration at a time when the securitization discourse is growing, when migrants/refugees are increasingly criminalized and described in almost every political and media debate with racist and xenophobic labels. Syntagmas such as "host country" and "reception policies" are still used to describe methods by which countries maintain control over newcomers. As Katarine Rozakou (2012) has shown, the use of such syntagmas in the context of a restrictive migration policies is not as paradoxical as it may seem. She analyses a speech of the Greek minister of the interior in which he described a deportation centre as a "hospitality centre", invoking "filoxenia" or hospitality as a "traditional Greek value". As the author shows, the use of the term "hospitality" in this context is not a contradiction, because the hospitable practices of the Greek state and NGOs are part of the biopolitical practices that turn refugees and asylum seekers into passive recipients of Greek "hospitality", which takes the form of assistance and care, but also of control and repression (Rozakou 2012, 573).

However, hospitality is a complex polysemantic term that is simultaneously a political issue, a tradition, a philosophical value, an ethical imperative and a collective as well as individual practice (Rosello 2001, 6). In the article we have attempted to show that the level of rhetoric of national hospitality towards migrants/refugees should not be equated with the level of the hospitality practices of local inhabitants. At the first level, as scholars (Rosello 2001; Candea 2012) have shown, the concept of hospitality is nowadays commonly used in political discourses that legitimize repressive practices towards migrants/refugees and enforce control over the national territory. On the second level, the practices of hospitality of local communities and individuals are concrete events that are at times in opposition to those repressive migration policies. The latter level of hospitality is a central theme of this article, in which we have tried to explore how Velika Kladuša became a scene of a multifaceted tension between the spontaneous hospitality of the local population and increasingly restrictive policies that criminalize not only migrants/refugees, but also all forms of solidarity with them. During our fieldwork we were able to observe the dynamics that emerged at the intersection of hospitality between the public and the private spheres as well as the consequences of the interference of authorities in hospitality the in private sphere. The analysis of the field material showed a transformation of local hospitality practices towards migrants/refugees that we defined as a shift from open to criminalized hospitality. In these changed circumstances, some residents of Velika Kladuša responded to the criminalization of hospitality by subordinating to it, some by negotiating with it, and others by openly resisting it.

Moreover, in our research we wanted to examine to what extent the concept of hospitality is apposite in the context of contemporary migration, particularly in

the European buffer zones, such as Velika Kladuša today. We argue that the concept is appropriate when the local inhabitants have direct contact with migrants/refugees and host them in their private sphere, and when it is used as emic term in relation to migrants/refugees. Nevertheless, caution is needed when using the concept of hospitality, as it can obscure and distort certain relationships between locals and migrants/refugees. As Rosello (2001) points out, hospitality can obscure the distinction between the discourse of rights and the discourse of generosity and between solidarity and humanitarianism. Moreover, the construction of the refugee/migrant as a guest blurs the diversity of other social dynamics (e.g. employee-employer, client-merchant). Furthermore, ascribing the identity of guest to a migrant/refugee can construct him or her as the Other and place him or her in a permanent dichotomy with the local inhabitants (Rosello 2001). In this sense the local inhabitant is understood as the "legitimate author of welcome" (Lentin & Karakayali 2016, 144), thus establishing the distinction between outsiders and insiders and setting the limits to the autonomy of migrants/refugees. As stated in the article, the prerequisite for hospitality is to have a place where hospitality can be offered. On the basis of our research, we can conclude that hospitality, unlike solidarity, cannot be understood without taking into account power relations, temporality, and ownership of a real estate. As we have tried to show through ethnographic examples, hospitality provides a fertile ground for different forms of dichotomies between the locals and the newcomers who are allowed to stay in the territory on unequal grounds and under specific conditions, which is not the case when the concept of solidarity is applied. Therefore, this concept seems particularly useful since it reveals the unequal and precarious relationship between local inhabitants of Velika Kladuša and migrants/refugees. In fact, these rare, unequal and criminalized acts of hospitality are the only thing that is left to migrants/refugees in "repository of people on the move" (Kurnik 2019, 22), Velika Kladuša.

Literature

Andresson, Ruben. 2014. *Illegality, Inc.: Clandestine Migration and the Business of Bordering Europe*. Oakland: University of California Press.

Berg, Mette Louise & Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, eds. 2018. *Hospitality and Hostility Towards Migrants: Global Perspectives. Migration and Society* 1(1). New York, Oxford: Berghahn.

Beznec, Barbara, Marc Speer & Marta Stojić Mitrović. 2016. *Governing the Balkan Route. Macedonia, Serbia and European Border Regime.* Beograd: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung Southeast Europe.

Bjelica, Maja. 2018. "Filozofsko-antropološka študija možnosti etike gostoljubja: Dih, tišina in poslušanje v prostorih intersubjektivnost." PhD dissertation. Koper: Faculty for Humanities, University of Primorska.

Božič, Kristina. 2016. "Militarizacija mej in ilegalizacija ljudi: Dobičkonosni napad na človečno in demokratično družbo." *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo* 264: 236–247.

Bužinković, Emina & Marijana Hameršak, eds. 2018. *Formation and Disintegration of the Balkan Refugee Corridor: Camps, Routes and Borders in Croatian Context*. Zagreb, München: Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research, Centre for Peace Studies & FPZ – CEDIM.

Candea, Matei. 2012. "Derrida en corse? Hospitality as Scale-Free Abstraction." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 18: 34–48.

Candea, Matei & Giovanni Da Col. 2012. "The Return to Hospitality." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 18: 1–19.

Carpi, Estella & Hatice Pinar Şenoğuz. 2018. "Refugee Hospitality in Lebanon and Turkey: On making 'The Other'." *International migration* 57 (2): 126–142.

Derrida, Jacques. 1999. *Adieu To Emmanuel Levinas.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Derrida, Jacques. 2000a. *Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond*. Stanford: Stanford University Press Books.

Derrida, Jacques. 2000b. "Hostipitality." *Angelaki*: *Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 5 (3): 3–18.

Derrida, Jacques. 2002. "Hostipitality." In *Acts of Religion*, ed. G. Anidjar, 356–420. London – New York: Routledge.

Derrida, Jacques. 2005. *The Politics of Friendship*. London, New York: Verso.

Doupona Horvat, Marjeta, Jef Verschueren & Igor Ž. Žagar. 1998. *Pragmatika legitimizacije: Retorika begunske politike v Sloveniji*. Ljubljana: Open Society Institute.

Evans-Pritchard, Edward Evan. 1940. *The Nuer: A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fekete, Liz. 2017. "Introduction". In *Humanitarianism: The Unacceptable Face of Solidarity* 1–5. London: The Institute of Race Relations.

Flynn, Michael. 2013. "The Hidden Costs of Human Rights: The Case of Immigration Detention." *Global Detention Project Working Paper* 7. Geneva: Graduate Institute's Programme for the Study of Global Migration. https://www.refworld.org/docid/545b41570.html (Accessed December 20, 2019).

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Germann Molz, Jennie & Sarah Gibson. 2007. "Introduction: Mobilizing and Mooring Hospitality." In *Mobilizing hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World,* eds. Jennie Germann Molz & Sarah Gibson, 1–26. Hampshire, Burlington: Ashgate.

Gibson, Sarah. 2007. "'Abusing Our Hospitality': Inhospitableness and the Politics of Deterrence." In *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in*

a Mobile World, eds. Jennie Germann Molz & Sarah Gibson, 159–174. Hampshire – Burlington: Ashgate.

Harney, de Maria Nicholas. 2017. "The Ritualisation of Hospitality: Comparative Notes at the Frontiers of Migration." In *Frontiers*, *Migrations*, *Anchorings / Frontières*, *migrations*, ancrages / *Frontiere, migrazioni, ancoraggi*, ed. Melania Nucifora & Paolo Militello. Catania: University of Catania.

Herzfeld, George. 1987. "As in Your Own House: Hospitality, Ethnography and the Stereotype of Mediterranean Society." In *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*, ed. David D. Gilmore, 75–89. Washington, American Anthropological Association.

Jalušič, Vlasta. 2001. "Ksenofobija ali samozaščita? O vzpostavljanju nove slovenske državljanske identitete." In *Poročilo skupine za spremljanje nestrpnosti 01*, ed. Brankica Petković, 13– 43. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut.

Jalušič, Vlasta. 2019. "Criminalizing "Pro-Immigrant" Iniciative: Reducing the Space of Human Action." *Dve domovini* 49: 105–123.

Jelnikar, Ana. 2015. "Hospitality in Colonial India: Ancient Legacy, Modern Tool of Resistance." *Annales* 25 (2): 285–294.

Kralj, Ana. 2008. "Nezaželeni? Medijske in politične konstrukcije tujcev v Sloveniji." *Dve domovini* 27: 169–190.

Križišnik Bukić, Vera. 2017. "Kmečko uporništvo kot fenomen komunističnih družb in Cazinska buna leta 1950." In *Leukhup! Kmečko uporništvo v obdobju predmoderne – zgodovina, vzporednice, (re)prezentacije*, ed. Sašo Jerše, 223–236. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, Posavski muzej Brežice & Zgodovinski inštitut Milka Kosa ZRC SAZU.

Kurnik, Andrej. 2019. "Migracija onkraj pravnega diskurza: Politična subjektiviteta migracije in skupki mobilnosti." *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo* 47 (278): 9–28.

Lashley, Conrad, Paul Lynch & Alison Morrison, eds. 2007. *Hospitality*: *A Social Lens*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Lashley, Conrad, ed. 2017. *The Routledge Handbook of Hospitality Studies*. London, New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Lentin, Alana & Juliane Karakayali. 2016. "Bringing Race Back in: Racism in 'Post-Racial' Times." *Movements: Journal for Critical Migration and Border Regime Studies* 2 (1): 141–151.

Lipovec Čebron, Uršula. 2002. *V zoni prebežništva: Antropološke raziskave prebežnikov v Sloveniji.* Ljubljana: Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

Lunaček, Sarah. 2019. “Posledice eksternalizacije politike migracij Evropske unije v Agadezu (Niger).” *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo* 47 (278): 56–81.

Mauss, Marcel. 1954 [1925]. *The Gift: Forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies*. London: Cohen & West.

Malinowski, Bronisław. 1992 [1922]. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An account of native enterprise and adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: Routledge.

Meh, Ela. 2016. “Evropska migracijska politika in ustvarjanje kategorije ‘migrant’ v Srbiji.” *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo* 264 (44): 267–290.

Nation, Craig R. 2016. *The History of the War in the Balkans*. Perennial Press.

Pajnik, Mojca, Petra Lesjak-Tušek & Marta Gregorčič. 2001. *Prebežniki, kdo ste?* Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut.

Pavić, Lana. 2016. “Hospitality as a Virtue of the Place.” *Poligrafi* 83/84 (21): 27–45.

Pitt-Rivers, Julian. 2012 [1977]. “The Law Of Hospitality.” *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 2 (1): 501–517.

Rivière, Peter. 2000. “Indians and Cowboys: Two Field Experiences.” In *Anthropologists in Wider World*, ed. Paul Dresch, Wendy James & David Parkin, 27–44. Oxford: Berghahn.

Porić, Nevzet, Nedžad Grabus, Amra Halilović Đurković, Ela Porić, Špendi Fidani et al. 2015. *Tako je govoril poslanec Mohamed, a. s.* [*Izbor hadisov*]. Ljubljana: Kulturno-izobraževalni zavod Averroes.

Rosello, Mireille. 2001. *Postcolonial Hospitality: The Immigrant as Guest*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Rosello, Mireille. 2013. “Conviviality and Pilgrimage: Hospitality as Interruptive Practice.” In *The Conditions of Hospitality: Ethics, Politics, and Aesthetics on the Threshold of the Possible*, ed. Thomas Claviez, 127–144. New York: Fordham University Press.

Rozakou, Katerina. 2012. “The Biopolitics of Hospitality in Greece: Humanitarianism and the Management of Refugees.” *American Ethnologist* 39 (3): 562–577.

Shryock, Andrew. 2012. “Breaking Hospitality Apart: Bad Hosts, Bad Guests, and the Problem of Sovereignty.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 18 (1): 20–33.

Smith, Valene L. & Maryann Brent, eds. 2001. *Hosts and Guests Revisited: Tourism Issues of the 21st Century.* New York: Cognizant Communications Corporation.

Stasch, Rupert. 2009. *Society of Others: Kinship and Mourning in a West Papuan Place*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Stojić Mitrović, Marta & Ela Meh. 2015. "The Reproduction of Borders and the Contagiousness of Illegalisation: A Case of Belgrade Youth Hostel." *Glasnik Etnografskog Instituta SANU* 63 (3): 623–639.

Tazzioli, Martina. 2018. "Crimes of Solidarity: Migration and Containment through Rescue." *Radical Philosophy* 2 (1): 4–10.

Urbańska, Joanna. 2019. "Negotiating Marginality." Unpublished essay. Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

Vidović, Tea. 2016. "Refugee Transit through Croatia". Paper presented at the conference *Camp, Train Station, Border – Microstudies of Refugees in Contemporary Croatia*, Zagreb, June 14–15.

Webber, Frances. 2017. "The Legal Framework: When Law and Morality Collide." In *Humanitarianism: The Unacceptable Face of Solidarity*, 7–21. London: The Institute of Race Relations.

Sources

Amnesty International. 2019. "Pushed to the Edge. Violence and Abuse against Refugees and Migrants along the Balkans Route." https://www.amnesty.org/download/Documents/EUR0599642019ENGLISH.PDF (Accessed December 6, 2019)

Al Jazeera. 2019. "Bihać: 30.000 eura kazni zbog pružanja ilegalnog smještaja migrantima. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZPWRA-Nu_zc (Accessed July 22, 2019)

Are You Syrious. 2018. "AYS Special from Bosnia – The Unique Solidarity of Velika Kladuša." https://medium.com/are-you-syrious/ays-special-from-bosnia-the-unique-solidarity-of-velika-kladu%C5%A1a-a34ed8140357 (Accessed December 6, 2019).

Are You Syrious. 2019. "AYS Special from Bosnia: Killing Solidarity in Velika Kladuša." https://medium.com/are-you-syrious/ays-special-from-bosnia-killing-solidarity-in-velika-kladu%C5%A1a-be9045b1dfec (Accessed December 6, 2019).

Border Violence Monitoring Network. 2019. "Illegal Push-backs and Border Violence Reports, Balkan Region October 2019." https://www.borderviolence.eu/wp-content/uploads/October_Report_2019_.pdf (Accessed December 6, 2019).

Border Violence Monitoring Network. 2020. "Press release: Court find Slovenian State Guilty of Chain Pushback to Bosnia-Herzegovina."

https://www.borderviolence.eu/press-release-court-find-slovenian-state-guilty-of-chain-pushback-to-bosnia-herzegovina/ (Accessed July 22, 2020).

Davy, Jones. 2019. “In the Early Hours of Friday, 22nd November 2019, a Large-Scale Police Eviction Took Place in Šid, Serbia.” *Facebook*, November 25, 2019. https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=973792239674633 (Accessed December 19, 2019).

European Commission. 2020. “Bosnia and Herzegovina.” https://ec.europa.eu/echo/where/europe/bosnia-and-herzegovina_en (Accessed June 30, 2020).

Frontex. 2019. “Budget 2019.” https://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Key_Documents/Budget/Budget_2019.pdf. (Accessed December 16, 2019).

Gadzo, Mersiha. 2018. “‘Solidarity, Understanding, Humanity’ Welcome Refugees in Bosnia.” *Aljazeera,* July 7, 2017 https://www.aljazeera.com/news/europe/2018/10/understanding-humanity-refugees-bosnia-181004100937794.html (Accessed December 18, 2019).

Hvalc, Luka & Gašper Andrinek. 2017. “Vsi naši Agrokomerci: Reportaža iz Velike Kladuše.” *MMC RTV*. https://www.rtvslo.si/gospodarstvo/vsi-nasi-agrokomerci/433121 (Accessed December 12, 2019).

Info Kolpa. 2019. “Poročilo o nezakonitih kolektivnih izgonih na slovensko-hrvaški meji.” *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo* 47 (278): 81–114.

Krajina.ba. 2019. “Izbjeglice u Velikoj Kladuši: Godinu dana kasnije.” *Krajina.ba*, February 16, 2019. https://www.krajina.ba/izbjeglice-u-velikoj-kladusi-godinu-dana-kasnije/ (Accessed December 20, 2019).

Leslie, Chris. 2018. *In Photos: Migrants Finding Refuge in Sarajevo*. https://theferret.scot/finding-refuge-sarajevo-migrants-surviving-bosnias-capital/ (Accessed December 19, 2019).

No Name Kitchen. 2019. “No Name Kitchen is Forced to Stop Working in Velika Kladuša.” *Facebook*, January 18, 2019. https://www.facebook.com/NoNameKitchenBelgrade/posts/656667311398223 (Accessed December 6, 2019).

24UR. 2018. “Tudi sam sem bil med vojno begunec, 44 mesecev sem živel po tujih hišah.” *24ur.com*, November, 11. 2018. https://www.24ur.com/novice/fokus/tudi-oni-so-od-nekoga-otroci-ne-morem-vsem-pomagati-a-me-zanje-boli-dusa.html (Accessed December 18, 2019).

Примљено / Received: 25. 02. 2020.
Прихваћено / Accepted: 04. 09. 2020.