



# Migrant housing struggle and racial discrimination

## The case of postsocialist Leipzig and Riga

Harriet Allsopp  
Giovanna Astolfo  
Annegret Haase  
Karlis Laksevics  
Anika Schmidt  
Bahanur Nasya  
Ayesha Khalil

**Harriet Allsopp** is a Research Associate on the AHRC-funded project Reframing Infrastructures of Arrival, at the Bartlett Development Planning Unit, University College London (DPU-UCL).

**Giovanna Astolfo** is an Associate Professor at DPU-UCL. **Annegret Haase** and **Anika Schmidt** work at Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ in Leipzig, Germany.

**Bahanur Nasya** is an architect, researcher and film producer. **Kārlis**

**Lakševics** is a researcher at the University of Latvia. **Ayesha Khalil** works at Westminster Council London, and is a researcher at DPU-UCL.

**Contact:**

[h.allsopp@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:h.allsopp@ucl.ac.uk)  
[giovanna.astolfo.13@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:giovanna.astolfo.13@ucl.ac.uk)

### **Abstract**

The civic mobilisation welcoming Ukrainian refugees after Russia's invasion in February 2022 has shown how housing is a social infrastructure based on care and solidarity. But it has also shown its discriminatory face. By drawing on our recent collaborative research in Leipzig and Riga and conceptual reflections from previous research, this paper elaborates on how practices of welcoming and housing refugees intertwine with state racism and everyday discrimination. It is grounded in two intersecting lines of inquiry. The first one focuses on migrant housing struggles in the context of increased financialisation, privatisation and austerity urbanism. The second expands on the intersection of race and discrimination with housing, asking how race and racial discrimination intersect and affect migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers' access to and experiences with housing. The underlying argument is that while housing is the site where this type of discrimination becomes spatialised and visible (and thus can be challenged), there is still a missing discourse around discrimination in migration and housing policy.

### **Keywords**

Migration, housing struggle, discrimination, equality, racism

### **Introduction**

The civic mobilisation to welcome Ukrainian refugees following Russia's invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 has shown how housing could be a social infrastructure based on care and solidarity. In a short timeframe, several European countries opened their borders

and launched new policies to make refugees feel at home (Machin, 2023; Haase et al., 2023). However, such a heartfelt show of solidarity followed by supportive policy measures has also revealed a very different face of housing, less visible in public narratives—a colonial and discriminatory one. A few years back, during and in the immediate aftermath of the so-called ‘summer of migration’ of 2015, Black and Brown refugees who were fleeing from African and Middle East countries were not welcomed with fast-track visas nor open homes schemes. On the contrary, the ‘summer of migration’ triggered the creation of a hotspot system, more camps and resettlement policies (Zizek, 2022; OHCHR, 2022; Astolfo et al., 2022; GCR et al., 2022; Costello & Foster, 2022) in an EU wide effort to de-territorialise asylum, criminalise migration, deter and detain people of colour.

The differential treatment between refugees fleeing from Ukraine in 2022 and those fleeing from the Middle East and several Sub-Saharan countries in and around 2015, speaks volumes to what extent certain bodies and subjectivities are ‘worth’ welcoming, hosting and homing, while other bodies are not. The differential treatment visibilises the permanence of racialised discrimination, and exposes the interconnection of race and racism not only with border policy and migrant management but also with housing and accommodation. While writing this piece, we were informed that the association coordinating housing for refugees in the city of Leipzig had received an unprecedented amount of private flat offers, but the offers were explicitly only for Ukrainians (Haase et al., 2023), pointing towards a continuation of previous dynamics.

By drawing on insights from collaborative research in Leipzig and Riga, and informed by the authors’ previous research, this paper further elaborates on practices of housing refugees, in particular those that materialise in forms of structural and everyday racial discrimination. In order to do so, the article is grounded in two distinct but intersecting lines of inquiry. The first one focuses on the repertoire of challenges and difficulties that migrants, asylum seekers and refugees often face when seeking safe, accessible and affordable housing while on the move. Exacerbated by increased financialisation, privatisation and austerity urbanism, these struggles can manifest in various ways and are shaped by a range of factors, with discrimination playing a substantial role. Building on this and bringing postcolonial approaches of refuge and race (Mayblin & Turner, 2021; Fiddian-Qasmieh, 2020; Achiume, 2019; Grosfoguel et al., 2015) into a discussion on housing, the second line of enquiry expands on the intersection of race and discrimination with housing. Particularly, it asks how forms of identity (race) and oppression (discrimination) with colonial roots intersect and affect migrants’, refugees’ and asylum seekers’ access to and experiences with housing.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The authors are a collective of European and Asian researchers who have engaged in research and bring in perspectives from south, central, east and north Europe as well as the Middle East and South Asia. Our cultural archives (Said, 1993) and vantage points are not homogeneous nor monolithic and sometimes, not even similar. We are part of an extended research collective that interrogates issues of housing, displacement and migration across different geographies and temporalities. Amongst our funded research: AHRC/DFG funded project “REFRAME” (UK PI– Giovanna Astolfo; German Co-Is Annegret Haase and Birgit Glorius); JPI/ESRC project HOUSE-IN (UK PI: Giovanna Astolfo; German PI Annegret Haase).

## **The migrant housing struggle in the context of austerity and financialisation**

The close connections between housing and migration is well documented. Housing plays a prominent role in migrant journeys following settlement and is considered key to ‘integration’ (Ager & Strang, 2008) whatever that means. Access to housing as a major resource however, has been used by governments as a tool in the management of migration. Brown et al. (2022) explain how the accommodation of refugees is tightly connected with neo-liberal trends and policies, to the point that the latter influence settlement and meaningful lives. Alongside national legislation and local conditions that restrict housing and welfare rights of migrants, literature on this topic highlights trends toward commodification and privatisation of housing markets, where their financialisation has compounded difficulties and vulnerabilities experienced by migrants and increased housing insecurity and precarity.

Access to accommodation and the form or quality of housing and tenure that people can secure is (differentially) affected by the categorisation and compartmentalisation of migrants, legal or otherwise. Different national legislation and management processes around citizenship, immigration, employment, and housing respond to different historical phases of migration and shape migrant categories and housing trajectories/pathways. Although the term ‘migrant’ itself presents a further categorisation, it is used here to highlight problems encountered by those defined as such as well as to challenge it. Migrant diversity and the struggles around housing, require a broad conceptualisation of ‘migrant’ and a comprehensive understanding of migration including internal and international flows, economic-driven migration (students, labour migrants, highly skilled professionals) and forced migration (refugees). Housing includes the living space (flat, house, shelter) as well as the capacity for social participation and care within the residential environment (Amin, 2002; Haase & Schmidt, 2019; Power & Mee, 2020).

Within migration research, the analytic differentiations between refugees from other migrants, the overlap of the term migrant with that of ethnic minority and distinctions between ethnic groups are all recognised as problematic (see Hamlin, 2021; Lukes et al., 2019). Differentiation within law relating to housing access has increased over time as has exclusion of migrants (Lukes et al., 2019). Brown et al. write that ‘refugees are particularly disadvantaged in relation to housing due to their socio-legal status, pre-migratory experiences and their positioning in society which affords them additional vulnerabilities and exacerbates the housing stress they face.’ (Brown et al., 2022, p.34). This compartmentalisation of migrant housing access produces forms of differentiation within housing markets and laws that disadvantage migrants and contribute to further forms of discrimination and inequalities, including peripheralization and exclusions.

Communal accommodation, referring to a kind of mass accommodation either in state or private owned properties that are commonly used for reception of new asylum seeker arrivals, is often described in case literature as poor-quality or within ‘dilapidated’ buildings, which frames the residents in a poor light (Brown et al., 2022; Lietaert et al., 2020). The connection of this accommodation type with other mental and physical health problems is recognised in several studies (see Bakker et al., 2016; Blank, 2019; Gewalt et al., 2018;

Kreichauf, 2018; Righard & Oberg, 2019; Walther et al., 2020). Research and policy often present the transition from initial state or municipal managed temporary accommodation into the rental market as an indicator of integration (Adam et al., 2020). This approach largely underplays and misrepresents the many difficulties and challenges faced by asylum seekers and refugees during said transition. Access to either the rental market and to social or affordable housing is shown to be complex and challenging, and often impossible. Rapid transition periods, particularly between asylum seeker and refugee status, are commonly found to create situations of deprivation and ‘differential inclusion’ (Lukes et al., 2019).

Examining peripheralisation and segregation, Arbaci & Malheiros (2013) show how housing and socio-urban changes have triggered additional processes of socio-residential exclusion, contextualised by neoliberal urban renewal and gentrification. The complexity and interconnectedness of migrant housing struggles includes wider urban processes and global financialisation, described as ‘the concomitant conversion of housing into an asset, where the value of property may often relate to the distance from the excluded other, further divides populations into those who have assets and those who do not. Settlement for some means unsettlement for others’ (Powell & Simone, 2022, p.840).

The relationship of states to the housing sector and to those to whom they have human rights obligations has been dramatically altered by the financialisation of housing (Farha, 2017). States’ policies reflect an intertwining of domestic housing policy with the priorities and strategies of central banks and international financial institutions. Decisions around housing are disengaged from and not accountable to the communities within which ‘assets’ are located (ibid. p.10). Conventional and securitised forms of urban planning also contribute to racialisation and migrant housing disadvantage. Rolnik (2019) writes that ‘Urban planning and housing policies have been fundamental to the expansion of financialized capitalism’ (p.280).

Discriminatory housing infrastructures are similarly implicated as ‘a key feature of neoliberalization especially in light of the global financial crisis’ by Bhagat (2021, p.637), who suggests that the economic and political processes of racialisation are built into the urban environment. Neoliberalism is described as ‘a dominant ideological and disciplinary feature of market-based regulation resulting in government downsizing and increased pressure on cities to contend with social issues of welfare and poverty (Adrienne & Soederberg, 2014; Peck, 2015; Peck & Tickell, 2002) thereby producing housing insecurity and other issues of survival for refugees’ (p.635). In a similar vein, Kreichauf (2018) argues that neoliberalism has become the norm in many policy approaches towards vulnerable groups including asylum seekers, resulting in the privatisation of the refugee sector.

Compounding the effects of racialised neoliberalism, austerity and its political paradoxes have also shaped refugee accommodation in (European) cities since the 2000s (Soederberg 2019) and have excluded the most marginalised from either social or affordable housing. As an analytical concept ‘austerity urbanism’ describes ‘the intensification of existing neoliberal practices that have resulted in deeper and wider entrenchment of pro-market solutions to housing provisioning, whilst implementing additional fiscal retrenchment of the social state’ (Soederberg 2019: 924). In Berlin, refugee accommodation has become a profitable industry

to the point that ‘the politics and paradoxes of pre-existing local governance practices since the early 2000s, notably austerity urbanism’ (p. 943) are largely responsible for shaping its arrival space and for the crisis around housing refugees - more so than the arrival of migrants themselves.

Discourses and management of crises and catastrophes link with the deepening of longer-term trajectories of dispossession and disposability, bordering, ethno-nationalism, financialisation, imperialism, capitalism, patriarchy, and racism (Vilenica et al., 2020). The unequal governance of crises and the implementation of ‘shock doctrines’ (Klein, 2007) entrench austerity measures and exacerbate existing inequalities and injustices. From this view, the rhetoric of ‘crisis’ around migration of non-Europeans to Europe takes on a broader significance, offering space and logic for the intensification of policies designed to extract capital by rendering vulnerable those entering European states. In Germany, studies clearly showed that the crisis as well as anti-crisis-policies contributed to social and socio-spatial polarisation in cities, negatively affecting those who commonly suffer from poor housing conditions and have limited access to affordable housing (Reinhold & Brendel, 2022). International examples showed how low income and migrant areas were stigmatised for being Covid-19 hotspots and, in certain cases, were subject to local lock-downs (Haase, 2020).

In the context of neoliberal financialisation of housing and austerity policies, the task of ensuring access to housing has fallen increasingly upon civil society, local authorities and volunteers (Brown et al., 2022), resulting in the housing sector becoming ever more *humanitarianised*. This has led to the development of new governance cooperation at the local level giving ‘a much greater role in policy-making, administration and implementation to private economic actors on the one hand and to parts of civil society on the other in self-managing what until recently was provided or organised by the national or local state.’ (Swyngedouw, 2005, p.1992). Concurrently, it also resulted in what Tazzioli (2020) refers to as ‘the traps of humanitarianism’ (p.515), in which humanitarianism, its discourses and interventions, are seen as a politics of life (Fassin, 2007).

Concentrating on these conditions that frame housing choices available to asylum seekers and to agents facilitating these choices, Bernt et al. (2022) point to the growth of ‘internal migration industries’ in which the housing infrastructure and access to housing is informed by informal agents (those who provide their own housing stock or those that deliver specific services supporting access to the housing market). This ‘industry’ controls housing access and actively shapes new patterns of segregation and disadvantage. One such pattern, evident within the available literature, is that of racial discrimination. Picker et al. (2019, p.6) write that ‘gentrification of previously ‘run down’ inner cities and competition over housing has become a mechanism through which subtle logics of racism are played out through the market as well as the trope of urban regeneration’. In parallel however, these informally mediated markets often offer the only accessible and affordable option (see Shrestha et al. 2021).

## **The intersection of race and discrimination with housing as part of the migrant struggle**

The migrant experience, including access to housing, is also and especially intimately shaped by discrimination and racism, whether structural—through clear mechanisms of separation and exclusion, as well as through subtle logics of abandonment and inaction, or in the ordinary space of everyday housing interactions and routines. The exclusion from social housing access, or the lack of alternative affordable housing provision, or the deregulated rent system, are all different means toward preventing migrants and refugees from accessing dignified housing, while compelling them to live in segregated and dilapidated buildings, or to depend upon exploitative networks, condemning them to precarity, scarcity, stigma, a future of homelessness, and sometimes even death.

The majority of refugees who find themselves in this situation are Black and Brown subjects, and this exposes how housing itself operates to (re)produce racial discrimination, segregation and distinctions that are hallmarks of coloniality.

The differential access to housing, is also an othering process that generates more discrimination, creating refugees as *others*. The housing struggle, tied as it is to global logics of financial capital and extraction, contributes to racial difference, and to its perpetual reproduction as scholarship has profusely made clear (Fields & Raymond, 2021). By extension, we could say that contemporary cities in Europe as much as in the UK, are built upon such reproduction, where the other is the Black and Brown refugee.

Urban theory and planning examine the intersection of migration, housing, and race from three angles. The first one is the spatial perspective, that connects race, space and housing, and that has received attention in the past couple of decades, especially in the US, and the UK. Looking at cases in the US, back in the early 2000s, Lipsitz highlighted how race is always experienced spatially, and, with relation to housing, he argued that ‘Race serves as a key variable in determining who has the ability to own homes that appreciate in value and can be passed down to subsequent generations’ (2007, p.12). The relation between race and ownership, or whiteness and the ability to climb up the housing ladder, is key to understanding how the majority of Black and Brown refugees are made unable to secure property (Taylor, 2019). Disconnecting ‘racial regimes from their spatial grounding’ (Lipsitz, 2007, p. 20) becomes, therefore, a major task for planners and policy makers.

In a similar vein, Rhodes and Brown (2019) recall how in the UK, ‘during the 1970s and 1980s, the “inner city” came to be “territorialised” as a pathological, racialised space subject to particular modes of institutional regulation’ (p.3243). Here, the urban core is represented through images of ‘decline, crime, disorder, poverty and economic stagnation where “race” has been the defining feature’ (ibid). They argue that such issue with representation goes beyond the ‘representational device’ and operates ‘as a subject of and object for forms of socio-political knowledge and institutional action’ (ibid) shaping urban and housing policy ‘producing specific (in)visibilities that promote or occlude particular bodies, practices and issues’ (ibid). Through an archaeological excavation of the inner cities in the UK, the authors explain how concentration of Black and Brown migrants in certain areas ‘was central to the

racialisation of this group, as racialised bodies became associated with racialised and stigmatised spaces, reflective of the simultaneous process of the “racialisation of space and spatialisation of race” (p.3246) recalling what Lipsitz argued a decade before in the case of the US.

The second angle is related to the race-migration-integration-housing nexus and provides a framework for understanding the conceptualisation of race and how it is ignored within migration scholarship and policy. Erel et al., (2016) argue that approaches that eschew race and racialisation analytically, present racism as external to (‘post-racial’) European identity and deny the necessity of anti-racist approaches to migration. That racism, migration management and ‘integration’ are embedded, is discussed by Sebastiani & Martín-Godoy (2020). They point to specific connections between apparatuses of ‘multi-level governance’ of integration and the functioning logics of racism and, thus, question the transformative potential of integration policies. From this basis, ‘integration’ is described as a ‘civilising and disciplinary programme aimed at correcting the presumed deficiencies in ethnically marked populations’ (p.53). It ‘depoliticises racism by constantly shifting the focus to the presumed characteristics of the ‘other’, re-enacting white-privileged notions of nationhood’ (ibid).

Integration as a concept, a framework, a process and policy is discussed and widely criticised also in Schinkel (2018), Favell (2019), Astolfo and Allsopp (2023), to name but a few, who cast its monitoring as a form of ‘neocolonial knowledge’ (Schinkel 2018, p.1) able only to generate more racialised categories of beings which are more or less useful to the reproduction of capital (Astolfo & Allsopp, 2023).

A third and related angle looks into race-migration-housing from the local lived experience and/or through the role of local actors and everyday interactions in the reproduction of racialised spaces and subjects. Lukes et al. (2019) connect race and migration with migrant housing histories and practices and find that ‘the interplay of legal changes, which have increasingly differentiated migrants since the 1940s, and shifting housing markets, has driven exclusion of migrants and minorities such that considerable disadvantage is revealed by analysis of census data’ (p.3191). Theories of integration and of race and racism, and how they overlap, reflect ‘how slippery discrimination operates to differentially exclude migrants and minorities’ (ibid). They suggest that local devolution and variability pose policy challenges and also offer opportunities to develop local action that is effective in addressing discrimination. They advocate for future research to ‘inform and challenge discriminatory policies and practices by considering minority and migrant housing pathways in the context of their housing and migration histories’ (p. 3201).

Finney et al. (2019a and 2019b) similarly underline the role of local institutions and housing providers ‘to examine how social housing providers negotiate their positions and are complicit in constructing a certain vision of community’ (2019b, p. 3207). They make three arguments: ‘first, that race and ethnicity as facets of “integration” have been subsumed into broader agendas, yet remain implicit in community building; second, that housing organisation practices are often detached from local meanings of community and prioritise exclusionary activities focusing on behavioural change and third, that the roles of housing organisations in constructing “integrated” communities are highly variable and localised,

influenced by the history and contemporary dynamics of place' (ibid). The increasing operation of housing providers as agents of 'integration' and of exclusion, rather than as neutral arbiters, are seen to have placed housing at the centre of the entanglement of race, housing and cohesion/integration, often overlooked in social science disciplines.

### **The housing struggle and discrimination across Riga and Leipzig**

Despite what we know about the links between migration struggle, race and housing, these connections can be experienced and play out differently in different contexts. In postsocialist Europe, the space-housing-race issue is relatively less explored (or at least, less covered in anglophone literature). Officially, these socialist states did not previously know racism and segregation, nor were these featured in any official discourse. However, old patterns of racial segregation and discrimination and attitudes persisted while being tabooed within the myth of state anti-fascism for political/ideological reasons. The issue 'returned' through the breakdown of those myths after 1989, within postsocialist trajectories through more visible forms of discrimination (Loose, 2008). More recent entanglements between European bordering regimes, discrimination and the postsocialist mass privatisation of housing (Lancione, 2022) provide a crucial angle through which to understand this nexus. Riga and Leipzig, in Latvia and Germany respectively, engender many of these aspects: from the increased local pressure to contend with social issues of welfare and poverty, to the transformation of refugee accommodation into a profitable industry. Located at different points of this context, we argue that these two cities can help to illuminate the complex interplay of housing financialisation and discrimination.

#### ***Real estate bubbles in Riga***

Riga serves as the capital of Latvia hosting 609,489 inhabitants (CSB, 2013). It is a German settler colonial city built on the settlements of Livs, where ethnic Latvians form only 47 percent of the population and at least 17 percent of residents claim a migration history. It is also a shrinking city that has lost 300,000 inhabitants in the past 30 years with the last wave of emigration following one of the most drastic austerity regimes in Europe after the 2008 financial crisis (Blyth, 2013).

While the choice of the austerity regime stemmed from political interpretations of responsibility at the time, in Latvia the crisis itself was largely fuelled by a mortgage based real estate bubble (Sommers, 2014). After mass privatisation in the 1990s following the break-up of the Soviet Union, Riga is now mostly a homeowner market with a lack of affordable rental housing. What exists by way of affordable housing is mostly in poor condition due to selective residential upgrading (Krišjāne & Bērziņš, 2014). For migrants, this presents a double challenge as the rental market is rather small, but mortgages are largely denied to migrants even after longer periods of residence.

While these challenges in the housing market affect many actors within it, among the most affected are non-white migrants, especially refugees. This research is based on our



embeddedness in the field since the mid-2010s,<sup>2</sup> where we have observed how, in an informality-rich rental market organised primarily by other homeowners or landlords owning few properties, housing becomes the area where racism and discrimination is most visible. In addition, there is no legal basis to contest discrimination perpetrated by private landlords. Outlined in what follows, there are several discourses on which landlords draw when avoiding contracts with refugees and non-white migrants.

First, the tightness of the affordable rental housing market exacerbates various forms of stigmatisation of, and subsequent discrimination against, resource-limited households. The figures that landlords avoid commonly include single mothers, former homeless, former inmates, but also non-white migrants and refugees. The tropes most often used as ‘justification’ for choosing someone else as a tenant include lack of cleanliness, untrustworthiness and other ethnicised and racialised characterisations (towards ‘Blacks’, ‘Asians’ or ‘Arabs’) of otherness that can be blatantly racist. Nevertheless, most often discrimination manifests simply as hung-up calls, intensifying the silencing of this being an issue at all. This stigmatisation of migrants and discriminatory practices have led to increased exploitative practices by private homeowners and require greater effort by civil society, local authorities and volunteers to support affected newcomers in their journey to find decent accommodation.

Second, the meanings and recognition of discrimination and racism are widely politically challenged. While political liberalism has gained a certain ground in Latvia, especially since the accession to the EU, its ideological underpinnings are present only in a few political parties that are not in the majority. The promoted perception of racism as a ‘backwards’ stance, which Latvia has to abandon in order to ‘catch-up with Western democracies’, does not challenge either European border regimes, nor broader structures of oppression (Dzenovska, 2018) that are present in the housing market as well as the previously described geopolitics of discrimination. Thus, the humanitarian narratives of NGOs, political liberalism of politicians and the anti-imperial solidarity with Ukrainians are not sufficient to contest racism in the housing market of Riga. As a result, housing in Riga becomes the site where racism is visible as it interacts with local nationalist narratives of decolonisation and other types of discrimination perpetuated by the financialisation and privatisation of housing. This is especially challenging in terms of long-term prospects for non-European migrants, as their opportunities to become members of the community are limited through their housing options.

### ***‘Arrival’ in Leipzig***

Similarly to Riga, Leipzig witnessed shrinkage until the end of the 1990s. This was followed by regrowth, driven by international migration. Today, the city has 625,341 inhabitants of which around 20 percent have a migrant background (Stadt Leipzig, 2023,

---

<sup>2</sup> The authors of the Leipzig and Riga sections have worked with NGOs and municipal departments in charge of migration and housing. The findings presented in this paper derive from structured content analysis of workshop documentations and interviews. See Lakševics et al., 2024 ; Haaase et al., 2023.

p.1). With the large influx of refugees and asylum seekers in 2015, some areas of the city have been called ‘arrival spaces’, and managed through a ‘governance of arrival’ (Werner et al., 2018), a contested term and practice. Central to it is the concept of decentralised housing, which was initially developed to provide an alternative to mass accommodation centres. In Italy and the UK, dispersal policies have received wide critiques because they are seen as a biopolitical technology for the government of refugee lives, aimed at addressing social cohesion by diluting the presence of non-conforming bodies (Astolfo & Allsopp 2024; Darling, 2011; Manara & Piazza, 2019). German dispersal policies have received less critical attention, in part because they have never been fully implemented. The financialisation and tightening of the housing market have hindered the process and today the lack of low-cost flats (adequate for state support payments) makes it an impossible strategy to pursue (Werner et al., 2018).

At the time of writing, housing for refugees in Leipzig is mostly provided by the municipality, which relies on cooperation with NGOs and, in particular, so-called intermediary actors (Werner et al., 2018). Our research<sup>3</sup> has evidenced three problematic aspects within this. First, private housing owners and companies (e.g. Leipzig-Grünau or Paunsdorf) explicitly do not rent their properties to refugees, illustrating a largely racist practice. Second, the existing housing stock that is accessible to refugees is not adequately maintained and renovated to an acceptable standard. Finally, NGO’s and municipality’s efforts to establish anti-racist practices (including the creation of the state of Saxony anti-discrimination office) had little effect, and they offered no learnings around how (racial) discrimination could be effectively counteracted, particularly but not exclusively when it comes to private landlords.

Research conducted over 2020-22 in Leipzig’s inner east (Allsopp et al. 2023; Haase et al, 2023 and 2020; Lakševics et al 2024), combined with statistical analysis, showed how discrimination against migrants is multifaceted, multiscale and multidimensional. In long conversations with landlords and housing providers, we learned how they operate forms of selective ‘readiness’ to house refugees. Some landlords seem ready to welcome them, others not. In these conversations, discrimination was often hidden behind rhetoric and sometimes even justified. Some landowners we interviewed told us they did not rent to Black or Brown refugees in order to, benevolently, prevent them from becoming a target in the neighbourhood. They used the potential threat of discrimination as a seemingly ‘protective’ argument to justify why they were not renting to people of colour.

A closer look at the municipal migrant survey from 2020 confirmed and even revealed other forms of inequality and discrimination related to housing. For all migrant groups the average housing size was smaller compared to other residents; while the price per square meter and the share of household income paid toward housing was higher than non-

---

<sup>3</sup> The authors of the Leipzig and Riga sections have worked with NGOs and municipal departments in charge of migration and housing. The findings presented in this paper derive from structured content analysis of workshop documentations and interviews. Findings are also included in three policy information papers on [Forced migrants’ access to housing](#), [Enabling settling down and belonging](#) and [Discrimination against forced migrants](#). (see also Nasya et al.2023a and b, and Allsopp et al. 2023).

international inhabitants. Data was even more unequal for some migrant groups within Leipzig's inhabitants, including those from Syria (Stadt Leipzig, 2021, p. 8).

Discrimination in Leipzig also emerges from structural and institutional mechanisms, including general housing market rules that exclude newcomers from access to and allocation of social housing. For instance, refugees and migrants with temporary residence (below one year), rarely get contracts. This restricts their range of housing options. Likewise, the allocation policies for municipal housing generate long waiting lists.

Apart from this, there are prevailing practices of rejection of refugee demands for housing by owners, officially due to formal or technical reasons, that in fact conceal deeply-rooted racist and colonial attitudes (e.g. against non-white, non-European people) which 'materialise' as discriminatory practices in a context of unequal power relations. So far, such cases are being documented and reported but there are few opportunities to counter them, as an interview with Leipzig's anti-discrimination officer carried out in June 2020 stated.

### **Nuanced perspectives on addressing housing discrimination**

In this article, we have argued that current migrants' struggle for housing intersects discrimination with unjust housing market regulations deriving from predatory (and racial) global capitalism. The cases of Riga and Leipzig—with their similarities and differences—point at a few intertwined aspects. Both postsocialist cities have undergone shrinking and regrowth, each to a different extent. They are currently under mounting pressure to contend with social issues of welfare and poverty, and with the downsizing of government roles. Neoliberal practices promote pro-market solutions for housing, while the task of ensuring access to housing, especially for increased numbers of migrants and refugees, has fallen heavily upon civil society, local authorities and volunteers. Issues of discrimination and racism play out in different ways in these cities as a result of different stages in the institutionalisation of anti-discrimination, or in relation to different nationalist discourses.

The postsocialist times and condition of the two cities has led to specific forms of discrimination. Their contexts are comparable in the taboo of racism and the way that liberal and neoliberal trends brought up specific forms of racism in postsocialist societies. Differences can be related to their respective postsocialist trajectories - Leipzig formed part of reunified Germany, Latvia became independent again. In a way, the period after state socialism coincided with the return of newly visible but persisting forms of discrimination and racism towards non-white, non-European, and in the case of Latvia, non-Latvian people/newcomers. The new national self-confidence after the end of the Soviet/'socialist block' rule (although this was different in Riga and Leipzig) have led to new appearances of intolerance, racism, xenophobia and discrimination.

In this context, housing discrimination is not a single event but a process which affects migrants' lives at different stages and with different intensities. For many reasons, discrimination against migrants is often neither reported nor punished, while antiracist discourse sits outside both housing and migration discourses. Allsopp et al. (2023), point out

in their policy information paper that racial discrimination is one of the key challenges within the housing sector, and the case studies in our work also highlight this. The solidarity efforts toward Ukrainian refugees demonstrate what would be possible to achieve for all refugees. They also highlight how the mainstream infrastructure of support for migrants is failing many of them and how hierarchies, asymmetries and competition amongst vulnerable groups are created. Additionally, the lack of social housing in Riga, and the insufficiency of affordable housing in Leipzig, leave refugees and migrants at the mercy of the so-called ‘free-housing-market’ and related neoliberal practices. This is a form of state racism through *laissez-faire*, inaction, and abandonment.

Over time, Leipzig has established some local organisations and procedures for addressing the needs of long-term residents and is increasingly opening them to migrants. This is, however, mostly true for the affordable housing sector, while the private sector is rather spared from responsibility in this regard. The same occurs in most cities across Europe, with very few exceptions. In the privately dominated housing market in Riga, as well as Leipzig, establishing neighbourly relations is left to individuals’ skills and initiatives, with some support of NGOs and social welfare.

Special mechanisms of solidarity from all sectors are needed to face the challenges of housing migrants. But they are not enough. Moving forward there is the need to put more efforts into re-politicising the subject of migrant housing to avoid the normalisation of discrimination, including racial discrimination and the perpetuation of hidden colonial legacies. Working with the most affected, marginalised and vulnerable groups can help toward reducing urban injustices and inequality and mainstreaming fair housing opportunities for all. There also needs to be scrutiny of state and humanitarian practices and resistance to privatisation patterns and neoliberal, market-oriented practices. This would involve a work of recognising and exposing racism in migration management, accommodation and housing as well as among housing providers, while putting forward some antiracist campaigns with homeowners. It might involve strengthening existing institutions, such as antidiscrimination bureaus and their connections with migrant based advocacy organisations and supporting their work on the ground.

Another method is to actively unsettle integration as a key policy framework - recognising it as a structure of contemporary colonialism (Astolfo et al., 2020; Astolfo & Allsopp, 2023). Taking account of subjective time frames of the formation of belonging, in which housing fulfils various functions for people on the move, the failure of static one-size-fits-all integration models becomes more visible. Radically shifting the subject and object of discourse away from the need/problem/opportunity of integration toward different frameworks/processes/concepts and policy—like for instance those of urban equality and justice (see also Astolfo et al., 2020), could help to address housing as a multidimensional multitemporal element, making room for diverse experiences, expectations and needs, as well as paving the way to new social arrangements that foster urban foundations rooted in equality. In a time of multiple crises, and increasing disruptions (climate crises, housing crises, wars, conflicts and genocide) cities need to continue to think about urban equality and justice to imagine a less racist and discriminatory future for their inhabitants.

## **Acknowledgements**

The authors wish to express gratitude to every individual who has been involved in the project HOUSE-IN funded by JPI Urban Europe/ESRC (2021-22).

## **Funding Details**

This work was supported by the JPI Urban Europe / ESRC under Grant [number ES/V016865/1].

## **About the authors**

**Harriet Allsopp**, PhD in IR, Politics and Middle Eastern Studies, is a Research Associate on the AHRC-funded project Reframing Infrastructures of Arrival, at the Bartlett Development Planning Unit, University College London. Her research focuses on global and local integration and exclusion mechanisms, migration and displacement and on the intersectionality of these with racial discrimination and structural inequalities.

**Giovanna Astolfo** is an Associate Professor at the Bartlett Development Planning Unit, University College London. Her research focuses on non-conventional urbanisms, continuous displacement and migration, spatial violence and housing justice. Pi on AHRC-funded project Reframe (2024-27). Co-I on ESRC-funded project House-In (2020-22)

**Annegret Haase** is urban sociologist and works at Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ in Leipzig, Germany, at the Dept. of Urban and Environmental Sociology. Her main research interests include urban transformation and resilience, urban migration, diversity and governance, socio-spatial inequities and justice in cities as well as participation and transdisciplinary research.

**Kārlis Lakševics** is a researcher at the University of Latvia. His research focuses on housing justice, social service design and urban political ecology with a special focus on homelessness, social marginalization and the energy transition.

**Anika Schmidt** has been working in various research projects on sustainable urban development, urban resilience, migration and housing at the Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research Leipzig. She is a social geographer as well as a trained mediator. Her research activities have a special focus on the analysis of conflicts of social-ecological transformation and new forms of transdisciplinary cooperation.

**Bahanur Nasya** is an architect, researcher and film producer. She studied in Vienna and Barcelona where she has specialized in sustainable architecture, just and fair scenarios, and future proof development concepts. She supports communities in Europe to work collectively, to serve everyone and not just selected few.

**Ayesha Khalil** is an Urban Development Practitioner and Analyst with a focus on Inclusive Development, Migration and Sustainable Neighbourhoods. Worked for World

Bank and United Nations (UN). Currently works at Westminster Council London. Researcher for the HOUSE-In project, at the Bartlett Development Planning Unit, University College London.

## References

- Achiume, T. (2019), Migration As Decolonization, *Stanford Law Review* 71, pp.1509-1574, UCLA School of Law, Public Law Research Paper No. 19-05, Available at: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3330353> (accessed 30/01/2023).
- Adam, F., Föbker, S., Imani, D., Pfaffenbach, C., Weiss, G., & Wiegandt, CC. (2020) Municipal Housing Strategies for Refugees. Insights from Two Case Studies in Germany, in: Glorius, B., & Doomernik, J. (eds.), *Geographies of Asylum in Europe and the Role of European Localities*. IMISCOE Research Series. (Cham: Springer Nature). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25666-1\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25666-1_10).
- Adrienne, R., Soederberg, S. (2014) Politicizing debt and denaturalizing the ‘newnormal’. *Critical Sociology*, 40(5), pp.657–668. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920514528820>.
- Ager, A. & Strang, A. (2008) Understanding integration: A conceptual framework, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21, pp.166–191.
- Amin, A. (2002) Ethnicity and the Multicultural City: Living with Diversity, *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 34(6), pp.959–980. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a3537>
- Allsopp, H., Astolfo, G., Nasya B., Schmidt, A., Haase, A., Stevens, U., Laksevics, K., Arroyo, I., Franz, Y., Reeger, U., Girardi-Hoog, J., Patti, D., Gruber, E. (2023) Discrimination against forced migrant newcomers in the housing market – challenges and possible governance responses House-IN: policy information 3. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/development/research-projects/2023/oct/refugees-and-politics-urban-space> (accessed 19/09/2024).
- Arbaci, S., Malheiros, J. (2012) De-Segregation, Peripheralisation and the Social Exclusion of Immigrants: Southern European Cities in the 1990s, in Bolt, G., Özüekren, A.S., & Phillips, D. (Eds.). (2012) *Linking Integration and Residential Segregation* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203718490>.
- Astolfo, G., Allsopp, H., (2023) The coloniality of migration and integration: continuing the discussion. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 11(1), pp.1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-023-00343-2>.
- Astolfo, G., Allsopp, H., Duszczyk, M., Haase, A., Franz, Y., Laksevics, K., Nasya B., Schmidt A., Franz Y., Reeger U., Raubisko, I. (2022) Now and then. Precariousness, double standards and racism in housing refugees. DPU UCL Blog. June 20<sup>th</sup> 2022. Available at: <https://blogs.ucl.ac.uk/dpublog/2022/06/20/now-and-then-precarioussness-double-standards-and-racism-in-housing-refugees/> (accessed 06/12/2023).
- Astolfo, G., Allsopp, H., Rudlin, J., Samhan, H (2020) Unsettling integration. DPU: London. Available at: [https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10140548/1/2021\\_Unsettling%20integration.pdf](https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10140548/1/2021_Unsettling%20integration.pdf) (last accessed 10/09/2024).
- Bakker, L., Cheung, S. Y., & Phillimore, J. (2016) The asylum-integration paradox: comparing asylum support systems and refugee integration in The Netherlands and the UK, *International Migration*, 54, pp.118–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12251>.
- Beeckmans, L., Singh, A., & Gola, A. (2022) Rethinking the intersection of displacement and home from a spatial perspective, in: L. Beeckmans, A. Gola, A. Singh, & H. Heynen (Eds.), *Making home(s) in displacement: critical reflections on a spatial practice*, pp.11–44 (Leuven: Leuven University Press).
- Bernt, M., Hamann, U., El-Kayed, N., & Keskinilic, L. (2022) Internal migration industries: Shaping the housing options for refugees at the local level, *Urban Studies*, 59(11), pp. 2217–2233. DOI: 10.1177/00420980211041242.

- Bhagat, A. (2021) Displacement in “actually existing” racial neoliberalism: refugee governance in Paris, *Urban Geography*, 42(5), pp.634–653. DOI: 10.1080/02723638.2019.1659689.
- Blank, M. (2019) “Wir Schaffen Das!”? Spatial pitfalls of neighborhood-based refugee reception in Germany - a case study of Frankfurt-Rödelheim, *Social Sciences*, 8(5), article no. 161. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci8050161>.
- Blyth, M. (2013) *Austerity: The history of a dangerous idea*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Brown, P., Gill, S. & Halsall, J.P. (2022) The impact of housing on refugees: an evidence synthesis, *Housing Studies*, 39(1) pp. 227–271, DOI: 10.1080/02673037.2022.2045007.
- Costello, C., & Foster, M. (2022) (Some) refugees welcome: When is differentiating between refugees unlawful discrimination? *International Journal of Discrimination and the Law*, 22(3), pp.244–280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13582291221116476>.
- Darling, J (2011) Domopolitics, governmentality and the regulation of asylum accommodation, *Political Geography*, 30(5), pp.63–271. ISSN 0962-6298, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2011.04.011>.
- Darling, J. (2016) Privatising asylum: neoliberalisation, depoliticisation and the governance of forced migration, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 41(3), pp. 230–243. DOI: 10.1111/tran.12118.
- Dzenovska, D. (2018) *School of Europeanness: Tolerance and other lessons in political liberalism in Latvia*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Erel, U., Murji, K., Nahaboo, Z. (2016) Understanding the contemporary race–migration nexus, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(8), pp.1339–1360, DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2016.1161808.
- Fassin, D. (2007) Humanitarianism as a Politics of Life, *Public Culture* 19(3), pp.499–520. DOI: 10.1215/08992363-2007-007.
- Favell, A. (2019) Integration: Twelve Propositions after Schinkel, *Comparative Migration Studies*, 7(21) pp.1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0125-7>.
- Farha, L. (2017) *Report of the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context*. United Nations Human Rights Council, A/HRC/34/51 (Available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/special-procedures/sr-housing/financialization-housing> (accessed 12/01/2023).
- Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E. (2020) Introduction. *Migration and Society*, 3(1), pp.1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3167/arms.2020.030102>.
- Fields, D., & Raymond, E. L. (2021) Racialized geographies of housing financialization. *Progress in Human Geography*, 45(6), pp.1625–1645. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03091325211009299>.
- Finney, N., K. Clark, & Nazroo, J. (2019a) Opportunities and Challenges Doing Interdisciplinary Research: What Can We Learn from Studies of Ethnicity, Inequality and Place?, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45(17), pp.3173–3187. DOI:10.1080/1369183X.2018.1480995.
- Finney, N., Harries, B., Rhodes, J., & Lymperopoulou, K. (2019b) The roles of social housing providers in creating ‘integrated’ communities, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(17), pp.3207–3224. DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2018.1480997.
- Gewalt, S. C., Sarah, B., Ziegler, S., Szecsenyi, J., & Bozorgmehr, K. (2018) Psychosocial health of asylum seeking women living in state-provided accommodation in Germany during pregnancy and early motherhood: A case study exploring the role of social determinants of health, *PLoS One*, 13(12), pp.1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0208007>.
- Grosfoguel, R., Oso, L., & Christou, A. (2015). ‘Racism’, intersectionality and migration studies: Framing some theoretical reflections. *Identities*, 22(6), pp.635–652. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2014.950974>.
- Haase, H., Arroyo, I., Astolfo, G., Franz, Y., Laksevics, K., Lazarenko, V., Nasya, B., Reeger, U., Schmidt, A. (2023) Housing refugees from Ukraine: preliminary insights and learnings from the local response in five European cities, *Urban Research & Practice*, 17(1), pp.139–145, DOI: 10.1080/17535069.2023.2225333.

- Haase, A., Schmidt, A., Rink, D., & Kabisch, S. (2020) Leipzig's Inner East as an Arrival Space? Exploring the Trajectory of a Diversifying Neighbourhood, *Urban Planning*, 5(3), pp.89–102. DOI: 10.17645/up.v5i3.2902.
- Haase, A., Schmidt, A. (2019) Grüne Freiräume in Ankunftsquartieren: Funktionen und Herausforderungen für ihre kooperative Entwicklung, UFZ Discussion Paper, 4/2019, (Leipzig: Helmholtz-Zentrum für Umweltforschung (UFZ)). Available at: <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-63120-4> (accessed 10/01/2023).
- Haase, A. (2020) Covid-19 as a Social Crisis and Justice Challenge for Cities, *Frontiers in Sociology*. 5:583638. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2020.583638> (accessed 25/01/2023).
- Hamlin, R. (2021) *Crossing: How We Label and React to People on the Move*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press).
- Klein, N. (2007) *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*, (London: Penguin).
- Kreichauf, R. (2018) From forced migration to forced arrival: the campization of refugee accommodation in European cities, *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6(7), pp.1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-017-0069-8>.
- Krišjāne, Z., & Bērziņš, M. (2014) Intra-urban residential differentiation in the post-Soviet city: the case of Riga, Latvia, *Hungarian Geographical Bulletin*, 63(3), pp.235–253. <https://doi.org/10.15201/hungeobull.63.3.1>.
- Lakševics, K., Franz, Y., Haase, A., Nasya, B., Patti, D., Reeger, U., Raubiško, I., Schmidt, A., & Šuvajevs, A. (2024) The permanent regime of temporary solutions: Housing of forced migrants in Europe as a policy challenge, *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 31(1), pp.81-87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09697764231197963>.
- Lancione, M. (2022) Inhabiting Dispossession in the Post-Socialist City: Race, Class and the Plan in Bucharest, Romania, *Antipode*, 54(4), pp. 1141-1165. DOI: 10.1111/anti.12821.
- Lietaert, I., Verhaeghe, F. & Derluyn, I. (2020) Families on hold: How the context of an asylum centre affects parenting experiences, *Child & Family Social Work*, 25(S1), pp.1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12706>.
- Lipsitz, G. (2007) The Racialization of Space and the Spatialization of Race: Theorizing the Hidden Architecture of Landscape, *Landscape Journal*, 26(1), pp.10–23. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43323751>.
- Loose, I. (2008) The Anti-Fascist Myth of the German Democratic Republic and Its Decline after 1989, in: Kopeček, M. (Ed.) *Past in the Making. Historical revisionism in Central Europe after 1989*, pp. 59-71 (Budapest: Central European University Press).
- Lukes, S., de Noronha, N., & Finney, N. (2019) Slippery discrimination: a review of the drivers of migrant and minority housing disadvantage, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(17), pp.3188-3206. DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2018.1480996.
- Machin, R. (2023) The UK – a home for Ukrainians? An analysis of social security and housing policy, *Journal of Poverty and Social Justice*, 31(2), pp.298-305. <https://doi.org/10.1332/175982723X16770921278736> (accessed 20/09/2023).
- Manara, M., Piazza, G. (2018) The depoliticisation of asylum seekers: Carl schmitt and the italian system of dispersal reception into cities, *Political Geography*, 64, pp. 43–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2018.02.005>.
- Mayblin, L., Turner, J. (2021) *Migration studies and colonialism*. (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Nasya B., Schmidt A., Haase A., Stevens U., Laksevics K., Arroyo I., Franz U., Reeger U., Girardi-Hoog J., Patti D., Gruber E. (2023 a) Forced migrants' access to housing, House-IN policy information 1. Available at: [https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/development/sites/bartlett\\_development/files/policybrief07.pdf](https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/development/sites/bartlett_development/files/policybrief07.pdf). (Accessed 10/01/2024).
- Nasya B., Schmidt A., Haase A., Stevens U., Laksevics K., Arroyo I., Franz U., Reeger U., Girardi-Hoog J., Patti D., Gruber E. (2023 b) Enabling settling down and belonging, House-IN policy information 2. Available at: [https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/development/sites/bartlett\\_development/files/policybrief2\\_final8.pdf](https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/development/sites/bartlett_development/files/policybrief2_final8.pdf) (Accessed 10/01/2024).



- OHCHR (2022) Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Racial Discrimination against persons fleeing from the armed conflict in Ukraine: Statement 1 (advanced unedited version), 17 March 2022, Available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/treaty-bodies/cerd/decisions-statements-and-letters#b>. (Accessed 21/02/2023).
- Peck, J. (2015) *Austerity Urbanism: The Neoliberal Crisis of American Cities*. (New York: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung Foundation).
- Peck, J., Tickell, A. (2002) Neoliberalizing space. *Antipode*, 34(3), pp.380–404. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00247>.
- Picker, G., Murji, K. & Boatcă, M. (2019) Racial urbanities: towards a global cartography, *Social Identities*, 25(1), pp.1-10. DOI: 10.1080/13504630.2017.1418606.
- Powell, R. & Simone, A. M. (2022) Towards a global housing studies: beyond dichotomy, normativity and common abstraction, *Housing Studies*, 37(6), pp.837-846. DOI: 10.1080/02673037.2022.2054158.
- Power, E. R. & Mee, K. J. (2020) Housing: an infrastructure of care, *Housing Studies*, 35(3), pp.484-505. DOI: 10.1080/02673037.2019.1612038.
- Reinhold, S. & Brendel, P. (2022) *Brennglas Corona. Lokale Integrationsarbeit in Zeiten einer globalen Pandemie*, (Stuttgart: Robert Bosch Stiftung).
- Rhodes, J. & Brown, L. (2019) The rise and fall of the ‘inner city’: race, space and urban policy in postwar England, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(17), pp.3243-3259, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2018.1480999.
- Righard, K. & Oberg, E. (2019) Integration governance in Sweden: accommodation, regeneration and exclusion. (Malmö: Malmö University). Available at: <https://www.glimer.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Sweden-WP3.pdf> (accessed 01/03/2022).
- Rolnik, R. (2019) *Urban Warfare: Housing under the Empire of Finance* (London: Verso Books).
- Sebastiani, L., Martín-Godoy, P. (2020) Elective affinities between racism and immigrant integration policies: A dialogue between two studies carried out across the European Union and Spain, *Identities*, 29(5) pp.594-613. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2020.1831780>.
- Schinkel, W. (2018) Against ‘immigrant integration’: for an end to neocolonial knowledge production, *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6(31), pp1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0095-1>.
- Shrestha, P., Gurrán, N., & Maalsen, S. (2021) Informal housing practices. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 21(2), pp.157–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19491247.2021.1893982>.
- Soederberg, S. (2019) Governing Global Displacement in Austerity Urbanism: The Case of Berlin's Refugee Housing Crisis, *Development and Change*, 50(4), pp.923-947. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12455>.
- Sommers, J. (2014) Austerity, internal devaluation, and social (in) security in Latvia. In J. Sommers & C. Woolfson (Eds.), *The Contradictions of Austerity: The Socio-Economic Costs of the Neoliberal Baltic Model*, pp.17-43. (London: Routledge).
- Stadt Leipzig (2023) *Statistischer Quartalsbericht I/2023*. (Leipzig: Stadt Leipzig).
- Stadt Leipzig (2021) *Migrantenbefragung 2020. Ergebnisbericht* (Leipzig: Stadt Leipzig).
- Swyngedouw, E. (2005) Governance Innovation and the Citizen: The Janus Face of Governance-beyond-the-State, *Urban Studies* 42(11), pp.1991-2006 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980500279869>
- Tazzioli, M. (2020) The politics of migrant dispersal. Dividing and policing migrant multiplicities, *Migration Studies*, 8(4), pp510–529. <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnz003>.
- Taylor, K-Y (2019) *Race for Profit: How Banks and the Real Estate Industry Undermined Black Homeownership*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).
- Vilenica, A., McElroy, E., Ferrari, M., Fernandez, M., Garcia-Lamarca, M., & Lancione, M. (2020) Covid-19 and housing struggles: The (re)makings of austerity, disaster capitalism, and the no return to normal. *Radical Housing Journal*, 2(1), pp. 9-28. Available at:

<https://radicalhousingjournal.org/2020/covid-19-and-housing-struggles/> (accessed 14/02/20230).

- Walther, L., Fuchs, L. M., Schupp, J., & von Scheve, C. (2020) Living conditions and the mental health and well-being of refugees: evidence from a large-scale German Survey. *Journal of Immigrant & Minority Health*, 22(5), pp. 903–913. DOI: [10.1007/s10903-019-00968-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-019-00968-5).
- Werner, F., Haase, A., Renner, N., Rink, D., Rottwinkel, M., & Schmidt, A. (2018) The Local Governance of Arrival in Leipzig: Housing of Asylum-Seeking Persons as a Contested Field. *Urban Planning*, 3(4), pp.116-128. [https:// doi.org/10.17645/up.v3i4.1708](https://doi.org/10.17645/up.v3i4.1708).
- Zizek, S. (2022). What Does Defending Europe Mean?. *Project Syndicate* March 2<sup>nd</sup>, Available at: <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/europe-unequal-treatment-of-refugees-exposed-by-ukraine-by-slavoj-zizek-2022-03> (accessed 10/01/2023).