"Homes for Ukraine": Gendered Refugee Hosting, Differential Inclusion, and Domopolitics in the United Kingdom

Megan Crossley
Lancaster University, UK

Recommended Citation

"Homes for Ukraine": Gendered Refugee Hosting, Differential Inclusion, and Domopolitics in the United Kingdom

By Megan Crossley[1]

Abstract

Since the Russian invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, many Ukrainians have been displaced and sought refuge in other European countries, including the United Kingdom. Analyzing newspaper articles, public opinion polls, and emerging reports on the scheme, I argue that this policy draws on a particular conception of home, blurring the distinctions between private and public forms of hospitality towards certain kinds of migrants. In this moment of intensified public engagement with border politics, through a crisis displacing primarily women, this essay considers the "Homes for Ukraine" scheme as an overt manifestation of gendered domopolitics. In comparing the response to Ukrainians with the response to other kinds of refugees, I argue that this hospitality is conditional and gendered, reinforcing hierarchical claims to migration and belonging. The question of who is an (un)welcome guest through processes of racialization, nationalism, and gendering becomes more entangled as the sophisticated filtration mechanisms of bordering emerge within the home itself as an extension of the nation—and also the nation as an extension of the home.

Keywords: Ukraine, Forced migration, Domopolitics, Refugee hosting, Refugee women

Introduction

The "Homes for Ukraine" scheme was announced by the UK Government on the 14th of March 2022 in response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine, following public pressure around the lack of a fast-track route for Ukrainian refugees. Around 179,900 applications have been made to the Ukraine Sponsorship Scheme, with approximately 150,800 of these sponsorship scheme visas already granted to date (Home Office, 2022). Of these applications, the majority are women and children as most men aged between 18-60 have been drafted into military service as a result of the conflict (UK Visas and Immigration, 2022). The Homes for Ukraine scheme encourages UK citizens to invite Ukrainian refugees into their private homes, opening up spare bedrooms to individuals and families in search of safety. The scheme is therefore significant as an overt manifestation of domopolitics, blurring the distinctions between private and public forms of hospitality towards migrants and intensifying imaginings of the "cohesive and homely" nation (Darling, 2011; Walters, 2004).

This is evidenced through the analysis of newspaper articles and public opinion polls that focus on the launch of the scheme in March 2022 as well as comparing media responses to people seeking asylum and refugee status more widely. I obtained data from the online versions of daily mainstream newspapers published in the United Kingdom. I surveyed seven popular publications

---

[1] Megan Crossley is a PhD researcher and Associate Lecturer at Lancaster University. She is now in the second year of her Ph.D. project which uses photovoice methods to explore the experiences of people seeking asylum or with recent refugee status in North-West England. Her research is concerned with sociologies of migration and her primary research interests are refugees and the asylum system, gender, community-making, and resistance. This paper represents research that was conducted for her Master's degree in Social Research. Contact: m.crossley@lancaster.ac.uk

for headlines using the search terms "Ukrainian refugees" and "Homes for Ukraine." These publications were *BBC News*, *The Sun*, *The Mirror*, *The Daily Mail*, *The Telegraph*, *The Times,* and *The Guardian*; these were chosen to represent tabloid and non-tabloid reporting across the political spectrum. This search returned many results; however, for my own analysis, I only included headlines and associated images published from March to May 2022. I also compared opinion poll results from YouGov, comparing polls that asked questions included the terms Ukraine, asylum, refugees and channel crossings between January 2020 and May 2022.

In this moment of intensified public engagement with border politics, through a crisis displacing primarily women, it is crucial to pay attention to these politics as they are enacted—not only at the geographical site of the border but also through diverse and diffuse modes of governance which "actively attempt to utilise, manage and accommodate mobility" (Darling, 2011, p. 263). This essay focuses on "accommodation" in a literal sense, demonstrating how the national home is reproduced within the feminized private home and contesting the hierarchical governing of whose mobility is accommodated. It will also consider the gendered and racialized conditionality of this hospitality, using the Homes for Ukraine program as a case study to illustrate the framing of "deservingness" of asylum in the UK that structures conditional and hierarchical claims to belonging.

Nation as Home, Home as Nation

By the end of its first month, the Homes for Ukraine scheme had received 32,200 applications offering to house Ukrainians in British homes. The program allows individuals to nominate an adult or family to come to the UK and live with them or in an alternative residence that they provide, for at least six months. In return, the UK Government will offer the host sponsor £350 per month, essentially subcontracting housing through individual sponsors rather than replicating more formalized resettlement schemes. Sponsors will not need to know or have met these people that they invite into their homes beforehand, and an unrestricted number of Ukrainians will be able to use this route. Meanwhile, local authorities will receive an additional £10,500 per adult for support services with more offered for school-aged children.

Until this most recent program, housing for refugees and people seeking asylum has primarily been provided by the state through asylum dispersal to shared houses and hotels or has been regarded as the personal responsibility of refugees when they are granted leave to remain. Jonathan Darling (2011) offers useful insight into the domopolitical logics that influence and inform these governmental forms of hosting, arguing that the much-criticized National Asylum Support Service (NASS) implements a logic of accommodation which acts to discipline asylum seekers and becomes a key space through which a relation to the border is lived. For Darling (2011), the discomfort felt by people seeking asylum because of the mobility and insecurity of NASS housing is a productive element of domopolitics, as the knowledge that they could be subject to inspection, dispersal, or eviction at any time is a means of constraining and controlling those awaiting decisions from the Home Office. Though often referred to publicly as refugees, most Ukrainians seeking safety in the UK do so by applying for a visa rather than making a claim through the asylum system. This affords them access to employment, benefits, and accommodations that people seeking asylum are typically excluded from.

Historically, the nation has been constructed through claims to the familial and is imagined as an extension of the home (Yuval-Davis, 1997). The discursive framing of "homeland" or "motherland" is a romanticization of these perceived domestic and familial ties. Bordering the nation is therefore rationalized in the name of a particular conception of home, as state policies

entangle the home with the nation as sites of securitization. Its sovereign powers are also maintained through this reinforced association, as the UK Government department responsible for policing, counter-terrorism and immigration is itself named the Home Office. William Walters (2004) understands this entanglement as "domopolitics," whereby the state is governed as a "home" or *domos*, and this model of home is used to represent the connections between citizen, community, and state.

The home-ly nation is one which must be secured, ordered, and maintained and so anxieties of the home underpin social ordering through the *domos* (Walters, 2004). This in turn produces mechanisms which filter, classify, and monitor subjects through their relationship to the imagined home or their disruption of it (Turner, 2016). As such, regulating the nation as the "family home" involves managing and cultivating ideal morals, behaviors, forms of intimacy, and social ties (Darling, 2011, p. 265). This process reinscribes heteropatriarchal ideals of the nuclear family as representative of the nation. Darling articulates this domopolitical logic as

> produc[ing] both the categories of position through which individuals are sorted and understood and the route or pathway of response which such positions imply, as categories of position come to be linked to particular responses in terms of case management, welfare entitlements and *the provision of accommodation and services*. (2011, p. 266, my emphasis)

It is this "provision of accommodation and services" that is of particular interest here; under the Homes for Ukraine scheme, the national home and its borders are reproduced within the private home in a literal sense. Moreover, the uncomfortable nexus of the perceived feminized vulnerability of some refugees and the masculinized threat of some migrants unravels the gendered conditionality of belonging. This is intensified by the relocation of this provision to the private home—a space historically associated with women. The question of who is allowed to join the family, stay as a guest, or is excluded from the private and national home becomes more closely knotted as the sophisticated filtration mechanisms of bordering enter the home in a new form. Perhaps it is time to amend the old adage "an Englishman's home is his castle"—rather, it is an immigration office.

A Woman's Place Is in the *Domos*: Gendering Domopolitics

Using domopolitics as an analytical framework as it pertains to the construction of national identity and belonging is evidently useful; however, a significant limitation is Walters' notable gender-neutrality (2004). Despite an interest in the state's use of the concept of home, his theorization fails to address the significance of gender in these imaginings of familial and private domestic spaces. Gwyneth Lonergan challenges this oversight, asserting that "a gendered dichotomy involving 'the home' lies at the heart of modern liberal citizenship" (Lonergan, 2018, p. 7). Lonergan draws on Pateman's work on the gendered divisions between the feminine, apolitical, "private" domain and the masculine, political, "public" domains (Lonergan, 2018; Pateman, 1989); the private sphere includes the family home, which is thus regarded as detached from politics.

As women (and the family) are located in the private sphere, they have not historically been understood as politically relevant or active. Yuval-Davis challenges this idea by arguing that "the public realm cannot be fully understood in the absence of the private sphere, and, similarly, the meaning of the original contract is misinterpreted without both, mutually depending halves of the story" (1997, p. 4). As Elizabeth Cowie (1978) argues, women are not essentially located within

the family home; however, the analytic category of women is constructed in the family, defined within and by kinship structures. As part of this construction, women have historically held a greater responsibility for hospitality and home-making (Baxter & Brickell, 2014; Blunt & Dowling, 2006; Hamington, 2010; Hochschild & Machung, 2012). Feminist theories of home identify this as a potential source of frustration and conflict for those who strain against expectations of hospitality as labor that women typically perform in addition to the domestic work of maintaining the home itself (Rottmann & Nimer, 2021; Young, 2005). Moreover, this binary of a separated political public and apolitical private domains is implicitly undermined by Walters' theorization of domopolitics as he demonstrates the ways in which politics, and particularly border politics, must be understood through the home and not separate from it—despite the absence of an explicit gendered analysis from the original publication of this theory (Walters, 2004).

Extending this critique, we can begin to consider the position of refugee women with complex relations to home. De Angelis' work with women in immigration detention reveals how domestic work, such as sharing cultural foods and recipes, can be reclaimed as everyday resistance in immigration removal centers and demonstrates how migrant women strategically build an identity as a homemaker in a space defined by deportability (2020). Furthermore, Rottman and Nimer's study on hospitality as a homemaking strategy for Syrian women against their "differential inclusion" into Turkish society illustrates the ways in which refugee women navigate (in)hospitality, renegotiate ethnic discourses and subjectivities that are imposed upon them as "guests," and revalorize their roles and status in their families (Rottman & Nimer, 2021). Though the study is concerned with the relations between Syrian refugees and their Turkish neighbors, it is useful for an analysis of Homes for Ukraine because it shifts the focus of analysis from integration towards considering "hosting" and "guesting" as mutually negotiated and contested practices while also paying attention to gendered relations of care. It remains to be seen how the complex practices of hosting and guesting will be negotiated by Ukrainian women and British hosts as the Homes for Ukraine program is implemented; however, it is evidently a critical area for future empirical research to fully understand the implications of hospitality, home-making, and gendered relations of care in this context.

"Homes for Ukraine": Encounters of Private and Public Hospitality

This scheme marks a shift in the ways in which refugees are housed in the UK; however, it is not the first example of a national hosting scheme dependent on volunteers. In 2016, a Community Sponsorship scheme was launched by the Home Office following the success of similar programs in Canada (Reset, n.d.). Like Homes for Ukraine, the Community Sponsorship scheme allows people in the UK to play a direct role in supporting refugees, but this typically involves finding housing for the family rather than inviting them to live in their own private homes. Originally established as a response to the Syrian crisis, more than 150 community groups welcomed almost 700 refugees in the first five years of the program (Reset, n.d.). The program has thus demonstrated some success; however, its popularity and place in the national consciousness is eclipsed by the Homes for Ukraine scheme.

The scheme could be interpreted as a conservative turn towards the laissez-faire "Big Society," placing responsibility on individuals and communities to care for those seeking asylum and making minimal demands upon the state. This understanding obscures the significant role that voluntary organizations already take on to complement, collaborate with, or supplement the state in housing refugees and people seeking asylum (Mayblin & James, 2019). While researching the experiences of individuals and families who voluntarily host refugees in their household, Monforte and associates argue that this practice is a kind of private hospitality which offers "a critique and

an alternative action to the lack of public hospitality, and to the boundaries that governments draw between 'desirable' and 'undesirable' migrants,'" drawing clear distinctions between forms of private and public hospitality (2021, p. 675). Fataneh Farahani (2021) highlights the evident tension between hostile governmental border regimes and public claims to solidarity as enacted through voluntary hosting, illustrating the complex relationship between hostility produced and maintained by the nation-state (or what is termed in the UK as the "Hostile Environment") and private hospitality.

While hospitality to migrants and refugees through voluntary private hosting does play a valuable role in contesting social exclusion, it also produces a point of encounter between citizen and stranger. Jacques Derrida (2000) conceptualizes this tension as "hostipitality," deconstructing the close etymological links between hospitality and hostility which both derive from the original *hostis*, or foreigner. Hostipitality recognizes occurrences of hostility as more than the adverse or absence of hospitality, but as something that may coexist, overlap, or supplement it (Derrida, 2000). Therefore, while both Monforte and associates and Farahani frame private hosting as a means of private hospitality that is resistant to the violent bordering logics that are perpetuated through NASS accommodation provision, this binary is not so static and definitive. It is evident that both public and private hosting and housing arrangements are structured by domopolitics. Voluntary private hosting arrangements do not exist in isolation from bordering logics; rather, they are susceptible to reproducing precarity and reinscribing the conditionality of refugee belonging and regimes of "deportability" (De Genova, 2002). In the case of the Homes for Ukraine scheme, this distinction is blurred even further as private and public hospitalities intersect through a government-sponsored private hosting scheme.

In her work on voluntary private hosting of refugees in the UK, Yasmin Gunaratnam suggests, "this reproductive labour in a domestic venue and where otherness is close by [...] is inevitably caught up in the imperatives and contingencies of hostile environment policies" (2021, p. 711). Politics of belonging are thus produced and reproduced by this environment, determining who is worthy of hospitality and who is not, and refigures the home as representative of the nation. The Homes for Ukraine scheme figures certain refugees as guests to be invited into British homes, and therefore represents a new form of accommodation provision, as the concepts of home and nation intertwine further in this overt manifestation of domopolitics. The scheme also intensifies the conditionality of belonging among refugees in the UK as the question of who is invited as a guest in British households is raised.

Rescuing Refugee Women: (Re)producing Vulnerability through the Homes for Ukraine Program

Though the Homes for Ukraine scheme does not determine eligibility by gender, the majority of applicants are women and children (Home Office, 2022). This is because the Ukrainian government declared martial law which prohibited all men aged 18-60 from leaving the country through military conscription (UK Visas and Immigration, 2022). This has specific implications for the representation of Ukrainian refugees as a gendered crisis and offers somewhat of a departure from typical representations of refugees and people seeking asylum in British media, a demographic which is typically figured as a distinctly masculine threat. In a study of media images of refugees and asylum-seekers by Blumell and Cooper (2019), men were identified eight times more than women, predominantly in association with criminality, terrorism, and violence. Wilmott (2017) confirms these findings, adding that 88.24% of photographs portraying women from online newspapers include children compared to only 40.68% in photographs of male refugees. A

distinction is drawn along gendered lines through which refugees and asylum-seekers in popular media are understood as either a risk or as at risk (Gray & Franck, 2019).

When surveying British newspapers' online reports on the launch of the Homes for Ukraine scheme, this dichotomy is reproduced as the articles are accompanied by images of Ukrainian women waiting, crying, sleeping, and/or caring for children (Ferguson & Leo, 2022; Retter, 2022; Riley-Smith, 2022; Sparrow, 2022; The Times, 2022; L. Turner, 2022). These women are constructed as passive victims in need of special attention and rescue, an ideological mechanism that is directly connected to their perceived vulnerability. This ideological impulse towards protecting the "womenandchildren," to use Cynthia Enloe's neologism, demonstrates the ways in which discourse on gender and on nation tend to intersect as mutually constitutive (Enloe, 1991). The naturalized image of the nation as an extension of the home and family also involves sexual divisions of labor, in which the men protect the vulnerable women and children (Yuval-Davis, 1997). Across categories, women are figured as passive, in need of protection, and constrained to the home in caring roles that are detached from violent and political conflicts. Women are limited to the role of potential victims defined by their need for refuge and rescue. The gendered character of war deepens this divide through construction of the masculine aggressor against the feminine peacemaker; gender is shaped by the war system, and the war system is shaped by gender through mutually invested processes (Goldstein, 2003).

It is this perceived vulnerability that entitles Ukrainian women to the Homes for Ukraine scheme as a route to safety, defining them as deserving of protection and inspiring the UK Government to act. It is precisely this vulnerability, however, that raises concerns for critics of the program. Organizations working with refugees in the UK have expressed fears that this new scheme asks members of the public to take in people who may have experienced trauma without the necessary safeguarding and training, thus putting inordinate responsibility on their shoulders and leaving refugees at risk of exploitation (JCWI, 2022; NACCOM, 2022; Positive Action in Housing, 2022; Refugee Action, 2022; Refugee Council, 2022). Though sponsors are offered a £350 per month incentive, no such remunerations are offered to the refugees themselves, potentially attracting hosts with harmful intentions and reinforcing unequal power dynamics. As most Ukrainians come to the UK through family or sponsorship visas rather than through the asylum system or as resettled refugees, they do not have the protections and entitlements afforded by official refugee status that they may need, particularly if the relationship with their sponsor breaks down.

A letter to Michael Gove, then Communities Secretary, from 16 refugee and anti-trafficking organizations reaffirms this risk, suggesting that, "by adopting a hands-off approach to matching, there is a high risk that traffickers, criminals and unscrupulous landlords set up matching sites and Facebook pages to prey upon the vulnerable" (Townsend, 2022).

The United Nations Refugee Agency has called on the UK Government to review the scheme following such reports by sharing concerns around safeguarding (UNHCR, 2022). Alongside these speculations, organizations are beginning to report experiences of these risks becoming reality; Louise Calvey, Head of Safeguarding at the charity Refugee Action, reported that she was aware of a UK resident who only offered to house a single Ukrainian woman in return for help with childcare (Townsend, 2022). In Calvey's own words, issues with the scheme "means that it risks being a Tinder for sex traffickers" (Townsend, 2022). A *Times* journalist posing as a young Ukrainian woman from Kyiv reported she was overwhelmed with inappropriate messages within minutes of uploading a post on the largest Facebook group for UK hosts (Bakht & Kenber, 2022). One sent a recorded voice message, suggesting "I am ready to help you and maybe you can help

me also." Some men pretended to have multiple bedrooms in their one-bedroom residences, while another suggested sharing a bed, writing: "I have a large bed. We could sleep together" (Bakht & Kenber, 2022). Similarly, the charity Positive Action in Housing shared the experience of a young woman who was offered accommodation in exchange for an arrangement of a sexual nature by a man who sent her a screenshot of his official confirmation email from the UK Government's Homes for Ukraine scheme (Wilson, 2022).

Bosworth and associates claim that "traditional gendered and racial ideologies uphold and legitimate the spaces created by the hyper-politics of border control" (Bosworth et al., 2018, p. 2192). This includes the domestic space of the family home, as well as the geographical borders of the imagined national home. As previously discussed, voluntary private hosting practices can reproduce precarity and reinscribe the conditionality of refugee belonging. In the case of the Homes for Ukraine scheme, these uneven power dynamics between host and guest are also gendered and therefore the program is at risk of reproducing the vulnerabilities imposed on refugee women, particularly in relation to sexual violence and coercion. These accounts are particularly concerning when considering the context of Ukraine as a source nation for human trafficking, coercing, and/or deceiving women into sex work, childcare and/or domestic slavery (Deighan, 2010; Hughes & Denisova, 2001, 2001; Sharapov, 2014).

Women from Eastern Europe are often perceived as being more feminine and more caring than Western women (Cvajner, 2011) but also more sexualized (Näre, 2014). In her study on the experiences of migrant Ukrainian women in paid domestic work in private households, Lena Näre (2014) emphasizes that these women are often stereotyped as sexually aggressive which stokes anxieties about migrant women tempting men in search of marriage and, ultimately, citizenship. She argues that these women "must manage their bodies in ways that make them asexual and decent – in other words, they must conform to the moral order of the household" (Näre, 2014, p.377). This control and management of migrant women's bodies within the household is equivalent to the regulation of the nation as the family home through domopolitics, managing and cultivating the ideal morals, behaviors, forms of intimacy, and social ties that may occur in a home as in the nation (Walters, 2004).

Bordering is justified through a particular conception of home and state policies that interweave the home and the nation as sites of securitization (Walters, 2004). This logic, however, relies on an understanding of home as an essentially safe place in need of protection from potential disruption or threat. This theory fails to recognize that, despite domopolitical imaginings, the home is not always and has historically failed to be a safe space for all women (Blunt & Dowling, 2006; Hamington, 2010). Although the scheme is promoted as a means of protecting Ukrainian refugees, in this way any protection afforded to migrant women through gendered means ultimately fails and is unable to disrupt powerful ethnicized and sexualized constructions of migrant womanhood. Their safety and belonging are inherently conditional, dependent on their willingness and capacity to assimilate to the expected ideals and controls on the nation-state as imagined through the *domos*. For Ukrainian refugees applying to the Homes for Ukraine scheme, this is at least perceived as possible, though it remains to be seen to what extent this is accepted in practice.

Uninvited Guests: The Racialized Conditionality of Hospitality and Belonging

As previously outlined, many Ukrainians fleeing the Russian invasion apply for a visa to enter the UK and enroll in the Homes for Ukraine scheme. Though often referred to as refugees in the media and public discourse, they are not officially granted refugee status as recognized by the UN Refugee Convention (Goodwin-Gill, 2001). Despite this classification, it is clear that the

public regard Ukrainians as deserving refugees, with 75% of people in support of allowing Ukrainians to come to the UK without a visa (YouGov, 2022). Though these results may ostensibly indicate positive attitudes towards refugees and people seeking asylum, it becomes clear that this is an exceptional case.

In response to a similar survey taken five months earlier, but with regards to people crossing the English Channel to seek asylum from the Global South, results were far less favorable (YouGov, 2021). The majority of respondents (61%) support attempts to intercept boats in the English Channel and divert them back to France, a tactic that is currently authorized for Border Force officials in limited circumstances. Almost half of the respondents (47%) also agreed that people seeking asylum in the UK should be sent to another country while their case is being processed, and the UK government has since announced its controversial intentions to send people seeking asylum to Rwanda for off-shore processing, a policy which was announced exactly one month after the introduction of the Homes for Ukraine program and highlights the clear disparities in how those escaping conflict are treated (BBC News, 2022).

This differential inclusion is also (re)produced within private hosting schemes. Monforte and associates demonstrate that the narratives of private hosts typically reproduce and reify racial and social inequalities often observed in studies on humanitarian action, figuring the vulnerable victim who depends on the help of more powerful (middle-class and white) actors (2021, p. 683). As Turner argues, though "dominant modes of familial domesticity are imagined through claims to universal inner sanctuary and privacy, these are always etched with a certain ethnocentric, bourgeois and colonising logic" (2016, p. 212). While volunteer-led schemes may include refugees, people seeking asylum and people without secure documentation or legal status (see Gunaratnam, 2021), the government-sponsored scheme is more selective in determining who is deserving, as only those recognized as Ukrainian refugees are eligible. This reinforces the conditionality of hospitality; only those who are considered deserving are invited as guests, and who is deserving is decided by the host. The Homes for Ukraine scheme is an intensification of this dynamic as the host is both the nation-state and the private home-owner through the "delocalization of the border," where the functions and obligations of the border are performed by agents both inside and outside the nation-state, separate from the physical border itself (Walters, 2004, p. 193).

Anderson (2013) theorizes that modern nation-states are constructed as "communities of value," in which current and prospective citizens engage in good behavior and can contribute something in return. These "good citizens" are contrasted with "non-citizens," including refugees, asylum-seekers, and migrants, as well as "failed citizens," such as criminals and people who exploit benefits. This dichotomous framework excludes those who are either economically unproductive or unable to assimilate into British society. People seeking asylum from the Global South are framed as a draining burden on resources, using economic rhetoric to justify bordering and rights to safety (Jones et al., 2017). Moreover, the categories of non-citizen and failed citizens are elided as it is implied that people are not genuine asylum-seekers but deceptive economic migrants trying to exploit the system. In comparison, good citizens are positioned as "law-abiding and hard-working members of stable and respectable families" (Anderson, 2013, p. 3) and constructed by government, media, and public discourses as in need of external protection from non-citizens (foreigners and migrants) and internal protection from failed citizens (benefit scroungers, criminals, and so on) (Anderson, 2013 p. 4). These are domopolitical logics from another angle, rationalizing border controls and distrust of asylum seekers as a threat to the imagined national home (Walters, 2004).

To explain why Ukrainians seem to be excluded from this narrative of undeserving migrants, we must consider the influence of race and coloniality in structuring hierarchies of belonging. Yuval-Davis and associates attest that "the border is being opened up very selectively while maintaining a strong demarcation and boundaries between the 'deserving' and the 'undeserving'" (2005, p. 520). Though Ukrainians may be subject to othering as Eastern Europeans, their proximity to whiteness affords them some privilege. Anna Safuta (2018) recognizes that "peripherally white" migrant domestic workers from Central and Eastern Europe benefit from being racialized as white compared to their non-white counterparts, while also recognizing that this privilege is inextricable from the subalternity of their status. To this end, while their belonging may still be conditional, it is also a differential inclusion structured by racial reordering as the mask of whiteness may position them as less obvious outsiders.

Who Is Allowed to Be at Home? Concluding Thoughts on Hierarchies of Belonging for Refugees and Asylum Seekers

This essay has highlighted the provision of accommodation as an articulation of domopolitics for migrants who are perceived as (un)welcome guests in the home as an extension of the nation, and also the nation as an extension of the home. In the case of Homes for Ukraine, this is particularly acute as the private family home stands in as a microcosm of the home-ly nation, entangling the distinctions between private and public forms of hospitality towards migrants. It has also begun to link the mutually constitutive processes of racialization, nationalism, and gendering, and the ways in which these processes intersect to shape the lives of refugees and people seeking asylum in the UK.

This work has never been more critical, as the Homes for Ukraine program unfolds and thousands of British households prepare to take in Ukrainian individuals and families in the wake of the escalating conflict. Simultaneously, increasingly restrictive immigration policies threaten to intensify an already violent and stifling border regime, as the Nationality and Borders Bill becomes law and the plans to send people seeking asylum for offshore processing are implemented (BBC News, 2022; Nationality and Borders Bill, 2021). It is therefore crucial to represent the experiences of these communities in the growing body of literature on border politics and the imaginings of home, laying the groundwork for a rich area of future research that unearths the violent processes structuring the current immigration system, as well as the practices of hospitality, home-making, and gendered relations of care, that refugees and people seeking asylum must navigate.

References

Anderson, B. (2013). *Us and them? The dangerous politics of immigration control*. Oxford University Press.

Bakht, S., & Kenber, B. (2022, April 9). Single British men offer beds to female refugees. *The Times*. https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/single-british-men-offer-beds-to-female-refugees-d369hl6r7?utm_medium=Social&utm_source=Twitter#Echobox=1649481333

Baxter, R., & Brickell, K. (2014). For home unmaking. *Home Cultures*, *11*(2), 133–143. https://doi.org/10.2752/175174214X13891916944553

BBC News. (2022, April 14). UK to relocate asylum seekers to Rwanda. *BBC News*. https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/av/uk-61107181

Blumell, L., & Cooper, G. (2019). Measuring gender in news representations of refugees and asylum seekers. *International Journal of Communication*, *13*. https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/23066/

Blunt, A., & Dowling, R. (2006). *Home* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Bosworth, M., Fili, A., & Pickering, S. (2018). Women and border policing at the edges of Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *44*(13), 2182–2196. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1408459

Cowie, E. (1978). Woman as sign. *M/f*, *1*, 49–63.

Cvajner, M. (2011). Hyper-femininity as decency: Beauty, womanhood and respect in emigration. *Ethnography*, *12*(3), 356–374. https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138110392463

Darling, J. (2011). Domopolitics, governmentality and the regulation of asylum accommodation. *Political Geography*, *30*(5), 263–271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2011.04.011

De Angelis, M. (2020). Female asylum seekers: A critical attitude on UK immigration removal Centres. *Social Policy and Society*, *19*(2), 207–224. Cambridge Core. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746419000216

De Genova, N. (2002). Migrant 'illegality' and deportability in everyday life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *31*, 419–447. JSTOR.

Deighan, C. (2010). A Business of supply and demand: The trafficking of women and girls from Russia and Ukraine. In G. Wylie & P. McRedmond (Eds.), *Human Trafficking in Europe: Character, Causes and Consequences* (pp. 82–96). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230281721_6

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

Enloe, C. (1991). Womenandchildren: Propaganda tools of patriarchy. In G. Bates (Ed.), *Mobilizing Democracy: Changing the US Role in the Middle East* (pp. 29–32). Common Courage Press.

Farahani, F. (2021). Hospitality and hostility: The dilemmas of intimate life and refugee hosting. *Journal of Sociology*, *57*(3), 664–673. https://doi.org/10.1177/14407833211018511

Ferguson, K., & Leo, B. (2022, March 15). Doing my bit: Ukrainian refugees can sleep in my living room – I'll cook for them & they can share anything I own. *The Sun*. https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/17948458/ukraine-refugees-brits-welcome/

Goldstein, J. S. (2003). *War and gender: How gender shapes the war system and vice versa*. Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin-Gill, G. S. (2001). Article 31 of the 1951 convention relating to the status of refugees: Non-penalization, detention and protection (pp. 1–89). Department of International Protection for the UNHCR Global Consultations, https://www.unhcr.org/3bcfdf164.pdf

Gray, H., & Franck, A. K. (2019). Refugees as/at risk: The gendered and racialized underpinnings of securitization in British media narratives. *Security Dialogue*, *50*(3), 275–291. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010619830590

Gunaratnam, Y. (2021). 'Not in my name': Empathy and intimacy in volunteer refugee hosting. *Journal of Sociology*, *57*(3), 707–724. https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783320969866

Hamington, M. (2010). Toward a theory of feminist hospitality. *Feminist Formations*, *22*(1), 21–38.

Hochschild, A., & Machung, A. (2012). *The second shift: Working families and the revolution at home*. Penguin Publishing Group.

Home Office. (2022). Ukraine Family Scheme and Ukraine Sponsorship Scheme (Homes for Ukraine) visa data. UK Government. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ukraine-family-scheme-application-data/ukraine-family-scheme-and-ukraine-sponsorship-scheme-homes-for-ukraine-visa-data#:~:text=Total%20Ukraine%20Scheme%20visa%20applications%20received%3A%

20117%2C600,-
Data%20is%20as&text=Ukraine%20Sponsorship%20Scheme%3A%2074%2C700

Home Office, MHCLG, & Department for International Development. (2017). Syrian vulnerable person resettlement programme. UK Government. www.gov.uk/government/publications/syrian-vulnerable-person-resettlement-programme-fact-sheet

Hughes, D. M., & Denisova, T. A. (2001). The transnational political criminal nexus of trafficking in women from Ukraine. *Trends in Organized Crime*, *6*(3), 43–67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12117-001-1005-7

Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants. (2022). *The Homes for Ukraine scheme is not a substitute for a fair and effective asylum system*. The Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants. https://www.jcwi.org.uk/the-homes-for-ukraine-scheme-is-not-a-substitute-for-a-fair-and-effective-asylum-system

Jones, H., Gunaratnam, Y., Bhattacharyya, G., Davies, W., Dhaliwal, S., Jackson, E., & Saltus, R. (2017). *Go home?: The politics of immigration controversies*. Manchester University Press. https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526117946

Lonergan, G. (2018). Reproducing the 'national home': Gendering domopolitics. *Citizenship Studies*, *22*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2017.1406455

Mayblin, L., & James, P. (2019). Asylum and refugee support in the UK: Civil society filling the gaps? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *45*(3), 375–394. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1466695

Monforte, P., Maestri, G., & d'Halluin, E. (2021). 'It's like having one more family member': Private hospitality, affective responsibility and intimate boundaries within refugee hosting networks. *Journal of Sociology*, *57*(3), 674–689. https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783321991679

NACCOM. (2022, March 15). *'Homes for Ukraine'–our response*. https://naccom.org.uk/homes-for-ukraine-our-response/

Näre, L. (2014). Moral encounters: Drawing boundaries of class, sexuality and migrancy in paid domestic work. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *37*(2), 363–380. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2012.729669

Nationality and Borders Bill, HL Bill 82—EN, House of Lords and House of Commons. (2021). https://bills.parliament.uk/publications/44307/documents/1132

Pateman, C. (1989). *The disorder of women: Democracy, feminism, and political theory*. Stanford University Press.

Positive Action in Housing. (2022, March 28). Michael Gove's homes for Ukraine is a human traffickers charter. Positive action in housing. https://www.paih.org/ukraine-refugee-crisis-call-to-action/

Refugee Action. (2022, March 13). Refugee action statement on government's homes for Ukraine scheme. https://www.refugee-action.org.uk/refugee-action-statement-on-governments-homes-for-ukraine-scheme/

Refugee Council. (2022, March 13). 'Homes for Ukraine Scheme' – Refugee council response. https://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/latest/news/homes-for-ukraine-scheme-refugee-council-response/

Reset. (n.d.). Community sponsorship. https://resetuk.org/about/what-is-community-sponsorship

Retter, E. (2022, March 10). Brits ready to welcome desperate Ukrainian refugees fleeing war into their homes. *Mirror*. https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/brits-ready-welcome-

desperate-ukrainian-26439014

Riley-Smith, B. (2022, March 20). Homes for Ukraine scheme: Receive £350 a month, but you have to find your own refugee to sponsor. *The Telegraph*. https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2022/03/20/homes-for-ukraine-refugees-support-350-refugee-payment/

Rottmann, S. B., & Nimer, M. (2021). 'We always open our doors for visitors'—Hospitality as homemaking strategy for refugee women in Istanbul. *Migration Studies*, *9*(3), 1380–1398. https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnab005

Safuta, A. (2018). Fifty shades of white: Eastern Europeans' 'peripheral whiteness' in the context of domestic services provided by migrant women. *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies*, *21* (3), 217-231. Amsterdam University Press. https://doi.org/10.5117/TVGN2018.3.002.SAFU

Sharapov, K. (2014). Giving us the 'Biggest Bang for the Buck' (or not): Anti-trafficking government funding in Ukraine and the United Kingdom. *Anti-Trafficking Review*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.14197/atr.20121432

Sparrow, A. (2022, March 14). UK politics: Gove makes statement on homes for Ukrainian refugees as website for scheme opens–as it happened. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/politics/live/2022/mar/14/uk-politics-live-boris-johnson-russia-ukraine-nato-sajid-javid-michael-gove?filterKeyEvents=false#filter-toggle

The Times. (2022, March 14). *The Times view on the UK's Homes for Ukraine scheme: Refugees welcome*. https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/the-times-view-on-the-uks-homes-for-ukraine-scheme-refugees-welcome-w65x2dv6d

Townsend, M. (2022, March 26). UK's homes for Ukraine scheme risks operating as 'Tinder for sex traffickers', say charities. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2022/mar/26/uk-homes-for-ukraine-scheme-risks-operating-as-tinder-for-sex-traffickers-say-charities

Turner, J. (2016). Governing the domestic space of the traveller in the UK: 'family', 'home' and the struggle over Dale Farm. *Citizenship Studies*, *20*(2), 208–227. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2015.1132568

Turner, L. (2022, March 15). Homes for Ukraine refugee scheme launches in UK. *BBC News*, https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-60741942

UK Visas and Immigration. (2022, July 27). Country policy and information note: Military service, Ukraine, June 2022. UK Government. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ukraine-country-policy-and-information-notes/country-policy-and-information-note-military-service-ukraine-june-2022-accessible#:~:text=7%20In%20April%202022%2C%20the,Return%20of%20men%20from%20abroad

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2022, April 13). UNHCR statement on the UK's homes for Ukraine scheme. https://www.unhcr.org/uk/news/press/2022/4/6256b5144/unhcr-statement-on-the-uks-homes-for-ukraine-scheme.html

Walters, W. (2004). Secure borders, safe haven, domopolitics. *Citizenship Studies*, *8*(3), 237–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/1362102042000256989

Wilmott, A. C. (2017). The politics of photography: Visual depictions of Syrian refugees in U.K. Online Media. *Visual Communication Quarterly*, *24*(2), 67–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/15551393.2017.1307113

Wilson, C. (2022, March 31). Ukrainian women being offered refuge for sex warns Glasgow

charity. *The Herald*, https://www.heraldscotland.com/politics/20036269.ukrainian-women-offered-refuge-sex-warns-glasgow-charity/

YouGov. (2021, November 30). What policies do the British public think should be put in place to deal with the Channel crisis? https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/articles-reports/2021/11/30/four-five-britons-disapprove-governments-handling-

YouGov. (2022, March 9). Would you support or oppose allowing Ukrainian refugees to come to the UK without a visa? https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/survey-results/daily/2022/03/09/d206c/1

Young, I. M. (2005). House and home: Feminist variations on a theme. In S. Hardy & C. Wiedmer (Eds.), *Motherhood and Space: Configurations of the Maternal through Politics, Home, and the Body* (pp. 115–147). Palgrave Macmillan US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-12103-5_8

Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). *Gender & Nation*. SAGE.

Yuval-Davis, N., Anthias, F., & Kofman, E. (2005). Secure borders and safe haven and the gendered politics of belonging: Beyond social cohesion. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *28*(3), 513–535. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870420003