WAYNE VECK, LOUISE PAGDEN AND JULIE WHARTON

1. CHILDREN SEEKING REFUGE, ASSIMILATION AND INCLUSION: INSIGHTS FROM THE UNITED KINGDOM

INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims to elucidate the social and educational significance of distinguishing assimilation from inclusion for children who, having been uprooted from their homes, continue to confront an unnecessarily cruel world. 'Arguably, the response to asylum-seeking and refugee youth,' Pinson and Arnot (2010, p. 248) contend, 'provides one of the greatest tests of social justice for any educational system'. In this chapter we address the complexities of this test by way of examining the pressures on schooling to assimilate children seeking refuge into existing school structures without pausing to consider the ways these children might be included.

We are concerned here with two forms of assimilation. In pursuing this analysis we take our lead from the work of Zygmunt Bauman. In his writings, Bauman points to a significant distinction between processes of assimilation determined by the goals of modernity and processes formed within what he (2005a; 2013) names 'liquid modernity'. The first is an active process that can see children new to the UK and seeking refuge within it forced, both to fit into fixed structures and practices, and to confirm to established values and social norms. The second process is characterised, not by what happens to people, but precisely by the absence of activity on, attention to and concern with them. This form of assimilation occurs, for example, when children seeking refuge find themselves left alone, abandoned, and thus with little choice but to adjust themselves to fit into a society of indifferent individuals. We name the former, *assimilation into the given*, and the latter, *assimilation into indifference*.

Due, Riggs and Augoustinos (2016, p. 1287) usefully note that it 'is important to consider the broader social context of schools in addition to the learning experiences of students with migrant or refugee backgrounds'. It is within this broader context that we witness the ways the term refugee or asylum seeker can conjure up the image of the 'stranger' – someone unfamiliar to us in appearance or way of life. Bauman's (2016) book, *Strangers at our door*, examines what has been described as the 'migration crisis' (p1), and emphasises the complex attitudes that this 'crisis' has given rise to. Despite the moral panic and feelings of fear that has spread across Western societies in recent years in relation to mass, forced migration, Bauman (2016, p. 2) suggests these same societies may be reaching a point of 'refugee tragedy fatigue'. This chapter explores these shifting attitudes to immigrants in the UK, incorporating nationalism and xenophobia, and their consequences for children seeking refuge in the UK. We go on to address the role of schools that have been awarded the status of 'Schools of Sanctuary' in countering assimilation and promoting the inclusion of these children.

LEARNING FROM SCHOOLS OF SANCTUARY

Alongside Bauman's thinking, the analysis that follows is illuminate by illustrative examples and insights from the Deputy Head and the Headteacher of a School of Sanctuary in the south of England, along with the reflections of a regional co-ordinator for the Schools of Sanctuary, again in the south of England. The Schools of Sanctuary organisation promotes the commitment of schools to be a 'safe and welcoming place for all, especially those seeking sanctuary' (Schools of Sanctuary, 2017). The Deputy Headteacher offered the following explanation of what it means for a school to gain recognition as a Schools of Sanctuary:

> The initiative is based on the three principles, and the first is learning what it means to be seeking sanctuary, the second is embedding that within your curriculum, your extra-curricular activities, and the third is to share your vision and your achievements. So they're three quite simple principles that you can interpret in different ways. It's not a set way in which you have to run the initiative across your schools.

Reflecting on the influence that this framework can have on inclusive values in schools, a regional co-ordinator for the Schools of Sanctuary organisation explained that schools 'take different sort of steps to building welcome … So it's a question of raising awareness, which is one of the key areas of our work going into schools'. The Schools of Sanctuary (2017) website outlines how the Framework they offer to schools can help to create 'a sense of safety and inclusion for all', alongside developing an 'understanding of what it means to seek sanctuary'. Concluding her research into the ways in which secondary schools promote inclusion, McCorriston (2012, p.185) notes that a 'community approach to education for refugees and other marginalized groups … is a successful way to meet the educational needs of these vulnerable groups'. The Schools of Sanctuary Framework represents a significant way in which this strategic approach practice is put into practice. As the regional representative from Schools of Sanctuary stated, 'I think what inspires some of us to the cause is the revolution of generosity out there…British people are welcoming'. The Schools of Sanctuary movement attempts to cultivate this generosity to ensure that children seeking refuge in the UK are educated and welcomed in inclusive schools.

On the surface, at least, such values-led work is underpinned by the UK's 2006 *Education and Inspection Act*, which outlined the duty to report on schools' approaches to promoting community cohesion. In Guidance to legislation the message is advanced thus: 'Different types of schools in different communities will clearly face different challenges and globalisation means both that the populations of schools are often more diverse, and that they might also change at fairly short notice' (DCSF, 2007, p.1). Significantly, community cohesion is no longer a part of UK schools' inspections, nor does it fall within the official remit of school governors (although community relationships are to a lesser extent). The duty to report on community cohesion was repealed in the UK's 2011 *Education Act* (please see Section 154 EIA 2006).

In our interviews we explored the concept of inclusion and the various ways the school attempts to embed its inclusive values. Moreover, we examined together how the school was supported to be inclusive and considered the many challenges it encounters in its attempt to realise its inclusive values in its practices. We were keen to use an inclusive approach to our research to ensure that our participants were involved as 'people who may otherwise be seen as subjects for the research as instigators of ideas' (Walmsley and Johnson, 2003, p. 10). In an effort to secure this participation, the interviewees were given the initial questions we had in mind in preparation for the interview and, once the interview was underway, supplementary questions were asked in order to 'probe discussion and follow ideas' (Savin-Baden and Howell Major, 2013, p. 359). As the interview progressed answers were given freely and spontaneously (Opennakker, 2006), and our time together resembled a 'normal conversation' (Savin-Baden and Howell Major, 2013, p.371). The interview was recorded and then transcribed to allow for the thematic analysis of the findings. This allowed us to focus on the participants and their responses to our questions (Burton and Bartlett, 2009). The emerging themes related to tensions between exclusion, inclusion and assimilation. The interview also allowed for an initial exploration of the Schools of Sanctuary Framework (Saks and Allsop, 2013).

ASSIMILATION INTO THE GIVEN

Bauman (1995, p. 2) depicts 'the strategy of assimilation' under modernity as being concerned with 'making the different similar; the smothering of cultural or linguistic distinctions, forbidding all traditions and loyalties expect those meant to feed the conformity of the new and all embracing order, promoting and enforcing one and only measure of conformity'. If we begin with the expectation that other people should have similar life histories to our own, similar careers and similar interests, then acceptance of difference may be replaced with an attempt to eradicate difference. The quest here is to ensure that we all become one and the same, identifiable as part of the same group. In modern society this process occurs in a twofold fashion, since the same society that creates the stranger by way of distinguishing a person as 'other', an 'outsider', can then work upon this person, to reshape and recreate them to fit into the mould named, 'One of us'. The assimilated are, therefore, under the conditions of modernity, twice produced – they are at once a by-product of the actual and symbolic borders others have produced, the boundaries they have established to clearly distinguish what is 'normal' from what is to be deemed 'strange', *and* they are a direct product of the efforts of others to transform them. Bauman (2005a, p.305) suggests that 'it is the gardener's attitude that best serves as a metaphor for modern worldview and practice'. It is the role of that gardener state to determine 'what kind of plants should, and what sort of plants should not grow on the plot entrusted to his care' and to guarantee that all plants conform to or are assimilated into 'the desirable arrangement' it has envisioned (Bauman 2005a, p.306). In what follows, we examine processes of assimilating people into what is given within any society in relation to children seeking refuge and schooling. We consider: first, Brexit and its

consequences; second, the power of language to exclude; and, finally, attitudes to persons seeking sanctuary.

Brexit and hostile attitudes to immigrants in the UK

What, then, are the pressures on UK schools to assimilate rather than to include children seeking refuge? It is hardly possible to answer this question without reflecting on the enormous importance of what is commonly referred to as Brexit. 2016 saw the people of the UK vote in a referendum to determine levels of support for the country remaining within or exiting from the European Union (EU). 51.9% of those who voted did so in favour of leaving the EU. In March 2017, the process of exiting the EU was initiated by the UK government, with 30 March 2019 set as the date for the completion of this process. One way of appraising the consequences of this decision can be found in the difference between the UK's responsibilities to persons seeking refuge within and out of the EU. As a member of the EU, the UK has to adhere to Dublin III Regulation, which ensures that refugees have the right to be reunited with members of their extended family members. In contrast, under the UK's current policy this right does not extend beyond parents and their children. This has particularly obvious and stark implications for orphans seeking refuge in the UK. Thus, Mike Penrose, Executive Director of Unicef UK, observed, in an interview with the newspaper, *The Guardian*, 'Brexit could risk the ability to get children fleeing war and persecution to the safety of their close family in the UK', before going on to conclude: 'Now is the time for the UK government to broaden its own rules and ensure the protection of unaccompanied refugee children' (Elgot, 2017).

The dominant message of the campaign to leave the European Union was encapsulated in the title of their website, 'Vote leave, take control'. The website insisted: 'We can control immigration and have a fairer system which welcomes people on the basis of the skills they have, rather than the passport they hold'. In a continued effort to motivate voters, the site maintained:

> If we stay in the EU, immigration will be out of control. Nearly 2 million came to the UK from the EU over the last ten years. Imagine what it will be like when new, poorer countries join.

What was overlooked by this rhetoric was the fact that in 2015 over 1.2 million British people live outside the UK in the EU, with over 300,000 British people living in Spain alone (United Nations, 2015).

The five yearly monitoring report by *The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance* (ECRI), (established by the Council of Europe, as an independent human rights monitoring body that specialised in questions relating to racism and intolerance) states:

> There continues to be considerable intolerant political discourse focusing on immigration and contributing to an increase in xenophobic sentiments. Muslims

are portrayed in a negative light by certain politicians and as a result of some policies. Their alleged lack of integration and opposition to "fundamental British values" is a common theme adding to a climate of mistrust and fear of Muslims. (ECRI, 2016, p. 9).

There are, of course, many strategies employed by politicians, all of which serve to exacerbate difference and intolerance rather than embrace inclusion and understanding. In particular, there has been a proliferation of connections drawn between migrants and the rise of terror. As Bauman (2016, p. 31) records, the Hungarian leader, Orban, has said that 'all terrorists are migrants' and has built a wall in order to keep out the 'stranger', thus creating what Bauman has terms the 'reciprocity of causation'. Bauman (2016, p. 35) illuminates the consequences of such otherisation, noting that 'once they have been cast in the category of would be terrorists, migrants find themselves beyond the realm of, and off limits to, moral responsibility… and outside the space of compassion and the impulse to care'. In the UK, the language is more subtle. The Conservative party's manifesto for the 2016 national election included a section on 'Bringing Britain together', which focused on controlling immigration, integrating divided communities and defeating extremists. However subtly packaged and delivered, such associations between immigration and terrorism ensure that, in Bauman (2016, p. 44) words, 'governments … endorse the popular security panic by focussing on the victims of the refugee tragedy instead of the global roots of their tragic fate'.

Reflecting on Brexit and its consequences, the Headteacher of a School of Sanctuary noted, 'It's a bit of a cliché now but definitely some of the parents feel more comfortable making comments that would've been regarded as 'beyond the pale' a year or so ago'. A stark example of hostility to immigrants in the UK was given by a Deputy Head of a School of Sanctuary in England:

> There was a horrible event yesterday. We had all the classes move up a year group and had next year's Reception class come in and one of our new parents was walking in with her son for his first day at school, [and] just round the corner some big guy got in her face, shouted out, 'Al-Qaeda,' and then reappeared with a baseball bat in his hands shortly afterwards … and I was - maybe it goes on a lot and people just don't say - but I was horrified.

This horrible and horrifying example of violence represents the dreadful extreme of the violence that accompanies the rejection of person deemed entirely other. Indeed, in order to do away with strangers, the modern state engages in two, quite distinct exclusionary practices. First, strangers are assimilated; they are, that is, worked upon in order to fit them into dominate social norms and values. Second, there is the strategy of direct and violent exclusion where, in order to maintain what is perceived to be the 'norm', difference is not assimilated but banished into ghettos or out of the boundaries of the state. "Selecting, marking and setting aside the 'fringe of abnormality' is," Bauman (2012a, p. 78) maintains, 'a necessary concomitant of order building and the unavoidable cost of an order's perpetuation'. Thus understood, refugee camps might not be a stepping stone to safety, but a way of containing all the 'undesirables' and preventing them from disrupting order in a societies imagined to be orderly.

The language of hostility and assimilation

The word, refugee, has its origins in the English language in the Huguenot diaspora. The word refugee originates from the French word *réfugié* (Oxford Living Dictionary, 2017); this, in turn, comes from the verb *se réfugier*, which means 'to take shelter or refuge' (Collins Dictionary, 2017). The Huguenots, a group of French Protestants, were the first to be categorised as refugees as they fled from oppression in their homeland.

Wittgenstein (1975, pp. 17-18) describes 'the craving for generality' as 'the tendency to look for something common to entities which we must commonly subsume under a general term'. The signifiers 'refugee' and 'asylum seeker' are, for example, used in everyday discourse as interchangeable and generalisable terms. However, in practice they will be employed in many different and distinct ways. The definitions of 'refugee' and 'asylum seeker' vary greatly at a local, national and international level and the events that have caused people to seek sanctuary away from their homes differ in their nature. Hence, Goodwin-Gill and McAdam (2007,p. 15) consider the single word 'flight' and its multiple meanings thus: 'The reasons for flight may be many; flight from oppression, from a threat to life or liberty, flight from persecution; flight from deprivation, from grinding poverty; flight from civil war or strife; flight from natural disasters, earthquake, flood, draught, famine'.

Roger Slee (2011, p. 48) connects 'times of recession' to 'the rapid metastasizing of racism and the loathing of the immigrant, refugee and disabled people'. Certainly, in the UK, austerity has brought real degradation in the life conditions of the poor, the ill, the disabled and the elderly, but caught within these categories there are real people to whom we might respond. And yet, all the time the other person is contained within the category, austerity and its accompanying cuts can remain something that happens, not to the other person to whom I am responsible, but a mere category of individual. People living in poverty can find themselves frozen in one of a whole host of derogatory stereotypes contained on the front pages of tabloid newspapers, adults with impairment in fixed ideas about ability, and elderly persons in images of old age that arise in opposition to abstract fantasies about youthful potency. Young people labelled as 'having SEN', poor persons, persons with impairments and elderly persons can, in these ways, be rendered invisible. The same, of course, is true for the immigrant.

Garthwaite (2011, p. 370) sees, in accounts of illness and disability, advanced in the media,

> echoes of the 'undeserving' and 'deserving' poor, implying that people labelled workless are 'undeserving' if they do not at least seek paid employment, regardless of the quality and calibre of the work available. On the other hand, the 'deserving' poor are those who are making an effort to find work and see

this as their responsibility to society regardless of how fruitless their search might be.

A parallel language resounds through much discussion of immigration in the popular press in the UK, where the deserving immigrant is distinguished from the undeserving immigrant. Indeed, in their manifesto for the 2016 national election, the Conservative party's vowed to reduce the number of asylum claims made in this country and welcome those most in need, rather than those 'young enough and fit enough' to make it to Britain. Thus, Lister & Bennett (2010, p. 88), reviewing the attitude of UK politicians from 1997-2010, maintain:

> Like New Labour, Cameron's Conservatives understand the power of language. They deploy it skilfully to represent the problem of poverty and its causes and solutions in ways which place the main responsibility on the individual and on communities rather than on government.

Further examples of the craving to generalise in relation to refugees can be found in the UK media. Khosravinik (2010) undertook a critical discourse analysis of the language used to describe refugees, asylum seekers and immigrants in the British press. 'Throughout all the text analyses,' Khosravinik (2010, p.11) notes, "terms used to refer to 'people who have moved out of their countries and entered the UK' seem to vary in terms of the degree of associated negativity." Thomas and Loxley (2007) describe how labelling can exacerbate power relationships that are unequal with the person who has assigned the label being able to exert an element of control over the person who has been labelled. Khosravinik (2010, p.11) notes, "terms used to refer to 'people who have moved out of their countries and entered the UK' seem to vary in terms of the degree of associated negativity." MacDonald (2017, p. 11) observes how for 'young, African-Australian refugees', the combination of 'opportunistic politicians' and the media more generally, ensures the 'continual linking of these young refugees to gang violence' and so 'perpetuates another layer of socio-political exclusion that is largely unsubstantiated'. In sum, as a consequence of our generalising tendencies refugees are seen as a homogenous group, the 'otherness' of this group, their assumed strangeness, reduces them to a set of essences that accentuate their difference.

It is thus crucial that we recognise the ways in which our understanding of the terms and labels we use depend on the meanings we ascribe to them and also on the environmental context in which we employ them at any given time. In this way we might learn how to respond to a child seeking refuge as something more than an excluded other, a unit in a category, and witness who the child is becoming and not to what they have been reduced to. It is a question of addressing potential that can be given no definitive name, the potential to participate in the world and make an unforeseen and unforeseeable difference to it.

Understanding hostile attitudes to seekers of refuge

Bauman (1995) elucidates two ways in which the immigrant as a 'stranger' can be viewed. For those who live outside of impoverished neighbourhoods or 'ghettos', the stranger can be viewed as an exotic other, someone who can offer them something different – a unfamiliar meal or a useful service. But for those who live

in close proximity to the stranger, marginalised and trapped in their own powerless and lack of freedom, the stranger might come to be viewed as a threat.

It now seems difficult to avoid the conclusion that a desire to curb freedom of movement across national boundaries, to take control of the borders and to tighten immigration controls encouraged people to vote in favour of leaving the EU. For example the town of Boston, in the UK's east midlands, voted 75.4% in favour of leaving the EU; according to the Telegraph (2016) a UK newspaper that is politically on the right, the town has struggled to integrate the large numbers of eastern European immigrants. Other areas with similar results were also largely in the same geographic area of Britain and they experienced similar growing levels of unemployment amongst lower socio-economic groups, along with increasing numbers of immigrants. However, the areas with the highest percentage of 'remain' votes were (unsurprisingly) Gibraltar, followed by Lambeth. This is significant since, despite its high levels of immigration, Lambeth has 'a strong local economy means people aren't as fearful of rising European migration' (Dunford and Kirk, 2016). What this suggests, immediately, is that levels of economic flourishing inform attitudes to immigration. Brexit might, then, be heard as a cry, not simply against increasing immigration, but more broadly against social inequality. As Bauman (original emphasis, 2016b) observes, for the deprived and marginalised, 'the British referendum was the rare, well-nigh unique chance to unload their long accumulated, blistering/festering anger against the establishment *as a whole*'.

Bauman (2016) describes this growing group of people who voted to leave the EU as the 'precariat'. The precariat, Bauman (2016) suggests, responds to the arrival of an unwanted social group with a lower social standing as something of a saving grace, a means to 'redeeming their human dignity and salvaging whatever is left of their self-esteem' (p13). At the same time, 'the arrival of a mass of homeless migrants stripped of human rights' (Bauman, 2016, p. 13), confronts them as a threat. Indeed, the very presence of the newcomer, the stranger, can speak, 'irritatingly, infuriatingly and horrifyingly, of the (incurable?) vulnerability of our own position and the endemic fragility of our hard-won well-being' (Bauman, 2016, p. 16). For one living in perpetual economic insecurity, the stranger can bring to mind just how close one is to being exposed as strange.

Asked how the children's families responded to the school becoming a School of Sanctuary, the Headteacher recalled:

> Our School of Sanctuary [launch] was due in the referendum running so it was a very sensitive time so we had to think very carefully about how we were selling the message and ironically we'd got to stage a big celebration assembly the day the result of the referendum was announced and it was just the strangest atmosphere, the assembly, the scene, the kids were all sat there singing songs about a better tomorrow and some of the parents were sat very arms folded looking very disapprovingly. It was the strangest, strangest thing.

'In the postmodern city,' Bauman (1995, p. 10) observes, 'the strangers mean one thing to those for whom "no go areas" (the "mean streets", the "rough district") means "no go in", and those to whom "no go" means "no go out"'.   Could it be that what distinguishes the views of some teachers from that of some parents is that where the stranger represents an opportunity for the former, to the latter this same stranger holds up a mirror to precariousness that perpetually loams over their lives? The school's Headteacher recorded the most illuminating of incidents:

> When we had Ofsted a year ago and the inspectors were talking to some parents and one of the questions they asked was, 'Is the school welcoming?' And the comment that came back from one of the parents was, 'Yeah, if anything it's a bit too welcoming.

It might be that **the** difference **-** between those who can welcome the newcomer, **receiving persons seeking** refuge with open arms**,** and those who feel drawn to defensiveness **-** corresponds to the distinction Bauman (1995, p. 11) draws out between those for whom the world is 'an adventure park' and those for whom it is 'a trap'.

ASSIMILATION AND INDIFFERENCE

If a child seeking refugee can be seen as a site of difficulty, a problem to be fixed, then there is also the possibility that, in what Bauman (2005a; 2005b; 2013) calls 'liquid times', the same child will be meet not with hostility but with indifference. It is Bauman's view that, while modernity was governed by the vision of a perfectly harmonious society, "the current 'utopia' of hunters" is essentially "'deregulated', 'privatized', and 'individualized'" (Bauman 2005a, p. 310). In postmodern, liquid times, then, the included are precisely those people for whom the absence of a solid ground is a chance to glide and the excluded those for whom it is a condemnation to stumble. Thus, Bauman writes:

> Individuality' stands today, first and foremost, for the person's autonomy … [it] means that I am the one responsible for my merits and my failings, and that it is my task to cultivate the first and to repent and repair the second. (original emphasis, Bauman, 2005b, p. 19)

So where the modernist project was to assimilate the stranger into the assumed natural and given order of things, the postmodern or 'liquid' project of assimilation involves the paradoxical project of making the stranger conform to non-conformity, to fit into a way of life characterised precisely by the absence of well-trodden paths to walk along. The task here is not, then, to assimilate the other into a given order but into a world without order.

The absence of political commitment to immigrants in the UK

Before refugee children can be included into or assimilated within schooling in the UK, they must first, of course, be welcomed across the UK's borders. According to the British Red Cross (2017), there are an estimated 118,995 refugees living in the UK or 0.18 per cent of the total population (65.1 million people).   This is

estimation, based on the previous year's successful asylum applications, fails to account for any person who came to the UK illegally nor does it include those people staying on beyond a failed application. In terms of unaccompanied minors, in 2016 3,175 children sort asylum in the UK, which was a similar number to 2015 (Refugee Council, 2017). However, this is a stark increase from the previous year which had 1,945 applications and only 1265 in 2013 (Refugee Council, 2017). Consequently, applications for asylum from unaccompanied minors have more than doubled in just three years. The vast majority of these were minors were aged 16 and 17 (65%), with only 8% less than 14 years of age 2013 (Refugee Council, 2017).

However, further statistics, published by the *House of Commons (*Hawkins, 2017), are more telling of the UK's commitment to persons seeking refuge when the UK's immigration figures are compared to those of other EU countries. The UK granted 9,900 of 31,100 asylum applications in 2016 (a 31.8% approval rate) (Hawkins, 2017, p. 16), while France granted 28,800 of 87,500 applications (a 32.9% approval rate) and Italy granted 35,400 of 89,900 applications (a 39.4% approval rate) (Hawkins, 2017, p. 16). Significantly, the following EU countries were more than twice as likely as the UK to approve applications:

- Austria granted 30,400 of 42,400 applications (a 71.7% approval rate)
- Germany 433,900 of 631, 200 (68.7%);
- Netherlands 20,800 of 28,900 (72%);
- Spain 6,900 of 10,300 (67%);
- and, Sweden 6,900 of 10,300 (67%) (Hawkins, 2017, p. 16).

Also crucial to our understanding of political commitment (or its absence) to the welfare of persons seeking refuge in the UK is a potentially significant amendment to the 2016 UK *Immigration Act*, tabled by Lord Alf Dubs, and now known as the 'Dubs Amendment'. This amendment, now law, as Section 67 of the Act and spoken of, in general public discourse, as the 'Dubs scheme', guarantees the safety of *some* children seeking refuge in the UK. The amendment, in Section 67 of the Act, states:

> The Secretary of State must, as soon as possible after the passing of this Act, make arrangements to relocate to the United Kingdom and support a specified number of unaccompanied refugee children from other countries in Europe. (UK Parliament Act, 2016, p. 60)

However, despite a commitment to provide refuge for 480 lone children, a mere 200 children arrived in the UK in 2016 and not a single child has been transferred in the first 6 months of 2017 (Travis, 2017).

How can we account for this limited political commitment to the acceptance of refugees and what are its consequences in relation to the schooling of children seeking refuge in the UK? Slee's (2011, 38) diagnosis of 'collective indifference'

10

in contemporary Western societies provides a useful way to begin to articulate an answer to these questions. Such societies are characterised, according to Beck (2002, 135), by processes that lead to 'the subjectivization and individualization of risks and contradictions', and this 'means that each person's biography is removed from given determinations and placed in his or her own hands'. Bauman (2007a, 60), observing the same trends, notes:

> [I]n our hedonistic and thoroughly individualized society … loving care for others for the other's sake is disparaged as leading to detestable "dependency" and so to be avoided at all cost, while taking responsibility for the other's well-being tends to be condemned as an imprudent limitation of freedom to go where pleasurable experiences beckon.

Such individualism is perpetuated in UK schools whenever schooling becomes valued as a means to external, economic ends, whenever it becomes difficult not 'to think of knowledge production and consumption after the pattern of fast food, prepared rapidly and eaten fresh, hot, and on the spot' (Bauman, 2005a, p. 316). The consequences of this reduction of learning to consuming are significant, since there is no better preparation for taking up a place in a society of indifferent individuals than being in a classroom of indifferent learners.

Indifference to uniqueness: Assimilation and deficiency views of children seeking refuge

In 2005, the UK's Home Office published *Integration matters: National strategy for integration*, in it the inclusion of refugees in the UK was firmly connected to language acquisition and employment. In response to this approach to the integration of refugees, Pinson, Arnot and Candappa (2010, p. 54) write:

> The decision to include only refugees in integration programmes symbolically deepened the exclusion from which asylum seekers already suffered. In effect the message to schools from the Home Office was that only some of their students needed to be integrated, to be prepared for a national model of democratic citizenship or for membership of a local community.

In other words, a division is created: it is "them" and not "us" that are in need of integrating. Dada (2012, p. 153) emphasises the role that schools have to play not only as education providers but also as 'a gateway for leading a new and peaceful life and being part of a wider community'. He writes that language acquisition is vital for communication and for studying and that education can lead to employment. He also stresses the importance of adequate resourcing by Local Authorities to allow schools to provide appropriate support. McCorriston (2012) supports this view by stressing the importance of extended services such as Ethnic Minority Achievement Services (EMTAS) supporting schools with the inclusion of children who are seeking asylum or who have refugee status. Such measures are, of course, essential features of the inclusion of children seeking refuge, but they do not in and of themselves constitute a guarantee of inclusion. Indeed, what is missing in such technical approaches is a 'school approach to social inclusion' that

incorporates the "'the whole child' rather than specific educational needs" (Pinson and Arnot, 2010, p. 256). This means that embracing a merely specialist, additional needs based approach, to the inclusion of children seeking refuge risks ignoring a primary need of all children – one that is, nevertheless, especially acute in those children who have been uprooted from their homes – the need to find a place where one can belong within the world.

In her investigation into the experience of six male adolescent refugees as they began their education in London, Hastings (2012, p. 337) discovered how 'a whole school attitude to refugee children which allows them to feel confident to identify themselves as refugees'. This confidence to announce where one has come from is secured only once one feels oneself to be welcomed, to belong to - as opposed to being assimilated into - a concrete and shared space. Luff and Gillies (2013), drawing on the findings of a study of young people at risk of being excluded from inner-city London schools, outline a quite different experience. They note how 'a contemporary preoccupation with notions of personal development and emotional learning', one that constitutes an 'apparently progressive and inclusive agenda', has resulted in 'a highly regulatory framework, ordering the ways in which teachers and pupils are expected to experience and express care' (Luff and Gillies, 2013, p. 42). Laurent (2013, 40), too, observes the painful irony that has seen a policy focus on 'values education and social and emotional learning' lead to 'highly regulated professional caring' at the cost of 'a school-wide focus on pedagogical care'. When our care for, and the education we offer to, children seeking refuge is seen as synonymous with the meeting of established needs in particular individual children, caring and educational relations can become delimited and the potential commonality between those receiving this care and education and others can be obscured.

ADDRESSING HOSTILITY AND INDIFFERENCE: INCLUSIVE VALUES AND PRACTICES

Writing over twenty years ago, Bauman (1995, p. 14) contended that 'there is a genuine emancipatory chance in postmodernity, the chance of laying down arms, suspending border skirmishes waged to keep the stranger away, taking apart the daily erected mini-Berlin walls meant to keep distance and to separate'. Of course, this 'emancipatory chance' has passed and the borders stand firm, more fortified than ever. The chance was not taken and exclusion and assimilation remain. And yet, Bauman stands firms in his belief that the gardener's vision of a perfectly harmonious landscape, which guided the governance of modern societies, has come to be replaced by "the current 'utopia' of hunters", which is essentially "'deregulated', 'privatized', and 'individualized'" (Bauman 2005a, 310). In other words, the defining state has lost its capacity to define, the gardener has left the garden, and the opportunity awaits us to allow persons designated as strangers to grow as they are, and not as some bureaucrat would have them grow. What is

12

required first of all **is** to understand our need for strangeness and the stranger. Might schools of sanctuary have a role to play in this process?

The Deputy Head of a School of Sanctuary reflected:

> One of the things that's really made a difference in achieving becoming an inclusive school and a School of Sanctuary is just being really clear in articulating our values. And the children, well they're really proud of them, but it's a new thing for them to think and talk about values and apply them to different situations.

Booth (1999) argues that all involved in schooling share a responsibility to address how our schools might change, how they may become places that are worthy of the inclusion of *all* young people. This suggests a move from viewing 'some learners as a focus for inclusion and a group apart' to seeing all students 'as part of the diversity that includes us all' (Booth, 1999, p. 165). Asked about individualised attention to children seeking refuge, the Headteacher of a School of Sanctuary responded:

> I think the best thing to do is just make sure that you've got the culture where whatever's right for that child if they want to talk about it then they know they'll be listened to with a sympathetic ear for that or if they want to access support in more of a low key way then that's fine as well.

There is a subtle and important irony at work here: the rejection an individualised approach – where needs are looked upon as 'special', as evidence of individual deficiency – in favour of a whole school approach actually enables teachers to address the unique needs of all their children. This is the case for no other reason than this approach, as the Headteacher illuminates, promotes deep listening, that is, listening to the child for the person they are now and for the person they are becoming, and not for what they have been through and what they are categorised as being. Asked how they welcome children seeking sanctuary, the Deputy Headteacher response conveys the significance of such careful attention to the uniqueness of all children:

> We respond in the same way that we would welcome anyone to the school: to make sure that they feel safe, that they understand who everybody is, where everything is that we have a really good understanding of who they are as a person what their needs might be and new children are always paired up with somebody in a classroom and we try if possible if there's another child who is from the same part of the world or speaks the same language, to be paired up so that they have that kind of comfort too.

Inclusion stands, then, in contrast to a specialist approach to children seeking refuge, one that focuses merely on additional needs and deficiency. Schools of Sanctuary suggest that what is lacking in this approach – with its blinkered focus on what is lacking in the newcomer to the UK and to the school – is an acknowledgement of what this newcomer can contribute to the school and to the world beyond the school.

Rutter and Jones (2001, p.3) observe that in there may be the risk that the 'refugee child' is viewed as a 'problem' in UK schooling, that the pressure on resources and the ever-present possibility of a school inspection may contribute to less than an inclusive welcome for a newly arrived child. 'Put an unheralded, non-English speaking refugee child into that classroom teacher's classroom on a wet, cold February morning', Rutter and Jones (2001, p.3) maintain, 'and a camel's-last-straw reaction may seem understandable'. And yet, Rutter and Jones (2001, p.3) insist that a child seeking sanctuary or a child granted refugee status may bring 'a range of opportunities and perspectives that can enrich the learning and understandings of everyone working there'.

However, the contributions that children seeking refuge might make should not, we contend, be delimited to their ability to share insights into the culture, geography and history of the land they have been forced to leave. This would be to risk degrading these newcomers to a particularly exotic species of the Stranger. On the contrary, the child seeking refuge, the newcomer, is new to the school and new, also, to the world. To include this child is to welcome and to celebrate a uniqueness that is entirely their own and which is becoming still in accordance with the child's growing ability to make a difference to others. The Deputy Head of a School of Sanctuary expresses how we might begin to address such otherising by way of encouraging reflection on and compassion for the experiences of others in the following reflections:

> We've made welcome bags recently for refugees and asylum seekers that are new to the city and it really made the children think about how would they feel if they were in that position, and what would they want to be in the bag, what would help to make them feel welcome, and their ideas were fantastic, really good. I think it's opened their eyes to different experiences and different challenges around the world and it's really helped them to show their empathy towards others.

Such values-led practices open up the possibility that inclusive communities might be created where persons enable, and in turn allow themselves to be enabled by, others.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have argued that the inclusion of children seeking refuge into schools stands in direct opposition to assimilation. In an inclusive school, we have contended, not only are children's individual histories, experiences, culture and faith celebrated, but attention is given to the distinct and unique characters of all children. In developing such inclusive schools, schools in the UK have turned for guidance to the Framework advanced by the UK's Schools of Sanctuary organisation. In these schools, teachers, support workers, other professionals and parents work together to elude a deficiency approach to the education of children

14

seeking refuge so they might prepare all the children within their school for a flourishing life in an inclusive community.

REFERENCES

Bauman, Z. (1976). *Socialism: The active utopia*. London, Routledge.

Bauman, Z. (1995). The making and unmaking of strangers. *Thesis eleven.* 43: 1-16.

Bauman, Z. (2001a). *The Individualized Society*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bauman, Z. (2001b). *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bauman, Z. (2004). "Culture and Management." *Parallax* 10 (2): 63–72.

Bauman, Z. (2005a). "Education in Liquid Modernity." *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 27 (4): 303–317.

Bauman, Z. (2005b). *Liquid Life*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bauman, Z. (2007a). *Society under Siege*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bauman, Z. (2007b). "Society Enables and Disables." *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research* 9 (1): 58–60.

Bauman, Z. (2008). *Does Ethics Have a Chance in a World of Consumers?* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Bauman, Z. (2011). *Living on Borrowed Time: Conversations with Citlali Rovirosa Madrazo*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bauman, Z. (2012). *On Education: Conversations with Richard Mazzeo*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bauman, Z. (2013). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bauman, Z. (2016b). Bauman: History repeats itself. We are coming back to the small, tribal states. An interview with Helena Celestino. Political Critique. Available:
http://politicalcritique.org/world/2016/bauman-history-repeats-itself-interview/

Beck, U. (2002). *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. Trans. M. Ritter. London: Sage.

Booth, T. (1999). Viewing inclusion from a distance: Gaining perspective from comparative study, *Support for Learning* 14(4): 164–168.

British Red Cross. 2017. *Refugee facts and figures*. Available:
http://www.redcross.org.uk/What-we-do/Refugee-support/Refugee-facts-and-figures

Burton, D. and Bartlett, S. (2009) *Key issues for education governors.* London: Sage

Dada, J. (2012). Refugees and Education in Kent in England. In: *Education, refugees and asylum seekers*, edited by L. Demirdjian, 151-165. London: Continuum.

Davies, J.S. and Pill, M. (2012). Empowerment or abandonment? Prospects for neighbourhood revitalization under the big society, *Public Money & Management*, 32:3, 193-200

Department for Children, Schools and Families. (2007). *Guidance on the duty to promote community cohesion*. London: DCSF

Due, C., Riggs, D.W. and Augoustinos, M. (2016). Diversity in intensive English language centres in South Australia: sociocultural approaches to education for students with migrant or refugee backgrounds. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 20(12), 1286-1296.

Dunford, D. and Kirk. A. (2016). Revealed: The most eurosceptic and europhilic areas in the UK. *The Telegraph*. Available:http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/06/24/revealed-the-most-eurosceptic-and-europhilic-areas-in-the-uk/

Elgot, J. (2017). Refugee children 'could be separated from their families after Brexit'. *The Guardian*. Available: https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/aug/04/refugee-children-could-be-separated-from-their-families-after-brexit

Garthwaite, K. (2011). 'The language of shirkers and scroungers?' Talking about illness, disability and coalition welfare reform, *Disability & Society*, 26:3, 369-372

Goble, C. (2013). Dependence, Independence and Normality. In: *Disabling Barriers - Enabling Environments*, ed. J. Swain, S. French, C. Barnes and C. Thomas. London; Sage. **PAGES**

Hastings, C. (2012). The experience of male adolescent refugees during their transfer and adaptation to a UK secondary school. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 28(4), 335-351.

Hawkins, O. (2017). *Asylum Statistics: Briefing Paper*. Number SN01403. *House of Commons.* Available: http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN01403#fullreport

Home Office. (2005). *Integration matters: National strategy for integration*. London: Home Office.

UK Parliament. (2016) *Immigration Act*. London: UK Parliament. Available: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2016/19/pdfs/ukpga_20160019_en.pdf

Lingard, B. and Sellar, S. (2012). A policy sociology reflection on school reform in England: from the 'Third Way' to the 'Big Society', *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 44:1, 43-63

MacDonald, F. (2017). Positioning young refugees in Australia: media discourse and social exclusion, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. Online first, 1-14.

McCorriston, M. (2012). Twenty-first learning: the role of community cohesion in refugee education. In: *Education, refugees and asylum seekers*, edited by L. Demirdjian, 166-189. London: Continuum.

Pinson, H & Arnot, M. (2007).Sociology of Education and the Wasteland of Refugee Education Research. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28(3), pp. 399-407.

Pinson, H. and Arnot, M. (2010). Local conceptualisations of the education of asylum-seeking and refugee students: from hostile to holistic models. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 14(3), 247-267.

Refugee Council. (2017). *Children in the Asylum System*. Available: https://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/assets/0004/0485/Children_in_the_Asylum_System_May__2017.pdf

Rutter, J. and Jones, C. (2001). *Refugee education – mapping the field*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Saks, M. and Allsop, J. (2013). *Researching health: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods.* London: Sage

Savin-Baden, M. and Major, C.H. (2013). *Qualitative research: the essential guide to theory and practice.* London: Routledge.

Travis, A. (2017). *UK has not taken in any child refugees under Dubs scheme this year. The Guardian. Available: https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/jul/19/uk-not-taken-any-child-refugees-dubs-scheme-this-year*

Walmsley J and Johnson K. (2003). *Inclusive Research with People with Learning Disabilities: Past, Present and Futures*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Wittgenstein, L. (1975). *The blue and brown books*. London: Blackwell.