

Introduction to *Thinking Like a Route*

Yolanda Weima and Claudio Minca

Thinking like a Route represents a preliminary attempt to reflect methodologically on the possibility of studying an informal migratory route – such as the so-called Balkan Route – as a whole. Global media attention to ‘the Balkan Route’ has somewhat faded since the emergence of a semi-formal overland migration corridor in the spring of 2015, which gained international visibility as it connected Greece to Western Europe via FYR Macedonia, Serbia, Hungary, Croatia, and Slovenia. Although this semi-formal ‘humanitarian corridor’ was officially closed in the spring of 2016, a range of new, clandestine trajectories soon emerged. Today, the Balkan Route remains the largest overland informal migration route in Europe. It loosely encompasses a variety of diverse and shifting passageways that link Turkey and Greece to several Western European countries, passing through a number of ‘Balkan’ states in ever-changing configurations. The latter include, in addition to those already mentioned, Albania, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo,¹ and Montenegro – along with countless deviations beyond the dominant trajectories.

As we shall see in the following pages, the very concept of a route has been contested within the critical literature on migration, as it has been adopted by various organizations and authorities to describe, investigate, and contain the transnational informal mobility of migrants. However, as we will discuss, the concept of the route is also employed by other key actors implicated in the making of this migratory corridor. The idea for this volume – which brings together some of the initial steps in the exploration of the Balkan Route by members of the team involved in the ERC TheGAME project – sprang from our engagement with this fundamental issue. Indeed, several chapters in this collection represent a continuation of conversations that began during

¹ This designation is in line with United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

the project's first workshop, organized by the editors and held in Trieste in December 2023, and that evolved within the team in the months that followed.

The title of this book is clearly inspired by the titles of other, far more ambitious works – such as James C. Scott's *Seeing Like a State* (1999) and Mahmoud Keshavarz and Shahram Khosravi's *Seeing Like a Smuggler* (2022). This was a deliberately provocative indirect citation, intended to stimulate further reflection on the possibility of conceptualizing a route *as such*, in its multiple dimensions. At the same time, it is also important to note that *Thinking Like a Route* is the second volume in the 'Counter-geographies of the Refugee Balkan Route' book series – which was conceived as a space to showcase some of the most significant reflections and outcomes of TheGAME project. The first volume in the series, *A Spatial Theory of the Camp* (Carter-White & Minca, 2025), theorizes the spatial logics and practices that connect diverse historical and contemporary camps vis-à-vis the modern nation-state, including the multiplicity of camps established along the Balkan Route. This edited volume delves more deeply into 'the Route' itself. It represents a first, partial, and necessarily incomplete attempt to map and counter-map key aspects of this complex space carved out by migrants' informal mobilities. To this end, we approach the Balkan Route from two perspectives – each corresponding to a distinct analytical scale – through which we attempt to understand this specific geographical formation that cuts across the Balkans and has drawn sustained attention from numerous European governments and various European Union (EU) institutions. On the one hand, we consider the perspectives of state and transnational organizations, whose imaginaries of the Route shape how they seek to know, contain, and manage informal migration in the region. This hegemonic form of 'route thinking' has informed border politics and policies – particularly those centred on securitization and the externalization of borders – for over a decade. On the other hand, we engage with the embodied 'route thinking' of people-on-the-move, who navigate the region in pursuit of their desired destinations, often in the face of immense challenges generated by the irregularization of their mobilities. These challenges include both structural violence and forms of direct border violence.

These two 'scales' of 'route thinking' inform the structure of this work. Chapter 1 begins by reviewing the existing literature on the Balkan Route. At its core, the chapter questions the very concept of a 'route' and its appropriateness as an analytical lens in critical migration research. We outline critical perspectives on 'route thinking' in order to ask: given that it operates as a powerful geographical imaginary – shaping how states and EU institutions attempt to manage migration – is it an appropriate framework for our research? Hegemonic 'route thinking' tends to homogenize, simplify, and criminalize different mobilities. It is often used to justify border policies and practices that intensify both structural and direct violence against people-on-the-move. The

chapter then shifts from a discussion of this dominant perspective to an exploration of what it might mean to counter-map the Route in light of such critiques. This section introduces our theorization of the ‘Game’: an ambivalent term used by migrants and others to describe the challenge of attempting to cross borders while facing pushbacks and other obstacles and forms of violence. We interpret the Game as a form of ‘route thinking’ in its own right – though one grounded in embodied geographical imaginings of how to navigate the Route rather than in abstract imaginaries. Accordingly, this chapter proposes ‘thinking like a route’ as a conceptual entry point for counter-mapping informal mobilities – mobilities shaped by the entwined dynamics of ‘route thinking’ across different scales. It also reflects on the methodological implications of such an approach, both for the book and for the broader aims of the project.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

Following this foundational chapter, the two main parts of this book, each comprising three chapters, reflect the two analytical perspectives outlined above. The chapters in Part I, entitled ‘Mappings,’ address the formal infrastructure of migration management across the Route and how this infrastructure has been shaped by – and in turn shapes – the Route. Specifically, the chapters discuss the designation of camps (Chapter 2), the shaping of asylum systems (Chapter 3), and the construction of border walls (Chapter 4). The establishment of this infrastructure reflects ‘route thinking’ by authorities, including at the state and supra-state scales, and is shaped by the geopolitics of migration management. Nevertheless, it is not homogeneously or consistently implemented. Rather, it takes different forms at different times in the different countries along the Route. Tracing these key elements of the Route’s formal infrastructure, as conceived from a state perspective, may reveal what remains invisible or obscured by the official state gaze and by many international organizations engaged in migration management and humanitarian aid.

In Chapter 2, Yolanda Weima traces the shifting archipelago of state-run camps across the region from 2015 to the present. She adopts a broad definition of camps, encompassing asylum and detention infrastructure, as well as transit camps, temporary reception centres, and other forms of open and restricted-access migrant accommodation. Although the literature on camps is very uneven across the Route, she nevertheless identifies two key patterns in this key infrastructure of state and humanitarian migration management. First, she notes the initial use of EU-funded asylum and detention infrastructure, although this infrastructure was eventually overwhelmed in each country (sometimes within days of increased arrivals, and in other cases more slowly due to changes in micro-routes). Second, she notes a shift to an expressly created and explicitly transit/temporary migration camp infrastructure across the

Route, bound up in many places with other trends such as moving migrant accommodation away from urban areas, formalizing shelter arrangements, and privileging the use of shipping containers as camp infrastructure. Drawing from the work of Kreichauf (2017), Weima describes these trends as the ‘campization’ of the Balkan Route, as states seek to use the opening, closure, and management of camps, to both respond to and seek to shape the ways that refugee-migrants navigate mobilities across the region (on this, see also Carter-White & Minca, 2025).

In Chapter 3, Lorenzo Vianelli explores how the conditions tied to EU accession are influencing the asylum systems of countries along the Balkan Route. He shows how these processes contribute to the externalization of the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) and shape broader migration management across the region. Drawing on a range of sources – including policy documents, legal frameworks, and reports from both institutions and NGOs – Vianelli identifies key trends in the evolving configuration of this migration corridor. A central theme in the chapter is the EU leverage over non-EU countries through its Enlargement Policy. On the one hand, the EU exerts direct influence via formal pre-accession requirements; on the other, it operates more subtly through mechanisms such as training programs and operational support. Vianelli argues that while ‘the declared objective of the externalisation of the CEAS is to establish functioning asylum systems in the Balkans; on the other hand, this outcome might reflect a broader concern on the part of EU actors to create a buffer zone of safe third countries along one of the main migratory routes towards the EU’. Such a buffer zone could later be used to justify ‘safe’ returns and to contain migration flows. In this light, the push for CEAS harmonization may epitomize institutional ‘route thinking’ at the same time as it promotes the right to asylum in the region.

In Chapter 4, Alexandra Rijke traces the proliferation (and in some cases the decay) of border walls and fences across the Balkan Route over the past ten years. She situates this ‘walling’ within a broader global context where the construction of border walls has been accelerating. First engaging with the critical literature on border walls, she then homes in on the uneven and incomplete literature on the walls marking sections of the borders between Hungary and Serbia, Serbia and North Macedonia, North Macedonia and Greece, Greece and Turkey, and Turkey and Bulgaria, as well as the already ‘fallen’ walls between Hungary and Croatia and Slovenia and Croatia. Based on this ‘mapping’, she raises three key questions to guide further research. First, Rijke asks how walls can be studied as part of migration routes. Second, she highlights the importance of examining the impact of walls that both ‘wall-in’ and ‘wall-out’ – shaping the experiences of local residents and irregularized migrants alike. Finally, she reflects on the methodological challenges of researching walls, which, while serving as spectacular symbols of state power,

are correspondingly ‘difficult, if not impossible, to study “on the ground”’ due to restricted access and the scarcity of reliable secondary sources.

Part II entitled ‘Regional Dispatches’ is based on empirical research conducted across the Balkan Route, tracing the relationship between key sites of migration management and counter-mobilities. The chapters approach this topic at three different scales: those of a country (Serbia – Chapter 5), a canton (Una-Sana Canton, Bosnia and Herzegovina – Chapter 6), and a city (Trieste, Italy – Chapter 7). In Chapter 5, Dragan Umek and Claudio Minca draw on their twenty-plus field trips over the past decade to examine changes in Serbia’s ‘geopolitics of migration’ since the so-called ‘long summer of migration’. They identify three key phases: first, the period of the humanitarian corridor (2015–2016); second, the slowing of mobilities and Serbia’s positioning as a ‘buffer zone’ (2016–2020); and third, a renewed ‘buffer zone’ phase centred on the emergence of the ‘Sombor Hub’ – a refugee hub in the northern city of Sombor, which has become a key site in the organization of informal border crossings in the region (2020–2023). The authors conclude by reflecting on the significant shifts in migration management in Serbia since the autumn of 2023 and considering their broader implications. Over the past decade, Umek and Minca argue, each phase of Serbia’s response has been shaped by the complex geopolitical dynamics of the Route, with Serbia playing a central role in the management of informal migration towards Western Europe. State policies and practices have been marked by a strategically ambivalent stance – on the one hand, tacitly facilitating the informal mobility of migrants; on the other, often actively working to contain and delay their onward movement. These shifting geopolitical imperatives have in turn shaped both state and humanitarian interventions, most notably in the formation and governance of an archipelago of camps across the country.

In Chapter 6, Roberta Gentili, Claudio Minca, and Yolanda Weima again draw attention to camp geographies as a key analytical entry point for analysing the Balkan Route – this time focusing on the shifting camp geographies of the Una-Sana Canton in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In 2018, this canton experienced a significant surge in the arrival of migrants seeking to cross the border from Bosnia into Croatia. The region has since witnessed the rapid establishment and subsequent closure of a series of institutional camps and informal migrant settlements, with key changes occurring during the early months of the Covid-19 public health emergency. This chapter details how the opening of new formal camps in the canton over a period of several years has facilitated the erasure of previously widespread makeshift camps and squats in the area. It has also entailed the increased securitization of migrant accommodation, as well as the distancing of people-on-the-move from urban areas and their consequent invisibilization. The authors ultimately argue that camp closures

have changed the composition of migration in Una-Sana Canton, significantly affecting people-on-the-move and altering the dynamics of the ‘Game’.

In Chapter 7, Claudio Minca and Dragan Umek tease out the intertwining of formal and informal migrant spatialities in Trieste, Italy. Often seen as a terminus of one of the key articulations of the Balkan Route – the end of ‘the Game’ – Trieste represents both a symbolic and actual entry point into Italy and a gateway to Western Europe more broadly (though many migrants continue their journeys beyond the city). Yet for numerous arrivals, the precarious living conditions endured along the Route persist in Trieste. In the absence of formal accommodation, migrants are often left to survive in dire, informal, and makeshift living quarters. While they can access certain forms of humanitarian support, their lives frequently remain suspended in a kind of limbo as they await the outcomes of administrative procedures and the ‘opening’ of spaces within the formal hospitality system. The chapter concludes with a discussion of how Trieste’s migrant geographies in many ways extend the interplay of formal and informal spatialities that underpins the ‘making of migration’ across the Balkan Route.

The three chapters in Part II of the book offer an initial, partial attempt at exploring what it might mean to counter-map the Route. While they begin to draw insights from the ‘route thinking’ of people-on-the-move, this is still done in a limited way, with significant emphasis placed on the actions and geopolitics of state and humanitarian actors operating at different scales. As noted above, this volume represents a first preliminary effort to reflect methodologically on the possibility of studying an informal migratory route – such as the Balkan Route – in its entirety. Inevitably, this comes with limitations, which we hope to address in the next stages of the ERC project and in future publications. For example, future research could delve more deeply into the often ambivalent but meaningful connections between sites along this migration corridor, aiming to analytically link city ‘refugee hubs’ and border regions along the Route to the camp archipelagos that span across state borders. At the same time, more could be said about how the networks of smugglers that facilitate migrant mobility along the Route are continuously generating new counter-geographies in response to both shifting border regimes in the countries traversed and the EU’s evolving strategies of border externalization.

The ERC project will also investigate other areas in the Balkans where the Route has reshaped local economies, with a particular focus on countries such as North Macedonia, Bulgaria, and Montenegro – contexts in which very little research has been conducted on the impact of this large-scale movement of people across their territories. Greece, despite being a key entry point to the Balkan Route and a focus of forthcoming project research, is also underrepresented in this volume. This omission is largely due to the pace of the project and the extensive fieldwork still required in this region before any substantial

analysis of its complex migrant geographies can be published. Finally, deeper critical engagement with the ‘grand narratives’ of the Route – those produced and promoted by the various actors operating within this space – would have further enriched our analysis of the different manifestations of ‘route thinking’ and their influence on how the Route is not only imagined but also managed and continually reshaped. We sincerely hope that readers will overlook these limitations and still find value in the set of analyses presented in the volume. Most of these limitations, along with further lines of inquiry, will be addressed in subsequent volumes of this series. In relation to our future writing plans – and also to some of the ethical considerations that have accompanied the project, and this volume, from the outset – we would like to conclude this Introduction by reflecting on certain terminological choices we have made, with a view to addressing sensitive concepts and issues related to the study of vulnerable subjects, such as those who have engaged, and continue to engage, with this informal migration corridor.

A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

Debates around terminology in refugee and migration studies have been ongoing for decades, grounded in the shared recognition that categories *matter*. Many of the terms used to describe people who cross borders – such as those traveling along the Balkan Route – ‘carry connotations of colonization and racialization’ (Bauder, 2013: 5) and can be entangled with forms of ‘epistemological violence’. These terminological choices can have real-world implications for state, societal, and humanitarian responses to human mobilities (Crawley & Skleparis, 2018; Ehrkamp, 2017; Hyndman & Giles, 2017; Hyndman & Reynolds, 2020). Indeed, states often construct legal frameworks that categorize certain mobilities as illegal (Bauder, 2013), while humanitarian categories similarly determine access to rights and aid for some but not others (Hyndman, 2000; Long, 2013). Acritical use of these state and humanitarian categories can therefore inherently constrain the scope of researchers in the field, together with the breadth of their questions and analyses (Bakewell, 2008). In the context of the Balkan Route, critical discussions around terminology – particularly the debate over the use of ‘refugees’ versus ‘migrants’ – have not been confined to academic literature but have featured prominently in media discourse, especially during 2015 (Crawley & Skleparis, 2018; Rydzewski, 2023).

Precisely because ‘migrant’ is such a broad term, it can encompass a wide range of legal statuses and experiences – from privileged investor-class migrants to the most precarious border-crossers. Broadly speaking, most refugees are also migrants in the basic sense that they have moved from one place to another (Long, 2013; Rydzewski, 2023). Yet in everyday usage, the

term has often come to be equated with people moving for economic reasons and thus seen as ineligible for protection under international refugee law. In her review of migration geographies, Ehrkamp argues that the term ‘migrant’ ‘reduces people to labor and does not fully capture the complex webs of reasons and decisions why people migrate’ (2017: 815). As more states seek to evade humanitarian responsibilities and access to asylum becomes increasingly restricted, the insistence on using the term ‘refugees’ – regardless of legal status – can serve as a political statement emphasizing the necessity of offering refuge. However, the category of ‘refugee’ is complex: it is broad in that it can homogenize diverse experiences and subjectivities, yet also limited in its legal application, having been conceptualized from its inception in ways that are Eurocentric and exclusionary (Abuya et al., 2021; Hyndman, 2000; Malkki, 1995; Mayblin, 2014).

Some scholars, seeking to avoid this refugee/migrant binary, have proposed or chosen alternative terminology.² Terminology such as ‘refugees and other migrants’ (Crawley & Jones, 2021: 3226), ‘refugee-migrants’ (Hyndman & Reynolds, 2020), or ‘humanitarian migrants’ (Van Houte et al., 2023) seek to ‘blur’ the boundaries between categories while drawing attention to the associated politics (Hyndman & Reynolds, 2020). Not only do people leave their homes for a wide variety of reasons that do not necessarily fit easily with definitions in international law, but how such categories are applied also varies from country to country and even within countries. The use of a single category that depends on identifying a single ‘rationale for migration’ may ‘limit understandings of complex migration journeys’ (Hyndman & Reynolds, 2020: 72; Schwarz, 2020).

In the context of the Balkan Route specifically, a number of scholars propose terms such as ‘irregularized humanitarian migrants’ (Van Houte et al., 2023) or ‘irregularized migrants’ (Bendixsen, 2017; Hameršak, 2022; Jacobsen & Karlsen, 2020) to draw attention to the role of socio-political processes in producing laws and practices that limit access to legal options for many people seeking to cross borders (Bauder, 2013). The term ‘people-on-the-move’ has also become common. While it is widely used by activist and solidarity groups (see, for instance, Collective Aid, 2023; No Name Kitchen, 2024), it has also been adopted by the International Organization for Migration (IOM, 2025) and other UN agencies, and even features in reports by business consulting

² Humanitarian agencies and states have also multiplied the terms and categorizations they use – most often with the effect of limiting access to secure, long-term status (Bakewell, 2021) – but also, at times to broaden the scope of their response, or to justify their role in a given context in relation to their mandate, as in the UNHCR’s use of the term ‘persons in need of international protection’ at reception centres in Serbia (Rydzewski, 2023: 9).

firms such as the McKinsey Global Institute (2016). Critiques of this term include that it may obscure the fact that not everyone is aiming to or able to move at every point along their journey (Crawley & Jones, 2021).

Yet, for all these debates, Ryzdewski argues that, particularly after the closure of the humanitarian corridor across the Balkans, ‘the emphasis on terminology did little to enforce the duty to protect people fleeing war, political terror, hunger or because of a desire to change the environment in which they live. In fact, their situation worsened month by month’ (2023: 8). Furthermore, from a discursive perspective, no category can capture ‘the full human experience’ (Bakewell, 2021: 64) or even the full migration experience. A degree of ‘flattening’ is perhaps analytically necessary, even when unintended (Bakewell, 2021), given that all ‘people are more than their migration status’ (Hyndman & Reynolds, 2020: 72).

Many of the chapters in this volume use the ‘migrant’ category, or the term ‘people-on-the-move’, precisely because they are broad. These terms can encompass the way that a single person’s status may vary along the Route and over time. They allow us to discuss people who have left homes in vastly different contexts and for diverse reasons (El-Shaarawi & Razsa, 2019), without needing to formulate any judgement regarding their reasons for travelling the Route. Especially because national profiling has been central to securitizing the Balkan Route, justifying border closures and violence, we are reluctant to refer to state categories that may see some people as coming from ‘refugee-producing countries’ or ‘safe countries’. Furthermore, ‘irregularity’ is itself a continuum in many settings along the Route, as people move in and out of a variety of temporary statuses at different points in their journeys (Bendixsen, 2023; Hyndman & Reynolds, 2020; Jacobsen & Karlsen, 2020: 1). Arguably, the use of the term refugee, or asylum seeker, or any other term, when not tied to state definitions, could be used with equally broad understandings. Yet, at times, differentiating between legal statuses *is* analytically relevant and important to understanding how people navigate the Route. Accordingly, the authors in this volume use different terminologies – sometimes interchangeably and broadly, sometimes with purposeful reference to specific legal regimes – but always with the understanding that these categories are contested, slippery, and imperfect, with connotations changing across contexts and over time.

REFERENCES

- Abuya, E. O., Krause, U., & Mayblin, L. (2021). The neglected colonial legacy of the 1951 refugee convention. *International Migration*, 59(4), 265–267.
- Bakewell, O. (2008). Research beyond the categories: The importance of policy irrelevant research into forced migration. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21(4), 432–453.

- Bakewell, O. (2021). Humanizing refugee research in a turbulent world. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 37(2), 63–69.
- Bauder, H. (2013). *Why we should use the term illegalized immigrant* (RCIS Research Brief No. 2013/1).
- Bendixsen, S. (2017). The production of irregular migrants: The case of Norway. *Two Homelands*, 45.
- Bendixsen, S. (2023). Journeys interrupted: The labyrinthine border experience along the Balkan Route. In A.J. Knudsen & K.G. Berg (eds), *Continental encampment: Genealogies of containment in the Middle East and Europe* (pp. 190–215). Berghan.
- Carter-White, R., & Minca, C. (2025). *A spatial theory of the camp: Geopolitics, biopolitics and the immunitarian state*. Edward Elgar.
- Collective Aid. (2023, December 28). Everyday violence at Europe's external borders: Violence and inhumane treatment as part of daily life for people on the move. <https://www.collectiveaidngo.org/blog/2023/12/28/everyday-violence-at-europes-external-borders-violence-and-inhumane-treatment-as-part-of-daily-life-for-people-on-the-move>
- Crawley, H., & Jones, K. (2021). Beyond here and there: (Re)conceptualising migrant journeys and the 'in-between'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 47(14), 3226–3242.
- Crawley, H., & Skleparis, D. (2018). Refugees, migrants, neither, both: Categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe's 'migration crisis'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(1), 48–64.
- Ehrkamp, P. (2017). Geographies of migration I: Refugees. *Progress in Human Geography*, 41(6), 813–822.
- El-Shaarawi, N., & Razsa, M. (2019). Movements upon movements: Refugee and activist struggles to open the Balkan Route to Europe. *History and Anthropology*, 30(1), 91–112.
- Hameršak, M. (2022). Irregularized migration. *e-ERIM: An online network of keywords of the European irregularized migration regime at the periphery of the EU*. <https://e-erim.ief.hr/pojam/iregularizirane-migracije?locale=en>
- Hyndman, J. (2000). *Managing displacement: Refugees and the politics of humanitarianism*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Hyndman, J., & Giles, W. (2017). *Refugees in extended exile: Living on the edge*. Routledge.
- Hyndman, J., & Reynolds, J. (2020). Beyond the global compacts. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 36(1), 66–74.
- IOM. (2025). Our work: Saving lives and protecting people on the move. IOM: UN Migration. <https://www.iom.int/saving-lives-and-protecting-people-move>
- Jacobsen, C.M., & Karlsen, M.-A. (2020). Introduction: Unpacking the temporalities of irregular migration. In C.M. Jacobsen, M.-A. Karlsen, & S. Khosravi (eds), *Waiting and the temporalities of irregular migration* (pp. 1–20). Routledge.
- Keshavarz, M., & Khosravi, S. (eds) (2022). *Seeing like a smuggler: Borders from below*. Pluto Press.
- Kreichauf, R. (2017). From forced migration to forced arrival: The campization of refugee accommodation in European cities. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6(1).
- Long, K. (2013). When refugees stopped being migrants: Movement, labour and humanitarian protection. *Migration Studies*, 1(1), 4–26.
- Malkki, L.H. (1995). Refugees and exile: From 'refugee studies' to the national order of things. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 495–523.

- Mayblin, L. (2014). Colonialism, decolonisation, and the right to be human: Britain and the 1951 Geneva convention on the status of refugees. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 27(3), 423–441.
- McKinsey Global Institute (2016). *People on the move: Global Migration's impact and opportunity*. <https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/industries/public%20and%20social%20sector/our%20insights/global%20migrations%20impact%20and%20opportunity/mgi-people-on-the-move-full-report.pdf>
- No Name Kitchen (2024). *Forced displacement of people on the move in southern Serbia: November '23-April '24* [Assessment Report]. <https://www.nonamekitchen.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Assessment-Report-South-Serbia-No-Name-Kitchen.pdf>
- Rydzewski, R. (2023). *The Balkan Route: Hope, migration and Europeanisation in liminal spaces*. Routledge.
- Schwarz, I. (2020). Migrants moving through mobility regimes: The trajectory approach as a tool to reveal migratory processes. *Geoforum*, 116, 217–225.
- Scott, J.C. (1999). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. Yale University Press.
- Van Houte, M., Kaşlı, Z., & Leerkes, A. (2023). Introduction: Irregularized humanitarian migrants – Policies, rationales, and the search for more durable solutions. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 36(3), 315–336.