CHAPTER 6

ANTHROPOLOGY AND FORCED MIGRATION

DAWN CHATTY

INTRODUCTION

ANTHROPOLOGY, with its focus on people in groups, has had a pivotal role in the development of the modern interdisciplinary study of forced migration. Both before and after the birth of 'refugee' studies, anthropology's contribution to this new field has been and continues to be the prioritizing of the views of the uprooted, the displaced, and the dispossessed. Its emphasis on phenomenological and ethnographic field methods gives voice and agency to refugees, exiles, and other forced migrants. This chapter articulates anthropology's unique contribution to the field by setting out the conceptualizations and tools which have put the lived experience to the fore, documenting and further analysing what happens to people, their culture, and society when they are wrenched from their territorial moorings, be they refugees and exiles, development induced displaces, or mobile peoples evicted, restricted, and forced to remain in one place. In particular, it examines some of the important anthropological studies which pre-dated the 'fieldwork in a refugee camp' era of the early 1980s and after, and reflects on the significance of the 'view from below' centralized through anthropology's unique research tool and strategy: participant observation.

The chapter commences with an examination of anthropological studies of people who have been forced to move which pre-date the 1980s (Colson in the 1940s, Turnbull in the 1950s, Loizos in the 1960s, and Chatty in the 1970s). These contributions to the field clearly tied people to places from which they were dispossessed or evicted, a conceptualization in anthropology which was not challenged until the 1990s when Malkki's work gave rise to debates on deterritorialization, liminality, and belonging. The chapter then engages with the further elaboration in more recent anthropological studies which have come to question territorialization. As anthropology's foundation principles include the association of

spaces with particular cultures and societies, the decoupling of territory and culture has been approached rather gingerly within the discipline. The emergence of transnationalism and diasporas as an area of anthropological scholarship area is a response to this reticence (Van Hear 2000; Monsutti 2005). Over time, the research agenda of anthropologists working in the field of forced migration has come to focus on certain other binaries: sedentism and mobility; those who remain and those who move; camp-based versus urban refugees; refugees in the global South and those in the global North; and more recently the circularity of forced migration including integration, return, and development.

THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE ACADEMIC FIELD OF FORCED MIGRATION STUDIES

Anthropology developed as a discipline in the United States early in the twentieth century and was closely associated with protecting the rights and cultural memory of indigenous peoples, hence its early focus on phenomenological note taking and recording. In the United Kingdom and France, its growth and close association with European imperialism meant a disciplinary trajectory that focused on the theoretical and conceptual rather than the substantive, often in support of the colonial project. In whichever continent anthropology developed, the importance of the 'real' rather than the 'armchair' or desk study was prioritized. Thus participant observation, as a strategy and as a core method, became the hallmark of the discipline.

The academic interest in the study of migration as a specific field developed in the late nineteenth century with the work of the British demographer Ravenstein (Ravenstein 1889). This was followed by economists and sociologists in the USA mainly concerned with labour markets and immigration assimilation. Most of the migration research in the first half of the twentieth century in the USA was interested in immigrant absorption but not the immigrant experience. In Europe, pioneering work by the historian Ferdinand Braudel and others began to explore migrants' experiences; but this was also focused on national agendas and the priorities of the state. The experience or memory of migrants—forced or otherwise—were not on the research radar other than as elements which expanded or espoused ideas about national cultures (that is in terms of integration and assimilation). As Soguk saw the citizen as rooted in territorial space, the refugee was seen as uprooted, dislocated, and displaced from the community of citizens and thus the refugee lacked affinity with the national community. The refugee was a negative, an empty, or bare space in theory and in research (Soguk 1999). It took anthropologists with their fundamental interest in human experience and behaviour to turn the tide and bring the migration experience, the memory of dispossession and displacement, as well as the lived response to uprootedness into the core of a developing field of study (Sayigh 1979; Reynell 1989; Huseby-Darvas 1994; Malkki 1995; Das 1996; Hirschon 1998; Chatty 2010).

The twentieth century has been called the 'century of the refugee', so it is not surprising that the twenty-first century looks set to become known as the 'century of displacement and dispossession' (Colson 2003). Anthropologists have increasingly engaged in ethnographic studies of uprooting, displacement, migration, and resettlement. These interests reflect the current state of the world. For a field which sets out to understand the lived experience and which depends upon participant observation as its fundamental research tool, it is not surprising that forced migration has captured the attention of large numbers of anthropologists. This is so much so that the American Anthropological Association even contains a subgroup composed of those whose research interests focus on refugees, the internally displaced, and other involuntary migrants.

In the United States, anthropology developed through research on Native Americans, peoples who had been subjected to massive ethnic cleansings in the preceding two centuries. Much of that early work was with tribes who had been displaced, dispossessed, and involuntarily marched into resource-poor reservations. The anthropologists working with them thought they were engaging in a kind of salvage ethnography to record ways of life before they disappeared. These researchers largely ignored the impacts of displacement—the destroyed settlements, land occupation, non-viable reservations, inadequate welfare and hostile administrations, and lack of legal rights—and focused instead on trying to reconstruct memory culture of 'what life was like in the old days'. Nevertheless these studies gave us many of our basic concepts to describe the experience of uprootedness despite later embeddedness in gratuitously assumed stable modern societies. These fundamental anthropological concepts have become important in the discipline of forced migration studies. They include understandings of: role and identity, hierarchy, social networks, conflict mechanisms, reciprocity and trust, boundary creation, rites of passage, liminality, and the role of myths. Anthropological research in Africa also largely ignored the impacts of displacement on a continent which had seen much turmoil for the century before anthropologists had arrived. These largely British anthropologists also ignored the facts of displacement or dealt with partial systems of people living under colonial regimes.

Perhaps the earliest work with displaced populations was conducted by Elizabeth Colson between 1942 and 1943 at Poston War Relocation Camp in Arizona, where largely second-generation Japanese-Americans (Nisei) from California were interned during the Second World War. Here, the fact of displacement could not be ignored, and the thrust of the work was applied; to study the 'causes of resistance' to camp administration and to propose measures to ameliorate the effects of interment. Little work from that period has been published and is perhaps overshadowed by the long-term studies which Colson engaged in with the Plateau Tonga and the Gwembe Tonga from 1946 to the present. The latter represents the longest longitudinal study of forced migration—development induced displacement and resettlement—which we have. The work of Colin Turnbull whose two classic monographs were published in the 1960s but researched in the 1950s, The Forest People and The Mountain People, characterize the anthropological lens of the time perfectly. The first is a sympathetic study of a people—the pygmies of the Ituri forest—largely removed from much contact with the colonial regime. It is very much an ode to a harmonious way of life largely untouched by the twentieth century. The second, The Mountain People, largely ignored the displacement of these people from Uganda for the establishment of a National Game Reserve on their traditional grazing lands. It ignores their dispossession to the mountains of the Kenya/Uganda border, their loss of livelihood, and their lack of legal rights. Instead it focuses on their social disintegration into a 'band' of hostile people whose only goal is individual survival. Published in the 1960s it was a study in societal breakdown which some saw as beginning to produce the same results in the West. This was classic anthropology: to study the other so as to better understand ourselves.

The 1970s saw a turn to greater introspection and holistic analysis. Peter Loizos was in many ways a pioneer in the study of the plight of refugees and in the emerging postmodernist lens. He was, to an extent, an accidental chronicler of displacement. His original Ph.D. study was intended to be on the 'dowry' in his father's Greek Cypriot village of Argaki, and yet processes of politicization in the early 1970s saw him shift emphasis to study politics in a Cypriot village. A few years later, in the aftermath of the Cypriot civil war, he found his village and his large extended family had become refugees and he returned to study how people had coped with dispossession and exile, what resources they had deployed, and how they had created new lives in difficult circumstances. Renee Hirschon also engaged in the determined study of a refugee group—some of the 1 million Orthodox Christians to be forcibly moved for 35,000 Muslim Turks after the 1922 Exchange of Populations. This international agreement resulted from the unsuccessful Greek attempt to retake Eastern Anatolia during the Turkish 'War for Independence' between 1918 and 1923. Hirschon set out to study the dispossessed and displaced Orthodox Christians from Asia Minor who were 'resettled' in the Greek port of Piraeus. She also sought to understand how people coped with exile and how they created new lives in difficult circumstances, and how second- and third-generation refugees identified themselves and structured the myths of origin. During this period a number of anthropological studies emerged looking at long-term dispossession among the Palestinian refugees in the Levant, as well as examining adaptation and innovation among dispossessed and stateless mobile groups (Chatty 1986; Peteet 1995). With regard to the latter, this involved anthropologists understanding competing concepts of sedentism and mobility and the way legal categories of territorial habitation were used to justify eviction such as *terra nullius* to justify the dispossession of 'the Other' in Australia, *vacuum domicilium* in the USA to justify the forced marches of Native Americans from their traditional territories, and *tabula rasa* in South West Africa to account for the genocide of the Herero by German colonialists.

Anthropology and the Formal Founding of the Discipline of Forced Migration Studies

The discipline was edging towards trying to understand the lives, the perceptions, and the aspirations of those who suffered forced migration whether caused by war or other forms of violence, or because the dominant view of the 'greater economic good' required removal. However, these ethnographies and the move towards defining a discipline

ested on a problematic premiss. What right did social scientists have to study the suffering of others, unless it could be claimed—to use the old liberal assumption—that good research would contribute to better informed policy and practice and that such research would be for the betterment of both? That is not the same as saying that advocacy was an element in fieldwork, but rather that advocacy had a place in ameliorating desperate conditions. This positioning gave the new field a moral anchor significantly different from other disciplines grounded in traditional academic specializations such as sociology, politics, and geography where the traditions of knowledge were for knowledge's sake. The study of refugees and forced migrants had an ethical and individual moral imperative to give something back to the community studied, as a step to ameliorating suffering.

As early as the 1970s, studies were showing that the condition of involuntary movement and resettlement was not following the classical pattern established in the magisterial sociological study by Thomas and Znaniecki's work on Polish immigration to the USA (Thomas and Znaniecki 1996 (1918)). That study set out the way migrants used networks, established coherent ethnic communities, and reinforced links to the homeland, bypassing as much as possible contact with formal institutions provided by the host community where they felt powerless to control outcomes. What these new studies were showing was that voluntary migrants adjusted faster and their adjustment to their new physical and social environments was more stable and less conflict-ridden than those forced to move [or stay in one place] and officially relocated and under the control of a resettlement administration (Lieber 1977). Comparable findings for camp versus self-settled refugees in the Sudan emerged in Harrell-Bond's study (Harrell-Bond 1986) and those of Malkki for camp and self-settled refugees in Tanzania (Malkki 1995).

By the 1980s anthropologists were bringing together their findings from work on forced migration of various kinds, including refugees, internally displaced persons, those uprooted because others wanted their land or resources, and disaster victims. Many anthropologists had conducted this research thinking that it would have an impact on policy and make uprooting and readjustment less traumatic (Hansen and Oliver-Smith 1982; Oliver-Smith and Hansen 1982; Cernea 1985; Morgan and Colson 1987). Ethnographic studies of displacement for large development projects and biodiversity conservation protected areas had already aroused sufficient concern at the World Bank for guidelines to be drawn up evaluating social impacts on those at risk of involuntary displacement. However, these guidelines did not immediately provide any institutional means through which the displaced could appeal to an international constituency.

It was in this period that several institutions were established—largely by anthropologists—to find ways of taking their own research to the public and to policymakers and to give voice to the forced migrants, and other oppressed peoples. In 1971, a group of anthropologists framed the Barbados Declaration calling for the protection of the rights of indigenous people not to be dispossessed or assimilated by the nation states they found themselves in. The International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) was set up at this time followed shortly thereafter by Cultural Survival in 1972 and its accompanying journal (*Cultural Survival*). The Refugee Studies Programme (RSP; now known as RSC) was established in the same tradition at the University of Oxford by Dr Barbara Harrell-Bond in 1982. It developed an academic focus emphasizing research and empirical findings and reached out to policymakers, practitioners, and refugees alike. It brought the broad critical study of humanitarianism squarely into anthropology and interrogated the motives, nature, and implications of humanitarian aid agencies'— and their staff's—interventions. By 1989, it had established both a journal (*Journal of Refuge Studies*) as well as a newsletter for practitioners (*Forced Migration Review*). In 2002, the RSC spearheaded a drive to protect the rights of mobile peoples—hunters and gatherers, pastoralists, and swidden agriculturalists—from eviction, dispossession, and forced settlement. That effort, the Dana Declaration on Mobile Peoples and Conservation was an advocacy effort based on research conducted at the RSC in the previous decade. Nonetheless, by and large, the RSC strengthened its academic credentials in teaching and research during this time. The IWGIA and Cultural Survival, on the other hand, emphasized service to the local communities, advocacy and activism bringing them and their plight to the attention of international public opinion.

The RSC, in the intervening decades, grew and became successfully integrated into the academic teaching and research programme of the University of Oxford. Barbara Harrell-Bond developed a broad-based teaching programme drawing on anthropological theories of the interconnectedness (holistic) of life that other disciplines generally dealt with separately. She recognized that people became (and remained refugees) because of largely national politics, and so she argued for research which examined the political contexts in which forced migration, dispossession, protection, and resettlement occurred. She also saw that vulnerable people who were abused or no longer protected by their own state needed to depend upon the international system to provide them with the basics of life (food, shelter, and water) and legal protection. Thus she included international law and international organizations into her teaching programme. Finally she put at the core of the teaching programme the immediate experience of displacement and dispossession and its aftermath. This she tied to a teaching module and practitioner training course on the psycho-social impacts of being a forced migrant. Overall, it took an anthropologist to see that what was needed was an interdisciplinary programme of teaching and research carried out by specialists in law, international relations, political science, anthropology, psychology, and other subjects including geography, sociology, and social policy. By incorporating representatives of other disciplines into the core programme at the RSP [RSC], Harrell-Bond followed a long-standing anthropological tradition. Anthropologists have always worked across interdisciplinary boundaries, which is why there is so much 'hyphenated anthropology': legal anthropology, medical anthropology, political anthropology, economic anthropology, cross-cultural psychology, etc. The programme she set up continues today and although there are now a handful of other 'refugee studies' programmes in the world—many founded by Harrell-Bond herself—the RSC remains uniquely holistic in its approach committed to the vision of its founder.

However, even with this strong interdisciplinary and holistic focus which shaped the field, there remains a tension between the phenomenological approach of anthropology and the 'refugee policy' concerns of law, politics, and international relations studies. The

itized state-based agendas and state-based legal and political histories, while
focused on people and their lived experience. This tension has seen sedenta-
vorks and liberal democratic statist orientations gain ascendancy in the field
nigration studies. Notwithstanding this 'second place' positioning of anthro-
long forced migration scholars, the concepts and concerns which anthropol-
rought to the field have been ground-breaking.

RITICAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONCEPTS
THE DISCIPLINE OF FORCED MIGRATION
STUDIES

anthropological concepts 'borrowed' at the founding of refugee and forced
studies quickly matured and incorporated a 'postmodern' tint. As a reaction
umed certainty of scientific or objective efforts to explain reality, anthropol-
uick to embrace and integrate social constructivism into its conceptual toolkit.
of explanations that claimed to be valid for all groups, cultures, and traditions,
ted the position that reality was socially constructed and that there were no
truths. By the 1990s, mature social constructivist work by Malkki, Gupta and
and Appadurai undertook a distancing from the 'roots' and territorial orien-
earlier studies (Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Malkki 1992; Malkki 1995; Appadurai
ace and place, home and homeland came to be dramatically reconsidered as
of this body of work and these concepts figured prominently in research with
exiles, and other forced migrations. Their work challenged the inherent link
cultural difference and space or physical territory so prominent in earlier
ological and political science structuralist/functionalist approaches. They crit-
e partial incarceration of the native which saw the world as a colourful map
nes clearly delineated geographic territories (spaces) with distinctive cultures
Ideas and concepts regarding displacement assume a natural correspondence
people, geographic space, and place which anthropologists such as Malkki
ave now questioned for over two decades.
Malkki shows, there is an abundance of 'botanical metaphors', largely derived
neteenth-century nation-state ideologies, through which both anthropological
ionalist discourses have rooted people in the 'soil' of the nation or 'ethnic terri-
t despite this theoretical preoccupation with 'roots', historical research has con-
y shown that migration is not the exception in human history, but rather more
nstant. Even more popular postmodern metaphors like 'grafting' transplant-
'hybridization' continue this 'mother-earth' imagery. Contesting this popular
tualization, Malkki makes clear in her work that people are chronically mobile
utinely displaced. They invent homes and homelands in the absence of terri-
ases. It is through such memories that they can inhabit their imagined nation

(Malkki 1992). This undermining of the connections between peoples and places, which are imagined to be natural, has not led to cultural homogenization (Clifford 1988). Instead what has tended to happen with this blurring of places and localities is that ideas of cultural and ethnic distinctions are becoming more prevalent. Here, what we see is the 'imagined community' striving to become attached to imagined places (Anderson 1983). Dispossessed people everywhere remember their 'imagined' homelands in a world that increasingly denies such firm identification of 'place' with 'geographic space'. Remembered places have often served as symbolic anchors for forced migrants and other dispersed, diasporic, and transnational people. Thus 'homeland' is one of the most powerful unifying symbols for the dispossessed even though the way in which that place is constructed in the social imagination may be quite different among the far-flung members of the imagined community. Geographic space, as anthropology has long argued, is made meaningful by people. The experience of space is always socially constructed. Spatial meanings are thus established by those with the power to make places out of spaces.

Malkki, furthermore, argued that such territorialization is dominant in discourses of nationalism where biological or kinship metaphors are used to show the rootedness of nations to specific lands—the Fatherland or the Motherland. Thus the national order of things is considered to be normal while uprootedness and displacement are abnormal. According to Malkki, these 'sedentarist' approaches, based on the idealization of homeland, consider migration an anomaly and thus uprootedness and displacement are pathologized. These 'sedentarist' scholars viewed territorial displacement as a cause of identity loss and cultural stripping away (Rosaldo 1988). Thus, return to the homeland is regarded as the only durable solution.

Social constructivists such as Malkki, Appadurai, and Gupta and Ferguson argue that places and cultures are socially, politically, and historically constructed. They call for disengaging 'culture' and 'identity' from territorialized, nation-bounded concepts of place and space. For many of the dispossessed, the imagined 'homeland' acquires a mythical status and image. It is assumed to be unchanged by the departure and relocation of its dispossessed. Yet the way in which the representation of the imagined community is drawn and fixed rests largely with the people themselves. The past is smoothed out, pre-existing differences and ambiguities are often covered up or cleaned up, and the society and homeland is often assigned a primordial being by members of the dispossessed group. This imagery is now being challenged by anthropologists and geographers, among others, and is becoming the 'current orthodoxy' in the social sciences. Anthropology has had a special interest in this area as the practice of fieldwork, so central to the discipline, has long revolved around the idea that cultures are spatially located, which fits perfectly with the conception of the nation-state model that nations are 'naturally rooted' in the native soil of their people. It is perhaps because anthropology realizes it must abandon this idea of the natural, demarcated link between culture and nation, that there has been so much effort in the last decade or so to find ways of 'constructing' the field in 'unbounded' territory or multi-local and transnational milieus (Marcus 1998). As Malkki writes 'There has emerged a new awareness of the global social fact that

latter prioritized state-based agendas and state-based legal and political histories, while the former focused on people and their lived experience. This tension has seen sedentarist frameworks and liberal democratic statist orientations gain ascendancy in the field of forced migration studies. Notwithstanding this 'second place' positioning of anthropology among forced migration scholars, the concepts and concerns which anthropology have brought to the field have been ground-breaking.

CRITICAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONCEPTS IN THE DISCIPLINE OF FORCED MIGRATION STUDIES

The core anthropological concepts 'borrowed' at the founding of refugee and forced migration studies quickly matured and incorporated a 'postmodern' tint. As a reaction to the assumed certainty of scientific or objective efforts to explain reality, anthropology was quick to embrace and integrate social constructivism into its conceptual toolkit. Sceptical of explanations that claimed to be valid for all groups, cultures, and traditions, it promoted the position that reality was socially constructed and that there were no absolute truths. By the 1990s, mature social constructivist work by Malkki, Gupta and Ferguson, and Appadurai undertook a distancing from the 'roots' and territorial orientation of earlier studies (Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Malkki 1992; Malkki 1995; Appadurai 1995). Space and place, home and homeland came to be dramatically reconsidered as a result of this body of work and these concepts figured prominently in research with refugees, exiles, and other forced migrations. Their work challenged the inherent link between cultural difference and space or physical territory so prominent in earlier anthropological and political science structuralist/functionalist approaches. They criticized the partial incarceration of the native which saw the world as a colourful map where lines clearly delineated geographic territories (spaces) with distinctive cultures (places). Ideas and concepts regarding displacement assume a natural correspondence between people, geographic space, and place which anthropologists such as Malkki (1992) have now questioned for over two decades.

As Malkki shows, there is an abundance of 'botanical metaphors', largely derived from nineteenth-century nation-state ideologies, through which both anthropological and nationalist discourses have rooted people in the 'soil' of the nation or 'ethnic territory'. Yet despite this theoretical preoccupation with 'roots', historical research has consistently shown that migration is not the exception in human history, but rather more of a constant. Even more popular postmodern metaphors like 'grafting' transplanting and 'hybridization' continue this 'mother-earth' imagery. Contesting this popular conceptualization, Malkki makes clear in her work that people are chronically mobile and routinely displaced. They invent homes and homelands in the absence of territorial bases. It is through such memories that they can inhabit their imagined nation

(Malkki 1992). This undermining of the connections between peoples and places, which are imagined to be natural, has not led to cultural homogenization (Clifford 1988). Instead what has tended to happen with this blurring of places and localities is that ideas of cultural and ethnic distinctions are becoming more prevalent. Here, what we see is the 'imagined community' striving to become attached to imagined places (Anderson 1983). Dispossessed people everywhere remember their 'imagined' homelands in a world that increasingly denies such firm identification of 'place' with 'geographic space'. Remembered places have often served as symbolic anchors for forced migrants and other dispersed, diasporic, and transnational people. Thus 'homeland' is one of the most powerful unifying symbols for the dispossessed even though the way in which that place is constructed in the social imagination may be quite different among the far-flung members of the imagined community. Geographic space, as anthropology has long argued, is made meaningful by people. The experience of space is always socially constructed. Spatial meanings are thus established by those with the power to make places out of spaces.

Malkki, furthermore, argued that such territorialization is dominant in discourses of nationalism where biological or kinship metaphors are used to show the rootedness of nations to specific lands—the Fatherland or the Motherland. Thus the national order of things is considered to be normal while uprootedness and displacement are abnormal. According to Malkki, these 'sedentarist' approaches, based on the idealization of homeland, consider migration an anomaly and thus uprootedness and displacement are pathologized. These 'sedentarist' scholars viewed territorial displacement as a cause of identity loss and cultural stripping away (Rosaldo 1988). Thus, return to the homeland is regarded as the only durable solution.

Social constructivists such as Malkki, Appadurai, and Gupta and Ferguson argue that places and cultures are socially, politically, and historically constructed. They call for disengaging 'culture' and 'identity' from territorialized, nation-bounded concepts of place and space. For many of the dispossessed, the imagined 'homeland' acquires a mythical status and image. It is assumed to be unchanged by the departure and relocation of its dispossessed. Yet the way in which the representation of the imagined community is drawn and fixed rests largely with the people themselves. The past is smoothed out, pre-existing differences and ambiguities are often covered up or cleaned up, and the society and homeland is often assigned a primordial being by members of the dispossessed group. This imagery is now being challenged by anthropologists and geographers, among others, and is becoming the 'current orthodoxy' in the social sciences. Anthropology has had a special interest in this area as the practice of fieldwork, so central to the discipline, has long revolved around the idea that cultures are spatially located, which fits perfectly with the conception of the nation-state model that nations are 'naturally rooted' in the native soil of their people. It is perhaps because anthropology realizes it must abandon this idea of the natural, demarcated link between culture and nation that there has been so much effort in the last decade or so to find ways of 'constructing' the field in 'unbounded' territory or multi-local and transnational milieus (Marcus 1998). As Malkki writes 'There has emerged a new awareness of the global social fact that

now, more than perhaps ever before, people are chronically mobile and routinely displaced, and invent homes and homelands in the absence of territorial, national bases—not in situ, but through memories of, and claims on, places that they can, or will, no longer corporeally inhabit' (Malkki 1992: 24).

Yet, as David Turton and others point out, those who write on the subject of forced migration and displacement pay little attention to 'social and cultural constructions of the…places occupied by refugees and other forced migrants, preferring instead to concentrate on the physical and productive properties of these places' (Turton 2005: 276). It is ironic then that anthropological theorizing about 'place' and 'place-making' (emplacement) has not made more of a mark on those who study displacement (Allen 1996; Hammond 2004). It is as though the recognition of places as imagined and contested decouples or 'denaturalizes' the link between people and territorial space. This somehow is regarded as entering a minefield by those who seek to help or protect people such as refugees. Such conceptualizations, especially those which question and contest the 'natural' link between people, culture, and space, may be feared to play into the hands of governments and others who may wish to diminish or ignore the suffering of those who have been forced out of their homes. As we move ever more into a deterritorialized world we are coming to recognize that questions of space and place are very much more central to the concerns of both the dispossessed in their new resting places and those who remain.

With regard to return, the sedentarist positioning as the only durable solution, these social constructivists view this as problematic both because geographic spaces and cultural places change over time. The homeland existing in the imagination and memories of the uprooted may no longer correspond to realities on the ground. This historical and socially constructed notion of nations and national identity is well documented in the work of Benedict Anderson (1983). By decoupling nationalism from territory in his imagined communities he calls into question the discipline's heavy emphasis on the nation state, its sovereignty at the expense of the dispossessed, uprooted, and displaced.

Ethnicity is another broad concept important to forced migration studies which anthropologists have actively elucidated. For many anthropologists, ethnicity is generally defined as a sense of belonging to a group, based on shared ideas of group history, language, experience, and culture. Commonly in this sense, nationality and ethnicity are frequently interchanged with one another, while some anthropologists see nationalism as a variant of ethnicity (Eriksen 1993). There are several theoretical positions regarding the rise of ethnicity. Clifford Geertz, for example, regards ethnicity as being a 'primordial attachment', something pre-social, something one is born into (Geertz 1963). Fredrick Barth, on the other hand, sees ethnicity as socially constructed or created and emerging from the recognition of difference from neighbouring groups (1969). The differentiating markers are generally cultural characteristics such as language, shared history, religion, and customs. Other anthropologists see ethnicity as derived from instrumental need. These ideas have their roots in the work of Max Weber who identified organizational efforts by status groups to establish rules which exclude others (Weber 1968). Whichever model is followed, ethnicity is often linked to political processes of bound-

rather than simply an ethnic community is a mechanism of marginalization which can have profound effects on how a community creates and maintains its social stability and cohesion. Being regarded as an ethnic community in a multicultural society is generally seen as a positive attribute. At the other extreme, however, is the ethnic minority in a dominant majority state whose presence is regarded as undesirable and divisive. The concept of ethnic minority generally implies some degree of marginalization or exclusion leading to situations of actual or potential conflict, dispossession, and displacement. These understandings support the 'holistic' turn of anthropology and confirm the importance of integrating the study of politics and international relations with that of the lived experience of dispossession and uprootedness in order to fully understand the processes of exclusion from the larger society and the state, the citizen and the non-citizen, the threats to state sovereignty and the international humanitarian regime.

CONCLUSION

Anthropology has given the growing field of forced migration studies its core conceptual binaries such as: place and space; home and homeland; territoriality and liminality; belonging and identity; social networks and capital; ethnicity and nationalism; displacement and emplacement; eviction and return; camp-based and self-settled; integration and assimilation. It has also given us sub-fields of investigation within this field such as the significance of gender and generation in camp ethnographies as well as humanitarian policies and practices; victimization and agency of the forced migrant, as well as refugee return and development in local hosting communities. Furthermore it has given the field two interrelated, fundamental research strategies and tools, participant observation and the ethnographic method, as well as permitting the development of critical approaches to concepts of agency, morality, and ethics in forced migration and humanitarianism studies. It is a body of work that has helped maintain a balance between state-centric work in politics, international relations, and law with a continuing interest in the refugees and forced migrants themselves. This above all else has been its most important contribution; the primacy of the vision of anthropology has been the perspective and voice of the forced migrant, the phenomenological encounter that permits the uprooted, the displaced, and the refugee to break out from the category of 'object of study' and to bring to life the individual experience of dispossession.

REFERENCES

Allen, T. (ed.) (1996) *In Search of Cool Ground: War, Flight and Homecoming in North East Africa*. London: James Currey.
Anderson, B. (1982) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*

Appadurai, A. (1995) 'The Production of Locality'. Pp. 204–25 in R. Fardon (ed.), *Counterworks: Managing the Diversity of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Barth, F. (ed.) (1969) *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

Cernea, M. (ed.) (1985) *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chatty, D. (1977) 'Land Leaders, and Limousines: Emir Versus Sheikh'. *Ethnology* 16(4): 385–97.

Chatty, D. (1986) *From Camel to Truck: The Bedouin in the Modern World*. New York: Vantage Press.

Chatty, D. (2010) *Dispossession and Displacement in the Modern Middle East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clifford, J. (1988) *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Colson, E. (1945) 'The Makah: A Study of Assimilation'. PhD dissertation, Radcliffe College, Cambridge, MA.

Colson, E. (2003) 'Forced Migration and the Anthropological Response'. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 16(1): 1–16.

Das, V. (1996) 'Dislocation and Rehabilitation: Defining a Field'. *Economic and Political Weekly* 1(24): 1509–14.

Eriksen, T. H. (1993) *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Pluto.

Geertz, C. (1963) 'The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States'. Pp. 105–57 in C. Geertz (ed.), *Old Societies and New States: The Quest for Modernity in Asia and Africa*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Gupta, A., and Ferguson, J. (1992) 'Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference'. *Cultural Anthropology* 7: 6–23.

Hammond, L. (2004) *This Place Will Become Home: Refugee Repatriation to Ethiopia*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hansen, A., and Oliver-Smith, A. (eds.) (1982) *Involuntary Migration and Resettlement: The Problems and Responses of Dislocated People*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Harrell-Bond, B. E. (1986) *Imposing Aid*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hirschon, R. (1998) *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe: The Social Life of Asia Minor Refugees in Piraeus*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Lieber, M. (1977) *Exiles and Migrants in Oceania*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Loizios, P. (1981) *The Heart Grown Bitter: A Chronicle of Cypriot War Refugees*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Malkki, L. H. (1992) 'National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees'. *Cultural Anthropology* 7(1): 24–44.

Malkki, L. H. (1995) *Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory, and National Cosmology among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marcus, G. (1998) *Ethnography through Thick and Thin*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Monsutti, A. (2005) *War and Migration: Social Networks and Economic Strategies of the Hazaras of Afghanistan*, trans. P. Camiller. New York: Routledge.

Morgan, S., and Colson, E. (eds.) (1987) *People in Upheaval*. New York: Center for Migration Studies.

Oliver-Smith, A., and Hansen, A. (1982) 'Introduction: Involuntary Migration and Resettlement: Causes and Contexts'. Pp. 1–9 in A. Hansen and A. Oliver-Smith, (eds.),

Involuntary Migration and Resettlement: The Problems and Responses of Dislocated People. Westview Special Studies. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Peteet, J. (1995) 'Transforming Trust: Dispossession and Empowerment among Palestinian Refugees'. Pp. 168–86 in E. V. Daniel and J. Knudsen (eds.), *Mistrusting Refugees*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ravenstein, E. (1889) 'The Laws of Migration'. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 52(2): 241–305.

Reynell, J. (1989) *Political Pawns: Refugees on the Thai-Kampuchean Border*. Oxford: Oxfam.

Rosaldo, R. (1988) 'Ideology, Place and People without Culture'. *Cultural Anthropology* 3(1): 77–87.

Sayigh, R. (1979) *Palestinians: From Peasants to Revolutionaries*. London: Zed.

Soguk, N. (1999) *States and Strangers: Refugees and Displacements of Statecraft*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Thomas, W., and Znaniecki, F. (1996 [1918]) *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America: A Classic Work in Immigration History*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Turnbull, C. (1972) *The Mountian People*. New York: Touchstone Press.

Turton, D. (2005) 'The Meaning of Place in a World of Movement: Lessons from Long-Term Field Research in Southern Ethiopia'. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 18(3): 258–80.

Van Hear, N. (2000) 'People Abroad and People at Home in Societies under Strain'. *Forced Migration Review* 7: 33–6.

Weber, M., Roth, G., and Wittich, C. (eds.) (1968) *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. New York: Bedminster Press.