

Camps and Migration Governance

Lewis Turner

Abstract

Camps have long constituted a central element of the governance of migration. This chapter offers an overview of the key insights from, and debates within, the scholarly literature about camps. It explores the range of political and strategic reasons why states and humanitarian actors often promote encampment, and why refugees sometimes form their own camps. Subsequently, it discusses the different ways in which camp life and governance have been analysed, arguing that the influence of the scholarship of Giorgio Agamben has led to important aspects of camp life, including the agency and political lives of refugees, often being side-lined. It finally looks at the use of encampment in contexts of non-forced migration, and encourages scholars to productively engage with debates on encampment across the 'forced migrant'-'labour migrant' divide, and to place ostensibly different forms of encampment within the broader political contexts and transformations in which they occur.

Key words: camps, refugees, labour migrants, humanitarianism, encampment

<a>Introduction<a>

Camps have long represented a “cornerstone” of humanitarian and state responses to displacement (Petee 2005, 29), especially in the Global South. While only a minority of those experiencing displacement currently live in camps, in numerous contexts camps are central to how migration is experienced, imagined and understood. Whether in the form of Palestinians camps that have gradually and unevenly become integrated into the urban fabric of Middle Eastern cities, the temporary ‘jungle’ of Calais founded by migrants and refugees in France, the isolated encampments at Dadaab near the Kenya-Somalia border, the camp-cum-prison at Azraq in the Eastern Desert of Jordan or the accommodation being created on remote islands by countries such as Bangladesh and Denmark, they represent a crucial aspect of migration governance. Yet as this list indicates, the designation of ‘the camp’ encompasses a wide range of spaces, which represent different strategies of governance and very different experiences for those who live in them. As Kirsten McConnachie has succinctly put it “camps vary in almost every dimension” (McConnachie 2016, 397).

This chapter explores the key scholarly debates surrounding camps as spaces of migration governance. Like the literature as a whole, its primary focus is on camps that are understood to be ‘refugee camps;’ that is, camps for those who have been recognised to have been ‘forcibly’ displaced across international borders. Simultaneously, however, recognising the limitations inherent in such categorisations (see Bakewell, Chapter 10), it also examines the important research about forms of encampment that are used to govern other ‘categories’ of migrants, and argues that future research should explore more the connections and entanglements between these different forms of encampment. Following this short introduction, the chapter proceeds by analysing why different actors (states, humanitarian actors, and refugees and migrants themselves) decide to build and live in (different forms of) camps. It argues that, despite extensive rhetoric to the contrary, refugee camps are typically not created primarily for humanitarian purposes, nor are they necessarily designed to respond to the needs of the people who will live there. Subsequently, it turns to the key scholarly debates on the nature and politics of camp spaces. It explores how the work of Giorgio Agamben has both enabled and restricted research in this field, and argues that scholars should actively seek to overcome the limitations inherent in many Agambenian perspectives on encampment. It then turns to the scholarship on camps for labour migrants. It highlights the importance of research that has questioned the boundaries of what is understood to constitute a ‘camp,’ and that has thereby productively placed trends in encampment within wider political contexts and transformations. Reflecting where encampment typically occurs, it primarily draws on empirical studies from the ‘Global

South,' while also recognising the recent increase in the use of encampment within contexts of the 'Global North.'

<a>Why States, Humanitarians and Refugees (Sometimes) Opt for Encampment<a>

While it is often noted that the “standardization” of the camp began in the period during and after World War II (Lippert 1999, 308), the history of encampment is a longer one. Camps were, indeed, used extensively for people fleeing the Nazi regime, and subsequently for people fleeing the Soviet Army or who had been freed from concentration camps (Oesch 2017). Camps were quickly adopted across a range of contexts, including during and following the partitions of India and Palestine (McConnachie 2016). It was also around this time that the foundations of the new refugee regime, which still heavily shapes today’s landscape, were being put into place. Nevertheless, prior to these times, camps were used extensively by colonial regimes, which established the camp as a dominant model for “isolating groups seen as problems, risks, or threat” (Oesch 2017, 114). European colonial powers created “the first concentration camps,” which were sometimes referred to as refugee camps, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to, for example, suppress potential revolts. As Petti argues, these camps claimed to be “taking care” of the people living in them, but their uses within colonial governance demonstrates, from the outset, the complex and multifarious functions and purposes that camps can serve (Petti 2013). McConnachie argues that the genealogy of the refugee camp should extend back ever further, rather to prisoner of war camps, which are first known to have been used in the 1790s (McConnachie 2016). These competing histories and genealogies demonstrate the varied origins of, motivations for and experiences of encampment, and offer important insights into how we understand more contemporary forms of encampment, both as a mode of governance and as a social and political space.

This can clearly be demonstrated through an analysis of why and how different actors have decided to use encampment in the refugee regime of the post-World War II era (see Crawley & Setrana, Chapter 16). These actors include both states and humanitarian agencies, most prominently in the latter group the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). From the perspective of states, camps can serve numerous purposes. While they can be a response to an ‘emergency’ context, in which large numbers of people cross borders during a short period of time, it would be inaccurate to imply that a preference for encampment was largely a question of logistics. Rather, in spatially segregating refugees (or others), states can both physically and symbolically differentiate refugees from the population at

large, thereby upholding the trinity of state/nation/territory that ideologically underpins the modern state system, and that refugees (as well as other mobile populations and indigenous nations) can be understood to disrupt (Jaji 2012; Kibreab 2007). Even if camps exist for years or decades, their status as ostensibly 'temporary' spaces similarly provides both physical and symbolic representation that refugees will be returning 'home,' or at least not integrating into the host society (Jaji 2012). Housing refugees in camps enables their freedom of movement to readily be restricted, and thus can reduce (the perception of) competition for scarce resources, such as land, housing and job opportunities (Loescher and Milner 2005; L. Turner 2015). States that are unwilling to contemplate refugee integration, and/or who do not have the ability or capacity to provide for refugees, can also shift the costs and responsibilities entailed in hosting refugees onto international actors such as UNHCR through the creation of camps (Seeley 2013). Some analysts argued that Kenya's 2015 announcement that it would close the refugee camps at Dadaab was an attempt "to make a point" about funding shortfalls, and to ensure that donors took responsibility for funding the camp's operations (Anyadike 2016). Governments may also wish to 'make a point' by establishing camps, for example to 'showcase' the suffering of those who fled the regimes of host governments' political opponents (International Crisis Group 2013). A further category of motivations for refugee encampment can be grouped under the heading of 'security.' Given that many people seek protection across borders because of on-going armed conflicts, host states are often concerned that refugees will attempt to intervene in the conflict, and that if they were to do so using the territory of the host state, that this could trigger an intervention from their state of origin (Loescher and Milner 2005). While the existence and extent of these fears will be based on a number of factors, including the host state's relationship to the conflict in refugees' state of origin, states wishing to ensure that refugees can be monitored and controlled may well opt for encampment (Jacobsen 1996).

While states have often insisted on encampment for refugees, for many decades encampment was also UNHCR's 'default' response for people experiencing displacement. In the 1970s and 1980s, non-camp refugees were "conceived as a problem, even by the most sympathetic commentators" and even in the mid-1990s, UNHCR's policies regarding non-camp refugees were described by an internal discussion paper as both "weak" and "unclear" (Crisp 2017, 88). This approach meant both poor levels of support for refugees not living in camps, and a greater number of people being forced or pressured to live in camps, where their rights are often severely restricted (Verdirame and Harrell-Bond 2005). UNHCR's preference for encampment was demonstrated, and became the subject of great controversy, during the debates surrounding its policies on 'urban' (read: non-camp) refugees, the first of which was published in March 1997. This policy stated that if refugees of a particular nationality were assisted within camps or rural settlements within a host country, UNHCR would provide these

refugees with assistance in urban areas “only with the agreement of the government and if there are compelling reasons to do so” (UNHCR 1997, 1). The lack of focus on refugee protection, and the tone of the document, in which refugees outside of camps were depicted as a problem and a security threat, quickly made it controversial among human rights groups and refugee advocates (Crisp 2017). Although “UNHCR hurriedly issued a revised version of the policy” in December of the same year, this did little to mollify its critics (Crisp 2017, 90). According to critical scholars, UNHCR’s preference for encampment was based on the advantages, from the perspective of humanitarian actors, of spatially containing refugees in order to render them governable and to facilitate the distribution of aid (Hyndman 2000; Verdirame and Harrell-Bond 2005). As Barbara Harrell-Bond noted, refugee camps also helped to render refugees ‘visible’ and countable, which helped to raise donor funds for refugee assistance (Harrell-Bond 1998).

These policies have developed extensively in the intervening two decades. In 2009, the aforementioned December 1997 policy was replaced by a new *Policy on Refugee Protection and Solutions in Urban Areas*, which pledged that UNHCR would protect and assist refugees in non-camp settings, regardless of whether the host government approved of refugees’ residence there (UNHCR 2009). In July 2014, UNHCR’s global policy reversed its ‘default’ position, by stating that henceforth it would “avoid the establishment of refugee camps, wherever possible,” and that where camps could not be avoided, the agency would attempt to phase them out “at the earliest possible stage” (UNHCR 2014, 6). Not establishing camps, UNHCR argued, would avoid unnecessary investments in camp infrastructure and the establishment of parallel services, in contrast to that money being used to strengthen pre-existing services, from which refugees and host communities could both benefit (UNHCR 2014, 5). Nevertheless, in some contexts long-term encampment continues with the active participation of UNHCR. Notably, in the same year as the release of the *Alternative to Camps* policy, UNHCR unveiled what was planned to be one of the largest refugee camps in the world near Azraq in the Eastern Jordanian desert. While, as Sophia Hoffman has argued, there should no longer be “any pretence that the camp is anything other than a prison facility,” upon the camp’s opening, UNHCR’s then country representative in Jordan, Andrew Harper, described Azraq as “probably one of the best planned refugee camps in the world” (Oddone 2014). The example of Azraq aptly demonstrates that UNHCR’s supposedly ‘global’ shifts in encampment policies will be interpreted and implemented differently in different contexts, in part because of the varied and often restrictive political contexts within which UNHCR operates.

More abstractly, encampment can be understood as a mechanism through which a particular subject position associated with refugeehood is created and enforced. Humanitarian and state actors who govern refugee camps often enact policies that attempt to create passive and depoliticised subjects (Petti 2013), who are “managed through a quasi-military mode of operations” (Hyndman 2000, 24). Importantly, this subject position is both gendered and racialized. As numerous scholars have argued, visions of refugees in the ‘Global South,’ particularly those living in protracted displacement in camps, have been subject to intertwined processes of feminisation, racialisation and depoliticisation (see Chimni 1998; Hyndman and Giles 2011; Johnson 2011). Indeed, as Linda Tabar has argued, humanitarian responses to suffering are predicated on the “non-Westerner’s conformity to a subordinate position that denies their voice and agency” (Tabar 2016, 23; see also Hart, Chapter 8). Camps, which segregate and securitise refugees, provide a setting in which such subordination is enacted along intersecting axes of power and differentiation.

The racialized politics of encampment can also be seen in the geographical dispersal of refugee camps. In 2002, for example, in Africa “camps sheltered 83.2 per cent of refugees assisted by the UNHCR, and in Asia 95.9 per cent, as against 14.3 percent in Europe” (Agier 2011, 36). While UNHCR’s main funding tends to come almost exclusively from states in North America and Europe, as well as Japan, (see e.g. Loescher 2001), these states have typically not been, and still are not, the main refugee hosting countries. Yet, as Verdirame and Harrell-Bond have argued, in the interests of protecting (for example) ‘fortress Europe,’ states in the ‘Global North’ have both funded UNHCR and promoted the “unworkable logic of control and containment” to keep refugees in the ‘Global South.’ Camps have often been an important part of the strategy to achieve this (Verdirame and Harrell-Bond 2005, 278).

Nevertheless, despite the ways in which encampment is often imposed on populations experiencing displacement, refugees and migrants themselves can also set up a wide variety of encampments, often against the wishes of host governments (Katz, Martin, and Minca 2018). Michel Agier claims that these “self-installed and self-organized” camps “represent the very basis of refuge, the shelter that we create in a hostile environment without a politics of welcome” (Agier 2010, 36). As Agier explores, the increasing restrictions on movement across borders has meant that many of these camps are set up internally within a country, and are then described as internally displaced persons (IDP) camps (Agier 2010).

Calais, in northern France, offers an example of a form of encampment created by refugees and migrants themselves. Following the closure of a refugee reception centre run by the Red Cross in 2002, refugees and migrants pitched tents a few miles away from the city centre, to create small, informal camps, often in groups divided by nationality. Under threat of eviction, they were “offered the ‘option’ to relocate to a dumping ground out of town, which later became known as the Jungle” and hosted between 3,000 and 5,000 people (Sandri 2018, 68). This camp was demolished in October 2016, although several hundred people continued to live in the area, and many hundreds moved to Paris, where they would often find sites to pitch tents, only for the police to either force them to move on, or arrest or deport them (Nossiter 2016). As Amelia Gentleman explained “the crisis has not been solved, merely shifted to other locations” (Gentleman 2016). Two years later, newer makeshift camps, which had become settling places for refugees and migrants since the demolition of the ‘jungle,’ were being destroyed by French authorities (European Council on Refugees and Exiles 2018). These encampments are just a few of the many “provisional spaces [that] have become common in European cities...as part of the movements of displaced populations who are both their residents and their constructors” (Katz 2016, 17). Life in this kind of camp is often especially precarious. While people may choose to create and live in these camps, and the creation of such spaces can be a means of and site for recovering agency (Katz 2016), such choices are typically taken within enormous constraints. The camps typically have fewer services and assistance than formal camps, yet are still often under the surveillance of police and other entities, “which either monitor, destroy, or transfer these populations to other types of camps” (Agier 2010, 36).

Even when refugees were not the ones who decided to set up camps, in some contexts camps have been utilised by refugees and their national liberation movements. Camps have provided refugees spaces to organise politically and militarily, for example in the case of Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon (Hanafi and Long 2010; Peteet 2007), and in such contexts camps can themselves become military targets (Khalili 2005). That camps can provide spaces for self-organisation has in turn caused some host states to be wary of encampment (Salehyan 2007), and the militarisation of some camp contexts is one of the factors that led to the use of the label ‘refugee warriors,’ which is meant to denote refugee communities with political leadership structures and armed groups pursuing their political objectives (Zolberg, Suhrke, and Aguayo 1989). This terminology, and the debates surrounding it, has in turn been critiqued by Leenders (2009), as part of the problematic tendency to securitise refugees. Even aside from their possible military uses, however, camps can be symbolically important in political contestations over refugeehood, and in national struggles. As Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh has argued, for example, the Polisario Front has “projected a specific image of the camps” hosting Sahrawi refugees in Algeria – as secular spaces of democracy and gender equality - in an attempt to “secure

the humanitarian and political support of Western state and nonstate actors” (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2014, 3, 2; see also Finden 2018). Camps, in summary, are typically not established primarily for humanitarian motives - multiple rationales are always at play. Camps can represent the potential of de-facto permanent exile, but also centres of resistance to occupation and colonisation; the reinforcement, but also rejection, of gendered and racialized visions of refugeehood; the response to and cause of (perceived) security threats; sites for the exercise and undermining of state sovereignty; and spaces where national identities are both undermined and (re-)affirmed.

<a>Analysing Camp Spaces and Lives<a>

While offering important contributions to our understanding of the role of camps in migration policy, the debates examined so far in this chapter still leave unanswered many questions about how camp spaces themselves are governed, and what life is like within them. These questions have, however, attracted a wealth of scholarship, and a growing interest (Katz, Martin, and Minca 2018), from a range of disciplines including refugee studies, anthropology, urban studies, geography, law, architecture, politics and international studies, among others. This literature has attempted to investigate the politics, lived experiences, governmentalities and spatial dynamics of camp life.

One influential figure within these debates has been Giorgio Agamben (see Agamben 1998, 2005), who came to occupy a central place within critical refugee studies over the past few decades (Owens 2009, 567; see also Ek 2006). As Patricia Owens argues, one of Agamben’s most original contributions was the suggestion that refugees are “the ultimate ‘biopolitical’ subjects,” who can be governed in a “permanent ‘state of exception’” (Owens 2009, 571). The camp is a key site where this happens, outside of the normal juridical system, and is thus a space “in which biological and political life, private and public, cannot be distinguished from one another” (Owens 2009, 572). As Nando Sigona has noted, demonstrating the influence of this work, Agamben and the notion of the camp as a ‘state of exception’ are deployed “from the Nazi concentration camps to Guantanamo Bay via asylum reception centres” (Sigona 2015, 4). Indeed, it is the breadth with which Agambenian analysis is deployed that is a point of criticism for many scholars; one singular framework cannot adequately speak to the realities of such a diverse range of contexts, they argue (Sigona 2015). A second point of critique has been that the idea of the camp constituting a state of exception has had the effect of not only generalising, but also dehistoricising and depoliticising camps. Indeed, such an approach leaves little analytical space for the contingencies and specificities of local contexts or for the agency of refugees (Bulley 2014; Ramadan

2013; Rygiel 2012; Sigona 2015). As Sigona convincingly argues, in contrast to Agambenian approaches, scholars should offer analysis “more rooted in the materiality of the camp” (Sigona 2015, 5).

Centring the materiality and specificities of different camps has led to a wealth of productive insights. Of particular relevance to discussions about the governance of migration is the scholarship that has argued that the camp should be understood not as a homogenous state of exception, but rather as a space of ‘hybrid’ or ‘contested’ sovereignties, where sovereign power is exercised and contested by states, humanitarian actors, non-governmental organisations and refugees themselves (Janmyr and Knudsen 2016; S. Turner 2005). Many authors acknowledge that the extra-territoriality of camps can bestow upon their administrators tremendous power and control over camp inhabitants, while also recognising the multiplicity of actors who hold that power, and the varied forms taken by what Agier terms “humanitarian government” (Agier 2010). An important part of these varied governance structures, which has often received too little attention, is the roles that refugees themselves play in the control of camp spaces and resource allocation within them. This often occurs through informal structures, which may build upon social networks that were established in refugees’ home countries or may represent an upending of pre-established hierarchies (for example see Sullivan and Tobin 2014; S. Turner 2016). Others have taken different approaches still. Lucas Oesch, for example, drawing on Aihwa Ong’s scholarship on graduated sovereignty and citizenship (see Ong 2000), has offered a Foucauldian analysis of al-Husseini camp for Palestinian refugees in Jordan to argue that Agambenian analysis misses the varieties and complexities of power in refugee camps (Oesch 2017).

Related scholarship has focused on the agency, activities and political lives of refugees, and the roles this has in shaping camp life. While, as many scholars have noted, humanitarianism attempts to depoliticise its refugee ‘beneficiaries’ (Harrell-Bond 1986; Tabar 2016), refugee camps often have a vibrant political life, not only through the creation of formal or informal structures for political representation (Omata 2017a), but also through everyday acts that represent a profoundly political response to refugees’ circumstances and humanitarian governance (Lecadet 2016; Newhouse 2015). Extensive work has also demonstrated how refugees re-shape the space and life of camps, and how many camps come to resemble ‘cities’ or other ‘urban’ environments. In his research on Kakuma refugee camp, for example, Bram Jansen terms the camp an ‘accidental city.’ Kakuma has become, he argues, a ‘normal’ feature of the Kenyan landscape in ways authorities never intended, and refugees living there have created dynamic camp markets, which inevitably interact with and influence the wider Kenyan economy (Jansen 2016). Za’tari camp in Jordan has attracted a lot of attention for similar

reasons, and has again increased the volume of research that approaches studies of camps through, or informed by, the perspectives of urban studies (for example see Dalal et al. 2018).

The demonstration of refugees' influence over how camps develop calls into question many of the narratives that are promoted about refugees by humanitarian actors, in policy literatures and in the media (see also Hart, Chapter 8). Of particular prominence has been the idea that refugees in camps suffer from a 'dependency mentality.' In a 1993 paper, the insights of which remain important for contemporary discussions, Gaim Kibreab argued that it is a 'myth' to suggest that long-term aid in camps creates a system, or mentality, of dependency among refugees (Kibreab 1993). Even in difficult conditions and under considerable structural constraints, refugees, he demonstrated, were able to maintain large amounts of independence. While refugees in camps strive to create their own independent structures and economic opportunities, this does not mean that the increasing emphasis on refugee 'self-reliance' in camps is necessarily to be welcomed. UNHCR has promoted 'self-reliance' even in contexts in which refugees' objective circumstances would appear to preclude such a possibility (Kaiser 2006), and research has demonstrated that in a camp that is presented by UNHCR to be a model of 'self-reliance,' "the significance of access to overseas remittances [was] a main determinant of economic well-being" (Omata 2017b, 8). Increasingly, as Ilcan and Rygiel (2015) have argued, refugees in camps are expected to be 'resilient' – less dependent on long-term 'care and maintenance programs' and more involved in camp governance. As they argue, however, behind these progressive buzzwords are new forms of refugee de-politicisation, in which refugees are encouraged to adapt to their conditions in a camp, rather than protest or challenge them. There are, therefore, numerous ways in which scholars have challenged acontextual and ahistorical depictions of camps. They have demonstrated the complex and contested nature of power relations in camps, the diverse and deeply political lives that refugees build in them, and the independence for which they strive, even in extremely challenging circumstances.

<a>Camps and the Governance of non-'forced' Migration<a>

One type of encampment that is rarely put into conversation with the scholarship discussed above is the use of camps for migrant workers. Perhaps reflecting divisions in the legal regimes and organisations that govern different 'kinds' of migration, as well as the organisation of knowledge production, comparisons between 'refugee camps' and 'labour camps' remain very rare. Given that, rightly, the supposedly clear-cut distinction between 'voluntary economic' migrants and 'forced political' migrants has increasingly been questioned and broken down (Bakewell, Chapter 10; Crawley

and Skleparis 2018), the same could be done within scholarship on the 'camp' and migration governance.

'Labour camps' have, of course, received extensive attention in their own right among scholars, international organisations and human rights activists. The focus of this attention in recent years has often been on the Gulf Arab states, although, as Vora (2013) argues, the exceptionalism often present within these discussions should be problematized. Particular attention has been paid to Qatar, in the context of it hosting the men's football World Cup in 2022 (for example see Human Rights Watch 2012). Like in the cases of many refugee camps, scholars and human rights organisations have highlighted the poor conditions in labour camps, and how they can be used to enforce segregation along lines of race, nationality, class and status. Syed Ali describes Sonapur, the largest of Dubai's labour camps, and the name of "which means, ironically, 'city of gold,'" as located "on the outskirts of the desert surrounded by barbed wire." The camp "is basically a dormitory setting for labouring men...[with] poor drainage and poor sanitation" (Ali 2010, 91). Discussing the overall context of the states of the Gulf Cooperation Council, Zahra Babar notes that 'labour camps' can be used to segregate "large swathes of low-wage migrants," backed up by "a culture of spatial separation which can be overtly or subtly enforced" (Babar 2017, 161, see also L. Turner 2015; Azmeh, Chapter 18). Labour camps then, like refugee camps, can serve multiple purposes and agendas at once.

In a particularly thought-provoking contribution to the literature, Neha Vora takes the discussion of labour camps in the Gulf a step further by examining what she terms 'expat/expert camps' in Qatar. These 'camps' are "occupied primarily by white professionals from North America and Europe" - 'expats' who live in "sites of white/Western privilege and expat consumption and production" (Vora 2013, 170, 182). Although they are rarely designated or conceptualised as such, Vora argues that these spaces "are also camps that cordon off and contain this population" (Vora 2013, 182), and thus constitute a key part of migration governance in contexts such as Qatar. Could the study of camps and migration governance be enriched by recognising the range of ways in which spatial segregation occurs, even (or perhaps, especially) when the camps in question do not fit neatly into the definitional and disciplinary categories that often structure research?

This is not to argue that there is nothing particular about refugee camps (or labour camps or expat/expert camps). Rather, it is to suggest that there is a need for critical migration scholars to continue to deconstruct boundaries and differentiations that structure how 'camps' are studied and

understood. Although they are rare, some examples of this kind of approach are found in the literature. Bülent Diken, for example, analyses both refugee camps and gated communities as part of the broader context he terms 'the end of the city' (Diken 2004). In a different but related move, scholars of humanitarianism such as Mark Duffield and Lisa Smirl have interrogated the ways in which aid workers spatially segregate themselves from the populations they are apparently 'there' to assist (see Duffield 2010; Smirl 2008). Although it is regularly unremarked upon, humanitarian workers, who retreat to their "fortified aid compounds" and "gated communities" (Duffield 2010), are often themselves migrants across international borders. Therefore, again demonstrating the heterogeneity of camps, these processes and techniques of spatial (self-)exclusion exist across a spectrum, variously creating, marking and reinforcing both privilege and oppression.

<a>Conclusion<a>

This chapter has offered an overview of the key scholarly debates surrounding camps as spaces of migration governance. In analysing why camps are built, how they are governed, how life within them is experienced, and how camp governance is resisted, it has demonstrated the varied ways in which encampment becomes part of the responses to and politics of migration. It has emphasised the need to acknowledge and foreground the diversity of spatial and political formations that constitute 'the camp,' as well as the range of understandings of what 'the camp' is and represents. It has argued for the relevance of multiple political and strategic motivations for encampment, the limitations inherent in Agambenian approaches to studying camps, and the similarities and interconnections between ostensibly different 'kinds' of camps.

As the chapters of this handbook make clear, camps are but one spatial formation and context through which the lives of migrants are regulated, and in which they are lived. Nevertheless, and despite the fact that a minority of refugees worldwide live in camps, camps remain central to how migration is imagined, discussed, experienced and governed, and will thus remain a productive field of research for many decades to come. Furthermore, as this chapter has emphasised, encampment exists across spectrums – not only of 'categories' of migrants, but cities can contain encampments, just as camps can come to resemble cities. Scholarship on camps, therefore, both to date and in the future, will continue to offer crucial insights across boundaries of context and discipline, and across the very categories of migration that it studies.

<a>Bibliography<a>

- Agamben, Giorgio (1998), *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- (2005), *State of Exception*, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Agier, Michel (2010), 'Humanity as an Identity and Its Political Effects (A Note on Camps and Humanitarian Government)', *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* **1** (1), 29–45.
- (2011) *Managing the Undesirables: Refugee Camps and Humanitarian Government*, Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Ali, Syed (2010) *Dubai: Gilded Cage*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Anyadike, Obi (2016) 'Will Kenya Really Close Dadaab?' *IRIN* 19 May, accessed 4 February 2019 at <http://www.irinnews.org/analysis/2016/05/19/will-kenya-really-close-dadaab>.
- Babar, Zahra (2017) 'Free Movement of People within the Gulf Cooperation Council', in Sonja Nita, Antoine Pécoud, Philippe De Lombaerde, Paul de Guchteneire, Kate Neyts, and Joshua Gartland (eds), *Migration, Free Movement and Regional Integration*, Paris; Brugge: UNESCO Publishing, pp. 149–70.
- Bulley, Dan (2014) 'Inside the Tent: Community and Government in Refugee Camps', *Security Dialogue* **45** (1), 63–80.
- Chimni, B. S. (1998) 'Geopolitics of Refugee Studies: A View from the South', *Journal of Refugee Studies* **11**, 350–74.
- Crawley, Heaven, and Dimitris Skleparis (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.
- Crisp, Jeff (2017) 'Finding Space for Protection: An Inside Account of the Evolution of UNHCR's Urban Refugee Policy', *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees* **33** (1): 87–96.
- Dalal, Ayham, Amer Darweesh, Philipp Misselwitz, and Anna Steigemann (2018) 'Planning the Ideal Refugee Camp? A Critical Interrogation of Recent Planning Innovations in Jordan and Germany', *Urban Planning* **3** (4), 64–78.
- Diken, Bülent (2004) 'From Refugee Camps to Gated Communities: Biopolitics and the End of the City', *Citizenship Studies* **8** (1), 83–106.
- Duffield, Mark (2010) "Risk-Management and the Fortified Aid Compound: Everyday Life in Post-Interventionary Society." *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* **4** (4), 453–74.
- Ek, Richard (2006) 'Giorgio Agamben and the Spatialities of the Camp: An Introduction', *Geografiska Annaler: Series B* **88** (4), 363–86.
- European Council on Refugees and Exiles (2018) 'France: 2 Years After the Demolition of 'The Jungle', Camp Clearances Continue', *ECRE*, 26 October, accessed 24 May 2019 at <https://www.ecre.org/france-2-years-after-the-demolition-of-the-jungle-camps-clearances-continue/>.
- Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena (2014) *The Ideal Refugees: Gender, Islam, and the Sahrawi Politics of Survival*, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Finden, Alice (2018) 'Active Women and Ideal Refugees: Dissecting Gender, Identity and Discourse in the Sahrawi Refugee Camps', *Feminist Review* **120** (1), 37–53.
- Gentleman, Amelia (2016) 'Refugees Take to Hiding in Northern France after Calais Camp Demolished', *The Guardian*, 5 November, accessed on 24 May 2019 at <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/nov/05/refugees-northern-france-dunkirk-calais-camp-demolished>.
- Hanafi, Sari, and Taylor Long (2010) 'Governance, Governmentalities, and the State of Exception in the Palestinian Refugee Camps of Lebanon', *Journal of Refugee Studies* **23** (2), 134–59.
- Harrell-Bond, Barbara. (1986) *Imposing Aid: Emergency Assistance to Refugees*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . (1998) 'Camps: Literature Review', *Forced Migration Review* **2**, 22–23.

- Human Rights Watch (2012) 'Building a Better World Cup | Protecting Migrant Workers in Qatar Ahead of FIFA 2022', accessed 22 January 2019 at <https://www.hrw.org/report/2012/06/12/building-better-world-cup/protecting-migrant-workers-qatar-ahead-fifa-2022>.
- Hyndman, Jennifer (2000) *Managing Displacement: Refugees and the Politics of Humanitarianism*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hyndman, Jennifer, and Wenona Giles (2011) 'Waiting for What? The Feminization of Asylum in Protracted Situations', *Gender, Place & Culture* **18** (3), 361–79.
- Ilcan, Suzan, and Kim Rygiel (2015) 'Resiliency Humanitarianism': Responsibilizing Refugees through Humanitarian Emergency Governance in the Camp', *International Political Sociology* **9** (4), 333–51.
- International Crisis Group (2013) *Too Close for Comfort: Syrians in Lebanon*. International Crisis Group: Brussels.
- Jacobsen, Karen (1996) 'Factors Influencing the Policy Responses of Host Governments to Mass Refugee Influxes', *International Migration Review* **30** (3), 655–78.
- Jaji, Rose. (2012) 'Social Technology and Refugee Encampment in Kenya', *Journal of Refugee Studies* **25** (2), 221–38.
- Janmyr, Maja, and Are J. Knudsen (2016) 'Introduction: Hybrid Spaces', *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* **7** (3), 391–95.
- Jansen, Bram (2016) 'Digging Aid': The Camp as an Option in East and the Horn of Africa', *Journal of Refugee Studies* **29** (2), 149–65.
- Johnson, Heather (2011) 'Click to Donate: Visual Images, Constructing Victims and Imagining the Female Refugee', *Third World Quarterly* **32** (6): 1015–37.
- Kaiser, Tania (2006) 'Between a Camp and a Hard Place: Rights, Livelihood and Experiences of the Local Settlement System for Long-Term Refugees in Uganda', *The Journal of Modern African Studies* **44** (4): 597–621.
- Katz, Irit (2016) 'A Network of Camps on the Way to Europe', *Forced Migration Review* **51**, 17–19.
- Katz, Irit, Diana Martin, and Claudio Minca (2018) 'The Camp Reconsidered', in Irit Katz, Diana Martin, and Claudio Minca (eds), *Camps Revisited: Multifaceted Spatialities of a Modern Political Technology*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield International, 1–16.
- Khalili, Laleh (2005) 'A Landscape of Uncertainty: Palestinians in Lebanon', *Middle East Report*, no. **236**: 34–39.
- Kibreab, Gaim (1993) 'The Myth of Dependency among Camp Refugees in Somalia 1979–1989', *Journal of Refugee Studies* **6** (4), 321–49.
- (2007) 'Why Governments Prefer Spatially Segregated Settlement Sites for Urban Refugees', *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees* **24** (1), 27–35.
- Lecadet, Clara (2016) 'Refugee Politics: Self-Organized 'Government' and Protests in the Agamé Refugee Camp (2005–13)', *Journal of Refugee Studies* **29** (2), 187–207.
- Leenders, Reinoud (2009) 'Refugee Warriors or War Refugees? Iraqi Refugees' Predicament in Syria, Jordan and Lebanon', *Mediterranean Politics* **14** (3), 343–63.
- Lippert, Randy (1999) 'Governing Refugees: The Relevance of Governmentality to Understanding the International Refugee Regime', *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* **24** (3), 295–328.
- Loescher, Gil (2001) *The UNHCR and World Politics: A Perilous Path*, Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Loescher, Gil, and James Milner (2005) *Protracted Refugee Situations: Domestic and International Security Implications*, Adelphi Papers. Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge for the International Institute for Strategic Studies.
- McConnachie, Kirsten (2016) 'Camps of Containment: A Genealogy of the Refugee Camp', *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* **7** (3), 397–412.
- Newhouse, Léonie S (2015) 'More than Mere Survival: Violence, Humanitarian Governance, and Practical Material Politics in a Kenyan Refugee Camp', *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* **47** (11), 2292–2307.

- Nossiter, Adam (2016) 'Paris Is the New Calais, With Scores of Migrants Arriving Daily', *The New York Times*, 3 November 3, accessed 24 May 2019 at <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/04/world/europe/paris-migrants-refugees.html>.
- Oddone, Elisa (2014) 'Azraq Refugee Camp Officially Opened', *Jordan Times*, 30 April, accessed 6 March 2017 at <http://www.jordantimes.com/news/local/azraq-refugee-camp-officially-opened>.
- Oesch, Lucas (2017) 'The Refugee Camp as a Space of Multiple Ambiguities and Subjectivities', *Political Geography* **60**, 110–20.
- Omata, Naohiko (2017a) 'Unwelcome Participation, Undesirable Agency? Paradoxes of De-Politicisation in a Refugee Camp', *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, **36** (3), 108-31.
- (2017b) *The Myth of Self-Reliance: Economic Lives Inside a Liberian Refugee Camp*, New York: Berghahn Books.
- Ong, Aihwa (2000) 'Graduated Sovereignty in South-East Asia', *Theory, Culture & Society* **17** (4), 55–75.
- Owens, Patricia (2009) 'Reclaiming 'Bare Life'?: Against Agamben on Refugees', *International Relations* **23** (4), 567–82.
- Peteet, Julie (2005). *Landscape of Hope and Despair: Palestinian Refugee Camps*. The Ethnography of Political Violence. Philadelphia, PA.; Bristol: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- — — (2007) 'Problematizing a Palestinian Diaspora', *International Journal of Middle East Studies* **39** (4), 627–46.
- Petti, Alessandro (2013) 'Beyond the State: The Refugee Camp as a Site of Political Invention', *Jadaliyya*, 26 March, accessed 29 May 2014 at http://www.jadaliyya.com/pages/index/10813/beyond-the-state_the-refugee-camp-as-a-site-of-pol.
- Ramadan, Adam (2013) 'Spatialising the Refugee Camp', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* **38** (1), 65–77.
- Rygiel, Kim (2012) 'Politicizing Camps: Forging Transgressive Citizenships in and through Transit', *Citizenship Studies* **16** (5–6), 807–25.
- Salehyan, Idean (2007) 'Transnational Rebels: Neighboring States as Sanctuary for Rebel Groups', *World Politics* **59** (2), 217–42.
- Sandri, Elisa (2018) 'Volunteer Humanitarianism': Volunteers and Humanitarian Aid in the Jungle Refugee Camp of Calais', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* **44** (1), 65–80.
- Seeley, Nicholas (2013) 'The Last Refugee Camp', *Foreign Policy*, 30 October 30, accessed 5 August 2014 at http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/10/30/the_last_refugee_camp.
- Sigona, Nando (2015) 'Campzanship: Reimagining the Camp as a Social and Political Space', *Citizenship Studies* **19** (1), 1–15.
- Smirl, Lisa (2008) 'Building the Other, Constructing Ourselves: Spatial Dimensions of International Humanitarian Response', *International Political Sociology* **2** (3), 236–53.
- Sullivan, Denis, and Sarah Tobin (2014) "Security and Resilience Among Syrian Refugees in Jordan." *MERIP*, 14 October, accessed 7 November 2014 at <http://merip.org/mero/mero101414>.
- Tabar, Linda (2016) 'Disrupting Development, Reclaiming Solidarity: The Anti-Politics of Humanitarianism', *Journal of Palestine Studies* **45** (4), 16–31.
- Turner, Lewis (2015) 'Explaining the (Non-)Encampment of Syrian Refugees: Security, Class and the Labour Market in Lebanon and Jordan', *Mediterranean Politics* **20** (3), 386–404.
- Turner, Simon (2005) 'Suspended Spaces - Contesting Sovereignties in a Refugee Camp', in Thomas Blom and Finn Stepputat (eds) *Sovereign Bodies: Citizens, Migrants, and States in the Postcolonial World*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 312-332.
- — — (2016) 'What Is a Refugee Camp? Explorations of the Limits and Effects of the Camp', *Journal of Refugee Studies* **29** (2), 139–48.
- UNHCR (1997) *UNHCR Comprehensive Policy on Urban Refugees*, UNHCR: Geneva.
- — — (2009) *UNHCR Policy on Refugee Protection and Solutions in Urban Areas*, Geneva: UNHCR.
- — — (2014) *UNHCR Policy on Alternatives to Camps*, Geneva: UNHCR.

- Verdirame, Guglielmo, and Barbara Harrell-Bond (2005) *Rights in Exile: Janus-Faced Humanitarianism*, New York; Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Vora, Neha (2013) 'Expat/Expert Camps: Redefining 'Labour' Within Gulf Migration', in AlShehabi, Omar, Adam Hanieh, and Abdulhadi Khalaf (eds) *Transit States: Labour, Migration and Citizenship in the Gulf*, London: Pluto Press, 170–97.
- Zolberg, Aristide R., Astri Suhrke, and Sergio Aguayo (1989) *Escape from Violence: Conflict and the Refugee Crisis in the Developing World*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.