Introduction: Movement, violence, and the making of home

Stef Jansen and Staffan Löfving

Abstract: By giving an extensive literature review and presenting the central objectives of this theme section, this introductory article develops a programmatic call for a critical anthropology of 'home' in relation to violence and place. Challenging assumptions that territoriality, rootedness, and memories of violence are necessarily the primary determinants of identification among people on the move, it proposes conceptual tools to investigate how and when such discourses may provide or prohibit the making of 'home'. In particular, it draws attention to issues of political and economic transformation and the changing forms of violence and movement produced by them.

Keywords: home, movement, place, transformation, violence

This special section of *Focaal* investigates the making of home among people whose lives are characterized by both movement and violence.¹ Through ethnographic case studies from Sri Lanka, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Guatemala, this special section traces contestations of emplacement through an analysis not only of memories of social and geographical belonging but also of forward-looking practices of attachment to and detachment from place. We investigate how discourses of localized belonging may on the one hand facilitate, yet on the other hand prohibit, the making of home. Crucially, this implies a critical approach to the power relations that shape particular places. Through such a political anthropology of 'home', we hope to insert a sensitivity to transformation (and to the power to

transform) into discussions of movement and place.

Movement

The growing anthropological interest in mobility² represents a welcome development for a discipline that, while it may have had an early interest in people on the move, has nevertheless contributed to dominant notions of culture and identity as being closely attached to specific territories (cf., e.g., Clifford 1992; Clifford and Marcus 1986; Gupta and Ferguson 1997a, 1997b, 1997c; Olwig and Hastrup 1997; Rapport and Dawson 1998). Recent developments in the field are providing an adequate response to changing and

contradictory social realities that result from accelerating and increasing human mobility and its significance even for those who do not migrate. Anthropologists critically engage with the territorializing efforts of nationalist movements, transnational capitalist restructuring, and migration policies. Issues that tended to be obscured by the previous methodological and epistemological focus on the normality of boundedness and fixity are now addressed in novel ways. Conceptually, researchers expose the contingency of 'belonging' by de-essentializing notions of 'identity', 'nation', and 'home', and by investigating their relationship to territory. Politically, moreover, the new anthropology of mobility represents a potentially liberating reaction against a history of oppressively essentialist-collectivist ideologies of 'home', such as nationalism, and of the normative anthropological approaches to 'community' and 'culture' that are congruent with them (cf. Gilroy 2000).

A useful starting point from which to approach the contribution of our project to this new anthropology of mobility may be the debate in the *Journal of Refugee Studies* (1999) around Gaim Kibreab's critique of Liisa Malkki's work in Tanzania. In a monograph on refugees from anti-Hutu violence in Burundi (1995a), and in a series of related articles (1992, 1994, 1995b), Malkki deploys her ethnographic data on people's memories of violence and their experience of movement in order to construct a critical reading of what she calls a 'national cosmology': the modern, globally dominant representations of nationality and territoriality that underlie the very categories of 'refugees'. In particular, she warns of a 'sedentarist' bias (1995b: 208), a tendency to conceive of people's movements as inherently violent in a world of 'rooted' populations, naturally attached to territories. Singling out Liisa Malkki as a prominent exponent of what he terms 'post-modernist anti-sedentarist thinkers', Gaim Kibreab replied with a sustained polemic (1999). In Kibreab's view, anti-sedentarists stand for an empirically and politically flawed approach to forced migration. He argues that ignoring existing patterns of territorialization, identification with place, and a desire to

return to locality of origin, anti-sedentarists engage in politically dangerous forms of wishful thinking, mistakenly concluding that identities are nowadays more and more detached from territory in a global move toward a-national, deterritorialized citizenship (ibid.: 385).

Kibreab makes a number of important points on the structural constraints that shape refugee experiences, and his work provides a call to arms for social scientists not to lose sight of the oppressive nature of current migration regimes. However, some of the misunderstandings present in the debate are indicative of the problems that commonly beset the emergence of constructive discussion in the study of mobility, belonging, 'home', and place. Kibreab's argument assumes that a commitment to anti-sedentarism necessarily adheres to the larger project of the 'deterritorialization of identity' (1999: 387). Moreover, it presumes that denying a necessary, essential link between territory and identity, and opposing the naturalization of such links, implies the negation of any link at all. In contrast, this special section of *Focaal* re-asserts the value of a critical analysis of unmarked, normative sedentarism, which we would define as the assumption that all human beings, understood collectively as cultural groups, 'belong' to a certain place on earth and derive a primordial identity from that belonging. Questioning sedentarist discourses and demonstrating their role in processes of oppression and marginalization does not entail neglecting the impact of other dimensions in these processes. Instead of ingrained sedentarist modes of representation, Kibreab argues, it is the selfish and hostile attitudes of host governments toward refugees that are to blame for the latter's predicaments (ibid.: 388ff.). We would argue that not only can these two factors coexist perfectly well, but that they actually reinforce one another. If we were to follow their strict separation, any critical investigation of emplacement and displacement would risk being rejected as part of an exercise under a presumably postmodern manifesto (which is usually seen as the mechanical product of the position of metropolitan privilege of those accused of promoting it). To be fair, such criticisms may be

called for with regard to a subfield of the scholarly interest in mobility—a body of work shaped by what could be called a ‘placeless’ paradigm, including often largely theoretical pieces on movement and belonging with a strong emphasis on detachment from place and shifting positioning. Many studies in this vein contain a programmatic element—they are not so much descriptions *of* as calls *for* new forms of subjectivity, particularly in response to various forms of cultural fundamentalism.³

In the articles that follow, we approach the key concepts of this paradigm—including territorialization and deterritorialization, and emplacement and displacement—as empirical issues to be investigated rather than as elements of programmatic statements about what characterizes our age. We do not take for granted the territorial rooting of identification, but this cannot and should not be equated with the blanket argument that ‘identities are deterritorialized’. This would be to conflate the empirical with the analytical. In the following studies of home making among persons involved in violence-related movement in Sri Lanka, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Guatemala, we explore the ways in which practices of identification are related (or not related) to territory, rather than simply assuming that they are related everywhere in the same way. The contributions gathered here are based on ethnographic work with women and men who have been subjected to practices of territorialization brought about by revolutionary mobilization and counterinsurgency, border creation, war, and ‘ethnic cleansing’. As a result, rather than propagating a free-floating placeless paradigm, we emphasize the need to critically investigate the unequal, differential, and contested processes by which persons come to be (dis)associated—and (dis)associate themselves—with or from place.

We also aim to avoid a further problematic dimension of most sedentarist thinking, namely, the idea that if people display a strong attachment to territory, this can and must be understood as an issue of (ethno-)nationality (Jansen 2005). In work on migrants and refugees, there is a strong presumption of authenticity attrib-

uted to this link between nationality, ‘homeland’ territory, and a desire to return. While it is usually not spelled out why this should be the case (which only goes to show that the presumption follows the dominant ‘national order of things’; Malkki 1995a), it is simply presumed that the refugees’ ‘real identity’, if they were “allowed to be themselves” (Kibreab 1999: 397), is their belonging to an (ethno-)national category territorialized in relation to the “homeland and the past” (ibid.).⁴ If the contingency of such belonging, its possible temporal instability, and its structural context are ignored, we end up with a reified, essentialized notion of belonging—a primordial identity that is lived in links with the ‘homeland’ and a yearning to return home. Even though such essentializing is becoming increasingly unacceptable in anthropology, its underlying assumptions retain some of their strength because *other* ways of relating to territoriality are often assessed in a position relative to this one.⁵ Paradoxically, rather than questioning essentialized conceptions of place and identification, many studies of migration thus re-instate them by seeing movement as a move away from ‘home’ and reflecting a preoccupation with rooting—sometimes more so than in studies of ‘homebodies’. Clearly, there are a number of good reasons for this interest, particularly in instances of movement toward the involuntary pole of the continuum. However, this should not divert attention from the instabilities that may characterize people’s attachment to territory in the first place, as well as the transformations both the people and the places go through. Ignoring the mutually constitutive relationship of ‘home’ and movement, deterritorialization is too often simply seen as detachment from an unaffected territory that presumably remains an original, authentic, centered locality (cf. Gupta and Ferguson 1997a: 7).

The three contributions in this special section of *Focaal* ethnographically refine such arguments. Stef Jansen’s analysis of refugee return in post-war Bosnia-Herzegovina unfolds against a background of ‘ethnic cleansing’ that brought to the fore some of the dangers of sedentarist naturalizations of the links between people and place.

Jansen shows how, even though it is marked by similar sedentarist assumptions, post-war belonging of returnees to Bosnian territories must be understood in articulation with generational differences on the one hand, and the political-economic transformations of places of origin on the other. In a similar vein, by turning the focus away from alleged rootedness toward the everyday practices of reinventing or maintaining home, Sharika Thiranagama stresses the need to understand social relationships as constitutive of places. Her story about a Tamil woman in Sri Lanka revolves around movement and relationships to people over a time-period of more than twenty years. 'Home' emerges here through both political and social histories of inclusion and exclusion and is thus not only about place but also about the people through whom we 'feel-at-home'. In our third essay on the social dynamics of emplacement, Staffan Löfving discusses the pragmatics of resettlement among internally displaced Mayan peasants in Guatemala. When presented with several options for new peacetime residence, people embarked on strategic negotiations with wartime enemies, the state, and foreign donors. With their former homes now inhabited by others, and the land they once owned now occupied, it was social and political issues—and not 'roots'—that determined their choices of resettlement.

Violence

Defamiliarizing the everyday language of place and belonging in both social science and migration regimes has become an ever more attractive option to anthropologists, particularly since the so-called postmodern turn of the 1980s (see Marcus and Fischer 1986). If sedentarism with its accompanying myths of 'roots' and 'return' is now exposed as a discourse to be analyzed rather than a truth to be told about identities and cultures, so should conventional understandings of the role of violence in and for movement be defamiliarized. Empirical investigations of local perceptions of violence are central to this project, as they often challenge the officially accepted

(the familiar) notions of legitimacy, responsibility, and means of prevention.

Current anthropological approaches to violence tend to leave the role of place rather underanalyzed: Place is remarkably often reduced to the 'décor' where the violence 'takes place', but it is seldom viewed in conjunction with phenomena constitutive of both displacement and emplacement. In contrast, the contributions gathered here investigate the relationship between violence, displacement, and emplacement by conceiving of them as practices that (re)constitute conceptions, embodiments, and inhabitations of space (see also Daniel 1996; Feldman 1991; Jansen 2005; Malkki 1995a; Richards 2005; Stepputat 1994, 1999). Studying violence in relation to place elucidates tensions between the processes that make people mobile and those that keep them in place, thus calling into question the drawing of strict boundaries between 'forced' and 'voluntary' migration. There is an inherent contradiction in the notion of 'forced' migration, which implies a lack of agency, whereas migration most certainly carries with it associations of choice and agency (Turton 2003: 1, 6ff.). Based on the debate on sedentarism above, we believe that this contradictory potential can be fruitfully deployed in anthropological analysis. An emphasis on agency and pragmatism within structural limitations contributes to the increasing recognition within the study of human mobility of the inability of bureaucratically imposed categories to 'capture' actual movement. It highlights the fact that these categories are not innocent. Analyses of the regimes of interpretation that constitute them and their real effects have shown, for example, that the commonality of 'refugee-ness' does not lie in a uniform experience of forced movement but rather in a forced engagement with the interplay of structural factors such as state border regimes, legal frameworks regulating the relation between people and place, and humanitarian aid interventions (see, e.g., Allen 1996; Barrett 2004; Malkki 1995b; Soguk 1999; Stepputat 1994). As a result, to grasp the experiential realities of the women and men involved, we need to develop a comprehensive approach that treats persons who move (even if

their moving is overwhelmingly involuntary) as “‘ordinary people’, or ‘purposive actors’, embedded in particular social, political, and historical situations” (Turton 2003: 9), and accordingly, not as ‘representatives’ of ‘types’ of displacement.

Our critical take on both bureaucratic and social scientific forms of categorizing people thus extends to similar attempts at typologizing the violence that affects them. One common scholarly approach has been to split violence up into different types (domestic, political, criminal, and military, to name but a few types that elaborate on responsibility and purpose, but not necessarily on perception and spatiality) and then proceed with the difficult task of inter-relating them—only to find how poorly they fit the dynamic character of social worlds (Kleinman 2000). Alleged differences between origins, intentions, and social dynamics of violence are often at odds with experiences on the ground. People overwhelmed by fear of violent attacks, of vulnerability to drought or disease, often perceive violence in the singular with one responsible perpetrator, one purpose, and one suffering and/or resisting body or people (see Löfving 2006; Scarry 1985). In the articles gathered in this special section, we aim to highlight the ways in which contested concepts of violence and place function in tandem; how they interrelate in contemporary discourses on belonging, personhood, and citizenship; and what different meanings are ascribed to them by people on the move and people who stay put, by state bureaucrats and nationalist agitators, by political activists and those ‘tired of politics’, and by scholars and other storytellers.

It is important to understand such disputes in the current historical moment. Contributing their share to the typologizing quest of our times (categorizing problems to be able to administer them away), liberal states today produce a specific discourse on the morality of different (and reified) forms of violence. With ‘globalization’ structuring movements of people and capital on an unprecedented scale, a particular kind of violence, labeled political, has been identified as a key threat to the liberal project of individual rights and responsibilities. From the perspective

of the state, political violence exists in two forms: insurrectionary or terrorist (illegitimate) on the one hand and overt state violence (legitimate) on the other. Both, however, cause bodily harm beyond the control of the individual (and thus liberally sovereign) victim. Their condemnation is therefore sanctioned by international jurisprudence such as humanitarian law, and these political practices are accordingly deemed illegitimate—even by many of those they claim to represent—if they involve such violence. As a corollary, the suppression of political violence becomes a goal in itself, even if it heightens the impact of other forms or ‘types’. Consequently, contemporary efforts to conceal the performance of state violence in non-transparent prison cells (Wacquant 2001, 2002) or to conceal the accountability for state violence by outsourcing it to non-transparent firms or militias (Löfving 2004) speak to the contemporary contestations of this particular monopoly of the state.

We would argue that it is possible to trace the desire for reified ‘types’ of violence and for the contested assessment of their legitimacy in the current era to the paradoxes of power within the liberal project itself and to the response of affluent ‘northern’ states to the (imagined or real) threats posed by ‘southern’ people on the move. The violence that justifies flight in the eyes of the liberal state equals ‘political violence’ (state-performed, because states are generally endowed with the responsibility to protect their citizens from insurrectionary violence within their own borders), while those seeking refuge from a violence that in a previous paradigm was labeled ‘structural’, such as poverty, are deemed fortune-seeking, and therefore politically illegitimate, ‘economic migrants’. This, in turn, forces many people on the move to rewrite their stories in tune with a general narrative in which their suffering and subsequent migration must inevitably be the result of a violence acknowledged as ‘political’. Hence, ‘politics’ increasingly figures as a discursive device to legitimize movement, and less as a term denoting collective organizing for social change, because discontent with one’s predicament in a particular societal system leads ever more people to abandon

it rather than to engage in collective mobilization to change it (Löfving 2005; cf. Hirschman 1970). Democratization in the context of liberal globalization (or global liberalization) thus increasingly provides the very incentive for migration from poverty-ridden regions. But non-violent conditions for such migration remain few and far between, due to a continuing, if selectively reinforced, territorial definition of citizenship.

Let us take this opportunity to briefly address the risks associated with studying home making among moving people of all kinds within a conceptual framework that does not draw hard lines between 'forced' (i.e., violent) and 'non-forced' (i.e., non-violent) migration. If, instead, we conceive of relative positions on a continuum denoting one's relationship to territory and capacity for decision making with regard to mobility, this could be a dangerous game at the expense of the persons in question. The current geopolitical moment is characterized by strong hostility toward certain forms of movement, particularly those from poorer to richer contexts, and this attitude is reflected in ever-stricter border restrictions in the latter. In this exercise, northern migration regimes rely on a distinction between 'deserving' and 'undeserving' victimhood, judged largely in the place of destination. It could be argued that, in such a context, everyone should be making an effort to save the claims to legitimacy of those who have been or might be able to get through, glossing over the complexities and contradictions produced by the current migration regime they are experiencing. Instead, we argue that anthropological analysis should not accept, not even temporarily, the naturalized categories of that regime and the consequences of those categories, nor the moral judgments about the context of origin that such a regime entails. Not strictly separating out 'forced' migration from movement in general, we should also be aware that this analytical and political choice may contradict the insistence of many of our research subjects on the moral distinction between themselves and others. We argue that the contextual relevance of such understandings should be investigated within the actually lived experiences of the women and men in

question. Like the study of migration in general, these understandings must be placed in the wider context of the transformative and transforming relations between people and place and of structural inequalities and struggles for resources and entitlements (see Turton 2003; Vincent and Refslund-Sørensen 2001).

In this special section, we have assembled three case studies that, in a conventional account, would have led us to stress not only the forced nature of past movement, but also the analytical privilege of that force *in the past*. However, we show that violence is not merely a property of memory. Violence lives on, beyond memory, affecting moving people and their home-making efforts in ways that cannot be explained with recourse to the mere history of war itself. For example, in Sharika Thiranagama's account, people reject repeatedly having to go through the painstaking task of reordering their lives and their world in the aftermath of recurrent violence. Memories are thus themselves regarded as violent (cf. Jansen 2002), and 'home' is imagined as a place free of violence, both remembered and anticipated. Stef Jansen argues that the foreign intervention in Bosnia-Herzegovina has privileged safety through individual property over all other concerns. Its focus on the restitution of property rendered invisible its policies of what could be called 'forced transition', of which refugee return was in fact merely one dimension. The memory of war among returnees thus 'took place' in contexts of shifting insecurities, vulnerabilities, and expectations, and those contexts were characterized by post-war reconstruction as well as post-socialist transformation. Staffan Löfving's work exposes how the liberalization of politics during the Guatemalan peace process of the 1990s was accompanied by a liberalization of the economy, altering the balance between them to the detriment of the political sphere. While liberal democratization brought a move away from the organized (insurrectionary and state) violence of the twentieth century, people's chances to transform societies politically waned in the new, market-governed context. Peace in its contemporary guise in both Bosnia-Herzegovina and Guatemala is charac-

terized by this suppression of some types of violence (military, political, to an extent criminal) and the persistence and even rise of other types (especially through exploitation, inequality, and marginalization). This paradox leads us to suggest that the conventional categorization of violence mystifies power relations that prevail *through* war and peace. We therefore work with a broader notion of violence as a function of power both during and after war (cf. Binford 2002; Richards 2005).

Home making

The problem of the sedentarist bias, we argue, is not only that people are presumed to be naturally rooted, and that movement is therefore somehow inherently violent, but also that they are seen as *forever* rooted. Taking seriously the experiences of persons who move and of those who stay put, and studying them as social agents, implies that we uncover the linkages between the changes in politics and social contexts through which they are moving with transformations in their individual and social life trajectories. Such intersecting transformations inform all three articles here, not least in terms of inter-generational household strategies of emplacement and movement that people deploy in their dealings with large-scale change. This generational dimension, it is shown, is strongly articulated with gender, resulting in structurally unequal experiences of belonging.

According to sedentarist logic, human beings are seen not only as being collectively rooted in a particular place, but also as deriving their meaningfulness, or their 'culture', from this very rootedness. As a result, people on the involuntary pole of the movement continuum in particular become a deeply problematic phenomenon, and their anticipated return re-establishes the 'natural' way of the world. Reflecting this mode of thought, the desire to return is often seen as a direct function of the depth of national belonging, charting an uneasy halfway course between a contextual notion of 'home' and its designation as the territory previously inhabited (e.g.,

Kibreab 1999: 404ff.). This view is related to a common theme in migration studies: the 'myth of return'. In his eponymous 1979 book, Muhammad Anwar argued that most of his Pakistani informants thought of their residence in Britain as a temporary stage in expectation of return to Pakistan once it was economically viable to do so. In most cases, this proved to be a myth, which was nevertheless reinforced through remittances, investments, visits, and kin obligations to Pakistan and resulted in a new form of British-Pakistani sociality. Particularly in later periods, because of family reunion, settlement in Britain was *de facto* permanent, even though Anwar's informants remained 'home-oriented'. The critical relevance of this 'myth of return' does not depend on whether people actually do go back, but on whether they cherish this 'homeland orientation', and on how it affects their lives. However, even among those leaning toward the pole of involuntary movement, the prevalence of such a professed desire to 'go home', rather than being 'invariably powerful' (Kibreab 1999: 404), varies tremendously according to individual and collective experiences as well as social, political, and economic contexts (see Allen 1996; Al-Rasheed 1994; Long and Oxfeld 2004; Markowitz and Stefansson 2004). We wish to take part in ethnographic critiques of the presumed universality of a desire to return, and go beyond them, in at least two ways. First, we aim to transcend the dominant identificational-cultural focus, adding an eye for transformations in the socio-economic and political structure of the place that was left behind. Second, we believe that, even if many people on the move do express very strong nostalgia, this is not always and necessarily best understood as desire for return (see Hage 1997; Jansen 1998). As Zetter (1999) has suggested, a more accurate and useful notion might be that of a 'myth of home'. 'Home' itself, then, needs to be problematized, and particularly the self-evidence with which it is territorialized. If we fail to do so, as we indicated above, 'home' is all too easily represented unwittingly as a timeless entity in an unchanging context of origin, something that is particularly inappropriate if we take into account that

that context is often one of dramatic transformation such as war or socio-economic restructuring. There is, then, an important temporal dimension to narratives of 'home'.

Particularly in studies of people whose movement is to be understood on the 'forced'/'involuntary' pole of the continuum, this temporality often takes the form of discontinuity, and more precisely, loss. This includes loss of capital and entitlement, as well as dramatic disconnections from persons, objects, and environments invested with emotional attachments—often experienced as a loss of 'home' (Loizos 1981, 1999). However, the 'home' that has been lost has not simply been left behind in another place. Rather, we would argue, it has also been left behind in another time and is therefore often experienced as a previous 'home', irrevocably lost both spatially and temporally. Prefacing her study of Asia minor refugees in Greece, Renée Hirschon ([1989] 1998) points out the painful irony of employing the term 'repatriates' to refer to her informants, who moved from the newly emerging state of Turkey to neighboring Greece as part of the 1920s population exchange agreed on between the two governments. "How can you be 'repatriated,'" she asks rhetorically, "to a place you do not come from, that is not your home?" (ibid.: xvii). Hirschon's point has only gained in significance in recent times, when the experience of 'being out of place' in one's presumed 'ethnic' mother-state has become evident among, for example, Serbs from surrounding post-Yugoslav areas in Serbia, Bosnian Croats in Croatia, British Zimbabweans in the UK, Eastern European *Volksdeutsche* in Germany, and Central Asian Russians in Russia. However, the argument can be taken further by problematizing the seemingly straightforward relation between 'home' and place. In addition to the question of "how you can be 'repatriated' to a place you do not come from, that is not your home," we would ask to what extent 'home' can simply be understood as the place you come from. Hirschon's own study provides strong ethnographic evidence that 'home' is made and remade on an everyday basis through strategies of cultural con-

tinuity, which she understands as ways of overcoming alienation as well as social disintegration. This reliance on cultural capacities by which 'home' can be continuously recreated has been further developed by Ghassan Hage in his studies of Lebanese immigrants in Australia (1997), but Hage shifts the focus from tradition to the social realm of security, familiarity, community, and what he calls a 'sense of possibility'. Here, security denotes a set of rules that a person masters, familiarity "a space where one possesses a maximal spatial knowledge" (ibid.: 102), and community "a space where one possesses a maximal communicative power" (ibid.: 103). 'Sense of possibility', finally, challenges the passive notion of 'home' as mere social and physical shelter and attaches to it the opportunities for change, improvement, and the unexpected—that is, room for dreaming and imagining. This 'home' is an ideal, and people everywhere live, at best, in what Hage calls its 'approximation'. In this model, expressions of nostalgia by people on the move become themselves a means by which a new 'home' is built—they are strategies to approximate the ideal 'home' in the new context, or, in Hage's words, "a desire to promote the feeling of being there *here*" (ibid.: 108; see Turton 2005: 267). This approach corresponds with existentialist writings about the nomadic Warlpiri of Central Australia, where 'home' is a metaphor for people's continuous negotiation between familiarity and estrangement (Jackson 1995), but it places that 'home' more firmly in a context of social transformation.

In this theme section, Sharika Thiranagama contributes ethnography of expectation, aspiration, and desire to complicate seemingly nostalgic dimensions of home making. When talking of loss and displacement, her informants always recounted these through attempts to imagine future homes. However, Thiranagama's analysis does not stop at the level of imagination. She explores the desire of people not just to 're-inhabit' the world (cf. Das et al. 2002) but for the world to change for them, embracing transformation by striving to be able to condition change on local or even personal control. Sharing Thi-

ranagama's concern for the 'what' (and not just the 'where') of home making, Löfving discusses an attempted scaling up of 'home' from the domestic to the societal sphere in the revolutionary project in Guatemala. He narrates a history of 'home' among the displaced Mayan rebels from recruitment in 'private kitchens' through the state-performed 'domicide' to the contested reconstruction of the post-war nation and the ways, in peace, in which a public-private divide was discursively and politically re-established. Both Löfving and Jansen also discuss the economic strategies to establish persistent alliances (perceived as secure or stable) against a still-changing socio-economic environment during and after the accomplishment of 'return'. While Löfving ends with neo-liberal interventions in local community formations resulting in the social atomization of 'home', Jansen explores the unequal processes in which localized home making comes to be seen as more or less feasible by certain groups of people. Elaborating on physical, but also on social and existential dimensions of *Sicherheit* (cf. Bauman 1999), Jansen's comparative tale of two households' return reveals how positioning in the life course and in what he calls 'social relations-in-process' account for the differences in people's ability to successfully remake 'home'.

In sum, this theme section seeks to reconceptualize the significance of place for people on the move by positioning the often violent and always transformative tension between fixity and change at the center of the analysis. Holding to account both cosmopolitan ideologies arguing against roots (for those who can afford to be rootless) and their sedentarist opponents (anxious to put everyone in their place by naturalizing 'home'), we investigate the importance of violence-in-residence in relation to violence-in-movement. We consider 'home' in terms of a struggle to create opportunities, to engage in what Turton's (1996) Northeast African Mursi informants called a 'search for cool ground'—a concern to find or establish secure places that may serve as bases for developing a future.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers of this special section, as well as Finn Stepputat, Fiona Ross, Liisa Malkki, and Peter Loizos for their constructive comments on earlier drafts of this introduction.

Stef Jansen is Lecturer in Social Anthropology at the University of Manchester, UK. His research centers on critical ethnographic investigations of home and hope with regard to nation, place, and transformation. Based on fieldwork in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia, and Kosovo, he has published numerous journal articles and book chapters on these themes, as well as the monograph *Antinationalism* (in Serbian, 2005).

E-mail: Stef.Jansen@manchester.ac.uk.

Staffan Löfving is Assistant Professor at the Institute of Latin American Studies, Stockholm University. He is currently engaged in a research project on paramilitarism and neo-liberal government in Colombia and Central America. Among his publications is *Peopled Economies* (2005), an edited volume that elaborates on an anthropological critique of neo-classical dogmas in development economics.

E-mail: staffan.lofving@lai.su.se.

Notes

1. The articles in this section will be included in the book *Struggles for home: Violence, hope, and the movement of people*, edited by Stef Jansen and Staffan Löfving, forthcoming with Berghahn Books.
2. For an overview of the anthropology and mobility, see Brettell (2000). See also Colson (2003), Hein (1993), and Malkki (1995b) on refugees; Gmelch (1980) and Kearney (1986) on migration and 'development'; Al-Ali and Koser (2002), Glick-Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton (1992, 1995), Kearney (1995), Kivisto (2001), and Povrzanović-Frykman (2001) on migrancy, refuge, and transnationalism. Edited anthropolog-

- ical volumes on belonging and locality include Lovell (1998) and Low and Lawrence-Zúñiga (2003). For more detailed discussions of mobility and home, see Ahmed, Castañeda, Fortier, and Scheller (2003), Jansen and Löfving (forthcoming), and Rapport and Dawson (1998).
3. The results often take the form of literary-theoretical manifestoes, such as Chambers's treatise on 'migrancy' (1994) or Minh-ha's definition of our time as 'the age of exile' (1994), which itself recalls Berger's earlier dictum that global movement is the quintessential experience of our times (1984). Sociologists (Bauman 1996, 1999; Hall 1990; Melucci 1989), anthropologists (Hannerz 1996; Rapport 1997), cultural critics (Bhabha 1994; Naficy 1999), and philosophers (Braidotti 1994; Deleuze and Guattari 1986) call for various liberating forms of 'nomadic thought', by strategically combining notions of marginality, interstitiality, non-rootedness, and displacement into theoretical and political positioning (for a critique, see, e.g., Kaplan 1996).
 4. In a related point, we need to take on the lessons of decades of feminist scholarship, which has, not least through the study of domestic abuse, consistently pointed out the inadequacy of the universalizing dichotomy of the safety in staying put 'at home' versus the violence of movement (see also Ahmed, Castañeda, Fortier and Scheller 2003). The three ethnographic studies collected here clearly expose the fallacy inherent in such approaches.
 5. For a critique, see Gupta and Ferguson (1997a: 7; 1997b: 354) and Warner (1994).
- ## References
- Ahmed, Sarah, Claudia Castañeda, Anne-Marie Fortier, and Mimi Scheller, eds. 2003. *Uprootings/regroundings: Questions of home and migration*. Oxford: Berg.
- Al-Ali, Nadia, and Khalid Koser, eds. 2002. *New approaches to migration: Transnational communities and the transformation of home*. London: Routledge.
- Allen, Tim, ed. 1996. *In search of cool ground: War, flight, and homecoming in Northeast Africa*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Al-Rasheed, Madawi. 1994. The myth of return: Iraqi Arab and Assyrian refugees in London. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 7 (2/3): 199–219.
- Anwar, Muhammad. 1979. *The myth of return: Pakistanis in Britain*. London: Heinemann.
- Barrett, Michael. 2004. *Paths to adulthood: Freedom, belonging, and temporalities in Mbunda biographies from Western Zambia*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1996. From pilgrim to tourist—Or a short history of identity. In *Questions of cultural identity*, ed. Stuart Hall and Paul duGay, 18–36. London: Sage.
- . 1999. *In Search of Politics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Berger, John. 1984. *And our faces, my heart, brief as photos*. London: Writers and Readers.
- Binford, Leigh. 2002. Violence in El Salvador: A rejoinder to Philippe Bourgois. *Ethnography* 3 (2): 201–19.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 1994. *Nomadic subjects: Embodiment and sexual difference in contemporary feminist theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Brettell, Caroline B. 2000. Theorizing migration in anthropology: The social construction of networks, identities, communities, and global-scapes. In *Migration theory: Talking across disciplines*, ed. C. B. Brettell and J. F. Hollifield, 97–135. London: Routledge.
- Chambers, Iain. 1994. *Migrancy, culture, identity*. London: Routledge.
- Clifford, James. 1992. Travelling cultures. In *Cultural studies*, ed. L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, and P. Treichler, 9–116. London: Routledge.
- Clifford, James, and George Marcus, eds. 1986. *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Colson, Elizabeth. 2003. Forced migration and the anthropological response. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 16 (1): 1–18.
- Daniel, E. Valentine. 1996. *Charred Lullabies: chapters in an anthropography of violence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Das, Veena, Arthur Kleinman, Margaret Lock, Mamphela Ramphele, and Pamela Reynolds. 2002. *Remaking a world: Violence, social suffering, and recovery*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1986. *Nomadology: The war machine*. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Feldman, A. 1991. *Formations of violence: Narrative of the body and political terror in Northern Ireland*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

- Gilroy, Paul. 2000. *Against race: Imagining political culture beyond the color line*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Glick-Schiller, Nina, Linda Basch, and Cristina Blanc-Szanton, eds. 1992. *Towards a transnational perspective on migration*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- . 1995. From immigrant to transmigrant: Theorizing transnational migration. *Anthropological Quarterly* 68 (1): 48–63.
- Gmelch, George. 1980. Return migration. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 9: 135–59.
- Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson. 1997a. Culture, power, place: Ethnography at the end of an era. In *Culture, power, place*, 1–29. Durham: Duke University Press.
- . 1997b. Beyond ‘culture’: Space, identity, and the politics of difference. In *Culture, power, place*, 33–51. Durham: Duke University Press.
- . 1997c. Discipline and practice: ‘The field’ as site, method, and location in anthropology. In *Anthropological locations*, ed. A. Gupta and J. Ferguson, 1–46. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hage, Ghassan. 1997. At home in the entrails of the West: Multiculturalism, ‘ethnic food’, and migrant home-building. In *Home/world: Space, community, and marginality in Sydney’s West*, ed. Helen Grace, Ghassan Hage, Leslie Johnson, Julie Langsworth, and Michael Symonds, 99–153. Annandale: Pluto Press.
- Hall, Stuart. 1990. Cultural identity and diaspora. In *Identity: Community, culture, difference*, J. Rutherford, 222–37. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hannerz, Ulf. 1996. *Transnational connections: Culture, people, places*. London: Routledge.
- Hein, Jeremy. 1993. Refugees, immigrants, and the state. *Annual Review of Sociology* 19: 43–59.
- Hirschman, Albert O. 1970. *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hirschon, Renée. [1989] 1998. *Heirs of the Greek catastrophe: The social life of Asia minor refugees in Piraeus*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Jackson, Michael. 1995. *At home in the world*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Jansen, Stef. 1998. Homeless at home: Narrations of Post-Yugoslav identities. In *Rapport and Dawson*, 85–109.
- . 2002. The violence of memories: Local narratives of the past after ethnic cleansing in Croatia. *Rethinking History* 6 (1): 77–93.
- . 2005. National numbers in context: Maps and stats in representations of the post-Yugoslav wars. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 12 (1): 45–68.
- Jansen, Stef, and Staffan Löfving, eds. Forthcoming. *Struggles for home: violence, hope, and the movement of people*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Kaplan, Caren. 1996. *Questions of travel: Postmodern discourses of displacement*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kearney, Michael. 1986. From the invisible hand to visible feet: Anthropological studies of migration and development. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 331–61.
- . 1995. The local and the global: The anthropology of globalization and transnationalism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 547–65.
- Kibreab, Gaim. 1999. Revisiting the debate on people, place, identity, and displacement. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 12 (4): 384–410.
- Kivisto, Peter. 2001. Theorizing transnational immigration: A critical review of current efforts. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24 (4): 549–77.
- Kleinman, Arthur. 2000. The violences of everyday life: The multiple forms and dynamics of social violence. In *Violence and subjectivity*, ed. Veena Das, Arthur Kleinman, Martha Ramphela, and Pamela Reynolds, 226–41. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Löfving, Staffan. 2004. Paramilitaries of the empire: Guatemala, Colombia, and Israel. *Social Analysis* 48 (1): 156–60.
- . 2005. Outline to a critique of liberal peace: Guatemala. In *El Caribe Centroamericano*, ed. Jussi Pakkasvirta, 167–95. Helsinki: Renvall Institute.
- . 2006. Poverty, security, vulnerability: towards a theory of singular violence. *Iberoamericana: Nordic Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* 36 (2): 298–323.
- Loizos, Peter. 1981. *The heart grown bitter: A chronicle of Cypriot war refugees*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1999. Ottoman half-lives: Long-term perspectives on particular forced migration. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 12 (3): 237–63.
- Long, Lynellyn D. and Ellen Oxfeld, eds. 2004. *Coming home? Refugees, migrants, and those who stayed behind*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press.
- Lovell, Nadia. 1998. Introduction: Belonging in need of emplacement? In *Locality and belonging*, ed. N. Lovell, 1–24. London: Routledge.

- Low, Setha M., and Denise Lawrence-Zúñiga. 2003. Locating culture. In: *The anthropology of space and place: Locating culture*, ed. Setha M. Low and Denise Lawrence-Zúñiga, 1–47. London: Blackwell.
- Malkki, Liisa. 1992. National geographic: The rooting of peoples and the territorialization of national identity among scholars and refugees. *Cultural Anthropology* 7 (1): 24–45.
- . 1994. Citizens of humanity: Internationalisms and the imagined community of nations. *Diaspora* 3 (1): 41–67.
- . 1995a. *Purity and exile: Violence, memory, and national cosmology amongst Hutu refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- . 1995b. Refugees and exile: From refugee studies to the national order of things. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 495–523.
- Marcus, George, and Michael M. J. Fischer. 1986. *Anthropology as cultural critique: An experimental moment in the social sciences*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Markowitz, Fran, and Anders Stefansson, eds. 2004. *Homecomings: Unsettling paths of return*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1989. *Nomads of the present: Social movements and individual needs*. London: Hutchinson Radius.
- Minha-ha, Trinh T. 1994. Other than myself/my other self. In *Travelers' tales: Narratives of home and displacement*, ed. G. Robertson, Melinda Mash, Lisa Tickner, Jon Bird, Barry Curtis, and Tim Putnam, 9–26. London: Routledge.
- Naficy, Hamid, ed. 1999. *Home, exile, homeland: Film, media, and the politics of place*. London: Routledge.
- Olwig, Karen E., and Kirsten Hastrup, eds. 1997. *Sitting culture: The shifting anthropological subject*. London: Routledge.
- Povrzanović-Frykman, Maja, ed. 2001. *Beyond integration: Challenges of belonging in diaspora and exile*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Rapport, Nigel. 1997. *The transcendent individual: Towards a literary and liberal anthropology*. London: Routledge.
- Rapport, Nigel, and Andrew Dawson, eds. 1998. *Migrants of identity: Perceptions of 'home' in a world of movement*. Oxford: Berg.
- Richards, Paul, ed. 2005. *No peace no war: An anthropology of contemporary armed conflicts*. Oxford and Athens: James Currey and Ohio University Press.
- Scarry, Elaine. 1985. *The body in pain: The making and remaking of the world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Soguk, Nevzat. 1999. *States and strangers: Refugees and displacements of statecraft*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.
- Stepputat, Finn. 1994. Repatriation and the politics of space: The case of the Mayan diaspora. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 7 (2/3): 175–85.
- . 1999. Politics of displacement in Guatemala. *Journal of Historical Sociology* 12 (1): 54–80.
- Turton, David. 1996. Migrants and refugees: A Mursi case study. In Allen, 96–110.
- . 2003. Refugees, forced resettlers, and 'other forced migrants': Towards a unitary study of forced migration. New Issues in Refugee Research Working paper 94. UNHCR, Geneva.
- . 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.
- Vincent, Marc, and Birgitte Refslund-Sørensen, eds. 2001. *Caught between borders: Response strategies of the internally displaced*. London: Pluto Press.
- Wacquant, Loïc. 2001. The penalization of poverty and the rise of neo-liberalism. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 9: 401–12.
- . 2002. The curious eclipse of prison ethnography in the age of mass incarceration. *Ethnography* 3 (4): 371–97.
- Warner, Daniel. 1994. Voluntary repatriation and the meaning of return to home: A critique of liberal mathematics. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 7 (2–3): 160–74.
- Zetter, Roger. 1999. Reconceptualizing the myth of return: Continuity and transition amongst the Greek-Cypriot refugees of 1974. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 12 (1): 1–22.