

(Re)Interrogating Camp and Refugees in Forced Migration Studies

By

Nasreen Chowdhory *

Agamben points out that the camp situation reduces them to naked life, “absolute bio-political space...in which power confronts nothing other than pure biological life without any mediation,” yet refugees as residents of camps can reinterpret their existence in camps as politicised space.¹ Most refugees located in North and South live separately from what is presumed to be normal and mainstream and their location beyond the city limits is an indication of their marginalisation and scant access to resources. Camp space becomes the paradigmatic of stratification on one hand, and diversification of membership prevalent in contemporary society. My paper will analyse the space within the domain of forced migration studies and suggest that like the refugees, camps too have become tools of society when it should have been rather a place of exception. The paper will engage theoretically with camps as loci within forced migration studies and critically addresses the following: a) the refugee-subject relation in developed and developing world, b) the interrelation between refugee subject and camp, and the usefulness of camp as an analytical tool to understand forced migration study.

The Refugee Subject in Global Context

An increasing number of scholars agree with the premise that refugee syndrome was a fallout of post-Cold War issue.² But it subsequently opened a new range of issues and possibly rethinking about the significance of international migration, refugees. Some other literature deals with the issue of international migration and how it exceeds the bounds of humanitarian concern, which directly touches on debates on national and international security, nationalism, ethnicity, development, citizenship, and democracy.³ It is imperative to locate refugee discourse within the statist paradigm to understand its implication in terms of their rights and privileges that exist

* Nasreen Chowdhory, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Delhi, India., Email: nchowdhory@gmail.com
Refugee Watch, 61 & 62, June & December 2023.

within this framework vis-à-vis its own citizens. State is an important category that both defines and excludes refugee/immigrant/alien rights. The insider-outsider dichotomy defines the true meaning of rights and privileges enjoyed by those who are either outside or inside the state parameters. The refugee movement and its constant sense of mobility challenge state territorial norms and boundaries. Refugees as a category seek to de-territorialise the very concept of statehood, and its legitimate boundaries, that result in re-examination of their position of exceptionality in forced migration to that of being a normal phenomenon.

Numerous literatures on asylum and immigration agree on the premise that asylum is shaped by a complex configuration of national interest and international norms. Steiner makes a compelling case on European asylum policies. Based on parliamentary debates of three countries viz., Switzerland, Germany, and Britain, Steiner attempts to understand the confluence of factors that contribute to either strengthening asylum policies of any country or in some cases might even weaken the existing ones. Studies on asylum demonstrate the weakness in the dominant international relations paradigm that seeks to explain state behaviour on the basis of the rational pursuit of assumed national interests of the state. Steiner separates concepts for analytical purposes, national interest, and international norms. International norms have been defined as explicit international and regional agreements that determine and institutionalise the asylum process, the definition of a refugee, the principle of non-refoulement, and the link between asylum and human rights. He asserts that it is rather dubious to expect that national interest can be strengthened with the acceptance of refugees, along with the contention that it strengthens democracy, and enables the opportunity to express humanitarian sentiments. These factors might act as a constraining mechanism and influence any decisions towards asylum policies and subsequently harm refugee interests. Loescher believes “the formulation of refugee policy involves a complex interplay of domestic and international factors at the policy-making level and illustrates the conflict between international humanitarian norms and sometimes narrow self-interest calculations of sovereign nation-states.”⁴ Collinson writes “[a] moral, legal or humanitarian obligation to offer protection to refugee, in practice will always be balanced against the political and economic interests and concerns of potential asylum states.”⁵ Similarly, Shacknove argues, “closer[refugee] policy has always been at least one part state interest and at most one-part compassion. Appeals based solely upon compassion, solidarity or rights are only occasionally successful.”⁶ Joly asserts that “ethical factors...generally play some part when supranational values are accorded sufficient importance or when a particular conjuncture allows the refugees’ interest to coincide with other interests at stake in the variegated fabric of national and international factors at play.”⁷

More literature is now linking refugeeism with notions of citizenship, nationality, and democracy. Some recent literature reveals the interface of immigration and refugeeism with citizenship and democracy. Walzer asserts that membership allows for an “exclusivist membership in the

democratic state which is essential for a democratic society.”⁸ Soguk’s interpretation is different from others, he contests that refugee being a negative concept, rather in terms of their capacities to effect disruptive changes in sites of governance, including Connolly.⁹ Despite the negative connotation of refugee as a term, this particular author claims and views refugees as a positive sum that impacts changes in “sites of territorial governance.” Both refugees and immigrants transgress political and cultural boundaries and undermine the “democratic and its institutions as the domain of the life of citizen.” Their existence in any state and its territory construct and negotiates new identities for democratic space. Thus, despite their ambiguous status which is invisible and uncertain, refugees participate in the “exclusionary legal, cultural, political, and economic practices of a specific kind of democracy” which privilege the citizen as the proper entity of a sovereign state. However, refugees are instrumental in creating tension and making their presence felt in any events of discrimination, despite their improper status, which subsequently makes them more visible than “invisible.” Citizens draw *raison d’être* from their position within the state based on membership. This clearly puts refugees at a disadvantage vis-à-vis their position in any state. Furthermore, to a certain extent, territorial democracy is a specific manifestation of the sovereign territorial state, which clearly contests any space for refugees who are disruptive and fails to reaffirm relations, identities of the territorial, and citizen-oriented democracy.

“The nexus between state and citizen represents the lowest common denominator of any reflection upon citizenship.”¹⁰ According to Ralf Dahendorf “[t]here is no more dynamic figure in modern history than the [c]itizen.”¹¹ “Citizenship is civil rights, political participation. Social welfare on the other hand is identity and recognition”. Citizenship is a contentious issue and has much more significance once an individual has crossed the international border. Once in an alien territory, refugees have no rights other than those entitled to under international law more specifically stipulated under international refugee law. The identities of refugees are enmeshed with nationality along with the question of statehood, citizenship, becomes a vital issue that both shapes and governs the state’s recognition towards their distinctive identity.¹² Increased state defensiveness and redrawing citizenship boundaries are partly in response to the perceived threat of differences due to decades of population and refugee movement across borders within the region of South Asia. In developing countries, refugees lack both *de jure* and *de facto*, civil, political, and social rights.¹³ Many refugees in developing countries suffer indignity and lack of respect because in most cases, they lack “the capacity claims” that can be implemented independently of governments. That is why millions have been voting with their feet homewards in anticipation of recouping citizenship rights they lost when displaced and are unable to achieve in the context of exile. Refugees politicise “space” by imploding the cartographic logic that engenders it.¹⁴ “What the map cuts up,” says Michel de Certeau, and Soguk are the “stories [that] cut across.”¹⁵ Refugee becomes those stories, which cut across the cartographic logic of the territorial state and its privileged sites of identity and start negotiating point.¹⁶

State, therefore, is the primary cause of refugee flow. It also has a pivotal role in determining when it should allow entry and exit of certain refugee groups. The debate is much more relevant in the context of countries that have passed through decolonisation and have either inherited colonial institutions or have undergone massive reformist movements. The debate when situated in the South Asian context has special relevance.¹⁷

State and national borders are defined through immigration and citizenship politics by denying “migrant” or refugee groups any rights during the period of stay in exile country. There is an ongoing debate regarding who belongs as an insider and who is an outsider, premised any rights they might enjoy, during the period of exile. Therefore, there is a constant tussle between the insider and the perceived outsider both in relation to territory and identity. These conflicts often crystallise over competition for control of the state or in protests against particular groups’ control over resources or complete access to certain resources. Sometimes, the notion of identity i.e., nationality, depends on the idea of memory and vice versa. Any individual or group identity is a sense of sameness over time that is sustained by remembering and is actually remembered is defined as “assumed identity.”¹⁸ Sometimes, memories are revised to suit the current identity, thereby giving memory more longevity that transcends the present one. Thus, making both memory and identity social constructs, which means that they can either be used or abused, also means that at a certain point, they can be re-asserted to meet certain/particular purposes. The political meaning and identity of refugees and their status have been both universally accepted and acknowledged in accordance with UN Convention. In its application, states discriminate depending on whether it contradicts the state’s jurisdiction. Refugees depend on the state for its determination process and its consequent protection and assistance on the administrative system of the host government. Hammer refers to this category of foreign nationals that enjoy rights that are intrinsic in national citizenship as denizens. These are foreign citizens who are “...entitled to equal treatment in all spheres of life, with full access to the labo[u]r market, business, education, social welfare, even to employment in branches of the public services, etc.”¹⁹ Kibreab contends that countries that treat refugees as denizens are less likely to return on their own to their countries of origin.²⁰ Silverman makes a geographical distinction. He asserts that countries in the north are likely to give denizen status to incoming refugees, rather than those living in the southern states. However, in most developing countries nationality and citizenship are inextricably interwoven with each other.²¹ Citizenship rights are accessible to nationals only, and the basis of entitlement to rights is nationality, not necessarily residence. The basic thrust of the citizenship model is to dissociate nationality from citizenship.²² Non-nationals, particularly, refugees are least likely to receive such rights and entitlement. Also, a corollary to this is that a person’s “natural” entitlements to rights are deemed to rest within his/her own country of origin i.e., nationality. Although citizenship right is subsumed under nationality issues, that state has absolute jurisdiction. In the case of refugees, they strive for lesser rung of the hierarchy and have some basic rights that can only be

enjoyed by citizens. The equation is revered for refugee or non-citizen category as they lack nationality of the host-state but might have some rights stipulated under international refugee law.²³

Ascertaining the refugee question through the lens citizenship is important.²⁴ Do refugees contribute to the ethos of statehood, or do they threaten the very premise of statecraft, and thereby challenge the territoriality notion of democracy²⁵ and that of nation state.²⁶ These notions are both exclusionary and heavily stacked against non-citizens while privileging citizenship. Also does refugee groups and immigrants challenge and attempt to dislocate the rights and privilege of citizen's rights by cutting across the notion of territoriality? Are immigrants and refugees an exclusive category with de-territorial identity? Do asylum seekers and alien groups aim to problematize the existence and presence through discourse in order to delegitimize the notion of statehood or the very notion of the state itself? If it is true, then do refugees pose a threat to the state and citizens or is it one of the many reasons put forth by the state in its attempt to control further proliferation of refugee movement by undermining their rights vis-à-vis citizen rights.²⁷ Refugees threaten the relational hierarchy of the citizen/nation/state constellation, a hierarchy that refugees refute as a "figure of aberration, a figure that lack proper agency, proper face and voice."²⁸ In this section, I have engaged with the refugee subject in global context, while evaluating the statist paradigm and its relevance in both North and South.

Interrelation between Camps and Refugee-subject

The earlier sections have discussed the creation of the refugee subject and its reinforcement by the state. Camps in this context have assumed importance in refugee and forced migration studies. While the refugee subject is a creation of the state processes in both the developed and developing world, the construction of camps in this narrative has assumed a specific centrality. While engaging with the historicity of camps in the refugee narrative, it cannot be denied that indeed a temporary/ transient/ in-between place has now become an almost permanent state of being for refugees. In the context of the developing world, the notion of a massive and mixed flow of people has become very relevant. Often the reality of the developed world holds relevance to the developing world, both as conceptual categories and historical context which is a problem. The protracted nature of displacement and governmental technology of migrants produce the identity of migrants.²⁹

Camps remain a problematic area in forced migration studies primarily because of their sway on the discipline and policies that tend to impact refugee lives. While Agamben's work on the zone of indistinction emerges quite clearly where the state of exception is, it is the suspension of law that has become the norm. Refugees are those who inhabit terrains, denied access to law, resources, rights—where lives exist in a state of limbo. To borrow from Agamben's state of exception, the "bare life" and zone of indistinction are refugees deprived of rights etc., yet the very nature of exception has transformed the abnormal into normal. Refugee subject in

camps has become normality in everyday existence, where the state subjects its existence from being an abnormal to normal. Interestingly, the relationship between refugees and camps is close, as one draws legitimacy from the other. Often terms such as “human refuse,”³⁰ “pariahs”³¹ and “urban outcasts”³² are associated with refugees, who presumed to be unwanted people, that, contribute toward instability and a burden to the resource-strapped society. “If all this continues . . . camps will no longer be used just to keep vulnerable refugees alive, but rather to park and guard all kinds of undesirable populations.”³³ In this context, this represents the embodiment of refugees, especially those denied of rights, status and entitlements. Camp therefore can be understood as space inhabited by illegal/aliens/refugees etc., those who live on the margin, an abnormality that assumes normal existence based on their location of stay. Therefore, camps represent normalcy to “bare life” where the sovereign has suspended its legitimacy.³⁴ Homi Bhabha, writes, “the stateless,” “migrant workers, minorities, asylum seekers, [and] refugees” who “represent emergent, undocumented lifeworlds that break through the formal language of ‘protection’ and ‘status’ because”—he says, quoting Balibar—“they are ‘neither insiders [*n*] or outsiders, or (for many of us). . . insiders officially considered outsiders.”³⁵ This captures the essence of migrants and refugee populations around the world today. Chakrabarty suggests that today there are more detention centres in and around Europe than before which is the result of state failures connected to a whole series of factors: economic, political, demographic, and environmental i.e., “globali[s]ation of capital and the pressures of demography in poorer countries brought about by the unevenness of postcolonial development.”³⁶ Notwithstanding, the cause, the reality appears that indeed there are more camps/detention dotted in Europe and outside.³⁷

Presently, Syria is going through unprecedented political strife and a civil war generating extreme violence and insecurity. Since the uprising in 2011, Syrian civilians have been forced to flee their homes, cross the borders and seek protection in neighbouring countries such as Lebanon³⁸, Turkey, Iraq, Egypt, and Jordan. According to the latest UNHCR data, 3,726,988 Syrian refugees are registered in this part of the Middle East Region,³⁹ including 619,160 in Jordan. Representing approximately one-tenth of its population, the country hardly managed such an important influx of refugees and has rapidly needed external assistance to respond to the Syrian crisis. For that reason, camps have been established, since then managed by UNHCR, the United Nations Refugee Agency (whose role is to provide assistance and protection to refugees and other persons of concern), in collaboration with a wide range of humanitarian partners and NGOs. Nearly, 80 per cent of Syrian refugees live in Jordan’s urban and rural areas, and the remaining 20 per cent live confined in those camps. The very definition of camp has been transformed into the normal day-to-day lives of refugees. The encampment of refugees is the new reality, especially keeping in mind the meagre resources. A slight point of departure is the African refugee camps where people are perceived to assume certain “legal consciousness,” i.e., by developing a special relationship to legal rules, spontaneously claiming justice or equity, and

refusing to live in a “state of exception,” where they would be deprived of any legal rights.⁴⁰ In this instance, such possibility becomes lower as opportunities to negotiate with the state become less and refugee subject as an agent gets enmeshed into camp formation. Thus, camps and refugees have now become the new normalcy in a much-skewed world, with the exception of becoming the everyday norm of society.⁴¹

Conclusion

The paper has discussed the interconnection between refugee subjects and camps. The close proximity between refugee and the state i.e., the creation of refugee subject on one hand, and on the other how their location in camps have indeed transformed them from being exceptional to normal. In a manner of speaking refugee discourse can be seen in relation to statist regimentation and how the state is both instrumental in one hand generating refugees and also sustaining refugeehood inside and outside camps. It is often the latter that is missing while there is ample literature on the former. Refugee figures central to statecraft, which though challenges the prevalent hierarchy, yet it being at a peripheral and marginal level impact the discourse on statehood. By placing refugees and immigrants centrally to any discussion on citizen's rights, poses the question of who is in and who should remain outside the domain of statehood. This is a double-edged argument, while stating that refugees occupy the centrality in the state's jurisdiction, yet it does not fall within the framework of territoriality that constitutes the boundaries of the state. In other words, refugees are being who seeks to deterritorialise the state while existing outside the domain of statehood. In this kind of setting, camps are created by the state to provide temporary sanctuary which assumes a peculiar permanency. While arguably, camps were places of exception in forced migration where the sovereign was supreme as life is reduced to bare life. However, the metaphoric use of camps has transformed the lives of refugees from a point of exception to that of everyday reality, wherein the abnormal becomes the normal.

This article builds on the author's ongoing research engagement with the issues of refugees, camps, migration, and protection of the state and previously published works: Nasreen Chowdhury, and Nasir Uddin, eds., Deterritorialised Identity and Transborder Movement in South Asia (Singapore: Springer, 2019); Nasreen Chowdhury, Refugees, Citizenship and Belonging in South Asia: Contested Terrains (Singapore: Springer, 2018); Nasreen Chowdhury, and Biswajit Mohanty, Citizenship, Nationalism and Refugeehood of Rohingyas in Southern Asia (Singapore: Springer, 2020).

Notes

¹ Giorgio Agamben, *Means Without End: Notes on Politics*, trans. Vincenzo Binetti, and Cesare Casarino (London, and Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 40.1; B. Harrell-Bond, (1998), “Camps: Literature Review,” *Forced Migration Review*, no.2 (1998): 22–3, <https://www.fmreview.org/camps/harrellbond>.

² Gil Loescher, ed., *Refugees and the Asylum Dilemma in the West* (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1992); Gil Loescher, "Introduction: Refugee Movements and International Security (Adelphi Papers)," *International Institute of Strategic Studies* 3, no.268 (1992): 3–8; E. Ferris, *Beyond Borders: Refugees, Migrants and Human Rights in Post Cold War Era* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1993); A. Suhrke, "Pressure Points: Environmental Degradation, Migration and Conflict," International Security Studies Program, Occasional Paper 3 (Cambridge, MA: American Academy of Arts and Sciences), 3–43; A.R. Zolberg, A. Suhrke, and S. Aguayo, *Escape From Violence: Conflict and the Refugee Crisis in the Developing World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989); D. Valentine, *Charred Lullabies: Chapters in an Anthropography of Violence* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1996).

³ Gil Loescher, *Beyond Charity: International Cooperation and Global Refugee Crisis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Ferris, *Beyond Borders*; J. Habermas, 'Citizenship and National Identity: Some Reflections on the Future of Europe', *Praxis International* 12 (1992): 1–19.

⁴ Gil Loescher, "Introduction," in *Refugees and International Relations*, eds. Gil Loescher, and Laila Monahan, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), cited in, Niklaus Steiner, "Arguing about Asylum: The Complexity of Refugee Debates in Europe," in *Problems of Protection: The UNHCR Refugees and Human Rights*, eds. Niklaus Steiner, Mark Gibney, and Gil Loescher (London, and New York: Routledge, 2012), 181; Gil Loescher, *The UNHCR and World Politics: A Perilous Path* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2001); M. Steger, and F.P. Wagner, "Political Asylum, Immigration and Citizenship in Federal Republic of Germany," *New Political Science* vol.24-25 (1993): 59–73.

⁵ Sarah Collinson, *Beyond Borders: West European Migration Policy Towards the 21st Century* (London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1993), cited in Steiner, "Arguing about Asylum," 181; S. Collinson, *Europe and International Migration* (London: Pinter and The Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1993).

⁶ Andrew Shacknove, "From Asylum to Containment," *International Journal of Refugee Law* 5, no. 4 (January 1993): 516–33, cited in, Steiner, "Arguing about Asylum," 181.

⁷ Danièle Joly, *Haven or Hell? Asylum Policies and Refugees in Europe* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 42. Also cited in Steiner, "Arguing about Asylum," 181; D. Joly, ed., *Global Changes in Asylum Regimes* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

⁸ M. Walzer, "Education, Democratic Citizenship and Multiculturalism," *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 29, no. 2 (1995): 181–89, cited in, Nasreen Chowdhory, and Biswajit Mohanty, eds., *Citizenship, Nationalism and Refugeehood of Rohingyas in Southern Asia*, (Singapore: Springer, 2020),

⁹ Nevzat Soguk, *States and Strangers: Refugees and Displacements of Statecraft* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).; W.E. Connolly, *Identity/Difference: Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991).

¹⁰ André Liebich, "Citizenship in Its International Dimension," in *Citizenship East and West*, eds. André Liebich, Daniel Warner, and Jasna Dragovic (London, and New York: Routledge, 2009), 25; T.H. Marshall, *Citizenship and Social Class: And Other Essays*, Cambridge: The Syndicate Cambridge University Press, 1950).

¹¹ Ralf Dahrendorf, "Citizenship and Beyond: The Social Dynamics of an Idea," *Social Research* 41, no. 4 (Winter 1974): 674, cited in, Liebich, "Citizenship in Its International Dimension," 25; and, Nasreen Chowdhory, and Biswajit Mohanty, "Contextualising Citizenship, Nationalism and Refugeehood of Rohingya: An

Introduction,” in *Citizenship, Nationalism and Refugeehood of Rohingyas in Southern Asia*, eds. Nasreen Chowdhory, and Biswajit Mohanty (Singapore: Springer, 2020), 15.

¹² Chowdhory, and Mohanty, “Contextualising Citizenship, Nationalism,” 15.

¹³ Chowdhory, and Mohanty, “Contextualising Citizenship, Nationalism,” 10; G. Kibreab, *African Refugees: Reflections on the African Refugee Problem* (Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press, 1985). Weiner, M., “Rejected Peoples and Unwanted Migrants in South Asia,” *Economic & Political Weekly* 28, No.34 (1993): 1737–46.

¹⁴ Soguk, *States and Strangers*, 204.

¹⁵ Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Randall (Berkley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1988), 129; Soguk, *States and Strangers*, 204.

¹⁶ Soguk, *States and Strangers*, 204.

¹⁷ T. Peiris, *Citizenship Law and the Republic of Sri Lanka* (Colombo: Government Publications Bureau, 1974); P. Sahadevan, *India and the Overseas Indians: The Case of Sri Lanka* (New Delhi: Kalinga Publications, 1995); A. Jalal, *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

¹⁸ John R. Gillis, “Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship,” in *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, ed. John R. Gillis (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994), 3.

¹⁹ Tomas Hammer, *Democracy and the Nation-State: Aliens Denizens and the Citizens in a World of International Migration* (Aldershot: Avebury, 1990).

²⁰ G. Kibreab, *African Refugees: Reflections on the African Refugee Problem* (Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press, 1985).

²¹ Maxim Silverman, *Deconstructing the Nation: Immigration, Racism and Citizenship in Modern France* (London: Routledge, 1992).

²² S. Bouâmama, “Au-delà du Droit de Vote. La Nouvelle Citoyenneté,” *Hommes et Migrations* 1118 (1989): 13–16, in Silverman, *Deconstructing the Nation*, 139, cited in, Nasreen Chowdhory, *Refugees, Citizenship and Belonging in South Asia: Contested Terrains* (Singapore: Springer, 2018), 19.

²³ Chowdhory, *Refugees, Citizenship and Belonging*, 19.

²⁴ Nasreen Chowdhory, “Citizenship and Membership; Placing Refugees in India,” in *Deterritorialised Identity and Transborder Movement in South Asia*, eds. Nasir Uddin, and Nasreen Chowdhory (Singapore: Springer, 2019), 42; A. Vajpeyi, *Prolegomena to the Study of People and Places in Violent India* (New Delhi, India: WISCOMP, 2007).

²⁵ W.E. Connolly, *Identity, Difference: Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2002)

²⁶ Soguk, *States and Strangers*.

²⁷ Chowdhory, *Refugees, Citizenship and Belonging*, 19.

²⁸ Soguk, *States and Strangers*, 243.

²⁹ Ranabir Samaddar, *The Postcolonial Age of Migration* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2020); Ranabir Samaddar, *The Marginal Nation: Transborder Migration from Bangladesh to West Bengal* (Kolkata: SAGE, 1999).

³⁰ Z. Bauman, *Wasted Lives: Modernity and its Outcasts* (Cambridge, U.K: Polity Press, 2004), cited in, Chowdhory, “Citizenship and Membership,” 40.

³¹ E. Varikas, *The Outcasts of the World: Images of the Pariah* (Paris: Stock, 2007), cited in, Chowdhory, “Citizenship and Membership,” 40.

³² L. Wacquant, *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality* (Cambridge, U.K: Polity Press, 2007), cited in, Chowdhory, “Citizenship and Membership,” 40.

³³ M. Agier, *Managing the Undesirables: Refugees Camps and Humanitarian Government* (Cambridge, U.K: Polity Press, 2011), 3.

³⁴ Chowdhory, "Citizenship and Membership," 40; N.P. De Genova, "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31 (2002): 419–47.

³⁵ H.K. Bhabha, "Notes on Globalization and Ambivalence," in *Cultural Politics in a Global Age: Uncertainty, Solidarity and Innovation*, eds. David Held, Henrietta L. Moore, and Kevin (Oxford: Oneworld, 2008), cited in, Chowdhory, "Citizenship and Membership," 40.

³⁶ D. Chakrabarty, "Postcolonial Studies and the Challenges of Climate Change," *New Literary History* 43, no. 1 (2012): 1–18.

³⁷ Chowdhory, "Citizenship and Membership," 40.

³⁸ S. Hanafi, and T. Long, "Governance, Governmentalities, and State of Exception in the Palestinian Refugee Camps of Lebanon," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 32, no.2 (2010):134–159.

³⁹ UNHCR, *Syria Regional Refugee Response: Inter-agency Information Sharing Portal*, updated February 12, 2015, accessed February 13, 2015.

⁴⁰ E. Holzer, "What Happens to Lae in a Refugee Camp?" *Law and Society Review* 47, no. 4 (2013): 837–72, cited in, Chowdhory, "Citizenship and Membership," 40.

⁴¹ Chowdhory, "Citizenship and Membership," 41.