REFUGEES AND EXILE: From "Refugee Studies" to the National Order of Things

Liisa H. Malkki

Department of Anthropology, University of California, Irvine, California 92717

ABSTRACT

This review offers a critical mapping of the construction-in-progress of refugees and displacement as an anthropological domain of knowledge. It situates the emergence of "the refugee" and of "refugee studies" in two ways: first, historically, by looking at the management of displacement in Europe in the wake of World War II; and second, by tracing an array of different discursive and institutional domains within which "the refugee" and/or "being in exile" have been constituted. These domains include international law, international studies, documentary production by the United Nations and other international refugee agencies, development studies, and literary studies. The last part of the review briefly discusses recent work on displacement, diaspora, and deterritorialization in the context of studies of cultural identity, nationalism, transnational cultural forms—work that helps to conceptualize the anthropological study of displacement in new ways.

INTRODUCTION: DISPLACEMENT AND THE CURRENT HISTORICAL CONJUNCTURE

> The consul banged on the table and said;
> "If you've got no passport you're officially dead":
> But we are still alive, my dear, but we are still alive.
> WH Auden (7:256)

It has become common to observe that the spatial and social displacement of people has been accelerating around the world at a fast pace and that these

movements include enormous numbers of people who are legally classifiable as refugees. Watching current media coverage on refugees from Rwanda, Burundi, Haiti, Cuba, Bosnia, and elsewhere, one could easily conclude—as has increasingly been done—that the term refugees denotes an objectively self-delimiting field of study for anthropologists. This review begins from the contrary premise: that "refugees" do not constitute a naturally self-delimiting domain of anthropological knowledge. Forced population movements have extraordinarily diverse historical and political causes and involve people who, while all displaced, find themselves in qualitatively different situations and predicaments. Thus, it would seem that the term refugee has analytical useful-ness not as a label for a special, generalizable "kind" or "type" of person or situation, but only as a broad legal or descriptive rubric that includes within it a world of different socioeconomic statuses, personal histories, and psychologi-cal or spiritual situations. Involuntary or forced movements of people are always only one aspect of much larger constellations of sociopolitical and cultural processes and practices. Nationalism and racism, xenophobia and immigration policies, state practices of violence and war, censorship and si-lencing, human rights and challenges to state sovereignty, "development" discourse and humanitarian interventions, citizenship and cultural or religious identities, travel and diaspora, and memory and historicity are just some of the issues and practices that generate the inescapably relevant context of human displacement today. In many studies of refugees, however, these are the kinds of "background information" or "root causes" that sometimes have been con-sidered, for many reasons, beyond the scope of study.

In this historical moment, and with specific reference to anthropology, critical thinking about the framing of the study of displacement is of special importance. The generalized category of refugees is an object of anthropologi-cal knowledge that is still in the early stages of construction. As the sociologist Hein has observed, "Research on refugees accumulated with minimal concep-tual elaboration: Immigrants constituted an economic form of migration, refu-gees a political form" (69:43–44; cf 77). Because the object is not yet stable, this may be a propitious moment for disciplinary self-reflection on future research directions and on the theoretical framing of questions. Indeed, a valuable opportunity might be lost if we prematurely claim in displacement a specialist's domain of knowledge, a coherent field or subfield of anthropology, where one does not (and perhaps should not) exist. Such a move would risk forcing new research into already existing research trajectories or can-ons—often developed outside of anthropology and in a conspicuously nonan-thropological manner—that might seem to offer a ready-made theoretical and methodological toolkit.

The first part of this review critically maps the construction-in-progress of refugees and displacement as an anthropological domain of knowl-

edge. I situate the emergence of "the refugee" and "refugee studies" in two ways: 1. historically, by looking at the management of displacement in Europe in the wake of World War II; and 2. by tracing an array of different discursive and institutional domains within which "the refugee" and/or being "in exile" have been constituted. These domains include international law, international studies, documentary production by the United Nations and other international refugee agencies, development studies, and literary studies. The second part of this review briefly discusses recent relevant work on displacement, diaspora, and deterritorialization in the context of studies of cultural identity, nationalism, transnational cultural forms—work that helps to conceptualize the anthropological study of displacement in new ways.

"THE REFUGEE": AN EPISTEMIC OBJECT IN CONSTRUCTION

Histories: The Birth of "the Refugee"

In mapping the historical transformations that most directly contributed to the birth of the modern, internationally recognizable figure of "the refugee," it is useful to resist positing an automatic evolution of the phenomenon or assuming that it has had a single recognizable germ or form growing out of the "beginning" of the phenomenon in the Classical mists of time where banishment was a form of social death—a kind of capital punishment (42:193; cf 117). There is no "proto-refugee" of which the modern refugee is a direct descendant, any more than there is a proto-nation of which the contemporary nation form is a logical, inevitable outgrowth.

Instead of constructing such false continuities (41:146), we might do better to locate historical moments of reconfiguration at which whole new objects can appear. In the genealogy of "the refugee," one such moment can be located in post–World War II Europe. There is a danger of Eurocentrism in looking for the global figure of the refugee in postwar Europe; yet, there are also justifications for this specific localization. As far as has been possible to determine, it is in the Europe emerging from World War II, that certain key techniques for managing mass displacements of people first became standardized and then globalized.[1] This does not mean there were no refugees or techniques for managing them before World War II (177:18ff; cf 87). People have always sought refuge and sanctuary. But "the refugee" as a specific social category

---

1
    The emergence of such techniques was not the result of careful and considered planning. Rather, the unprecedented scale of displacement seems to have impelled the improvisation of new techniques. "[T]he total number of Europeans displaced in the six years of war…was around thirty million. At the end of the war, of these, eleven million survivors were outside their country and in need of assistance" (177:21; cf 87:305, 107:296ff, 138, 139).

and legal problem of global dimensions did not exist in its full modern form before this period. There were specific displaced populations and specific treaties, but not a more encompassing apparatus of administrative procedures (cf 107:8–10, 177:18ff). The standardizing, globalizing processes of the immediate postwar years occurred, importantly, in the institutional domain of refugee settlement and refugee camp administration, and in the emerging legal domain of refugee law.

It was toward the end of World War II that the refugee camp became emplaced as a standardized, generalizable technology of power (40) in the management of mass displacement.[2] The refugee camp was a vital device of power: The spatial concentration and ordering of people that it enabled, as well as the administrative and bureaucratic processes it facilitated within its boundaries, had far-reaching consequences. The segregation of nationalities; the orderly organization of repatriation or third-country resettlement; medical and hygienic programs and quarantining; "perpetual screening" (173:59) and the accumulation of documentation on the inhabitants of the camps; the control of movement and black-marketing; law enforcement and public discipline; and schooling and rehabilitation were some of the operations that the spatial concentration and ordering of people enabled or facilitated. Through these processes, the modern, postwar refugee emerged as a knowable, nameable figure and as an object of social-scientific knowledge.

The importance of the accessibility of the camp inhabitants to documentary accumulation should not be underestimated in this connection; neither should the social fact that the Displaced Persons' camps scattered over Europe (especially Germany) created a whole class of people (administrators, bureaucratic functionaries, doctors, therapists) who came to be trained in refugee relief and management as well as others who had different kinds of knowledge of refugees (journalists, writers, academics, photographers, and the refugees themselves) (see 177:24).

Several social histories and other descriptive documents on World War II refugee camps in Europe were written at the end of or immediately following the war (23, 58, 70, 73, 74, 78, 84, 86, 87, 91, 118, 121, 123, 127; cf 140, 145, 155, 158). These texts are extremely useful because they enable one to see precisely how the various technologies of power associated with the care and control of refugees first became standardized practices. They show how the spatial isolation and management of refugees and displaced persons in Displaced Persons' camps and the practices that came to characterize camp life

---

2

These practices have connections to earlier forms of confinement, e.g. quarantine and concentration camps, such as the concentration camps used by the British during the Anglo-Boer War in Africa.

first emerged as ad hoc, emergency, temporary measures that depended heavily on improvisation (23, 73, 123, 173).

Careful study of this early literature (as well as the documents generated by the organizations involved at the time) shows that refugees have not always been institutionally or discursively approached as an international humanitarian problem (102). Indeed, in the last years of World War II and the immediate postwar years, displaced people in Europe were classified as a military problem, and they were under the jurisdiction of the Displaced Persons Branch of the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEF). Throughout much of the war, the control of civilians and refugees had already been widely considered as a combat problem, and the benefits of organizing refugees "for useful service behind the combat lines" had been recognized by the military forces (123:107). During the last two years of the war, however, the problem took on new and different implications. It was increasingly anticipated that, upon victory, the masses uprooted during the war would soon be an enormous "refugee problem" concentrated in Germany. Policy plans began to be drafted by the Allied military in 1944 in response to predictions of a great disorder to come (164:484–486). A host of voluntary relief agencies (70:145–166; 123: 187), such as the Red Cross, made plans of their own, but it was clear from the outset that the refugees were to be first of all a military responsibility (123: 147; 172). The definitive Allied operations plan for administering the refugees, known as the SHAEF Plan, illustrates vividly what a military, administrative gaze on displacement revealed:

> The problem of displaced persons is likely, within a matter of days, to assume vast proportions before the ground organization for dealing with it is fully established.... [U]ncontrolled self-repatriation of displaced persons who might form themselves into roving bands of vengeful pillaging looters on trek to their homes...[,] revolutions, or the partial or complete breakdown of central or local government authority in Germany concomitant with surrender or collapse, would endanger millions of Allied nationals [whose] fate will be regarded as a gauge of Allied capacity to deal effectively with major European problems (123:116–17; cf 173:17).[3]

In spatial terms, too, the military model was important. The basic blueprint of the military camp and many of its characteristic techniques were appropriated by those new spatial and disciplinary practices that were emerging in the 1940s refugee camps in Europe. There is bitter irony in the fact that many of the hundreds of work and concentration camps in Germany were transformed into "Assembly Centres" for refugees when the war ended (118:90, 112;

3
   The foregoing discussion of the refugees as a military problem draws extensively on Reference 102 (p. 44ff).

121:180; 123:308, 313; 173:43ff). The concentration camp was itself quasi-military in design and specially suited to the mass control of people. Immediately after the liberation, the camp architecture allowed for efficient summary quarantines for the prevention of epidemics.

Refugee camps were also often modeled on military barracks (121; 123: 110, 124, 125, 250; cf 78:5; 145:215). The utilization of existing institutional buildings suited to mass control and care[4] was built into the policy plans of SHAEF and UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration), and despite frequent contemporary criticisms of this practice, it persisted (102:58, 59; 121:16; 123:249; 165:29, 30). The interiors of the Displaced Persons' camps were also arranged into disciplinary, supervisable spaces.

SHAEF administration of the refugees was followed by several different civilian international organizations, including IGCR (Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees), IRO (International Refugee Organization), and UNRRA (70, 71, 155, 172). Sjöberg has critically analyzed the motives and practices of these early organizations (149). Finally, in 1951, the UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) was established. At this point, refugees began to appear more clearly as an international social or humanitarian problem, rather than as a primarily military one (cf 173:47). In this transformation of "the problem" from the military to the social and humanitarian, the refugee camp as a productive device of power played a vital role. The camps made people accessible to a whole gamut of interventions, including study and documentation, and the postwar figure of the modern refugee largely took shape in these camps. Since the immediate postwar years, much excellent historical work has been done on the refugees and displaced persons who were such a prominent aspect of European life from the mid-1940s to the early 1960s (23, 71, 74, 78:55, 87, 107, 123, 140, 155, 167, 172, 173).

Another reason Europe warrants special attention is that the principal elements of international refugee law and related legal instruments grew largely out of the aftermath of the war in Europe, and from what must have been a powerful sense of postwar shame and responsibility for the predicaments of the people who were fleeing the Holocaust and yet were so often refused entry when they were in the most desperate need of asylum. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted in 1948 (146), as was the Genocide Convention. As Nobel has observed, "Refugee law is an inseparable part of the code of Human Rights" (116:20). Article 14.1. of the Declaration states: "Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution." International law pertaining to refugees has "developed within the framework of the international code of Human Rights" (116:19; cf 93).

4

   Sometimes schoolhouses and hotels were used (173:43).

The most universally cited part of the basic legal definition of refugee status is as follows:

> [T]he term "refugee" shall apply to any person who[,]...owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.

This definition, contained in the 1951 Geneva Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (111:26–28), is widely regarded as "the critical event in the institutionalization of the post–World War II regime" for handling refugees (177:21; cf 1, 53, 54, 67). The Convention definition is the "universal basic definition which can pragmatically be expanded, when need arises[,] by extending the mandate of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) through resolutions by the UN General Assembly and by the adoption of regional instruments complementary to the universally respected Geneva Convention" (116:20). This instrument was more encompassing than the case-by-case treaties of the prewar period, but it was still only intended to address the European refugee situation (covering events occurring before January 1, 1951) and not refugees as a universal phenomenon. In response to the limitations of the 1951 Convention, other legal instruments were developed. The 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees removed the Eurocentric geographical restriction and the war-linked time restriction (54, 111, 116, 143). "It was with the 1967 Protocol that the Geneva Convention became the universal instrument of refugee law" (116:21).[5]

Grahl-Madsen provides a useful summary of the many sources that list and analyze the principal legal definitions of refugees (57; cf 52, 99, 111, 147, 148) and discusses a set of terms that are often used synonymously: refugee, stateless person, displaced person. A stateless person is any individual who is not considered by any state to possess its nationality (57:77). That is, "a person may possess a nationality or be stateless at the time when he becomes a refugee, and a refugee of the former category may retain or lose his nationality without his quality of refugee being in the least affected" (57:77). As Simpson (cited in 57:77) has put it, "Not all stateless people are refugees, nor are all refugees technically stateless.... Statelessness is not the essential quality of a

---

[5]
  In 1969 the Organization of African Unity (OAU) Convention Governing Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa provided an expansion of the individual-centered 1951 definition of the refugee that stresses an individual's "well-founded fear of persecution" (116:23). (See also 96:6 for other legal instruments, e.g. the Cartageña Declaration of 1984, intended to address refugee issues in Latin America.)

refugee, though many refugees are in fact stateless people." Displaced person has come to be used widely as a synonym for refugee; in a legal sense, the two terms are not interchangeable, though they overlap in substantial ways (57: 137ff). In many cases, the former term is meant to denote internally displaced persons, i.e. those who have not crossed a national border and thus do not qualify for formal refugee status.

Beyond a practical road map into the basic legal instruments, international refugee law is beyond the scope of this review; but it is an important part of the history of the contemporary figure of the refugee. The legal apparatus that has developed in the past 50 years has been of formative importance in the orders of knowledge in which "the refugee" makes its appearance, and in practice, this legal apparatus tends to take the contemporary order of sovereign nation-states as given (1).

It was not always clear that this would be so. The postwar formulation of international rights contained within it the possibility of superceding the national order; for many it presaged the eventual development of a world state—a world truly beyond nations. Indeed, as Cooper has observed, a notion of internationalism was for a short time elaborated in the 1940s that seemed to promise a set of universal values transcending the national. "In the forties, 'the willingness of international organizations to talk, in effect, about global social citizenship promised something more...[—]a world of principles' rather than a Small World of separate nationalities.[6] There is still a perceptible tension between 'the internationalism of nations and the internationalism of transcendent values'; the latter 'appears in many guises, connected by such threads as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.' But, as Cooper rightly notes, 'the family of nations version of internationalism eclipses the other version from the late 1950s onward'" (F Cooper, personal communication, cited in 104:56).

Of the people writing in this period, Arendt remains one of the most perceptive. In her 1951 study of totalitarianism, she insisted on the necessity of examining displacement through the prism of often xenophobic national states, and she explicitly traced the political and symbolic logics that had the effect of pathologizing and even criminalizing refugees (6; cf 107, 176, 177:12–13ff; for instances of pathologization, cf 25, 158). The contemporary linkages among nationalism, racism, and immigration in Europe (2, 10, 48–50, 61, 133) and elsewhere attest to the continuing relevance of Arendt's observations. Yet these relationships (among xenophobia, immigration, nationalism, and a do-

---

6
   "Of course, the readiness of states to engage in discussion of international standards for social policy reflected their perceptions of international politics at the time; and an important part of this era was the representation of continued colonial rule in a progressive light" (F Cooper, personal communication, cited in 104:64, n. 26).

mesticated, nationalized version of international community) have not been foregrounded in the field of refugee studies.

Decolonization and the Emergence of Refugees as a Third World Problem

It is now taken as axiomatic in much of the sociologically and anthropologically oriented refugee literature that refugees are first and foremost a "Third World problem" or a problem of "developing countries" (55, 63, 66, 69, 129). The period of rapid decolonization in the 1960s saw a watershed period in the modern phenomena of refugees and refugee settlement practices. The establishment and, in some cases, movement of nation-state boundaries, and the global consolidation of processes of extraction and impoverishment were just two factors in the emergence of the "Third World" as a vast source of refugees and migrants—and as a vast asylum zone.[7] But as Zolberg et al have noted correctly, it is all too easy to oversimplify the relationship between poverty and refugee movements: "The simple notion that poverty produces refugees is inconsistent with the fact that situations of extreme economic deprivation usually have not generated population outflows claiming international refugee status" (177:260).

If we accept that poverty, political oppression, and the mass displacement of people are all global or world-systemic phenomena (43, 69, 176, 177), then it becomes difficult to localize them (and to localize refugees, specifically) in the Third World. From the 1950s to the 1970s, as in the 1980s and 1990s, the movement of people (and the control of the movement of people[8]) has been inescapably global (2, 4, 5, 49, 50), and the political, social, and ethical responsibility for it must therefore also be global.[9] It is estimated that 97% of the world's refugees "remain in Third World countries. The rich countries in the West have started in the 1980s to defend themselves against immigration" in what Nobel has described as an "arms race against humanitarianism" and an "escalation of unilateral measures against refugees" (116:29–30). The same tendencies are even more evident in the 1990s. If said rich countries do not have "a refugee problem" within their borders, this fact is clearly not a simple accident of geography or history (cf 33, 45).

"From World War Two to the end of the Cold War, decolonization and superpower conflict produced the largest number of refugees..." (69:47–48).

---

[7] Thus, Africa, for example, is not simply a continent of refugees; it is also a place of refuge.

[8] "The control of the movement of people" was the working title of a graduate seminar taught by Sally Falk Moore at the Harvard University Department of Anthropology. This course led me to think about displacement in the terms laid out here.

[9] In a longer historical perspective, the globality of the forced movement of people—in the form of the slave trade, for example—is a much older phenomenon (see 50).

And today, what George (45) has called the "debt boomerang" ensures a tragic stability in global cycles of impoverishment, oppression, and displacement. As Nobel (116:29; cf 23:19) has observed:

> Some say we live in the era of the Bomb and the migrant. I would say it is the era of the refugee as very few states today encourage anything but marginal immigration and then exclusively in the interest, as it is understood, of that state. The overwhelming majority of the refugees originate in the Third World. The direct causes of their flight are conflicts kept alive mostly by super-power politics and by weapons forged and manufactured at bargain prices in the rich countries, who export death and destruction, and import the natural and partly processed products of the poor countries. At the same time they refuse to a great extent to receive the refugees who try to escape the suffering and the sorrow generated by super-power politics.

In sum, the end of official colonialism, the emergence of the Third World, and contemporaneous transformations in dominant forms of nationalism in the wealthy states together form one relevant history in the examination of refugees as an emergent domain of knowledge.

"THE REFUGEE" AS AN OBJECT OF KNOWLEDGE: A BRIEF SURVEY OF DISCURSIVE FIELDS AND CONNECTIONS

This section traces possible or actual connections between anthropological knowledge and knowledges produced in other disciplines dealing with refugees and displacement. The domains included have been chosen because of their specific locations in relation to the emerging frameworks and orders of knowledge that have entered the disciplinary field of anthropology, from whatever direction.

International Relations and International Security: A View from Above

Population displacement and the control of movement have long been objects of attention in international relations, the study of international security, peace studies, and related fields (55, 56, 87, 95–99, 138–140, 155). As Loescher points out, "Refugee movements already figure prominently on the post–Cold War political and security agenda....Mass migrations are frequently employed as foreign policy tools, and refugees have become instruments of warfare and military strategy....Too often refugees are perceived as a matter for international charity organizations, and not as a political and security problem. Yet refugee problems are in fact intensely political: mass migrations create domestic instability, generate interstate tension and threaten international security" (96:4–5).

International relations as a field tends to assume a vantage point that anthropologists, in particular, are unaccustomed to taking. Seeing large, worldwide patterns and adopting, in many cases, an administrator's gaze on the phenomena under study, international relations produces very different kinds of knowledge than, say, long-term ethnographic research. It is important for anthropologists to consider work in this field for a number of reasons. First, there is an insistence in the work of Loescher, Zolberg et al, and others on viewing refugee movements as inescapably political phenomena. Second, a critical, anthropological engagement with the questions and topics conventionally groupable under "international relations" might open up new theoretical spaces for conducting ethnographic research on the social imagination of war, peace, and "world order"; on the use of civilian population displacements in political struggles among states; on the global social life of the arms trade, on the interpenetrations of the language of diplomacy with the language of international refugee aid, and so on.

International Organizations and the "International Refugee Regime"

Numerous UN bodies deal with refugees in some capacity, but the key body is the UNHCR. The UN apparatus generates an enormous documentary outflow on refugees (see e.g. 21; 71; 125; 153:383–389; 161–163). The bulk of this documentation is archived in the collections of the international organizations themselves (153:331), but most research libraries are also significant repositories of these documents. This bureaucratic and discursive domain is an important source of the forms that social-scientific questions and assumptions about "refugeeness" have tended to take in recent decades. For instance, the explicitly "nonpolitical" role of international refugee agencies (95:1) clearly helps to frame the leaching-out of the immediate political histories of mass displacement from studies that define themselves as development or policy oriented or as humanitarian (106). Other examples of the influence of the frameworks developed by international refugee agencies on a wider world of scholarship include the widespread use of the bureaucratic UN model of the three "durable solutions" to refugee problems—repatriation, integration, and resettlement—as well as the relative absence of critical questioning of the refugee camp as an apparatus for the control of space and movement (see "Refugee Studies" section).

The UN organizations (together with other national and international aid and relief agencies, nongovernmental organizations, charity groups, development agencies, etc) have played a decisive, instrumental role in consolidating "the international refugee system" (43, 55). Hein has observed that "an organization functioning as a global state is forming to manage refugee problems," and that the "very concept of 'migration' emerged from the growth of national

bureaucracies...." (69:47). Zolberg et al have also mapped the existence and effects of what they call "the international refugee regime" (177:258ff). This regime, I would suggest, has been instrumental in the recent emergence of "refugee studies" as an academic or "applied academic" specialization. Much social scientific research—whether resulting in policy recommendations, development reports, or academic articles—has been conducted in more or less formal connection with (and often funded by) these international organizations. It can hardly be surprising that these institutional, organizational settings have had subtle (and sometimes not-so-subtle) effects in shaping the questions that scholars have formulated about displacement and refugee settlement.

This international regime itself seems particularly important to study now. Having grown from the domesticated version of world community that Cooper described (see above), this regime produces the social, political, and legal constructions that we now recognize as refugeeness.

Refugees as a "Problem for Development"

The influence of the international refugee regime on scholarship has been images especially marked in the linked figures of "refugees" and "development." The settlement of refugees and other displaced people, especially in the Third World, has shown a marked tendency to be absorbed into well established forms of development discourse (22, 63, 65, 66, 69, 82, 141; cf 35, 36).

The domain loosely characterizable as "refugees and development" appears to have by far the largest social-scientific, documentary accumulation. For one thing, development programs targeted at refugees are often established in conjunction with the UNHCR, and these programs have offered points of entry for many social scientists. But the refugee-development link is more far-reaching than that. Hein has argued, "Economic development and assistance to refugees are inseparable issues...because the 'refugee' is an indicator of world system dynamics" (69:45). Many others have also called for development-oriented strategies in the management of mass displacement in the Third World (but notably not generally in the First World, where the vocabulary for managing the movement of people is quite different). The argument has often been made that rather than just providing immediate emergency relief in the face of new refugee crises, the agencies involved should also concentrate on setting up mechanisms for long-term development aid to improve conditions of life for everyone in impoverished regions of the Third World (see e.g. 14, 22, 66, 79, 82, 88, 115, 154; cf 177:353, n. 6). It is in the arena of refugees and development that anthropology has been particularly visible (17, 65, 66, 72).

While there is certainly good reason to look beyond immediate emergency relief in cases of mass displacement, it is also worth tracing precisely how the discourse of development has colonized refugee issues, and what other intellectual or political connections have been erased and rendered unthinkable in

the process. If nothing else, the development discourse on refugees has some-times facilitated the continued depoliticization of refugee movements; for instead of foregrounding the political, historical processes that generated a given group of refugees, and that reach far beyond the country of asylum and the refugee camp, development projects tend to see a whole world in a refugee camp.[10]

"Refugee Studies"

The fields and discursive domains thus far reviewed have contributed, un-evenly, to the emergence of the new, interdisciplinary discursive domain of "refugee studies." The 1970s and especially the 1980s saw several calls for the systematization of the study of refugees. This was an era that also saw several attempts at general model building (88, 89). The generalized label of "refugee studies" began to appear more frequently at that time (141, 152, 174). It has emerged more recently in geography and anthropology (19, 32, 72, 128).

   Important milestones in the consolidation and institutionalization of this discursive domain occurred with the establishment in 1982 of the influential Refugee Studies Programme at the University of Oxford (128:3) and with the appearance in 1988 of the *Journal of Refugee Studies*. Also in 1988, the Committee on Refugee Issues (CORI) was established as a committee of the General Anthropology Division, a unit of the American Anthropological As-sociation. The Committee has since published two volumes of *Selected Papers on Refugee Issues* (32, 72).

   The very newness of this discursive domain, refugee studies, makes diffi-cult any attempt to give a comprehensive synopsis of its intellectual agenda. Case studies of specific refugee situations—often quite valuable—have multi-plied rapidly. Yet it seems to be generally agreed that a broader theoretical framework has been lacking (69, 177). On reflection, however, it seems not so much that "refugee studies" has lacked theory as that it has uncritically im-ported its main theoretical ideas, often on an ad hoc basis, from other scholarly domains. As discussed above, for instance, one of the main ways in which "refugee studies" has conceived its analytical object is as a problem for devel-opment, thereby linking anthropological work on displacement directly to a well established—if theoretically dubious (35)—body of work in "develop-ment anthropology" (cf 14, 22, 65, 66, 79, 141).

10
   Another interesting view into the development-displacement link in the African context is provided by the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, adopted by the Organization of African Unity (OAU). According to Article 22 of this Charter (known as the Banjul Charter), "1. All peoples shall have the right to their economic, social and cultural development with due regard to their freedom and identity and in the equal enjoyment of the common heritage of mankind. 2. States shall have the duty, individually and collectively, to ensure the exercise of the right to development" (114:48ff).

A second mode of importation of theoretical framework occurs when studies of refugees fall back, as they often do, on an implicit functionalist model of society. Stein's work is an apt example of this tendency. He proposes that there is a generalizable phenomenon that can be called "the refugee experience" and that this experience has characteristic "stages," as outlined by Keller (80): "perception of a threat; decision to flee; the period of extreme danger and flight; reaching safety; camp behavior; repatriation, settlement, or resettlement; the early and late stages of resettlement; adjustment and acculturation; and, finally, residual states and changes in behavior caused by the experience" (cited in 152:321). The normative stages thus set up strongly suggest an organismic, functionalist view of society that constructs displacement as an anomaly in the life of an otherwise "whole," stable, sedentary society. As Marx among others has pointed out, "some of the often tacit assumptions on which many social anthropological studies of migration rest must be re-examined....[W]e must revise our image of society as a territorially based organism" (109:189).

The implicit functionalism of much work in "refugee studies" is especially clear when one is dealing with questions of identity, culture, ethnicity, and "tradition." Again and again, one finds in this literature the assumption that to become uprooted and removed from a national community is automatically to lose one's identity, traditions, and culture (103).

It has long come naturally to us, in the theoretical apparatus of anthropology, to study "indigenous peoples," "local contexts," and "closed systems," as opposed to studying the movement and traffic of people. This kind of sedentarist analytical bias is not unique to anthropology, as the interdisciplinary literature in "refugee studies" attests. "Common notions of culture" are biased, as Clifford has observed, "toward rooting rather than travel" (26:338). The bare fact of movement or displacement across nation-state borders is often assumed a priori to entail not a transformation but a loss of culture and/or identity (107:8, 144:29; cf 38). Stein's work (152) offers a particularly clear illustration of this sedentarist norm (103:31). Talking about the initial "stage" of exile for refugees in general, Stein predicts, "They will confront the loss of their culture—their identity, their habits. Every action that used to be habitual or routine will require careful examination and consideration..." (152:325). Taylor & Nathan echo this statement: "Loss of patterns of conduct is intensified by the uncertainty of what kind of behavior is acceptable or nonacceptable in their new environment..." (157; cf 20, 38, 112). The asylum country is rendered as unfamiliar as if it were worlds apart. "The refugee is searching his way through a strange and frightening society. The patterns of behavior that sustained life at home are no longer sufficient" (152:328).

Upon examination of mass displacements that become recognized as refugee movements, it is clear that initial displacements generally occur across the

nearest international border if the neighboring state is at all viable as an asylum country. It is doubtful that most people's social universe stops abruptly at the border of their own country or that the lifeworlds just across the border could be as axiomatically alien as Stein (152) suggests. Also, one would imagine that mass displacements occur precisely when one's own, accustomed society has become "strange and frightening" because of war, massacres, political terror, or other forms of violence and uncertainty. This realization is the starting point for Daniel & Knudsen's forthcoming essay (29) on re- fugeeness and the breach of trust (cf 119).

The "making strange" of the asylum country often corresponds to the assumption that the homeland or country of origin is not only the normal but the ideal habitat for any person (cf 3:37), the place where one fits in, lives in peace, and has an unproblematic culture and identity. In Stein's work, this tendency is manifested in the following idealizations: "Most refugees are not poor people. They have not failed within their homeland; they are successful, prominent, well-integrated, educated individuals who fell because of fear of persecution" (152:322). Geiger, speaking of his work among Cambodian and Vietnamese refugees, similarly idealizes the worlds that his informants had left behind: "Before they became refugees, however, they had experienced lives in which there was peace, stability, enough food to eat today and tomorrow, a place in society and a future for themselves and their children" (44:68).

In the sedentarist analytical scheme, then, "[g]oing home involves only the most minor cultural adjustment problems..." (152:324). To go home is to go where one belongs. But is it? Two problems present themselves right away. First, one thinks of how this sedentarist bias unintentionally mirrors the in- creasingly elaborated nativism of anti-immigrant or xenophobic violence that often relies on the slogan "[Category name], go home!" (see 122). But if "home" is where one feels most safe and at ease, instead of some essentialized point on the map, then it is far from clear that returning where one fled from is the same thing as "going home." Second, recent work in other theoretical domains has shown how fraught the concept and the lived experience of home can be, and how little studied it is (12, 108, 110, 119–120). This work might be linked profitably with the growing interest in theorizing the repatriation of refugees (130, 168, 175).

That loss of homeland is so readily linked to a presumed loss of cultural identity is one aspect of the functionalism of much work in this field. Another aspect is the uncritical use of the concepts of "adaptation" and "acculturation" to analyze processes of transformation in identity, culture, and cultural tradi- tion (13, 31, 44, 51, 72, 112, 152). This complex of ideas is strongly connected with yet another thematic tendency in refugee studies: the prominence of psychological interpretations of displacement, not only by psychologists but by other social scientists as well. As Brik et al have observed, "It is a generally

accepted conclusion...that refugees constitute a high-risk group as far as mental health is concerned, due to the mere fact that they have been forced to emigrate" (20:179). This is an old theme that appears widely in the World War II–era literature on displacement (25; cf 140) and in the most recent work in anthropology (29, 32, 44:68, 72) and other fields (13, 20, 112, 169:213).

It would be foolish to claim that displacement does not cause distress of many kinds, but when considering the question of psychological disorders among refugees, it is necessary to remember that we are dealing with a set of empirical questions. We cannot assume psychological disorder or mental illness a priori, as an axiom, nor can we claim to know, from the mere fact of refugeeness, the actual sources of a person's suffering. This doesn't mean psychologists, psychiatrists, and other related professionals have nothing to say or do about refugees or the broader phenomenon of displacement—patently they do (136, 160). Clearly, many people who have become (or have been) refugees suffer profoundly from having been tortured, raped, terrorized, spied upon, militarily attacked, separated from friends and families, and often, from having been left alive to witness death (29). If these experiences did not have spiritual or psychological effects on people, that would be something to be explained. Thus, although many refugees have survived violence and loss that are literally beyond the imagination of most people, we mustn't assume that refugee status in and of itself constitutes a recognizable, generalizable psychological condition.

Although many displaced people might benefit from the therapeutic interventions of psychiatry and psychology, psychologizing modes of knowledge and therapeutic forms of relationship have too often been unreflectively imported into the disciplinary toolkit of sociocultural anthropology or sociology, subtly reinforcing the depoliticizing and dehistoricizing tendencies of the implicit functionalism that has been already noted (44, 66, 80, 152; cf 72:5).

The Essential Refugee

The on-going systematization of the discursive domain of "refugee studies" has thus far had specific traceable effects, some intended, others not. On the one hand, it has propelled useful self-criticism among scholars who have worked on refugee-related questions (e.g. 29, 109, 174). But on the other, it has led more often to modes of generalization and essentialization that have been less enabling. While some researchers located in "refugee studies" [e.g. Zetter (174:102)] have cautioned against generalizations about refugeeness, other researchers, notably Stein (152:320–321) and Keller (80), have argued that there is such a thing as "the refugee experience," and moreover, that this generalizable experience can be differentiated into stages (cf 32, 51, 112). Stein's paper, "The Refugee Experience: Parameters of a Field of Study," was first presented at a conference of the same title, "The Refugee Experience,"

sponsored by the Royal Anthropological Institute and the Minority Rights Group in London in 1980 (cf 88, 89). Arguing that refugee problems are too often viewed (by refugees and refugee agencies) as "temporary and unique events," Stein (152:320–21; cf 88, 89) has proposed:

> If we are to move toward a comprehensive professional refugee assistance system then research must be encouraged and supported. The research should focus not only on the most recent arrivals or specific policy questions but general research, looking at refugees everywhere from a broad historical perspective that views them as recurring phenomena with identifiable and often identical patterns of behavior and sets of causalities....We must investigate broadly all of the stages of the refugee experience.

The construct "the refugee experience" has also been used in the emerging anthropology of refugee studies (72:2–3).

An obvious problem with the intellectual project of defining "the refugee experience" is that it posits a single, essential, transhistorical refugee condition.[11] The quest for *the* refugee experience (whether as analytical model, normative standard, or diagnostic tool) reflects a wider tendency, in many disciplines, to seize upon political or historical processes and then to inscribe aspects of those processes in the bodies and psyches of the people who are undergoing them. In this way, very mobile, unstable social phenomena may be imagined as essential "traits" and "characteristics" attached to, or emanating from, individual persons. Instead of being content with seeing commonalities and differences in the socio-historical processes that produce refugees (see 176), researchers tend to seek to fix and make permanent something "essential" about these processes and to do so by personalizing them.

Almost like an essentialized anthropological "tribe," refugees thus become not just a mixed category of people sharing a certain legal status; they become "a culture," "an identity" (see 152:323), "a social world" (109, cf 144), or "a community" (51). There is a tendency, then, to proceed as if refugees all shared a common condition or nature (cf 85:31, 174).

The tendencies toward functionalism and essentialism outlined above have real consequences for the shape of interventions in refugee crises. For example, functionalist visions of an identity that can only be whole and well when rooted in a territorial homeland (30, 166) reinforce the assumption that state sovereignty as we know it at the close of the twentieth century is part of a natural or necessary order of things. This mutually reinforcing relationship, in turn, can naturalize other things: (*a*) It naturalizes and renders reasonable the

---

11
   Positing a transhistorical refugee condition or experience becomes especially problematic when we think about displacement in relation to children, childhood, and questions of memory and witnessing. There is a growing literature on refugee children that would open up a rich field for anthropological study (see e.g. 126).

sealing of borders against applications for asylum (as the United States is now doing with Haitian asylum seekers). (*b*) It makes obvious the need to control the movement of people "out of place," and thus acts to naturalize technologies of power like the refugee camp, the transit camp, the screening or reception center, etc. (*c*) If the category "refugees" becomes another "culture," then refugees and the places where they are found come to appear as natural sites for anthropological field research. This is where it is useful to ask a battery of interconnected questions: What does it mean to be an expert or specialist on refugees? What does it (or what could it) mean to do "policy-oriented" research? What is the proper object of "refugee studies"? What are the observable effects of a regime of practices thus labeled?[12]

Problematizing the construction of the refugee as an object of knowledge invites examination of the roles that anthropologists may, or should, have in this construction. This issue (and the question of the social uses and consequences of anthropological knowledge) has been chillingly raised by Starn (151) in his study of the War Relocation Authority and the forced displacement of Japanese-American citizens of the United States during World War II. Starn traces how anthropologists working for the US government used structural-functionalist models of culture and community to analyze people's circumstances within these wartime internment camps and to advise the US relocation effort.

With the benefit of hindsight and of decades of critical reevaluation of functionalist models of "culture" and "community," it is sadly evident that there is a world of other questions and projects with which these earlier anthropologists might have engaged. But now, in 1995, the ever-growing scale and frequency of violent mass displacement, routine measures of the de facto sealing of borders, the criminalization of migrant labor and foreignness, and reactionary rhetorics of indigenousness and so-called just principles of exclusion are contemporary phenomena that are creating vast, important fields for new political, scholarly engagements and for well-thought-out subversions of the national order of things. Before pursuing some promising new directions for such engagements, an absent connection must be identified: that between "refugee studies" and literary studies of exile.

"Exile": The Aesthetic Possibilities of Displacement

> Although it is true that anyone prevented from returning home is an exile, some distinctions can be made between exiles, refugees, expatriates, and émigrés. Exile originated in the age-old practice of banishment. Once banished, the exile

---

[12]
  "To analyse 'regimes of practices' means to analyse programmes of conduct which have both prescriptive effects regarding what is to be done (effects of 'jurisdiction'), and codifying effects regarding what is to be known (effects of 'veridiction')" (124:5).

lives an anomalous and miserable life, with the stigma of being an outsider.
Refugees, on the other hand, are a creation of the twentieth-century state. The
word "refugee" has become a political one, suggesting large herds of innocent
and bewildered people requiring urgent international assistance, whereas
"exile" carries with it, I think, a touch of solitude and spirituality.

There are shadows of international definitions of legal status in this passage
from Said's essay, "Reflections on Exile" (135), but its main value in the
present context is its synthetic characterization of a set of widely distributed
common-sense understandings about displacement and its capacity to suggest
that contemporary refugees as a mass phenomenon are subject to different
representational conventions than are individual exilic figures. Into the con-
trast between "refugees" and those "in exile" is built a whole history of
differences, not only of race, class, world region, and historical era but of
different people's very different entanglements with the state and international
bureaucracies that characterize the national order of things. The word "refu-
gees" evokes not just any persons who happen to have sought sanctuary or
asylum but rather, as was suggested earlier, a "kind" of person. Many litera-
tures have contributed to the emergence of the figure of refugee studies, but
the existing literature on exile in Said's sense does not appear to be one of
these. "Exile" connotes a readily aestheticizable realm, whereas the label
"refugees" connotes a bureaucratic and international humanitarian realm.

Exile is a central theme in twentieth-century literature. Said, with Steiner,
has suggested that "a whole genre of twentieth-century literature is 'extraterri-
torial', a literature by and about exiles" (135:159). In her thoughtful study,
Kaplan (76:13–14) has observed:

> The "view from afar" characterizes the perspective of much of modernist
> writing....Even those writers who do not find themselves actually exiled may
> easily extend the metaphor. If detachment is the precondition for original
> thought then disaffection and alienation as a state of mind becomes a rite of
> passage for the "serious" modernist writer. Following Flaubert's belief that the
> artist ought to be either a man (sic) without a country or a foreigner in his own
> country, the modernist seeks to recreate the effect of statelessness—whether
> or not the writer is, in fact, in exile. Thus, within modernism the exiled writer
> has come to assume a privileged position as witness and seer....[I]solation,
> solitude, alienation, and uncertainty are necessary preconditions for "great art"
> since it is distance and perspective that produce "vision."

These representational conventions are important because they operate not
only in the domain of twentieth-century art (26, 83) and literature; they travel
and lend their shapes to other discursive and institutional arenas, even to
anthropology (cf 26, 27). There is evidence of such traveling theoretical forms
in at least three arenas within anthropology. It is visible, first, in those contem-
porary writings in anthropology (as well as critical theory, cultural studies,

history, and other fields) in which the object of study is diaspora, deterritoriali-
zation, multiculturalism, migration, racism, ethnicity, "people of color," and
related topics. Second, the classical concept of anthropological fieldwork is
predicated on the kind of social, cultural, and geographic distance to which
Kaplan refers. The anthropologist as stranger becomes, it is thought, seer and
witness to the difference of "another culture." Third, anthropologists them-
selves, as intellectual figures, sometimes readily assume the alienated panache
and worldliness of the exiled writer—seeking to connect themselves deeply
(as deeply as possible) with another place or culture, and cultivating their
alienation from and innocence of the "mundane," "garden-variety," "mass
culture" of the societies in which they actually live and work most of the time.
Lévi-Strauss was, of course, quite literally in exile in New York, but many
other anthropologists have [like Lévi-Strauss in *Tristes Tropiques* (94)] ended
up celebrating the "conflation of literal exile with metaphoric representations
of distance and loss" (76:15). Here we might think back to the story of
Malinowski, in which anthropology was born from his "internment" in the
Trobriands.

Seidel (142, cited in 76:22) has talked about how writers "have gained
imaginative sustenance from exile" (cf 135:160). In her critical exploration of
this move, Kaplan (76) asks, "Why does the concept of exile as aesthetic gain
lend itself so well to expatriate and tourist alike (as well as to the exile)? How
is it that the tourist can participate in exilic aesthetics without experiencing the
prolonged effects of material exile?" Kaplan's motivation is to challenge the
dehistoricization that is implicit in the aestheticization of exile.

In a longer review, it would be useful to trace how the axes of dehistoriciza-
tion and depoliticization that characterize much of "refugee studies" (see
above) might dovetail with the tendencies that Kaplan has identified. Kunz
(88, 89), Stein (152), Berry (13), Miserez (112), and others have written
(mostly from a "refugee studies" perspective) of the "loss" of identity and
culture that "uprooting" can exact. Tabori (156), Said (135), Seidel (142),
Hemingway, Eagleton (34), Kitaj (83), and others have discussed the aliena-
tion of artistic or literary exile, but many of them have placed a different
valuation on this alienation (cf 24, 28, 75, 81). Kaplan notes that literary exile
can hold a kind of freedom and power. Persons huddled in masses under the
refugee label are not thought of as seeking freedom or power in quite this way.
But in both discursive realms, belonging (identity, community) and not be-
longing (uprooting, exile) to a place are spiritualized in a broad sense of the
word. And this spiritualization can lead to dehistoricization and depoliticiza-
tion (106).

The idealization or romanticization of exile and diaspora can be just as
problematic for anthropology (and literary studies) as is the idealization of
homeland and rooted communities in works of refugee studies. Both forms of

idealization take for granted certain categorical forms of thought (104), and both forms set up, as Kaplan has suggested, a "conventional opposition of origin and exile" (76:9).

ON BEING EMPLACED AND DISPLACED: BRIEF REMARKS

To orient this last discussion, I begin with a narrow methodological observation. Where there is war, violence, and mass displacement, one's eye quite naturally moves to the fleeing people who are about to become "refugees." There are innumerable good reasons to focus analytical attention on refugees, but it is also useful to look back at the scene of violence to discover what in it has not been foregrounded. In most cases of mass displacement—even in extraordinary situations of terror like Rwanda in 1994 and Burundi in 1993—there are people who do not become displaced, people who stay behind, for whatever reason. In some cases they stay because they have nothing to fear, because they do not belong to a category marked for persecution—but not always. Thus, the question stands: What about those who stay? Are they not a part of the processes of mass upheaval in contexts like Rwanda and Burundi (105, 106)? Are they not connected to the people who fled? In many works of refugee studies, there is an implicit assumption that in becoming "torn loose" from their cultures, "uprooted" from their homes, refugees suffer the loss of all contact to the lifeworlds they fled. It is as if the place left behind were no longer peopled.

What does it mean to be, or to remain, emplaced?[13] This must remain an open question in the specific sense just outlined; but the question also helps us to move on to more general theoretical terrain. In writing anthropologically about refugees, it is useful to also ask, What is the state of not being a refugee like? How is it denoted? These questions lead into considerations of citizenship and nationality, origins and nativeness, nationalisms and racisms, and of the concepts of identity, ethnicity, and culture—in short, all the theoretical surfaces that are still hot from recent rethinking in anthropology, cultural studies, and other fields (for key moments in this rethinking, see 4, 5, 8–11, 15, 16, 24, 29, 46, 50, 60, 61, 64, 113, 132, 133, 159, 171). More comprehensive reviews of relevant literature are also available (39, 77, 170).

Recent discussions of postcoloniality (171), hybridity (15, 68, 150; S Lavie & T Swedenburg, manuscript in preparation), creolization (64), transnational cultural forms (4, 5), and diaspora (28, 49, 50, 62, 132–134, 159) are all enabling in that they insist on the analytical linkage made here between dis-

---

13

   This question has been posed by Bisharat (18; cf 137, 159; S Lavie & T Swedenburg, manuscript in preparation).

placement and emplacement. These discussions do not assume the purity or naturalness, wholeness or wholesomeness of origins, identities, communities, cultural traditions, or nationalities. Instead, both displacement and emplacement are seen as historical products, ever-unfinished projects. And far from seeing displacement as obviously and necessarily constituting "a problem," these scholars see the study of the everyday facts of diaspora, movement, and displacement as a lens through which to examine the supposedly normal condition of being attached to a territorialized polity and an identifiable people (cf 60, 103). These relationships and processes occur in the context of a system of territorial national states. It is therefore useful to explicitly contextualize the study of refugees in this national order of things (103:37; 104), instead of taking this order as a given to such an extent that it becomes invisible.

The phenomena and connections at issue here—the movement of people, the international refugee regime, and the study of displacement—occur, then, in the national order of things, within what Löfgren has called an "international cultural grammar of nationhood" (100). Just as power secretes knowledge, the national order of things secretes displacement (176), as well as prescribed correctives for displacement. Thus, the international refugee regime, as defined by Zolberg et al (177) and others is inseparable from this wider national order of things, this wider grammar (cf 159). It is also in the context of this order that such phenomena as diaspora, hybridity, and postcoloniality are set.

Throughout this review, the use of an interdisciplinary lens has been inescapable and, one hopes, enabling. But interdisciplinarity in the study of displacement is perhaps best seen not only as a matter of academic interdisciplinarity. It also seems necessary to identify and develop new engagements with organizations and governments that deal with issues of refugees and immigration, citizenship and sovereignty, human rights and other rights, as well as with the concept of humanitarian intervention. Until recently, it has appeared that "refugees and development" was a self-evident vector for more policy-oriented research in anthropology. But this is perhaps no longer quite such a natural connection. Thanks to the complex, historical conjunctures of the present moment, it is becoming more visible that "policy orientation" could, and should, mean more than it has tended to mean in practice up to now.

New directions for such work are suggested in the following passage from Foucault (101:437–438):

> It seems to me that we have to keep in mind three principles:
> 1. There is such a thing as international citizenship which has its rights, which has its duties and which implies a commitment to rise up against any abuse of power, whoever its author, whoever the victims. After all, we are all governed...and, by that token, our fates are bound up together.

2. Because they claim to look after the happiness of societies, governments arrogate to themselves the right to draw up profit-and-loss accounts for the human misery which their decisions provoke, or which their negligence causes. One of the duties of international citizenship is to reveal human misery to the eyes and ears of government, as it is not true that they are not responsible for it. Human misery must never be the silent residue of politics....

3. We must reject the division of labour we are so often offered: it is up to individuals to become indignant and to talk; it is up to governments to think and to act.... Amnesty International, Terre des Hommes and Médecins du Monde are the initiatives which have created this new right: the right of private individuals to intervene effectively in the order of international policies and strategies.

Foucault's concept of international citizenship might at first glance be taken to refer to the international order in which contemporary "refugee problems" are already being managed and in which humanitarian aid and legal protection efforts unfold—that is, the international refugee regime. But the political citizenship to which Foucault appealed cannot easily be contained within the domesticated, "Small World" version of "the international order" or "the international community" that is so hegemonic now (cf 104). It is, precisely, subversive of the international grammar of nationhood and, if anything, harks back to the brief moment when, as Cooper pointed out, post–World War II discourses of internationalism were directed at transcending the national order of things.

Thus, a denaturalizing, questioning stance toward the national order of things presents itself as a promising site from which to identify new research directions in the study of refugees, exile, displacement, and diaspora—as well as for imagining new forms of political engagement. The first arena for research in this spirit was already identified above: the study of emplacement (the flipside of displacement) in the national order of things. This leads directly into questions concerning nationality, citizenship, and the sovereign state. Much excellent work has appeared recently on citizenship (8, 10, 11, 61, 131).

The implications of sovereignty have also been examined in a new light recently (cf 1:387; 47; 146:11). Challenges to sovereignty in cases of genocide (90), in international peacekeeping (47), and in the enforcement of human rights (11) are examples of instances where state sovereignty and the mass movement of people often collide. The actual form of these collisions would seem to be worth careful ethnographic study.

From these angles of view into the national order of things, it is only a short distance to the study of contemporary forms of international or supranational organizations and political orders. Gupta's work on the nonaligned movement (59), Ghosh's work on peace-keeping (47), and Balibar's on racism, migra-

tion, and European Union (10) provide excellent concrete road signs for future work. They also push further the conceptualization of what Foucault called international citizenship. Gupta and Ghosh especially help to underscore the need to study, ethnographically, international organizations like the enormous UN apparatus. As Ghosh has observed,

> Of the many dramatic consequences of the end of the Cold War, few have been as notable as the sudden expansion in the international role of the United Nations....It is no accident that the majority of the UN's peace-keeping operations have been in places that fall within anthropology's traditional domains—in Asia, Africa, and Central America.... In many of these places, peacekeeping operations will inevitably become harbingers of the future, not merely because of their immediate impact on the ebb and flow of politics, but also because they will serve as a political model, as a pattern of order and governance (42:412).

It is in this context that the whole concept of humanitarian intervention also takes shape as an object of study (106).

We return now to a connection that appeared at the beginning of this review: the connection between human rights and refugees. In almost any situation of violent mass displacement, the issue of human rights violations cannot be very distant (37). Yet, just as with discourses of humanitarianism, the discourse of human rights sometimes seems grotesquely abstract and cere-monial in the service of many of the very organizations (like the UN) that claim this discourse in their mandates. Balibar has rightly noted,

> The rights of man have become, again, the absolute of political discourse. But little or practically nothing is heard about the politics of the rights of man, no questioning of its conditions, its forms or its objectives. Why this discretion? Either such a notion is considered to be self-evident...[o]r it is considered to be contradictory, for (since they are either its absolute or its principle) the rights of man are always either beyond or above politics... (11:205).

People who are refugees can also find themselves quite quickly rising to a floating world either beyond or above politics, and beyond or above history—a world in which they are simply "victims." As I have tried to show elsewhere (105, 106), it is this floating world without the gravities of history and politics that can ultimately become a deeply dehumanizing environment for refugees, even as it shelters.

Literature Cited

1. Aleinikoff TA. 1995. State-centred refugee law: from resettlement to containment. See Ref. 29, pp. 387–422
2. Anderson B. 1992. The new world disorder. *New Left Rev.* 193:3–14
3. Appadurai A. 1988. Putting hierarchy in its place. *Cult. Anthropol.* 3(1):36–49
4. Appadurai A. 1990. Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Public Cult.* 2(2):1–24
5. Appadurai A. 1992. Global ethnoscapes: notes and queries for a transnational anthropology. In *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, ed. R Fox, pp. 191–210. Santa Fe, NM: School Am. Res.
6. Arendt H. 1973. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich. 2nd ed.
7. Auden WH. 1962. "Refugee Blues." In *Collected Shorter Poems 1930–1944*, pp. 256–57. London: Faber & Faber
8. Balibar E. 1988. Propositions sur la citoyenneté. In *La citoyenneté et les changements de structures sociale et nationale de la population française*, ed. C Wihtol de Wenden, pp. 223–34. Paris: Edilig/Fond. Diderot
9. Balibar E. 1990. Paradoxes of universality. In *Anatomy of Racism*, ed. DT Goldberg, pp. 283–94. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
10. Balibar E. 1991. Es Gibt Keinen Staat in Europa: Racism and Politics in Europe Today. *New Left Rev.* 186:5–19
11. Balibar E. 1994. *Masses, Classes, Ideas: Studies on Politics and Philosophy Before and After Marx*. New York: Routledge
12. Bammer A, ed. 1992. The question of "home." *New Formations* 17(Special Issue)
13. Berry JW. 1988. Acculturation and psychological adaptation among refugees. See Ref. 112, pp. 97–110
14. Betts T. 1980. *Spontaneous Settlement of Rural Refugees in Africa*. London: Euro-Action ACORD
15. Bhabha H. 1990. The third space. See Ref. 134, pp. 207–21
16. Bhabha H. 1992. The world and the home. *Social Text* 31/32:141–53
17. Biery-Hamilton G. 1993. Disruption of a population that did not relocate: the impact of the Tucurui Dam on a riverside community in the Brazilian Amazon. See Ref. 72, pp. 83–104
18. Bisharat G. N.d. Transformations in the political role and social identity of Palestinian refugees in the West Bank. In *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*, ed. A Gupta, J Ferguson. Durham: Duke Univ. Press. In press
19. Black R, Robinson V, eds. 1993. *Geography and Refugees: Patterns and Processes of Change*. London: Belhaven
20. Brik E, Colmenero A, Benedicto JM, Martinez J, Sancho C. 1988. An analysis of psychiatric ailments among refugees and asylum seekers in Spain. See Ref. 112, pp. 179–91
21. Centre for Documentation on Refugees. 1988. *A Selected and Annotated Bibliography on Refugee Children*. Geneva, Switzerland: Cent. Doc. Refug.
22. Chambers R. 1979. Rural refugees in Africa: what the eye does not see. *Disasters* 3(4):381–92
23. Chandler EHS. 1959. *The High Tower of Refuge: The Inspiring Story of Refugee Relief Throughout the World*. New York: Praeger
24. Chow R. 1993. *Writing Diaspora: Tactics of Intervention in Contemporary Cultural Studies*. Bloomington: Ind. Univ. Press
25. Cirtautas CK. 1957. *The Refugee: A Psychological Study*. Boston: Meador
26. Clifford J. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
27. Clifford J. 1991. Travelling cultures. In *Cultural Studies*, ed. L Grossberg, C Nelson, P Treichler, pp. 96–116. New York: Routledge
28. Clifford J. 1994. Diasporas. *Cult. Anthropol.* 9(3):302–38
29. Daniel EV, Knudsen JR, eds. 1995. *Mistrusting Refugees*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press. In press
30. Desrez M. 1988. The French Red Cross approach. See Ref. 112, pp. 299–303
31. DeVoe P. 1992. Refugee work and health in Mid-America. See Ref. 32, pp. 111–19
32. DeVoe P, ed. 1992. *Selected Papers on Refugee Issues*. Washington, DC: Comm. Refug. Issues, Am. Anthropol. Assoc.
33. Dowty A. 1987. *Closed Borders: The Con-*

temporary Assault on Freedom of Movement. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press

34. Eagleton T. 1970. *Exiles and Emigrés: Studies in Modern Literature*. New York: Schocken

35. Escobar A. 1991. Anthropology and the development encounter: the making and marketing of development anthropology. *Am. Ethnol.* 18(4):658–83

36. Ferguson J. 1994. *The Anti-Politics Machine: 'Development', Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis, MN: Univ. Minn. Press

37. Ferris EG. 1993. *Beyond Borders: Refugees, Migrants and Human Rights in the Post–Cold War Era*. Geneva: WCC

38. Forbes Martin S. 1992. *Refugee Women*. London: Zed

39. Foster R. 1991. Making national cultures in the global ecumene. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 20:235–60

40. Foucault M. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage

41. Foucault M. 1984. *Language, Counter-Memory and Practice*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press

42. Fustel de Coulanges ND. 1980. [1864.] *The Ancient City: A Study on the Religion, Laws, and Institutions of Greece and Rome*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press

43. Gallagher D. 1989. The evolution of the international refugee system. *Int. Migrat. Rev.* 23:579–98

44. Geiger V. 1993. Refugee cognitive expectations and sociocultural change theory. See Ref. 72, pp. 67–80

45. George S. 1992. *The Debt Boomerang: How the Third World Debt Harms Us All*. London: Pluto

46. Ghosh A. 1989. *The Shadowlines*. New York: Penguin

47. Ghosh A. 1994. The global reservation: notes toward an ethnography of international peacekeeping. *Cult. Anthropol.* 9(3):412–22

48. Gilroy P. 1990. Nationalism, history, and ethnic absolutism. *Hist. Workshop J.* 30:114–20

49. Gilroy P. 1991. It ain't where you're from, it's where you're at... The dialectics of diasporic identification. *Third Text* 13:3–16

50. Gilroy P. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

51. Gold SJ, ed. 1992. *Refugee Communities: A Comparative Field Study*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

52. Goodwin-Gill G. 1983. *The Refugee in International Law*. Oxford: Clarendon

53. Goodwin-Gill G, ed. 1990. *International Human Rights Law: The New Decade: Refugees—Facing Crisis in the 1990s*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press

54. Goodwin-Gill G, ed. 1991. The 1951 convention relating to the status of refugees: principles, problems, and potential. *Int. J. Refugee Law* 3(3) (Special Issue)

55. Gordenker L. 1983. Refugees in developing countries and transnational organization. *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.* 467:62–77

56. Gordenker L. 1987. *Refugees in International Politics*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

57. Grahl-Madsen A. 1966. *The Status of Refugees in International Law*, Vols. 1–2. Leyden, The Netherlands: Sijthoff

58. Gruber R. 1983. *Haven: The Unknown Story of 1,000 World War II Refugees*. New York: Coward-McCann

59. Gupta A. 1992. The song of the non-aligned world: transnational identities and the reinscription of space in late capitalism. *Cult. Anthropol.* 7(1):63–79

60. Gupta A, Ferguson J. 1992. Beyond "culture": space, identity, and the politics of difference. *Cult. Anthropol.* 7(1):6–23

61. Hall S. 1990. Cultural identity and diaspora. In *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, ed. J Rutherford, pp. 222–37. London: Lawrence & Wishart

62. Hall S, Critcher C, Jefferson T, Clarke J, Roberts B. 1979. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. London: Macmillan

63. Hamrell S, ed. 1967. *Refugee Problems in Africa*. Uppsala, Sweden: Scand. Inst. Afr. Stud.

64. Hannerz U. 1987. The world in creolisation. *Africa* 57(4):546–59

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

66. Harrell-Bond BE. 1986. *Imposing Aid: Emergency Assistance to Refugees*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press

67. Hathaway J. 1991. *The Law of Refugee Status*. Toronto: Butterworths

68. Hebdige D. 1987. *Cut'n'Mix: Culture, Identity, and Caribbean Music*. London: Methuen

69. Hein J. 1993. Refugees, immigrants, and the state. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 19:43–59

70. Holborn LW. 1956. *The International Refugee Organization*. London: Oxford Univ. Press

71. Holborn LW. 1975. *Refugees: A Problem of Our Time: The Work of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 1951–72*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow

72. Hopkins M, Donnelly N, eds. 1993. *Selected Papers on Refugee Issues*, Vol. 2. Arlington, VA: Comm. Refug. Issues, Am. Anthropol. Assoc.

73. Hulme K. 1953. *The Wild Place*. Boston: Little, Brown

74. International Labour Office. 1957. *International Migration, 1945–57*. Geneva: Int. Labour Off.

75. Jay M. 1986. *Permanent Exiles: Essays on the Intellectual Migration from Germany to America*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

76. Kaplan C. 1987. *The Poetics of Displacement: Exile, Immigration, and Travel in Contemporary Autobiographical Writing*. PhD thesis. Univ. Calif., Santa Cruz

77. Kearney M. 1986. From the invisible hand to visible feet: anthropological studies of migration and development. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 15:331–61

78. Kee R. 1961. *Refugee World*. London: Oxford Univ. Press

79. Keely C. 1981. *Global Refugee Policy: The Case for a Development Oriented Strategy*. New York: Popul. Counc.

80. Keller S. 1975. *Uprooting and Social Change: The Role of Refugees in Development*. Delhi: Manohar

81. Kent DP. 1953. *The Refugee Intellectual*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

82. Kibreab G. 1985. *African Refugees: Reflections on the African Refugee Problem*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World

83. Kitaj RB. 1989. *First Diasporist Manifesto*. New York: Thames & Hudson

84. Koestler A. 1941. *Scum of the Earth*. New York: Macmillan

85. Krulfeld R. 1993. Bridling Leviathan: new paradigms of method and theory in culture change from refugee studies and related issues of power and empowerment. See Ref. 72, pp. 29–41

86. Kulischer EM. 1943. *The Displacement of Population in Europe*. Montreal: Int. Labour Off.

87. Kulischer EM. 1948. *Europe on the Move: War and Population Changes, 1917–47*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

88. Kunz EF. 1973. The refugee in flight: kinetic models and forms of displacement. *Int. Migrat. Rev.* 7(2):125–46

89. Kunz EF. 1981. Exile and resettlement: refugee theory. *Int. Migrat. Rev.* 15(1): 42–51

90. Kuper L. 1982. *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press

91. Lafitte F. 1988. *The Internment of Aliens*. London: Libris

92. Deleted in proof

93. Lawyers Committee for Human Rights. 1991. *The Human Rights of Refugees and Displaced Persons: Protections Afforded Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Displaced Persons under International Human Rights, Humanitarian, and Refugee Law*. New York: Lawyers Comm. Hum. Rights

94. Lévi-Strauss C. 1974. *Tristes Tropiques*. New York: Atheneum

95. Loescher G. 1986. *Humanitarianism and Politics in Central America. Work. Pap. No. 86*. Notre Dame, Ind.: Helen Kellogg Inst. Int. Stud., Univ. Notre Dame

96. Loescher G. 1992. *Refugee Movements and International Security. Adelphi Paper 268*, Int. Inst. Strat. Stud. London: Brassey's

97. Loescher G, Loescher AD. 1982. *The World's Refugees: A Test of Humanity*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich

98. Loescher G, Monahan L, eds. 1989. *Refugees and International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press

99. Loescher G, Scanlan J, eds. 1983. The global refugee problem: U.S. and world response. *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.* 467:1–253 (Special Issue)

100. Löfgren O. 1989. The nationalization of culture. *Ethnol. Eur.* 19(1):5–24

101. Macey D. 1993. *The Lives of Michel Foucault: A Biography*. New York: Pantheon

102. Malkki L. 1985. *The Origin of a Device of Power: The Refugee Camp in Post-War Europe*. Specials Pap., Dep. Anthropol., Harvard Univ.

103. Malkki L. 1992. National Geographic: the rooting of peoples and the territorialization of national identity among scholars and refugees. *Cult. Anthropol.* 7(1):24–44

104. Malkki L. 1994. Citizens of humanity: internationalism and the imagined community of nations. *Diaspora* 3(1):41–68

105. Malkki L. 1995. *Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory, and National Cosmology among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

106. Malkki L. 1995. Speechless emissaries: refugees, humanitarianism, and dehistoricization. In *Siting Culture*, ed. K Fog Olwig, K Hastrup. Oslo: Scand. Univ. Press. In press

107. Marrus M. 1985. *The Unwanted: European Refugees in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press

108. Martin B, Mohanty CT. 1986. Feminist politics: what's home got to do with it? In *Feminist Studies/Critical Studies*, ed. T De Lauretis, pp. 191–212. Bloomington: Ind. Univ. Press

109. Marx E. 1990. The social world of refugees: a conceptual framework. *J. Refug. Stud.* 3(3):189–203

110. Massey D. 1992. A place called home? *New Formations* 17:3–15

111. Melander G, Nobel P, eds. 1979. *International Legal Instruments on Refugees in Africa*. Uppsala, Sweden: Scand. Inst. Afr. Stud.

112. Miserez D, ed. 1988. *Refugees—The Trauma of Exile*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff

113. Naficy H. 1993. *The Making of Exile Cul-*

tures: *Iranian Television in Los Angeles*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press

114. Nobel P. 1987. Notes on the right to development. See Ref. 115, pp. 47–52

115. Nobel P, ed. 1987. *Refugees and Development in Africa*. Uppsala, Sweden: Scand. Inst. Afr. Stud.

116. Nobel P. 1988. Refugees and other migrants viewed with a legal eye—or how to fight confusion.See Ref. 122, pp. 18–31

117. Norwood FA. 1969. *Strangers and Exiles: A History of Religious Refugees*, Vols. 1–2. Nashville, TN: Abingdon

118. Nourissier F. 1950. *L'homme humilié: sort des réfugiés et 'personnes déplacés,' 1912–50*. Paris: Spes

119. Passaro J. N.d. *Men On the Street, Women In Their Place: An Ethnography of Homelessness in New York City*. New York: Routledge. In press

120. Peck JM. 1995. Refugees as foreigners: the problem of becoming German and finding home. See Ref. 29, pp. 149–86

121. Perrin I. 1948. Voyage chez les parias d'Occident. In *Personnes déplacées*, ed. F Berge, pp. 179–211. Paris: Clermont

122. Petersen KH, Rutherford A, eds. 1988. *Displaced Persons*. Sydney, Australia: Dangaroo

123. Proudfoot M. 1956. *European Refugees: 1939–52—A Study in Forced Population Movement*. London: Faber & Faber

124. Questions of method: an interview with Michel Foucault. 1981. *I & C Publ.* 8: 3–14

125. Refugee Policy Group. 1991. *A Selected Bibliography on Refugee Health: A Joint Project of the UNHCR Center for Documentation on Refugees, and the Refugee Policy Group*. Washington, DC: Refug. Policy Group

126. Ressler EM, Boothby N, Steinbock DJ. 1988. *Unaccompanied Children: Care and Protection in Wars, Natural Disasters, and Refugee Movements*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

127. Ristelhueber R. 1951. *Au secours des réfugiés*. Paris: Plon

128. Robinson V. 1990. Into the next millennium: an agenda for refugee studies. A report of the first annual meeting of the international advisory panel, January 1990. *J. Refugee Stud.* 3(1):3–15

129. Rogge JR, ed. 1987. *Refugees: A Third World Dilemma*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield

130. Rogge JR. 1992. Return to Cambodia: the significance and implications of past, present and future spontaneous repatriations. In *Repatriation During Conflict in Africa and Asia*, ed. FC Cuny, BN Stein, P Reed, pp. 103–95. Dallas, TX: Cent. Stud. Soc. Crisis

131. Rosaldo R. 1994. Cultural citizenship and educational democracy. *Cult. Anthropol.* 9(3):402–11

132. Rouse R. 1991. Mexican migration and the social space of postmodernism. *Diaspora* 1(1):8–23

133. Rushdie S. 1991. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism, 1981–91*. London: Granta

134. Rutherford J, ed. 1990. *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence & Wishart

135. Said E. 1984. Reflections on exile. *Granta* 13:159–72

136. Sandler RH, Jones TC, eds. 1987. *Medical Care of Refugees*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press

137. Sayigh R. 1994. *Too Many Enemies*. London: Zed

138. Schechtmann JB. 1946. *European Population Transfers, 1939–45*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

139. Schechtmann JB. 1962. *Postwar Population Transfers in Europe, 1945–55*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press

140. Schechtmann JB. 1963. *The Refugee in the World: Displacement and Integration*. New York: Barnes

141. Scudder T, Colson E. 1982. From welfare to development: a conceptual framework for the analysis of dislocated people. See Ref. 65, pp. 267–87

142. Seidel M. 1986. *Exile and the Narrative Imagination*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press

143. Shacknove AE. 1985. Who is a refugee? *Ethics* 95:274–85

144. Shawcross W. 1989. A tourist in the refugee world. In *Forced Out: The Agony of the Refugee In Our Time*, ed. C Kismaric, pp. 28–30. New York: Random House

145. Sherman AJ. 1973. *Island Refuge: Britain and Refugees from the Third Reich 1933–39*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

146. Sieghart P. 1983. *The International Law of Human Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon

147. Simpson JH. 1938. *The Refugee Problem: Report of a Survey*. London: Royal Inst. Int. Affairs

148. Simpson JH. 1939. *The Refugee Problem: Report of a Survey*. London: Oxford Univ. Press

149. Sjöberg T. 1991. *The Powers and the Persecuted: The Refugee Problem and the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees (IGCR), 1938–47*. Lund Stud. Int. Hist. 26. Lund, Sweden: Lund Univ. Press

150. Squires J, ed. 1992. Hybridity. *New Formations* 18 (Theme Issue)

151. Starn O. 1986. Engineering internment: anthropologists and the War Relocation Authority. *Am. Ethnol.* 13(4):700–20

152. Stein BN. 1981. The refugee experience: defining the parameters of a field of study. *Int. Migrat. Rev.* 15(1):320–30

153. Stein BN. 1981. Documentary note: refugee research bibliography. *Int. Migrat. Rev.* 15(1):331–93

154. Stein BN. 1986. Durable solutions for developing country refugees. *Int. Migrat. Rev.* 20(2):264–82

155. Stoessinger JG. 1956. *The Refugee and the World Community.* Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press

156. Tabori P. 1972. *The Anatomy of Exile: A Semantic and Historical Study.* London: Harrap

157. Taylor R, Nathan D. 1980. *Resettlement casework: the role of the professional.* Presented at Annu. Meet. Conf. Jewish Communal Serv., Denver

158. Thompson D. 1938. *Refugees: Anarchy or Organization?* New York: Random House

159. Tölölyan K. 1991. The nation-state and its others: in lieu of a preface. *Diaspora* 1(1): 3–7

160. Turner S. 1995. Torture, refuge, and trust. See Ref. 29, pp. 82–106

161. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). 1985. *A Selected and Annotated Bibliography on Refugee Women. A Joint Project of the Office of the UNHCR & Refugee Policy Group for the UN Decade for Women.* Geneva: UNHCR/ Washington, DC: Refugee Policy Group

162. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). 1993. *The State of the World's Refugees: The Challenge of Protection.* Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin

163. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), Centre for Documentation on Refugees. 1993. *Refug. Abstr.* 12(1). Geneva: UNHCR

164. United States Army Medical Service. 1976. *Preventive Medicine in World War II.* Vol. 8: *Civil Affairs, Military Government, Public Health Activities.* Washington, DC: Off. Surgeon Gen., Dept. Army

165. United States Congress. 1947. *Displaced Persons and the International Refugee Organization.* Washington, DC: House of Represent., Comm. Foreign Affairs

166. Verhelst T. 1990. *No Life Without Roots: Culture and Development.* London: Zed

167. Vernant J. 1953. *The Refugee in the Post-War World.* New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press

168. Warner D. 1994. Voluntary repatriation and the meaning of return to home: a critique of liberal mathematics. Presented at 4th Int. Res. Advis. Panel Conf., Somerville College, Univ. Oxford

169. Westermeyer J. 1987. Psychiatric care of refugees. See Ref. 136, pp. 213–18

170. Williams BF. 1989. A class act: anthropology and the race to nation across ethnic terrain. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 18:401–44

171. Williams P, Chrisman L, eds. 1994. *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader.* New York: Columbia Univ. Press

172. Woodbridge G. 1950. *UNRRA: The History of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration,* Vols. 1–3. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

173. Wyman M. 1989. *DP: Europe's Displaced Persons, 1945–51.* Philadelphia: Balch Inst. Press

174. Zetter R. 1988. Refugees and refugee studies—a label and an agenda. *J. Refug. Stud.* 1(1):1–6

175. Zetter R. 1988. Refugees, repatriation, and root causes. *J. Refug. Stud.* 1(2):99–106

176. Zolberg A. 1983. The formation of new states as a refugee-generating process. *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.* 467:24–38

177. Zolberg A, Suhrke A, Aguayo S. 1989. *Escape from Violence:Conflict and the Refugee Crisis in the Developing World.* Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press