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Thinking Post-Home: An Introduction

Safet HadžiMuhamedović and Marija Grujić

What is home after home? Where do bodies, landscapes and communities reside once alienated from the habitual? In its aftermath, does a dwelling continue to dwell? Can forms of belonging be replanted, or replaced with new ones? And, what kinds of claims are articulated in the belonging inclusive of absence?

The following contributions on post-home tackle such vexed questions by situating them within specific timespaces of movement, travel and forced migration, through gendered and bodily transformations, in religious ritual and the promise of the eternal, through the dire straits of developmental projects, the loss and disintegration of social relations, as well as through the resurrected colonial and nationalist tropes. Each contribution unfolds intertwined intimate and political (hi)stories to keep pace with the workings of the returning pasts, arrested presents and imaginatively negotiated futures.

Post-home considers some of the ways in which the meanings and expressions of ‘home’ might change after persons, communities and things ‘move’ – by will, force, rituals, dreams, or otherwise – towards new spaces, times and bodies, as well as through new political and affective capacities. Whatever the ‘novel’ horizons bring, such movements seem to always be predicated on something denied, discarded or left behind, something that lingers, dialectically, in the present positionalities. Post-home, as a condition, often entails some kind of eviction from the world – an erosion of ontological security – variously managed and felt on the skin. Yet, these evictions do not amount to evacuation – one’s new place in the world does not mushroom in a vacuum. Home does not disappear into thin air; it is continuously generative of the place and time (or the placelessness and timeless) of its aftermath. In other words, this special issue does not simply engage with situations where one ‘home’ is supplanted by another. We are looking at post-home worlding, a processual condition where the ‘post-’ is always in relation to ‘home’ and vice versa.

Post-home is also an inward perspective on the self and the other – fraught with both past and present relations of power – as they unfold the world. We think of it as a ‘site’ of political articulation and affect. For hooks (1990: 41-9), homeplace as a ‘site of resistance’ questions the ontological
(in)security that the notion of ‘home’ might suggest. It reveals a set of co-emerging and co-constructing categories of power – such as family, race, gender and class – that weave a web of unhomely and homely ‘homes’, left for us to uncover through movement.

Post-home blends the homely and the unhomely: it exposes the oft-violent structures of ‘home’, ‘homecoming’, ‘unhomeliness’ and ‘alienation’, yet it also maintains the affective pull of home as the anchoring of the self in the world. Glancing ‘home’ from such interstices initiates the simultaneous processes of homing and unhoming. In the present, the past ‘home’ emerges as the fullness and the absence of ‘being at home’, revealing itself in different shapes and through multiple registers.

Unhoming ruptures

In his poem ‘The Nightmare’, Abdulah Sidran (1997: 41) sketched the phantasmagorical landscapes of loss: his character narrates a dream in which he sings, with a voice he has not, in a tongue he has not, about a house he has not. Through these ‘unthinkable’ workings of alienation, Sidran’s dreamer finds the only available home: its total inversion. This multiplicity of present absences locates for us a phenomenon with haunting qualities – an indelible disposition that enounces one’s self through the no longer graspable, the no longer accommodating. The post-home here sounds a reverberation of home where (or when and how) home cannot be, a present-future where the past constantly is despite the fact that it is not and will not be. This post-home worlding is thus anchored in the fullness of absence.

An effort to re-place one’s self may hurt. Post-home may be reluctant to emplacement. As we read in Saakshi Joshi’s article, the people forcefully displaced by the construction of the Tehri Dam experienced various forms of bodily resistance to new, unhomely spaces, including digestive disorders, respiratory problems and joint pain. In their critical review of Nora Krug’s (2018) graphic novel Heimat, Marija Grujić and Ina Schaum write for this special issue on how Krug’s feeling-at-home is shaken by the experience of

1 For Freud, unheimlich (usually translated as ‘uncanny’, but literally ‘unhome-ly’) did not simply describe the strange or the unfamiliar; rather, he argued, ‘the “uncanny” is that class of the terrifying which leads back to something long known to us, once very familiar’ (1955: 220).

In both the dictionary form and its most frequently quoted – Freudian – conceptualisation, homely and unhomely entangle, as Henriette Steiner noted: ‘das Unheimliche, literally meaning unhomely, enfolds the word heimlich, homely. [...] The transition from homely to strange, which is implied in the notion of das Unheimliche, more often than not has its origin in the most intimate realm relating to the body or the domestic sphere’ (2010: 135).

2 Similarly, in another of his poems, ‘Planet Sarajevo’, a girl picks non-existent flowers with her non-existent hand (Sidran 1997: 11). The homely world, dissolved, continues to exist like a phantom limb.
migration, in which familiar ‘things’ become sources of desired homeliness. Writer Dubravka Ugrešić, on the other hand, finds her post-home ‘nest’ in the ‘non-place’ of the airport: ‘I feel good here. I am a human larva. Here, in this no man’s land, I shall weave my natural nest. I shall wander from sector A to B, from sector B to sector C. I shall never leave’ (1994: 225). Her ontological (or, ‘post-ontological’) harbour is anchorless, a space where nothing ‘sticks’, an unhomely refuge from the many ‘homes’ determined to accommodate.

The authors in this special issue variously seek to understand what happens to ‘home’ – as a sense of (place in) the world – after certain unhoming ruptures. These moments produce tectonic rifts between what is in the ontological sense of the measure of the world and what is as the new – wanted or unwanted – existential condition. The articles highlight a set of geographically, historically and affectively different unhoming ruptures: Vanja Hamzić writes about the nirban rituals in the Punjabi city of Lahore, which establish not only the new ‘gender’ subjectivity and the home-kinship framework of the dera household for the khwajasara individuals, but also entail the severance of ties with natal families and the mis-sexed bodily characteristics; Katie Hayne encounters unhoming, and captures it visually, in a large public housing precinct scheduled for demolition in Canberra, Australia; Saakshi Joshi writes about the affective and geographic unhoming of Tehri in India through the construction of the Tehri Dam and the town of New Tehri; Alys Tomlinson takes us on a visual journey through the moments of spiritual displacement – unhoming and homing – at three European pilgrimage sites; Tom Selwyn takes three recent critical events in Britain (the Brexit referendum, the fire at Grenfell Tower and the ‘Windrush scandal’) as the starting points for a conversation on the persistent loss of home with the new politics of a ‘hostile environment’; Lauren Harding demonstrates how events such as the cataclysmic tsunami of the 1700s or the ‘discovery’ of the ‘New World’ and the subsequent settler policies and practices form part of the narration and negotiation of home for the Knighton family in Qua-ba-diwa (within contemporary Canada); Dragana Kovačević Bielicki looks at the rifts in diasporic belonging following the displacement produced by the 1990s war in Bosnia.

In each discussion, then, we see that post-home hinges upon unhoming ruptures – breaks within the sense of order and continuity – movements away from the habitual. By opening a critical abyss between the safety of being and the uncertain horizons, such events may defy articulation. They confuse the bodily registers; they are ‘out of place’. These ‘moments of disorientation’, Sara Ahmed (2006: 155) has argued, ‘are bodily experiences that throw the world up, or throw the body from its ground’. Post-home continues to exist precisely where home is felt as unsettled, or where the world becomes unhomed. Such journeys are often, as we read in bell hook’s (1990: 41-9) experience, diverse in their duration, sometimes simultaneous to ‘home’.
Post-home is not a ‘homeless’ condition, but one where the homely and the unhomely reside together and negotiate each other. It starts with a notion of ‘home’ that always already contains ‘movement’, which implies that being ‘away’ does not produce a ‘migrant ontology’ (Ahmed 1999). In her critique of the ontologised notion of ‘home’ as the ‘stasis of being’, Ahmed (ibid.) noted that estrangement stands for the process of transition from ‘familiarity’ to ‘strangeness’, but cautioned against generalisations that ‘conceal how estrangement marks out particular selves and communities’ (ibid.: 344).

As we explain later in this introduction, we are not merely thinking of home in the familiar, domestic, architectural, geographical, or territorial senses; we rather see home ontologically, as the broad perimeter (‘measure around’) of one’s ‘what is’. Thus, the unhoming ruptures summon the ‘what is’ frames of the world, which are absorbed by bodies and landscapes, against the ‘what is not’ made real in one way or another.4

Fateful and disorienting as they may be, unhoming ruptures are not to be abstracted from their historical, legal, political and other contexts, as the contributors to this special issue carefully argue. Veena Das (1997) has looked at ‘critical events’ in India, events that propel redefinitions of social categories, after which certain novel forms of action become possible. Attempting to bridge the divide between the large-scale social processes and an individual life, she demonstrated the ‘mutual implication’ of various social institutions in eventful fissures.

Our contributors reflect on contested histories, past and present, within various geographies, as well as the discursive and affective registers of ‘home’. They complicate any home-as-such through the restless intimate and political vocabularies of their research contexts. For us, then, post-home as a notion offers an analytical dimension to ‘home’ – as it is, was, will be – and summons ontologies of (in)security of being in terms of places, housing and movement, as well as through the resistance to segregation and ‘status’ divisions. Post-home offers a way of speaking about the tectonic social shifts that are unfinished – which reverberate and fold the past into the present-future in different ways – as well as about the dialectic between stasis and movement.

---

3 Or, as Homi Bhabha noted, ‘[t]o be unhomed is not to be homeless […]’ (1992: 141). Sara Ahmed (1999: 339) argued that we should avoid references to ‘home’ by way of what home is not (‘the homelessness of migration and exile’): ‘By being defined negatively in this way, home henceforth becomes associated with stasis, boundaries, identity and fixity’.

4 Anthony Giddens (1991) suggested that ontological security – an existential anchoring of reality – may be understood as ‘a sense of continuity and order in events, including those not directly within the perceptual environment of the individual’ (ibid.: 243). Responses to what he called ‘fateful moments’, which threaten ontological security, cannot easily make use of the existing formulae developed as part of one’s habituated knowledge (ibid.: 45, 114, 185).
Movement is not an ‘innocent’ category. It divides people and places in terms of origin, current residency, legality and other variables, along the grids of power that define one’s status, belonging and the right to home. In this issue, we see numerous status divisions – into the gendered ‘casts’ and outcasts, as well as between the classes or castes, into the migrants, the ‘aliens’, the tourists, the pilgrims, the refugees, the returnees, the asylum seekers, the rightful citizens and the autochthonous dwellers, or the First Nations, the indigenous, and so on – but also that such categories are internally conflicted and continuously redefined.5

Even the simplest ‘journey across town’, hooks (1990: 41-49) described, may expose one’s self as other and to others. The motion from the ‘segregated blackness’ of her residence towards her grandmother’s house in the middle of a ‘white neighbourhood’ placed her body amidst the dominant power relations. What lingered in such movement through ‘terrifying whiteness’ was a tension felt, residing in the fissures between the processes of belonging, unbelonging and nonbelonging. Even the houses would ‘stare with hate’ and ‘speak’, warning about the lurking ‘dangers’, the nonbelonging and the unsafety (ibid.: 41). For hooks, then, homecoming seems to signify the process of bodily attunement to segregation. Such orientation (and resistance) through homing can be felt ‘inside’ the homeplaces, as ruptures on a daily basis.6

Our focus on ‘unhoming ruptures’ in the research of post-home is different from the conventional historicist focus on historical events. Fernand Braudel called such an ‘eventful’ perspective l’histoire événementielle, ‘the history of events: surface disturbances, crests of foam that the tides of history carry on their strong backs. A history of brief, rapid, nervous fluctuations’ (1995 [1949]: 21). Instead, he looked towards the longue durée, the slow yet substantial changes. In assembling a reading of post-home, we see the ‘abrupt’ historical event as part of the wider historical, political currents and the affective resonances of loss. These currents are assembled as histories of the present and intimately tied to the futurities of the present.7

5 Indeed, there is a (renewed) sense of urgency, to take these status divisions and the question of home seriously in light of the growing refugee displacement and anti-migrant hostility, Selwyn argues in his contribution to this issue (see also Selwyn and Frost 2018: 1).

6 In hooks’ (1990: 41) words: ‘Oh! that feeling of safety, of arrival, of homecoming when we finally reached the edges of her yard, when we could see the soot black face of our grandfather, Daddy Gus, sitting in his chair on the porch, smell his cigar, and rest on his lap. Such a contrast, that feeling of arrival, of homecoming, this sweetness and the bitterness of that journey, that constant reminder of white power and control.’

7 As Michael Foucault (2010: 20–21) suggests, the ‘history of the present’ offers a methodological frame for diagnosing and defining ‘the present’; it is the ‘critical thought which takes the form of an ontology of ourselves, of present reality’ (see also Garland 2014: 372).
The very concept of post-home signals the uncanny amalgamation of the before and the after. It is marked by precariousness of one sort or another. This kind of insecurity, synonymous to home (which is often understood as security and shelter), may only be described through situated lives. Together with the other contributors, we thus argue for an ethnographic turn to the history of the body standing in and being projected through its fluctuating world (and its political). Such history is intimate, fragile, fragmented and vivacious. It may travel through stories, cosmologies, political changes, personal and collectivised anxieties, gender taxonomies, infrastructural demands, technologies, and so on.

In his contribution to this issue, Hamzić certainly reveals how any conversation on the contemporary khwajasara lifeworlds requires a rummage through the fragments of spun-out histories of empires, colonial enterprises and subjective positionings (see also Hamzić 2016). Likewise, Harding suggests that the indigenous notions of home in the state of Canada reverberate with colonial (as well as pre- and post-colonial) political and environmental interventions. Tom Selwyn proposes that three recent events – Brexit, the Grenfell fire and the ‘Windrush scandal’ – may be read through the entwined histories of colonialism, racism and capitalism, as well as the right-wing ‘anti-social dispositions’ at least since the introduction of Thatcherite policies. Saakshi Joshi shows how the national, colonial and life histories intersect in the responses to the development-induced displacement of Tehri inhabitants in India. Reviewing Krug’s graphic novel Heimat, Grujić and Schaum write that the places reminding Krug of Germany and signifying home and homeland ‘are distant in the past, and yet emerge as intimate in proximity’. They notice that Krug, as someone who belongs to the generation ‘after’ (the war), knows these places ‘through a sense of complicity and accountability’. Post-home for the authors thus means a process of inhabiting the post-memories and the ghostly narratives about the perpetrators of the terrifying violence.

Life (hi)stories of post-home also demand a fuller conversation about the past and the future than historiography is able to provide. What is required is to open the research to various forms of ‘historicity’ (as an anthropological concept), in which the past and the future share a present horizon. As Eric Hirsch and Charles Stewart (2005: 262) have noted, historicity is about ‘the manner in which persons operating under the constraints of social ideologies make sense of the past, while anticipating the future’. To look for such histories is about more than ‘objective’ evidence about something bounded in the past and separate from the present and future. Lived, habituated home in the ‘post-’ unfences the conversation about the historical, communal and political changes from the mere sequence in the archive, and ties it into the expectations, hopes, fears and dreams of the future.
Unhoming ruptures generate an unavoidable conversation about the continuity and coherence of home – about what lingers, transforms or dissipates – requiring a pursuit of the restless genealogies of the present.

What lingers? On home and dwelling

How do we place home into language? It may be useful to state the obvious: home and house are English words. They have partially discernible genealogies (Hollander 1991: 39-40). Home, as an English noun, may be etymologically traced through the German *heim*, and then further into the more speculative Indo-European root *kei*, meaning ‘to lie or settle’ (ibid.). An Indo-European root of an English word could, for example, relate not only to the enduring lexical forms, but also to an ontological assertion. Joseph Rykwert has noted:

> It follows that a notion so deeply rooted in human experience should have its appropriate term in every language: yet translators have always complained about the difficulty of finding an exact equivalent for it – particularly in Romance languages. (1993: 47-48)

So, what is lost in the translation of home? And, what lingers? We do not want to offer here a broad discussion of home’s linguistic, affective and political histories. However, if we are looking at non-English-speaking spaces whilst working through the hegemony of the English language, we need to consider how other worldings might make different claims about ‘home’. We do not suggest that ‘etymology is destiny’, in English or any other context, although it does have the potential to hint at some enduring ontological frameworks.

Translation is only ever partial. For the Pakistani khwajasara, Hamzić notes in his contribution, the dera as home may not only be a family household idealised against the violence of natal homes and the state, but also a place of vocational training, site of sex work, dance studio, ritual sanctuary, beauty salon, local kindergaten and a bank-like depository. Saakshi Joshi, in her article, observes how language registers the affectivity of home, differentiating between the house-as-home (ghar) and the house-as-residence (makān). As one of her interlocutors poignantly noted: ‘The transition from a makān to a ghar takes several generations. The former is brick and cement. The latter is filled with emotions through which it comes to life’.

Investigating home ‘within’ one codified language does not alleviate the problem of translation. In many Slavic languages dom (or its variants) is the word for ‘home’. Dom comes from the Proto-Indo-European *dem-* (‘to

---

8 On home and language, see also Selwyn and Frost (2018: 10-11).
9 Indeed, the word ‘etymology’ is a case in point. Derived from the Greek étu-mos (‘true’), etymologies are often employed in search of various truths and continuities, which have political reverberations.
build’), but it also dwells in the Ustaše Nazi salute Za dom spremni! (‘Ready for home!’), or similar exclusionary political slogans. Selwyn and Harding, in their respective contributions, show how home as (national) homeland may run against home as a sense of security and community. In different ways, they both argue that hospitality can be an act of resistance to the (un)homing tactics of the state.

Language is a site of homing and unhoming. In her contribution, Kovačević Bielicki describes language-based discrimination experienced by one of her ‘returnee’ interlocutors, who was scorned by the teacher for not being as proficient in her ‘mother tongue’ as the other children: ‘There you see. She cannot read, and all of them from the West think they are better than us’.

The English word ‘dwelling’ works as both a noun and a verb. As a noun it suggests a spatial home, a specific site of residence. As a verb, it reveals the temporality of being, the protracted attachment to something. It can signify a duration of life in one place, a focused meditation over some topic, but also an interval, a break within the worldly pace (a lingering of eyes upon something, a pause in the work of a machine). The etymology of ‘dwelling’ leads through Old English dwellan, ‘to lead astray, deceive; to hinder; to wander; to tarry’, to Old High German twaljan, ‘to hinder, delay’ and Old Norse dvelja ‘to linger, delay, tarry’ (see Klein 1966: 491, Partridge 1966: 901). As we explain later on, we do not seek to provide a definition of home in one etymology or another. Home is for us a heuristic device to canvass various ideas about being and belonging. Yet, the origins of words are phenomenological – suggestive of situated experience – and seem to offer a glimpse into the eventful, long-term and bodily histories.

Through this limited lexical sequence, we want to ask what home might be across difference? Language ontologises. In the context of writing descriptions of the world, there is nothing innocent about home’s associated English idioms. There is a homeland, but not a homesea, the warmth of home, but not its chilliness; one leaves home and returns to it, but is hardly ever said to be simultaneously at home and away from it; one is homesick or homeless, but somehow never homeful...

Perhaps it would be good to first start with the images summoned by home and its associated idioms. Landscape, a term with a shorter and more readable history, travelled to English language in the late sixteenth century through the landschap of the ‘Dutch Golden Age’ painting. Reaching further than home, it eventually became a ubiquitous term in art, science and colloquial language. Yet, it is rooted in particular kinds of representations of nature. As Eric Hirsch has noted, the painterly origin of this concept is impor-
tant: ‘What came to be seen as landscape was recognized as such because it reminded the viewer of a painted landscape, often of European origin’ (1995: 2).

These images are powerful in how they direct knowledge; they may help us discern a landscape from a random patch of woodland, or place from non-place. In Alys Tomlinson’s photograph on the cover of this issue, one is unsure whether the sight is of a dense woodland or a clearing. The tendency to provide a frame (a bounded dwelling) to the sights of the world is a lingering one. As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argued, we tend to project a container – an in-out orientation – onto the encountered world, as an ontological metaphor, or a metaphor we live by.\footnote{As Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 29) note: ‘A clearing in the woods is seen as having a bounding surface, and we can view ourselves as being in the clearing or out of the clearing, in the woods or out of the woods. A clearing in the woods has something we can perceive as a natural boundary – the fuzzy area where the trees more or less stop and the clearing more or less begins. But even where there is no natural physical boundary that can be viewed as defining a container, we impose boundaries — marking off territory so that it has an inside and a bounding surface — whether a wall, a fence, or an abstract line or plane.’} In this issue, Lauren Harding notices that the Canadian colonial and national epistemologies employ the notion of ‘wilderness’ to position indigenous lands as empty – uninhabited and placeless – and thus conquerable territory.

Home’s taxonomy and imagery mix our personal experiences with the wider systems of metaphors and metonyms. To ‘see home’, like seeing a landscape, implies an application of these trajectories onto an unsuspecting community, which is why we need to critically situate our conceptual frameworks before engaging in projects of description.

The ‘post-’ in post-home

What is this home that tarries into its ‘post’? Is one measure of the world supplanted onto another, or does the world double with the new location of its sighting? In her Lost in Translation (2011 [1989]: 132), Eva Hoffman wrote about her Poland in the past, as seen from her exile in the United States – Poland ‘coeval with the dimensions of reality’ – from which all distances were measured. With the migrant’s ‘double vision’, she saw it as the Poland of herself and as it emerges for others on the map – a place among other places (imagined as ‘communism’ and place ‘without freedom’). With displacement, she noted, the world had been shifted away from her centre.

However, the axis that for her was displaced could be regained. Her displacement has palpable meaning; she regains what is lost and experiences it anew through language (ibid.: 132), which becomes a ‘memento’ of the past dwelling, loss and belonging. The post-homely grip onto the world often...
functions by way of references to the past, an anchoring ‘captured’ through objects, images and practices. Objects taken by refugees onto their journeys may become repositories of relations and sentiments, and may play an important role in the re-articulation of the shifting boundaries of cultural knowledge (Parkin 1999).

The ‘post-’ in post-home denotes a spatio-temporal movement. Like Marianne Hirsch’s notion of ‘postmemory’, it also ‘signals more than a temporal delay and more than a location in an aftermath’ (Hirsch 2008: 106). It is a ‘post-’ shared by post-colonialism, post-socialism, post-modernity and post-war knowledge. Thinking ‘between the posts’ might be crucial for the knowledge production on both the ‘before’ and the ‘after’. Sharad Chari and Katherine Verdery (2009) invited us to ‘think between the posts’ of colonialism and socialism, in terms of their effects on ethnographies and knowledge production. Nevertheless, they stressed that abrupt changes are only the nominal ‘ends’ of colonialism and socialism, and that the results are much more complex for those directly affected.

The material, affective and epistemic elements of colonial homemaking, Ann Laura Stoler argued, do not disappear when empires cease to exist, but rather survive in their ‘aftershocks’ – as imperial debris – sticking to ‘structures, sensibilities, and things’ (2008: 194). Considering homes, landscapes and community in post-partition Cyprus, Yael Navaro turned to the concept of ruination, to ‘refer to the material remains or artefacts of destruction and violation, but also to the subjectivities and residual affects that linger, like a hangover, in the aftermath of war or violence’ (2009: 5, see also Navaro 2012). Whilst looking for signs of ‘shared’ Bosnian saints in the archives of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, Safet HadžiMuhamedović argued that syncretic debris is the outcome of ‘deep lacerations in the relational fabric, of the cavernous charting of otherness, of the violent unmaking of the world’ (2018b: 86). Yet, the destinations to which such debris of the social travels and gets to be re-articulated are primarily determined by the original ‘impact’ (ibid.: 79-80).

---

12 For Hirsch (2001, 2008), postmemory emerges after traumatic events for generations who did not have ‘direct’ experience of the events yet embody them as part of their own life histories. We also follow Hirsch’s argument that ‘painful histories’ and the ‘belated nature of traumatic memory itself’ form the knowledge and experience of the generations ‘after’ (2001: 11-12).

13 In their comparative reading of the postsocialist and postcolonial scholarship, Chari and Verdery (2009) have argued for a key similarity of the two ‘posts’: ‘both labels signify the complex results of the abrupt changes forced on those who underwent them: that is, becoming something other than socialist or other than colonized’ (ibid.: 11).
The eventfulness of wars and the multiple modes of violence inflicted upon ‘people and place’ marked for us a significant ‘post-’ to think with in the process of writing about post-home. As we have learnt during our formative years in the ‘countries we come from’, the remnants of war (as well as socialism) are everlasting and continuously emerge from multiple sources – bodies, homes, dreams... – in so many ways that it would require a timeless time to both record and repeat them. So, ‘post-’ does not sight ‘home’ by taking a temporal look ‘backward’; we do not attach the ‘post-’ to designate some aftermath of ‘home’, which would thus inevitably be rendered as frozen in time, left behind, destroyed, taken away, hijacked or interrupted. For us, the ‘post-’ of ‘home’ rather captures what it does for Hirsch in her analysis of postmemory – ‘an uneasy oscillation between continuity and rupture’ (Hirsch 2008: 106). To spell out post-home, we embrace the hyphen. It suggests a single condition clustering around a rupture and connects the apparently disparate meanings of being-at-home and being-after/away-from-home.

The ‘post-’ of home signals something as ‘past’, yet with long-lasting effects and multifaceted residues. The ‘post-’ of home also encounters the effects of alienation and estrangement in the forms of displacement, distiming (Jansen 2009a; Jansen and Löfving 2007) and distimeplacement (HadžiMuhamedović 2018a). Yet, as HadžiMuhamedović notes, time and place are but frames of what has been lost and entangle systems of relationships and sensations (ibid.: 111).

Through the concept of post-home, we also ask if ‘home’ is contingent on ‘not-home’, the way that ‘I’ is performed through the ‘Other’. We take inspiration from Marianne Hirsch’s (2001, 2008) concept of postmemory: she noticed how others’ memories become one’s own through deeply affective and familial transmissions after traumatic events. This conundrum – embodying another’s memory, a memory after memory – is one of our springboards for an interrogation of home that is differently home: a home after home. Moving away from the concept of ‘identity’ as something stable and unique in spatial, temporal or psychic spheres, we offer here seven anthropological elaborations of the concepts of (un)homely and affectivity of home, as the attempts to locate the self at the intersections of social and political realities of belonging. Our focus is on both the personal and the collective localities of belonging as they appear through the being or becoming of/at ‘home’ and ‘unhomely’. Furthermore, our contributors locate ‘home’ and ‘belonging’ in discursive positioning, movement through landscape and materialities, silences and dialectics arising from ‘new spaces’ in the process of displacement.

The notion of post-home emerged for us in continuous engagement with the question on how times of social crises become modes of interruption (in a bodily, communal and ritual sense) of ‘home’s’ dominant orders of gender, race, sexual, ethnic, class, or any other divisions that translate as power and hierarchical relations within the political contexts of displacement/emplace-
ment and their scholarly elaborations. The ‘post-‘ of home has a spatial and temporal connotation, as it materialises everything that lingers: from hopes to houses left behind. Yet, most of the contributors to the studies of home and movement habitually dealt with ‘place’. The spatiality (of both people and places) designates one valuable perspective to analyse displacements as process and movement from ‘here’ to ‘there’ or mark possible routes of return, but temporality and affectivity need to be taken into account as well.

Dwelling upon a photograph of his old house, in ‘his lost city’ of Bombay, Salman Rushdie noted:

“The past is a foreign country’, goes the famous opening sentence of L.P. Hartley’s novel The Go-Between, ‘they do things differently there’. But the photograph reminds me that it’s my present that is foreign, and that the past is home, albeit a lost home in a lost city in the mists of lost time. (1992: 9)

We see such temporal incongruence in Saakshi Joshi’s article about people displaced by the construction of the Tehri Dam, or as Katie Hayne’s interlocutors watch their homes being demolished for an ‘urban renewal’ project in Canberra.

Post-home as a lingering of something past may not have any worldly coordinates outside of life-(hi)stories. Marianne Hirsch and Leo Spitzer wrote about Czernowitz, ‘a place that cannot be found in any contemporary atlas’ (2010: xiii), a place sustained in the idealised memories of its Jewish inhabitants. Hirsch and Spitzer connected this afterlife of Czernowitz to Svetlana Boym’s (2001) discussion of nostalgia ‘for a home that no longer exists or has never existed’ (ibid: xiii). They saw it as ‘a spectral return emanating both seductive recollections of a lost home and frightening reminders of persecution and displacement’ (Hirsch and Spitzer 2010: xx). Post-home is not sim-

ply a place; it is a condition. It may indicate a lingering of home despite its destruction.15

Homelands too may appear through the haunting, ghostly presences of the past, as we read in Grujić’s and Schaum’s review of Krug’s *Heimat*. Selwyn, in his contribution, shows that the past lingers, forming exclusionary (or less migrant-inclusive) politics in the present: the cutting of funds for communal libraries and the increasing division between those belonging and not belonging to the ‘imagined home country’. To regain what is perceived as lost requires imagination. Often, the imagination of homeland runs counter to the imagination of home (see Rushdie 1992, HadžiMuhamedović 2018a). Hamzić writes about the *khwajasara* gender-variant inhabitants of Lahore who creatively chronicle a more homely place for themselves in the ‘Mughal times’, but also turn away from the past of unhomely natal homes and the state. Selwyn notices the imaginative resistance in the homing strategies of migrants and civil society groups in the UK against the (un)homing violence of the state.

The notion of belonging, which so easily attaches to ‘home’, informs us perhaps best about the commonly unnoticed temporal sequencing of all those ‘in-betweens’ in the journeying from ‘there’ to ‘here’ to ‘there.’ Post-home appears as the only mode for the ontological home to exist here and now, in the Heideggerian sense of narrating one’s being in the world(s) that too often falls apart.16

Post-home is formed through a continuous disagreement with the sedentary, reductionist thinking about homemaking anchored in a single (primal) place or belonging to a family/ethnicity/national homeland (see Jansen and Löfving 2007). Together with the contributors to this issue, we seek to further question the inadequacies entrenched in the notion of ‘home’ as a static and fixed anchor. As an analytical category, post-home captures what it means to ‘lose place’, and thus becomes a condition of spatial and temporal alienation of dwelling. We notice such interruptions in the times of

---

15 Halilovich (2013) has looked at the term *zavičaj* as employed by displaced Bosnians, which may translate as a place, a region and a community of home and encompasses ‘the wholeness of person-in-place and place-in-person’ (ibid.: 10). *Zavičaj* is etymologically related to Proto-Slavic *vyknọtī* – ‘to get used to something’. If we think of home through this habitual aspect, then post-home is about the resonances of the embodied. Home does not cease as long as the body insists upon it (see also HadžiMuhamedović 2018a: 94-100).

16 See Annika Lems’ (2014, 2018) Heideggerian operationalisation of ‘Dasein’ in the field of anthropological analysis of displacement and emplacement among Somali refugee residing in Australia, and what she terms ‘being here’.
various crises that increase violence (hostility) and resistance (hospitality), as Selwyn demonstrates in his article for this issue.

Post-home for us is about thinking through temporal and spatial alienation. It is a conversation about home unanchored from its imagined secure centre, inevitably sighted through experiences of loss and violence.

The ‘-home’ in post-home

*‘The problem begins when we start to produce descriptions of the world.’*

Marilyn Strathern (1999: 172)

Home is an ambiguous term. Thinking with and against three dominant approaches aiming to explain *what* and *how* home is, we ask about the viability of the very notion. We are interested in the scope of the damaging analytical frameworks that portray home as an ontological anchor or a point of reference in the scales of racialised imaginaries of dwellings.

A situated comparison of being and belonging might, at first, suggest that persons and communities conceptualise home *differently*. We could recognise these differences in home’s semblances, its relation to kinship, or to legal, ethical, historical, political and various other contexts. Researchers of the social could (as they have) fit home into an evolutionary scale, for example by establishing a progression from primitive to modern forms of dwellings. The way in which others are ‘given a home’ may uncover something about our ontological arrangements. This is explicitly made visible in the projects of the nineteenth century scientific racism, the disciplinary foundation of *anthropology*. See, for example, how Reverend John George Wood (1866), the famous Victorian parson-naturalist, systematised the habitations of animals, or ‘homes without hands’, together with racialised perceptions of colonised groups:

> Of all forms of habitation, the simplest is a burrow, whether beneath the surface of the ground, or into stone, wood or any other substance. The lowest grades of human beings are found to adopt this easy and simple substitute for a home, and the Bosjesman of the Cape, and the ‘Digger’ Indian of America, alike resort to so obvious an expedient. (ibid: 19)

His prelude reads as unwavering; difference neatly furnishes the scientific paradigm. If we were to think of home as an ontological anchor, then such scales of the world may too be qualified as home. Scientific disciplines may work to offer our frames *to* the world. Like an aperture, they control how the light reaches the film, how the world gets to be articulated. Disciplinary
homeowners are sheltered in such scalar securities. Home thus functions in different safeguarding manners. It does not only shield from the violence. It may be violent itself. It not only works to define what is on the inside and what on the outside but may also ‘swallow difference’ by imposing a given natural order onto others. Here, ontology functions much like territoriality, although it runs deeper.

Similarly, we could (as researchers of the social have) adopt a culturalist perspective, which inevitably subsumes into home a range of ethnic, national and racial imaginaries. Even though it shifts away from naturalised difference, the notion of culture, like its predecessors, produces and maintains it through the myths of essential origin (see Abu-Lughod 2006 [1991]). It is ‘shadowed by coherence, timelessness, and discreteness’ (ibid.: 472). It also naturalises a presumption of sameness. As Henare, Holbraad and Wastell have noted, this approach controls alterity: ‘Things of the world may appear different, but the point is that they are different in similar – universal – ways; nature in this sense is “one”. Culture, on the other hand, is “many”’ (2007: 9). Thus, to speak of ‘culture’ as a homing device – or, indeed, a kind of home – makes more sense than to insist on culturally specific homes.

The third option is to ‘particularise’ home and suspend the question of commensurability, in which case home seems to become a heuristic device to frame a range of questions about being and belonging.18 There are two main problems with this approach. The first one is related to the hegemony of ontology in the language of the world’s elucidators – as we signal with Strathern’s words opening this section. The second, related, problem is again scalar. Whichever definition of the ‘particular’ we adopt, it rests on the presumption of something more general. So, even when the scale remains silent in our writing, we are already making an act of comparison. As Sari Wastell has pointed out, ‘[n]othing is particularly “local” unless it is measured against something “bigger”, less “local” than itself – and here so many prejudices flee from analytical view’ (2001: 186).

Scaling home then always results in an evaluative, comparative judgement about what home is or is not. We invite critical attention to the contexts in which scales emerge, as well as to their workings in the articulation of home. For, if I pronounce your home, the problem lies in the provenance of the scales into which you will be colonised by my authorial voice. Will I be ready, willing and able to shift from the perception of many temporary homes

---

18 In her critique, Abu-Lughod proposed ‘ethnographies of the particular’ as one strategy of writing against culture: ‘[T]he effects of extralocal and long-term processes are only manifested locally and specifically, produced in the actions of individuals living their particular lives, inscribed in their bodies and their words. What I am arguing for is a form of writing that might better convey that.’ (2006 [1991]: 474)
by way of your ‘nomadic’ movement through nation-states to an understanding that the centre of your world is constantly recreated in your campfire?29

This veritable mess begs some questions of definition: What is home, as such (if there is home, as such)? Are we referring to a form (or act, discourse, process, feeling...) of dwelling? Is home a landscape, a house, an academic discipline, a set of relations, a memory? Could it be all of this, or is it something wholly different? Where do we, then, draw some conceptual boundaries around home? Is nest to bird as home is to human? What, indeed, is the nest for a bird? A shelter? Human insistence on ‘safety’, as Selwyn demonstrates in his contribution to this issue, may erode home and hospitality (in the name of home-lands). Shelters are deeply implicated in the construction of their outsideness, the imminent threat (racial, ethnic, national, gender, sexual, class, and so on).

Can waterways be home? Or, to push this question further out of our hegemonic comfort zone, can rivers have a home? One need not think far beyond the Whanganui River in New Zealand, which had recently been granted legal personhood after more than a century of Māori claims of its ancestral powers. Anne Salmond (2014) reminds us that the assertive human-non-human distinction falls short of capturing the knowledge expressed in the Whanganui people’s saying ‘I am the River, the River is me’ (ibid.: 286).

Language colonises ontologies. If the Natchez gender variant persons were described by colonial administrador Dumont de Montigny in 1753 (see Hamzić 2017) as ‘hermaphrodites’, it was an act of approximation of an ‘abominable difference’ scaled into his own colonial scientific ontology. He conjured up an existing ‘anomaly’ and prescribed these bodies in proximity to his binary gender norm. Similarly, in this issue, Hamzić mentions the Italian travel writer Niccolao Manucci who found the Mughal khwajasara repulsive (‘a sort of animal’, ‘these baboons’) and approximated them to ‘eunuchs’. The homing of unhomely difference may be a violent process of blanketing ‘anomaly’ in definable ‘dirt’. As Mary Douglas (2001 [1966]: 39-40) proposes, ‘anomalies’ can be ignored, overseen or fitted into a classification of reality. She, however, seems to have been sceptical about the prospect of ontological shifts.20

The mistake we make is to assume that our home means something across different realms of being/dwelling/belonging.21 Home effectively be-

---

19 On this point regarding the Mongolian nomads, see Humphrey (1995).
20 For some of the central discussions on the ‘ontological turn’ in anthropology, see Henare, Holbraad and Wastell (2007) and Holbraad and Pedersen (2017).
21 Selwyn and Frost (2018: 2) argue that ‘the concept has come to appear rather like a loose holding company for a diverse range of ideas, scales and registers used in a broad expanse of conceptual ground’. The danger they see in this scholarly eclecticism is the loss of perspective on the lived realities, which is why they also call for ethnographies of the particular when it comes to home and homemaking.
comes a scale upon which difference is forcibly mounted. Maybe we are not speaking anymore about ‘primitive’ versus ‘modern’ forms of dwellings, but we seem to (more than colloquially) retain the presumption that some ‘basic’ functions and emotions may be encapsulated as home. Albeit differently, we all have a home, or have lost one, or have wanted one, right?

Maybe not. We should be careful not to perpetuate home as part and parcel of the ‘ontology of one ontology’, a hegemonic project of describing the world as such (see Henare, Holbraad and Wastell 2007). This implies steering away from home as one ‘thing’ appearing in a variety of actualisations. Such a perspective on difference – ultimately founded in something more solid – means that others are never taken on their own terms. Your ‘home’, which I write about in my research, is ultimately but a version of Home as such (with a capital H). I may recognise that your home is different from mine in an evolutionary, cultural or another fashion, whilst maintaining that it has a foundational similarity to mine. Henare, Holbraad and Wastell further note:

*If we are to take others seriously, instead of reducing their articulations to mere ‘cultural perspectives’ or ‘beliefs’ (i.e. ‘worldviews’), we can conceive them as enunciations of different ‘worlds’ or ‘natures’, without having to concede that this is just shorthand for ‘worldviews’. [...] For if cultures render different appearances of reality, it follows that one of them is special and better than all the others, namely the one that best reflects reality. And since science – the search for representations that reflect reality as transparently and faithfully as possible – happens to be a modern Western project, that special culture is, well, ours.*

(ibid.: 10-11)

Taking others seriously begs the question about the viability of home as an analytical concept. What if there is no such animal? What if Home-as-such needs to be unimagined before approaching something otherwise (for which ‘home’ acts only as heuristic placeholder)?

Since the 1960s, after almost a century of grand anthropological theories of kinship, David Schneider famously moved to dismantle the whole thing. Kinship was, he argued, but a ‘theoretical notion’, ‘undefined and vacuous’, a ‘non-subject’, which ‘exists in the minds of anthropologists but not in the cultures they study’ (2004 [1972]: 269; 1984: 185). He problematised what he saw as a concept loosely based on a Western folk model, which established as a universal fact a specific notion of biological relatedness (Parkin and Stone 2004: 19). Others have taken up his radical break. Yanagisako and Collier (1987) have, for example, geared the same critique towards gender. Mohanty and Martin (2003: 86) have considered the possibilities of unsettling feminism as home and various possible identitary homes within feminism (based on gender, race, sexuality, and so on). We suggest, with some caution, that
approaching home requires a similar kind of exercise. We need to unhome home, engage in critical reflection on our own homely shelters, before ‘writing up’ a home for an other. ‘The problem’, to repeat Marilyn Strathern’s warning, ‘begins when we start to produce descriptions of the world’ (1999: 172).

Even when we recognise the historically and spatially diverse forms of ‘dwelling’ and ‘belonging’, the signified is durable in the signifier. The problem is not solved by the lack of exact definition. Beyond words, and this is where it gets sticky, ‘we’ tend to know or feel what home is or might be. Feelings are here not only the discursive, but also the more-than-discursive – bodily – locus of the sustained power of concepts. As part of our habituated dispositions, to deflect off Bourdieu’s words on taste, ‘[home] classifies, and it classifies the classifier’ (1984: 6).

An ontological turn to home then does not seek to propose bubbles of radical difference. Rather, by joining the voices calling to take others seriously, we suggest that home should be, first and foremost, approached as a heuristic device, one that always requires an ontologically reflexive mooring as a critical methodological positionality (by asking: what are our homes?) and a holistic understanding of our interlocutors’ statements and actions (by asking: what is left of home without an imposition of our own homes?). Such an approach does not ‘deny’ others their homes by theoretically pushing them into indeterminacy. On the contrary, the ontology of one ontology is actually the denial of difference; it acts as both a home and a site of confinement, with an inherently obstructed view onto an other.

Post-home is not an absence of home; to unhome home is to invite ourselves to make space for others without the necessary disclaimer of what home is. We suggest an analytical framework of post-home without presuming that one can ever be completely disentangled from the enduring constellations guiding our ‘ways of seeing’. Yet, before endeavouring to provide a stable home for anyone through acts of representation, we need to make sure that these beguiling matrices are left unprotected.

Post-home is an articulation of the homely and the unhomely amidst the temporal, spatial and affective structures and intensities of present loss. It is a timespace, a condition and a process of disorientation and orientation. And, post-home, willy-nilly, shakes the habitual registers of the world.

Post-home in seven case studies

Vanja Hamzić leads the reader through dera (singular: dera) households in the Punjabi city of Lahore in Pakistan, inhabited by khwajasara, a gender-variant subjectivity known as hijre in the wider South Asian context. Dera, Hamzić argues, is a post-home not only because it articulates detachments and new loyalties and forms of belonging, but also as a station in the process of homecoming, a journey towards the Unity of Being, a return to One Self.
A novice initiated as a khwajasara attains a new household, a new name, language, kin (including a mother and a guru), as well as spiritual and vocational training. The author observes a wide range of political and intimate meanings in dera arrangements. The lives of his khwajasara interlocutors include multiple – homely and unhomely – registers of home, from the homing projections into Mughal histories, through the (non)belonging to natal families, school environments and the national body, still through the defining haven of the dera household, and the being towards the eternal, true Home of the afterlife.

Dera, claims Hamzić, also blurs the boundaries of gender, religion, ethnicity and language. It may be a locus for the articulation of moral panic, everyday violence and a lingering coloniality, but also a site of resistance. We are cautioned not to slip into easy romanticisations of dera, which also have to be ‘constantly negotiated’ and are fraught with their own hierarchical arrangements. The contemporary status of dera intertwines with the post-colonial geographies of homeland, which assign khwajasara to a specific ‘there’ within the town and yet profoundly exclude them. Hamzić invites us to think dera through the lens of the ‘post-’ of the South Asian colonial histories. As gender non-conforming modes of dwelling and belonging, dera and khwajasara were both exposed to systemic violence and the legal and political domination of colonial rulers. The post-home of dera stands for the ‘thereness’ of bodily and spiritual homecoming journeys. This khwajasara ‘homecoming’ is a process of ‘identitary journeying towards collective there-ness’, the author argues. It is a journey of belonging to one’s own body, community and One Self – a being-in-becoming. Khwajasara home is at odds with homeland; it is, as Hamzić notes, ‘contingent on a loss of the homeland’s prescriptive forms of dwelling in the world’. Yet, by inviting a symbolical recuperation of the Mughal past and continuously travelling towards home, khwajasara project a more homely future.

Katie Hayne’s contribution is an artistic-anthropological engagement with post-home. She considers the Northbourne Avenue public housing precincts in Canberra, Australia, scheduled for demolition as part of a project of ‘urban renewal’. Hayne guides us through the moment of this unhoming rupture – homes being demolished or awaiting imminent demolition. Drawing and painting in the street, Hayne slowly comes to be invited into the individual life (hi)stories. This artistic process, she argues, focused her attention to the place as lived: its relations, colours, scents and sounds, the architectural details, and so on. It also made her aware of the responsibilities inherent to the representation of home. Revealing the boundedness of her knowledge about these homes and indicating the precariousness of the future for their residents, Hayne leaves parts of these works unpainted. Hayne’s interlocutors face us with the uncanny everydayness of homes about to disappear; they tell her that the best time to see the houses is in the afternoon, when
'those long shadows and the railings and pergolas make interesting patterns', or simply point out ‘That was my bathroom’ whilst watching their house being demolished. Hayne tries to imagine the feeling of watching your home being demolished. The demolition as an unhoming rupture figures differently in the residents’ positionings.

The artistic process offered Hayne a way into various conversations on housing, politics, fears, plans and hopes. She discovers the Northbourne Housing and its life (hi)stories to be entangled with the modernist ideals of functional and egalitarian architecture, but also the reduction of public housing in Australia since the 1960s and the growing perceptions of such spaces as unhomely and alienating. Countering these broad brushstrokes, Hayne portrays a quotidian stillness of the architecture, with rubbish bins and washing lines, occasionally interrupted by a dog walker or the slow rhythm of the seasons marked by the changing colours of the trees. House as a home thus moves between the ideal and the real, Hayne notices. Her argument is captured by one of the residents: 'I loved and hated the place but I will never forget the experience of living there'.

Saakshi Joshi’s contribution considers post-home in the echoes of the town of Tehri in the Himalayan state of Uttarakhand in India, which was submerged by the gigantic Tehri Dam in the early 2000s. However, Tehri-as-home continuously resurfaces in everyday conversations and affective capacities. It is contrasted against the unhomeliness of the ‘replacement’ town of New Tehri and other sites to which people were relocated, becoming a way to recover the histories of home and displacement against the state’s developmental projects of erasure. Bodies highlight the configuration of home in friction with the new spaces: they resist the altitude, the winds, the necessity for jackets in summertime, the absence of the river and its sounds, as well as the transformed kinship and caste relationships. Mementoes of home appear everywhere, in children’s names, the photographs on living room walls, or the salvaged doors and window frames. Post-home also appears as an actual bodily ailment – people complain that the new provision of reservoir water causes digestive disorders, or that the altitude and the climbing of stairs give them joint pain and respiratory problems.

The absence of the river also intervenes into the cremation rituals. The damming of sacred rivers more generally causes cosmological and ontological ruptures, Joshi notes. The town and the river, she argues, come into sight as animate beings. The river is understood as a mother carrying the town in its womb, despite destruction. It harbours the potential to resist the arrogance of developmental projects. The town is not simply a ‘container’ but appears as a person who was ‘left to drown’. Temporal orientations of Joshi’s interlocutors revolve around the time ‘after Tehri’s death’ and ‘when Tehri was alive’. The displaced people, she argues, make both a spatial and temporal distinction between Tehri and New Tehri (here vs. there; now vs. then).
They also make an affective differentiation, between the house-as-home (ghar) and the house-as-residence (makān). Displacement affected marriage and caste alliances. Yet, the change in these structures of home also provided opportunities for upward social mobility. Joshi sees the prevalence of the selective, idealised turn to the past-as-home to be a form of political insistence on the desired communal life.

**Alys Tomlinson**’s photo essay takes us through three pilgrimage sites – Ballyvourney in Ireland, Mount Grabarka in Poland and Lourdes in France. It visually explores the meaning of ‘ex-voto’ religious offerings and provides an intimate view onto sacral landscapes, temporally and spatially removed from the everyday. Through the complex entwining of people, places and objects, Tomlinson's images of the offerings and their devotees raise numerous questions about the modalities of belonging and spiritual distimeplacement (‘unhoming’). Personal possessions are left out in the open; they dwell and belong as absences of home. Emplacing themselves in the world, these objects unfold collective and individual histories, yet also become charged with affective capacities beyond the intended purpose of their pilgrim producers. The post-home ‘ex-voto’ offerings are implanted in the setting of nature. The landscape in which they transpire takes them inside nature’s time. Spatially and temporally intersecting, they articulate a worlding of things without their faithful owners. Tomlinson's photo essay is an excellent example of the various dimensions of ‘home’ from the perspective of one’s everlasting desire to find shelter and experience belonging as ‘being-at-home’. By opting for monochrome imaging and depicting the stillness of the human-forest conversations, she achieves a peculiar temporal confusion (the scenes are at once in the past and suggest a lingering of traces into the future). Tomlinson thus reminds that home is fragile and persistent, and never solely anthropogenic.

**Tom Selwyn** offers an anthropological analysis of post-home in contemporary Britain through the nautical metaphors of mooring, un-mooring and re-mooring. He juxtaposes the notions of ‘hostility’ and ‘hospitality’ as modes of belonging in the post-home world. The article elaborates three home-challenging events: the 2016 Brexit referendum, the fire at Grenfell Tower in London in 2017, and the so-called ‘Windrush scandal’ exposed in 2018. Analysing numerous examples from the media that demonstrate these events as unhoming ruptures, he notices hostility and the lack of hospitality towards migrants as the post-home norm in Britain. These events situate totalitarian discourses that inspire resentment against the migrants; they are a consequence of the normalisation of a ‘hostile environment’ that will have long-term effects on homing and unhoming among both the ‘migrant’ and ‘non-migrant’ populations.

The metaphors of mooring, un-mooring and re-mooring home capture, in Selwyn's words, ‘a world shaped by seascapes which are nowadays full of small, often unseaworthy, boats carrying refugees’. These notions help us
understand the process of the house becoming a home in the age of global migration and refugee movement. What the author shows is that the home-related acts of intimate doings should not be bounded by the notion of ‘home’ as a familiar and familial space. The gerund form of mooring, un-mooring, and re-mooring aims to stress the meaning of ‘home’ as unfixed. Homes are ‘moored’ within smaller and extensive social and political networks. Also, they are, Selwyn writes, ‘un-moored’ by violence, so the refugees ‘by definition’ search for new moorings. In the post-home world, ‘home and home making need co-ordinated co-operation at domestic, regional, national, and global levels’, he adds. Selwyn’s contribution draws our attention to various upsetting facts of the structural hostility against the migrants and refugees. The author invites us to rethink the notion of resistance as connected to homespace, and critically approach the post-home Britain. Thus, we have to ask ourselves, how much hospitality (and what kind of hospitality) is needed to ‘un-moor’ the oppressive atmosphere of a society in which the media most commonly attached the word ‘illegal’ to the words ‘migrant’ and ‘immigrant’ in the last decade. Finally, we read Selwyn’s choice of the author’s plural (or the first-person plural: ‘we’) as an emphasis on collectivity, an act of solidarity with those un-moored, and of resistance to the unhoming ruptures encapsulated in Thatcher’s ‘no such thing as society’ as much as in May’s ‘hostile environment’.

Lauren Harding writes about the entangled histories of colonial settlement and First Nations displacement to discern post-home in the competing claims for home(land) in contemporary Canada. Building on her fieldwork in Qua-ba-diwa (known to the state as the Indian Reserve Number 6), she contrasts the notions of belonging and territorial claims of one Ditidaht family, the Knightons, against the national belonging articulated by the hikers through the West Coast Trail. Harding takes the host-guest relationship of domestic tourism as central to these competing visions. The settler-Canadian tourists understand this land of the national parks as the national natural ‘backyard’ or ‘pristine wilderness’, crucial to the definition of citizenship. In the national imaginary, she notes, these spaces are deterritorialised, understood as people-less and place-less. Wilderness is not a ‘place’ but a symbolically saturated abstraction within Euro-American (and Canadian colonial) epistemologies. Canadianness is confirmed through an active participation in such environments. The West Coast Trail, Harding argues, is a ‘ritual test of one’s ability to corporeally participate in the wilderness-based rituals of citizenship’. The hikers’ language echoes the colonial tropes of conquered empty space. Endurance in the wilderness and the ‘genuine’ bond with the nature are performative; they enact the colonial-national scripts.

This kind of homeland has, however, always been in friction with the homemaking practices of the First Nations people, who experienced systematic forced removal and other forms of alienation from their land. By recog-
nising the domestic Canadian visitors as tourists, Harding’s interlocutors resisted the deterritorialising tendencies of the state narratives. By reiterating that the non-indigenous Canadians are the guests, they constructed the First Nations as the hosts. Home thus appeared as a political claim against homeland. Harding summarises this claim in the words of Monique, one of her interlocutors: ‘This isn’t Canada, it’s home’. Monique made this distinction for one of the hikers who asked about the application of Canadian smoking laws in front of her burger stand at Qua-ba-diwa. For the Knightons, hospitality became an assertion of ownership, Harding concludes. Post-home is here a quest to redefine belonging against the (post-)colonial, nationalist visions of homeland in which the fetish of ‘wilderness’ continues to invalidate non-settler dwelling.

Dragana Kovačević Bielicki’s contribution invites thinking of post-home through the lens of nonbelonging and spatial and temporal alienation of ‘home’. Focusing on Bosnia, she understands the refugee diasporic belonging as different from other types of transnational living. Diasporic ethnic (br)others are othered through their national belonging, she argues. Patriotism and belonging to the designated homeland are questioned for displaced refugees. Displacement and the decision to either return or ‘remain displaced’ in the countries of Western Europe created new types of boundaries between the diasporic ‘co-ethnics’. The author juxtaposes diasporic and homeland belonging, which she also sees through the lenses of ‘outsiderhood’ and ‘insiderhood’. However, these terms are entangled with the ‘post-’ of the notion of ‘back home’, which refers to the belatedness of spatial and temporal being. The article’s primary focus is the discursive othering among the so-called ‘stayers’ in and ‘leavers’ from homeland during wars and conflicts. These notions intend to describe dynamic relations of exclusion among ‘ethnic’ other(s). In the setting of post-home, the so-called ‘leavers’ experience nonbelonging ‘back home’, since their markers of belonging are lensed through movement away from homeland. Kovačević Bielicki, for example, notes that one of her interlocutors was scorned for not knowing her ‘mother tongue’ as good as the local children.

The us-them positioning between ‘stayers’ and ‘leavers’ exemplifies that the required attachments to homeland are (still) dominantly seen as sedentary and that national belonging continues to be fixed to a ‘primordial’ soil. Kovačević Bielicki shows that ‘anchored’ soil-belonging becomes a source of continuous spatial and temporal alienation for refugees. Moreover, the sedentary thinking of belonging to a homeland unlocks multi-layered unhoming ruptures. The ‘real’ nation-ness is constructed through the identification with a homeland territory. The diasporic (br)others experience alienation precisely on the grounds of the ‘same soil’ semiotic, as their loyalty to ‘home’ is questioned (leaving during the war is interpreted as treacherous act).
A note on the becoming of the *Post-home* special issue

For us, the editors of this special issue, the notion of post-home suggested itself in various settings, over a period of more than ten years. Both of us matured against the changing articulations of homelands, the systematic destruction of home (albeit, in the name of ‘home’), and amidst the absences, debris and violent identity politics that somehow made themselves *at home* in our worlds. Whenever and wherever home attained its homely outlines, it was quickly countered by its incompleteness and ambiguity, or ricocheted with the violence inscribed into the concept. It is precisely because of what our homes are, and what they are not, because of the homes prescribed and ‘allowed’ for us, and what our homes seek to be against such authorisations, that we strive to understand the workings of belonging and alienation more generally. We have also ventured into long-term explorations of post-conflict, post-homely lives of refugees, displaced persons and returnees (and post-homely ‘others’) in spaces that were officially ‘our home’, yet spaces that also remained homely and unhomely in different ways, often simultaneously.

The core of this special issue was formed as part of our panel ‘Post-Home(land): Being and Belonging after Spatial and Temporal Alienation’, organised at the 2015 International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) Inter-Congress *Re-imagining Anthropological and Sociological Boundaries* at Thammasat University in Bangkok, Thailand. Other contributors have joined us on the way, including through Tom Selwyn’s 2018 panel ‘Representations of Displacement and the Struggle for Home and Homemaking’ organised by the Royal Anthropological Institute, the British Museum and SOAS University of London as part of the *Art, Materiality and Representation* Conference. The critical review of Krug’s graphic novel *Heimat* originated in a class discussion that Marija Grujić organised for one of her courses on displacement and belonging at Goethe University Frankfurt.

We warmly thank the contributors – Vanja Hamzić, Katie Hayne, Saakshi Joshi, Alys Tomlinson, Tom Selwyn, Lauren Harding and Dragana Kovačević Bielicki – as well as our many meticulous reviewers of individual articles. We would also like to thank Mijal Gandelsman-Trier and Michael Pröpper for their collegiality, patience and a well-run journal editorship. We celebrate the value of open-access platforms such as *Ethncripts* for the advancement of responsible academic visibility. As concepts travel and run into their *otherwise*, we hope that our inherently unfinished conversations might acquire post-home extensions elsewhere.
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‘If you live in one place for a long time’, Saima explained reclining from her cherished old divan, ‘people eventually learn how to respect you. Despite some problems that we may have had, here we all help each other’ (Hamzić 2016: 163). A cigarette in her hand, the trusty puppy playing in her lap, Saima was recounting to me the merits of neighbourly solidarity surrounded by a half-dozen of her young disciples (chele; singular: chela), some of whom also considered her to be their mother (ma‘un). We were sitting in a simple half-open-air flat, basking in the early evening mist, amidst a busy lower-class neighbourhood in Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan. Saima was the head of this dera (plural: deray), a type of household that the majority of khwajasara call their home. Indeed, Saima and her chele all considered themselves khwajasara—a gender-variant subjectivity known by many names across South Asia, of which hijra (plural: hijre) is most common.

---

1 This article is based on my long-term fieldwork in Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan, but in particular on a very special late September afternoon in the early 2010s in Saima’s dera. I am grateful to her and to many other khwajasara who have made me feel so homely in their presence, and especially to Bindiya Rana, Chalu, Chandhi, Gangha, Hashu, Jala, Jelek, Kajol, Nariman and Neeli Rana. I thank Shadab Bano, of Aligarh Muslim University, and Abraham B. Weil, of Transgender Studies Quarterly, for their kind assistance in securing access to some less readily available research materials. The two anonymous reviewers were exceedingly kind and supportive and I found their recommendations extremely useful. Finally, Safet HadžiMuhamedović and Marija Grujić, the co-editors of this special issue, were an absolute joy to work with, and I greatly appreciate their insightful comments and suggestions. All remaining errors are mine.

2 Note on transliteration: For the transliteration of classical Arabic and Persian sources and their historical derivatives in this text, I used the IJMES (International Journal of Middle East Studies) system, but I omitted the usual diacritics in personal names. Diacritics were not used for the transliteration from present-day South Asian languages. All non-English terms were pluralised in accordance with the source language’s own rules, which, in some contemporary South Asian languages, depart from their classical versions. Hence, the singular and the plural of khwajasara are the same. I also gave preference to the linguistic context in which a certain word had appeared, rather than always reverting to its classical version; for instance, I referred to dergah, not dargâh.
'When people say stuff to us', Saima continued, keeping a watchful eye on the goings-on in her *dera*. ‘I tell them: give us a better job and we won’t do what we do. We have no other way to feed ourselves’ (ibid.). *Khwajasara* were not here alone. There were children running around the rooms, some busy chasing a large and very loud rooster. Several of Saima’s *chele* were babysitting them for the neighbouring families. Some rooms were used for this purpose, some for prayer, some for cooking and social events, still some for sex work. Saima credited the success and survival of this complex enterprise to one word: *izzat* (respect) (see also Reddy 2005). Gaining respect in an urban slum was no easy feat, however, and it meant navigating, on a daily basis, the oft-violent encounters with the police, local vigilante and religious groups and countless others. It also meant negotiating intricate intra-*khwajasara* kinship, economic and political ties, which Saima light-heartedly referred to as dealing with ‘your characters in a soap opera’ (Hamzić 2016: 163).

Not all *khwajasara* live in *deray*; some *chele* marry their *giriya* (male lover and/or customer) and leave, whilst others prefer to live alone. Yet, as a quintessential *khwajasara* household, *dera* holds a paradigmatic place in *khwajasara*’s stories of homecoming, be it as a post-home—a refuge from never-quite-homely natal familial households and terrorising former school environments—or the bodily, spiritual and communal *genius loci*, signalling that a true Home might only be found in the hereafter—that is, *after* post-home. Using the idea of the *dera* as its anchor, this article meanders through *khwajasara* historical and contemporary multi-local experiences of home-
coming, understood here as both spatial and identitary journeying towards collective thereness (cf. Sutherland 2018). As a property of dwelling with kindred souls, I argue that thereness equips khwajasara with exploratory senses of the subject (to paraphrase Butler 2015), including, as we shall see, those of being otherworldly and nomadic (Jaffer 2017: 184). This thereness transgresses the very idea of settlement and allows the dera and its inhabitants to not only ‘blur communal boundaries’ (Khan 2017: 1290)—such as those of gender, religion, ethnicity and language—but also to construe home as a journey, not a destination.

Mughal homecomings

‘In Mughal times, khwajasara used to serve at the imperial courts, to educate people, to give them good manners, to teach them how to be well-behaved. That used to be their job’, maintained Saima, her face beaming with pride (Hamzić 2016: 280). For her, as for many other khwajasara, recalling such an illustrious past was not only a nostalgic act, but a teachable opportunity, too. ‘Back in the day, only khwajasara knew what it meant to have good manners’, she averred. ‘Unfortunately, nowadays, khwajasara are ill-mannered. They can barely help themselves, let alone teach the others’ (ibid.).

The term khwajasara has only recently been reclaimed, chiefly by Pakistani cohorts of the larger South Asian gender-variant hijra community. In Punjab, for example, khwajasara are also known as khusre (singular: khusra)—a name that is now thought not to command much izzat. Instead, harking back to a name that invokes an imperial household is the preferred—and clearly political—choice. Indeed, the guardians of the zenana (secluded women’s quarters) at the Mughal court were known by their Persian title, khwajasara, connoting the master (khwājā) of the palace (sarā or sarāʾī) (Nath 1995: 13–22; Hamzić 2016: 156). Many of them were male-born, often in distant lands (such as Abyssinia), and then castrated in their youth before being sold or gifted into the Mughal imperial service. Of course, the practice of acquiring, schooling and then tasking such individuals with a variety of professions predates the Mughals and was the staple of Muslim courtly life and imperial affairs probably already during the ‘Umayyad Caliphate (661–750) (Hathaway 2005: 8) and certainly since the ‘Abbāsid era (750–1258) (El Cheikh 2018). The euphemisms used to describe their bodily and gender difference or the particular profession ranged from khāṣi (plural: khiṣyān), meaning the castrated one, to ṭawāshi (plural: ṭawāshiyya) and khādim (plural: khadam and later khuddām), denoting elite military and domestic servitude (Ayalon 1985; Hamzić 2016: 121–123). In the later periods of the Mamlūk state (1250–1517) and in the Ottoman Empire (1299–1922), terms referring to castration were almost entirely displaced by honorifics, of which the principal was aghāwāt (singular: agha, Turkish: ağa, mean-
ing usually sir or lord) (Marmon 1995: 41), due to their high office and awe (hayba) they were said to command. And yet, their bodily and gender experience was such that aghāwāt largely sought and formed their own societies, ‘outside of the dominant binary phantasm’ (Hamzić: 2016: 123). The idiosyncratic, aghāwāt-only names by which they were sometimes known, such as Yapraksız (Leafless) Ağa (Hathaway 2005: 29; 2009: 294), attested, also, their social difference.

On the Indian subcontinent, the term khwajasara denoted this subjectivity both within the confines of the Mughal Empire (1526–1540, 1555–1857) and in other Muslim polities. The sixteenth-century author Rizqullah Mushtaqi noted, for instance, in his Wāqīʿāt-i-Mūshtāqi that a khwajasara typically stood at the inner gate of a noble’s harem, preceded by two officers on the outer parts and followed by an older woman sitting along the wall inside of it. So, if a message was to be delivered to the secluded women, it would have to change hands at least four times (Mushtaqi 2002 [c.1570s]: 98; Bano 2009: 417).

Fig. 2. Khawas Khan, a Mughal khwajasara. Late seventeenth-century illumination. Courtesy of the Saeed Motamed Collection.
The specific place of *khujjasara* reflected, in a way, their positionality alongside the perceived gender-sex continuum. Yet the strict segregation of noble women was, in large part, a subcontinental practice. In the early Mughal harems in Central Asia, people of all genders (but not ranks and classes), including *khujjasara*, were allowed to mix and communicate with one another to a certain extent (ibid.: 418). Castrated individuals were also found performing a range of functions within the imperial household other than that of the harem guardian. For example, Babur (r.1526–1530), the founder of the Mughal state, had in his service a castrated superintendent (*nāẓir*) named ʿAmbar (Jawhar 1832 [1554]: 78, 129). Several generations later, this very title—*nāẓir*—came to be synonymous with those who had undergone castration (Bano 2009: 418).

By the time of Akbar (r.1556–1605), references to notable *khujjasara* and *khujjasara*-like people abound, from Niʿamat, a guard of emperor’s resting place (ibid.: 419; Lal 2018: 99), to the famous *khujjasara* ʿItimad Khan, whom the author of the *Akbarnāma* described as ‘distinguished for sense and judgment’ (Abu’l Fażl 2010 [1590–1602]: 228) and who was, in 1576, appointed the governor of Bhakkar (Bano 2009: 420). And yet, for all their successes, *khujjasara*‘s bodily and gender difference drew the ire of more conservative segments of Mughal society. Akbar’s contemporary and fierce critic, ʿAbd al-Qadir Badaʿuni, thus felt compelled to quote in his *Muntakhab al-tawārīkh* an alleged prophetic saying against the counsel of women, the rule of boys and the management of *khujjasara* (Badaʿuni 1986 [1595]: 2:63–64), precisely in response to ʿItimad Khan’s many important military and political roles.

Akbar was himself much concerned with sexual propriety and wanted to set an example by further segregating the ‘male’ and ‘female’ lifeworlds within his palace (Lal 2005: 140–175). However, as a consequence of this imperial agenda, the officers and subjectivities necessary to negotiate the access and communication between such lifeworlds only grew in importance. Whilst *khujjasara* may have been ‘gradually withdrawn from the interiors of the harem’, an office of its interior guardians fell upon ‘sober and active women’—as the author of the *Āʿīn-i Akbarī* called them—usually of Kashmiri or Turkic origin (Bano 2009: 422; Abu’l Fażl 1873 [c.1592–1602]: 1:46-47). As with *khujjasara*, these women’s perceived gender difference did not go unnoticed in the European travelogues of the time. Writing during the tumultuous reign of Aurangzeb (r.1658–1707), the Italian author Niccolao Manucci praised them as ‘highly skilled in the management of the bow and other arms’ but also noted that ‘these women do not veil themselves to anybody’ and were in regular contact with the *nāẓir* via ‘a scribe who is obliged to report to the *nāẓir* all that comes in or goes out, and everything that happens’ (Manucci 1907 [c.1708]: 2: 332, 352). As for *khujjasara*, Manucci acknowledged their faithfulness but thought them, on the whole, deeply repugnant. Echoing the
centuries of European epistemic violence, he called them ‘eunuchs’ and left this telling description:

Among the [...] qualities of this sort of animal, one is their extreme covetousness in collecting gold, silver, diamonds, and pearls, and they are immeasurably avaricious. [...] [T]hey are anxious to appear well dressed [...]. Well may they hold themselves in such estimation, for they are the favourites of princesses, who are very liberal to them [...]. Another of their qualities is to be friendly to women and inimical to men, which may be from envy, knowing what they have been deprived of. The tongue and the hands of these baboons act together, being most licentious in examining everything, both goods and women, coming into the palace; they are foul in speech, and fond of silly stories. Among all the Mahomedans they are ordinarily the strictest observers of the faith, although I knew some who did not fail to drink their little drop, and were fond of wine. [They] are the spies for everything that goes on in secret, whereby they are always listening among the kings, princes, queens, and princesses. (ibid.: 80–81)

Manucci’s disdain for khvajasara was by no means an isolated example. Compiled a century earlier, the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī recounts, for example, how the ruler of Gujarat ‘reproached [...] and commenced to revile’ his castrated ennobled subject, Ḥujjat-ul-Mulk, saying ‘O fool, what shall I say to you? If you were a man, I would have reviled you by calling you a coward; if you were a woman, I would have called you unchaste. You are neither man nor woman, but the bad qualities of both are present in you’ (Sikandar b. Muḥammad 1889 [c.1611]: 126). Such readings provide for a gloomy portrait of courtly life for many khvajasara and khvajasara-like subjectivities. Caught in a lavish but, for the most part, unhomely world of imperial intrigues, many khwajasara sought some form of seclusion and respite, whether through charitable activities, education or affluence. Others dedicated their lives to those whom they served, out of which amorous and sexual liaisons were often born (Kidwai 2000: 113). Still others sought to build intra-khvajasara networks similar to (and probably in some communication with) those of aghāwāt. For instance, Aurangzeb’s powerful chief castrated officer, Khwaja Ṭalib, also known as Khidmatgar, had several khvajasara protégés who served other princes (Lal 2018: 105) but maintained regular contact with their mentor.

Some of khvajasara’s experience of unhomeliness must have also had to do with the trauma of unwanted castration (although a few submitted to it voluntarily or were born intersex; ibid.: 104) and the fact that many of them were traded as slaves from faraway lands. As a South Asian courtier and author attested in the early thirteenth century, ‘the further [slaves] are taken from their hearth, their kin and their dwellings, the more valued, pre-
cious and expensive they become’, for their natal homes would soon become but a distant memory (Fakhr-i Mudabbir 1927 [1206]: 36). Furthermore, he claimed, ‘when their hearts turn to Islam, they do not remember their homes, their place of origins or their kinsmen’ at all (ibid.). Both castration and forceful conversion were generally thought repugnant to Islamic law, and as such were performed either in non-Muslim lands or far from the eyes of Muslim rulers and their religious establishment (ʿulamāʾ). Mughals were particularly uncomfortable with both of these practices. By 1582, Akbar would no longer allow himself to possess slaves, instead calling them chele (Bano 2002: 318)—the same designation the twenty-first-century khwajasara use for their disciples. In 1608, Akbar’s successor Jahangir (r.1605–1627) even issued an injunction prohibiting the practice of castration (Lal 2018: 103). He is said to have explained this, two years later, as follows: ‘I had repeatedly given orders that no one should [castrate boys] or buy or sell them, and whoever did so would be answerable as a criminal’ (Jahangir et al. 1909 [1627]: 1:168). Nonetheless, he continued to receive as gifts numerous khwajasara, including at least one who was intersex and, as such, not castrated (ibid.: 2:201). The trade in castrated youths also continued in a relatively uninterrupted fashion, and a notable contemporary of both Akbar and Jahangir, Sa’id Khan Chaghata’i, is believed to have had as many as 1,200 castrated individuals in his service (ibid.: 1:13), without much objection from the emperors.

Mughal khwajasara and khwajasara-like subjectivities thus largely lived their lives within a complex system of courtly servitude, which both delimited their choice of the homely and empowered them to assert their distinct identitary tropes. Be that as it may, it is from this period in the South Asian history that present-day Pakistani khwajasara mostly draw their strength and their collective demand for izzat. Some have claimed, for instance, that ‘they take their inspiration from inscriptions in the Lahore Fort’, a foremost Mughal architectural masterpiece, ‘which single out the residences of the khwaja saras who lived there’ (Khan 2016b: 226). However, this reliance on the Mughal past should not be misunderstood as a claim to khwajasara origins, which the Punjabi khwajasara, unlike some other subcontinental hijra collectives (Reddy 2005), link to the story of Madayanti or Mainandi, an ancient Indian princess said to be born khwajasara (Hamzić 2016: 160–161). Instead, Mughal times (Mughalan da wela) are invoked as an auspicious era in the khwajasara history that provides a blueprint of sorts for the prosperous khwajasara future.

In contrast to the Mughal era, the colonial and post-colonial Indian and Pakistani experience is seen as entirely unhomely, abject and disastrous. As Bindiya Rana, a prominent Sindh-based khwajasara guru and political leader, told me,

[It]he changes started occurring once the Mughals were no longer in real power. Once the white men came to India, the pow-
ers of the Mughals were slowly finishing off. The Mughals were then forced to take customs of the white men, and to receive all sorts of orders from them [...]. By the time of India and Pakistan’s partition, khwajasara were only there to dance and sing at weddings. And that was it. They were no longer perceived as valuable for the society in any other way. (ibid.: 159–160)

Indeed, khwajasara were one of the particular targets of the systemic legal and political oppression that accompanied the British colonial presence in India, especially during the first decades of the British Raj (1858–1947). The British, along with various domestic collaborators, sought to regulate and restrict their ‘abominable existence’ as much as they could, first by making a distinction between khwajasara (or khojay, as they would call them) who served in noble households and those who have not (described in colonial sources as hijre and zenana or, in legal contexts, as ‘eunuchs’), and then by depriving the latter category of khwajasara of any inheritance or property rights, by means of the infamous Criminal Tribes Act, 1871 (Hamzić 2014: 189–193). Once again, the battle centred on khwajasara households, with those—presumably living in deray—who could not solicit upper-class protection all but left to ‘die out’ (Gannon 2009: 347–348). Although colonial administrators ultimately failed to do away with khwajasara, similar classificatory and legal violence continued to accompany this subjectivity well into Pakistan’s and India’s postcolonial statehoods. One of the tell-tale remnants of colonial oppression was the distinction some khwajasara still made between those who truly belong to this community (and mostly living in deray) and zenana—deemed ‘feminine males who situationally cross-dress’ (Khan 2016a: 159). Whilst, for the former, the dera would serve as the principal site of thereness—and, indeed, survival—it would have precisely the opposite effect on the latter, reminding them that this paradigmatic post-home was not

3 Ostensibly introduced to curtail the ‘habitual criminality’ of groups such as the Thuggees, a secretive cult devoted to Kālī whose members were often accused of committing murders and robberies, the Criminal Tribes Act, 1871 quickly became one of the prime tools of colonial violence and control. Numerous small communities of poor, low-caste and nomadic people were subjected to forceful registration under this act, and some, such as low-status khwajasara, bereft of any inheritance or adoption rights. Part II of the act categorised all khwajasara as ‘eunuchs’, although in practice this criminal label applied only to those who were not attached to high-status households. The act introduced an array of ‘eunuch’-specific penalties—including for ‘appearing in female clothes’, ‘dancing in public or for hire’, ‘keeping [a] boy under sixteen’ and ‘kidnapping or castrating children’—and allowed for arresting ‘eunuchs’ without warrant. Although the Criminal Tribes Act, 1871 was repealed in 1949 and the former ‘criminal tribes’ ‘denotified’ in 1952, its legacy continues to haunt some 60 million people, who are still subject to social stigma, stereotyping and economic hardship across the subcontinent.
necessarily open to all those who sought refuge from gender-biased, usually natal, households of the past.

Coming post-home

Speaking of the daily violence that permeated *khwajasara* lifeworlds in the Punjab, Nazli pointed out in a recent interview that ‘even those who have no status in their own home, feel that they can abuse and disrespect us’ (Jaffer 2017: 185). Evidently, coming post-home to a *dera* did not necessarily mean overcoming the ill-treatment most *khwajasara* continuously suffered from in a largely hostile society. Whilst significant in the make-up of *khwajasara* lives, the *dera* offered but a limited protection from the outside world and, in turn, imposed hierarchies and limitations of its own—a cautionary tale for anyone’s attempt at romanticising a post-home. And yet, there was an ideality about the *dera* that, for many *khwajasara*, had to do with the trauma experienced in their natal homes.

‘I knew from my childhood that this was inside of me’, Saima told me. ‘Other kids around me, of my age or older, used to tease me because of how I was’ (Hamzić 2016: 281). And *this*, inside her, was a spiritual being. Kajol, an office clerk who was not an inhabitant of Saima’s *dera*, explained it to me: ‘We become *khwajasara* when a spirit—called *murid*—enters us [...]. Once *murid* is within oneself, one feels very special about oneself and then one can consider oneself *khwajasara*’ (ibid.: 156). That *murid* denotes both a disciple of a Şūfi teacher and a spirit sent onto *khwajasara* directly by God or through a *pir*’s (wise person’s) intercession is, of course, a testament of a deeply spiritual selfhood (ibid.: 282)—and one directly related to *khwajasara* foremost gender experience. In Kajol’s words, ‘[w]hen I was six, my sister used to dress me up as a girl and I used to feel very, very well that way’. But the abuse suffered in the hands of ‘people in the neighbourhood’ in which they lived with their natal families was commonplace to all of Saima’s *chele* (ibid.: 281). Whilst my interlocutors did not do so, *khwajasara* and *hijre* speaking to other researchers recounted numerous examples of domestic violence. A *khwajasara* in Peshawar spoke, for example, of the sense of shame she felt she had brought on her natal family, whilst several Delhi-based *hijre* reported that they had been abused by their parents or siblings. Surviving such a home was hard, and especially so when compounded by the severe violence experienced in school. Some would frequently change schools, others would drop out early—formal education was simply not a viable option for the great majority of *khwajasara* (Hahm 2010; Mazumdar 2016), nor was, indeed, their staying with their natal families. So a difficult search for a post-home would begin.
Some were brought to a dera, the others would happen upon one. As Saima recalled, ‘[w]hen I was a kid, I’d see all these khwajasara being invited by other people to their homes when child was born, to give blessings. And, if a baby happened to be a khusra, they would take it away. They wouldn’t let the baby stay in the house’ (Hamzić 2016: 281). She was referring to bad-hai—ceremonial performances at births, weddings and other auspicious occasions that are one of khwajasara’s principal traditional jobs and sources of income. That they could go as far as to claim a child whom they thought to be khwajasara attested to an extraordinary baraka, or special powers, that khwajasara were widely believed to possess, which could be used both as a blessing and a curse. Other times a post-home seeker, ostensibly guided by her murid, would find and join a khwajasara dera of her own volition—or almost so. As Jelek, one of Saima’s chele, explained:

*I entered a khwajasara household when I was eleven. I went to a mela [a local festival; plural: mailay]. At mailay, there are always many khwajasara, who go there and dance. I used to dance with them. Eventually, they enticed me to go and live with them. So I did. Through them, I got in touch with my guru. (ibid.)*

The enticement that Jelek suggested here might have had to do with the circumstances in which one entered a dera, which remained a taboo topic for many a khwajasara, not least because the ritual of emasculation and initiation, known as nirban, was thought to be a mystical experience that words could not quite capture and that an outsider was not capable of understand-
ing. It was through nirban that a khwajasara would truly become, whilst, with the help of her guru, being reminded of her khwajasara ancestry. As Bindiya Rana told me, '[w]henever I get a new chela, during the initiation ceremony, I will make [my first ancestral guru] her guru as well [...]. We even have certain documents of our khwajasara ancestors, when they received some tip or a reward from the Mughal emperor’ (ibid.: 162). These records (khata) of khwajasara lineage were kept safe by khwajasara leaders. Besides, being written into the khwajasara kinship system also meant to become beautiful. According to Neeli Rana, another khwajasara community leader, ‘whenever a khwajasara becomes nirban, she assimilates Mainandi and becomes as beautiful as she was […]. And, on the first night when a person becomes nirban, Mainandi appears before her and curses her’ (ibid.: 160–161). This narrative was perhaps a reminder that great beauty is born from great pain, and that the baraka a khwajasara embodied and was able to bestow upon others was a curse as much as a blessing.

Such a Manichaean view of khwajasara life was reflected in the dera’s idiosyncratic familial economy in myriad ways. When a novice was ritually initiated to the community of khwajasara, she was given a new name and assigned a mother (ma’an) and a guru to look after her. In return, the novice would vow never to return to her natal family’s home. The dera thus became her home after home as well as a place of vocational training—the true school (of life) where many of her vital skills, including a new secret language, known in the Punjab as Khwajasara Farsi, would be learnt. The homeliness of a dera for the new inhabitant was gradually acquired, often through hardship and struggle. The daughter (dhi) and the mother did not always get along. As Jala and Gangha told me, in front of their ma’an Saima, sometimes this was more so ‘like a mother-in-law and daughter-in-law relationship […]. We always fight with each other. There’s always some fuss’ (ibid.: 163). Some guru were known to be overly demanding and would threaten their chele’s disobedience with expulsion from the dera. On the other hand, chele were at freedom to change their guru and, indeed, to seek and enter other deray or go live on their own. Also, if their guru had died and there were no clear candidates for her successor, some chele of an equal status in Peshawar could opt to live together for some time without a distinct head of the household (Hahm 2010: 30). However, in the other deray in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and generally in the north of the country, the household hierarchy was such that it required a separate title for the head of a dera (naik), in charge—importantly—of the household income (Ahmad 2010; Saeed et al. 2018). In contrast, the Punjabi deray were often described as ‘more “modern” than “traditional” hijra families’ (Jaffer 2017: 189), implying more horizontal relationships and greater financial freedom.

The dera, as we have seen, was a particularly complex kind of post-home with respect to the intersections of communal living and semi-domes-
tic labour. The Lahori deray I have been to often simultaneously dubbed as family homes, brothels (or, rather, occasional sites for home-based sex work), dance studios, ritual sanctuaries, beauty salons, local kindergartens and bank-like depositories of khwajasara communal money and other valuable possessions (Hamzić 2017: 199). This multiplicity of uses of a collective space redrafted but did not entirely extinguish the boundaries between the private and the public. It did, however, make an idea and the daily habituation of a khwajasara post-home an exceptionally difficult and contingent labour. For example, the process of distributing income (nijra) was often particularly complicated (Sultana and Kalyani 2012: 106) and prone to many internal disputes, whilst home-based sex work required a special kind of sensitivity to the dynamics of neighbourly relations. And yet, however unfathomable the activities the dera was supposed to negotiate and house, it seemed to be a labour of love and struggle as much as the other types of households in the neighbourhood. The stability of a dera was neither guaranteed nor denied by its structure, however idiosyncratic it may have been. Ultimately, it was a space where labours of the informal found their quotidian utterance, where they were habituated and ossified. It was a joyful centre as well as a predicament of khwajasara’s daily life. The dera provided, delimited, healed, hurt, directed and disoriented—sometimes all at once.

Besides, the deray I have visited were firmly a part of the larger urban slum microcosm, negotiated and built upon the neighbourly solidarity in its countless manifestations—none of which, perhaps, as essential as collective action against police brutality (Hamzić 2017: 198–199). Khwajasara were often the particular targets of the police, especially if found begging or doing sex work outside the dera. As one Punjab-based study summarised, khwajasara were ordinarily ‘subjected to degrading treatment, torture, arbitrary arrest, detention, extortion, assault, and rape by police due to their gender nonconformity’ (Alizai et al. 2017: 1226). Police raids were commonplace even to some deray, for an allegation that the inhabitants were running a brothel would suffice for the officers to demand and take bribe from khwajasara (Sultana and Kalyani 2012: 104). Sometimes no allegation of sex work was necessary for the police to engage in violence. As Almas Boby, a Rawalpindi-based khwajasara community leader explained, ‘[w]hen we would return from functions the police would stop us and taunt us and steal the money we had collected at the function. We were grateful if the police only took our money and did [not] beat us or lock us up in the thana (police station)’ (Khan 2017: 1296–1297). Boby documented police brutality against khwajasara across the country and used it to demand state responsibility and protection (ibid.: 1299). But even the cases that had ended with a fatality, such as that in which a khwajasara had died of her injuries whilst in police custody (Alizai et al. 2017: 1227), have not been properly investigated and no police officer was ever brought to trial. In such precarious circumstances, kh-
wajasara worked tirelessly to negotiate some level of community protection from the police, and to win ‘the right to be left alone, as much and whenever possible, except in times of wider “moral panic”’ (Hamzić 2017: 199). The dera proved to be the key element in such endeavours, offering an economic and social model of coexistence that was sufficiently cohesive and multifarious to earn khwajasara some substantial bargaining powers. Of course, it could not and did not afford an environment free from everyday violence—but the dera did make some khwajasara lives more liveable.

Post-home diffusions

Whilst living in a dera also meant participating in the kind of resistance a particular lower-class neighbourhood had assumed in order to keep the state and its violent law-enforcement agents at bay to the extent possible, such modes of public engagement presented a challenge for khwajasara. The neighbourly defiance often took the form of what James C. Scott called ‘the infrapolitics of the powerless’, which he described as ‘the strategic form that the resistance of subjects must assume under conditions of great peril’ (Scott 1990: xiii, 199). For Scott, this form was mainly discursive, relying on the ‘hidden transcript’ that such subjects developed through speeches, gestures and other practices as ‘a critique of power spoken behind the back of the dominant’ (ibid.: xii). As the existence of Khwajasara Farsi—which vested certain common words in a local language (in Lahore, this would be mostly Punjabi) with special meaning, known only to khwajasara and their allies—shows in no uncertain terms, khwajasara were veritable masters of the hidden transcript. It also enabled them to move subversively between different types of local solidarity and togetherness, choosing, for instance, between ‘male’ and ‘female’ attire to achieve different social, political and spiritual goals. Their resistance to oppressive mainstay legalities, be they of Muslim, colonial or post-colonial origin, also rested on an ability to claim, along with their neighbours, what I called an alegal space (Hamzić 2017), where law’s public force, reliant as always on the legal-illegal dyad, could be gradually displaced by an altogether less violent and much more ambiguous normativity.

But the khwajasara bodily and gender difference was such that it could never quite fully benefit from or count on the domain of the infrapolitical. In fact, an entire set of bodily gestures, sounds and sartorial choices, sometimes described as hijrapan (hijra-ness) or hijraism (Hinchy 2019: 82; Pamment 2010), have been for a very long time associated with khwajasara subjectivity and their performance of gender. Subversive to the extent that they made khwajasara the recognisable agents for social and political change, these traits enabled, for example, the Pakistani collectives of khwajasara to lead numerous peaceful demonstrations on issues of importance for lower and working classes (Hamzić 2016: 168) and to spearhead the wave of momen-
tous legal change, which included an official recognition of ‘third-gender’ communities in Pakistan and led to the state legislation aimed at protection of transgender persons (ibid.: 2016: 166–169; Hamzić 2019: 424–427, 432; Redding 2015). The public visibility of khwajasara, a source of both daily violence and khwajasara’s complex social interactions with the wider world, meant that at least from the early 2010s—which saw the rise of formidable media-savvy khwajasara organisations—the distinction between infra-politics and politics was no longer tenable. Faced with a global appetite for the type of activism that would fit the larger developmental and identitary schemes and an ambiguous reaction of the Pakistani civil society (Hamzić 2012; Hamzić 2019), the newly formed khwajasara associations sought to carve out an idiosyncratic space for themselves. Or, as Shahnaz Khan has claimed, ‘[r]efusing to be contained within static traditional space, khwajasara articulate[d] political society in ways that both challenge[d] civil society and embrace[d] it at the same time’ (Khan 2017: 1302).

For instance, when khwajasara organised and led the very first Trans Pride March on 29 December 2018, they came out on the streets of Lahore in their festive traditional clothes, some driven on ornate horse buggies, waving both Pakistani and trans pride flags (Malik 2018; Imtiaz 2018; Mehmood 2018). There was a cake with stripes in the colours of transnational trans solidarity, but also an abundance of symbols of traditional celebrations. It was as if khwajasara activists brought out to the public some of the celebratory and
heart-warming manifestations of their dera life and their traditional badhai performances—albeit for the purposes of demanding their newly affirmed legal rights. This blend of the tried out and the experimental, of the familial and the public, of an intersectional solidarity, may have been surprising to some but it fits quite well the interstitial politics that in the past decade or so has become the staple of khwajasara activism in Pakistan. This has been, no doubt, an out-of-dera process, where the skills and practices of belonging, solidarity and collective action had been honed first, only to be brought to the new—and larger—social and political contexts.

What did this mean for khwajasara’s post-home-coming? That their post-homes were nearly always diffusive and could not be contained within the bounds of a single dwelling practice. And also, conversely, that the dera, as a key model of communal life, extended into the ever-expanding khwajasara spaces of social and political intervention. These were both unifying and deeply unsettling forces.

On the one hand, khwajasara entered the whirlwind of transnational debates on gender and sexuality, described recently as a trans-in-Asia and Asia-in-trans dynamic in which, mindful of the epistemic and political dangers associated with ‘immediate assumptions about the universality of transgender experiences’, the subjectivities such as khwajasara could help ‘provincialize, decolonize, de-Cold War, and/or decolorize the category and practice of trans’ (Chiang et al. 2018: 299). According to one author, there could be a role for khwajasara to play in answering the larger question of what it would ‘mean to hybridize the term transgender’, so that it becomes homelier to their lives and politics (Chatterjee 2018: 317). Related to this effort would also be the task of challenging ‘the India-centricity in hijra studies’ so as to reach ‘new epistemological and analytical possibilities in terms of how the hijras are conceived and interpreted’ (Hossain 2018: 321). Interestingly, an example used to propose this turn was a hijra sex worker in Bangladesh who, after work, ‘returns to this room, changes into masculine sartoriality and then heads back to her heterosexual household’ (ibid.: 323). Was this a kind of infrapolitics, or a ‘mere’ manifestation of social conformity, or even a challenge to the dera as the dominant model of hijra dwelling and identitary practices? In Saima’s dera, for example, her chele showed me the wedding photograph of a wife and a husband. But, as I found out, both of them were, in fact, khwajasara and each of them sometimes wore ‘men’s’ and ‘women’s’ clothes (Hamzić 2016: 163). This ambiguity and plurality of gender expressions, so central to so many khwajasara and their deray, should not be lost on those seeking to situate anew khwajasara’s lives and politics. The dera, in that sense, could be understood as a hermeneutical (post-)homing device that re-centres both the locality of where one is writing from and where/who one is writing about.
On the other hand, an increasing exposure to transnational funding (Chatterjee 2018: 311–312) and different (however limited) domestic sources of financial and organisational aid revealed and perhaps even caused certain, primarily class-based, fissures within the khwajasara community. This might have been an inevitable consequence of some khwajasara representatives further ascending to and walking the halls of power in a deeply neoliberal post-colonial state—a road, sadly, well-travelled by some notable national feminist organisations (Hamzić 2019). But it has shown, too, that a small number of khwajasara non-governmental collectives had not necessarily arisen in congruence with the wishes of local khwajasara communities. As a non-governmental worker amidst such turmoil told me, there were moments when local, mostly middle-class, men would come up and say, 'Let’s assemble a group of hijre and call it a CBO [community-based organisation]' (Hamzić 2016: 283). Connected to all this were complaints that some khwajasara had made, to me and other researchers, that some of those ‘conference-hopping’ individuals were not necessarily their true representatives. Once again, one’s distance from the dera—as a source of kinship or, better, ‘feeling of belongingness’ (apnapan) (Mazumdar 2016: 26)—may have been the deciding factor in whether one could still embody and represent the kind of sociality and politics that the majority of khwajasara subscribed to in their post-home lifeworlds.

However, the spatial and identitary formations provided by the dera were not static or sedentary per se. Rather, they presumed a type of constant journeying towards thereness—in gender, in spirit, in the body—along with fellow travellers. This thereness could not be simply construed as hijrapan, precisely because it transgressed the spectacle (tamasha)—so ordinarily associated with khwajasara—and reached deep into the performativity beyond the public act and the actuality of post-home-coming unfettered by a spatial or identitary destination. And, as we shall see, such thereness was manifest especially when a khwajasara—guided by her murid, her pir and an otherworldly sense of the Self—began an ascetic journey towards her Home in the hereafter.

After post-home

Jala was squatting on the floor next to Saima’s divan. By now the dusk had fallen and the last call for the evening prayer (ṣalāt al-maghrib, maghrib namaaz) still echoed in the distance. She was a Christian and Saima’s chela. Still, she was holding in her hand a picture of her pir. ‘I often go to his dergah [shrine]’, she told me. ‘We go there and pray for ourselves and for our families. We dance there and join our hands in prayer’. Saima, a Muslim, explained, ‘When one becomes a disciple of a pir […] one is taught how to become a better person, how to immerse oneself in [ṣalāt]’ (Hamzić 2016: 164). Khwa-
Jasara’s spiritual journeys placed little emphasis on nominal religious differences and their common hieropraxis was intimately linked with frequent visits to the dergah of their pir, where they immersed themselves in various devotional practices—some of which they led, some of which they followed (Jaffer 2017: 177). Dotted throughout the country as a testament to South Asia’s never-faltering Sufi spiritual geographies, these bustling shrines offered khwajasara a threshold (this, too, is the literal meaning of dergah) to the hereafter, a palpable sense of an eternal home after post-home in which they and their inner murid would eventually join their pir and their God. Journeying towards a dergah was, at times, an ascetic experience, where a khwajasara would renounce all relations and possessions to become a faqir (from Arabic: faqir, poor person; plural: fuqarāʾ), the spiritual seeker depending solely upon the divine mercy and guidance. This sort of devotion would, however, culminate at the dergah in the state of mast, a sense of being intoxicated by one’s love for God—and, by extension, one’s love for one’s fellow spiritual and human co-travellers—that made one ‘completely and genuinely consumed in divine pleasure such that nothing else matters’ (ibid.: 186).

The dergah was also a place of gender transience. Saima’s pir, for example, was Shah Hussain, a sixteenth-century Punjabi Sufi poet whose love for a young beardless Brahmin named Madho Lal has led to Hussain himself becoming known as Madho Lal Hussain. Many Pakistani khwajasara have told me they believed that Madho Lal was, in fact, also a khwajasara. Besides, the spiritual oneness of the poet and his beloved transgressed the earthly genders and, for that matter, sexualities, too (Kugle 2000; Kidwai 2000; Kugle 2007). A Mughal-time Sufi poet—such as the famous Bulleh Shah—would often switch to the female first person voice (and sometimes attire), as a result,
presumably, of the state of mast (Jaffer 2017: 185). Khwajasara’s hieropraxis was similarly gender-variant. So, just like some mosques, churches and other shrines in the Punjab, Madho Lal Hussain’s dergah in Lahore was a sacred place that khwajasara visited both in their ‘female’ and ‘male’ clothes (Hamzić 2016: 164–165). In so doing, they saw themselves as an embodiment of barzakh, the mystical isthmus that God has placed between the two seas (Qur’an 55: 19–21) signifying, in khwajasara cosmology, an interworld between the two genders (Hamzić 2016: 272; Corbin 1993: 213; Fakhri 2004 [1970]: 308; Hussaini 2012). Researchers therefore have proposed that khwajasara occupied a liminal space that was ‘neither here nor there’ with respect to the binary vision of either sex or gender, and that this was an expression of their ‘spiritual gender identity’ (Jaffer 2017: 175, 182–183; Hussaini 2012). But I would suggest that, as an interworld proper, khwajasara saw barzakh—and, by extension, the dergah and other spiritual loci—as manifest of (a higher) thereness, where one’s spatial and identitary journey could reach the threshold of the Unity of Being (in Sufi metaphysics: waḥdat al-wujūd) so as to return to One Self. That threshold could be experienced and embodied in this life in various fashions, but it could not be crossed, for to do so would mean to enter (forever) one’s true Home in One Self in the hereafter.

Such journeys were neither limited to Pakistan nor, indeed, South Asia. South Asian borders seemed wondrously porous for this subjectivity, with a number of hijre regularly crossing between countries—sometimes even ‘without a visa and passport’ (Hossain 2018: 325)—for the reasons of trade, communal dispute resolution (or other intra-hijre affairs) and, indeed, pilgrimage. Some have completed the hajj or the umra (the main and the lesser Muslim pilgrimages to Mecca) and claimed that they had seen aghāwāt there and thought them to be just like themselves. Such journeys were often indicative of what Ratna Kapur described as ‘another way of being in the world, where freedom is addressed not as an explicit, imposed process but as a modality of self-transformation that functions as a catalyst for external emancipation’ (Kapur 2018: 239). Freedom, in other words, was primarily in thereness, whether experienced in a post-home or in one’s pilgrimage as/to the threshold to one’s Home after post-home. In meeting aghāwāt on such a journey khwajasara may have completed a trans-historical cycle of gender-variant thereness, across spaces and times. This certainly would not be unusual for khwajasara metaphysics, so geared towards exploratory senses of the subject, including that subject’s gender and bodily/spatial identities.

Conclusion

The critical phases in a khwajasara life path I have endeavoured to engage with in this article are, of course, at best an approximation, a brief sketch of khwajasara identitary and material dwelling practices, which, in reality, did
not always cohere. Some *khwajasara* felt alienated by the explicit and implicit community hierarchies; some bore the brunt of Pakistan’s dominant narratives of belonging and habituation to such an extent that they felt orphaned both within and without their post-homes; still some saw an opportunity for ‘upward mobility’ in the country’s entertainment, news or non-governmental industries that presumed severing all but essential ties with their former *dera*. Even the *dera*, as the key model of *khwajasara* social occupancy, provided a type of homeliness that had to be constantly negotiated through and depended upon numerous domestic and non-domestic relations. And yet, the affective and habitual ties produced in and by the *dera* so directed a great many *khwajasara* that journeying from it, whether into the new social and political realities of *khwajasara*’s public life or towards one’s Home after post-home, still felt as a form of thereness (political, spiritual and so on) and, therefore, open to individual and communal experimentation.

It was this resilient, exploratory spirit that seems to have sustained *khwajasara* lifeworlds the most, often against all odds. Its latest iteration, manifest in the Pakistani *khwajasara*’s strong identitary claim on the Mughal past, sought both to decolonise their communal common ground and to conjure up the visions of a dignified and less violent future. As we have seen, there is much in this eventful past that the *khwajasara* history of today could build on, but also some cautionary tales of never-quite-perfect homecoming. Similarly, the recent *khwajasara* public activism is not without its pitfalls. Careful though it may be to foreground an essentially intersectional politics—akin, perhaps, to the demands of transfeminist collectives elsewhere (Stryker and Bettcher 2016)—it nonetheless may have inadvertently exacerbated certain class-based fissures within the *khwajasara* community. It is, therefore, all the more regrettable that the political ties between *khwajasara* and Pakistani feminist movements are still far and few between (Hamzić 2019), though there are some signals that this could change. The class divisions befalling Pakistan’s civil society are still a major obstacle, as is the stereotype of *khwajasara* as the gendered other.

To be sure, such othering is still perpetuated in academic research, too. A cursory glance at recent works on *khwajasara* reveals, for example, studies accusing them of ‘femaling males’ or of ‘socially constructed kinlessness’ (Sultana and Kalyani 2012; Taparia 2011), whilst *dera* is routinely described as ‘pseudo-household’ (Alizai et al. 2017: 1217). Such research follows the long trajectory of colonial and post-colonial ‘scientific’ works, which sought to exoticise and pathologise *khwajasara* and, in some extreme examples, do away with them altogether. Against the background of such violence, *khwajasara* immersed themselves fully in South Asia’s bustling spiritual geographies and crafted an interworld of their own, capable of both containing and communicating with the protean concepts—and spaces—of ‘maleness’ and ‘femaleness’.
It would, therefore, be a mistake to perceive *khwajasara*’s lifeworlds, largely framed by and in *deray*, as abject or inconsequential to the other Pakistani ‘ways of living’. My proposal is, rather, that the dynamics of identitary and spatial journeying within and throughout the *khwajasara* dwelling strata reveal what one could term as *productive anxieties* about their—or, indeed, everyone’s—classed, urbanised, economised and gendered home-life. These anxieties seem to me productive inasmuch as they signal a set of one’s collectively and individually acquired life skills that unsettle the affective and material ‘truths’ and ‘commonplaces’ about one’s self and the other as well as the spatialities such knowledge habituates. For *khwajasara*, at least, home-coming has meant, for a very long time, a struggle for a homeliness that is ultimately contingent on a loss of the homeland’s prescriptive forms of dwelling in the world.
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Your Dream Home Awaits You:
Engaging with People and Place through Painting in an
Australian Public Housing Precinct Undergoing Renewal

Katie Hayne

Introduction

For over a decade, I travelled down Canberra’s Northbourne Avenue each
day on my way to work.¹ The fleeting glimpses of the iconic modernist archi-
tecture of the public housing between the towering gums created the char-
acter of the Avenue. The curious signs of life gave some clues to the com-
munity that lived there: an old couch on the footpath, a broken-down car, a
political sign in a window. In 2015, the Australian Capital Territory (ACT)
Government announced the Northbourne Avenue inner-city public housing
precincts were to be demolished between 2016 and 2019 as part of an ‘urban
renewal project’. The land would be sold to fund a light-rail program. The
Government claimed the housing was ageing, expensive to maintain and had
created large concentrations of disadvantage (see Canberra Times 2015 and
2017, ABC News 2015). It is a story of gentrification that is being told in many
cities across the world.

In a final attempt to save some of the architecturally significant build-
ings, the ACT Heritage Council was successful in a compromise deal with the
Government, who agreed to retain a representative sample of the key build-
ing styles (McIlroy 2015). The political tussles that played out in the media
about the value of the housing clearly had an impact on the community that
lived there. Resident Phil Brown wrote an article in the Canberra Times stat-
ing:

Since the Northbourne redevelopments were announced, our
homes have been called eyesores, ghettos and drug-infested
crime dens that should have been knocked down years ago;
the people within called scumbags, drug addicts, dole bludgers,
criminals and paedophiles among the many insults. Now we’re
told we’re not wanted anywhere simply because of where we
come from and based on the above assumptions. (Brown 2017)

Mr Brown’s comments indicate the extent to which the public housing had
become stigmatised in Canberra, as well as the stereotyping of the people
who lived there. In my project, I hoped to engage with the residents through

¹ I rented an ex-government house, known as an ‘ex-guvvie’, in the inner-north
area for this period. Due to the increasing house prices and high rents in the
area, I have since moved to a suburb further from the inner-city.
creative practice to gain a deeper insight into their opinions of the public housing precincts and their pending demolition.

This article provides a brief background to art–anthropology convergences and presents an introduction to the Northbourne Avenue public housing site. This is followed by an exegetical account of the fieldwork research and the studio-based creative research I conducted between 2016 and 2018. The research set out to gain an insight into the residents’ lived experience of the Northbourne Avenue public housing. Taking the broad definition of lived experience as ‘personal knowledge about the world gained through direct, first-hand involvement in everyday events’ (Chandler and Munday 2011: para. 1), I discuss the methodologies of practice-led research in painting, augmented by photography and video, as complementary to anthropological methods for engaging with people and place. I present a series of oil paintings that I produced as part of the research process and trace how an ongoing creative practice was a point of connection with the public housing residents. Whilst acknowledging the limitations of traditional studio- and exhibition-based art models in enabling community participation (Kester 2013: 124–126), my intention here is to demonstrate how creative practice-led research in drawing and painting can enable engagement with residents of a large housing estate, and contribute to understandings of home and house at a time of increasing global housing uncertainty.

Art–anthropology convergences

Over the past two decades, there has been a growing body of literature in anthropology arguing for further explorations into interdisciplinary art–anthropology approaches (see Grimshaw and Ravetz 2004, 2015; Schneider and Wright 2006, 2010 and 2013; Ingold 2013; Sansi 2015; Pröpper 2015, Rutten 2016 and Haviland 2017). Arnd Schneider proposes:

>[...] there is now a current climate of ‘convergence’, with on the one hand, the so-called ‘ethnographic turn’ of the arts, and on the other hand, the (post) writing culture critique of fieldwork practices in anthropology, coupled with a renewed emphasis on practice (in addition to, and beyond text). (2015: 24)

Tim Ingold, in his book Making (2013), argues for an anthropology with art rather than anthropology of art, noting that we are used to the idea of anthropological research including photographs and films: ‘But could they also include drawings, paintings, or sculpture? Or works of craft? Or musical compositions? Or even buildings?’ (ibid.: 8). In art, this focus on making and practice as knowledge has been explored in depth in discussions around the model of creative practice-led research (Smith and Dean 2009, Barrett and Bolt 2010, Gibson 2010). This art-based model outlines an iterative research
process that emphasises creative studio-based work as part of new knowledge creation, although less consideration is given to field research and social interaction.

As an undergraduate student, I studied visual arts and anthropology and, for over a decade, I worked alongside anthropologists and ethnographic filmmakers in a research centre for visual anthropology and digital humanities.² When I decided to do a postgraduate degree in painting, it seemed natural to me to explore the relationship between practice-based research in painting and anthropology. I was wary, from the outset, of being criticised for being a ‘quasi-anthropologist’ (Foster 1996: 302). This was despite my experience of anthropology where the realities of fieldwork and participant observation had become much more fluid than alluded to by Foster. Hal Foster’s questioning of art’s ability to challenge, rather than reiterate inequitable power relations, continues to be discussed in depth today (see Rutten et al. 2013, Hjorth and Sharp 2014, Grimshaw and Ravetz 2015). A relevant example here is the implication of art in aiding the gentrification of our cities. The term ‘art-washing’ has been used to describe this process of government and businesses moving galleries and artists into run-down areas to revitalise them. In some cases, negative criticism has even been directed at the community-based and creative place-making projects of the individual artists themselves (Prichard 2018). Lucy Lippard has argued that, as artists and anthropologists, we must always firstly ask: ‘are we wanted here?’ (2010: 32). This is not always an easy question to answer and it has remained at the forefront of my mind throughout this project.

As I continue to explore how to position myself as a researcher, whose primary practice is oil painting and who engages with a community, I have looked to other art-anthropology projects. The projects most often cited as examples of art-anthropology collaborations are socially engaged (Sansi 2015: 17), typically incorporating photography, video and installation. Nevertheless, there are painters who identify as artist-ethnographers (for example, Zoe Bray and Lydia Nakashima Degarrod), as well as anthropologists who draw and/or paint (Manuel João Ramos, Amanda Ravetz, Susan Ossman and Michael Taussig). I do not consider this project’s approach to be a socially engaged or participatory one, in the sense that I have not invited residents of the public housing precinct to create art or interact with the creation of the art directly. Nor have I held community art workshops. I do propose, how-

² I was influenced by visual anthropologists and ethnographic filmmakers Philippa Deveson, Kim McKenzie, David and Judith MacDougall and Howard Morphy at the Centre for Cross-Cultural Research, The Australian National University. I collaborated on numerous Indigenous media projects, which provided in-depth experience in the use of the visual methods of photography, video and digital media in cross-cultural contexts, producing several short ethnographic films and digital media publications (e.g. Morphy et al. 2005).
ever, that my drawings and paintings have been a catalyst for social engagement through urban field research. From an anthropological perspective, I seek to take a reflexive approach (MacDougall 1998: 89), acknowledging my role and agency as an artist, one benefiting from the development of their own art practice. Through the furthering of relationships with the research participants, spending time in place and conducting interviews, I hope to develop a painting practice that is ethical and such that it can contribute deeper understanding of the residents’ lived experience of the public housing precincts. This research thus offers an alternative, and a more nuanced image of public housing than the one presented in the public media.

Public housing in Canberra

Public housing has played an important role in the development of Canberra as Australia’s national capital. When the capital was founded in 1911, it was only a small country town and it soon became clear to the government that providing adequate housing was key to the city’s success (Wright 2000: 6).

This led to a public housing development program designed to accommodate all classes of society, not only low-income earners. Accommodation was provided in the form of free-standing housing, which came to be known as ‘ex-guvvies’, as well as camps, hotels and hostels (Hutchison 2006, Graham Brooks and Associates 2014: 55). Despite this provision, there remained a

3 A comprehensive history of the development of public housing in Canberra can be read in Bruce Wright’s (2000) Cornerstone of the Capital: History of Public Housing in Canberra.
significant housing shortage throughout the period between the 1930s and the 1950s. A piecemeal approach to planning, the 1930s depression, as well as the shortage of materials and labour due to World War II, all exacerbated the problem. Further pressure was placed on the housing supply in 1948, when the ACT Government decided to transfer the remaining public service departments from Melbourne to Canberra (Graham Brookes and Associates 2014: 55). Blocks of flats, previously considered undesirable, suddenly found favour (Wright 2000: 29) and there was a shift towards faster and cheaper modern design and construction techniques (ACT Heritage Council 2015: 3).

It is this later phase of Canberra’s public housing program that has been the target of urban renewal/redevelopment, and the one I focus on here. In particular, I consider the Northbourne Flats and the Northbourne Housing Precinct, both situated along Northbourne Avenue, the main northern entry leading into Canberra. The Northbourne Flats (see Figure 1), completed in 1958, consist of 248 flats of one, two, and three bedrooms. They are arranged in a repetitive configuration of three-storey blocks on either side of Northbourne Avenue. The Northbourne Housing Precinct (Figure 2) was built between 1959 and 1962, and is considered to be a more confident adoption of the postwar International Style and of greater architectural significance (Graham Brooks and Associates 2014: 57). The architectural firm Ancher, Mortlock and Murray was selected to design the precinct, with Sydney Ancher as Director in Charge. Ancher is known to have been inspired by European modernism, particularly the work of Le Corbusier and Mies van de Rohe, during his travels throughout Europe. He visited the, then controversial, Wiessenhoffsiedlung exhibition in Stuttgart and the Berlin Building exhibition in 1931 (ACT Land Development Authority 2014).

The modernist ideal of a more egalitarian housing, with an emphasis on rational and functional design, can be identified in the designs of the Northbourne Housing Precinct. The brief was to provide a range of prefabricated concrete and brick housing flats and attached houses with an emphasis on a strong landscaping program. The final precinct consisted of four housing groups: the two-storey De Burgh Street pair houses, the four-storey Dickson and Lyneham bachelor flats, and the three-storey Karuah maisonettes and Dickson garden flats. According to the ACT Heritage Council, the precinct was ‘designed and constructed to present a “gateway” to Canberra which required a high degree of civic design’ (2015: 5). A small sample of each housing type in the Northbourne Housing Precinct will be saved due to the successful heritage listing, but the demolition of the precinct as public housing questions whether the ideals of modernist housing estates were ever realised. It presents an example where, despite the variety in design of the housing, none of the housing types have been deemed suitable as public housing. Did the Northbourne Flats and Housing Precinct fail its intended purpose? Or is the failure simply a part of broader attitudes towards public housing?

There has certainly been a reduction in public housing across Australia since the 1960s, and in 2018, 7.1 per cent of housing stock remained public housing (Burgess, 2018). Public housing, originally available to the fully employed, is today means-tested and predominantly occupied by welfare recipients (Wright 2000: 71). In a critical literature review on the meaning of home, Shelley Mallett notes that [the] governments of advanced capitalist countries such as Britain, Australia, Canada and New Zealand have actively promoted the conflation of house, home and family as part of a broader ideological agenda aimed at increasing economic efficiency and growth. These governments have attempted to shift the burden of responsibility for citizens’ welfare away from the state and its institutions on to the home and nuclear family. (2004: 66)

Furthermore, the public housing on Northbourne Avenue had gained a very poor reputation, predominantly through media reporting and the visual appearance of the buildings.

The study of home and domestic spaces has long been of central importance to anthropology (Miller 2001: 2) and, likewise, explorations of dwellings and the domestic sphere have been an important subject in the visual arts (see Perry 2014, Racz 2015, Lauzon 2017). However, researchers have increasingly recognised home as a complex, multilayered concept that requires a multidisciplinary approach (Mallett 2004: 64, Cox and Buchli 2017: xii). Researchers have also outlined a conflation between the materiality of ‘house’ with the more nebulous concept of ‘home’, particularly with regards to how the ‘ideal’ and ‘real’ can be seen to coexist in a tension (Mallett
2004: 70, Blunt and Sheringham 2018: 6–8). This is especially relevant to the stigmatisation of large social housing estates, which has been recognised in many developed cities across the world (see Arthurson 2004; Wassenberg 2004, 2013; Hastings 2004; Atkinson et al. 2008; Jacobs and Flanagan 2013). Blunt and Sheringham suggesting ‘wider perceptions and media representations of certain residential buildings as unhomely and alienating run counter to the lived realities of such spaces’, citing projects that have sought to challenge the assumption that declining buildings must contain declining communities (2018: 7). Indeed, due to the poor reputation of Canberra’s inner-city public housing, there was a backlash from communities living in the outer suburbs against the building of new public housing in their areas (Lawson 2015 and Brown 2017).

It was in this sensitive social and political context that I sought to engage with housing residents: a social system that favours private ownership; a time of increasingly unaffordable house and rental prices; a society that conflates public housing with crime and dysfunction; and a time when many long-term residents were facing forced relocation.

Observation and engagement through drawing

As noted, my research methods included a combination of participant observation, drawing, painting, photography, video and interviews. I began by videoing the Dickson Bachelor Flats – the first public housing buildings to be demolished (Figure 3).
Behind the camera was *my* comfort zone, due to having had more experience in photo-based media than drawing or painting. After several days of returning to watch the peeling back of the building exteriors (revealing previously hidden interiors), I finally met one of the ex-tenants who was watching his home being demolished. ‘That was my bathroom’, he said, as the metal claw nibbled away at the brick walls. He told me that there ‘used to be a community garden’ and that ‘the man downstairs caused some problems, but things were good’. He said he’d be happy to be interviewed but, before it could be arranged, he walked off. He was clearly very emotional, and I tried to imagine how watching your house be demolished would feel. It became evident how difficult it was going to be to meet and talk to the residents and I wondered if the large camera was a deterrent. The issues were sensitive and it became clear that waiting to talk to people after their homes were demolished was too late.

After several weeks of filming and photographing in and around the remaining housing precincts, with little progress in meeting any more residents, I eventually forced myself to leave the camera behind and try drawing. Drawing in the street was generally slower than photography; it required somewhere to sit and, at first, I felt more exposed. Despite this, after some initial hesitation, I began to experience a greater sense of engagement with place, simply due to being *in situ* for a longer period of time. Drawing required more effort than taking a ‘snapshot’ and was more personally revealing – a passer-by could potentially come and have a look at my drawing. Michael Taussig (2011: 21) describes drawing as a process of ‘giving’ and photography as a ‘taking’. This is an overly simplistic analogy, as Taussig himself acknowledges, yet, at a basic level, it describes how I experienced sketching versus photographing at this time.

To further experiment with sketching in the street, I selected the De Burgh Street housing in the Northbourne Housing Precinct, as well as the Northbourne Flats, the housing that was still occupied by residents. Drawing sharpened my attention to architecture and enabled me to observe in detail the individual character of the houses and gardens. I noticed such features as the variety in the window coverings, the plantings, the hanging windchimes, the washing-drying, the subtle variation in paint colours, the mailbox styles and the front-gate signage. I also became aware of the comings, goings and the sounds of people, cars, cats, dogs and birds. These were not necessarily represented in my drawings, but the process of drawings forced me to experience them with greater attention.

When drawing, there is an activation between the hand and the eye that creates a physical–mental connection with what one is representing. John Berger (1953) wrote eloquently about the drawer becoming one with their subject:
Each confirmation or denial brings you closer to the object, until finally you are, as it were, inside it: the contours you have drawn no longer marking the edge of what you have seen but the edge of what you have become.

Amanda Ravetz (2011: 158) similarly discussed a ‘heightened awareness’ when drawing and how, for her, this sensation was comparable to the expanded sensorial perception induced while conducting observational filmmaking. Ravetz’s description of a heightened awareness resonates with me, although I did not feel such a strong similarity between drawing and observational filmmaking (ibid: 169). The sketch book and pencil do not carry the same technological burden as the video recording, which entails a constant need to monitor image and audio quality, as well as the battery levels and storage memory. And, secondly, returning to Taussig’s (2011) description of drawing as a process of giving, my experience of drawing felt closer to an exchange. The act of drawing, due to its immediate visibility, required me to give more of myself than notetaking, photography or video would.

My drawings, albeit realistic in style, do not set out to be a highly accurate documentation, nor do they contain invented things of what I did not actually see. In this way, my sketches became the beginnings of narrative compositions, as I selected and framed, chose to focus on certain features and not others. I was aware of the same responsibilities of representation that apply when photographing or videoing (or the more conventional ethnographic writing for that matter). For example, I did not intentionally emphasise aspects that might be seen as negative – the signs of deterioration and rubbish – nor did I completely leave them out. In my street drawings, I tried to experience the ‘essence of place’ through my observations.
Beyond experiencing place, what I did not expect was that drawing in the street would become one of the most significant ways for me to meet and engage with the residents (Figure 4). In the De Burgh Street housing precinct, the high fences seemed an impassable barrier. However, within a 20-minute time frame of doing a quick sketch, someone would almost always come past or out of their home. I would show my sketches and explain that I was drawing the houses as a part of my artistic and anthropological study into the housing precinct. Through this exchange on the street, I got the immediate sense that my drawings were valued. The conversation would almost immediately lead to the narration of stories about the housing, as well as the showcasing of the objects that they valued.

![Fig. 5. Drawing of a De Burgh Street pair (semi-attached) house, pencil on paper. By Katie Hayne, 2017.](image)

After seeing my drawings, Hughie, one of the project participants, went inside his home and brought out a prized possession — a team football photo with both him and his brother when they lived in Ireland. At another time, a woman brought out a landscape painting she had done to see what I thought of it. One resident, Michael, who saw me drawing, told me that he used to be a professional artist. He shared his knowledge about painting and recommended several artists I should look at. Michael told me that the best time to see the houses is in the afternoon — ‘you get those long shadows and the railings and pergolas make interesting patterns’. He also talked about the bird life and how John, his neighbour, fills the water pots for the birds every day. When I showed Michael one of my drawings, he said ‘you know the roofs are
flat’ (Figure 5). He was alluding to their architectural significance and diplomatically questioned how I had missed this important aspect of their design. ‘It’s not a very good design for the Australian climate because there are no eaves’, he added. These conversations usually took place around a cluster of the ubiquitous ‘wheelie’ (rubbish) bins. Sometimes, another neighbour would come out of their house and join in. From these meetings, I started to gain small insights into the community, stories from their time living there, and how they felt about the housing.

I believe that the very act of drawing, including its reception, was important in being accepted by the residents. As Manuel João Ramos (2004: 149) suggests, for the anthropologist, ‘drawing is not merely a documenting activity but also an important and creative tool for interacting with and relating to human beings, of different cultures and languages’. Furthermore, for Ramos, drawing ‘helps humanise me in other people’s eyes, it becomes part of the anthropological process of tentatively bringing together observer and observed’ (2004: 149). When one of the residents, Jim, saw me drawing, he said I had a ‘gift from god’ and that it was my responsibility to document the buildings and the trees before they go. Jim gave me a tour of his favourite trees in the Northbourne Flats precinct, commenting on the species, the tree canopy and the bird life (Figure 6). He said I must draw the Golden Ash. In comparison to ethnographic writing, filmmaking or photography, drawing starts with sharing something of yourself and may have the potential to elicit a greater sense of exchange. In this way, the residents demonstrated that they valued my
artworks and, as they started to play a role in directing the focus of my drawings and subsequent paintings, they often also opened up to the possibility of recorded interviews.

Interviews with residents

I formally interviewed six residents in the De Burgh Street houses and four residents (or people associated with) the Northbourne Flats. I had many conversations with other residents that also informed my perception of place and community. This was predominantly through a period of participant observation, whilst visiting the Northbourne Community Centre over six months. Of the ten people I interviewed, eight were current residents, one had been a resident as a child, and one was the Anglican Deacon who ran the Northbourne Community Centre. Of the eight current residents, all, except Kolka, presented themselves as ‘single’ and living alone. Kolka lived with her nine-year-old son and was in a long-term relationship. Hughie moved in with a partner who had since passed away. Five interviewees were male and five were female, ageing from approximately 42 to 82 years old. Six people mentioned having children, two had grandchildren or step-grandchildren. One interviewee arrived in Australia as a refugee, Hughie as an Irish migrant and Paul was a descendent of one of the first European families to settle in Canberra. Five mentioned having pets living with them at some stage. There was a surprising diversity in such a small sample. It revealed that it was likely that people living in public housing in Canberra had extremely varied backgrounds and lives.

When I interviewed Peta, I discovered she had studied architecture and that she was passionate about the design of urban spaces in Canberra. Peta worked for many years in the Australian Public Service and raised her daughter as a single mother. She had lived in De Burgh Street for 42 years. Her granddaughter now comes to stay regularly, and she told me they are big fans of the comedy sketch Portlandia. She was thrilled that I was documenting the houses and she lent me a book about the architect Sydney Ancher, as well as her book on the Bauhaus. She corrected me every time when I referred to the De Burgh houses as ‘flats’ and explained how technically they are ‘pair houses’ and how her place is, in fact, one of the few standalone houses. She pointed out how the pergolas connect the houses through horizontal lines (and that I had captured that in my drawing) and that I must paint the Le Corbusier-inspired curved wall. Peta did not want me to take a photograph of her, because, as she explained, of the way that people in public housing are often represented. Instead, she gave me some of her photos, including one of her garden (‘looking better in spring’, she said) and one of her up at Mt Ainslie, where she described herself as being in alignment with the symmetry of Canberra’s layout (Figure 7a). Before I left, Peta said: ‘You can draw my front
garden if you like, but as long as I can have the drawing’ (Figure 7b). ‘It’s a deal’, I said.

Fig. 7. (a) Photo of Peta up at Mt Ainslie, date and photographer unknown. Courtesy of Peta Dawson; (b) Drawing of Peta’s front garden, pencil on paper, by Katie Hayne, 2017.
Hughie has lived in his De Burgh house for 34 years. He tells a story of finding a man asleep in his lounge room one day, and how it took nine years for him to finally get ‘Housing’ to fix the security screen door. Despite this, he says: ‘I love this place, this is my home’. He showed me where his two dogs are buried in the back garden and I asked if I could take some photos of his lounge room. The interviews revealed stories about place and individual biographies that increasingly connected me with the residents. They usually took place inside people’s homes, which added another layer to my understanding their lives.

My initial research plan proposed that interviews would take place outside of peoples’ homes, on the front verandah for example. This was not simply because the research participants were initial strangers, but also due to the wide-spread perception that the people in public housing might be ‘dangerous’. My plan was partly based on the University ethics and risk assessment processes, in which a researcher is encouraged to adopt a cautious position. In retrospect, this process also encouraged me to focus upon negative stereotypes. This is not to say that I did not need be cautious, as one might be when venturing into any unknown place. When Peta saw me sitting outside, drawing in the street, she sternly warned me that I should not sit there because the man that lived in that house was an ‘ice-addict’ and could be unpredictable. I took her advice, but the notion that the residents I had come to know quite well posed any danger became ridiculous, and on being invited ‘inside’, I found myself accepting.

In fact, almost every resident who agreed to be interviewed invited me inside their home, insisting on showing me around the entire house, including the bedrooms and bathrooms. Even Peta, who said that her house was too messy, invited me in to see her art collection. Indeed, upon entering the houses, I gained further insight into the lived experience of the housing. Daniel Miller, in his introduction to *Home Possessions* (2001: 15), notes: ‘The life of anthropology comes from its insistence in seeing the world through perspectives we would never have even imagined if we had not forced ourselves into the site from which other people view their worlds’. I did not do any drawings inside people’s homes, but I did ask if it was okay if I took a photo of them in the room, or of other items. I also used my mobile phone to take 360-degree panoramas of the lounge rooms in some instances. Doing this, I occasionally felt like the insistent anthropologist described by Miller, but, in retrospect, I wonder what would have happened if I had been more insistent and asked to draw the house interiors as well. These photos came to be a form of notetaking and, along with the drawings, became a part of the dataset from which I could develop creative responses in the studio.
Ongoing engagement through paintings in progress

Concomitant with the street drawings and the interviews was my solitary process of work in the studio. I was relatively new to painting and had never had a dedicated studio before. I wondered how my style of realist painting could possibly communicate my engagement with the housing residents. My studio space, although only a five-minute drive away, felt completely removed from my field location. I tried not to worry about this, but I regularly took visits back to the housing precinct to try and stay connected with the site. I began grappling with materials: the various painting grounds, the different shades of viridian green to capture the vegetation and styles of brush strokes to deal with the flat areas of the building walls. As a primarily representation-al painter, I am inspired by artists such as the Italian still life painter Giorgio Morandi, the American social realist Edward Hopper and Eleanor Ray, a contemporary, New York-based, painter of architectural space. I also looked at artists who have engaged with housing estates or public housing as a subject matter. Catherine O’Donnell’s large-scale drawing installations such as ‘Inhabited Space’ are a key example. Others include George Shaw’s painting of housing estates in the UK, Rachael Whitehead’s installation ‘House’ (Perry 2014) and Tom Hunter and James MacKinnon’s model ‘London Fields East – The Ghetto’ (1994), which I saw on display at the Museum of London in 2018.

I painted what had inspired me from the outset: the exterior views of the houses and the subtle individual features that distinguished them from each other. I have come to see these paintings not as the final communication of my research, nor as a substitute to the ethnographic text, but rather as an active part of the research process. These works do not depict specific people. I have instead sought to explore how the subjectivity embedded in the paintings, and the houses themselves, suggest an imagined person. To communicate this studio work back to the residents, I started showing them photographs of my paintings in progress (on my mobile phone). This elicited further conversations which provided new insights and was one of the ways the recursive nature of the creative process enabled opportunities for exchange and dialogue.

Below are some of my paintings presented as a short ‘photo-essay’ followed by brief responses from the residents, or my observations about the paintings.

When Hughie saw the painting of his house (Figure 8), he said ‘I should have brought the bins in’. His comment became the title of the painting.

---

Fig. 8. (a) *I should have brought the bins in*, 2017, oil on board, 28 (h) x 35 (w) cm; (b) Hughie outside his house. Photo: Katie Hayne, 2017.
This painting is a view of Peta’s house from Northbourne Ave (Figure 9). She titled the painting: *My little urban forest, planted 40 years ago, woodchips soon, sad*. Peta, one of the longest residents in the De Burgh precinct – who knows everyone in the street – introduced me to Carolyn.
Carolyn has a perfect view of the street from her upstairs window (Figure 10). She told me that she cannot wait to move to a new house: ‘they don’t fix anything here and it’s freezing in winter’.

Fig. 10. *Window Twitcher*, oil on board, 28 (h) x 35 (w) cm. By Katie Hayne, 2017.
This painting (Figure 11) was inspired by Jim. He is concerned with what is going to happen to the trees and he took me on a tour of all the species of trees he knew. He said: ‘You must paint the Golden Ash’. When I showed him my painting, he was very pleased and asked if I had also done one of the Amber Ash. He was disappointed to learn that I had not.
I first met Kolka after completing the painting of her house. Kolka is a single mother and lives here with her son. Kolka told me how the place smelt like cats when she moved in, but that she had put new lino in the kitchen and painted the walls. She was thrilled that the green wall colour perfectly matches the colour of their pet budgie Danny’s feathers. Kolka described the view from upstairs of the bike path as akin to living in little Amsterdam but said that she never tells anyone she lives there due to the stigma of living in public housing. She named this painting *Kolka and Darcy’s Home* (Figure 12).
In the case of some of the houses, I never met the residents. I experimented by leaving areas unpainted (see Figures 13, 14 and 15), which accentuated both the limits of my knowledge about these homes and the uncertainty of what the future holds.
Fig. 14. *Bike on a roof*, oil on board, 28 (h) x 35 (w) cm each. By Katie Hayne, 2018.
Fig. 15. *Two Bins*, oil on board, 28 (h) x 35 (w) cm each. By Katie Hayne, 2017.
Similarly, in these paintings (Figures 16 and 17), I simply tried to evoke the mood I had experienced due the time of the year and the day.
Fig. 17. Pair houses, oil on board, 28 (h) x 35 (w) cm. By Katie Hayne, 2017.
In January of 2018, I exhibited these works for the first time. Planning the exhibition involved finalising a series of seventeen paintings, including the titles that communicated a story about the Housing Precinct. The titles became a key way of incorporating the perspectives of the residents into the works. I invited the residents I had met to the exhibition, and I was pleased that a few came along. However, the reality was that even a local artist-run space was inaccessible to many of the residents and, in retrospect, it would have been more appropriate to explore other exhibition spaces – even in the street. The gallery space did enable connections with other audiences and several people shared their experiences of public housing.

When a local artist, who I will call Steve, saw the painting of the Lyneham Flats (Figure 18), he pulled me aside and began telling me about his experience of living there: ‘It looks very calm, it’s not like that, it’s crazy in there’. He noticed the ‘LOVE SUX!’ sign I included in the window. This is an edited version of the story he told me about it:

Yeah that’s Debbie – you know she eventually found love – she’s had a shit time, but she discovered her passion for horses (...) unconditional caring from these two horses that she looks after. So, people come into that place pretty messed up, but they have that stability.

Steve told me stories about each of the residents in his building and how he has coffee with his neighbour every week and helps Debbie bring in her washing, but he said:

I don’t socialise at home. It’s not a good building for socialising. When you bring people here, you don’t talk on the stairway, everyone can hear you. I’ve been trying to get carpeting for years.

Steve told me how Debbie wants to move from the Flats to be closer to the horses now, but that he himself did not want to move. It is his home, and he likes that the buildings are an iconic gateway to Canberra. He said: ‘It’s a really great thing – even with all of its shortcomings – to have a permanent address. It’s so important and transformative’.
Fig. 18. LOVE SUX!, oil on board, 61 (h) x 49 (w) cm. By Katie Hayne, 2018.
Conclusion: ‘I loved and hated the place’

At the outset, this project did not set out specifically to understand ideas of home or house. Yet, through the consideration of the lived experiences of the residents of Canberra’s Northbourne Avenue public housing, at a time of forced relocation, I gained unexpected insights into the complexities of what people hope for in housing. One of the most common observations from the residents was that the public housing is stigmatised. Hughie told me that a taxi driver did not want to drive down his street. Kolka said she never tells anyone where she lives because people think differently of you. Jim said he is looking forward to moving because no one will know his new house is public housing. Wassenberg (2004: 223) writes: ‘It is curious that the most frequently reviewed and well thought out large housing estates are now the areas with the worst image’. He further notes that the ‘residents are socially stigmatised merely for living in a stigmatised area’ (ibid.: 223). It was clear from my discussion with the residents that they felt their identities were closely tied to the public perception of their homes and that they often sought to distance themselves from such associations. At the same time, Kolka was incredibly proud that I had painted their De Burgh Street house and suggested the title of the work to be ‘Kolka and Darcy’s home’. In an online comment on Google Maps, user Andy M sums up these conflicted emotions well: ‘After spending 18.5 years living in Northbourne Flats it’s sad be forced out of my home. I loved and hated the place but I will never forget the experience of living there’.5

I noticed how the feelings of the residents about moving to a new house changed as other options became available to them. Steve did not want to move, but, when I saw him a few weeks later after he had finally been offered a new place, he said that he was glad to be out of there. Hughie said that the new place they offered him ‘you couldn’t swing a cat in’. Having lived in a De Burgh pair house for 32 years, he could not stand the thought of moving from his attached house to a flat. He suggested that his neighbour John might like the flat instead; and, John decided to take it. John was pleased with his new place – although small, it has a north-facing window. In the same way that people’s views of their existing housing varied, their hopes for a new house did too. Jackson (1995: 122–3) notes that home ‘is always lived as a relationship, a tension’, that it ‘may evoke security in one context and seem confining in another’. Mallett suggests this is a way of understanding home that

\[\ldots\text{ holds ideas of the real and the ideal, or the real and the imagined in tension rather than opposition. Accordingly the real and}\]

---

5 This is a comment left by user Andy M on Google Maps. https://www.google.com.au/maps/place/Northbourne+flats/@-35.2674429,149.131638,561m/data=!3m1!1e1!4m7!3m6!1s0x6b16529e34583b39:0xf8a12724afadcad0!8m2!3d-35.267517!4d149.1301963!9m1!1b1 [accessed 09 April 2019]
the ideal are not pure and distinct concepts or domains. They are mutually defining concepts and experiences. (2004: 70)

These tensions have led me to consider how I might represent the transitional state of the residents in the Northbourne Avenue housing and I have begun experimenting with a new body of work (see Figure 19). The text is painted on a re-claimed cupboard door from one of the first public housing buildings to be demolished. It speaks to the promise and possibility of the future, of both the residents who are forced to leave and of those moving into the new apartments that will take their place. As an opening and closing, an entry and an exit, the door is a symbol of the tensions embedded in the public housing renewal in Canberra.

Fig. 19. Your dream home awaits you, oil on reclaimed cupboard door, 63 (h) x 63 (w) cm. By Katie Hayne, 2018.
Following Lippard (2010:24), I have looked towards anthropology for an ethically responsible approach to social engagement. However, as the artist Susan Hiller recently noted, art has a greater potential than the social sciences to create a space that elicits empathy in the viewer (Chaisson 2018). Painting, in its poetic capabilities, has provided me, the residents and the broader community with an alternative representation of the houses and a platform to consider the issues of housing affordability, gentrification and homelessness in our cities. It is these capabilities of art and anthropology that I seek to explore further in my research and practice.
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‘From Mangoes to Apples’: Exploring Belonging in New Tehri

Saakshi Joshi

Introduction

I have long been in conversation with Tehri Garhwal, situated within the Himalayan state of Uttarakhand in India. This mountainous state lies along international boundaries, with Tibet at its north and north-east edges and Nepal to the east. It shares the north-western boundary with the state of Himachal Pradesh and the southern ones with the plains of Uttar Pradesh. Although I was born and raised in Delhi, the Garhwal mountains have been another place to which I belonged. The pahar, or the mountains, as a place of attachment are kept alive through annual trips to the region, the family events, the vernaculars, the songs – as geographical markers of ancestry and the foundation on which varied family narratives rest – and through my surname (cf. Joshi 2018).

In 2006, the Tehri Dam began working in the Tehri Garhwal district of Uttarakhand. Family visits to the state in the following years included a bus trip to the dam site from the state’s capital of Dehradun. On such occasions, my father, born in a Tehri Garhwal village, would remind us that the former palace of the King of Tehri used to be there, whilst one of my mausa ji would explain how the dam, made of earth, sand and gravel, was resistant to

---

1 Broadly, Uttarakhand has two regional divisions, Garhwal and Kumaon. Administratively, it comprises of thirteen districts, nine of which are completely mountainous. Earlier, it was a part of Uttar Pradesh, a state dominated by plains. Uttarakhand was created in 2000, after a movement demanding the separation from Uttar Pradesh. The population of the mostly mountainous Uttarakhand region was much smaller than in the plains of Uttar Pradesh, so people felt under-represented and marginalised. A separate state was formed due to the political under-representation, disenfranchisement and economic exploitation (see Linkenbach 2012, 2007; Mawdley 1999 and Sachs 2011).

2 This is a Hindi word for mountain or hillside.

3 Dehradun, in the valley, is the capital of Uttarakhand, 110 km away from the Tehri dam.

4 Tehri became the capital of the Parmar/Shah dynasty of Garhwal in 1815 and a part of India in 1949.

5 Mausa is a word used for the maternal aunt’s (mausi’s) husband. ‘Ji’ is a gender-neutral honorific used as a suffix in several languages like Hindi and its dialects.
earthquakes, which is an important feature in the seismically active Himalayas. Apart from the visits to the dam, the conversations about the *visthapit* and their lives became a common part of the *chai* discussions in Dehradun. In 2013, when I reached New Tehri for ethnographic work, I initially wanted to understand the meanings of *visthapit*. But, people spoke of Tehri. By re-creating their old town for me, an outsider who was removed from their experience of relocation, someone who had not lived in Tehri, they articulated displacement, loss of home and the meaning of belonging to a place.

The sense and significance of place for humans, irrespective of the constant transformations we and our worlds undergo, seem to persist. Despite the destruction of known landscapes and the manufacturing of new ones, the struggles over homelands and borders, place is still significant for many, whether as a particular location of belonging, a sense of boundaries, or a connection to everyday life against a backdrop of power and instability (Escober 2001, Geertz 1996). Keith Basso (1996: 55) argued that '[p]laces possess a marked capacity for triggering acts of self-reflection, inspiring thoughts about who one presently is, or memories of who one used to be, or musings on who one might become'.

Belonging has no direct translation in Hindi, the language I used during research. But it takes a coherent shape when being discussed vis-à-vis boundaries, and categories that exist as something finite, something tangible. Pfaff-Czarnecka and Toffin (2011) discuss belonging as an emotionally charged site. It incorporates relationships with humans, things and places, and involves different circles of attachment – for example, to one’s house and other possessions, one’s family, locality, lineage, nation-state – that often overlap, or intersect, but may also contradict one another.

In Tehri’s case, the cartographic coordinates to enable return were gone, submerged under the waters of the Tehri Dam reservoir or the Tehri *jheel*. In a similar vein, Hirsch and Spitzer (2010) write of Czernowitz (now Chernivtsi, Ukraine) as a ‘place that cannot be found in any contemporary atlas’ (ibid.: xiii). Although, unlike Tehri, a physical return to the ‘location’ was possible for its former residents and their families, ‘Czernowitz’ itself remains alive only as a projection – an idea physically disconnected from its geographical

---

6 Tehri Garhwal lies in earthquake hazard zone V, which signifies the highest risk of effects by earthquakes. The dam structure is a rock and earth-filled dam with a clay core for flexibility.

7 This is a Hindi word that was used by my interlocutors for the actual process of displacement (*visthapit hona*, also *visthapan*), as well as a term for people who were displaced and relocated. A detailed discussion on this term is available in a separate article (Joshi 2017). Where I discuss this word in a particular narrative on the Tehri dam, there can be many more *visthapit* with their own narratives/backgrounds.

8 Here, I am referring to the ethnographic fieldwork I have conducted for my doctoral dissertation, between 2013 and 2016.
location, dependent on the ‘vicissitudes of personal, familial, and cultural memory’ (ibid.: 15). Kingsolver (2011) has written about phantom landscapes – buildings, neighbourhoods, farms, and families – which are no longer there, but by which people may still navigate. Exploring the idea of belonging to the memory of a place, Lovell writes, that

*I*locality and belonging may be moulded and defined as much by actual territorial emplacement as by memories of belonging to particular landscapes whose physical reality is enacted only through acts of collective remembering. (1998: 1).

Thus, remembrance of the past may also relate to the people’s present and future in significant ways. If history is conventionally imagined as bound to the past only, the concept of ‘historicity’ allows for a conversation about the ways in which a nexus of past-present-future plays out in the present based on events, political needs, available cultural forms and emotional dispositions (see Hirsch and Stewart 2005; Stewart 2016).

To understand the remembrance of Tehri, I begin with a brief background of the Tehri Dam, which caused the people to become visthapit. It was through experiences of my interlocutors during displacement that Tehri was told to me. It has been a position where the past, present and future overlap (see Joshi 2017). The next section of the article introduces the voices of my interlocutors to situate the narratives of displacement. The last section of the article is an overview of the different categories that figure into the ideas of belonging for the *visthapit*.

Why does Tehri remain alive in people’s conversations and the everyday? Through various everyday instances from their narratives, like the absence of the Ganga, the changed physical landscape, or the loss of livelihood opportunities, the article considers how people recreate their belonging in New Tehri by finding markers in their former lives, prior to the forced removal.

**Background**

After serving as the capital of the Shah dynasty of Tehri Garhwal in the Himalayas since 1815, Tehri was annexed to the state of Uttar Pradesh (U.P.), in what became known as India. After a long struggle for separate statehood and following local concerns over negligible representation in a state mostly consisting of flatland, the town became a part of the Tehri Garhwal district in the Himalayan state of Uttarakhand in 2000. Tehri held significance as a transit point for travellers, tourists, and traders. Its location lay en route to popular shrines of Kedarnath and Badrinath, which beckon masses of pilgrims and tourists each year.\(^9\) In 2005, the town of Tehri and its surround-

---

\(^9\) In 2018, close to seven lakh (100,000) people had visited Kedarnath (see Sharma 2018).
ing villages were submerged (fully or partially) following the completion of the Tehri Dam. Close to six thousand families resided in the town before its submergence.

The idea of the dam was conceived in 1949 by the Geological Survey of India, upon the Bhagirathi and Bhilangana rivers, tributaries of Ganga (Werner 2014: 139). By 2005, the work on the dam was finished, and it began functioning a year later. The dam reservoir, also called the Tehri jheel (lake), was spread over the 55 km² of fertile agricultural land of the Bhagirathi-Bhilangana valley. As a multipurpose project, which includes flood prevention, the dam provides irrigation water to the neighbouring state of U.P., as well as drinking water and electricity to Delhi situated 316 km away.

In this entire process, more than a hundred thousand people were uprooted, becoming the Tehri Dam vișṭhapit. Their resettlement was forked into urban and rural, based upon the previous place of living (the Tehri town or a village). The urban resettlement happened in New Tehri, Rishikesh and Dehradun, and the rural resettlement was spread across Dehradun, Rishikesh and Haridwar. From living in a town or neighbouring villages, which were reachable due to smaller distances, people were relocated across different parts of Uttarakhand. Rishikesh is a semi-hilly region, 85 km away from the old town, Haridwar is a popular pilgrim city 105 km away and Dehradun is a valley 120 km away from Tehri.

Whereas the old town was at an elevation of 660 metres and surrounded by rivers, New Tehri is at an altitude of between 1350 and 1850 metres and located on a slope overlooking the dam and its reservoir. New Tehri was created for resettlement and administration. Its appearance was associated with the disappearance of the old town.

In July 2013, when I began my fieldwork, locals wound up talking about the catastrophic flash floods, which had made national headlines a month earlier. Questions related to the Tehri Dam would lead to doubts about its functioning, fears about the dam reservoir overflowing and the consequent impact on New Tehri. The Tehri Dam is among the 59 completed dams listed in the national register as ‘dams of national importance’ (Central Water Commission 2014). It is the fifth tallest dam in the world and a point in a series of examples where a nation is attempting to be defined and recognized through massive projects of landscape and social engineering (Cederlöf and Sivaramakrishnan 2012: 2). There are 600 hydroelectric dams in the Himalayan region, whether planned, under construction, or working (Dharmadhikary 2008, Vidal 2013). India leads this catastrophic charge in the mountains with roughly 400 dams in total. Increasing incidents of flash floods, landslides, cloudbursts and forest fires impacting the mountain ecosystems, especially in Uttarakhand, are tied to the concerns about global warming, climate change

10 These are dams with a height of 100 m and above, or those with a storage capacity of 1 km³ and above, and which have been completed.
and water shortage. It is within these debates that dams have found significance in recent years, as saviours from or as the causal agents of disasters. Additionally, damming, as mentioned above, highlights the social and ecological consequences of our urban water management systems, which rely heavily on the sourcing of water for urban areas from ever-increasing distances. Thus, many large Indian cities must source water from long distances, ranging between 50 and 200 kilometres, due to the exhaustion of remaining sources, or the pollution of nearby ones (Joshi 2019, Rohilla et al. 2017). After initial jibes about my arrival from Delhi and the dam being built for me, the people in New Tehri began telling me about their old town.

Whose Tehri is in these words?

This article is based on the analysis of unstructured interviews and focused group discussions with 62 Garhwali women and men from the Brahmin and Rajput castes. These interviews were taken across New Tehri, Dehradun and Haridwar. During the years of dam construction, most of these Tehri locals were either adults, who were in universities or working, or children. Whilst men were more visible in public spaces, working or forming groups in markets, on the roads and in their shops, women mostly had to be approached at their workplaces, informal groups in the open spaces right outside their front doors, or inside their houses. The use of ‘house’ in place of ‘home’ is deliberate and comes from my conversations with the people. Different mohallas (neighbourhoods) developed over time and came together to form the old town of Tehri on the banks of the Bhagirathi-Bhilangana valley. The sloping new town has been divided into sectors which have flats, plots and tin sheds for accommodation. The shift from the inhabiting of a home to the receiving of a plot or a piece of land was a significant change people had to undergo, irrespective of the eventual sizes of the houses built on those plots. An oustee from the urban resettlement in Dehradun said:

*Here, where you are sitting, is not our ghar. This is our makān. The transition from a makān to a ghar takes several generations. The former is brick and cement. The latter is filled with emotions through which it comes to life. Similarly, a town is built of brick and cement, houses and buildings. It becomes alive through con-

---

11 Garhwali here was used as a regional identity – specifically, to stake claim to the region through a long mountain ancestry of those who have lived here or arrived to Garhwal with the king.

12 Here, I write about the women and men I met, but the gendered realities are multiple and beyond this binary.

13 Oxford Dictionaries (2019) defines ‘oustee’ as an Indian English noun with origins in the 1970s. It is used to describe the forced ousting of a person by the ‘development of land’. Thank you for highlighting this, Dr Safet.
nection. For this to become a ghar, we need our sincerest efforts. We have a beautiful makān. There might be many here living in houses much better than the ones they had in Tehri. But these are makān.

This distinction was expanded to indicate the difference between Tehri and New Tehri. The position as visthapit was defined to a large extent by the specific trajectory of relocation, the compensation received, the castes one shared the neighbourhood with, the kind of housing structure or land one received and the current livelihood options. Being moved to the already inhabited new locations, where the oustees were the outsiders, as well as the altered dietary patterns, accompanied stress and other mental health issues related to the adaptation to a new environment (Kedia 2009). All of these factors led to differing accounts of the forced removal and conflicting views about the dam. And, they coloured the conversations on Tehri.

When dead places talk: anthropomorphising Tehri

home
resource
wasteland
biodiversity
carcass
vikas\(^{14}\)
dynamite
deity
memory
dammed
you

What is a mountain? I ask.

(Saakshi Joshi, ‘Giving meanings to mountains’, 2018)

For the people now resettled in New Tehri, displacement is a shared experience. It has become a continuous part of their lives. It was not an event in hearsay. It did not happen to their ancestors. It was recent. Accompanying this life-changing course was the knowledge that there is no Tehri to return to.

The loss of this former, known way of life, attained a specific form in the anthropomorphising expressions for the old town, which punctuated both

---

\(^{14}\) Vikas is a Hindi term for ‘development’. In the Garhwali dialect, ‘bikas’ is also used. During fieldwork, vikas was the word used pre-dominantly, hence my own usage in the article.
the conversations and the local writings. Often, people would begin or end sentences or their accounts of events with ‘After Tehri’s death...’; or ‘When Tehri was alive...’ (Joshi 2018). There were instances, written and verbal, of 28 December being mentioned as Tehri’s birthday. On this date, the town was founded as the capital by king Sudershansh Shah. In local writings, Tehri has been portrayed as a narrator, a woman, or a person left behind to drown.

In ‘Tehri ke naam ek patr’ (‘A letter in Tehri’s name’), the poet writes a letter to the town which is still drowning while the people have left. A sense of guilt becomes palpable as he tells the town that ‘we all left you to drown’ (Azad 2012: 23-24). Hindi words have been used in such ways as to suggest that the town was alive when it drowned; it was not an inanimate landscape that was submerged. In several texts, *jāl samadhi* has been used in place of *doobna* to highlight that Tehri was forced under water while still alive, still flourishing, rather than just drowning. In another piece titled ‘Trihari’, the town is anthropomorphised as a woman, bitter that its residents left her to drown (Faruqki 2012: 30).

‘From mangoes to apples’: altered landscapes

This phrase – from mangoes to apples – was repeatedly used by one septuagenarian who had shifted from the resettlement in New Tehri to Dehradun due to breathing problems. He used it as a metaphor, to emphasise the climatic and geographic changes that came with New Tehri, which impacted the social lives of the oustees. External, internal. From warm to cold. From Tehri to a resettlement colony. Conversations would begin with the altered atmosphere and environment that people had to get accustomed to – the altitude, the stairs, the strong winds, the reservoir in place of the river – before describing the disappointment over the disintegrating community life and the transformed everyday.

---

15 All translations from Hindi to English are done by the author.

16 Several stories tell how Tehri was named. It is considered a distortion of ‘Trihari’ (union of three rivers), alluding to the union of Bhagirathi, Bhilangana and the now invisible Ghrit Ganga. It is suggested that the way Bhagirathi and Bhilangana bent around the land to meet led to the use of *tedha* (‘twisted’ or ‘bent’) which became Tehri. A third story informs that a village named Tipri was located near the area, and that “Tehri” caught on from there. Yet another version, mentioned on the district website, says that the area washes away three types of sins – born out of *mansa* (‘thought’), *vacha* (‘word’) and *karmana* (‘deed’) (Tehri Garhwal: n.d.). It is also said to be the place where the three *hari* (‘lords’), Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh, the Hindu trinity of the creator, the preserver and the destroyer, come together.
Where Tehri was remembered as a capital, as Ganga’s *mait,*\(^\text{17}\) as a town with a market that was an active social space, New Tehri was considered a part of a development (or *vikas*) scheme where the *pahari* were sacrificed for the interests of the people from the plains and where treating some people as ends in themselves seems possible only if other people are treated as a means to achieve the first goal (De Wet 2009: 78).\(^\text{18}\) This *vikas* was built upon intensive energy consumption, consistent with a focus on expanding infrastructure projects like large dams\(^\text{19}\) and the purchase of material goods sourced from outside the town. A similar sentiment is found in Channa’s (2018) work in the Himalayan upper reaches, where, she writes, the people of Kinnaur have been seen as dispensable when planning and drafting policy (of mainland population). This has led to the locals building an opposing rhetoric about dams as ‘outside’ their social and economic world, with a hope to merit the government’s attention (ibid.). Not specific to New Tehri, but a frequent example I have been given, through-out my time in different parts of mountainous Uttarakhand, is the habit of ‘outsiders’ to buy land and build hotels/resorts, for which the locals then serve as cooks or housecleaning staff. Resettlement in New Tehri came to be seen in this larger scheme of things, where the dam represented the outsiders, which took over local land and resources, and in which people were moved while the water went elsewhere.

**From Bhagirathi to Tehri *jheel***

In contrast to a river filled with stories and experiences, the unmoving Tehri dam reservoir has been a stark reminder of attempted human control over the flowing waters of the Ganga – a lifeline, a goddess, a daughter to Tehri. This shift from direct interactions with the river to berating the dammed unmoving waters of the reservoir which belong to U.P. and Delhi, is another aspect which has influenced the oustees’ experience of living in a new place.

Conversations about Ganga or the Tehri *jheel* usually had one of the following central threads: the quality of the water people received in New Tehri (and its felt impact on their health), the loss of Ganga and its *ghats* as the loss

---

\(^{17}\) Local Garhwali word for maternal place. Tehri as Ganga’s *mait* has roots in the tale of King Bhagirath who managed to bring Ganga to earth from the heavens. Since this was the region where Ganga touched upon earth, she was regarded as a daughter.

\(^{18}\) As already mentioned, the dam provides water to Delhi, 316 km away. In January-March 2019, water from the dam (12,000 cusecs) was also used during the Kumbh Mela in Allahbad (renamed Prayagraj in 2018) where more than 500 million people took ritual baths.

\(^{19}\) Researchers working in different Himalayan states have made similar observations on hydroelectric dams and how this *vikas* ends up excluding the local residents (see Channa 2013, Huber and Joshi 2015, Drew 2013, Linkenbach 2007 and Mawdsley 1999).
of ritual and festive landscape, the loss of the free flowing Ganga or Bhagirathi as the loss of a provider, goddess, and daughter.\textsuperscript{20}

Although no conclusive medical surveys for the town were undertaken, the urban region of Tehri Garhwal has recorded the maximum cases of diarrhoea or dysentery (429 persons per 10,000 population) in the state, across both urban and rural categories and among all districts (see Annual Health Survey 2012). A doctor at the district hospital reported greater cases of jaundice from the area in New Tehri where the oustees had been resettled. Several people complained of post-displacement digestive disorders, blaming the reservoir water.

Some would begin describing the old town with the river. Some would bathe in nostalgia, missing the sound that the flowing waters made. The elderly would bring up this imagery the most. The younger oustees focused more on the utilitarian aspects of the river. Several people had told me about the logs drifting in the river during monsoons. Locals would take them out, dry and store them for use during winters. The sand and clay from the riverbank were used for construction purposes. The river was also used for catching fish, which was sold at the market. There were also people who discussed the cremation rites of the deceased without their sacred river and its banks serving as the cremation area. The river was also an integral part of several festivities like \textit{Makar Sakranti}\textsuperscript{21} or \textit{Basant Panchmi} where people would light earthen lamps on its banks or take baths in its waters at certain hours on days considered auspicious. In her research, Drew (2013) notices that the reduced river waters in the dam-affected Himalayan areas were a sign to the locals that people had lost respect for such an important river goddess. For some, this transformation of the mountains and of the Ganga had the potential to cause cosmological and ontological ruptures with real implications for the practices that they valued (ibid.: 27).

Local writings have portrayed the river as a protective mother, as well as a young woman violated by oppressors. Even when dammed, the river-as-mother continues carrying the town in its womb (Joshi 2012: 29). Though exploited for its free flow, imprisoned and silenced, the river will eventually fight back – a reference to future disasters awaiting the mountains due to several dam projects. The human attempt to curb the river through damming was held as a sign of arrogance, which would see consequences. But it would not harm the river itself. Since the river is sacred, the dam cannot take away

\textsuperscript{20} Bhagirathi and Ganga have been used interchangeably by the locals from Tehri. Bhagirathi is the primary tributary of Ganga, whereas Bhilangana is a tributary of Bhagirathi.

\textsuperscript{21} Both festival days have variant names in different regions of the Indian subcontinent. Makar Sakranti is based on the Hindu solar calendar signalling a change in season, marking the end of winter solstice and advent of longer days. Basant Panchmi signals the arrival of spring towards late January or early February.
her powers. It is this valorisation of the river that has let government officials and industrialists continue its exploitation (Alley 2002: 237).

If, on the one hand, people have a belief that no harm can befall Ganga, they also question the development in which the damming of a deity becomes justified. In Tehri, apart from being a benevolent deity, a nurturer, a mother, Bhagirathi is also described as a victim, and in an angry or violent form. The river may be silently enduring human arrogance and greed (materialised through the Tehri Dam), but one day it will snap, leading to a deluge. For example, the poem ‘Nahin pachhtaegi nadi’ (‘The river won’t repent’) describes the silence of the dammed river as momentary. But, once the time comes, it will be unrepentant (Joshi 2012: 29). These texts added to the ecological risks like earthquakes, landslides and accidents concerning the dam, which people associated with their new lives. The rivers of the Ganga basin carry one of the largest sediment loads in the world, higher than in the past due to a complete deforestation of the Gangetic Plains and the ongoing deforestation of the Himalayan foothills (Alley 2002). A growing area of concern and commentary is Ganga’s condition in the Himalayas, where the development projects and climate change produce a visible difference in the quality and quantity of the river flow (Drew 2013: 26). Incessant construction and deforestation make way for landslides in the mountains. These are common on the slopes surrounding the Tehri Dam, especially during the monsoons. Agricultural land of the villagers living at the dam’s periphery is silting and people have pointed out the damage to their homes, especially during monsoons, which they linked to fluctuating reservoir levels.

A town without a market

The Tehri bazaar remains a favoured memory, irrespective of whether you lived in a village or the town proper. The bazaar was talked about as a gathering place. In the new town, grocery shops and vendors selling vegetables may be found in different sectors. In addition, there is a market area which consists of several shops for clothing, stationery, footwear, jewellery, hardware, electronics and meat. Whereas the bazaar sketched a sense of togetherness, the current market is mentioned in terms of the scattered shops and a strictly utilitarian quality.

Chamba, 11 km uphill from the new town, has emerged as the regional market. An oustees from New Tehri spoke of the fresh produce they purchased in the old town:

> We had several villages growing vegetables like rai,\(^22\) radish, spring onion, lady finger, gourd, which the women from the villages would come and sell. So, it was providing livelihood too.

> Now most of our vegetables come from Bijnor, Najibabad (from

\(^22\) Rai are brown mustard seeds.
Ethno Scripts

In the old town, all our vegetables were locally grown, especially the green, leafy ones, and there would be a mad rush to buy them as they would be sold rapidly. The pulses we had were traditional seedlines grown in villages, without any harmful fertilizers. Now, what we are eating has urea and who knows what else added to it. The ones from the villages were local, packed with nutrition.

Conversations with the owner of a local department store revealed that the food supplies and goods in the new town came from two depots – Dehradun or Rishikesh.

Previously, Tehri lay on the connecting route to popular mountain destinations and revered shrines, attracting masses of people from near and afar, which provided many people’s livelihoods. Interviews with some of the local hoteliers gave a glimpse into the business of the previous market. During the tourist season, from April until about October, if on average there were 50 vendor carts each day, then the numbers would double. Similarly, if there were two helpers at a hotel, the owner would keep two more due to the additional work. An oustee who had worked in the old town as a journalist explained:

_The old bazaar would go on for 18 hours out of the 24 hours in a day. 320 buses used to operate. Travelers would stay overnight and wake up at three since the buses would start operating by six. So, the shopkeepers would also open their shops early since people would buy utilities to take home with them or to eat before their journeys. Uttarkashi, Ghansali, Devprayag, buses to all these routes went via Tehri._

The bus stand in the new town was usually deserted. All the routes to different regions within Tehri Garhwal, or to other districts now went via Chamba, or Rishikesh. During my stay in New Tehri, the bus stand, adjacent to the commercial area with the hotels and the market, was under different stages of construction. There were small eateries opened for travellers before or after their bus journeys. But, much like the buses, these eateries catered to a fixed clientele consisting of locals.

According to some of the locals running their shops in the commercial area, the bus stand in the old town was always packed with people, shops opening as early as three in the morning for business as travellers would come and go. Today the town stands isolated on a slope, a reason for loss of income and seasonal employment. The locals working there are from all over the district, not limited to the displaced population. The district hospital of New Tehri (2 km uphill from the market) has no specific provisions to provide employment to the ousted population, skilled or unskilled, in whatever capacity, I was told by the hospital staff and the locals.
New Tehri does not lie en route to any popular tourist places, nor has it been popularised as one itself. At the reception of a hotel I used to frequent, the owner had told me pointedly that if I were not conducting my research in New Tehri, I would not bother coming there either. Being the district headquarters, people would come to New Tehri for official work. If something could not be accomplished in a day, they would either spend the night at somebody’s home, or check into the hotel. Apart from that, the hotels saw their maximum activity during weddings, when they would be booked for the ceremonies as well as for guest accommodation.

The same people have now become strangers

Forced removal caused old networks of people to spread over different parts of Uttarakhand. New Tehri on a slope was away from the hustle-bustle of any surrounding villages that were part of the old town’s routine life. Haridwar in the plains, Rishikesh in a semi-hilly region, and Dehradun in the valley were different topographies, with their own resident populations comprising several different groups.

Former neighbours were now more than just a door’s distance away – often several kilometres apart. Friends and relatives who met each evening were now meeting only during occasions like marriages or other festivities. The displacement led to the scattering of years-old community networks strongly built around caste alliances linked to the access and allocation of resources. These networks were further enforced through caste-endogamous/village-exogamous marriages between neighbouring villages, or between the town and the surrounding villages. People’s narratives about their uprooting due to the Tehri Dam were consistent with an attachment to and dislocation from their mountainous area of living. Channa (2013: 23) and Linkenbach (2012: 163), through their respective works in Uttarakhand, have reaffirmed the different ways in which people from the mountains and the plains categorise each other. Working with the Jad Bhotiyas in the Uttarkashi district of Uttarakhand, Channa discusses this outlook towards the pahari or people living in the mountains: ‘It is ironical that the pahar or mountain areas, although representing a most sacred complex of Hinduism, is viewed as the abode of “inferior” Hindus. The plains or desi Hindus look down upon the pahari’ (Channa 2013: 23). These choices also stem from the dichotomy between the pahar and the plains as a metaphoric differentiation between the safe and the dangerous, between self and others, from the perspective of those living in the pahar, and vice-versa for those living in the plains (ibid.: 148). For Linkenbach (2012: 163), pahari is enacted when people try to distance themselves from the inhabitants of the plains (maidani log, desi log). The locals in Uttarakhand described themselves to her as honest, sincere and frank, valuing brother-

In recent years, the promotion of Tehri jheel for water and adventure sports has seen mixed results.
hood, truth, helpfulness, and a sense of community. These traits were used as a measure of contrast when describing people from the plains who were all ‘said to be thieves, and to be dishonest, untrustworthy, and greedy’ (ibid.: 163).

People resettled in Haridwar (100 km from New Tehri) expressed fear that their children would grow up in the plains – in an environment alien to the one in the pahar. A visible outcome of this was the difficulty in finding marriage partners from the mountains for their children. If families were unsure about brides coming from the plains, then families from the mountains were not willing to marry their daughters into the plains either. A similar example from the consequences of the Bhakra Nangal Dam in Himachal Pradesh was discussed by Manthan Adhyayan Kendra (2009: 133-153). Families living in Himachal Pradesh (mountains) did not prefer marriages into families resettled in Haryana (situated in the plains). An important aspect of the proliferation and continuity of the caste networks had been endogamy. Displacement affected marriage alliances because distances had increased. Families in the mountains preferred marrying their daughters in nearby areas.

Through caste-endogamous but village-exogamous marriages, caste networks had a geographical spread which provided a safety net during troublesome periods. After the displacement, some oustees were helped out by their wives’ parents in villages to buy land, or to set up shop, or even to start a business when the new town provided limited livelihood options.

The old town was divided into mohallahs (neighbourhoods), many of which had explicit regional and caste references like the Purviyana24 mohallah. Their specific caste affiliations also decided the spatial distribution within or outside the town. Often, when meeting acquaintances on the streets, or recalling somebody, dropping neighbourhood references would be a part of their introductions to me. In New Tehri, the spatial distribution has led to different ways in which neighbourhoods have emerged. The new town is divided into sectors numbered vertically from the top of the slope going downhill. Within these different sectors are smaller neighbourhoods and administrative blocks, commercial areas and offices. With the old networks scattered, and with the migration in and out of the town, these sectors of the new town are seeing a greater mix of populations across caste lines than people had experienced before. There are now colonies with mixed-caste neighbours – a change which has not gone unnoticed.

---

24 ‘Purv’ refers to the east. This neighbourhood had residents who had come to Garhwal from Kumaon, which is situated to the east of the Garhwal region.
When people had begun moving from Tehri in the early 1990s, there were villages opposed to ‘lower’ castes being resettled on their land.\footnote{Caste/\textit{jaati} was referenced in the field. ‘Lower’ or ‘upper’ caste comes from how locals used it. Brahmin and Rajput locals’ use of the term ‘lower’ caste was associated with social hierarchy based on caste-specific occupations considered ‘polluting’ like cutting hair, butchery, scavenging. This caste-based hierarchy also allowed for discrimination (overt or otherwise) through opposition to inter-caste marriages, spatial placing of different caste groups, and even in relocation.}

In Dehradun, I would often hear comments like ‘All our people are here’, or ‘The kind of community we have here, New Tehri does not’. What was this community that New Tehri lacked? A walk around the neighbourhood provided clues – most of the nameplates had Garhwali Brahmin surnames on them. An oustee retired from government service told me there were five to seven Rajput families apart from the majority Brahmin families in this urban resettlement. Upon asking about other castes, he said there were none. After a pause, he added that there was one mason family, which sold its plot and left. As an explanation to my ‘Why?’, he continued:

\textit{We are from Tehri, you are from Tehri. We know who you are, you know who we are. Here it would have gotten uncomfortable, right in our midst. Outside where nobody knows you, you can be anybody, Joshi, Bahuguna, Rawat [Garhwali Brahmin and Rajput surnames], nobody would find out. Here we all are from Tehri so it would have been uncomfortable. Even if we would not have done or said anything, they would have felt that ‘we are scheduled castes,’\footnote{Here the person used scheduled caste as a synonym to ‘lower’ caste. Broadly, scheduled castes are formally recognised in the Constitution of India as groups which are socially disadvantaged.} living in their midst.}

Caste groups were a deciding factor in people’s social lives before displacement, and during the process of resettlement and receiving compensation.

\textbf{We are used to open spaces}

An elderly oustee, who had lost both her village and her town to the dam, had the space for a kitchen garden behind her house. Here, I often found her bent over, growing greens and collecting whatever dry twigs and tree branches she could. ‘I am used to living like this, not staying inside’.

Driving back from the dam in 2014, we passed by a group of women unloading the cement they were carrying on their heads. The two locals in the car with us urged me to get out and talk to the group. We sat by the roadside where they were taking a break from their work as daily wage labourers, before their male contractor shouted for them to return. The women had been
resettled in Rishikesh after their village was submerged for the dam. In a chorus of Garhwali and Hindi, they told us that they preferred being in the mountains, and so kept returning, spending time with relatives. Some had purchased land here again after selling their land in Rishikesh and made new houses in the mountains. ‘We are unable to live there, with so many mosquitoes. And, it is hot. We are inside a room, with a fan on the ceiling. We are used to open spaces. So, we keep returning here.’

In Tehri Garhwal, 66% of the population practices cultivation, of which 83.60% are women and 49.99% are men (see Census of India 2011). Migration of men from the mountains to the regional urban centres or further away has been an important feature of Garhwali societies due to scarce livelihood options and a majorly farming society, which is not enough to sustain the people (Rajendra Dobhal et al. 2011: 1-15). In the mostly rural Garhwal hills, it is the women who cultivate the land and take on the household chores, which also include outdoor activities like collecting dry wood. Activities like firewood or water collection coupled with household and agricultural work have been viewed as exploitative or as a burden by the women I interacted with. But the outdoor chores have also been a way to get away from the house. Gurunani (2014) similarly noted, during her fieldwork in Uttarakhand, the amount of work women have to do. Women worked long hours to collect fuel wood, water, and take care of the seasonal crops, but it was through the idiom of work that women’s subject positions and their sense of self came to be constituted. They compared their lives to that of their cattle: ‘We live like cattle; we work like cattle’.

A few who had resettled in Dehradun were relieved that they did not have to walk several kilometres to fetch water any longer. However, one person suggested that the displacement had reduced their roles and voices within the household. She explained that this was a result of those activities where women were most involved, like agriculture, tending to cattle, or firewood collection, becoming redundant. Husbands talked about the resettlement ‘freeing their wives’ from the earlier physically arduous work, even as the wives would be in the background – washing the clothes, mopping the floor, cleaning the kitchen, or running after the children.

Conversations with women who had been widowed, separated, or were victims of domestic abuse revealed that they had started independent businesses or shops, be it knitting sweaters, or selling paper bags made from old newspapers. This was made possible through networks from the old town when no monetary respite came from their earning husbands. The social networks in the former town acted as filters for some, but also a motivation to earn money for themselves and their children if things came to a naught between the married couple.

An oustee in New Tehri, who had grown up in Tehri, spoke about the difference she feels in her routine now:
Going and meeting somebody has turned into a formal event based on invitations. Then, in Tehri, let us say a marriage was happening. Everybody would pitch in to fill the water, just like in the village, everybody would clean the rice. Here, you just go to the market for things. Everything has finished. Yes, we do not have to do all that work anymore, but then, we have become unemployed too, right?

If the resettlement was favoured for its material comforts compared to the old life in the town and the villages, it was also held responsible for taking away the women’s chances of being ‘free’. Going to the field or to the river was a way for women to be away from their households, to be away from their responsibilities, however briefly. It was a legitimate way for them to get away from the patriarchal set-up which had sent them out in the first place.

Accounts of women and men pointed towards the experience of women’s mobility (access to open spaces and a freedom of movement across the town) as an important lens to view their new lives and the experience of a place. This included the idea of ‘female safety’ which was embodied. It was linked to moving in a geography which was familiar (pahar) and moving amongst people who were known (caste groups).

A group of women in New Tehri had once pointed at me to indicate that I lived in the plains (Delhi) before pointing at the gold earrings, necklaces, or bangles they were wearing. ‘If you wear all this in the plains, somebody will come on a bike and snatch it away. Here, we still roam about, even at night, without worry.’

A member of staff at the district hospital, hailing from Udham Singh Nagar (a plains district in Uttarakhand), told me that her family had agreed to send her to New Tehri only because it was in the mountains. She had preferred working in Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, after completing her studies there. But her family was more comfortable and relaxed about her posting to the mountains. ‘They felt the crime rate is much less, it is more serene and peaceful, and there is less pollution.’ The safety or the feeling of being safe or unsafe was usually compared to the plains. The fracturing of the pahari from the plains had as one of its major components the construction and use of women’s bodies (Channa 2013: 182).

How does one belong?

For the people living closest to the dam, the present that forms the basis of any future, appeared unpredictable. Apprehensions about dams turning the pahar into sites of catastrophes and vikas, which excluded the pahari from its intended benefits, were interspersed with elements that create our daily lives: livelihood, water, food, neighbours, medical facilities, sounds and views of the places we dwell in (Joshi 2018: 238). Belonging was being cre-
ated, through choices. The location of schools, medical facilities and caste, became some of the reasons to stay or move. When you think about the future, you start thinking about places of action in the present, rather than just going back and forth between the past and the present (Smith, 2015).

Meanings given to the Tehri Dam, the people’s own positioning as *visthapit*, and the ecological risk they found in inhabiting their new place, have formed the basis of how people chose to reconstruct their lives before the displacement and how they talked about Tehri. And through these conversations – on climate, on the river, on wearing jackets during summer afternoons, on joints paining and stomach aching due to water, people showed me how they were creating ways of belonging to Tehri which no longer existed.

Conversations in the new town would often lead to differences between the ‘here’ and the ‘there’, the ‘now’ and the ‘then’. A four-hour long power cut would make people speak. Wearing jackets in summer could take a person back in time. The absence of the perennial sound of the river could lead to discussions. Panting while climbing several steep stairs in the new town could cause complaints about respiratory problems and joint pains. The sight of shopkeepers playing cards in a deserted market would lead to reflections on the old Tehri bazaar. The sectors in place of neighbourhoods or living in a ‘tin shed’ could take people back. Thus, belonging to Tehri after it submerged, after there was no physical place called Tehri, became a way to talk about the *pahar, vikas* and *visthapit*.

By immersing themselves in conversations about Tehri, they were also guiding me to what mattered to them, what made them feel secure, what gave them a sense of familiarity, what made them feel a part of something, or what made them feel excluded. It was through conversations and material evidence of the past that people built new forms of shared sentiments. If the present was lacking, it lacked because the past made particular things, specific intangibles, available. Glorifying the past by overlooking, avoiding, or omitting the more unpleasant aspects can serve as an adhesive for people to live together in their present. While for some this can be a fuel for change, for others they can be what ‘ought to be’ or what ‘not ought to be’.

---

27 I wish to thank the editors of this special issue and the reviewer for their thorough reading of the manuscript and the feedback. None of this bears fruit without my utmost thanks to all the people I know and keep meeting across Uttarakhand.
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Ex-Voto
A Photo Essay

Alys Tomlinson

The following images show three different pilgrimage sites: Ballyvourney in Ireland, Mount Grabarka in Poland and Lourdes in France. Between 2016 and 2018, I visited these places to expand on the project that I began a few years before at Lourdes. ‘Ex-Voto’ is a larger, multi-sited project, and this essay shows a selection of ten images that I see as expressive of the home and post-home lives of offerings carried and prepared by the pilgrims who visited these places.

In my photo essay, people and landscape merge, just as place, memory and history entwine. A handwritten note is neatly folded and hidden into the crevice of a rock, crosses are etched onto the stone and a ribbon is carefully wrapped around piles of twigs. These are all offerings of religious devotion, known as ‘ex-voto’ and found at Christian pilgrimage sites worldwide. ‘Ex-voto’ offer a powerful way for pilgrims to connect with shrines and pilgrimage sites, since they bring home to the ‘field’ of pilgrimage. The everyday belongings gain a different meaning when left at sacred sites, becoming a source of comfort and solace to those who leave them.

The first and the last image of this photo essay both display views into the vastness of woodland surrounding sacred sites. Their presence is sublime. The forest is not just ‘next to’ or ‘within’ the religious field but it also contains its beauty and greatness. It suggests that nature has the power to conceal and to reveal; it can also overgrow the site at any time. The persistence of pilgrims and their pilgrimage sites over centuries confirms the need for devoutness and the multiplicity of spiritual forms.

In this photo essay, places and people remain anonymous in terms of dates, countries and names. And yet, the viewer can and might guess or imagine where they come from. The style of a specific male uniform, female type of veiling or the ordination of clothing act as markers of belonging. The nun’s headdress is a sign of a particular Orthodox Christian denomination, the young men’s boiler suits adorned with insignia present national affiliations, and so on. The images invite the viewer to transcend these markers and observe the people, places and landscapes as they appear in the apparent stillness of a photograph.

The sites’ histories vary in origins and timeframes, ranging from the 6th and the 13th to the 19th century. The compelling religious narratives that draw pilgrims to them are both ‘distinct and distinctive’. Similarly, the images are
united by a purity in intention and a simplicity in action, argues Rowan Cerys Tomlinson in her introductory notes to the ‘Ex-Voto’ photo series.¹ Moreover, she signals that these images show a shift in the way pilgrims approach sites of devotion. In contemporary religious journeys, there is less emphasis on the once-arduous journey to and from home (many pilgrims nowadays travel to the sites by car or plane), as the visitors experience pilgrimage physically through a variety of material engagements. At all three sites, this includes the bathing in and the drinking of holy water, the touching of rocks and the leaving behind of ex-voto brought from the home environment (including photos, letters, coins and crutches). Placed in the sacred landscapes as a sign of a commitment, and a hope waiting to be met, these ex-voto turn the natural features of the land into vessels for human stories of anticipation and expectation.

The post-home lives of objects are complicated. Here, in their dwelling in the vastness of a forest, or their retreat into the multitude of religious offerings, they exist through an unspoken promise of the ‘field’ to keep and protect them. We can understand it as being-at-home in the world, as a feeling of attachment to the idea of greatness, God and nature. There is hope and trust that the ‘field’ will open itself for us in its truth and beauty, which brings us back to Christian morality and faith as the motivation of the pilgrims.

The images encompass formal portraiture, large format landscape and small, detailed still-life shots of the objects and markers left behind. Shot on 5x4, large format film, the images evoke a distinct stillness and reflect the mysterious, timeless quality present at these sites of great spiritual contemplation.

These images offer a look through the entwining of people, places and objects and remind us of the intricate coupling of ‘beauty’ and ‘truth’ in works of art, humanities and natural science, which Elaine Scarry described thus: ‘It creates, without itself fulfilling, the aspiration for enduring certitude. It comes to us, with no work of our own; then leaves us prepared to undergo a giant labor’.²

---

¹ See Rowan Cerys Tomlinson’s introductory essay in Alys Tomlinson’s (2019) Ex-Voto. GOST Books (pp. 1-2).
Alys Tomlinson is an award-winning photographer based in London. Before receiving an MA in the Anthropology of Travel, Tourism and Pilgrimage from SOAS University of London, she studied English Literature and Communications at the University of Leeds, as well as photography at Central Saint Martins College of Art and Design. Alys is interested in the relationship between people and place, exploring themes of environment, belonging and identity. She exhibits her work widely. For the *Ex-Voto* series, Alys was named the Sony World Photographer of the Year 2018. Her work has also been recognised through the International Photography Award of the British Journal of Photography, the Taylor Wessing Portrait Prize and the Renaissance Photography Prize, the HOTSHOE Award, the Creative Review Photography Annual, the Magenta Foundation Flash Forward and the Photo District News’ ‘PDN’s 30’ list. *Ex-Voto* was published by GOST Books in 2019.
Brexit, Grenfell, Windrush, and the mooring, un-mooring, and re-mooring of home

Tom Selwyn

Preface

This article argues that three events that have dominated the UK over several years – the 2016 Brexit referendum and its subsequent fallout, the fire at Grenfell Tower in June 2017 and the ‘Windrush Scandal’ of 2018 (several decades in the making and continuing as this article is being written) – derive, in part, from closely related sources deep in the foundations of British political culture.¹

When looking for a frame to explore the connections between the three events, we find many factors at work. Some of these are linked to geopolitical movements at a global level. Others are regional and/or local. There are political, economic and socio-cultural strands too. We may look for one particular cultural strand with which to start the article. Ryszard Kapuściński (2018) argues that the relationship between ‘us and them’, selves and others, are always and everywhere characterised by either contempt and hatred, on the one hand, or exchange of knowledge on the other. Kenan Malik (2019) develops Kapuściński’s insight for the British setting thus: ‘Officials eyeing you with contempt. Police treating you as scum. […] Such is likely to be your experience if you are working class. Such is also likely to be your experience if you are of black or minority ethnic origin’.

The present article builds on these two observations to suggest that one feature of the discourse associated with Brexit, Grenfell and Windrush deployed by the British ruling class and its political bag carriers is, indeed, contempt for the working class and migrants. Nigel Farage’s ‘Breaking point’ poster (see Figure 2) appeared at a key moment in the Brexit process while Boris Johnson’s recurring slurs – such as his linking of the burqa with post-

¹ The Brexit referendum or the ‘United Kingdom European Union membership referendum’ took place on 23 June 2016 in the UK and Gibraltar, asking whether the UK should leave or remain in the European Union (EU citizens and the British Overseas Territories Citizens beyond the UK and Gibraltar were ineligible to vote). Grenfell Tower is a twenty-four-story tower block in West London that suffered a catastrophic fire in June 2017, which killed at least seventy-two of its inhabitants. The ‘Windrush Scandal’, per se, broke in 2018 and consisted of popular outrage about the deportation to the Caribbean of hundreds of people of Afro-Caribbean heritage who had lived much of their life in Britain. Deportation of so-called ‘illegal immigrants’ was being carried out well before the ‘Windrush scandal’ itself and is, shamefully, proceeding apace at the time of writing (2019).
boxes and bank robbers – pop up routinely. As for the British working class, the ideological principles of the five authors of the tragi-comic manifesto of an extreme rightist clique – the conservative politicians Kwasi Kwarteng, Priti Patel, Dominic Raab, Chris Skidmore and Elizabeth Truss – is clear. They begin chapter four of their book, Britannia Unchained, by claiming: ‘Once they enter the workplace, the British are among the worst idlers in the world’ (2012: 61). Their response to this is to imagine a Britain unregulated by social considerations, free to pursue a ‘buccaneering’ mode of being, ‘getting on the side of the responsible, the hard working and the brave. We must stop’, they add, ‘bailing out the reckless, avoiding all risk, and rewarding lazi-ness’ (ibid.: 112).

The ‘othering’ of immigrants, refugees, and the working class is achieved partly by the distribution to the British people of powerful mythologies (to be defined and explored below). The article thus considers actions, ideas and values of those involved in producing and reproducing the politics of othering, one assumption being that such complex political notions as ‘Will of the People’, ‘sovereignty’ and ‘democracy’ (and the latest at the time of writing, ‘liberty’) are being spread around as myth themes rather than subjects of sober thought. It follows that, colloquially put, we can see the Britain of Brexit, Grenfell, and Windrush being led, Pied Piper-like, towards a political and cultural space in which the realities of austerity and de-regulation on the ground2 have simultaneously been both orchestrated and shrouded from view by economic interests articulated by a political class making sizeable financial gains at the same time as wielding technologically-charged mytholo-gies that have been lying dormant since the 1930s.

We are, to put it in a slightly different way, in Fintan O’Toole (2018) territory where pleasure and pain (‘heroic failure’ as he puts it) co-exist in a political field into which we have all been invited to experience an ecstasy of humiliation promising to achieve the reclamation of ‘sovereignty’ and ‘independence’ through obeisance to the ‘Will of the People’ at a time when the actual means of democratic renewal have all but been stripped bare (see below). The implications of all this for our understanding of the meanings of home, homecoming and home making in a post-home world underpin everything that follows.

Introduction

Issues of home and ‘post-home’ are integral to this article, the terms being at the centre of all three of our events. The Brexit process has raised pro-

---

2 A parliamentary report records that The Food Foundation estimates that 1.97 million people within the UK may be undernourished. The British Association for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition (BAPEN) places the number of malnourished, specifically undernourished, people at 3 million (House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee 2019).
found questions about the extent to which the British are at home in Europe (as many banners at recent pro-European demonstrations have proclaimed) and/or Europeans are (still) at home in Britain. The fire at Grenfell Tower destroyed all the homes of those living there and has raised many questions about how those made homeless have subsequently been looked after and enabled to find new homes. The ‘Windrush scandal’ started out as the so-called ‘hostile environment’ project activated by the then Home Secretary in 2012. This programme sought to persuade people who came to the UK from the Caribbean in the ‘Empire Windrush’ to ‘go home’ if they lacked official papers dating from the time of their arrival.

The chapter is divided into four parts. Part 1 (Displacement) itself has four sections. The first and second of these sections consider the present state of the anthropology of home, discusses the notions of ‘un-mooring, mooring and re-mooring’ in defining home in an age of migration and refugees, and looks at the definition of ‘hostile environment’. The third section reflects on the extent to which local democratic processes have been shattered by austerity while the fourth speculates about the senses in which citizens may feel ‘intellectually displaced’ in a post-imperial Britain. Part 2 (Architects of Brexit) looks at the individuals, groups, networks and ideas leading the Brexit project and describes the aims and objectives of its architects. High on the list of these aims are visions of a British political economy built upon the most extreme principles of individualism, social fragmentation and deregulation, linked closely to a rising anti-immigrant and anti-refugee rhetoric. Part 3 (Mythologies) briefly identifies a selection of ‘mythologies’ – in the Barthian sense – attached to the three events. Part 4 (Resistance) sketches ways in which the politics and practices of resistance to all of the above are presently being fashioned and enacted. Reference to our three events will be made throughout.

Part 1: Displacement

Inspired by the arrival in London docks of HMT Empire Windrush in 1948 (see Figure 1), and the practical and theoretical connotations of displacement accompanying the ship, we build our analysis around the notions of mooring, un-mooring and re-mooring of homes. These nautical metaphors are all too appropriate in a world shaped by seascapes which are nowadays full of small, often unseaworthy, boats carrying refugees attempting to cross into Europe

3 Part of this project is the ‘Immigration Act 2014’ (see Home Office 2014).

4 The term ‘mythologies’ in this article follows the work of Roland Barthes (1991 [1957]) and his studies of French iconographic objects, actions and ideas – such as the Blue Guide, ornamental cookery, the Eiffel Tower, and so on. One essential aspect of his approach is to show how these ‘mythologies’ simultaneously highlight particular cultural ‘ways of seeing’ whilst obscuring crucial material features of the objects.
from the southern and eastern shores of the Mediterranean in search of good and settled lives in new homes.

The terms mooring, un-mooring, and re-mooring express well where we have reached in the field of anthropology of home. In a recent co-edited volume on home (Frost and Selwyn 2018), I have argued that contemporary anthropological work on the idea of home has been shaped by several discernible features (Selwyn 2018). Firstly, the field is increasingly being framed within a ‘world systems’ jigsaw in which, for example, ‘the life of an asylum seeker in Sydney is inexorably linked to conflict and war in the Spice Islands of eastern Indonesia’ (ibid.: 170). Secondly, ideas about home are inseparable from questions of identity and the formation of the self. Thirdly, anthropological work on homemaking has become closely related to analyses of the symbolism of material objects, including the human body. Fourthly, the anthropology of home combines studies of space, identity and the role of civil society and the state in a fragmented and fragmenting world.

Displacement I: home moored, un-moored and re-moored

Nigel Rapport and Joanna Overing (2007) have correctly observed that, although home is a ‘key term’ in anthropology, not a great deal of theoretical use has been made of it over and above its application to the term house. For us, however, the notion of a moored house allows us to understand how a house becomes a home in large measure by being attached to ways of being and doing both within and beyond its doors. Homes are intimately related to places of work, sources of food, to medicine, worship, leisure, familiar and familial spaces, transport and so on, and are, in that sense, moored within larger social, economic, political and cultural circles of ideas, places and
practices. Equally clearly, homes become ‘un-moored’ by war and forced migration. Refugees, by definition, are searching for new moorings.

Ethnographic analysis of the re-mooring of homes to new and re-shaped systems and structures in contemporary Britain (or, indeed, anywhere else) challenges anthropological approaches in several ways, two of which may be emphasised here. To start with, the spatialities of mooring are complex. Making a home involves constructing, affirming and re-affirming relationships at social and geographical levels ranging from the domestic to the global as well as the many points in between – within urban or regional communities and networks, for example. Secondly, such construction involves making a large number of institutional relationships - from health professionals to diaspora groups, from religious sites to sites of leisure and enjoyment, and so on. Social processes involved in mooring and homemaking are thus also complex and multi-layered. The challenge lies in the analytical capacity to draw together the threads (social, cultural, political, economic) into a coherent and intelligible whole.

One reason why the anthropological usage of the idea of home has been uneven and theoretically marginal is that the term has been used in two different and seemingly contradictory ways (Frost and Selwyn 2018: 5). On the one hand, there is Mary Douglas’s (1991) claim that home is to be understood in terms of the routinisation of time and space, and thus of ‘patterns of regular doings, furnishings, and appurtenances’ (ibid.: 289). On the other hand, Rapport and Overing (ibid.: 176) have argued that, in a globalised world shaped by migration, the term home must address the fact of people’s multiple attachments to different places. The crochet-like patterns of senses of identity that accompany these attachments speak precisely of a lack of routinisation. In such a world, they argue, Douglas’s approach is ‘anachronistic, providing little conceptual purchase in a world of contemporary movement’ (ibid.). Frost and I argue that the ideas of home and homemaking in a world of migrants necessarily require the insights of both Douglas and Rapport and Overing (see Frost and Selwyn 2018).

The notion of home à la Douglas connotes the space/house/dwelling place of individuals and the intimate collectivities of which they are a part: couples, families, friendship groups and so on (Palmer 2018). A classic ethnographic description and analysis of such a dwelling is Pierre Bourdieu’s (1979 [1970]) exquisite ‘The Kabyle House or the World Reversed’, a work much admired by Douglas herself and incorporated in her own edited collection Rules and Meanings (1973). In his essay, Bourdieu (1979 [1970]) describes familial structures and processes in a Kabyle house: birth, death, marriage, the raising of children, food production, animal husbandry and so on: in short, the temporal and spatial rhythms of home.

Shifting our gaze from Bourdieu’s ‘house’ towards our contemporary world of migration and movement from north Africa to Europe reveals a fea-
ture of the socio-cultural landscape that has precise relevance for the present article. Kabyle people have a long history of migration to France and elsewhere in Europe, migrating there in waves from 1913 onwards. At the time of writing this (July 2019) a number of web-based platforms of interest to the Kabyle diaspora can be found. For example, ‘Algérie Mariage/Charmes d’Orient’ is an enterprise based in Lyon, France, offering Kabyle style fashion items for weddings, while Walimation Production Company offers wedding music clips such as ‘Alilou – Vive les Mariés’.\(^5\) The site is linked to Facebook comments by members of the diaspora about Kabyle identity in Europe.

Web-based platforms like these and others are best interpreted as quintessentially homemaking agencies. As noted above, the sites tend to be linked to opportunities to comment on what it means to be a north African immigrant in France and are often linked up to support groups of various kinds providing services for incoming migrant families engaged in re-mooring homes in France, whilst also maintaining close links with homes in north Africa. They also remind us, yet again, that home making in our present world tends for many to be an enterprise that occurs on a variety of levels, from the intimate and domestic to the regional and global. In making the journeys from ‘La Maison Kabyle’ to and from ‘Algérie Mariage/Charmes d’Orient’ – effectively, from Douglas to Rapport/Overing and back again – what we see are processes of un-mooring and re-mooring of homes. Our task, as anthropologists of home, is to trace the complex forms these processes take.

**Displacement II: the ‘hostile environment’ towards refugees, asylum seekers and ‘illegal immigrants’**

The title of the iconic image of the 2016 campaign to leave the EU was ‘Breaking Point’ (see Figure 2). This consisted of a photograph of a long line of young male Muslim refugees in the Balkans walking towards the camera (see Heather and Mason 2016). The image, greatly magnified, was placed on the side of a van which was wheeled out into public view on the day that the former Labour MP Jo Cox was murdered. Cox’s views on the need to stay within the EU and to defend immigration were well known. Her murderer, a neo-Nazi, Thomas Mair, shouted ‘Britain first’ and ‘keep Britain independent’ as he shot and stabbed her (see Cobain, Parveen and Taylor 2016). Asked to state his name at the trial, he said that it is ‘death to traitors, freedom for Britain’ (see Booth et al. 2016). During the trial Mair was shown to have multiple links with far-right political groups. The ‘Breaking Point’ van was reproduced in the media together with a photograph of Farage, then Head of the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), positioned in front of the

van, pointing towards the text written across the picture of the refugees. This read: ‘The EU has failed us all. We must break free of the EU and take back control of our borders. Leave the European Union on 23rd June’. Likewise, the UKIP ‘Brexit battle bus’ toured with a sign ‘We want our country back’ (see Figure 5).

Fig. 2. The ‘Breaking Point’ poster, as it appeared in one of Nigel Farage’s messages on Twitter, June 2016. Photo: ©@Nigel_Farage.

The EU has failed us all.

The explosive entry of refugees into the centre of the debate about Britain’s relationship to the EU built upon rhetoric that been established some years earlier by the then Home Secretary, Theresa May. In 2012, May promoted what became known as the ‘Hostile Environment’ policy, which she and the British Home Office named ‘Operation Vaken’.6 This was a programme based

6 Simon Hattenstone (2018) drew attention to the fact that the programme was termed ‘Vaken’ and that this term derived from the slogan Deutschland Erwache (‘Germany Awake’). This programme, which, according to Hattenstone, was the only British Home Office policy ever to have been given a title in a language other than English, was emblazoned on banners flown at the Nuremberg rallies held annually in Germany between 1923 and 1938 by the Nazi Party. Amongst the many films made to commemorate the rallies, one in particular seems relevant to the present article, namely Leni Riefenstahl’s Triumph of the Will (1935).
on the promise by the Conservative Party, enshrined in its manifesto, to ‘get immigration down to the tens of thousands’. It was to be achieved partly by a programme of deportation of residents in the UK who were unable (often through no fault of theirs) to produce papers the Home Office decided legitimated their residence and/or citizenship in Britain. May referred to such people with the blanket term ‘illegal immigrants’ or, as she put it at the 2016 Conservative party conference ‘citizens of nowhere’? In the case of Vaken, a magnified image of handcuffs and three textual messages were spread out on the side of vans. ‘In the UK illegally?’ asked one message; ‘106 arrests last week’ announced a second; ‘Go home or face arrest’ said a third. These inscriptions suggested that at the heart of May’s enterprise was an attempt to shape the way we think about ideas of home and homemaking. The reproduction in the British press of the texts on the Vaken vans steered us not only towards determining who amongst us should be invited home and who kept out, but also towards going along with the implication that it was somehow ‘normal’ to be attached to a single home and a singular identity. Vaken targeted all who were assumed (before any due process) to be sans papiers but was arguably felt most strongly by people of Afro-Caribbean heritage living in Britain.

It is out of Vaken that the Windrush scandal grew. The troop-carrying ship HMT Empire Windrush\(^8\) docked in London in 1948 with 1,029 passengers from Jamaica. Of these, nearly seven hundred came from the Caribbean with the intention of settling in the UK. These and others who arrived at the same time are referred to as the ‘Windrush generation’. When, at the time of the scandal, it became widely known how this group of people, invited as they had been by the British government to contribute to the post-war rebuilding of the UK, had been so crassly and belligerently targeted since 2012, there were many voices raised in outrage. Despite these voices and the resignation of Amber Rudd, then Home Secretary, officially generated hostility is still in full swing. Home Office (Home Office, 2018) statistics record that in the year ending September 2018 10,190 immigrants were forcibly deported (slightly less than in the previous year) while 2049 were held in detention. Diane Taylor (2018) has written that conditions in detention centres are worse than in prison.

---

7 Theresa May’s speech included the following: ‘Today, too many people in positions of power behave as though they have more in common with international elites than with the people down the road, the people they employ, the people they pass on the street. But if you believe you are a citizen of the world, you are a citizen of nowhere. You don’t understand what citizenship means’ (see Davis and Hollis 2018).

8 The original name of HMT Empire Windrush was MV Monte Rosa. This was a passenger ship launched in Germany in the 1930s and used by the Nazis in World War II to deport Jews from Norway to the concentration camps in Poland.
David Lammy has been one of the most vocal MPs on the plight of the Windrush generation, including the children of Windrush families. He has stressed the close relationship between Vaken and the appeasement by the Conservative party of its extreme right wing and its UKIP shadows (see Lammy 2018). During the Windrush debate, Lammy stressed the long relationship (since the first British ships arrived in the Caribbean in 1623), shaped by slavery and colonisation as it was, between Britain and the Caribbean (ibid.). He pointed out that 25,000 people with Caribbean origins had served in the first and second world wars. He ended his speech declaring:

*This is a day of national shame, and it has come about because of a 'hostile environment'. Let us call it as it is: if you lay down with dogs, you get fleas, and that is what has happened with the far-right rhetoric in this country.* (ibid.)

Despite being an active and visible member of the Anglican church, May has followed others in the use of the sort of far-right language that has found its way into the hearts of Windrush (and Brexit) related speech. She herself built on rhetorical declarations previously made by members of her own party about immigrants. David Cameron had referred to a ‘swarm of people coming across the Mediterranean’ trying to ‘break into Britain without permission’ (Elgot 2016), whilst Philip Hammond had spoken of ‘marauding’ African migrants (Perraudin 2015). May herself spoke of asylum seekers as ‘foreign criminals’ (Chakrabortty 2017). Indeed, aided by these and other such terms, characteristic as they are of the rhetoric of UKIP, May has done much to encourage a spirit of intolerance amongst the general public towards refugees and migrants more generally. It comes as no surprise that the Oxford University Study of Migration (Allen, 2016) found that, in the decade before its publication, the most common word used in the British press in conjunction with migrant or immigrant was ‘illegal’. The linguistic elision between migrant and illegal has underscored the routine holding of asylum seekers, without prior due process, in detention centres and/or in accommodation often unfit for human habitation run by private companies in receipt of public funds.

---

9 A majority of those presenting as members of the Anglican Church voted to leave the EU (cf. Smith and Woodhead (2018).
10 When measured by criteria suggested by this article, the boundary between the Europhobic right wing of the Conservative Party and the extreme right (Farage and beyond) appears highly permeable.
11 Clearsprings Ready Homes is one example. This is a property group that is paid substantial sums of public money to provide accommodation for asylum seekers in London and the South-East. The quality and maintenance standards of the properties managed by the company are reported to be very poor (see Williams 2016).
May’s ‘hostile environment’ vans, their frightening images and texts with their implied messages, were archetypical examples of the ‘relentless targeting of hyper-partisan views’ which the parliamentary committee of the Digital, Culture, Media and Sport later defined as ‘fake news’ (DCMS 2018). ‘Fake news’ is fed by a particularly toxic fertiliser in which one set of ‘facts’ grows into others in seamless elaborations: hostility towards refugees into hostility towards the EU into hostility towards the ‘Westminster élite’, and so on. Such flowing inseparability is precisely what UKIP and its Brexiteer associates placed at the centre of their efforts to summon the Brexit votes. Nigel Oakes, one of the founders of Cambridge Analytica, in and out bedfellow of Farage and his followers (see Doward and Gibbs 2017), described his profiling work in a 1992 interview: ‘We use the same techniques as Aristotle and Hitler. We appeal to people on an emotional level to get them to agree on a functional level’ (Robinson 2018).

Displacement III: austerity, urban displacement and the theft of local democracy

The policies and rhetoric indicated above have targeted people who have been displaced from their homes in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, parts of sub-Saharan Africa and elsewhere, and who have made their way to the UK to make their homes in Britain. We will return to this aspect of the theme of displacement in part two of this article. Before that, however, we may consider the theme of displacement from another point of view, namely that which relates to feelings of being displaced from one’s own hometown and even the displacement of the town itself. In his conspectus of the effect on local municipal life and governance of ‘austerity’, Tom Crewe (2016) has described what he terms ‘the strange death of municipal England’. We may follow Crewe’s lead by referring to a variety of journalistic reports and ethnographic evidence as follows.

Recently made redundant from the closing of the Goodyear factory in Wolverhampton, one of the people interviewed by Jim O’Neil (2017) in the BBC’s ‘Fixing Globalisation’ series explained the background of his city’s vote to leave the EU with brutal simplicity:

All I have known, in 38 years of working in this country – all my working life – is short-time working, recessions, people losing their jobs, factory after factory closing. […] This region has been stripped down and taken abroad […] People voted Brexit as a protest vote. (ibid. emphasis mine)

He went on to describe the food banks in the town, the homeless and ‘people queuing up 60-deep outside Citizens Advice worrying about bailiffs’, concluding: ‘This is my town, and we’ve got to do something about it’ (ibid.). His
words expressed feelings, not only of despair about what he perceived to be a socially fragmenting and directionless post-industrial economy, but also of deep sadness about the deterioration of social life in his hometown.

O’Neil’s interlocutor spoke of the displacement both of himself and of his home town. His words fit with accounts of the ways that urban spaces, as centres for the gathering of familiars and generators of social solidarity all over Britain, have been closed off, shut down, and/or sold off. There are many examples. Tim Coates (2018) has written of the closure of public libraries and the laying off of library staff. The Sutton Trust (see Smith et al. 2018) has documented the systematic closure of Sure Start children’s centres. This has left the UK’s flagship early years programme ‘hollowed out’ and in decline (ibid. 5). Local municipalities throughout Britain have been selling off public land under their control in order to fund their services in the face of relentless reductions from central government. Brent Council, for example, has sold off public space it formally controlled, worth thirty million sterling over the past five years for this reason (see Shaw 2019). Most recently, in 2018 and 2019, Brent found itself in the High Court, fighting to confirm its power to acquire a fully operating centre for the Afro-Caribbean community, the Bridge Centre (see Taylor 2019). Brent’s plan was, and remains at the time of writing, to shut down the centre, demolish the building, clear the land, and build apartments in order to sell these off in order to make up its budget from the depredations that the government’s austerity programme has visited on it.

A report based on a collaborative, cross-country investigation led by reporters from the Huffington Post (see Davies et al. 2019) has reported on the extent to which the cities in the UK’s North East have been stripped of funding and, consequently, forced to sell large amounts of public land and property, and cut services to the bone. The report has revealed that several councils in the North East have axed housing support services, including hostel beds, refuges and sheltered housing, as they struggle to meet the demands of fresh rounds of cuts.

In Sunderland, for example, the housing support budget for homeless people in the city is being cut to zero. The Salvation Army, which runs a local hostel, has said that the council faced hard decisions: ‘They have closed libraries and children’s centres and they are now having to look at cutting support to the most vulnerable people’ (Butler and Laville 2017). Sunderland council has stated ‘Because of budget cuts and the government’s austerity programme, the council is reviewing and remodelling many services’ (ibid.). Sunderland voted Leave by a substantial majority in the 2016 referendum and was the starting point of Farage’s ‘sort of march’ (his words). The Council has signalled the imminent closure of Centrepoint, a homelessness charity for young people, following the withdrawal of all council funds. Four hostels for vulnerable young people will close in 2017. Furthermore, with £568,000
budget cut, the voluntary society ‘Wearside Women in Need’, which runs refuges and a helpline will close (Dawn 2017).

In Birmingham, voluntary organisations wrote to Theresa May in 2017, arguing that it was likely vulnerable people would die as a direct result of the proposed £10 million cuts over two years to services for homeless and mentally ill people. A couple of months before this letter, Chiriac Inout, a homeless man, was found dead near a car park in Birmingham city centre in temperatures of minus 6C (see Cartledge 2016).

In Norfolk, charities have said £5m cuts to housing support services (equivalent to around 55% of the total funding for such services) proposed by Norfolk county council from April 2017 will drive up homelessness in Norwich, which is already reporting record numbers of people sleeping rough on the streets (Butler and Laville 2017). The Norwich city council leader, Alan Waters, described the combination of reductions to the council’s budget, the rising rents and the welfare cuts as a ‘perfect storm’. According to the Local Government Association, local authorities have a 40% real-terms reduction to their core government grant over the past 10 years and are facing more cuts every year (ibid.). Across the country, other local authorities are in the same position: facing huge budget cuts and deciding whether to continue to cut funding for services into non-existence. What’s happening in Sunderland, Bristol, Norwich, Birmingham and elsewhere in the UK is about to happen in the rest of the country.

Crewe’s ‘death of municipal England’ has involved the fracturing of public spaces and the fragmenting of public services. As O’Neil’s (2017) interlocutor in Wolverhampton implied with forceful precision, these processes resulted, inter alia, in the current disillusion with politics, governance, and (crucially in our case here) the EU. Many would argue, however, that the EU is the wrong address. Austerity is the child of the Conservative government rather than the EU.

There are further aspects to this fracturing, one of which has to do with the ‘de-democratisation’ of local government by Tony Blair’s first government. I will quote, more or less verbatim, from my colleague, Alan Templeton. According to Templeton, in a drive for local efficiency, Blair’s ‘Local Government Act 2000’ required local municipalities to change their traditional committee-based system of decision making into an executive model (see Home Office 2000). One form of this consisted of a council having a leader supported by a cabinet executive. Backbench councillors were granted

---

13 I am indebted to Templeton, Chair of Camden Public Libraries User’s Group (CPLUG) for this analysis. As noted, I quote him almost verbatim in the paragraphs that follow as well as using his words (‘theft of local democracy’) in the title of this sub-section.
a scrutiny role but in a way that lessened their power when compared to their situation in their former committee-based structures of governance. According to Templeton (see notes 12 and 13), this was a system copied from the one operating in the national parliament. However, unlike their national counterparts, councilor members of local scrutiny committees enjoy little or no support structures (research capacity, training, access to specialist advice, for example). At the local level, the scrutiny committees have part time councilors with no research and little independent specialist advice available. As a result, power has been taken away from the council as a whole and given to the cabinet without any effective oversight. Moreover, executive members of the cabinet are also part timers without independent research and advice. This clearly renders them less able to work with their council officer colleagues with any sense of equality. In short, much of the power wielded by councillors in the traditional form of local government has been transferred to unelected officers. As the price of making municipalities ‘more efficient’ in the sense of being more amenable to national edicts, local democracy has obviously been weakened.\(^\text{14}\)

*Displacement IV: nostalgic memorialisation – temporal and spatial displacement*

Following research by Danny Dorling (2018) and Lorenza Antonucci *et al.* (2017), Gurminder Bhambra (2018) has drawn attention to the fact that it was the ‘squeezed middle’, that is to say ‘propertied, pensioned, educated, white, southern English middle-class voters uncomfortable with their declining economic position’, as she puts it, rather than poor and angry working-class voters (and still less BME voters who overwhelmingly voted ‘Remain’) who made the statistical running in voting ‘Leave’. Noting that prominent slogans before and after the referendum have included ‘we want our country back’ and ‘we are voting for our sovereignty’, Bhambra (ibid.) argues that, amongst the ‘squeezed middle’, the main motivation for supporting Brexit was a displaced reaction to the implications for national identity caused by the loss, from 1948 onwards, of the British Empire.

Bhambra’s (ibid.) argument has three interrelated strands. The first is that, as rulers of a multi-cultural empire, the British felt themselves to have global status. Secondly, although this sense of global status continued to be felt when the UK joined the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1973, it was a feeling that became tinged with resentment: now Britain was only one amongst 28 nations and thus *primus inter pares* rather than ruler of the

\(^{14}\) Templeton points out a fascinating twist to this narrative of the decline of local democracy, namely that the Cameron government’s ‘Localism Act 2011’ made it possible for larger councils to revert to the traditional local authority method of operation provided a locality had a population greater than 85,000 (see also Home Office 2011).
roost. Thus, thirdly, when the multi-cultural inhabitants of the former empire began to ‘come home’, the sense of resentment grew. Islamophobia and racist dispositions towards Eastern Europeans and others grew. These found their way into anti-European Union rhetoric and the idea not only that the EU was responsible for ‘illegal immigration’ but that the UK had no power to stop this. This sense of powerlessness has been inflamed by the buffoonery of ‘vassal state’ utterances by Johnson, Jacob Rees-Mogg, Farage and other leading ‘bastards’ or ‘bad boys’\footnote{‘Bastards’ was the late Prime Minister John Major’s term for Eurosceptic Conservative MPs, whereas ‘bad boys’ is Nigel Farage’s term for the group of prominent members of the UKIPery, including himself and Banks.} that, as Lammy (2018) has rightly said, conjure sightings of a darkening horizon beneath which lurk the malignant shadows of Tommy Robinson and his fascist thugs. An example of this came to light in 2017, following the Grenfell fire. The largest single donor to the Vote Leave movement, Arron Banks, launched a photograph of Grenfell Tower on the LEAVE.EU Twitter account (see Figure 3). Across the picture was the text ‘An amnesty for Grenfell illegal immigrants? Absolutely not! The law is the law’. Next to the group’s logo was another one, of Banks’s GoSkippy.com insurance company. The Daily Mirror re-published Banks’s image in a double page spread excoriating its author and his associates. We return to the image in part III.

![Fig. 3. LEAVE.EU message published on Twitter on 22 June 2017, days after the Grenfell fire. Photo: © @LeaveEuOfficial.](image-url)
When combined, these threads of British representations over the last decades and more, with their echoes and intimations of times past and future, offer us a complex pattern within which one dominant narrative can be discerned. This speaks of cultural introspection, progressive marginalisation of the idea of the social (including social responsibility) from the lexicon of the political right, and rising abuse and hostility to others. In present contexts the above paragraphs have begun to outline how this hostility has included, via Vaken, Windrush and, by way of local incompetence together with active dislike for public services in general and public housing in particular, Grenfell Tower itself.

So far, we have concentrated on the ‘losers’ of the displacement processes we have described: the refugees and ‘illegal immigrants’ displaced from their homes by war; those whose home towns and cities are felt to have been displaced by privatisation; even those in the ‘squeezed middle’ who feel they have been part of a historical shift that has displaced their own country from the dominance it once enjoyed as ruler of an Empire. It is now time to look at some of the ‘winners’.

Part 2: Architects of Brexit

The ground base of this article is that Windrush, Grenfell and Brexit derive from the dispositions towards the concept of society espoused by Margaret Thatcher and the Conservative right wing whose project, since 1979, has involved the shrinking of the state, reduction of taxes, de-regulation, wholesale privatisation and reduction of public services (including public housing and home building), demise of heavy industry and demolition of union strength and influence, and the radical stoking of financial services. When at her pomp in 1987, 8 years after her rise to power, she revealed her beliefs with unusual clarity. In that year, in an interview for Woman’s Own, she uttered her credo as follows:

*I think we have gone through a period when too many children and people have been given to understand ‘I have a problem, it is the Government’s job to cope with it!’ or ‘I have a problem, I will go and get a grant to cope with it!’ ‘I am homeless, the Government must house me!’ and so they are casting their problems on society and who is society? There is no such thing! There are individual men and women.* (Thatcher 1987)

Five years after this intervention, in 1992, the Maastricht Treaty was signed at a time when Euroscepticism was warming to its task and a more extreme version of Thatcher’s project began to stir. In 2007/8 the financial crash took place which then led to the long and unfinished period of austerity. The extreme right, anti-Europe, pro-US free trade lobby groups (see below) began
to circle and austerity was joined by a culture of hostility to immigrants and refugees (the ‘hostile environment’ appeared in 2012) together with all the rest of the extreme right’s by now familiar baggage.

Brexit must have seemed like the prize of all prizes: all the aims of the far right could be achieved in one single blow. And the ‘people’ (as in ‘Will of the People’) could imagine that the project was none of the above, but rather the fulfilment of the seductive myth of ‘getting back control of our money, borders and laws’: the most perfect trompe l’oeil or, to put it another way, three card-trick, imaginable. All of this invites us to look closely at some of the leading Brexiteers, their flag wavers and their strategies.

Donors and their affiliations

There were at least seven well, or reasonably well-known, associations involved in campaigning for Brexit, the two most conspicuous ones being Vote Leave, the official campaign group and Leave.EU. Following acrimonious disputes between these two, a third group, Grassroots Out, came into being with Peter Bone and Liam Fox (Conservative), Kate Hoey (Labour), Farage (UKIP) and others towing the group on its way. The complex institutional structures and dynamics between these groups is for another day. It needs noting, though, that Leave.EU has become involved in legal disputes about overspending and other alleged criminal activity.

There have been several reports and journalistic interventions listing names of donors to the Leave campaigning groups, noting their business and political affiliations. What follows here is a very narrow, initial, second-hand and incomplete glimpse of where some of the funds for the Brexit campaign came from, using the report by Adam Payne and Will Martin (2017) to chart a path.

Payne and Martin (ibid.) published their list of Brexit donors a year after the referendum. From Lady Annabel Goldsmith (£25,000 given to Brexit campaign groups) to Banks (over £8m) via the pub chain owner Tim Martin (£212,000) and a host of other hedge fund owners, members of the House of Lords, millionaire bankers, a Conservative party treasurer, the chairman/managing director of JCB, Lord Bamford (a supporter of Johnson’s campaign to be Conservative Prime Minister), Payne and Martin (ibid.) have subsequently reported that the campaign received over £24m in donations, the majority of which came from the five richest businessmen in Britain.

Payne and Martin, as well as others, have confirmed that the donors to the campaign groups supporting Brexit were, without exception, from the

16 Apart from these two groups, some of the more prominent promoters of Brexit included Grassroots Out (a UKIP-related/Faragist entity founded by Peter Bone MP), Labour Leave (featuring, amongst others, John Mills and Graham Stringer MP), and Left Leave (a ‘Lexit’ outfit supported by the Socialist Workers Party and the Communist Party).
political right (including the extreme right), mostly attached either to the right of the Conservative Party or to UKIP. Also without exception, all were concerned with the tax advantages to multinational corporations of leaving the EU and the concomitant deregulatory possibilities that Brexit presented.

**Brexit: some key ideas and values**

Although written by a freelance writer without any apparent institutional affiliation, I have found the blog entries by Richard Hutton (2018) useful in steering the way towards an assessment of the political influence of the large variety of lobby groups active before, during, and after the Brexit referendum. In what follows I give examples of some of these, basing the selection on a variety of sources including texts from the institutions themselves.

As Hutton (ibid.) has said, the Brexit referendum was built on lobbying by many groups starting years before the actual event. In the early days, the lobbyists’ aim was to transform the EU into a deregulated free-trade zone thus suiting the interests of British and American businesses. The lobby groups were dedicated to the curtailment of the EU’s financial, environmental, and employment regulations within Britain, their intention being to withdraw Britain from the European social model and transform the country into a US-style outfit featuring minimal taxes and maximum profits for transnational corporations.

Here are some examples of the groups, their personnel, and their ideas and values. In 2013, the group Business for Britain, was set up by Matthew Elliott, founder and former chief executive of the right-wing group, the Tax Payers’ Alliance. The group was made up of 500 professed business-leaders, used a number of media outlets to circulate a letter to persuade the government to transform the EU into a ‘flexible, competitive, Europe with more powers devolved from Brussels’ (see Castle 2013). The letter lobbied to ‘return control over social & employment laws’ to Britain, to ‘cut the EU budget to save taxpayers’ money’, to ‘protect the City and financial services’, to ‘fast track international trade deals’ and to ensure the EU dispensed with social protections and employment laws. In the group’s view this would allow Britain to be transformed into a free-market zone. It saw the demon principle of the EU as the ‘Social Chapter’ of the Maastricht Treaty. BforB lobbying was supported by the Telegraph Group (The Daily Telegraph, along with the Daily Express and the Daily Mail constitute the main Brexit supporting newspapers in the UK). Elliott (2016) himself explained that he founded BforB ‘to bring together business leaders who supported a referendum and a fundamental change in our relationship with the EU’. The group produced a pamphlet (which it regarded as its *magnum opus*) entitled ‘Change or Go’ and morphed into Brexit Central in 2016. It is important to add that Elliott had co-launched the Tax Payers’ Alliance (TPA) in 2004, a lobby group dedicated
to the reduction of the size of government, and lower government spending. According to Evans et al. (2018), the TPA received £223 worth of foreign (including Russian) donations.

As time went on, many other lobbying groups came on the scene. Amongst these was the All-Party Parliamentary Group for European Reform, co-founded by MP Andrea Leadsom in 2015 (cf. Parliamentary Register of All-Party Groups 2015). She was joined by several Conservative and opposition MPs (including Frank Field and Gisela Stuart). The group (dedicated to reducing regulation of several kinds, including working hours) records in the parliamentary register that its aims are:

\[\text{to explore each area where EU legislation impacts on the UK and assess whether this is better dealt with at the national or European level. To work with MEPs, interest groups and other experts to explore what a new UK-EU relationship could look like and what needs to be done to get there. (ibid.)}\]

More and more lobby groups tumbled into the open. Hutton (ibid.) lists, inter alia, The Institute for Policy Research, The Stockholm Network, The Social Market Foundation and, importantly, Economists for Free Trade. The Home Page of this group records that its members include Patrick Minford, its chair, Roger Bootle (advisor to House of Commons Treasury Select Committee), Warwick Lightfoot, Special Adviser to the Chancellor of the Exchequer between 1989 and 1992, James Dyson, John Longworth (Chair of Leave means Leave), Owen Patterson, and Jacob Rees-Mogg. As Minford (2019) explains, the group believes (to quote one of its pamphlets) that ‘No Deal is the Best Deal for the UK’.

One of the more interesting (for us) lobbying groups is the Legatum Institute. Iain Duncan Smith (IDS), founder of Centre for Social Justice, is a Legatum supporter and Hutton (2018) claims that IDS’s approach to poverty is basically to encourage people to find work by ensuring that the benefits they may claim for being unemployed, sick, disabled, caring for others, and so on, are never higher than the wage they would receive if in work. It is a view reminiscent of the Poor Law. Hutton (ibid.) argues that, despite appearances Legatum and the Centre ‘are intended to serve the profiteering of multinational businesses’.

The aim of Part 2 of this article has been twofold. The first has been to suggest that the leading Brexiteers are, without apparent exception, enthusiastic heirs of the Thatcher project, bearing it ever rightwards. The second has been to sketch out a few (there are many more) of the financial winners of the Brexit movement.
Part 3: Mythologies and iconography

From the rolling out of the Vaken vans to Grenfell, via the Brexit referendum, several powerful mythologies have come to be created. Some of those surrounding our events serve to obscure rather than enlighten, to re-arrange ethical hierarchies, to privilege the abstract over the concrete in ways we will shortly indicate. The mythologies at issue here have appeared either in imagery (‘Breaking Point’, for example) or in the oft repeated phrases or texts (‘Will of the People’, for example) that have filled columns and airways and continue to do so.

Before moving to examples, however, there is an essential question we should ask: what are the conditions (social, economic, political) in the contemporary world that give rise to the generation of, and belief in, the kind of myths we are focusing on here? Hannah Arendt writes in her The Origins of Totalitarianism (1962 [1951]) that, if society and social structures are broken (like those as bruised and fragmented by austerity as those in the UK) and citizens have become more or less isolated individuals, then the ground is ready for the rise of powerful mythological structures that serve to give us what we lack in practice: a sense of purpose and agency even if this is known to be imaginary. As Arendt says, totalitarian regimes succeed because isolated, isolated individuals get a ‘sense of having a place in the world’ (ibid.: 323-4). We have argued above that this sense of place, equating to a sense of how home should be, is precisely what many feel has been lost in practice in Brexit/Grenfell/Windrush Britain. We may look now at our images and texts.

Breaking point and its predecessors

As noted earlier, ‘Breaking Point’ was the icon of the 2016 referendum campaign. Farage’s poster built on UKIP’s 2016 local election poster of a line of people queuing in front of a notice hung in an airport-looking space reading ‘UK Citizens’. The title of this image was ‘Open door immigration isn’t working’. The parent/grand parent of these two latter political advertisements was the Conservative 1979 election icon of a line of people queuing in front of a labour exchange with the title ‘Labour Isn’t Working’, an image credited with winning the election for the Conservatives. According to Michael Heseltine’s Campaign magazine it was the ‘best poster of the century’ (see Kelly 2015). It was the background to Thatcher’s dismissal of the existence of society and assertion that ‘there are only individuals and families’. As noted, the UKIP promotional brochures at the time of the lead up to the referendum were derivative of those by the extreme conservative right.
As already noted, Banks launched a photograph of Grenfell Tower at the height of the fire (which the Daily Mirror bravely re-published) with the following words superimposed: ‘An amnesty for Grenfell illegal immigrants? Absolutely not! The law is the law’ (see Figure 3). Banks’s image could well have been the inspiration for an unimaginably and darkly violent ritual incarnation carried out in south London of the myth theme he had constructed. In November 2018 (around the time of Bonfire Night), party goers built and then burned a model of the Grenfell Tower, with brown faces at the windows. Video pictures reproduced in newspapers the following day a group of white party goers lifting the tower into a bonfire and laughing as it and the models inside went up in flames. A George Cross flag appeared in the background. A cheer goes up as the model finally falls, burnt out, to the ground. A cosmopolitan home is reduced to cinders. One cannot help but be reminded of the initial target of those who surrounded Sarajevo at the start of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina, namely the Sarajevo Library, also the home and standard bearer of cosmopolitan history and heritage.
Banks’s seesaw

The Independent newspaper re-published another image tweeted by Banks in 2018: a seesaw with ‘3 million Muslim votes’ written across one end at ground level, and ‘300,000 Jewish Votes’ on the opposite skyward end with a text reading ‘Turkeys Don’t Vote for Christmas’ (see Figure 4). The claim here was that the Labour Party was solely interested in the votes of ‘Britain’s exploding Muslim population’. Amongst those who took exception to this image was the British Board of Jewish Deputies, who reported that some of its best allies in the fight against antisemitism are Muslims.

Banks’s seesaw points out several features of the Brexit project which permeate its institutional variations. Muslims and Jews are conceptualised as having singular and unified identities and dispositions just like two individual persons (as children on either ends of a seesaw in the playground). It is a step away from claiming that all Muslims, like all Jews, speak with one voice. It even implies that members of the Labour party speak with a single voice.

The Will of the People

The term ‘the Will of the People’, sometimes accompanied by the amendment ‘as expressed in the 2016 referendum’, emerges repetitively in the rhetorical pronouncements of Brexiteers. The phrase has the quality of the sacred about it, as if it settles an argument rather than opening up a debate. In Brexit discussions, the ‘Will’ seems to be challenged only in relation to time. The recurring question is asked about whether the ‘Will’ is subject to change or whether it is fixed for ever. Yet, very little, if any, talk is heard about what the ‘Will of the People’ actually means.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s notion of ‘General Will’ (volonté générale) is a complex one. This alone makes its simplification in the Brexit debate problematic or absurd. However, in Rousseau’s thought, there are two particular aspects to the idea which are relevant here. First, the formation of ‘General Will’ is linked to arguments in political philosophy about the legitimacy of government. This is an issue to which various thinkers, including Thomas Hobbes and John Locke (albeit from different standpoints) gave much time and effort. Rousseau (1998 [1762]) himself, in The Social Contract, argued that agreement amongst citizens about law and governance derived from understanding of what was in the ‘common good’ – what was right, just and necessary for the wellbeing of the political community as a whole rather than the individual. Notions of shared citizenship and collective action are incorporated in the idea of ‘common good’. Secondly, therefore, for Rousseau, the idea of ‘common good’, and thus of ‘General Will’, come out of a fundamental attachment (both rational and emotional) to the political community of which individuals are a part.
In contemporary Britain, unlike in Rousseau’s imagination, the political community has been so battered by cuts to social institutions that in many ways it has been shorn of any potency it once had. Does a political community, in the sense that Rousseau took it to mean, actually exist at a time when society itself has been splintered and broken by austerity?

‘Illegal immigrants’

Satbir Singh (2019) has written about the ‘arbitrary cruelty of the government’s hostile environment policy’, adding: ‘We all now live under a system of Orwellian immigration laws that find people of colour guilty until they can prove their innocence’. We now live in a country in which immigration is something to be ‘controlled’, ‘brought down’, ‘mitigated’. Immigration, and by extension immigrants, are a problem. In the present context, we should add that we live in a country in which black British citizens of Caribbean origin are called ‘illegal’, are detained, denied healthcare and deported.

Tie, blazer, pint and forefinger

Farage’s dress codes and stage settings have been of interest for some time (Picardie 2015). In the run up and aftermath to the 2019 European elections, Nigel has adopted several semiotic dressage markers of note. Whilst simultaneously acknowledging that he does not speak French but does ‘know his way around a good wine list’, one of his most recent party-political broadcasts places the familiar pint glass of beer on the table next to him: Nigel the nice guy in the pub. Never filmed without a tie, he now routinely sports a blazer with bright silver buttons: Nigel the good sport/golf club member. He concluded several video broadcasts before the European elections by pointing his forefinger at the camera saying that ‘The Brexit Party Needs You’. Clearly this is a reference to the iconic poster of Lord Kitchener beckoning young men to enlist for the First World War with the call ‘Your Country’s Army Needs You’: Nigel the military commander. The BBC (2014) magazine commented on the Kitchener poster, observed ‘The authorities anticipated that an image of Kitchener - immensely popular with the public and seen as a great symbol of army and empire - would be good for recruiting’: Nigel the smart symbolist historian. And in one other recent broadcast, wearing what appears to be a Piccadilly Field Hat from an established purveyor of gentlemen’s field accessories, the setting is (of course!) the White Cliffs of Dover: Nigel as officer rank defender of the country. In these ways, Nigel presents himself as, at once, man of the people, officer, gentleman, possessor of military authority and defender of the Brexit faith. Or, as Yasmin Alibhai-Brown put it on a recent televised edition of the Jeremy Vine show, ‘racist bounder’.17

17 Journalist Alibhai-Brown made this remark in April 2019, as part of her contribution to the Jeremy Vine Show on BBC.
Fig. 5. ‘Nigel Farage’s battle bus in Birmingham on the pre-referendum tour’, May 2016.
Photo: © Derek Bennett.

‘Sovereignty’ and ‘getting our country back’

The argument advanced by the Brexiteers is that ‘Brussels’ has taken away the ‘sovereignty’ of the UK with the help of regulations and laws generated and enforced by the European Commission and the European Court of Justice. Brexit, it is said, will return agency and autonomy to ‘The British People’. But, like the ‘ornamental cookery’ of Barthes (1991 [1957]), this looks and tastes good enough yet, also like Barthes’ ‘cookery’, it hides two features of Brexit in austerity Britain. One of the most basic means of exercising political agency has been all but swept away in the austerity-driven ‘theft’ of municipal Britain (see above). We have seen here that all the Brexit-related think tanks and institutes, as well as their associated political leaders and followers, have lobbied for significantly more deregulation, as well as the removal of rights, corporate tax avoidance, and so on. In this context, the idea that Brexit will achieve the promised autonomy and sovereignty seems far-fetched.

Summary

The third part of this article has offered brief reflections on select ‘mythologies’ associated with our three events. The subject here is not myths-as-lies, but myths/mythologies as potentially powerful narratives containing ideas, notions and assumptions that mobilise imagination at the same time as ob-
scuring underlying realities. The notion of ‘Will of the People’, for example, obscures the reality that, within collectivities, there are many potentially fluid contrasting ideas and values. ‘Illegal immigrants’ as a notion works to blind us to the suffering and trauma of people displaced by war. ‘Labour isn’t working’ implies unwillingness to work whilst obscuring the downturn, or outright disappearance, of many industries in the face of the rise of the gig economy. And so on. Mythologies such as these allow us to look the other way as members of the ‘Windrush generation’ are imprisoned or deported, to brush aside the humanity of those who died in Grenfell and to be caught up in a belief that Brexit (which itself has assumed the status of a myth) is going to ‘Make Britain Great Again’ by way of switching British post-imperial history into reverse gear.

Part 4: Resistance

Ayesha Hazarika (2018) has referred to a ‘culture war’ in contemporary Britain, one aspect of which is a conflict between the principles of hospitality and hostility. Hazarika links this directly to Brexit. We would wish to extend the link to Windrush and Grenfell. To put it more fully, and as we have described at some length in this article, the Britain of Brexit, Grenfell, and Windrush stands at a crossroads. On the one hand, we have Thatcher’s politico-economic project, which, in its mature post-Thatcher form, came to encompass our three events. This was made up of absolutist individualism, further and faster de-regulation, corporate tax avoidance and the definitive end of any kind of ‘Social Chapter’ (that part of the 1992 Maastricht Treaty from which John Major, then Prime Minister, negotiated a British ‘opt out’) inflamed by a rhetoric of hostility towards immigrants. On the other hand, there is considerable and growing evidence of multiple civil society projects celebrating hospitality to immigrants, sociability, and the construction of what Mayo and Moore (2002) have called ‘the mutual state’, namely a government and public sector fully engaged in home making for all.

The relationship between the Brexit related de-regulation project and Grenfell may be illustrated with precision by a single anecdote. Days before the Grenfell fire, the Red Tape Group of Brexiteer MPs (founders included Oliver Letwin and Gove) was due to discuss what regulations to junk after leaving the EU. One ‘regulatory folly’, EU No. 305/2011, imposed compulsory use of construction materials, including external cladding, designed to address the spread of fire. Greenpeace wrote of the group, ‘It’s obvious that there are powerful political and corporate interests out there, ready to use Brexit as an excuse to get rid of vital laws that they see as a hindrance to businesses’ (see Laville 2017). The final piece of the jigsaw is thus to ask where and in what form resistance to the politics of the past 40 years which has been the founding contexts of our three events in particular, is to be found. For us this lies in
de-centralised and geographically wide-ranging co-operation between civil society groups and networks under the level of the state actively supported and encouraged by the kind of ‘mutual state’ imagined by Mayo and Moore (2002). Flora Cornish of LSE, who investigated the process of community-led recovery in West London in the aftermath of the Grenfell Tower, told me that no less than sixty-four civil society groups were formed after the event. These range from Justice4Grenfell and the Grenfell Action Group (with its blog) to the North Kensington Library (recently saved from closure). Here are pointers to a brief selection of others found in the wide field of Grenfell, Windrush, and Brexit practices.

At one of the sharpest ends, there is Medical Justice, a small civil society group of professional doctors and psychiatrists who provide legal help to some of the 30,000 people a year (many with experience of torture, most with significant health problems), who are in immigrant detention centres and facing the danger of deportation. Their office is located in the same building used by the Leader of the UK’s largest Opposition party. Then, there is a growing number of projects, frequently overseen by civil society groups and institutions, aiming to provide safe housing for refugees and asylum seekers. The group Abide, based in Ottery St Mary is, in its own words, ‘devoted to converting strangers to neighbours’ by resettling refugee families within local communities.

In a similar vein, Exeter City Council encourages private landlords to lease flats to the council, enabling it to house Syrian refugees. This particular project has provided the space for one such refugee to carve out a life for himself and his family. My colleague, Nicola Frost, told me about him and his family in detail. Arriving from Syria via Lebanon, their story is marked by fear, insecurity and constant uprooting. Nicola added:

Unable to work until his English skills have improved, he has hurled himself at life in Exeter in a way that leaves others full of admiration, if slightly breathless. With a new baby at home, as well as a boisterous pre-schooler, he volunteers with a community-based exercise group. He’s also to be found serving free food on the street every weekend (he is a fantastic cook, and dreams of opening his own restaurant one day) and has even recently turned his hand to hairdressing, giving free cuts to homeless people alongside the hot meal. He is involved in planning a local event celebrating cultural diversity, likes to teach himself piano [...] .

This account provides a glimpse into the stories of actual people, stories that tend to be obscured by political rhetoric and the enumeration of migrant bodies.
Then, there is the burgeoning amount of research and development work in universities (from Glasgow to Oxford and UCL to SOAS) and other types of civil society associations imaginatively concerned with refugee issues. Moreover, in schools, libraries, community centres, within faith communities (‘refugees welcome’ posters in several of the above in north London, for example) and many other public spaces and institutions all over the UK, careful and detailed work is taking place to turn us away from siren voices advocating a ‘hostile environment’ in the name of ‘illegal immigrants’, ‘Brexit’, or whatever, towards one based on principles of hospitality. One of the most remarkable of these spaces is the Lambeth-based Immigration Museum. Working with hundreds of school children, university students and members of the public, this revolutionary museum expresses and represents migration as a homecoming and homemaking to which we are all attached in multiple ways. The museum is immersed in stories of immigrants and their experiences.

Daniel Renwick (2018) spoke of the prophesy of the Grenfell Action Group Blog months before the fire that only a catastrophe would make those in power take proper note of the decrepit state of tower blocks in the borough of Kensington and Chelsea. Renwick’s view of the fire and its relation to Brexit is as follows:

‘Class contempt, institutional indifference and organised state abandonment brought Grenfell into being. And, Brexit is a project of deregulation and border regime politics which will make a bonfire of European standards and further nudge those in precarity to the margins of British life’. (ibid.)

Home in a ‘post-home’ world

And what of the notion of home? What lessons can we learn about homemaking and homecoming from Brexit, Grenfell, and Windrush? Here are some pointers.

In this article, we have suggested that home and homemaking need coordinated co-operation at domestic, regional, national and global levels. Such de-centralised co-operation is very far from the programme of the Brexit funders and their clients. Instead, their project offers cargo cults in which ‘cheap food, clothes, and footwear’, as Rees-Mogg puts it (see Daly 2018), fall from the sky, while they take advantage of a world without rules. They invite others to imbibe mythologies about migrants and refugees as sources of danger. It is an outlook built on actual and structural hostility bolstered by distrust and dislike of the qualities shown by the people of Windrush and Grenfell.

Thatcher declared her antagonism to society in 1979. A decade and more of austerity since the financial crisis has been a time when the antagonism
towards the feckless working class was pursued with literally catastrophic consequences as food banks, street sleepers, zero-hour contracts have testified. Brexiteers have taken up Thatcher’s baton with the aim of constructing an atomised, flexible and (as O’Neil’s interlocutor from Wolverhampton said so clearly) a profoundly homeless work force. To achieve this, the Brexiteer leaders have deployed very powerful myths (in the full classical, as well as Barthian senses): ‘getting back control’, ‘sovereignty’, ‘freedom’, ‘independence’, the slogan of the new Brexit party ‘democracy’, and now ‘liberty’. All these have been laced with the Brexiteer leaders’ hostility towards the Windrush generation, the cosmopolitan residents of Grenfell, the refugees fleeing from war and the EU itself.

But we have also pointed towards forces on the ground – not least in the traumatic spaces surrounding our three events – that speak of emergent conviviality, sociability, and the recovery of belief that the means of homemaking and homecoming are on the way to being recovered in our ‘post-home’ world. Choice of the direction of travel is in our hands.
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‘This isn’t Canada, it’s Home’:
Re-claiming Colonized Space through the Host-Guest Relationship

Lauren Harding

In this article, I describe two competing attachments to territory, both of which appear as a form of post-home, as both are directly based on experiences of displacement and relocation. First Nations and settler-Canadian peoples both claim as their own the territory known in English as Vancouver Island, the former due to their occupation of these lands ‘since time immemorial’, the latter through a convoluted reasoning based on British colonialism and legal and imagined claims of Canadian nationhood. Domestic settler-Canadian tourists tend to have a possessive and affectionate preoccupation with landscapes they deem to be ‘wilderness’. National parks are largely viewed as pockets of primeval wilderness, and visiting these is not an act of tourism, but rather a connection to settler-Canadian patrimony. This is contrasted with the perspective of First Nations peoples, whose perspective on home is rooted in experiences of territory as ‘lived in’, both in a contemporary sense and through ancestors. The legal, historical and ideological permutations of Canadian claims to indigenous territory, particularly in the context of the province of British Columbia where historic treaties are absent, are far too complex to address in this article. Instead, I look at the issue of settler-indigenous relationships to territory and ‘home’ through a different lens: domestic tourism, or more specifically, the host-guest relationship. The question of who a host or a guest is finds its complexity under the conditions of settler colonialism. Settler-Canadian domestic tourists view the places they are visiting as part of ‘their’ heritage, while, at the same time, these places may be unceded indigenous territory which the domestic tourists have never lived in, or even traveled through before. At the same time, due to the forced removal from their territory through Canadian colonial actions (for example through the reserve system, or the residential schools), many First Nations people have experienced an alienation from their ancestral homes. I explore the interactions and relationships between settler-tourists and indigenous peoples in a very specific place, at a very specific time. I hope that, through a discussion of the unique hospitality at the place called Qua-ba-diwa, I can provide new avenues for the exploration of the settler and indigenous relationships to the concept of ‘home’ as it transpires in the Canadian context.
The West Coast Trail (WCT) is a 75-kilometre long wilderness route on the southwest coast of the Vancouver Island in British Columbia. Located along the Graveyard of the Pacific, the trail was originally constructed as a lifesaving trail for shipwreck victims and was transformed into a recreation trail in the 1970s as part of a national parks expansion program that took place under the Liberal government of Pierre Trudeau. The trail attracts approximately eight thousand hikers each season and is considered the ‘holy grail’ of Canadian backpacking trails. The trail is located within the boundaries of the Pacific Rim National Park Reserve, an appellation indicating that the space is a First Nations territory. It lies within the traditional territories of the Huu-ay-aht, Ditidaht, and Pacheedaht First Nations and has, since the 1990s, been co-managed with these nations.

In 2013 and 2014, I conducted anthropological fieldwork both on the trail and in the adjacent villages of Bamfield and Anacla at the northern trailhead. I hiked the trail multiple times, interacting with hikers, campers, the Parks Canada staff, the indigenous Trail Guardians, the Canadian Coast Guard lighthouse keepers and other ‘hosts and guests’. When I began my fieldwork, I expected to focus on both the Canadian and the international hikers. What I discovered, to my surprise, was that a large majority of hikers were Canadian, mostly from British Columbia and Alberta. When I asked them why they hiked the West Coast Trail, many cited its place on their ‘bucket list’ of places to visit in Canada. The refrain ‘We’re so lucky to be Canadian’ was one I heard frequently exclaimed upon a particularly picturesque view. The most common subject of small talk on the West Coast Trail were the trail conditions and the camping gear, but narratives of nationhood, citizenship, and belonging were also a frequent part of wider discussions on the landscape aesthetics.

There are three main points of contact between visitors who hike the West Coast Trail and the indigenous peoples whose territory the trail crosses. The primary one is at the Nitinat narrows, which must be crossed by a ferry, one operated by the Edgar family, members of the Ditidaht First Nation. The second most common point of contact is at Chez Monique’s, a hiker restaurant and refuge run by the Knighton family at Qua-ba-diwa (also known by its English name as Carmanah). The third most common point of contact is with the operators of the Trail Guardian program, typically at their cabins. In this article, I focus on the Knighton family of Qua-ba-diwa, but I also seek to emphasize the features shared by all of these points of contact. The ferry and crab shack at Nitinat Narrows, the Chez Monique’s hamburger stand at Qua-ba-diwa, and the Trail Guardian cabins each create a space for socialization and hospitality with the traditional owners of the territory acting as hosts.

1 I allude here to Nelson’s Graburn’s (1989) idea of ‘secular pilgrimage’.
2 Co-management was finally introduced after First Nations peoples protested that Parks management intruded on their traditional territorial rights and actively agitated for change.
The sharing of shelter, food and drink, as well as advice, stories, and refuge from the elements characterizes these spaces of indigenous hospitality. And, as I argue later, there are subtle politics of resistance at play in the act of taking on the host role in the context of tourism and in spaces where the indigenous territorial rights are still often overshadowed by colonial imaginations of pristine national wilderness.

British Columbia was the only Canadian province that was not subject to the established treaties defining the indigenous peoples’ relationships to the Canadian governments. European contact with indigenous peoples along the western Canadian coast did not occur until the late 18th century, and the settlement process did not gain momentum until the latter half of the 19th century. The lack of treaties, the historically large indigenous population, as well as the relatively late colonization of and settlement in the region, have all factored into the significantly dynamic politics of colonialism and indigenous resilience in this space throughout the 20th and 21st centuries.

The notion of ‘settler-Canadian’ requires some attention. As Makkii (1992) has made clear, the territorial rooting of identity to place is complex, problematic, and often more idealized in nationalist discourses than reflective of actual practice, due to ever-increasing human mobility. I use the term expansively, to refer to all Canadian citizens who are non-indigenous. This is a somewhat controversial take on the term, as the term ‘settler’ is usually used to refer to those who trace their ancestry to the original colonizing European nations (United Kingdom and France). My issue with this limited definition is that it restricts the process of colonialism to the past and, more importantly, to European imperialist actions. It is this restrictive definition that former Prime Minister Stephen Harper likely had in mind when he infamously stated in 2009 that ‘Canada has no history of colonialism’ (see Ljunggren 2009). In contrast, Patrick Wolfe (1999: 163) insists that ‘invasion is a structure, not an event’. The Canadian state was not only founded through a process of European imperialism and colonialism but continues to be fundamentally structured upon the appropriation of land, extraction of resources, and the displacement of indigenous peoples. Veracini discerns the characteristics of settler-colonialism:

The successful settler colonies ‘tame’ a variety of wildernesses, end up establishing independent nations, effectively repress, co-opt, and extinguish indigenous alterities, and productively manage ethnic diversity. By the end of this trajectory, they claim to be no longer settler colonial (they are putatively ‘settled’ and ‘postcolonial’ – except that unsettling anxieties remain, and references to a postcolonial condition appear hollow as soon as indigenous disadvantage is taken into account). Settler colonialism thus covers its tracks and operates towards its self-superession. [...] In other words, whereas colonialism reinforces the
distinction between colony and metropole, settler colonialism erases it. [...] Colonialism reproduces itself, and the freedom and equality of the colonised is forever postponed; settler colonialism, by contrast, extinguishes itself. (2011: 3)

In Canada and British Columbia, settler-colonialism is an ongoing process, foundational to the Canadian nation-state. Therefore, Canadian citizenship is predicated upon the participation in the continuing process of settlement. In light of this, I refer to all non-indigenous Canadian citizens as settlers, regardless of their ‘ethnic’ origin. This is a choice made to combat the erasure of settler-colonialism from the contemporary conceptions of Canadian identity. It is also, of course, a simplification of the complex subjectivities evoked by the label ‘Canadian’ for many people of color, for new immigrants, and those whose family experiences are markedly different from the dominant mythology of historical settlement. Many Canadian citizens are racialized and marked by their ethnic origins in ways that make the grouping with ‘white’ settler Canadians very problematic. Thus, I do not ignore the fact that the state has also oppressed (and continues to oppress) Canadians of color. However, I find here that the rites of citizenship, the rituals of domestic tourism, and the use of settlement as a means of creating a sense of ‘belonging’ to a place are more strongly linked to the identities of my various research participants as ‘Canadian’ than they are to some racial/ethnic origins. It would, likewise, be problematic to qualify the testimonies of certain participants by noting an estimated ethnic identity, different from the one they attested to (Canadian). Overall, my study is one of contemporary Canadian culture, and Canada as a settler-colonial state. I expand on why I take this with further evidence on how certain attitudes towards the Canadian territory and ‘homeland’ are cultivated as part of the process of ‘becoming Canadian’. Throughout, I hope to show the complex, socially constructed, contested, and easily fragmented process of defining ‘home’ in a colonial and settler context.

At Home in the Wilderness: Settler-Canadian Nature-Nationalism

Outdoor recreation in what is conceived as the ‘national backyard’ is often represented in state and popular discourses as integral to the Canadian experience (see Harrison 2010, Sandilands 2012). Meta-narratives of pristine wilderness play an important role in the formation of settler Canadian constructions of the western landscape (see Braun 2002, Loo 2006, Mackey 2000, Mawani 2007). However, ideals of wilderness as ‘empty space’ to be ‘conquered’ by hikers clearly relate to past and current processes of colonialism in western Canada. Will Cronon (1996), Jocelyn Thorpe (2012) and others have critiqued the notion of ‘wilderness’ and its conceptual foundation in Euro-American/Canadian colonial epistemologies. The construction of certain spaces as wilderness is inescapably rooted in practices, attitudes, and
patterns inherited from colonialism and perpetuated through leisure narratives of wilderness exploration.

This is further complicated in settler societies, which not only maintain a mythology of certain spaces as ‘wilderness’, but also encode the land with proprietary sentiments. In the settler-colonial states, national parks are envisioned as places for citizens to connect to a natural environment designated as being of national significance. Often, these are places perceived both as pristine and as representative of a particular ecological type significant within the national imaginary. I argue that, in Canada, wilderness is not so much a place as a symbol-laden abstract space. It is, to use Deleuze’s and Guattari’s (2014 [1988]) term, deterritorialized. It is not only conceived as people-less, but also place-less. It is understood as amorphous nature, where mountains, beaches, and forests may be ‘beautiful’, but remain indistinguishable from one another, as they are decontextualized from the territories and the histories, the routes and the roots that render them significant markers of place. In many ways, wilderness is the ‘anti-homeland’, and yet, in Canada, it is the symbolism of wilderness that has become a rallying point for nationalist sentiments. In a nation-state dominated by settler-Canadian culture, which elevates narratives of settlement of a wild landscape to a mythic status, to be in the wilderness is still considered to be in the ‘real’ Canada. The contemporary Canadian narrative of identity is largely a nature-based one. Forged during the same political era of official multi-culturalism, nature and the Canadian relationship to the environment have become the dominant unifying nationalist tropes. This makes sense in a country with a vast geography, a dual colonial heritage, a pluralistic vision of national ‘ethnicity’, and precariously perched next to the cultural behemoth of the United States. Canadian cultural practices around ‘nature,’ whether in the form of outdoor recreation, adaptations to weather conditions, or the celebration of a seemingly vast and variable supply of natural resources (while still extracting them), have become the common ground necessary for the forging of the a Canadian ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 2006). Although Pacific Rim National Park Reserve attracts many international visitors each year, it is dominantly visited by Canadian citizens. While sitting around a campfire at the end of a seven-day trek down the WCT, one hiker made the unprompted remark to me, in a half joking but somewhat sincere way: ‘I feel so Canadian right now, is there anything more Canadian than this? Camping in a Canadian National Park?’ Citizens embark on treks through what is ‘their’ ‘national backyard’, creating an affective sense of belonging to landscape that intertwines with ideas of nationhood and what it means to be Canadian.

As Werry (2011: xiv) and other tourism scholars have shown, ‘the relationship between tourism and nationalism is a well-established one’ (see also Bruner 2005 Handler and Gable 1997, Harrison 2010). The two are intertwined, since the tourism’s production of and the domestic tourists’ con-
Iconic tourist landscapes – the White Mountains of New England or the British Lake District – participate in the invention of tradition, becoming the coin of international recognition or the loci for experiences of national belonging. Where national hegemony is forged across deep (racial or ethnic) disparities in power or entitlement, however, its touristic representation manifests as a form of symbolic violence (Werry 2011: xiv). At the same time, Werry argues, tourism, like the state itself is both material and ideational, and one cannot simply critique representations of nation without also looking at the way nationhood is performed (Werry 2011: xiv) (through bodily practices, the making of collective representations, the mobilization of material resources, and ritualized actions). Canada is not only represented as, to borrow Loo’s (2006) use of the phrase, a ‘State of Nature’, but also mobilizes its citizens to perform rituals of nature worship/outdoor recreation as participatory acts of nation-building.

What is particularly interesting in the case of Canadian national parks is the emphasis on active participation in the environment, rather than merely its scenic significance. National parks are advertised through their scenic potential, and it is the visual representation of mountains, waterfalls, and beaches that draw domestic tourists to these places. In her analysis of tourism and the state in New Zealand, Werry (2011) argues that tourism acts as a form of governmentality, ‘a political technology that works in classically liberal fashion at arm’s length, organizing populations, assigning value, and producing values, not through the top-down application of power, but through the promulgation of desire, habit, and commitment on the part of its subjects’ (ibid.: xxv). Canadians are not only asked to worship national nature, but to also ‘commune’ with it. They are ‘trained’ to adopt bodily practices that engage the senses in ways that emphasize a visceral relationship with the homeland. One of my interlocutors, a young man, described his desire to hike the WCT as directly related to his upbringing and identity. He understood outdoor recreation as a way to ‘test his mettle’ (i.e. prove his status as a ‘hardy’ Canadian):

My family is pretty outdoorsy, we’ve done lots of hiking and stuff. I was on a canoe trip on the Churchill River, not this summer but the summer before that. And some of the people who were on the trip with us they suggested hiking the West Coast Trail. And they were pretty experienced and me and my buddy decided it would be a pretty good idea to do it. And it sounded pretty intense, like the knee-deep in mud and everything. And it’s one of the most renowned trails in Canada and in North America. We thought it’d be pretty sweet. We really wanted to do something that would, I don’t know, test us a bit.
Not only is the WCT a ritual pilgrimage in the sense that it venerates nature/nation, but it also acts as ritual test of one’s ability to corporeally participate in the wilderness-based rituals of citizenship. As Minca (2007: 439) noted:

The direct, tactile experience of sites of national ‘heritage’ [...] thus becomes, from the nineteenth century onwards [as the nation-state became the primary political entity], an essential support for new rhetorics of antiquity and inheritance that emplace belonging within landscape.

The ability to ‘rough it’, to ‘cope with the weather’, to ‘grin and bear it’ was a common part of the hikers’ discourse during my fieldwork. The ability to ‘hack it’ was a matter of pride, and often directly linked to one’s ‘Canadian-ness’. Around the campfire, one could hear which trails they had hiked, how many times, what wildlife they had seen, what weather they had encountered, and so on. These narrations were filled with a sense of attainment of a genuine, tangible relationship with Canadian nature (and therefore with the nation). Back in Vancouver, after my fieldwork, I joined a hiking meet-up group that explored trails in the Lower Mainland. I found that most of the hikers were newcomers to Canada, and that they had started hiking both to explore their new home and to become part of the community. In western Canada, particularly in British Columbia, outdoor recreation is not only a past-time, but also a ‘rite and right of citizenship’ (Werry 2011: xxi).

Furthermore, in British Columbia, enculturating new immigrants on how to properly appreciate Canadian nature is part of the process of ‘settling’ the newcomers. The quotation marks used here imply a double-meaning: the new immigrants are both settled in terms of the help they receive to find housing and employment but are also encouraged to embrace the settler-Canadian cultural norms. As the governmental Parks Canada Agency (2015) suggests on its website:

One of the best ways to discover some of Canada’s most beautiful natural heritage areas is by spending the night in one of Parks Canada’s many campgrounds across the country. Starry nights, breathtaking views, tons of activities and a chance to bond with your family around an open campfire... Let these experiences inspire you at Parks Canada-operated campgrounds.

Starting in 2014, Parks Canada offers equipped campsites on select national park grounds, which are designed to cater to those who are new to camping and lack the necessary equipment. Parks Canada also offers ‘learn-to-camp’ programs that teach people how to pitch a tent and build a fire. In 2015, Parks Canada also designed a free downloadable app with guidelines on how to camp, including everything from wildlife safety to campfire recipes. The ‘learn to camp’ part of their website is available in traditional and simplified
Chinese characters, Punjabi, Tagalog and Spanish, as well as the two official languages, English and French. Photos on the website depict more ‘ethnic’ diversity than usually found in the outdoor recreation promotional materials (Braun 2003).

Graburn defines tourism as ‘those structurally-necessary ritualized breaks in routine that define and relieve the ordinary’ (1989: 23). He draws on the classic Durkheimian contrast between the sacred and the profane to describe how such ritualized breaks from the everyday serve to reinvigorate the social self for action within cultural structures and strictures. Importantly, the pilgrimage motif addresses not only the symbolism of the tourist’s journey, but also the bodily affects. The consumption of signs is, of course, a significant part of the tourist journey (the photographs and the maps were the most common products of the consumptive hikers’ practices that I studied). However, a pilgrimage is also a journey defined by physical movement, and therefore has embodied effects and affects. At the end of each day of hiking, sitting around the campfire, hikers jovially compared bruises and scrapes. They discussed moments when they experienced physical obstacles but ‘kept going’ so that they could ‘finish this thing’ and ‘say they did it’. The visceral engagement with the landscape, the accompanying frustrations, triumphs, bodily aches and pains, as well as the sheer affectivity intrinsic to a physical removal from a familiar landscape, are also very much part of a pilgrimage.

I found that the experiences and practices that make up the cultural ritual of wilderness escapism, not just their representations (in promotional tourism literature and outdoor recreation narratives), must also be addressed, for it is through the consumption of these experiences that hikers gained the feeling of a legitimate and socially sanctioned connection to the landscape. Through the participation in a ritual travel across the territory marked as ‘sacred’ (via its status as a national park), they felt personally connected to the Canadian nation-building project.

Settler-Canadian domestic tourists viewed national parks as part of the Canadian homeland and therefore took on the role of host, as well as that of guests/tourists. International visitors typically positioned themselves as guests, as tourist. Although Canadian tourists recognized, to differing extents, their own status as visitors to this particular territory, they also viewed the trekking of the trail as a means to explore and ‘get to know’ their home. Minca (2007: 438) argues that ‘[l]andscape becomes the poetic veneer that the nation-state adopts to colour its calculated translation of places into (national) space’. For domestic tourists, the trail is a part of ‘their’ domain (the possessive pronoun was used frequently by the hikers I met). Many British Columbians, and Canadians generally, bristle at the use of the term ‘tourist’ to describe their travels within ‘their own country’. However, if we are to recognize First Nations as nations, and indigenous traditional territory as such,
then the label ‘tourist’ becomes more significant. It is then a recognition that the settlers and the newcomers are ultimately guests, not hosts.

However, the geographically closer the visitor’s place of residence to the West Coast Trail, the more contentious the identification of the hiker as tourist becomes. Hikers from Victoria, Nanaimo, and even the closer and smaller settlements of Sooke, Cowichan Lake, and Port Alberni, who also hike the WCT as means of exploration, often term this space as ‘their backyard’. Entangled in the label ‘domestic tourist’ are the layered forms of belonging to and interacting with territory, the conceptualization of citizenship and identity through borders and geographic distance, as well as the complexity of what ‘home’ itself signifies. Many Canadian hikers, particularly those from British Columbia, saw themselves more as hosts (particularly when interacting with international tourists) than guests. Furthermore, because they ‘knew how to camp’ or ‘had been camping for years’ they felt competent in performing a ritual veneration of territory and would give non-Canadians advice on how to ‘handle’ camping in a Canadian environment. Where to buy the best gear/clothing/fuel/camping food and how to use it a frequent theme of advice doled out to ‘foreigners’ who often were poked fun at for over or under preparing for the conditions of the trail.3

For domestic tourists, national park visitation is intertwined with nation-building, and an embodied competence in participating in the ritual of camping marked them as ‘real’ Canadians who belonged in this territory. I witnessed many domestic visitors to the West Coast Trail enthusiastically embrace the role of host and guide, doling out travel advice and recommendations ‘as locals’. Nearly all of those who performed this role had never set foot in these specific places, or on Ditidaht territory, before. Rather, they saw the entirety of Western Canada as ‘home’ and ‘theirs’ to host in.

‘This isn’t Canada, it’s Home’

The title of this article is a reference to something my key interlocutor and dear friend, Monique Knighton, said on one sunny summer day in the August of 2013. A visitor sitting at her hamburger stand had asked if he could smoke a cigarette. In Canada, smoking is highly regulated and legally prohibited inside or in close proximity to indoor public spaces, as well as within some outdoor ones (such as parks and beaches). Monique told him that he could smoke. When he asked if it was legal, she responded: ‘This isn’t Canada, it’s home’. Her statement encapsulates an attitude of stubborn opposition to the colonization of her family’s ancestral territory and reveals her strategic self-positioning. For, what better way to display one’s claim to territory, to home,

3 For example, cotton clothing is difficult to dry in a temperate rainforest environment and a synthetic material was preferred by experienced hikers. I witnessed a domestic hiker dressing-down an international visitor for wearing cotton and for supposedly putting himself in danger of hypothermia.
than to claim the role of the host? Through the assertion of their role as hosts, the Knighton family subverted the deterritorializing settler visions of their home. In a state where First Nations people have been systematically removed from their territory, the offering of hospitality becomes an assertion of ownership. With more than a little intentional irony, selling burgers at Qua-ba-diwa has, for this Ditidaht family, become a political act.

According to the oral history of the Knighton family, Qua-ba-diwa was settled by people from Neah Bay, in what is now Washington State, approximately 300 years ago. This rough calculation may point to the disastrous earthquake and tsunami of 1700 (which occurred before the contact with European peoples). The village of Qua-ba-diwa was an important waypoint for Nuu-chah-nulth peoples traveling by canoe on what is a notably treacherous section of the coast. The village numbered in the hundreds prior to a major smallpox epidemic in the late 19th century, which decimated the local population, causing colonial authorities to call the Ditidaht peoples ‘nearly extinct’ (Walbran 1971 [1906]: 82). My friend Peter Knighton’s great-grandfather was one of only three survivors of the epidemic. Although the Knightons continued to maintain a residence at Qua-ba-diwa, the Canadian government encouraged them to relocate their main residence to the settlement of Clooose, a few kilometers down the coast, in the early twentieth century. At this time, Clooose had a school, a mission-run church, and was a regular stop on a coastal ferry route, as it had a small settler community. However, by the 1960s, most of the settler population had left, the school had closed, and the coastal ferry had been canceled. The government then imposed a relocation of the remaining Ditidaht peoples on the coast, including the Knighton family, to an inland reserve at Nitinaht. Improved access to jobs, educational opportunities, and transportation infrastructure was promised. However, the result was an alienation from traditional territory, language loss through residential schooling, and the continuing isolation from employment and other opportunities due to the remote location of the inland reserve. The Knighton family, along with other outer-coast Ditidaht families, argue that it is no accident that their relocation coincided with the formation of a national park on their former homes.

4 Another powerful way of claiming territory is through the assertion of jurisdiction. The Knightons regularly defied National Park regulations and Canadian laws about pets (their dogs ran freely up and down the beach), garbage (they burnt some of it rather than packing it all out), or the sale and consumption of regulated substances (they sold alcohol and cigarettes and let people consume both on their beach).

5 For a detailed history of the relocation of First Nations people by the British Columbian and Canadian governments onto small reserves, as well as the resulting alienation from their traditional territory and resources, see Harris (2011).
In 1992, Peter and Monique Knighton made the decision to leave the main reserve at Nitinaht and return to Qua-ba-diwa, their ancestral home. However, Qua-ba-diwa, which the state calls Indian Reserve Number 6, now lies within the boundaries of the West Coast Trail Unit in Pacific Rim National Park Reserve. The name of their home has been anglicized to Carmanah, and the main sign of human habitation on the landscape visible to non-local eyes is the Canadian Coast Guard lighthouse with its brightly painted red and white walls over the cliff area that was formerly the Qua-ba-diwa burial site. The lighthouse itself symbolizes both the remoteness of the territory and the imperial control over it. When the Knightons returned home, it was a place fetishized as wilderness and managed as such by the Canadian federal government. A place to visit, not a place to live in.

Yet, the Knightons returned home to live there. They built a cabin for themselves and shelters for their extended family who often visit. Monique grew a magnificent garden, transforming the supposedly rough wild beach into a cultivated space (which in itself is a fascinating inversion of colonial tropes of settlement). The hamburger stand came later. Monique tells the story of several bewildered and bedraggled hikers knocking on her door after seeing smoke from their wood stove. Other hikers asked if they had any food that they could buy. What the Knightons offered freely at first (and still do to those without funds) soon became a growing enterprise, as the sheer number of hikers, several thousand each summer, made it impossible to host without some sort of compensation. Chez Monique’s, the West Coast Trail hamburger stand was founded and Qua-ba-diwa became known amongst hikers as a particularly hospitable place to visit. The Knightons like to say that they attract ‘strays’. Several hikers over the years who have stumbled upon Chez Monique’s have ended up staying for weeks or even months, helping the elderly couple by chopping wood and laboring in the garden in return for food and shelter. Notably, the cafe doesn’t follow the ‘rules’ of hospitality industry in the capitalist settler-Canadian world. Anyone, whether they purchase something or not, is welcome to stop and have a chat, share her shelter, and even stay for a night or two with the family’s permission. Whether one has money or not, no one at Qua-ba-diwa is allowed to go hungry or left out in the rain. This is despite the material difficulties faced by the Knightons upon returning home and creating a place for hospitality at Qua-ba-diwa. There is no electricity and running water, although some hikers who were engineers have helped the family by rigging up a system of hoses running to the kitchen from a nearby creek. Water is untreated and garbage must be either made into compost or burnt. All food is stored in coolers with ice that is boated in by Peter from the closest town, over an hour-long voyage away. The only way to access the Qua-ba-diwa is an approximately forty-kilometer hike on foot. It can also be accessed by boat, but such travel is actually only for those who have the local knowledge of navigating the narrow passage, through
the rock shelves created by Peter’s ancestors. In order to keep the operation flowing during the busy season, Peter must travel by boat down the rugged coast to Port Renfrew for supplies every few days. His trip is not always easy or safe. He also transports injured or sick hikers off the trail, a duty that Parks Canada reserves for itself, but is often unable to carry out. In some ways, Qua-ba-diwa operated outside of, and even against, the regulations of the Canadian state. The café has no license to sell cigarettes or alcohol, nor does it pay taxes. Parks Canada officials have tried over years to obstruct the Knightons’ occupation of their land and the operation of their café by fining the Knightons for breaches of federal park regulations. In the past, wardens have attempted to penalize them for everything from burying their compost to having their dogs running around without leashes. Most of the fines and charges have been dismissed when brought to court. The government’s opposition to the Knightons’ return home reveals the political nature of their seemingly innocuous enterprise of selling burgers on a beach to tourists. It is important to stress that the Knightons engage tactically with the settler and capitalist structuring of hospitality, in a way that also asserts indigenous conceptions of territorial ownership and the host role.

When I first approached the Knighton family at the Qua-ba-diwa to discuss my project, their reaction was both skeptical and mildly hostile. With one eyebrow raised, Monique addressed me in what I would later come to know as her habitual ‘confrontational’ style: ‘So you’re writing about us, huh? You know the problem with writing things down? It becomes truth. And then, your truth becomes the truth. Each of us has various truths’. She gestured around to the other hikers sitting in her restaurant (which also served as both a shelter from the rain for wet hikers and, sometimes to the hikers’ discomfort, Monique’s personal soapbox). ‘But, when you write it down, it becomes the truth. And, what if you get it wrong? Lots of people have gotten it wrong.’ She went on to describe, with humor, an encounter with an ethno-historian who she claimed had ‘got their family history wrong’, during which she became angered and chased him out of the Royal BC Archives in Victoria all the way to his car, whence he made a hasty escape. After a long discussion during a rainstorm, as I tried to defend my project as ‘not like that’, Peter, her soft-spoken husband, quietly interjected: ‘You should call it [the research project] “Why are we still in the way?”’. Both her exclamations about the nature of truth and his quiet intervention encapsulate the feeling of the people of Qua-ba-diwa and other First Nations people caught in the works of the tourism production, the feeling that they are understood as either artefacts or obstacles. Their culture is objectified, made into something to be cataloged, examined and consumed, but they are also seen as recalcitrant anachronisms, threatening the illusion of wilderness cherished by the tourist imagination. When indigenous peoples follow their own paths on trajectories that diverge from those of the settler state, when they do not fall into line,
they are made to feel as being in the state’s way. And yet, abundant evidence, particularly in the middle of the trail, reveals people going ‘off-program’ and asserting their role as territorial hosts. The Knightons built their own access trail between Qua-ba-diwa and an inland logging road, a move deemed illegal by Parks Canada. Together with their dogs (again, against Park regulations), the Knightons roam ‘their’ beach, and bathe and wash clothes in ‘their’ river. Peter drives his boat in and out of the harbor, and fishes for salmon and ling cod, in an area where private watercrafts are heavily restricted. All visits to the WCT Park Reserve are highly regulated, with hikers having to register and cautioned to not wander from the main route lest they be fined for invading ecologically or culturally sensitive areas that the Parks administration wants undisturbed. But one does not follow a linear route in one’s home; one rather moves according to their needs or wishes. In some ways, it is the indigenous peoples’ movements ‘off-trail’ (and off-program) that most clearly mark the West Coast Trail as their home-space, and their role as territorial hosts.

Home as a Refuge in the Wilderness

September 2013 was a lovely month for hiking. At the beginning of the month, I hiked the entire trail from Port Renfrew to Bamfield, taking a leisurely ten days to do it. Then, on the 17th of September, I began what was to be the final trip of the season, heading into Qua-ba-diwa from the Bamfield end, spending a few days there, then heading out via the same northern trailhead. The weather was gorgeous and sunny, even hot at times, and all seemed to be going well. However, on the third day of the trip, the wind picked up, blowing vigorously, despite the sunshine. As I crossed paths with the Ditidaht Trail Guardians near the Nitinat Narrows, they warned me that a storm was coming. Having encountered what I thought to be ‘stormy’ weather on the trail before, I thought that I could handle a bit of rain, so I continued onwards. I set up a camp with some other hikers at Dare Beach, about ten feet past the previous night’s high tide line, made a cozy fire, and watched the sunset, then the full moon rising. It was ‘postcard perfect’.

At four in the morning, I woke up to strange clicking/buzzing that sounded like an odd sort of rain. However, the sound originated from something hitting against the bottom section of my fly, not from above. It was tiny little sand flies, jumping about. Usually, these creatures stay near the tide line, so I wondered why they were suddenly descending on my tent. As I lay there wondering, I heard a shout from a fellow camper. ‘Hey, our tent is wet!’ I peeked out. They had camped about a meter closer to the ocean then I had, and the water had crept up, far past the previous high tide lines, until it was lapping at their tent. A panicked move, and then head-scratching ensued. We had camped far above the previous night’s high tide at 10.5 feet, and that night,
it was supposed to be 11 feet. Why was the tide so high? Looking out at the ocean, even in the dark, I discerned the reason. The waves were at least twice the size of what I had ever seen before on this section of beach. The wind had also picked up, and the rain was starting to pour down. In my sleepy state, I did not fully realize the size and the power of the storm that was descending on us. I decided to just huddle up in my sleeping bag, wait and hope that it would get better later in the morning.

It did not get better, and by ten in the morning, the rising tide again became a cause for worry. The others had already left, as they were on a stricter schedule than me and had to finish the trail by a certain date. So, when I emerged from my tent, I was alone and wet. I felt like I was in a completely different environment, even though I had hiked this section of the trail on dozens of occasions. It had rained so much in the past few hours that creeks, which were barely dripping the day before, were now raging torrents, and the tide threatened to sweep over logs and dunes that the ocean probably had not touched since the hiking season began. I knew these types of storms could happen, but the difference between the knowledge of what it could be like and my actual experience of a west coast storm caused confusion and disbelief.

Wetter than I had ever been in my life, my goal was to reach Chez Monique’s. Unfortunately, as I had made a late start from camp, I had to battle a high tide, which, strengthened by the storm surge, kept lapping at my ankles. What I did to get to Monique’s was certainly dangerous. Descending from the ladder from the lighthouse, I found that the tide had already swamped the beach, and that the waves were bashing up against the piles of driftwood logs under the headland. I could see Monique’s, but the only way to get there was to crawl on hands and feet along precarious piles of driftwood logs, which were being battered by the waves, rolling and crashing into each other. I crawled over the logs, moving during the intervals between the waves and slipping and sliding on my hands and knees.

When I arrived, my fellow campers shouted a greeting, and Monique bellowed some sort of combination of a welcome and admonishment of my stupidity. She and her helpful WOOFers cooked up a big pot of soup for me and the other bedraggled hikers to sip on while we dried out our wet items by her wood stove. The waves came so high that they began to threaten her shelter, and a fast, little creek of rainwater began to flow into the dip between her kitchen and the ocean. As the storm grew worse, Monique and Peter encouraged everyone who made it to their home to take shelter there for the

6 The acronym ‘WOOFers’ stands for Willing Workers on Organic Farms, a global organization of volunteer farmworkers, usually international tourists, who labor on the agricultural endeavors of their hosts in return for food and lodging. The WOOFers the Knightons hosted were usually young people from a variety of European countries who stayed with them from periods of three weeks to three months.
night. She shrugged off our repeated thanks for her hospitality by saying 'It's a storm! What would the ancestors say if I didn't help people during a storm like this!' Humble in the face of the storm, I endured her tongue-lashing and gratefully drank hot tea and listened to Knighton family stories of other storms, and the different moments when the newcomers to their territory had made use of their hospitality after the unexpected ‘wildness’ of the ‘Canadian wilderness’ had taken them by surprise.

Although the West Coast trail continues to be shaped by colonialism, the representations of space promoted by the tourism industry, and the grand national narratives of wilderness, these historical processes are in constant dialogue with the affective, immanent experiences of place. Anthropologists of tourism (for example, Bruner 2005, Edensor 2001) who have engaged in participant observation research note that, although social institutions and representations play an important role in tourist narratives, these are always negotiated through the vector of personal experience. Picard (2018) follows Bruner in noting that

*collective institutions like sign-worlds, conventionalized gazes, or the liturgical order of tourism rituals certainly supply tourists with a meta-narrative frame leading to and through the journey and providing means to articulate and communicate the journey’s experiences. Yet, he [Bruner] argues (and I follow him on this point), they are not equivalent, not even in a metaphorical way, to the emotions, transformations and deceptions that define the actual experience of the journey, whatever its particular format (ibid.: 46).*

Although I focus on critiques of grand narratives of what I call ‘nature-nationalism’, as well as the settler-colonialism, and the notion of ‘wilderness’ as the guiding factors in hikers’ interpretations of their journeys along the trail, I also recognize that moments of affect, of uncertainty, of bodily awareness, and of an environment that does not necessarily align with the whims or desires of humans, also shape the journey. Furthermore, there are constant imaginative negotiations that must be made when tourists encounter people, places, things, environments and experiences that do not fit neatly into pre-conceived expectations. The cognitive dissonance created by such ‘matter out of place’ is not, I argue, one that can be easily resolved; the resulting space of uncertainty may also create the potential for change.

Although the national discourse of settler-Canadians as people ‘at home’ in nature encourages millions of Canadians each year to participate in ritualized outdoor recreation practices, the actual experience of moving through space opens up the possibility of uprooting the static depictions of ‘home’.

The destabilization of self that arises in the difficulty of meeting basic needs opens up a space for communication and communion with oth-
ers, across social boundaries and hierarchies, but also across ‘home-making’ practice in the ontological sense. What I am suggesting then is that the experience of dealing, intimately, with an unknown and unstable environment where physical discomfort can be acute, may actually intensify the formation of connections to other people encountered, and that such encounters are more likely to create moments of communitas. As Werry notes:

Tourism accentuates a paradox [...] familiar from theories of nationalism and globalization: those political formations that appear most stable, hermetic and enduring – nation, ethnic collectives, and the state – are constituted through circulation. The constant passage of people, ideas, images, and capital, both within their borders and abroad, makes these constructs imaginable, but their continual translation and their becoming through motion is an unsettling condition, always threatening to unseat the certainties of permanence and power to which they pretend. (2011: xvii)

When the settler-Canadian is forced to switch from the status of host to that of guest due to a lack of intimate knowledge with territory, and through the need for the help and hospitality of others, there opens up the potential for a re-evaluation of, to quote one hiker-guest, ‘whose land this really is’. Furthermore, through the acts of hospitality, the Knighton family and other indigenous peoples I have encountered on the trail assert their role as hosts, and therefore as the legitimate owners of their territory.

Tourism is British Columbia’s third largest industry. While the relationship between indigenous peoples and the tourist industry has often been characterized by the exploitation, appropriation, and deterritorialization of First Nations cultures, there are generative possibilities within the hospitality paradigm for the reterritorialization of First Nations places through the assertion of their role of hosts. Of course, the idea of ‘host’ nations is one which has been itself appropriated by the Canadian settler-state in some instances, for example through the (mostly token) references to indigenous host nations during the 2010 Vancouver Olympics. However, I argue that, when the role of host is taken on by First Nations, not just symbolically but in an active and territorializing manner, the possibilities to challenge the dominant spatial narratives also open up. The Knights’ engagement with tourism is more syncretic than assimilative, fusing indigenous ideas of territorial ownership and the role of host with tourist ideals of hospitality. By continuously acting as consummate hosts – feeding, sheltering, entertaining, and educating visitors to their home – the Knighton family have reterritorialized the Pacific Rim wilderness as Qua-ba-diwa, as a thriving, lived-in, and peopled space. Furthermore, their adamance that Qua-ba-diwa is not Canada, but rather home reinforces the deterritorializing force of the state. This is a particularly
important point since the national parks in Canada continue to be used as markers of the settlement visions of ‘home-making’ in the wilderness, drawing upon the colonial ideals of terra nullius. The Knightons thus challenge the settler conceptions of Canadian wilderness by fashioning a place that belongs to them, the burger-flipping hosts of Qua-ba-diwa.
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Introduction: Bosnian divisions

The notorious and widespread campaigns of ethnic cleansing during the 1992-95 Bosnian War caused what was, at the time, the largest displacement of people on European territory since World War II. It is estimated that more than two million people were displaced by this war (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2004, Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees 2003). Out of this number, over one million people are estimated to have crossed the borders of the country, while close to one million were internally displaced (see Dahlman and Ó Tuathail 2005, Kälin 2006, Porobić 2017). The worldwide diaspora from Bosnia and Herzegovina (hereinafter BH) numbers about two million people, spread across more than 50 countries (Halilovich et al. 2018).

Popular discourses ‘back home’ in the sending society, as well as among the emigrants themselves, often label – in the Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian language – those people from BH who continue residing abroad as dijaspora (Valenta and Ramet 2011, Kovačević Bielicki 2017a). This label applies to people from Bosnia, whether they migrated before, during or after the conflicts in the region. The predominant majority of the people who reside abroad, however, had emigrated due to the war, as refugees.

Post-conflict developments in BH include the institutionalizing and cementing of ethnicity in practical terms, as dominant group identification. This is also largely the case in diasporic settings. Ethnic cleansing led to drastic transformations of the population and the social relations (see for example Tuathail and Loughlin 2009, Halilovich 2011 and Jansen 2011).\footnote{As Cox (1999: 204-5) notes: ‘It is somewhat paradoxical that on the one hand, the DPA institutionalized the ethnic division of the country by creating two entities, and on the other hand, is promoting the return of refugees and displaced persons to recreate a multi-ethnic country’.
}

During the post-war period, the society witnessed a clear failure to ‘reverse’ the effects of ethnic cleansing by ensuring a massive and sustainable minority return. Minority return here refers to the return to those areas and pre-war residences where the returnees’ perceived ethnic group was not, or no longer is, in the majority. It can certainly be agreed that the ethnic lens also continues to dominate academic discussions of the Bosnian post-war
context, as people in BH were persecuted and killed in the name of ethnic and religious differences. The main dominant social and political divisions revolve around ethno-nationality (and different aspects of ethnic belonging), so the ethnic divisions are widely brought into focus in both the context of the war and the post-war developments (see for example Bringa 1995; Rosegrant 1998; Cox 1998; Bieber 2004; Esterhuizen 2006; Grün 2009; Jansen 2011; Halilovich 2011, 2013; Majstorović and Turjačanin 2013).

However, the ethnic lens is clearly not the only one through which one can observe how different groups of people feel excluded, and BH is no exception to this rule. The tendency to overemphasize ethnic divisions in research may further contribute to the perpetuation of methodological nationalism (see Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002, 2003) and methodological groupism (see Bauböck and Faist 2010). Both of these problems are particularly prominent in research about the region and migrants from the region (Kovačević Bielicki 2017b). Many additional prominent lines of us-them divisions that are non-ethnic or intra-ethnic in character are mentioned in some of the scholarly sources, but they are usually not made the main and explicit focus of attention. Halilovich (2013) explicitly notes how displacement has not only (re)territorialized the old local and ethnic identities within Bosnia and Herzegovina, but has produced new, often antagonistic, group categories. He identifies the following divisions: stayers versus leavers, newcomers versus old settlers, defenders versus deserters, peasants versus city dwellers, internally displaced versus refugees, and diaspora versus homeland. Halilovich (2013) finds that these new group identifications have sometimes been replicated to an even greater extent in the worldwide Bosnian diaspora. Míčinski and Hasić (2018) argue that the new social cleavages, created as a result of conflict, displacement, and repatriation, intersect with ethnic identities.

In this article, I adopt Halilovich’s labels of ‘stayers’ and ‘leavers’ and explore them as largely overlapping with the homeland-diaspora division. I also provide examples of how those who are considered diaspora feel significantly excluded – at least occasionally and in part – from ‘fully having’ imagined ‘real’ Bosnianness. The ‘real’ Bosnianness in question is constructed in this case in a sedentary, nativist manner, in terms of soil rather than blood. Physically leaving the soil leads to contestedness of belonging. In all the examples I provide, othering is experienced by leavers, from stayers, regardless of the fact that all of the people who narrate it are perceived as co-ethnics in the areas of BH that they visit or have resettled to. Different aspects of the spatial and temporal alienation these people have previously experienced or continue to experience trigger the processes of exclusion and lead to the ascribed and lived otherness. This article focuses exclusively on how people who were or still are re-settled abroad due to the war narrate (non)belonging

---

2 These two group identifications, religious and ethnic, are often intertwined in the case of BH.
in and to BH. I argue that diasporic ‘ethnic brothers’ often experience being seen as one of the new main others by the stayers, according to the leavers’ own perception. The stayers and leavers in question can thus be called diasporic (br)others, to borrow a suitable term from Edin Hajdarpašić. It will be shown in the text which specific ways these processes of othering may be experienced and described.

In the following sections, I present the case study by providing the relevant information about the methods used in the two research projects it is based on, and I give an overview of relevant concepts and how I employ them. After this, I present my findings, first by introducing the narratives that testify to the experienced otherness of the leavers, and then by introducing three sub-sections that help me group these narratives around the main clusters of reasons for the experienced otherness. The last section summarizes my research results and offers concluding reflections.

The study: concepts, background and method

Otherness is seen here primarily as the attributed quality of being different from. But, to be more precise, my approach suggests that the active process of othering – in the sense of affective or discursive labeling of persons or imagined groups as ‘others’ – implies something essentially evaluative, negative and, often, even hostile. It frequently entails not only an awareness that others are different, but also an assessment of some forms of being different as ‘wrong’, less valuable, less moral, strange, or foreign.

My insights about the experienced otherness among leavers – whether or not they attempted to return to BH at some point – in their interaction with people and the society in the perceived homeland, comes directly from two empirical research projects related to the post-conflict diaspora from the former Yugoslavia conducted between 2011 and 2016. During this period, I conducted, for one of the projects, twenty interviews with people who

---

3 Hajdarpašić (2015) uses South Slavic debates over Bosnian Muslim identity to propose a new figure in the history of nationalism: the '(br)other', a character signifying at the same time the potential of being both ‘brother’ and ‘other,’ containing the fantasy of both complete assimilation and insurmountable difference. While Hajdarpašić had in mind the relations between different ethnoreligious groups in BH, which are, nevertheless, closely connected by culture, history and language, I here reflect mostly on intra-ethnic divisions through which ethnic brothers are constructed as non-sedentary others due to their leaving (or, as already specified, diasporic (br)others). This adds an additional dimension to Hajdarpašić’s insight, by proposing a type of nesting otherness within constructed ethno-national boundaries. What is similar is that, as Hajdarpašić notes, ‘(br)other stands for both living antagonisms and intimacy between co-nationals, and in my case also co-ethnicities’ (ibid.).

4 The main results of one of these projects have been published in a monograph (Kovačević Bielicki 2017a).
remain resettled abroad, as well as fifteen separate interviews with people who repatriated to BH from the six so-called Western countries after many years of living abroad. Both sets of interviews were complemented in their research periods by participant observation and numerous additional unrecorded conversations both in BH and abroad.

The research questions of the two separate projects did not focus specifically on the feelings of otherness that the leavers experience when they visit or repatriate ‘back home’, when they communicate, or interact with the stayers in any way (whether face-to-face or through the use of recent social technologies). It was striking, however, already in the initial recorded conversations, that the narratives speaking about this diasporic otherness arose spontaneously. I decided to continue raising the topic with all my subsequent interlocutors, as a side-discussion. This was partly considered in the publications that came out of my two projects but was never made the explicit subject matter. Due to the gap observed in the literature focusing directly on Bosnian us-and-them divisions other than the over-researched ethnic ones, I decided to make the issue explicit here. To support my argument, I selected the relevant narratives from the existing thirty-five interviews that illustrate my point about new diasporic (br)others as one of the most prominent us-and-them divisions among the multiple non-ethnically or intra-ethnically framed ones.

When, how and why have ‘diasporic brothers’ been seen as ‘the new others’? This question captures the rationale for the article’s central point, and it will be answered through the words of the leavers themselves. The category of leavers is introduced here to refer collectively to those people from BH who continue residing abroad, as well as to those who have attempted to return after many years of living abroad. They are both considered for the purposes of the article in their relation to the stayers or the homeland dwellers.

As the backdrop for the study I draw on the theoretical insights gained from my previous research with former Yugoslav refugees in Norway (see Kovačević Bielicki 2017a), showing how the multiple and overlapping categories of ‘us’ and ‘them’ cause outsiderhood and insiderhood to become highly contextual and shifting. The intersection of situational identities for each individual produces different experiences with salience in different contexts. Hence, for example, a person with a strong ethno-national attachment might ‘other’ some people from their own ethnic group in many contexts, based on other positionings and attitudes. I identified the dominant ways in which the boundaries between us and them are drawn in the researched settings. In the context of the Bosnian diaspora, I found that one of the most prominent boundaries is drawn in relation to people who have not experienced migration (Kovačević Bielicki 2016). This type of boundary making is thus experientially motivated; it posits people who have migrated versus those who have not. There are at least two important ‘experientially’ motivated
types of boundary making. One refers to how people testified to the feeling of being othered as migrants in relation to non-migrants (in terms of the majority in the host society), while the other, more relevant for the current study, was about the awareness of the division between the diaspora and the people who stayed in the ‘sending society’ or the ‘homeland’. Such othering based on experientially framed divisions is very often to be found exactly in the boundaries that situate migrants ‘in-between’ and, thereby, prompt them to frequently experience being situated ‘nowhere’. Belonging and non-belonging can be expressed, amongst other ways, in terms of discourses on homes and homelands, integration and assimilation, as well as the belonging ‘in-between’, to ‘neither-nor’, or to ‘both’ societies (see also Krzyżanowski 2010: 189).

Experientially motivated boundary-making may, in some cases, further reconfirm and reproduce nation-thinking and nation-talking – particularly the sedentary and nativist nationalisms – although they are not ethnonationally motivated, in a normative sense, in all their forms and starting points. For example, I showed how positioning ‘us’ in the diaspora as opposed to ‘them’ back home does not usually have much to do with ethnicity and ethno-national boundaries (Kovačević Bielicki 2016); in fact, as I pointed out there, the ‘us’ constructed in such a way often shares ethno-national belonging and identification with ‘them’, constructed as the people ‘back home’. Nevertheless, they can perpetuate the belief that ‘not fully belonging’ to a single nation-state is a challenge and an ‘unnatural’ position to be in, following the sedentarist logic to which Jansen and Löfving (2009) refer. While the ideas and attitudes of many individuals are the result of the power of imposed nation-thinking and the dominant belief in the reality of ethno-national groups, individual discourses end up perpetuating such beliefs.

It is important, finally, to note that the divisions in this study, into stayers and leavers, the diaspora, the returnees and the homeland dwellers, are not in any way clear cut and unquestionable. The construction of these and any other social divisions and categories happens along a continuum where the stayers and the leavers, the diaspora, the homeland dwellers and the returnees, the brothers and the others, may often overlap. People can negotiate and refuse their own or other’s membership in these categories in different ways. For example, in my study of the diasporic people who remain abroad, I was told that the word *dijaspora* has a negative connotation. My interlocutors often experienced that people back home excluded them personally from this category not to offend them, while others included them in the category to ‘other’ them. Self-exclusion is also a common strategy. Yet, I keep operating with the label ‘diaspora’, since my interlocutors use it extensively. Regarding the term ‘returnee’, another important label used here, several people in my study of returnees did not refer to themselves as such. Also, when I discussed return and the returnees with the stayers during my fieldwork, they often
negotiated who can be called a returnee and who cannot, because labeling people as returnees seems to immediately imply that they do not really or fully belong. In this sense, they made exceptions for those people they found close or dear, ‘granting’ them the right to belong, even if they technically are, or used to be, leavers. For the purposes of research, I kept the label ‘returnees’ or povratnici. The strict legal definition in national BH law includes people who officially expressed the wish to return and initiated the process, and those who did actually return. People included in this study, while they did factually return in the period considered by the study, are not necessarily registered as ‘returnees’ as they did not return through official channels, and often not to the settlement where they resided before the war.

To summarize, many of my interlocutors in both of the mentioned research projects, suggested repeatedly that, in the context of the sending society, the Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (hereinafter BCS) word dijaspora has a stigmatizing and derogatory connotation. With the interlocutors who were repatriated there was discussion about what the label ‘returnee’ entails and how most of them reject it. I will now turn to the findings that further illustrate this otherness and stigma.

Findings: Otherness and stigma related to the diasporic (br)others

In a seminar on the position of women and youth in the Bosnian society, organized in 2012 by a Norwegian-Bosnian youth organization, there was a discussion about what ‘we here’ can do for the society ‘there’. During the panel, I noted a comment made by a young woman from the audience who introduced herself as being ‘originally’ from Bosnia, but who had been living ‘here’ for many years:

*Naša pomoć nije dobrodošla kod naroda tamo. A mi želimo da pomognemo. Mi jesmo dijaspora, ali smo ipak prvo Bosanci.*

Our help is not welcome by the people there. And, we want to help. We are the diaspora, but we are nevertheless Bosnians first.

---

5 As the Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees (2012, my translation) states: ‘The returnee is a refugee from BH or a displaced person who has expressed their wish to return to their previous place of residence and is in the process of return, as well as a refugee from BH and displaced person who has returned to their previous place of residence’.

6 The problematic nature of this label also became clear when I was looking for interlocutors using the snowball method, as people were not always willing to self-label or label others they knew as returnees. Only after a longer discussion with me about the topic of my study would they suddenly remember that they knew several ‘returnees’ (according to my definition), who in fact do not at all advertise the original experience of ‘leaving’, or who completely undercommunicate it in order to avoid othering and exclusion.
As her Bosnianness is contested, this woman’s strategy was to reconfirm their Bosnianness by claiming to be Bosnian first, as something more important than being someone from the ‘diaspora’, despite the ‘but’ she herself puts forward.7

As a person who, at the time of the interview, had ‘returned’ or at least was spending most of his time in the sending society, one of my interlocutors spoke about similar kinds of experiences, mentioning that people ‘always’ employ the label ‘diaspora’. Uvek počnu sa onim, ‘dijaspora’! (“They always start with that, ‘diaspora!’”). This reportedly means that many people at ‘home’ regularly mention, criticize and complain about the ‘diaspora’ and label its members as different and even as problematic. However, according to the interlocutor, this attitude is usually reserved for those who visit during the holidays, while people who actually return to live ‘at home’ are sometimes excluded from such labeling and criticism: ‘Iako, malo drugačije gledaju nas koji smo se odlučili vratiti’ (‘Although, they regard us who decided to come back a bit differently’). For this person, by making an active choice to come back, one stops being ‘diaspora’ in the eyes of some stayers, or at least one becomes less ‘diasporic’ and contested than before. Another interlocutor further confirmed the stigmatizing nature of the label ‘diaspora’, by noting:

Ja tu riječ dijaspora nikad nisam volio, to je kao gramatički ispravan izraz, no kod nas ta riječ ima negativan naboj. Ja koristim izraz ‘naši ljudi u inostranstvu’. Kroz posao se čuje: ‘kada dodu ovi dijasporeci’. Zapara mi odmah uši. Odnos je OK, uvijek će biti, ‘ma šta ovi iz dijaspose, oni mogu ...’. I to je uvijek svuda isto: u Sarajevu, Mostaru, Zenici, uvijek neko o nekom ima nešto reći, kao da je ... Ima te neke podjele, gdje će vazda ljudi gledati nas povratnike drugačije ...

I have never liked that word diaspora; it is like a grammatically correct expression, but here in our country, the word has a negative meaning. I use the expression ‘our people abroad’. Through business you often hear: ‘When the diaspora people come’. It immediately bothers me to hear this. The relation is, OK, it will always be there, ‘don’t get me started on those people from the diaspora, they can ...’. And it is always the same everywhere: in Sarajevo, Mostar, Zenica, someone always has something to say about someone else, as if it were... There is this certain division, where people will forever look at us, the returnees, differently...

7 At the same seminar, interestingly, to illustrate the strained relationship between the ‘diaspora’ and the non-migrants, a panelist mentioned seeing a coffee bar in a small Bosnian town with the sign ‘Dijaspori ulaz zabranjen’ (‘Diaspora – No entry!’).
In both the first and the second example, since the topic pertains to people who left during the war in relation to people who remained in BH, both interlocutors temporarily constructed new, more layered in-groups and out-groups inside the national group of a particular ‘us’. They are themselves, then, clearly in the in-group of ‘us’ who left, and the even smaller sub-group of ‘us who returned’.

Knowing the possible stigmatization and negative associations connected with diaspora members, several of my interlocutors often made sure to stress that ‘nisu svi iz dijaspore jednaki’ (‘not everyone from the diaspora is the same’). People who feel the need to argue for this tend to provide evidence and examples of how the ‘Scandinavian’ or ‘Norwegian’ diaspora is not as hated and badly behaved as, for example, the Bosnian diaspora in Germany or Austria, which are reportedly often stigmatized as ‘najgori’ (the worst) by the Bosnians back home. One of the roots of this stigmatization lies in the fact that these countries have a large community of pre-war migrants from former Yugoslavia, the former guest workers (Gastarbeiter). On many occasions, I heard that mostly najgori (‘the worst people’) migrated abroad before the war: people with the lowest qualifications, education, background, etc., while, allegedly, everyone had to leave during the war, causing a lot of the ‘best people’ to migrate abroad. I regularly identified such frames of reasoning in the conversations recorded in my field notes. Such claims are often connected to evidence of how the later generation of emigrants is better integrated and more successful than the migrant laborers, although the migrant laborers have been in the host society much longer. For example, one of my interlocutors claimed that the pre-war diaspora is more poorly educated than the war migrants. According to him, in those days of the good life in the old Yugoslavia, only the lowest classes of the least privileged and savvy people wanted to leave the country. These oft-repeated classist stereotypes are also one of the many ways to stress that a certain ‘we’ is better than a certain ‘they’; in other words, this is an attempt to further divide the constructed category of diaspora into hierarchically organized sub-divisions, in order to place oneself and one’s ingroup in one of the ‘better’ sub-groups.

In the next three sections, I explore my findings about otherness of diasporic ethnic (br)others through the three most salient clusters of topics arising from the study’s insights: 1. self-othering and contextual belonging; 2. othering as a reaction to perceived privilege and arrogance and 3. othering due to perceived blame and betrayal related to leaving.

Self-othering and contextual belonging

The process of experiencing othering also includes ways in which people tend to exclude themselves due to a difference in attitudes and experiences, or as a reaction to being seen as other. For example, one of my interlocutors stat-
ed that his feelings of being foreign were triggered and heightened when he compared himself to people in Bosnia, whilst also showing how the ‘diaspora’ is potentially used by Bosnians in a pejorative sense:

\[\ldots ja se osjećam, kao prvo, em, sad kad se poredim, sa Bosancima dole, znači u Bosni ljudi što žive, bez obzira koje, vjeroispovjesti, ono, Hrvati i šta znam, em, ja se osjećam više kao Norvežanin. To, iskreno rečeno, to. Znači, moj identitet, ja, kao neki [smeh], ja sam neki norveški Bosanac. Em, Bosanac koji, bo, bosanski dijasporac\] na neki način i tako. Iako ta dijaspora ne zvuči baš pozitivno u svakom smislu [smeh].

I feel primarily, um, when I compare myself now, with Bosnians down there, meaning people who live in Bosnia, regardless of which religious affiliation, Croats or whatever; um I feel more like a Norwegian. To be honest. So, my identity, I am something like some kind of [laughter], I am a Norwegian Bosnian. A Bosnian who is a Bosnian diaspora man, although that, diaspora, that does not really sound all that positive in every sense [laughter].

Remembering the family’s arrival to Norway and the desires and possibilities of returning home after the war, an interlocutor stated something with which many of my interlocutors and other former refugees would agree, according to many other conversations I had. She said:

\[Um, hva skal jeg si, og når vi kom til Norge det var, planen var aldri at vi skulle bli her. At vi skulle bli boende, her. Um, planen var alltid at vi skulle flytte ned, til Bosnia, og når jeg spurte foreldre mine om, når skal vi hjem, når skal vi tilbake, de sa alltid at , vi flytter tilbake når krigen er ferdig. Og nå har det gått tjue år. Og vi flyttet aldri tilbake, fordi at, em, etter krigen så tar det, mange år, mange generasjoner før, em, på en måte bein, landet kommer på beina igjen. Og, Bosnia er et veldig spesiell tilfell for at, det handler om et etniske, em, krig, og ...ja. Så, det er veldig, politi, politikken er veldig, feil i Bosnia. Og selve systemet, ikke sant at, forskjellige etnisiteter, kaller, styre etter\]
hverandre og det er veldig lite som blir gjort, så mye pengene går på administrasjon, som er veldig synd, så....ja.

Um, what can I say, and when we came to Norway it was, the plan was never to stay here. To remain living here. Um, the plan has always been to move back, to Bosnia and, when I asked my parents about when we would go home, when we would go back, they would always say that we would move back once the war was over. And now it has been twenty years. And we never moved back, because, after war, it takes many years, many generations before, um, in a way, feet, before a land gets back on its feet. And Bosnia is a very special case because it is about ethnic um, war and ... yes. So that, it is very, the politi, politics is wrong, very, in Bosnia. And the system itself, right, for different ethnic groups to attempt to run one another, and very little is being done, so much money goes on administration, which is a great shame, so that... yes.

In the quoted statement, the ethnic divisions and the political situation in the sending society are identified as the main reasons for not moving back, despite the expectations and plans that, as she recalls, her family had upon their arrival to Norway. In addition to other types of reasons, this one implicitly includes a normative assessment and an othering of the people back home as the ones perpetuating the situation preventing ‘us’ (the family) from coming back. ‘We’, in this narrow sense, is implicitly painted as the group not wishing to live in that kind of political situation, the ones who assess the circumstances as wrong and bad, and thus self-exclude from the possibility of returning. In such understanding, this narrow ‘we’ is positioned not only as different but also as more progressive.

In the majority of the conversations, people expressed the feeling that they did not really belong abroad where they lived, as one of the reasons for moving back to the sending society, even if they did feel integrated and socially accepted. However, many also became aware of being different and ‘not really belonging’ anymore in the country of origin due to various factors: being influenced by life in a different culture, feeling changed by it or, very often, due to the fact that they were assessed as ‘not really Bosnian’ (or not enough, or not anymore) by the people who, unlike them, remained in Bosnia and Herzegovina. One of the main factors influencing their feeling of being alienated is the fact that their belonging to the society they returned to came to be frequently contested, so that they found themselves othered and labeled
as the ‘diaspora people’ (another potentially loaded label) and met with generalizations, stereotyping, skepticism and criticism.\(^9\)

**Othering as a reaction to perceived privilege and arrogance**

The reasons why some people experience not feeling Bosnian when in Bosnia lie, at least partially, in the complex relationship between the diaspora as an imagined collective and the people who stayed. One interlocutor felt that part of the reason for the bad image of the diaspora lies in envy (\textit{zavist}) towards the greater economic power of the diaspora and the disproportional financial possibilities in comparison to the people ‘back home’. Irritation is caused by discrepancies in financial abilities, practices and social behavior of the two constructed ‘groups’. An interlocutor confirmed that ‘\textit{ima ljubomore}’ (‘there is jealousy’) on the ‘domestic’ side, but also that ‘\textit{ima i bahatosti}’ (‘there is also arrogance’) on the part of the diaspora. Many interlocutors conceded that such infamous ‘diaspora behavior’ can often be detected when the diaspora visits the homeland, particularly during the summer holidays. The interlocutors talked about this, although they themselves are the perceived and self-perceived diaspora. Of course, they report that they personally do not condone and certainly do not assume such behavior, which makes the othering more layered. As individuals, people exclude themselves from the ‘diasporic’ ‘we’ when describing this ‘bad behavior’. The most often-used noun to describe the negatively evaluated behavioral pattern displayed by the visiting diaspora is \textit{bahatost} (‘arrogance’). People also use phrases with a similar meaning, such as \textit{osiliti se} (‘to became arrogant’), \textit{ponašaju se drsko} (‘they behave impertinently’), \textit{pretvaraju se} (‘they put on airs’), and \textit{razbacuju se} (‘they toss away money’). All of these expressions, found in my interviews, were used to generalize the ways in which many members of the diaspora behave during their vacations in the home country. However, the ‘I’, the individual speaking, is never included in the generalized bad behavior. Likewise, those defined as ‘us’, such as ‘us from Norway’, or the ‘Scandinavian diaspora’, are exempted from such descriptions of bad behavior and labeled as better behaved than the ‘bad’, ‘rude’ and rightfully-criticized ‘them’.

The diaspora youth mentioned being ridiculed ‘back home’ for not speaking the language well enough. Some of my interlocutors referred to this di-

---

\(^9\) I have sought to show why this division between the ‘stayers’ and the ‘leavers’ is particularly pronounced in the Bosnian case (see Kovačević Bielicki 2016). The two main explanations for this gap offered by the people consulted for that study were: 1. the fact that the people in the ‘diaspora’ are generally better off financially than the people who stayed, which, according to my interlocutors, causes irritation, jealousy and misunderstandings and 2. the fact that ‘getting away’ during the war can, in some cases, be assessed and labeled as selfish, unpatriotic, even treasonous. For more details about this particular topic, see sections of the above-mentioned work (ibid.: 293-301).
rectly and listed the occasions when they felt self-conscious about their BCS, including the cases when it was corrected, or even mocked. One interlocutor recalled what it was like to go to high school in Bosnia after finishing elementary school abroad. She spoke about feeling discriminated, ridiculed for her accent and way of speaking, as well as publicly scorned by teachers for being ‘from the West’. She mentioned how a teacher had asked her to read aloud in Bosnian on her very first day in the new school. As she had just arrived in Bosnia, after many years in Norway, she read the paragraph very slowly. The teacher reportedly pointed to the whole class: ‘Evo vidite. Ne zna čitati, a svi ovi sa Zapada misle da su bolji od nas’ (‘There you see. She cannot read, and all of them from the West think they are better than us’).

Another interlocutor criticized both what he labeled as the diaspora and the non-migrants, positioning himself partially outside of both groups, as someone who assesses their behaviour. Among the emigrants, some ‘do the worst possible jobs where they live, only so they can show off down there’, while domaći (domestic people) who ‘we’ as the diaspora give so much money to, ‘they’ think money grows on trees for us (‘Oni misle da nama novac raste na drveću’). Interestingly, but in no way surprising, when describing negative and stigmatized practices, interlocutors refered to the diaspora as ‘they’. When describing positive characteristics, progressiveness and help, the diaspora became their ‘we’ and they claimed to be a part of this in-group. As one of them noted:

A ne znam, isto nekad, šta ja znam, vole dijasporu sigurno kad dođe da, al dijaspora je, za jedna trećina za bruto nacionalnog proizvoda, zar nije u Bosni? Velikih je para, mi što dajemo dole da, da, To ta, ekonomija, nekako ide, oh, u krug. Ovaj, i eto, k’ vole dijasporu kad dođu, ovo ono. Al opet, ne vjerujem da su [dijaspora] na nekom dobroj glas. I kažu: ‘Ma oni, dijaspora, on ne razumije naše patnje ovdje... njemu je lako, iz X je. Tamo, pare rastu na drv, na drvećima, ono, pa može da uzme kantu i pobere malo para i vrati se, kući’.

But I don’t know, also, sometimes, what do I know, they like for sure for the diaspora to keep coming, yes, but the diaspora is providing one third of the gross national income, or isn’t it so, in Bosnia? It is big money that we give to them down there, yes, yes. So that the economy can somehow keep on, oh, turning, like, and there you go, they supposedly like the diaspora when they come, this and that. But, then again, I doubt that they [the diaspora] have a good reputation, and they say: ‘Well them, the diaspora, they do not understand our suffering here... it is easy for him. He

10 Correct usage would be na drveću.
is from X.\footnote{X here stands for the country where the interlocutor has resettled.} Yeah. There, the money grows, on tre, trees, like, so he can grab a bucket and pick some money and go back home.

Besides the obviously interesting and ironic comment describing people’s unrealistic ideas about the easy and privileged life abroad of ‘picking money from trees’, this quotation shows, in a striking way, how this young man, or anyone from the diaspora, is likely to be perceived when in Bosnia-Hercegovina that ‘he is from X’. From that point of view and in that context, he ‘comes from’ abroad, as he himself notes. The fluidity of ‘coming from’ once again comes to the fore. Another important dimension to be considered from this statement is that the respondent, although a man from the diaspora himself, while talking about how the diaspora is perceived in a negative sense, chooses not to use ‘we’ but rather ‘they’ to refer to the diaspora. In doing so, he avoids identifying with this somewhat stigmatized term. However, when claiming that the diaspora provides a lot of money for the homeland, he uses the term we: ‘we’ give ‘them’ money. When the group is labeled as generous and positive, the interlocutor wants to be included in it.

Interestingly, in all of these various cases, the generalizing discourses can be challenged, adjusted and even dropped when people are faced with concrete individuals instead of imagined groups to which they discursively refer, and about which they generalize. As one interlocutor explained, despite the fact that she repeatedly heard how ‘niko ne voli dijasporu’ (‘no one likes the diaspora’), she was told many times ‘Ali ne ti. To se ne odnosi na tebe’ (‘But not you. That does not apply to you’). As someone who grew up abroad, this exception-making is a strategy some people use to avoid direct conflict, or to make it easier on themselves. For many people who like to consider themselves objective, fair and reasonable, it is easier to stereotype an imaginary group than a person physically standing before them (in contrast to the teacher in the earlier example who seems to have found satisfaction in directly and publicly shaming a teenager). The perceived socio-economic privilege of those from abroad is often the central reason for the othering that occurs on a more general level, as exemplified here:

\begin{quote}
Tako da sam osjetila, bilo je dosta priče da smo svi mi koji smo se vratili donijeli pare, kupili stanove, obezbijedili sebi poslove, bilo je tih priča... za razliku od ljudi koji su ostali tokom rata u BH. Ja mislim da je dosta bilo ljudi koji su komentarisali, ‘i sada je to tako, lako je vama koji ste živjeli vani’. Ili je to ljubomora ili nezadovoljstvo, da oni imaju isto tako, ne bi tako komentarisali, teško im je.
\end{quote}

So that I felt, there was a lot of talk how all of us who returned brought back money, bought apartments, provided jobs for ourselves, those stories were there... in contrast to the people who...
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remained during the war in BH. I think there were a lot of people who commented, ‘now it is easy, it is easy for those of you who lived abroad’. That is either jealousy or dissatisfaction. If they had the same things, they would not be commenting. It is difficult for them.

In this example, despite the fact that the interlocutor labeled all the negative discourse targeting her in-group as jealousy and dissatisfaction, she also immediately provides justification and understanding for those others who target ‘us’, as they do not have ‘our’ resources and the opportunities the in-group has. In another part of the same interview, the interlocutor offers a type of explanation for why people think and talk in such a deprecating way: in this case the fact that he believes it is a universal trait in people’s nature everywhere to talk about others and create divisions, so this is but one of many such otherings.

Othering due to perceived blame and betrayal related to leaving

Not only did the experiential differences and perceived differences in ‘mindset’ cause the relation between migrants and non-migrants ‘back home’ to be strained. One of the most delicate aspects of this relationship is that many war refugees experience their patriotism and belonging as contested, and their right to have a say in the society as delegitimized and challenged on the basis of accusations that they ‘left’ and ‘got away’ when the country ‘needed to be defended’. This is a strategy that occasionally delegitimizes migrants’ opinions and contests their belonging and right to participate in the home society. One interlocutor noted how people, especially grown men who left the country during the war, come to be labeled as traitors who ‘saved their own asses’ (‘pokupili guzice’), in the sense that they took off. A different interlocutor also reported that such animosities exist, but feels that he personally was not targeted by such accusations because of his young age when he left. No one should find it reasonable to accuse a child of cowardice for not staying and participating in the war, even if they believe that grown-ups had the moral duty to participate and ‘defend’ the country. Although he was very young (eleven) when he left the country during the war, he experienced feeling ‘blamed’ and ‘scorned’:

Ono, šta ja znam, sve zavisi na koga naletiš! Al’ ono, dosta je onoga... znaš, chatovao s nekim curama iz Bosne i, šta ja znam, davno na, preko Facebook-a ili šta je ono. Ja probam da joj kažem, onda smo, znaš, iako ... iako, to će se desiti opet ko, na

---

12 This was often labeled by my interlocutors as mentalitet (‘mentality’).
13 This corresponds to the divisions of stayers versus leavers and defenders versus deserters mentioned by Halilovich (2011).
14 Pokupiti literally translates as ‘to pick up’.
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Like, what do I know, it all depends on who you encounter. But like, there is a lot of that... you know, I chatted with some girls from Bosnia and, dunno, a long time ago, through Facebook or whatever. I tried to tell this one girl that we, you know, as much as we could, we sent money, for humanitarian causes or whatever. And, she says to me ‘yeah, yeah, it is so nice for you, how you escaped from here.’ You know. Get it? Like... and what can I say to that? Like... come on, OK, if that is how it is, I just stop that conversation, I don't feel like (going into) it. Because, like, what am I going to talk about, say, who do I have to justify myself to? Get it, to no one, it was how it was: you could have ended up having my fate, or I could have stayed trapped in Sarajevo like you were'. Like. Like you can't know what your destiny will be.

People perceived as members of the diaspora sometimes counter the negative attitudes and criticisms of people in the ‘homeland’ with the argument that they, the ones abroad, are the ones who are in fact the better patriots. As one interlocutor said, while in this particular context explicitly calling the sending society ‘their’ (not ‘our’) country:

_Ajmo reći, u, u dijasperi ima većeg patriotizma, naprimjer mi, ljudi u dijasperi, mi volimo njihovu zemlju više nego ljudi dolje._

We might say that in, in the diaspora there is greater patriotism, for example us, we people who are in the diaspora, we love their country more than the people down there do.

On this occasion, he constructs the ‘we’ group as ‘us abroad’, in contrast to ‘them’ back home as the ‘others’ in this particular context (although, for this person, the ‘they’ most often means ‘the Norwegians’). The interlocutor thus discursively constructs a different ‘other’ than the usual ‘designated other’ identified in his statements (the ‘majority population’). This strategy can be seen as a way to emphasize the in-groups’ patriotism in order to counter the blame and accusations for the lack of patriotism or even betrayal.
Conclusions

I have considered here a form of non-ethnically situated otherness or, to be more specific, I have offered a view into an experientially framed intra-ethnic otherness of a constructed diasporic minority. The constructed difference is based on these people’s experiential and/or residential difference to most of the stayers ‘back home’, but also on the perceived privileges, arrogance and socio-economic advantages that the leavers often have. People who can be put in the categories of the diaspora and the returnees – as two sub-categories of the group labeled here as 'leavers' – report highly similar experiences and processes of othering and self-exclusion. Both diaspora and returnee are here recognized as conditional and loaded terms. As with all problematic labels, it is not always clear where the lines between groups are drawn and whether people would self-identify with one of these labels or not.

I introduce the labels and categories discussed above as admittedly contested and non-absolute. They are used here mainly because they help explain relevant social divisions: some people stayed, some left, and yet others left and returned. They provide a useful lens for research about both the new cleavages and the new solidarities in the region. I thus introduced these labels as categories of analysis, while I do not see them as bounded and set in stone. In my view, the perceived diaspora and the returnees in one sense often feel significantly excluded from ‘fully’ belonging to their perceived ethnic groups ‘back home’ due to often being viewed as foreign, changed, privileged, and so on. In another sense, their experience of migration and otherness, both home and abroad, creates a space for building new, transnational and inter-ethnic solidarities that intersect the generalized groups of migrants and non-migrants.¹⁵

As pointed out at the beginning, the original interviews I used here did not in any way directly focus on the diaspora-homeland division. However, a strikingly large number of respondents pointed to this division as something they experience as important to their identification and belonging when they are physically spending time in the sending society, or when they interact with people who live there in any way. This division is exemplified specifically by the selected narratives about the experienced othering and feelings of non-belonging reported by interlocutors who are perceived as current or former members of the Bosnian diaspora.

The most interesting general findings are that both people who visit or in other ways keep in touch with the so-called homeland and those who decide to return do so in order to belong more. The ideologies of blood and belonging, prominent within and beyond Europe, condition them to believe this is the case. However, these people may find that they are othered in the original homeland in ways different than in the receiving societies. The ideologies of

¹⁵ This is my own reflection that comes directly out of this study but could not be further explored in this article due to the limitations of space and topic.
connection to the soil revolving around the patriotic ideas of one’s duty to defend the so-called homeland and remain in it when the going gets rough are part of the reason why Bosnian leavers may feel othered by the stayers. Just as they are often othered, they also other themselves and exclude themselves from perceived rightful belongingness. My long-term study with the Bosnian diaspora and the returnees has repeatedly taught me how many people who remain displaced, as well as those who attempt to return from the West, feel othered and alienated despite visiting and returning to the areas where they are perceived as co-ethnics.

Despite the existence of the perceived gap between those who left and those who stayed, it is also important here to briefly add that a number of my interlocutors seemed to agree on the fact that they still feel their belonging to be less often, or less intensively, contested ‘here’ than abroad, where they were migrants and non-natives. The gap is partially bridged by the fact that they returned and did not stay abroad, but, more importantly, the feeling of non-belonging was not of the same intensity as it was abroad where most of them felt foreign and marked by their names, family and origin. The othering discussed here is thus occasional and situational, not constant or all-encompassing.

Nevertheless, I argue that both research and media discourses tend to overestimate, or solely focus either on the ethnic solidarity and sameness or the opposition to an ethno-national or ethno-religious ‘other’. Research thus often neglects other divisions and types of othering that people experience outside of, or within these dominant groupings. While ethno-nationality certainly is an important category around which in-group constructions happen, there are many other ways in which people construct ‘us’ and ‘them’. These positionalities are multiple and contextual, here as much as in any other societal context.16
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German Postmemory and Ambivalent Home Desires: 
A Critical Reading of Nora Krug’s (2018) Graphic Novel 
*Heimat: A German Family Album*

Marija Grujić and Ina Schaum

*Heimat* and the conditions of a post-National Socialist society

In the time of the so-called ‘refugee crisis’ – the Brexiter, the Alt-Right and the anti-migrant racist discussions about the ‘Heimat ministry’ in Germany – producing an aesthetic account of homeland seems a risky business. Yet, Nora Krug had dared to do so in her graphic novel *Heimat: A German Family Album*, published in the USA, UK, and Germany in 2018.

*Heimat* is a personal account about the history of the rise of the Nazis and the exclusion, segregation and subsequent persecutions of German Jews. It visually engages with the ambiguity of belonging to that Germany and of having a family history intimately entangled with the Nazi past. Krug was born in 1977 and therefore does not belong to the so-called ‘68 generation’. The Guardian thus perceives her project as surprising since ‘[t]he task of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, of coming to terms with the National Socialist era, is in Germany mainly associated with the literature and films of Krug’s parents’ generation’ (emphasis ours).

Inspired by our teaching at German universities, we decided to read *Heimat* as educators and persons affected by the way popular culture deals with the politically saturated notion of ‘homeland’.

---

1 We use homeland and Heimat interchangeably. In the UK edition, the word HEIMAT is not translated, but written in capital letters. Written in italics, *Heimat* refers to the graphic novel. The mentioned ‘Heimat ministry’ in Germany carries the title *Bundesministerium des Inneren, Bau und Heimat* which was translated into English as ‘Federal Ministry of the Interior, Building and Community’ (see the ministry’s official English homepage). The range of meanings that the German word Heimat can encompass, however, are not reflected by the English word ‘community’ – not least because Heimat is highly politically charged and had been a central term of Nazi ideology.

2 It is interesting that the title of the US version is different from the British and German versions. Whereas the German title is *Heimat: Ein deutsches Familienalbum*, the British title is *Heimat: A German Family Album*, and the US title is *Belonging: A German Reckons with History and Home*.

3 See the article published in the Guardian (Oltermann 2018), which keeps the author’s notion of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* untranslated. In the British edition, Krug keeps this in the German original, noting: ‘we learned that *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* means “coming to terms with one’s political past”, but felt that it really defined “the process of struggling to come to terms’ with it”’. (Chapter 1)
We asked, among other questions: how can we understand the timing of this publication on belonging to Germany and its Nazi history? How does an urban, professional visual artist, who was born and socialized in Germany but lives abroad, embody shame about the Nazi past? What does *Heimat* aim to do in the present to its (German) readers?

Nora Krug came to New York in her twenties to obtain a degree in visual arts. However, as she notes, she decided to leave Germany for good, and settled in the USA. In the book, we learn that she is married to a Jewish man and that she was pregnant while writing her graphic novel. Contrary to our initial expectations as readers, Krug does not seem to experience difficulties in feeling accepted to the USA context, despite her venture into the domains of national affiliation and senses of belonging. In biographical accounts on lives in 'new countries' and 'languages', migrants commonly express difficulties and experiences of estrangement (see, for example, Lutz 2011). A possible reason for the absence of these kind of difficulties could be the author’s social location that grants her access to rather uncomplicated migration-related procedures, for instance concerning her legal status and her ability to begin a new life in a new country under her own terms.

Krug was prompted to produce a graphic novel on homeland because of the troubles she felt with belonging to a 'German family' – a family whose preceding generations did *something or nothing* during the Nazi period.

4 Dan Diner (1986: 15) observed that '[t]he more German Germany becomes or became, the more powerfully are Jews confronted with the history in which they are involved with the Germans, or which separated them from them, in such a terrible manner'. In order to stress this separation – the abyss formed by the Holocaust – in the context of this commentary we use the juxtaposition ‘Germans and Jews’ to denote the difference between the descendants of survivors on the one side, and descendants of perpetrators and bystanders on the other. Of course, this notion already becomes complicated in relation to Krug’s husband who is a Jewish American/American Jew. Regardless of his family history, or whether the Nazis persecuted his family, during the time of National Socialism, he would have been on the side of the (potential) victims; whereas Krug’s familial descent would place her on the side of the ‘perpetrators’. As Kurt Grünberg (2006: 21) notes, ‘Germany, the “home of the persecutors” is also the “home of the victims”’ and ‘the juxtaposition “Germans and Jews” already calls into question a deep-seated conflict: is one to understand that Jews with a German passport, who have grown up in Germany, who have a perfect command of the German language [...] are not German?’.

Even though the access to ‘being German’ was not readily granted to German Jews before the Shoah, many Jews tried to embody it (often predicated by certain conditions such as baptism and assimilation). Jakob Wassermann (1994 [1921]) seems to epitomize this in his autobiographical account of his existence not as ‘Jew per se’ but as ‘German Jew, two concepts that even for the impartial open the way to a wealth of misunderstandings, tragedy, contradictions, strife and suffering’ (ibid: 7). We do not intend to affirm a certain meaning of ‘being German’, or a dominant notion of German identity con-
learn about this incentive in the very first scene depicted in the graphic novel. Krug recounts her encounter with a woman during the first days of her New York life. This woman recognizes her to be German (presumably by her accent) and tells her that she is a Shoah survivor. This recognition forms an immediate trigger for Krug to remember where she ‘comes from’, and she experiences what she later describes as ‘shame’: ‘A familiar heat began to form in the pit of my stomach. How do you react, as a German, standing across from a human being who reveals this memory to you?’ (Chapter 1).

We understand Krug’s visual encounter with Heimat as a work of what Marianne Hirsch describes as postmemory (see Hirsch and Spitzer 2009; Hirsch 2008, 2016). This notion aims to denote generational transmissions of knowledge about dreadful violence and its traumatic proceedings. Hirsch developed her idea of postmemory in relation to Holocaust survivors who pass on traumatic memories to their children. She also understood it by way of her own family history, her parents’ survival of the Shoah and their migration from the totalitarian post-WWII Romania to the USA. In this commentary, we employ the notion of postmemory as an analytical tool that helps us locate the complex historical and emotional contexts from which Krug’s graphic novel receives its impulses.

We begin by describing the context of Krug’s ‘unique memorial artwork’ (Random House 2018), and by presenting some scenes from her novel that we subsequently analyse and relate to the findings of memory and postmemory scholarship, as well as their subsequent critical debates.

Firstly, the context of Krug’s graphic novel is the condition of a post-National Socialist society (see Messerschmidt 2007), a society whose national, ritualized culture of remembrance is full of contradictions. It is the kind of struction in the context of the current post-migration society in Germany, but rather to relate to the context of the Shoah. Even then, we are aware of the juxtaposition’s diminishment of cultural complexity and agree with Katja Garloff’s (2016: 13-15) notion of an existential, rather than essential, Jewishness/Germanness and that the meanings of the terms ‘intersect and change over time’ (see also the discourse about German Jewish migrants to Mandate Palestine/Israel).

We use Shoah and Holocaust interchangeably, as Shoah is the word used by some Jewish survivors (with whom one author of this commentary, Ina Schaum, is in contact) to describe their experiences of persecution and being in concentration camps. We acknowledge that Holocaust as a term is more widely spread and connotes the genocide against several groups identified for persecution, whereas the Hebrew term Shoah specifically stands for the persecution of Jewish people.

Her graphic novel had no page numbers. We therefore reference the respective chapter from which the quotes are taken. Quotes are from the UK version of Heimat.

A term used by Random House’s homepage to advertise the German version of Heimat. The original term in German is ‘einzigartiges Erinnerungskunstwerk’.
present condition encapsulated both in the statement of the former President of Germany, Joachim Gauck (2015), that there is ‘no German identity without Auschwitz’, the situation in which the right-wing party ‘Alternative for Germany’ (AfD) enters the German Parliament, and while the calls to ‘draw a line’ under the Shoah are getting louder. Krug describes how she was socialized in school to learn about ‘the collective guilt’ of Germans by analysing Hitler’s speeches, by omitting certain German words from her vocabulary – such as ‘hero’ (Held), ‘victory’ (Sieg), ‘battle’ (Kampf), ‘pride’ (Stolz) – and how she and her classmates learned to have difficulties with the meaning of the term Heimat. She depicts the received knowledge of guilt and shame as an essential part of belonging, of thoughts about home and family, of what it means to be a German of her generation, and an imaginary ‘We’.

*We learned that the German word for RACE should only be used to distinguish animal species, and ETHNIC only in the context of genocides; yet we felt that history was in our blood, and shame in our genes.* (Chapter 1)

At the same time, the ‘shame’ that was transmitted to subsequent generations of Germans remains remarkably abstract. It is not connected to explicit knowledge about actions, experiences and memories of family members. ‘Genes’ are not translated into actual grandparents. Krug describes her experiences in school:

*We prepared questions for the old women who travelled from America to tell us about the camps, but we never thought to ask about one another’s grandparents. We learned that our language was once poetic, but now potentially dangerous.* (Chapter 1)

On the other side, in paradoxical concomitance, is the phenomenon of ‘felt victims’, of a remembrance culture that encourages what Ulrike Jureit and Christian Schneider (2010) called ‘victim-identified remembering’. By identifying with the victims of Nazi persecution – and not with the perpetrators – a desire to be redeemed of guilt and shame expresses itself through the adoption of ‘borrowed identities’, of feeling, or longing, to have the identity of the victim. Krug also experienced this desire and depicts it in *Heimat*. She recounts how her mother entered her room when she was stitching a yellow star on the sleeve of her jacket. When her mother asked her what she was doing, she replied: ‘I made this star and I am going to wear it out of solidarity with the Jews’ (Chapter 1).

Jureit and Schneider (ibid.) identify this desire as an externalisation and a strategy to position the perpetrators as those with whom one has nothing in common. This desire also has the potential to belittle and disavow the

---

8 Unless otherwise noted, all translations of German publications, and quotes from video clips and movies into English, are ours.
suffering of the actual victims. Gabriele Rosenthal and Dan Bar-On (1992) called this phenomenon ‘pseudo-identification’. Krug might be alluding to this problem by depicting her mother’s response who said: ‘I do not think that’s a good idea’, whereupon she unstitches the yellow star. Likewise, she remembers the narratives in her family about her grandfather looking Jewish, and perhaps having hidden a Jewish man from persecution, as well as fantasies that her great-grandmother might have been Jewish given that she had red hair (Chapter 4).

In her research, Barbara Steiner (2015: 149-150) found that the attempt to seek encounters and contacts with Jews served many Germans in the 1950s to 1970s as a device to distance themselves from their families. She concluded that philo-Semitism can be a strategy of non-Jewish Germans to disengage themselves from familial and societal guilt. Likewise, contemporary conversions to Judaism can be attempts to come to terms with the past and involve an instrumentalisation of Jewishness because Jews are thought to possess what non-Jewish Germans long for: a historically untainted origin.

Krug does not mention a consideration of conversion, or if that is important for her or her husband. She mentions her attendance at Bar Mitzvas, having Jewish-American friends (who tell her that they are just as guilty for slavery and the genocide brought upon the Native Americans as she is for the Shoah), and a mother-in-law who tells her not to trust Germans. Krug dedicated her graphic novel to both ‘my old family and my new family’. How important is it to have ‘a new family’ in order to engage with ‘the old family’? How can one understand distance and proximity between the two? We wonder if her ‘closeness’ to Jewish people – and simultaneously her ‘geographical

9 This scene reminded us of the recent documentary ‘Meschugge oder was: Jude werden, Jude sein in Deutschland’ [Meschugge or what: To Be and to Become a Jew in Germany] by Dmitrij Kapitelman (2019), in which a non-Jewish woman is depicted in the process of converting to (the liberal stream of) Judaism. This woman describes herself as a descendent of a family of ‘really evil Nazis’ (researching her family tree, she had hoped ‘to have at least one Jew in the family’), whilst she simultaneously asserts that her conversion has nothing to do with that fact. She has a tattooed Star of David on her chest. She describes her reasoning for getting the tattoo: ‘People in the Shoah have carried the yellow star here. Now, I am carrying the star for these people on this side [of her chest] to say “I stand by your side”. […] It is important for me to be able to speak in the name of the Jews’. Kapitelman, a patrilineal and secular Jew, comments: ‘But do the Jews want that?’

10 We would contend that a disengagement from the past through philo-Semitic – or allosemitic (Bauman 1998) – feelings is the counterpart of a defensive and aggressive disengagement, as embodied by functionaries of the AfD. These call to ‘draw a line’ under the Holocaust and demand a ‘180 U-turn of the politics of memory’ (AfD politician Björn Höcke; see the newspaper Tagesspiegel 2017), and to stop ‘implanting a deep guilt consciousness in subsequent generations’ (AfD politician Marc Jongen, see Reinecke 2019).
distance’ to Germany – allows her to investigate Heimat as she does, and indulge in ‘things German’ such as old photographs, songs, or her endeavour to establish emotional closeness to her uncle who fought as a young man in WWII. She described the importance of being away from Germany to learn about her hometown’s war history: ‘From this safe distance, I allow myself to see the loss it once endured’ (Chapter).11 Can a reader without any knowledge of her affiliations with Jewish people univocally read that she does not understand Heimat as primordial linkages to ‘soil and blood’?

Does the fact that Krug is in an intimate relationship with a Jewish man – as she quotes her father saying work to ‘not quite [make] amends, but [to mend the] relationship to Judaism’ (Chapter 2)? This desire, that close relationships to Jews contribute to the ‘regoodification of the Germans’ (Geisel 2015), is also illustrated by the remark made by a friend of Krug’s mother that she would have loved to have a Jewish boyfriend in order to have the feeling of making something good again. In Chapter 2, Krug discusses her own marriage: ‘Not even marrying a Jewish man has lessened my German shame’.

And why would it? The question here is less about whether she ought to feel ashamed. It is about why this feeling of hers should be altered by marrying a Jewish man and having a ‘new family’.12

Later in her life, when working on her graphic novel, Krug set out to research her ‘old family’s’ past by visiting archives, talking to historians, her parents, and other relatives. With drawings and handwritten stories that she combines with family and historical photographs, archive material and ‘things German’ that she bought at flea markets, Krug becomes a ‘memory archivist’. She reads the old schoolbooks of her uncle who was drafted into the army and who in school learned poems which described Jews as dangerous and ‘poisonous mushrooms’, but also finds her maternal grandfather’s denazification documents. What we found troubling was Krug’s graphic rendition reminiscent of a children’s book which, in our view, plays down the topic to make it more ‘manageable’.13 But, what does her graphic novel do to the reader? What ought they to remember? What is not to be forgotten about the Nazi past and the Shoah?

---

11 It is interesting to ask here which perspective on loss is taken – of the persecuted and disowned Jewish Germans or of non-Jewish German war-torn perpetrators – and whether these are or ought to be mutually exclusive perspectives on loss.

12 The topos of love is also evoked in the first scene of her graphic novel when Krug encounters a survivor who tells her that she survived the death camp because a female guard fell in love with her.

13 In fact, the book is nominated for the German Youth Literature Prize 2019.
Heimat and Postmemory: 
Bringing Nora Krug’s Recollections Back to their Places

No matter how hard I look, a nagging sense of unease won’t disappear. Perhaps the only way to find the HEIMAT that I’ve lost is to look back; to move beyond the abstract shame and ask those questions that are really difficult to ask – about my own hometown, about my father’s and my mother’s families. To make my way back to towns where each of them is from. To return to my childhood, go back to the beginning, follow the breadcrumbs, and hope they’ll lead the way home. (Chapter 2)

The places of Heimat and home visually presented by Krug (‘things German’, family and public archival photos) are distant in the past, and yet emerge as intimate in proximity. She knows them through a sense of complicity and accountability. What does it mean to inhabit memories of ghostly narratives about perpetrators and how does it form a feeling of post-home (see Introduction)?

Heimat visually and literally explores belonging to the culture and attachments to what Krug names as ‘things German’ (the material and symbolic mementos that come to her only in her ‘native tongue’) that encapsulate homeliness, the familiarity of the language and places. She is aware of danger (we read above that German was poetic), but when she listens to Schubert in New York, Krug reveals: ‘my native language evokes longing, rather than shame’ (Chapter 2). Simultaneously, homeland and its language stand for the Shoah, oblivion, and accountability for the violence of systematized industrialized genocide. But in its everydayness, homeland for her denotes protection and something positive. Nevertheless, from the perspective of the ‘after’ generation, to name and long for Heimat is deeply troubling, as it signifies the horror of something evil which was (and is) done in ‘your name’ – and therefore had to be lost – as in the quote above.

Already on the first page, we read that homeland invokes safety by means of the mother tongue and of the mother herself. It is lived through everyday objects and the cosiness they provide, such as the bandage (the German brand Hansaplast) or the hot-water bottle as staple of a German household. Connected to these objects, a feminine trope (motherly care) plays a central role. In Chapter 1, Krug explains: ‘Next to my mother, Hansaplast was the safest thing in the world’.

Likewise, the moment in which she first learns about the murder of the Jewish population is narrated as a gendered memory: it is connected to the memory of her mother declaring at the family’s dinner table that Krug had her first menstruation (and, hence, lost the ‘innocence’ of childhood oblivion in a twofold way). Moreover, Krug presents herself almost exclusively in gen-
dered roles that are known to and understood by most (female) readers: as the (menstruating) daughter, the young woman, the bride, the granddaughte-

ter, the pregnant woman, and the soon-to-be mother. We wonder if this pro-
duces the effect of an argument ad hominem/feminem to identify with her perspective.

Visual and literary interventions by the children of Shoah survivors are a central aspect of post(Shoah)memory. The concept of postmemory stands for ‘indirect’ knowledge about the Holocaust that is passed on to the genera-
tions ‘after’ by the survivors and the witnesses. Through such memory, how-
ever, the boundaries of ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ experience are blurred. Accord-
ing to Hirsch’s theory and personal experience, parents and children share
the heaviness of witnessing extreme violence and the impossibility of making
sense of it. The experience of one generation is hence passed on through ob-
jects, stories, images, behaviours and affects. The postgeneration, as Hirsch
names it, receives knowledge as a belated experience, and yet the ‘post’ does
not stand for its end, as the narratives about the violence and the trauma con-
tinue to inhabit perpetrators’ and survivors’ family lives. The postmemories
thus appear as memories in their own right, even though many of those who
narrate them were either children or not yet born during WWII.

Hirsch’s (see 2008, Hirsch/Spitzer 2010) analysis of postmemory builds
on one other aesthetic engagement with the Nazi persecutions; Art Spiegel-
man’s graphic novel Maus (1986, 1992). Spiegelman.revives his father’s nu-
merous displacements from homes, his Auschwitz encampment, his escapes
from shelters, and his parents’ immigration to the USA. In absence of (other)
ways to tell the horror of the atrocities, he writes ‘[m]y father bleeds history’.14
For Spiegelman, the visual expressions become a sort of memory archive
about family members he will never meet but whose ghostly presence he nev-
evertheless feels (for instance of his brother who was hidden and poisoned by
his aunt in order to save him from persecution). In Maus, the loss of a mother
who commits suicide plays a significant role in the (missing) feeling of safety
and in establishing a relationship to a father. Both parents’ hardships to live
a ‘normal life’ after surviving the death camp are relevant for Spiegelman’s
dealing with their past, however the feminine trope is central for him to es-
tablish a good relation to the burden of their past that he receives. Finally,
the feminine and ‘familial’ tropes have the power to rebuild and re-embody
linkage, which appears to the author as vanishing, while gender becomes a
key element which makes it possible to claim memory in situations of detach-
ments and forgetting (Hirsch 2008: 124).15

14 This is the subtitle of the first of the volumes of Maus: A Survivor’s Tale (Spie-
gelman 1986).
15 An example that Hirsch puts forward in her analysis of Spiegelman’s graphic
novel is the maternal loss. A similar trope is also present in another aesthetic
account that the author analyses - W. G. Sebald’s novel Austerlitz (2001). She
argues that the generation of affiliative postmemory needs such familiar, fa-
Another example of a postgenerational aesthetic articulation of postmemory can be found in Eva Hoffman's writings, and more explicitly *After Such Knowledge* (2004), in which ‘knowledge’ refers to parents’ transmission of their experiences of being prosecuted as Polish Jews during WWII. In her earlier autobiographical novel *Lost in Translation* (1989), she also put forward this knowledge’s relevance for experiences of movement and belonging. She described their life in post-war Poland and non-belonging, thus emigrating to Canada, with Hoffman further migrating to the USA. The author also renders the ways in which language makes her feel safe, highlighting its role in intimate life, especially from the perspective of a migrant having to learn another language. Hoffman’s troubles with belonging are connected to the persecution of her parents in Poland during and after WWII. Hoffman presents herself as someone who lost homeland, however her complex attachments (Polish, Jewish, multiple migrations) make it impossible to write about longing only for one place. The family survived and emigrated to Canada upon realizing that the anti-Semitic violence did not end with the war. For Hoffman, therefore, home(land) is also hostile territory. Still, the Polish language, culture and landscape for her represent the initial frame of self-awareness and the connections to the world. She holds on to thinking in the Polish language upon arrival to a new country, until such time when a safe separation is possible and the words in a new language again have their *wordly* flavour. Sociologist Helma Lutz (2011: 348) argues that what we learn from Eva Hoffman is how migrants continuously experience estrangement. The ‘new language/life’ forcefully separates material and symbolic layers from words, as Hoffman notes: ‘The milk, homogenized, and too cold from the fridge, bears little resemblance to the liquid we used to drink called by the same name’ (1989: 106).

However, the nostalgic look ‘back’ and retrospective ‘glance’, which is according to Hirsch a characteristic of trauma knowledge, can also have a different meaning (2016: 80, 92). As an act of postmemory, it drives the generations ‘after’ to understand traumatic events and describe their effects on personal migrations and life choices (both Hirsch and Hoffman become scholars and re-articulate past atrocities in language). Art Spiegelman learns of his father’s memories not on a return trip, or in the course of his own migration, but by giving them spatiality in the visual form of a graphic novel that ‘memorialises’ his family members who were killed, the images of his hometown and various mementos destroyed in the Holocaust.

Likewise, Krug’s graphic novel foregrounds various forms of loss: the loss of the familiarity of home and the proximity to people (her relatives), the loss of ‘things’ (the Hansaplast, a hot water bottle, or the Leitz folders), of places (the German forest) and words (from Heimat to *Vergangenheitsbe-*milial and feminine tropes, as they “rebuild and reembody a connection that is disappearing, and thus gender becomes a powerful idiom of remembrance in the face of detachment and forgetting” (Hirsch 2008: 124-125).
wältigung). She wants back what is lost, both through her personal migration and through her family’s past. She seeks the homeliness of familiarity. She desires to know: ‘Who would we be as a family if the war had never happened?’ (Chapter 15). From a distance, the things that symbolize her desire appear strange and mostly as the precursors of what being German ultimately led to: the planning and implementation of mass murder. Therefore, Krug seeks to visually engage with what it means (for her) to be German in a positive sense from the perspective of the present and the future. However, she does not gloss over the negative aspects of German identifications and her discomfort of longing for them.

Krug’s graphic novel is an aesthetic representation of what it means to grow up in a post-National Socialist society. She explores what it means to be a descendent of the persecutors and the bystanders (or Mitläufer16), which is how her maternal grandfather categorized himself in a denazification questionnaire. Krug considers her belonging and attachments to places full of complicity, silenced guilt, shame, accountability, and anti-Semitic emotional heritage (cf. Moré 2013). We take her novel as an aesthetic representation of postmemory – or, rather of postmemories – but, this time, one that considers the reverberations of the perpetrators’ and bystanders’ worlds.

**Heimat and Gegenwartsbewältigung**

As already mentioned, the Guardian (2019) describes Krug’s novel as an act of Vergangenheitsbewältigung, of coming to terms with the past. Germany’s ritualized national remembrance culture — that motivates some to consider Germany an overbearing ‘world champion of remembrance’ (see Meier and Kassel 2015) — seems to be the happy end point of a horrible history that can be left behind by the very act of memory. This desire to be redeemed by remembering is epitomized by Richard Weizsäcker’s speech in 1985 (see ARD 2015), in which he called the end of the war on the eighth of May the ‘day of liberation’ (as if the Nazis had occupied the Germans themselves). Moreover, he promised the German population that sincere remembering could lead to redemption from collective guilt. This suggestion opens a path for Germans as such to become constituted again (or to feel good again) (see Jureit and Schneider 2010: 39; see also Czollek 2018). In this spirit, a reader commented on the German publisher’s website advertising Krug’s novel:

‘What is Heimat? Why have we Germans almost completely eliminated or forgotten our identification with our homeland? Is the German inheritance debt, which has been with us since

---

16 This is one of the ‘German words’ mentioned earlier, which remains untranslated in the UK original. Krug explains it through an image of a ‘sheep’ and the following definition: ‘Mitläufer describes a person lacking courage and moral stance.’ (Chapter 12)
the time of the Third Reich, justified? Are we still guilty? Is it bad to be German? In the course of a family research, the book deals with these questions in detail, stimulating amazement, reflection and a bad conscience. But is it really meaningful and appropriate to feel bad for something that has happened to generations before you? 17

Does belonging for Krug mean a disassociation from the feeling of shame and guilt of being German? 18 Is her graphic novel a way for her to feel better? To feel close to her uncle? She describes how her heart becomes heavy and how she feels attacked when her grandfather is categorized as the ‘Offender’, or how she feels close to her uncle, as never before, when picturing his death on the battlefield. Does such ‘empathy’ contribute to a perpetrator-victim-reversal? 19 Is Heimat Krug’s attempt to redeem her grandfather – or, rather, to substitute him? She reports a telephone conversation with the son of Shoah survivors whose father had written a positive reference for her grandfather in his denazification process, and quotes him saying:

‘You shouldn’t feel guilty’, Walter says with a soft tone of voice, and by telling me this, he does exactly what his father had once done for my grandfather: he signs a testimonial for me. And even though I know that I can’t accept forgiveness for the unforgivable, that individual atonement can’t erase the suffering of millions, the warmth of his voice and his generosity make me feel intimately bound to him, the way I had always longed to be bound to my own grandfather. (Chapter 14)

Should the reader understand Krug’s experience as a problematic scene of reconciliation? If so, is her graphic novel a controversial intervention, or rather problematic in the context of current European nationalist discussions about Heimat? There are no straight answers to these questions. Although she seems to succumb to a desire for reconciliation in the scene above, we did not perceive her entire novel as a way for her to feel good (again) as a German.

17 This is a comment made by user ‘LiteraTouristik’ on 20 January 2019 on Random House’s homepage (see Penguin Verlag 2019).
18 Marija Grujić discussed Krug’s graphic novel with students as part of her ‘Gender, Belonging and War Displacements’ and ‘Introduction to Gendered Nationalism’ courses at Goethe University, Frankfurt. In these class discussions, the students underlined these aspects as particularly problematic.
19 How different is this from the representation of Germans as tragic, decent, guilty-and-not-guilty victims of Hitler in the 2013 TV miniseries Generation War (Unsere Mütter, unsere Väter)? Maxim Biller (2019) describes the miniseries as suggestive to German grandchildren, who are asked to explore how painful the war was for their grandparents. He identifies as subtext of the show the message that the war was horrible for the Germans too – and not only for the Jews, Russians, and French etc.
Instead, Krug seems to embody an ambivalent oscillation between emotional distancing on the one side (the strategy of externalization, of trying to have nothing to do with the perpetrators even though intimately related to them) and expressing her impossible longings for an untroubled home on the other. She swings back and forth between the desire to discover and to disguise (Moré 2013: 26). Furthermore, her work shows her positionality shifting between guilt and (pseudo-)identification, as well as her difficulty and desire of being German beyond those two modes of relating to the past and its influence on the present. At the same time, her Germanness should not be understood as an ontological predicament, but part of her everydayness as citizen and migrant who has crossed many borders by holding a German passport.  

Her graphic novel also raises questions on the role of shame. Is it enough to record and remember, or does an engagement with the Shoah require going through difficult feelings of shame and guilt? As the poet Adrianne Rich (1986: 82) notes, ‘[g]uilt does not move, guilt does not look you in the eyes, guilt does not speak a personal language’. Perhaps Krug needs to stop thinking that this discomfort is something to overcome. Instead of answering the question of whether one needs to feel bad to be German, we argue that her work shows how the deprivation of rights and the murder of European Jews are part of German family histories and how there is no way to overcome this discomfort. One must be at home with it and embrace the feeling of vulnerability it evokes. As Hirsch and other feminist scholars argue, vulnerability is not something that needs to be overcome; it is not a stigma or a sign of powerlessness (see Butler, Gambetti and Sabsay 2016, Hirsch 2016). It can also be an act of resistance, especially in an aesthetic work on past atrocities, if they bring the reader/viewer into the position where they ask themselves about their own involvement and complicity. Still, it must not mean a (symbolic) resolution from your family (though Krug writes about her ‘new’ family – not ‘two’ families, or ‘my’ families, but one ‘back’ and the other ‘forth’ – almost as if letting us think that she moves on from feeling bad about being German).  

Rather than being about reconciliation and coming to terms with the past (Vergangenheitsbewältigung), we would argue that her work demonstrates the Nazi past’s encroachment on the present (Gegenwart). The editors and authors publishing in the journal Jalta: Positions on the Jewish Present

---

20 Nation, like gender, habitually appears in the hegemonic discourses of belonging, as both come to be felt ‘inborn’, something one cannot escape. However, they are social categories of difference which embody hierarchies (Yuval-Davis 2011). In Marija Grujić’s class, the German students with ‘migration history’, or who have migrant parents and grandparents, expressed ambivalence towards their personal role in coming to terms with the Nazi history. On the other hand, some also spoke about their uneasiness with the terms Heimat and homeland, perceiving them as signifiers of their non-belonging to Germany, regardless of the fact that they were born in Germany and held the German passport.
(Brumlik et al. 2018) radically question the pastness of the past and criticize the ‘mentality’ of wanting to draw a line under the past. They propose the notion of Gegenwartsbewältigung (roughly translated as coming to the terms with the present) to denote the process of coming to terms with the present in a post-National Socialist society and how the present is intricately infused with the past. The concept thus defies attempts to integrate the Shoah into a master narrative of a successful German remembrance culture.

Krug’s conclusion concerning the impossibility of Heimat is rather romantic. She thus describes it as:

‘HEIMAT can only be found again in memory, that is something that only begins to exist once you’ve lost it’. She informs us that she asked, ‘all the questions [she] needed to ask – that [she] went back and collected the breadcrumbs until [she] was sure that none were left’ (Epilogue).

Asking, in a ‘post-migrant society’, questions about belonging leaves some people on the ‘outside’. It is surprising that Krug does not ask, for instance, how those Germans with a migration background, or simply the ‘German passport holders’, do not need to (and cannot?) feel discomfort for ‘their’ associations to Germany as such. Isn’t Germany also theirs? Or, does the author suggest that Heimat cannot simply be chosen, and is thus selectively allotted to some?

Does Krug imagine Heimat to be the yearned-for place for the majority of Germans, a place to which the ‘minorities’ do not belong and a place for which they do not long? Defined by the German government as ‘the respect and appreciation of the traditional way of life here’ (Deutscher Bundestag 2018), Heimat is dangerous and requires unpacking. It was not only a central term of Nazi ideology, but also continues to be used as an exclusionary term to define those who can feel comfortable, accommodated and settled in Germany. In this spirit, another poet, Max Czollek (see BR Mediathek 2019), reminds us about what the debates on Heimat omit and exclude by posing the more intimate, vulnerable and demanding question that expects answers in the here and now: ‘Why doesn’t anybody talk about “Zuhause” (to be at home)?’

Heimat: A German Family Album demonstrates how a longing for an untainted, comfortable home might not need to remain unexpressed, but definitely needs to remain unfulfilled. Her embodied ambivalence and desire for a home notwithstanding, the meaning of (post-)home for non-persecuted Germans can only be the ‘inescapability of who we are’ (Chapter 14). An aes-

---

21 There is much debate on whether Heimat is in fact a #GermanDream (see, for example, the interview with Düzen Tekkal, who notes that ‘also those migrants need to be heard who do not merely complain about Germany but also regard it as their homeland [Heimat]’; see Schippmann 2018) or a nightmare (see Aydemir and Yaghoobifarah 2019).
thetic engagement with belonging to Germany cannot avoid presences of the past (starting from the street stones to stumble upon)\textsuperscript{22} to a tangibility of unquestioned (family) attachments, loyalties and the numerous ‘blind spots’ they entail. It has to be able to tell us that it is \textit{alright} to continue feeling vulnerable in the face of the discomfort of a home that in intricately woven into the histories of anti-Semitism, its persecution and its industrialized genocide.
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Mexiko-Stadt im Sinne der *Grounded Theory*-Methodologie während des Forschungsprozesses selbst (S. 31).


Während Streule die *Recorridos Explorativos* als eine Form von Wahrnehmungsspaziergängen definiert, bei denen sie hauptsächlich beobachtet, bezieht sie bei ihrer zweiten Strategie, den *Entrevistas en Movimiento*, Interviewpartner*innen ein. Beide Methoden sind insofern als mobile Ethnografie zu verstehen, als dass die Forscherin hier Informationen aufnimmt und Daten sammelt, während sie sich selbst innerhalb des Raumes bewegt. Bei den *Recorridos Explorativos* bewegte sich die Forscherin beobachtend durch verschiedene Viertel in Mexiko-Stadt, die sie dann anhand der gemachten Beobachtungen kartographisch aufarbeitete. Dafür entwarf sie ein Kategorisierungssystem für die von ihr wahrgenommenen (Urbanisierungs-) Prozesse und teilte diesen jeweils Proben, also Teile der Stadt zu, innerhalb derer sich diese Prozesse untersuchen lassen (S. 33-35). Im zweiten Schritt führte Streule die *Entrevistas en Movimiento* durch, bei denen sie ihre Interviewpartner*innen nach den Prämissen der *Grounded Theory* anhand eines theoretischen Sampling aussuchte. Sie beschreibt diese Methode als Leitfadeninterviews, bei denen sowohl sie selbst als Forscherin als auch ihre Gesprächspartner*innen sich durch ein spezifisches Areal bewegen und da-
bei während der Interviewsituation mit dem Raum interagieren. Das ermöglicht eine Kombination der ethnografischen Beobachtung mit der Interviewführung und verknüpft erfragtes Wissen mit Erlebtem (S. 35-38).


Nach der Erläuterung der theoretischen Grundlagen und der angewandten Methoden zur Datenerhebung widmet sich die Autorin der Erläuterung der Darstellungsweise ihrer Ergebnisse in Form einer Karte bzw. dem Prozess des Kartierens. Auch hier erscheint die Vorgehensweise schlüssig. Streu-


Sie führt die Leser*innen zunächst ins Centro, Reforma und Santa Fe, welche sie dem Prozess der Centralidades Metropolitanas zuordnet. Dieser ist geprägt durch Zentralität als entscheidende Komponente für urbane Prozesse, die auch auf umliegende Teile der Stadt wirken und dort wiederum weitere Transformationen auslösen (S. 191-201). Diese werden bezeichnet als Efecto Bando Dos, welche vor allem Umwertungsprozesse durch Verdrängung in zentrumsnahen Vierteln zum Gegenstand haben (S. 201-210). Im nächsten Prozess der Zonas Residenciales gipfeln solche Umwertungsprozesse oft in einer gewissen Verdrängung, da hier Wohnviertel vor allem für wohlhabende Bürger*innen in vorteilhafter Lage geschaffen wurden und werden (S. 210-225). Der nun folgende Efecto Santa Fe beschreibt einen Vorgang, welcher maßgeblich von den Entwicklungen der Centralidades Met-


Monika Streule hat sich mit der ethnografischen Annäherung an den hochkomplexen metropolitanen Raum Mexiko-Stadt eine schwierige Aufgabe gesetzt – und sie gemeistert. Das Buch „Ethnografie urbaner Territorien. Metropolitane Urbanisierungsprozesse von Mexiko-Stadt“ ist all denjenigen zu empfehlen, die nach überzeugenden Beispielen für innovative stadtethnologische Forschungen suchen, wie auch jenen, die Freude an einem tieferen
Einblick in die Kartographie sozialräumlicher Zusammenhänge haben, aber auch denjenigen, die Mexiko-Stadt und seine spezifischen territorialen Konstellationen besser kennenlernen wollen. Es ergibt sich ein ganzheitliches Bild von Mexiko-Stadt, welches es ermöglicht, das Wirkungsgefüge von Urbanisierungsprozessen nachzuvollziehen und besser zu verstehen. Das Zusammenführen der theoretischen Komplexität mit der dichten Ethnografie bleibt dabei allerdings zuweilen Aufgabe der Leser*innen. Hier könnte sich so manche*r vielleicht zuweilen Wünschen, Streule hätte eine*n nochmal an die Hand genommen und mehr Hilfestellung geboten bei der Übertragungsleistung, die reichen ethnografischen Beispiele mit der theoretischen Analyse ausdrücklich und direkt zu verknüpfen.


Svenja Schöneich ist Doktorandin am Institut für Ethnologie der Universität Hamburg und Fellow des Doktorandenprogrammes des German Institute of Global and Area Studies (GIGA).

Hartmut Lang und Astrid Wonneberger


Die Passage, mit der wir uns hier nachträglich befassen, ist betitelt „Das mosaische Modell der Hebräer“. Es geht dort darum, die verwandtschaftsethnologischen Inhalte der Bibel, genauer gesagt, in den fünf Büchern Mose des Alten Testaments ,herauszupräparieren‘.

Unserem Nachtrag liegt folgende Prämisse zugrunde: Nur mit den fachethnologischen Werkzeugen kann man die Verwandtschaftsethnologie der Bibel nicht erschließen; vielmehr muss auch theologisches Fachwissen einbezogen werden. Uns selbst fehlt dieses Wissen, und was wir wissen, reicht gerade einmal aus, um diese Prämisse plausibel zu finden. Wir wollten diese Prämisse aber gerne auf einen solideren Prüfstand stellen und haben uns zu diesem Zweck an einen klassischen Vertreter der Theologie, einen evangelischen Pfarrer, gewandt. Diesen haben wir um eine fachkundige Beurteilung des pfefferschen Texts gebeten, welche er geliefert hat - dankenswerterweise.

Diese Idee wurde erst nachträglich verwirklicht, denn wir wollten zunächst die Hauptsache, nämlich die Rezension des ganzen Buchs, zu einem Ende bringen. Erst dann haben wir uns an das Thema gewagt, bei dem wir fürchteten, es könnte sich selbst zu einer Hauptsache auswachsen. Wie sich herausstellte, hatten wir uns da nicht getäuscht.

Pfeffers Text besteht aus folgenden Abschnitten:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D1.1 Das mosaische Modell der Hebräer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Auslese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Conus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Primogenitur und Rang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sexualität</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Brautgaben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Hypergamie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Diachronische Auswirkungen individueller Heiraten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Fazit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Die Hirten-Herde-Metapher

Diese Metapher ist in der Bibel nicht unbekannt. Der Hirte kann Gott sein und die Herde die Hebräer, aber gelegentlich auch die gesamte Menschheit; und wenn es nur die Hebräer sind, können Propheten oder Könige die Hirten sein.

In Pfeffers Text nun stößt man in diesem Zusammenhang auf wesentlich mächtigere und reichhaltiger ausgestattete Bilder. Dazu wird der Leser zunächst einmal mit dem Vorbild der Metapher vertraut gemacht und erfährt dabei unter anderem dies: Die Hebräer haben Ziegen und Schafe gehalten; und eine Schafherde geht auf ihren Wanderungen stromlinienförmig1 hinter dem Leittier her, das der älteste und stärkste unter den Widdern ist. Diesem voran schreitet der Herr und Hirte.

Mit diesen Vorbild-Komponenten gestaltet Pfeffer dann seine umfassende Metapher des Alten Testaments, wo die Menschheit eine gigantische Herde ist, die in Stromlinienform den alten bedeutenden Männern folgt.

Der Theologe bemängelt an diesen Ausführungen dies: All diese pfefferschen Zutaten trafen nicht zu, und zwar weder in der Welt der realen Herden, noch in der Welt des Alten Testaments; und er stellt die Frage, wann Pfeffer wohl zum letzten Mal eine reale Schafherde gesehen habe.

---

1 Pfeffer benutzt tatsächlich den Ausdruck Stromlinienform in dieser neuen oder jedenfalls sehr ungewöhnlichen Bedeutung.
Die Verhaltensbiologie von Herden ist gewiss kein Teilgebiet der Theologie. Um aber herauszufinden, wer es wie mit der Wahrheit hält, haben wir die Korrektheit der biologischen Daten in Theorie und Praxis gecheckt.


„Natürlicherweise besteht eine Schafherde aus Mutterschafen und ihren Lämmern. Die Widder sind nur während der Brunstzeit in der Herde. […] Wie bei den Rindern und Ziegen regelt auch bei den Schafen die Rangordnung das Zusammenleben der Tiere. In der Regel dominieren die Widder die weiblichen Tiere. Der Widder führt jedoch nie eine Herde, sondern verteidigt nur seine Position und deckt die brünstigen Schafe.“ (Schweizer Tierschutz STS, o.J.)


Primogenitur

Theologe nicht ohne Grund; denn in diesem und weiteren Passus lässt sich manches an der pfefferschen Darstellung nicht in konsistenter Weise mit dem Bibeltext in Einklang bringen.


Man könnte meinen, das Opfer nicht „gnädig ansehen“, sei ein Verhalten, das niemand fröhlich stimmt, und schon gar nicht (vermutlich) einen Erstgeborenen. Nur verliert man mit solchen Überlegungen und mit dieser Geschichte die Primogenitur ein wenig aus den Augen. Ob hier Primogenitur-Regeln im Spiel gewesen sind oder nicht, bleibt also unklar. Das macht aber nichts, denn als Nächstes kümmert sich Pfeffer ohnehin darum, was aus den Nachkommen von Kain geworden ist, nämlich „fahrendes Volk“, „Gaukler“ und „Musiker“ und „Schmiede“.


2 Wir haben leider keine Ahnung, wie viel biblische Geschichte man heute bei unseren Lesern voraussetzen kann. Hier gehen wir von der Annahme aus, es könnte weniger als die Hälfte sein.
3 In der katholischen Übersetzung der Bibel steht „auf Kain und seine Gabe schaute er nicht“.
denn er sagt, auch Manasse werde Stammvater eines Volkes, aber aus Ephraims Volk werde das Größere.

Das Eingreifen von Josef belegt die Existenz des Primogenitur-Prinzips. Solche Belege gibt es noch öfters in der Bibel. Weiterhin belegt die Geschichte die Existenz einer Zeremonialgeste (s. rechte Hand).

Die Segnung selbst aber enthält Komponenten, die man als Erweiterung von Begrifflichkeit und Sachlogik der Primogenitur interpretieren kann oder vielleicht gar muss. Die Erweiterung bringt zugleich mächtige Komplikationen mit sich, die das Primogenitur-Prinzip bei den Hebräern, und wer weiß bei wem sonst noch betreffen. Wir nennen sie mangels eines besseren Namens 'Erzvaterschaft', die ja unter anderem auch die relative Größe des Volkes einschließt.


Die Geschwisterehe

Pfeffer führt die Geschwisterehe so ein: Abraham, ein Patriarch von einmaligem Rang, hat Sara geheiratet, die die Tochter seines Vaters, aber nicht seiner Mutter ist. Die Ehepartner sind also Halbgeschwister, und überhaupt ist diese Geschwisterehe einmalig in der Geschichte der Hebräer. Diese Geschichte beschäftigt Pfeffer sowohl in Abschnitt 5 als auch 7.

In der Welt, über die Pfeffer spricht, gelten folgende Werte. Wenn die Menschen dort ihre Töchter anderen als (Ehe-)Frauen geben, dann empfinden sie das als Schmach, Schande und Demütigung. Frauen weggeben lässt sie ihre Minderwertigkeit spüren. Durch geeignete Kategorienbildung wird es aber möglich, dies zu umgehen. Pfeffer führt dazu eine Redewendung der Paschtunen an, die sagen, der Mann heiratet sich selbst.

Die Geschwisterehe – sonst eine der schwersten Normbrüche bei den Hebräern – hat im Fall von Abraham und Sara eine Umwertung zur Folge. Es wird daraus ein Ausdruck von unvorstellbarer Heiligkeit. Solche Umwertungen von Werten haben Ethnologen so häufig angetroffen, dass jedenfalls

---

5 Wörtlich steht heute in der Bibel an dieser Stelle zu lesen, „sein jüngerer Bruder wird größer als er“ (1. Mose 48, 19).
6 Alle mit „*“ markierten Wörter sind Schlüsselwörter im Vokabular des pfefferschen Texts.
die (hierarchischen) Strukturalisten, zu denen Pfeffer gehört, dafür den Terminus Inversion eingeführt haben.

Der Theologe konnte Pfeffers Deutung des Bibeltextes hier nicht folgen; und dieser Deutung sollen nun die drei Geschichten aus dem Alten Testament, die einen Bezug zur Geschwisterehe haben, gegenübergestellt werden. Die Geschichten gleichen einander, aber sie unterscheiden sich auch.

Wir werden zunächst darstellen, worin die Varianten übereinstimmen. In Gang gebracht werden sie so: Einen Mann verschlägt es mit Weib, Gesinde und Vieh in die Fremde, und dieser Mann befürchtet, die Menschen dort könnten ihn töten, weil sie es auf seine Frau abgesehen haben. Daraufhin hat der Ehemann die Idee, man könnte die möglicherweise bösen Fremden wissen lassen, seine Frau sei seine Schwester, so dass man ihn nicht töten muss, um sich ihr zu nähern. Gesagt getan! Früher oder später kommt es aber in allen drei Varianten heraus, dass die Frau gar nicht die Schwester, sondern die Ehefrau ist.


Nun weiß Pfeffer in seiner Interpretation sehr viel darüber, wie sich die Hebräer gefühlt haben, wenn sie Frauen in die Ehe weggegeben haben, und wie bei den Hebräern aus einem Normbruch eine heilige Andersartigkeit wurde. Beispiele für solche Denkweisen gibt es gewiss anderswo in der Welt. Die Frage ist aber, gab es diese auch bei den Hebräern des Alten Testaments zur Zeit, als der Patriarch Abraham mit Frau, Kindern und Kindeskindern noch lebten, oder als die Geschichten erzählt wurden. Der Theologe weiß davon nichts. Er kennt keine Belege dafür in der Bibel, und er stellt wie gesagt
fest, dass bei Pfeffer wiederholt die Belege fehlen, die es ja dann auch mögli-
cherweise bis sicherlich nicht gibt.

Mehrfache Überlieferungen von Geschichten und Textpassagen, wie wir sie am Beispiel der Schwester-Lüge in den drei Geschichten vorgeführt ha-
ben, gibt es im Übrigen in Mengen im Alten wie im Neuen Testament, mit
Übereinstimmungen und Verschiedenheit in den unterschiedlichsten Gra-
den. Damit haben die Theologen also Erfahrungen und wissen, was möglich
ist oder nicht möglich, und was mal mehr, mal weniger regelmäßig wieder-
kehrt.

Auch haben sich die Theologen über Varianten wie die Geschwisterehe-
Variante schon länger Gedanken gemacht und auf eine bestimmte Interpre-
tation geeinigt. So gilt heute die Variante mit Geschwisterehe eben nicht
als Beispiel für die Umwertung von Werten zu Abrahams Zeiten, sondern
als eine „sehr spät entstandene“ Nacherzählung, der man diese Ergänzung
beigefügt hat, weil ein Abraham, der lügt, „nicht mehr vorstellbar war“. Als
Nicht-Theologe weiß Pfeffer davon nichts, und falls doch, spart er sich eine
Erklärung, aber nimmt in Kauf, für uninformiert gehalten zu werden.

Das mosaische Modell der Hebräer

Woran der Theologe ernstlich Anstoß genommen hat und gewiss auch neh-
men musste, ist der Titel der Passage, den wir gerade wiederholt haben.
Was meint der Titel? Gibt es nur ein einziges Modell? Mosaisch kann nicht,
wie Pfeffer gelegentlich explizit oder implizit schreibt, die Bibel insgesamt
meinen, sondern nur einen Teil des Alten Testaments, nämlich die 5 Bücher
Mose. Auf diese Bücher beziehen sich jedenfalls ausschließlich die wenigen
Belegstellen, die in der pfefferschen Passage vorkommen, und das Neue Tes-
tament wird nur kurz gestreift.

Die Bücher Mose sind übrigens auch nicht alle von einem Autor namens
Mose verfasst worden, sondern sind über einen Zeitraum von mehreren
hundert Jahren entstanden und beziehen sich auf unterschiedliche und sich
wandelnde Verhältnisse. Darüber besteht Einigkeit in der Theologie.

Auch der Ausdruck „die Hebräer“ kann einen ziemlich viel oder wenig
umfassenden Bedeutungsumfang haben. Wenn wir im Rahmen der christli-
chen, also der Bibel-Texte, bleiben, bedeutet das immer noch einen Umfang,
der tausende von Jahren umfasst. Sollte dieses eine Modell sich auf die vielen
Varianten der Texte und ihrer Deutungen beziehen und gültig sein für alle
Zeiten? Das würde eine Konstanz implizieren, die im Widerspruch zu zentra-
len kulturwissenschaftlichen Axiomen stünde. All diese gerade aufgezählten
Fragen bleiben bei Pfeffer unberührt.

Schließlich sollte auch noch darauf hingewiesen werden, wozu sich
Pfeffer mit Bibelexegese abgibt. Mindestens ein Zweck oder möglicherwei-
se der ultimative ist der Kulturvergleich, der ja auch schon innerhalb der
Bibelexegese-Passage gelegentlich angesprochen wird. In dem Kapitel (D),
in dem die Passage zuhause ist, warten Gesellschaften „vom Atlas bis zum
Indus“ auf den Vergleich, der von den Erkenntnissen der Bibelexegese profi-
tieren soll. Hier sind wir allerdings jenseits unserer Fragestellung angelangt,
und ab hier bedeutet das für uns ‚life is too short‘... 

Resümee

Die Dinge, die dem Theologen bei seiner fachkundigen Durchsicht der pfef-
ferschen Bibelexegese aufgefallen sind, haben uns auf einige echte und spezi-
fische Vorteile der Zusammenarbeit mit der Theologie aufmerksam gemacht.
Das Leithammel-Rätsel gehört offenkundig nicht dazu. Solche Patzer lassen
sich fachintern ‚behandeln‘.

Das Primogenitur-Problem hat auf Neuland verwiesen, genauer gesagt
auf neue Fragestellungen für Ethnologie und möglicherweise auch Theologie.
Das ist auf jeden Fall ein Existenzbeweis für den spezifischen Nutzen der
Theologie für die Ethnologie, der für uns erst richtig ersichtlich wurde durch
Jakobs Segnung; und diese Deutung und überhaupt den Umgang mit den
Geschichten des Alten Testaments haben wir erst von dem Theologen richtig
gelernt.

Die Geschwisterehe hat uns auf die klassischen Vorteile der fachüber-
greifenden Zusammenarbeit hingewiesen. Man stößt also auf Gegenstände,
die man im harmloseren Fall nicht immer ohne Zusammenarbeit gefunden
hätte, oder aber wie in unserem Fall, wo ‚wir‘ (die Ethnologen) ohne Zusam-
menarbeit etwas gefunden haben und sogar der Überzeugung waren, mit un-
seren eigenen Mitteln perfekt ans Ziel gelangt zu sein, und dabei übersehen,
dass es da schon fertige und etablierte Interpretationen gibt, die wir schlicht
und einfach ignorieren.

Interdisziplinarität ist kein Allheilmittel für jede Art des Forschens,
manchmal aber ist sie unbedingt notwendig. Das ist es, was, wie wir ‚glaub-
en‘, der Bibel-Exegese-Fall zeigt.
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