Doná, G., Brun, C. and Fábos, A. (2023) Home and forced migration, in P. Boccagni (ed) *Handbook on Home and Migration,* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing (pp. 42-54)

Home and Forced Migration[1]

Giorgia Doná, Cathrine Brun and Anita Fábos

ABSTRACT

This chapter examines the meaning of home and its evolution in the interdisciplinary field of Forced Migration and Refugee Studies over the last seven decades. From an initial phase in which home was implicitly rather than explicitly studied, we now witness burgeoning literature on home. Connecting scholarship and geo-political realities, we identify the three main phases of this transformation. From the 'classic' notion of home that overlaps with the nation-state in Phase I, through the critique of the 'refugee cycle' scholars explored the multiple meanings of home in Phase II. Home was viewed as multi-scalar, diverse and translocal. In Phase III, scholars document processes of belonging and estrangements and the proliferation of contingent, fragmented and precarious home(s) that have unsettled the meaning of home. We suggest a contrapuntal, mobile, rhythmic understanding of home in displacement that brings to the fore ambiguities, complexities, and the messiness of home for forced migrants.

Keywords (six): home; forced migration; refugee studies; belonging; nation-state; displacement;

[1] This chapter has been conceptualised and written collaboratively. For the purpose of authorship, the first author has taken the coordinating role.

INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines how the concept of home has been understood and addressed in the interdisciplinary field of refugee and forced migration studies. While home is relevant for individuals in general, it is even more significant for people who experience uprootedness, displacement and migration, as these trajectories are often accompanied by the loss of material, relational and symbolic homes, and the (re) imagining and (re-)making of new homes.

Home is a complex concept (Blunt and Dowling 2006; Mallett 2004). In the field of forced migration and refugee studies, home is generally understood to be multi-scalar: it refers to dwelling, local community, nation, nation state, and transnational belonging (Brun and Fábos 2015; Taylor 2015). It may be experienced inside and across national borders, in urban and rural settings as well as refugee camps and other settings of displacement (Fábos 2015; Haugen 2019; Omata 2016). In addition to its spatial dimensions, home also has temporal connotations. Displacements can be short- and long-term, and increasingly contexts of temporary residence become sites of prolonged habitation, revealing the coexistence of permanency and temporariness of home-making across stages of displacements (Jansen and Löfving 2009; Trapp 2015). Home for forced migrants has both material and symbolic qualities (Brun 2015; Dudley 2010). It has idealised aspects that describe aspirational norms and ideals, as described in the myth of return (Al-Rasheed 1994) and its lived reality (Muggeridge and Doná 2006). Home is not a static entity but rather a dynamic process of emplacement (Blachnicka-Ciacek 2018). Importantly, home is conceptualised differently by different stakeholders, such as policy makers, researchers, humanitarians and forced migrants (Brun and Fábos 2017; Taylor 2013). This variety of perspectives may lead to different understandings, and at times tensions, in the articulation of the meaning of home.

In this chapter, we examine the meaning of home and practice of home-making with a specific focus on forced migrants. The term refers to the forced movement of people in search of protection inside and across borders to include internally displaced populations, asylum seekers and refugees[2]. We situate our analysis of home for forced migrants within the broader fields of

[2] We use the term 'forced migration' to describe in general the involuntary movement of individuals and communities and the term 'refugee' to refer to individuals who are pushed to flee their homes because of conflict, generalised violence and human rights abuses and are in search of protection. We use terms like 'asylum seekers' and 'internally displaced populations' to refer to specific legal, administrative and geographical contexts of migration in search of protection. Asylum seekers are forced migrants whose application to protection is in the process of being examined; refugees are both individuals with legal protection status and more broadly populations who have crossed borders in search of protection, while internally displaced individuals are those who still reside within the borders of the nation-state but are unable to avail themselves of the protection of the state.

migration and mobility studies, and associated fields of transnationalism and diaspora studies (Boccagni, Murcia, and Belloni 2020). Thus, we adopt an interdisciplinary approach to the understanding of home in forced migration research that is informed by related fields of study.

We offer a chronological overview - divided into three phases - of the concept of home in the evolving field of forced migration and refugee studies. We situate home and home-making within changing geo-political realities and policy responses to refugee movements. These political, social, and cultural realities shape how home is conceptualised by scholars. While situating the developments of the concept of home that are located within geopolitical realities, we emphasise the perspectives of people living with displacement. We conclude with an overview of the current field of study and identify new areas of research.

Different meanings of home have been expressed in forced migration and refugee policy and scholarship over time. In this section, we follow a periodisation approach that identifies three main phases: the 'classic' notion of home and the nation-state; the multiple meanings of home; and unsettling the meaning of home. We trace the shift that starts from an unquestioning stance where the meaning of home is taken for granted, then moves through exploring multiple meanings of home, and lastly problematizes the concept of home itself. These phases represent a shift from a classical standpoint to the meaning of home in refugee studies to more critical discussions of home in forced migration studies. They reveal a transition from essentialist to constructivist perspectives, from an essentialist notion of home that is defined by nation-states boundaries to post-colonial and intersectional critiques of the concept of home itself. While specific elements coexist across the three phases and continuities persist across periods, we argue that dominant understandings of the meaning of home change across phases in ways that are significantly distinctive.

PHASE I: THE 'CLASSIC' NOTION OF HOME AND THE NATION STATE

Even though throughout history, people have been forced to leave their places of residence, it is in the second half of the 20th century that our modern understanding of refugee movements and responses to forced uprootedness began. This period saw major involuntary migrations across the globe, which were followed by national and international humanitarian responses and the formation of policy and legal frameworks, most notably the redaction of the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. From the end of WWII through the liberation struggles of former colonies to the collapse of the Soviet Union, the global system of nation-states became the hegemonic framework through which involuntary migration was regulated (Turton 2002). Following from this, permanent resettlement in a new home country became the most popular 'durable' solution in the 1970s and 1980s for major groups fleeing persecution including Southeast Asian refugees, Latin Americans fleeing dictatorships and Eastern Europeans fleeing the Soviet bloc (Gallagher 1994).

What can be understood to be the 'classic' notion of home at this time is an essentialist one: home refers to a place, a territory, a country of origin and a country of destination (Brun 2001; Brun and Fábos 2015). In this essentialist perspective, home is approached by key international actors in the refugee regime as overlapping entirely with the nation-state. In the post-WWII world order in which the nation-state system is the main organising principle for regulating movements inside and across borders, home is where an individual has the right to reside and the right to citizenship. For instance, Article 1 of the 1951 Refugee Convention defines refugees as those individuals who are outside the country of origin and are unable or unwilling to return to it. To be considered for refugee status, an individual must be without a home country to call their own. The state therefore provides a political home for everybody except those who flee because of lack of and in search of protection. Similarly, Kunz's (1973) kinetic model of migration revolves around the idea of nation-states when making a distinction between refugees and immigrants, with the former 'pushed away' from the country of origin and the latter 'pulled into' the country of resettlement.

During this phase, the classic notion of home overlapping with nation-states is taken for granted rather than questioned. This view of home is closely linked to refugee policy and policy-driven research that categorises responses to involuntary migration in terms of 'durable' and 'temporary' solutions to refugee crises. The three durable solutions -- local integration, resettlement, and repatriation -- are very much reliant on the unquestioned idea of a place of destination or return defined by national boundaries (Brun and Fábos 2017; UNHCR 1989). The place for former refugees to call home is assumed to be located within the borders of a new country of settlement or resettlement or in the country of origin where refugees return to. Temporary solutions describe residual situations of liminality, the most notable being a sojourn in refugee camps. Temporary spaces are set up with a view to providing humanitarian assistance to displaced populations in the short-term. To make a home in these transient spaces in-between where refugees live in policy limbo waiting for a permanent solution was not regarded as a priority by policy makers and humanitarian workers.

Categorisation of refugee movements is formulated, in this phase, along the continuum pre-flight-flight-post-flight/arrival that similarly draws connections between movements and homes. Kuhlman (1990) points out that Kunz distinguishes three categories of factors, which he calls home-related, displacement-related, and host-related. The pre-flight/flight/arrival image posits that the refugee journey follows a linear trajectory from a place of leaving to a place of arrival, and from an abrupt and involuntary departure from one's home (country) to a destination where a new home is found. In this framing, one's lost home (country) is replaced by another home (country) at a place of arrival. In the 1980s, the prevailing view was that settlement and resettlement were permanent, and open reception policies in host countries were available to support newcomers who presumably were making a new home. Most reception policy models of western countries supported assimilation (Castles 1998; Kunz 1981) and acculturation processes (Doná and Berry

1999) and were largely based on experiences of European Jews, East European refugees and South East Asians fleeing to North America and Europe.

Whereas research on refugees, with a focus on long-term settlement and adaptation implying a permanent home, was predominantly conducted by scholars located in institutions in resettlement countries of the global North (Berry 1990; Kunz 1981; Neuwirth 1988), it is important to note that struggles over homes, homelands and home countries were unfolding in the global south. The colonial legacy of the creation of artificial borders, liberation struggles for independence and partitions resulted in mass involuntary population movements across Africa and parts of Asia in the second part of the 20th century. The formation of post-colonial nation-states did not consider the overlap between national borders and ethnic homelands. In the spirit of pan-Africanism, newly formed nation-states in Africa adopted a continental approach to hosting refugees, which was officialised in 1969 by the Organisation of African Unity Convention Governing the Specific Problems of Refugees in Africa. Across Asia, partitions and mass populations movements were interlinked with the formation of new 'home' countries and the search for new dwellings for Muslim and Hindu populations (Banerjee and Samaddar 2019).

Within the classic solutions-based triad of pre-flight/flight/arrival, flight constitutes an intermediary step, a short phase in-between to be succeeded by the arrival at a destination. This view presumes that refugees who are stuck in the post-departure and pre-arrival condition are confined to life in limbo (Harrell-Bond and Voutira 1992), generally associated with temporary solutions to refugee crises. To be in limbo, in this view, means not having a place to call home and not being able to feel at home. It implies that refugees are stuck in between two options only. Malkki (1992) locates the scholarly and humanitarian view of refugees' involuntary uprootedness as an anomaly in the hegemonic sedentary bias. According to this bias, people are at home only when they are settled. It follows that refugees who are forced to move and find themselves outside their countries of origin are the anomaly--people without a place to call home.

Over time, the interests and agendas of policy makers, practitioners, and researchers led to the formation of the field of Refugees Studies. The field brought together scholars, humanitarian workers and policy makers to discuss geo-political realities leading to refugee movements and legal, political, and humanitarian responses to refugee crises under the auspices of the Refugee Studies Programme of Oxford University in the early 1980s. The connections between policy, practice and theory in conceptualizing home can be seen in the notion of the 'refugee cycle' that emerged in the 1990s (Black and Koser 1999) and builds upon Kunz's pre-flight/flight/arrival model. The perspective of a 'refugee cycle' describes the cycle of violence, persecution and flight that repeats itself, and its termination that is achieved when refugees return home. The point of departure in the cycle is the forced uprootedness of individuals and communities from their places of habitual residence in the home country; the cycle is considered closed with the return of refugees to their

country of origin. Other trajectories, such as migrants' efforts to find a safe place to live in the different spaces of local settlement, camps, urban dwellings or in a resettlement location, are included in the cycle but they are not necessarily considered to be the aspirational, ultimate closure of the cycle. The refugee cycle model mirrored the expectations of the international community that viewed going 'home'--that is, repatriation--as the preferred solution to the end of the refugee trajectory.

This section has shown that in the decades following WWII to the 1980s the concept of home was not explicitly examined in refugee policy and scholarship. It was implicitly linked to the home country and taken for granted. There was a linearity to the refugee journey that started with the loss of home and ended with the reconstitution of a permanent home at destination, either a place of permanent settlement in the linear pre-flight-flight-arrival triad or return to the home country at the end of the refugee cycle. Towards the end of the 1980s and early 1990s, geo-political realities rapidly shifted globally while the field of Refugee Studies consolidated. This resulted in an emerging scholarship that began to unpack the overlap of home with the nation-state. This questioning became particularly salient in relation to repatriation and the end of the refugee cycle. In this next phase, researchers introduced and began to explicitly examine the multiple meanings of home.

PHASE II: FROM QUESTIONING THE END OF THE REFUGEE CYCLE TO EXPLORING THE MULTIPLE MEANINGS OF HOME

The 1990s saw a geopolitical realignment following the end of the Cold War, with the collapse of the Soviet Union and ethno-nationalist violence erupting in countries such as Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, amongst others. In this new geo-political post-cold war order, refugees' political value in the ideological war between communism and capitalism diminished (Bloch and Doná 2019). This geo-political shift was accompanied by a change in international responses towards migrants that favoured restrictive resettlement policies combined with the preference for the return of refugees to their countries of origin. With increasing numbers of people fleeing, and conflicts ending, the decade of the 1980s marked an international shift toward return to a home country (UNHCR 1983; UNHCR 1989). Considering changes in geo-political conditions and policy priorities, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Sadako Ogata described the 1990s as the 'decade of return' (Macdonald and Porter 2020; UNHCR 1985). According to Crisp (2001) UNHCR shifted from being 'exile oriented' to becoming a 'home-land oriented' agency.

In this second phase of home and forced migration thinking, researchers turned to the study of repatriation, and based on their post-return findings began to problematize the idea of return home as the 'end' of the refugee cycle. Research on repatriation critiqued the discourse of home as

equated with homecoming and the happy ending of the refugee cycle was questioned (Eastmond and Ojendal 1999; Muggeridge and Doná 2006; Stefanson 2006; Warner 1994). In this phase, refugee studies scholars also questioned the classic idea of home that was founded on the system of nation-states. Drawing from research with forced migrants and returnees, scholars challenged the essentialist singular notion of home in terms of country of origin or resettlement and began to highlight the idea of the multiple meanings of homes (Capo 2015).

The lost-and-found idea of home reflects a simplified, uni-directional conceptualisation of movement that fails to capture the multi-directionality of trajectories and the complex processes of emplacement and displacement. Key contributions that opened new understandings of home for forced migrants began to emerge in the late 1990s with contributions from diaspora literature (Graham and Khosravi 1997) and early 2000s through critical analysis of repatriation (Hammond 2004). Furthermore, there was a realisation that homemaking took place in situations of temporary and protracted displacement, with an emerging body of research on home-making practices across different contexts of forced migration (Dudley 2010; Taylor 2015).

At the same time, the understanding and interest in forced migration expanded to include internally displaced people - making visible the experiences of people forced to leave their homes to become displaced within the nation-state boundaries. This raised new questions for the understanding of home within the home country and established the recognition that the experiences of home making in displacement were often shared between refugees crossing borders and the internally displaced inside nation-state borders. The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (UNOCHA 1999) showed that feeling at home and the right to safety in the home country were distinct ideas. Similarly, the short-lived international experiment of creating 'safe havens' in countries of origin (Hyndman 2003) showed that home inside the boundaries of the nation-state, presumably a space of safety, could be severely undermined and become a space of unsafety and death.

The increased emphasis on return and internal displacement should also be seen in relation to shifts towards more restrictive immigration policies by governments of traditional countries of resettlement. These policies coincided with the preference for the containment of refugee movement to the global south, and most often in situations of encampments (Hyndman 2000). Restrictive immigration policies, combined with renewed and longer conflicts that became known as 'new' wars (Kaldor 1999) meant that permanent solutions to refugee movements, most notably repatriation, were eroded and replaced by the introduction of temporary protection measures. These included, for instance, temporary status for Bosnian refugees crossing European borders in the early-mid-1990s (Al-Ali and Koser 2002).

During this second phase, the replacement of permanent with temporary solutions marked a related shift in the understanding of home in refugee and forced migration studies that challenged the view of home and its connections to permanency. During Phase I, the view of home and forced migration disconnected home from limbo under temporary solutions, which exclusively described the predicament of people being caught in-between nation states and unable to make a home. Policy makers and humanitarian actors largely assumed that home was about achieving durable solutions - i.e., permanent residency in a host country or return to the previous country of citizenship. The rise and consolidation of permanent temporariness sparked research on the ways in which refugees made a home in protracted displacements (Boer 2015) and led to a more critical perspective reinforced through research on current policies and practice towards a singular home and endpoint for forced migrants. Following from this policy research was also the analysis of 'domopolitics' and ways in which border practices and the governance of asylum seekers took place through their accommodation, which was mainly seen to deprive asylum seekers of the possibility of homemaking (Darling 2011; Thorshaug at al 2019).

In this period, research focussed on the explicit study of home flourished, contributing to notions of home in displacement as multiscalar, diverse and translocal (Brun 2015, 2016; Graham and Khosravi 1997, Kabachnik et al. 2010; Zetter 1991). Additionally, research began to include the experiences of home for those who stayed behind, recognising the transnational dimensions of home (Van Hear 2020). For instance, Taylor (2013) identified spatial, temporal, material, and relational dimensions of home for Cypriot refugees settled in the UK while Brun and Fábos (2015) developed the conceptual framework of the constellation of HOME-Home-home to explain the ways in which different stakeholders understand home in situations of policy limbo. The constellation distinguishes three dimensions visually coded as HOME, referring to the global order and institutions, Home, referring to values, traditions, memories and feelings, and home, describing day-to-day practices of homemaking in exile.

The essentialist and sedentary notions of home described in the first phase were placed under scrutiny, and to a certain extent, scholars de-linked home from the nation-state. They approached home and forced migration as a multi-scalar and even multi-sited experience and practice. They also demonstrated that experiences of displacement within and across borders were more similar to one another, and people remained more connected, than was described in Phase 1 (Al-Rasheed 1994, Brun 2015, 2016; Graham and Khosravi 1997; Kabachnik et al. 2010; Muggeridge and Doná 2006; Zetter 1991).

At the same time, researchers increasingly emphasised people's agency mobilised during displacement, exploring the multiple and diverse spaces of displacement where the dynamics of 'home' and 'home-making' were emerging. These spaces went beyond the traditional refugee camps to encompass the myriad spaces where forced migrants were living in self-settled, urban,

and rural areas - because the traditional durable solutions were increasingly out of reach (Fábos and Kibreab 2007). These homemaking practices then contributed for many displaced people across the globe to finding ways for *de facto* informal integration and grass-root homemaking (Bloch and Doná 2019; Landau 2019). Despite the lack of a formal status in places of displacement, people nevertheless made homes in displacement and their movement contributed to creating the multiple or translocal homes (Brun 2011). Yet, the policy environment, distinguished by its increased focus on return, protracted displacement, and containment policies in the context of more widespread and diversified temporary solutions, continued to regard home as place-of-origin, and solutions as a way of putting people back into a place.

This section has shown that from the early 1990s policy responses to forced migration changed to favour repatriation, strengthen restrictive resettlement policies, and opt for the containment of refugee movements in regions of origin. Research on home began to problematise the overlap of home with the nation-state, the exclusive association of home with permanent solutions and the discourse of repatriation linked to homecoming and the ending of the refugee cycle. This period also saw a shift towards the idea of the multiple meanings of home. Home in displacement was viewed as multiscalar, diverse and translocal. During this Phase, researchers showed that experiences of home making in displacement were often shared among refugees crossing borders and the internally displaced within nation-state borders, and that refugees exercised agency in making homes across temporary and durable contexts of forced migration.

PHASE III: UNSETTLING THE MEANING OF HOME: CONTINGENT HOMES AND BELONGING

The beginning of the new millennium saw a further geo-political reconfiguration of the international system that began with the narrative centred around the new axis of terrorism and the war on terror. The attacks on the US Twin Towers in 2001 sped up the tightening of border controls and the acceleration of the 'securitisation' of migration (Lazaridis and Khusheed 2015) in and beyond the global north. This was followed by the 2008 global economic crisis and the increase in mixed flows of forced migrants fleeing conflicts, generalised violence, and economic uncertainty. Restricted legal routes regulating the movement of forced migrants climaxed in the 2015 European migration crisis (Panebianco and Fontana 2018) when responsibility to protect 'hit home'. Ongoing discussions around climate change raised questions about the limitations of protection rights of climate refugees (Scott 2019). Recently, the 2019 Covid pandemic has given rise to new forms of (im)-mobilities at a time of border closures and restricted mobility that have disproportionately affected forced migrants and asylum seekers confronting hostile immigration environments (Doná 2021).

The current global status is characterised by widespread precarity, fewer opportunities for safe migration routes, informal local integration arrangements, new immobilities, and restricted forms of graduated citizenship. In the global south, millions of refugees continue to live in in 'protracted refugee situations' (Crisp 2003), a policy term used to describe the conditions of those who have 'lived in exile for more than five years, and when they still have no immediate prospect of finding a durable solution to their plights by means of voluntary repatriation, local integration, or resettlement' (p. 1). At least 30 such major situations are identified globally, affecting millions of people (Milner 2014). Hyndman and Giles (2019) argue that temporary protection in regions of origin is not a short-term prospect, but it has become the 'new normal', and caution that there is not a single experience of protracted displacement. The last few decades have seen a reversal of permanent and temporary solutions, with permanent solutions shrinking and even becoming precarious, and temporary solutions becoming protracted. The condition of 'permanent temporariness' (Bailey et al 2002) and 'chronic exile' (Khan 2019) has reverberations for understanding the meaning of home and forced migration studies (Brun and Fábos 2015; Hyndman and Giles 2019). In the context of waiting and the concomitant temporal injustices against forced migrants (Fábos and Isotalo 2014; Fontanari 2018; Khosravi 2019; Thorshaug at al 2019), how do forced migrants make home when they do not have rights to a place, do not own more than a tent, and are not permitted to work? What creative means do they use to make a home in these spaces that are not of their choice, and mire them in urban slums, protracted refugee situations, asylum systems? The scholarship on home in this phase tends to engage more actively with a temporal dimension in notions of home (Brun 2016).

As a response to the increasingly precarious living and protracted displacement, in 2016 the international community came together to look for renewed protection measures and humanitarian and permanent solutions to forced migration crises. Multi-stakeholders' consultations led to the ratification in 2018 of the Global Compact on Refugee, a non-binding framework for guiding international responses to large movements of refugees and protracted refugee situations. The Global Compact introduces motions directed towards collective development and integration 'with the approval of the host state'. Refugees are being reconstituted as 'self-reliant' people -- devolving to some degree the responsibility to protect and provide a home in exile from the state to the individual. International policies support a fluid notion of home, which is expressed by the idea that refugees can reside in a host country but mainly precariously. There are tensions between security-driven, migration management-driven policies and humanitarian responses on one side and the realities of increasingly complex and mixed migratory flows on the other side. Due to the multiplication of protection statuses and varied informal accommodation arrangements, the lives of forced migrants - urban refugees, undocumented forced migrants, and people on the move - are characterised by the coexistence of hyper-fragmentation and localism with transnationalism and globalisation. While the meaning of home, in many ways, has stayed the same in policies and humanitarian responses to forced migration, research on forced migrants' experiences of displacement has revised the discourse to unsettle the meaning of home in prolonged displacement.

In this phase, we identify two main trends: the transition from places to processes of belonging, and the proliferation of what we refer to as contingent/precarious home(s). As this recent phase is ongoing, the understanding of the meaning of home is still fluid and somewhat blurred and at times ambiguous. First, the conceptualisation of home has moved away from the primary idea of place(s) and space-based residency that characterised Phase I and II to incorporate other types and meanings of home. These are de-territorialised processes and modalities of belonging that extend the idea of home as framed within the boundaries of the nation-state. Home is still about the nation-state but also not about the nation-state. Places and place-making are processual and physical spaces become less essential.

Research on home has expanded to analyse home as relational in its connections to citizenship, membership and belonging (Choudhory 2018; Korac 2009; Verdasco 2019). For instance, processes of inclusion and exclusion are articulated through citizenship for Syrian refugees in Turkey (Akcapar and Simsek 2018) while following prolonged exile, refugees may have little interest in a physical return 'home' but they recognise the value that a restoration of citizenship may bring (Long 2010).

As shown above, home and belonging are beginning to be used in an overlapping way in the literature (Blachnicka-Ciacek 2017; Boer 2015; Hogarth 2015). Belonging becomes a proxy for home, and processing of emplacements decouple home from the (national) territory. Differently from Phase I when resettlement coincided with the idea of a permanent home, making home in the context of 'durable solutions' is only relevant for a minority of forced migrants. The majority live in prolonged conditions of displacement where durable prospects are limited. In these situations of precariousness, home is decoupled from conventional countries of origin, resettlement, and return. Yet, forced migrants living in prolonged conditions of displacement who have limited if non-existent opportunities of making permanent homes, continue to make precarious homes in conditions of precarity and to enact practices of informal belonging and translocalised integration (Brun and Fábos 2017; El Masri, 2020; Hart, Paszkiewicz and Albadra 2018).

In these new contexts of permanent temporariness, a second shift is identified: from the idea of stable home(s) to that of contingent, precarious and fragmented homes. Home is being reconstituted and rethought differently, depending on circumstances. Contingent, fragmented and precarious homes have some elements of the multi-scalar qualities of home identified in Phase II but they do not contain the full spectrum of qualities associated with home(s), such as memories and feelings, institutions and day-to-day practices of homemaking.

The new configurations of home are translocalised, simultaneously localised and transnational (Haugen 2019; Magezi 2017), and also increasingly virtual (Almenara-Niebla 2020; Doná 2015). For instance, refugees may feel at home in smaller and rural areas where they have been resettled rather than the nearby city or the host state (Haugen 2019), through their belonging to a local church (Magezi 2017) rather than the host country or in virtual spaces (Niebla 2020). Contingent homes are also dependent on forced migrants' positionalities along gendered (Basnet 2018; Bragg 2020), sexual (Ritholtz and Buxton 2021; Wimark 2021), lifecourse (Baldassar Wilding, and Worrell 2020) and disability (Pearce 2017) identities that differ along intersectional lines (Miled 2020; Porziella 2021). Positionality is the new lens to the understanding of home.

This section has shown that in the current phase home has become processual and deterritorialized. Home is contingent, fragmented, and precarious. Home has become a process of emplacement in conditions of prolonged displacement. There are intersecting landscapes of understanding home in forced migration that map different geographies, identities, and positionalities.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has examined the meaning of home and its evolution in the interdisciplinary field of Forced Migration and Refugee Studies over the last seven decades. This work is connected to broader and similar debates in related fields of migration and diaspora studies. For instance, the multi-scalarity and multi-location of home, with the attendant dilemmas and inequalities, has also been made to some extent out of refugee studies (e.g. Boccagni et al. 2020). Connecting scholarship and geo-political realities, the chapter identified the three main phases that have characterised the chronological evolution of the meaning of home and forced migration. From the 'classic' notion of home that overlaps with the nation state in Phase I, through the critique of the 'refugee cycle' scholars have begun to explore the multiple meanings of home in Phase II to move beyond the sequential articulation of the different homes in displacement to explore processes of belonging and estrangements that have unsettled the meaning of home. The meaning of home changes through displacement processes.

At present, thematic areas for future research on home and homemaking are also emerging or developing. At a time where post and de-colonial approaches to knowledge formation are on the rise (e.g., Kale et al 2018; Samaddar 2020), forced migration scholarship would benefit from the analysis of home from a post-decolonial perspective. This approach could unpack power relations in conceptualising home among stakeholders and bring to the fore the perspectives of scholars from the global south.

Similarly, intersectional and positionality approaches are more widely applied in social sciences as a lens for understanding the ways in which categories such as gender, age, class, race intersect to influence economic, political, and social inequalities (Hayes 2020; Lee and Brotman 2013; Lewin 2001; Murray 2014). The study of home and forced migration would benefit from the intersectional analysis of the ways in which racialised, gendered and other positionalities interact to shape the understanding of home and meaning-making and homemaking in exile. The increase in the role of the digital in everyday life (Alencar 2020; Godin and Doná 2021) calls for research on digital homes and homemaking. Lastly, at this historic moment dominated by the covid pandemic and responses to it, it is important to understand how Covid has changed the ways in which displaced populations in refugee camps, asylum seekers in temporary accommodations, and migrants in transit experience and make homes in displacement.

In conclusion, this chapter has contributed to unpacking assumptions about home, interjected new ways of imagining home, and reflected on what forced migration can teach us about home. Our analysis has unpacked home beyond its assumed meaning, helped us to rethink home through multiple perspectives, and considered home as an unsettled concept. From an initial phase in which home was implicitly rather than explicitly studied in scholarly research, we are now witnessing burgeoning literature on home in Forced Migration and Refugee Studies, where its understanding has increased in complexity as geo-political realities changed. We therefore suggest a contrapuntal, mobile, rhythmic understanding of home in displacement that brings to the fore ambiguities, complexities, and the messiness of home for forced migrants.

REFERENCES

Akcapar, S. K., & Simsek, D. (2018) The politics of Syrian refugees in Turkey: A question of inclusion and exclusion through citizenship. *Social Inclusion*, *6*(1): 176-187.

Al-Ali, N. and Koser, K. (2002) Transnationalism, international migration and home. In: N. Al-Ali, Nadje and K. Khalid (eds.) *New Approaches to Migration? Transnational Communities and the Transformation of Home*. London; New York: Routledge, pp. 1-14.

Al-Rasheed, M. (1994) The myth of return: Iraqi Arab and Assyrian refugees in London. *Journal of Refugee Studies,* 7(2/3): 199–219.

Alencar, A. (2020) Digital place-making practices and daily struggles of Venezuelan (forced) migrants in Brazil. In: K. Smets, K. Leurs, M. Georgiou, S. Witteborn and R. Gajjala (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Migration and Media*. London: Sage, pp. 503-514.

Almenara-Niebla, S. (2020) Making digital 'home-camps': Mediating emotions among the Sahrawi refugee diaspora. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, *23*(5): 728-744.

Bailey, A. J., Wright, R.A., Mountz, A. Miyares, I. M.(2002) (Re)producing Salvadoran transnational geographies. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 92(1): 125-144.

Baldassar, L., Wilding, R., & Worrell, S. (2020) Elderly migrants, digital kinning and digital home making across time and distance. In: B. Pasveer, O. Synnes, & I. Moser (eds.) *Ways of Home Making in Care for Later Life: Health, Technology and Society*. Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 41-63.

Banerjee, P. and Samaddar, R. (2019) Why critical Forced Migration Studies has to be post-colonial by nature. In: A. Bloch & G. Doná (eds.) *Forced Migration: Current Issues and Debates*. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge, pp. 44-59.

Basnet, S. (2018) *Feelings of Home and Belonging amongst Bhutanese Women and Girls with Refugee Backgrounds who Live in New Zealand*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Waikato).

Berry, J. W. (1990) Acculturation and adaptation: A general framework. In: W. H. Holtzman & T. H. Bornemann (eds.) *Mental Health of Immigrants and Refugees.* Austin Texan: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, pp. 90–102.

Blachnicka-Ciacek, D. (2018) Palestine as 'a state of mind': second-generation Polish and British Palestinians' search for home and belonging. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *44*(11): 1915-1931.

Black, R., & Koser, K. (eds.) (1999) *The End of the Refugee Cycle?: Refugee Repatriation and Reconstruction*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Bloch, A., & Doná, G. (eds.) (2019) *Forced Migration: Current Issues and Debates*. London: Routledge.

Blunt, A. & R. Dowling (2006) *Home*. London: Routledge.

Boccagni, P., Murcia, L. E. P., & Belloni, M. (2020) *Thinking Home on the Move: A Conversation across Disciplines*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.

Boer, R. D. (2015) Liminal space in protracted exile: The meaning of place in Congolese refugees' narratives of home and belonging in Kampala. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *28*(4): 486-504.

Bragg, B. (2020) *Making Home in Little Syria: Gendered Geographies of Refugee Placemaking* (Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia)

Brun, C. (2016) Dwelling in the temporary: The involuntary mobility of displaced Georgians in rented accommodation. *Cultural Studies,* 30(3): 421–440.

Brun, C. (2015) Home as a critical value: From shelter to home in Georgia. *Refuge,* 31(1): 43-54.

Brun, C. (2001) Reterritorialising the link between people and place in refugee studies. *Geografiska Annaler,* 83B(1): 15-25.

Brun, C., & Fábos, A. H. (2017) Mobilizing home for long-term displacement: A critical reflection on the durable solutions. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, *9*(2): 177-183.

Brun, C. and Fábos, A.H. (2015) Homemaking in limbo? A conceptual framework. *Refuge,* 31(1): 5–18.

Capo, J. (2015) "Durable solutions", transnationalism, and homemaking among Croatian and Bosnian former refugees. *Refuge,* 31(1): 19-29.

Castles, S. (1998) *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Chowdhory, N. (2018) *Refugees, Citizenship and Belonging in South Asia*. New Delhi: Springer.

Crisp, J. (2003) *No Solutions in Sight: The Problem of Protracted Refugee Situations in Africa.* UNHCR New Issues in Refugee Research, Working Paper No. 75 http://www.unhcr.ch/

Crisp, J. (2001) Mind the gap! UNHCR, humanitarian assistance and the development process. *International Migration Review,* 35(1): 168–191.

Darling, J. (2011) Domopolitics, governmentality and the regulation of asylum accommodation. *Political Geography,* 30 (5): 263-271.

Doná, G. (2021) Race, immigration and health: The Hostile Environment and public health responses to Covid-19. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 44(5): 906-918.

Doná, G. (2015) Making homes in limbo: Embodied virtual "homes" in prolonged conditions of displacement, *Refuge*, 31(1): 67-73.

Doná, G. & Berry, J. W. (1999) Refugee acculturation and re-acculturation. In A. Ager (ed.*), Refugees: Perspectives on the Experience of Forced Migration*, London: Continuum, pp. 169-195.

Dudley, S.H. (2010) *Materialising Exile: Material Culture and Embodied Experience among Karenni Refugees in Thailand*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Eastmond, M., & Ojendal, J. (1999) Revisiting a 'repatriation success': The case of Cambodia. In: R. Black & K. Koser (eds.) *The End of the Refugee Cycle?: Refugee Repatriation and Reconstruction*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 38-55.

El Masri, Y. (2020) 72 years of homemaking in waiting zones: Lebanon's "permanently temporary" Palestinian refugee camps. *Frontiers in Sociology*, *26 November* https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fsoc.2020.587063/full

Fábos, A. H. (2015) Microbuses and mobile homemaking in exile: Sudanese visiting strategies in Cairo. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, *31*(1): 55-66.

Fábos, A. and Isotalo, R. eds., 2014. *Managing Muslim Mobilities: Between Spiritual Geographies and the Global Security Regime*. Basingstoke: Plagrave MacMillan.

Fábos, A., & Kibreab, G. (2007) Urban refugees: Introduction. *Refuge*, *24*(1): 1-19.

Fontanari, E. (2018) *Lives in Transit: An Ethnographic Study of Refugees' Subjectivity across European Borders*. London: Routledge.

Gallagher, D. (1994) Durable solutions in a new political era. *Journal of International Affairs,* 47(2): 429-450.

Godin, M. and Doná, G. (2021) Rethinking transit zones: Migrant trajectories and transnational networks in *techno-borderscapes*. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration* Studies, 47(14): 3726-3292.

Graham, M., & Khosravi, S. (1997) Home is where you make it: Repatriation and diaspora culture among Iranians in Sweden. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *10*(2): 115-133.

Hammond, L. C. (2004) *This Place Will Become Home*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Harrell-Bond, B. E., & Voutira, E. (1992) Anthropology and the study of refugees. *Anthropology Today*, *8*(4): 6-10.

Hart, J., Paszkiewicz, N.& Albadra, D. (2018) "Shelter as home?: Syrian homemaking in Jordanian refugee camps. *Human Organization,* 77(4): 371-380.

Haugen, S. (2019) "We feel like we're home": The resettlement and integration of Syrian refugees in smaller and rural Canadian communities. *Refuge*, *35*(2): 53-63.

Hayes, J. C. (2020) *Trajectories of Belonging: Literacies and Intersectionality in the Mobile Phone and Home Building Practices of Syrian Refugees in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh).

Hogarth, K. (2015) Home without security and security without home. J*ournal of International Migration and Integration*, 16(3): 783-798.

Hyndman, J. (2000) *Managing Displacement: Refugees and the Politics of Humanitarianism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Hyndman, J. (2003) Preventive, palliative, or punitive? Safe spaces in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Somalia and Sri Lanka. *Journal of Refugee Studies,* 16(2): 167-185.

Hyndman, J. & Giles, W. (2019) Protracted displacement: Living on the edge. In: A. Bloch, & G. Dona' (eds.) *Forced Migration: Current Issues and Debates*. London: Routledge, pp. 74-87.

Jansen, S. & Löfving. S. (eds.) (2009) *Struggles for Home: Violence, Hope and the Movement of People*. New York: Berghahn.

Kabachnik, P., Regulska, J. & Mitchneck, B. (2010) Where and when is home? The double displacement of Georgian IDPs from Abkhazia. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 23(3): 315-336.

Kaldor, M. (1999) *New and Old Wars. Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kale, A., Kindon, S. & Stupples, P. (2018) 'I Am A New Zealander Now - This is My Home: Refugee citizenship and belonging in a post-colonising country! *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 33(3): 577-598.

Khan, F. (2019) In chronic exile: rethinking the legal regime for refugees in protracted refugee situations. *Stellenbosch Law Review*, *30*(2): 186-211.

Khosravi, S. (2019) What do we see if we look at the border from the other side?

Social Anthropology, 27(3): 409-424.

Korac, M. (2009) *Remaking Home: Reconstructing Life, Place and Identity in Rome and Amsterdam*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Kuhlman, T. (1990) *The Economic Integration of Refugees in Developing Countries*. Series Research Memoranda; No. 1990-35. Amsterdam: Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Vrije.

Kunz, E.F (1981) The analytic framework: Exile and resettlement: Refugee theory. *International Migration Review*, 15(1-2): 42-51.

Kunz, E.F. (1973) The refugee in flight: Kinetic models and forms of displacement. *International Migration Review,* 7(2):125-146.

Landau, L. B. (2019) Displacement and the pursuit of urban protection: Forced migration, fluidity and global cities. In: A. Bloch, & G. Dona' (eds.) *Forced Migration: Current Issues and Debates*. London: Routledge, pp. 106-125.

Lazaridis, G. & Khursheed W. (eds.) (2015) *The Securitisation of Migration in the EU: Debates since 9/11*. Basingstoke: Palgrave McMillan.

Lee, E. O. J., & Brotman, S. (2013) Speak out! Structural intersectionality and anti-oppressive practice with LGBTQ refugees in Canada. *Canadian Social Work Review/Revue Canadienne de Service Social*, 30(2):157-183.

Lewin, F. A. (2001). The meaning of home among elderly immigrants: Directions for future research and theoretical development. *Housing Studies* 16(3): 353-370.

Long, K. (2010) Home Alone? *A Review of the Relationship between Repatriation, Mobility and Durable Solutions for Refugees*. UNCHR/PDES Evaluation Report, *PDES/2010/02*.

Macdonald, A. & Porter, P. (2020) The politics of return: Understanding trajectories of displacement and the complex dynamics of 'Return' in Central and East Africa. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 33(4): 639-662.

Magezi, V. (2017) 'Glocal' and integrated churches within a practical theological imagination of 'home away from home': Towards a ministry of migrants and refugees in diaspora. *Stellenbosch Theological Journal*, *3*(1): 227-250.

Malkki, L. (1992) National geographic: The rooting of peoples and the territorialization of national identity among scholars and refugees. *Cultural Anthropology*, *7*(1): 24-44.

Mallett, S. (2004) Understanding home: a critical review of the literature. *The Sociological Review,* 52(1): 62-89.

Miled, N. (2020) Can the displaced speak? Muslim refugee girls negotiating identity, home and belonging through Photovoice. *Women's Studies International Forum* 81, July August, no. 102381, *10.1016/j.wsif.2020.102381*

Milner, J. (2014) Protracted refugee situations. In: E. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, G. Loescher, K. Long, & N. Sigona (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*. Oxford; Oxford University Press, pp. 151-162.

Muggeridge, H. & G. Doná (2006) Back Home? Refugees' experiences of the first visit back to their country of origin. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 19(4): 415-432.

Murray, D. A. (2014) The challenge of home for sexual orientation and gendered identity refugees in Toronto. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, *48*(1): 132-152.

Neuwirth, G. (1988) Refugee resettlement. *Current Sociology*, *36*(2): 27-41.

Niebla, S. A. (2020) *Transnational Home: Gender and Belonging among the Sahrawi Digital Diaspora*. (Doctoral dissertation, Universidad de la Laguna) https://www.educacion.gob.es/teseo/imprimirFichaConsulta.do?idFicha=603306

Omata, N., (2016) Home-making during protracted exile: Diverse responses of refugee families in the face of remigration. *Transnational Social Review*, 6(1-2): 26-40.

Panebianco, S., & Fontana, I. (2018) When responsibility to protect 'hits home': The refugee crisis and the EU response. *Third World Quarterly*, *39*(1):1-17.

Pearce, E. (2017) '*Ask Us What We Need': Operationalizing Guidance on Disability Inclusion in Refugee and Displaced Persons Programs*.

http://repositoriocdpd.net:8080/handle/123456789/1519

Porziella, B. (2021) LGBT migrants and refugees' search for home: An intersectional struggle. *The Interdisciplinary Journal of International Studies*, *11*(1) https://doi.org/10.5278/ojs.ijis.v11i1.6568

Ritholtz, S., & Buxton, R. (2021) Queer kinship and the rights of refugee families. *Migration Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnab007

Samaddar, R. (2020) *The Post-Colonial Age of Migration*. New Delhi: Routledge India.

Scott, M. (2019) Climate refugees and the 1951 Convention. In: S. Singh Juss (ed.) *Research Handbook on International Refugee Law*.Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 343-356

Stefansson, A.H. (2006) Homes in the making: Property restitution, refugee return and the senses of belonging in a post-war Bosnian town. *International Migration,* 44(3): 115-139.

Taylor, H. (2015) *Refugees and the Meaning of Home: Cypriot Narratives of Loss, Longing and Daily Life in London*. Springer.

Taylor, H. (2013) Refugees, the state and the concept of home. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 32(2): 130-152.

Thorshaug, R. Øwre, & Brun, C. (2019) Temporal injustice and asylum reception centres in Norway: Towards critical geographies of architecture in the institution. *International Journal of Geography*, 197(2): 232–248.

Trapp, M.M. (2015) Already in America: Transnational homemaking among Liberian refugees. *Refuge*, *31*(1): 31-41.

Turton, D. (2002) Forced displacement and the nation-state. In: J. Robinson (ed.) *Development and Displacement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 19-75.

UNHCR (1989) *Durable Solutions and Refugee Protection*

https://www.unhcr.org/excom/exconc/3ae68c428/durable-solutions-refugee-protection.html

UNHCR (1985) *A Background Study Prepared for the Round Table on Voluntary Repatriation Convened by the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees in cooperation with the International Institute of Humanitarian Law*, *San Remo, 16–19 July*.

UNHCR (1983) *General Conclusion on International Protection*. No. 29 (XXXIV) - 1983. Executive Committee 34th session. Contained in United Nations General Assembly Document No. 12A

(A/38/12/Add.1). By Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme, 20 October.

UNOCHA (1999) Handbook for Applying the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. OCHA/The Brookings Institution, Washington.

Van Hear, N. (2002) Sustaining societies under strain: Remittances as a form of transnational exchange in Sri Lanka and Ghana. In: N. Al-Ali and K. Koser (eds.) *New Approaches to Migration? Transnational Communities and the Transformation of Home*. London: Routledge, pp. 202-223.

Verdasco, A. (2019) Communities of belonging in the temporariness of the Danish Asylum System: Shalini's anchoring points. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(9): 1439-1457.

Warner, D. (1994) Voluntary repatriation and the meaning of return to home: A critique of liberal mathematics. *Journal of Refugee Studies,* 7(2/3): 160-174.

Wimark, T. (2021) Homemaking and perpetual liminality among queer refugees. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *22*(5): 647-665.

Zetter, R. (1991) Labelling refugees: Forming and transforming a bureaucratic identity. *Journal of refugee studies*, *4*(1): 39-62.