

Original citation:

Davies, Thom, Isakjee, Arshad and Dhesi, Surindar. (2017) Violent inaction : the necropolitical experience of refugees in Europe. Antipode.

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/88964>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

"This is the peer reviewed version of the following article Davies, Thom, Isakjee, Arshad and Dhesi, Surindar. (2017) Violent inaction : the necropolitical experience of refugees in Europe. Antipode., which has been published in final form at <http://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12325> This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving](#)."

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP URL' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

VIOLENT INACTION: THE NECROPOLITICAL EXPERIENCE OF REFUGEES IN EUROPE

ABSTRACT

A significant outcome of the global refugee crisis has been the abandonment of refugees to survive in makeshift camps inside the EU. By 2015 one of the largest informal camps of this kind was in Calais (France), the site of this study. This paper details some of the ways in which state authorities have prevented some refugees from surviving with formal provision, leading directly to thousands having to live in hazardous spaces such as the Calais camp. The paper then goes on to explore the subsequent violent consequences of this abandonment. By bringing literatures on bio/necropolitics (Foucault 1997, Mbembe 2003) together with structural violence (Galtung 1969), the paper traces the connections between political insouciance towards refugees and the physiological violence they suffer. By framing the management of refugees in Calais as a series of *(in)actions*, this paper demonstrates how the biopolitics of migrant control has given way to necropolitical brutality.

Keywords:

Necropolitics, violence, migration, camps, Calais, abandonment

For a free copy of the final version of this article, please email davies.thom@gmail.com

How to cite:

Davies, T., Isakjee, A. and Dhesi, S., (2017) Violent Inaction: The Necropolitical Experience of Refugees in Europe. *Antipode*.

1. INTRODUCTION

With global refugee numbers at their highest since the end of the Second World War (UNHCR 2015), EU states have been collectively failing to guarantee adequate provision and recourse to asylum to refugees. Thousands of forced migrants deep within European territories have resorted to living informally in urban and rural spaces with minimal or no state-intervention. The scale and concentrated spatiality of such makeshift refugee encampments within advanced liberal states is unprecedented. In 2015 the largest such site in Northern Europe was the 'new jungle'¹ in Calais, France, which by the end of that year housed 6000 refugees.

While important scholarship on such sites has focussed on the agency and political resistance of forced migrants (Millner 2011, Rygiel 2013, Sigona 2015), this article takes a different approach. Instead we explore the violent consequences of state (in)action in an informal camp. Using empirical data from a study conducted in Calais in 2015, this paper seeks to uncover (i) the (bio)political mechanics through which asylum seekers in Europe are abandoned by European state and supra-state agencies, and (ii) the stark, material and bodily consequences of these necropolitical (in)actions on refugees within and beyond the camp. The empirical data therefore helps draw a direct line between the governmental mechanics refugees are subject to, and the violence they are exposed to in Calais. We conceptualise the empirical material using a framework bringing together bio/necro-politics (Foucault 1978, Foucault 1997, Mbembe 2003) and structural violence (Galtung 1969). By doing so, we trace the connections between political abandonment of refugees and the physiological violence they suffer. By framing the management of refugees in Calais as a series of *in*actions, the paper demonstrates how the biopolitics of migrant control has given way to necropolitical brutality.

The paper begins by putting the Calais encampments within a contemporary historical context. We then review literature related to bio/necropolitics and violence as theoretical lenses for our analysis. After describing the research methodology, the paper's empirical findings are presented in two parts, intrinsically linked. The first part '*Abandoned to Informal Existence*' describes some of the ways in which refugees in Calais have come to find themselves in the makeshift encampment, as they try to negotiate inflexible and insufficient levels of EU protection. This section is crucial to rebuke notions that forced migrants in Calais are suffering through their own individual negligence or reluctance to apply for asylum in EU countries of arrival. This leads on to the second empirical section '*Violence of the camp*', which exposes the subsequent violent consequences of state inaction. This section details the ways in which residents of the camp are subject to spatial constriction and bodily harm. We conclude with a discussion emphasising that refugee experiences in Calais are a result of structural violence, a violence operationalised through multi-scalar state withdrawal as well as state action. By doing so we argue that such denial of provision is tantamount to a violent action by EU states towards forced migrants.

2. THE CALAIS CAMP IN CONTEXT

The Calais camp lies in France on the northern edge of the European Union's Schengen area, within which travellers are permitted to cross borders without systematic immigration control procedures. The United Kingdom, although part of the EU, is not part of the Schengen area, and therefore Calais has become both a bottleneck for migrants attempting to reach the UK, as well as 'an emblem for mass suffering of refugees' (Hurley 2016). During the course of the research in Calais, we encountered refugees from sixteen nationalities, some of whom had spent over a year in the French town. Many were awaiting an opportunity to smuggle themselves through the border in a lorry, or seeking an equally dangerous route involving jumping onto

¹ The term 'jungle' to describe informal settlements in Calais is very problematic, yet is often used by refugee residents of the camp themselves. The site was referred to as 'the new jungle', 'jungle 2' or simply 'the jungle'. Informal landmarks were given the 'jungle' moniker: a camp cafe was named 'Jungle Cafe' and an NGO-run bookshop was ironically dubbed 'Jungle Books'. When asked about the term, participants generally appropriated it to demonstrate that they were being '*treated like animals*'. For this reason we will use the term cautiously, in inverted commas. For a discussion of the animalisation of migrants and their 'Zoopolitical' framings, see Vaughn-Williams (2015a).

passing trains as they cross through the Eurotunnel. A large minority of other residents were also waiting to seek asylum in France. All forced-migrants encountered in Calais were living in poor and informal conditions with little if-any assistance from the French state or the EU.

Such informal settlements have existed in Calais since the late 1990s (Reinisch 2015). In 2015 however, there were two key developments relating to the numbers of migrants in Calais, and the location of their settlements. In terms of numbers of residents, despite the number of 'roving' asylum seekers living in the Calais area having reached an estimated 3000 at some point before 2002 (UNHCR cited in Reinisch 2015, 521), the estimated refugee population throughout town had usually remained between 1000-1500. In 2015 however, the number of refugees in Calais dramatically increased, echoing global refugee levels. The numbers living in the camp fluctuate daily, but by in July 2015 during the second research visit, this number had reached over 3000. By November 2015 the camp's population had considerably increased to 6000 (Gentleman 2015). While the majority of residents were male, a minority of female inhabitants also resided in the camp. Furthermore, a survey jointly conducted by *L'Auberge des Migrants* and *Help Refugees* estimated that the population of the camp included 445 children, 305 of which were unaccompanied (McAuley 2016).

The second key development in 2015 was the forced concentration of refugees onto a single squalid site. Prior to 2015, migrants in Calais had tended to live in small 'squatter camps' around the town (see Millner 2011), often dubbed 'jungles'. As of April 2015, French police and security services systematically demolished smaller squatter camps in Calais, forcibly moving refugees to the new, single peripheral location [Figure 1]. Consequently from April 2015, this 'new jungle' became the only permitted site for forced migrants to inhabit. This new site is approximately 0.5km² and lies on wasteland, part of which was formerly an industrial site. Whilst the 'new jungle' sits adjacent to the Jules Ferry Centre, which provides accommodation to only 200 refugee women and children, the site itself is not managed or administered by the French state in any meaningful way, and refugees are left to look after themselves, dependent on their own resources and any extra assistance that may be provided by charities, NGOs and volunteers.



Figure 1 - Map of the Calais Camp as it stood during the research period

A = Informal New Calais camp or 'new jungle'

C = Centre of Calais

● = Sites of forcibly cleared encampments

B = Formal accommodation for 200 women and children

P = Port area for ferries to the UK

After the research period, in March 2016 the French government forcibly demolished part of the camp, and provided inadequate temporary housing in shipping containers for a minority of those displaced (see Dearden 2016). However, most of those who had their tents and self-built shelters demolished have simply relocated to smaller sites peripheral to the 'new jungle'. Crucially, although the spatiality of makeshift encampments has been prone to change, a sizeable section of Calais' displaced population have for decades lived on informal, makeshift sites, and a majority continue to do so at the time of writing (see Reinsich 2015).

Ultimately it is the identity and status of Calais' migrant population which allows for them to be neglected by state authorities in this way (see Bauman 2004). The 'new jungle' and its predecessors have become a concentrated visible symbol of the 'apartheid' of migrant Others from the Global South, living in conditions far removed from the residences of normative French and EU citizens living in their neat houses with kept gardens even on the camp's very periphery (Rigby and Schlembach 2013). In recent years camps have been the landscapes of significant political change and revolution. The barricaded battleground of the Maidan in Ukraine for example, which helped overthrow President Yanukovich (Phillips 2014), or the events in Egypt's Tahrir Square where the 'camp defeated the dictator' (Ramadan 2012). While the geopolitical importance of these spaces has been made (Minca 2005), the informal refugee camp within the EU has increasingly become a space of stagnation and a symptom of political failure.



Figure 2: Photo of former squatter camp forcibly cleared by police in April 2015 [Thom Davies, April 2015]

3. BIOPOLITICS, NECROPOLITICS, AND VIOLENCE

The concept of 'biopolitics' is now extensively used throughout geography and the social sciences as a lens through which to understand forced migration and its governance (see Amoore 2006, Minca 2015a; Vaughan-Williams 2015b). For Foucault (1978, 1997) biopolitics alludes to a historical shift towards the use of power to protect, regulate and manage the life of the 'legitimate' population (Lemke 2011). Biopolitics can therefore refer to the emergence of liberal nation-states often using a vast spectrum of democratic, legal and managerial apparatus in order to administer life within, and sometimes beyond its borders (see Brachet 2015). In the context of governing migration into the European Union, this managerialism is evident in both the strategies and rhetoric of immigration control; as Bialasiewicz (2012, 852) notes, the EU's border-work is presented as a technical exercise underpinned by managerial language of co-operation, partnership, best-practice and technical know-how. Power operationalised in this way is therefore subtler in its tactics, but can obscure the often brutal consequences:

"Such a power has to qualify, measure, appraise, and hierarchize, rather than display itself in its murderous splendor" (Foucault, 1978, 144)

Processes of management through documentation are discussed in the first empirical section – and the acts of fingerprinting, identification and being provided with documents that provide a legal avenue for protection may all be considered to be *biopolitical* technologies of government (Amoore 2006; Nguyen 2015). This may raise the question as to how *necropolitics* contributes to the theoretical framing. Necropolitics was in part a reaction to the inadequacy of biopolitics to conceptualise the more extreme cases of body regulation, when life was not so much being governed, as much as death itself was being sanctioned. Through necropolitics Mbembe (2003) builds upon Foucault's famous flip of the medieval couplet 'making die / letting live', which has evolved into the modern 'making live / letting die' (Fassin 2009; Sparke 2014: 690). Partly inspired by the work of Agamben (1998), Mbembe introduced necropolitics, not in relation to the camp per se, but in relation to the more brutal forms of oppression found in colonial spaces such as the plantations on which slaves toiled. Within these spaces Mbembe highlights how brutality was administered to the colonised body. Mbembe also addresses the more Eurocentric theorisations of both Agamben (1998) and Foucault (1978, 1997), by putting race firmly at the centre of his analysis. Despite the prefix 'necro', necropolitics can apply outside of outright death, as well as beyond historic spaces of the colony. Mbembe draws attention to the 'morbid spectacle' (ibid, 35) of suffering and the experience of 'death-in-life' (ibid, 21) that emerges from deliberately produced abject conditions and it is this observation which is most relevant to our paper. The permanent wounding of individuals, rather than their direct and active killing, can be used as a means of control. Suffering therefore can be used as a political technology, where certain groups are exposed to conditions in which they are 'kept alive but in a state of injury' (Mbembe 2003, 21). Within such conditions, a system of domination in which 'obscene, vulgar and grotesque' (Mbembe 1992, 1) conditions become sanctioned for political ends.

Before returning to the notion of being kept 'permanently injured', we should emphasise that biopolitics and necropolitics are interrelated rather than antithetical. Recent scholarship has begun to articulate the intricate entanglements between biopolitical and necropolitical modes of governance, viewing them as separate concepts that are nevertheless intrinsically linked (McIntyre & Nast 2011). For example Williams (2015) examines the nexus between life and death at the US-Mexico border, suggesting that a 'bionecro enforcement regime' is being enacted, whereby unwanted migrants have their biological life minimally cared for by medics only insofar as to ensure their swift deportation. Castro (2015) too, in his research – again on the US-Mexico border – describes how the biopolitical production of life is enmeshed within the fabric of Mbembe's death worlds, arguing that expendable migrants are exposed to the 'necroeconomy of disposability' (Castro 2015, 249). The interlinking of the biopolitical fostering and management of life with its necropolitical limitation or disavowal can also be seen in research into normalised racism (Lee & Pratt 2012). For Lee and Pratt, paths to citizenship necessitate forms of injury and violence that can be both spectacular and brutal – as well as clandestine and slow. Thus the confluence of 'necro' of 'bio' forms of governance challenges the notion that

they are binary oppositional forces; they 'do not merely sit opposite one another; they constitute a spatial dialectical unity' (McIntyre & Nast 2011, 1472). This spatial dialectical unity is evident in the Calais case study in which biopolitical regulations are seen to give way to necropolitical inactions.

NECROPOLITICS AND STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE

Returning to the notion of being kept in 'permanent injury', Mbembe's notions of necropolitics imply a political violence being administered to a particular group through constriction: being deprived of the opportunity or freedom to improve one's hazardous or miserable condition. This constriction can be operationalised through political action – but also through *inaction*. Advanced states such as those in Northern Europe have ample resources with which to ensure those within its borders are protected from hunger, provided with shelter and given the security required to live without constant fear. Welfare systems are relatively well-funded; but just as power can be activated by such states through distribution of provision, exclusionary power can be exerted through its withdrawal. When such securities are removed, regulated so as to exclude marginalised groups or kept purposely insufficient – individuals may fall victim to harmful conditions that are easily preventable. 'Letting die' in this way can therefore be seen as 'an active inaction' (Tyner 2016a, 206), in other words, power can be administered through the deliberate withholding of care. Recent scholarship in this journal has drawn attention to the 'let die' violence implicit in Mbembe's work (also see Round & Kuznetsova 2016). Gilbert and Ponder (2014) have explored how withholding of compensation for 9/11 victims can be considered tantamount to a violent act (see Davies & Polese 2015). Squire (2015) discusses how 'acts of desertion' in the Sonoran desert lead to 'abjection' of migrant others.

With few notable exceptions (see Tyner & Rice 2015), relatively little has been written connecting Mbembe's necropolitical work with the idea of 'structural violence' as posited by Johan Galtung (1969). This is surprising given that biological harm and the potentiality of death are central to necropower, which transcends the direct violence of genocide or active killing. Galtung has been highly influential in many academic fields, most notably in sociology, anthropology and peace studies by defining 'structural violence' as a means to combat institutionalised forms of repression based on race and gender. Galtung interrogates the idea of violence, arguing that it is 'present when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential' (ibid, 168). For Galtung, unlike 'personal violence' by an individual "which shows" (ibid, 173), structural violence is more silent, more stealthy (see Li 2010) – concealed in the 'hidden violence of abandonment' (Davies & Polese 2015, 38). Structural violence maintains an unseen quality that is institutionalised within wider structures and therefore normalised (DeVerteuil 2015). In this way, violence can be seen as 'a processual and unfolding moment, rather than as an "act" or "outcome"' (Springer & Le Billon 2016). The spatialisation of such suffering may not be invisible in a literal sense, but the vulgar banality (Mbembe 1992) of structural brutality allows such everyday forms of violence to be hidden in plain view. This theme is also taken up by Nixon (2011, 2) who describes 'slow violence' as a delayed destruction, occurring attritionally across space and time, and often out of sight. Structural violence tends to be latent rather than manifest. Yet it is also more consistent and more static, because unlike personal violence which is rarely legitimised explicitly by state authorities, structural violence is underpinned by social order itself (Galtung 1969; 173). The notion of structural violence is also implicit within Mbembe's (2003) writing about the post-colony, in which necropolitics is framed as an institutional form of oppression upon the colonised body.

Galtung also distinguishes between 'physical' violence of being attacked by direct contact such as being punched, burnt, poisoned or attacked with weapons, and 'physiological' violence which is the denial of air, water, food or constrained movement (Galtung 1969; 174). This latter form of violence is more likely to be structural in nature, and is evident in the empirical case study. Similarly, the 'repressed topographies of cruelty' of which Mbembe writes (2003; 40), can also be interpreted as a spatialised form of structural and physiological violence. Structural violence takes place when certain people are 'left to suffer in agonizing circumstances that are normalised through the law' (Gilbert & Ponder 2014). In these conditions, excluded

groups may not be actively killed but are instead allowed to suffer the brutal indignity of harmful spatial environments (Castro 2015). There is a danger of drawing too stark a divide between direct and structural violence (Loyd 2012; Tyner 2016b). A violent accord can exist between structural and direct violence, where rather than being dichotomous, the physical violence refugees suffer works in unison with the brutal conditions they are exposed to.

Ultimately this paper responds to Tyner and Inwood's call 'to use violence as a theoretical vantage point for a more comprehensive and sustained analysis of social and spatial relations' (2014, 6). Bringing together the strands on bio/necropolitics and structural violence allows us to identify some of the processes through which structural violence is meted out in relation to the impact of migration policy on the residents of the Calais camp. By framing political measures as inactions as well as actions, we can uncover forms of violence delivered by migration policies: policies which seek to govern through the calculated withholding of the means to live.

4. METHODS

This study took place during two research periods in Calais, in April and July 2015. The first research visit was designed as an exploratory piece of fieldwork to catalogue the experiences and expectations of refugees who had come to Calais, a majority of whom intended to migrate onwards to the UK. Semi-structured interviews were designed with a view to gathering narratives of journeys into Europe and to Calais, including motivations for migration, routes of travel, experiences of negotiating border controls and evidence of how documentation was allowing or restricting mobility. Nonetheless the research team acknowledged that participants would have likely been through traumatic experiences and therefore interviews were structured to allow participants to speak about issues important to them, and encouraging the 'reaffirmation of self' (Eastmond 2007, 254). Ethical considerations were paramount and care was taken to ensure that participants were comfortable with the topics of discussion at all times. Due to the constant presence of hunger in the camp, all participants were provided with food and hygiene packs for themselves and fellow residents in their sub-camps, and this was not conditional on their participation. As many scholars have rightly commented (Jacobsen & Landau 2003; Mackenzie et al 2007), there are particular challenges to conducting research with vulnerable groups that necessitate going beyond a 'do no harm' research practice.

The first research visit took place a few days after the displaced migrants had been systematically and forcibly cleared from former squatter camp in more central locations, to the peripheral new site alongside the Jules Ferry Centre. The living conditions in the camp were plainly so poor, that cataloguing these through photographs and observation became part of the data-collection process. Fieldnotes and reflections were drafted every night and special efforts were made to count, for instance, the number of toilets, water access points and whether or not residents had been provided with any food or opportunities to wash by state or NGO organisations. On the first visit, twenty-one interviews were conducted with residents and over 500 photographs were taken of camp conditions, with participant identities protected. The purpose of anonymity was not just for standard ethical reasons but was also attentive to the research context (Saunders et al 2014); several residents of the camp described their displeasure of being photographed by photojournalists in the camp because of feelings of shame associated with living in such squalid conditions. Participants often described how they '*don't want my mother to see me like this*', and becoming photographed was a not just a threat in terms of potential identification by border authorities, but also by their family members back in origin countries who may be upset at seeing them suffering in the camp.

As the importance of cataloguing the environmental conditions of the camp became clear, a second ESRC funded visit took place which focussed more specifically on the public health situation. Eleven group interviews were conducted within different sub-camps, detailing conditions and everyday life in the context of food, hygiene, shelter and experiences of physical and psychological trauma. As part of this second visit, a full environmental health study was conducted on each site, and though the results of this assessment cannot be captured in the limited scope of this paper, initial results are published in a research report (Dhesi et al 2015).

These results are alluded to briefly within the empirical sections of this paper. Additional information was gathered through close links with Doctors of the World, the only NGO delivering medical aid in the camp during the research period. In line with Mackenzie et al (2007), we shared our research findings and recommendations with NGOs as soon as possible. During this study, fourteen further interviews of varying lengths were conducted about motivations, journeys to Europe, tactics of survival and border negotiation. Though generally in English, some interviews with Afghan and Pakistani residents were also conducted by the research team in Urdu.

5. ABANDONED TO INFORMAL EXISTENCE

To understand the ways in which refugees in Calais are institutionally abandoned upon entry into the EU, we must explore their experiences of arrival and understand the mechanics through which this abandonment takes place. The Dublin Convention which regulates refugee arrivals into the EU was enforced in 1997 (see Hurwitz 1999 for a comprehensive assessment); its chief aim being to establish a set of principles for assigning responsibility for asylum-seekers to particular EU member states. A key principle of that convention and its successive agreements in 2003 and 2013 is the notion that an asylum-seeker must apply for protection status in the *first* EU country they arrive in. Italy and Greece, situated along 'Shengen's soft underbelly' (Pastore et al 2006), have hosted far more arrivals from outside the EU than other member states, and the legal framework can therefore be seen as producing a lopsided system. States that are relatively less equipped to provide refugee protection are made to bear responsibility for larger numbers of refugee applicants and the subsequent provisions and entitlements due to them, based upon their peripheral geographic position on the edge of the EU (Eurostat 2015).

Despite this, a majority of refugees interviewed for this research felt they had been 'abandoned' by European state authorities. To explain how this abandonment takes place, a closer look at the application and asylum seeker experience is necessary. During the research period for this project, most interviewees in the camp had travelled the Central Mediterranean route to Europe via North Africa and Italy. When refugees landed in Italy they were strongly encouraged and sometimes coerced into being fingerprinted, photographed and registered by the Italian border police or port authorities, a biopolitical act of surveillance known as *fotosegnalamento*. Indeed a European Commission statement to Italian authorities approved 'the use of force for fingerprinting and...longer term retention for those migrants that resist fingerprinting' (European Commission 2015, 4). In this way the EU border is underpinned by a securitized nationalism regulated by biometric identification (Sparke 2006). Just as Sparke has uncovered the potential carceral consequences of transgressing the US border without documentation, the threat of prison is also a distinct possibility for asylum-seekers entering the European Union who do not co-operate with these biopolitical procedures. This biometric process can be seen as one of the diverse techniques for subjugating bodies in order to control populations (Foucault 1978). Several interviewees experienced this 'semicarceral' (Minca 2015b, 91) process of documentation, for example:

"The police tell us that we must put your finger here [gesturing being fingerprinted as part of the registration process in Italy]. If you don't put your finger there, the police will take us to prison."

(Sudanese interviewee)

Following this biometric process, migrants must be formally registered through the second-stage *verbalizzazione* (verbalization) process, involving the submission of a statement and detailed information about the specific nature of the asylum claim. By the time the asylum process reaches this second stage, refugees are expected to be housed in reception centres, distributed across Italy's various regions. Whilst the above process indicates the de jure legal framework within which asylum claims are to be made by EU law, the de facto process and experience was starkly different, as evidenced in our research. Participants routinely

indicated that upon arrival in Italy, they were denied provision and shelter, often only being allowed to spend a maximum of 2-5 days in emergency reception centres before being made to leave. This led directly to refugees living informally and homeless in Italy, as indicated consistently by interviewees. Refugee homelessness and destitution in Italy has been well documented by the Swiss Refugee Council (Nuffer and Trummer 2013) and other NGOs (AIDA 2014), who ascribe it partly as a consequence of delays between the finger-printing and formal registration process. It is only after the latter of these biopolitical processes that asylum seekers can be housed in a reception centre. The accounts of denial of basic shelter and provision in Italy are also supported by other investigations. For example Kirchgassaner (2015) reveals incidents of severe overcrowding in Naples, with up to 300 migrants living in single space, with large groups being housed in accommodation with no access to water or gas. Moreover the destitution and homelessness of refugees throughout Europe has been reported by the European Union itself (European Commission 2014). As a result, interviewees expressed their doubts as to whether any accommodation would be forthcoming within the formal asylum system. They described having to find spaces to sleep under entrances of commercial properties, in public parks (from which they would be forcefully removed) and in train stations. This indicates the most overt form of abandonment experienced by the asylum seekers - an absence of the necessary means to live within the EU country of reception:

"You don't have work, you don't have a room...this is not the way to live. On the road, you find those who are drunk and high on drugs this is not a good life. The fascists are also on the road and if I am to sleep on the road, then maybe he or someone else might kill me."

(Eritrean interviewee)

COERCED ONWARDS MIGRATION

The abandonment is more active still when we find that many of our interviewees were explicitly directed and coerced into moving to other European countries by police and border authorities, being informed that they could not expect provisions in Italy. Adding to this coerced mobility further, some were even shown or provided with *maps* to encourage them to go north into other European countries. This coercion leads to refugees finding themselves in a bureaucratic bind. Following registration in Italy, these nominally documented refugees are not permitted to register for asylum in any other EU country, for a period of at least twelve months (Article 13, Council Regulation No. 604/2013). Inability to register for asylum also disallows for state subsistence to be provided; coerced mobility translates therefore into forced informality, in which refugees must rely on their own efforts to find informal or 'illegal' work to survive. Refugees therefore enter a 'hyper-precarious' situation of bureaucratic entrapment (Lewis et al 2014, 593); they are denied provision in one country (Italy), and simultaneously coerced to move into other EU states where they would no longer be eligible for either asylum or provision.

The process of legal inclusion - of being nominally documented - in this instance results in de-facto exclusion, from the very material objects and political rights that would allow asylum seekers to survive healthily within the EU. This problematizes Agamben's legalistic framing of refugees as bare life (1998), with a simultaneous de jure legal entitlement and documentation paradoxically existing alongside a lived-reality of abandonment. This bind of forced mobility of refugees is reinforced by the ban on employment for unregistered asylum-seekers. Their possibility of finding legal employment in such a scenario is extinguished. The abandonment of refugees is therefore constructed actively, first between the denial of provisions upon entry to the EU, and secondly, the subsequent coerced mobility into northern European states. It is not only the refugees who arrived from the Central Mediterranean route who faced the potential abandonment through nominal inclusion; the predominantly Syrian and Afghan refugees arriving through Turkey into Greece also explained the peril of being finger-printed in Hungary, a country whose right-wing government has been amongst the most vocal in opposition to any refugees being allowed through into the EU.

"In Hungary you have to be very careful. In towns and cities we walked apart [from each other] and pretended to be Hungarians. If police catch you they sometimes make you register in Hungary, and then [we are] trapped."

(Syrian former camp resident, interview)

Without question, some refugees in Calais had set out from their home country with the destination of the UK in mind, with language, colonial history, and familial links all discussed as driving factors. But for many residents of the camp it was the experience of systematic abandonment, discrimination and coerced mobility while *inside* the EU that had led them on an uncertain path to northern France. For this group, Calais is the temporary apogee of an extemporary, ad hoc and forced migration. Furthermore, a sizable yet under-reported minority of camp residents had no intention of reaching the UK and were going through the formal process of claiming asylum in France. Indeed some participants were waiting up to five months for accommodation to be granted, being forced to endure the squalor, hardship and indignity of the 'new jungle' until that point.

Whether individual refugees have been caught in the aforementioned biopolitical binds of limited documentation – whether they are unsupported in their attempts to reunify with family members in the UK or live in a country in which they can communicate more effectively – or whether they find themselves in Calais on a long waiting list for housing, in all instances they are, temporarily at least, resigned to live informally within the makeshift camp. All of them had travelled through a gauntlet of biopolitical surveillance and border technologies, where the process of documentation either offered no direct benefit, or restricted their mobility. Whereas this section has highlighted the active ways in which the state has attempted to biopolitically control immigration, the following section will reveal the necropolitical outcomes of deliberate state inaction. As the next section will demonstrate, the conditions to which all these forced-migrants are abandoned to, have violent, bodily consequences.

6. VIOLENCE OF THE CAMP AND DELIBERATE STATE INDIFFERENCE

'When I arrived at the Jungle, suddenly I find that people are living like this, I thought to myself: "Is this really Europe?". This is Europe! This is France!? For a long time I thought that people did not live like this, people are living under the tree! Under a tree!'

(Sudanese camp resident, interview)

Abandoned by authorities to living informally, residents of the Calais camp find themselves exposed to stark conditions that have profound and detrimental consequences for their health and wellbeing. It is at this point at which the abandonment can be said to have led directly to violence on the refugee body. The violence is consequently structural (Galtung 1969) and takes place across a range of scales, from the confinement of living in the polluted and ill-equipped makeshift encampment, to the violence then enacted very directly on (and within) refugee bodies, through assault, preventable illness and the systematic deprivation of food.

In describing these acts of violence, we begin with the confinement of refugees in the 'improvised spatialities' (Minca 2015b, 91) of the 'new jungle'. The securitisation of Calais is evident in the heavy police presence, which led to over 18,000 migrants being arrested in 2015 alone (Milmo 2015). Police brutality was widely reported during interviews with refugees as well as physical attacks from racist thugs in the town or at the edges of the makeshift camp. Fear of this, as well as the disciplined mobility of removal (Moran et al 2012) has meant that public urban spaces in Calais are considered unsafe or off-limits by the residents of the 'new jungle'. The restricted mobility of refugees is also reinforced by the aggressive border control infrastructures, including a large security fence funded by the British government, to prevent camp residents accessing the

adjacent road from which they might be able to smuggle themselves into lorries heading for Dover (see Liempt & Sersli 2013, 1036). Despite the deprivation and squalor of the camp, and the deliberate lack of state support, the 'new jungle' remains the only viable location now for refugees who are forcibly prevented from living elsewhere.



Figure 3 – A Sudanese refugee in the Calais camp holds onto his ramshackle shelter, made from branches, string and plastic bags. [Thom Davies, July 2015]

Refugee camps are often 'demonstratively peripheral sites' (Diken 2004, 91) and the 'new jungle' on the far eastern edges of Calais is no exception. The miserable conditions of the camp are highly detrimental to the health and wellbeing of its inhabitants (Davies & Isakjee 2015) and this is exacerbated by the geographic location of the encampment itself. It is situated in a 'Seveso Zone' of moderate toxic risk, due to its proximity to two chemical plants, and while conducting this research we noticed distinct chemical smells emanating from the plant and drifting across the site. The camp is also located on the site of an informal dumping ground, with piles of building waste and other hazardous material jutting out of the sand and intermingling with the tents. The sight of such waste and rubble provides a grim metaphor for the 'wasted lives' of those residing within the camp (see Bauman 2004). Squire (2014) rightly encourages attentiveness to the materiality of refugee objects – and alarmingly, many broken pieces of highly toxic chrysotile (White Asbestos) were also located in the overcrowded camp, which can cause asbestosis, mesothelioma, and lung cancer, among other health problems. This toxic materiality and its invisible carcinogenic threats are emblematic of the 'stealthy' (Li 2010, 67) acts of violence and 'desertion' (Squire 2015) that refugees are allowed to suffer. In these hidden polluted spaces of the camp, the disposability of certain objects - as well as certain people - exists in a hazardous union (Wright 2006; Gidwani & Reddy 2011).

Although the camp is the only site near Calais where refugees are permitted to live, the humanitarian facilities therein do not approach suitable standards. For example, during the first research visit to the camp in April 2015, an initial population of roughly 1500 newly (and forcibly) relocated refugees had regular access to just one water point and four filthy NGO-built drop-toilets (Dhesi et al 2015). Many refugees had to drag water up to a kilometre through the rubble and sand dunes of the camp. By the summer in 2015, the number of

residents had more than doubled to over 3000, with only one toilet per 75 residents, far below Sphere Project and United Nations recommendations of a minimum of one per 20 in emergency situations (UNHCR 2007; Sphere 2015). Early 2016 saw the population double again to 6000, and the abject conditions of the few available toilets forced many residents to openly defecate near to where they live and prepare food, adding to the wretched nature of this makeshift encampment and its related health risks.



Figure 4: A view of the tents and makeshift structures that make up the western part of the Calais camp [Thom Davies, July 2015]

Lack of sanitation for thousands of refugee residents is clear evidence of social injustice and a deliberate state inaction, which can be read as a stark form of structural violence (Jewitt 2011). The active state practices and biopolitical experiences of pan-EU migration highlighted in the previous section can be compared with the deliberately inactive, violently-forsaking forms of desertion that allow such squalid conditions to continue. Together, these form a tapestry of 'bio' and 'necro' forms of governance. The camp's grave environmental health conditions are regarded with deliberate indifference by French authorities who intentionally withhold care. The continual disavowal of basic services relies heavily on an agnotological approach - that of a willing ignorance to conditions in the camp, and 'turning a blind eye'. Adapting from Proctor and Schiebinger's work on agnotology (2008), this deliberate ignoring of a glaring humanitarian problem can be read as an agnopolitical expression of power. State authorities are mobilised into inaction for political ends, or to a calculatedly limited form of involvement. As the following section will reveal, denial of sanitation is only one of a number of multi-scalar threats that the residents of the makeshift camp endure.

Following Mountz and Loyd's (2014) call to shift the scale of enquiry from the legal level towards the bodily experience of migratory violence, it is important to highlight how migrants in Calais literally embody the destitution of the camp, with many suffering hunger, injury, infestation and infection. Of the most calculated and necropolitical (in)actions of the French state, the decision to only provide insufficient food hand-outs to

refugee residents stands out as particularly crude. The provision of one meal a day is distributed via a third-sector organisation and is deliberately insufficient to keep refugees without any reliable food provision. In July 2015 when the research took place, it was estimated by NGOs in the camp that even these meals would only be provided for 1500 people out of the 3000 in the camp. Meal boxes were often being stored unsafely by refugees so that the meagre ration could be stretched out over a number of days. In this way the findings precisely recall Galtung's notion of structural and physiological violence through the denial of food (Galtung 1969; 174). The scenario also recalls Mbembe's (2003, 21) description of subjects being kept in a state of permanent injury and pain. In Calais this is reflected in the pain of permanent hunger which participants consistently articulated during interviews.

Medical professionals attest that the lack of safe and sufficient food has the potential to exacerbate the many viral and bacterial illnesses experienced by refugee residents. In the Calais camp, Doctors of the World were able to provide immediate basic medical treatment to as many as possible, yet in interviews several volunteers repeated being overwhelmed with frustration in not being able to treat the most basic of parasitic blights which spread easily in the overcrowded camp. The cramped sleeping conditions, as well as the lack of facilities to wash and dry clothes and bedding, has meant that scabies has reached epidemic proportions. Health workers estimate that one in five people in the camp suffer from this demoralizing infestation (Hargreaves 2016, 27), which causes incessant itchiness and discomfort - especially at night - and in normal circumstances would be very easy to treat. The invisible and preventable nature of this parasitic outbreak allows it to be framed as a form of structural violence that is adding to the misery of everyday life in the makeshift camp (Galtung 1969). Frustrated with the lack of basic health care and facilities in the 'new jungle', many refugees discussed their discomfort. For example one resident explained how:

'The situation in the Jungle is too [emphasis] bad. Because here there is no medicine, there is no good health, you know? If you want to cook food you have to use this...' [see Figure 5]

(Sudanese resident, interview)

Indeed the violence that refugees are exposed to in the Calais camp has impacts across different scales, including at the microbiological level, thus highlighting what Farmer (1999, 5) calls the 'pathogenic roles of social inequalities'. Interviews with residents of the camp and with NGO health workers indicated many cases of vomiting and diarrhoea. In every group-interview with residents of the eleven selected sub-camps [including Figure 5], interviewees indicated that one or more members of their group were suffering from gastrointestinal illnesses. Analysis of swabs taken from various locations in the 'new jungle' supported this finding, with laboratory analysis indicating high levels of harmful bacteria. Alarming one of the water points was contaminated with E.coli and coliforms, indicating the presence of faecal matter (Dhesi et al 2015). Thus the abandonment in Calais has a microbiological component (see Loyd 2009), and the subsequent invisible injuries that residents of the camp are subjected to form part of a multi-scalar abandonment that submits 'large numbers of people to lead short and limited lives' (Li, 2010, 3). The unseen nature and gradual consequences of these easily preventable conditions also recalls 'slow violence' (Nixon 2011), where – just like the consequences of climate change - suffering may be delayed and hard to articulate. Furthermore, the lack of safe drinking water directly recalls Galtung's (1969; 174) analysis in which the denial of water is framed as a form of structural violence.

The morphology of the camp is in a constant state of flux, with new refugees arriving daily and the regular construction of improvised shelters to escape the elements. Accommodation for the thousands of destitute residents consisted largely of ramshackle shelters made from scrap wood, branches and plastic sheeting as well as donated tents [see Figures 3 and 4]. This too resulted in a slow violence on the refugee body: interviewees with breathing difficulties reported their conditions worsening over time by damp and cold conditions, whilst all residents interviewed reported being extremely cold, especially during the night. This

permanent wounding of refugees would not be as grievous if it was for a very short period, but some residents had been exposed to such conditions for up to a year, articulating how they felt 'trapped'. As security around the port town increased in the Summer of 2015, the possibility of reaching the UK was reduced and the camp was increasingly seen as a temporary home, with refugees having built makeshift educational, community and religious spaces.



Figure 5 - A refugee with an injured foot cooking in a makeshift kitchen inside the 'new Jungle'. Due to a lack of facilities for clean water and washing facilities, pathogenic bacteria was found in this and other makeshift spaces (see report by Dhesi et al, 2015) [Thom Davies, July 2015]

Despite the agency of some residents to construct such infrastructure, the ability to resist the necropolitical violence of the camp was limited. Calais residents could regularly be seen to be physically injured, limping, bandaged – with a queue of refugees lining up on most mornings to be examined by medical professionals from Doctors of the World. These injuries were usually a result of attempted border crossings; the most dangerous of these being attempts to board trains going through the Channel Tunnel into England. The increasingly deadly assemblage of securitization around Calais took 16 lives between June and October 2015 (BBC 2015); many killed attempting to board trains, with others drowning in the English Channel or suffocating in refrigerated lorries. However others have perished in the camp itself, both through illness and direct violence. NGO medics in the camp have stated that 15 people died within the makeshift camp between June and September 2015 alone, despite the population being overwhelmingly young (Hurley 2016). The potentiality of death is an ever-present reality in the 'new jungle', where refugees are, as Foucault suggests - rejected into death (*rejeter dans la mort*) as part of an active abandonment (Foucault 1976 cited in Fassin 2009).

Yet the direct violence is also accompanied by the untreated infections, widespread chest illnesses, constant hunger, cold conditions, physical injury and psychological trauma. These are all symptoms of political and structural processes that add up to the creation of what Mbembe (2003, 40) referred to as a 'death-world'.

The Calais residents represent disposable subjects, kept alive whilst injured through extreme marginalisation, which also puts their lives at severe jeopardy. Their suffering closely resembles the form of structural violence which sees a marginalised group of people existing far below their potential (Galtung 1969). The violence may be interpreted as indirect but is in no way *abstract*; instead it so recognisable to the residents of the camp, that refugees themselves regularly compared the experience of living in the Calais camp to violent abuses and traumas suffered in origin countries, or to the brutal journeys to Europe. As one participant articulated:

'A quick bullet through the head in Afghanistan would be better than this slow death here' (Afghan refugee).

7. CONCLUSION

This paper has demonstrated how the abandonment of refugees in Europe has led directly to thousands being subjected to forms of violence that are ultimately structural. The violence is first operationalized through active biopolitical mechanisms of documentation and registration which can begin at the very point that they enter the EU's Schengen Zone. With provision withheld and legal inclusion often only nominal, some refugees are coerced through EU states to live informally. The structural violence for those in this study reaches its apogee in the squalor of the Calais camp, producing stark suffering of refugee bodies and the potential for a 'slow death'. In this way, the state's biopolitical activities have given way to calculated necropolitical *inactions*.

Central to the argument of this paper is that the empirical findings can be conceptualised by a dialectic unity between the 'bio' and 'necro' – between action and inaction. The active involvement of the state in the bureaucratic biometric border processes could be seen as being in contrast to the evident absence of the state in the EU's abandoned refugee spaces. Necropower can in fact be evidenced in states such as Italy where empirical evidence from this study shows how denial of provision can be used to coerce migrants to onward migration. However it is in the Calais camp that necropolitical inactions manifest into a brutal reality.

As our empirics starkly testify, the squalor and permanent wounding of the Calais camp can be likened to Mbembe's 'death-worlds' (Mbembe 2003, 40), where the conditions therein, as well as the political inactions of the state, assign its inhabitants the status of the 'living dead' (ibid, 40); not actively killed – as would befit a 'bare life' reading - but destined to suffer the harm and indignity of long-term cruel conditions. The brutality that men, women and children suffer in such places becomes a 'socially sanctioned dehumanisation' (Castro 2015, 248); a normalisation of suffering where a 'hands off' state response can in fact have deliberate and violent consequences. The agno-political way in which the plight of refugees is deliberately overlooked by state agencies is intended to constrain and disrupt onward migrations, perhaps ultimately coercing migrants 'back along their pathways of expulsion' (Rygiel, 2011, 5). In this way, the deadly decision to stop rescuing refugees out at sea – as witnessed in 2014 when the Mare Nostrum rescue missions were halted (ECRE 2014) – can be put on a continuum of violent inaction in which the squalid conditions of the Calais camp form an inherent part.

As the violent ramifications of the EU's border work continues to be 'offshored', outsourced, and externalized beyond its traditional borders (Vaughn-Williams 2015b, 11; Brachet 2015), it is all the more important to also look *inside* EU sovereign space to examine stealthier forms of structural violence that are hidden in plain view. More often than not this internal brutality is concealed behind a veil of inaction, and the withholding of the means of life. This paper has demonstrated how *inactivity* - as well as political actions - can be wielded as a means of control, coercion and power. By being attentive to what states choose *not* to do, as well as their active counterparts, may provide new openings to examine instances of oppression and structural violence. In line with McIntyre and Nast (2011), we have shown in this paper how biopolitical activity has worked hand in

Davies et al (2017)

glove with necropolitical abandonment in the (mis)management of refugees in Europe. Action and inaction can be used in political unison as a means of control.

REFERENCES

- Agamben G., (1998) *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. London: Stanford University Press
- AIDA (2014) Mind The Gap: NGO Perspective on Challenges to Accessing Protection In The Common European Asylum System. Brussels: ECRE
- Amoore L (2006) Biometric borders: Governing mobilities in the war on terror. *Political geography*, 25(3): 336-351
- Bauman Z (2013) *Wasted lives: Modernity and its outcasts*. London: John Wiley & Sons
- BBC News (2015) Two Migrants Killed In Calais Over Two Days [online] available: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-34547195> [accessed 20/03/16]
- Bialasiewicz L (2012) Off-shoring and Out-sourcing the Borders of EUrope: Libya and EU Border Work in the Mediterranean. *Geopolitics* 17(4): 843-866.
- Brachet J (2015) Policing the Desert: The IOM in Libya Beyond War and Peace. *Antipode* 48 (2): 272-292
- Castro A F H (2015) From the “Bio” to the “Necro”, in Wilmer S E & Žukauskaitė A [eds.] *Resisting Biopolitics: Philosophical, Political, and Performative Strategies*. London: Routledge. 237-253.
- Davies T and Isakjee A 2015 Geography, migration and abandonment in the Calais refugee camp. *Political Geography*, 49, pp.93-95.
- Dearden L (2016) Calais Jungle Evictions: Demolition teams return to refugee camp with riot police after overnight clashes, *The Independent*, 01/03/2016 available: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/calais-jungle-evictions-demolition-teams-and-riot-police-return-to-refugee-camp-after-tear-gas-fired-a6904566.html> [accessed 20/03/16]
- DeVerteuil G (2015) Conceptualizing violence for health and medical geography. *Social Science & Medicine*, 133: 216-222.
- Dhesi S, Isakjee A and Davies T ‘An Environmental Health Assessment of the New Migrant Camp in Calais’ University of Birmingham [accessed via <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-les/gees/research/calais-report-oct-2015.pdf> on 22/04/2016]
- Diken B (2004) From refugee camps to gated communities: biopolitics and the end of the city. *Citizenship studies*, 8(1): 83-106.
- Eastmond M (2007) Stories as lived experience: Narratives in forced migration research. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(2): 248-264.
- ECRE (2014) MareNostrum to end - New Frontex operation will not ensure rescue of migrants in international waters. *European Council on Refugees and Exiles* available: <http://ecre.org/component/content/article/70-weekly-bulletin-articles/855-operation-mare-nostrum-to-end-frontex-triton-operation-will-not-ensure-rescue-at-sea-of-migrants-in-international-waters.html>
- European Commission (2014) Study on Mobility, Migration and Destitution in the European Union. *European Commission*. Brussels, March
- European Commission (2015) Progress Report on the Implementation of the hotspots in Italy, *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council*. Strasbourg, 15.12.2015
- Eurostat (2015) Asylum in the EU, *press release* [accessed via <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/2995521/6751779/3-20032015-BP-EN.pdf/35e04263-2db5-4e75-b3d3-6b086b23ef2b> on 21.12.2015]

Davies et al (2017)

Farmer P (1996) Social inequalities and emerging infectious diseases *Emerging infectious diseases*, 2(4): 259-269

Fassin, D., 2009. Another politics of life is possible. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(5), pp.44-60.

Foucault M (1978) *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1. An Introduction.* Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Random House.

Foucault M (1997) *The Birth Of Biopolitics* in Michel Foucault: Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth. Paul Rabinow [ed]. New York: New Press

Galtung J (1969) Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of peace research*, 6(3): 167-191.

Gentleman (2015) The horror of the Calais refugee camp: 'We feel like we are dying slowly'. *The Guardian*, 3.11.2015

Gidwani V and Reddy R N (2011) The afterlives of "waste": Notes from India for a minor history of capitalist surplus. *Antipode*, 43(5): 1625-1658.

Gilbert E and Ponder C (2014) Between tragedy and farce: 9/11 compensation and the value of life and death. *Antipode*, 46(2): 404-425.

Hargreaves S (2016) Europe's migrants face unacceptable humanitarian situation. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 16(1): 27-28.

Hurley R (2016). Vandals force volunteer doctors to close clinic in Calais's refugee camp. *BMJ*, 352: i182.

Hurwitz A. (1999) The 1990 Dublin Convention: A Comprehensive Assessment. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 11(4): 646-677.

Jacobsen K and Landau L B (2003) The dual imperative in refugee research: some methodological and ethical considerations in social science research on forced migration. *Disasters*, 27(3): 185-206.

Jewitt S (2011) Geographies of shit Spatial and temporal variations in attitudes towards human waste. *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(5): 608-626.

Kirchgassaner S (2015) 'We were abandoned': migrants tell of suffering in Italy's private shelters. *The Guardian*, 26.11.2015

Lee D and Pratt G (2012) The spectacular and the mundane: racialised state violence, Filipino migrant workers, and their families *Environment and Planning A*, 44(4): 889–904

Legg S. (2007) Beyond the European province: Foucault and postcolonialism. *Space, knowledge and power: Foucault and geography*: 265-289.

Lemke T (2011) *Biopolitics: An advanced introduction.* New York: NYU Press.

Lewis H, Dwyer P, Hodkinson S and Waite L (2015) Hyper-precarious lives Migrants, work and forced labour in the Global North. *Progress in Human Geography*, 39(5): 580-600.

Li T M (2010) To make live or let die? Rural dispossession and the protection of surplus populations. *Antipode*, 41(1): 66-93.

Liempt I and Sersli S (2013) State responses and migrant experiences with human smuggling: A reality check. *Antipode*, 45(4): 1029-1046.

Loyd J M. (2009) "A Microscopic Insurgent": Militarization, Health, and Critical Geographies of Violence. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 99(5): 863-873.

Loyd J M (2012). Geographies of peace and antiviolence. *Geography Compass*, 6(8), pp.477-489.

Davies et al (2017)

Mackenzie C, McDowell C and Pittaway E (2007) Beyond 'do no harm': The challenge of constructing ethical relationships in refugee research. *Journal of Refugee studies*, 20(2): 299-319.

Mbembe A (1992) The Banality of Power and the Aesthetics of Vulgarly in the Postcolony. *Public Culture*, 4(2): 1-30.

Mbembe A (2008) Necropolitics, in *Foucault in an Age of Terror*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. 152-182

McAuley J (2016) French court gives okay to demolish Calais's 'Jungle' refugee camp. *Washington Post* 25.02.2016 [accessed via https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/french-court-gives-okay-to-demolish-calaiss-jungle-refugee-camp/2016/02/25/52cae46e-dbd1-11e5-891a-4ed04f4213e8_story.html on 12.03.2016]

McIntyre M and Nast H J (2011) Bio (necro) polis: Marx, Surplus Populations, and the Spatial Dialectics of Reproduction and "Race". *Antipode*, 43(5): 1465-1488

Millner N (2011) From "refugee" to "migrant" in Calais solidarity activism: Re-staging undocumented migration for a future politics of asylum. *Political Geography*, 30(6): 320-328

Milmo C (2015) Calais crisis: The seven claims made about the migrants - and the reality. *The Independent* 01/08/2015

Minca C (2015a) Geographies of the camp *Political Geography*, 49: 74-83

Minca C (2015b) Counter-camps and other spatialities. *Political Geography*, 49: 90-92

Minca C (2005) The return of the camp. *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(4): 405-412

Moran D, Piacentini L. and Pallot J. (2012) Disciplined mobility and carceral geography: Prisoner transport in Russia. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 37(3): 446-460

Mountz A and Loyd J M (2014) Constructing the Mediterranean Region: Obscuring Violence in the Bordering of Europe's Migration "Crises". *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 13(2): 173-195

Nguyen N (2015) Chokepoint: Regulating US student mobility through biometrics. *Political Geography*, 46: 1-10

Nixon R. (2011) *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. London: Harvard University Press

Nuffer S and Trummer M (2013) Reception Conditions In Italy. Berne: Swiss Refugee Council available online at: <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/5315872c4.pdf> accessed: 24/03/2016

Pastore F, Monzini, P and Sciortino G (2006) Schengen's soft underbelly? Irregular migration and human smuggling across land and sea borders to Italy. *International Migration*, 44(4): 95-119

Phillips S D (2014) The Women's Squad in Ukraine's protests: Feminism, nationalism, and militarism on the Maidan. *American Ethnologist*, 41(3): 414-426

Proctor R and Schiebinger L L (2008). *Agnology: The making and unmaking of ignorance*. Stanford University Press

Ramadan A (2013) From Tahrir to the world: The camp as a political public space. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 20(1): 145-149.

Reinisch J (2015) 'Forever Temporary': Migrants in Calais, Then and Now. *The Political Quarterly*, 86(4): 515-522

Round, J. and Kuznetsova, I., 2016. Necropolitics and the Migrant as a Political Subject of Disgust: The Precarious Everyday of Russia's Labour Migrants. *Critical Sociology* 1-18

Rigby J and Schlembach R (2013) Impossible protest: noborders in Calais. *Citizenship studies*, 17(2): 157-172

Rygiel K (2011) Bordering solidarities: migrant activism and the politics of movement and camps at Calais. *Citizenship studies*, 15(01): 1-19.

Saunders B, Kitzinger J. and Kitzinger C. (2015) Anonymising interview data: challenges and compromise in practice. *Qualitative Research*, 15(5): 616-632.

Sparke M B (2006) A neoliberal nexus: Economy, security and the biopolitics of citizenship on the border. *Political geography*, 25(2): 151-180.

Sparke M B (2014) Health, in Lee R. et al Handbook of Human Geography, Thousand Oaks: Sage 684-708.

Sphere (2015) Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response. *Sphere Project*

Springer, S. and Le Billon, P., 2016. Violence and space: An introduction to the geographies of violence. *Political Geography*, 52, pp.1-3.

Squire V (2014) Desert 'trash': Posthumanism, border struggles, and humanitarian politics. *Political Geography*, 39: 11-21.

Squire V (2015) Acts of Desertion: Abandonment and Renouncement at the Sonoran Borderzone. *Antipode*, 47(2): 500-516.

Tyner J and Inwood J (2014) Violence as fetish Geography, Marxism, and dialectics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(6): 771-784

Tyner, J.A. and Rice, S., 2015. To live and let die: Food, famine, and administrative violence in Democratic Kampuchea, 1975-1979. *Political Geography* 1-10

Tyner, J.A., 2016a. *Violence in Capitalism: Devaluing Life in an Age of Responsibility*. New York: University of Nebraska Press.

Tyner, J.A., 2016b. Hate-crimes as racial violence: a critique of the exceptional. *Social & Cultural Geography*, pp.1-19.

UNHCR (2007) Handbook for emergencies. UN (third edition)

UNHCR (2015) The Sea Route to Europe: the Mediterranean passage in the age of refugees. UNHCR: The United Nations Refugee Agency

Vaughan-Williams N (2015a) "We are not animals!" Humanitarian border security and zoopolitical spaces in EUrope. *Political Geography*, 45: 1-10.

Vaughan-Williams, N. (2015b) *Europe's border crisis: biopolitical security and beyond*. USA: Oxford University Press

Williams J M (2015) From humanitarian exceptionalism to contingent care: Care and enforcement at the humanitarian border. *Political Geography* 47: 11-20.

Wright M W (2006). *Disposable women and other myths of global capitalism*. London: Taylor & Francis.