

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Ethically (un)bounding camp research: Life histories within and beyond camp boundaries

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Weima Y. (2022). Ethically (un)bounding camp research: Life histories within and beyond camp boundaries. AREA, 54(3), 374-382 [10.1111/area.12760].

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/955113> since: 2024-03-26

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1111/area.12760>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

[Weima, Y. (2022) Ethically (un)bounding camp research: Life histories within and beyond camp boundaries. Area, 54, 374–382.]

The final published version is available online at:

[<https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12760>]

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Ethically (un)bounding camp research: Life histories within and beyond camp boundaries

Yolanda Weima

*Department of Geography, York
University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada*

Correspondence

*Yolanda Weima, Department of Geography, York University, Toronto, ON, Canada.
Email: weima@yorku.ca*

Funding information

Ontario Graduate Scholarship. SSHRC Canada Graduate Scholarship to Honour Nelson Mandela. York Fieldwork Cost Fund.

ABSTRACT

The changing enforcement and porosity of camp boundaries have implications for research in camps and their environs. Camp research is increasingly blurring their locational and categorical boundaries. However, in contexts where camp boundaries are being actively “hardened,” researchers must be attentive to possible effects of research across boundaries for those who are targeted by encampment. Research has an ethical imperative to challenge exclusionary boundaries and categories, recognising the many ways these constructed boundaries are already crossed and contested. It must also conscientiously negotiate and even defer to boundaries in research when participants may otherwise be at risk because of the underlying violence that maintains camps as discrete spatial technologies of power. In conducting life-history research with Burundian refugees in Tanzania, I chose to “bound” my research with Burundian refugees to within camp boundaries, to reduce the risk to research participants. I argue that although research in camps may risk reifying camp boundaries, it can nevertheless conscientiously reach beyond and challenge camp boundaries through attentive methods. The stories recounted in this research reach far beyond camp boundaries, and include experiences of Burundian border-crossers seeking liveable lives in diverse places and situations, not always of their own choosing. Life histories thus weave an imperfect, inchoate “minor cartography” of often-invisibilised, diverse sites of refugee lives, bound up with the changing power and policing of camp boundaries shaping refugees' trajectories in the broader “campscape” over time.

KEYWORDS

boundary politics, Burundian refugees, life history, refugee camps, research ethics, Tanzania

INTRODUCTION

What the map cuts up, the story cuts across. (de Certeau, 1984, p. 129)

Boundaries are a defining feature of institutional refugee camps (Turner, 2016) and shape research in camps and the broader landscapes in which they are situated. While the state creation of camps seeks to effectively imprison “undesirable” border-crossers under a humanitarian guise, camp borders and categories are nevertheless negotiated, crossed, blurred, and refused, including by those they seek to contain (Agier, 2011; Abourahme, 2015; Brankamp, 2021; Jansen, 2016; Tallio, 2012; Turner, 2016). The topological interrelation of camps and their environs despite their boundaries is captured in the term “campscape” (Martin, 2015). Martin's (2015) conception of the “campscape” describes a context in which camp boundaries became more “fluid” and ambiguous over time. In this paper, however, I apply the term “campscapes” to Tanzania, where camp boundaries are “hardening” for Burundian refugees, in tandem with policing that creates and enforces state and humanitarian categories of inclusion and exclusion.

Precisely because of the performative power of camp boundaries, studying their transgression may raise ethical and methodological dilemmas. Significantly, the presence of researchers may visibilise people seeking liveable lives beyond camp boundaries who are targeted by encampment, endangering those who participate in research (Khosravi, 2018; Krause, 2017; Landau, 2020; Neto, 2017; Polzer & Hammond, 2008). Even though I believe ethical research should challenge the camp boundaries and categories, I chose to consciously create boundaries in my research design and practice (Cuomo & Massaro, 2016). I limited research with Burundian border- crossers to the formally recognised space of the camp, to reduce the risk of visibilising research participants. In situating research in this way, there is a real possibility of reproducing and reifying the boundaries created by state and humanitarian knowledge and power. But research in camps need not be camp- centric. Through attentive approaches, researchers can conscientiously reach beyond and challenge camp boundaries, without endangering border- crossers outside of camps. Although potentially possible through many methods, I specifically highlight how life histories conducted with refugees within camps reach beyond the formal camp space. Burundian refugees' boundary- crossing life histories sketch a “minor- cartography” of often- invisibilised refugee lives (Tazzioli, 2020). They reveal “spatial disobedience” beyond camps (Tazzioli, 2020) while also highlighting the consequences of hardening of boundaries in the campscape for border- crossers.

BOUNDARIES WITHIN AND BEYOND CAMPS

Often used synonymously with “borders,” boundaries have been an enduring theme in human geography (Jones, 2009; Newman & Paasi, 1998). “Boundaries” denote “line- on- the- ground political division” (Jones, 2009, p. 180) such as territorial borders demarcating states, or a formally gazetted camp perimeter. They also commonly signify the construction, division, and distinction of social categories (Fassin, 2011; Jones, 2009). Both uses refer to imperfect, incomplete processes, rather than natural, absolute demarcations (Jones, 2009; Paasi, 1998). For example, camp scholars highlight their permeability, the changing nature of camps' locational boundaries over time (Abourahme, 2015; Jansen, 2016; Martin, 2015; Oesch, 2020), and the deficiencies of entwined legal and humanitarian categories bound up with the state- centric management of displacement (Bakewell, 2008; Fresia, 2007; Hyndman & Giles, 2017; Ikanda, 2018). Nevertheless, in the context of many camps these porous “lines” still have significant performative power (Turner, 2016). They distinguish a space and define a population subject to exceptional governance. For example, in Tanzanian camps, decrees can be proclaimed and rules changed suddenly, outside of the law, differently shaping everyday life within and beyond camp bounds.

Locational and categorical bounding are intertwined in migration contexts, producing “populations” and distinguishing their “desirability” within a defined territory (Agier, 2011; Agier & Lecadet, 2014; Fassin, 2011; Picker & Pasquetti, 2015; Tallio, 2012). Entangled with the policing of state- territorial boundaries, the policing of a camp's locational boundaries is linked with the construction of identities such as “Burundian,” the policing of legal categories such as “illegal aliens” (subject to detention and expulsion from the bounded territory), and complementary legal- humanitarian categories, such as “refugee” (who, in Tanzania, must remain in a camp to retain the “protection” of this category). In this way, camp boundaries rely on and reify colonially constructed state borders, hierarchical categories of territorialised belonging and nonbelonging, and states' desire to contain, and humanitarian “management” of people cast as out- of- place (Brankamp & Daley, 2020).

BOUNDARIES, METHODOLOGIES, AND ETHICS

Geographers also use the language of boundaries in discussing research design and practice, including ethical and methodological considerations (Cuomo & Massaro, 2016; Katz, 1994; Meissner & Hasselberg, 2012). While all research is necessarily “bounded” in scope and due to practicalities

(Meissner & Hasselberg, 2012), the ethical issues addressed in this paper resonate with the concerns of researchers in other carceral or “closed” contexts (Koch, 2013; Maillet et al., 2016; Thomson, 2010; Turner, 2013). Research ethics frameworks generally concern the risk of immediate harm to research participants (Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, & Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, 2018; Clark-Kazak, Canadian Council for Refugees (CCR), Canadian Association for Refugee and Forced Migration Studies (CARFMS), & Centre for Refugee Studies (CRS), 2017; Krause, 2017), and may require researchers to create boundaries in their research design and practice (Cuomo & Massaro, 2016; Hyndman, 2001). For example, where invisibility is key to the survival strategies of forced migrants, researchers must weigh whether their project may draw unwanted attention to people wishing to remain clandestine, or if their exclusion from research would be unjust (Khosravi, 2018; Landau, 2020; Polzer & Hammond, 2008; Hagan, 2022; Minca, 2022).

Beyond typical institutional ethics reviews, a methodological approach to ethics considers how the underlying philosophies of a project (including research objectives and the terminology used) may also contribute to the long-term “production of harm” (Daley, 2021). This includes deliberation as to whether the aims and terminology of research serve policymakers’ interests in the containment and exclusion of people deemed out- of- place. When located within camps and other sites of migrant imprisonment, methodological ethics may also include how researchers imagine the bounding of their “field sites” (which postcolonial and feminist geographers have long sought to challenge and transgress; Hyndman, 2001; Katz, 1994; Massey, 2003; Meissner & Hasselberg, 2012). As Crawley and Skleparis state, “categories have consequences” (2018, p. 49). They argue that “we need to explicitly engage with the politics of bounding, that is to say, the process by which categories are constructed, the purpose that they serve and their consequences” (2018, p. 60). In camp(scape) research, this may include approaches that challenge the locational and categorical boundaries that produce the camp. This paper considers the challenges and possibilities of methodologically aiming to challenge boundary- politics of camps, while also recognising how their power and policing shapes research practices and ethical boundaries in the campscape.

LIFE- HISTORY METHODS

Although all human identities are relational and fluid (Massey, 2004), the refugee category is essentialised and concretised in order to manage people deemed out- of- place through dehumanising policies such as encampment (Daley, 2021). In reality, refugees living in camps shape and are shaped by relationships and places beyond camp boundaries. In such a context, life- history methods have particular strengths in tracing the varied “ruptures and sutures of displacement, return, and return again” that are not captured by the boundaries of dominant humanitarian categories, or the locational boundaries of the camp (Weima and Hyndman, 2018). Feminist geographers and migration scholars advocate the strengths of narrative approaches to research in challenging essentialist and homogenising stereotypes and categorisations of people forced to cross borders through attention to lived experience (McDowell, 2016, 2018). Life histories are able to highlight sites and experiences within migration stories that are otherwise inaccessible to researchers, and thus often overlooked in research, without the researcher’s physical presence in those sites (Eastmond, 2007; McDowell, 2018).

Narrative methods raise questions of reliability, anonymity, and consent (Krause, 2017; McDowell, 2018; Thomson, 2010). While beyond the scope of this paper, other scholars have highlighted how language, surveillance, trauma, suspicion, and humanitarian governance shape power relations, positionality, and narratives in particular ways in camp(scape)s (Bouillon et al., 2005; Brankamp, 2021; Clark- Kazak, 2009, p. 13; Hyndman, 2001; Minca, 2022; Powles, 2004; Turner, 2004; Vermylen, 2016; Carter- White, 2022).

In 80 life-history interviews, with 40 primary participants, I heard stories that spanned six decades, five countries, over 25 different refugee camps, numerous transit camps, large cities, diverse towns and villages, jails, forests, and farms. (Some identifying details have been changed; pseudonyms are used.) Due to length constraints, only brief excerpts are recounted. Such a methodology “foregrounds and keeps a memory of spaces that are invisibilised and whose traces get lost” in formal humanitarian and state-centric mappings of displacement (Tazzioli, 2020, ch. 5). Thus, “through a counter-mapping gaze the existence of ephemeral places of containment, movement and struggle can be brought to the fore” beyond official camps (Tazzioli, 2020, ch. 5). In this research, such a cartography was traced through stories that both defy and illustrate the performative power of camp boundaries, from within.

CONTEXT: RECURRENT REFUGE AND ARCHETYPAL CAMPS

Nyarugusu and Nduta, the two camps in which I conducted doctoral research, resemble archetypal imaginaries of refugee camps. Both are 37 kilometres from the Tanzania–Burundi border, in Kigoma province, north-western Tanzania (United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), 2018), a region that is not new to hosting refugees. Nyarugusu Camp opened in 1996, initially hosting ~60,000 Congolese refugees. Nduta had been one of several camps opened to host Burundian refugees in the 1990s, but had closed in 2008 as Burundian refugees were repatriated. By 2012, nearly all the Burundians remaining in those camps had been “returned.” Less than three years later, in 2015, large numbers of Burundians began seeking refuge in Tanzania again. The former “1990s camps” were expanded or re-opened. In 2018, 153,024 Burundian and Congolese refugees and asylum seekers were registered in Nyarugusu Camp, and 104,784 Burundian refugees officially resided in Nduta. Over 50,000 more Burundian refugees were registered in Mtendeli camp, another former camp re-opened in the same region (UNHCR, 2017). Just as the sites had formerly hosted refugees, the majority of the Burundians registered in 2015–2017 had previously been refugees (Author's interviews, 2018; Masabo et al., 2018; Peter, 2015).

The camps established in the 1990s, and re-opened in 2015–2016, differ from the settlements established in the 1970s for Burundians who fled genocide in 1972. The old settlements were geared towards self-sufficiency and integration, providing land and Tanzanian curriculum schools (Chaulia, 2003; Kweka, 2007). Although recounted in “new camps,” several life histories included stories of the “old camps.”

Nearly all camp research includes varied locations, such as government, INGO, and UN agency offices and archives. I conducted interviews and observation in offices in Dar es Salaam, Kigoma, Kibondo, Kasulu, and Makere. Nevertheless, research in differing sites does not automatically avoid camp-centrism. Such places are crucial nodes in the power geometries of camp creation and governance (Hyndman, 2001). Here my reflections centre on research within camps.

HARDENING BOUNDARIES: DECREES AND PRACTICALITIES

Sarah Turner writes of research in closed contexts that “boundaries between formal procedures and on-the-ground negotiations are often flexible” (Brankamp, 2019, p. 73; Turner, 2013, p. 397). In my experience the flexibility was largely one-sided, reflecting the exceptional governance of camps and the increasingly strict rules being applied to camp residents. As required, I reported to the commandant on my initial arrival in each camp. One commandant then decided that I should report to him in-person every subsequent time I arrived in the camp and before I left each day (beyond the formal requirements of the Department of Refugee Services). This was usually a simple check-in, often just a wave, but it took time each day (both as the office was over three kilometres from the camp gate, and waiting in line to report). It also reinforced a “particularity” shaping research within camp boundaries (Vermeylen, 2016): the commandant's power to rule by decree in the camp. For

example, part-way through my research, a sudden decree banned bicycle and motorcycle-taxis in the camp – stalling livelihoods and making the delivery of goods and the mobility of people much more difficult. While far less important, this ban changed the time I needed to walk or hitch rides for research and daily reporting, and shaped how I concentrated my research in specific zones. In the other camp, the commandant seemed rarely present. I reported my presence to his staff, shared copies of my permits, and occasionally checked in to maintain cordial relations. This inattention to me did not mean the residents of this camp were exempt from sudden, strict restrictions. Though they differed between camps, the implementation of such decrees further accentuated the difference between life inside and outside camp boundaries, including razed common markets; demolished kiosks; bans on certain businesses (so that even barbering became a clandestine activity for some); and the cutting of maize crops (as a “security threat”) (Author's fieldnotes). These measures actively curtailed urbanising processes, and heightened distinctions between life in the camp and the surrounding area. Camp boundaries were hardening rather than blurring.

CAMPS AND CATEGORIES: RISKS WITHIN AND BEYOND BOUNDARIES

Brankamp notes how “permits and papers are the bureaucratic currency needed for people's circulation within and beyond the camp” (2019, p. 73). While my access to the appropriate permits meant that I could enter camps for research,¹ obtaining permits to leave the camps is difficult for those imprisoned by encampment. Burundians without permits outside of camps are framed as nefarious, linked to insecurity in speeches, and the subject of campaigns to identify and deport “illegal migrants.” They are the nationality most frequently deported from Tanzania (Mulisa, 2020). While many “town refugees” self-settled in Tanzania in the 1970s (Malkki, 1995), Burundians who sought long-term settlement or moved from camps to villages in later years were not recognised. Despite the long history of this practice, they face increasing precarity in seeking homes and livelihoods outside of camps (Masabo et al., 2018; Whitaker, 1999). Preliminary interviews with high-ranking civil servants in the Department of Refugee Services recognised the widespread practice and emphasised their strict stance: “that's why we [...] carry out a number of – many times – operations, to nab them, refugees, and take them to the camps” (Interview, Dar es Salaam, 2017) – with such an operation said to be underway at the beginning of my research. Additional similar statements, along with awareness of forced encampment and deportation from prior research with returnees (Weima, 2015), shaped the “boundaries” of this research. Hardening camp boundaries and categories changed the nature of life in the campscape for Burundian border-crossers avoiding encampment. In such contexts, the presence of researchers can draw unwanted attention, endangering people wishing to remain clandestine (Khosravi, 2018; Landau, 2020; Neto, 2017) as well as interpreters and research assistants who may also be implicated.

I did meet Burundians (of varied migration statuses and professions) in diverse settings outside of the camps while in Tanzania, but I did not seek them out and did not try to do interviews or otherwise conduct formal research with them. The encounters inform my understanding of the context, but they are not central to my analysis. Camps, their contexts, and researchers ourselves vary greatly and change through time, so I do not suggest that my “bounding” is universal. For example, Sommers (2001) and Mann (2010) conducted careful research with clandestine refugees in urban Tanzania, continually weighing risks and working to limit the attention they might draw to participants. Importantly, they took cues from their participants – trusting their expertise in navigating lives beyond/refusing encampment. The rural, border region, however, does not afford the same urban anonymity – including for researchers. My boundary construction (Cuomo & Massaro, 2016) is not an unconsidered, automatic defaulting to formal state-created boundaries. Rather, it derives from weighing long-term study of the context with self-reflexivity on my linguistic limitations and contextual inexperience in ethically navigating this highly sensitive “campscape.”

LIVES BEYOND BOUNDARIES

“Bounding research” only to research with refugees with recognised status in camps did not necessarily mean excluding experiences of Burundians outside of camps. Although Burundian refugees in Tanzania are categorised by legal status based on a single border-crossing and current encampment, their life stories reach far beyond simplified trajectories. Many narratives included long periods outside of the camps in Tanzania, in Rwanda, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and further. These stories locate the camps, their boundaries, and their categories, within broader “campscapes” (Martin, 2015) and “transnational migratory fields” (Thiollet, 2014) in which people who have experienced displacement seek liveable lives.

For example, Basabose was initially a refugee in an “old settlement” in 1972, but moved to a fishing town on the lake with his wife: “[when we arrived] we didn't have anything” he recounted, “[but] we met people, Burundians, [and] they had fishing boats. We had to beg there, so that we could work for them for a sum [of money] to dry fish [...]. So, I started learning fishing, and I was a fisher, and it's like that I gained the money to buy the fishing boat.” Eventually Basabose owned his own boats, employing both Burundians and Tanzanians. His wife sold fish, and his eight children studied in public schools. They lived on the lake for two decades and felt stable because of the refugee permits they had sought and possessed.

In 1993, the assassination of Burundian President Ndadaye instigated a civil war, and hundreds of thousands of new Burundian refugees began to arrive in Tanzania, but the policies towards refugees had changed (Chaulia, 2003; Kweka, 2007). The Tanzanian government began to enforce strict encampment policies, and in 1997–1998 conducted campaigns to capture foreign residents residing “unlawfully” in Tanzania, primarily targeting the region bordering Burundi and Rwanda (Human Rights Watch, 1999). Despite the permits that had made them feel safe for nearly two decades, Basabose's family was subject to arrest without warning at 2 a.m. one morning. He says that perhaps his permits had been “cancelled” by the general leading the campaign. While most of the family was brought to Mtabila, one of their children disappeared during the raid: “maybe he is already dead, but we don't know ... we haven't had news of him since that time. That's a reason this country is difficult for us.” All of their belongings were left behind, including the boats he had worked hard to earn. They restarted life in the new camps, no longer willing to risk seeking life outside, despite their prior de facto integration.

Umunezero's story also includes a fishing village, where, like Basabose's children, she was born to Burundian parents who had sought refuge. When she reached school age in the 1990s, her parents sent her to a camp to live with her grandmother and to study in the Burundian school system – learning Kirundi and French (the national languages of Burundi, which she did not speak prior to moving to a camp). Later, like Basabose, her parents were forced to the camp, joining her there. Umunezero moved back to Burundi to continue her education when schools in the camps were closed in the 2000s, but fled to Tanzania in 2015 because of her involvement in an opposition political party. Initially she went to Arusha, where she had a cousin working for a church organisation, and a married sister, both established and “passing” as Tanzanian. Umunezero had Tanzanian documents, and passed an interview and test to get a job teaching languages in a secondary school.

“At first, I did not have the idea of coming to live in the refugee camps,” she shared, “I thought I could look for money, there at Arusha, and after ... go to another country ... [...] but, uh, I heard that my little brother was sick [in the camp], and I didn't know what he was suffering from.” She decided to come to the camp by returning to the border to register as a refugee. While visiting, she ended up marrying in the camp and having her first child. She remained in the camp because her spouse could not as easily move “as Tanzanian” as she could.

The limits to passing “as Tanzanian,” and to negotiating and establishing life beyond camp boundaries, were common in many trajectories.² For example, Niyonzima had lived in many different Tanzanian villages. Initially, in the 1980s, he negotiated for land with village leaders and established his farm and family there. Later things became more difficult. In interactions with police, such as at rural road checkpoints, he drew on his language skills, local knowledge, and small bribes when needed. For example, he described a time he was stopped: “I lied to them. I said, ‘yes, I am Tanzanian,’ because I know a lot of Swahili like Tanzanians, but they had doubts. They asked my grandfather’s name. I lied to them again. Then they said, ‘take off your clothes’, and they said, ‘no, no, you are not Tanzanian’.” Seeing the location of his vaccination scar, they could tell he had received it in Burundi, not Tanzania (a biopolitical marker that is not foolproof for Burundians raised in Tanzania). On that occasion, he negotiated further: “By luck, God saved me: I paid 10,000 [Tanzanian Shillings] and they let me go.” He soon decided to move to the camps due to the pressure his family faced (in the 1990s), and his inability to continuously pay such sums. Later, living outside the camps again he was caught and deported (in 2013). He tried returning to farm rice with help from a Tanzanian friend, far from the previous sites where his identity had been exposed, but was caught, imprisoned, and then forced to move to a camp (in 2015). Having been dispossessed of his harvests and goods twice, he says he now intends to remain in the camp.

Complementing life histories, I observed connections to life outside the camp through comings, goings, and absences. For example, one young woman, Yvette, shared worries about her asthmatic husband, who was not in the camp when we first met her. He had a diploma from Burundi, but worked as an agricultural labourer outside the camp, often for days or weeks at a time. We met him a few months later when he had returned. An older couple, Maria and Aimé, thought about returning to Burundi, where one of their adolescent children remained. (She had been in another city when they had fled.) But they were also waiting to hear from their eldest son, who had left the camp clandestinely almost a year prior to seek work and had not been heard from since. They felt torn and unable to move back to Burundi without news of him.

From within the camp, such stories and observations traced changing refugee management. Camp boundaries hardened, making life outside of camps increasingly difficult. For some Burundians, moving to a camp was a strategic choice in a challenging campscape. Despite incredible efforts, and long-term convivial relationships in Tanzanian communities, others were arrested and dispossessed of their goods, facing fines, imprisonment, and encampment or deportation. These stories of policing “spatial disobedience” (Tazzioli, 2020) attest to the fact boundary transgression is “not evidence for the camp’s less- than carceral nature, but expressions of a strong autonomous will to circumvent its constraining geography” (Brankamp, 2021, p. 15). They reinforced my decision to not conduct research with refugees outside of camps, which could increase their visibility and risk of identification and encampment. Nevertheless, in highlighting varied experiences beyond camps, such narratives complement a methodological approach to camp research that opposes encampment by highlighting refugees’ negotiation of liveable, convivial lives, transgressing camp bounds.

CONCLUSION

The changing enforcement and porosity of camp boundaries have implications for research in “campscares.” Although camp research is increasingly blurring boundaries and situated within broader landscapes, in contexts where camp boundaries are being actively “hardened” researchers must be attentive to possible effects of research across boundaries for those who are targeted by encampment. Research has both an ethical imperative to challenge exclusionary boundaries and categories, recognising the many ways these constructed boundaries are already and ongoingly crossed and contested, and to conscientiously negotiate and even defer to boundaries in research when participants may otherwise be at risk because of the underlying violence which maintains

camps as discrete spatial technologies of power. Although I was interested in researching the diverse trajectories of Burundian border- crossers, not only defined by encampment, I consciously chose to limit my research with Burundian refugees to within camp boundaries. Changing politics and enforcement have shaped the negotiation of boundaries in the campscape. Nevertheless, the stories that I heard reach beyond camp boundaries, and include experiences of people seeking liveable lives in diverse places and situations not always of their own choosing. These trajectories weave an imperfect, inchoate, “minor cartography” of often invisibilised campscape history (Tazzioli, 2020), bound up with the changing power and policing of camp boundaries over time.

Camps and their boundaries are profoundly contradictory. Ultimately, I wonder if it is ethical to “use” these contradictions as I have. Although there are other risks in camp-based research, the participants in this research are not at risk of identification and forced encampment as they are already identified, and already within the camp. Is this “bounding” of my research to the camp really ethical if it relies on the convenience of captivity in research recruitment? As Maillet et al. note in their discussion of research in “obscured” places, although the ethical questions may be challenging, not conducting such research would “add to the silences of research and analytical understandings of these phenomena” (2016, p. 946). (Indeed, other researchers have been denied permits and access to camps (Neto, 2017; Sommers, 2001).) Here the variety of stories shared and the ways they move in and out of camps are a counter-“ boundary politics” to that which seeks to (but can never entirely) contain and exclude.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest gratitude to those who shared their time and stories with me in Nduta and Nyarugusu camps. Thank you to Hanno Brankamp and Jennifer Hyndman for reassurance and constructive critique throughout the process of writing and revising this paper. I am grateful to Opportuna Kweka for encouragement and advice during the research process in Tanzania, and to the anonymous reviewers for their time and feedback over the past challenging year.

ENDNOTES

1) Over 5 months in Dar es Salaam, I applied for and received: a research permit from the Tanzanian Commission of Science and Technology (COSTECH); a “researcher class” visa from the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA); and permission to enter specified “Refugee Designated Areas” from the Department of Refugee Services, MHA.

2) On how “passing” continues to shape the lives of naturalized Tanzanians, see Daley et al. (2018).

REFERENCES

- Abourahme, N. (2015) Assembling and spilling- over: Towards an ‘ethnography of cement’ in a Palestinian refugee camp. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(2), 200– 217. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12155>
- Agier, M. (2011) *Managing the undesirables* (D. Fernbach, Trans.). Cambridge, UK & Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Agier, M. & Lecadet, C. (Eds.) (2014) *Un monde de camps [A world of camps]*. Paris, France: La Découverte.
- Bakewell, O. (2008) Research beyond the categories: The importance of policy irrelevant research into forced migration. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21(4), 432– 453. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fen042>

- Bouillon, F., Fresia, M. & Tallio, V. (2005) *Terrains sensibles: Expériences actuelles de l'anthropologie* [Sensitive lands: Current experiments in anthropology]. Paris, France: C'entre d'études africaines, EHESS.
- Brankamp, H. (2022) Feeling the refugee camp: Affectual research, bodies, and suspicion. *Area*, 54(3), 383– 391. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12739>
- Brankamp, H. (2019) 'Occupied Enclave': Policing and the underbelly of humanitarian governance in Kakuma refugee camp, Kenya. *Political Geography*, 71, 67– 77. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2019.02.008>
- Brankamp, H. (2021) Camp abolition: Ending carceral humanitarianism in Kenya (and Beyond). *Antipode*, 1–2 4. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12762>
- Brankamp, H. & Daley, P. (2020) Laborers, migrants, refugees. *Migration and Society*, 3(1), 113– 129. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3167/arms.2020.030110>
- Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, & Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (2018) Tri- council policy statement: Ethical conduct for research involving humans. Canada. Available from: https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique_tcps2-eptc2_2018.html. Accessed 20 August 2021.
- Carter- White, R. (2022) Witnessing the witnesses: Responding to the testimonial spaces of the camp. *Area*, 54(3), 347– 354. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12743>
- Chaulia, S.S. (2003) The politics of refugee hosting in Tanzania: From open door to unsustainability, insecurity and receding receptivity. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 16(2), 147–1 66.
- Clark- Kazak, C. (2009) Power and politics in migration narrative methodology: Research with young Congolese migrants in Uganda. *Migration Letters*, 6(2), 131– 141.
- Clark- Kazak, C., CCR, CARFMS, & CRS. (2017) Ethical considerations: Research with people in situations of forced migration. *Refuge*, 33(2), 11– 17.
- Crawley, H., & Skleparis, D. (2018) Refugees, migrants, neither, both: Categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe's 'migration crisis'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(1), 48–6 4. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183x.2017.1348224>
- Cuomo, D. & Massaro, V.A. (2016) Boundary- making in feminist research: New methodologies for 'intimate insiders'. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 23(1), 94– 106. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369x.2014.939157>
- Daley, P. (2021) Ethical considerations for humanizing refugee research trajectories. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*. 32(2), 11–1 9.
- de Certeau, M. (1984) *The practice of everyday life*. Berkley, CA, Los Angeles, CA & London, UK: University of California Press.
- Daley, P., Kamata, N. & Leiyo, S. (2018) Undoing traceable beginnings: Citizenship and belonging among former refugees in Tanzania. *Migration and Society*, 1(1), 22– 35.
- Eastmond, M. (2007) Stories as lived experience: Narratives in forced migration research. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(2), 248– 264. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fem007>
- Fassin, D. (2011) Policing borders, producing boundaries. The governmentality of immigration in dark times. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 40(1), 213– 226. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-081309-145847>

- Fresia, M. (2007) Les refugies comme objet d'etude pour l'anthropologie: enjeux et perspectives [Refugees as an object of study for anthropology: Challenges and perspectives]. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 26(3), 100–118. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdi0246>
- Hagan, M. (2022) Precarious encampments in hostile border zones: The methodological challenges of and possibilities for studying contingent camps. *Area*, 54(3), 355–364. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12741>
- Human Rights Watch. (1999) Human rights abuses and the forced round-ups of refugees. Available from: <http://www.hrw.org/reports/1999/tanzania/index.htm>- TopOf Page. Accessed 20 March 2020.
- Hyndman, J. (2001) The field as here and now, not there and then. *Geographical Review*, 91(1/2), 262–272.
- Hyndman, J. & Giles, W. (2017) *Refugees in extended exile*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ikanda, F.N. (2018) Animating 'refugeeness' through vulnerabilities: Worthiness of long-term exile in resettlement claims among Somali refugees in Kenya. *Africa*, 88(3), 579–596. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0001972018000232>
- Jansen, B.J. (2016) 'Digging aid': The camp as an option in east and the horn of Africa. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 29(2), 149–165. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fev018>
- Jones, R. (2009) Categories, borders and boundaries. *Progress in Human Geography*, 33(2), 174–189. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132508089828>
- Katz, C. (1994) Playing the field: Questions of fieldwork in geography. *The Professional Geographer*, 46(1), 67–72. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0033-0124.1994.00067.x>
- Khosravi, S. (2020) Afterword. Experiences and stories along the way. *Geoforum*, 116, 292–295. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.05.021>
- Koch, N. (2013) Introduction - Field methods in 'closed contexts': Undertaking research in authoritarian states and places. *Area*, 45(4), 390–395. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12044>
- Krause, U. (2017) *Researching forced migration: Critical reflections on research ethics during fieldwork*. Refugee Studies Centre Working Paper Series (123).
- Kweka, O. (2007) *The impact of Structural Adjustment Program on the refugee policy in Tanzania: Implication for survival strategies of Burundian Refugees in Camps*. (PhD), Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Landau, L.B. (2020) Afterword: The times of invisibility. In: Bjarnesen, J. & Turner, S. (Eds.) *Invisibility in African displacements: From structural marginalization to strategies of avoidance*. London, UK: Zed Books, pp. 252.
- Maillet, P., Mountz, A. & Williams, K. (2016) Researching migration and enforcement in obscured places: Practical, ethical and methodological challenges to fieldwork. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 18(7), 927–950. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2016.1197963>
- Malkki, L.H. (1995) *Purity and exile: Violence, memory, and national cosmology among Hutu refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mann, G. (2010) 'Finding a life' among undocumented refugee children in Tanzania. *Children and Society*, 24, 261–270. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2010.00310.x>

- Martin, D. (2015) From spaces of exception to 'campscares': Palestinian refugee camps and informal settlements in Beirut. *Political Geography*, 44, 9– 18. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2014.08.001>
- Masabo, J., Kweka, O., Boeynik, C. & Falisse, J.-B. (2018) Socio- economic assessment in the refugees camps and hosting districts of Kigoma Region, Tanzania.
- Massey, D. (2003) Imagining the field. In: Pryke, M., Rose, G. & Whatmore, S. (Eds.) *Using social theory: Thinking through research*. London, UK: SAGE Publications, pp. 71–88.
- Massey, D. (2004) Geographies of responsibility. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 86(1), 5–18. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0435-3684.2004.00150.x>
- McDowell, L. (2016) *Migrant women's voices: Talking about life and work in the UK since 1945*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- McDowell, L. (2018) Moving stories: Precarious work and multiple migrations. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 25(4), 471–488. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369x.2017.1420634>
- Meissner, F. & Hasselberg, I. (2012) Forever malleable: The field as a reflexive encounter. In: Hirvi, L. & Snellman, H. (Eds.) *Where is the field? The experience of migration viewed through the prism of ethnographic fieldwork*. Helsinki, Finland: Finish Literature Society, pp. 87–106.
- Minca, C. (2022) Makeshift camp methodologies along the Balkan Route. *Area*, 54(3), 365–373. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12705>
- Mulisa, M. (2020, 9 October) Tanzania: Pakistani national held Over illegal entry. *Tanzania Daily News*. Available from: <https://allafrica.com/stories/202010090794.html>. Accessed 1 July 2021.
- Neto, P.F. (2017) Surreptitious ethnography: Following the paths of Angolan refugees and returnees in the Angola- Zambia borderlands. *Ethnography*, 20(1), 128– 145. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138117724577>
- Newman, D. & Paasi, A. (1998) Fences and neighbours in the postmodern world: Boundary narratives in political geography. *Progress in Human Geography*, 22(2), 186– 207.
- Oesch, L. (2020) An improvised dispositif: Invisible urban planning in the refugee camp. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 44(2), 349– 365. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12867>
- Paasi, A. (1998) Boundaries as social processes: Territoriality in the world of flows. *Geopolitics*, 3(1), 69–88. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650049808407608>
- Peter, T.A. (2015, 10 August) For Burundians, Tanzania's refugee camps offer a better life. *Al Jazeera America*. Available from: <http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2015/8/10/amid-unt-burundian-refugees-return-to-tanzania.html>. Accessed 1 Feb 2017.
- Picker, G. & Pasquetti, S. (2015) Durable camps: The state, the urban, the everyday. *City*, 19(5), 681–688. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2015.1071122>
- Polzer, T. & Hammond, L. (2008) Invisible displacement. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21(4), 417– 431. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fen045>

Powles, J. (2004) Life history and personal narrative: Theoretical and methodological issues relevant to research and evaluation in refugee contexts. *New Issues in Refugee Research* (106), Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Unit.

Sommers, M. (2001) *Fear in bongoland: Burundi refugees in urban Tanzania*. Oxford, UK: Berghahn Books.

Tallio, V. (2012) La construction de la catégorie “réfugié” dans un camp en R.D.C.: Rôle de l'institution, stratégies des exilés et place du chercheur [The construction of the “refugee” category in a camp in the DRC: Role of the institution, strategies of exiles and place of the researcher]. *E-Migrinter*, 9, 18– 28.

Tazzioli, M. (2020) *The making of migration: The biopolitics of mobility at Europe's borders*. London, UK: SAGE UK.

Thiollet, H. (2014) Wad Sharifey, Kishm el- Girba, Asotriba...: Métamorphoses d'un réseau régional de douze camps de réfugiés érythréens dans l'est du Soudan (1962– 2013) [Wad Sharifey, Kishm el - Girba, Asotriba ...: Metamorphoses of a regional network of twelve Eritrean refugee camps in eastern Sudan (1962–2013)]. In: Agier, M. & Lecadet, C. (Eds.) *Un monde de camps [A world of camps]*. Paris, France: La Découverte, pp. 203– 217.

Thomson, S. (2010) Getting close to Rwandans since the genocide: Studying everyday life in highly politicized research settings. *African Studies Association*, 53(3), 19– 34.

Turner, S. (2004) Under the gaze of the ‘big nations’: Refugees, rumours and the international community in Tanzania. *African Affairs*, 103(411), 227– 247. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/ adh006>

Turner, S. (2013) Red stamps and green tea: Fieldwork negotiations and dilemmas in the Sino-Vietnamese borderlands. *Area*, 45(4), 396– 402.

Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12017>

Turner, S. (2016) What Is a refugee camp? Explorations of the limits and effects of the camp. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 29(2), 139– 148. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fev024>

UNHCR (United Nations High Commission for Refugees) (2017) Mtendeli Camp Profile. Available from: <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/60872>. Accessed 20 August 2021.

UNHCR. (2018) Nduta Refugee Camp Profile. Available from: <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/65653>. Accessed 20 August 2021.

Vermeylen, A. (2016) Une anthropologue dans un camp de réfugiés [An anthropologist in a refugee camp]. *Parcours Anthropologiques*, 11(1), <https://doi.org/10.4000/pa.508>

Weima, Y., (2015) *Villagisation for our time: Neoliberal governmentality and the experiences of villagised Burundian returnees*. (MA). Queen's University, Kingston, ON. Retrieved from: https://qspace.library.queensu.ca/bitstream/handle/1974/13560/Weima_Yolanda_M_2015_08_MA.pdf?sequence=1

Weima, Y. & Hyndman, J. (2018) Managing displacement: Negotiating transnationalism, encampment, and return. In: Mitchell, K., Jones, R. & Fluri, J. (Eds.) *Handbook on critical geographies of migration*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, pp. 30–43.

Whitaker, B.E. (1999) Changing opportunities: Refugees and host communities in western Tanzania. *New Issues in Refugee Research* (11). Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Unit.