A Sociology of Knowledge on Humanitarianism and Displacement: The Case of Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt, and Turkey

Estella Carpi and Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh

The Oxford Handbook of the Sociology of the Middle East
Edited by Armando Salvatore, Sari Hanafi, and Kieko Obuse

Subject: Sociology, Political Sociology, Social Theory Online Publication Date: Nov 2020
DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190087470.013.43

Abstract and Keywords

In this chapter, the authors endeavor to build a sociology of knowledge of studies conducted on humanitarianism and war-induced displacement in the Middle East region, considering the cases of Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt, and Turkey in particular. A comparative analysis suggests that similarities and differences across the literature are not always motivated by specific forms of state governmentality. In this framework, postcolonial history seems to provide partial explanations. As a result, the displacement and humanitarianism literature need to transcend the state paradigm and focus on a larger variety of social and political factors. While most scholars have examined the work of the United Nations and of international institutions in the region, the authors highlight the need to learn from multilingual literature, especially that produced in the Global South, and from a deeper investigation of the principles and modalities of crisis management developed by actors from the Global South.

Keywords: displacement, humanitarianism, sociology of knowledge, postcoloniality, refugee

In this chapter, we analyze studies conducted on humanitarianism and conflict-induced displacement, considering the cases of Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt, and Turkey in particular. In the Middle East, large-scale conflicts have produced multiple forced migrations throughout the 20th and present centuries. Over 60 percent of the world's nearly 26 million refugees and 30 percent of the world's 45.7 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) are found in the region, with the majority of these people displaced by human-made conflicts. As today's Middle East is both a source and a recipient of refugees and IDPs, having "a long history of absorbing, integrating, marginalizing, and expelling displaced groups" (White, Haysom, and Davey 2013), in this chapter, we do not presume to tackle all war-induced displacements in the region but instead limit our discussion to academic literature addressing the largest processes of intrastate and interstate migration in and across Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt, and Turkey. These are primarily those of Palestinians, Sudanese, Iraqis, and Syrians, whose displacement situations we briefly introduce in the

remainder of this introduction, before turning to the sociology of knowledge production on humanitarianism and displacement in the region.

The international refugee regime distinguishes Palestinians from non-Palestinians, with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) having a global mandate to protect all refugees *except* Palestinians, while the United Nations Relief and Works for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA) is mandated to offer assistance *solely* to the circa 5 million Palestinian refugees living in its areas of operation (the West Bank and the Gaza Strip in the Occupied Palestinian Territories [OPT], Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria), acting like a state for welfare provision. The Palestinian "right to return" (*haqq al-'awda*), formally recognized by UN General Assembly Resolution 191 in 1948, has never been implemented and is instead used as a pretext for receiving countries to refrain from nationalizing (*tajnis*) Palestinians. Most of these 5 million Palestinian refugees reside in 58 UNRWA-recognized camps and 10 unofficial camps located throughout UNRWA's areas of operation. Palestinians often live in these camps alongside diverse non-Palestinian refugees displaced from other conflicts across the region (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2016a, 2016b), including Iraqis, Sudanese, and Syrians.

During the 1990s, it was primarily Shi'ites, then Christians and Kurds who were displaced from Iraq as they were persecuted during Saddam Hussein's regime (which lasted from 1979 to 2003) (Sassoon 2009, 92). With the American embargo following Hussein's 1990–1991 invasion of Kuwait and the subsequent economic crisis, an increasing number of Iraqis fled the country. Between 2003 and 2007, as a result of the US invasion of Iraq aimed at toppling Hussein's regime, large numbers of forced migrants reached other countries of the region. Today, 2 million Iraqis are estimated to have sought protection in neighboring countries, among whom at least 1.5 million fled to Syria where, from 2011, they became displaced again. Most Iraqi refugees in the region are believed to be skilled workers and wealthy, coming from a middle- or even upper-class background (Dardiry 2017, 709–712).

Where significant attention—both by humanitarians and by academics—has been given to Palestinians, Iraqis, and Syrians, the displacement of Sudanese refugees at several stages in history, mainly two civil wars (1955–1972 and 1983–2005), has received relatively less focus. While earlier displacement processes included large numbers of refugees from Khartoum and East Sudan and, since the conflict there in the late 1990s, from Darfur (Murphy et al. 2016), the majority of the total of more than 2 million refugees currently come from South Sudan. Sudanese refugee communities across the region have established their own cultural centers and associations in addition to mobilizing against discriminatory and inhumane treatment in receiving countries (Murphy et al. 2016).

We will finally focus on the literature produced in the wake of the Syrian political and humanitarian crisis, which has led thus far to half a million dead, nearly 7 million IDPs—the largest IDP population worldwide—more than 5 million refugees primarily living in the Middle East and North Africa region, and nearly 14 million in need of assistance.[1] The Syrian refugee crisis, started by a popular uprising in March 2011, has now become a

crucial watershed in international scholarly literature concerned with the Middle East, paving the way for a large number of studies focused on humanitarian governance, forced migrations, security and borders, migrant labor, and social integration in receiving countries.

In countries where the central state tends to emerge as authoritarian in the organization of society (e.g., Turkey and Egypt), such themes have been addressed differently from political environments where the state has been considered absent and fragile and political power is fragmented (e.g., Lebanon and OPT). In these countries, refugees from different backgrounds have been rebuilding their lives over a long period of time and, in some cases, have faced multiple displacements and "overlapping refugeedoms" (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2011, 2016b), such as the cases of Palestinians, Armenians, and Kurds, who have relocated and rebuilt their lives more than once within the Middle East. Nonetheless, some of these people have not always appeared in academic texts under the label of "refugees" but have instead been categorized as "migrants" since economic and climatic migrations are both unlikely to be classified as "forced" in the global political arena. Conversely, beyond normative frameworks, migration has often been a livelihood strategy not necessarily involving "crisis." However, when linked to war and geopolitical shifts, human mobility becomes a negative interruption of normal affairs.

While it has become increasingly mainstream to acknowledge that academic and policy studies of displacement have been dominated by scholarship produced in the Global North (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2020a, 2), meaningful steps toward the production of critical knowledge are yet to be made. It is in this sense that we deem capturing scholarly tendencies toward the study of displacement and humanitarianism, and how such tendencies relate to different sociopolitical contexts, to be of importance.

Defining the Sociology of Knowledge

"Sociology of knowledge" is defined as the relationship between the production of knowledge and the social context in which it develops and examines how knowledge is constructed socially and what factors mainly influence such a construction. Since knowledge is contextual, it is shaped as much by the social and political positioning of knowledge producers as by their local, regional, and international environments. Academic cultures —not always overlapping with official "national cultures," which are defined by the boundaries of the nation-state—frame such topics in a peculiar manner. In the effort to build a sociology of knowledge, we seek to identify the political and social factors that have been molding international scholarship in the field of displacement and crisis management. Such an attempt intends to contribute to what Hanafi (2020, 4) frames as "global sociology," which mainly implies the combination of the global/transnational/general and the national/local/particular. In doing so, the term "global" introduces a "geographical space as central to the formation of knowledge" (ibid.), wherein national and other vernacular knowledges need to be accounted for. In this sense, in order for knowledge production of the Global South to become more visible and adequately resourced, it can-

not exclusively focus on the local scale of human phenomena or on the use of a local language, but it also needs to address the world as a whole (Mathews 2019, 93).

In this chapter, we exclusively navigate the literature produced in the Anglosphere, thus drawing on English literature produced in disparate academic settings. For the construction of global sociologies on displacement and humanitarianism, it is, however, necessary to draw on multilingual literature and, most importantly, literature written in the (ideally both majority and minority) languages of the countries being researched. The local languages of the areas in which research takes place are thus a priority. In this case, while Turkish sources on displacement are easily accessible and even on the rise in the wake of the Syrian crisis, important initiatives are Arabic databases such as e-Marefa, al-Manhal, and the Portal for Social Impact of Scientific Research in/on the Arab World (Athar),[2] founded by Sari Hanafi in 2018 (American University of Beirut). The need for a common language and for somehow embracing functional monolingualism has subtly justified the implicit demand to think and present ideas monoculturally. Such an Anglocentric monoculture risks emerging as the only valuable and acceptable one. In order to change epistemic monoculturalism, we need to question, for instance, the "politics of citation" (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2020a, 10) in academic knowledge production:

> People who are involved in diverse migratory processes conceptualize their own situations, positions, and responses as everyday theorists rather than as providers of "data" to be analyzed to provide the materials for conceptual and theoretical scholarship. This means that it is urgent for us to focus intently on identifying and challenging the diverse structural barriers—including academic, political, economic, cultural, and social ones—that prevent certain people's understandings and worldviews from being perceived as knowledge. (ibid., 12)

This chapter also emerges from our experience with teaching displacement and humanitarianism in several international institutions and the responses received from different cohorts of students (as discussed in Carpi 2018). We seek to identify some of the contemporary challenges for scholars in this area of study, such as decentering the mainstream humanitarian and refugee discourse that developed in Global Northern institutions (e.g., North America, the United Kingdom, and Switzerland). With the English language dominating the knowledge production scene, local, national, and sometimes regional understandings of humanitarianism and displacement tend to go unheeded; and, even for scholars who are not "native" users, English often becomes the first language for researching such topics. In our ongoing Southern-led Responses to Displacement from Syria project,[3] we endeavor to decenter mainstream knowledge by shedding light on responses to displacement led by organizations, governments, informal groups, and individuals from across the Global South, including refugees themselves (see Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2019). In order to do so, the use of multilingual literature becomes vital. At stake is our understanding of how academic cultures both differ from and overlap with national and local cultures. By examining the blurred space composed of academic, national, and other local cultures, we see displacement and humanitarianism as culturally nuanced, where the no-

tion of “culture” is not tied to a specific (ethnic or religious) community but rather refers to a hybrid pattern of recurrent features.

Against this backdrop, while distancing ourselves from “methodological nationalism”—according to which the nation-state is the “natural” social and political form of the modern world (Beck 2000; Wimmer and Glick-Schiller 2002) and a key category of analysis for international scholars—human phenomena such as displacement and humanitarian action remain defined, ordered, and critiqued within the boundaries of the state system, which influences knowledge production methodologically. We, therefore, depart from an analysis of knowledge production in different nation-states to ultimately aim for a global sociology. With enhanced epistemic consciousness, it is indeed possible to move away from state-centrism in researching displacement and humanitarianism. In order to examine similarities and differences across the literature produced in the three Arab states and Turkey, we consider not only how each form of government tackles displacement but also how the different processes of displacement are received in relation to local, national, and regional identity politics and geopolitical configurations.

Most scholars working on the Middle East have focused on the “significance of a statist–humanitarian paradigm that emphasizes the particularity of refugee marginalization and loss” (Dardiry 2017, 703) and point to the “biopolitical mechanisms and apparatuses with which states define, manage, and marginalize [refugees]” (ibid.). The construction of the humanitarian narrative during processes of displacement thus depends on national and governmental politics, with humanitarian assistance provision and migration gaining different labels and levels of visibility. Most recent literature proposes a historiographical approach to the study of displacement, which can connect histories of refugeedom and challenge state-centered accounts, finally placing refugees, states, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and institutions in an interactive framework (Tejel and Öztan 2020, 15).

Reviewing Studies of Displacement and Humanitarianism

The history of relief and aid provision in Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt, and Turkey can be traced back to the Ottoman Empire, which had ruled these territories since the 16th century. Decentralized service provision marks the local welfare history of these areas. Nonetheless, over the last decades, regionalism is a lacking reality in the Middle East, according to many scholars (Fawcett and Gandois 2010, 618); and it has, in fact, never been the response model to crisis management. The four aforementioned countries have all implemented independent political projects for facing refugee crises and setting up humanitarian governance. While Egypt is a signatory to the 1951 Geneva Convention Related to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol and signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the UNHCR in 1954, Jordan and Lebanon have not accepted being countries of settlement and integration and officially remain “countries of transit.” Turkey, a signatory of the 1951 Geneva Convention but not its 1967 Protocol, only recognizes dis-

placed people from Europe as refugees and adopts a “temporary protection” framework for Syrian refugees (Art. 7 of the national regulation). Notably, Egypt and Turkey were the only non-Western members of the drafting committee of the UN Convention on Refugees in 1951 (Zohry 2006, 44).

We have chosen to provide a cross-analysis of Lebanon and Jordan, on which scholarship has evolved in similar ways to, and separately from, Egypt and Turkey; the latter two countries have often been compared by scholars due to similar political orders and similar limits imposed on foreign and local humanitarian agencies. We will, however, demonstrate how Egypt and Turkey still present different scenarios for refugee management. As the literature on displacement and humanitarianism in the four countries under consideration is practically endless, we have chosen to organize our critical review on the basis of four main themes for discussing Lebanon and Jordan: faith-based aid provision, refugee governance including legal instruments and security measures, spaces of displacement, and the politicization of refugeehood. We will then discuss Turkey and Egypt separately, by orienting our discourse around the infrequent use of the humanitarian framework in these nation-states and the focus on secular/faith-based acts of assistance, which are on the rise in contemporary scholarship in the whole region.

Lebanon and Jordan

In Lebanon, which is not a signatory to the 1951 Convention, informality dominates the legal framework, with crisis management hence becoming decentralized and fragmented. Palestinian refugees aside, most refugees in Lebanon reside in cities, unofficial camps, or informal gatherings. Unlike the 2003 Iraqi refugee crisis, when the Lebanese government signed an MoU with the UNHCR, municipal and governmental authorities took a direct role in the response to the Syrian crisis at a later stage with the enforcement of the 2015–2016 Lebanon Crisis Response Plan, which was meant to strengthen local cooperation and guarantee the involvement of local authorities (Boustani et al. 2016). Jordan is also not a signatory to the Refugee Convention, but the government signed an MoU with the UNHCR in 1998 (amended in 2014) to establish its parameters for cooperation. A minority of refugees in Jordan live in camps, while the rest are registered as living in Jordan’s cities, towns, villages, and farmland (Lenner and Turner 2019, 69). The government of Jordan also signed the Jordan Compact, issued in 2016, which is a political commitment to integrate Syrian refugees into the formal Jordanian labor market and which, in practice, excludes Yemeni, Iraqi, and Sudanese refugees (Lenner and Turner 2019, 70). In turn, Lebanon signed a compact with the European Union in 2016 to improve the living conditions of Syrian refugees, excluding other smaller refugee groups from the agreement. The peculiarity of the Lebanon and Jordan compacts is the inclusion of “vulnerable host communities,” shifting the humanitarian focus from forced migrants’ to citizens’ chronic vulnerability.

Lebanon has primarily been home to Palestinian (400,000 according to the UNRWA, although a 2017 census determined the number to be 172,000,[4] in addition to circa 30,000[5] Palestinian refugee newcomers from Syria), Sudanese (around 2,000 according to the

UNHCR[6]), Iraqis (circa 50,000 according to the UNHCR but initially between 60,000 and 100,000 according to the Lebanese Ministry of Internal Affairs), and Syrian refugees from 2011 (presently fewer than 1 million according to the UNHCR). It also hosts a few thousand refugees from Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, and Somalia. In turn, Jordan has been home to Palestinian refugees since 1948. Today, more than 2 million registered Palestine refugees live in Jordan, with only 18 percent living in the 10 official camps served by the UNRWA across the country.[7] It is home to more than 67,000 Iraqis and fewer than 700,000 Syrian refugees.[8]

Among our four case studies, Lebanon and Jordan, often compared in the study of displacement and humanitarian governance (e.g., Kraft and Smith 2018; Pascucci 2018; Anholt and Sinatti 2019), are the two main countries outside Palestine that have dealt with the long-standing Palestinian refugee crisis. The latter shaped a significant part of the political history of both countries and today's regional geopolitics. Since the first Palestinians who became displaced as a result of the 1948 exodus ended up in camps—the primary life management unit that the UNRWA addresses—most of the literature on displacement in Lebanon, and more broadly in the region, has focused on camps (Knudsen and Hanafi 2011; Schiocchet 2014; Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2016b; Feldman 2018). This led scholars to pay less attention to the Iraqi and Sudanese humanitarian crises during the 1990s and 2000s, which had not been managed in refugee camps. Unusual and powerful narrative tools such as poetry are being employed to reflect upon local understandings of camps and camp life and to interrogate the relationship between camp and non-camp spaces (Qasmiyeh 2019). More recently, after urban scholars like Sanyal (2014) questioned the separation line between camps and refugee-populated urban spaces and in line with the UNHCR's focus on urban refugees since the 2010s, studies of displacement in Lebanon and Jordan have increasingly focused on non-camp refugees and have problematized the indistinctive label of "urban" (Carpi and Boano 2018).

The governance (Stel 2016; Ramadan and Fregonese 2017; Nassar and Stel 2019), political life (Gabiam and Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2017; Feldman 2018), and reconstruction of camps (Hassan and Hanafi 2010) have long since been topics of research in both countries. Vast research has been conducted on the security aspect of governance in Syrian and Palestinian refugee camps in Jordan (Hoffman 2017), especially stressing the importance of the security of hosts, rather than that of refugees. Indeed, the United Nations Development Program has worked in concert with the Jordanian government to develop a "community security" approach,[9] which was implemented in Lebanon at a later stage, based on the Jordanian model. While most camp-dwellers have a war-induced forced migration background, for historical reasons, Lebanon has also been researched for internal displacements. These are less commonly associated with security issues as, with no borders crossed, they do not alter state-to-state relations directly. Due to the continuous Israeli attacks on Lebanon's infrastructure and the occupation of its southern region (1978–2000) and owing to internal conflicts in camps (Knudsen 2018), scholars who focus on IDPs have mainly discussed reconstruction (e.g., MacGinty 2007; Fawaz 2009) and postwar aid politics (MacGinty and Hamieh 2010; Carpi 2014).

Recent literature on Lebanon's displacement has covered refugee law instruments and informal frameworks more broadly, focusing on the strategic use of legal instruments in international institutions and the national government (Janmyr 2017a, 2017b). The 2018 Global Compact on Refugees established by the UNHCR—a framework which should generate equitable responsibility-sharing—raised similar concerns worldwide, showing the illusorily protective character of some legal instruments, such as the integration of refugees into host labor markets. Against the backdrop of multiple (in)formal sovereignties, Lebanon scholars have increasingly worked on local forms of power, municipalities (Mourad 2017), and (in)formal mandates to tackle the refugee crisis (Boustani et al. 2016) on a local scale. The substantial difference between the Lebanese and Jordanian legal scenarios is a "policy of no policy" in the former case—which allowed for deliberate institutional ambiguity (Nassar and Stel 2019) in which refugees struggle to envision their own rights—and, in the latter, overlegislation and regulation by the central state without sufficiently improving refugees' living conditions (e.g., the Jordan Compact; see Lenner and Turner 2019).

Another segment of the scholarship has engaged with questions of legality by examining the normalization of vulnerability/eligibility criteria for categories in need during the Syrian refugee crisis (Janmyr and Mourad 2018)—a body of literature that, in Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria, has been covered by studies on the identity politics of humanitarianism (Feldman 2007, 2012). Here, identity politics has been discussed in ethnic and religious terms in the fields of education, employment, and access to the international assistance regime. In Jordan and Lebanon, the material and existential aspects of refugee employment have mostly been approached on a nationality basis; that is, scholars tend to study single national refugee groups employed in host economies, such as Syrians in Lebanon (Saleh and Zakar 2018) and Syrians in Jordan (Lenner and Turner 2019). The nationality bias that influences analyses of both displaced people and the aid industry has been scrutinized in both countries (Pascucci 2018; Carpi 2019a). Nevertheless, recent literature focuses on the intersectionality of nationality with other factors such as gender, class, and race among refugee populations. Gender-, race- (Turner 2020), and class-oriented analyses predominate in the case of Jordan (Turner 2015; Thomas and Vogel 2018), where the previous migration of middle- and upper-class Iraqi refugees oriented the displacement discourse differently (Dardiry 2017). By contrast, Lebanon lacks class-based accounts of humanitarianism as well as of refugeehood overall (as noticed in Carpi 2019b) and accounts pertaining to race and racialization.

Lately, after focus on refugees and service provision has started blooming, Lebanon has increasingly been the subject of research centered on local populations—frequently addressed and interpellated as "host communities"—and their relationships with refugees, predominantly through the lens of social cohesion (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2016b; Carpi and Diana 2019). The shift from "refugee guests" to "local hosts" in the scholarly interest mirrors the history of international humanitarian priorities, which redirected assistance provision from people who were forcibly moved due to war to vulnerable people who received forced migrants but never physically moved. This brought again to the fore important changes for the development–humanitarian nexus in international humanitarian dis-

course and practices, reasserting the need to merge long-term development efforts with short-term relief (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2019).

In this framework, the faith–secularism paradigm is increasingly discussed with regard to displacement and humanitarianism, noting that recent literature proposes a faith-focused approach as not antithetical to secularism (Carpi and Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2020). In both Jordan and Lebanon, the literature on faith-based and faith-inspired humanitarian action is now on the rise due to a major interest in local humanitarian responses (Ager, Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, and Ager 2015; Refugee Hosts 2018; Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and Pacitto 2019) and in the involvement of Arab Gulf-funded aid provision (Schmelter 2019; Carpi 2020). Local forms of relief have long been studied in the case of Lebanon's internal displacements (Fawaz 2005; Harb 2008), whereas local responses to forced migrations have been studied more in Jordan (Ager and Ager 2015; El-Nakib and Ager 2015; Wagner 2018) than in Lebanon thus far (Kraft 2015; Kraft and Smith 2018; Carpi and Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2020; Fiddian-Qasmiyeh's Refugee Hosts[10] and Southern-led Responses to Displacement projects).

While some scholars promote a focus on "refugee–refugee relationality" (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 2016a, 2016b, 2020b), most research still revolves around refugees' agency versus nation-states that limit their freedoms and rights, hence maintaining the central state as the paramount paradigm for discussion about displacement and social inclusion/exclusion dynamics in receiving societies. Research on human agency has developed to counter the trope of refugee passivity, whose voices are only told and represented by non-refugees (Hannah Arendt's "biological" versus "biographic" lives in 1958 *The Human Condition*). Such research has emerged especially as a result of a great interest in the political dimension of in-camp life (Achilli 2015; Gabiam and Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2017; Feldman 2018) and the politicization of refugees in shaping state–refugee relations (Dionigi 2017). Such approaches take academic analysis beyond Agamben's (1998) *zoe*, which pointed to the biological survival of refugees as opposed to *bios*, the qualified dimensions of life. Agency —that is, the capability of refugees to develop tactics of survival and empowerment, respond to crisis, and rebuild their lives—is now the analytical entry point of most displacement and humanitarianism studies in the Middle East.

Turkey

Turkey historically hosts 2 to 3 million internally displaced Kurds (Çelik 2005, 979) and currently hosts 200,000 to 500,000 Iranians, representing the largest number of asylum-seekers in the country. Hosting nearly 3.6 million Syrian refugees makes it the country, globally, which is hosting the largest number of people from neighboring Syria.[11] In Turkey, displacement has become the subject of international discussions, particularly after the beginning of the mass arrival of Syrian refugees (in spring 2011) and the subsequent intervention of international humanitarian agencies that came to assist the displaced.

As a signatory to the 1951 Convention, Turkey recognizes refugees but only from Europe and currently adopts a “temporary protection” framework for Syrian refugees once they are registered with Disaster and Emergency Management (AFAD), which was later replaced by the General Directorate of Migration Management. While the majority of refugees, just as in Lebanon and Jordan, reside in urban and peri-urban areas, AFAD still plays a large role in Syrian refugee camps (Carpi and Şenoğuz 2018, 3). The Turkish migration regime offers some social protection (e.g., access to basic healthcare, education, and social assistance) while denying asylum (ibid.). Moreover, pushbacks, forced returns, and anti-refugee violence are commonly reported.

With reference to literature addressing humanitarian responses to forced migration in the country, the 1915 Armenian genocide and deportations from Ottoman Turkey prompted the first cases of foreign charitable assistance in Anatolia (Watenpaugh 2015), while the international refugee regime was established in the region to deal with the massive displacement caused by World War I (ibid.). At that time, Ottoman authorities were reluctant to accept unconditional international assistance because they did not want to see their political power undermined. Traditionally decentralized and domestically managed during the Ottoman Empire, humanitarian services for forced migrants were mostly delegated to local communities (Chatty 2013), although subject to “modern Ottoman bureaucracies for care” (Watenpaugh 2015, 7). As a result, contemporary global humanitarian programs designed and pre-packaged in Western societies appeared unsuitable in the Turkish context, finding there no colonial counterparts. Paradoxically, Turkey has recently emerged as a regional and international force in peacekeeping and humanitarian operations and has enhanced its own role in world politics. This contrast between a domestic (and uncomfortable) humanitarianism and a growing humanitarian foreign policy is evident: while the Turkish government has pursued a policy of intervention in Somalia since 2011, the recent intervention of international humanitarian agencies inside Turkey in response to the Syrian crisis is largely unprecedented.

Most scholarship centered on Turkey has framed the international humanitarian presence in terms of “refugees versus hosts” and has mostly discussed refugee governance and integration (Şimşek 2018; Akar and Erdoğdu 2019), thus shifting the analytical focus from refugees themselves to local society and politics. A more intensive look at the displacement literature in our four case studies suggests that, as opposed to previous movements perceived as “transit migrants” such as Iraqis (Danış 2007) and Iranians (Akcapar 2010; Rivetti 2013), integration in Turkish society is now discussed more with regard to Syrian refugees. This is due to the higher employment rate of Syrians in Turkey, as well as an overall larger demographic presence, which has led researchers to dedicate particular attention to the role of Syrian refugee “businessmen” (Akçalı and Görmüş 2018) and has led governmental or international institutions like the UNHCR to speak about “refugee entrepreneurship” in the country.[12] Moreover, the Turkmen segment of Turkey’s Syrian refugee population was already familiar with the national language and culture before the ongoing conflict in Syria, hence raising the issue of integration within Turkey more frankly than with other refugee groups.

Overall, scholars of refugee governance in Turkey primarily adopt a political science approach, resulting in a number of studies that are closer to policy than to ethnographic analysis. As opposed to in Lebanon, which has long opted for a refugee-unfriendly "policy of no policy" (Mourad 2017, 250), Turkey-specific scholarship has a legal and policy orientation due to the continual processes of lawmaking and -unmaking that the country engaged with vis-à-vis the refugee crises and its soft power–driven negotiations with Europe. In the geopolitical scene, Turkey's position is indeed usually framed as entrenched in contradictions, such as previously aiming for European integration and being an integral part of NATO's operations in the Balkans while simultaneously desiring to become a leader of the Global South (Bayer and Keyman 2012). Likewise, Turkey's philanthropic initiatives are characterized by Islamic solidarity and Ottoman nostalgia but are also seen as a step toward internationalist modernism (ibid.), which underpins the global politics of humanitarianism.

From Turkey's complex position on hybrid grounds, scholars have made hardly any use of the humanitarian discourse to refer to aid assistance in displacement. While some scholars, especially after the 2013 Gezi protests in Istanbul, have started speaking of domestic "medical humanitarianism" (Açiksöz 2016), most approach humanitarian discourse and diplomacy only when referring to Turkey's foreign policy (e.g., see Donelli 2017 on Somalia since 2011, a turning point for Turkish humanitarian action). Nevertheless, even in the foreign policy sphere, some scholars have highlighted the limited resources and capabilities of Turkish NGOs to succeed and emerge internationally as full-fledged humanitarian actors (Aras 2017). Such efforts are defined in terms of "middle power activism" in international affairs (Gilley 2015) and of Turkey as an "emerging donor" in official humanitarian discourse. In the wake of the Syrian political and humanitarian crisis, the Turkish International Cooperation and Development Organization has been leading local and international humanitarian operations on the ground in a bid to mold the domestic character of that crisis according to the government's political priorities. Such official bodies have, therefore, become an object of discussion in the academic work that focuses on refugee governance.

Domestic displacement has rarely been discussed through a humanitarian framework (Gökalp 2010), but several crises have befallen Turkey in recent history, such as internal displacement following the Van earthquake in October 2011, the frequent floods affecting the country such as the 2009 inundations in Marmara, and the long-standing conflict between the Turkish government and its opponent Kurdish Partîya Karkerén Kurdîstan. Similarly, although they are the product of a population exchange between Greece and Turkey that took place by force in the first half of the 20th century in order to create monoreligious nation-states (Iğsız 2018), humanitarianism has played no part in orienting public discourse on Muslims from Greece, who are seldom represented as forced migrants.

Qualitative research on Turkey has largely focused on the role of religion in philanthropy during crisis, providing an analysis of volunteering, charity acts (Alkan-Zeybek 2012), and aid provision in faith-based NGOs (Turhan and Bahçecik 2020). Some scholars have re-

cently highlighted faith-based actors' "inclination to elicit a secular understanding of compassion as a way to spur donations" (Vicini 2020, 107). Such studies, therefore, grant a larger understanding of the secularism–faith nexus relevant to Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey. This turn to religion, interpreted through the humanitarian lens and vice versa, overshadows the actual long-standing humanitarian history of religious actors—relief was inherently a religiously driven activity (Watenpaugh 2015, 4), therefore different from "modern humanitarianism," which instead takes a secular approach to addressing the root causes of human suffering while carrying a transnational ideology of standardized "best practices."

Egypt

Egypt has historically hosted many refugee populations from across Africa and the Levant, including Armenians and Palestinians. It has also acted as a gateway for refugees attempting to reach Europe by sea or land. It currently hosts nearly 45,000 refugees, among whom 57 percent are from Sudan (ibid.), and the rest of whom are from Iraq, Somalia, and, in smaller numbers, Ethiopia and Eritrea who, on a daily basis, struggle with the UNHCR's bureaucracy and its normative labeling system. During Mohammed Morsi's presidential mandate (2012–2013), Egypt also became a destination for Syrian refugees (currently 130,000 according to UNHCR's records) as Morsi's leniency toward Syrian refugees was well known, due to his political alignment with the Muslim Brotherhood (a large opposition movement fighting the Assad regime in Syria).

Egypt, despite being a signatory to the 1951 UN Convention and having ratified the 1969 Organization of the African Union (OAU) Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa in 1992, regularly abuses human rights and carries out arbitrary detentions and deportations of refugees (Brown, Riordan, and Sharpe 2004; Fiddian 2006), also breaching Article 53 of the National Constitution.[13] Indeed, the 1951 UN Convention was drafted under King Farouk's rule (1936–1952), after which national laws about migration—far from being comprehensive—were all influenced by Egypt having become an independent republic (1952). Refugee-related issues are indeed managed by multiple legal regimes, creating confusion and ambiguity that the government tends to instrumentalize in order to deny asylum rights. In this regard, part of the literature (Häkli, Pascucci, and Kallio 2017; Badawy 2010) discusses the overlap between and legal blurredness created by refugee definitions and regimes in Egypt with the uncertainty and suffering to which refugees are subjected due to the confusion generated by contradictory bureaucratic tools.

Among the four countries analyzed here, researchers have often overlooked Egypt as a receiving country, representing it instead as a sending country, although, historically, it was a land of immigrants rather than emigrants until the state, after the 1973 war, started promoting migration to manage the regional oil crisis (Zohry 2006, 36). Although different nationalities have sought refuge in Egypt, refugees from different African countries—especially Somalis and Sudanese—have often been discussed as a single or a groupable refugee category (Henry 2012; al-Sharmani and Grabska 2009). At times, all African

refugees have even been referred to as “Sudanese,” adopting a racial discourse tout court (as noted in Ben-Ze’ev and Gazit 2018, 265), proving the particular interest of scholars in Sudanese displaced people in Egypt (Elgaddal Saeed 1999; Adam 2014; Fábos 2015). Instead, the expectations, the relationship with the receiving society, and the migration backgrounds of these refugee groups are all deeply diverse. Nevertheless, such diversity is not considered in the establishment of eligibility criteria for accessing assistance, which are often standardized in the international humanitarian regime.

Similar to Turkey, humanitarianism is not a usual analytical framework for the explanation of refugee governance and refugee experience in Egypt (cf. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and Pacitto 2015). It can be found in studies examining philanthropy and development efforts toward local vulnerable categories such as garbage collectors living in Cairo’s peripheries (Furniss 2012), and it became a discursive tool to investigate urban informality in Cairo (Pascucci 2017). It is not by chance that the humanitarian narrative has been employed especially in the case of refugees from countries officially listed as Arab, rather than for African refugees, who are at times merely defined as “migrants.” In this regard, Egypt’s refugee governance has historically shifted in reflection to governmental politics—no presidential mandate has prioritized pan-Africanism over pan-Arabism (the latter being promoted during Gamal Abdel Nasser’s presidency between 1954 and 1970) or over particular interests and ad hoc acts of friendship toward African unity (e.g., during Anwar Sadat’s presidency between 1971 and 1981, who did indeed accede to the OAU Convention in 1980; this was later ratified by Hosni Mubarak). While presidential politics certainly influenced differing local perceptions of Arab and African refugees, Sudan has never been considered as just any other African country due to its past British–Egyptian administration and because, as an Arab African country, similarly to Egypt, it occupies an ambiguous position in the political geography of Africa and the Middle East. This has translated into better legal treatment of Sudanese refugees in Egypt, which still differs from what humane treatment would imply. For instance, the 1976 Nile Valley Treaty sanctioned unrestricted access to employment and education for Sudanese nationals in the country, and the 2004 Four Freedoms Agreement established legal work, residency, and education for both countries—raising hopes in vain for better living conditions for Sudanese people in Egypt.

Political Orders, Postcoloniality, and Catastrophe

Humanitarian interventions traditionally rest upon the will to assist crisis-stricken populations and alleviate their suffering. They are historically an indicator that some states are not performing well and that political life can be supported and maintained only through a politics of “catastrophization” (Ophir 2010), where crisis response is needed to allegedly guarantee basic resources and services to “weak states.” Nevertheless, different social and political factors—which cannot be reduced to the politics of nation-states but also relate to broader processes of political order—influence the sociology of researching human

displacement and humanitarianism. Our comparative analysis suggests that similarities and differences across the literature are not always motivated by specific forms of state governmentality. As a result, the displacement and humanitarianism literature would need to move beyond the state paradigm and instead focus on a variety of sociopolitical factors.

In this context, while we agree that the postcolonial lens has by now been abused by international scholarship (Hanafi 2020), we still emphasize its complex role in suggesting the political, historical, and social factors that underlie current scholarship. Countries with a postcolonial background rely on diverse forms of governmentality, which, in turn, build different relationships with external humanitarian actors; in so-called fragile states, international humanitarian agencies are believed to dictate rules and influence policy-making, enacting a sort of "trickle-down imperialism" (Schuller 2012). In contrast, humanitarianism is believed to barely survive in authoritarian states like Turkey, Jordan, and Egypt, which are generally said to be more likely to repress the politics of assistance and humanity. Reality shows that scholarship on different countries such as Lebanon and Jordan has actually covered similar themes. It also shows that local sites of power shift continuously, being at times formal institutions and, at other times, informal power holders curbing assistance provision. Likewise, states like Lebanon have also proved that, although domestic sovereignty is seemingly fragmented and delegated to more than one actor, they can still curb or hold sway on assistance provision and its layered politics, for example, forbidding marches in support of refugee employment and living conditions.

Postcoloniality is thus a key variable to carving out a transnational sociology of knowledge of these localities. Identifying this sociology means meditating on the ways in which crisis is defined and understood in different political histories. In this respect, Lebanon is overcharacterized by the catastrophe discourse, having a wavering political past and present during which governmental mandates have never lasted long, unlike many other states in the region. It would, however, be incorrect to argue that Lebanon has historically been more exposed to crisis than countries like Jordan, Egypt, or Turkey (also characterized by outbreaks of nonstate political violence and coups d'état) because "crisis" per se should have contextual and relativistic meanings and at times resides in the ordinary details of everyday life. Rather, knowledge producers have used instability and fragmentation as entry points to research Lebanon by constantly marking out the sectarian differences within the country. The gaze of the "international community," of which scholars are a part, in fact, contributed to framing Lebanon as eternally affected by crisis versus the stable order of other countries in the region. In this sense, it is no surprise that research on humanitarianism in Lebanon has only focused on local infrastructures and local citizens *after* the country turned into a fragile humanitarian space and when local people became the "host communities" for refugees and migrants.

Contrarily, Turkey is a country in which catastrophe is only one among many factors that trigger the deployment of exceptional security measures and political states. As shown, research on Turkey has mostly shed light on the policy-oriented aspects of refugee movements and humanitarian practices. Such frameworks tend to make catastrophe domestic

and controlled by connecting it with national legal and welfare regimes. The catastrophe narrative is less used in what political scientists would term “authoritarian regimes,” where the state is highly centralized, implementing surveillance mechanisms and adopting repressive measures. A state that does not allow the politics of humanitarianism to emerge intends to show control and domestic accountability vis-à-vis crises by gate-keeping refugee-populated areas and limiting international assistance and involvement in domestic affairs. Humanitarianism in such contexts can even be regarded as a Western conspiracy (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and Pacitto 2015).

In other words, while in Turkey refugee migration has triggered scholarly efforts to capture domestic changes in light of the crisis (e.g., the labor market, livelihoods, housing), in Lebanon, a large proportion of humanitarian research initially revolved around refugees and nonstate assistance providers approaching Lebanon as a “host” environment. The protracted nature of the Syrian crisis has led scholars to focus on Lebanon’s governance, service provision, and social groups other than refugees and, as illustrated, to question the humanitarian labeling system reproduced by the scholarship. However, it remains problematic that local people and the service provision system are acknowledged as being vulnerable in light of their interrelation with refugee-related issues. Despite its centralized government, Jordan is approached by researchers in a similar manner to Lebanon, and this can be only partially explained through the postcolonial character of both countries. The French Mandate in Lebanon (1920–1943) and the British Mandate for Palestine in Transjordan (1923–1948) marked, to some extent, the colonial background of humanitarian assistance in the two countries. Other imperial influences entered the region without exercising direct rule, like Great Britain and France. Modern humanitarianism, in fact, has functioned as a moral vessel, wherein the politics of other foreign presences like that of America may be placed, and to, therefore, distinguish the latter from other types of colonialism (Watenpaugh 2015, 56).

Not all external aid coming into the region, however, should be associated with such forms of hybrid colonialism. On the one hand, it is certain that a large portion of international resources was directed to support the colonial sentimentalism of “bringing good” to the Middle East. On the other hand, such colonial sentimentalism was heterogeneous across the different foreign powers—the Levantine diasporas in the United States, for example, advocated for Arab independence from Ottoman power through relief advocacy. Several international NGOs continue the colonial tradition today, reproducing former colonial agendas and drawing on older forms of the Global North’s missionary charities, which look at suffering in the Middle East as a plague to be addressed by making “religious minorities” (e.g., Armenians and Assyrians) deserving and well-bounded objects of humanitarianism. Instead, humanitarianism should also be disentangled from the colonial framework, formed as it is by the multiple realities of managing crisis at a local level and not being reduceable to an object of the Western humanitarian agenda (Watenpaugh 2015, 3).

Conclusion

Scholarship focusing on local responses to displacement by adopting local understandings of humanitarianism is still rare. While most scholars have examined the work of international institutions operating in the region and have reflected on the correlation between states and refugees, we highlight the need to move away from the state paradigm and to consider equally relevant factors such as informal power-holding, nuanced conceptions of humanitarianism and solidarity, and the relationships between social groups. This becomes particularly relevant in light of the multiscale responses to the COVID-19 pandemic in the region. As English-language users and scholars, we also emphasize the need to learn, to a greater extent, from multilingual literatures, especially those produced in the Global South, and from a deeper investigation of the principles and modalities of crisis management from across the Global South. As Fiddian-Qasmiyeh recently argued (2019, S37), "exploring the principles and modalities of South–South cooperation, rather than promoting the incorporation of Southern actors into the 'international humanitarian system' via the localization agenda, presents a critical opportunity for studies of displacement and humanitarianism in the Middle East region." From our perspective, such considerations, while overcoming the nation-state paradigm, could drive us toward an actual global sociology of knowledge.

References

Achilli, Luigi. 2015. *Palestinian Refugees and Identity: Nationalism, Politics and the Everyday*. London: I. B. Tauris.

Açiksöz, Salih C. 2016. "Medical Humanitarianism under Atmospheric Violence: Health Professionals in the 2013 Gezi Protests in Turkey." *Cultural and Medical Psychiatry* 40: 198–222.

Adam, Gamal A. 2014. *Living in Limbo with Hope: Sudanese Refugees and Social Injustice in Egypt*. Vernon, BC, Canada: J. Charlton.

Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Ager, Alastair, and Joey Ager. 2015. *Faith, Secularism and Humanitarian Engagement*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ager, Joey, Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, and Alastair Ager. 2015. "Local Faith Communities and the Promotion of Resilience in Contexts of Humanitarian Crisis." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 28: 202–221.

Akar, Sevda, and Mustafa M. Erdoğdu. 2019. "Syrian Refugees in Turkey and Integration Problem Ahead." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 20: 925–940.

Akçalı, Emel, and Evrim Görmüş. 2018. “Diaspora Business: The Economic Contribution of Syrian Refugees to Turkey and Their Political Role in (Post-)Conflict Resolution.” *Heritage Turkey* 2018: 15–16.

Akcapar, Sebner K. 2010. “Rethinking Migrants’ Networks and Social Capital: A Case-Study of Iranians in Turkey.” *International Migration* 48 (2): 161–196.

Alkan-Zeybek, Hilal. 2012. “Ethics of Care, Politics of Solidarity: Islamic Charitable Organizations in Turkey.” In *Ethnographies of Islam: Ritual Performances and Everyday Practices*, edited by Baudouin Dupret, Thomas Pierret, Paulo G. Pinto, and Kathryn Spellman-Poots, 144–152. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Al-Sharmani, Mulki, and Katarzyna Grabska. 2009. “African Refugees and Diasporic Struggles in Cairo.” In *Cairo Contested: Governance, Urban Space, and Global Modernity*, edited by Diane Singerman, 455–488. Cairo, Egypt: AUC Press.

Anholt, Rosanne, and Giulia Sinatti. 2019. “Under the Guise of Resilience: The EU Approach to Migration and Forced Displacement in Jordan and Lebanon.” *Contemporary Security Policy* 41 (2): 311–335.

Aras, Bülent. 2017. “Medical Humanitarianism of Turkey’s NGOs: A ‘Turkish Way’?” *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 42 (4): 183–194.

Arendt, Hannah. 1958. *The Human Condition*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Badawy, Tarek. 2010. “The Protection of Refugees Between Obligations under Multilateral Conventions and Specific Treaty Obligations: The Case of Egypt.” *African Yearbook of International Law* 18: 151–196.

Bayer, Reşat, and Fuat E. Keyman. 2012. “Turkey: An Emerging Hub of Globalization and Internationalist Humanitarian Actor?” *Globalizations* 9 (1): 73–90.

Beck, Ulrich. 2000. “The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity.” *British Journal of Sociology* 51: 79–105.

Ben-Ze’ev, Efrat, and Nir Gazit. 2018. “Juggling Logics on the Egyptian–Israeli Borderland: Soldiers between Securitization and Arbitrary Humanitarianism.” *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 47 (2): 255–277.

Boustani, Marwa, Estella Carpi, Hayat Gebara, and Yara Mourad. 2016. “Responding to the Syrian Crisis in Lebanon. Collaboration between Aid Agencies and Local Governance Structures.” IIED Working Paper. IIED, London. **https://pubs.iied.org/10799IIED/**.

Brown, Neil, Sean Riordan, and Marina Sharpe. 2004. “Developments. The Insecurity of Eritreans and Ethiopians in Cairo.” *International Journal of Refugee Law* 16 (4): 661–701.

Carpi, Estella. 2014. “The Political and the Humanitarian in Lebanon. Social Responsiveness to Emergency Crisis from the July 2006 War to the Syrian Refugee Influx.” *Oriente Moderno* 94: 402–427.

Carpi, Estella. 2018. “Teaching Humanitarianism in Lebanon, Turkey, and Italy.” *Public Anthropologist*, April 26. **http://publicanthropologist.cmi.no/2018/04/26/teaching-humanitarianism-in-lebanon-turkey-and-italy/**.

Carpi, Estella. 2019a. “The ‘Need to Be There’: North–South Encounters and Imaginations in the Humanitarian Economy.” In *Routledge Handbook of South–South Relations*, edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and Patricia Daley, 296–308. New York and London: Routledge.

Carpi, Estella. 2019b. “Bringing Social Class into Humanitarian Debates: The Case of Northern Lebanon.” Middle East Institute, December 4. **https://www.mei.edu/publications/bringing-social-class-humanitarian-debates-case-northern-lebanon**.

Carpi, Estella. 2020. “Different Shades of ‘Neutrality’: Arab Gulf NGOs in Northern Lebanon.” In *Refuge in a Moving World: Tracing Refugee and Migrant Journeys across Disciplines*, edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 415–428. London: UCL Press.

Carpi, Estella, and Camillo Boano. 2018. “Border Towns: Humanitarian Assistance in Peri-Urban Areas.” *Humanitarian Exchange* 71: 39–42. **https://odihpn.org/magazine/border-towns-humanitarian-assistance-in-peri-urban-areas/**.

Carpi, Estella, and Chiara Diana. 2019. “The ‘Right to Play’ Versus the ‘Right to War’? Vulnerable Childhood in Lebanon’s NGOization.” In *Disadvantaged Childhoods and Humanitarian Intervention. Processes of Affective Objectification and Commodification*, edited by Kristen Cheney and Aviva Sinervo, 135–156. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Carpi, Estella, and Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh. 2020. “Keeping the Faith? Examining the Roles of Faith and Secularism in Syrian Diaspora Organizations in Lebanon.” In *Diaspora Organizations in International Affairs*, edited by Dennis Dijzkeul and Margit Fauser, 129–149. London: Routledge.

Carpi, Estella, and Pinar Şenoğuz. 2018. “Refugee Hospitality in Lebanon and Turkey.” *Journal of International Migration* 57 (2): 126–142.

Çelik, Ayşe B. 2005. “Transnationalization of Human Rights Norms and Its Impact on Internally Displaced Kurds.” *Human Rights Quarterly* 27 (3): 969–997.

Chatty, Dawn. 2013. “Guests and Hosts.” *Cairo Review of Global Affairs* 9: 76–85. **https://www.thecairoreview.com/essays/guests-and-hosts/**.

Danış, Didem. 2007. “A Faith That Binds: Iraqi Christian Women on the Domestic Service Ladder of Istanbul.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33 (4): 601–615.

Dardiry, Giulia. 2017. "'People Eat People': The Influence of Socioeconomic Conditions on Experiences of Displacement in Jordan." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 49: 701–719.

Dionigi, Filippo. 2017. "Statehood and Refugees: Patterns of Integration and Segregation of Refugee Populations in Lebanon from a Comparative Perspective." *Middle East Law and Governance* 9 (2): 113–146.

Donelli, Federico. 2017. "Features, Aims and Limits of Turkey's Humanitarian Diplomacy." *Central European Journal of International and Security Studies* 11 (3): 59–83.

Elgaddal Saeed, Ehsan. 1999. "Sudanese Women Refugees in Cairo, Egypt." *Journal of Gender Studies* 8 (1): 103–104.

El-Nakib, Shatha, and Alastair Ager. 2015. *Local Faith Community and Civil Society Engagement in Humanitarian Response with Syrian Refugees in Irbid, Jordan*. *Report to the Henry Luce Foundation*. New York: Columbia University, Mailman School of Public Health. **https://jliflc.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/El-Nakib-Ager-Local-faith-communities-and-humanitarian-response-in-Irbid-.pdf**.

Fábos, Anita H. 2015. "Microbuses and Mobile Homemaking in Exile: Sudanese Visiting Strategies in Cairo." *Refuge* 31 (1): 55–66.

Fawaz, Mona. 2005. "Agency and Ideology in Community Services: Islamic NGOs in a Southern Suburb of Beirut." In *NGOs and Governance in the Arab World*, edited by Sarah Ben Néfissa, Nabil Abd al-Fattah, Sari Hanafi, and Carlos Milani, 229–255. Cairo, Egypt: AUC Press.

Fawaz, Mona. 2009. "Hezbollah as Urban Planner? Questions to and from Planning Theory." *Planning Theory* 8 (4): 323–334.

Fawcett, Louise, and Helene Gandois. 2010. "Regionalism in Africa and the Middle East: Implications for EU Studies." *European Integration* 32 (6): 617–636.

Feldman, Ilana. 2007. "Difficult Distinctions: Refugee Law, Humanitarian Practice, and Political Identification in Gaza." *Cultural Anthropology* 22 (1): 129–169.

Feldman, Ilana. 2012. "The Challenge of Categories: UNRWA and the Definition of a Palestine Refugee." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 25 (3): 387–406.

Feldman, Ilana. 2018. *Life Lived in Relief: Humanitarian Predicaments and Palestinian Refugee Politics*. Oakland: University of California Press.

Fiddian, Elena. 2006. "Relocating. The Asylum Experience in Cairo." *Interventions. The International Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 8 (2): 295–318.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena. 2011. “Invisible Refugees and/or Overlapping Refugeedom? Protecting Sahrawis and Palestinians Displaced by the 2011 Libyan Uprising.” *International Journal of Refugee Law* 24 (2): 263–293.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena. 2016a. “*Repress*entations of Displacement in the Middle East.” *Public Culture* 28 (3 [80]): 457–473.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena. 2016b. “Refugees Hosting Refugees.” *Forced Migration Review* 53: 25–27.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena. 2019. “Looking Forward. *Disasters* at 40.” Supplement, *Disasters* 43 (S1): S36–S60.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena. 2020a. “Introduction. Recentering the South in Studies of Migration.” *Migration and Society* 3 (1): 1–18.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena. 2020b. “Shifting the Gaze: Palestinian and Syrian Refugees Sharing and Contesting Space in Lebanon.” In *Refuge in a Moving World: Tracing Refugee and Migrant Journeys across Disciplines*, edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 402–414. London: UCL Press.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena, and Julia Pacitto. 2015. “Writing the Other into Humanitarianism: A Conversation between ‘South–South’ and ‘Faith-Based’ Humanitarianisms.” In *The New Humanitarians in International Practice: Emerging Actors and Contested Principles*, edited by Zeynep Sezgin and Dennis Dijkzeul, 282–300. London and New York: Routledge.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena, and Julia Pacitto. 2019. “Southern-Led Faith-Based Responses to Refugees: Insights for the Global North.” In *Religion and European Society: A Primer*, edited by Benjamin Schewel and Erin K. Wilson, 183–210. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Furniss, Jamie. 2012. “Religion, Humanitarianism and Development: The Secular Materialist ‘Mission’ of Sœur Emmanuelle with Cairo’s Garbage Collectors.” *A Contrario* 18: 97–123.

Gabiam, Nell, and Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh. 2017. “Palestinians and the Arab Uprisings: Political Activism and Narratives of Home, Homeland, and Home-Camp.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 43 (5): 731–748.

Gilley, Bruce. 2015. “Turkey, Middle Powers, and the New Humanitarianism.” *Perceptions* 20 (1): 37–58.

Gökalp, Deniz. 2010. “A Gendered Analysis of Violence, Justice and Citizenship: Kurdish Women Facing War and Displacement in Turkey.” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 33: 561–569.

Häkli, Jouni, Elisa Pascucci, and Kirsi P. Kallio. 2017. “Becoming Refugee in Cairo: The Political in Performativity.” *International Political Sociology* 11 (2): 185–202.

Hanafi, Sari. 2020. “Global Sociology Revisited: Toward New Directions.” *Current Sociology* 68 (1): 3–21.

Harb, Mona. 2008. “Faith-Based Organizations as Effective Development Partners? Hezbollah and Post-War Reconstruction in Lebanon.” In *Development, Civil Society and Faith-Based Organizations*, edited by Gerard Clarke and Michael Jennings, 214–239. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hassan, Ismael S., and Sari Hanafi. 2010. “Insecurity and Reconstruction in Post-Conflict Nahr al-Bared Refugee Camp.” *Journal of Palestinian Studies* 11 (1): 27–48.

Henry, Hani H. 2012. “African Refugees in Egypt: Trauma, Loss, and Cultural Adjustment.” *Death Studies* 36 (7): 583–604.

Hoffman, Sophia. 2017. “Humanitarian Security in Jordan’s Azraq Camp.” *Security Dialogue* 48 (2): 97–112.

Iğsız, Asli. 2018. *Humanism in Ruins: Entangled Legacies of the Greek–Turkish Population Exchange*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Janmyr, Maja. 2017a. “UNHCR and the Syrian Refugee Response: Negotiating Status and Registration in Lebanon.” *International Journal of Human Rights* 22 (3): 393–419.

Janmyr, Maja. 2017b. “No Country of Asylum: ‘Legitimizing’ Lebanon’s Rejection of the 1951 Refugee Convention.” *International Journal of Refugee Law* 29 (3): 438–465.

Janmyr, Maja, and Lama Mourad. 2018. “Modes of Ordering: Labeling, Classification and Categorization in Lebanon’s Refugee Response.” *Journal of Refugee Studies* 31 (4): 544–565.

Knudsen, Are. 2018. “Decade of Despair: The Contested Rebuilding of Nahr al-Bared Refugee Camp, Lebanon, 2007–2017.” *Refuge: Canada’s Journal on Refugees* 34 (2): 135–149.

Knudsen, Are, and Sari Hanafi, eds. 2011. *Palestinian Refugees: Identity, Space and Place in the Levant*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kraft, Kathryn. 2015. “Faith and Impartiality in Humanitarian Response: Lessons from Lebanese Evangelical Churches Providing Food Aid.” *International Review of the Red Cross* 97 (897–898): 395–421.

Kraft, Kathryn, and Jonathan D. Smith. 2018. “Between International Donors and Local Faith Communities: Intermediaries in Humanitarian Assistance to Syrian Refugees in Jordan and Lebanon.” *Disasters* 43 (1): 24–45.

Lenner, Katharina, and Lewis Turner. 2019. “Making Refugees Work? The Politics of Integrating Syrian Refugees into the Labor Market in Jordan.” *Middle East Critique* 28 (1): 65–95.

MacGinty, Roger. 2007. “Reconstructing Post-war Lebanon: A Challenge to the Liberal Peace?” *Conflict, Security and Development* 7 (3): 457–482.

MacGinty, Roger, and Christine S. Hamieh. 2010. “Made in Lebanon: Local Participation and Indigenous Responses to Development and Post-war Reconstruction.” *Civil Wars* 12 (1–2): 47–64.

Mathews, Gordon. 2019. “South–South Relations in the Academic World. The Case of Anthropology.” In *Routledge Handbook of South–South Relations*, edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and Patricia Daley, 86–95. London and New York: Routledge.

Mourad, Lama. 2017. “‘Standoffish’ Policy-making: Inaction and Change in the Lebanese Response to the Syrian Displacement Crisis.” *Middle East Law and Governance* 9 (3): 249–266.

Murphy, Emma, Will Todman, Abbie Taylor, and Rochelle Davis. 2016. “Sudanese and Somali Refugees in Jordan. Hierarchies of Aid in Protracted Displacement Crises.” *Middle East Report* 279 (46).

Nassar, Jessy, and Nora Stel. 2019. “Lebanon's Response to the Syrian Refugee Crisis—Institutional Ambiguity as a Governance Strategy.” *Political Geography* 70: 44–54.

Ophir, Adi. 2010. “The Politics of Catastrophization: Emergency and Exception.” In *Contemporary States of Emergency*, edited by Didier Fassin and Mariella Pandolfi, 59–88. New York: Zone Books.

Pascucci, Elisa. 2017. “Community Infrastructures: Shelter, Self-Reliance and Polymorphic Borders in Urban Refugee Governance.” *Territory, Politics, Governance* 5 (3): 332–345.

Pascucci, Elisa. 2018. “The Local Labour Building the International Community: Precarious Work within Humanitarian Spaces.” *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 51 (3): 743–760.

Qasmiyeh, Yousif M. 2019. “Introduction: Engendering Plural Tales.” *Migration and Society* 3: 254–255.

Ramadan, Adam, and Sara Fregonese. 2017. “Hybrid Sovereignty and the State of Exception in the Palestinian Refugee Camps in Lebanon.” *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 107 (4): 949–963.

Refugee Hosts. 2018. *Local Faith Community Responses to Displacement in Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey: Emerging Evidence and New Approaches*. UCL Migration Research Unit Report. London: Refugee Hosts Project.

Rivetti, Paola. 2013. “Empowerment without Emancipation: Performativity and Political Activism among Iranian Refugees in Italy and Turkey.” *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 38 (4): 305–320.

Saleh, Elizabeth, and Adrien Zakar. 2018. “The Joke Is on Us: Irony and Community in a Beirut Scrapyard.” *Anthropology Today* 34 (3): 3–6.

Sanyal, R. 2014. “Urbanizing Refuge: Interrogating Spaces of Displacement.” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38 (2): 558–572.

Sassoon, Joseph. 2009. *The Iraqi Refugees. The New Crisis in the Middle East*. New York: I. B. Tauris.

Schiocchet, Leonardo. 2014. “Palestinian Refugees in Lebanon: Is the Camp a Space of Exception?” *Mashriq & Mahjar* 2 (1): 130–160.

Schmelter, Susanne. 2019. “Gulf States’ Humanitarian Assistance for Syrian Refugees in Lebanon.” Civil Society Knowledge Centre, Lebanon Support, Beirut.

Schuller, Mark. 2012. *Killing with Kindness: Haiti, International Aid, and NGOs*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Şimşek, Doğuş. 2018. “Integration Processes of Syrian Refugees in Turkey: ‘Class-Based Integration.’” *Journal of Refugee Studies*. **https://academic.oup.com/jrs/advance-article-abstract/doi/10.1093/jrs/fey057/5139595?redirectedFrom=fulltext**.

Stel, Nora. 2016. “The Agnotology of Eviction in South Lebanon's Palestinian Gatherings: How Institutional Ambiguity and Deliberate Ignorance Shape Sensitive Spaces.” *Antipode* 48 (5): 1400–1419.

Tejel, Jordi, and Ramazan H. Öztan. 2020. “Towards Connected Histories of Refugeedom in the Middle East.” In “Forced Migration and Refugeedom in the Modern Middle East,” special issue, *Journal of Migration History* 6: 1–15.

Thomas, Joely, and Birte Vogel. 2018. “Intervention Gentrification and Everyday Socio-economic Transactions in Intervention Societies.” *Civil Wars* 20 (2): 217–237.

Turhan, Yunus, and Şerif O. Bahçecik. 2020. “The Agency of Faith-Based NGOs in Turkish Humanitarian Aid Policy and Practice.” *Turkish Studies*. **https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14683849.2020.1756786?journalCode=ftur20**.

Turner, Lewis. 2015. “Explaining the (Non-)Encampment of Syrian Refugees: Security, Class and the Labour Market in Lebanon and Jordan.” *Mediterranean Politics* 20 (3): 386–404.

Turner, Lewis. 2020. “‘#Refugees Can Be Entrepreneurs Too!’ Humanitarianism, Race, and the Marketing of Syrian Refugees.” *Review of International Studies* 46 (1): 137–155.

Vicini, Fabio. 2020. “‘Worship Is Not Everything’: Volunteering and Muslim Life in Modern Turkey.” In *Muslim Subjectivities in Global Modernity: Islamic Traditions and the Construction of Modern Muslim Identities*, edited by Dietrich Jung and Kirstine Sinclair, 97–120. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Wagner, Ann-Christine. 2018. “Remapping the Holy Land from the Margins: How a Jordanian Evangelical Church Juggles the ‘Local’ and the ‘Global’ in the Syrian Refugee Response.” *Contemporary Levant* 3 (2): 95–109.

Watenpaugh, Keith D. 2015. *Bread from Stones. The Middle East and the Making of Modern Humanitarianism*. Oakland: University of California Press.

White, Ben, Simone Haysom, and Eleonor Davey. 2013. “Refugees, Host States and Displacement in the Middle East: An Enduring Challenge.” *Humanitarian Exchange* 59: 20–21. **https://odihpn.org/magazine/refugees-host-states-and-displacement-in-the-middle-east-an-enduring-challenge/**.

Wimmer, Andreas, and Nina Glick-Schiller. 2002. “Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences.” *Global Networks* 2 (4): 301–334.

Zohry, Ayman. 2006. “Immigration to Egypt.” *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies* 4 (3): 33–54.

Notes:

(1.) For updated statistics, see https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria.

(2.) See, respectively, https://emarefa.net, https://platform.almanhal.com and https://atharportal.net.

(3.) The 2017–2022 project is funded by the European Research Council under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Program, with grant agreement 715582. See https://southernresponses.org.

(4.) See http://www.lpdc.gov.lb/DocumentFiles/Key%20Findings%20report%20En-636566196639789418.pdf.

(5.) See https://www.unrwa.org/activity/protection-lebanon.

(6.) See https://www.unhcr.org/lb/wp-content/uploads/sites/16/2019/11/UNHCR-Lebanon-Operational-Fact-sheet-October-2019.pdf.

(7.) See https://www.unrwa.org/where-we-work/jordan.

(8.) See https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/73770 and https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/36.

(9.) See http://www.undp.org/content/dam/jordan/docs/Governance/Comm%20Security%20Project%20Document_FINAL%20_JUN-2015.pdf.

(10.) See https://refugeehosts.org.

(11.) See https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/113.

(12.) See for example: https://www.unhcr.org/innovation/10-refugees-who-will-change-your-perception-of-entrepreneurship/.

(13.) Art. 53 states that Egypt is obliged to provide political asylum to foreigners who have been persecuted (Brown, Riordan, and Sharpe 2004, 693).

Estella Carpi

Department of Geography, University College London

Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh

Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh was the Director of the Refugee Studies Centre's International Summer School in Forced Migration between 2010 and 2012. Prior to joining the RSC, Elena was Senior Teaching Fellow in Development Studies and Research Fellow in Diaspora Mobilisation and International Security at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. She has also worked as a legal advisor for refugees in Cairo with AMERA-Egypt, as a refugee case-worker with Amnesty International Australia's Refugee Team, and as a legal clerk at the International Criminal Court, conducting research on crimes committed in Darfur (Sudan). She is Departmental Lecturer in Forced Migration at the Refugee Studies Centre, and Junior Research Fellow in Refugee Studies at Lady Margaret Hall, both at the University of Oxford.