Introduction

Care in a Time of Humanitarianism

Stories of Refuge, Aid, and Repair in the Global South

Arzoo Osanloo and Cabeiri deBergh Robinson

In these times, a reader perusing any newspaper will quickly encounter stories of forced migration, displacement, and flights from persecution. Contemporary depictions of forced migration call up the bodies of children washed up on European shores, while examples of humanitarian care portray relief workers delivering supplies to desperate women and children baking under the Mediterranean sun in makeshift refugee camps. Yet, as we witnessed the flight of Ukrainian civilians across Europe's internal borderlands, numerous others, forcibly displaced from their homes and seeking refuge, remained within the Middle East, North Africa, and South and Southeast Asia. The vast majority of these forced migrants are denied the welcoming embrace of Europe, North America, and Australia.

As two anthropologists of the global South—Iran and Pakistan, respectively—working on complementary but divergent topics, ranging from Islamic law to women's and refugee rights and political violence, we were puzzled over this vivid, sympathetic, and sensorial attention to the need for aid accompanied by vocal and self-congratulatory praise for a culture of hospitality found in wealthy countries of Europe, North America, and Australia. One reason for our continued surprise at the dominance of narratives and visual representations of humanitarian care administered to suffering displaced people in these regions was that in 2017, these countries hosted just 15 percent of the world's forced migrants and refugees. The remaining 85 percent sought refuge and remained in the global South, mostly for protracted periods, often generations.[1] We also noted that much contemporary scholarship on humanitarianism portrays patterns of forced migration as linear flows north and westward, for which West-

ern philosophies of care serve to construct migrants as subjects of compassion and aid. One of the effects of framing the practices of care in this way is that the global South is relegated to being a region that produces refugees and a place refugees migrate *from* rather than *to*. Yet, the stark reality is that the vast majority of migrants, displaced persons, stateless people, and refugees continue to seek shelter and stay in the global South.[2]

For decades, the top host countries of the world's refugees have been in the global South; Columbia, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, Pakistan, Türkiye, and Uganda are frequently named in the top five.[3] Additionally, 13 percent—9.4 million—of forcibly displaced people who are now "of concern" to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) are in the Asia and Pacific region. They include 4.2 million refugees, 2.7 million internally displaced people, and 2.2 million stateless people, of whom the majority originate from Afghanistan and Myanmar.[4] In 2016, the top six destination countries for forced migrants (Jordan, Türkiye, Palestine, Pakistan, Lebanon, and South Africa) hosted approximately 50 percent of refugees, asylum seekers, and forcibly displaced people but commanded only 1.9 percent of the world's cumulative GDP. The six richest countries (Germany, France, China, the United States, UK, and Japan) made up 56.6 percent of the world's cumulative GDP but hosted only 8.8 percent of forced migrants.[5] The 2021 collapse of the Afghan government resulted in a small rise in Afghan hosting by countries of Europe and North America, but the vast majority fled to neighboring Pakistan and Iran.[6] The outpouring of refugees from Russia's unprovoked attack on Ukraine in 2022 added to these numbers but also elicited a greater welcome by countries in North America and Europe.

If we give due consideration to the actual scale and duration of relief and aid projects that these statistics invoke about responses to the forced migrations of the global South, then we must also rethink our understanding of the normative claims of the global humanitarian project. The humanitarian sites that were intended to deliver temporary refuge and aid are actually intertwined with protracted living in nominally temporary conditions. The conditions we outlined above are not exceptions to ideal global humanitarian practices or aberrations of the principles of global humanitarianism. In actuality, displaced people, the places they inhabit in short-term or long-term rehabilitation, and the representatives of host governments and local relief agencies also produce the field of humanitarian experiences. As it stands, depictions of humanitarianism have largely written the global South out of the accounts of its historical origin, philosophical foundations, legal apparatus, and expert practices, except as the recipient of aid. One of the enduring features of this framing of humanitarianism has been to exclude from this master narrative an account of the experiences, knowledge, and values about care from other parts of the world. In

an attempt to include these previously excluded forms and accounts of care, we refer to *humanitarianisms*, in the plural, in an effort to invoke the multiplicity of forms of humanitarian care.

In contrast, the overarching argument of *Care in a Time of Humanitarianism* is that the global humanitarian project will be better understood if we look at it as developing out of hybrid formations of the management of care, which include local and vernacular practices. The hosting practices of any nation-state are a combination of many factors—geopolitical, social, cultural, and economic. Thus, care work, one of the central inquiries of this volume, presents itself in myriad forms and practices. Through this exploration, humanitarian care emerges as possessing multivalent properties of historical, cultural, and religious traditions of caring for distant others, all of which shape humanitarianisms in practice in the global South. We argue that the spaces and practices of humanitarian care in the global South do not stand outside of or as exceptions to normative global humanitarian practices but are integral to it as it is practiced in reality.

The critical chapters in this collection decenter the normative rhetoric and understanding of humanitarianism by examining the histories of forced migration and practices of humanitarian care both for "conventional" and "humanitarian" refugees that developed outside of Europe and North America. Our contributors examine alternative historical trajectories of humanitarianism. They explore important conceptual categories that organize regional humanitarian practices, such as the figure of the refugee, what caring for others looks like, and what kinds of suffering, beyond that of humans, is worthy of repair. Our approach to understanding contemporary humanitarianism is both comparative and focused from the ground up. We start by examining practices and spaces where care is offered in the global South as examples of humanitarian engagement. From there, we seek to reveal the ethical systems, logics, and rationalities of care that underlie everyday practices of crisis management, charity, hospitality, and caring labor across cultural and religious traditions in the Middle East and North Africa, the southern Mediterranean, South Asia, Southeast Asia, and Eastern Europe.

Each chapter offers an illustrative story that serves as a departure point from which each author offers a layered interpretation of the story. While the chapters emphasize grounded humanitarian practices over their philosophical genealogy, ideology, or legal apparatuses, the authors also show readers how they think with and through expert frameworks to understand the work of care in a time of humanitarianism. Through the telling of the story, each contributor highlights how their ethnographic and humanistic research into refuge making and sustaining, care work, and material and therapeutic practices of repair in the global South reshapes understandings of humanitarianisms writ large.

What Is "the Global South"?

At this juncture, it is useful to consider the question: What is the global South? And further, why do we claim that the global South is an important concept to use to understand forced migration and care in the contemporary world?

The term "global South" now has a substantial history with several different meanings and implications. In its most simple invocation—and one that we are not using here in this volume—the "Global South" (with both words capitalized) is a term that developed in the 1990s to replace the concept of the "Third World."[7] For many nongovernmental organizations, including those involved in providing humanitarian aid, the term "refers to countries classified by the World Bank as low or middle income that are located in Africa, Asia, Oceania, Latin America, and the Caribbean."[8] However, beyond this nation-state and development-paradigm definition is a conceptually richer and, we think, analytically more useful meaning of the term. This conception of the "global South" (with the mixed capitalization that we use here) draws on critiques of the ongoing global structures of inequality and subjugation, particularly those created by colonial legacies and by neo-imperial geopolitical relationships. This articulation of the global South is not exclusively territorially defined, and indeed, in this conceptualization, "there are Souths in the geographic North and Norths in the geographic South."[9] Instead, this concept of the global South has created a very important domain of dialogue for scholars and activists who articulate connections between struggles that appear localized and global power structures that have enduring historical impacts and spatial connections that sometimes contradict contemporary geopolitical realpolitik.[10]

We are particularly inspired by Mukoma Wa Ngugi's discussion of the value of the concept of the global South as one that requires that we dare to do away with classic colonial and imperial theories of cultural and political centers and peripheries. Instead, the concept requires that we think in nonhierarchical ways of the interactional production of all forms of knowledge and expertise and the composite nature of identity. He credits the origins of global South thinking to the process of decolonization and its theorization and to the dynamics of the postcolonial world, in which "knowledge becomes a multiple lane highway in which all sorts of exchanges, some of them equal and others exploitative, take place."[11] He further suggests that the West Indian poet and intellectual Édouard Glissant's concept of being "in-relation" is a good way of expressing horizontal, circular exchanges that abolish the concept of center and periphery. As Ngugi argues, "Other ways of knowing and relating have always been there—that is to say, they are historical and at the same time ongoing, and to ignore them is to approach the world with one intellectual hand tied behind our backs."[12] In this task, he argues, "the goal is not to sublimate or

ignore the West—far from it. . . . The goal is to be in-relation with the West as with everyone else."[13]

We draw from Ngugi's use of "the global South" because it has a critical edge that we find helpful in thinking about the global production of humanitarian conditions in new ways that go beyond decentering these geographic South-to-North images of forced migration. The "Global South" is too often relegated to being a site in which Enlightenment humanitarianism operates and as the place refugees migrate *from* rather than *to* and *within*. As a result, much contemporary scholarship, journalism, policy analysis, and public culture representation of forced migration depict migrant flows as linear, northward, and westward, for which Western philosophies of care ultimately make the migrants visible only as depoliticized subjects of compassion and aid. Allowing "the North" to occupy the center stage for understanding humanitarian norms and practices inevitably obscures forms of humanitarian engagement as enacted and experienced by vast numbers of people in various parts of the world.

More significantly, however, by thinking in dynamic, horizontal, circular, and "in-relation" ways, we recognize that there are diverse rationalities and forms of expertise that underlie practices of care, aid, relief, and repair among the bulk of the world's refugees and forcibly displaced people. From a purely geopolitical perspective, a focus on host countries and societies in the global South, which have been and remain the primary hosts of displaced peoples since World War II, would reorient our attention to the spaces of caregiving and of living in extended precarious conditions. Hosts in the global South—and this means host countries, host communities, and refugees who host other refugees—are sources of knowledge and producers of expertise in humanitarian care; they are not its passive recipients, beneficiaries, or conduits for external donor agencies. Moreover, these spaces and practices are not exceptions to global humanitarianism. Rather it is in these spaces, in the global South, that multiple historical, cultural, and religious traditions of caring for others shape humanitarianism in practice. It is to these relations that we turn our attention.

Humanitarianisms "in-Relation"

As we have noted, the Europe-centered depiction of the origins of humanitarian law and the international refugee regime, the foundations of humanitarian reason, and the basis of professional expertise has largely written the global South out of its genealogy, except as the beneficiary or recipient of care. This master narrative excludes accounts of the experiences and knowledges about care from other parts of the world—what we, joining a critical community of scholars call, *humanitarianisms*.[14] We revisit the limiting assumption that rules of care and the management of suffering during wartime and

other crises emerge from Western political thought and ethical traditions. We examine the production and management of humanitarian care in the global South by shifting our focus to practices, knowledges, and traditions of care to those parts of the world that are empirically responsible for hosting most of the world's forced migrants, displaced persons, stateless people, and refugees. We also note that these humanitarian practices draw not only from philosophical and cultural traditions but also from regional legal apparatuses that may not have become globally dominant but have nonetheless left traces; their logics are evident and their effects impact the implementation of relief or aid administration in local contexts. We argue that the resulting hybrid or composite *humanitarianisms* have had an impact on the global humanitarian project as it expanded and made ever broader claims to universalism. It is the recognition of the importance of these multiple ways of coming to understand care work that ultimately motivates our attempt to understand humanitarianism "in-relation."

To look at humanitarian encounters in this way—as *humanitarianisms*—we must examine the foundations of important conceptual categories that organize humanitarian practices, such as the figure of the refugee, what caring for others looks like, and what kinds of human suffering are deemed worthy of care. Legal and administrative regimes, particularly, purport to have a natural, self-evident reality, but they are, themselves, products of cultural and political struggles.[15] Indeed, the epistemological ordering—the process of defining categories—of displacement is a project that arranges political relations by assigning different values to dislocation experiences.[16] Thus, when a category is represented as nonpolitical and possessing self-evident boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, it has already become naturalized. It is important to remember this about all of the regulatory apparatuses that guide policies on forced migration and to clarify distinctions between categories of migration—including labor migration, family reunification, human trafficking, and internal displacement.

Humanitarian Logics

In this section, we seek to unpack some of the diverse but conflated strains of thought, law, and practice that make up understandings of humanitarianism across academic fields and in the popular media. We do not seek to narrow the term to one superior understanding but rather to trace the numerous domains from which the idea of humanitarianism has emerged and gains purchase and meaning.

Often when reporters or scholars speaking across disciplines speak of "humanitarianism," a number of different ideas and concepts are conflated. Humanitarianism may refer to a philosophy about a common humanity that serves as the basis for the ideal that all humans, regardless of race, nationality, gender, or social class, are equal and deserving of liberty and security. Or, it may

invoke the notion of humanitarian law, which emerges from centuries-old laws of war and a more direct expansion of the Fourth Geneva Convention (1949). These laws provide for the protection of civilians during armed conflicts. Additionally, there is a separate but related area of regulation: international refugee laws, which are composed of international agreements regarding the treatment of civilians forced to flee their home countries.

In what follows, we hope to underscore the importance of understanding these distinctions, but also note that by the end of the twentieth century, these concepts had come to be used more or less interchangeably. In other words, Enlightenment logics and philosophical ideals about a common humanity and notions about protection of civilians in times of war have come to overlap with logics of providing safe haven for refugees and forced migrants.

Indeed, humanitarianism, as a concept for organizing practices of care, has deep roots in diverse religious traditions of love, compassion, charity, mercy, hospitality, and also cosmopolitanism. But later influences evolved beyond faith and philosophy to include social and political movements, including the abolitionist movement, the emergence of social work, the politics of anticolonialism and national liberation, and other moral movements, faith-based and non-faith-based alike. Many of these practices later became professionalized, and even if faith-based in their conception, they often came to appear secular amid wider bureaucratic and regulatory approaches to humanitarianism.

Thus, discussions of humanitarianism often index discursive traditions that mingle all these meanings and concepts. These are not simple misunderstandings or conflations that need to be disentangled. Instead, humanitarianism, once flattened and thus obscuring the multiple traditions of care and processes of humanitarian management, possesses its own productive power. We believe that it is this ensuing power that scholars must examine more methodically.

Philosophical Humanitarianism, the Laws of War, and the Refugee Conventions after World War II

Most contemporary genealogies of humanitarianism emphasize its historical emergence through a Western canon, especially the philosophical traditions grounded in the European Enlightenment. In this understanding, humanitarianism begins with European moral sentiments and, at its core, is a project oriented around preserving life and relieving human suffering near and far.[17] These life-preserving measures, as indexed in a European context, were also connected with Christian moral values, notably charity, hospitality, and love and compassion.[18]

The origins of the laws of war are often linked to the traditions that by the late eighteenth century came to emphasize a common humanity of all people, regardless of social ties, race or ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, or

creed, if not in practice, at least in discourse.[19] This specific humanitarianism grew out of a broader movement in seventeenth-century Europe to establish the rule of law between nation-states. The principles emerging from this, over centuries, addressed states' conduct during warfare and other emergencies in order to regulate the treatment of civilians caught in zones of conflict or disaster.

In this context, contemporary understandings of humanitarianism trace their origins to the Genevois social activist, Henri Dunant. In the mid-nineteenth century, Dunant, who witnessed the ravages of war firsthand, cofounded the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in 1863.[20] After the Battle of Solferino, Italy, in 1859, Dunant sought to establish a permanent wartime voluntary relief network to protect soldiers, albeit initially for Christians only. While Dunant likely meant unpaid labor, a more contemporary understanding of voluntarism includes the "selflessness" of humanitarian workers who willingly accept a dangerous mission in order to serve others. However, Dunant's colonial interests were part and parcel of these organizations' missions.[21] Today, these critiques have been folded into their broader aid and relief works.

Sometime later, the ICRC's Jean Pictet, a Swiss lawyer and later vice president of the ICRC, was instrumental in drafting the 1949 Geneva Conventions for the protection of victims of war and negotiating the 1977 Additional Protocols I and II. Pictet also proposed the ICRC's seven Fundamental Principles adopted in 1965: Humanity, Impartiality, Neutrality, Independence, Voluntary Service, Unity, and Universality, the first four comprising the core of humanitarianism. These humanistic projects derive from and delve into how European forbearers valued the lives of distant others and encountered their suffering and how public mourning indexed the differential values accorded to human lives.[22] They further underscore that humanitarian aid practices are political processes even as they aim to address human suffering.[23]

Of course, humanitarian organizations are far from the only sources of aid or relief for human suffering. In the aftermath of World War II, international laws to protect the right of forced migrants to seek protection emerged as a domain distinct from international humanitarian law (or the laws of war). The 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees defined a refugee as a person outside of their country of nationality or habitual residence and who is unwilling or unable to return due to a well-founded fear of persecution. The persecution must be causally linked to their race or ethnicity, religion, nationality, membership in a social group, or political opinion. This convention was adopted largely in response to displacements caused by World War II and was limited to people displaced as a result of events occurring prior to 1 January 1951 and who were fleeing Europe. The 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status

of Refugees removed the geographical and temporal constraints to the refugee definition. Today, 149 countries have ratified one or both of these treaties.

Some forty years after the ratification of the 1951 Convention, human rights scholar Louis Henkin wrestled with the shortcomings of the convention and protocol, noting that while they afforded forced migrants a right to seek asylum, they offered "the right to leave, not a right to be received, to enjoy a haven or to resettle," and thus amounted to "half a right."[24]

A World of Refugees, Looking beyond the "Conventional" Definition

Yet even in this critical reflection, Henkin was still thinking about Europeans, not about the millions of people across the global South who had been displaced because of World War II and the period of postcolonial nation formation that followed. For, in the years immediately following World War II, as the Refugee Convention was being negotiated, forced displacement was a truly global phenomenon, driven as much by wars that were fought in Africa, the Middle East, and the Asia-Pacific region as in Europe. Displacement was also driven by the pressures of decolonization and postcolonial nation-state formation. In addition to those displaced across Europe, tens of millions of displaced persons emerged from conflicts in East Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. In South Asia, during the Partition of British Colonial India between 1947 and 1951, over fourteen million people were registered as legal refugees, and approximately ten million were accommodated in official state refugee camps.[25] In China, the total number of people who were forcibly displaced during the Sino-Japanese War of 1931–45 reached over sixty million. Due to Japanese efforts at imperial expansion in the Asia-Pacific during World War II and decolonization immediately after, displacements from Korea, Indochina, and the Pacific islands meant that the overall scale of forced migrants who were recognized by regional authorities in East Asia as refugees between 1937 and 1950 was over ninety-five million.[26]

In 1951, Nehemiah Robinson, the Israeli delegate to the Geneva Conference of Penitentiaries, which drafted the final version of the Convention Relating the Status of Refugees, observed, "For the purposes of the Convention, there were practically no refugees in the world other than those coming from Europe."[27] Indeed, while the representatives who drafted the Refugee Conventions aspired to produce a useful definition of "refugee" that would transcend the politics of states, the actual minutes of the drafting committee show that many representatives who participated in writing the definition thought that it did not represent the universal aspirations of the Charter of the United Nations.[28] Still, nearly as soon as the politically negotiated definition of the "refugee" as a person who "crosses international borders" due to "fear of persecution" was adopted in 1951

and entered into force in 1954, this conventional definition quickly came to dominate categorial recognition of refugees and became hegemonic on a global scale. Indeed, already by 1953, Jacques Vernant, in his global refugee survey for the UNHCR, concluded that there were "no refugees" in Asia.[29]

Colonial-era legal categories impacted who could be seen as a refugee worthy of care, even in those foundational moments when the Refugee Convention was being drafted. Moreover, even at the edges of Europe at the end of World War II, large numbers of people were written out of refugee recognition. Therefore, the alleviation of human suffering related to forced migration in practice became intricately linked with practices of national or ethnic identification and, often, forced repatriation.[30] These legacies have regrettably been written out of many accounts of humanitarianism's genealogies.[31]

In the Middle East and North Africa, for example, displacement after World War II was handled as a problem of national repatriation and, in the case of displaced and dispossessed Palestinians, marked off as a separate problem that would be administered by distinct agencies.[32] This treatment was in part a legacy of the treaty agreements that developed in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to handle mass forced displacement between and within the Ottoman Empire and European colonial territories. It also derived from the institutional and administrative practices applied by the League of Nations after the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire and during the interwar years. Refugee recognition as applied in this region was developed to reduce conflict and also to legitimize new territorial borders. Over time, in the spaces of short-term and long-term rehabilitation, the representatives of voluntary charitable organizations, host governments, and relief agencies fundamentally shaped the field of humanitarian experience and expectation.[33]

The examples of East and Southeast Asia further highlight how a distinction between labor and economic migration, tied to practices of compelled displacement and forcible resettlement by the alliances between global trading companies and colonial governments, was codified in legal distinctions during the global colonial era and then taken up by international relief organizations in the interwar and postwar years.[34] Indeed, comparatively speaking, international law and politics from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which sought to create a legal basis by which colonial authorities could compel individuals and populations to move in order to engage in "productive labor," influenced contemporary categories of migration.[35] These cases underscore that forms of structural violence—economic, labor, or environmental—have historically been written out of analyses of forced migration, in part because national governments (such as the Chinese nationalist government) operating near or on the edges of areas of colonial influence (such as Hong Kong) also had vested interests in retaining the ability to make its citizenry mobile through dispossession.[36]

Development and Transformation of the Figure of the Refugee

During the Cold War, another category of recipient of protection emerged, that of the "humanitarian refugee," who was a subject of aid and intervention as the United Nations expanded the scope of refugee recognition to deal with what it refers to as "refugee-like" situations. The expansion of the normative legal category of the "refugee" shifted the work of refugee identification from the realm of legal adjudication to one of sociopolitical representation. The "humanitarian refugee" emerged as a subject of aid and intervention as the United Nations sought to provide assistance to displaced people who were not juridical recipients of relief in a strict reading of the refugee conventions. By the 1980s, this "new humanitarian" approach to people in such "refugee-like" situations had become firmly established.

One impetus for this new approach was a need to respond to the suffering produced by famines, environmental disruptions, and conflict-driven migration, which were not covered by the conventions. In the 1970s, groups such as Oxfam and Save the Children worked with governments to launch large-scale relief projects in Africa, seeking to address the structural causes of starvation.[37] United Nations relief projects also began to operate on a development paradigm, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees became a central coordinator of seemingly paradoxical "relief-development" projects.[38]

Another motivation was political turmoil and conflict that displaced large numbers of people *within* state borders. The emergence of the internally displaced person (IDP) was one way of classifying who was eligible for this kind of humanitarian response.[39] Yet another factor was the emergence of a "rights-based humanitarianism" and the practice of offering temporary protection to people who could be shown to be victims of human rights violations, a shift that became one of the core ethical, philosophical, and practical questions of humanitarian practice in the post–Cold War era.[40] In the international mobilization of philanthropic funds by International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGO), for example, the visual and discursive representations of women and children became "embodiments of refugeeness" and reflected institutional expectations of refugees' helplessness in order to draw donations. This also produced refugees as dehistoricized and depoliticized "speechless emissaries," whose experiences were represented as separate from the geopolitical and postcolonial conflicts that had displaced them.[41] These depictions similarly drew on representations of women as inherently innocent and less political than men. This attitude is expressed in the humanitarian domain through the fact that boy children become, as they grow into men, a "problem" for humanitarian projects in a way that girl children do not.[42]

Yet, more recent studies have argued that the figure of the refugee is, itself, a subject-making category. Building on foundational philosophical works, such

as those in the post–World War II period by Hannah Arendt (1951) and in the contemporary period by Giorgio Agamben (2000), newer scholarship has examined the conditions of the camps as well as urban integration, whose spatial and temporal dimensions create new conditions of possibility for refugees.[43] At the same time, some scholarship has begun to question the adequacy of the current legal framework to resolve the vast flows of forced migrants in the world.[44] Indeed, many of the distinctions that vex our ability to apply these terms today—for example to those who have had to migrate due to environmental degradation and require us to ask the question: Is there such as thing an environmental refugee?—are determinations that in turn subject people to very different treatments and contain traces of global power relations.

Scholars regularly reference these European origins of humanitarianism and the management practices that have served to standardize and professionalize the care of the afflicted.[45] Such a focus treats the spread of these ideas and practices around the world as the progression of an enlightened reason, fraught though it may be, rather than as the product of processes of erasure and appropriation—the elimination of other values, rationalities, and practices of care—from the narrative of humanitarianism.

Rather, the representatives of host governments and local relief agencies produce the very field of humanitarian experiences, and it is in these spaces that multiple historical, cultural, and religious traditions of caring for distant others shape humanitarianism in practice. Through engagement with the practices that govern the care of forced migrants in the global South, we look beyond the Euro-American canon to investigate how refugees and forced migrants, as privileged subjects, make visible diverse genealogies, theories, and practices of humanitarianism. As such, this volume explores how these forms of knowledge and practices of care enter into this humanitarian canon.

Logics and Philosophical Grounds of Other Humanitarianisms

In order to better understand humanitarianism "in-relation," we need to consider the multiple sources of knowledge that underwrite logics of care. Some of these we have acknowledged already—including legal categorial thinking and Enlightenment moral reasoning. Here, we need to engage with the concept of moral reasoning outside of Enlightenment frames.

The traditions and philosophies that provide sources for such moral reasoning include orthodox religious systems, and a significant body of inquiry establishes these connections through examination of faith-based aid networks.[46] Other values, such as service, hospitality, gift giving, or mercy, preceded and influenced such moral reasoning. They underlie and legitimate practices of care that operate as part of the daily experiences and ethical ideals of both caregivers and care-receivers. It is thus worthwhile to consider these practices as part

of a repertoire of humanitarian care rather than assuming they stand apart from "real" humanitarianism, which is known, regulated, and evaluated by standards set through Euro-American norms.

During the Sino-Japanese War across China, relief for armed-conflict wounded and displaced persons was organized primarily by grassroots civilian groups and religious orders. These groups became more formal voluntary societies after the end of the war and provided the first models of organized and standardized collective action for refugee relief fundraising and material provisioning as they tapped into international social networks.[47] These resources were important as local governments took up some of their practices—for refugee identification, aid distribution, and resettlement policies after international governmental organizations (such as the UNHCR) refused to recognize the war-displaced of Asia as "refugees."[48] In the Middle East and South Asia as well, the functioning of emergent relief regimes depended on making distinctions about who would receive what kind of aid, a process in which nongovernmental voluntary organizations, missionary societies, and national militaries participated, alongside of United Nations relief agencies.[49] This dynamic is particularly significant in contexts where state agencies and international organizations take over refugee-hosting practices initiated by local communities, a process that continues into contemporary times. This does not always occur willingly, such as in the case of Acehnese fishermen, who invoked the right of offering hospitably in their homes and brought displaced Rohingya, stranded on the Andaman Sea, onshore in direct resistance to government authorities. Their actions forced the hand of the Indonesian government, whose attempted solution to the problem of boat refugees had been to prevent them from landing.[50]

Faith-based groups working around the world drew on models of charity that were imbued with religious values of "responsibility for others."[51] The origin of many humanitarian practices across traditions can be traced to such values. In India, Hindu communities created a new form of domestic humanitarian work by connecting gift giving with voluntary service work.[52] Many early humanitarian INGOs were founded by organized Christian groups, which brought specific sectarian values and conventions of network organizing into early humanitarian practices, especially in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Examples include the role of Calvinists in establishing the Red Cross Federation and the Society of Friends (Quakers), the latter of which was prominent in the founding of both Oxfam and Amnesty International.[53]

Throughout this volume, we engage understandings of humanitarian and care practices from the ground up. We thus pay close attention to the practices of care that emerge in Muslim-majority countries. The literature on humanitarianism, however, has marked Islam as an exception to care, and as having distinct logics, such as a *compulsion* to charity that, for some, challenges the possibility of an authentic concern for the suffering of others.[54] This creates a

conceptual paradox because there is an important connection between Islamic charitable organizations, as institutions of funding, dispersal, and aid management, and conceptions and values of service, hospitality, and the human right to be cared for by others in many contemporary predominantly Muslim societies.[55] This characterization, however, misses a key component in an intellectual exploration of Islam: that it is not charity but rather an ethical sensibility to build a more just and compassionate society that defines Islam's theory of care, one that emphasizes equity not equality.[56] So, engaging with the concept of Islamic humanitarianism is an interesting way to take up the challenge to think "in-relation" about humanitarianisms. This is not only because Türkiye, Jordan, Lebanon, Iran, Pakistan, and Bangladesh, hosts that have taken in a large portion of the world's refugees, are predominantly Muslim-majority countries, but also because several of these countries are not parties to either the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees or the 1967 Protocol, and thus have no legal duty to take in refugees. As five of the six top host countries for forced migrants are Muslim majority, we examine how people articulate Islamic values as both a force of faith and as a source of intellectual knowledge that underwrites logics of care.

We do not aim to search or exhaust the corpus of non-Western traditions to find common ground and are not attempting to forge humanitarian dialogue.[57] Instead, we are engaging understandings of humanitarian and care practices from the ground up to illustrate the myriad forms they take and how they operate in-relation to other processes and forms of care. Ultimately, these comparisons allow us to illuminate how values and reasoning, beyond those of the Western Enlightenment, constitute the objects of suffering, practices of care, and who or what qualifies as the object of that care.

Care in a Time of Humanitarianism

Possibly one of the boldest assertions in this volume comes from our claim that we are examining care in a specific temporal moment, in a *time of humanitarianism*. In the next few paragraphs, we elaborate on what we mean by this, noting that we advance this claim as an offering for how to understand our current zeitgeist. The protections ostensibly offered to humans in the post–World War II regime of human rights and humanitarian care, simply by virtue of their humanity, have been found to be unfulfilled. It remains that states confer protection through citizenship or some other legal category of personhood. In lieu of full recognition, we are witnessing a wider range and new forms of care, aid, and relief to serve the basest of human needs.

We see these forms of care increasingly spread beyond the "marginal" figure of the refugee to categories of people living in precarious conditions. As we

have noted, these forms of care have their roots in emergency—and are thus *intended* to be temporary. These frameworks of humanitarianism, however, have come to settle into our lifeworlds as more than temporary and have themselves become the forms-of-life through which millions of forced migrants, and many others who have had their rights and liberties diminished, seek to survive. Thus, we argue, we are living in a period in which humanitarian and other forms of care are life defining and demarcating for us all (not just forced migrants). That this is an era of humanitarianism, moreover, becomes clear once we account for both the scale and duration of this formerly-seen-as-temporary problem and reckon with the fact that care, in the form of charity, aid, and relief, no longer exists only for those living in or fleeing from active war zones but for millions of others as well.

As of this writing, more than one hundred million forced migrants are wandering the globe seeking shelter, asylum, solace, and succor from innumerable catastrophes, whether their underlying causes are human conflict or climate disaster. The secretary general of the Norwegian Refugee Council, Jan Egeland, reflected, "Indeed, we have broken that ceiling that I didn't believe we would break, I hoped we would never break in my lifetime, which is well over 100 million people now displaced by violence and conflict in the world. You go back ten years and it was 45 million; now it is 110 million."[58] While this volume attends to the kinds of care work wrought by these emergencies and disasters, we take seriously the meaning-making effects of these enduring and protracted regimes of humanitarianism and understand care work in the context of this temporal dimension.

Taking "care in a time of humanitarianism" seriously begins with the recognition that the drafters of the 1951 Refugee Convention construed the need for refugee protection as a temporary problem. The UNHCR has provided three durable solutions to the temporary problem of forced migrants: repatriation, local integration, and resettlement in a third country. Yet only about 3 percent of forced migrants have recourse to these (according to UNHCR statistics, in the past few years, anywhere between 1 and 3 percent are resettled, while only about 2 percent return voluntarily). And while these stated solutions are desired, they have no binding legal basis in international refugee law. As a result, the vast majority of forced migrants remain in the liminal spaces of temporary camps. This "zone of indifference" to which they are relegated makes up the constitutive outside of today's nation-state.[59] But our point is not simply about the numbers of people that remain in temporary and isolated camps. To add to this consideration, we also need to take note of the fact that these forced migrants, 85 percent of which remain in the global South, are also in what the UNHCR defines as *protracted conditions*. The UNHCR defines protracted conditions as twenty-five thousand or more people in a camp for five or more years in refugee situations. Today's average for protracted situations is a whop-

ping twenty-six years! And 78 percent of the world's refugees are currently living in such conditions. These statistics do not necessarily account for the world's internally displaced or those who are in what we referred to earlier (as defined by the UN) as refugee-like conditions. These are people whose circumstances do not fit the very narrow definition of a refugee according to the international laws.

In 1943, Hannah Arendt wrote that refugees "represent the vanguard of their peoples."[60] What made them the vanguard? The fact that the refugee is only a figure with rights when it has the recognition and thus protection of a nation-state, but refugees remain subject figures and have the potential to comprise a political community outside the boundaries of a nation-state. However, without recognition as subjects with rights in the nation-state polity, refugees remain dependent on charity.[61] At a time at which the nation-state was in decline, as Arendt saw it, refugees could form a new kind of assemblage of peoples, rethink political categories, and, in doing so, reshape relationships between states and societies.

Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben later found resonance with Arendt's argument and sought to extend it to the contemporary era.[62] Agamben noted that the refugee, although "formerly regarded as a marginal figure," had now become an enduring and disquieting one: enduring because of the quality of this exclusion through which "growing sections of humankind are no longer representable inside the nation-state," a fact that contests the nation-state's very foundation.[63] The plight of so many forced migrants is ultimately a disquieting concern because it disrupts the ordering capacity of the nation-state. The presence of refugees challenges the nation-state's ability to define itself through the creation, categorization, and distinction between citizens and non-citizens and to give meaning to life, itself, by defining categories that include some in the polity and others outside of it. Thus, this state of ever-increasing precarity, characterized by myriad struggles for mere biological survival in which forced migrants find themselves, is no longer simply an exceptional situation. Rather, now, the exceptional figure of the refugee, in its enduring and increasingly widespread forms, has become a normative and defining personage of our present.

In order to think this through, we look beyond the definition of a refugee or laws of war or the immediate post–World War II era and shift our thinking to the *humanitarian conditions* through which countless groups, not just refugees, are living. Ever-increasing numbers of people are living in precarious situations, characterized by diminishing, little, or no state protection. Without a state's acknowledgment of their personhood, the rights of such people, which are vested in legal recognition, have been subverted and overtaken by forms of charity, aid, care, refuge, and repair—in a word, humanitarianism.

Humanitarian Conditions and Humanitarian Governance

Scholars have been tracing this shift away from refugees as subjects of political exclusion to refugees as recipients of care. For instance, Feldman's work on Palestinians examines refugees in principle, but the generational study reveals the persistence and transference of forms of care from village to village, camp to village, people to people, and generation to generation.[64] Similarly, Fiddian-Qasmiyeh has emphasized that this dual identity of displaced people living as both refugees, recipients of aid and care, and also as hosts, serving as expert care workers and providers of aid, is a defining feature of protracted refugeedom in the global South.[65] Scholars increasingly examine care as politics and what the politics of care look like in a world in which the struggle for mere survival has overtaken the (now) bold claims to civil and political rights, that is, political recognition.[66]

Thus, care or care work, which is our focus here, has become an enduring and expansive legacy of humanitarian governance.[67] Yet, as we show in this volume, these forms of care are not or are no longer limited to the figure of the refugee, or forced migrants, or other displaced people relegated to live their lives in nominally temporary camps. The practices of aid NGOs in the African Sahel during the Cold War also show that international humanitarian organizations spread new forms of governmental practice that undermined newly developing independent postcolonial states.[68] As aspects of their humanitarian labor, Catholic activists in the trans-Mediterranean deploy theories of charity and hospitality to critique, undermine, and work around state practices of asylum processing and administrative detention.[69] Gendered migration between Southeast Asia and the Middle East raises questions as to whether humanity has become a category of juridical protection from which the domestic field of careworkers are excluded.[70]

At the same time, the politics of a global economy have engendered *humanitarian conditions*, even where humanitarian crises as we know them have not manifested. We can see this in the context of the neoliberal restructuring in societies—through which millions of people have been made to live under precarious conditions—such as Chile, Greece, or even the south side of Chicago.[71] We can also see humanitarian conditions emerge as a result of protracted regimes of international sanctions in, say, Cuba, Haiti, Iran, and Iraq.[72]

Increasingly, questions about care and caring for others relate to entities beyond the living or even human. We might, moreover, need to understand the demands by the already dead for rights recognition and intervention, as described by Claire Moon in her analysis of "forensic humanitarianism" in Latin America.[73] And, of course, in this era of climate change, care for animals has become an important nodal point in questions about climate governance.[74] Thus, while the refugee represents, perhaps, the most vulnerable of the categories

of personhood that have become dependent on forms of care, ever-increasing numbers of people are becoming refugees or find themselves in refugee-like situations. We observe these latter refugee-like conditions as an extension of care, akin to humanitarian care to populations that ostensibly fall *within* the sanctified, if not protected, realm of the nation-state.

Drawing from these points, we add that the extensiveness, attractiveness, and ubiquity of forms of care for forced migrants have multiplied and spread so much that they have become normalized. They are overwhelmingly the taken-for-granted forms of claims that people now make. The state of exception has been extended to include the members of the polity. Here we agree with Agamben, who notes that "so-called sacred and inalienable human rights are revealed to be without any protection precisely when it is no longer possible to conceive of them as rights of the citizens of a state."[75] That is, this resort to aid, charity, and relief takes place even within a nation-state system; this political era is a time of humanitarianism.

Organization of the Volume: Stories of Refuge, Aid, and Repair

We begin this section with a note on the tone and voice of this volume as we seek to reorient audiences to the conceptual basis for and importance of story-based chapters. The chapters in this volume are empirically grounded and theoretically informed but are communicated through stories and the first-person voices of the researchers. The story-forward emphasis of these chapters is intentionally distinct from other writings on humanitarianism. By "story forward," we mean that each story holds at its core an illustrative person, place, or thing that carries the story to its conclusion. Each story leads readers into the complex worlds of humanitarianisms, but without the jargon that requires scholarly specialization. We invite instructors who are interested in incorporating some of these chapters into their courses to make use of the appendix to this volume, in which we offer thematic pairings among the volume's contributions for teaching on topics related to these critical issues of our time.

The motivation underlying our storytelling methodology is to animate and highlight the lived experiences and lifeworlds of forced migrants and of recipients of humanitarian care rather than contend with primarily scholarly issues in historiography, law, or even the formation of institutional categories. Here, our story-forward approach permits a reorienting and even questioning, if subtly, of the underlying taken-for-grantedness of categories. Our scholars' positionality and choice of person, place, or thing to explore humanitarian lifeworlds exposes the hidden assumptions underlying seemingly fixed categories. At the same time, the authors' embeddedness within the narratives and their commit-

ment to sharing how they come to their interpretive interventions allows them to show the myriad ways their interlocutors may be positioned in-relation to history, law, or the formation of categories as objects of care.

The chapters in this volume emphasize the care work being done in the global South, including its motivations, methods, and manners. They focus geographically on South and Southeast Asia, the Middle East and North Africa, and socialist Eastern Europe, areas of the world that have been historically and epistemologically underrepresented in studies of humanitarian care. These regions have been conceptually marked off from the understanding of the development of humanitarianism but have been and continue to be the hosts of the bulk of the world's refugees and forcibly displaced people since World War II. At the same time, we are not attempting to represent every understudied area.[76]

The authors of these stories are scholars sharing encounters and interpretations of being in-relation with interlocutors and objects and ideas. It is through these interactions that they interpret the contingent historiography, the taxonomies of legal apparatuses, and the conceptual frameworks that people draw on in orienting themselves to their lived experiences of humanitarian care. Our researchers do not claim the authority to write as refugees or as humanitarian workers, but instead work to center global South perspectives *in-relation* as the starting point to understanding the importance of the stories they tell in a period of expanded and protracted humanitarian contingency.[77]

We present the chapters in *Care in a Time of Humanitarianism* in three parts. In part 1, "Refuge, Law, and Empire in the Global South," the chapters examine the foundations, contingencies, and elisions of international humanitarian law. In part 2, "Aid, Intimacy, and Humanitarian Praxis," the authors explore how humanitarianism operates in distinct and different contexts. In part 3, "Repair in a World of Care," we provide chapters that seek to understand how care work may contribute to healing after conflict in what we claim is a new era that privileges charity and aid over rights.

Part I: Refuge, Law, and Empire in the Global South

In the first part of the volume, our story-based chapters explore and question the international legal apparatus that shapes humanitarianism and produces categories of forced migrants, including refugees, displaced people, stateless persons, and asylum seekers. Our contributors challenge the status of the laws and legal framework as the sole source of humanitarian legitimacy. By examining other legal, bureaucratic, and institutional structures created for managing forced migration and mitigating suffering, their stories reveal the contingent nature of this legal framework. These other structures draw their force from legal forms that did not internationalize but still carry weight in local or re-

gional contexts. These stories also show the limits of the law as a means to protect individuals, provide them with relief, and offer a sense of belonging. The chapters in this section include investigations into how the new postwar legal order codified certain inequalities while consolidating and maintaining power, especially after World War II.

This section also considers the contingency of the refugee definition; it examines its taxonomies and who and what were written out of recognition as well as who was recognized in the moment the Refugee Convention emerged as the legal codification of protected classes of migrants. It also emphasizes the colonial legacies of these taxonomies and their underlying legal structures. Denaturalizing these nomenclatures is a part of understanding humanitarianisms in the global South, as is recognizing how they shaped the greater global humanitarian order.

The chapters speak to and offer unique global Southern considerations, impacts, and reactions to the new postcolonial legal order. Thus, each chapter here explores the unspoken or hidden aspects of the world order created by the decolonial movements in the immediate postwar period. This is why the focus on the global South as a site of humanitarian production, not just its object, is such a crucial intervention.

Pamela Ballinger's story explores debates over how to classify newly arrived European migrants (Italian nationals) to Italy who were forced to leave Libya at the end of colonial rule and in the immediate postwar era when the 1951 Refugee Convention was being finalized. Her chapter illustrates that evaluations of language, race, and cultural identity underlie distinctions between "refugees" and "repatriating migrants" and justify new legal structures for citizenship recognition that in turn begin to map out a (postcolonial) global South domain.

James Pangilinan's story examines *Quezon's Game* (2019) for its filmic representation of the Philippine leader Manuel Quezon's humanitarian gesture of offering "Filipino hospitality" to Jewish refugees during the interwar years. Pangilinan considers the film's representation of how the Filipino government shored up resources to deliver relief to displaced European Jews at a time when the domestic context allowed the president to showcase a nationally distinctive conception of care as a method of state building.

Emma Meyer's chapter tells the story of how one of the founders of the Burma Evacuees Association influenced the development of refugee relief practices of modern India. The chapter links the classification of the "evacuee," a legal category for forcibly displaced people in South Asia during World War II and thus before independence, both to the colonial legal structure and the organizational moment of the international refugee system.

Khathaleeya Liamdee's chapter focuses on the story of Khao-I-Dang (KID) Transit Center, a representative of camps along the Thai-Cambodian border that shelter those who escaped armed conflict and political turmoil during the

Cold War era. The story of border refugee camps highlights the continuation of postcolonial regional conflicts in Cambodia's ongoing transition to peace.

Kathie Friedman-Kasaba's chapter examines the story of a Bosnian refugee who encountered a legal "architecture of repulsion" alongside idiosyncratic access to humanitarian protection. Her chapter examines the importance of personal interactions and experiences, which one refugee calls moments of "luck," in making it possible for forced migrants to access the bureaucratic processes that lead to relief in a global postcolonial world of intrastate conflict.

Finally, Arzoo Osanloo's chapter examines how a play, produced in Iran—both a major host country and a site from which refugees flee—reflects the circulation of knowledge about international humanitarian norms. Her story about cultural production explores the enduring relationship between premodern modalities of benevolence and contemporary humanitarianisms and suggests that appeals to care have overtaken rights-based demands in a world in which humanitarianism has become a normative mechanism of governance.

Part II: Aid, Intimacy, and Humanitarian Praxis in Comparative Context

In the second part of the book, our contributors highlight the different logics at work in humanitarianism. Understanding the forms of humanitarianism in the global South requires a willingness to engage with humanitarianism not as an ideology but rather as a praxis with multiple agents. These chapters also emphasize that practices which are different from the mainstream ideology are not to be treated or viewed as failures to live up to an idea but as the actual core of what humanitarianism is. These chapters examine how humanitarian practices become sites of agency for so many actors involved in this work. They also reveal the deeply intimate qualities of care work. Thus, as our authors show, care work and humanitarian engagement emerge from multiple sources.

Examining humanitarian praxis in the global South shifts the perspective away from states as managers of temporary relief operations, including material aid, repatriation, and asylum—and thus whether forced migrants are deserving of relief. The attention then turns to the actual long-term, often multigenerational, reality of living and working as a refugee. Our contributors, thus, examine the new practices of humanitarian management, refugees themselves as experts in delivering humanitarian assistance, and caring labor as a particular domain of work that has governance aspects to it.

Ilana Feldman's story about a refugee aid worker shows how, in the spaces of short- and long-term rehabilitation, the representatives of voluntary charitable organizations, host governments, and relief agencies shaped the field of humanitarian experiences and expectation. Here, Palestinian aid work serves

as a testimony to the "double position" of being simultaneously aid worker and refugee—a common phenomenon in protracted refugee situations.

Cristian Capotescu's chapter tells the story of a young Viennese woman moved by a catastrophic flood in Romania in 1970 to mount a relief effort to aid victims of the disaster. Through this story, Capotescu shines a light on humanitarian work across the Iron Curtain, especially among socialist Romanian aid workers, and considers the role of private aid networks in socialist societies. The story illustrates how relations of informality in private aid giving combined both cultural and material forms of care across boundaries that were impenetrable to institutionalized humanitarian organizations.

Gözde Burcu Ege's chapter examines generational support mechanisms through the story of a refugee aid worker in a Jordanian refugee camp. Ege considers the intricacies and complexities of doing aid work in one's own community as refugees aspire to shape a long-term care regime for an intergenerational community while humanitarian organizations paradoxically persist in pursuing crisis-oriented care even while those organizations take on governance roles within the camps and incorporate refugees into their labor force.

Tanzeen Doha's story is an ethnographic meditation on the dynamic interactions between Islamists of the South Asian Deobandi tradition and Rohingya refugees from Myanmar in Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh. Doha recounts how these encounters, which re-historicize classical Islamic stories into the present, also displace the taken-for-granted categories of humanitarian "volunteers" and "refugees" within the logics of secular humanitarianism.

Lastly, Cabeiri Robinson's chapter explores the shift from militancy to humanitarian care work in the face of disaster. She tells the story of an Islamic militant fighting in the Kashmir Jihad who demobilized after a disaster and became a relief worker and organizer of humanitarian assistance. His acceptance as a "humanitarian" by the local community began when he performed care work, including recovering dead bodies and offering specialized medical care to the least privileged segments of society.

Part III: Repair in a World of Care

In the third part of the book, our contributors explore the effects of care in light of the prevalence and persistence of humanitarianism as a global norm and ethos of our contemporary moment. The stories in this section demonstrate that care is multivalent; it is material, psychological, environmental, and social. At the same time, care work is not limited to attending to innocent "victims" but rather extends to active agents, maybe even those who are morally compromised. Indeed, humanitarian care is not solely human focused, and hosts in the global South do not necessarily limit their ideas of relief, material aid, protection, or reparation to the human subjects of liberal humanitarianism.

Our contributors highlight the deeply intimate relations care work produces. They also examine emotional repair, especially in protracted humanitarian conditions in which generations of forced migrants find common cause—and each other—through layered memories attached to what might otherwise be seen as trivial objects. Our contributors' attention to the many facets of care also highlights the politics of that care. They do so by exploring the restorative work that goes into developing memorials or archives of tragedy, crafting cultural productions intended for social critique or reflection or developing databases for what counts as cultural heritage worthy of preservation.

Rawan Arar's story considers how a denim shirt she wore during interviews with refugees signals a sensorial realm in refugee life sparking a sense of enduring attachment and fraught nostalgia. Arar's denim shirt, first worn by her own mother a generation earlier, emphasized her relational link to Palestinian displacement after 1948 and demonstrates that objects are imbricated with memories that produce intergenerational affective relationships.

Jenna Grant tells the story of a photograph and its enduring memory. She demonstrates that care may focus on reparative strategies proposed by art and artists who engage with an archive of photographs of daily life under an authoritarian regime during a time of genocide. Her chapter offers a different vision of what it means to engage in care work after humanitarian crisis by attending to the persistent psychic effects of violence that are left unmet by emergency relief.

Megan Butler's chapter examining a memoir by Kurdish-Iranian intellectual Behrouz Boochani conveys how an asylum seeker experienced the sea voyage and arrival at Manus Island Prison as a forced migrant seeking to access the liberal promises of protection from persecution. Butler's story underscores how writing serves not only as an archive of inhumane policies but also as a space of the refugee's sovereignty and agency.

Amira Mittermaier's story details the efforts of a devotee who provides food to the homeless, displaced, and other visitors of a Sufi shrine in Cairo. She describes the breadth of *khidma* or service in a space of giving that is situated outside of the logic, infrastructure, and rhetoric of humanitarianism. In doing so, Mittermaier explores the margins of humanitarianism and reflects on the possibilities of care that exist in a time of humanitarianism, but which are not centered exclusively on humans as their sole object of attention.

Mediha Sorma focuses on Kurdish mothers' embrace of their dead children in order to examine unconventional forms of care work that emerge from resistance to the Turkish state. Her story illustrates that intimate care work extends to the nonliving but ultimately serves as a form of political expression, even resistance to state violence. Here, mothers', not humanitarian experts', work of "rescuing the dead" extends the boundaries of the object of caring beyond the living.

Finally, Stephanie Selover's story considers the protection of cultural heritage during the Syrian Civil War and the role of international aid and intervention. Starting with the destruction of archaeological sites in Syria from 2011 to the present, Selover evaluates international initiatives to protect cultural heritage in the Middle East. Through the Syrian case, Selover considers the effects of these initiatives to determine which objects are deemed worthy of protection and the consequences of such determinations. Ultimately, Selover boldly situates the history of intervention in the destruction/protection binary of cultural heritage care work.

Conclusion: Humanitarianisms in-Relation

The stories in this volume demonstrate that care is always multivalent with psychological, environmental, and relational-social as well as material aspects, and that aid is also best understood as a form of caring labor. Our contributors' attention to the praxis of humanitarianism and caring, rather than its ideology, makes room for recognizing cultural, religious, or ethical values other than those of the Enlightenment tradition—values that actually guide and organize principles of refuge, aid, and repair in multiple contexts in the global South. They also show that there are rich national and regional legal regimes that developed to manage forced migration or to alleviate the impact of armed conflict. These alternative definitions left political traces, and, we contend, these definitional practices impact how global humanitarianism is understood and operationalized on a global level.

Each story, ultimately, disrupts the conventional narratives about suffering told by the humanitarian aid industry. Our overall aim is to add depth and nuance to the meaning of the figure of the refugee, to reconsider the kinds of suffering that seem worthy of care, and to reevaluate what caring for others looks like once we open our investigations beyond—albeit not independent of—the global North: thus, to think always of humanitarianism as a project "in-relation."

Arzoo Osanloo is professor in the Department of Law, Societies, and Justice at the University of Washington. She is a legal anthropologist and has previously worked as an immigration and refugee attorney. She is the author of the award-winning *Forgiveness Work: Mercy, Law, and Victims' Rights in Iran* (Princeton University Press, 2020), and *The Politics of Women's Rights in Iran* (Princeton University Press, 2009).

Cabeiri deBergh Robinson is associate professor of international studies and anthropology at the University of Washington. She is the author of *Body of*

Victim, Body of Warrior: Refugee Families and the Making of Kashmiri Jihadists (University of California Press, 2013), which won the Bernard Cohn Book Prize in 2015. She is coeditor of *Forced Migration In/ Of Asia: Connections and Convergences*, a special issue of the *Journal of Refugee Studies* (2018), and of *The Palgrave Handbook of New Directions in Kashmir Studies* (Palgrave, 2023).

Notes

1. UNHCR, *Global Trends*, 2017.
2. UNHCR, *Global Trends*, 2022, citing 76 percent of refugees and others in need of protection are hosted in low- and middle-income countries, while 70 percent remain in neighboring countries.
3. UNHCR, *Global Trends*, 2017, 2018, 2021, 2022.
4. UNHCR, *Global Trends*, 2017.
5. Oxfam 2016.
6. UNHCR, *Global Trends*, 2021.
7. Clarke, "Global South"; Kloß, "Global South as Subversive Practice." This usage became especially prevalent after the 2003 "Forging a Global South'" initiative of the United Nations Development Program.
8. Clarke, "Global South."
9. Mahler, *From the Tricontinental*, 32. Mahler and other scholars working within an orientation to the global South that starts with a critique of deterritorialized political economy and the concept of "internal colonization" draw inspiration from Antonio Gramsci's notes on "Some Aspects of the Southern Question" (1926).
10. Clarke, "Global South."
11. Wa Ngugi, "Rethinking the Global South," 1–2.
12. Wa Ngugi, "Rethinking the Global South," 8–9.
13. Wa Ngugi, "Rethinking the Global South," 8–9.
14. There are several ways that multiple scholars have sought to engage with this empirical condition that they have observed in their research. Some have talked about "hybrid humanitarianism" to acknowledge the merging of legal or administrative apparatus. Some used the phrase "alternative humanitarianisms" to highlight systems of ideas and practices that drew on sources other than the Western cannon but had long regional traditions. Others used the term "vernacular humanitarianism" sometimes in this way, but sometimes more specifically to refer to locally organized efforts that drew on global humanitarian practices but were run by private voluntary groups. And still others noted that the tension between "Islam" and "Western modernity," which has historical colonial origins, led to forms of humanitarian practices that, while locally distinct, shared some features that warranted their own terms, either "Islamic humanitarianism" or "Muslim humanitarianism." We believe this experimentation with terms at that time emerged from multiple engaged scholars and practitioners responding to the need to decenter the idea that global North humanitarianism could adequately explain the lived experience of care—or knowledges, expertises, practices, and legacies—in the global South. See, for example, Brković, "Vernacular #Humaniarianisms"; Mostowlansky, "Muslim Humanitarianism."
15. For an extensive discussion of this point, see Mazower, "Strange Triumph."

16. Malkki, "Refugees and Exile"; Zolberg, "Formation of New States."
17. Feldman, *Life Lived in Relief*.
18. Albahari, *Crimes of Peace*.
19. Fassin, *Humanitarian Reason*. Some defend these Western origins. See, for example, Slim, *Humanitarian Ethics*.
20. Dunant, *Memory of Solferino*.
21. Whyte, "'Dangerous Concept of the Just War.'"
22. Butler, *Precarious Life*. The trope of the distant other as the object of humanitarian action should not be understood solely in terms of proximity. See, Fechter, "Helping Distant Strangers"; Chatterjee, "Introduction," 2.
23. Whyte, "'Opposite of Humanity.'"
24. Henkin, "Refugees and Their Human Rights," 1079.
25. Robinson, "Too Much Nationality," 345.
26. Gatrell, *War and Population Displacement*; Muscolio, *Refugees, Land Reclamation*; Lary, *Chinese People at War*.
27. Bem, "Blank Cheque," 662.
28. For a discussion of objections made on behalf of Kashmiri, Indian, Arab, Greek, and Chinese displaced peoples' exclusion from the "refugee" definition in 1950, see Robinson, "Too Much Nationality," 345–46.
29. Vernant, *Refugee in the Post-War World*.
30. Ballinger, *World Refugees Made*; Mayblin and Turner, *Migration Studies and Colonialism*.
31. Mayblin, *Asylum after Empire*, 32.
32. Tejel and Öztan, *Forced Migration and Refugeedom*.
33. Feldman, *Life Lived in Relief*; Ballinger, *World Refugees Made*.
34. See Ho and Robinson, "Forced Migration in/of Asia."
35. Peterson, "Sovereignty International Law."
36. Muscolio, *Refugees, Land Reclamation*.
37. De Waal, *Famine Crimes*.
38. Loescher, *UNHCR and World Politics*.
39. Barnett, "Humanitarianism with a Sovereign Face."
40. Barnett, "Humanitarianism with a Sovereign Face"; Chandler, "Road to Military Humanism."
41. Malkki, "Speechless Emissaries," 388–89.
42. Robinson, *Body of Victim*, 140–43.
43. Turner, "What Is a Refugee Camp," 144; Mayblin, Wake, and Kazemi, "Necropolitics," 110.
44. Behrman, "Legal Subjectivity," 2; Benhabib, "End of the 1951 Refugee Convention," 79.
45. Barnett, *Empire of Humanity*; Fassin, *Humanitarian Reason*; Feldman and Ticktin, *In the Name of Humanity*.
46. For a full discussion, see Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and Horstmann, "Introduction"; Barnett and Stein, *Sacred Aid*.
47. Lincoln, "Fleeing from Firestorms"; Henriot, "Beyond Glory"; Dillon, "Politics of Philanthropy," 190–91; Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes*, 61–64.
48. Madokoro, "Surveying Hong Kong"; Lopes, "Impact of Refugees."
49. Feldman, "Difficult Distinctions"; Robinson, "Humanitarian Internationalism"; Zamindar, *Long Partition*.
50. McNevin and Missje, "Hospitality as a Horizon of Aspiration."
51. Benthall and Bellion-Jourdan, *Charitable Crescent*.

52. Bornstein, *Disquieting Gifts*.
53. See Dromi, *Above the Fray*, and Feldman, "Quaker Way."
54. Calhoun, "Imperative to Reduce Suffering."
55. Benthall, *Islamic Charities*.
56. Osanloo, "Measure of Mercy"; Osanloo, *Forgiveness Work*.
57. Our goal here is not to trace the genealogy of the term *humanitarianism* through multiple linguistic traditions to create parallels or draw distinctions, although there are some excellent resources for this approach (see, for example, Moussa, "Ancient Origins, Modern Actors"). Instead, we acknowledge that the concept and terminology of humanitarianism is wrapped into global discursive traditions in ways that are constantly evolving and changing. Understanding the power of these discursive forms requires understanding their multiple meanings in global and local settings and in circulation as they evolve. See Davies, "Continuity, Change and Contest," for scholarly discussion, and de Lauri, *Humanitarianism: Keywords*, for a compendium of contemporary terms that emerge from this approach.
58. Egeland, "End the Occupation."
59. Agamben, *Means without End*, xi.
60. Arendt, "We Refugees," 77.
61. Arendt, "Decline of the Nation-State," 296.
62. Agamben, *Means without End*, x.
63. Agamben, *Means without End*, 21.
64. Feldman, *Life Lived in Relief*.
65. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, "Shifting the Gaze."
66. See de Lauri, *Politics of Humanitarianism*; Fassin and Pandolfi, *Contemporary States of Emergency*; Feldman and Ticktin, *In the Name of Humanity*.
67. Practitioners and scholars began using this term in the early 2000s to trace changes in the humanitarian field that were evident after the mid-1990s. For an overview of the origins of the term, see Aalen, "Governance." For a full discussion of its incorporation into current scholarly analysis of contemporary humanitarianism, see Barnett, "Humanitarian Governance."
68. Mann, *From Empires to NGOs*.
69. Albahari, *Crimes of Peace*.
70. Tadiar, *Remaindered Life*.
71. Han, *Life in Debt*; Varoufakis, *And the Weak Suffer*; Walley, *Exit Zero*.
72. Alejandro, "Economic Impact of US Sanctions"; Garfield and Santana, "Impact of the Economic Crisis"; Osanloo, "Entangled Lives"; Gordon, *Invisible War*.
73. Moon, "Human Rights, Human Remains."
74. Parreñas, *Decolonizing Extinction*; Govindrajan, *Animal Intimacies*.
75. Agamben, *Means without End*, 19.
76. Readers seeking a focus on Latin America or Africa will find that recent studies do heavily emphasize these regions of the world.
77. See Kloß, "Global South as a Subversive Practice," 12, 14.

References

Aalen, Lovise. "Governance." In *Humanitarianism: Keywords*, edited by Antonio de Lauri, 84–86. Leiden: Brill. 2020.

Albahari, Maurizio. *Crimes of Peace: Mediterranean Migrations at the World's Deadliest Border*. Pennsylvania Studies in Human Rights. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015.

Agamben, Giorgio. *Means without End: Notes on Politics*. Translated by Vincenzo Binetti and Cesare Casarino. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

Alejandro, Pavel Vidal. "El impacto económico de las sanciones estadounidense a Cuba, 1994–2020" [The Impact of Economic Sanctions on Cuba, 1994–2020]. Working Paper, *Real Instituto Elcano*, January–July 2022.

Arendt, Hannah. "The Decline of the Nation-State and the End of the Rights of Man." In *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 267–302. New York: Schocken Books, 1951.

———. "We Refugees." *The Menorah Journal* 31, no. 1 (January 1943): 69–77.

Ballinger, Pamela. *The World Refugees Made: Decolonization and the Foundation of Postwar Italy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2020.

Barnett, Michael. "Humanitarianism with a Sovereign Face: UNHCR in the Global Undertow." *International Migration Review* 35, no. 1 (2001): 244–77.

———. *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011.

———. "Humanitarian Governance." *Annual Review of Political Science* 16, no. 1 (2013): 379–98.

Barnett, Michael, and Janice Stein. *Sacred Aid: Faith and Humanitarianism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Behrman, Simon. "Legal Subjectivity and the Refugee." *International Journal of Refugee Law* 26, no. 1 (2014): 1–21.

Bem, K. "The Coming of a 'Blank Cheque'—Europe, the 1951 Convention, and the 1967 Protocol." *International Journal of Refugee Law* 16, no. 4 (1 December 2004): 609–27.

Benhabib, Seyla. "The End of the 1951 Refugee Convention? Dilemmas of Sovereignty, Territoriality, and Human Rights." *Jus Cogens* 2 (2020): 75–100.

Benthall, Jonathan. *Islamic Charities and Islamic Humanism in Troubled Times: Islamic Charities and Islamic Humanism in Troubled Times*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016.

Benthall, Jonathan, and Jerome Bellion-Jourdan. *The Charitable Crescent: Politics of Aid in the Muslim World*. 2nd ed. London: I. B. Tauris, 2008.

Bornstein, Erica. *Disquieting Gifts: Humanitarianism in New Delhi*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012.

Brković, Čarna. "Vernacular #Humaniarianisms." Allegra Lab: Anthropology for Radical Optimism, September 2017. https://allegralaboratory.net/category/thematic-threads/humanitarianisms/.

Butler, Judith. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso, 2006.

Calhoun, Craig. "The Imperative to Reduce Suffering: Charity, Progress, and Emergencies in the Field of Humanitarian Action." In *Humanitarianism in Question: Politics, Power, Ethics*, edited by Michael Barnett and Thomas Weiss, 73–79. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008.

Chandler, David. "The Road to Military Humanitarianism: How the Human Rights NGOs Shaped a New Humanitarian Agenda." *Human Rights Quarterly* 23, no. 3 (2001): 678–700.

Chatterjee, Deen K. "Introduction." In *The Ethics of Assistance: Morality and the Distant Needy*, edited by Deen K. Chatterjee, 1–8. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Clarke, Marlea. "Global South: What Does It Mean and Why Use the Term?" *Global South Political Commentaries*, 2018.

Davies, Katherine. "Continuity, Change and Contest: Meanings of 'Humanitarian' from the 'Religion of Humanity' to the Kosovo War." London: Overseas Development Institute, 2012.

de Lauri, Antonio, ed. *The Politics of Humanitarianism: Power, Ideology, and Aid*. London: I. B. Taurus. 2016.

———. *Humanitarianism: Keywords*. Leiden: Brill. 2020.

de Waal, Alexander. *Famine Crimes: Politics and the Disaster Relief Industry in Africa*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Dillon, Nara, and Jean Chun Oi, eds. *The Politics of Philanthropy: Social Networks and Refugee Relief in Shanghai, 1932–1949*. At the Crossroads of Empires: Middlemen, Social Networks, and State-Building in Republican Shanghai. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008.

Dromi, Shai M. *Above the Fray: The Red Cross and the Making of the Humanitarian NGO Sector*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2020.

Dunant, Henry. *A Memory of Solferino*. Washington, DC: American National Red Cross, 1959.

Egeland, Jan. "End the Occupation: Norwegian Refugee Council Warns Israeli Elections May Empower Extremist Parties." Online Interview, 1 November 2022. https://www.democracynow.org/2022/11/1/jan_egeland_israel_election_november_2022.

Fassin, Didier. *Humanitarian Reason: A Moral History of the Present*. Berkeley, CA: University uf California Press, 2012.

Fassin, Didier, and Mariella Pandolfi. *Contemporary States of Emergency: The Politics of Military and Humanitarian Interventions*. New York: Zone Books. 2010.

Fechter, Anne-Meike. "Helping Distant Strangers? Proximity and Distance in Everyday Humanitarianism." *EASA Anthropology of Humanitarianism Network*, 2020.

Feldman, Ilana. "Difficult Distinctions: Refugee Law, Humanitarian Practice, and Political Identification in Gaza." *Cultural Anthropology* 22, no. 1 (2007): 129–69.

———. "The Quaker Way: Ethical Labor and Humanitarian Relief." *American Ethnologist* 34, no. 4 (2007): 689–705.

———. *Life Lived in Relief: Humanitarian Predicaments and Palestinian Refugee Politics*. 1st ed. Oakland: University of California Press, 2018.

Feldman, Ilana, and Miriam Ticktin, eds. *In the Name of Humanity: The Government of Threat and Care*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena. "Shifting the Gaze: Palestinian and Syrian Refugees Sharing, Making and Contesting Space in Lebanon." In *Refuge in a Moving World*, edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 402–14. London: UCL Press, 2020.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena, and Alexander Horstmann. "Introduction: Faith-Based Humanitarianism in Contexts of Forced Displacement." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 24, no. 3 (2011): 429–39.

Garfield, R., and S. Santana. "The Impact of the Economic Crisis and the US Embargo on Health in Cuba." *American Journal of Public Health (1971)* 87, no. 1 (1997): 15–20.

Gatrell, Peter. "War and Population Displacement in East Asia, 1937–1950." Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Gordon, Joy. *Invisible War: The United States and the Iraq Sanctions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Govindrajan, Radhika. *Animal Intimacies: Interspecies Relatedness in India's Central Himalayas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018.
Han, Clara. *Life in Debt: Times of Care and Violence in Neoliberal Chile*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.
Henkin, Louis. "Refugees and Their Human Rights." *Fordham International Law Journal* 18, no. 4 (1994): 1079–81.
Henriot, Christian. "Beyond Glory: Civilians, Combatants, and Society during the Battle of Shanghai." *War & Society* 31, no. 2 (2012): 106–35.
Ho, Elaine Lynn-Ee, and Cabeiri deBergh Robinson. "Introduction: Forced Migration in/of Asia—Interfaces and Multiplicities." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 31, no. 3 (2018): 262–73.
Kloß, Sinah Theres. "The Global South as Subversive Practice: Challenges and Potentials of a Heuristic Concept." *The global South* 11, no. 2 (2017): 1–17.
Lary, Diana. *The Chinese People at War: Human Suffering and Social Transformation, 1937–1945*. New Approaches to Asian History. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
Lincoln, Toby. "Fleeing from Firestorms: Government, Cities, Native Place Associations and Refugees in the Anti-Japanese War of Resistance." *Urban History* 38, no. 3 (2011): 437–56.
Loescher, Gil. *The UNHCR and World Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
Lopes, Helena F. S. "The Impact of Refugees in Neutral Hong Kong and Macau, 1937–1945." *Historical Journal* (2022): 1–27.
Madokoro, Laura. "Surveying Hong Kong in the 1950s: Western Humanitarians and the "Problem" of Chinese Refugees." *Modern Asian Studies* 49, no. 2 (2015): 493–524.
Mahler, Anne Garland. *From the Tricontinental to the Global South: Race, Radicalism, and Transnational Solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018.
Malkki, Liisa H. "Refugees and Exile: From 'Refugee Studies' to the National Order of Things." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24 (1995): 495–523.
———. "Speechless Emissaries: Refugees, Humanitarianism, and Dehistoricization." *Cultural Anthropology* 11, no. 3 (1996): 377–404.
Mann, Gregory. *From Empires to NGOs in the West African Sahel: The Road to Nongovernmentality*. African Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
Mayblin, Lucy. *Asylum after Empire: Colonial Legacies in the Politics of Asylum Seeking*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017.
Mayblin, Lucy, and Joe B. Turner. *Migration Studies and Colonialism*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2021.
Mayblin, Lucy, Mustafa Wake, and Mohsen Kazemi. "Necropolitics and the Slow Violence of the Everyday: Asylum Seeker Welfare in the Postcolonial Present." *Sociology* 54, no. 1 (2020): 107–23.
Mazower, Mark. "The Strange Triumph of Human Rights, 1933–1950." *Historical Journal* 47, no. 2 (June 2004): 379–98.
McNevin, Anne, and Antje Missbach. "Hospitality as a Horizon of Aspiration (or, What the International Refugee Regime Can Learn from Acehnese Fishermen)." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 31, no. 3 (2018): 292–313.
Moon, Claire. "Human Rights, Human Remains: Forensic Humanitarianism and the Human Rights of the Dead." *International Social Science Journal* 65, no. 215–16 (2014): 49–63.
Mostowlansky, Till. "Muslim Humanitarianism." Allegra Lab: Anthropology for Radical Optimism, July 2019. https://allegralaboratory.net/category/thematic-threads/humanitarianisms/.

Moussa, Jasmine. "Ancient Origins, Modern Actors: Defining Arabic Meanings of Humanitarianism." London: ODI Humanitarian Policy Group, 2014.

Muscolino, Micah S. "Refugees, Land Reclamation, and Militarized Landscapes in Wartime China: Huanglongshan, Shaanxi, 1937–45." *Journal of Asian Studies* 69, no. 2 (2010): 453–78.

Nedostup, Rebecca. *Superstitious Regimes: Religion and the Politics of Chinese Modernity*. Harvard East Asian Monographs, no. 322. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2009.

O'Hagan, Jacinta, and Miwa Hirono. "Fragmentation of the International Humanitarian Order? Understanding 'Cultures of Humanitarianism' in East Asia." *Ethics and International Affairs* 28 (2014): 409–24.

Osanloo, Arzoo. "The Measure of Mercy: Islamic Justice, Sovereign Power, and Human Rights in Iran." *Cultural Anthropology* 21, no. 4 (2006): 570–602.

———. *Forgiveness Work: Mercy, Law, and Victims' Rights in Iran*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020.

———. "Entangled Lives: Enduring under Sanctions." *Journal of Humanity* 14(2): 264–281, Summer 2023.

Oxfam International. *A Poor Welcome from the World's Wealthy*. 18 July 2016. Retrieved 14 December 2022 from https://oi-files-d8-prod.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/a_poor_welcome_-_embargoed180716.pdf.

Parreñas, Juno Salazar. *Decolonizing Extinction: The Work of Care in Orangutan Rehabilitation*. Experimental Futures: Technological Lives, Scientific Arts, Anthropological Voices. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018.

Peterson, Glen. "Sovereignty, International Law, and the Uneven Development of the International Refugee Regime." *Modern Asian Studies* 49, no. 2 (2015): 439–68.

Reeves, Caroline. "Lost in Translation: Local Relief Provision and Historiographical Imperialism." *New Global Studies* 12 (2018): 277–92.

Robinson, Cabeiri deBergh. "Too Much Nationality: Kashmiri Refugees, the South Asian Refugee Regime, and a Refugee State, 1947–1974." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 25, no. 3 (2012): 344–65.

———. *Body of Victim, Body of Warrior: Refugee Families and the Making of Kashmiri Jihadists*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013.

———. "Humanitarian Internationalism and Funding Relief for Refugees from Jammu and Kashmir in Pakistan, 1947–1951." In *The Handbook of New Directions in Kashmir Studies*, edited by Haley Dushinski, Mona Bhan, and Cabeiri Robinson, 333–50. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2023.

Slim, Hugo. *Humanitarian Ethics: A Guide to the Morality of Aid in War and Disaster*. London: Hurst & Company, 2015.

Tadiar, Neferti Xina M. *Remaindered Life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2022.

Tejel, Jordi, and Ramazan Hakkı Öztan. "'Forced Migration and Refugeedom in the Modern Middle East' towards Connected Histories of Refugeedom in the Middle East." Special issue, *Journal of Migration History* 6, no. 1 (February 17, 2020): 1–15.

Turner, Simon. "What Is a Refugee Camp? Explorations of the Limits and Effects of the Camp." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 29, no. 2 (2015): 139–48.

UNHCR. *Global Trends Forced Displacement in 2017*, 25 June 2018. https://www.unhcr.org/media/unhcr-global-trends-2017.

UNHCR. *Global Trends Forced Displacement in 2018*, 20 June 2019. https://www.unhcr.org/media/unhcr-global-trends-2018.

UNHCR. *Global Trends Forced Displacement in 2021*, 16 June 2022. https://www.unhcr.org/media/global-trends-report-2021.

UNHCR. *Global Trends Forced Displacement in 2022*, 14 June 2023. https://www.unhcr.org/global-trends-report-2022.

Varoufakis, Yanis. *And the Weak Suffer What They Must? Europe's Crisis and America's Economic Future*. New York: Nation Books, 2016.

Vernant, Jacques. *The Refugee in the Post-War World*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1953.

Wa Ngugi, Mukoma. "Rethinking the Global South." (Blog) The Global South Project. Retrieved 12 December 2022 from http://www.globalsouthproject.cornell.edu/rethinking-the-global-south.html.

Walley, Christine J. *Exit Zero: Family and Class in Postindustrial Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.

Whyte, Jessica. "The 'Dangerous Concept of the Just War': Decolonization, Wars of National Liberation, and the Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions." *Journal of Humanity* 9, no. 3 (2018): 313–41.

———. "'The Opposite of Humanity': Anti-colonial Challenges to International Humanitarian Law." 3 December 2020. https://www.humanitarianisms.org/.

Zamindar, Vazira Fazila-Yacoobali. *The Long Partition and the Making of Modern South Asia: Refugees, Boundaries, Histories*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Zolberg, Aristide. "The Formation of New States as a Refugee-Generating Process." *ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 467, no. 1 (1 May 1983): 24–38.