

"US AND THEM" – APPROACHING THE REFUGEE OTHER? CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL RETHINKING OF THE FIELDWORK EXPERIENCE IN SLAVONIA¹

IVA GRUBIŠA
Zagreb

Preliminary communication

Received: 17. 11. 2016.

Accepted: 17. 1. 2017.

DOI: 10.15176/vol154no108

UDK 323.28-054.73

341.43(497.542

Slavonski Brod)*2016"

In this paper the author rethinks her experience of volunteering and interaction with refugees at border crossings, as well as in temporary accommodation centers, in Slavonia. The paper is mainly based on the author's experience of participant observation conducted on several occasions between September and December of 2015, while volunteering for the Welcome Initiative. The author draws attention to the problems with two of the most common discourses on refugee crisis, securitization on the one hand, and humanitarianism on the other, which although seemingly diametrically opposed, share the very same starting point of refugees as radical Others. Furthermore, the last part of the paper deals with the question of power inscribed into the spaces of temporary accommodation of refugees. Here, the author argues that the spatial and functional organization of the temporary accommodation centers was not a coincidence, but was rather deliberately designed so that the power relations of those who managed and monitored over the centers, and those who temporarily stayed in them, remained clear at any time.

Keywords: humanitarian and securitarian discourse, Us-Them, approaching refugees, Slavonia

¹ This article is to appear in the edited volume entitled *Kamp, šator, granica: studije izbjeglištva u suvremenoj hrvatskom kontekstu* (Camp, Tent, Border: Studies of Refugeehood in the Contemporary Croatian Context) (Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research, 2017), and is published here with the permission of the volume editors.

INTRODUCTION

At the end of August 2015, I went on a tourist trip to eastern Switzerland with my family.² We left from Rijeka, and reached the Slovenian border (and the Schengen zone) in less than one hour. Our passports (and nothing but our passports) were checked, and in a very short time, we were back on our way. In front of us was “Europe without borders”. From Slovenia we entered Italy, then from Italy we entered Switzerland, and after a ten hour drive we reached our destination. Two days before our trip was to end, we decided to take another trip – to Lichtenstein. But since we were already in Lichtenstein, we were very close to the Austrian border, so we went to Austria – “for coffee”, which also meant that we spent one afternoon in three countries.

On our way back to Croatia, we stopped in Milan to visit the EXPO 2015 World Exhibition. Ironically, or expectedly, at the entrance terminal, whose size and appearance was reminiscent of global airport terminals, we were faced with a “border control” for the first time. All personal bags had to go through an x-ray machine, and all people through a metal detector; anything suspicious showing up on the x-ray, or the sound of the metal detector, meant that an additional, more detailed check of people and things was in order. We passed the control, suffering minor losses (we were not allowed to take a glass bottle of water with us), and we found ourselves in a 110-hectare exhibition space, where 145 countries of the world were presenting their visions and ideas on how to feed humanity.³ However, there were also countless interactive possibilities for visitors, who could taste or buy gastronomic specialties from all parts of the world, climb a net above the Brazilian rainforest, see the folklore of “exotic” countries, walk around gardens and temples, enjoy light shows and many other attractions that, at least for a moment, invoke a feeling of being a cosmopolitan, global citizen. This was the world in miniature, which expected 20 million visitors in a 6-month period; a world in miniature which was, symptomatically for that very same globalized world, guarded by 2000 surveillance cameras...⁴

During the several days that we spend in Switzerland, our primary source of information were television news. But not any news; the only program that we could watch because of the language barrier was CNN, which, at the time, had around-the-clock reports about the events on the Greek-Macedonian border.⁵ Although the condition at the border was really difficult, the news that we watched generally repeated the same footage and photographs of the chaos for days, frequently without compelling arguments and well-founded

² I would like to thank Dr Petra Kelemen, Dr Drago Župarić-Ilić and Dr Marijana Hameršak for their comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this article.

³ Cf. <http://www.expo2015.org/en/participants> (accessed 5 October 2016).

⁴ Cf. <http://www.vecernji.hr/svijet/na-expou-2015-gotovo-cijeli-svijet-osim-hrvatske-1003259> (accessed 5 October 2016).

⁵ On 19 August 2015, Macedonia declared a state of emergency in the northern and southern border regions, as a result of which thousands of people remained “stranded” on the so-called no man’s land on the Greek and Macedonian border, waiting for the Macedonian police to let them pass. (cf. <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/08/22/europe/europe-macedonia-migrant-crisis/> (accessed 5 October 2016).

information: the reports showed vast crowds, “masses” of people trying to break through police barriers, panic, breaking through the so-called green borders and corn fields, armed police, women and children crying; whereas the words that the reporters used to describe what we saw in the footage and the photos frequently included expressions like: “*human flood of refugees*”.⁶

Shortly after my return from Switzerland, on 16 September 2015, the “refugee crisis”⁷ entered⁸ Croatia, and Croatia became part of the so-called “Balkan route”, after Hungary closed its border with the Republic of Serbia on 15 September 2015, thus preventing entry of refugees into their country. During the first several days, people entered Croatia in Slavonia (first through the Šid – Tovarnik border crossing, and then the Berkasovo – Bapska crossing); they were transported to the reception centers in Ježevo, Sisak, Kutina, Beli Manastir and Zagreb,⁹ and then on to the border with Slovenia, which had also temporarily closed its border, preventing the passage of people. Still, by 21 September, anyone who reached the Croatian-Slovenian border, also managed to cross it. On that very day, 21 September, the Opatovac temporary reception center (also known as “the Opatovac camp”), which was some twenty kilometers from the above-mentioned border crossings, was opened, and from there people were transported further on to the border crossings with Hungary.¹⁰ Initially, there were significant organizational problems and deficiencies here as well. For instance, transfer from Bapska to Opatovac was not organized until 23 September, so people had to walk some twenty kilometers to the Opatovac reception center.¹¹ Also, people who were coming were not given key information about where they

⁶ See the video report: <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/08/21/europe/europe-migrant-crisis/index.html>, released on 21 August, 2015. Also see the report: <http://edition.cnn.com/videos/world/2015/08/23/misery-at-europes-gate-damon-pkg.cnn/video/playlists/arwa-damon-reports-on-migrant-crisis/>, released on 22 August, 2015 (accessed 5 October 2016).

⁷ “Refugee crisis” (sometimes “migrant crisis”) is a common term used particularly in the media to refer to an increase in the entrance of refugees into the European Union in 2015 (cf: <http://data.unhcr.org/mediterranean/regional.php>, accessed 5 October 2016). Some experts criticize the use of the term “crisis”, cautioning about the point of view and the discourse that is created in the public if the issue of refugees is approached as a crisis (e.g. see the video from the Forum organized by the Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Research entitled “Pravo na goli život, pravo na bolji život? O izbjegličkoj krizi iz istraživačke i aktivističke perspektive” (The right to a bare existence, the right to a better existence? On the refugee crisis from a research and activist perspective) – Emina Bužinkić (CMS): <https://vimeo.com/145841213>, accessed 5 October 2016). For more on the construction of the crisis cf. De Genova et al. (2016).

⁸ I use the form *enters* on purpose, although it may seem unconventional. By using the expression *the crisis enters*, I want to point to the creation of the public discourse and the approach taken by the Croatian media (which will be discussed later), which started to report on the crisis with more intensity only directly before the first refugees entered the Republic of Croatia. In this sense, I want to emphasize that, at least according to the reports by the Croatian media, the “refugee crisis” (and/or the “migrant crisis”) *entered* Croatia on the same day as the first refugees did, i.e. on 16 September.

⁹ Cf “Infografika HRT-a”: <http://vijesti.hrt.hr/299204/prihvat-i-smjestaj-migranata-u-hrvatskoj> (accessed 5 October 2016).

¹⁰ See “Obavijesti o prihvat u i smještaju migranata u RH za rujun, 2015”, <http://www.mup.hr/main.aspx?id=220928> (accessed 5 December 2015).

¹¹ Cf. <http://welcome.cms.hr/index.php/hr/2015/09/23/ljudi-neprestano-stizu-u-bapsku/> and <http://welcome.cms.hr/index.php/hr/2015/09/23/nasi-volonteri-nalaze-se-u-bapskoj-i-opatovcu/> (accessed 5 October 2016).

were (for instance some were uncertain which country they were in), which purpose the Opatovac reception center served and how long they would have to stay there, where they would be taken next, or whether they would be allowed to leave Croatia and continue their journey, which European Union member countries closed their borders, whether the Dublin Regulation was still enforced, which data they would be required to present at registration in Opatovac, whether their fingerprints would be taken and if so, whether the prints would be entered into the EURODAC database, as well as a number of other pieces of information. Not providing timely and clear information led to misunderstandings and an atmosphere of fear, thus causing conflicts between the refugees and the police in the camp, one of which in particular escalated on 23 September, when the police in the camp, among other things, used "pepper spray".¹² The organization of the reception and the transit of people, as well as of the Opatovac center itself, improved with time: buses that took people from the reception center to the border crossings became regular (with minor interruptions, mostly during the night, when the number of available drivers and buses was not commensurate with the number of people that needed transport). Also, its capacity was raised to 5000 people, so that the temporary reception center in Opatovac started functioning nearly smoothly. The Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Croatia played the main role in the organization of work at the border crossings and the reception center, whereas the Croatian Red Cross was the main coordinator of humanitarian support. Because of increasingly worse weather conditions, on 3 November 2015, The Winter Reception and Transit Center in Slavonski Brod was open, which took over the function of the temporary center in Opatovac, and remained active until mid-April 2016. The Ministry of the Interior and the Red Cross played the key role in Slavonski Brod as well.¹³ Numerous non-governmental organizations, initiatives, associations and freelancer or independent volunteers from Croatia and abroad joined them from the very beginning, from September 2015, in more or less coordinated activities. One such initiative that I myself joined was "Welcome" Refugee Support Initiative (Inicijativa Dobrodošli).¹⁴

¹² Inicijativa Dobrodošli (the Welcome Initiative) also cautioned about the importance of providing information in their public reports: <http://welcome.cms.hr/index.php/hr/2015/09/23/informiranje-izbjeglica-moze-sprijeciti-tenzije-na-terenu/> (accessed 5 October 2016). The news about the conflict was also published in the media. For instance, some of the media reported that tear gas (which is more intensive than "pepper spray") was used. However, this was denied by the Ministry of the Interior, which confirmed only the use of "pepper spray", explaining that it was an exceptional situation, when the agent used was meant to calm the tensions and bring order and security back into the camp. See e.g.: <http://www.nacional.hr/bikic-policija-nije-upotrijebila-suzavac-nego-pepper-sprej/>, <http://izbjeglice.hrt.hr/300173/vojska-nije-u-stanju-pripravnosti-policija-smirila-situaciju-u-opatovcu-pepper-sprejem>, <http://24sata.info/vijesti/regija/240648-sukob-izbjeglica-u-opatovcu-policija-upotrijebila-suzavac.html> (accessed 5 October 2016).

¹³ Cf. <http://welcome.cms.hr/index.php/hr/2015/11/02/od-bapske-preko-tovarnika-i-opatovca-doslavanskog-broda/> (accessed 5 October 2016).

¹⁴ Cf. <http://welcome.cms.hr/index.php/hr/about-hr/>, and e.g. https://www.facebook.com/areyouyriious/info/?tab=page_info, <https://www.facebook.com/groups/1471413449832894/> (accessed 5 October 2016).

ACCESSING THE FIELD: INTERWEAVING THE VOLUNTEER AND RESEARCH ROLE

As part of the Initiative's volunteer team, I stayed in Opatovac, Bapska and Tovarnik in the period from 25 until 28 September and from 2 until 6 October 2015, whereas, in the Winter Reception and Transit Center in Slavonski Brod, I volunteered from 6 until 10 December of the same year. The role of the volunteer at times included helping in organized distribution of humanitarian aid (food, clothing, blankets and the like), occasionally it meant socializing with and talking to the refugees and providing information available at the time, sometimes it meant observing the situation in the camp and the border crossings and pointing at the deficiencies and opportunities for better organization and approach to the refugees, but mostly it meant the simultaneous blend of all the mentioned "jobs", as well as some others, depending on the context of the situation.

I engaged in direct work with the refugees, in the temporary reception center in Opatovac, at the Bapska and Tovarnik border crossings, and at The Winter Reception and Transit Center in Slavonski Brod primarily as a volunteer. During my short but intensive stays in the field, I was one of the many people who, driven by various motives, involved in direct work with the refugees. Furthermore, throughout my volunteer activities I followed the instructions given by the coordinator of the Welcome Initiative that I joined, and did my utmost to respect the basic principles of the Initiative, including approaching the refugees with solidarity, which, among other things, meant solidarizing with their experiences, while respecting their human dignity. Still, my motivation to engage in fieldwork was also infused with my professional interests and the cultural-anthropological and sociological "worldview", which had become an inseparable part of my personality and identity already during my college education. This cultural-anthropological and sociological habitus (cf. Bourdieu 1990), as a specific body of theoretical and methodological knowledge and skills, necessarily had an effect on *what* and *how* I perceived in the field, and how I interpreted it. In other words, as explained by Nevena Škrbić Alempijević, Sanja Potkonjak and Tihana Rubić "when ethnology and cultural anthropology become your life's calling, the tendency to observe things in depth and to understand the world around you becomes an urge that we cannot resist, and that becomes almost automatic after a certain point" (2016: 19). Thus, the mentioned centers and border crossings, in addition to being the places of my volunteer experience, the first one of such intensity, also began to actualize as a research field where, in the pauses between volunteer shifts, I would take notes about the events that day, about what I noticed and experienced. Later, returning to and going through them, now also with some temporal and spatial distance, I continued to ruminate on my lived experience and the data I gathered, as well as the ways in which I could analyze and present it. However, I would frequently ask myself where is the limit beyond which I should not go (and if there is one) when analyzing my experience at the border crossings and in the temporary reception centers, and analyzing their organization and functioning. The issues of solidarity, active inclusion and self-organization of people into initiatives

and organizations, securitization of the “refugee crisis”, humanitarianization of the “refugee crisis”, spatial organization of the reception centers, media representation of the events at the border crossings and the camps, the issue of “real” and “non-real” refugees and the relationship of Us-Them, were only some of the numerous questions that occurred to me. Any of these questions could, on its own, provide the basis for a research topic. I believed, and I still do, that it is important to write and talk about this subject matter, but I wondered how to do it, so as to offer a different perspective and provide new insights that would differ from the, frequently, sensationalist media reports about ongoing (forced) migratory movements. In other words, was there a way that I, as an ethnologist, cultural anthropologist and sociologist, could contribute to the discussion, and if so, how?

Hence, how can one study different aspects of refugeehood: lives, practices and experiences of people forced to migrate? How can one analyze the processes that frequently prevent people from (legal) access to the territory of the European Union, the processes of reception and management of their temporary accommodation, and the organization of their further transfer? Moreover, what is the role that we as researchers have in the lives of those whom we are researching? Do we leave a trace in their lives? What is it that we offer our narrators in return? Whose story are we telling by writing ethnographic texts – those of our narrators, or, at least in part, our own? All these questions make a constituent part of rethinking any anthropological fieldwork, research process, presentation and interpretation of collected ethnographic data. However, it seems that they become more intensive when we study socially marginalized groups, and when the life circumstances of the researched and the researchers are not only radically different, but also frequently go to the benefit of the researchers. I believe that none of these questions have a single correct and final answer, while the asymmetrical relations of power are part and parcel of nearly any cultural-anthropological study and any other similar studies in the social sciences and humanities. The researcher will always have a certain authority and his/her voice will always have priority in a text that s/he is creating, while the ethical dilemmas that s/he encounters in the course of the research and presentation of results, no matter how much s/he strives to disentangle them, will always remain open and susceptible to criticism. These dilemmas are frequently exacerbated by the fact that different roles and relations are entangled in the field, whereby the researcher, in addition to his/her professional role, may also have the role of a friend, advisor, advocate, activist and many others. The boundary between the researcher and the narrator often becomes very vague, sometimes almost completely disappearing, while at other times it remains very clear (cf. Kości-Ryżko 2012–2013). Because of these complex and parallel roles and relationships that we have while conducting research (and often much later too) with our narrators, it is important that those whom we are studying are aware that we are doing it. On the other hand, it is also important to become aware that, because of such intertwining of the different roles during fieldwork, the awareness of being a participant in a research can become lost or neglected in various contexts. It is frequently unclear when our collocutor is addressing us as a researcher collecting his/her data, and when as a friend or a volunteer

offering humanitarian aid; as well as it can remain uncertain when researchers throughout their fieldwork take on the role of researchers, and when that of friends, volunteers etc., including whether these roles can and should exclude one another. This is why rethinking one's own role both in the field and in the lives of those being researched is an indispensable part of any self-reflection about one's own field experience.

It is precisely self-reflection that is in the basis of autoethnography as a research method, which is, according to Škrbić Alempijević, Potkonjak and Rubić, "a retrospective method" (2016: 99). This is because "one's own lived experience, using the theoretical and conceptual framework of ethnology and cultural anthropology, is analytically and critically connected with broader social processes, on a synchronic and diachronic level" (ibid). Autoethnographic use of lived experience can go far into the author's past, but it may also boil down to very recent experiences, such as was my volunteering at the reception centers and border crossings. In doing so, as stated by Škrbić Alempijević, Potkonjak and Rubić, the author/researcher is engaged on multiple levels – emotionally, intellectually and activistically, "communicating one's own experience in public, with the aim and idea of social change" (ibid). Still, autoethnography, like any other method, does not come without its set of potential traps, some of which are "overemphasis on narration rather than analysis and cultural interpretation [and] exclusive reliance on personal memory and recalling as a data source" (Chang 2008: 54). Furthermore, according to Heewon Chang, the benefit of autoethnography lies in the potential to present the extensive, detailed, intimate and frequently emotionally charged autoethnographic data, that we would otherwise not have access to using a different method, while relying on "critical, analytical and interpretive eyes" (2008: 49) so as to detect latent cultural patterns of lived experience.

Therefore, based upon this sort of self-reflection about my fieldwork experience and my own role in the field (whether I was a volunteer, a researcher or whether I could be both at the same time), I decided to write this article. Taking into consideration that the circumstances on the ground frequently did not leave much room for explanation that I was, in addition to being a volunteer of the Welcome Initiative, a cultural anthropologist and a sociologist, I decided to write a text based upon my personal experience which serves as the guiding principle. Thus, had the circumstances been different, I would have certainly devoted a significant part of the text to the voices of the refugees with whom I spent a short but intensive time in the field; however I have not done so in this paper, not because I consider these voices irrelevant, but because this seemed to be the right decision in this particular situation, taking into account the described ethical dilemmas and problems in doing anthropological research and presenting the collected data, as well as the particular characteristics of this research.

Therefore, this article may also be considered as an autoethnographic text that took shape in several phases. Starting with "simply" writing down my experiences and emotions from the field that lacked elements of critical questioning and a theoretically-grounded analysis (cf. Chang 2008: 54), I gradually built up the text by including into the analysis

some media sources that were presenting “the refugee crisis” and news from the field, so as to contextualize my fieldwork experience. Here I primarily relied on the official webpage of the Welcome Initiative¹⁵ since it provides reports from the field and other information, systematically starting with 18 September 2015 onwards. I also used the webpages of three Croatian broadcasters: Croatian Radiotelevision,¹⁶ RTL television¹⁷ and Nova TV,¹⁸ which were devoted to the “refugee crisis”, as well as some other online news portals, where I found texts dealing with the “refugee crisis” in the period starting from mid-September until the end of November 2015. Choosing the latter was mostly spontaneous: while routinely going through the daily news, I would come across some of the articles, while the aforementioned webpages have been selected since these are the three biggest Croatian television broadcasters, which provided news and information both on TV news and on its webpages. Given that the aim of this paper is not to provide a systematic analysis of the “refugee crisis” representation in the Croatian media, this source-selection is necessarily partial, however, in the context of this article, it may be helpful in understanding the ways in which the public discourse on “refugee crisis” was being constructed, as well as how the “refugee crisis” was represented in the Croatian media. My experience and knowledge of the topic, in addition to my fieldwork experience and media analysis, was created and/or complemented through several public forums organized to discuss the ongoing events at the time; this includes, for instance, the Forum organized by the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research, held on 30 September 2015, entitled: “Pravo na goli život, pravo na bolji život? O izbjegličkoj krizi iz istraživačke i aktivističke perspective” (“The right to a bare existence, the right to a better existence? On the refugee crisis from a research and activist perspective”),¹⁹ and the Forum organized by the “Treći Program” station of the Croatian Radio: “Jesu li izbjeglice naša braća ili civilizacijska prijetnja?” (“Are the refugees our brothers or a civilizational threat?”)²⁰ held on 27 October 2015. The scholarly literature that I used enabled me to establish a relationship between ethnographic and autoethnographic data and the cultural-anthropological rethinking of the refugeehood phenomenon. For instance, Liisa Malkki (1995; 1996; 2002) discusses the problems of humanitarization of the refugeehood, as well as the approach towards refugees and their representation in the public. Emma Haddad (2004) talks about the problems with defining the concept of *being a refugee*, posing an important question: “Who is (not) a refugee?”, and problematizing the aforementioned humanitarization of the refugee “phenomenon”. Duško Petrović and Romana Pozniak (cf. Petrović 2013; Petrović and Pozniak 2014) deal with the securitarian discourse that is ever more present in dealing with refugees, as well as the biopolitics of

¹⁵ <http://welcome.cms.hr/index.php/hr/> (accessed 5 October 2016).

¹⁶ <http://izbjeglice.hrt.hr/> (accessed 5 October 2016).

¹⁷ <http://www.vijesti.rtl.hr/pretrazivanje/?upit=izbjeglice> (accessed 5 October 2016).

¹⁸ http://dnevnik.hr/bin/search_result.php?sort=date&query=izbjeglice (accessed 5 October 2016).

¹⁹ <http://www.ief.hr/Novosti/Digitalnabazadoga%C4%91anja/TribinalEfa/tabid/542/language/hr-HR/Default.aspx> (accessed 5 October 2016).

²⁰ <http://radio.hrt.hr/ep/jesu-li-izbjeglice-nasa-braca-ili-civilizacijska-prijetnja/133582/> (accessed 5 October 2016).

refugees in the contemporary local context. Finally, I have also consulted papers that deal with the methodology and ethics of studying topics of refugeehood (cf. Harrell-Bond and Voutira 1992; Košč-Ryžko 2012–2013; Smith 2009) and the already mentioned texts of authors who rethink autoethnography as a method (cf. Škrbić Alempijević et al. 2016; Chang 2008).

Given all this, while analyzing my own fieldwork experience on the one hand and the selected media sources on the other, in the remaining text I will place an emphasis on the problem of the construction of refugees as *radical Others*, or the *refugee Others*, and on the problem of the representation of, the relationship towards and the approach to the refugees on the one hand, as well as the construction and self-perception of "Us" (the West, volunteers, etc.) on the other. Finally, in the last section of the text, I turn to the issue of power inscribed into the spaces of temporary reception centers and border crossings, and to the ways of managing temporary accommodation of refugees.

WHO ARE WE AND WHO ARE THEY?²¹

In her speech at the Forum organized by the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research, Emina Bužinkić from the Center for Peace Studies, pointed at the construction of the "refugee threat" in the political and media discourse. Above all, refugees are seen as a "phenomenon" that upsets us every day through the media where we see images of chaos, disorder and despair, and regardless of being shocked by these images, the refugees, according to Bužinkić, remain a great unknown, thus also remaining a threat. An important part in the creation of the "refugee threat" is played by politicians, who, from the outset of the "crisis", explicitly talked about the necessity to protect Croatian borders and Croatian territory and population from potential terrorists.²² President Kolinda Grabar Kitarović, for instance, strongly criticized the politics of the Croatian Government towards refugees, frequently saying that Croatia "failed the test of safeguarding borders",²³ whereas the then Minister of the Interior, Ranko Ostojić, pointed out that in addition to organized and humane reception of the refugees, the Croatian government is primarily working to preserve national security.²⁴ By emphasizing terms such as "protection",

²¹ I briefly discussed the relationship between securitarian and humanitarian discourse, that I will be looking into in this section, in my diploma thesis entitled *Integracija migranata u prostor grada – studija slučaja kulinarsko jezičnog kolektiva Okus doma* (Integration of migrants in the city – a case study on culinary-cultural collective Taste of Home) (2016: 8–11).

²² See the recording of the Forum organized by the Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Research: "Pravo na goli život, pravo na bolji život? O izbjegličkoj krizi iz istraživačke i aktivističke perspektive" (The right to a bare existence, the right to a better existence? On the refugee crisis from a research and activist perspective). <https://vimeo.com/145841213> (accessed 5 October 2016).

²³ <http://www.vijesti.rtl.hr/novosti/hrvatska/1786686/predsjednica-ostro-kritizirala-vladinu-politiku-o-izbjeglicama-pali-smo-na-ispitu-cuvanja-granice/> (accessed 5 October 2016).

²⁴ <http://vijesti.hrt.hr/298887/otvoreno-hoce-li-rijeka-izbjeglica-skrenuti-prema-hrvatskoj> (accessed 5 October 2016).

“national security”, “safeguarding borders” or “threat”, the idea of refugees as a menace from which one should protect oneself was implicitly formed in the public.

Securitarian discourse, thus, was in the forefront. Refugees (and migrants in general) were and still are primarily an issue of national, international and global security. Distrust towards the refugees, both by the local population whose villages they passed through or where they settled down and by the European Union in general, is becoming more intense. Refugees are increasingly perceived as a security threat, and are seen as “false [asylum] seekers and hidden economic (illegal) immigrants” (Petrović 2013: 130). The issues of protecting national borders, particularly protecting the outer borders of the European Union, including questions of keeping territorial sovereignty and protecting from terrorism, are only some of the central points in international political discussions about the “refugee question”. Intensification of the securitarian discourse was reflected in media representations of these issues, and particularly deepened after the terrorist attacks in Paris on 13 November 2015, when, frequently, the growing number of refugees into the European Union was connected with or even claimed to be causally linked with the attacks.²⁵

Securitarian-discourse-infused media representations of the refugee crisis suggest that the refugees are radically different than *Us* – the citizens of the European Union; that they are those from whom we must protect ourselves by putting up wires and building fences defending the so-called “Fortress of Europe”. In this dichotomy, *We* as the citizens of the European Union, represent the “developed” part of the world, the powerful West and “civilization values”, whereas, on the scale of “development”, we have placed refugees and migrants, the “Others”, somewhere far below. In this regard, *They* are presented as “primitive” people from an “undeveloped” part of the world, people who have “strange” and “different” values and customs, and are thus a “threat”²⁶ to the presumed “European” culture and way of life.

There was almost no time in the reception centers or at the border crossings that this dichotomy was not obvious. The symbolic demarcation into *Us*, as an imagined union of an allegedly homogenous Europe and its full-fledged citizens, and *Them* as a threat to this presumed European cultural, religious and political community, was embodied in specific practices and situations in the field. For instance, the volunteers wore fluorescent vests to be as visible and recognizable as possible, and to stand out from the otherwise *chaotic mass of bodies* (cf. Malkki 1996: 386–387), which is how the refugees are frequently presented in the public. Face masks worn by the majority of police officers and some of the volunteers were an even more striking illustration of the embodied practice of symbolic separation. The masks, according to the protocol, are meant to ensure hygiene

²⁵ Cf. <http://www.vijesti.rtl.hr/novosti/hrvatska/1828405/mnogi-terorizam-u-parizu-povezali-s-izbjegli-cama-sto-izbjeglice-u-kampu-u-slavonskom-brodu-kazu-na-to/>, <http://www.hrt.hr/308681/vijesti/ostojic-terorizam-prijeti-svima>, <http://dnevnik.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/izbjeglice-prolaze-kroz-hrvatsku-kako-ustvrditi-je-li-osoba-sumnjiva---416337.html> (accessed 5 October 2016).

²⁶ See e.g. <http://dnevnik.hr/vijesti/svijet/eu-zbog-migranata-prijeti-propast-poput-rimskog-carstva---417875.html> (accessed 5 October 2016).

requirements (for instance when giving medical assistance or when handling food), but were mostly worn in situations when ensuring hygiene standards and regulations were not an issue. A police officer standing erect wearing a uniform, armed with a standard issue pistol and police baton, and wearing a mask covering most of his/her face, is not only a presentation of the careful concern for the highest hygienic standards in the area where refugees pass and are temporarily detained. On the contrary, this was frequently no representation of hygienic standards, but a technique of delimiting between those maintaining order and security (but, let us leave aside the issue of whose security for now) and those who are helping distribute humanitarian aid, as well as those, on the other hand, who are getting this aid, but from whom one should be protected, as from a "virus". For instance, at the beginning of one night shift at the Opatovac reception center, a volunteer approached me holding a box of face masks and a box of plastic gloves. She had been working there for a few days as well, but since we had not met before, she assumed that it was my first shift, and gave me several pieces of advice. She recommended that the mask would help, because there were places that *stank*, and recommended that, in the case of a riot breaking out at the Center, I should go outside as soon as possible until the police reestablished order, explaining that the Opatovac center was not safe, i.e. that the people in it were *dangerous*. A similar attitude was evident in a comment given by a police officer that I witnessed. On one occasion in the Opatovac center, as I, along with other volunteers, was distributing blankets to the people who would spend the night in the camp before continuing their journey, one of the police officers commented with several volunteers who worked for a large international organization that he wondered whether, several years from then, when *They* "would be throwing bombs on us", they would remember the "generous aid" that they had received. I have no intention of generalizing on the basis of the mentioned individual examples. I am sure that there were many other similar examples, as well as others that stood in opposition to them. However, I do not consider the presented examples irrelevant, but on the contrary, I believe they should be taken into consideration when we think about the ways in which we approach the *refugee Other*. However, before I move on, I would like to turn to the other side of the problem, seemingly directly opposed to securitarian discourse – the issue of humanitarianization. Given that, especially at the beginning of the "refugee crisis" in Croatia, narratives that were usually imposed through media representations were those of particular humanity, hospitality, compassion and empathy of the local people through whose villages the refugees passed, which were often connected with their recent war and exile experience of the 1990s (cf. Čapo 2015), humanitarian discourse also turns out to be an important part of this analysis.

Although the refugees are usually perceived within the framework of threat and danger, they are also globally presented as desperate and helpless victims. The refugees, thus, become "problematic" social category in the national order of things, an exception made familiar through the media and through humanitarian appeals on behalf of their 'bare humanity' (Malkki 2002: 356). These people stop being individuals and become symbols of a universal victim "whose judgment and reason had been compromised by his

or her experiences" (Malkki 1996: 384), whilst the idea of helplessness, dependence on international humanitarian organizations and absolute despair (cf. Haddad 2004) become globally recognizable images of the *refugee experience*. Humanitarization, then, "implies a depoliticization of the refugee and asylum regime" (Petrović 2013: 130), and constructs the refugee as an ahistorical, universal humanitarian subject, or a speechless and passive victim (cf. Malkki 1996). But, it is precisely the very image of the victim, according to Haddad, that will provide funds, and thus enable the work of international humanitarian organizations which will, furthermore, continue to work on the protection of a victim perceived in this way. The globally known photograph of a boy who drowned, Aylan Kurdi, is a prime example of the way in which the idea of the victim can be used for such purposes. Thus, including the concept of a victim in the definition of refugeehood is "necessary for the survival of the concept in theory and the survival of the individual in practice. The definition of the refugee, therefore, frequently becomes merely 'an abstraction, a category which qualifies a person [...] to become eligible for UNHCR aid'" (Haddad 2004: 16).²⁷

If we consider "our refugee crisis" as a humanitarian crisis, the crux of the problem shifts to intervention, collection, and distribution of humanitarian aid. My experience from the field showed that the very way in which humanitarian support was provided sometimes served to reproduce the mentioned gap between *Us* and *Them*. For instance, as opposed to the very negative comment of the police officer that I mentioned above, there is a story and a photograph of a police officer holding a baby in his arms, with one of the articles in the news saying: "Those who "are dying" in the field every day, admitting exhausted refugees, wrapping children's bare feet in this cold and looking at the river of the suffering people, are very much living through it emotionally. Although wearing police uniforms, they are above all people who do not find it easy to see other people suffering",²⁸ thus alluding to mutual suffering, of the refugees as absolute victims, but also that of police officers witnessing their suffering. Humanitarization is also visible in great passivization and depoliticization of the refugees as individuals as well as the refugee phenomenon in general. The volunteers in the field would frequently approach the people going through the refugee experience with pity, directed particularly at the women and children, who "fit" the described concept of a helpless victim, thus contributing to, consciously or not, the further perpetuation of the delimitation between "*Us* who are helping" and "*Them* who need the help" in order to survive.

There are many individual examples from the field exemplifying the features of the interaction between the refugees on the one hand and the police and/or volunteers on the other. They are, of course, varied, and depend on the individuals who participate in the interaction, but can be positioned between two poles. On one end of the continuum are individuals (police officers, volunteers, representatives of institutions, etc.) who take a

²⁷ Haddad quoted Waldron according to Harrell Bond et al.

²⁸ See <http://www.hrt.hr/301022/vijesti/fotografija-policajca-i-bebe-obisla-svijet-ne-proe-dan-da-ga-se-ne-sjetim> (accessed 5 October 2016).

particularly humanitarian approach, where the figure of the refugee as a speechless and passive victim, primarily needing humanitarian aid, is at the forefront. On the other end of the continuum we can place those individuals who take a particularly negative attitude towards the refugees and migrants, mostly being led by the already mentioned idea that these are drastically different people, leading to the conclusion that they are “strange” and “dangerous”. In this case, the figure of the refugee is interpreted as a threat – the refugee takes on the role of a potential terrorist. At first sight, the humanitarian and the securitarian discourse are two opposed models of approaching refugees, with no common ground. However, if we focus on the question *how* we approach refugees, these discourses take on an important common feature.

What is common to both the pole that strongly emphasizes the humanitarian approach, and the pole with a heavy emphasis on the securitarian discourse, is approaching refugees as *radical Others*. In the former case, the image of the refugee is completely victimized, so we do not see a refugee as an individual with a name, history, reason, experience, knowledge and voice (cf. Malkki 1996: 387), but rather as part of a depoliticized mass, without *agency*, a desperate and helpless Other who is in need of our help. In the latter case too, the refugees are deprived of their specific personal identity, but rather than being victims, they become part of a hyper-politicized mass realized as a terrorist security threat. Both the humanitarian and the securitarian discourse originate from the same common initial idea – the refugee as a *radical Other*. In this sense, it is less important whether one feels pity for refugees and talks to them as if they were children, consciously or unconsciously taking away their ability of self-articulation, or constructs such a negative approach towards refugees so as to be afraid of the “bombs that they would drop on us in a few years”, because both of these poles see in a refugee someone completely different than oneself. If we consider the crisis from a strictly humanitarian or securitarian perspective, sooner or later we will have to face the described poles that necessarily imply the idea of refugees as *radical Others*. Furthermore, the trap of the humanitarian approach is also discussed by Emina Bužinkić, who claims that the humanitarian action in its core epitomizes the unequal relationships of power between those *who are helping* and those *who are being helped*.²⁹ Moreover, some anthropologists have already shown that “the ethos of humanitarian work [is] one in which the victims are too often treated as villains, with the helpers assuming the role of figures of authority” (Harrell-Bond and Voutira 1992: 8), drawing ever closer to the securitization perspective.

However, if we focus our attention on the concept of solidarity, i.e. on giving support to the refugees, solidarizing with their experiences and showing respect but not pity, new possibilities for volunteer engagement in the field open up, as well as for alternative research approaches. In revitalizing the idea of solidarity, Bužinkić sees the potential for

²⁹ See the recording from the Forum organized by the Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Research: “Pravo na goli život, pravo na bolji život? O izbjegličkoj krizi iz istraživačke i aktivističke perspektive” (The right to a bare existence, the right to a better existence? On the refugee crisis from a research and activist perspective). <https://vimeo.com/145842782> (accessed 5 October 2016).

gradual but long-term social changes, as well as the opportunity for high quality integration of those people who will not only pass through Croatia on their journey towards the EU, but will stay here as well. A more detailed questioning of the concept of solidarity and the connection between the cultural-anthropological and activist practice is beyond the scope of this work, which is why I leave a critical rethinking of the possible advantages and the potential traps of such a perspective for another occasion.

HOW DO WE REPRESENT THE REFUGEE OTHER?

I will briefly turn back to the process of humanitarization of the "refugee crisis". As part of the ahistorical depoliticized and speechless *mass of otherness*, the refugee and/or the migrant is usually not offered a possibility for auto-representation in the public. This role is played by the media on their behalf. But how do they do it? Let us remember Aylan Kurdi, a boy who drowned; more specifically, let us remember the photograph of a deceased Aylan Kurdi. In his text "Što sa fotografijom mrtvog djeteta" (What to do with a photograph of a dead child), Davor Konjikušić criticizes how the morbid stage was set in an acontextual and sensationalist manner, by putting on stage those who not only cannot resist this type of representation, but, faced with their life circumstances, consent to, and sometimes even condone recording, photographing and reproducing their most intimate suffering, which at least allows their voice to be heard, thus, unfortunately, becoming part of the media spectacle. Konjikušić (2015) says:

As opposed to the Western countries, where it would be nearly impossible to release a photograph of a killed child without protecting his/her identity, unless it was a case of the yellow press of the worst kind, migrants, the "others" are filmed with no permission on all sorts of occasions, and their photographs are released and distributed without obstacles. We do not have to take into account their privacy or pain, or their dignity [...], the father of the drowned boy said, go ahead, record, let the world see what is happening to us.

Similarly, the documentary "Balkanska ruta" (The Balkan Route) directed by Saša Kosanović,³⁰ although it offers a chronological review of events from mid-August 2015, and gives a translocal view, encompassing Macedonia, Serbia, Hungary, Croatia, and Slovenia, also succumbs to sensationalism. For instance, there are at least two ethically problematic scenes, as seen from the cultural-anthropological perspective on the representation of others. However, they are not problematized as such in the film, but are instead presented as scenes which, accompanied by dramatic music in the background, make the film suspenseful, and keep the viewer riveted to the screen. For instance, there is a close-up scene of a man being resuscitated when he collapsed in Tovarnik – his

³⁰ Available at: <https://hrti.hrt.hr/#/video/show/304463/balkanska-ruta-dokumentarni-film> (accessed 5 October 2016).

face, naked upper body, a woman sitting next to him and crying in fear were all filmed; similarly, there is footage of a young man who, grasping for air, collapsed in Preševo – his face was zoomed in on when he was unconscious, his body twitching captured on film, as well as the moment when the young man, having regained consciousness, but still visibly scared, kissed the hands of the soldier who helped him. Did they know that they were being filmed at the time? No. Were they later asked for permission to release the footage? Most probably not. Were they given a chance to say something? No. Their bodies on the screen said everything. There are very few occasions when refugees are approached as active individuals, as people *doing* something, and even more infrequently as people *saying* something, as Marko Valenta, Drago Župarić-Ilić and Tea Vidović (2015) caution in their paper on asylum seekers in Croatia, their experiences, wishes and plans for the future. On the contrary, moments when they are being represented as people to whom something is *happening* come in abundance. Moreover, they are “hardly ever figured as a person but [were] part of an amorphous mass, faceless and speechless (Soguk 1999; as cited in Haddad 2006: 16). If, however, they are granted voice, these are mostly selected distressing stories that fit in the predetermined media picture of the “refugee chaos” or the image of refugees as universal victims.

POWER, SPACE AND REFUGEES

Initially, when the “crisis” had just *entered* Croatia, people were transported to the reception centers in Ježevo, Sisak, Kutina, Beli Manastir and Zagreb, from where they were taken to the border crossings with Slovenia within a period of several days. Soon, however, on 21 September, a temporary reception center was opened in Opatovac, Slavonia, situated some twenty kilometers from the Bapska and Tovarnik border crossings, which refugees used to enter Croatia. The relocation of the reception centers from the capital to isolated border areas of the national territory, although a practical solution, was no symbolic coincidence – this was a way to move the camp out of the reach of the public, and leave the marginalized people on the edges of the society, thus preventing, or at least hindering, unhampered contact between the local community and the people in transit. This is also evident from numerous media stories, where the journalists themselves or the interviewed representatives of the institutions, pointed out that the local population have no reason for fear or concern, because the police was present wherever refugees were passing or temporarily stopping, to make sure that there was no direct, and obviously undesirable, contact.³¹ Once again, securitarian discourse comes into the forefront. Refugee camps, both for international humanitarian organizations and for security institutions, were a prac-

³¹ See e.g. <http://www.vijesti.rtl.hr/novosti/hrvatska/1808396/kada-hrvatska-nije-imala-ni-postene-puske-uspjela-se-obraniti-obranit-cemo-se-i-ubuduće-nitko-se-ne-treba-plasiti-napada/> and <http://www.vijesti.rtl.hr/novosti/hrvatska/1797135/vlada-drzi-pod-kontrolom-izbjeglicku-krizu-ucini-cemo-sve-danasi-ljudi-budu-mirni/> (accessed 5 October 2016).

tical solution to establish control where otherwise, judging by the public political discourse, chaos would ensue (cf. Schechter 2000: 160). The refugee camp, as claimed by Malkki, has become a vital instrument of power: “the spatial concentration and ordering of people that it enabled, as well as the administrative and bureaucratic processes it facilitated within its boundaries, had far-reaching consequences” (Malkki 1995: 498), which is particularly true in establishing control over peoples’ movements.

The spatial organization of the Opatovac and Slavonski Brod reception centers was also no coincidence; it was designed so as to make the relations of power between those monitoring and managing the centers and those who temporarily stayed in them clear at every point in time. For instance, the Opatovac temporary reception center was organized in several sectors. Each sector contained tents for temporary accommodation, and points for the distribution of food and clothing. The sectors were separated by earthen embankments, approximately two meters tall; tall enough to prevent seeing outside a sector and beyond the embankment when standing inside the sector, as well as tall enough to allow seeing most of the sector or most of the whole center, when standing on top of the embankment. Police officers standing guard were posted at several locations on each of the embankments, working in several shifts, surveilling the people in the sectors. On the other hand, the people temporarily staying in the camp were not permitted to climb onto the embankment and look at the center from the same vantage point as the members of national security institutions. As a volunteer, I was allowed to cross the embankments in designated areas to go from one sector into the next, but neither were we permitted to spend time on the embankments which, for instance, police officers could do. In addition to pointing to a strict hierarchy in managing the “refugee crisis”, where the representatives of security and the state apparatus are at the top, and the individuals temporarily staying in the center at the bottom, such management of movement frequently made it difficult to coordinate volunteers in different sectors in the center, who sometimes did not know what was happening in the other parts of the reception center, limiting volunteers’ ability to react to the situation in the field in a timely manner.

While volunteering in the area of the temporary reception centers, my movements were also monitored and strictly controlled. For instance, after I first came to the “Opatovac camp”, which had been in operation for only a few days at that time, no volunteer permits were necessary to enter the center,³² however during one night shift, a new Decision of the Ministry of the Interior came into force: starting the next morning at 8 am, in order to enter the center, one had to have an appropriate permit issued by the Ministry of the Interior. At the time when the decision came into force, several minutes before 8 am, I was at one of the center exits, watching people entering buses that would take them to the border. I was standing a few meters away from several police officers, whom I had talked to a moment

³² This in no way means that the access to the center was free and uncontrolled. All organizations operating within the center were required to present a list of volunteers to the Ministry of the Interior, and obtain permission to carry out their activities in the center.

ago, but as I turned to return to the center, given that the clock had just struck 8, I was no longer allowed to enter. Despite the fact that they had just talked to me, and that they knew “whose” volunteer I was, and the fact that I had spent the entire night volunteering in the center and had no opportunity to obtain my accreditation until then, I had to wait for my volunteer colleagues in front of the center.

The logic of spatial organization of The Winter Reception and Transit Center in Slavonski Brod mirrored the one in Opatovac. Surveillance over movement (cf. Foucault 1994) was additionally visible here, because people were brought directly into the reception center by bus or train,³³ where they would be, both at the beginning and the end of the center’s operation, allocated into sectors awaiting further transit, or would be directed back to the buses, immediately upon registration, which would take them on to the border crossings. In any case, their movement through and stay at the center were under constant control, with strict, although frequently inconsistent rules about what is (not) permitted and where. Moreover, surveillance over volunteer movements was also implemented. For instance, most organizations were not allowed to have volunteers in or in front of the tent where the people who had just arrived were being registered.

The organization and functioning of the reception centers include elements characteristic of prisons and similar spaces of the repressive apparatus (cf. Foucault 1994). For instance, in Opatovac, in addition to being monitored from earthen embankments, the entire space of the center was under constant video surveillance, giving security services constant and complete control. In Slavonski Brod people exited the train or the bus in front of the space designated for registration, and were then, in the initial weeks, directed towards the sectors where they would be temporarily accommodated, or came back to the buses and trains headed for border crossings directly after registration, passing through, on their way, the tent for the distribution of humanitarian aid. Such organization of space and transit left very little time and opportunity to use the space other than the intended and strictly monitored route. Moreover, the fact that people who were temporarily accommodated in the centers could not move about freely within them, could not leave them if they wanted to, could not go around them or even not pass through them at all, ties these centers with jails and other similar spaces. Finally, just like jails are frequently situated outside or on the very edges of towns and settlements, both reception centers were also situated in isolated locations (at the exit from Opatovac, on the edge of Slavonski Brod) to systematically make it impossible, or at least significantly limit, the possibility of interaction between local population and the people who passed through the centers or were temporarily situated there.

³³ Arrival to Opatovac was also organized, but people crossed the border with the Republic of Serbia on foot (mostly at the Berkasovo-Bapska and Šid-Tovarnik border crossings), and upon entering Croatia they would be taken to the entrance of the Opatovac center by buses. On the other hand, the arrival in the Slavonski Brod center was jointly coordinated by the Republic of Serbia and the Republic of Croatia, and people were taken by train (sometimes, because of works on certain parts of the railway, they were taken by bus one part of the way) from Serbia directly to The Winter Reception and Transit Center in Slavonski Brod.

Moreover, along the entire route through Croatia, people were under strict surveillance of the police, without whose orders and rules they were not allowed to move freely at border crossings or in the reception centers. For example, upon arrival at the Bapska border crossing, the police organized people into groups of 50 to 60 individuals, roughly as many as can fit in a single bus, and they would then be taken to the Opatovac reception center, sometimes not knowing where they were being taken and why. Upon exiting the bus, and on entrance to the center, the police formed queues of two people in a line waiting for registration, and then again formed a line of two people following registration. People were not allowed to break out of the line, while there was at least one police officer per queue, most frequently there being two – one at the beginning of the line, and one at its end, who controlled that no one broke the line during the wait, the walk to the sectors or boarding into the bus. The formation of lines was accompanied by a simple imperative sentence *two in line!* or *two lines!* that had been said to them so many times, it seems, even before they entered Croatia, that people knew the *procedure* and would *fall in lines* themselves. Boarding the trains or buses functioned very similarly in Slavonski Brod as well.

Strictly controlled walking of two people in line, accompanied by police instructions and rules that put the refugees' bodies under control, complete surveillance over movement in the camps and their surroundings as well as at border crossings, many police officers patrolling wherever refugees went, erasure of personality and the individual's agency, are only some of the common practices used in the centers and border crossings, legitimated by the perspective that this was a way to preserve order and security. According to Liisa Malkki, "refugee camps are devices of care and control in much the same way as are transit centres, internment camps, 'reception centres' run by national immigration officials, and countless other social technologies that discipline space and the movement of people, all the while producing knowledge for specific administrative, therapeutic, and other ends" (2002: 353). Still, the question remains: whose security are we concerned about?

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper I examined several problematic points in rethinking and studying the topics related to refugees. I dealt with the question of constructing refugees as *radical Others*, the problem of the representation of refugees in the media, and the issue of power relations, particularly the power inscribed into the spaces of reception centers, border crossings, and the ways of managing temporary accommodation of the refugees.

At this juncture, I would like to underscore the problems with two of the most common discourses of representing and approaching refugees: the humanitarian and the securitarian discourse. If we observe refugees only as a humanitarian subject, they become universal and passive victims. In this case, their experiences and personal histories are neglected, and no importance is given to examining their agency. A refugee, seen ex-

clusively as a humanitarian subject, does not exist as an individual, but only as part of a depoliticized mass. On the other hand, the securitarian discourse emphasizes the threat that the refugees supposedly pose – in this case, these people are perceived as potential extremists and terrorists, violators of presupposed European culture and security, those who one should be protected and defended from. Both of these discourses, although they originate from opposed starting points – the universal victim on the one hand, and the universal threat on the other, meet at the point of establishing relationships between *Us* and *Them* – in both approaches *They* are perceived as radically different than *Us*. By gaining insight into this type of treatment of the refugees, both on the micro level in the field, and on the macro level (in the mass media and in politics), I tried to identify the pitfalls that these discourses are fraught with. Lastly, I believe that if we move from this approach to the “refugee crisis” and towards the idea of solidarity with the refugees, new perspectives and possibilities arise, both for direct work with the refugees, and for cultural-anthropological rethinking of these topics, which is yet to follow.

REFERENCES AND SUORCES

- Are you Syrious? 2015. Available at: https://www.facebook.com/areyousyrious/info/?tab=page_info (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bužinkić, Emina. 2015a. “Kritika medijskih, političkih i drugih reprezentacija izbjeglica”. Available at: <https://vimeo.com/145841213> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Bužinkić, Emina. 2015b. “Odgovornost Europske unije, strategije izlaza i poruke”. Available at: <https://vimeo.com/145842782> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- B. V. 2015. “EU zbog migranata prijeti propast poput Rimskog Carstva”. Available at: <http://dnevnik.hr/vijesti/svijet/eu-zbog-migranata-prijeti-propast-poput-rimskog-carstva---417875.html> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Chang, Heewon. 2008. *Autoethnography as Method*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Čapo, Jasna. 2015. “Od Opatovca do Strasbourga. Razna lica izbjegličke 'krize'”. *Zbornik Trećeg programa Hrvatskog radija* 87: 5–17.
- Damon, Arwa. 2015. “Conditions for Refugees are Spiraling Out of Control”. Available at: <http://edition.cnn.com/videos/world/2015/08/23/misery-at-europes-gate-damon-pkg.cnn/video/playlists/arwa-damon-reports-on-migrant-crisis/> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Damon, Arwa, Gul Tuysuz and Laura Smith-Park. 2015. “Misery for Migrants Caught in Bottleneck at Greece-Macedonia Border”. Available at: <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/08/22/europe/europe-macedonia-migrant-crisis/index.html> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- De Genova, Nicholas, Elena Fontanari, Fiorenza Picozza, Laia Soto Bermant, Aila Spathopoulou, Maurice Stierl, Zakeera Suffee, Martina Tazzioli, Huub van Baar and Can Yildiz. 2016. “Migrant Crisis’/Refugee Crisis’”. Available at: <http://nearfuturesonline.org/europecrisis-new-keywords-of-crisis-in-and-of-europe-part-3/> (accessed 16 November 2016).
- Dnevnik.hr. 2015. Available at: http://dnevnik.hr/bin/search_result.php?sort=date&query=izbjeglice (accessed 5 October 2016).

- Domitrović, Ivana. 2015. "Izbjegljece prolaze kroz Hrvatsku. Kako ustvrditi je li osoba sumnjiva?" Available at: <http://dnevnik.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/izbjegljece-prolaze-kroz-hrvatsku-kako-ustvrditi-je-li-osoba-sumnjiva---416337.html> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- "EXPO Milano 2015". 2015. Available at: <http://www.expo2015.org/en/participants> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Foucault, Michel. 1994. *Nadzor i kazna. Rađanje zatvora*. Zagreb: Informator, Fakultet političkih znanosti.
- Grubiša, Iva. 2016. *Integracija migranata u prostor grada – studija slučaja kulinarsko jezičnog kolektiva Okus doma*. [Diploma paper]. Zagreb: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology – Department of Sociology. Available at: <http://darhiv.ffzg.unizg.hr/7877/> (accessed 26 January 2017).
- Haddad, Emma. 2004. *Who is (not) a Refugee?* San Domenico: European University Institute.
- Harrell-Bond, Barbara E. and Eftihia Voutira. 1992. "Anthropology and the Study of Refugees". *Anthropology Today* 8/4: 6–10. [<https://doi.org/10.2307/2783530>]
- Hrvatska novinska agencija. 2015a. "Bikić: Policija nije upotrijebila suzavac nego pepper sprej". Available at: <http://www.nacional.hr/bikic-policija-nije-upotrijebila-suzavac-nego-pepper-sprej/> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Hrvatska novinska agencija. 2015b. "Vojska nije u stanju pripravnosti, policija smirila stanje u Opatovcu 'paprenim spejem'". Available at: <http://izbjegljece.hrt.hr/300173/vojska-nije-u-stanju-pripravnosti-policija-smirila-situaciju-u-opatovcu-pepper-sprejem> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Hrvatska novinska agencija. 2015c. "Milanović smiruje situaciju: 'Vlada drži pod kontrolom izbjegličku krizu, učinit ćemo sve da naši ljudi budu mirni'". Available at: <http://www.vijesti.rtl.hr/novosti/hrvatska/1797135/vlada-drzi-pod-kontrolom-izbjegličku-krizu-ucinit-ćemo-sve-da-nasi-ljudi-budu-mirni/> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Hrvatska radiotelevizija. 2015a. Available at: <http://izbjegljece.hrt.hr/> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Hrvatska radiotelevizija. 2015b. "Ostojić: Primit ćemo izbjegljece humano, ali pazimo i na državnu sigurnost". Available at: <http://vijesti.hrt.hr/298887/otvoreno-hoce-li-rijeka-izbjeglica-skrenuti-prema-hrvatskoj> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Hrvatska radiotelevizija. 2015c. "INFOGRAFIKA: Prihvat i smještaj migranata u Hrvatskoj". Available at: <http://vijesti.hrt.hr/299204/prihvat-i-smjestaj-migranata-u-hrvatskoj> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Hrvatska radiotelevizija. 2015d. "Tribina Trećeg programa – Jesu li izbjegljece naša braća ili civilizacijska prijetnja?" Available at: <http://radio.hrt.hr/ep/jesu-li-izbjegljece-nasa-braca-ili-civilizacijska-prijetnja/133582/> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Hrvatska radiotelevizija. 2015e. "Ostojić: Terorizam prijeti svima". Available at: <http://www.hrt.hr/308681/vijesti/ostojic-terorizam-prijeti-svima> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Hrvatska radiotelevizija. 2015f. "Balkanska ruta" (dokumentarni film). <https://hrti.hrt.hr/#/video/show/304463/balkanska-ruta-dokumentarni-film> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Hrvatska radiotelevizija. 2015g. "Fotografija policajca i bebe obišla svijet: 'Ne prođe dan da ga se ne sjetim'". Available at: <http://www.hrt.hr/301022/vijesti/fotografija-policajca-i-bebe-obisla-svijet-ne-proe-dan-da-ga-se-ne-sjetim> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Individuals on the field – international group. 2015. Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/1471413449832894/> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Inicijativa Dobrodošli. 2015a. "Ljudi neprestano stižu u Bapsku". Available at: <http://welcome.cms.hr/index.php/hr/2015/09/23/ljudi-neprestano-stizu-u-bapsku/> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Inicijativa Dobrodošli. 2015b. "Naši volonteri nalaze se u Bapskoj i Opatovcu". Available at: <http://welcome.cms.hr/index.php/hr/2015/09/23/nasi-volonteri-nalaze-se-u-bapskoj-i-opatovcu/> (accessed 5 October 2016).

- Inicijativa Dobrodošli. 2015c. "Informiranje izbjeglica može spriječiti tenzije na terenu". Available at: <http://welcome.cms.hr/index.php/hr/2015/09/23/informiranje-izbjeglica-moze-sprijeciti-tenzije-na-terenu/> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Inicijativa Dobrodošli. 2015d. "Od Bapske do Tovarnika i Opatovca do Slavenskog Broda". Available at: <http://welcome.cms.hr/index.php/hr/2015/11/02/od-bapske-preko-tovarnika-i-opatovca-do-slavonskog-broda/> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Inicijativa Dobrodošli. 2015e. "O inicijativi". Available at: <http://welcome.cms.hr/index.php/hr/about-hr/> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Inicijativa Dobrodošli. 2015f. Available at: <http://welcome.cms.hr/index.php/hr/> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku. 2015. "Tribina IEF-a: Pravo na goli život, pravo na bolji život? O izbjegličkoj krizi iz istraživačke i aktivističke perspektive". Available at: <http://www.ief.hr/Novosti/Digitalnabazadoga%C4%91anja/TribinalEFa/tabid/542/language/hr-HR/Default.aspx> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Konjikušić, Davor. 2015. "Što sa fotografijom mrtvog djeteta?". Available at: <http://www.portalnovosti.com/sto-s-fotografijom-mrtvog-djeteta> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Kość-Ryżko, Katarzyna. 2012–2013. "The Refugee Centre as a Field of Research". *Ethnologia Polona* 33-34: 229–241.
- Latković, Goran. 2015. "Mnogi terorizam u Parizu povezali s izbjeglicama: što izbjeglice u kampu u Slavenskom Brodu kažu na to?". Available at: <http://www.vijesti.rtl.hr/novosti/hrvatska/1828405/mnogi-terorizam-u-parizu-povezali-s-izbjeglicama-sto-izbjeglice-u-kampu-u-slavonskom-brodu-kazu-na-to/> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Malkki, Liisa. 1995. "Refugees and Exile. From 'Refugee Studies' to the National Order of Things". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 495–523. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.24.100195.002431]
- Malkki, Liisa. 1996. "Speechless Emissaries. Refugees, Humanitarianism and Dehistoricization". *Cultural Anthropology* 11/3: 377–404. [https://doi.org/10.1525/can.1996.11.3.02a00050]
- Malkki, Liisa. 2002. "News from Nowhere. Mass Displacement and Globalized 'Problems of Organization'". *Ethnography* 3/3: 351–360. [https://doi.org/10.1177/146613802401092797]
- Ministarstvo unutarnjih poslova. 2015. "Rujan 2015: obavijesti o prihvatu i smještaju migranata u RH". Available at: <http://www.mup.hr/main.aspx?id=220928> (accessed 5 December 2015).
- N. A. 2015. "Sukob izbjeglica u Opatovcu, policija upotrijebila suzavac". Available at: <http://24sata.info/vijesti/regija/240648-sukob-izbjeglica-u-opatovcu-policija-upotrijebila-suzavac.html> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Petrović, Duško. 2013. "Biopolitike izbjeglištva i azila u ozračju krize političkog azila na Zapadu". *Narodna umjetnost* 50/2: 128–147. [https://doi.org/10.15176/VOL50NO107]
- Pozniak, Romana and Duško Petrović. 2014. "Tražitelji azila kao prijatelja". *Studia ethnologica Croatica* 26: 47–72.
- Schechter, Jim. 2000. "Anthropological Theory and Fieldwork. Problem Solving Tools for Forced Migration Issues". *High Plains Applied Anthropologist* 20/2: 153–166.
- Smith, Valerie J. 2009. "Ethical and Effective Ethnographic Research Methods. A Case Study with Afgan Refugees in California". *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics. An International Journal* 4/3: 59–72.
- Smith-Spark, Laura, Vasco Cotovio and Arwa Damon. 2015. "Worries Mount About Migrant Crisis on Macedonia Border". Available at: <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/08/21/europe/europe-migrant-crisis/index.html> (accessed 5 October 2016).

- Škrbić Alempijević, Nevena, Sanja Potkonjak and Tihana Rubić. 2016. *Misliti etnografski. Kvalitativni pristupi i metode u etnologiji i kulturnoj antropologiji*. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Odsjek za etnologiju i kulturnu antropologiju, Hrvatsko etnološko društvo.
- Šprajc, Zoran. 2015. "Ministar Ostojić za RTL direkt: 'Kada Hrvatska nije imala ni poštene puške, uspjela se obraniti, obranit ćemo se i ubuduće – nitko se ne treba plašiti napada'". Available at: <http://www.vijesti.rtl.hr/novosti/hrvatska/1808396/kada-hrvatska-nije-imala-ni-postene-puske-uspjela-se-obraniti-obranit-ćemo-se-i-ubuduće-nitko-se-ne-treba-plasiti-napada/> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Tomašević, Silvije. 2015. "Na Expou 2015. gotovo cijeli svijet osim Hrvatske". Available at: <http://www.vecernji.hr/svijet/na-expou-2015-gotovo-cijeli-svijet-osim-hrvatske-1003259> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- UNHCR. 2015. "Refugees/Migrants Emergency Response – Mediterranean". Available at: <http://data.unhcr.org/mediterranean/regional.php> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Valenta, Marko, Drago Župarić-Ilić and Tea Vidović. 2015. "The Reluctant Asylum–Seekers. Migrants at the Southeastern Frontiers of the European Migration System". *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 34/3: 95–113. [<https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdv009>]
- Vijesti.hr. 2015a. Available at: <http://www.vijesti.rtl.hr/pretrazivanje/?upit=izbjeglice> (accessed 5 October 2016).
- Vijesti.hr. 2015b. "Predsjednica oštro kritizirala vladinu politiku o izbjeglicama: 'Pali smo na ispitu čuvanja granice'". Available at: <http://www.vijesti.rtl.hr/novosti/hrvatska/1786686/predsjednica-ostro-kritizirala-vladinu-politiku-o-izbjeglicama-pali-smo-na-ispitu-cuvanja-granice/> (accessed 5 October 2016).

"MI I ONI" – KAKO PRISTUPAMO IZBJEGLIČKOM DRUGOM? KULTURNOANTROPOLOŠKO PROPITIVANJE TERENSKOG ISKUSTVA U SLAVONIJI

Autorica propituje vlastito terensko iskustvo volontiranja i interakcije s izbjeglicama na graničnim prijelazima te u privremenim prihvatnim centrima u Slavoniji. Rad se stoga bazira na iskustvu sudjelovanja s promatranjem kroz koje je autorica, kao volonterka Inicijative Dobrodošli, prošla višekratno u razdoblju od kraja rujna do sredine prosinca 2015. godine. Autorica upozorava na problematičnost dvaju najčešće prisutnih diskursa o "izbjegličkoj krizi": onog sigurnosnog s jedne strane, te onog humanitarizacijskog s druge, koji iako naoko dijametralno suprotni, kreću od iste polazišne točke izbjeglica kao *radikalno Drugih*. U posljednjem dijelu rada propituje moć upisanu u prostor privremenog smještaja, ukazujući kako prostorna i funkcionalna organizacija privremenih prihvatnih centara nije bila slučajnost, nego je osmišljena kako bi odnosi moći onih koji su centre nadgledali i njima upravljali te onih koji su u njima privremeno boravili u svakom trenutku tijekom rada prihvatnih centara ostali jasno naznačeni.

Ključne riječi: humanitarizacijski i sigurnosni diskurs, *Mi-Oni*, pristup izbjeglicama, Slavonija