
H-France Review Vol. 21 (August 2021), No. 136

Dan Hicks and Sarah Mallet, *Lande: The Calais 'Jungle' and Beyond*. Bristol: Bristol University Press, 2019. x + 114 pp. Photographs, notes, references, and index. £45.00 U.K. (cl). ISBN 978-1-5292-0618-0; £8.99 U.K. (eb). ISBN 978-1-5292-0621-0.

Review by Beth S. Epstein, New York University Paris.

"L'opération humanitaire de démantèlement est terminée." [1] Pronounced by the Prefect of the Pas-de-Calais region in northern France in late 2016, this declaration was meant to signal the final demolition of the La Lande migrant camp in Calais, better known as "The Jungle," in October of that year. It is repeated as a refrain throughout Dan Hicks and Sarah Mallet's book, *Lande: The Calais 'Jungle' and Beyond*, a reminder of the obscurantist logics at work in the border zones of the new world order. The book was written as a companion piece to an exhibit of the same name at the Oxford University Pitt Rivers Museum in 2019. Together, the book and exhibit offer "an archaeology of Europe's undocumented present" (p. 19), a means to bear witness to the violence of border regimes and the ideologies that sustain them.

La Lande and the other "Jungles" of Calais constitute one of a proliferating number of locations within the shifting geography of the European borderlands, place-names that have a dubious renown in relation to the numerous migrant crises to wrack the continent over the past ten years. According to the International Organization for Migration, over 21,000 people have died attempting to enter Europe from the Mediterranean Sea since 2014. [2] Hicks and Mallet report that at the Calais border, there have been over 200 deaths since the early 2000s—the stowaways, the Channel swimmers, the victims of beatings and of suicides. At its peak, the La Lande encampment was a temporary home to over 10,000 displaced people. Since its dismantling in 2016, the formerly contaminated industrial site has been "re-naturalized," and in a singular example of the cruel ironies of human history, now serves as a Natura 2000 coastal reserve for migrating birds.

Readers interested in a comprehensive elucidation of the chronology, politics, and conditions of the successive "Jungles" at Calais will not find it in this book. [3] Such information is provided in intermittent passages but is not the focus. Rather, in this slim volume, the authors undertake to upend and displace such linear accountings. Their project, which they qualify as an exercise in contemporary archaeology, aims to render unexceptional the exceptionalness of La Lande, to show how it is continuous in time and space with broader politics of definition and containment, and to break with its conceptualization as a "camp" or an "event"—a discrete happening, neatly inscribed in space. La Lande was rather, they state (citing geographer Oli Mould), "a *de facto* slum of London" (p. 45), a position along the UK's "outsourced border" (p. 4), a "chronotype" that is

repeatedly destroyed but always there (p. 50), one outpost among many along the multi-faceted frontier that sustains the geopolitics of (post)colonial power. It was also, they say, before being cleared, a site of new imaginaries, of utopian “resistance against the border regime” (p. 70), of a vision, however ephemeral, of an alternative to the exclusionary logics that undergird the order of things.

The first of the Calais “Jungles” dates to the late 1990s, when the Red Cross opened a facility for displaced people in the midst of the Kosovo refugee crisis. Other encampments followed throughout the first decade and a half of the twenty-first century, to be met in regular succession with high-profile demolition campaigns. The intent, as former British Home Secretary Theresa May stated in 2012, was to create a “really hostile environment” in order to discourage “illegal” migrants from entering the UK, a policy that extended to the implementation of deterrence policies in the Calais borderlands.[4] Consecutive to the 1994 opening of the Channel Tunnel and the 1995 implementation of the European Schengen accords, the Calais encampments reflect the simultaneous expansion and contraction of the European project, which has facilitated new market flows while re-calibrating citizenship to render the status of the “immigrant” synonymous with the non-European. Advertisements for the Eurotunnel shuttle proclaim that it is now possible to go from Folkestone to Calais in just thirty-five minutes. The Calais “Jungles” stand as a stark reminder that such facility of movement was never intended for more than the happy few, and for, as Theresa May put it, the “British haulers [who] work tirelessly to keep our economy moving.”[5]

The majority of migrants in Calais who have sought entry into Great Britain come from former protectorates of the British Empire—Afghanistan, Sudan, South Sudan, Somalia, Eritrea, Syria, and Iraq. Hicks and Mallet argue that is important to recall these lineages and trace their convergence in Calais because to do otherwise, to forget the colonial connections, is to reinforce a reading of the crisis as literally a current event, with shallow temporal origins on other, far away shores. Such accounts provide fodder for what they call the “imperial enactment of Britain as a just and good place” (p. 63), that bolsters depictions of migrants as perfect strangers and justifies complicating their entry into countries to which they have imperial ties. Moreover history itself, they argue—temporality and change and the power to control access to both—comprises a weapon in the politics of border control. To recall history is to push against the numbing effects of its suppression. “At the Calais ‘Jungles,’” they write, “impermanence is a form of governance, an artificial limbo of timelessness....The experience of displacement here is a condition of waiting, of unsafe boredom, of the banal everyday experience of wasting time collapsed into immobile transit” (p. 54). The power to dole out time, to determine who can advance and who must wait, intensifies the erosion of self-determination in the camps. “This is a cosmopolitics of differential access to time,” they state, “a mode of existence that produces difference through the withholding of duration” (p. 51). Also withheld is access to time’s rewards: “I was surprised that I saw no houses, no electricity, there were just shelters,” Muhammed, from Syria, stated upon his arrival. “I arrived knowing no one, with no connections, to see a place that belonged to the European Middle Ages” (p.52).[6]

Together, the British and French governments have spent hundreds of millions of euros to ensure border protections in Calais. Deterrence has translated into drones and dogs, heat sensors to locate stowaways, tear gas and pepper spray, sleep deprivation, “baton strikes on the top of the legs to break items in trouser pockets” (p. 34), and in a particularly cruel symbolic gesture, depriving migrants of a single shoe, as if to stop them literally in their tracks, as if to say their

arduous journeys would never amount to more than this, arrival in a dehumanized camp only thirty-five kilometers from their desired destination. “The police come in the night-time,” a refugee named Fahad states. “They cut the tent with blades” (p. 31). It is perhaps only in such contexts, and in relation to the exclusionary logics that uphold them, that decisions such as that made in 2016 to move people living in tents and shanties into shipping containers with bunkbeds (twelve people to a container) can be qualified as “humanitarian” (p. 37). Such are the dictates of these border regimes that sublimate gestures of care to the apparently more pressing demands of containment and control.

La Lande was also, however, a space of resistance. Hicks and Mallet seek not only to exhume the logics that sustain the camps and their politics of dissuasion, but also to “give time,” as they put it, to the array of gestures and connections that took hold across these meeting grounds. “The practices of care were both human-centered and materially focused in building safety and dignity,” they write, “with advice, information, support, translation, and the creation of spaces for women and children alongside the distribution of food, shoes, shelter, clothing, sleeping bags, blankets, firewood, and sanitary and medical supplies. Here were architectures of dignity and care—toothbrushes for example, and the ongoing needs of warm meals, clothing, phone recharging, firewood, wi-fi” (p. 70). All too often pushed away as ephemeral or hardly significant in relation to the business-as-usual exigencies of borderwork, such gestures demand our attention precisely because they break with the dominant logics of difference, fear, exceptionality and crisis that frame the camps. As acts of “utopian resistance,” they open a breach in the patina of things as they are, to accord presence to the camps and the people who move through them. Refusing the discursive framings that relegate these events to the short-term spatio-temporal zones of “emergency” and “crisis,” such acts reveal new and potentially significant social bonds in the process of becoming, signaling in the process a politics built on principles of humanitarian engagement in counter-distinction to the fixed and fixing enactments of differentiation and difference that underscore the exclusionary practices of border control.

It is in relation to this final point that this complex book makes its most significant contribution. Deeply critical of the (post)colonial regimes of the Global North that have seen such locations flourish, Hicks and Mallet take their most pointed aim against the intellectual habits that bolster views of the camps and the walls and the untold deaths from attempted crossings as temporary exceptions to the more comforting view of sovereign states acting within their rights to control their borders. They argue in particular with scholars in anthropology and refugee studies who advance situational accounts of the camps at the expense of historically and geographically engaged analyses that show how these phenomena conspire with neocolonial strategies to contain persons even as channels are opened to unequal and disproportionately unidirectional capitalist flows.^[7] And they assert that if anthropology is to have any relevance in the present, it must do more than make the social constructivist point that boundaries define difference, to investigate instead the larger political economies that those boundaries serve and/or seek to resist. Analysis of borderwork, they argue, is rightly the domain of anthropology, “a discipline with a unique conception of the diversity of human worlds” (p. 107). At issue is not only the constructedness of diverse social configurations but, far more compelling and politically cogent, how those constructions are tied to struggles for resources, for survival, for political gain.

In the absence of the exhibit that this book was designed to accompany,^[8] it can be difficult to grasp the scope of the actions and artifacts that inform the authors’ reflections. The book favors far-reaching thematic inquiry over ethnographic description or linear exposition. Black-and-

white photographs by Caroline Gregory that accompany the text help, however, to provide context. Gregory sums up what she was after in the book's preface: "It wasn't a period of constant happenings" she writes about life in the camps; "most of it became some kind of normal life...and I think it's important to show that...What these photos bear witness to is both extraordinary and painfully ordinary: flowers in front of a house, a man making chips, young men playing football...Only by taking our time and looking beyond the urgency can we really understand La Lande in all its contradictions" (pp. vii-viii). To locate the extraordinary in the painfully ordinary is at the center of the anthropological endeavor. What is significant about this work is its authors' discernment of the transgressive meanings of those everyday gestures, that potentially challenge established orders of separation and reveal the powers that produce them. It is this, they assert, that constitutes the work before us, of staying attentive to grassroots refusals of parochial divisions and to efforts to create more inclusive ties.

"I came for human rights," an Afghan man cited in the book states (p. 33). The tragedy and trauma of the European response to the so-called "migrant crisis" knocking at its gates lie in habits of division that confuse and contradict its highest ideals. This is a compelling book that challenges us to re-think those habits, to reach for broader conceptions of shared humanity as a necessary prelude to the achievement of a more just social order.

NOTES

[1] "Démantèlement de la « Jungle »: Fabienne Buccio, la ète du Pas-de-Calais en première ligne," *La Voix du Nord* (29 October 2016); <https://www.lavoixdunord.fr/66830/article/2016-10-29/fabienne-buccio-la-prefete-du-pas-de-calais-en-premiere-ligne>, consulted 12 July 2021.

[2] <https://missingmigrants.iom.int/region/mediterranean>, consulted 9 July 2021.

[3] There is considerable speculation about the origins of the term "jungle" to designate the Calais encampments. According to French anthropologist Michel Agier, the word derives from the Pashto word "*dzhangal*," meaning "forest or wooded area," first used to refer to Afghan refugee camps in Pakistan (p. 2). The racist overtones of the word are not to be discounted.

[4] <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/0/theresa-may-interview-going-give-illegal-migrants-really-hostile/>, consulted 9 July 2021.

[5] <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/home-secretary-statement-on-illegal-immigration-in-calais>, consulted 9 July 2021.

[6] Quoted from M. Godin, K. Møller Hansen, A. Lounasmaa, C. Squire and T. Zaman, eds., *Voices from the 'Jungle': Stories from the Calais refugee camp*. London: Pluto Press, 2017.

[7] Hicks and Mallet are particularly critical of the work of Michel Agier. For alternative ethnographic accounts see, among others, Catherine Besteman, *Making Refugee: Somali Bantu Refugees and Lewiston, Maine* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2016) and Liisa H. Malkki, *Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory, and National Cosmology among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

[8] The authors address the contradictions latent in their decision to mount this exhibit in the Pitt Rivers Museum, a prototype of the nineteenth-century ethnographic museum built on the technologies of objectification and cataloguing that they seek to expose. Rather than bypass the institution's colonial history, they argue that it must be taken on. "The predicament of both the border and the museum is a (post)colonial one, and thus one of the ongoing obligations formed through an unfinished imperial past. The anthropological museum is always already, as was La Lande, in part a monument to national shame. That is the point of departure for our Pitt Rivers exhibit" (p. 84).

Beth S. Epstein
New York University Paris
be16@nyu.edu

Copyright © 2021 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for edistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of *H-France Review* nor republication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on *H-France Review* are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

ISSN 1553-9172